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survey goals

**Primary**: Examine faculty attitudes and practices regarding scholarly communication to inform open access advocates’ outreach efforts on campus.

**Secondary**: Discover useful insights about faculty attitudes and practices regarding scholarly communication by comparing survey results from 3 universities: IUPUI (2013), University of Toronto (2010), and University of California (2006).
why do we care?

http://www.sparc.arl.org/COAPI
https://www.nihms.nih.gov/
https://impactstory.org/
https://pkp.sfu.ca/
http://www.dspace.org/
Anecdoteak, Scam.
http://commons.wikimedia.org/
http://www.plosone.org/
survey instrument & recruitment

Recruitment:

• Fall 2013 online survey; sent to all faculty by email (twice).
• Included: tenure track faculty members and lecturers
• Excluded: clinical, research ranks, visiting, and “other” faculty.

Instrument:

• Replicated from two prior university-wide surveys—U. of California (2006) and U. of Toronto (2010)—see http://hdl.handle.net/1807/26446 for Toronto results and instrument
• **Scope:** Scholarly Communications (publishing, peer review, promotion and tenure, and more)
• IRB exempt
• Adapted and delivered with REDCap, Indiana CTSI (https://redcap.uits.iu.edu/)
• 126 fields; ~ 20 minutes to complete
survey response rate

• Majority of analysis examines 286 responses
  • Received a total of 338 responses partial and complete
  • 215 eligible respondents completed entire survey
  • 71 eligible respondents completed a portion
  • Excluded: 52 respondents (by rank, by request or because they didn’t complete the demographic questions)

• Achieved sample: 18% (14% for complete survey)
  • Toronto: 16% of population
  • California: 13% of population
rank and tenure status of sample

Rank?
- Assistant
- Associate
- Full
- Lecturer

Tenured?
- Not Tenure Track
- Tenure Track
- Tenured
IUPUI’s coded disciplinary categories

- Health Science: 176 respondents
- Humanities: 18 respondents
- Physical & Technical Sciences: 16 respondents
- Social Sciences: 76 respondents
key points of interest

Independent Variables
• Rank
• Tenure
• Discipline
• Campus (UC 2006; UT 2010; IUPUI 2013)

Dependent Variables
• Scholarly communications attitudes:
  • Perceived cultural norms in discipline
  • Attitudes toward open access
  • Interest in change
  • Preferred features of a publisher
• Interest in self-archiving
• Support for university open access policies
selected findings

full article

When considering where to submit your work for publication, how important to you are each of the following factors? (p < .05)

- Quality of peer review
- Ability to retain copyright
- Ability to self-archive
- Journal impact factor

scale: Not important=1; Important=2; Very Important=3
To what extent do you agree or disagree that the existing tenure, merit and promotion processes in your department or faculty ...

cause me to forego using alternative forms of communication

are keeping up with the evolution of scholarly communication

encourage new forms of high-quality (peer-reviewed) scholarly communication

No significant difference.

scale: Strongly disagree=1; Disagree=2; Agree=3; Strongly agree=4
Overall how would you characterize the scholarly communication system in your field?

- works fine as it is
- there is considerable resistance to change
- the field is experimenting with a number of new ideas and forms

% of respondents | No significant difference
open access awareness and participation

% of respondents | “have self-archived” p<.05
motivations for OA participation

- OA threatens the survival of my societies
- Making my work OA to everyone is a benefit to me
- OA will dramatically change scholarly communication in my discipline in the next 2 years
- OA is likely to lead to an increase in citations of my work

Scale: Strongly disagree=1; Disagree=2; Agree=3; Strongly agree=4

P<.05

Health Sciences
All Others
OA policy comments

**Pro**
- “Open access is the future. It is inappropriate to not make knowledge widely accessible. We are an institution of higher learning, not an institution of secret knowledge.”
- “Because it can enhance the reputation of IUPUI.”
- “OA policies will increase the distribution and value of IUPUI faculty's research.”

**Con**
- “It's MY work. Why should the university be able to tell me what to do with it?”
- “Whether IUPUI and its library want it to be the case, requirements like that fly in the face of academic freedom. If the majority of my field looks down on them comparatively, it doesn't matter what the university thinks of them. And can they really require me to do something that hurts my standing in the field just to make a point?”
- “We already have too many different levels of mandates, and time burdens, which adversely impact productivity.”
how does the survey inform our practice?
overall low awareness of OA policies significantly worse in Health Sciences

73% of respondents were “unaware” of OA policies (Health Science: 82% unaware; Other: 58% unaware)
have hope!

“Should IUPUI consider implementing an OA policy?”

40.3% support!

9.8% from majority support
outcomes of the OA policy

articles archived by year

https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/3272
OA policy participation rate

Archival rate: 85%
- In 2017 IUPUI ScholarWorks archived 2,400 articles in the OA policy collection
- In the same year, 2,824 articles eligible under the OA policy in 2017 (Scopus search + liaison searches – duplicates/ineligibles)

Author Response Rate: 50% (315/629 authors)

Article-level Response Rate: 44%
- 461 articles received a response (356 deposits; 105 opt outs)
- 1,043 articles required participation from the authors
disciplinary differences in participation?
other OA Services at IUPUI
disciplinary differences in participation?

**Attitudes ≠ Participation**

[anecdotal observation]

**Arts and Humanities:** interested in cultural heritage collections, allies for the OA cause (critical of the impact factor), but unlikely to send us an article for the repository

**Social Sciences:** more likely to start an OA journal or to use the repository for a white paper series

**Sciences:** eager to use the OA fund for article processing charges and mostly willing to send us a manuscript for the repository when we ask for it

**Health and Medicine:** unsure of the cause & impact factor complacent; less interested in starting a journal with us, but often have the accepted manuscript and happy to let us harvest one from PubMed Central.
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