

Katie G. Womble. Collaboration between Library Publishing Services and University Presses. A Master's Paper for the M.S. in I.S. degree. April, 2015. 58 pages. Advisor: Amelia Gibson

The rapid pace of change in scholarly communication in the digital age has led many academic research libraries to adopt new roles as scholarly publishers, while university presses have also been in a state of changing roles. Qualitative research explores both the development of these library publishing services at responding libraries and how these services collaborate and relate to the university presses at their host institutions. Results demonstrate a variety of degrees of collaboration between library publishing services and university presses.

Headings:

Libraries and electronic publishing.

Scholarly publishing.

Open access publishing.

Communication in learning and scholarship.

Libraries – Publishing.

COLLABORATION BETWEEN LIBRARY PUBLISHING SERVICES AND
UNIVERSITY PRESSES

by
Katie G. Womble

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Information Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

April 2015

Approved by

Amelia Gibson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	2
Research Questions.....	6
Literature Review.....	7
Lay of the Land.....	7
Scholarly Presses.....	9
Academic Libraries.....	11
The Concept of Collaboration.....	12
Presses and Libraries in Dialogue.....	13
New Directions.....	16
Library Publishing Services.....	17
Methods.....	19
Survey Instrument.....	20
Coding Strategy.....	21
Results.....	25
Demographics of Library Publishing Services.....	27
Relationships between LPS and Corresponding University Presses.....	29
Permissions and Licensing Agreements.....	29
Open Access Collaborations between LPS and University Presses.....	30
LPS Perception of Relationship with University Press and Potential for Collaboration.....	31
Discussion.....	35
Demographics of Library Publishing Services.....	35
Relationships between LPS and Corresponding University Presses.....	38
Permissions and Licensing Agreements.....	38
Open Access Collaborations between LPS and University Presses.....	39
LPS Perception of Relationship with University Press and Potential for Collaboration.....	39
Conclusion.....	43
Bibliography.....	47
Appendix.....	49
Survey Instrument.....	49
Memos.....	53
Codes and Code Definitions.....	54
Coded Responses.....	56

INTRODUCTION

Libraries have historically been warehouses of knowledge, made accessible to few or to many, and of every size, shape, and stripe. Publishers have always been the initial producers of the content that libraries collect, differing distinctly in purpose and scope. A book written in the 1970s might go through numerous drafts and be exchanged multiple times with the primary editor, not to mention the copyediting, marketing, and production knowledge required to make it a physical reality connoting curated, quality scholarship. Then the book would go to live at the library, where it would be made available via the card catalog for users to check out, and there it would probably live out the rest of its lifespan, being a physical object subject to deterioration.

In 2010, that book is probably gone from its spot in the library. There are probably comfy chairs, work tables and classrooms, and many computers. Publishers and libraries have both had to react to the increasingly untethered-to-physical-space nature of scholarship, offering new services and eliminating others. What happens now that it has become so easy to publish material online? What happens to publishers' traditional role in the content production process, and what happens to libraries that want to curate and provide access to this same content? Can the two coexist?

Library publishing services have emerged as a response to these questions. Library publishing services have, according to the Library Publishing Coalition's inaugural 2014 directory, developed over the past two decades as users of academic

libraries have come to librarians for assistance with technical support and help with “early experiments in digital scholarship.” The Library Publishing Coalition’s 2014 directory roughly sketches the a general outline of library publishing services as follows:

“From hosting ejournals and electronic theses and dissertations... to collaborating with teams of researchers to construct multimedia experiences...[these libraries have been involved in the] mission of creating and disseminating scholarship.”
(Library Publishing Directory 2014, 2013, p. viii)

Many of the academic research libraries from the ARL have active publishing services, publishing everything from white papers to conference proceedings, or journals that are no longer published by their original publisher, to name a few. Libraries, academic libraries specifically, are publishing electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs), digital humanities projects, and even on rare occasion, monographs, often stored in online digital repositories.

In most situations librarians are seeking to publish materials that traditional academic publishers would not undertake because of the relatively niche audiences of these works. Librarians often focus on dissemination rather than the laborious and complex editorial, production, and marketing devoted to a traditional scholarly monograph. Still, library publishing services are carving out a sizeable niche. The Library Publishing Coalition stated in 2014 that 2007 marked a key point in the growth of library publishing services as indicated by the growing numbers of studies being conducted on library publishing services, which “reinforced the importance of these emerging library-based publishing endeavors,” concluding that, “publishing services now are thriving across the whole range of academic libraries today” (Library Publishing Directory 2014, 2013, p. viii). Publishers are beginning to take notice, as evidenced by the extensive survey recently published by the Association of American University Presses in 2013,

which, like this study, focuses on collaboration between library publishing services and university presses (Press and Library Collaboration Survey). The accessibility of DOIs and URIs makes it fairly easy for scholars to draw these library-produced resources into their body of reading with few barriers. Library publishing services are only gaining in credibility, but their role in the publishing ecosystem is still undetermined, fitting into the “Wild West” analogy often referenced by publishers and information science professionals regarding the effects of the internet on scholarship. Sarah Thomas, the vice president for the Harvard Library, comments in an article on changing scholarly communication that, “we are still in the Wild West of sorting out how we will communicate our academic developments effectively” (Lambert, 2015).

This picture is complicated in cases where library publishing services exist at institutions of higher learning that also have university presses. The Library Publishing Coalition traces the development of library publishing services back to a little more than two decades (Library Publishing Directory, 2014, 2013, p. viii), and the Library Publishing Coalition has only been around long enough to issue two directories, one in 2014 and one in 2015 (Library Publishing Coalition Homepage, 2015). On the other hand, the Association of American University Presses (hereafter referred to as the AAUP) was established in 1937 as the result of the growing bonds between the roughly two dozen university presses in America during the 1920s (AAUP History Webpage). The AAUP’s longer lineage confers upon university presses the prerogative to judge these new inhabitants of their publishing landscape: Phill Jones writes on the scholarly communications blog, Scholarly Kitchen:

I had been half expecting the librarian publisher movement to fizzle out, or perhaps reduce in scope to just creating archives of grey literature and PhD dissertations for use as a campus resource.

Importantly, his next point was that he had been shown otherwise, and that “a number of conversations with librarians have caused me to take another look at the role of librarians as publishers” (Jones, 2014). Library publishing services are new but they are demonstrating their viability, as Jones’s comments indicate.

It is critical for information professionals to have a better understanding of the relationship between library publishing services and university presses that exist within the same institutions. This will give us a better understanding of obstacles, and potential for collaborative or adversarial relationships between university publishing services and university presses. Examples of successful collaborations between library publishing services and university press within the same institutions will better help information professionals increase the impact of their library publishing services. By examining this relationship as experienced by the managers of library publishing services at institutions that also have university presses, we can identify best practices for collaboration. Through observation of productive collaborations, and trends emerging from the participating libraries, we can provide context for further exploration of the topic on a broader level. This is the route forward to making library publishing services effective and well-received members and perhaps eventual competitors in the world of publishing.

The qualitative survey administered in this research study seeks to derive a better understanding of how library publishing services relate to the university presses hosted by the same institutions. The results not generalizable by any means but they do provide a clear picture of the types of activities and relationships between library publishing services and their corresponding presses at many institutions that are engaged in library

publishing services. There were three main research questions that informed the mainly qualitative survey.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are the demographics of library publishing services? How have library publishing services evolved over time and what is their scope at different institutions?
2. What relationship do library publishing services have with their corresponding host institution university press?
 - a. Specifically, what, if any, are their agreements over university press book permissions and licensing?
 - b. Do library publishing services collaborate with the university press on open access initiatives?
 - c. How do library publishing services describe their relationship to their host institution university press? How do the two organizations relate to each other in the larger organizational scheme of the university? Do they see potential for collaboration? What kind of relationship do they have to their university press, and where do they see it going?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies pertinent to collaboration between academic libraries and their university's university presses are not exclusively found in either the library literature or the publishing scholarship available. To remedy this, the literature survey will pull material from both library and publishing arenas as well as from an organizational management article dealing with the challenges of creating collaborative cultures. The literature can be arranged along several different themes. First, what led to the current situation in scholarly communication as it pertains to both libraries and university presses. Second, an exploration of the challenges and initiatives amongst publishers, succeeded by the very same question applied to academic libraries. Then, following a brief overview of the scholarship on collaboration, we will explore ideas and studies regarding the collaborations between university presses and academic libraries to date, followed by an overview of what both academic libraries and university presses envision in their future and directions they need to take to achieve their goals.

LAY OF THE LAND

University presses and academic libraries share a common feature: both are mission-driven organizations dependent on the university system and fundraising for their budgets. Historically, university presses have served to disseminate cutting-edge scholarship. The fiscal support of the press parent institutions allowed scholarly presses

to make publishing decisions “solely by their quality, with as little regard as possible for their potential market,” but instead presses have been increasingly pressured to generate their own funds via profits (Bartlett, 2009, p. 3). This encourages idea that “the ‘best’ books are those that sell the most copies” (Bartlett, 2009, p. 6). Bartlett states on the same page that authors do not publish with scholarly presses with profit as their main motive, and professes that “a book’s quality is the author’s currency.” The result of economic pressures over the past couple decades has manifested in the so-called “serials crisis” of the 1990s, which Jones and Courant term as being practically a parable amongst publishers (Jones and Courant, 2014, p. 43). ‘Serials crisis’ refers to the fast-rising rates for serial subscription in the late 1990s that forced academic librarians to order serials at a higher price, to the disadvantage of scholarly presses publishing monographs, as monograph budgets were (in theory) reduced to compensate for the rise in serials prices (Jones and Courant, 2014, p. 43). Yet as Jones and Courant assert in their empirical study of whether the serials crisis actually caused the dire financial straits of university publishers, “the relationship between library budgets and the relative health of university presses is a topic on which one can find many claims, but little verifiable data” (Jones and Courant, 2014, p. 45). Still, the common lore amongst scholarly press publishers is that “plummeting retail and library sales...present us with an environment in which this type of publishing has never been more endangered” (Bartlett, 2009, p. 5). Jones and Courant find that the idea that the serials crisis caused the plight of monograph purchases (and therefore of scholarly presses) is misdirected for three reasons, first, the decrease in monograph purchases only began very recently (not in the 1990s), the data used by publishers is biased towards large academic libraries and therefore skews the information

publishers are drawing their conclusions from, and lastly, that those same statistics used by publishers regarding monograph purchases by libraries are quite different from statistics pertaining to scholarly press monographs (Jones and Courant, 2014, p. 45). The very recent nature of this article means that the publishing literature still attributes many business problems to shrinking monograph funds at libraries, and Jones and Courant do not deny that this may be true, it merely says the existing information used to demonstrate the causality of scholarly press financial difficulties from the serials crisis of the 1990s is inadequate; the argument is not complete. In 2012, the Modern Language Association created the “Committee on the Future of Scholarly Publishing,” which did come to the conclusion that “the ‘library budget problem’ of sharply reducing monograph budgets and shrinking university press revenue corresponded with a concomitant rise in manuscripts submitted to university presses” (Walters, 2014, p. 430). Jones and Courant also mentioned the rise in manuscripts being published *per annum* by scholarly presses in the 1990s as a reason that each individual monograph was being purchased less on a percentage basis (Jones and Courant, 2014); that at least is something both articles agree upon.

SCHOLARLY PRESSES

The discourse amongst publishers is often marked by anxieties over the future of scholarly presses. In his article on the future of university press publishing, Richard Brown mentions the struggle of many scholarly presses to keep their doors open and, in response to a list of problems with the existing model of scholarly publishing, admits that university presses “need to reassess how [they] operate in a digital environment” (Brown, 2013, p. 107). Particularly helpful is the enumeration of stakeholders of a typical

university press in the Brown article, notably including academic and research librarians and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) (Brown, 2013, p. 108). As previously mentioned, studies using ARL data have often been so limited by the limits of ARL data that the number of academic libraries included is less than one thirtieth of the total number (Jones and Courant, 2014). Despite conviction by publishers that the serials crisis accounts for a huge part of their financial difficulties, Jones and Courant conclude that the answer to that question was a “fairly decisive *no*” (Jones and Courant, 2014, p. 56). Jones and Courant opine that “perhaps unsurprisingly, press directors and editors seem especially quick to assert [that the serials crisis caused the current problems in scholarly publishing]...library purchasing, after all, tends to be well out of the scope of factors under the press’s control” (Jones and Courant, 2014, p. 45).

If Jones and Courant’s work is any indication, publishers are sticking their heads in the sand. That has not been evidenced in my survey of the literature: publishers are actively debating what steps forward they ought to be taking in aggregate. For instance, Brown writes that “it is our responsibility, as UPs [university presses], to get more content online and to do so immediately. We must provide better, more discoverable content that can help teachers teach, learners learn, and librarians serve their institutions. We need to collaborate, aggregate, chunk, and enhance....University presses....should (a) strategically seek the widest possible access for value-added content through (b) creative delivery channels in order to help scholarly communities of practice advance their teaching, learning, and research” (Brown, 2013, pp. 111-112).

Ultimately, regardless of whether these publishers think the serials crisis caused their current financial situations or whether they think other factors were the more heavy-

hitting contributors, the steps presses need to take to stay viable are not dramatically different. One example of an initiative from a prominent press is the Stalin Archive at Yale University Press. As of 2009, in direct conversation with a book published by YUP, more than 400,000 pages (or 28,000 documents) are being digitized and made fully searchable online into a “living, constantly updated and expanded resource for researchers, students, and all those interested in twentieth-century history” (Bartlett, 2009, p. 10). John Donatich, YUP’s director, comments that the Stalin Archive lets the YUP act more like a “research centre...with its careful value-added publishing of scholarly primary sources” (Bartlett, 2009, p. 11). These sorts of initiatives are laudable and tangibly useful to the new generation of scholars who will be using them, not to mention the many questions they generate regarding data storage and maintenance that figure into the discussion of the role of academic libraries in the changing scholarly communication atmosphere.

ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Academic libraries have been strongly affected by changing patterns of scholarship as well as university presses. We’ve been going digital for decades now, and the conversion from print to electronic resources is happening in one way or another on increasing scales at high-powered academic libraries. Yet even ‘high-powered’ academic libraries are under a lot of pressure these days to acquire all the research and to also serve scholars within our institutions by hosting their digital projects (in connection with presses at that university or elsewhere or not at all), providing access to e-content, making collaborative spaces for students and faculty, and promoting the idea of the library as more of a toolbox than a lockbox—we seek to facilitate scholarship in almost

every way imaginable rather than check out and check in books. Many academic libraries are getting into the realm of publishing, though often with differing impetuses than scholarly publishers (Walters, 2014, p. 441) Walters states that libraries getting involved in digital publishing often are already dealing with financial strictures, and that “funding for library publishing may be low, necessitating ingenious approaches to leveraging resources across institutions, such as through publishing cooperatives and library-publisher collaborations” (Walters, 2014, p. 429) Many academic libraries experimenting with library publishing services (LPS) are only hoping to be “supplementary commercial and large-scale society publishing” (Walters, 2014, pp. 441-442). Society publishing and commercial publishing are very different from scholarly publishing.

Another facet of libraries becoming interested in providing access to original content (or as it was known before Web 2.0, publishing) is that the types of content extend far beyond books, digital or analog. Many libraries are interested in providing access to old forgotten repositories, “digital humanities-like projects” where “typically text-based book content becomes visual/text/numeric content expressed as an interactive website,” or other “new media and informal” tactics that differ from the traditional notions associated with publishing (Walters, 2014, p. 441). Finally, according to Walters, the real challenge for academic libraries becoming quasi-publishers is going to be to “develop a rich set of digital publishing support services and operations” (Walters, 2014, p. 429).

THE CONCEPT OF COLLABORATION

If collaboration were easy it would be the norm. It seems more realistic from an organizational standpoint that traditionally discrete disciplines (scholarly publishing and

academic libraries) will each in their own way try to maintain their discreteness and impede collaboration. Yet both organizations have been impacted by shrinking budgets and both are charting new courses from the ones that previously served them in the pre-digital age. Maccoby posits, “Ideally, you’d like to simply round up the experts from the different disciplines to achieve a common purpose. But it’s not that easy” (Maccoby, 2006, p. 60). Instead he describes how it is difficult to map collaborations onto organizational charts and how issues such as accountability, conflict-resolution, authority and ability to relate to each other as peers not as subordinates or superiors predetermines the potential success of many collaboration attempts before they begin (Maccoby, 2006, pp. 60-61). He states that problems especially occur when authority figures do not want to invest more decision-making power in their subordinates or when by-the-book subordinates do not want to step out of their normal bounds (Maccoby, 2006, p. 61). This has definitely been a problem in libraries, where stalwart but remarkably hard-nosed employees have been known to show resistance to the ever-expanding functions of the library. It may also have been behind a lot of the reactivity (rather than proactivity) of scholarly presses to changing market demands.

PRESSES AND LIBRARIES IN DIALOGUE

The path forward for both academic libraries and university presses might involve more collaboration than before. According to a 2004 account of the collaboration between Penn State’s academic library and university press, “there will be numerous models of successful library/press partnership and that...we need them all if we are to rebuild the scholarly publishing system, which we all agree is broken.” (Eaton, MacEwan, and Potter, 2004, p. 215). Penn State’s academic library and university press

slowly built a collaborative atmosphere based on the initial crossing of organizational boundaries in the 1970s of a librarian on the press's editorial board. Accordingly, "the director of the press and the dean of the libraries were instrumental in bringing together their counterparts at other 'Big Ten' institutions for in-person meetings, beginning in the early 1990s, under the auspices of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC)" (Eaton, MacEwan, and Potter, 2004, p. 216). The resulting projects at Penn have been fruitful—including a digital project hosted by the library and based on scholarship published by the press dealing with Three Mile Island. The Three Mile Island project went well and the library and press were "emboldened...to explore a more ambitious e-publishing partnership....we hope to make a large proportion of these titles available electronically via the libraries' web site" (Eaton, MacEwan, and Potter, 2004, p. 218). Other instances of similar collaborations in 2004 were happening at these universities: Purdue, Columbia, Michigan, Utah, and California (Walters, 2014, p. 429).

This collaborative effort at Penn State is valuable for a couple reasons. The description provided by the authors emphasizes that the collaboration was slowly developed over time. Throwing an entirely new initiative at both organizations would probably have created much more conflict than the incremental steps both organizations took to work together over the course of several decades, though the digital collaborative efforts took place much more recently (Eaton, MacEwan, and Potter, 2004, p. 216). The authors state, "our idea was that if we could successfully collaborate on a few relatively limited endeavors, we would then have set the stage for more ambitious and systematic collaboration....In the process we began to better understand each other's strengths (and weaknesses) and simultaneously learned more about our respective institutional cultures"

(Eaton, MacEwan, and Potter, 2004, pp. 216-217). Besides the steady development behind the project, another interesting aspect of the collaboration is that the project was not done in isolation, but as a proactive gesture; the authors recount, “we understand that Penn State must be proactive if it wants to shape, and not simply be shaped by, the dramatic changes that are transforming the scholarly community’s information landscape” (Eaton, MacEwan, and Potter, 2004, p. 216).

Neither organization claims that one organization has all the skills necessary to survive in the new era of scholarly communication, but Walters compiles lists of the skillsets specific to scholarly presses and academic libraries (see Table 1). Items in the publisher category are ones librarians listed as needing to acquire themselves, but the libraries list was generated by the panel of librarians in the study, so there is some bias but it is a rich starting point nonetheless.

Academic Libraries	Scholarly Publishers
digitization, digital curation, metadata, organizational vision, outreach, repository infrastructure, research data management, scholarly communication awareness and training, search and discovery technology, understanding the faculty in their disciplinary setting	assessment of publishing services, business modeling, business negotiation, client needs assessment, commissioning authors and writers, copyright, rights management, licensing and legal experience, editorial services, graphic design, marketing, new media and social software expertise, product design, product management, project management, publishing technology and software programming, revenue generation, user experience, user needs assessment

Table 1: Differing Skillsets between Academic Libraries and Scholarly Publishers (adapted from Walters, 2012, p. 443)

NEW DIRECTIONS

Ultimately most of the articles surveyed indicate a need to adapt to the changing market and forms of scholarly communication. Some publishers see collaboration with libraries as a path forward, some libraries see library publishing services as an option, and some are focused on their own organization and not on the other. Yet, to quote Yale University Press's entry in the 2009 University Press Forum, "by the end of the day...what was needed was...a plan for their [books and new media formats] coexistence, if not mutual aggrandizement" (Bartlett, 2009, p. 10). The need to be "more nimble, creative, and entrepreneurial" is widely recognized amongst scholarly publishers, including, "press-library collaborations at Purdue, Pittsburgh, and Penn State....These [non-library initiatives were listed as well] are the new models of scholarly publishing, and they are just the beginning" (Brown, 2013, p. 112).

Libraries are innovating as well, with programs known as library publishing services, which are often not designed to make the library competitive publishers, and according to Walters, the "key aspect [to succeed with LPS] is the incorporation of a variety of general business acumen, some specific publishing industry expertise, and certain library skills into any library organization with the goal of becoming a publishing services provider" (Walters, 2014, p. 444). Many of the librarians did not see a future for this non-traditional role in academic libraries, so this is all but determined (Walters, 2014, p. 438). Yet the one constant amongst academic libraries and publishers alike is experimentation.

LIBRARY PUBLISHING SERVICES

My research focuses on the relationships that library publishing services have with the university presses of their host institution. While some research has been conducted by the AAUP (Press and Library Collaboration Survey, 2013), it has focused on both library publishing services (hereafter referred to as LPS) and presses and has taken more of a quantitative approach. This is a great step forward as LPS are speedily evolving, but there is certainly room and a need to provide greater qualitative understanding of some of the relationships that LPS have with the university presses of their host institutions.

I have written in the past about how publishers are often frustrated with LPS misconceptions about what constitutes solid publishing (Womble, 2014, p. 6). Specifically, a blog post written by Phill Jones for Scholarly Kitchen in December of 2014 expressed frustration that librarians still think, ““if you put an article up on wordpress [sic], that’s publishing”” (Jones, 2014). While Jones first imagined that the LPS movement would “fizzle out” or “reduce in scope to just creating archives of grey literature and PhD dissertations for use as a campus resource,” he admits that these presentiments were incorrect (Jones, 2014), and I write that some of the reasoning for why LPS has burgeoned is because, “librarians seek to provide their constituencies with adequate resources for both dissemination of their scholarship and copyright protection of their digital content, as well as numerous other impetuses like providing a storage center for data sharing and digital humanities projects” (Womble, 2014, p. 7). I then write that instead of libraries being marginalized in the campus community, libraries are actually better positioned in the campus community than university presses as libraries are

“constantly attuning themselves to the particular needs of their institution’s faculty and students, not the needs of academics as a whole like university presses do (Womble, 2014, p.10).

METHODS

The decision to conduct a survey of LPS attitudes towards collaboration between LPS and University Presses from the same parent institution evolved out of the researcher's original plan of examining the topic from both the angle of press employees as well as LPS employees. The thoroughness of the 2013 AAUP Press and Library Collaboration Survey informed the decision to avoid a replication of it and rather to focus on the library side, which has, from a library science perspective been less explored, as well as to focus more specifically from a qualitative standpoint to gather a different level of detail from participants.

Thirty-two potential participants were identified from the Library Publishing Directory 2015 based upon their listed status as the primary contacts for LPS programs (along with their emails) as well as the existence of a university press at the institution in question (Library Publishing Directory 2015, 2014). There could have easily been a greater number of participants, around forty-three, but attempts were made by the researcher to make sure the relationship between the LPS and the university press were at least the same from a hierarchical view. For example, the University of Florida LPS was excluded despite the existence of the University Press of Florida, which is the affiliated publisher with the University of Florida, the parent institution of the LPS in question, because the University Press of Florida (not the University of Florida Press, significantly) is the system-wide press for the whole of the University Florida system. Several similar cases were also excluded to try and only deal with cases where the press and the LPS

have similar relationship potential based on organizational hierarchy under the same umbrella of the parent university. The researcher has since learned that even with these methods in mind there is still the possibility that the press serves more campuses than the one to one ratio she hoped to ensure, but the above-described criteria for inclusion have at least eliminated some potential participants that fell into this nebulous category of library publishing services that have corresponding university presses that serve more campus communities than the library does. Additionally, the LPS at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill was not included because of the concern that the researcher's own bias from working at the University of North Carolina Press as an intern in former years could influence her coding of the data. One LPS contact was also excluded because the contact email did not pertain to a single person but rather to a whole department and the researcher wanted to minimize the chance of multiple persons from the same department responding to the survey.

Upon identification, the thirty-two potential participants were sent an initial email briefly requesting their participation in the survey, estimated to take ten minutes of their time. In reality this was an overestimate, the survey only took seven minutes on average to complete. A brief description of the aims of the project was mentioned and the link to the survey was included.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The survey itself consisted of eighteen questions, with three to make sure the participant met the inclusion criteria (which were a) agreement to conditions of the study, b) whether the participant was an employee of the library, and c) whether their job involved library publishing services), six questions to get a demographic picture of the

type of LPS, and ten questions dealing with the remaining research questions, namely focusing on the relationship of the LPS to the university press at their institution as exemplified through promotions and licensing relationships between the two, open access initiatives facilitated by both organizations, the participant's perception of the formality of the relationship of the LPS to the University press, and the participant's understanding of whether the roles of the two organizations overlap in any way and their thoughts on the best way forward regarding future collaborations with the university press. See the appendix for a detailed representation of the survey instrument.

CODING STRATEGY

Responses to each question were coded along the lines of inductive analysis through a combination of initial coding to gather information about themes present, creating a list of codes from the corpus of the responses, and then going back and examining each response and applying (sometime multiple) applicable codes to it. The process of initial coding was informed by Barbara Wildemuth and Yan Zhang's chapter on qualitative analysis (Wildemuth and Zhang, 2009). The basic unit of analysis for each response was the full extent of the participant's response to a given survey question as informed by Wildemuth and Zhang's delineation of units of coding analysis (Wildemuth and Zhang, 2009, p. 310). The researcher then analyzed seven participants' responses (looking at the sum total of one participant's responses to the entire survey and then moving to the second participant's responses to the entire survey, and so on) and initially coded them according to the concepts that arose. This conforms to Corbin and Strauss's expectations that "in order *not* to miss anything that may be salient...the investigator must analyze the first bits of data for cues" (Corbin and Strauss, 1990, p. 6). This process

is evidenced through the first of two memos included in the appendix. These initial codes were provisional attempts to identify relevant categories, but it was only in the second phase of coding, the actual coding, that the actual codes were created and adhered to in the construction of categories.

By going through a three-part coding process of initial coding of the first seven participants' responses to identify provisional codes, creating the actual codes by going through each participant's responses to every question, and then, after organizing the list of possible codes for each survey question, going back and coding each participant's responses, the researcher ultimately (though she discovered this *ex post facto*) adhered to Corbin and Strauss's recommendations that researchers first adopt provisional codes and only after doing that go ahead and develop codes that express an abstracted form of the individual concepts presented in the data (in this case, the responses) (Corbin and Strauss, 1990, p. 7).

After developing these provisional codes, the researcher kept these codes in mind while approaching the responses from a different angle to come up with the resolved (actual, not provisional) codes. For provisional coding the researcher went through all the responses for each participant, participant by participant. For the creation of the resolved codes it was easier to view apparent themes by looking at the aggregation of all the responses from all participants to each question, which was easy, since Qualtrics readily allows users to view results in this way. Each response was coded with one code that expressed the concept described in the response. Semantically identical codes were collapsed and revised into one code, and this code replaced the two slightly different but

semantically identical codes. Then the researcher made an inventory of all the resolved codes, organized by question.

To prevent the researcher from merely recalling the code she applied to a certain survey response and applying it again without regard to whether another code might better apply, the researcher again varied the way she viewed the data by looking at it, as she did the first time with provisional coding, participant by participant, looking at all of participant *n*'s responses to all of the survey questions before moving on to another participant's responses. Using the resolved codes, she coded all of each participant's responses, sometimes applying more than one code to a response in order to make sure no possible meanings were being ignored and thus patterns began to emerge even in the small sample size of thirteen participants.

Potential downsides of the coding strategy lie in its selective borrowing from grounded theory techniques. Grounded theory demands consistency throughout the coding process (Corbin and Strauss, 1990, p. 9). Because memos were only written during the first two stages of coding and not after the final stage there is some loss of richness for future researchers seeking to replicate the study and consistency in documentation throughout the coding process was therefore weakened (Corbin and Strauss, 1990, p. 10). Grounded theory also demands proper techniques of theoretical sampling in order to be able to extend findings from the surveyed group of participants to the larger demographics they represent, something this study did not set out to do (Corbin and Strauss, 1990, p.9). Findings from this study only apply to the population surveyed, and while they might provide informal suggestions for areas where larger trends may exist in general, the trends discussed within the confines of this paper apply only to the

library publishing services employees surveyed. The researcher was not trying to use a grounded theory approach but rather an inductive analysis approach and therefore the selective borrowing of coding strategies was warranted as a way of, if imperfectly, at least attempting to in all ways possible ensure the scientific validity of the research.

There is an inventory of each resolved code per survey question in the appendix with operational definitions of each code. The structure of the survey (as opposed to, say, an open-ended interview) meant that answers to certain questions already dealt with certain themes. For example, a response to a question about the development of LPS services over time would not be coded as dealing with LPS services over time because that was already understood. Instead, the researcher has attempted to isolate what actual patterns emerged within the context of these questions, treating codes that repeated themselves across survey respondent's answers as patterns worthy of discussion later on.

RESULTS

The fifteen-question survey was administered on January 21, 2015 and closed two weeks later on February 4, 2015. During that time, fifteen of the thirty-two contacted persons completed the survey, but two participants left without completing it at all, so although participants were referenced ranging from participant 1 to participant 15, respondents no. 9 and no. 13 were essentially empty placeholders and were not included in statistics. According to Qualtrics, excluding these two participants, 100% of participants completed the survey, but all participants did not complete the survey fully. The survey was open response-heavy towards the end and there were fewer responses to these questions than the earlier, more easily answered yes/no and multiple choice/checklist questions. The participation rate for each question is detailed in Table 2 on the following page.

Question	Participation Rate (%)	Question	Participation Rate (%)
1	100	9	100
2	100	10	100
3	100	11*	46.15
4	100	12	100
5	100	13*	30.77
6	61.4	14	100
7	100	15	53.85
8	100		

Table 2: Participation Rates for Each Survey Question

*Questions 11 & 13 were both questions that only applied to those who answered “Yes” to the previous question, hence low participation rates were not indicative of participants willfully ignoring the question. Additionally, many questions had options to provide additional qualitative information and some respondents did not do this but because they did answer the non-qualitative portion of the question it was recorded as a completed response by Qualtrics.

The first three questions (not listed in Table 2) ensured that survey participants met the inclusion criteria for this study: they had to a) consent to the terms of the study including being over 18, b) be a library employee at their institution, and c) their job had to involve library publishing services at their institution. All thirteen respondents met these criteria, and had any not met these criteria they would not have been allowed to

continue. The three inclusion criteria filtering questions are not included in the total question count. The response rate for each question is as follows, with the fourth question counting as question 1 because of the first three being to filter out non-eligible persons. The appendix also contains a list of the operational definitions of each code.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF LIBRARY PUBLISHING SERVICES

The first six questions focused upon demographics of the participating library publishing services. The purpose of these questions was to get a picture of the scope and development over time of library publishing services surveyed. When asked how many years their library has offered library publishing services, all thirteen respondents responded. Only 8% indicated that they had been providing LPS for less than one year, 15% had been providing LPS between two and three years, 8% had provided more than four but less than five years, and the remaining 69% of participants indicated that their library has been providing LPS for more than five years.

When asked what type of publications their library publishing services publish (respondents often checked more than one option), 54% of the 13 total respondents to that question had published monographs, 85% had published journals, 62% had published undergraduate publications, 85% had published electronic theses and dissertations, 69% had published conference proceedings, 69% had published reports, 54% had published digital humanities projects, and 15% had published other types of publications like graduate journals or blog-like objects.

Of the thirteen respondents to the third question, which asked whether all of the publications produced by the LPS were open-access (OA), 62% of respondents indicated that yes, their publications were all OA, and of the 38% who indicated that not all their

publications were OA, four participants provided additional descriptions of why not.

These four responses were coded as follows (see appendix for code definitions):

Participant No. (out of all 13 participants)	Code
1	eventually OA; some OA
4	some OA; locally OA
7	some OA
10	eventually OA; some OA

Table 3: Degree of Open Access in LPSs

Regarding the medium of the LPS publications, none of the thirteen respondents answered that all publications were print. Instead, 77% indicated that all of their LPS publications were electronic and the remaining 33% that indicated a mix of print and electronic publications did not choose to describe why although that option was present. All thirteen respondents to question five indicated that yes, their library had an institutional repository.

The sixth question asked about the development of library publishing services over time at each LPS and was open-ended. The eight responses were coded as follows:

Participant	Codes
2	focus on IR; focus on online journals; repository-based; gradual growth
3	gradual growth; repository-based
7	gradual growth; many stakeholders
8	gradual growth; repository-based; cooperation with Press; focus on IR
10	gradual growth; repository-based; focus on ETDs
11	gradual growth; focus on IR; repository-based; focus on online journals; focus on digital humanities
14	gradual growth; repository-based; focus on IR
15	recent formalization; focus on digital humanities; focus on online journals

Table 4: Development of LPSs over Time

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN LPS AND CORRESPONDING UNIVERSITY PRESSES

PERMISSIONS AND LICENSING AGREEMENTS

Two questions dealt with permissions and licensing of press materials by LPSs. The first asked whether the library in general had a special purchasing relationship with the university press, for example library digitization of press backlist titles, which are then hosted through the institutional repository (which is considered LPS). 38% of the thirteen respondents to this part of the question indicated that they did have a special purchasing relationship with the university press at their institution, and all five of the respondents comprising the 38% who said yes detailed the type of relationship and these responses were coded as follows. 54% said no, and 8% (one respondent) chose “unsure”.

Participant	Code
2	Library does limited IR support of Press work
8	Library extensively supports Press work
10	Library supports Press work; Receives Press support
11	Library supports Press work; Receives Press support
14	Library supports Press work; Receives Press support

Table 5: Nature of Purchasing Relationships Between LPSs and University Presses

Regarding special licensing relationships (for example, special discounts for the library from the press on press books) between library publishing services and their corresponding presses (question 8), only 15% of the thirteen respondents to this question indicated that they did have special licensing relationships with their university presses, 46% indicated that they did not have special licensing relationships with their university presses, and 38% said they were unsure.

OPEN ACCESS COLLABORATIONS BETWEEN LPS AND UNIVERSITY PRESSES

When asked if their LPS collaborated with their respective university press on any OA initiatives, 54% of the thirteen respondents said that they did and 46% said no. All seven of the “yes” respondents gave additional detail about these initiatives coded as follows.

Participant	Code
3	Library hosts Press backlist; Library provides technological support for Press
4	Limited library hosting of Press backlist; library provides technological support for Press
7	limited library hosting of Press backlist; discussion
8	Library provides technological support for Press
10	Library hosts low-demand Press publications; Discussion
11	Library provides technological support for Press; Discussion
15	Discussion

Table 6: Collaborations on OA Initiatives

LPS PERCEPTION OF RELATIONSHIP WITH UNIVERSITY PRESS AND POTENTIAL FOR COLLABORATION

The first of the six questions concerned with the LPS perception of their relationship with their university press asked whether the LPS had any ongoing formal or informal relationship with their corresponding university press. 62% of the thirteen respondents to this question indicated that they did have an ongoing relationship of some kind with their corresponding university press; 38% indicated that they did not. The next question was a follow-up question only applicable to the 62% of respondents to the previous question who answered “yes”. Of the eight who responded yes to the previous question, six provided more detail in the follow-up question, coded as follows.

Participant	Code
3	Regular dialogue
7	Regular dialogue
8	Same organization
10	Irregular dialogue; Sharing of resources
11	Regular dialogue
14	Regular dialogue; Sharing of Resources; Shared Initiatives

Table 7: LPS Perceptions of Their Relationships with the University Press

The next question asked, in order to cover all bases, whether the participating LPS had any formal or informal relationships with publishers outside of their institution. 38% of the thirteen respondents to this question responded that they did have these relationships with publishers outside their institution, 62% said they did not. The next question was a follow-up question to the previous one about publishers outside the LPS's institution designed only for those who answered "yes" to the previous question to answer. Only four of the five who answered "yes" to the previous question provided more detail in the follow-up question, coded as follows.

Participant	Code
4	Library supports non-press titles
7	Library publishes archives of non-press titles
8	Library supports non-press titles
11	Library supports non-press titles

Table 8: LPS Collaborations with Presses Outside of their University

The following question asks for an opinion (yes, no, each followed with text boxes for further description) from the participant on whether library publishing services and university press publishing functionally overlap at their institution. 23% of the thirteen respondents chose “yes” that LPS and publishing functionally overlap at their institution, and 77% chose “no”, that they did not overlap. Eight respondents provided more detail for their responses, with all three “Yes” participants providing responses coded below alongside the five (of ten original) responses from those who said “no”, LPS and publishing did not functionally overlap. They were merged into one coding block because even the “yes” values did not actually express in their detailed responses any sentiments that opposed the “no” respondents.

Participant	Code
2	no overlap
3	mostly no overlap
4	only theoretical overlap
7	mostly no overlap
8	roles complement one another
10	no overlap; roles complement one another
11	maybe future overlap
14	no overlap

Table 9: LPS Perceptions of Functional Roles of LPS and University Press

And finally, when asked for their opinions on how their library publishing service might best collaborate with the university press at their institution, participants responses (seven total) were coded as follows.

Participants	Codes
2	no collaboration
3	uncertain
7	regular communication
8	both bring diverse perspectives
10	already collaborating in best way
11	both bring diverse perspectives
15	regular communication; both bring diverse perspectives

Table 10: Best Practices for Collaborations between LPS and University Press

DISCUSSION

DEMOGRAPHICS OF LIBRARY PUBLISHING SERVICES

By and large the majority of LPS represented have been in existence for more than five years, indicating that LPS is not a novel trend among participants. Although 69% of participants indicated their LPS had existed for more than five years, the remaining 31% were not insignificant, and the participants in the less-than-five-years category were spread across the possible responses evenly, with only 8% having had LPS for less than one year, indicative of perhaps being late to the trend. Yet the fact that the majority had been engaged in LPS of some kind for more than five years does not necessarily mean the majority were engaged in similar LPS activities.

In order of greatest to least representation amongst respondents, the following were publishing activities engaged in by the responding LPSs: in equal rank (85% marked both of these), journals and electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs), followed by conference proceedings and reports (tied at 69%), undergraduate publications (62%), and then monographs and digital humanities projects tied at 54%, and then 15% indicated other types of publications.

The order indicates that most of the participating LPS institutions place highest value on publishing journals and ETDs, slightly less emphasis but still a good deal of investment in conference proceedings and reports, undergraduate publications being less emphasized but still present in the LPS programs of the majority of participants. The fact

that monographs and digital humanities projects were published by 54% of participants indicates that monographs, often not expected publishing outputs of LPS programs, are in fact significant forms of LPS publications, and the prevalence of digital humanities (DH) projects at more than half of participating LPS programs indicates again that the niche for LPS programs is in providing access to unique, often non-traditional publications that traditional publishing does not fully support. It would be interesting to know whether these DH projects are being published in another, more traditional form by either LPS or university or trade presses. The main takeaway from the above-described ranking is that the participating LPS are involved mainly in areas that university presses traditionally focused on monographs are less involved in, but that LPS are not adverse to publishing in areas (specifically monograph publishing) that presses traditionally published.

The question of degree of open-access (OA) in LPS was a surprising mix; the general ethos of libraries being to provide as much access as possible to their patrons, it was interesting that 38% of respondents did not indicate that all of their LPS publications were OA. However, the additional details four participants provided about why the publications weren't all OA were enlightening: all four said some publications were OA, two of the four said that eventually all their publications would OA, and one respondent specifying that on campus, everything the LPS published was OA but off-campus there were charges. It's possible that even those who indicated all of their publications were OA could fall into that category because they were automatically restricting their concept of their audience to their on-campus users.

The majority of participants (77%) said all of their LPS publications were electronic, and it would have been helpful if the 33% who had a mix of the two provided

more description why. It makes sense that most LPS would be electronic and the results agree with the idea that as libraries began increasing their online holdings and creating institutional repositories, they became de facto publishers and that might be one way they became involved in LPS. That, coupled with the unanimous response from all 13 participants that their libraries have institutional repositories, again emphasizes the LPS focus on digital means of publishing. The fact that only 33% of the participants indicated they published print materials suggests that LPS see a niche for themselves in digital publishing of serials, ETDs, and other low-cost to produce publications that traditional publishers are not fully tapped into, although that would need to be explored from the publisher perspective as well.

Fortunately we have information regarding not only the current state of LPS at the participating institutions but also about the trajectory of the development of LPS at each institution. One strong theme was the gradual development of LPS at their institutions over time. Some reported that LPS activities were based in the development of their institution's repository. Four also indicated that their LPS activities were focused on their institutional repository, a code that aligns with the previously mentioned repository-based code. Three of eight respondents indicated their LPS activities had developed around their online journals. Others mentioned that their LPS activities had evolved with many stakeholders, that they had only recently formalized their LPS program, and two respondents indicated that their LPS activities developed around digital humanities related publications. From this we can see that respondents tended to have LPS trajectories that were defined by a slow evolution over time that centered around the institutional repositories and providing access to non-monographic style publications

(ETDS, DH projects, and journals), again showing how LPS has evolved to fill a niche left open by publishing.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN LPS AND CORRESPONDING UNIVERSITY

PRESSES

PERMISSIONS AND LICENSING AGREEMENTS

Agreements of any kind regarding permissions and licensing between LPS programs and their corresponding university presses were not the norm (54% said no, 8% unsure, 38% yes), but the five respondents who comprised the 38% who had special relationships regarding purchasing with their university presses all exhibited two main trends: first, all five expressed that they in some way support press publications through their offerings. Secondly, three of the five received support of some kind from the press in return. One of the two that did not receive press support in return described its work for the press as provided limited support via the library's institutional repository for Press publications. The norm was not to have special purchasing agreements with the press, but those agreements that did exist seemed often established a quid pro quo, where both LPS and press mutually benefit from the exchange.

When it came to licensing relationships between the two organizations as perceived by LPS respondents, 46% said they had no special licensing relationship with the press, 15% said they did have a special licensing relationship with the press, and 38% said they were unsure. This lack of confidence could have been due at least to two different factors: one, that the employee completing the survey was not involved in collection development for the library at large and therefore did not have the knowledge necessary to say yes or no, or two, that they were unsure what was meant by licensing.

Still, the discrepancy between those who indicated unsurety in the purchasing relationship question and those who indicated it in the licensing relationship question reinforces the idea that the wording of the licensing question was not the cause of unsurety but rather that the unsurety was genuinely in regard to the actual answer to the question. The lack of many respondents who had licensing relationships with their university presses indicates that these licensing relationships are not priorities for either or both parties.

OPEN ACCESS COLLABORATIONS BETWEEN LPS AND UNIVERSITY PRESSES

Regarding OA collaborations between participating LPSs and their university presses, more than half of the participants said their LPS had collaborated with their university press on OA projects, but only by a slight margin (54% yes vs. 46% no). Examples of these kinds of projects included (in order of most frequent to least) the library providing technological support for the university press, (tied in second) library and press discuss OA initiatives, the library provides limited hosting of the university press's backlist, and then tied in last, library hosts press backlist (presumably the entire backlist), and the library hosts low-demand press publications.

LPS PERCEPTION OF RELATIONSHIP WITH UNIVERSITY PRESS AND POTENTIAL FOR COLLABORATION

A clear but not overwhelming majority of participating LPSs had some kind of ongoing formal or informal relationship with their university press (62%), and the most common description of this relationship was that the two organizations engaged in regular dialogue. Two of the six respondents to the qualitative portion of this question

indicated that the LPS and press shared resources in some way. One respondent indicated that their LPS communicated irregularly with the Press, and one respondent indicated that they had a shared initiative together. One respondent said the LPS and press were, in fact, the same organization. The results indicate that participating LPSs more often than not have relationships with their corresponding university presses, and that these relationships are usually characterized by regular dialogue, that the two organizations sometimes share resources, and that other varied forms of engaging with each other occur as well. The one respondent that indicated both are part of the same organization points to a rare and exciting convergence of the two organizations; these would be great case studies on how the two organizations work as one and support each other as well as what tensions arise as well as how the decision to collapse the two organizations into one might be a response to market pressures and whether such a two-headed organization is sustainable. For now we can say that open streams of communication appear to define the relationships of the LPS participants to their university presses.

Only 38% of the respondents had relationships with publishers outside of their institution, and these relationships were usually reduced to the expression that the library supports non-press titles (3 of 4), as well as one instance (the remaining 1 of 4) wherein the library publishes archives of non-press titles (as distinguished from the current issues of those titles). This indicates that the majority of the participating LPS respondents don't work much with publishers outside of their institutions, but this question needs to be broken down in future iterations of this study in order to make sure participants understand what is meant by a relationship, and what qualifies as an actual ongoing relationship and what qualifies as a one-time, transactional-type deal. For now it is clear

that participating LPSs provide support for other presses the minority of the time and that this can mean support for either current publications or providing digital access to back issues.

The vast majority of participants (77%) did not think that their LPS and the university presses functionally overlapped. The qualitative responses (including from those who thought the two organizations did functionally overlap) were spread across a number of different areas ranging along the spectrum of whether they overlapped but all indicated that the two roles, if they overlapped did not do so significantly. 3 of 8 respondents said there was no overlap, two said mostly no overlap, one said it was only theoretically overlap (they had said yes, overlap existed), two people said the roles of each organization complemented one another, and one person said maybe in the future the two roles would overlap. From this we can gather that the main sentiment from all respondents was along the lines of saying the two organizations do not functionally overlap in their publishing activities. The one response about the two potentially overlapping in the future indicates perhaps that the scope of either of the two organizations publishing activities is definitely in flux at their institution.

The seven qualitative responses about how their library publishing service might best collaborate with their university press were varied and merit individual discussion. One participant said the best way for the two to relate to each other was to not collaborate at all, which indicates that there possibly is tension between the missions of the two organizations at their institution, and one respondent was uncertain on the best way to collaborate. Three participants said that both organizations bring diverse perspectives, implying that regular communication would be a fruitful endeavor, and two participants

said regular communication was the way forward. Finally, one participant said their LPS and university press were already collaborating in the best way.

CONCLUSION

There are several insights to be gained about the demographics of library publishing services that participated in this study. The first of these is that library publishing services have evolved slowly over time, and often their publishing activities center around their digital repositories. The majority of participants worked at library publishing services that had been around for more than five years, indicating that this is not a flash-in-the-pan trend arriving recently. Rather, these programs tended to develop out of their repositories, and there was a wide spectrum of activities engaged in by each LPS. Digital humanities projects were part, though not overwhelmingly, of these publishing activities, and as digital humanities gains cache in the academic community, it would be useful to follow this study up with another measuring the growth in DH projects within library publishing services from a longitudinal perspective. Mainly, the variety in types of publications produced by the participating library publishing services indicates the flexibility of library publishing services and the ability or at least the intent of these services in satisfying small niche markets, for example through providing access to undergraduate publications, which would not be of interest to a university press. Lastly, LPSs engage mainly in digital publishing, which was expected, but a not-insignificant portion of surveyed LPSs (33%) are still publishing some form of print materials.

Library publishing services relationship to their corresponding university presses were characterized by several key features. To start with, the permissions agreements between the two organizations were hard to ascertain. The question may have been unclear because of the high number of “unsure” responses, but it may have been that the respondents did not know the answer but understood the question, in which case it was targeted at the wrong audience. Still, from the information gleaned about permissioning between university presses and library publishing services, the participating LPSs by and large do not have special agreements with their university presses. The 38% who did all were involved in relationships whereby they were providing support to the press, and there was less reciprocal press support in this regard for LPS materials, though it was not unheard of. Licensing relationships to the university presses in question were subject to the same issues with question phrasing that could be due either to the targeting issue or to a comprehension issue. The results nonetheless indicate a plurality of those who do not have special licensing relationships with their university presses.

Open-access (OA) collaborations with the corresponding university presses were prevalent but not rampant amongst surveyed library publishing services. These collaborations were often in the form of libraries providing support for the university press’s provision of OA publications. Through these collaborations the LPSs sometimes gained access to the press backlist, and often involved some level of support by the LPS toward providing access to the press publications being made OA. This makes sense because of the earlier-discussed strong presence of repositories amongst surveyed LPSs, which would enable the LPSs to provide access to the press publications.

The LPS perception of their relationships with their corresponding university presses was illuminating in several different respects. 62% of participants had a relationship of some kind with their university press, and these relationships more often than not took the form of regular dialogue. The communication via regular dialogue varied in its formality, which demonstrates the current evolving relationship between the two parties. Again it would be useful to observe changes in communication patterns several years down the line. LPSs had, in several instances, ongoing relationships with publishers outside their institutions (simply buying books from a publisher was not considered a relationship), and these tended to be limited in scope like providing access to a society journal or back issues for discontinued serials.

There was one special case where the LPS and the university press were part of the same organization, ie. the two had merged. The participant was quite informative about this relationship and saw it as positive and ongoing. Because this is something novel even now in 2015, it will be key know later down the line if this is indicative of a trend or something that only occurs in special cases. The merged organization depended on clear communication and the participant saw any possible tension between differing missions of LPS and university press as constructive because of the discussion generated by having more than one viewpoint in the figurative room.

Mostly LPSs prized open communication with their university presses as their best route towards collaboration with the university presses. 77% of respondents did not see functional overlap between the two organizations, and the 33% who did still expressed that they were not really overlapping. One participant said there could be

future overlap. It would be neat to revisit this in the future to see whether there is a change in the competitiveness perceived by LPSs between LPSs and university presses.

There was no clear consensus on the best way for participating LPSs to collaborate with their university press. Answers ranged from no collaboration to lots of instances where participants thought ongoing dialogue and open communication was the way forward, not any particular types of initiatives. Ultimately, the conclusions of the participants were that the best way to relate to the university press was to keep communication open between the two organizations, and the diversity of the opinions brought from both library publishing services and university presses was viewed as productive.

Although this survey is by no means meant to represent the state of library publishing services and their relations to the university presses at their institutions at large, these qualitative findings ought to point researchers towards better ways of approaching future assessments of library-press publishing collaborations. The field is a dynamic one, and changes need to be periodically assessed to monitor trends in library publishing, especially as LPS programs become increasingly sophisticated. There might come the time, as one participant suggested, that library publishing and university presses will experience more functional overlap, in which case it will be useful for researchers, library publishing programs, and university presses to be able to look back and track these changes. By shedding some light on the types of collaborations between the surveyed LPSs and their corresponding university presses a key developmental stage has been recorded, and will hopefully provide context as the field of scholarly communication continues to change over the coming years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AAUP history. Retrieved from <http://www.aaupnet.org/about-aaup/aaup-history>
- Bartlett, R. A. (2009). University press forum 2009. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 41(1), 3-11.
- Brown, R. (2013). Stakeholders, service, and the future of university press publishing. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 44(2), 107-113. doi:10.1353/scp.2013.0002
- Eaton, N., MacEwan, B., & Potter, P. J. (2004). Learning to work together: The libraries and the university press at Penn State. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 35(4), 215-220.
- Jones, E. A., & Courant, P. N. (2014). Monographic purchasing trends in academic libraries: Did the 'serials crisis' really destroy the university press?. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 46(1), 43-70.
- Jones, P. (2014, Dec 1 2014). What's going on in the library?, part 1: Librarian publishers may be more important than you think. Retrieved from <http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2014/12/01/whats-going-on-in-the-library-part-1-librarian-publishers-may-be-more-important-than-you-think/>
- Lambert, C. (2015, January-February 2015). The "wild west" of academic publishing: The troubled present and promising future of scholarly communication. *Harvard Magazine*.
- Library publishing coalition homepage. Retrieved from <http://www.librarypublishing.org>
- Library publishing directory 2014* (2013). In Lippincott S. K. (Ed.), . Atlanta: Library

BIBLIOGRAPHY CONTINUED

Publishing Coalition.

Library publishing directory 2015 (2014). In Lippincott S. K. (Ed.), . Atlanta: Library

Publishing Coalition.

Maccoby, M. (2006). Creating collaboration. *Research Technology Management*, 49(6), 60-62.

Press and library collaboration survey: Survey conducted: 2012: Final report: 2013.

(2013). (Survey).The Association of American University Presses.

Walters, T. (2012). The future role of publishing services in university libraries. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 12(4), 425-454.

Womble, K. G. (2014). *Library publishing services and university presses: Innovation and collaboration*. Unpublished manuscript.

APPENDIX

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Collaboration between Library Publishing Services and University Presses

Q20 Collaboration between Library Publishing Services and University Presses IRB # 14-3233 You are invited to participate in a web-based online survey on collaboration between library publishing services and university presses. This is a research project being conducted by Katie Womble, a master's student at the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, under the supervision of her advisor, Dr. Amelia Gibson, assistant professor within the same department. It should take approximately ten minutes to complete. **PARTICIPATION** Your participation in this survey is voluntary. You may refuse to take part in the research or exit the survey at any time without penalty by closing out of the survey window. You are free to decline to answer any particular question you do not wish to answer for any reason, except for three questions at the beginning to determine whether you are a) over 18, b) an employee of the library at your institution, and c) whether your job involves library publishing services at your library. You can choose not to answer these questions by closing out of the survey window; no response will be recorded. Thirty-two (32) institutions are being surveyed in this study. **BENEFITS** You will receive no direct benefits from participating in this research study. However, your responses may help us learn more about how libraries investing in library publishing services stand to gain from collaborating with university presses as well as more insight into successful strategies for doing so. **RISKS** Some of the survey questions ask about collaborations between your library publishing services and the university press at your institution and you could say something in the open-ended responses that might result in consequences (loss of income, loss of employment or insurability, loss of professional standing or reputation, loss of standing within the community) if that information were revealed through someone's deductive use of indirect identifiers to figure out that you had said certain things. We are using coding to present the findings and additionally will take precautions not to directly quote controversial statements. **CONFIDENTIALITY** Your survey answers will be sent to a link at [Qualtrics.unc.edu](https://qualtrics.unc.edu) where data will be stored in a password protected electronic format. No one will be able to directly identify you or your answers, and no one will know whether or not you participated in the study, though there is the potential for deductive discovery of a participant, though this is a minimal risk and anonymity is being protected by not asking you for your name or email. **CONTACT** If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact me at (919)502-0780 or via email at kwomble@live.unc.edu. Any questions you have for my faculty advisor, Dr. Amelia Gibson, may be directed to angibson@email.unc.edu or you may call her at (919)962-0033. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or that your rights as a participant in research have not been honored during the course of this project, or you have any questions, concerns, or complaints that you wish to address to someone other than the investigator, you may contact the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Institutional Review Board at 105 Mason Farm Road, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, call (919)966-3113 or email IRB_Subjects@unc.edu.

ELECTRONIC CONSENT: Please select your choice below. You may print a copy of this consent form for your records. Clicking on the “Agree” button indicates that You have read the above information You voluntarily agree to participate You are 18 years of age or older

- ☐ Agree (1)
- ☐ Disagree (2)

Q27 Are you an employee of the library at your institution?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)

Q28 Does your job involve the library publishing services at your library?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)

Q24 How many years has your library offered library publishing services?

- ☐ Less than one year (1)
- ☐ More than one year; less than two years (2)
- ☐ More than two years; less than three years (3)
- ☐ More than three years; less than four years (4)
- ☐ More than four years; less than five years (5)
- ☐ More than five years (6)
- ☐ Unsure (7)

Q25 What kind of publications do the library publishing services at your library publish?

Please check all that apply.

- ☐ Monographs (1)
- ☐ Journals (2)
- ☐ Undergraduate publications (3)
- ☐ Electronic theses and dissertations (4)
- ☐ Conference Proceedings (5)
- ☐ Reports (6)
- ☐ Digital humanities projects (7)
- ☐ Other (8) _____

Q4 Are all of the publications produced by your library publishing services freely available (open-access)?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (please describe) (2) _____

Q5 What medium (print, electronic) are the publications of the library publishing services?

- ☐ All are print (1)
- ☐ All are electronic (2)
- ☐ Some are print; some are electronic (please describe) (3)

Q6 Does your library have an institutional repository?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)

Q9 Please describe the development over time of library publishing services at your library.

Q10 Does your library have any special purchasing relationship with the university press at your institution? (e.g. Library digitization of backlist titles from the press to be made openly available through the institutional repository.) If yes, please describe:

- ☐ Yes (1) _____
- ☐ No (2)
- ☐ Unsure (3)

Q11 Does your library have any special licensing relationship with the university press at your institution? (e.g. a special discount given to the library for all books published by the university press)

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)
- ☐ Unsure (3)

Q12 Do your library publishing services and the university press at your institution collaborate on any open access initiatives? Please describe.

- ☐ Yes (1) _____
- ☐ No (2)

Q13 Do your library publishing services have any ongoing formal or informal relationship with the university press at your institution?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)

Q15 If you answered yes to the previous question, please describe the formal or informal relationship with the university press at your institution.

Q16 Do your library publishing services have any ongoing formal or informal relationship with any publishers outside of your institution?

- ☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Q17 If you answered yes to the previous question, please describe the formal or informal relationships with publishers outside of your institution.

Q18 In your opinion, do the functions of library publishing services and the university press overlap at your institution? Please describe.

- ☐ Yes (1) _____
☐ No (2) _____

Q19 In your opinion, how would your library publishing services best collaborate with the university press at your institution?

MEMOS

2/23/15

I have felt uncertain about the first few stages of coding, but feel I am making significant progress. About two weeks ago I started to initially code my data going through each respondent's survey and quickly decided instead to just look at the compiled responses from all of the participants to each question and to derive initial codes from that. I wrote these summative codes next to the actual responses in pencil on the printout of the survey results.

Around last Wednesday night I looked over my very rough and lengthy initial codes and went through the rest of the responses and initially coded them as well. I was ending up with some codes that just sounded like the actual survey responses themselves because I was not sure how to distill it without just restating the obvious, especially in the instances when participants were saying "yes, because" or "no, because" to a certain question. Restating whether they agreed with the statement was unhelpful so I had to find a way to more meaningfully define my codes.

Just yesterday, this Sunday, I sat with the codes in the SILS Library and, at the suggestion of a sociologist friend, created an excel spreadsheet to track codes in. This proved to be hugely helpful. I typed up all of the responses to the survey questions (by question, not by participant), typed up my initial codes for all of these responses, and then in a new column went in and created the resolved (actual) codes I am using now. I made another excel sheet of the actual codes for each question and called it quits for the day.

Today I am going to code the responses going participant by participant using my brand new controlled vocabulary (my codes). I hope to compare this to what I originally labeled the responses as to see if looking at the data organized by participant rather than by question gave me a fresh gaze toward the data. I need to find out whether I need intercoder reliability.

2/24/15

I have finished coding the qualitative responses. Many were blank or n/a (different categories), but I'm beginning to see little trends. It helped to do the re-coding respondent-by-respondent because I really felt like having the data presented in a different format helped me evaluate it freshly according to my chart of codes and their operational definitions. I still think some of my operational definitions need tweaking and maybe one word or two adjusted in codes, but overall things are pretty representative and I feel like the codes convey a level of richness that I am comfortable with at this point. I would prefer it if I could just discuss every response in detail but I'm sure any readers would not! It is interesting especially that codes that I previously thought described only one or two responses sometimes seemed, upon reevaluation, to be ones that described other responses as well.

I have removed identifying respondent numbers from the spreadsheets.

CODES AND CODE DEFINITIONS

Question No.	Code Title	Operational Def	Date Created
3	eventually OA	perhaps not all publications are OA but they are slated to be so	2/22/15
3	locally OA	on campus the publications are OA	2/22/15
3	some OA	mixed OA and non-OA	2/22/15
6	gradual growth	LPS has grown over time	2/22/15
6	multiple platforms	LPS exists on multiple platforms	2/22/15
6	repository-based	LPS based in repository	2/22/15
6	many stakeholders	LPS has multiple stakeholders	2/22/15
6	cooperation with Press	LPS cooperates with Press	2/22/15
6	focus on ETDs	LPS has focus on publishing electronic theses and diss.	2/22/15
6	focus on digital humanities	LPS has focus on publishing digital humanities objects	2/22/15
6	focus on online journals	LPS has focus on publishing online journals	2/22/15
6	focus on IR	LPS has focus on developing the Institutional Repository	2/22/15
6	recent formalization	LPS has only recently become formalized	2/22/15
7	Library does limited IR support of Press work	Library supports Press work on a limited basis	2/22/15
7	Library extensively supports Press work	Library supports Press work on a labor-intensive level	2/22/15
7	Library supports Press work	Library supports Press work	2/22/15
7	Receives Press support	The Press in some way supports the library	2/22/15
9	Library hosts Press backlog	Library provides OA access to Press backlog titles	2/22/15
9	Discussion	Library and Press communicate about OA	2/22/15
9	Limited library hosting of Press backlog	Library provides OA access to Press backlog titles in limited way	2/22/15
9	Library provides technological support for Press	Library provides technological infrastructure and maintenance to support Press publications	2/22/15
9	Library hosts low-demand Press publications	Library provides OA access to low-demand Press titles	2/22/15
11	Regular dialogue	Library and press communicate regularly	2/22/15
11	Same organization	Library and press are part of same organization	2/22/15
11	Irregular dialogue	Library and press communicate some but not regularly	2/22/15
11	Sharing of Resources	Library and press share resources	2/22/15

CODES AND CODE DEFINITIONS, CONTINUED

11	Shared initiatives	Library and press collaborate closely on shared goals	2/22/15
13	Library provides support for non-press titles on limited basis	Library supports titles from other presses on a limited basis	2/22/15
13	Library publishes archives of non-press titles	Library publishes the archives of titles from other presses	2/22/15
13	Library supports non-press titles	Library supports titles from other presses	2/22/15
14y	only theoretical overlap	the roles serve different needs	2/22/15
14y	roles complement one another	the roles serve different needs in a way that benefits the other	2/22/15
14n	no overlap	the roles serve different needs	2/22/15
14n	mostly no overlap	the roles mostly serve different needs	2/22/15
14n	maybe future overlap	the roles might overlap someday	2/22/15
15	no collaboration	library sees no benefit in collaborating with Press	2/22/15
15	uncertain	library unsure of benefits of collaborating with press	2/22/15
15	regular communication	library thinks regular communication is best way to collaborate with Press	2/22/15
15	both bring diverse perspectives	library thinks the different perspectives both Lib and Press bring to table are way forward with collaboration	2/22/15
15	already collaborating in best way	Library thinks it is already collaborating with Press in best possible way	2/22/15

CODED RESPONSES

Response No.	Q3	Q6
1	eventually OA; some OA	blank
2	n/a	focus on IR; focus on online journals; repository-based; gradual growth
3	n/a	gradual growth; repository-based
4	some OA; locally OA	blank
5	blank	blank
6	n/a	blank
7	some OA	gradual growth; many stakeholders
8	n/a	gradual growth; repository-based; cooperation with Press; focus on IR
9	n/a they left survey	n/a they left survey
10	some OA; eventually OA	gradual growth; repository-based; focus on ETDs
11	n/a	gradual growth; focus on IR; repository-based; focus on online journals; focus on digital humanities
12	n/a	blank
13	n/a they left survey	n/a they left survey
14	n/a	gradual growth; repository-based; focus on IR
15	n/a	recent formalization; focus on digital humanities; focus on online journals

Response No.	Q7	Q9
1	n/a	n/a
2	Library does limited IR support of Press work	n/a
3	n/a	Library hosts Press backlog; Library provides technological support for Press
4	n/a	Limited library hosting of Press backlog; library provides technological support for Press
5	n/a	n/a
6	n/a	n/a
7	n/a	limited library hosting of Press backlog; discussion
8	Library extensively supports Press work	Library provides technological support for Press
9	n/a they left survey	n/a they left survey
10	Library supports Press work; Receives Press support	Library hosts low-demand Press publications; Discussion
11	Library supports Press work; Receives Press support	Library provides technological support for Press; Discussion
12	n/a	n/a
13	n/a they left survey	n/a they left survey
14	Library supports Press work; Receives Press support	n/a
15	n/a	Discussion

Response No.	Q11	Q13	Q14
1	blank	n/a	blank
2	blank	n/a	no overlap
3	Regular dialogue	n/a	mostly no overlap
4	blank	Library supports non-press titles	only theoretical overlap
5	blank	n/a	blank
6	blank	blank	blank
7	regular dialogue	Library publishes archives of non-press titles	mostly no overlap
8	Same organization	Library supports non-press titles	roles complement one another
9	n/a they left survey	n/a they left survey	n/a they left survey
10	Irregular dialogue; Sharing of Resources	n/a	no overlap
11	Regular dialogue	Library supports non-press titles	maybe future overlap
12	blank (actually blank)	blank	blank
13	n/a they left survey	n/a they left survey	n/a they left survey
14	Regular dialogue; Sharing of Resources; Shared Initiatives	n/a	no overlap
15	n/a	n/a	blank

Response No.	Q15
1	n/a
2	no collaboration
3	uncertain
4	blank
5	blank
6	blank
7	regular communication
8	both bring diverse perspectives
9	n/a they left survey
10	already collaborating in best way
11	both bring diverse perspectives
12	blank
13	n/a they left survey
14	blank
15	regular communication; both bring diverse perspectives