Episode 41: Michaela Willi Hooper

**KL:** Katie Linder

**MWH:** Michaela Willi Hooper

**KL:** You’re listening to *Research in Action*: episode 41.

[intro music]

# Segment 1:

**KL:** Welcome to *Research in Action*, a weekly podcast where you can hear about topics and issues related to research in higher education from experts across a range of disciplines. I’m your host, Dr. Katie Linder, director of research at Oregon State University Ecampus.

On this episode, I am joined by Michaela Willi Hooper, the Scholarly Communication Librarian at Oregon State University and an Assistant Professor for the Center for Digital Scholarship and Services at the Valley Library. Michaela is a resource for faculty, staff, and students with questions about fair use and open access. She promotes ScholarsArchive@OSU and encourages compliance with funder public access requirements and the university’s open access policy. Her research interests include transformative learning and student perception of issues in scholarly communication. Michaela earned her MS in Information from the University of Michigan and has a bachelor’s in History.

Thanks so much for joining me today, Michaela.

**MWH:** Thank you, Katie. I’m glad to be here.

**KL:** So, I’m excited that you’re in the studio with me because you’re here at Oregon State—so, this is one of our studio interviews. You’ve been here for about six months and I’ve already learned a ton from you. One of the things that I contacted you about pretty quickly to learn more about was copyright, because this is something that you really focus on in your work. So, one of the things that we’d kind of discuss in this episode is copyright more generally, what do researchers need to know. I feel like this is an area where people just don’t know as much as they should.

**MWH:** They don’t! And that’s unfortunate, because we interact with copyright every day. Any time you temporarily save something from your browser, that’s interacting with copyright. Every time you quote someone in a paper, you’re interacting with copyrights there. So, just like with traffic laws, it’s something that we should all have a general understanding of, because we all interact with it.

**KL:** Well, and I would imagine researchers in particular, this is an area that definitely comes up, especially when we’re publishing, we’re getting contracts to sign off copyright, and things like that. So, let’s start with just what is copyright, and why is it important for researchers?

**MWH:** Sure, let’s start out with what is copyright. So, that’s part of intellectual property law. There’s other pieces of intellectual property law such as patents and trademarks. Copyright really deals with creative expression, and that’s what my job is part of. It gives creators exclusive rights for a really limited period of time, and there’s more than one of them. So, copyright is a bundle of rights that includes the right to print, to copy, to publish, to adapt, to perform, film, or record original works. Those works have to be put in a tangible form, but right now that’s not putting them in a tangible form in a very formal way. So, any time you jot something on a napkin or send an email, by default you are a copyright holder. So, almost all of us—yes, researchers, but also our students—everyone is pretty much a copyright holder in the United States.

**KL:** That’s so interesting. Well, and I think—one of the things you said was, you referred to it as kind of creators—and I think a lot of researchers don’t think of themselves as creators or makers of things that would have copyright. And one of the questions I’ve heard from people that I would love for you to respond to is just, people will say, “Well, don’t I have to register something for copyright?” Can you talk about that? Like, is it something you just have, like you mentioned this writing on a napkin? When does copyright come into effect with something that you’ve created?

**MWH:** Sure. You can absolutely register your copyright with the Copyright Office. You can go online and do that, and it’s a fairly simple process. There is a small fee. You really only need to do that if you feel like you might have to defend your copyright against copyright infringement, so it gives you some additional standing there in courts. Since most of the time when we’re creating something that doesn’t end up in court (fortunately), if you have evidence that you created something, you are the copyright holder. You don’t need to put the “(C)” on it anymore—that convention has been eliminated when the U.S. came in compliance with the Berne Convention, which is sort of international copyright law. So, you are a copyright holder, whether or not you choose to register your copyright.

**KL:** That’s kind of a relief, I think, for many researchers, because as we’re creating things, that’s a whole other side of the business of being a researcher, that I don’t think people don’t want to be registering their copyright every time a new idea comes to them. When it comes to copyright, and particularly for researchers, what are kind of the main things that we need to be thinking about or that we need to know about it? And you’ve kind of already started with this, but are there other things that you might add?

**MWH:** Sure. So, it’s important to think about how you might want to reuse your own content in the future, because yes, when you create something, initially that copyright adheres to you, except in some strange cases like works for hire. For the most part, when you create something, you are the copyright holder, but you can transfer that copyright to other people, and this is a fairly common practice in academia. Most of the time, we as faculty don’t get paid for our academic work, so at least our scholarly articles, we’re used to giving those away for free. We don’t necessarily see that they have value, but publishing, journal publishing, is a multi-billion-dollar industry, so your research absolutely does have value. When you transfer that copyright to the publisher, you’re giving away your control over your own work. So, you may want to reuse your work—we reuse other people’s work all the time—so think about how are you going to want to reuse your work in the future. Are you going to want to post it in one of your classes, share it with your students? Maybe you want to post it in a MOOC, an open course. All of those things are things to consider. Maybe you want to share it at a conference or rewrite it so that it’s part of a book or an anthology. So, making sure you keep those rights so that you don’t have to go back and ask for permission to use your own work.

**KL:** So, there are, I think, lots of terminology kind of floating around, and one of those things is open access, and I think, for a lot of researchers, open access has kind of a stigma of not being as rigorous or—for whatever reason, like, I’m not even sure why—but I feel like there is kind of this stigma about open access. Tell me about that. What is it? What is kind of the relationship that researchers can have with open access?

**MWH:** Sure. Well, one important thing to understand is that you can promote open access and be part of the open access movement without necessarily publishing in an open-access journal.

**KL:** Hmm.

**MWH:** So, yes, because open access is fairly new, the really good open-access journals out there don’t necessarily have the name recognition of the journals that have been around for 10, 20, 30 years. They’re not on those lists of top journals that tenure and promotion committees have. So, you know, as an assistant professor, I certainly understand that pressure to publish in top journals. Open-access journals is known as *gold* open access. That’s only one path to open access. The other path is known as *green* open access, and that’s self-archiving a copy of your own work, so you can publish in any journal you want, and then upload your work to an institutional repository, which is probably what I, as the librarian, would want you to do. Or, make it available in another way. So, people distribute their work on ResearchGate and academia.edu now, those academic social networks, they post them on their own websites, and then those are usually picked up by Google Scholar so that the whole world can have access to your article. Most publishers actually allow some form of green open access, and if they don’t, you have the ability to negotiate, and by the time the publisher sends you a contract, they want your work, so you are in a position to ask for something, and you can add that in or add an addendum that allows you to self-archive that work.

**KL:** So, publisher contracts are a whole other animal. We’re actually going to spend a whole segment talking about them, because I think that this is an area where a lot of people feel really intimidated. But I want to go back to something that you said about academia.edu and ResearchGate and some of these other kind of social media-type sites where you can be engaging with other researchers, and this is an area that’s really confused me, actually, is that they will ask for you to upload a copy of your work. And something that I’ve always thought or been told is that I can’t do that—that once a journal has that copyright, once I’ve signed that contract and published something in a journal, that’s it’s not okay for me kind of put it out there and have it not behind that paywall of that journal. So I’m wondering if you can just expand on that a little bit more, I mean, you said it was a negotiation point, you said that sometimes it’s in the contract, and it says you don’t have to do that. Where might we find that information? Like, how do we know that we can put something up online and that it’s our choice to put that out there for people?

**MWH:** Well, I really encourage you to read your contracts and keep a copy of those, but if that didn’t happen for whatever reason, there’s a database we use in the library called SHERPA/RoMEO. It’s a free database online, and there are tens of thousands of journals, so I can’t give a blanket answer for this, but you can look up a specific publisher or a specific journal and kind of see an overview of what their default rights are. Certainly, a lot of stuff on academia.edu and ResearchGate is not compliant. The most recent copyright law was written in 1976, so that’s before the digital age. There have been some patches applied to copyright to try to deal with the explosion of new ways to violate copyright in the digital age and the new ways we need to use copyrighted works in the digital age. So, those include the DMCA (the Digital Millennium Copyright Act) and the TEACH act. They’re fairly complex pieces of legislation, so people don’t understand them. Copyright violation is very widespread, so a lot of things on ResearchGate and Mendeley and academia.edu people have just put up without thinking about whether it’s copyright-compliant or not, and there have been instances where the publishers have sent takedown notices to those sites, asking them to take work down. I think it’s fine to distribute your work if you can legally do so on those platforms. I think the more you get your work out there, the more visible it is. I do encourage you to deposit it with the library, and the institutional repository as well, because we have higher standards of preservation. We’re not a for-prof-psuehtundruntanrdtn pdran utnunashtneoiashnteoiashtneoaishtneoiashtnoei--he-ashtashtneoiashtneoiashnteoiasybkrpausybkrpausyb-profit company, we’re less likely to go bankrupt, we are less likely to sell out to someone else. Libraries are in the business of preservation, so if you really want your work available into the future, I encourage you to at least deposit it with us. We also keep stats for you. That’s an additional feature in the institutional repository. So, what some people do is they will post a Word document on academia.edu or ResearchGate with a link to the institutional repository copy, so that way readers are accessing the copy in the institutional repository, and you’re able to keep your statistics in one place.

**KL:** Interesting. That’s a great tip. So, the last thing I want to ask about this before we take our segment break is, on places like ResearchGate, people can request that you put something up, or they’ll say, “Will you just share this with me?” What does copyright say about kind of sharing your work on a one-to-one basis? You’re not posting it online, but maybe you have an author copy, a PDF of your article, that you could email to someone.

**MWH:** That is usually—and again, it really depends on the contract—that is usually covered in the contract with the publisher. There are—even if they ask for copyright transfers, so even if they ask you for that whole bundle of exclusive rights—they usually leave you the right to share copies with your colleagues or use it in the classroom, so you just want to make sure that those exclusions that they leave you are what you’ll need in the future. And, ideally, I think it’s preferable for researchers to actually keep their copyright and then just give the publishers some non-exclusive rights as well.

**KL:** Alright. Well, we’re going to take a brief break. When we come back, we’re going to talk more about publisher contracts, because I’m sure there is a lot more we need to know. Back in a moment.

[music]

# Segment 2:

**KL:** Michaela, we got into some details about publisher contracts in the first segment, but I wanted to devote an entire segment to this, because I think this is an area where I know I, and probably a lot of other researchers, feel kind of intimidated. Contracts are legal documents. We’re not trained as lawyers [laughs], we’re trained in all kinds of other disciplines. But let’s start with just, what are the components of a contract that would relate to copyright? What are the kinds of things that maybe, if we are concerned about copyright, we should look in those areas first?

**MWH:** Well, the actual heading, a lot of times, actually will say “copyright” or “intellectual property,” and remember, contracts are really just agreements between two parties. You are the default copyright holder. A lot of times they will ask for copyright transfer, but even if they don’t use those exact words, they may ask you for exclusive rights. So, for example, in ScholarsArchive, our institutional repository here at Oregon State, we ask for nonexclusive licenses to distribute from people who put their work in our repository. That means we can share it with the world, but we’re not at all putting any limits on what you’re doing with your work. When you give someone an exclusive right, you’re saying you’re not letting anyone else do that, so that’s putting a limit on what you can do with your work in the future. So just watch out for where it says “copyright transfer,” where it says “exclusive rights.” You may decide to go ahead and do that, but just be thinking ahead, not only about about what you might want to do with that article next year, but what might come up 5, 10 years down the road that you don’t know about yet, where you might want to use your work. So, as I said previously, most publishers actually allow you to deposit the accepted manuscript—or post-peer-reviewed but pre-typeset version of the article—in an institutional repository even if the journal isn’t open access. So that’s really something to think about: are you able to share it with the larger world that way? Because there’s a lot of people in the Global South who—they cannot get to the academic content. I hear a lot of people say, “Well, anyone who needs my article has access to it.” That may be true in the U.S., but when you go to other countries without the sort of financing that we have for higher ed, that’s not necessarily true.

**KL:** Mm-hmm. They don’t have access to the database and the stuff behind the paywall. So, one of the things you brought up was this idea of wanting to retain some amount of control so that you can reuse the piece in the future, and I can think of, maybe, some instances where this might be true, where someone might want to reprint it, for example, and maybe they say, “We want to put it in a book or a textbook,” you know, take an article and reprint it. But I’m wondering if you can speak to what are other things that people—and like you said, we may not know, I mean, we may not have a sense of this, and so we should try to protect that, just because you never know what’s coming—but can you give some examples of instances where someone wants to reuse their own work? Because I think a lot of people think about, particularly, peer-reviewed articles, once it’s out there, it’s out there. It doesn’t get reused, it’s kind of an artifact. But, tell us more.

MWH: Well, so one thing that comes up when I talk to researchers about how they do research is certainly an article has the most impact when it is first published, and that’s why embargoes are such a problem, which we can talk about. But even after that, if someone’s doing a literature review and searching for something that’s very topical, and they run across your abstract, they might not have the money to pay $40 for it, or they may just skip over it because they don’t want to wait for inter-library loan, because we know, as researchers, when we’re doing a literature review, we’re looking at dozens or hundreds of articles. There is some initial research that, by making your work open-access, by making sure people can access it, you increase your visibility, and you may increase your citation count, which is pretty important to us most of the time.

**KL:** So, part of what we’re talking about when we’re talking about quote–unquote “reuse” is just citing it and pulling it into other forms of scholarship so that people can relate to it in things like literature reviews.

**MWH:** Exactly. I mean, and just build on your work. So, someone, some dissertation student may want to take an instrument that you created from an article and build on that and use it in their dissertation. I mean, that’s how science is done. You take someone else’s work and you build on that. And also in the classroom—if you want to share your article with students, certainly you can make a fair use argument for that, but fair use is fairly complicated in its own right, and it’s much easier for you just to know that you have the right to reuse your work as you want to in the classroom.

**KL:** That is very interesting. So, one of the things that you had talked about—you kind of briefly mentioned in segment one and my ears perked up—is that you can negotiate these contracts and that you can also add things to them, and this is an area where I think, especially, people who are just starting to publish maybe don’t the confidence to negotiate this, they want their work out there for a range of reasons [MWH: “Of course.”], including tenure and promotion. But I think that I’d love to hear more about this, so let’s talk about how you can kind of engage in that conversation with a publisher when they send you this contract, and what are the kinds of things that maybe you can add on to it, who can help you with that?

**MWH:** Sure. So, you can come to the library and we have a variety of addenda that we can point you to. Some of them we have created here. Other institutions such as MIT have addenda that we can point you to, as well. And again, the addenda vary depending on what rights you really want to retain. So, what you can do is print that addenda out, attach it to the contract you’re sending back to the publisher, and above the signature just write, “Subject to attached addenda.” So that’s certainly one way to do it. Other people may strike out anywhere that it says “exclusive rights” and put “nonexclusive rights” instead. I think there’s the fear that if people do that, well, maybe the publisher will say, “Oh, I don’t want your article after all.” What’s much more likely is that they will just reject your attempt to negotiate, in which case you may have to sign the original contract, but it’s certainly worth it to try. Publisher contracts change all the time, they’ve changed over the years, and they may either accept your changes or send you back a contract that’s more favorable to you as the author.

**KL:** Mm-hmm. Well, and I like that, the point of even trying. You know, like, in opening up that door to say, “I know something about this and I have some opinions about what I want going out of my work,” but as you also mentioned earlier, publishers are really dependent on researchers. I mean, we are giving away the work, generally, for free, yeah.

**MWH:** We create the content that they publish.

**KL:** Exactly, and they’re making money on that, so we do have some negotiating power in these situations to push back and say, “This is not what I want.”

**MWH:** Absolutely, and if enough of us push back and they’re seeing that this is what their authors want, it is in their interest to make us happy. You know, we are in many ways a team with the publishers, we work together.

**KL:** So are there any other pieces of contracts that you think researchers find also problematic?

MWH: So, I mentioned embargoes earlier. I find embargoes particularly problematic, because what they are is, they’re saying, “Yes, you can share your work in an institution repository or elsewhere. For a matter of months or years, right after the work comes out, you cannot make it available to the public in that way.”

**KL:** Hmm.

**MWH:** So, one concrete way that makes things difficult here at Oregon State University is a lot of times we put out news releases—Marketing and Communications puts out news releases when we have a particularly exciting piece of research coming out—and they like to able to link to the full text of the article for those who are interested, but if there’s an embargo, saying, “You have to go through the publisher’s website for this period of time,” Marketing and Communication can’t link to the full text of that article, so again, that’s limiting the reach of the article when it’s most important and when people most want to access it. So, if you can negotiate and say “I reject this embargo” or “I want the embargo to be six months instead of 48 months,” that’s certainly preferable.

**KL:** Mm-hmm. So, I’m wondering—because we’ve primarily been talking about articles here—are the main things that you’re talking about here, in terms of negotiation and some of the copyright agreements, also true for book-like manuscripts?

**MWH:** Books are a little bit different, particularly in the humanities, because sometimes scholars actually make some money off of their books, so that’s a slightly different thing. So, in the humanities, I think rightly so, those scholars have been a little bit more wary of open access, because they do sometimes see the profits of their work, as well. So, that is sort of a little bit different. The Authors Alliance has a lot of really good information about negotiating for books and monographs. So, the Authors Alliance is a group of authors, it’s a non-profit, and it’s authors who want to be widely-read, so there’s some good information on there.

**KL:** Well, we will definitely link to that in the show notes. I also think another resource I know we’ve previously mentioned on this show is the Textbook & Academic Authors Association, and I know that they hold various webinars and educational events, too, about reading your contract and really understanding what it’s all about. We’re going to take another brief break. When we come back, we’ll hear more from Michaela. Back in a moment.

[music]

# Segment 3:

**KL:** Michaela, one of the things that we talked about earlier in the episode was this idea of reuse, and I want to think about copyright, particularly for people who are reusers of information, and it may be your own or someone else’s. What are some of the different things we need to be considering with that reuse?

**MWH:** Sure. So, we reuse works in different situations as academics. We may be reusing works in teaching, we may want to share works with our students, or we may be building on works in our scholarship. So, the first question to really consider is, is the content you want to reuse even under copyright? There is a lot of content that’s in the public domain, meaning there are no restrictions on its use. So, pretty much anything published before 1923 is in the public domain, the things from 1923 to the 1970s may be in the public domain—that’s harder to verify—and most federal U.S. works are in the public domain, so that’s a lot of content that we can draw on. Then another question to consider, if you decide something is under copyright, is do you already have a license for its use. We have a lot of campus licenses for content. The library has licenses that may allow scholarly and teaching uses. So, it’s worth looking into those licenses. Creative Commons is a type of license that I’m pretty excited about. Copyright is a pretty blunt instrument. It’s this whole set of privileges that adhere to an author, and the statute doesn’t mention some things that are sort of important to us as academics, so it doesn’t really explicitly mention attribution, and as academics, really care about getting cited. So, there’s this non-profit called Creative Commons that has created a set of licenses that you as a creator can apply to your works, or you as a reuser can search for. One of them is Creative Commons BY. So that says that, if you use this work, you’re free to reuse it, but you have to cite and you have to give attribution. So, that’s something that’s pretty common in open-access journals. They will distribute works under a CC BY license. And there’s other flavors as well if you don’t want your work to be used commercially, or if you are an educator at a non-profit institution, you can use those works without asking for permission. And then there’s also fair use, which we can talk about more, but it’s very favorable to education settings, although there’s other things you have to consider as well. And then there’s always the opportunity to ask for permission, so it’s getting easier and easier to find creators online and just email them and ask them for permission to use that content in a specific way, and if they respond, save that email. But that’s really the safest way to use someone else’s content, is to actually get permission.

**KL:** We will definitely link to Creative Commons in the show notes for people to take a look. One area I’ve seen that is people who do academic blogging, sometimes they’re doing more informal writing or processing their research, but it’s not in any kind of peer-reviewed setting, and they’re using some kind of Creative Commons license to protect that work. I think as we see more stuff go online—you probably have already seen a Creative Commons license, maybe you didn’t know what it was.

**MWH:** Yeah, absolutely. So, Creative Commons licenses, when they’re on online content like that, they are human-readable. So you may have seen the little logo down there, and you click that and it explains the license, and they’re also machine-readable so that Google and Flickr and other content aggregators can actually allow users to search for stuff that’s licensed that way that they know the creators want to be reused.

**KL:** Oh, interesting. Well, and I know that one of the things that Creative Commons licenses allow for is also the remixing of content and changing the content with the permission of the creator. Can you talk a little bit about that?

**MWH:** Absolutely. So, to some extent, changing content is already allowed under fair use. So, the absolute first factor of fair use is the nature or purpose of the work, and the courts have always looked very favorably upon transformative uses of the work, so, are you using the work for something different than it was originally created for. However, it’s a little bit sticky, because part of copyright is also the right to make derivative works. So, if you translate someone’s book, for example, without their permission, that is copyright infringement. So, it’s sometimes hard to see the difference between derivative works and what’s a transformative use under fair use, so, yeah, I think it’s great that Creative Commons explicitly gives that right not just to access the work and view it and make copies but also to build on it. Although there are flavors of Creative Commons works that I think maybe are used more by artists, and one of those is No Derivatives. So, some people are very concerned about the integrity of their work. Again, U.S. copyright doesn’t really address that, that if you put a Creative Commons No-Derivative license on your work, you’re telling people, “I actually don’t want you to mess with the integrity of my work.” But as scholars, usually we’re pretty open to people building on our work.

**KL:** Hmm. So you—we’ve mentioned a few times fair use. Let’s talk about that. So, can we get just a basic definition, what is it?

**MWH:** Sure. So, a lot of people think fair use is maybe just one thing, like if I use it for educational purposes, then it is always fair use, but fair use actually has four factors, and it’s very, very context-dependent. So, the first factor is the nature or purpose of the use—how are you using the work? And education and scholarship and teaching are absolutely mentioned as uses that may qualify, but you can’t really stop there. So, the second factor is the nature of the work itself. Fiction and very creative works are more highly-protected than—news and factual works have a much lighter layer of protection. The third factor is the amount taken, so you really only want to take the amount you need to accomplish that purpose. That’s why we don’t post entire books on our course websites for our students without permission, we only post a little bit. The courts have refused to put an actual number on how much you can use. We hear numbers like 10% thrown around, but in the recent Georgia State University case, those numbers were explicitly rejected by the courts, so you really just need to think, “How much do I need to use to accomplish my pedagogical goals?”, if you’re relying on fair use in education. And then the fourth factor is really the effect upon the market, which really plays nicely with the third factor. So, if you’re only using a little bit of someone’s content, you’re probably not creating a substitute for their work. This is also why, if you’re sharing something just with your 20 students, that’s probably more okay than if you’re posting it on the web in its entirety and people are accessing it there instead of purchasing a copy. So, you really need to consider all four of those factors if you’re making a fair use determination.

**KL:** I find this complete fascinating. [both laugh] So many layers to it, and I’m thinking, you know, there may be folks who maybe don’t have a librarian on their campus that they can engage with to really learn more about these things. Are there go-to resources that you might recommend to people, especially if they have a contract right in front of them, they’re trying to kind of figure out these pieces? Where might someone go to learn more about these issues?

**MWH:** Well, since copyright is the same for everybody, because it’s part of U.S. law, you can certainly look at the copyright guides. I have created one that perhaps you can link to, and other university, like Duke and Columbia and University of Texas also have great guides. Some of them are more tutorial-like. And if you really want to get into copyright, there’s a whole copyright X online course that you can take, [KL: “Oh!”] and they have YouTube videos that you can watch for free. It’s from Harvard. So there’s a lot of copyright education material out there, and usually a university library’s copyright guide is a good place to start.

**KL:** I love this idea that because it is the same, we can kind of share these resources across institutions, and we will definitely link to this in the show notes. Any final things that you think researchers need to be thinking about when it comes to copyright, anything they need to keep in mind?

**MWH:** So, one thing that I find very helpful is the Codes of Best Practices from the Center for Media & Social Impact. Because fair use is so general, it’s hard for me (like everyone else) to really take that and put it into concrete examples and how it might apply in concrete examples, and the courts have actually said it’s really important how your community has relied in fair use traditionally. So, how have scholars used fair use in the past? How have journalists and documentary makers relied on fair use in the past? So, what the Center for Media & Social Impact has done is gotten these communities together with attorneys and created a set of documents that sort of spell out some best practices. So, there’s one that covers images in teaching and research. There’s one for graduate students writing dissertations and theses and using images in those. There’s one for people who are teaching and creating OpenCourseWare. So I find it really helpful to look at those specific examples a little bit more deeply.

**KL:** Well that’s a great resource. We will definitely link to that as well. Michaela, I want to thank you so much for coming on the show and sharing your expertise in this area. It was really fascinating.

**MWH:** Great! Thank you, Katie.

**KL:** And thanks also to our listeners for joining us for this week’s episode of *Research in Action*. I’m Katie Linder, and we’ll be back next week with a new episode.
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# Bonus Clip

**KL:** In this bonus clip for episode 41 of the *Research in Action* podcast, Michaela Willi Hooper discusses the role of a librarian as a faculty researcher. Take a listen.

Michaela, one of the interesting things to me about your position is that you’re not only a librarian, but you’re also on the tenure track, you’re an assistant professor. And I’ve been at other institutions, I’ve seen other institutions, where this is also the case, but I’ve also been at institutions where librarians are not considered faculty, and our listeners may not be aware that this is a model that some institutions use. Can you talk a little bit about that? What does it mean to kind of have that dual role?

**MWH:** Sure. I believe that librarians are on the tenure track in roughly 50% of research libraries. Certainly some places they’re staff, but a lot of times those staff still do research. So, many librarians—I have taught research methods courses in the past—so, many of us teach. We certainly cooperate with other people teaching their classes, even if we don’t teach ourselves. And the type of research we do tends to be social science research. And again, we’re trying to improve libraries and how people access information and how people use information, so we use a lot of focus groups, interviews, surveys, traditional social science methods, but it’s fairly interdisciplinary, too, because we also are dealing with spaces and psychology, so we may borrow from other disciplines as well. What else do I want to say about that...? And, historically, tenure has been partly about protecting academic freedom. Librarians certainly need that in some cases. We are trying to make sure that everyone has access to information, that information is equitably available to all, that there’s a variety of information available to all, and certainly censorship is a political thing, and I really appreciate the protection of having some ability to have some academic freedom.

**KL:** Can you talk just briefly about the research that you’re working on to move your publication pipeline forward?

**MWH:** Sure. So, one research project I’m collaborating on is actually communicating the *serials crisis*, as the librarians call it, to faculty. So, the fact that publishers have increased prices for us and are increasingly forcing libraries to bundle, which mean buy a lot of content we don’t want in order to get the content we do want, has started causing some problems even for very large library systems like Harvard, MIT, and University of California. You can go to their websites and see where they’re basically saying, “We can no longer afford the content our faculty need.” So, again, faculty are creating this content and giving it to publishers, so we’re trying to find the best ways to communicate with our faculty and work with them to make sure we can get the content that they need to do their research.

**KL:** That sounds so interesting. Thanks for sharing a little bit more about our work.

**MWH:** Absolutely.

**KL:** You’ve just heard a bonus clip from episode 41 of the *Research in Action* podcast, with Michaela Willi Hooper discussing the role of a librarian as a faculty researcher. Thanks for listening!
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