



# Researcher attitudes to offset agreements for open access publishing

**Helena Francke**

University of Borås  
helena.francke@hb.se



UNIVERSITY  
OF BORÅS

Munin 2018,  
Tromsø, 28-29 November 2018

Acknowledging the other participants in the evaluation group: Henrik Aldberg, Swedish Research Council; Ulf Kronman, National Library of Sweden; Camilla Lindelöw, National Library of Sweden; Lisa Olsson, Stockholm University (coordinator) and Niklas Willén, Uppsala University. Thomas Neidenmark for the survey.

# BACKGROUND

## Targets

- The Swedish government's “target is that all scholarly publications which are the result of publicly funded research should become open access at the time of publishing.” (Bill 2016/17:50; my transl.)

## Current state in Sweden

- Around 30-40 % of journal and conference articles made OA, c. 10-20 % through 100% OA or hybrid OA
- OA is included in the Swedish negotiations with publishers around new agreements

Kronman, U. (2017). Open Access i SwePub 2010-2016. National Library of Sweden.

European Commission (2018). Trends for open access to publications. [Based on Scopus data, 2016 via Open Science Monitor]

Proposition 2016/17:50 (2016). *Kunskap i samverkan: för samhällets utmaningar och stärkt konkurrenskraft*. Stockholm: Utbildningsdepartementet.

# THE SWEDISH SPRINGER COMPACT AGREEMENT (2016-2018)

**Read & Publish agreement** between the Bibsam consortium (on behalf of 42 institutions) and Springer Nature

The organizations pays a publishing cost for affiliated authors' work to become OA and a reading cost to get access to subscription material

Pilot during July 2016 to December 2018

Co-funded by Bibsam consortium members, National Library of Sweden & Swedish Research Council

# THE EVALUATION OF THE SC AGREEMENT

Evaluation of the agreement on behalf of the Bibsam consortium

- Costs
- Administration
- **Author attitudes and practices** → Survey
- Dissemination/attention



Feb 20, 2017 to June 28, 2018

375 responses (c. 17% of possible responses)

Only authors from half of the institutions

Data primarily coded free-text answers

The evaluation group:

Henrik Aldberg, Swedish Research Council

Helena Francke, University of Borås

Ulf Kronman, National Library of Sweden

Camilla Lindelöw, National Library of Sweden

Lisa Olsson, Stockholm University (coordinator)

Niklas Willén, Uppsala University

# AUTHORS' MOTIVATIONS FOR OA PUBLISHING

Visibility	21 %
Accessibility	17 %
Accessible to the public	8 %
Tax-payers' money	7 %
Not all can afford subscriptions	5 %
(Other) ideological reasons	6 %
<b>No answer</b>	<b>39 %</b>

Percent of all respondents who provided this answer.  
Some respondents provided answers that have been coded as belonging to more than one category.



Chilimo, W. et al. (2017). Adoption of open access publishing by academic researchers in Kenya. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 49(1), pp. 103-122.

Nelson, G.M. & Egget, D.L. (2017). Citations, mandates, and money: Author motivations to publish in Chemistry hybrid open access journals. *JASIS&T*, 68(10), 2501-2510. DOI: 10.1002/asi.23897

Rowley, J. et al. (2017). Academics' behaviors and attitudes towards open access publishing in scholarly journals. *JASIS&T* 68(5), 1201-1211.

# Did the authors know about SC before submission?

27 % Yes

73 % No



# AUTHORS' REACTIONS TO OA PUBLISHING THROUGH SC (I)

Answer	Example	Per cent of respondents (n=375)
<b>Good</b>	Good; good opportunity; I appreciate it	<b>21%</b>
<b>Very good</b>	Really good; really useful; much appreciated	<b>25%</b>
<b>Excellent</b>	Splendid; brilliant; extremely important	<b>30%</b>
<b>Positive that the individual does not have to cover the costs</b>	Obviously, it's a nice feature to have given that I don't have to think about funding fees.	<b>5%</b>

# AUTHORS' REACTIONS TO OA PUBLISHING THROUGH SC (II)

Answer	Example	Per cent of respondents (n=375)
<b>Depends on the cost of the agreement</b>	Good but it also depends on the costs, if it impacts on other things	<b>6%</b>
<b>Companies make profit off research</b>	Something is obviously wrong when we need to pay fees to private companies for making publicly funded work available to the public	<b>5%</b>



# Would the authors like to see more, similar agreements?

87 % Yes

2 % No

12 % Perhaps

*”If only a few journals are covered by these kinds of deals it creates a dangerous skewness in where knowledge will be disseminated.”*

More journals with OA to choose from without cost	7 %
Good that author doesn't have to arrange for APCs	4 %
Enhances visibility	4 %
Enhances accessibility	7 %
Depends on the cost	5 %
No answer	57 %



## OPEN ACCESS – YES PLEASE!

If OA publishing is **made easy** for the authors, it is generally highly appreciated.

- most of the authors want OA if it is easy and predictable
- some are cost aware and would prefer non-profit alternatives

However, subject match and journal impact more important

## CHANGING PRACTICES – OH NO!

Open access is attractive given that not much else changes, that there is low risk. E.g.

- predictable and easy to get funding for potential publishing charges
- offset agreements that cover all the journals authors are used to publishing in

# NEXUS OF PRACTICES

**Practices:** aligning practical and

**Changing practices** requires academic decisions and rewards, e.g.

- **publishing traditions** – press visibility to peers, etc.
- **disciplinary practices** – how valuable contribution in the field
- **economical/business practices** – shareholder expectations, etc.



forms

as involved in publishing

blisher, editors, reviewers),

oving the research makes a

ing APC funding, employment,

Nicolini, D. (2012). *Practice theory, work & organization*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Schatzki, T. (2002). *The site of the social*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP.

# PUBLICATIONS FROM THE EVALUATION GROUP

[Evaluation of offset agreements – report 4: Springer Compact \(2018\)](#)

[Evaluation of offset agreements – report 3: Springer Compact \(2018\)](#)

[Utvärdering av offsetavtal – delrapport 2: Springer Compact och Institute of Physics \(2017\)](#)

[Utvärdering av Springer Compact – halvårsrapport 1 \(2017\)](#)

**THANKS FOR LISTENING!**



UNIVERSITY  
OF BORÅS