

Awareness and Attitude Towards Open Access Among Teaching Staff in Higher Education Institutions in Tamil Nadu

R. Govindarajan*, S. Dhanavandan**

Abstract

Background: Open Access (OA) is a mode of publication and distribution of research literature that removes the limitations such as payments, copyright. The impact of OA is clear and evident. Research accelerated to a significant amount due to OA. But the OA use is not same across the board. The adaption and use of OA is based on the awareness and attitude towards OA.

Objectives: This study aims to identify how well that teaching community working in higher education institutions in Tamil Nadu, know about the open access model, OA licensing terms, OA tools and their attitude towards open access model.

Methods: Survey design was used to conduct the study and a structured questionnaire is used to collect data. Convenience sampling method is adopted for the study. Data collected were organized in Excel and analyzed by using SPSS PASW 18. Cronbach's alpha is used to check the internal reliability of the attitude items. Frequencies and percentages were used to identify the teaching staffs' awareness level and attitude towards OA. ANOVA and t-test were used to check the statistical relationship between variables.

Results: A total 300 questionnaires were distributed randomly in five higher education institutions in Tamil Nadu and 121 teaching staffs were responded. The top most open access literacy tool used by the teaching staff was Journals and least was E-discussion websites. The top most open access repository used by the teaching staff was Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) and least was National Programme on Technology Enhanced Learning (NPTEL). Majority of the teaching staff are motivated to take full advantage of OA journals and they are of 65.3%. Around 57.9% of the teaching staff agreed on that they understand the licensing terms in OA. Around 68.6% of the teaching staff used to

access open access publications. 43% of teaching staff denoted that the IT tools, facilities provided to open access in their institution was not satisfactory. 55.4% of teaching staff mentioned that their friends and colleagues recognize open access publications. Teaching staffs' attitude towards open access doesn't have any statistical relationship with teaching staffs' individual characteristics and their experience in teaching, research and publishing.

Conclusion: The study results help the academic libraries, institutions, higher education system, and open access publishers to ascertain the facts and take required steps to promote and strengthen the OA use among the academic community.

Keywords: Open Access, Awareness of OA, Attitudes towards OA

Introduction

Open Access (OA) stands for "unrestricted online access to research literature and unrestricted reuse". It is a mode of publication and distribution of research literature that removes the limitations such as payments, copyright. OA resources ranges from journals, books, newsletters, institution repositories, personal websites, blogs, wikis, databases, videos, audios, webcasts, discussion forums, etc. Among these journal articles and institution repositories are considered as dominant and prominent vehicles. OA licensing improves and enhances the scientific progress. The terms Green OA, Gold OA, Gratis and Libre denotes the OA licensing for access and reuse OA.

* Librarian, Aravind Eye Hospital & Postgraduate Institute of Ophthalmology, Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India.
Email: govindarajanthamba@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-2060-0439

** Deputy Librarian & Head, Central Library, Central University of Tamil Nadu, Thiruvavur, Tamil Nadu, India.
Email: dhanavandan@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-1333-972X

The impact of open access is clear and evident. The number of articles published in open access shows up a phenomenal growth in all subjects. Due to the availability of more literature access, research accelerated to a significant amount. But the OA use is not same across the board. It is bound to different parameters like geographical region, awareness of OA, attitude towards OA, etc.

The teaching community working in higher education institutions is the pioneer in research who indulges themselves and motivates the next generation too. Adaption and use of OA among the teaching community will accelerate the OA movement. The adaption and use of OA is based on the awareness and attitude towards OA. The research problem of this study is to investigate the awareness and attitude towards OA of the teaching community, working higher education institutions in Tamil Nadu. It aims to identify how well that teaching community working in higher education institutions in Tamil Nadu, know about the OA model, OA licensing terms, OA tools and their attitude towards open access model. The outcome of the study will reflect the awareness level and attitude towards OA of the teaching community working in Tamil Nadu. This will help the academic libraries, institutions, higher education system, and open access publishers to ascertain the facts and take required steps to promote and strengthen the OA use among the academic community. This makes the study more significant.

Review of Literature

Obuh and Bozimo (2012) conducted a study to examine the awareness and use of open access publications by the LIS lecturers in Southern Nigeria. For this, 114 LIS lecturers were enrolled. A fairly high degree of awareness of open access publication concepts was found among the lecturers. Obuh (2013) investigated the attitude of LIS lecturers towards OA. The study revealed that the lecturers exhibit a positive attitude towards OA.

Issa, Akangbe, Igwe, and Aliyu (2014) investigated the level of awareness and extent of use of the open access model among the lecturers in Federal Polytechnic, Kwara, Nigeria. The study results revealed that they were aware of OA initiatives but faced challenges on accessing and using OA. The challenges were inadequate resource,

absence of internet services and high costs of internet subscription.

Okore, Anaehobi, and Haliru (2015) investigated about scientists' level of awareness of OA resources in agricultural research institutes in Edo state, Nigeria. The study sample size was 150. The descriptive survey results revealed that the scientists were fully aware of the existence of OA resources but they used to have greater access to traditional library materials than electronic sources for their research work.

Rowley, Johnson, Sbaffi, Frass, and Devine (2017) assessed the academics' behaviors and attitude towards OA. The academics reported strong views on reuse of their work. They were relatively happy with noncommercial reuse, but not in favor of commercial reuse. The attitudes are relatively consistent across the academic community.

Salaz, Johnston, and Pickles (2018) conducted a study among faculty members to investigate their open access experiences. The faculties share their opinion on OA in five dimensions. They are open access as resources for teaching, as a publication channel, as a social justice movement, as open source, and as free for me. The study results revealed that faculty members' understanding and definitions of OA. It also reported the faculty members' inquiry on author rights, self-archive work and their concerns for the issues around access to scholarly knowledge.

Dawson (2018) studied about the effective practices and strategies for open access outreach among fourteen individuals at seven universities in United Kingdom. Semi structured interviews were conducted to collect the opinions on the themes "The message", "key contacts and relationship", "Qualities of the OA practitioner" and "Advocacy versus compliance". The results revealed that the message on OA compliance should be clear and concise. They need to be delivered repeatedly and creatively adapted to specific audiences. Identifying and building relationships with influencers and informers is key to the uptake of the message, and OA practitioners must have deep expertise to be credible as the messengers.

Arndt and Frick (2018) discussed about the two approaches taken by the Central library of Forschungszentrum Julich in 2017 to foster OA among the scientists. The first approach focused on redesigning the training courses

offered by the library. The second approach implemented a international OA week along with several information event tailored to each scientific institute. As a result of these approaches, the access rate of OA was increased.

Objectives of the Study

The Objectives of the Study are

- To know about open access literacy tools used by the faculties.
- To find out the usage of open access repositories.
- To elucidate the attitude towards open access among faculties.

Hypothesis

- There is no significant difference between teaching staff's attitude towards open access with their individual characteristics and experience in teaching, research and publishing.

Methodology

Survey design was used to conduct the study and a structured questionnaire is used to collect data. The structured questionnaire is framed after a thorough literature review. The questionnaire uses Likert 5 point Scale (1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 –

No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree) to collect teaching staff's opinion. Convenience sampling method is adopted for the study. The data collection started in November 2016 and ended on February 2017. A sample of 121 was included the study. Data collected were organized in Excel and analyzed by using SPSS PASW 18. Frequencies and percentages were used to find out teaching staff's attitude and usage of open access literacy tools, and open access repositories. To assess the internal reliability of teaching staffs' attitude, Cronbach's alpha is used. Alpha value >0.7 means the factor is reliable. The teaching staffs' attitude are then examined with the teaching staffs' individual characteristics and their experience in teaching, research, publishing by using the statistical test t-test and ANOVA. Gender, age, designation denotes individual characteristics. Experience denotes the teaching experience. No. of Students guided denotes the research experience. No. of Journal Publications and no. of OA Journal Publications denotes the publishing experience.

Analysis and Interpretation

A total 300 questionnaires were distributed randomly in Annamalai University, Alagappa University, Gandhigram Rural Institute – Deemed University, Madurai Kamaraj University, Monomaniam Sundaranar University and 121 teaching staffs were responded. The demographic details are as shown in Table 1. The response rate was 40.3%.

Table 1: Demographics of Teaching Staff

S. No.	Characteristic	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Gender			
1	Female	38	31.4
2	Male	83	68.6
Age Group			
1	Age below 31	12	9.9
2	Age between 31 and 40	54	44.6
3	Age between 41 and 50	41	33.9
4	Age above 50	14	11.6
Designation			
1	Guest Lecturer	5	4.1
2	Assistant Professor	82	67.8
3	Associate Professor	20	16.5
4	Professor	14	11.6
Highest Degree			
1	MPhil	8	6.6
2	Doctorate	103	85.1
3	Others	10	8.3

S. No.	Characteristic	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Experience			
1	Below 10 years	52	43.0
2	Between 11 and 20	53	43.8
3	Above 21	16	13.2
Department			
1	Computer Science & Applications	27	22.3
2	English	15	12.4
3	Library and Information Science	11	9.1
4	Botony	10	8.3
5	Business Administration	10	8.3
6	Economics	8	6.6
7	Mathematics	8	6.6
8	Commerce	6	5.0
9	Communications	5	4.1
10	Rural Development	5	4.1
11	Sociology	4	3.3
12	CITE	3	2.5
13	Psychology	3	2.5
14	Education	2	1.7
15	Home Science	2	1.7
16	Instruments	1	0.8
17	USIC	1	0.8
University			
1	Annamalai University	76	62.8
2	Manonmaniam Sundaranar University	15	12.4
3	Alagappa University	10	8.3
4	Madurai Kamaraj University	11	9.1
5	Gandhigram Rural Institute – Deemed University	9	7.4
No. of MPhil/PhD Students Guiding / Guided so far			
1	Below 10	76	62.80
2	Between 11 & 30	36	29.80
3	Above 31	9	7.40
No. of Scientific Papers Published in Journals			
1	Below 10	59	48.80
2	Between 11 & 30	41	33.90
3	Above 31	21	17.40
No. of Scientific Papers Published in Open Access Journals			
1	Below 10	94	77.70
2	Between 11 & 30	20	16.50
3	Above 31	7	5.80
Total		121	

The total percentage of female teaching staff included in the study was 31.4% and male teaching staff was 68.6%. The teaching staffs enrolled in the study were in the four age groups, Age below 31 (9.9%), Age between 31 and 40 (44.6%), Age between 41 and 50 (33.9%), Age above 50 (11.6%). Majority of the staff were in the age group,

age between 31 and 40. The teaching staffs were in the designation mix of Guest Lecturer (4.1%), Assistant Professor (67.8%), Associate Professor (16.5%), and Professor (11.6%). The highest degree obtained by the respondents was M.Phil. (6.6%), Doctorate (85.1%), others (8.3%). Majority of the respondents were working

in Computer Science & Applications and it was around 22.3%. Around 12.4% of respondents were included from the department English department and it holds the second rank. Around 9.1% of respondents were included from Library and Information Science department and it holds the third rank. Majority of the respondents were included from Annamalai University and it was around 62.8%. Around 62.8% of the teaching staff had guided / are guiding M.Phil./PhD Students below 10 and it holds the first rank. Around 48.8% of the teaching staff had published scientific papers in journal below 10 and it holds the first rank. Around 77.7% of the teaching staff had published scientific papers in open access journals below 10 and it holds the first rank.

The open access literacy tools create awareness and promote open access model among teaching staff. They provide training to understand open access model and guidance on how to adapt for it. They showcase the existing open access repositories and support how to use it. Table 2 shows up the open access literacy tools usage frequency and percentage of teaching staff.

Table 2: Frequency Table - Open Access Literacy Tools Usage among Teaching Staff

S. No.	Description	No. of Respondents	Percentage	Rank
1	Journals	104	86.0	1
2	E-mail Alerts	103	85.1	2
3	Websites	98	81.0	3
4	Library/Librarians	90	74.4	4
5	Conference/Seminar/Workshop	82	67.8	5
6	E-Discussion websites	44	36.4	6

The top most open access literacy tool used by the teaching staff was Journals and it was around 86.0%. The least open access literacy tool used by the teaching was E-discussion websites and it was around 36.4%. The library and librarians holds the fourth rank in providing open access literacy and it was around 74.4%. This shows up the contribution level of library and librarians towards OA movement in higher education institutions.

The open access repositories store, organize and provide access to the resources. The most popular open access repositories in academics are Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), Shodhganga, Networked Digital Libraries of Thesis and Dissertation (NDLTD), Open J-Gate, OAJSE-Open Access Journal Search Engine, National Programme on Technology Enhanced Learning (NPTEL). Table 3 shows up these open access repositories usage frequency and percentage among teaching staff.

Table 3: Frequency Table - Open Access Repositories Usage among Teaching Staff

S. No.	Description	No. of Respondents	Percentage	Rank
1	DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals)	84	69.4	1
2	Shodhganga	70	57.9	2
3	NDLTD (Networked Digital Libraries of Thesis and Dissertation)	59	48.8	3
4	Open J-Gate	57	47.1	4
5	OAJSE-Open Access Journal Search Engine	49	40.5	5
6	NPTEL(National programme on Technology Enhanced Learning)	48	39.7	6
Total		367		

The top most open access repository used by the teaching staff was DOAJ and it was around 69.4%. The least open access repository used by the teaching staff was NPTEL and it was around 39.7%. The results show up that the teaching staff considers DOAJ as a major OA venue for their research and academic activities.

The teaching staffs' attitude towards open access is measured under five factors. They are Motivation, Literacy, Usage, Barrier and Self & Peer Support. Table 4 shows up the no. of questions in each factor and the calculated Cronbach's Alpha value. Alpha value >0.7 means the factor is reliable.

Table 4: Reliability Analysis Table on Teaching Staffs' Attitude Towards Open Access

S. No.	Attitude Factor	No. of questions	Alpha Value
1	Motivation	6	.765
2	Literacy	4	.738
3	Usage	7	.843
4	Barrier	4	.792
5	Self & Peer Support	5	.840

Alpha values of the factors are above than 0.7 which reveals the internal reliability strength of the factors.

The teaching staff's attitude towards Open Access Model was assessed with Likert 5 – point scale. Table 5 shows up the frequency and percentages of teaching staffs' attitude measured under the five factors. A Positive Agree score is derived by adding up the no. of respondents who strongly agree or agree. This Positive Agree score is used to rank the attitude within each factor.

Table 5: Frequency Table on Teaching Staffs' Attitude Towards Open Access Model

S.no	Item Description	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree	Positive Agree Score	Rank
Motivation								
1	I would like to take full advantage of OA journals	2 (1.7%)	9 (7.4%)	31 (25.6%)	55 (45.5%)	24 (19.8%)	79 (65.3%)	1
2	I am very happy with the OA literature quality	6 (5%)	9 (7.4%)	35 (28.9%)	57 (47.1%)	14 (11.6%)	71 (58.7%)	2
3	People should have positive attitude towards the reuse of work	7 (5.8%)	17 (14%)	26 (21.5%)	52 (43%)	19 (15.7%)	71 (58.7%)	3
4	I felt OA literature is competent enough	14 (11.6%)	11 (9.1%)	36 (29.8%)	44 (36.4%)	16 (13.2%)	60 (49.6%)	4
5	I am willing to provide reuse licenses of my work to others	10 (8.3%)	12 (9.9%)	39 (32.2%)	44 (36.4%)	16 (13.2%)	60 (49.6%)	5
6	I am interested in reusing others work	12 (9.9%)	23 (19%)	35 (28.9%)	35 (28.9%)	16 (13.2%)	51 (42.1%)	6
Literacy								
1	I understand the licensing terms in OA	7 (5.8%)	13 (10.7%)	31 (25.6%)	48 (39.7%)	22 (18.2%)	70 (57.9%)	1
2	I have the knowledge on how to publish articles in OA journals	8 (6.6%)	9 (7.4%)	35 (28.9%)	53 (43.8%)	16 (13.2%)	69 (57%)	2
3	I have the necessary resources to publish in OA	7 (5.8%)	7 (5.8%)	38 (31.4%)	50 (41.3%)	19 (15.7%)	69 (57%)	3
4	I know how to do self-archiving my resources	9 (7.4%)	14 (11.6%)	31 (25.6%)	48 (39.7%)	19 (15.7%)	67 (55.4%)	4
Usage								
1	I access open access publications	6 (5%)	10 (8.3%)	22 (18.2%)	59 (48.8%)	24 (19.8%)	83 (68.6%)	1
2	I give OA literature as references in my publication	6 (5%)	14 (11.6%)	25 (20.7%)	53 (43.8%)	23 (19%)	76 (62.8%)	2
3	I publish articles in open access journals	6 (5%)	9 (7.4%)	34 (28.1%)	57 (47.1%)	15 (12.4%)	72 (59.5%)	3
4	I cite articles published in open access journals	10 (8.3%)	12 (9.9%)	27 (22.3%)	57 (47.1%)	15 (12.4%)	72 (59.5%)	4
5	I self-archive my resources	11 (9.1%)	9 (7.4%)	30 (24.8%)	56 (46.3%)	15 (12.4%)	71 (58.7%)	5
6	I have given links to other OA articles in my publication	5 (4.1%)	12 (9.9%)	35 (28.9%)	53 (43.8%)	16 (13.2%)	69 (57%)	6
7	I access subject repositories as well as institutional repositories	9 (7.4%)	13 (10.7%)	34 (28.1%)	49 (40.5%)	16 (13.2%)	65 (53.7%)	7

S.no	Item Description	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree	Positive Agree Score	Rank
Barrier								
1	In my institution, IT Tools, facilities provided to open access are not satisfactory to me	11 (9.1%)	25 (20.7%)	33 (27.3%)	37 (30.6%)	15 (12.4%)	52 (43%)	1
2	In my institution, required infrastructure is not made available to access OA	10 (8.3%)	27 (22.3%)	35 (28.9%)	34 (28.1%)	15 (12.4%)	49 (40.5%)	2
3	I am not getting enough guidance in publishing OA journals	15 (12.4%)	34 (28.1%)	23 (19%)	30 (24.8%)	19 (15.7%)	49 (40.5%)	3
4	Sometimes I frustrate using OA since I have to depend technology	9 (7.4%)	21 (17.4%)	43 (35.5%)	38 (31.4%)	10 (8.3%)	48 (39.7%)	4
Self & Peer Support for OA								
1	My friends and colleagues recognizes open access publications	13 (10.7%)	7 (5.8%)	34 (28.1%)	54 (44.6%)	13 (10.7%)	67 (55.4%)	1
2	My institution recognizes OA publications for career development	7 (5.8%)	12 (9.9%)	38 (31.4%)	49 (40.5%)	15 (12.4%)	64 (52.9%)	2
3	I refer open access journals to others	11 (9.1%)	17 (14%)	33 (27.3%)	45 (37.2%)	15 (12.4%)	60 (49.6%)	3
4	Leading researchers publish in OA journals	16 (13.2%)	9 (7.4%)	37 (30.6%)	46 (38%)	13 (10.7%)	59 (48.8%)	4
5	My research funding agency recognizes OA publications	14 (11.6%)	8 (6.6%)	49 (40.5%)	33 (27.3%)	17 (14%)	50 (41.3%)	5

Majority of the teaching staff are motivated to take full advantage of OA journals and they are of 65.3%. Around 57.9% of the teaching staff agreed on that they understand the licensing terms in OA. Around 68.6% of the teaching staff used to access open access publications. 43% of teaching staff denoted that the IT Tools, facilities provided to open access in their institution was not satisfactory. 55.4% of teaching staff mentioned that their friends and colleagues recognize open access publications. Even though majority of the teaching staff are motivated towards OA, they need support to understand the licensing terms and not happy with the tools and facilities. The self

& peer support factor results indicates that the need of OA promotion activities among the teaching staff.

Attitude factor scores were derived for each teaching staff based on the Likert scale response value (1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree). To verify the significance level of the scores with gender, t-test was used. To verify the statistical significance of the scores with age group, experience, designation, no. of students guided, no. of journal publications, no. of OA journal publications, ANOVA test was used. The Table 6 shows up the scores and significance value.

Table 6: Attitude vs Individual Characteristics and Their Experience in Teaching, Research and Publishing

S. No.	Attitude Factor	Mean (SD)	Gender	Age	Experience	Designation	No. of Students guided	No. of Journal Publications	No. of OA Journal Publications
1	Motivation	20.19 (3.81)	.772	.964	.846	.615	.500	.977	.128
2	Literacy	7.89 (2.60)	.849	.228	.254	.596	.960	.969	.203
3	Usage	17.90 (4.04)	.588	.511	.219	.772	.975	.298	.891
4	Barrier	14.31 (3.45)	.499	.272	.414	.591	.422	.483	.314
5	Self & Peer Support	17.55 (3.90)	.827	.287	.126	.105	.486	.256	.630

* Significant at the 0.05 level

The test results show up that the teaching staffs' attitude factors don't have any statistical relationship with their individual characteristics and their experience in teaching, research and publishing. The statistical results revealed that teaching staffs' attitude is same towards open access and it didn't differ at any factor. It shows up the OA attitude similarity among the teaching staff group which is a positive indicator to approach the group for the promotion and implementation of OA. The right interaction, motivation and implementation of OA programs among the group will create more advancement in OA among the group. The motivated teaching staff will help to continue and accelerate the OA movement in the current generation and to the next generation too.

Conclusion

A total 300 questionnaires were distributed randomly in five higher education institutions in Tamil Nadu and 121 teaching staffs were responded. The top most open access literacy tool used by the teaching staff was Journals and least was E-discussion websites. The top most open access repository used by the teaching staff was Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) and least was National Programme on Technology Enhanced Learning (NPTEL). Majority of the teaching staff are motivated to take full advantage of OA journals and they are of 65.3%. Around 57.9% of the teaching staff agreed on they understand the licensing terms in OA. Around 68.6% of the teaching staff used to access open access publications. 43% of teaching staff denoted that the IT Tools, facilities provided to open access in their institution was not satisfactory. 55.4% of teaching staff mentioned that their friends and colleagues recognize open access publications. Teaching staffs' attitude towards open access doesn't have any statistical relationship with teaching staffs' individual Characteristics and their experience in teaching, research and publishing.

The study results help the academic libraries, institutions, higher education system, and open access publishers. The libraries should promote OA publishing among teaching staff, advocate for self-archiving and strengthen institution repositories. They should enhance their orientation programs and reinforce OA usage among the

teaching staff. The institution repositories serve as boon to the institution libraries which are limited with the budget constraints. The institutions and higher education system should provide special programs on promoting OA, give importance to build up institution repositories and strengthen their infrastructure for effective use of OA.

References

- Arndt, T., & Frick, C. (2018). Getting scientists ready for open access: The approaches of Forschungszentrum Jülich. *Publications*, 6(2), 24.
- Bamigbola, A. A. (2014). Surveying attitude and use of institutional repositories (IRs) by faculty in agriculture disciplines: A case study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 147, 505–509.
- Dawson, D. D. (2018). Effective practices and strategies for open access outreach: A qualitative study. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 6(1), eP2216.
- Issa, A. O., Akangbe, B. R., Igwe, K. N., & Aliyu, M. B. (2014). An investigation of the awareness and use of open access initiative at the federal polytechnic, Offa, Kwara State, Nigeria. *Journal of Information Science Theory and Practice*, 2(3), 55–65.
- Obuh, A. O. (2013). Attitude towards the use of open access scholarly publications: The position of LIS lecturers in Southern Nigeria. *The Social Sciences*, 8(2), 153–159.
- Obuh, A. O., & Bozimo, D. O. (2012). Awareness and use of open access scholarly publications by LIS lecturers in Southern Nigeria. *International Journal of Library Science*, 1(4), 54–60.
- Okore, N. E., Anaehobi, E. S., & Haliru, Y. U. (2015). Level of awareness of open access electronic resources by scientists in agricultural research institutes in Edo State, Nigeria. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 3(8).
- Rowley, J., Johnson, F., Sbaffi, L., Frass, W., & Devine, E. (2017). Academics' behaviors and attitudes towards open access publishing in scholarly journals. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68(5), 1201–1211.
- Salaz, A. M., Johnston, N., & Pickles, C. (2018). Faculty members who teach online: A Phenomenographic typology of open access experiences. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 44(1), 125–132.