



Project Document Cover Sheet

Project Information			
Project Acronym	IncReASe		
Project Title	Increasing repository content through automation and services		
Start Date	01/07/2007	End Date	28/02/2009
Lead Institution	University of Leeds		
Project Director	Bo Middleton		
Project Manager & contact details	Rachel Proudfoot Edward Boyle Library University of Leeds LS2 9JT 0113 343 7067 r.e.proudfoot@leeds.ac.uk		
Partner Institutions	University of Leeds, University of Sheffield, University of York		
Project Web URL	http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/increase/		
Programme Name (and number)	Repositories and preservation programme (04/06)		
Programme Manager	Andrew McGregor		

Document Name			
Document Title	<i>Questionnaire Report</i>		
Reporting Period	<i>for progress reports only</i>		
Author(s) & project role			
Date		Filename	
URL	<i>if document is posted on project web site</i>		
Access	<input type="checkbox"/> Project and JISC internal		<input type="checkbox"/> General dissemination

Document History		
Version	Date	Comments
0.1 – 0.3	13/08/2008	Circulation to project team only
1	31/10/08	Public

IncReASe: Increasing repository content through automation and services

Questionnaire Report

May 2008

Beccy Shipman, Project Officer

Rachel Proudfoot, Project Manager

Key findings

- Awareness of White Rose Research Online was disappointingly low – only 29% of respondents (93) had heard of WRRO prior to the questionnaire.
- Awareness of funders' policies on Open Access deposit of research outputs was also low. 65% of respondents were not aware of their funders' policies.
- 78% of respondents do not submit details of their publications to any systems or databases outside the University.
- Funder mandates were more popular than institutional mandates. 72% would willingly comply with a funder mandate compared with 65% willingly complying with a university mandate.
- Usage statistics was the most popular service for WRRO to offer to depositors.
- Though awareness of Open Access issues was low, 81% of respondents wanted their work to be freely available online.
- Carrying out a questionnaire can prove to be a useful advocacy tool.
- At the point of publication or after publication were the most popular times to deposit papers in WRRO.
- A recurrent request from respondents was for “regular reminders” to deposit. Broad brush advocacy may not be adequate for this task.

1. Introduction

An online questionnaire was not in the original project plan for the IncReASe project. However, it was felt the questionnaire could be extremely useful in providing supplementary information to our survey of publication data and interviews with academics. It would allow us to:

1. poll information on what departmental systems (not necessarily public) are in place to gather metadata (and possibly full text)
2. gather details of where researchers are required to / choose to deposit details of their publications (inside and outside their University)
3. identify drivers for deposit
4. identify areas for potential service development
5. publicise WRRO

These areas are also covered in the interviews with academics, but the questionnaire allowed us to reach significantly more people than we could interview.

2. Methodology

2.1 Audience

The first step in developing the questionnaire was to establish the audience. Targeting a spokesperson for each department was initially considered. This might be a library rep, the head of department or the chair of the research committee. Departmental administrators who would have knowledge of the existing systems utilised by the department as a whole were also considered. It was decided that neither of these groups would offer the diversity of views accessed through targeting all researchers, academic staff and research students.

2.2 Survey Software

Whilst the target audience was being chosen, it was also necessary to select the survey software. A number of different options were considered (see Appendix 1) and the Bristol Online Surveys (BOS) software was chosen. There were a number of reasons for this selection including local technical support and no cost due to an institutional subscription.

2.3 Questionnaire Design

Following the selection of the software, the design of the questionnaire was carried out over 5 months (see Appendix 2). This involved a number of drafts and revisions that were sent to the steering group, librarians, academics and administrative staff. A number of academics were selected to include some with prior knowledge of Open Access issues and WRRO, and some with no prior knowledge. This helped to

ensure the questionnaire was accessible and understandable to the widest audience possible.

The Embed project team at Cranfield University and Sheridan Brown at Key Perspectives were also consulted about the questionnaire design. The Embed project was carrying out a face to face questionnaire with academics about the same time as the WRRO questionnaire was being developed. This Embed survey was being undertaken by Sheridan Brown at Key Perspectives. Sheridan provided some very useful feedback on the draft design of the questionnaire including some recommendations for questions to include (such as the mandate questions) and distribution strategies. This input was very valuable.

The questionnaire contained a range of question types including closed and open ended questions. The main topics covered were:

- Institutional Information
- Research publications online (including current archiving behaviours)
- Knowledge of OA and repositories
- Drivers to deposit
- Funding bodies
- Institutional and funder mandates

The questionnaire is available at

<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/increase/questionnaire.html>

2.4 Questionnaire Distribution

The questionnaire was launched on the 12th February and closed on the 26th March 2008. Endorsement for the questionnaire was received from the pro-vice chancellors (PVC) for research from the three institutions. This helped the distribution of the questionnaire as emails were sent out from the relevant PVC at each institution. These emails were sent to a number of mailing lists and announcement services across the three institutions (see Appendix 3). Librarians were also contacted and asked to contact their library reps about the questionnaire and encourage their department to complete it.

2.5 Questionnaire Findings and Dissemination

The dissemination of findings from the questionnaire has been targeted at two different groups, the academic community and the repository community (see Appendix 4). A findings summary (http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/increase/Increase_Questionnaire_Findings.pdf) has been produced focussing on questions of interest to academics. The summary also includes some wider information about White Rose Research Online and funder mandates. This summary has been emailed out to all those respondents who wished to be contacted. It has also been distributed to librarians across the three institutions and to some repository mailing lists. This questionnaire report will be disseminated to the repository community.

3. Findings

All percentages are worked out as a percentage of the total number of respondents (325). Respondents were able to select more than one option for some questions.

1. Which institution are you based at?	Totals	
University of Leeds	127	39%
University of Sheffield	132	41%
University of York	66	20%

2. Please state the name of your department / research centre.	Totals
Archaeology	9
Architecture	2
Biological Sciences	30
Business and management	8
Chemistry	13
Communication studies	6
Computer science	13
Design	1
Earth and environment	17
Economics	5
Education	22
Engineering	34
Geography	13
Health sciences	12
History	4
History of art	6
Information studies	3
Kroto research institute	1
Law	5
Mathematics	15
Medicine and medical sciences	18
Modern Languages	33
Music	3
Philosophy	3
Physics	14
Politics	10
Psychology	11
Sociology, social policy and related	4
Town and regional planning	5

3. Which of the following best describes your role at the University:	Totals	
Professor, Reader, Senior Lecturer, Senior Research Fellow	124	38%
Lecturer, Research Fellow	98	30%
Graduate Student, Post-doctoral Researcher	74	23%
<i>Other</i>	28	8%
<i>No Answer</i>	1	1%

4. Do you list your research publications on an individual staff webpage?	Totals	
No	86	26%
Yes	214	66%
<i>Other</i>	25	8%
<i>No Answer</i>	0	0

5. What information about your publications do you have on your staff webpage?	Totals	
Bibliographic information	221	68%
Links to full text (e.g. pdf or Word files you have attached)	52	16%
Links to full text elsewhere	61	19%
<i>Other</i>	27	8%
<i>No Answer</i>	83	25%
Totals	444	

6. How often do you update the research outputs information on your staff webpage?	Totals	
Immediately	52	16%
Every month	27	8%
Every semester	41	13%
Annually	69	21%
<i>Other</i>	57	18%
<i>No Answer</i>	79	24%

7. What types of publications are listed on your department's website?	Totals	
My department does not list publications on its website	63	19%
Journal articles	223	69%
Book chapters	161	50%
Books	166	51%
Theses	44	14%
Working papers	45	14%
Conference papers	92	28%
Research reports	66	20%
<i>Other</i>	37	11%
<i>No Answer</i>	9	3%
Totals	906	

8. Whose responsibility is it to update information on the departmental website?	Totals	
Authors themselves	129	40%
Administrative staff	108	33%
Other members of the research team	25	8%
Don't know	62	19%
<i>Other</i>	40	12%
<i>No Answer</i>	43	13%
Totals	407	

9. How often is the information updated on the departmental website?	Totals	
Immediately	37	11%
Every month	27	8%
Every semester	15	5%
Every year	31	10%
Don't know	134	41%
<i>Other</i>	56	17%
<i>No Answer</i>	44	14%
Totals	344	

10. Do you submit details of your publications to any other University, faculty or departmental database?	Totals	
Yes	34	10%
No	210	65%
ULPD (University of Leeds staff only)	78	24%
Somebody does it on my behalf (please state who below)	20	6%
<i>No Answer</i>	6	2%
Totals	348	

10.a. If yes, please give details of where you deposit. If someone else deposits on your behalf please give details of their role.

The most frequently mentioned place to deposit was a university publications database. Other places mentioned were department or faculty databases. Administrators and information officers were the most common roles to deposit on behalf of respondents.

11. Do you submit details of your publications to any systems or databases outside the University?	Totals	
No	253	78%
Yes	48	15%
Somebody does it on my behalf (please specify who below)	3	1%
<i>Other</i>	15	5%
<i>No Answer</i>	6	2%

11.a. If yes, please specify where you submit and why. If someone deposits on your behalf please specify their role.

The most popular systems to submit papers to were ArXiv, UK PubMed Central, funding bodies such as NERC, the Leverhulme Trust, British Heart Foundation and the ESRC. The NHS and WRRO were also mentioned.

Amongst the reasons given for submitting papers were that it is expected in the field (particularly with reference to arXiv), fulfilling funding requirements and increased visibility.

12. Would you like to have your research publications freely available online?	Totals	
	Yes	260
No	11	3%
Don't know	51	16%
<i>No Answer</i>	3	1%

12.a. Please say why / why not.

Most respondents wanted the increased visibility for their work and to provide access to papers usually only available with subscriptions. Those who didn't want their work available through Open Access were worried about not being able to publish in the future and about having early versions of their work available.

13. Do you have any subject specific Open Access repositories for your discipline area?	Totals	
	Yes	55
No	83	26%
Don't know	184	57%
<i>No Answer</i>	3	1%

13.a. If yes, what are the subject specific repositories for your discipline area?

ArXiv and UK PubMed Central were the most popular subject specific repositories. Others mentioned were ERIC, BEI, RePEc and Ed-Line

14. Had you heard of White Rose Research Online (http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/) before you received this questionnaire?	Totals	
	Yes	93
No	228	70%
<i>No Answer</i>	4	1%

15. Have you deposited research publications in White Rose Research Online?	Totals	
	Yes - deposited myself	19
Yes - someone has deposited on my behalf	16	5%
Yes - have deposited on behalf of someone else	0	0%
No	296	91%
<i>Other</i>	7	2%
<i>No Answer</i>	2	1%
Totals	340	

15.a. If yes, what might encourage you to deposit more frequently?

A wide range of services and factors to encourage deposit were raised. These included:

- regular reminders
- easy system to use
- offering mediated services
- easier copyright
- being allowed to deposit publisher's PDF
- higher profile for WRRO

15.b. If no, what might encourage you to deposit?

The responses to this question were very similar to those for question 15.a.:

- single deposit, multiple uses
- greater awareness of WRRO
- automated service
- mediated service
- changes in copyright
- easy system to use
- reaching a greater audience
- if repository was used by community

16. What types of materials would you like to be able to deposit in White Rose Research Online?

Journal articles were the most frequently named type of material respondents wanted to deposit. There were a number of other types of materials suggested:

- conference papers
- free software
- patents
- earlier versions of papers
- non-refereed articles (e.g. professional press items)
- datasets
- theses
- working papers
- final grant reports
- presentations

Some respondents also wanted to be able to deposit any or all types of materials.

17. When, during the lifecycle of your research, would you like to deposit in White Rose Research Online?

The most popular time to deposit is at or after publication for papers. Other times suggested were:

- at all stages of research / any time / constantly
- annually / summertime / vacation
- before paper is published / as soon as paper is finished or accepted
- immediately
- at the end of research project
- depends / don't know
- never

18. What services might encourage you to use White Rose Research Online (more frequently)?	Totals	
Statistics about your publications (e.g. number of times your papers have been downloaded)	202	62%
RSS feeds (e.g. notification when new papers are available in your subject area)	138	42%
Different export options (e.g. export search results to Endnote)	79	24%
Automatic feeds to other systems / repositories (e.g. deposit in WRRO means your papers are automatically deposited in your funder's repository)	95	29%
Customised reports (e.g. the ability to prepare reports on the output of your dept or colleagues)	58	18%
Links to your papers from your personal website	186	57%
<i>Other</i>	31	10%
<i>No Answer</i>	44	14%
Totals	831	

19. What would make you want to deposit your research into White Rose Research Online on a regular basis?

A range of drivers for increased deposit were suggested:

- increased use by others (both deposit and searching)
- increased dissemination of work
- regular reminders
- easy system to use
- single deposit, multiple uses
- increased citation counts
- don't know / nothing
- automation
- mediated services
- more time
- financial incentive (one respondent suggested air miles!)

20. If the university "required" you to deposit copies of your articles in White Rose Research Online or another open archive, what would be your reaction?	Totals	
I would comply willingly	210	65%
I would comply reluctantly	69	21%
I would not comply	26	8%
<i>No Answer</i>	20	6%

21. Who are the major funders for your research area?
The major funders were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the 7 major research councils • a range of charities including the Leverhulme Trust, Wellcome Trust, Joseph Rowntree Foundation and British Heart Foundation • government departments • universities

22. Are you aware of your funders' policies on Open Access deposit of research outputs?	Totals	
Yes	36	11%
No	212	65%
Some but not all	63	19%
<i>Other</i>	3	1%
<i>No Answer</i>	11	3%

22.a. If yes, please summarise what the policies are.
Knowledge of the policies was mixed. Some respondents knew about requirements for deposit of data and / or publications. Others thought there were no requirements to deposit when their funders did have a policy to support this.

23. If your funder "required" you to deposit copies of your articles in White Rose Research Online or another open archive, what would be your reaction?	Totals	
I would comply willingly	233	72%
I would comply reluctantly	56	17%
I would not comply	16	5%
<i>No Answer</i>	20	6%

27. Do you have any other comments or suggestions about the questionnaire, White Rose Research Online or access to research?

Over a fifth of respondents had further comments or suggestions and they were hugely varied, including:

- criticism of the questionnaire (too long, questions ambiguous) though this was very limited
- queries about how WRRO might interoperate with other systems respondents currently use
- suggestions for increased advocacy due to respondents' lack of awareness of WRRO
- general observations about WRRO or Open Access, (some critical and others supportive) e.g.:

"I see this as another bureaucratic exercise. Why should anyone be interested in the output of White Rose staff? Why? People get the information they need from Web of Science. Why should they go to this service? Who is it aimed at? Stupid idea."

"It's a good thing. Research needs to be available to all, not just those associated with wealthy academic institutions."

"Keep up the good work."

- queries about copyright
- 9 people commented to say they had no comment

4. Outcomes for the project

4.1 Research publications online (including current archiving behaviours)

The information about research publications online supports the website survey we carried out. Individual staff webpages predominantly contain bibliographic information without full text. These webpages contain some links to full text elsewhere but this may be behind a subscription barrier. The information about publications available online is very inconsistent, as is the updating of this information.

A large proportion of respondents (78%) do not submit publications information anywhere outside the university. This suggests that WRRO offer a service that respondents are not currently receiving elsewhere.

The majority of advocacy work for institutional repositories has been aimed at academic staff. However, responsibility for updating publications information seems divided between academic staff and administrators. This would suggest introducing an additional approach for advocacy, targeting administrators, might increase the content of the repository.

4.2 Knowledge of OA and repositories

General knowledge about open access issues, repositories and WRRO specifically was very low. Over half of respondents did not know whether they had a subject specific OA repository. 70% of respondents had not heard of WRRO before filling out the questionnaire and 91% of respondents had not deposited in WRRO. These responses suggest there is still a significant amount of advocacy work to be done across the three institutions. The questionnaire itself and dissemination of the results have contributed to raising the profile of WRRO. However, it is also necessary to develop some new advocacy materials and undertake a wide reaching publicity campaign.

4.3 Drivers to deposit

The majority of the drivers for deposit suggested by respondents were to reduce the time it takes to add items to WRRO. These included making the system easy to use, providing a mediated service and / or an automated service. This supports one of the aims of the IncReASe project which is to explore automated services. In terms of a mediated service, WRRO currently offers some support for this but does not have the resources to offer this widely across the three institutions.

Some respondents also wanted the repository to be used more (by depositors and those searching) before they would consider using it. This is difficult to achieve if academic staff will not deposit until others are doing so. However, increased advocacy as well as content added through automated and mediated services may assist with this.

The types of services that respondents indicated WRRO should offer were usage statistics, RSS feeds and links on personal webpages to full text in the repository. Limited usage statistics are already available but it is hoped more detailed information can be offered on the release of IRStats. We can already offer RSS feeds and links to full text but it seems awareness of these services is low. Information about these services should be included in any new advocacy materials.

4.4 Funding bodies

Knowledge of funders' Open Access policies was relatively low. Amongst those who indicated they were aware of the policies there were still inaccuracies. This suggests the funding bodies are not publicising their policies sufficiently. Whilst this is not the responsibility of WRRO, it may offer an opportunity for further advocacy work. Targeted advocacy to grant holders, perhaps accessed through the research support offices, could provide a rewarding strategy for WRRO.

4.5 Institutional and funder mandates

The introduction of institutional mandates at the three White Rose institutions is not yet at the development stage. As a result there are no immediate implications to the results of the question on institutional mandates. However, the results may prove useful for future discussions on the topic.

Willing compliance for an institutional mandate was as low as 60% at one institution. If the results for all three institutions are analysed by job title (for an institutional mandate) of those in the categories “Professor, Reader, Senior Lecturer, Senior Research Fellow” and “Graduate Student, Post-doctoral Researcher” only 62% would comply willingly. This suggests the introduction of an institutional mandate would be unpopular with a significant proportion (as much as 40%) of the academic staff.

Compliance with funder mandates was generally higher than for institutional mandates. However, as discussed above knowledge of these mandates is relatively low. The IncReASe project is undertaking work with the ESRC to assist grant holders in fulfilling their OA requirements. This work should be coupled with more advocacy about funder requirements.

5. Wider Implications

The questionnaire has provided a useful insight into the depositing behaviours and knowledge of open access issues of academic staff and research students across three institutions. The results support the findings of the earlier website survey that very few academics have full text versions of their papers available on their staff webpages.

The results also support a number of findings from the Embed project (Key Perspectives 2008). These include the importance of advocacy, the need to offer some level of mediated service (possibly also with the help of departmental administrators), the ability to provide usage statistics and the promotion of the repository as a time saver.

The issue that the questionnaire results do not wholly support is that of mandates. The benchmark study carried out by Key Perspectives (Swan and Brown 2005) indicated just over 80% of respondents would comply willingly while the IncReASe results indicate less than 70%, with some variation between institutions.

Response to an institutional or funder mandate	IncReASe	Key Perspectives
Willingly comply	68%	81%
Reluctantly comply	19%	13%
Not comply	7%	5%
No answer	6%	

This suggests an institutional mandate would receive an ambivalent response and thus may not provide positive exposure for WRRO. The Embed Project suggests that patchwork mandates from departments or schools might be a productive strategy. The IncReASe questionnaire did not explore the area of departmental mandates, and this might be an area to pursue further.

6. Conclusions

The questionnaire has revealed the lack of self-archiving and low level of awareness of open access issues across the three White Rose institutions. This is highlighted in that only 29% of respondents had heard of WRRO before they received the questionnaire. Carrying out the questionnaire and disseminating the results has proved a useful advocacy tool in itself. The questionnaire achieved wide distribution with the endorsement of the Pro-Vice Chancellors for research at each of the three institutions. The response rate was also reasonable and has engaged more academic staff with WRRO. The repository has had some deposits as a direct result of the questionnaire. The questionnaire has also produced a list of people willing to be contacted and this is an extremely useful resource. This list has provided contacts to interview in the next stage of the IncReASe project.

A number of services and developments for WRRO have been identified through the questionnaire. Some of these services are already available and need greater publicity. Suggestions for other services will be explored in the interviews and case studies, as well as the technical developments for the IncReASe project.

References

Swan A. and Brown S. (2005) Open access self-archiving: An author study.
<Accessed at:
[http://www.keyperspectives.co.uk/openaccessarchive/reports/Open%20Access%20II%20\(author%20survey%20on%20self%20archiving\)%202005.pdf](http://www.keyperspectives.co.uk/openaccessarchive/reports/Open%20Access%20II%20(author%20survey%20on%20self%20archiving)%202005.pdf) 13/08/08>

Key Perspectives (2008) Embed Project: Research community requirements study.
<Accessed at: http://cclibweb-1.dmz.cranfield.ac.uk/embed/index.php/Embed_Wiki 13/08/08 >

Appendix 1

Software Selection

Survey Software 09/10/2007

Bristol Online Surveys <http://www.survey.bris.ac.uk/>

I have selected the Bristol Online Surveys (BOS) software for the following reasons:

- BOS is supported by Leeds University so training documentation and support are available.
- BOS has been used by others in the library and found to be satisfactory, though not without some issues.
- The software generates a useful URL which is short and easy to remember.
- There are no limits on the number of questions asked.
- There are no limits on the number of respondents surveyed.
- The software is free as Leeds has an institutional subscription. (York also appear to have a subscription).
- It is possible to have a variety of different question types, from tick boxes to full text answers.
- The results can be exported to Excel and SPSS for further analysis.
- Questions can be optional or mandatory.

Prior to the decision to use BOS I explored a range of software. Outlines of their pros and cons are below.

Esurveypro

<http://www.esurveyspro.com/>

Free

- Unlimited questions
- Unlimited responses
- Can't add own logo
- Can't specify mandatory questions
- Also has subscription rate of \$100 p.a.

Smart-survey

<http://www.smart-survey.co.uk/>

Free

- Unlimited questions
- Unlimited surveys
- Can't add logo
- No export function
- Can't review individual responses

- Also has subscription rates of £14.99 / 29.99 + VAT per month (35% discount for educational institutions)

Stellarsurvey

<http://www.stellarsurvey.com/>

Free

- 50 responses per month
- 10 surveys
- 10 questions per survey
- 10 choices per question
- 50 tracked responses
- Also has subscription rates of \$9.95 / 14.95 / 19.95 / 29.95 per month

Surveymethods

<http://www.surveymethods.com/>

Free

- 20 questions per survey
- 100 responses per subscription period
- Can't add logo
- No export function
- 20 question types
- Also has subscription rates of \$9 / 39 per month

SurveyMonkey

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/>

Free

- 100 responses per survey
- 10 questions per survey
- No export function
- Also has subscription rates of \$19.95 per month / \$200 p.a.
- Doesn't allow for checking multiple answers

Easy to use

Appendix 2

Questionnaire Design and Pilot

Development timeline:

September

Exploration of survey software

October

Initial design of questionnaire

November

19th - Questionnaire sent to steering group

27th – sent to 2 external academics

December

10th – sent to WR subject librarians and JISC programme manager

Phone call with Mary Betts-Gray at Embed (Cranfield)

January

Questionnaire sent to 5 academics at University of Leeds

Phone call from Sheridan Brown

17th – sent to 2 staff at Research Support Unit

30th – final draft sent to WR steering group and library directors.

February

12th – questionnaire made live

15th – publicity sent out at Sheffield

19th – publicity sent out at Leeds

21st – publicity sent out at York

March

Continued publicity across the 3 institutions

26th – questionnaire closed

Appendix 3

Publicity and distribution

Leeds

Publicity to individual Faculty Research Committees.
Email publicity via faculty specific research lists, administered by RSU.
Announcement on Campusweb.
Included in funding digests sent out to researchers by RSU.

York

Distribution via Research Office.
Announcement on York Extra (twice)

Sheffield

Campus announcement via MUSE portal
Went out on Announce service (targeted email list)

White Rose

Approach to the research PVCs via Julian White, Chief Executive of White Rose University Consortium to seek their endorsement.
Publicity to researchers involved in White Rose projects.
Publicity sent to subject librarians on the JISCMAIL list with a request to remind library reps about the questionnaire.

Appendix 4

Dissemination of results

Findings Document

Sent out to all respondents who left email addresses.

Email lists:

SHERPA-PROJECT@JISCMAIL.AC.UK

JISC-RPPROG-SUE@JISCMAIL.AC.UK

WHITE-ROSE-REPOSITORY@JISCMAIL.AC.UK

Added to wrro.blogspot.com

Added to <http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/increase/> (project website)

Included in SHERPA Update

The findings document will also be sent out more widely across the three universities in autumn 2008 to coincide with a wider publicity campaign for WRRO.

Questionnaire Report

Available on project website