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Abstract

This case study dissertation examined a third level institution that has recently begun to promote research among its faculty, notwithstanding the fact that many faculty members are currently independently research-active. This institution is one of two private colleges in Ireland to have launched an institutional repository. At present, the repository is primarily populated with student theses. The study covered three research objectives using a mixed methods approach. The first research objective examined why and how this institution was promoting research. It also examined the barriers that faculty face when conducting research in non-research institutions. The first objective identified numerous advantages that can be realised by this institution by conducting research; these include enhanced lecturer engagement, enhanced college reputation, attracting high achievers and offering a superior product to potential students. The primary barrier to conducting research was identified as a lack of time. The second research objective aimed to capture how aware lecturers were of repositories in general and the case study’s repository in particular. The survey findings revealed a high awareness of both. Finally, the broadest research objective captured lecturers’ attitudes to open access and institutional repositories. These attitudes are what cause lecturers to deposit onto repositories or not. These research objective findings revealed that a substantial majority of faculty believe that academic research should be open access; however, in relation to the other types of output from the institution, respondents expressed reservations about particular content. Respondents concurred with the stated institutional and personal benefits associated with IR contribution and the common concerns highlighted to respondents were mostly rejected. The survey also found that partaking in this research had favourably changed attitudes for a minority of respondents. In closing, the dissertation suggests measures the college can take to resource-effectively produce research and initiatives the Library can implement to increase faculty contributions to the repository.
Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Dissertation Aims, Institutional Repositories and Open Access

This dissertation aims to investigate the awareness and attitudes of faculty members towards institutional repositories at a teaching college which currently promotes research. In relation to research in “non-research” institutions, this dissertation will examine the approaches that a college can adopt in order to promote and support research, also the challenges that its faculty face when attempting to conduct research will be examined.

Barton and Waters of MIT (Developer of D-Space repository software) (2004-2005) define an institutional repository (IR) as “a database with a set of services to capture, store, index, preserve and redistribute a university’s scholarly research in digital formats” (Barton & Waters, 2004-2005, p.10). The EU’s ALFA Fr. (Latin America Academic Training) Programme, which encourages university cooperation between the EU and Latin America, broadened the scope of potential institutions that can use an IR to include all higher education institutions. With this definition the potential deposit material range is increased to include research output, teaching materials, administrative documents and grey literature (ALFA Network, 2007, p.63). Drake goes further, contending that any organisation can use and adapt an IR (2004, p. 41). However, central to all definitions of an IR is the concept of openness and interoperability; this means that the IR is OAI (Open Archives Initiative) compliant (Barton & Waters, 2004-2005, p. 10) which facilitates open access to scholarly research.

The open access movement began in the early 1990s in conjunction with the rapid expansion of the internet, from which, a new model for disseminating research evolved. Open Access (OA) publishing involves providing unrestricted access to peer reviewed journals via the internet. All associated publishing costs are funded through means other than subscriptions (Laakso et al., 2011, p. 1). The resulting journal titles are listed on the Directory of Open
Access Journals, which currently has nearly 4,000 journal titles searchable at article level (DOAJ, 2012). The primary difference between OA journals (Gold OA) and IR articles (Green OA) relates to the peer-review process. It is facilitated by the former as opposed to the latter (Suber, 2012). However, repositories can hold content that has been peer reviewed. IRs allow an author to disseminate their research to a large worldwide audience by means of metadata and search engines which according to Swan can increase the impact of their work. This occurs by others citing (quoting) an author’s work more frequently when substantiating their own research (2010, pp. 4-17).

1.2 Repositories in Ireland

According to the Registry of Open Access Repositories, there are currently 16 repositories in Ireland; this is in line with other similar sized European countries such as Denmark and Norway (16 each) (ROAR, 2012). All research contained within these IRs can be discovered via the individual IR interface or through a search engine. Of the 16 Irish IRs, the educational IR with the largest amount of content is Trinity’s Tara Repository, to date 6,465 items have been deposited on it ranging from conference papers to journal articles (RIAN, 2012).

In 2010 eight of the Irish public higher education institutions funded by the Government’s “Strategic Innovation Fund” and under the auspices of the Irish Universities Association launched an IR portal called RIAN. This portal took three years to develop and had a budget of €1.6 million. RIAN links the IRs of the individual members which allows harvesting of their content. This interconnectivity enabled the RIAN project to deliver its principle objectives, namely, showcasing Irish research and increasing the research profiles of individual researchers and their respective institutions (RIAN, 2012). As RIAN is a collaborative project of public institutions, there is no provision for the IR of a private college
to join the portal. To date there are only two such repositories, The RCSI’s e-publications@RCSI and DBS’s eSource (ROAR, 2012.)

1.3 Dublin Business School

Dublin Business School (DBS) is Ireland’s largest private third level institution, originally established in 1975 as an institution offering preparation programmes for professional accountancy examinations; the college has grown rapidly through acquisitions and expansion. DBS describes itself as a “student focused teaching institution” (DBS, 2010, p. 33), a description that is acknowledged by DBS’s principle accreditor, HETAC (2011, p. 31). The most recent publicly available numbers (2009) recorded 8,738 students enrolled in over 100 accredited courses. These courses span business, law, humanities and computer science. The majority of programmes at DBS now lead to HETAC (Higher Education and Training Awards Council) awards levels 6-9, the programmes are delivered by (2009) 81 full-time and 217 part-time lecturers (HETAC, pp. 43-45). One of the current strategic planning priorities of the college is to consolidate its position in the Irish third level sector, achieved by further developing and enhancing academic structures, systems and processes (HETAC, 2011, p. 19). In 2011 DBS began providing programmes to jobseekers via the Higher Education Authority’s (HEA) publically funded Springboard Programme (Irish Independent, 2011). The current academic committee structure (Figure 1) of this teaching institution includes a research committee, with responsibility for “research strategy and development” (DBS, 2009, p. 4).
DBS’s Institutional Repository, eSource was launched in May 2010 and registered in March 2012 (ROAR, 2012), with the aim of collecting works produced by DBS’s academic staff and students. Consistent with the teaching and learning focus of DBS, the repository’s potential content range is quite varied. These potential deposits include journal articles, books, book chapters, conference papers, teaching resources, student essays, student theses and audio-visual material (eSource, 2012). With regard to the actual uploading of resources onto eSource, the Library has made all the required documentation available on the e-learning platform (Moodle). The contributor downloads the documentation, gives consent and forwards the deposit to the Library for uploading onto eSource (Moodle, no date).
1.5 Current Situation

At present (July 2012) there are 188 items on the repository, of these deposits; the majority are student theses, both postgraduate and undergraduate (128). Of the remaining items, the second largest collection belongs to the Literature, Drama and Film Department and consists mostly of student photographic works. What is noticeable is the absence of staff contributions. To date, five faculty members have contributed to eSource. These contributions consist of one PhD dissertation, five translations, four conference papers and two journal articles (eSource, 2012).

1.6 Comprehensive OA and IR Literature Review

In Ireland, there has been little, if any research undertaken in recent years aimed at measuring faculty attitudes to OA and IRs. The jurisdiction with the most similar educational structure to Ireland is the UK; however, private third level education is not well established there. Therefore, a recent comprehensive mixed methods survey that attempted to gauge and
measure researchers’ and academics’ attitude to OA and IRs will be briefly analysed. This survey was carried out in 2011 at Loughborough University in the UK by the Library and Research Office. The survey built upon previous work undertaken by the Library which revealed that a high percentage of academics felt the IR was unimportant, a scenario possibly replicated at DBS. The survey received 161 respondents (7.8 per cent response rate), the findings of which, revealed that a large majority of respondents were in favour of OA with 82 per cent either “mildly” or “strongly” in favour of the principle of OA.

At Loughborough, the faculty’s general attitude to IRs was positive with 80 per cent being either “mildly” or “strongly” in favour of using an OA repository. There was a high awareness of the IR with 81 per cent of faculty knowing of the repository’s existence, of this percentage, 69 per cent indicated that they were currently contributing to the IR. The qualitative comments from the questionnaire attempted to ascertain how the institution could encourage more contribution to the IR. The barriers outlined by respondents that had prevented contribution included a lack of quality control, copyright issues and time constraints. The possible incentives to contribute identified by respondents included financial support, practical advice and more promotion of the IR (Appleton et al., 2012). The study was considered to be positive, owing to the fact that previous studies had indicated a low regard for the IR. The study concluded with 7 recommendations such as raising awareness of the IR further, promoting the benefits of IR contribution and allaying the primary concerns and reservations expressed in the questionnaire.
1.7 Research Objectives

As previously mentioned, there has been a negligible amount of research conducted in Ireland aimed at measuring awareness of, and capturing attitudes to IRs in educational institutions. A search via TCD’s Stella Discovery Tool, DBS’s EBSCO Discovery Tool and Google Scholar confirmed this situation. This dissertation not only adds to the negligible amount of research of IRs in Ireland, it is also a case study of an educational institution that is in quite a unique situation. This institution is in the Irish private sector, it describes itself as a “teaching institution” although research is actively promoted, at least on paper, and it has an IR with an insignificant amount of faculty content. This dissertation therefore has three research objectives:

- To examine research policy and promotion at this teaching institution and the challenges associated with conducting research at DBS.
- To measure how aware DBS faculty members are of IRs, as both an author and reader.
- To capture the attitudes that DBS faculty members hold in relation to OA and IRs and to determine whether these attitudes and/or other factors affect contribution/willingness to contribute to the IR.

This dissertation will pay particular attention to the third research objective. Promoting research and raising awareness of repositories will not, in themselves result in contribution to an IR. It is an individual’s willingness or unwillingness to contribute, influenced by their attitudes and other factors that results in actual contribution to the IR. Therefore, faculty attitudes and factors that affect attitudes will receive the most attention in both the literature review and the primary research.
1.8 Research Approach

This dissertation will take an eight step approach to the research:

- One: introduce repositories, the case study and its current unique situation; also demonstrate that there was a need for research in this area.
- Two: outline the general research objectives of this dissertation.
- Three: select the research methodology that will answer the research questions.
- Four: comprise specific research questions for each objective.
- Five: comprehensive literature review for each objective.
- Six: analyse the survey and transcribe the interviews.
- Seven: analyse the results, compare to existing literature and discuss in relation to aforementioned objectives.
- Eight: conclude with recommendations for case study institution.

1.9 Dissertation Structure

This dissertation will be divided into nine chapters. Chapter One will outline OA, IRs, RIAN and introduce the case study institution and its repository, it will also outline the research objectives and approach. Chapter Two will detail the research methodology, the research philosophies will be outlined and the research methods introduced and justified. This dissertation has three separate but interrelated research objectives. The final objective, which relates to faculty attitudes, is the broadest. Five chapters will contain a separate literature review, primary research and analysis of the findings, the first two of these chapters will be dedicated to the first two research objectives. The final research objective will have three dedicated chapters.
Chapter Three will examine the issues related to research practice and promotion at DBS, while Chapter Four will measure awareness of IRs and examine eSource promotion. The final and broader research objective, which examines faculty attitudes, will span three chapters, with each chapter exploring different factors. Chapter Five will explore general attitudes to OA, the necessity of eSource and attitudes to certain materials being OA. Chapter Six will investigate the benefits and concerns that have been articulated about IRs. Chapter Seven will outline and examine the factors that can affect contribution to an IR, and will investigate whether information changes faculty attitudes to IRs. Chapter Eight will contain a summary, conclusion and some recommendations for DBS. Chapter Nine will contain a self-reflection learning account experienced by the researcher in completing this MSc dissertation. The dissertation will finish with a reference list and appendices respectively.
Chapter Two: Methodology

2.1 Introduction

The primary objective of research is to discover answers to questions by means of the application of scientific procedures (Kothari, 1990, p.2). This chapter will outline the elements of the methodology that will be employed to fulfil the research objectives. Saunders et al. (2009) outlined certain practical issues that arise when carrying out research. These issues include time constraints, sample size and financial costs. For this research the primary constraints are time, sample size and the responsiveness of potential respondents.

The research methodology itself primarily assists the researcher in addressing questions and analysing the responses to these questions. There are several different ways that a researcher can approach research, Saunders et al. (2009) advice that the Research Onion approach is employed, this approach comprises the following segments:

- Research Philosophy
- Research Approach
- Research Strategy
- Time Horizons
- Data Collection
2.2 Research Philosophy

The research onion presented above represents the nature of knowledge and its development. According to Saunders et al. (2009) the research philosophy chosen by the researcher will reflect assumptions that the researcher has of the world. These philosophies are found on the outer layer of the onion; here Saunders identified several philosophies, such as positivism, interpretivism, realism and subjectivism among others. Creswell adds to Saunders list of philosophies with post-positivism and constructivism being identified (2009, p.6).

2.2.1 Positivism

Positivism is a structured approach that a researcher uses to replicate or test a theory. This approach is more associated with quantitative research. Data is collected and the researcher then makes interpretations about the data. Using statistical analysis, the interpretations will then be generalized and quantified. Positivism treats the research subject in a social reality, it
is a deductive approach where the researcher develops a theory and then subjects it to testing in the form of measurable hypotheses.

2.2.2 Interpretivism

Interpretivism is aligned with qualitative research. It attempts to understand organizational behaviour, marketing, library management and HRM. Interpretivism suggests that the differences between humans as “social actors” must be understood. An emphatic perspective is required by the researcher in order to understand the world from the subject’s point of view (Saunders et al., 2009).

2.2.3 Philosophy Chosen for this Research

This research will use an approach that emerged from positivism, namely, post-positivism (Creswell) and interpretivism (Saunders). Positivism maintains the existence of an absolute truth of knowledge; whereas post-positivism insists that we cannot be positive about our claims of knowledge when studying the behaviour and actions of humans (Creswell, 2009, p. 7). Although the researcher is not testing a hypothesis, several of the attitudes will be captured by allowing the respondent to either accept or reject statements in the quantitative part of the research; each statement can in itself be considered a hypothesis. An example of one of these statements from the research survey is shown here:

“Institutions that engage in research attract higher quality students”

Post-positivism’s contention that the personal values of researchers influence the value of their study is another reason why this research falls into this school (Ridenour, C., 2008, p.25). As the researcher is the agent who devises the statements to be rejected or accepted, the value system and world view of the researcher will influence the assertions. The aforementioned example is worded in a way that implies that the researcher believes it to be
true, although a respondent could completely reject the statement. Also, according to Creswell (2009, p.7) positivism mandates the existence of absolute truths and seeks to uncover them, whereas research, such as this which examines attitudes cannot be totally positivist.

2.3 Research Approach

The second layer of the research onion outlines the research approach. Saunders (2009, p. 124) suggests that a researcher can adopt two different research approaches, namely a deductive or an inductive approach. The former deductive approach is used when the researcher wishes to develop a theory from observations and empirical evidence; therefore, the results offer more flexibility. The resulting research will be focused on the context in which events occur and a theory will be developed. The latter inductive approach attempts to develop a hypothesis in order to test a theory.

2.3.1 Chosen Research Approach

For this dissertation neither of Saunders aforementioned approaches seems appropriate, as previously indicated there has been negligible research conducted in Ireland in relation to IRs, Irish research on establishing an IR in a “teaching institution” is non-existent. This dissertation does not expect to develop a theory nor does it seek to prove or disprove a hypothesis. This research is an explanatory study that aims to uncover casual relationships between variables. Explanatory studies attempt to study a situation (transition to research) or a problem (low IR contribution) (Saunders et al., p. 140). This research could also be classified as descriptive; its aim is to “portray an accurate profile of persons, events or situations” (Robson, 2002, cited in Saunders et al. 2009, p. 140).
2.4 Research Strategy

Saunders lists several different strategies that can be employed, among these strategies are experiments, case studies, survey and grounded theory (2009, p. 141). A survey is associated with the deductive approach, it is used to answer who, what, where and how questions, therefore it is used frequently for explanatory/exploratory and descriptive research (p. 144). Interviews can be categorized as either structured or semi-structured; the former uses an identical set of questions for interviewees, while the latter uses themes instead of questions (p. 320). The interview of an explanatory/exploratory study allows the researcher to discover more insight into a particular topic; also, in descriptive studies a structured interview allows patterns to be identified (p. 322).

2.4.1 Research Strategy Choice

This research will use a mixed methods approach for gathering the data, Saunders emphasises that this approach has become more common within business and management research (p. 151). The survey (quantitative research) will be sent to all lecturing staff with the hope that a significant number of responses are received. This research is aimed at capturing awareness and attitudes of faculty members during a transitional moment in time (move to research); therefore, the use of a questionnaire with certain statements being accepted and/or rejected by means of a likert scale seemed like the best choice. The secondary literature revealed that librarians are more comfortable with the terminology and objectives associated with OA and IRs; therefore, the questionnaire was structured primarily by outlining findings that were discovered via the literature review and then allowing the participant to accept or reject these findings. The interviews will give more insight as the survey will only have one open question. The interviews will attempt to capture the respondents’ willingness/unwillingness to contribute to eSource and their personal experiences of barriers/incentives encountered in
relation to research. They will be in a semi-structured format, with each responded being asked identical questions while allowing the researcher to probe and draw out the aforementioned themes.

### 2.5 Time Horizons

Regarding time horizons, according to Saunders et al. (2009) there are two types, cross-sectional and longitudinal studies. A cross-sectional study involves a study of a population or a subset of it at a specific point in time, a cross-sectional study is a descriptive study of a population. A longitudinal study involves repeated observations of a population over a period of time; it is a type of observational study used to study trends emerging. For this research a cross-sectional study will be done. The research questions aim to capture opinions and attitudes of a respondent at a specific moment in time. The opinion is only required once for this study, consequently a cross-sectional study is the most appropriate time horizon for both the qualitative (interviews) and quantitative (survey) research.

### 2.6 Primary Quantitative Data Collection

The primary data for the survey was collected via an online questionnaire designed and administered with Survey-monkey. The researcher had access to an unlimited Survey-monkey account and was already familiar with its features. Also, using an online provider allowed for the survey to be disseminated by an imbedded link via email. Email is the preferred method of communication within DBS, therefore it was decided that this was the best method to target a large number of potential respondents. A cover letter was sent along with the email. This cover letter introduced the topic of research and also defined what an OA repository was. The covering email also contained a link to eSource and invited the respondent to view it before participating in the survey. It was felt that if respondents were
not given a definition of OA, or were unsure what eSource was, there was a chance of incomplete responses.

The questionnaire consisted of a variety of topics covered in 23 closed questions and 1 open question, several questions had sub-questions. The topics were mixed up to keep attention focused on the question at hand. Many of the likert scale questions were based on findings that had emerged from the literature review.

- Participant Background Information:
  - Discipline/Full or part time/research history.
- Awareness of IRs as reader and author.
- Willingness/unwillingness to contribute.
- Rating incentives to conduct research.
- Approval/disapproval of certain content appearing on the IR.
- Sharing/disregarding perceived concerns.
- Sharing/disregarding potential institutional benefits of hosting an IR.
- Sharing/disregarding potential personal benefits of depositing on an IR.
- Closing question measuring whether taking survey had changed attitudes.

2.7 Primary Qualitative Data Collection

Interviews 1-3: The full-time lecturer interviews (L1, L2 and L3) were recorded with a Dictaphone to be transcribed and coded at a later stage. The researcher approached faculty members that were known to be research active and asked them to participate. The interviews took approximately 20 minutes and consisted of 9 questions aimed at exploring the five themes of willingness/unwillingness, attitude to OA and incentives/barriers. Active researchers were chosen because encountered incentives and barriers were to be examined as opposed to hypothetical ones. As each interviewee has their own individual reasons for
contributing or not contributing (interpretivism) this qualitative method was utilized in order to allow respondents to articulate their own opinions and views.

Interview 4: Research Committee Member (RCM) also took approximately 20 minutes. This interview’s primary objective was to discover the role of the Research Committee. Its other objective was to explore the benefits, incentives and barriers associated with conducting research at DBS; this was achieved by asking 10 questions.

There were also 2 short email interviews with targeted respondents; the first was with the Academic Director and aimed to explore the motives behind DBS’s transition to research, the second was with the Digitization Librarian, it aimed to investigate the Library’s role in relation to populating and promoting eSource.

2.8 Data Analysis

This research will employ Survey-monkey to gather and analyze the quantitative data. The different levels of measurement being employed will produce categorical responses, ordinal responses (likert), and interval/ration responses. This will allow descriptive statistics to be carried out. Cross-tabulation will also be conducted along with graphical representation of the affecting factors.

2.9 Population and Response

The population for the qualitative research was all lecturers in DBS; the amount of addresses on the departmental email lists was 265. Therefore, this is how many lecturers were targeted, however, 13 emails were returned indicating an incorrect address and 14 sent back an out-of-office reply. This would indicate a sample of 238. A reminder was sent out one week later, resulting in 13 returned incorrect addresses and 13 out-of-office replies, therefore the sample
average for both is 237. The number of responses was 56, all successfully completed producing a response rate of 23.62 per cent.

2.10 Ethical Issues

- Researcher will seek the consent of the Academic Directory prior to disseminating the survey.
- Researcher guaranteed questionnaire anonymity.
- Recipients were targeted by being listed in group email lists.
- Researcher did not pick specific respondents.
- Initial email outlined that this was in house research connected to a student’s dissertation.
- It was outlined that this research had the support of the Academic Director.
- The survey results were only accessible by logging on to Survey-monkey.
- Interview transcripts did not contain the name of the interviewee.
- Transcripts were kept in a drop-box folder that required a username and password.

2.11 Limitations of Research

The limitations of the research are time and response rate; there was pressure to have the survey circulated before the faculty left the college for the summer. The researcher works full time and this created limitations with regard to the amount of time that could be dedicated to the research.

The following chapter will address the first research objective, which relates to research at teaching institutions, by way of four research questions.
Chapter Three

3.1 Research Questions

- Why would a teaching institution promote research among faculty?
- How is research promoted at DBS?
- Are lecturers research-active?
- What barriers exist to conducting research in DBS?

3.2 Introduction and Literature Review

Publicly funded higher education in Ireland is faced with a financing challenge. Demand has increased for the services of the higher education institutions while their funding has, at best, stagnated. In 2009 the public institutions had 42,500 new entrants; a number that will increase to 50,000 by 2015. It is projected that this increased demand will come primarily from postgraduate students (Strategy Group, 2011, p. 44). As the sector will require an additional €500 million per year over the next ten years in order to cope with increased demand, the reintroduction of student fees seems inevitable (Flynn, 2012).

The Department of Education and Skills commissioned the Strategy Group to produce a report outlining higher education policy and strategies up to 2030. The resulting 2011 Hunt Report acknowledged the important role that research would play in future years within Irish higher education. It also acknowledged that in future the role of the private sector in relation to publicly funded education provision will increase (2011, p. 23). Many of the submissions received by the Strategy Group when compiling the report confirmed a commitment by the public institutions to the integration of research, scholarship, teaching and learning in the future. Specific to the “teaching” institution would be “research-led” teaching; this is a curriculum that is informed by the research interests of the lecturer (Strategy Group, pp. 53-
This vision of teaching and learning being informed by research has been introduced into the private educational sector by way of being incorporated into HETAC’s accreditation standards. Recommendations that were suggested in HETAC’s institutional review of DBS in 2010 demonstrate this approach:

“The panel considers that it is important for teaching and learning to be informed by research, and encourages DBS to enhance opportunities for staff and students to participate in research and scholarship activities”  (HETAC, 2010, p. 31)

John Kelly, President of The Independent College, Dublin, foresees a time when students, both public and private, can, as in the UK and USA, apply for state funding for research at postgraduate level. At present only students in public institutions can apply for this funding. Mr Kelly acknowledges that an impediment to this scenario is the fact that the research output of private colleges from both staff and students does not currently compare well with that of the universities (Kelly, 2012).

3.3 Challenges and Solutions for Teaching Colleges

The challenge for the private teaching college is to respond to the requirements of three principle stakeholders in a measured manner. The central stakeholder is the fee paying student who demands a high quality product, delivered by experts, that reflects increasing fees (Hawawini, 2005, pp.770-778). Another financial stakeholder is the HEA, which recommends that teaching is based on research. The final stakeholder is the accreditation body for Irish private teaching institutions, HETAC, which advises DBS to facilitate faculty research in order to establish the aforementioned HEA recommendations. The establishment of a research culture will allow the teaching college to meet these demands. The possibility of securing public funding for postgraduate research will also be aided by the establishment and
nurturing of a research culture which, in turn, requires the establishment of a research strategy, the promotion of research and the removal of barriers to research.

### 3.4 Transition Strategy

Hawawini (2005), in articulating the issues facing business schools in the developed world, stipulated that in modern and complex economies, the traditional business school will have to evolve in order to meet the demands of both students and employers. When an institution is charging high tuition fees, they need to be justified. A noticeable way to do this is to invest in the intellectual capital of the institution. Hawawini contends that this investment comes in the form of a “highly qualified faculty with lighter teaching loads and generous research budgets”. Also, a good practice of college management is to identify the school’s strategic choices in relation to conducting research and to execute that strategy in an efficient manner. Hawawini identifies two possible directions that a business school can take; the first option is to become primarily a research orientated institution that delivers quality business education in order to fund its research program. The second option is for the business school to remain as a teaching institution where some research is conducted, in this scenario, the primary objective of conducting research would be to enrich the teaching (2005, pp. 770-778).

### 3.5 Research Promotion

In relation to promoting research among a faculty that have not traditionally engaged in research, Khojasteh and Herring (2002) acknowledge that it is a challenge to motivate a faculty that has traditionally conducted teaching as opposed to conducting research. The authors identify different factors, both primary and secondary which an institution can use in order to promote research among teaching faculty. The first primary factor that can encourage research is called the “Self-fulfilling Prophecy” effect; this essentially means that a particular expectation being held will cause that expectation to be matched. For example:
A’s expectations for B will cause A to treat B differently, and consequently B will respond in such a way that confirms A’s expectations.

By means of this method, a unit or group can raise the expectations of faculty by setting higher standards in relation to the quality and/or quantity of research production. Social and intellectual capital can also play a key role in the development of a research culture within an organisation. Social capital is social networking with colleagues who have similar objectives, whereas intellectual capital is knowledge and the creation of knowledge, the combination of these is the second primary factor. The authors ascertained that these aforementioned primary factors were essential in motivating all faculty members.

Secondary factors compliment the primary factors, and an institution that wishes to establish a research culture need not employ all of them, but each one, in its own right increases motivation among faculty. Secondary factors include institutional support, creating a research culture, implementing research-based teaching, jointly setting faculty research goals, time allocation and recognition (Khojasteh & Herring, 2002).

### 3.6 Barriers to Conducting Research

Boone (2009) outlined the challenges faced by faculty members who wish to conduct research within a private teaching institution. He restates the often heard barrier to conducting research, namely a lack of time, but also suggests that at his teaching institution (private college) a primary reason for not allocating time for research is a lack of interest among the faculty. However, he acknowledges other challenges and barriers to conducting research exist in institutions where it is traditionally not supported. These impediments include: lack of tangible resources/infrastructure support, lack of financial/human resources, competing time demands, no rewards for conducting research, research not being prioritised and frequent changes in administration, among others (Boone, 2009).
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3.7 Background Questions

This question was used to ascertain the amount of faculty members that have conducted research, 30 respondents indicated that they had conducted research outside their teaching remit, whereas 26 respondents had not conducted research.

Figure 4: Independent Research
The follow on question attempted to discover whether this research was published. The respondents were evenly split; half of respondents (15) indicated that their research has been published compared to 15 who had not been published.

![Figure 5: Published Research](image)

The fact that many lecturers are currently research active was further emphasised by the RCM:

“A lot of people here are research active and have been research active for a long time”

This fact is substantiated by the DBS website which was recently re-launched with additional information and features, one of which is a “staff profile” section. Here the potential student can browse the faculty members and review their professional activities including publications. Several faculty members have been quite research active including one psychoanalysis lecturer who has authored or co-authored 8 books and 27 research articles and a School of Business faculty member with 9 articles produced in the previous 6 years.
3.8 Rationale for Lecturers Conducting Research

The question was asked whether a lecturer needed to be conducting research in order to keep up with developments in their respective field, the RCM thought that this was important for certain disciplines:

“Absolutely, I think it’s very important, very beneficial...because whenever you are teaching you are talking about knowledge, you are handing down information, facts or assumptions. This is going to be based on research because most of knowledge is derived from research, so having an understanding of the research process is really important when you are conveying that research to students. That’s going to vary depending on the discipline, so obviously psychology is something that is based on research findings so I think that most psychologists, psychology lecturers would have done some research”

This link between research and lecturing in specific disciplines was also highlighted by the Academic Director:

“I firmly believe that research informs or at least influences teaching. In some areas this is more closely linked than others, for example psychologists here at DBS would be more research active. Teachers who engage in research are more likely to be up to date as they are constantly engaging with the primary literature”
3.9 Research Culture

The RCM was asked whether there was currently a research culture in DBS:

“To say that there’s a culture is probably a bit of a strong word as it’s more of a teaching focused institution and always has been, but I think it will be changing in the future”

The three full-time lecturers were asked whether the institutional culture of DBS currently supports research, L1 was quite adamant that it did not:

“No it doesn’t and I’m very clear about that…it’s the same dilemma for every other institution that is trying to find a balance between research and lecturing...these organisations, that are private my understanding is that they are dependent on the number of students that they have...they have to utilise the resources that they have to the best of their ability”

L2 felt that there had been a positive change in recent years:

“There has been a change over the last 4 or 5 years and we are aware now of research seminars (research day) where lecturers present research”

L3 remarked that traditionally there was no support of research but perhaps changes were occurring:

“I know there are changes, it’s more of a teaching based organisation really rather than research based.....there is money in teaching as opposed to research, but it’s changing maybe, hopefully”
### 3.10 Institutional Benefits for Conducting Research

This question asks whether respondents believed that “an institution that engages in research can attract a higher calibre of student”. The respondents overwhelmingly agreed with the claim, 44 respondents either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” with the statement, 8 were neutral, 3 disagreed. 1 respondent skipped the question.

**Please rate this statement**

![Figure 6: Attracting High Calibre](image)

The Academic Director highlighted other benefits that can be realised for the institution by conducting research:

“Staff development, staff morale, enhanced staff engagement with their subject, increased staff engagement with the education process, and the dissemination of that amongst peers.

Also, opportunities for students to work on projects with research active staff. DBS generating new knowledge and associated kudos with publication, spin off activities such as networking, invited speakers, mini conferences, and enhanced reputation in the sector....”
The RCM articulated further benefits associated with research:

“I think that when researchers are engaged in research and they are publishing they are promoting the institution by having the affiliation institution there in print, Dublin Business School. That’s obviously been good publicity for the college, so they’re promoting not only themselves but the institution when they’re engaged in research”

“It raises the reputation of the college too which makes it comparable to other third level universities and other institutions….also for DBS it is a benefit…very good for enhancing the reputation so when you see DBS’s name there at these international conferences, that can’t be a bad thing in terms of marketing”

The RCM was queried whether institutions that conduct research have a better opportunity to secure government funding as per the Springboard Programme:

“Absolutely, I think it’s a standard, an expectation that lecturers at this level in this type of institution would be engaged in research because that’s what you’re competing with if you look at all the other institutions”
3.11 Promotion of Research by Research Committee

As mentioned in Chapter One the Research Committee’s role is “research strategy and development”. When it came to awareness of the Research Committee a large number of respondents were aware of it, 50 respondents had heard of the Research Committee whereas 5 respondents had not, 1 respondent skipped the question.

![Graph showing awareness of Research Committee]

Figure 7: Awareness of Research Committee

The RCM was questioned on how the research committee was promoting research:

“It supports researchers within DBS, in the beginning the focus was just to have a small budget to support them presenting at conferences and the like, since then we have branched out into other areas like the research day, actually having a stage for researchers to present, to talk to network with each other to collaborate”

“(Its aims are) to promote, to highlight research, to support researchers to set in place more formal procedures and policies for research related activity”
3.12 Current Incentives

The researcher attempted to identify possible incentives to promote research at DBS by way of the full-time lecturer interviews.

L3 indicated that they had been given unpaid leave in order to conduct research:

“They allowed me to take some time off, do less hours, but it’s been deducted from my salary and our holidays”

L2 felt that the ability to claim at the annual review that research had been completed in the previous year was a personal incentive:

“You’re asked what research have you done during the year…I don’t want to have to sit through another review and say it’s (current PhD) not done”

The RCM pointed out that currently lecturers can avail of a small monetary sum to attend conferences:

“A small support for conference attendance….everything is evaluated on an individual basis”
3.13 Incentive Effectiveness for Full/Part Time Lecturers

Before rating how incentives’ effectiveness differs between both full-time and part-time lecturers, the responses from the question about respondents’ contract type should be displayed. It transpired that the respondents comprised of 42 full-time lecturers and 14 part-time lecturers.

![Figure 8: Contract Type](image-url)
This next question listed three possible incentives that the college could offer in order to support lecturers conducting research, the question was cross-tabulated in order to see if part-time lecturers responded differently to incentives than full-time lecturers. Respondents rated incentives in terms of effectiveness (5 being the most effective and 1 being the least). Among the 42 full-timers, the first incentive “encouragement” received an average rating of 3.3 and was regarded as the least effective. “Financial support” received a rating of 4.27. The most effective incentive identified by respondents was “Time allowance” with a rating of 4.39.

![Figure 9: Incentives Effectiveness for Full-Timers](image-url)
The 14 part-timers, responded to the incentives differently, the first, “encouragement” received an average rating of 3.96 and was regarded as the least effective. “Time allowance” received a rating of 4.20. The most effective incentive identified by part-timers was “Financial support” with a rating of 4.52. When compared, full-time faculty regard time allocation as the most effective incentive, whereas part-time faculty regard monetary reward as the most effective incentive to conduct research.

![Figure 10: Incentives Effectiveness for Part-Timers](image)
The interviewees suggested other incentives to conduct research, time allocation featured prominently in the suggestions:

**RCM:** “Setting that (research) off against maybe hours teaching or workload or something”

**L1:** “Time allocation, because it’s all about time”

**L2:** “Reduced hours, so instead of your normal full quota of hours per week maybe you do half of those hours for a 6 month period”

### 3.14 Barriers to Conducting Research

The researcher attempted to identify the barriers to conducting research at DBS by way of the full-time lecturer interviews. Time or lack thereof, was identified by all interviewees as the primary barrier to conducting research.

L1 indicated that the amount of teaching hours stipulated by their contract was an impediment to conducting research:

> “When you do 500 hours lecturing there is no time for research”

L2 felt that the lack of time to conduct research was a structural issue:

> “The barriers are that there is no structure whereby we are given time off”

L3 pointed out that the contract was specifically for teaching and not research:

> “It’s not seen as part of your hours, your contract is for teaching hours, not for research”
Another barrier to conducting research identified by L1 was the physical work environment:

“The physical space, it’s much easier to find your thoughts in an office that you share with one or two people than an office where you have 30…. there is no isolation here... some people can do research when they are surrounded and there are private conversations going on, chit chat, fine for them, I can’t”
Analysis & Conclusions

The benefits and potential benefits that can be realised (for teaching institutions) by the fusing of research and teaching into research-led teaching have been articulated by several different stakeholders in both the secondary and primary research. HETAC encourages DBS to support research in order to achieve this, within DBS the RCM believes that research-led teaching is very beneficial, the Academic Director believes that research can influence teaching and the faculty believe it will entice a higher calibre of student. Tangible benefits relating to marketing DBS, enhanced college reputation and the possibility of securing future public finding were also articulated in the primary research. However, an official transition strategy, as suggested by Hawawini, to move from a teaching institution to a research-led teaching institution is not present. Even though The Research Committee has helped to establish certain structures and procedures that promote research, several barriers still need to be overcome in order to establish a research culture, a central factor of which is tangibly supporting research.

The primary challenge is not to promote research among a faculty with no history of research, as clearly many faculty members are research active, it is to actively promote and support research. The Research Committee plays a central role in research promotion (Khojasteh & Herring’s Primary Factors) and the fact that it is a faculty initiative is very promising. Nevertheless, in order to support research, DBS will need to implement the secondary factors that the aforementioned authors articulated, namely creating a research culture, and more practically time allocation and recognition.

Similar to Boone’s faculty, all the interviewees (RCM and L1-L3) identified the lack of time as a major barrier to conducting research. However, unlike Boone’s faculty, which is accused of being uninterested in research, many DBS faculty members are passionate about research;
they have been and continue to be research active. Therefore, the barrier is not a reluctant teaching faculty unwilling to conduct research, it is a lack of tangible support structures that facilitate research taking place, either by those who had previously conducted research or those wishing to begin conducting research in order to enhance their teaching practices. Research like any endeavour must be supported and this researcher has identified the removal of barriers as opposed to the creation of incentives as the most effective support strategy. The literature regarding research promotion (Khojasteh & Herring) and the removal of barriers (Boone) identify time as both a barrier (lack of) and incentive (allocation) to conduct research. Furthermore, the full-time faculty themselves regard time allocation as a more effective incentive/removed barrier than either encouragement or monetary reward. Therefore, time considerations must be central in any official transition to either research-led teaching or supported institutional research by full-time faculty. However, part-time lecturers, although a minority of respondents, represent the larger amount, in numbers, of lecturers at DBS. Those who responded to the suggested incentives were most responsive to monetary reward. The following chapter will address the second research objective, which relates to awareness of repositories, by way of two research questions.
Chapter Four

4.1 Research Questions

- Are DBS lecturers aware of repositories, both the concept and eSource?
- How can DBS Library effectively promote awareness and population of eSource?

4.2 Introduction

An IR offers two different types of benefits to an educational institution and its faculty. The first set of benefits relates to establishing and hosting an IR within an institution, these will be outlined in Chapter Six. Gaining access to other institutions’ research via their individual repositories is the second type of benefit that IRs offer, this is further facilitated by institutional repository portals such as RIAN whose primary goal is to “make Irish research material more freely accessible” (RIAN, no date). In order to realise these benefits, researchers, in a “reader” role, need to be aware of the existence of repositories and the resources that they hold. Within an institution, the library has become the primary administrator and marketer of the IR, therefore this literature review will focus on general awareness of IRs and measures that a library can take in order to promote and populate them.

Literature Review

4.3 Awareness of Repositories as Author and Reader

Dolan (2011) attempted to measure IR awareness among the faculty of a West Virginian University, the IR of which, was well established (13 years) at the time of the research. The IR had been originally launched to hold student theses, although in recent years the Library had broadened its mandate to include faculty publications, Dolan noted that faculty deposits remained almost non-existent. In order to measure awareness, a survey was sent to all faculty...
members, of which 92 faculty members replied (33 per cent response). The research revealed that awareness among the faculty was high with 94 per cent of respondents being aware that the university library hosted the repository; however, 80 per cent of the respondents had only used the IR for submitting approval for their students’ theses. Of the remaining 20 per cent, most were using the IR for searching and reading student theses. When it came to awareness about submitting their own work onto the IR, Dolan found low rates of awareness with only 17 per cent knowing that the repository could host any institution related work (2011, pp. 2-3).

A 2007 study from the University of California which had a larger sample found a lower level of general awareness among faculty. From a total of 1,092 respondents, covering all disciplines, 66 per cent had not heard of the University’s repository, a further 18 per cent had heard of the repository but did not understand its purpose. Only 16 per cent of respondents stated that they were either “actively involved, monitor and discuss the eScholarship regularly” or “have heard of, read and discussed it occasionally” (The University of California Office of Scholarly Communication, 2007, p. 89).

In a Dutch report Kircz (2005) outlined how repositories can be used as a research tool for two distinct stakeholder groups, namely readers and authors (contributors). Readers are identified as those who are conducting research; Kircz suggested that they could be categorised as either a “partially informed reader” or an “informed reader”. The partially informed reader could be somebody starting up in a field or having a general interest in adjacent fields to his/her own, while the informed reader would be a researcher in the same field as the author. The informed reader is focused in their search strategy and the retrieved items serve a direct, known information need. The report summarised, that for these groups an academic IR when transparently and properly linked to others can itself become a vital research tool (pp. 9 & 20).
4.4 Promoting Repositories

According to Abrizah (2010), prior to embarking on a marketing campaign for the repository, it is worth confirming and acknowledging the role that the library plays in relation to the IR. A study was undertaken in Malaysia in order to explore the academic library’s motivation in providing OA within the university environment, to ascertain the perceptions that academic librarians had about their role in establishing an IR and to investigate how librarians were promoting the IR. Survey responses were received from 16 librarian respondents. In relation to the library’s motivation in IR establishment, 87.5 per cent (14) agreed it was to “increase the visibility of the research institution’s research output”, 81.25 per cent (13) also thought that the IR would “preserve the institution’s research output” (2010, p. 127).

The follow on question related to the perception that academic librarians had regarding their roles in the implementation of an IR. Librarians accepted their role as the primary promoter of the IR but had reservations in relation to a selector of resources (editor) role in relation to potential content, 81.3 (13) per cent agreed that librarians play a leading role in encouraging contribution to the IR but only 25 per cent (4) felt that librarians should act as the steward of the collection. With regard to promoting the IR to faculty members, 75 per cent (12) agreed that person to person networking was required with “training sessions” and “speaking at departmental and faculty meetings” finding agreement. The circulation of promotional literature and information featuring in newsletters found less agreement among the respondents, each receiving 37.5 and 25 per cent approval respectively (2010, pp. 129-130).

Barton (2004-2005) contends that prior to devising a marketing plan for the IR it is important to identify its intended audience and then identify how the IR can benefit each stakeholder group individually. Once these benefits are defined, a marketing strategy can either take the form of a top-down approach or a bottom-up approach. The top-down approach focuses on
the senior faculty members whilst the bottom-up approach targets individual authors (academics). Library staff plays a key role in raising awareness of IRs and Barton suggests that regular sessions are held in order to keep them informed about the repository service (2004-2005, pp. 27-28).

Ramirez and Miller (2011) emphasise that marketing is an activity that is integral to the growth and use of IRs. They also recommend that the target audience of the marketing strategy be defined; once this is done the advantages of using the product (IR) should be articulated from the consumer’s perspective. This will outline the benefits that the consumer (potential contributor) can expect from using the product. With regard to marketing within academia, the authors suggest that education is essentially a “people based” activity; therefore, the relationships between individuals are a vital component of marketing within the educational environment. The authors acknowledge that in the past libraries were slow to adopt marketing strategies but have in recent years adopted a more proactive approach when promoting services and collections. The authors suggest that IRs should be marketed as a “set of services” offered by an institution to the members of its community (2011, pp. 14-16).
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4.5 Awareness of the Concept of an Institutional Repository

The purpose of this question was to ascertain how familiar respondents were with the concept of an IR, the question emphasised that the respondent was to indicate the level of their awareness prior to reading the accompanying email that delivered the survey link. All respondents answered the question with 42 of them indicating that they were familiar with the concept of an IR compared to 14 who were previously unfamiliar with repositories.

Figure 11: Repository Awareness
4.6 Awareness of eSource

The follow up question asked if respondents were aware of the fact that DBS had an IR. In total 55 respondents replied, 1 respondent skipped the question. The majority of respondents (48) were aware that DBS had an IR compared to 7 who were unaware of the repository’s existence.

Figure 12: eSource Awareness
4.7 Using Repositories as a Reader

This next question’s purpose was to determine if respondents had used an IR in a reader role, this would imply that they had used or consulted another institution’s IR. The question posed to respondents was “have you ever consulted another institution’s institutional repository?”, all of the respondents answered the question, half of them (28) had consulted a non DBS IR and half had not (28).

![Figure 13: Respondent as IR Reader](image)

Figure 13: Respondent as IR Reader
4.8 Promoting eSource

This question was presented in a multiple choice format that allowed the respondent to indicate where they had heard about eSource. This question was directed at those who were aware of the existence of eSource (48 in total). Respondents were allowed to select multiple sources from the list presented. From the 48 respondents, 36 indicated that they had heard about eSource from Library staff. The next most effective method that advertised eSource was “other”, this was included without an open field to provide more detail as there was no other official method of advertising eSource at the time of creating the survey, nevertheless 9 respondents had heard of eSource in this unspecified manner. A fellow lecturer had informed 8 of the respondents about eSource, this was the third most effective promotion method. The last two methods, which together had informed 9 respondents, were the library newsletter (5) and the library website (4).

![Figure 14: Discovery of eSource](image)
4.9 Role of the Library

The following interview with the Digitization Librarian was aimed at examining the Library’s role in hosting a repository; specifically, eSource promotion, content evaluation and population strategies were examined.

How does the Library effectively promote eSource?:

“The DBS Research Committee represents the most pragmatic opportunity for the library to communicate its commitment to raise awareness and participation among the academic community here at DBS. However, it’s crucial that tangible support structures are provided including personal incentives for academic staff. Tangibles will allow academics to pursue their research interests alongside teaching commitments”

Should the library evaluate the content on eSource to ensure that it is of academic quality?

“No, suitability checks and quality assessment of materials belong firmly in the domain of relevant schools and faculties.”

What is the library’s role in populating eSource?:

“The library facilitates and supports the archiving of materials. It advises and assists researchers with regard to copyright clearance and technicalities of submission. The library also engages in advocacy initiatives, via the Research Committee and other channels, to raise awareness and material contributions”
Analysis & Conclusions

As opposed to the two American faculties in the literature review, DBS faculty have a high awareness of the concept of an IR. Similar to Dolan’s faculty, respondents have a high awareness of the institutional IR. Unfortunately, eSource is similar to the repositories of the two American institutions in having a very low amount of faculty deposits. The fact that half of respondents had consulted another institution’s IR could work either positively or negatively in attempting to populate eSource. Viewing another institution’s IR, which contains possibly hundreds of faculty deposits in comparison to eSource, could render a researcher reluctant to deposit their research alongside mostly student theses. On the other hand, a familiarity with IRs and the associated quelling of perceived concerns should make it easier for the Library to persuade DBS faculty to deposit on eSource.

In relation to the Library’s role, it has been very successful in making faculty aware of eSource but this has not translated into faculty deposits. The Digitization Librarian contends, much like the librarians from Abrizah’s study, that speaking at departmental meetings; in this case The Research Committee is an effective way to promote population of eSource. The continued low contribution rate could indicate that this strategy alone is not the most effective. The Library also needs to actively “sell” eSource to faculty members and could adopt the approaches of Ramirez & Miller and Barton in order to achieve this. With this bottom up approach (Barton) the librarian can target individual faculty members who are research active and sell the IR as a “set of services” offered by DBS (Ramirez & Miller). Much like UCD (Hill, 2008, p. 208), the Library has attempted to make actual depositing as simple as possible; the one interviewee (L3) who had contributed found the process easy. Therefore, a targeted one-to-one session with active researchers explaining the benefits of IR archiving could be the deciding factor for them to deposit. These researchers can then assume
a “role model” image and this scenario could encourage others to follow suit. The following chapter will address the first part of the third research objective, which relates to attitudes to open access, by way of three research questions.
Chapter Five

5.1 Research Questions

- What are DBS lecturers’ attitudes towards open access, and does it affect willingness to contribute to eSource?
- Do lecturers see the need for an OA repository at DBS?
- How do lecturers rate different content appearing on an open access platform?

5.2 Introduction

An attitude is defined as “the way a person views something or tends to behave towards it” (Collins Dictionary, 2012), an attitude can be either positive or negative. The literature review of this chapter, along with that of Chapters Six, will attempt to outline the different attitudes and perceptions, both positive and negative which have been articulated about IRs. Also, since IRs are part of the OA movement, this chapter will examine faculty members’ attitudes towards OA in both the literature review and primary research. In DBS does this attitude affect willingness to contribute? Also, does a teaching institution even require an IR? Finally, what distinctions do DBS lecturers make between potential materials, emanating from both students and faculty, being OA?

Literature Review

5.3 Faculty Attitudes towards Open Access

Mackenzie-Cummins conducted a study in 2011 by means of a survey with the aim, among others, to measure current awareness of, and participation with the OA model. An online survey was sent out to a large mailing list, of which 275 respondents completed the survey. The majority (75 per cent) were researchers based at a university (70 per cent) covering a
range of disciplines. Overall, 51 per cent of respondents were aware of OA publishing, on
measuring participation with this publishing method, 26 per cent had published an article in
an OA environment while 10 per cent had done so for a book (Mackenzie-Cummins, 2011,
pp. 10-11).

Kenneway (2011) found that when it came to measuring the overall importance of OA to
respondents, a high number of researchers found OA to be of benefit to them. She sent out an
online survey to 25,000 and received a relatively high response rate of 32 per cent. The
responses came from a variety of professions, with the majority (78 per cent) being
researchers. The study found that overall, 75 per cent of participants stated that they felt it
was either “very important” or “important” to be able to offer their work free online
(Kenneway, 2011, p. 7).

5.4 Faculty Attitude to Different Content being Open Access

IRs facilitate the uploading of a varied range of materials onto an OA platform by any
institution (Drake, 2004, p. 41). A dedicated research institution produces content relating to
all aspects of research (student theses, conference papers, staff pre-prints, and post-prints).
Abrizah (2009) surveyed the faculty at a Malaysian University in order to measure attitudes
to and awareness of its IR. The participants were presented with a list of possible self-
archived material that could be held on the IR, the survey then asked whether that particular
content should be deposited on the IR. The top three material types that the participants were
willing to deposit were research reports (98.6 per cent), conference papers (98.6 per cent) and
co-authored work (97.3 per cent). The participants were less inclined to want grey literature
(department paper: 63 per cent) and complete student theses (61.6 per cent) deposited on the
IR. Least preferred were non peer reviewed preprints (20.5 per cent) (Abrizah, 2009, p.26).
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5.5 Faculty Attitude to Open Access and its effects on Willingness to Contribute

The following section endeavoured to measure respondents’ attitude to OA by asking them to rate the statement “I believe that the majority of academic research should be made freely available to the public”. 40 respondents either “completely agreed” or “agreed” with the statement, 11 felt neutrally and 4 disagreed to some extent. 1 respondent skipped the question.

Figure 15: Attitudes to OA

The interviews were an attempt to gain more insight into lecturers’ attitudes to OA and if they thought it was beneficial (or not).

L1 identified the benefits of OA as both a reader and an author:

“I feel it’s a platform where everybody is free to deposit their research and basically have access to other peoples’ research, so in general very positive, it’s a means to an end, basically to promote knowledge and to promote cross-fertilisation”
L2 gave insight as an “informed reader”:

“It’s much easier to be research active now because of the availability of full articles online through the electronic resources, for example like DIT have, and the availability of dissertations. If you’re doing something like a masters or a PhD, there’s a chance that you could access a dissertation of a very similar topic, all of that is very beneficial”

L3 generally felt positively about the idea, but expressed reservations:

“I think open access is good in principle, however when you are investing a lot of time and money in doing the research, it’s good to get some…. I don’t know in monetary terms, but some sort of return. If it’s a free for all you feel that it could be plagiarised a bit more easily, because it’s not maybe as regulated”
The responses from the previous question were then cross-tabulated in order to ascertain if a
general positive attitude to OA translated into a willingness to deposit material onto eSource.
The previous statement “I believe that the majority of academic research should be made
freely available to the public” was rated by respondents. 20 of them selected “completely
agree”, 20 selected “agree”, 11 selected “neither agree nor disagree”, 3 selected “disagree”
and 1 respondent selected “completely disagree”. The question was skipped by one
respondent. The respondents were divided into 4 groups depending on response selected. An
analysis was conducted in relation to the two questions; “Would you be willing to place
research you have undertaken on DBS eSource” followed by “If yes, can you specify the
remit of the research you would place on DBS eSource”. The cross-tabulation discovered that
group members who were the most positive about OA (Group One) were also 100 per cent
willing to contribute to eSource, although this willingness has not translated into actual
contributions.

Figure 16: Group One Willingness to Contribute
Group One were then asked to specify what type of material they were willing to contribute, namely research related to DBS and/or independent research. The members were more willing to contribute research not related to DBS. 80 per cent of respondents would contribute independent research to eSource whereas only 65 per cent would contribute DBS related research; this could be explained by respondents not differentiating between lecture notes and DBS related research.

![Figure 17: Group One Research Remit](image)

Figure 17: Group One Research Remit
The same analysis was conducted on Group Two, those who were slightly less enthusiastic about OA but positive nonetheless. This group consisted of those who “agreed” with academic research being OA. When analysed to ascertain inclination to contribute, this group were slightly less willing to contribute to eSource with 80 per cent indicating that they would deposit and 20 per cent not willing to do so.

![Figure 18: Group Two Willingness to Contribute](image)

**Figure 18: Group Two Willingness to Contribute**
Of Group Two’s members who would contribute, nearly 70 per cent would contribute DBS research and 50 per cent would contribute independent research.

Figure 19: Group Two Research Remit
The group who felt neutrally about OA, Group Three, were then analysed to ascertain their willingness to contribute. Of these 11 respondents 2 skipped the question. Of the remaining 9, 66 per cent (6) were willing to contribute and 33 per cent (3) were not.

**Figure 20: Group Three Willingness to Contribute**
The follow on question was answered by 7 Group Three respondents rather than the 6 who were willing to contribute. Of the 7, 100 per cent would deposit DBS research whereas only 4 (57 per cent) would contribute independent research.

Figure 21: Group Three Research Remit
Finally, those who were hostile to OA (Group Four) were analysed in order to discover if this hostility translated into an unwillingness to contribute to eSource. These 4 respondents has either “disagreed” or “completely disagreed” with the statement “I believe that the majority of academic research should be made freely available to the public” As expected this group were 100 per cent unwilling to contribute to eSource.

Figure 22: Group Four Willingness to Contribute
5.6 Necessity of eSource

Before capturing faculty attitudes to the different potential materials that eSource can hold it is worth investigating if faculty subscribe to Barton and Waters’ view that only a dedicated research institution requires an IR. Via the survey, respondents were asked if they believed that DBS needs an IR. An overwhelming majority of respondents felt that DBS required an IR. 50 respondents agreed with the statement, 5 rejected it and 1 skipped the question.

![Figure 23: Need for eSource](image)

Figure 23: Need for eSource
5.7 Faculty Attitude to Different Content being Open Access

This question’s objective was to see how lecturers rated, either positively or negatively, the different materials that the Library could upload onto eSource. The options that were presented to respondents covered all of the potential output from a teaching/research institution, the choices ranged from articles written by DBS lecturers (most positive towards appearance on eSource) to DBS academics’ lecture notes (most negative towards appearance on eSource).

![Figure 24: Potential IR Content](image-url)
5.8 Attitude to Lecture Notes on IR

With the attitudes from Figure 24 identified, the researcher attempted to discover, via the interviews, why lecturers were so unreceptive to lecture notes appearing on the IR.

L1 expressed concerns about their notes being copied by other lecturers:

“I’ve always been asked to share my notes and I said no. I don’t want a lecturer to try and copy and paste my own views and my work…. so that’s the reason why I would say no (to lecture notes on IR) but I would say yes if I knew that people were going to look at it as an inspiration and not for copying”

L2 thought that lecture notes gave an incomplete picture of a topic and felt that only registered students of a module should have access to them:

“lecture notes are only a guide, to what the lecturer might say, the students in your module then are going to get whatever additional information they require (in class). They are an incomplete picture, they are only a guideline....I would be a believer that students who are taking a module should be the only ones who have access to lecture notes”

L3 expressed concerns regarding the knowledge that the lecture notes are based on:

“If we were doing more research rather than teaching, then the notes are more our own, based on our own experience. I would still worry if it’s (notes’ content) really our own work, if you work in an agency or you work in marketing you put a bit of that experience into the notes. However, it’s not based on your own research, your own book or your own journal, with Moodle maybe it’s enough”
5.9 Attitude to Student Essays/Assignments on IR

DBS is an institution where continuous assessment plays a large role in students’ final grades; the Library encourages students to submit assignments to eSource while conveying the benefits of this for all students (Figure 25). The researcher attempted to discover if faculty members were receptive to previous assignments being OA. Figure 24 confirmed that the faculty were somewhat hostile to this, nevertheless, the researcher wanted to uncover the exact concerns that lecturers may hold about essays/assignments being OA. This was achieved by asking the following questions via the survey. Firstly, respondents were asked if they thought that “good quality” previous assignments should be on the IR; 42 thought that they should, 13 thought that they should not and 1 skipped the question (Figure 26).

![Figure 25: Assignments on eSource](image)

![Figure 26: Respondents and OA assignments](image)
Then, to see if there is student demand for this content, the researcher enquired if respondents had been asked for these resources. The students of 48 respondents had requested previous essays/assignments compared to 8 lecturers whose students had not made this request.

Figure 27: Student Requests
Lastly, the one open question of the survey asked respondents to identify any issues arising from placing essays/assignments on the IR, 37 responses were received.

A majority (25) identified plagiarism as their primary concern. The other concerns expressed related to conformism:

“Possibility to inhibit original thinking to copy formats and ideas from existing resources”

“There is not only one best way to write essays, students do not adopt a strict must do everything the same way approach”

Author consent, or lack of, was raised by another respondent:

“Lack of permission from authors”

Another felt that essays would diminish the repository:

“(Essays) devalue the repository. It should be kept to undergrad and postgrad dissertations and other large-scale pieces of research”
Analysis & Conclusions

DBS faculty were generally very positive about OA in general, but when it came to specific materials being hosted on eSource, there was a noticeable variation in acceptability levels. On a positive note, those who were most enthusiastic about OA were very receptive to the idea of placing their own research onto eSource, also as expected, those who were the least enthusiastic were the most unwilling to contribute. The respondents subscribed to the view that DBS requires a repository. In relation to IR content, the previous OA question given to respondents related to “academic research” only (Figure 15), whereas the list of potential deposits for eSource (Figure 24) contained a vast range of materials. In comparison, although Abrizah did not present respondents with an option to rate many student contributions, a trend emerged of more hostility towards students’ work, including theses, as opposed to academics’. In contrast to Abrizah’s findings, DBS faculty are very open to student theses on eSource. In relation to student coursework on eSource, demand exists for this from the students and the Library suggests it as a deposit (eSource, 2012). When “good quality assignments” are specified as a deposit, the majority of lecturers give approval, however a significant number believe that this content could be plagiarised. The Library should attempt to allay the plagiarism concerns of selected lecturers, and then seek permission from them and the student author to host a very limited amount of well-known high quality student assignments on eSource.

The research interviews revealed that confusion exists about the nature of OA, specifically the distinction between Green and Gold OA. Both types of OA will, by their nature, assist in detecting and reducing plagiarism as opposed to facilitating it (see Chapter Six). Therefore, the plagiarism concerns expressed by respondents were unfounded. OA publishing (Gold OA) is not an unregulated “free for all” as suggested; moreover, peer-review is facilitated by
it (L3). The negative attitude towards lecture notes appearing on eSource reflects the fact that DBS is primarily a teaching institution with numerous research active lecturers. Two scenarios became evident, the lecturer who had invested time and effort in producing notes from their own research who was unwilling to share it with others (L1), as opposed to the lecturer who had concerns stemming from the fact that their lecture notes were not based on their own research, and therefore should only appear on the e-learning platform and not OA (L3). It seems that further clarification is required in relation to the link between plagiarism, quality-assessment and OA. The following chapter will address the second part of the third research objective, which relates to benefits and concerns associated with IRs, by way of three research questions.
Chapter Six

6.1 Research Questions

- What benefits can the depositor realise by contributing to a repository?
- What are the institutional benefits for hosting a repository?
- What concerns can prevent contribution?

6.2 Introduction

Highlighting to authors the benefits associated with depositing on an IR can increase contribution rates, owing to this, they ought to be clearly articulated. Whether these benefits are realised by the author or not is another matter, it is the belief that contribution can bring reward that motivates an author to deposit. An institution can also benefit from hosting a well-populated IR; therefore, potential benefits for both contributor and institution will be outlined in this literature review. In relation to populating an IR, concerns can act in the opposite way to benefits, whereas (expectation of) benefits can promote contribution, concerns that the author may hold in relation to IRs in general, and contribution to them in particular (whether founded or not), can dissuade self-archiving. Consequently, the second part of this review will examine these concerns.

Literature Review

6.3 Benefits for Contributors

A comprehensive survey attempted to capture respondents’ attitudes to publishing in an OA forum, the authors (Swan and Brown, 2005) received 1,296 responses from a population of worldwide academics, of which almost half (49 per cent) had self-archived at least one article in the last three years in an OA forum. An IR, along with a subject based repository and a
personal website represented the three possible methods of OA archiving (Swan & Brown, 2005, p. 30). The authors proceeded to investigate the factors that encouraged the respondent to publish their work in an OA environment. Eighteen per cent of respondents stated that the principle of OA for all readers was their primary motivation for publishing, a further 11 per cent felt that the readership of their research would be larger via an OA platform compared to a subscribed journal, while another 8 per cent of respondents thought that their work would be cited more frequently if it appeared in an OA journal (Swan & Brown, 2005, p. 10).

Creaser et al. (2010) attempted to capture authors’ attitudes towards IRs by means of a survey (3,000 respondents) and 4 focus groups of researchers from around Europe in 2009. The authors investigated how important certain factors were in encouraging authors to contribute to an IR. 68 per cent (1,713) of respondents stated that “increased citations” were very important or important. Furthermore, nearly 90 per cent stated that “free access to all” was a very important or important factor (Creaser et al, 2010, pp. 150-155). A study from India attempted to uncover the reasons for researchers’ contribution to IRs, it found that from a population of over 1,600 respondents, 80 per cent agreed that contribution boosts a researcher’s image within their respective institution, while 72 per cent felt it would increase external recognition (Manjunatha & Thandavamoorthy, 2011, pp. 108-113).

Duke University Libraries gave further insight into the benefits that researchers can expect from contribution to an IR. Contributing could give an indication of the impact (citations) that a contributor’s research is having on their respective field, it will also allow a researcher to identify who is reading their work. (Duke University Libraries, 2012). Another longer term benefit for academic authors was identified by the University; when a researcher contributed to an IR, a permanent storage of the digital work was created and access to a digital copy of a researcher’s work was facilitated. A tangible way to demonstrate the impact contributors are
making to their respective field is to forward the depositor a monthly download report, this is what occurs when an author deposits on UCD’s repository (Greene, 2012, p. 9).

Kim (2006) conducted a study in order to investigate both the motivating and impeding factors that can affect faculty contribution to IRs. The study surveyed the faculty of an unnamed American university. In total, Kim got responses from 31 professors from a total of 67 surveyed. When trying to capture motivating factors, Kim used a likert scale to rate the perceived benefits a researcher could expect from contribution to an IR. The statements that were regarded as either important or positive from those who had contributed to the IR included “receiving recognition from my university” and “contribution (to IR) counting towards tenure and promotion” (Kim, 2006, p. 7). Kim also investigated motivational factors in those who had not yet contributed to the IR. A permutation test to measure the probability of future contribution was conducted. With this test, Kim discovered factors that increased the probability of future contribution to the IR; these included an increased chance to communicate a researcher’s findings with peers, an increased impact (citations) of researchers work resulting from being posted on an OA platform and increased readership potential (Kim, 2006 p.7).

**6.4 Institutional Benefits**

The holding of all intellectual output of an institution in a centralised OA repository has many benefits for an established research institution, however, these benefits could also be realised by other types of institutions, including those making the transition to research. According to Drake (2004) IRs provide a service internally to faculty, researchers and administrators who wish to archive creative, historic and research materials. By using OA repositories along with established metadata standards, institutions are making important information sources more freely available to a larger audience (Drake, 2004, p. 41). Gibbons
(2004) highlighted how an IR can be used to showcase the academic endeavours of an institution, not only as a single body but also the academic output of individual faculty members. She also suggested that perspective students and faculty can use an institution’s repository to obtain a fuller picture of the research currently in progress in a particular department. Gibbons also noted that due to metadata standards, documents held in IRs are showing up in the results of scholarly search engines, such as OAlster and Google Scholar on a more frequent basis, thus disseminating important data once stored on individual PC hard drives (Gibbons, 2004, p. 12).

The relationship between establishing a research culture in institutions that had not previously engaged in research and the establishment of an IR has been made in several studies from the developing world. Christian (2008) notes that the establishment of an IR within academic institutions in Nigeria, will not only enhance global visibility of the institution’s research but also establish a “research culture”, that is focused on meeting international standards (Christian, 2008, p. 23).

Robinson (2009) conducted a case study of a higher education institution in Hong Kong that was seeking to attain university status, in order to achieve this goal the institution decided to “enhance its research infrastructure and capacity”. Although the institution’s library already had a repository this was mainly used for internal grey literature with little of interest to those outside the institution, therefore, the decision was made to re-launch the repository with a focus on staff research. The newly launched repository had clear objectives in relation to research promotion. These objectives included strengthening the research capacity of the institution by providing a reference database for all research published in house and facilitating the demonstration of the institution’s research endeavours to all its stakeholders. Other objectives of the new repository related to enhancing search and viewing features, thus, making the discovery process easier for both contributors and viewers (p. 5-6). The
institution considered the re-launch a success, within four months, 75 per cent of traffic was via search engines, with an increasing amount of visits coming from outside Hong Kong, thus, the primary objective of promoting and disseminating research of the institution was considered to have been realised (Robinson, 2009, p. 11).

6.5 Concerns Preventing Contribution

Concerns that faculty members can hold, in relation to self-archiving, can affect contribution rates to an IR. A study of perceptions held by 251 doctoral students from New Zealand in relation to OA theses being deposited on an IR was conducted in 2011. Stanton and Liew (2011) noted that researchers can use an IR to disseminate their work to a wide audience but the authors also highlight the concern that contributors may have regarding plagiarism. A survey was circulated with respondents asked to rate perceived risks in relation to contributing to an IR. When the perceived risk, “my work may be plagiarised” was suggested, 58.6 per cent of respondents either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” with the statement (Stanton & Liew, 2011).

Davis and Connolly (2007) attempted to discover why there was a low contribution rate to the IR at Cornell University by means of a study involving in depth interviews of 11 faculty members from different disciplines. A fear that authors’ work would be plagiarised was mentioned as a reason for not contributing by faculty from three different disciplines (Davis & Connolly, 2007). Trinity College Dublin, in encouraging contribution to its Tara IR attempts to allay those fears. The college emphasises the fact that contribution to an IR can in fact reduce plagiarism, owing to the fact that when material is held in an OA environment the chance that plagiarism will be detected and exposed is higher. The college also suggests that the chance of plagiarism detection is increased further if an institution uses plagiarism detection software such as turnitin (TCD, 2009).
Another concern that contributors may have in relation to IRs relates to academic journals and the threat that repositories may pose to them. An article by Morris (2007) summarised the findings of two surveys of academic librarians’ views of IRs. The first survey (340 responses), conducted by Ware found that 81 per cent of academic librarians felt that the availability of OA repositories were a “very important” or “important” factor in future cancellation (journals) decisions. Thirty two per cent of respondents also thought that publishers should be worried. The second study by Beck and Inger with 424 responses found that a significant number of librarians were likely to substitute OA materials for subscribed resources, of these respondents, 38 per cent thought that publishers should be worried (Morris, 2007, p. 173).

Harvard University recently (2012) encouraged its 2,100 teaching and research staff to make their research available through OA journals. It also suggested that faculty members resign from publications which keep articles subscription based, although this proposal was only a suggestion, the story made world headlines. At the same time the University warned that it could no longer tolerate the price increases imposed on it by journal publishers (Sample, 2012). The rising price of journal subscriptions is not a recent development, the problem was highlighted in a 2005 white paper called the Serials Crisis, the authors, Panitch and Michalak found that between 1986 and 2003 the consumer price index rose by 63 per cent but the price of journal subscriptions rose by 215 per cent. At the time of the paper the authors noted that the rise of OA was one of the most promising developments in relation to countering the crisis in paid journal subscriptions but the authors could not foresee whether OA would complement or replace subscription based journals in the future (Panitch & Michalak, 2005).
Ignorance on the part of the potential contributor, of the journal publishers’ policies in relation to depositing material onto IRs can be considered as both a concern of the researcher and an impediment to potential contribution. Jain (2011) stated that researchers are sometimes apprehensive about infringing publisher copyright, and also, lack proper knowledge of their own intellectual property rights. This uncertainty can prevent an author from making their pre-published work (preprints) available on an IR (Jain, 2011, p.130). With respect to ownership of copyright, Eprints, an IR software developer, state that copyright remains the property of the author while the article is in the preprint stage of publication (before peer-review and copyright transfer agreement), therefore it can be contributed to an IR without seeking a third party’s permission. With regard to post-prints, sixty eight per cent of journals have approved post-print IR contribution. From another survey, Eprints state that of the 10,000 journal titles listed in the Directory of Journal Self Archiving Policies, 91 per cent of titles have approved author self-archiving: 62 per cent for post-prints and 29 per cent for preprints (Eprints, 2011-2012).

Another potential concern of authors’ that could prevent self-archiving relates to the amount of time and effort a contributor would have to invest in order to deposit onto an IR. Kim (2010) conducted a study in order to examine the motivations and barriers that effect faculty self-archiving. The study involved an analysis of survey responses from 684 professors combined with 41 telephone interviews. Kim identified the common concerns mentioned previously (2010, p. 1909), but also found that if respondents were less apprehensive about the amount of time and effort required for depositing onto an IR, they would increase their rate of self-archiving. Although the majority of interviewees from Kim’s survey who had actually self-archived found the process required little time and effort, a number of respondents stated that the process did take time. In summarising his findings, Kim, listed
this concern of one of three barriers that could prevent faculty self-archiving (2010, pp. 1918-1919).

Carr and Harnad (2005) conducted a study aimed at measuring the amount of time and effort required in order to deposit an item onto one of the University of Southampton’s IRs (School of Electronics and Computer Science IR). Although the university mandated the use of the repository, the researchers noted that only 50 per cent of full text deposits had been contributed to the IR in the previous year (2004). The researchers noted that authors had worries regarding copyright and the amount of effort required to deposit material onto the IR. The researchers monitored the transactions when items were uploaded onto the repository over a two month period and timed how long it took on average to complete the process. The researchers found that it took on average just over 10 minutes to complete the process; this included entering the metadata for each paper. The researchers concluded that that particular concern held by authors relating to time and effort was unfounded (2005, pp. 2-6), although it should be noted that the depositors’ discipline suggests a high level of computer literacy.
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6.6 Contributor Benefits

The respondents were asked to rate the statement “I believe that my research appearing in an open access institutional repository will affirm my standing amongst my peers in academia”. A total of 55 responses were received with the majority supporting the statement. A total of 40 respondents either “completely agreed” or “agreed” with the statement, 13 answered neutrally and 2 respondents disagreed.

Figure 28 Standing amongst Peers
The next question sought to discover if respondents thought that having their research in an OA platform would enhance their prospects as a researcher. Respondents were asked to rate the statement “I believe that my research appearing in an open access institutional repository will increase my marketability as a researcher”. Respondents were very receptive to the claim, 49 respondents either “completely agreed” or “agreed” with the claim, 13 answered neutrally and 3 respondents disagreed with the claim.

Figure 29: Enhanced Prospects
6.7 Institutional Benefits

This question relates to the possible benefits that can be realised by an institution that is attempting to promote research. Respondents were asked to rate the statement “An institutional repository can act as a catalyst in establishing a research culture at DBS”. Respondents responded positively to the assertion, 20 respondents “strongly agreed” with the statement and a further 26 “agreed” with it. “Neither agree nor disagree” was selected by 7 respondents, the statement was rejected by 2 respondents.

Figure 30: Research Culture Catalyst
The next question asked respondents if they agreed that an IR can have a marketing role by showcasing research within an institution. The statement “An open source institutional repository can act as the “shop window” of research at DBS” was presented. No respondent disagreed with the claim whereas 3 felt neutrally about it. An overwhelming 52 respondents either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” with the statement, 1 respondent skipped the question.

![Figure 31: IR as Shop Window](image)

Further institutional benefits were outlined by the Academic Director:

“If it is not properly recorded it never happened. The Institutional repository, if properly populated, is the tangible record of our achievement also, our research activity can be measured”
6.8 Concerns

Here the respondents were asked to rate the concerns relating to IRs, that had emerged from the literature. Selecting 1 meant the respondent completely shared the concern and 5 indicated that the concern was completely rejected. The first concern statement was “Repositories will facilitate plagiarism”. 54 respondents answered the question, of which 36 agreed with the statement to some degree by selecting either “1” or “2”, 9 selected the neutral or don’t know “3”, 9 respondents rejected the concern to come degree by selecting “4” or “5”.

Please Rate: 1=Completely Agree – 5=Completely Disagree

Figure 32: Increased Plagiarism
The second concern statement related to author unfamiliarity of publisher policies, the concern expressed was “Journal publishers will not publish material that has appeared on repositories”. 3 respondents skipped the question and 53 respondents replied. 20 respondents agreed by selecting either “1” or “2”. The most popular choice was the neutral or don’t know “3”, this had 24 respondents. 8 respondents disagreed by choosing “4”, 1 respondent completely rejected the claim by selecting “5”.

Please Rate: 1=Completely Agree – 5=Completely Disagree

Figure 33: Publisher Issues
The next concern articulated outlined the potential threat that repositories may pose to academic journals. Respondents were presented with the scenario envisaged by Morris “Repository use will kill academic journals”, 3 respondents skipped the question and 53 respondents replied. Only 10 respondents agreed, choosing either “1” or “2”. The most popular choice was the neutral or don’t know “3”, this had 19 respondents. 24 respondents rejected the concern by selecting “4” (16) or “5” (8).

Please Rate: 1=Completely Agree – 5=Completely Disagree

Figure 34: Kill Journals
The final concern presented to respondents could also be considered as a potential barrier to contribution, it is the belief that contribution takes times and effort. The suggestion was “Contribution to a repository is an imposition on academic authors”. 3 respondents skipped the question and 53 replied. Again, only 10 respondents agreed, choosing either “1” or “2”. The most popular choice was again the neutral or don’t know “3”, this had 21 respondents. 22 respondents didn’t share this concern, 15 chose “4” and 7 completely dismissed the claim by selecting “5”.

Please Rate: 1=Completely Agree – 5=Completely Disagree

Figure 35: Burden on Authors
Analysis & Conclusions

In relation to the personal benefits that can be realised by IR contribution, DBS faculty made the link between contributing research to an IR and the positive personal benefits it can bring. Noticeably, the respondents were able to differentiate between the intangible and the tangible benefits. The intangible benefit (increased academic standing) was slightly less well received than the more tangible increased prospects as a researcher. This suggests that, like the Indian respondents, researchers could be more willing to deposit if potential enhanced prospects as a researcher are clearly articulated to them.

Like the Nigerian study, respondents agreed with the assertion that an IR can act as a catalyst in establishing a research culture at DBS. Also, the question was framed in such a way as to suggest that the researcher felt that no such culture currently exists in the institution, an opinion that was shared and confirmed by a large majority of respondents and all of the interviewees. An even larger majority agreed with Gibbon’s more immediate and visible IR benefit, namely, displaying institutional research. The invitation for respondents to view eSource prior to taking the survey could have influenced this very high positive response.

In relation to the concerns, again, the issue of plagiarism is a concern for many, however, of the other three prominent concerns that emerged from the literature the majority of respondents were either indifferent to them or didn’t know of them. This is positive as it suggests that respondents had neither heard of, nor shared these concerns. As the suggested concerns were mostly unfounded, the Library will not have to invest time and effort in trying to allay groundless fears in its efforts to secure faculty deposits. Taken together the acceptance of benefits and unawareness of concerns can assist in formulating an eSource populating strategy. The following chapter will address the final part of the third research
objective, which relates to factors affecting contribution to IRs, by way of three research questions.
Chapter Seven

7.1 Research Questions

- Can factors stemming from the institution affect contribution rates to the IR?
- Can factors relating to the individual affect willingness to contribute to the IR?
- Does providing information about IRs change faculty attitudes towards them?

7.2 Introduction

Faculty contribution, or lack thereof, has been identified as a recurring problem in relation to populating IRs. A 2006 survey of the directors of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) in the United States found that two-thirds of respondents reported that the majority of faculty members were not contributing to their respective repositories (Association of Research Libraries, 2006). This lack of faculty contribution did not seem to dissuade the institutions from establishing IRs however; at the time of that survey six years ago, of the 87 respondent institutions, 37 already had an operational IR and a further 31 were planning to launch one within the next year.

Therefore, the factors that can affect attitudes towards contribution will be outlined in this literature review. These factors can come from the institution, such as creating incentives and barriers to contribute, or, perhaps mandating contribution. Factors can come from the individual, such as a general willingness to contribute or not. Also, an author’s individual circumstances such as permanency of position within an organisation and discipline will be examined in order to ascertain if these conditions affect contribution or willingness to contribute.
Literature Review

7.3 Incentives from the Institution

Incentives are measures that an institution can put in place in order to increase the contribution rate to an IR. In 2008 Zuber conducted a study of IR holdings by academic discipline, he acknowledged the challenge in soliciting materials for the IR and hypothesised that the majority of repositories do not offer incentives to contribute. He selected 18 American universities from a strict set of criteria and identified 5 incentive measures that an institution could adopt to encourage contribution. These incentive measures mostly consisted of rating contributions such as “most popular” and “paper of the day” on the repository interface. It transpired that 14 of the 18 repositories did have these incentives, as these features were part of the repository software used, therefore, Zuber’s hypotheses was not upheld. (Zuber, 2008). UCD (Hill, 2008) identified the time and effort required for a researcher to contribute to an IR as a barrier. In order to remove this barrier and incentivise contribution, UCD Library offered to complete the uploading process; all the contributor need do is email the research to the Library (Hill, 2008, p.208).

7.4 Barriers

In a study from New Zealand, Cullen and Chawner’s (2010) attempted to identify the barriers to depositing on an IR by means of a survey (499 respondents). They found that technological barriers were not as high as expected with a mean of 2.71 for the statement “I do not know how to deposit my research in a repository” and an even lower 1.86 for the statement “I am not comfortable using new technologies” (very important = 5, not at all important = 1). Using the same grade the researchers found that other factors were more of a barrier than technological issues. Time limitations scored higher with a 2.84 mean for the statement “I haven’t had time to consider the issue”, and a slightly lower “I haven’t had time to make a
deposit” at 2.71. The highest barrier related to authors not being aware of publishers’ IR deposit policies, this recorded a mean of 3.04 (Cullen & Chawner, 2010, pp. 143-144).

In contrast, Kim’s (2010) findings found that technological issues were a much larger barrier to contribution in his research. He observed from the analysis of his likert scale survey (684 responses) that “two individual traits – age and technical skills – were found to be significantly related to the percentage of self-archived research work…in other words, younger professors, or professors with more technical skills, tended to self-archive a greater percentage of their research” (Kim, 2010, p. 1917). Believing that the process is both difficult and time-consuming arose as a barrier to contributing to an IR in Manjunatha and Thandavamoorthy’s previously mentioned Indian study (2011). Its findings found that 66 per cent of respondents either “quite” or “very” strongly agreed with the statement “it is difficult and time-consuming to deposit my work”. The survey also found that a lack of uploading technical skills and uncertainty of what particular materials can be deposited to the IR created a barrier for a substantial minority of respondents, 42 per cent either “quite” or “very” strongly agreed with the statement “I do not know how and what to deposit” (Manjunatha & Thandavamoorthy, 2011, p.113).

7.5 Institution Mandating Self-Deposit

Mandating faculty to deposit content onto an IR is one such tactic that an institution can employ in order to increase contribution rates, but is it an effective strategy? Thomas and McDonald (2007) conducted a study in order to discover if there is a difference in contribution rates between institutions that mandate contribution and those that do not. The authors studied 8 separate repositories, 6 were classified as voluntary-deposit repositories while the remaining 2 were mandatory-deposit repositories. Of the 6 voluntary repositories, the authors found on an aggregated basis that 74 per cent of authors had contributed one item
to the repository moving up to 5.3 per cent who had 5+ contributions. Of the mandatory repositories, 61 per cent of authors had contributed 1 item moving up to 14 per cent with 5+ contributions. The study concluded that the limited data suggests that authors represented in mandatory repositories tend to contribute more of their intellectual output (Thomas & McDonald, 2007).

Mandating contribution could increase contribution rates, but would faculty accept this policy? Cullen and Chawner’s previously mentioned study from New Zealand (2010) investigated IR development from library managers’ and academics’ perspectives. The authors questioned all academics (those depositing on IRs and those not depositing) about their attitude towards a mandatory deposit policy to repositories. The results showed that the majority were not in favour of compulsory deposit. Of the 483 respondents, 73 per cent were against the policy, only 127 (23.3 per cent) respondents supported the policy. In contrast, 62.6 per cent supported voluntary deposit of peer reviewed conference papers, journal articles and theses. The authors concluded that very few institutions have adopted the practice, and it is likely that the policy would be strongly resisted if implemented (pp. 142-145).

7.6 Faculty Discipline as an Affecting Factor

A study by Schonfeld & Houseright (2010) revealed that of the faculty that contribute to IRs, there are noticeable differences in contribution rate among the different disciplines, with those more dependent on funding such as the sciences having a higher contribution rate than those in either the social sciences or the humanities. The authors conducted an ITHAKA (Provider of JSTOR Database) commissioned survey of faculty members throughout the United States (3,025 respondents) which found that less than 10 per cent of faculty members in the departments of literature has deposited materials compared to just over 20 per cent of faculty from departments of economics. The physics departments, however, had 40 per cent
of its faculty members depositing materials onto the IR (Schonfeld & Housewright, 2010). Overall, the survey found that 30 per cent of faculty had deposited to an IR, with a further 50 per cent reporting to have not yet deposited, but wishing to do so in the near future. A noticeable discrepancy was noticed by the authors between the overall 30 per cent of respondents who had reported depositing to an IR and the authors’ own national sample, which found only 15 per cent of faculty members depositing to an IR. A further study of contribution by discipline was conducted by Jantz and Wilson (2008), this study discovered that overall, IRs in ARL member institutions contained 5 per cent humanities content compared to 27 per cent social sciences content and 67 per cent science content (Jantz & Wilson, 2008, p.190).

7.7 Faculty Position as an Affecting Factor

Casey (2012) investigated whether tenure (or permanency in an Irish context) is an affecting factor of faculty contribution rates to IRs at an unnamed American public university. She conducted two focus group interviews; one group consisted of tenured faculty members of the English Department while the other group consisted of untenured faculty members of the same department. Overall the study, in line with other studies, found a low contribution rate to the IR of the institution. The focus group of tenured faculty had 8 members while the untenured group had 5 members. Of the former group, a total of two participants had contributed book chapters and journal articles to the IR, the remaining six members expressed an interest in contributing to the IR, however, within this subgroup, 4 members experienced time constraints or needed further information about the depositing process. The members of the latter untenured group had not contributed any material to the IR. The researcher also found a general lack of understanding among both groups in relation to OA in general and IRs in particular. However, the author noted that the participants of both groups indicated that the clarification of some assumptions and the answering of questions had left them with a
more positive impression of IRs and increased their willingness to contribute in future (Casey, 2012, pp. 5-8).

7.8 Author as Depositor

Once a faculty member is willing to contribute to an IR, the actual process of submitting must be completed. Should the library either request or receive documents from contributors and upload them onto the IR or should the contributor complete the process? Crow (2002) stated that “self-archive” is a broad term usually meaning the electronic posting of author supplied research (p. 11). However, this broad term does not explicitly state who completes the uploading process. Xia and Sun (2007) attempted to perform a quantitative analysis of self-archiving within several IRs, with the aim of identifying patterns of author archiving compared to non-author archiving. The researchers selected 9 repositories from a list of that use E-Prints as the repository software, E-Prints features a “depositor” field where data can be entered during the depositing process. The researchers selected well established IRs with a large amount of content. The authors took a sample of more than 10 per cent from each IR. Southampton University’s IR was the repository with the largest amount of content by a large margin; the researchers found that the majority of documents in this IR (77 per cent) were not deposited by the author, as the “deposited by” field contained either a department or school abbreviation or a name which was not that of the author. The situation was similar for 6 other IRs ranging from 61 per cent non-author upload (University of Queensland) to 99 per cent non-author upload (University of Strathclyde). The 2 remaining IRs did not provide depositor data (Xia & Sun, 2007, pp. 14-18).
Primary Research Findings

7.9 Incentives to Contribute

When it came to discovering incentives, the interviewees could not identify any incentives to contribute to eSource with certainty.

L3 suggested that an email had been circulated reminding researchers to contribute to eSource:

“Sometimes you will get some emails”

L1 answered directly when questioned about incentives to contribute:

“At the moment no (incentives)”

L2 was unaware of any incentives:

“Not that I’m aware of….haven’t really heard much about “when we do it then we should be putting it into the repository””

In relation to the repository software highlighting the most downloaded paper and this acting as an incentive, eSource uses D-Space for software and this is a feature of that product indicated in Figure 36.
7.10 Barriers to Contribution

The interviewees were not able to identify any barriers that could prevent contribution to eSource.

L1 remarked that although they had not yet contributed, the process (submitting) seemed straightforward:

“I haven’t tried…but the little attempts that I made I didn’t think it was that complicated”

L3, who had contributed, felt that the process seemed easy to complete:

“I think it’s quite clear”
7.11 Mandating Contribution

This survey question attempted to discover respondents’ attitude to mandatory contribution to eSource. The potential contribution material was limited to research that was conducted with the support of the college. As this type of research is in its infancy, this question related primarily to hypothetical research. One respondent skipped the question, of those who answered (55), 36 thought that supported researchers should be mandated to contribute to eSource compared to 19 who believed that there should be no mandatory contribution policy.

![Figure 37: Compulsory Contribution](image)

Figure 37: Compulsory Contribution
7.12 Faculty Discipline Affecting Willingness to Contribute

This research analysed whether faculty discipline affects willingness to contribute to eSource. The first part of the question asked respondents to identify their school; the two resulting groups (Arts and Business & Law) were then cross-tabulated with the question that queried willingness to contribute. Part one of the research revealed that the majority of respondents belonged to the School of Business and Law, 29 members of that school returned responses. The School of Arts faculty constituted the remaining 25 respondents.

![Figure 38: Faculty School](image-url)
Firstly, The School of Arts faculty were cross-tabulated with the question “Would you be willing to place research undertaken on DBS eSource”, 80 per cent (20) were willing to deposit compared to 20 per cent (5) who were not willing to deposit.

![Pie Chart](image)

**Figure 39: Arts Faculty Willingness**
Next the School of Business and Law faculty were then cross-tabulated with the question “Would you be willing to place research undertaken on DBS eSource”, 77.8 per cent (21) were willing to deposit compared to 22.2 per cent (6) who were not willing to deposit, 2 respondents skipped the question. When compared, differences in willingness to contribute are negligible between both schools.

![Business Faculty Willingness](image)

**Figure 40: Business Faculty Willingness**
7.13 Faculty Position Affecting Willingness to Contribute

This research analysed whether faculty contract type affects willingness to deposit on eSource. The two groups (full-time & part-time) were cross-tabulated with the question which queried willingness to contribute. Firstly, the group of 42 full-time lecturers was cross-tabulated with the question “Would you be willing to place research undertaken on DBS eSource”, 84.6 per cent (33) were willing to deposit compared to 15.4 per cent (6) who were unwilling to deposit, 3 respondents skipped the question.

Figure 41: Full-timers Willingness
Next, the group of 14 part-time lecturers was cross-tabulated with the same question “Would you be willing to place research undertaken on DBS eSource”, a noticeable lower 61.5 per cent (8) were willing to deposit compared to 38.5 per cent (5) who were unwilling to deposit, 1 respondent skipped the question. Overall, full-time lecturers are more willing to contribute to eSource compared to their part-time counterparts.

Figure 42: Part-timers Willingness
7.14 Contributor as Up-loader

This cross-tabulation analysis attempted to discover if those who were willing to contribute to eSource were also as willing to perform the uploading process. Firstly the respondents who were willing to contribute (unspecified) research to eSource were grouped together and then this group was cross-tabulated with the statement “Would you be willing to self-deposit on DBS eSource”. Of the willing contributors (41 in total), 85 per cent were willing to self-deposit compared to 15 per cent who were unwilling to perform the procedure. The question was skipped by 2 respondents.

Figure 43: Author Self-Deposit
7.15 Information Changing Attitudes

The final question of the survey attempted to ascertain if increased knowledge of IRs had changed three specific and one general attitude, either positively, negatively or neutrally. The first was a general attitude to IRs, the second related to willingness to contribute and the final two attitudes related to increased staff and student content on the IR. Respondents were asked if reading the accompanying email, viewing eSource and participating in the survey had changed their attitude. The first attitude was the following wide-ranging assertion “My attitude to repositories in general has changed”. 55 respondents answered the question with 1 skipping it. Attitudes had changed positively for 18 respondents, neutrally for 36 and negatively for 1 respondent.

Figure 44: General Attitude
The second attitude that was examined was a willingness to contribute to eSource, the question aimed to discover if increased information was an affecting factor. The statement “My attitude towards contributing to DBS eSource has changed” was presented. The survey found that attitudes had changed positively for 14 respondents, neutrally for 40 and negatively for 1 respondent. 1 respondent skipped the question.

Figure 45: Contribution Attitude
Faculty being more agreeable to an increased range of staff content was the third attitude to be captured. The statement “My attitude towards an increased range of staff content has changed” was displayed. The results revealed that attitudes had changed positively for 15 respondents, neutrally for 38 respondents and negatively for 2 respondents. 1 respondent skipped the question.

Figure 46: Staff Content
Finally, the last question of the survey aimed to discover if respondents’ attitude to an increased range of student content had been altered by participating in the survey. The declaration “My attitude towards an increased range of student content has changed” was presented. The survey results found that attitudes had changed positively for 20 respondents, neutrally for 34 and negatively for 1. The question was skipped by 1 respondent. In all four changed attitudes questions the majority of respondents selected neutrally, indicating that no change of attitude had occurred.

Figure 47: Student Content
Analysis & Conclusions

In this chapter, the research objective was exploring contribution to eSource and how certain variables affect this. However, a major barrier in analysing this research is the fact that the literature review covered several well populated IRs while the primary research analysed a faculty that had hardly contributed to a sparsely populated IR. For this reason the primary research could not examine actual contribution, so instead opted to examine a willingness to contribute or not. In relation to visually displaying download statistics as an incentive (Zuber), as indicated eSource has this function and not surprisingly the most downloaded item is a student deposit. The one interviewee who deposited (L3) could not identify any barriers to contribute, also all faculty members currently use an e-learning platform (Moodle) which suggests that lecturers are computer literate and consequently technology issues are unlikely to be a contribution barrier.

In relation to the aforementioned variables, the differences between the schools (Arts and Business) regarding contribution willingness is negligible, unlike the literature review findings. However, similar to the situation highlighted by Casey, those who have more of a commitment to an intuition (full-timers) are more willing to deposit. Any deposits that appear on eSource will be uploaded by the Library, a common occurrence according to Xia and Sun. Once lecturers begin contributing in greater numbers, the uploading policy could be amended as the primary research suggests that contributors would be willing to do this task themselves. Regarding mandatory contribution, the resistance predicted in Thomas and McDonald’s study is unlikely to occur, as a large majority feel that supported DBS researchers should be compelled to contribute to eSource. Finally, the last four questions relating to changed attitudes give cause for optimism, as a significant minority of respondents attitudes to IRs were changed positively by taking a ten minute survey. Much like Casey’s focus groups it
seems that any information about IRs improves attitudes towards them. Therefore, a targeted comprehensive information campaign should be employed as a strategy in promoting contribution to eSource.
Chapter Eight: Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 Summary of Research Questions and Answers

Below is a summary of the research questions and their findings, it should be remembered that the opinions and attitudes expressed have not resulted in large scale contribution to eSource. Strategies to rectify this situation will be addressed in the recommendations.

Research Objective One (Research within Teaching Institutions)

Q. Why would a teaching institution promote research among faculty?
   o The primary benefits include enhanced lecturer engagement, enhanced college reputation, attracting high achievers as students, offering a superior product and responding to the demands of HETAC and HEA as stakeholders.

Q. How is research promoted at DBS?
   o Primarily through the Research Committee and its activities. In terms of incentives to conduct research, full-timers would respond primarily to a time allowance, whereas part-timers could be incentivised by monetary reward.

Q. Are lecturers research-active at DBS?
   o Over half of lectures have conducted research outside their teaching remit.

Q. What barriers exist to conducting research in DBS?
   o For full-time lecturers the overwhelming barrier is a lack of time.
Research Objective Two (Awareness of IRs)

Q. Are DBS lecturers aware of repositories, both the concept and eSource?
   o The vast majority of lecturers are aware of both the concept of a repository and
     the existence of eSource.

Q. How can DBS Library effectively promote awareness and population of eSource?
   o The Library will need to engage lecturers on a one-to-one basis and sell the
     repository as a set of services offered by the Library.

Research Objective Three (Attitudes to OA and IRs)

Q. What are DBS lecturers’ attitudes towards OA, and does it affect willingness to
   contribute to eSource?
   o The majority of lecturers are positive about the concept of OA; the more
     positive a lecturer is the more likely they are to contribute to eSource.

Q. Do lecturers see the need for an OA repository at DBS?
   o An overwhelming majority thought that DBS requires a repository.

Q. How do lecturers rate different content appearing on an OA platform?
   o Respondents approved of student theses, academics’ articles and quality
     student assignments (with concerns) appearing on eSource, lecturers were
     hostile to their lecture notes appearing on eSource.

Q. What benefits can the depositor realise by contributing to a repository?
   o Enhanced prospects as a researcher and enhanced standing among a lecturer’s
     academic peers are the benefits that DBS lecturers concurred with.
Q. What are the institutional benefits for hosting a repository?

   o Establishing a research culture at DBS and acting as a display of DBS’s research.

Q. What concerns can prevent contribution?

   o The primary concern that was expressed related to increased plagiarism, other concerns highlighted were either not shared, or unheard of by lecturers.

Q. Can factors stemming from the institution affect contribution rates to the IR?

   o Lecturers could not identify actual barriers and incentives to contribute; they thought that colleagues who receive college support in their research should be mandated to contribute.

Q. Can factors relating to the individual affect willingness to contribute to the IR?

   o Faculty discipline is a negligible affecting factor in DBS, however full-time faculty are more willing to contribute to eSource than part-time lecturers.

Q. Does providing information about IRs change faculty attitudes towards them?

   o On average the attitudes of a quarter of respondents change favourably towards IRs by participating in the survey.
8.2 Limitations of Research

The primary limitations of this research were threefold, firstly in relation to “research supported by DBS”; currently this type of research is hypothetical as there are no official support structures for this. Therefore, respondents in the survey were giving opinions about a type of research that does not yet exist. The second limitation encountered related to the willingness of respondents to contribute “independent research” to eSource, there could have been many different individual factors reducing willingness to contribute, time and scope limitations prevented further research of this. Lastly, as so few lecturers had contributed to eSource, the barriers to the contribution process could not be fully examined and only a willingness to contribute could be explored as opposed to actual contribution.

8.3 Conclusion

This dissertation was a case-study of a situation somewhat unique in Ireland; it has not only added to, but instituted research in relation to IRs in Irish non-research third level institutions. It has highlighted and articulated the issues faced by non-research institutions that wish to promote research, and ultimately host this research on a repository. At DBS, the challenges in securing faculty deposits onto eSource were likely from its launch. At that time, the Library took the “if you build it they will come” approach and this has proven to be unsuccessful, in DBS and elsewhere (Giesecke, 2011, p. 531). Therefore, a concerted effort is required in order to get the IR populated. This is especially challenging as currently there is no official support of research in DBS (recommendation 1), resulting in all potential faculty deposits being independent research.

Although the findings revealed that there is a level of unawareness and ignorance about many aspects of OA and IRs among certain faculty members, again this is not unique to DBS; there are grounds for optimism. It transpired that the majority of faculty members at a private
college are willing to contribute unsupported independent research to the IR of that institution. In order to transform this willingness to contribute into actual deposits on eSource, the Library should adopt a more proactive approach; recommendations 2 and 3 describe two such strategies.
8.4 Recommendations

1

The findings of this dissertation suggest that official support structures for lecturers to conduct research are lacking in DBS, because of this, the majority, if not all research that has been conducted by DBS lecturers has been done independently. The Research Committee should continue its work in promoting independent research among those who chose to conduct it, however, if DBS wants to officially support research then time constraints must be considered. Currently, full-time lecturers are on 500 hour per year contracts and interviewees suggest that research is impossible with these lecturing commitments; also adopting either of Hawawini’s two institutional transition strategies (research or research-led teaching) would require a complete readjustment of full-time lecturers’ teaching commitments. However, there remains a third, more feasible option that DBS can adopt, in the short term, in order to become a research producing institution. It should not be forgotten that primary research is currently being undertaken by DBS students for their dissertations. DBS should, as official policy, give both part-time lecturers and students the option to collaborate in a joint effort to get dissertations of distinction level adapted and published (HETAC recommendation). The most obvious partnership would be between dissertation supervisor and postgraduate student. As policy, DBS should initially offer the supervisor role to those with possibly fewer time constraints, namely part-time lecturers. DBS should then aim to get a specific number of high quality postgraduate dissertations adapted as research papers and published annually. An increased remuneration for the conceivably more monetarily incentivized part-time lecturers combined with a small fee rebate for the students could act as tangible enticements to publish. This would represent a negligible investment in order to become a research producing institution which can realize the following benefits. Firstly, it will offer a superior product to
potential postgraduates, secondly, it will help establish DBS as a serious research institution, and lastly, it can enhance DBS’s reputation.

2

In relation to populating eSource, the recent addition of the “staff profiles” by the marketing department to the website has overcome a large hurdle in relation to this task. The staff profiles effectively created a census of independent research at DBS. From a college marketing perspective, each article title should link into a full text version of the research, which could showcase the calibre of lecturing staff to potential students. The Library should convince DBS to make this an official policy and then embark on a strategy to get consent from lecturers to deposit this already acknowledged research on eSource (copyright permitting). This could be considered a top-down approach.

3

The final recommendation is a more bottom-up approach in relation to securing contributions to eSource. Rather than trying to convince lecturers to contribute independent research to the IR, a “can you do something for us” approach, the Library should re-launch the repository as a personalised archiving service offered as “something we can do for you”. All that would be required is a change of both promotional literature and the method in which library staff members introduce and sell the concept of the IR (Digital Archiving Service).

The Library hosts an annual Staff Open Day which has been growing in popularity in recent years; it is an ideal opportunity to market the IR as the aforementioned service. Also, library staff can use the information from the staff profiles to target individual research active lecturers and endeavour to get them to avail of the digital archiving service that the Library now offers for their research portfolios.
Chapter Nine: Learning Reflections

9.1 Introduction and Researcher Background

The objective of this reflective learning account is to articulate how the programme has added value to both me and my working life. As it is a self-reflection it will be expressed in the first person. I should give some background about myself and my work. I am an Arts graduate who has worked in an academic library environment (Dublin Business School) for the previous seven years. I currently man an information point and would consider my role to be a combination of IT trouble-shooter and information skills provider. I have attended many training sessions in relation to information evaluation and retrieval. The library I work in has both implemented and kept abreast of the latest developments in the library world, for this reason I would consider myself quite well informed in relation to an academic library’s challenges, processes and strategies.

9.2 The Research Methods Module

This Semester One module, although not the most stimulating, was very useful in preparing me to conduct my own research. The theory of research methods, specifically research philosophies, was what I found to be the most beneficial in preparing for my dissertation. I had always been under the impression that a researcher must be one hundred per cent objective, and prior to commencing the module, I had assumed that maintaining this objectivity would be my biggest challenge. I was therefore relieved to learn that several different research philosophies exist that one can adopt to fit your own personality. With regard to the SPSS training, although this was expertly delivered, I had already decided that any quantitative analysis that was required would be done via Survey-Monkey, this is because I have, for work, conducted, analysed and cross-tabulated many Library surveys and was quite comfortable and knowledgeable using this application. However, the SPSS training
has assisted me in work, DBS students often use this software and I can now more confidentially troubleshoot any issues that they experience with SPSS.

9.3 Dissertation Choice

Before I had embarked on this Master’s Degree I was very familiar with the concept of an institutional repository. I had attended several LIR HEAnet conferences over the years where IRs had been discussed on numerous occasions. The Head Librarian became very enthusiastic about IRs, resulting in DBS Library launching its own, eSource, in May 2010. A colleague of mine, the Digitization Librarian was charged with establishing the repository and promoting population of it. In September 2011 at the library Staff Open Day I manned the eSource information point, in preparation I researched the promotional material that the Library had produced in order to encourage faculty to participate. I gave demonstrations to several lecturers who indicated that they had produced research and were willing to contribute, when contribution did not occur I was somewhat surprised and curious to discover why this had not happened. However, as I was not charged with populating the repository I did not follow through on it. When the time arrived for me to think about a dissertation choice (December 2011), I decided to revisit this on-going issue of the under populated repository. Therefore, I was presented with a real challenge in my own work place and investigating this problem via my dissertation served two purposes. Firstly, the Library can use my findings to formulate a new strategy to populate the IR and secondly I was able to lodge my research as a work project as I was investigating a problem experienced by my colleagues in my workplace, however, remaining somewhat objective would be a challenge.
9.4 Objectivity

I realised that remaining completely objective would be quite difficult for me and therefore chose to use the post-positivism research philosophy. This philosophy contends that the values of the researcher will influence their study and this allowed me to approach this research with a certain outlook. I had built up a good rapport with many lecturers over the years, for this reason I had to be careful in how the survey was worded and the interview questions were phrased. Any type of inquisition about the lack of contribution was avoided and I instead probed a general willingness and/or unwillingness to contribute from the interviewees. The survey was drawn by presenting several themes that had emerged from the literature. The lack of open questions was not an attempt to limit the response options of respondents, the likert questions were employed because the literature relating to OAs and IRs contained much jargon and it was felt that displaying the emergent themes in plain English while allowing respondents to accept/reject them was a better way to conduct the research.
9.5 Using Promotional Material as a Starting Point

DBS Library has produced hand-outs and leaflets relating to eSource (Figure 48), also the eSource website contained a FAQs section. Both of these sources of information were first consulted in order to obtain a general picture of the issues relating to OA and repositories. All of the repository considerations and issues were clearly articulated in both of these resources. I then set upon researching and reading as many resources as possible that I could find in preparation for my literature review.

Figure 48: eSource Hand-out
9.6 Research & Writing: Literature Review

I took a quite targeted approach when writing the literature review. I created different topics relating to OA and IRs and then set about researching each topic separately. This suited the outline of my thesis as it would consist of five separate literature reviews, each dedicated to separate research questions. As indicated in the methodology section, time constraints were an impediment for me and I used by research skills, somewhat fine-tuned by participating in the Information Literacy module, to conduct targeted online searches. I searched the DBS subscribed databases, TCD Stella Discovery Tool and Google. My work entails that I possess the ability to properly evaluate online formation and I used this skill, again enhanced by the Information Literacy module, to discover and read the literature. I learnt that the majority of authors who have researched OA and repositories have opted to host their findings on an OA platform. For this reason I was able to source the majority of the literature without using DBS’s subscribed databases. In relation to writing the literature review, I decided that certain topics would be allocated an approximate amount of words and aimed to write a specific amount of words per day. My personality type gets satisfaction from crossing off tasks from a list, and the ability to hit these targets on a daily basis was an effective motivator for me.

9.7 Research & Writing: Primary Research

The survey emerged from the findings of the literature review. However, it was suggested to me by Dr Chris McLaughlin that a mixed methods research strategy would give better insight into the factors that can affect conducting research and willingness to contribute to eSource. During the early summer I approached three lecturers who I know were research active and asked to interview them. The interviews were targeted, but allowed the respondents to elaborate somewhat, again the skills and techniques learnt in the Research Methods module were used.
9.8 Limitations and Progress

The Research Methods Module also gave me the opportunity to write a literature review for my proposal, at that time I had already decided on my dissertation topic and researched the issues relating to repositories. I was committed to conducting the research within DBS, and therefore had to get the survey out before the majority of lecturers left for the summer. This was the most pressure that I found myself under for this dissertation. The compiling of the dissertation was completed over 35 days of actual writing. I prefer to get the words onto the page and then review several times at a later stage, this method of writing suites me as I work by hitting targets, but once something is written I reflect upon it and review it several times.

9.9 Learning and the Learning Cycle

Learning can be defined in three separate ways. Firstly it can be defined as a noun, the knowledge acquired by systematic study in any field of scholarly application. Secondly it is a verb, the process of acquiring knowledge or skill. The last definition has a more psychological meaning; it is the modification of behaviour through practice, training, or experience. (Dictionary.com, 2012). Kolb developed a learning theory which identified four distinct learning styles; these styles are based on a four stage learning cycle which sees learning as a process (verb). With this cycle (Figure 49) “immediate or concrete experiences” provide a basis for “observations and reflections”. These are then assimilated and distilled into “abstract concepts” producing new implications for action which can be “actively tested” in turn creating new experiences; at this stage the cycle is complete (businessballs.com, no date).
Figure 49: Kolb’s Learning Styles

The four learning styles which Kolb identified, namely, diverging, assimilating, converging and accommodating occur between each stage of the learning cycle. For example after watching and before thinking about a task, a process of assimilating occurs within the learner.

9.10 Different Types of Learners

Kolb identified four types of learner to accompany his learning styles. The diverger looks at thinks in different perspectives, is sensitive and interested in people. The assimilator prefers a concise logical learning approach, ideas are more important than people. The converger prefers technical tasks and uses their skills to problem solve. The accommodator is a hands-on learner, using intuition rather than logic (Figure 49).

Honey and Mumford adapted Kolb’s learning model and created a learning cycle which complimented their theory of four types of learner. These are identified as reflector, theorist, pragmatist and activist (Figure 50). The reflector stands back, gathers data, ponders and
analyses before implementation. The theorist thinks things through in logical steps, is rationally objective and rejects subjectivity. The pragmatist is down to earth, enjoys problem solving, makes decisions quickly and is easily bored with long discussions. While the activist lives in the here and now, is open-minded and is easily bored with the implementation process. The two styles have strong similarities (businessballs.com, no date).

![Honey and Mumford Learning Cycle](image-url)

**Figure 50: Honey and Mumford Learning Cycle**
9.11 My Learning Type

The combination of completing this Master’s degree along with writing this reflective journal has helped me identify my learning type; essentially I am a converger (Kolb) pragmatist (Mumford). At the time of taking the Scientific Research Methods Module I realised that I would prefer to conduct quantitative research rather than qualitative. Analysing statistics appealed to me rather than conducting interviews. I prefer to work on my own; a Capstone type group dissertation would not appeal to me. I consider myself practical and realised that I would have to treat my research objectives as separate mini dissertations from the beginning. Although this is how I would classify myself as a learner, in my work environment, I enjoy one-to-one interaction with the customer and adopt a hands-on approach to problem solving (Kolb’s Accommodator). After completing this programme of study, I feel more confident in my business writing, attending library related conferences and I believe that I can add value to DBS, as both a more highly trained employee and a successful graduate.
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Appendices

Digitization Librarian Questions

1. What is the library’s role in populating the repository?
2. Do you think that the library should be evaluating what is in the repository?
3. In your opinion what is the best way to promote the repository

Academic Director Questions

1. Can you please outline why this self-described “teaching institution” (Quality Assurance Manual) is promoting research? Is there any link to HETAC most recent institutional review?
2. Can you identify any benefits for this institution in conducting/promoting research?
3. Can you identify any benefits for this institution in having an institutional repository?

Research Committee Member Questions

1. Do you think that there is currently a research culture in this institution?
2. How do you feel about the concept of teaching and learning being informed by research?
3. Can you tell me how about the establishment of the research committee?
4. Who played a prominent part in its establishment?
5. What are the aims of the research committee?
6. How does the research committee promote research generally within DBS?
7. Identify the benefits both tangible and intangible to conducting research at DBS for both institution and researcher?
8. Has the research committee attempted to gather research conducted by faculty members?
9. Are there any specific incentives for individual faculty members to conduct research?

10. Can you identify any barriers that could prevent research in DBS?

**Lecturer Questions**

1. What are your feelings with regard to the open access movement which IRs fall under?

2. Does the organisational culture of this institution support research?
   - *If yes, how is it supported?*
   - *If no, please elaborate.*

3. Are there any barriers that exist that prevent you conducting research at DBS?
   - *If yes, what are they?*

4. Are there any incentives that exist that promote conducting research at DBS?
   - *If yes, what are they?*
   - *If not, could you suggest an incentive?*

5. Would you contribute research conducted outside DBS to DBS’s IR?
   - *If no, then why not?*

6. Are there any barriers that exist that prevent you submitting to DBS’s IR?
   - *If there are, can you identify them?*

7. A large majority of respondents indicated that staff lecture notes should not appear on an open access IR, do you share this opinion?
   - *If yes, why?*

8. Are there any incentives for you to upload your own research onto eSource?

9. Can you identify any other reasons why there could be a low amount of contribution to DBS eSource?
Questionnaire

1. Please select your school
   - School of Arts
   - School of Business & Law

2. Prior to this survey, were you familiar with the concept of an institutional repository?
   - Yes
   - No

3. Have you ever consulted another institution's institutional repository?
   - Yes
   - No

4. Do you see the need for an institutional repository at DBS?
   - Yes
   - No

5. Please rate these statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An institutional repository can act as a catalyst in establishing a research culture at DBS.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An open source institutional repository can act as the &quot;shop window&quot; of research of DBS.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions that engage in research attract higher quality students.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Are you aware that DBS has an institutional repository?
   - Yes
   - No
7. If yes to previous question, where did you hear about the institutional repository at DBS (eSource)?

- Library Staff
- Library Website
- Fellow Lecturer
- Library Newsletter
- Other

8. Are you aware that DBS has a research committee?

- Yes
- No

9. 

- Yes
- No

10. If yes, was this research published in any way?

- Yes
- No

11. Bearing in mind that copyright remains with the author; please rate these statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Complctly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Complctly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my research appearing on an open access institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repository will affirm my standing amongst my peers in academia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my research appearing on an open access institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repository will increase my marketability as a researcher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the majority of academic research should be made freely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available to the public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Would you be willing to place research you have undertaken on DBS eSource?
   - Yes
   - No

13. If yes, can you specify the remit of the research you would place on DBS eSource?
   - Research related to DBS
   - Research not related to DBS

14. Would you be willing to self deposit (researcher uploads) on DBS eSource?
   - Yes
   - No

15. In terms of effectiveness (5 being the most effective and 1 being the least) please rate how these support structures could influence your decision to conduct research at DBS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Structure</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. If a lecturer conducts research with the stated support of DBS, should that person be mandated to deposit their findings on DBS eSource?
   - Yes
   - No

17. Have students ever requested access to previous years essays and/or assignments as an example of good quality work?
   - Yes
   - No

18. Do you think that good quality student essays and/or assignments should be hosted on DBS eSource?
   - Yes
   - No

19. Do you see any problems arising by allowing students independent access to previous essays and/or assignments, if so please state any problems you see arising.
20. Please select your contract type.

- Full Time
- Part Time

21. Please rate these common concerns that have been expressed with regard to institutional repositories, 1 being you completely share this concern and 5 being you completely disregard this concern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repositories will facilitate plagiarism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal publishers will not publish material that has appeared on repositories.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repository use will kill academic journals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to a repository is an imposition on academic authors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Please rate these items that could appear on DBS eSource, 1 being you believe that the item should definitely be held on eSource and 5 being it should definitely not be held on eSource.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles written by DBS academics with support of DBS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles written by DBS academics independently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference or workshops items written by DBS academics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters written by DBS academics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBS academics' lecture notes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBS academics' class assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student theses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student literature reviews.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs written by students and staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book reviews written by students and staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Taking into consideration the accompanying email, the viewing of DBS eSource and participating in this survey, please select the most appropriate attitude to these statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positively</th>
<th>Neutrally</th>
<th>Negatively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My attitude towards institutional repositories in general has changed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My attitude towards contributing to DBS eSource has changed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My attitude towards an increased range of staff content has changed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My attitude towards an increased range of student content has changed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>