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Why do researchers publish?

• Expansion of knowledge in their subject fields
• Contribution towards solving problems
• Establishing their reputation
• Validation of their work
• Becoming a part of the scientific community
• Proving to funding agencies
Open Access

• **Response to**
  – escalating costs of journals
  – restricted access to publicly funded research
  – internet technology

• **Significant progress with policy of OA**

• **But little attention to academic community’s**
  – views on and response to OA
  – satisfaction with OA business model
Attitudes towards OAP: literature review

**Few studies** have examined academics' behavior and attitudes towards OAP:

- *use* of and *intentions* regarding OAP
- perceptions regarding *advantages* and *disadvantages* of OAP
- authors' *charges*
- *preferences* towards peer review
- *reuse* of research
- *role* of discipline
Attitudes towards open access: A meta-synthesis of the empirical literature
Aspasia Togia and Stella Korobili
Information Services & Use 34 (2014) 221–231

Qualitative synthesis of 15 studies from USA, EU, Africa from 2002 to 2013
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Attitudes towards open access

1. Awareness and experience of OAJ
   - low and good awareness of OAP
     (difference between countries and disciplines)
   - small number of authors publishing in OAJ
     (lack of familiarity, economic constraints, poor quality of OA)
Attitudes towards open access

2. Factors affecting the decision to publish in OAJ

- principle of free access as an important motivation
- larger audience, increased usage and visibility
- opportunities for international collaboration
- journal quality
Attitudes towards open access

3. Perceptions of OA journals
- improved access to knowledge
- availability in developing countries
- wider diffusion of research outputs
- increasing the impact of research
- faster publication times
Attitudes towards open access

4. Author charges
- mostly against charges
- barrier to researchers publishing in OAJ
- role of funding agencies and institutions

5. Role of disciplines
- role in awareness and attitudes towards OAJ

Attitudes towards OA have changed over time.
Attitudes Towards Open Access Publishing in Scholarly Journals

Jennifer Rowley et al.
Journal of ASIS and technology, 68(5):1201–1211, 2017

Taylor & Francis worldwide online survey of authors’ views on OAP in 2014
- sent to 89,191 authors, response rate of 9%
- US and UK (41%), Europe (19%), rest of the world (40%)
  1. Academics OAP behavior
  2. Academics OAP attitudes
Attitudes towards open access

1. Academics OAP behavior
- publishing on average 3.1 article/year,
  but 1/3 as gold OA
- same ratio of OA in different disciplines
- more articles in the future:
  31% as gold OA, 46% as green OA, but 50% unsure
- effect of differing levels of funding for APCs in different disciplines
- researchers still confused and suspicious about OA
Attitudes towards open access

2. Academics OAP attitudes: advantages and disadvantages

- **wider** circulation
- **ambivalence** regarding higher visibility, larger readership and more citations
- **faster** publication time
- **ambivalence** regarding quality and production standards of OAJ (importance of peer review, impact factor and rapid publication)
Attitudes towards open access

2. Academics’ OAP attitudes: reuse
- **positive** response to reuse for non-commercial gain
- **negative** response to reuse for commercial gain
- **concern** regarding inclusion in an anthology and adaptation of their work
Exploring perceptions and attitudes towards Open Access among medical researchers at the University of Ljubljana

Vesna Cafuta, Nana Turk and Anamarija Rožič
Central Medical Library, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ljubljana

Presented as a poster at the 15th European Association for Health Information and Libraries conference 06-11 June 2016 – Seville, Spain

Background of our research

- **National Strategy** for Open Access to Scientific Publications and Research Data in Slovenia 2015-2020
- **Advocating OA** one of the crucial goals at the Central Medical Library
- CML has recently created an **OA guide** in Libguides
Aim of our research

• **Exploring perceptions and attitudes** towards OA among medical researchers affiliated with the Faculty of Medicine

• **Identifying the needs** of medical researchers regarding OA support

• **Assessing the usability** of the OA guide
Evropsko združenje agencij Science Europe je objavilo izjavo, ki priporoča razkritje stroškov znanstvenih objav

Združenje Science Europe je zavezano k učinkovitemu in trajnostnemu izvajanju načel odprtega dostopa, zato predlaga, da ustanove, ki delujejo na področju znanosti, razkrivajo obseg stroškov oz. plačil za znanstvene objave v okviru odprtega dostopa in s tem prispevajo k transparentnosti na tem področju.

Pobudnica izhaja iz predpostavke, da v okviru odprtega dostopa razkritje finančnih tokov med institucijami znanja in založbami omogoča primerljivost, ki naj bi dolgoročno prispevala k preglednejšim in strokovno učinkovitejšim okvirnim dogovorom med njimi.

Dodatni podatki o pobudi: Open APC Initiative: https://treemaps.intact-project.org.

Dokument, ki ga je pripravila delovna skupina za odprt dostop, je bil predstavljen aprila 2017 na mednarodni delavnici.

Vr in več o tem.

Kongressna "Odperta znanost v Evropskem raziskovalnem prostoru"


Odpredodostne biomedicinske revije vključene v Web of Science (WOS)

Na podporo Odpri dostop za področje biomedicine smo pripravili seznam biomedicinskih odpretodostnih (Open Access) revij, ki so bile vključene v Web of Science (WoS). Za vsako revijo je naveden faktor vprašavke (Journal impact factor) in kvartil (Q) za leto 2015, ISSN številka in kategorija (razvrstitev v WoS).

V CMK smo pripravili izpis le za kategorije, ki so osebno povezani s področjem medicine. Informacije o ostalih kategorijah/revijah lahko pridobite neposredno v bazah Web of Science. Navodila so zapisana na spletni strani.
Methods

• **Survey** among medical researchers at the Faculty of Medicine in 2016
• Anonymous **online questionnaire** sent to 300 researchers
  1. participants' familiarity and attitude towards OA
  2. publishing practices
  3. understanding of predatory publishers/journals
  4. researchers’ expectations about the Library's support on OA
Results: summary

- 7% response rate
- **Familiarity** of researches with OA in general is fair
- **Advantages** of OA: more citations and greater visibility
- **Disadvantages**: publication charges
- **Most important criterion**: journal impact factor
- **Majority** has published more than 7 articles in last 5 year
- **OA**: 1-3 articles (40%), 4-6 (10%), >7 (15%)
- Quite **familiar** with predatory publishers/journals
- Needs for the Library to provide support
Results: researchers' familiarity with OA
Results: advantages of OA

• Increased readership (95%)
• More citations (75%)
• Greater visibility of researchers (55%)

• Opinions:
  – easier access to articles
  – better chance of publishing in a quality OA journal than in a quality subscription journal
Results: researchers’ opinions on obstacles regarding publishing in OA

- High publication charges
- My colleagues would falsely believe that the publication of my work was possible only due to the payment
- Lack of guarantee for long-term availability and stability of OA journals
- Low indexing of OA in SCI (Science Citation Index)
- Plagiarism and misuse of my work
- Low quality peer-review and low quality of OA journals
- I don’t know

Response Percent
Results: publishing practices of medical researchers

- Important criteria when selecting a journal
  - journal impact factor (90%)
  - publisher's reputation (63%)
  - time of publication process (52%)

- Importance of OA journal selection
  - important (25%)
  - partially important (55%)
  - unimportant (20%).
Results: familiarity with predatory publishers and journals

- Very familiar with predatory publishers/journals (25%)
- Moderately familiar (55%)
- Have not heard of this issue before (20%)
- **Almost all** respondents (80%) have received an e-mail invitation from predatory publisher/journal to contribute an article or book chapter
Results: main reasons that would encourage researchers to publish in OA

- Increased readership (expert and public): 90%
- More citations: 80%
- Greater visibility in society: 35%
- High quality editorial board: 30%
- To obtain copyright of my work: 25%
- Recommendation of my superiors/peers: 20%
- Other: 5%
Results: researchers' expectations about the Library's support on OA

- OA literature searching support: 60%
- Support on selecting the most appropriate OA journal for submitting an article: 50%
- Information on the latest news about OA: 40%
- Information about predatory publishers/journals: 30%
- Training programs on OA: 40%
- Support on interpreting publishers' OA policies: 30%
- Support on interpreting research funders' OA requirements: 20%
- Support on depositing research works in repositories: 30%
- I don't know: 10%

Respondent Percent
Results: researchers' opinion on usability of the Library OA guide
Discussion

• Results revealed medical researchers' attitudes towards OA at the Faculty of Medicine
  – results are relatively consistent with findings of other studies

• The majority of participants were professors
  – underrepresentation of less experienced researchers

• The study revealed what kind of support from CML is the most important for researchers.
Conclusions

• Researchers' opinions motivated the Library to prepare a **plan of activities** and an usability enhancement of OA guide

• The needs of **younger researches** should be explored in a further study

• Changes to the scholarly information business model will only be successful if they continue to satisfy the underlying motivations and needs of researchers