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[Andrée’s part] PROBLEM
[SLIDE 1]
March 2013: University of Rhode Island passed a Harvard-style, permissions-based OA Policy.

Some institutions with OA policies (for example, MIT):
- harvest article full texts from open sources and/or
- have agreements with select publishers to deposit articles written by the institution’s authors into the IR.

Lack of staffing and technical support at URI:
- Our OA policy workflow is manual
- relies upon active faculty participation
  - search alerts across a number of databases to identify URI-authored articles
  - graduate student worker emails authors to ask for accepted manuscripts
  - We deposit article on authors’ behalf

Compliance rate:
- 13-14% of faculty (103 of 759 full-time faculty)
- Don’t know % of articles
- Numbers are hard to come by, but this is low, e.g compared to estimates of 25% of faculty at University of California system and 61% of faculty at Harvard

Yet, we saw that ResearchGate and Academia.edu growing;
Many URI faculty authors posting their full-texts

Even though OA Policy is legal
Academic social networking sites are “infringement machines” (Peter Suber).

We asked ourselves: “What, are URI faculty sitting around all weekend in their bunny slippers, uploading their articles to ResearchGate and Academia.edu? Yet they can’t find the time to comply with our OA Policy?”

So we wanted to see if this was really the case, and, if so, why.

**STUDY METHODOLOGY & RESULTS**

Population study and survey.

Briefly:

**Population study**

Method:

- Spreadsheet of all full-time URI faculty emails (728)
- For sake of time, removed Lecturers (full-time, non-research faculty), people who had left University
- 558 faculty (77% of original list)
- Looked up:
  - Rank
  - Department
  - Number of OA Policy articles
  - Number of RG articles published ≥ March 2013

Why RG: Most popular ASN and more manageable to study just one.

Overall results:

- 47% of URI faculty have RG profiles
- 34% had contributed full-texts, all publication years (73% of URI faculty with profiles)
Comparison with OA Policy (articles ≥ 2013):

- 20.3% of URI faculty - full-text of articles ≥2013 to RG
- 15.4% compliance with OA policy

But most faculty did neither:

- 9% OA policy only
- 14% RG only
- 6% both
- 71% neither

(Breakdown by discipline and rank also interesting)

- [SLIDE 4] RG more popular in sciences; OAP more popular in social sciences and arts & humanities, though A&H small
- [SLIDE 5] Participation by full professors highest by far for both RG and OAP

Discussion / Conclusion:

- [SLIDE 2] Of faculty who share their full-texts, RG beat OAP by only 5%
- Real difference is probably less b/c our OAP compliance numbers don’t include Gold OA articles and only count authors who submitted Assistance Authorization Form.
- And, b/c RG known to harvest full-texts w/out authors’ knowledge.
- So RG not the threat we thought it was.
- [SLIDE 3] Biggest issue is large number of faculty who don’t share work (at least not through OAP or RG)

Survey

Method:

- 23-question SurveyMonkey survey
- Goals:
  - Researchers’ motivations for participating in OAP and RG
  - Understanding of the differences between two services
- To 728 full-time URI faculty (710 valid emails => 19% response rate)
Results -- worth noting:

- 51% of respondents complied with OAP! (compared with 13-14% actual rate)
- 43% of respondents uploaded full-texts to RG (compared with population study=34% all publication dates)
- Suggests those who completed survey much more likely to be participants
- Perhaps comments insightful as result

[SLIDE 6] Results -- highlights:

- **Primary motivations + benefits** for OAP & RG
  - “Sharing work more broadly”
  - “Increasing visibility and impact of work”
- But, RG scores higher on both; belief that RG has wider audience
  - Because of social aspects of RG? Constant RG emails / notifications?
  - Both well-indexed by Google
  - Friction higher when downloading from RG

- Receiving requests for articles (RG or OAP) a motivating factor
  - Supports strategy of contacting faculty to ask for articles

- A number of respondents: **No benefit** to having articles in IR, or not sure of benefits
  - Supports use stories (like Harvard and MIT have done)

[SLIDE 7] Huge theme in responses = preference for sharing final published version (ResearchGate “accepts final PDF versions”) and **dislike for sharing manuscripts** through IR

- Preference for final published version of record
- Not wanting multiple versions of same work to be available
- Not wanting version with potential errors and typos to be made publicly available
- Manuscript often messy => potential misunderstandings by readers
- Manuscript version does not share the pagination of the final version => difficult to cite
- Not having ready access to accepted manuscript version, especially when not corresponding author
- Time and effort to reassemble manuscript, e.g. reintegrating figures and tables into text

[SLIDE 8] **Copyright confusion:** Survey comments reveal belief that legality of posting articles depends on publisher policy and article version=

- Ignorance of how permissions-based policies work
○ Yet 81.8% of respondents reported posting publisher PDF on RG (which most publishers do not allow)

● **[SLIDE 9] Statistical analysis:** Our co-authors created two multiple linear regression models of the survey results. Most significant finding:
  ○ Faculty who had provided articles to RG were more likely by 17% to have participated in the OAP than faculty who had not provided articles to RG (5% level of significance)
  ○ Faculty who had participated in the OAP were more likely by 15.5% to have contributed full-texts to RG (5% level of significance)
  ○ Conclusion - Positive correlation shows URI faculty are not using RG to the exclusion of the IR.

**CONCLUSIONS**

● **[SLIDE 10]** URI faculty who posted articles to RG more likely to have complied with OA Policy, not less.

● Only a minority of faculty are sharing their work through either service.
  
  => Academic networks not a threat to OA.
  
  => We need to recruit more faculty to share their work in general.

● **[SLIDE 11]** Strong preference for sharing publisher PDF; aversion to sharing author manuscript versions.
  
  => Education and outreach to authors around options for legally sharing articles is needed.
  
  => Green OA through IRs will remain an activity of a minority of authors?
  
  => Supports efforts to hasten the transition to Gold OA publishing system.
DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

- What are people’s experiences with their faculty authors and academic social networks like ResearchGate and Academia.edu?

- We know that faculty are often violating copyright when they post on ASNs, and it is our duty as information professionals to educate them on this, but... do we really care? Could it be a good thing that thousands of Elsevier PDFs are available through ResearchGate?

- Why don’t more faculty share their work in general? Or are there significant other ways they’re sharing besides IRs and ASNs? Will sharing always be a minority activity?

- Have others also experienced authors’ dislike for sharing their manuscript versions? If this is common, does it mean we should be focusing more on the transition to Gold OA, so that OA doesn’t depend so much on authors?