10 Incentivizing Them to Come: Strategies, Tools, and Opportunities for Marketing an Institutional Repository

David Scherer

With institutional repositories entering their second decade of existence there have been mixed reactions to their presence and acceptance. While usage data show that users are engaging with the repository, the same cannot be said about those who supply the repository's content. Early assumptions were that faculty would flock to use and contribute to repositories once the repository was established and functioning. But these assumptions never lived up to expectations. The notion of "If you build it, they will come" never happened for repositories (Foster & Gibbons, 2005; Russell & Day, 2010). What is needed to make the repository more appealing? What incentives are necessary to increase acceptance and deposits?

Even for institutions whose faculty began using the repository, the purpose for having it, and their direct benefits, were lost to them. Dorothea Salo describes this as a lack of necessary support provided by the libraries, and a failure of the repository to relate its value to faculty (Salo, 2008). The value proposition failed to continue once content was added to the repository in such a way that encouraged faculty to continue submitting their materials.

From the faculty's perspective, their publications went to the repository and did nothing. Salo elaborates, saying that the institutional repository became, in essence, a "roach motel" (Salo, 2008). Faculty scholarship was added to the repository where it went to "live and die." Faculty did not understand the purpose of the repository or experience the full range of benefits provided to them, their academic community, or the larger populace because these benefits weren't being disseminated in a manner that presented them as incentives.

These shortcomings are not just the results from certain repository platforms, strategies, or institutions, but are shortcomings that all repositories have faced at some point. No matter their background, libraries and repository managers simply could not sustain voluntary faculty engagement with the repository (Koopman & Kipnis, 2009).

An active multifaceted marketing strategy must be adopted for faculty to fully understand the internal and external value of repositories so that they may become active content contributors. Libraries must be able to relate the value of the repositories from multiple perspectives and to multiple invested parties. This may require the creation of new models for repository collection development, as well as the possible creation of new related repository service models provided by the repository itself, or in connection with related library partnerships and collaborations. Marketing a repository is not a one-time activity. Marketing a repository requires sustained engagement delivered on multiple occasions and avenues (Thiede, 2014). These campaigns should also be evaluated and assessed for future development.

This chapter is not intended to prescribe what types of materials the repository should collect, or what the structure or services of the repository should be, but rather is intended to be a chapter on why marketing a repository plays such a crucial role in its success. Developing a diverse, active, and constantly evolving repository marketing plan that emphasizes the numerous benefits and incentives requires an understanding of internal and external stakeholders, offerings, resources, and how they may be applied in effective marketing strategies and opportunities.

IDENTIFYING AND UNDERSTANDING STAKEHOLDERS

Prior to establishing a repository marketing plan, one must identify the key internal and external stakeholders. There are many common stakeholders for institutional repositories. By identifying these key repository stakeholders the repository can understand what information, capabilities, and services must be created to increase the incentives for participation. Repository stakeholders should be identified, and if possible consulted, when preparing the marketing plan (Russell & Day, 2010). The consequences of developing a marketing plan without thinking of those the plans are targeted to could be low levels of interaction and use. For the purposes of this discussion the major internal and external stakeholder groups for most institutional repositories have been identified.

Internal Stakeholder Groups

To effectively market a repository and its services to external stakeholders, the repository must first and foremost seek buy-in from internal stakeholders (Buehler, 2013). The repository cannot succeed under the outreach of one individual or one individual library unit. It will take collaboration among various internal library partners who will advertise the repository with those they interact with the most.

Liaison Librarians

As academic libraries move toward systems-based and campus-wide enterprises, the role of liaisons has also evolved. These evolving roles have turned liaisons into strategic repository partners (Buehler, 2013). Liaisons have the ability to serve as the repository's interpreter, relating the benefits of the repository to their constituency groups and serving as a champion and advocate. Liaisons can serve as the champions of the repository by delivering a more tailored message to groups that could not have otherwise had one in broader marketing campaigns.

For liaison librarians to become successful stakeholders they must understand the research culture of those they serve (Jantz & Wilson, 2008; Walters, 2007). By understanding where and how their faculty currently disseminate their research, liaisons will be able to address how the repository fits into those dissemination models. Liaisons have to see themselves as "change agents" who can express how the repository complements those current models or provides a better alternative. In this way, the liaison has to be comfortable serving as the "cultural intermediary" (Jantz & Wilson, 2008).

Most important, the repository must consider how it markets to liaisons as much as it considers marketing itself to other campus partners. If liaisons are not properly trained and educated about the repository, then they are unable to serve as change agents or cultural intermediaries. This is why training for those who will train others is so important (Bell, Foster, & Gibbons, 2005; Buehler, 2013). Whether it's through a direct point of contact, or through more formal libraries-wide trainings, the repository must first treat the liaisons like any other campus stakeholder requiring the repository's full attention and care.

External Stakeholder Groups

The repository must understand, beyond the overarching goal of providing global online access to the scholarship and research of its campus community, who the external stakeholders are that will be supplying said scholarship and research.

Faculty

While the general focus and makeup of the types of external stakeholders will be based on the type of institution the repository serves, for the most part, most repositories focus on their campus's faculty. Marketing directly to faculty can create the most challenges, but also produce the richest rewards. Faculty are fickle individuals. Although the higher philosophical notions of institutional repositories and open access may appeal to some, the major questions most faculty have when deciding whether or not to devote their time and energy will lie in what they will get in return. What can the repository provide? What benefits will faculty gain by adding their scholarship? Faculty should be made aware of what the repository does to make their content more discoverable (search engine optimization, indexing, metadata structuring) and how the content is being measured (usage statistics and altmetrics).

As many archivists may tell you, there are some faculty who do wonder about legacies. There may be some motivated by the repositories' capabilities for preservation and long-term management of their scholarship (Cullen & Chawner, 2011). While benefits and legacies may help to win over some faculty, the primary challenge in marketing to faculty is awareness and time. Davis and Connolly (2007) found in their study of Cornell University's repository that there were several reasons faculty do not participate in repositories. The primary reasons faculty did not participate included the following:

- Lack of awareness of the repository
- Redundancy with other models of dissemination

- Lack of knowledge and general confusion about copyright and author rights
- Fear of being plagiarized or having ideas scooped
- Preference to participate in disciplinary repository models over institutional-based repository models

Cullen and Chawner (2011) found in their study that the overwhelming majority of faculty surveyed weren't even aware of the existence of the institutional repository. From their study they identified that what faculty really wanted to do was conduct their research, share their findings, and discover the works of the colleagues in their field regardless of the medium. The repository will need to find ways to highlight its use in ways that will allow the faculty to do what they want by using the repository to do so. Faculty will need to have their perceptions altered so that they view the repository as the tool to achieve these goals, rather than a place their research goes to die.

STRATEGIES

When developing the overall marketing plan one should first decide the strategy. The strategy will become the marketing plan's raison d'être and determine its focus. The strategy is also crucial because it could potentially harm the repository if not carefully constructed. As Buehler (2013) points out, "What is said or thought about an institutional repository can determine a flourishing repository, or slow its intake, dependent on the library's messaging and action."

There are several ways to develop the strategy. In some cases, it may be more important to focus on the repository instead of its content. For example, one focus could be on how the repository aligns itself with the overall philosophy of open access. Another could be on the procedures and workflows that are utilized to make interacting with the repository as easy as possible. It may be more pertinent to focus on one or two aspects of the repository that are easiest to maintain and focus on.

When focusing on content, it may be pertinent to focus on what can be added quickly. This type of content is sometimes referred to as the "low-hanging fruit." In a recent study, Dubinsky (2014) noted that many repositories in recent years had experienced rapid growth by determining their low-hanging fruit and marketing directly to those particular stakeholders. No matter the approach, the strategy should be determined in advance and should concentrate on specific areas rather than those that are too broad or generalized.

The Repository

As previously stated, others have found their faculty were not aware of their repository's existence. Thus, focusing on awareness may be a good starting point. Fortier and Laws's (2014) main focus of their recent survey was on repository awareness (regardless if respondents had used the repository or not), the services the repository offered, and what faculty found were unfulfilled service needs. The results of their study found that the largest reason faculty were not participating was because they were unaware of the repository's existence and what purpose the repository was supposed to serve (Fortier & Laws, 2014).

Some have found that the lack of awareness has been due to the naming of the repository. When addressing the issue of a common language and terminology, some have noted that the usage of "institutional" isn't clear enough to relay the purpose of the repository (Jantz & Wilson, 2008). With many institutions having preestablished print repositories, many faculty simply may be confused about the differences between the print and digital repositories. To alleviate this, many institutions have removed the words "institutional repository" from their repository's name altogether. For example, at Purdue University the institutional repository is known as Purdue e-Pubs. (The name Purdue e-Pubs was chosen prior to the adoption of the EPUB format type.) At Clemson University, the newly formed repository is known as Tiger Prints. Both names highlight the close relationship to their home institutions (Purdue and the Clemson University mascot), while also relaying that the repository houses publications (e-Pubs and Prints).

Open Access Philosophy

The relationship of the open access philosophy and repositories can be addressed through both internal and external factors. Internally, with the rising costs of journals, libraries simply cannot afford to subscribe to every journal. Additionally, it also makes little sense to have to repay for the actual scholarship that was created on our own campuses through subscriptions to journals (Crow, 2002). Externally, the altruistic benefits of open access as a service for the greater good of science, scholarship, and knowledge plays a factor in motivating faculty who feel that their scholarship should be freely available. Jihyun Kim found in her study that faculty who most agreed with the altruistic motivation for self-archiving were more likely to have deposited to the repository (Kim, 2011). This implies that for some, it may be beneficial to point out what the repository does to ensure the widest array of discoverability and global accessibility.

Faculty Presence

As previously mentioned, one of the major reasons faculty are not participating in the repository is through a sheer lack of awareness. But another, equal reason is due to the time and effort required to self-submit materials (Fortier & Laws, 2014). This causes most participation to be done passively, creating large gaps of faculty participation in levels that are not reflective of the faculty's actual academic output.

Those faculty who have very little available in the repository may not be fully experiencing the benefits that the repository can provide. To entice faculty to participate, one could focus again on collections (e.g., gray literature such as technical reports or extension materials) that may be low-hanging fruit at their institutions (Bell et al., 2005; Dubinsky, 2014). In some cases, the gray literature may not have the same amount of copyright or versioning control issues that published scholarship may have. This allows faculty to "test-drive" the repository and see how the benefits they are receiving for their gray literature could be paralleled for their published works.

This also applies to the faculty's academic units. The best way for a repository to market its services to its academic community is to focus on its own academic unit—the libraries. This is especially useful if librarians hold faculty status at their institution and would be responsible for their own scholarship and research for promotion and tenure. By targeting the libraries as an academic unit, the libraries can market the repository to other units using itself as its primary example (Koopman & Kipnis, 2009).

SERVICES, RESOURCES, AND OPPORTUNITIES

In 2003 Clifford Lynch (as cited in Walters, 2007, p. 214) described institutional repositories as "a set of services that a university offers to the members of its community for the management and dissemination of digital materials created by the institution and its community." The repository is a service. For a repository to become successful it may need to develop an infrastructure of related supporting services.

These related supporting services and resources may or may not be built directly into the repository, but may be accessed through other related library services and support. They also may not be offered as traditional offerings, but could be offered as a function of the repository. Additionally, the affiliated librarians and staff of the repository should be seen as a part of these related services (Walters, 2007). Joan Giesecke describes this as "old wine in new bottles," where traditional library services are rebranded into functions of publishing that faculty may better understand than if they were offered in new "repository" models (Giesecke, 2011).

Repository Resources

Copyright Services

One of the major reasons noted earlier why individual faculty do not participate in repositories is their fear of copyright. Because of this fear, it logically makes sense that the repository (or related library services) would include some type of training or guidance on copyright and author rights. With copyright transfer agreements constantly changing, faculty will look to the libraries to better understand their rights and the agreements they sign with publishers. It's during those interactions that the libraries could inform faculty which agreements allow repository deposits. While the repository has to respect copyright, it should also provide mechanisms for faculty to understand their copyright, and should develop mechanisms so that faculty may request the necessary rights (either pre- or postpublication) to post a version of their work to the repository.

Deposit Services

While there are several models for faculty to deposit their works (Cullen & Chawner, 2011; Dubinsky, 2014; Giesecke, 2011), the one model that directly targets faculty's issues over time and energy is a repository-based mediated deposit. In this model, the repository serves as the author's proxy, and conducts the deposit on the faculty member's behalf. This model has expanded at some institutions where faculty also give the repository staff permission to seek the rights information on their works and allow the repository to deposit their works based on those findings (Dubinsky, 2014).

Institutions conducting deposits-by-proxy have reported that the leading motivation faculty had for depositing to the repository was due to someone from the repository asking for the work and depositing it on their behalf (Cullen & Chawner, 2011). For example, prior to May 2013, Purdue e-Pubs did not use a deposit-by-proxy model, which led to very little self-archiving by faculty. When deposit services were first offered in May 2013, faculty were more receptive to interacting with the repository, and they began adding their publications based on the libraries' reviews. To date, Purdue e-Pubs now offers faculty complete curriculum vitae reviews, which has tremendously increased the repository's previously published content (Scherer & Wilhelm-South, 2014).

Content Services

What the repository offers for collecting content will be based on several factors depending on the institution. Once content types have been identified, the repository can communicate its organization (faculty publications, theses/dissertations, etc.), as well as develop an institutional repository collection development policy. The central goal of any content policy will be how it affects the relevance of the repository (Crow, 2002). By developing a collection development policy, the repository can highlight to stakeholders the wide range of materials that the repository either accepts or does not. As content is identified these policies can be updated to reflect the collecting decisions for future materials.

Metrics and Impact Services

Many repository platforms now provide mechanisms to measure access and usage. Whether this usage is classified as access from Google Analytics reports, or through direct content downloads, repository usage can be tabulated quantitatively. These metrics provide impressive perspectives that the repository could share with individual authors and campus stakeholders. For instance, on the Digital Commons platform from bepress, authors are provided with automated monthly reports with COUNTER-compliant download statistics over the last 30 days and the lifetime of the material within the repository. These same reports can be aggregated so that schools, departments, and colleges can be informed about the availability and usage of items authored and produced by their faculty and students. This data can then be utilized in the creation of other tools and resources, which will be discussed later. Part 4 of this book provides more information about repository metrics and analytics.

Marketing Resources

Handouts

Although some may argue the effectiveness of physical marketing handouts, these materials allow information and messages to be conveyed when individual interaction isn't available. Handouts allow the repository to carry its message by either presenting additional information that could not be covered in traditional interactions, or passing on information that helps to solidify the messages that were conveyed during physical and digital interactions. Handouts can also take multiple forms and provide different messages. Some of the forms that could be used for repository handouts could be brochures, newsletters, postcards, bookmarks, magazine articles, and press releases (Ochoa, Taylor, & Sullivan, 2014).

Web Presence

Because of the wide range of topics and information that must be conveyed to authors and stakeholders, a secondary Web presence may be needed. Most repositories have one function with little to no educational component. During Open Access Week in 2013, the Purdue University Libraries launched a new Open Access Web site, Open Access @ Purdue (https://www.lib.purdue.edu/openaccess). This new Web site serves as a central location for key resources, timely information, and contact information for university expertise on the issues and topics related to open access.

More importantly, the site provides information and an easy workflow, which members of the Purdue community can use to make their work open access through Purdue e-Pubs with the mediated deposit service from the libraries. This Web site was based on the designs of other institutions with similar sites, such as the University of Kansas open access portal (https://openaccess.ku.edu/).

User/Author Narratives

Although repository usage and access data can provide a quantitative measurement of the repository, they cannot inform about the qualitative impact. Several universities have developed new systems that allow stakeholders to provide a level of feedback to the repository. This allows the repository to better understand its value.

First established in 2012, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) repository, DSpace @ MIT, has been soliciting users of the content from the open access articles collections through a link that is embedded on the content's cover page. The link takes the user to a simple form that provides information back to the repository. The submitter then has the option to decide how MIT can use that information (e.g., share it publicly, make it anonymous, or for internal use only). Those stories that have been permitted to be made publicly available can be found through MIT's scholarly publishing portal (http://libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/comments-on-open-access-articles/).

This same activity has also been replicated at the University of Kansas. When asked why the libraries had done this, Ada Emmett, associate librarian for Scholarly Communication and head, Shulenburger Office of Scholarly Communication & Copyright, replied,

> These stories of how access to a particular work benefits a visitor supplements computer generated usage data we gather that includes downloads and locations of downloads. These anecdotal stories offer us additional insights into the reasons and meanings why our users want these items and are highly valuable. The user has to take the time to offer those thoughts and stories and we request permission to make those comments public in order to indicate to our authors and visitors that the intention—to share openly the rich and diverse collection of scholarship created at the University of Kansas—has potential personal and research benefits globally.

Opportunities

Once the services and resources have been established, there will be several opportunities that allow repository staff to interact with its stakeholders and market the repository. In the most recent Academic Research Libraries (ARL) SPEC Kit 341: Digital Collections Assessment and Outreach, Ochoa, Taylor, and Sullivan (2014) found that a majority of respondents (58%) used different outreach and promotion strategies through a mixture of events and opportunities.

Meetings and Events

The value of physical interaction with stakeholders through meetings and events is truly unmatched by any other marketing method. They allow the repository to directly tailor its message based on real-time interactions with stakeholders. These meetings and events can occur in multiple types and levels of formality, including but not limited to one-on-one personal meetings, department meetings, open houses, receptions, exhibits, presentations from outside speakers, and informal brown-bag presentations. By meeting with stakeholders in a multitude of venues, the repository's message can be carried to the widest possible audience (Ochoa et al., 2014). Stakeholders also agree that while the other avenues are important and useful, direct interactions through meetings and consultations provided the most personable approach and the most encouragement to participate (Dubinsky, 2014).

Awards and Recognition

Awards and repository-based recognition provide an excellent way to highlight the work with current repository stakeholders. They also can entice current stakeholders to become further involved with the repository and to become more active participants in submitting their materials. Two examples of how this can be applied would be during key repository milestones and through annual awards recognizing leading stakeholders on campus. In July 2012 (http://blogs.lib.purdue.edu/news/2012/07/16/purdue-e-pubs-reaches-milestone-2-5-millionth-download/) and October 2012 (http://www.purdue.edu/newsroom/releases/2012/Q4/purdue-e-pubs-reaches-milestone-with-3-million-downloads-from-across-globe.html) the Purdue e-Pubs repository celebrated surpassing 2.5 and 3 million downloads. To celebrate these milestones the repository highlighted the item that was downloaded to reach the milestone. On each occasion the repository asked the authors what the repository meant to them.

Since 2011 the Purdue University Libraries have recognized several campus units for their leadership in depositing publications and/or materials into Purdue e-Pubs, and for globally advancing the impact of Purdue scholarship and research (https://www.lib.purdue.edu/scholarlyComm). These events have taken place in the provost's office at the conclusion of Open Access Week. The award is presented by the provost to the awardee on behalf of the libraries. The live event is then followed by a press release that is published through the campus-wide news feed.

This recognition allows libraries the ability to give further recognition to campus partners, while further expressing to the awardees the libraries' gratitude for their participation. Having the press release sent out to all campus members allows campus colleagues to recognize the relationship the awardee has with the repository and to seek a similar relationship for the same incentives and benefits.

Social Media

As the presence of social media grows, its usage as a tool for libraries further extends to marketing the repository and its content. Social media (e.g., Twitter, Facebook, blogs, etc.) allows the repository to connect agnostically to stakeholders and users. While social media can be a cost-effective and low-impact marketing activity, it should not be seen as the marketing silver bullet. Social media may work well for reaching some stakeholders and users, but it will not reach as many as the more traditional marketing offerings avenues (handouts, meetings, etc.) potentially could reach, especially when reaching content suppliers (Ochoa et al., 2014).

CONCLUSION

Although repositories continue to emerge and become adopted, they still have not lived up to the expectations for growth and coverage. By developing well-designed, multifaceted marketing plans, libraries can highlight their capabilities, services, value, and impact, which hopefully will provide the necessary incentives to internal and external stakeholders.

As repositories seek to expand their coverage across their campuses, the need to market their services and impact to stakeholders and users will need to increase. As repositories develop their marketing plans and discover what has worked and not worked, there will need to be a way to disseminate both positive and negative outcomes so that the broader community can evolve and benefit. Marketing the repository can never be a single activity that is done on ad-hoc compartmentalized schedules. Repository marketing has to be an ever constant and persistent activity (Buehler, 2013). As more and more faculty adopt repository-based practices, the libraries will have to evolve their marketing plans so that stakeholders see the repository as more than a tool, but rather see the repository, and more broadly the libraries, as their partners advancing the access and discoverability of research and knowledge created on their campuses.

REFERENCES

Bell, S., Foster, N. F., & Gibbons, S. (2005). Reference librarians and the success of institutional repositories. *Reference Services Review, 33*(3), 283–290. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00907320510611311

Buehler, M. (2013). *Demystifying the institutional repository for success*. Oxford, UK: Chandos.

Crow, R. (2002). The case for institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper. *ARL Bimonthly Report 223*. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/ir_research/7

Cullen, R., & Chawner, B. (2011). Institutional repositories, open access, and scholarly communication: A study of conflicting paradigms. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 37*(6), 460–470. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2011.07.002

Davis, P. M., & Connolly, M. J. L. (2007). Institutional repositories: Evaluating the reasons for non-use of Cornell University's installation of D-Space. *D-Lib Magazine, 13*(4). Retrieved from http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march07/davis/03davis.html

Dubinsky, E. (2014). A current snapshot of institutional repositories: Growth rate, disciplinary content and faculty contributions. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication, 2*(3), 1–22. http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1167

Fortier, R., & Laws, E. (2014). Marketing an established institutional repository: Marquette libraries' research stewardship survey. *Library Hi Tech News, 31*(6), 12–15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/LHTN-05-2014-0038

Foster, N. F., & Gibbons, S. (2005). Understanding faculty to improve content recruitment for institutional repositories. *D-Lib Magazine, 11*(1), 1–11. Retrieved from http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january05/foster/01foster.html

Giesecke, J. (2011). Institutional repositories: Keys to success. *Journal of Library Administration, 51*(5–6), 529–542. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.589340

Jantz, R. C., & Wilson, M. C. (2008). Institutional repositories: Faculty deposits, marketing and the reform of scholarly communication. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 34*(3), 186–195. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2008.03.014

Kim, J. (2011). Motivations of faculty self-archiving in institutional repositories. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 37*(3), 246–254. http://10.1016/j.acalib.2011.02.017

Koopman, A., & Kipnis, D. (2009). Feeding the fledgling repository: Starting an institutional repository at an academic health sciences library. *Medical Reference Services Quarterly, 28,* 111–122. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02763860902816628

Ochoa, M. N., Taylor, L. N., & Sullivan, M. V. (2014). SPEC Kit 341: Digital collection assessment and outreach (August 2014). *Association of Research Libraries*. Retrieved from http://publications.arl.org/Digital-Collections-Assessment-Outreach-SPEC-Kit-341/

Russell, R., & Day, M. (2010). Institutional repository interaction with research users: A review of current practice. *New Review of Academic Librarianship, 16*(1), 116–131. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2010.509996

Salo, D. (2008). Innkeeper at the roach motel. *Library Trends, 57*(2), 98–123. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/lib.0.0031

Scherer, D., & Wilhelm-South, M. (2014). *Facilitating faculty participation: Providing the repository service model catalyst for faculty deposits with the Purdue e-Pubs repository* (Libraries Faculty and Staff Presentations, Paper 61). Retrieved from http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/lib_fspres/61/

Thiede, M. (2014). On open access evangelism. *Serials Librarian, 67,* 21–26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2014.915608

Walters, T. O. (2007). Reinventing the library—How repositories are causing librarians to rethink their professional roles. *Libraries and the Academy, 7*(2), 213–225. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2007.0023