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Summary

1. Interviews and a questionnaire survey were conducted with researchers and policy makers in the University of Borås to obtain information on current publishing practices, the publishing policy of the institution, and attitudes towards open access.

2. Considerable variation in researchers’ understanding of these issues was found, but a number of common factors emerged that led to the recommendations made here. The rationale for the recommendations is set out in the concluding section of this report.

3. Recommendations:
   3.1. The University’s publishing policy should be strengthened by requiring all research outputs or (in the case of exhibitions, etc.) documentary evidence of those outputs to be deposited in BADA in full-text form. Library should receive a mandate to implement this policy to its full extent. Where publishers’ embargos exist, it should be the library’s responsibility to determine when the paper, etc., can be made openly available.

   3.2. A resource allocation model for research should be developed which prioritises the continuation of and application for doctoral education rights, while preserving research that is directed at supporting the University’s goal of serving as a “university of the professions”.

   3.3. Consideration should be given to the adoption of a document management system (or enterprise content management system) such as Sharepoint from Microsoft, or KnowledgeTree Inc., or one of the open source alternatives, such as Alfresco, LogicalDoc or OpenKM for management of research and research data. The costs and benefits of such an action should be explored in association with representative of the departments.

   3.4. Research staff needs to be made more aware of the need to deposit the full text of their publications in BADA. The role of the repository records in assigning research resources and in relation to promotion procedures should be emphasised, as well as the benefits that come from having an internationally-visible archive of research outputs.

   3.5. The potential of Open Journal Systems for managing the publication process of existing journals published in the University should be explored.

   3.6. In addition to any university-wide activity, seminars on the nature of open access publishing, etc., should be held in each Department, to ensure that all researchers are aware of the possibilities.

   3.7. Researchers should be advised of the existence of the “author’s addendum” and its terms and of their right to require that publishers accept such an addendum.

   3.8. Consideration should be given to expanding the role of the library in research support, provided that additional resources can be devoted to this. Specific topics suggested by respondents included: help with English writing; appointment of ‘research librarians’ to liaise with research groups in making proposals to funding agencies; considering recommendation 5 above; extending the scope of information literacy activities to researchers; providing bibliometric services to individuals and research groups; and provide advice on the national ranking criteria and their relevance to researchers.
3.9. The library should review how it disseminates information on the support it can give to research throughout the University and bring forward a plan for a support structure that can be provided to all researchers. This may take the form of a printed guide to research services, supported by existing and newly developed pages on the library Web site.

3.10 The resource implications of these recommendations, especially as they affect the library's functions, should be evaluated.
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1. Introduction: aims and objectives

The aim of the investigation has been to gather information on the publishing practices of researchers in the University, with a view to informing policy on the subject. Three research questions were designed to address this aim:

1. Within the institutions, how are research outputs distributed over different publication outlets (e.g., journals, conferences, books, ‘grey literature’, etc.) and what is the role of the institutional repository in relation to this activity?
2. How is publication activity affected by the institution’s publishing policy and research and development strategies, and how should they be revised to correspond to the current requirements from funders and government?
3. Which are the main areas of library service that should be developed to offer appropriate support to the researchers?

We have sought to answer these questions through a variety of means: the publishing policies of a number of universities have been examined [Appendix 4], as well as the statements of funding agencies such as the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet 2009) and these statements informed other parts of the study, as well as the recommendations made.

A multi-method approach was adopted: as noted above, policy statements were examined to obtain an ‘institutional’ view of the situation; individual interviews were held with researchers and policy makers; an online questionnaire was developed and researchers were asked to respond to this; and, finally, an analysis was made of a representative, random sample of entries in the BADA database, to determine the quality of the database and the variety of publication types reported.

2. Literature review

For the purposes of this report, some main concepts are defined to ensure the uniform understanding and usage of them throughout the report.

2.1 Main concepts

The concepts defined here are scholarly/scientific communication and publishing and open access.

2.1.1 Scholarly/scientific communication and publishing

Scholarly communication is understood as the system, through which scholars disseminate, exchange and appropriate research findings. It involves creation of scholarly writings, evaluation of their quality and spread within the relevant community. But it also includes other forms of discussions and idea exchange (conferences, seminars, project meetings), as well as network creation, functioning of invisible colleges, scholars exchange and informal communication. There is a number of definitions restricting scholarly communication to scholarly publishing, especially, publishing of scientific articles. Our understanding of scholarly communication is a broad one as defined by Borgman ‘how scholars in any field... use and disseminate information through formal and informal channels’ (Borgman 1990: 13-14). However, the focus of this study is the scholarly publication and dissemination of research materials.

2.1.2 Open access

A number of possibilities of open access publishing and to some extent unclear or invisible differences between different forms of open access are causing confusion among researchers and supporters of open access, starting with the definition of open access in Berlin Declaration (Berlin declaration... 2003).
E.g., Björk et al. (2010) run together in the “gold route” of open access all truly open access journals with the ones charging the authors (be it only the processing fee or a substitute for subscription) as opposed to the “green route” of open access through all kind of repositories and websites. Thus, the true distinction between the commercial access vs. not-for-profit vs. entirely open for authors and readers access (usually subsidized by one or several institutions or individuals) gets entirely lost in their otherwise interesting research paper. Though this distinction would not have affected the overall results showing the share of open access research articles in different disciplines and overall (Björk et al. 2010), we think that it is important to make a clear division between the essential features of commercial and non-commercial publishing that affects the access modes and possibilities to the highest degree. While developing the concept and the mechanisms of the open access the scholarly community should take into account following considerations regarding publishing in commercial “golden open access” journals (as expressed in Macevičiūtė 2009):

1. The money paid as excessive ‘article processing’ fees comes from the same pocket as the subscription fees - from the university or research institute budget, which has already paid for the production of raw material (articles) given free of charge to the publisher. In other words, research institutions still are paying twice in support of publishing. If a researcher has to find the grant for publishing, the institution still funds the time necessary to get this grant and part of the research grant is redirected from the actual research work to increase publisher’s profit.
2. The commercial ‘article processing’ fee is a greater evil than a subscription fee. It closes the publishing process at the entry point for those who cannot afford to pay. This is dangerous for academic freedom and research independence as researchers who have to publish not to perish will be inclined to accept the conditions of the funders.
3. In addition, a commercial ‘article processing’ fee potentially distorts the peer review process or rather the outcome of it. The articles at the final stage may be selected not on the basis of their excellence, but on the basis of financial capacity and power of the author or rather the institution employing the author. And only very naive people could accept ‘sincere denials’ that this is not the case of the publishers making up to 30 percent profits and willing to raise them to 38 percent (Heather 2009:48).
4. The most beneficial publishing model for the scholarly community is a university, research council, or scholarly society subsidized journal publishing model that gets rid of all the threats mentioned earlier. This was confirmed by Mark McCabe at the Third Nordic Conference on Scholarly Communication where he presented well-founded economic models of different modes of scholarly publishing. In response to a question, he noted that the ‘subsidised journal’ model ‘maximises social value and is the model that ought to be supported by the research councils’ (Wilson & Macevičiūtė, 2006). A thorough presentation of the complicated economic environment of scholarly publishing was later published by McCabe and Snyder (2007), but it does not explore the economic model of a subsidized journal.

Thus in this report the term open access means the free of charge access of published materials for the users. The “gold route” signifies the commercial publishing that closes the access to the publications at the author end by introducing author charges (even if those are only processing charges of non-profit journals). The “green route” signifies an open access through repositories and websites that does not pose any barriers for authors (including peer-review) or for users. The term “genuine open access” defines publishing through peer-reviewed journals that do not have either author or subscription charges, but are sponsored by some institutions or individuals.

2.1.3 Library services for research

Providing support for teaching, learning, and research is the focus of academic libraries. To achieve this task libraries build collections, provide services and conduct user education. Services for education and research are usually integrated. However different needs of the audiences demand different approach
to the collection building, shape the interactions with users, and as a result the form of service. E.g. library loan rules are usually different for the students and the staff, user education acquires different forms for the students and researchers, subject librarians are supposed to have higher levels of understanding the research areas that they serve, etc. Lately, the changes in research and scholarly communication as well as administration of higher education institutions and research in many countries have changed the roles of the academic libraries in their institutions. There is a wide range of new services that libraries start providing in relation to these changes, such as bibliometric measurements, publishing support, open access publishing, etc. Thus library services for research can be defined as all traditional and newly emerging services directed to satisfy the needs of the researchers as individuals and their community as a whole so that higher education institutions maintain the quality of their research and disseminate it effectively to their own and external scholarly communities (based on Curzon & Quiñónez-Skinner 2009; materials from SPARC 2010).

2.2 Publishing and research resource allocation policy

One can distinguish two levels of policy regarding resource allocation that are very closely related to each other: the national and the institutional. On the national level the resources are allocated to the research institutions and on the institutional distributed within them internally. In addition the groups of researchers and individuals may be funded on national, international level on the basis of projects by both private and public funders.

Publishing and research resource allocation are quite distinctively tied together in modern research policies, especially, lately. This intertwining has its roots in the attempts to find clear and simple measures of research output as a criterion of funding the best and most effective research, mainly since the time when a state has become a major funder of research activities. The recently increased attention to the bibliometric measures also points out the introduction of business models into scientific activity and increased attention to its effectiveness. However, it is not without problems.

2.2.1 National level – performance based resource allocation

Diana Hicks has done several international comparisons of the performance-based research funding systems in the Anglo-Saxon world and beyond (Hicks 2009, 2011). She has noted “a tension between increasing complexity and practicality” (Hicks 2009: 9). The complex sophisticated qualitative approach of peer-review or extremely rigorous bibliometric measurement increases the costs and time involved in carrying out the process, but it emerged as an answer to the demands of fairness across heterogeneous academic disciplines. The issue of fairness is related to the funding allocation to the institutions, therefore, the whole evaluation exercise, especially, its quantitative part have to be mistake free.

In Hicks’ (2011) examination of 13 national performance-based research funding systems for universities she describes Swedish New model of allocation of resources as seeking to “concentrate resources, believing that international competition requires concentration and priorities to maintain high scientific quality” (p. 6). This observation is based on the EC report from 2010. According to Hicks this trend was influenced by the search for increased efficiency of new public management reforms, while other systems seeking research excellence are more in line with newer “public values” movement (p. 6). Swedish system is based on the bibliometric indicators – number of papers and citations. The latter must be purchased from the outside. Any performance-based research funding system is costly and unreliable; besides, it is very difficult to find out how much resources are actually allocated according to them. They do not take into account other important research impact data, mainly steer competition for prestige and under the right circumstances may enhance control by professional elite (p.13-14). What is most important – these systems is not a good way to encourage interaction with industry and application of research that could demonstrate economic benefits. They also do not contribute to equity and diversity that are public values important to universities (p.14).
Hicks also pointed out that evaluating the social science output only on the preferred evaluation methodology that is SSCI (Social Science Citation Index) based bibliometrics, more or less exclusively, is quite inadequate and can misrepresent the actual influence and impact of social science in different countries or institutions. These dangers stem from the fact that social science literature is composed of four different parts (Hicks 2006):

1. Internationally oriented, largely English language published in peer reviewed journal articles. This part of social science publications can be measured by SSCI-based bibliometric indicators. Many researchers have found that the share of the publications from separate countries increases over time, including Scandinavian output, which in some health and social science areas became comparable to their share of natural science literature (Ingwersen, 2000).

2. Books that are a significant part of the output in social sciences (and even more so in humanities). The overview of investigations comparing the citations of journals and the books shows that “The low correlations in citation counts combined with the differing highly cited author sets suggests that the journal and book literature come from different worlds” (Hicks 2006: 8) and that they serve different role. Thus neither of the genres should be ignored in evaluation.

3. The third part of the social science literature is national. “Social sciences are more embedded in their social context because society is their concern” (Hicks 2006: 10). Most of the scholarly journals in national languages remain outside the bibliometric indicators, unless the national citation database is developed. They bring in a very important small country perspective on social sciences.

4. Non-scholarly or “enlightenment” writing in social science performs the function of a link between research and application in practice that in technical sciences is usually performed by patents. However, it remains entirely obscure while patent literature is measured and accounted in evaluation exercises.

Thus, the social science evaluation should be more careful and take into account different parts of the social science literature.

Regardless of the systems applied and the criticism of their fairness the universities responded to hierarchical ranking in each of them. Thus ranking systems create the need for improvement in the ranks and as a consequence in reputation even without explicit funding distribution (Hicks 2009).

**2.2.2 National and international level – open access**

Over the past decade the number of research funding agencies – governmental and private – adopting the principles of open access is growing steadily all over the world. The research content using public funds and even financed by private foundations is required to be accessible without restrictions on the web. Accordingly, a number of national parliaments adopt legislation that is favourable to open access in sciences and humanities. In addition to the policies supporting open access other barriers are removed that inhibited open access to data or digital books, etc. International organizations, such as UNESCO and European Commission put open access issues on their digital agendas, not to speak of international associations of scientists, scholars and librarians.

One that is important for our project is the decision of the Swedish Research Council (VR) that was enforced since January 2010:

“Researchers financed by the Swedish Research Council must publish with open access, which means that anyone using the Internet can freely read and download the research results. Researchers can archive previously published articles in openly searchable databases, or they can publish directly in Web-based journals that practice open access.” (Vetenskapsrådet 2009). The Research Council recommends
not publishing with the publishers who do not permit posting of the full-text within six month from publication.

**2.2.3 Institutional level**

Hicks (2011:2) points out a dual identity of university research: “on one hand it is part of the larger enterprise of the university” shaped by its governance and policy-making, on the other hand – “a substantial element of every national innovation system” of concern to governments seeking to enhance the innovativeness of their economies.

The response of the universities to the rankings in the world and national university listings together with the criteria used for funding allocation affect the internal assessment of research outcomes within the universities.

Though small university colleges would not aspire to get into the top 200 or 400 that are inevitably occupied by well funded research universities, but improving their rank in the list with respect to similar higher education institutions is an important task. Thus the internal evaluation criteria when applied to this effect tend to correspond with the evaluation criteria applied by the national funding institutions in the first place and by the world university ranking systems in the second. However, there are also local variations in internal evaluation criteria reflecting different priorities of smaller universities within the region or the power structures at the universities.

Regardless of the differences, lately the requirement to register the publications according to affiliation criteria and to increase publishing in international high ranking journals becomes more and more popular. As national research funding agencies introduce the requirement of open access to publicly funded research results, the requirement to publish the articles in open access outlets also becomes a part of requirements. Thus, a tension between the internal requirements is created reflecting the tensions on the publishing arena (Hicks 2011).

The local institutional publishing policies are influenced significantly by the requirements of national funding agencies to provide open access more and more. Sometimes, both requirements to publish in high ranking journals and provide open access have impact on the actual course of action taken by universities. Thus, the University of Glasgow has launched its repository in 2002 and promoted its use for the faculty as a central open publication database and a means to improve the scores of Research Assessment Exercise (Greig 2009).

Most Swedish universities and the biggest research funders are working for open access publishing. This can be read in the report that came out in September 2011 (Svensson, 2011). Since the big funders have started to demand open access the need for information about publishing and researchers’ rights to their publications has increased. It is the universities who are responsible for the institutional repositories and also the driving forces in developing them. The main purpose of this survey was to examine the current status of open access work at the Swedish universities and to find out what possible expectations for national work there are. 34 Swedish universities answered the survey. There were 7 universities that didn’t answer and two of these do not have an institutional repository. According to the study it is 22 universities that have open access policy or a decision on compulsory full-text publishing of dissertations and reports publish by the university. Three universities have a demand to publish their research results open access. 12 universities have a policy which recommends researchers to publish open access. There are 11 universities with no open access policy or recommendations to publish full-text, although several of these are in the process of introducing a policy or a decision (Svensson, 2011).
The universities were also asked which areas would benefit from national coordination and, especially, from national services to support the individual university’s work on open access. There were two clear areas: national licensing agreement for e-journals and co-operation for common standards for the institutional repositories and technical development. Both big and small universities see a common publication platform as something positive. Smaller universities have more limited resources for development and support. To have national licensing agreements for e-journals for parallel publishing would simplify the issue. (Svensson, 2011).

The open access questions have become even more important at the universities after the big research funders started to demand open access publishing. The result was that universities missing open access policy are in the process of developing one now. The need to inform and support researchers publishing in open access and making the process to parallel publishing easier has increased. Instead of informing about the benefits of open access it has, according to this study, turned into an issue of how to manage open access publishing (Svensson, 2011).

2.2.4 Open access policy in Swedish universities

The open access initiatives in Sweden have a history of over a decade. It includes a wide programme on open access promotion – OpenAccess.se, which was implemented during 2006–2009 and evaluated as successful by Waaijers and Kværndrup (2009). Since the implementation of some suggested recommendations and further developments (especially, an explicit and clear demand from the Research Council), open access is getting more strong in higher education institutions.

We have compared open access publishing policies within seven higher education institutions, both large research universities and smaller regional ones: Blekinge Institute of Technology (BTH s.d.), Chalmers University of Technology (2009), Jönköping University (2007), Malmö University (2010), Stockholm University (2006) Swedish Agricultural University (SLU 2008), and University of Borås (2007). The policies were adopted in different years and about to change over the time. However, we refer to the situation in spring of 2011. All policies appear under the heading open access, but University of Borås has Policy for publishing.

Three were published in Swedish and English (BTH, Chalmers and University of Borås), thus most probably directed not only to the Swedish speaking audience, but aiming to reach faculty with foreign background and international community. Though it should be noted that all policy documents identified the staff that has to comply with it. Three were directed towards all the staff (BTH, Malmö, and Borås), the rest to the researchers, but Stockholm University also mentions teachers.

The definition of the material that should be submitted through open access is not that clearly identified. Malmö and BTH do not mention any at all, while SLU is not very clear if it concerns only article or other types as well. Jönköping and Borås direct the policy to research articles and dissertations, while Chalmers includes all research. Stockholm University has the broadest policy, including all employment related publications.

Most of the policies are not strict in their requirement to publish through open access. All of them recommend publishing when a suitable journal exists, though BHT demands that the open access channel is the first choice. Securing the possibility of parallel publishing of the full-text is explicit in the policies of Chalmers and to some extent of the SLU. The post-print possibility in the institutional repository is mentioned in the BTH policy. Jönköping and Borås also require publishing in institutional repositories. But only Chalmers mentions the acceptable embargo period – 6–12 months. The others mainly require registration of bibliographic data in institutional repositories and encourage depositing of a full-text when a possibility exists.
Recommendation to publish in open access journals exists in all policies, except Stockholm University. Two policies include statement about publishing dissertations in institutional repositories (Borås and SLU). Three policies mention who is responsible for implementation of the policy. Stockholm University puts the responsibility on the heads of departments to ensure constant input of bibliographic data. Library at SLU is responsible for the control of bibliographic data and support of researchers in the matters of copyright agreements.

While writing the review we have learned that the Rector of University of Gothenburg has issued a mandate to the Library to control the quality of the bibliographic data and remove the records that do not answer quality criteria (e.g. cannot be traced to the source publication). Malmö University was more detailed with regard to the responsibility: researchers are responsible for registration of publications, the heads of departments – for implementation of the open access policy, the Library for the support of registration in institutional repository and consultations regarding copyright issues.

2.3 Open access publishing development

Lindh and Wiklund (2010) provide a review of the open access situation in Nordic countries for humanities and law publishing. They have conducted a survey of journal and monograph publishers in Sweden seeking to find out their awareness of open access publishing and what is the existing practice in this area. Though none of the publishers works as open access publisher, 15 of the journals made the articles available on the internet. Even more expressed willingness to distribute the content, but were not aware of legal, economic or technical constraints. Quite a significant number of journals and scholarly monographs are financed by the Research Councils (governmental funders), so very few journals were worried about diminishing revenues because of the open access. But book publishers had some worries about the issue.

The overall share of the open access articles (both gold and green) was 20,4% in 2009 (Björk et al. 2010). “One out of four green copies was found in institutional repositories. A lot of effort has recently been put into starting such repositories and issuing university guidelines encouraging and requiring academics to post copies there, but compared to the leading subject-based repositories these have had a shorter lifespan so far. Other web sites, in particular the authors’ home page were still the most popular places for placing copies (40%)” (Björk et al. 2010:8-9).

The factors that may be important for differences between the disciplines: “uneven spread of available open access journals across disciplines, unequal possibilities for financing author charges, availability of well established subject based repositories in some disciplines, traditions of making preprints available in some subjects” (Björk et al. 2010:9).

2.4 Publishing behaviour of researchers

The success of open access publishing rests on the attitudes and habits of the research community involved in research communication. Open access seems to be universally supported by researchers and most of higher education institutions are creating institutional repositories. The changes on the scene of the research communication reported above stimulated a number of studies in the attitudes and publishing practices of researchers throughout the world. The questions often raised in these investigations are: how often do researchers use open access publications and how often do they choose to publish in open access journals or repositories? Do they trust these journals and repositories? What kind of features they demand from these publishing outlets? These kinds of questions were raised by Theodorou (2010) and many others in bigger and smaller surveys of different segments of research community.
One of the biggest two year studies about researchers’ attitudes on open access SOAP (Study of Open Access Publishing) was finished in February 2011. The study was run by CERN and the questionnaire did not include questions on any other mode of open access, but the “gold” one and the data still requires some cleaning up. Nevertheless, it was answered by 40 000 scholars and researchers. The results show that 89% of them believe that their field will benefit from open access (Dalmeier-Tiessen et al. 2011). Among all the respondents there were also 628 researchers from Sweden and out of these 91% believed that open access can benefit their research field (Gilbert 2011), that is a slightly higher proportion compared with the overall answer.

A study was conducted in co-operation with seven universities in Sweden between February 2008 and March 2009. The project concentrated on parallel publishing of scientific articles and was financed by the Swedish Royal Library. The aim was to understand, from the researcher’s point of view, every step of parallel publishing and to find out what kind of support publishers policies, SHERPA/RoMEO offered. The researchers were positive to parallel publishing because it made the articles more visible and accessible, and also all publications were gathered in one place. The problems according to the researchers in this study were: the time used to parallel publishing, version control when using author copy and also difficulties when referring to the author copy since, e.g., page numbering might be wrong. Those totally against parallel publishing said it was too difficult, took up too much time and limitations by embargo time made it not feasible (Björklund et.al. 2009). They concluded that both research funders and universities should have clearer demands for parallel publishing since it would mean that the individual researcher understood better demands posed on him/her and also it would allow libraries to make decisions on continued developments of publishing systems and how to advise researchers in these matters. Some improvements have taken place since this report. The Swedish Research Council decided that all research funded by them after January 2010 should be freely accessible no more than 6 months after publishing (Fri tillgänglighet Open Access).

In 2010 a survey of the academic staff at the University of Toronto was conducted to collect evidence about the current practices of University of Toronto faculty scholarly publishing and dissemination, to find out what is the awareness of the faculty of the digital changes in the system, to stimulate conversation on open access and other related issues (Moor 2011: 4).

The basic data collection instrument was a questionnaire constructed of 24 questions about the practice involved in publishing and attitudes related to publishing requirements and changes. The main findings relate to the differences of characterization of scholarly communication system across disciplines and ranks of researchers. There is a core of actively publishing researchers interested in scholarly publication. Though most of them are active in dissemination of research, very few write to the higher education community. Another important finding is that reputational factors (audience reached, peer review, high rank) are most important for choosing one or another publishing venue. Conventional practices continue to dominate scholarly communication, though digital media forms are used more and more. It is important to note that publishers dominate the scholarly publishing relationships and dictate copyright terms and researchers usually accept them. One of the strongest reasons influencing this relationship is the commitment of the faculty to peer-review. It is a factor in choosing a publishing outlet, but researchers are also actively peer-reviewing papers themselves. In most cases, researchers agree that current promotion and assessment processes encourage traditional practices, but there is an obvious difference between disciplines. In some, like physics, self-archiving is a norm and the copyright is not an issue (Moor 2011: 19).

The data shows that most researchers at University of Toronto are aware of open access and strongly support the principle, however their perceptions of open access options are vague and the levels of awareness are shaped by the traditions of disciplines. But it is evident that the publishing services provided by the University are not known to researchers (Moor 2009:23)
3. The results of the study

The study consists of analysis of policy statements, four interviews with policy makers, 11 interviews with researchers and an online survey which was sent to 230 researchers who were judged to be active researchers at the University of Borås. We have also analysed 300 random posts in BADA to. In this chapter we will go through the results.

3.1 Analysis of policy statements

In 2007 the Rector of the University of Borås signed a publishing policy that was in line with the debates on making available research results when research was conducted using public funding and especially the recommendations of Berlin Declaration (2003). In addition, the policy aimed to make the University of Borås more visible on the national and international research levels. Therefore, the policy states that the author must show their affiliation to the University of Borås, seeks to stimulate publication in international, high-ranking journals that permit parallel publishing or self-archiving in the public domain and recommends more publishing through open access channels. The policy was suggested by the then Library Director who was seeking to introduce the notion of open access publishing to the University.

The data collection for the project was started by interviewing four persons who are leading the discussion on publishing, within a group created by the Rector on the recommendation of the then Library Director.

The aim of the interviews was to establish how publishing policy is perceived by policy makers, what factors influence publishing policy, and how publishing policy relates to research funding criteria. They also were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of the existing publishing policy and the role of the Library in its implementation (see the interview schedule in Appendix 1).

All four respondents were well informed about the developments in the modern publishing area and they had quite strong opinions about the state of the art of the issue and, in most cases, the ways of handling the situation.

3.1.1 Factors influencing publishing policy

All agreed that it is necessary to have a publishing policy that helps to increase access to the research done in the University and makes the University more visible, increases the value of the repositories and promotes research groups.

The economic factors, especially the allocation of research funding to the universities on the basis of publishing and citation indicators was recognized as one of the most significant in creating a policy that allows the registration of publications and control of what is published and where the publications appear. But, in addition to that, one of the respondents emphasized the necessity to pressure the management of all universities to introduce the open access to all publicly-funded research. This policy should be followed by individual universities.

3.1.2 Tensions related to publishing policy

The performance-based allocation of resources to researchers was seen as a positive but contradictory issue in relation to publishing. Financing related to publishing should strengthen the positions of those who publish in “good journals, though this entirely formal assessment is not always correct” (R1). First it is impossible to direct where the researchers should publish. Though these decisions always affect individual researchers publishing decisions, quite many of them use their own networks or are guided by traditions in a particular discipline (e.g., publishing monographs and textbooks). When the general
resource allocation method contradicts the established tradition, the change is much more difficult for the staff member to make. Besides, performance-based allocation of resources acts against the official policies supporting open access. One of the respondents was

“strictly against competitive resource allocation as it reduces research quality, is ideologically corrupt and ethically unprincipled” (R3).

The others also recognized the tension between the two sets of demands and pointed to the support of Research Council (VR) for open access and the fact that there is a possibility to publish in high-ranked open access journals, though limited at present. It was also pointed that the contradiction in requirements may press researchers to make compromises (R3).

Another tension perceived by all the respondents related to the orientation of the University of Borås to the professions. It seems that publishing in highly ranked research journals was perceived as a barrier to reaching the professions and applying research results in practice, as

“the local and regional companies need the results in a form that they can use and this is not an article in the ISI journal. English can also be a problem as they do not want anything in English” (R4).

Participation in public debates was regarded as an important contact with professions in public sector. In this case, all the respondents expressed a common opinion that the University in this case should find the ways to counter the effect of the resource allocation system locally.

“We [should] follow our own strategy of a professional university and pay less attention to the traditional academic evaluation forms” (R2).

“We can change somewhat the internal models… here our possibilities are limited by the resources that we have” (R1).

One of the respondents also pointed out that

“there are many different areas at our university and they work and publish in different ways. Some work more towards professions, others… follow the academic tradition. We should not try to squeeze all of them into one strict system” (R2).

3.1.3 Relations between different policies

The tensions discussed above suggest a need to harmonize University research policy with external factors and the University’s publishing policy. The problem was regarded as yet unresolved and the weak competitiveness of a small university was recognized, as the conditions will be dictated by the influence the large, well-funded research universities have with the research-funding agencies. The respondents also took into account the problem of harmonizing the two policies within the University composed of very different departments.

“In Engineering there is a researcher who has seventeen publications over one year. It is impossible in social science. So we have to find ways to compare” (R1).

“It is not clear how to treat art and artistic research – how will exhibitions… compete with articles?” (R10).
However, any model should require very strictly that “there is an outcome, a result of research activity” (R2).

3.1.4 Policy success and success factors
Before changing the policy it is important to assess how well it functioned over the period. Two respondents thought that with regard to promotion of the University research to professions it functions “partly successfully”, one “not very successfully” and one refused to give an evaluation on the grounds that additional investigation is required. One of the respondents thought that the publishing outcome corresponds well with the investment (R1).

All respondents pointed out that there are different channels for disseminating research results to society at large, not only the publishing channels. The University series “Vetenskap för profession” and Humboldt seminars and series are known in the region. Work with trade unions and professional associations ensure spreading of information to professions more than publishing. Professional conferences, newsletters and common projects are effective channels of information to professional communities. Business networks are also important for getting research funding in many cases, but these are lacking on the international level as well as stronger academic networks. The need to reconcile the demands of conference sponsors to publish in their journals (e.g. Blackwell sponsoring engineering conferences) with requirements to publish in open access outlets was pointed out.

The problem of monitoring of the success of the policy was also mentioned. The output can be controlled only through the institutional repository BADA, which is a good tool for discovering publishing patterns, but the input into it should be controlled better. The institutions start worrying about their publishing results only at the end of the year and very few full-text documents are deposited. The success was related to the knowledge of the policy that should be better promoted, especially in relation to open access. Spreading information and raising awareness about publishing policy through all possible channels should be one of the ways to influence the publishing decisions and registration in the repository.

One of the respondents pointed out that the University has a variety of bodies managing research (boards, committees, professor groups, etc.) that should take the responsibility in spreading the information about publishing policy and open access.

The most problematic issue was the depositing of full-text publications in BADA. The resistance to depositing full-text could be overcome by stricter policies and resource allocation models. On the other hand, it would be useful to motivate more publishing in general by all possible means, including sharing of experience, rewarding publishing by scholarships for attending conferences, help with signing the copyright agreements without embargo periods, provide administrative help for registering and depositing the publications. The establishment of a publishing prize and relating grants to the publishing results was suggested as the “best whip” (R2).

However, the respondents did not perceive that paying author charges by the university would be a way to increase open access publishing, while the establishment of a journal subsidized by a university met with approval, though the respondents recognized the difficulty of making it recognized internationally. They also had reservations about the idea of requiring University researchers to publish in such a journal, but suggested some non-intervention methods, like appointing a strong researcher as a chief editor, thereby attracting publications from the individual’s network.
3.1.5 The role of the library

The library was regarded as one of the chief success factors in making the publishing policy work, as it collects and spreads relevant competence. The library monitors the publishing world and the changes in research communication trends. Besides, the library possesses the monitoring tools, collects statistics and develops a research Web. They can compare everything with everything and apply bibliometric tools in a variety of ways. The library could sort the publications according to the quality, not quantity so that publishing activity is rewarded fairly. It may also be given more power to ensure that the departments and researchers fulfil their obligation and duty to provide their publications through BADA.

3.2 Individual interviews

Interviews with individual researchers were directed to finding out the differences and similarities of the representatives of several subject areas with regard to publishing behaviour, awareness of open access issues, attitudes towards the criteria used for research funding, and ideas about library support for research.

Initially 12 interviews were planned – with two active researchers in each department of the University of Borås. Actually, eleven persons were interviewed, as it was very difficult to find the convenient time for the remaining interview. Table 1 shows the affiliation of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business and IT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Behavioural Science</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library and Information Science</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Affiliation and positions of the respondents

We were seeking the most active researchers and selected them according to the recent number of publications (it had to be highest in the department over two to three years). It occurred that we interviewed five professors (four men and one woman) and five senior lecturers (four women and one man). All of them had quite significant research experience, although two were younger researchers: one was a recent PhD and another was finishing a post-doctorate period.

One of the most interesting characteristics of the group was that seven out of eleven did not know about the University’s publishing policy. Two revealed some knowledge of it, though decided to choose the alternative “Do not know”. Three knew of the existence of the policy, one admitted to know what it is about, but doubted if the knowledge was up to date.

Despite that the interviews have shown that most of the active researchers know the publishing issues quite well and have expressed their attitudes quite clearly. However, even in this most actively publishing group there were three respondents who did not know much about publishing or latest developments and asked for clarification of concepts or processes during the interview.
3.2.1 Publishing experience – choice of a publisher or journal

As we wished to make sure that we capture the actual experiences of the researchers, the respondents received two of their own publications registered in BADA and were asked to relate to them in answering the questions.

The questions on publishing experience sought to clarify the main motives of choosing a publishing outlet, how researchers handle copyright issues and how much effort is put into providing access after publishing.

Table 2 shows how varied set of motives is applied for choosing a publishing outlet in the sequence of how often it was named by researchers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motives for choosing a publishing outlet</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A journal on the subject of the article/topic of interest to a journal</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reaching the targeted audience</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leading or prestigious and visible publisher or journal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High impact factor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A publisher suggested submitting a publication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A request or an idea after a conference</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Publishing time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Open access journal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A special thematic issue of a journal or book</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Included in the ISI database</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A place where the journal is published</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A journal an author never published in before</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A suitable exhibition outlet for the outcome</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Assignment from a group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Composition of editorial board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Multidisciplinary journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Quality journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Peer reviewed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Permits larger size of article</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Published in the same outlet before</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. References in the published article from a journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. To support our own publication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Motives for choosing a publishing outlet

The list of motives shows that, first of all, the researchers look for a publisher/journal interested in their subject and reaching suitable audience (items 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16, 21). The reason for publishing in open access journals is given as reaching a wider readership in the world. Similar arguments were provided for choosing the journal because of a publishing place (reaching people far away or right here in the region).

A second strong motive is related to the prestige and visibility of a publisher or a journal. This issue is associated with the high quality research output or with the benefits derived from publishing in these journals, like reputation, funding, or strengthening of competitive power (items 3, 4, 10, 17, 18).
The social network seems to have influence on the decision to publish through one or another outlet (5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 20, 22). It may vary from a direct assignment from a peer group to produce a publication in a particular outlet to a loyal wish to support the locally produced journal. Conferences provide many opportunities to attract the attention of editors and requests from publishers often follow the presentations. A strong composition of an editorial board with people well known in the subject can be a reason to choose a journal, but also a wish to make oneself visible for a different readership.

The last group of motives can be tagged as “convenience” (3, 19). The speed of publishing is the most important among them. The permitted size of an article belongs to this group and maybe other features and editorial services accommodating the authors’ habits, though not named in the interviews.

The importance of the speed of publication was confirmed by the answers to the questions about the publishing time of the presented publications. Almost all the researchers were very aware of the time that lapsed between the submission and publishing. Only a couple of mistakes were made (verified with the actual publication data), mainly in respect of articles submitted in earlier years. The respondents appreciated speed very much, though time did not matter so much for book publishing: it always took longer than articles. One of the respondents having waited for the final result for three years was still very happy with the quality and prestige of the publication. The local publication was appreciated for giving the opportunity to control the speed of publishing.

Time was important in another aspect as well. Only one respondent mentioned working towards deadlines for submission of papers to targeted conferences, but it is a usual occurrence for thematic issues of journals or chapters for a book.

However, it is rarely one reason that influences the choice of a publisher or journal. Several of respondents named seven or eight, but at least two reasons for their choice.

Collaboration on articles did not seem to create any problems in the choice of a journal. There were sixteen articles written by two and more authors among those chosen for the interviews. In most cases the authors reached consensus after a discussion, in several cases described as a very exhaustive checking of relevant features of a journal. In other cases it seemed to be a simpler procedure by one person suggesting a possible journal and others agreeing to the choice. Usually, it was done by the main author or sometimes by a more experienced one.

**3.2.2 Publishing experience - copyright issues**

All respondents seemed to treat the issue of copyright not very seriously. Very often they do not remember whether or not they have signed any copyright agreement. Only one respondent who had problems in signing the agreements remembered the process well. If they have signed the contracts, they have not kept their copies or were not sure that they were still in their possession or if they were, no one knew where it was kept: “must be somewhere”, “somewhere on the computer” was the most frequent answer. One of the respondents said that copyright is not interesting and it would be much easier if everything was open, so it may be time to think more of this issue.

However, the limitations imposed by a copyright agreement were acknowledged by most of the respondents. All those who published in the open access outlets (seven publications out of twenty) knew that there was no agreement to be signed (in one case a license to be chosen); and no limitations to using the article later. Four respondents did not experience copyright limitations as a problem, because what is published is published and they move to other topics or because they think it is a natural condition in publishing and has functioned well over the years, or see it as an acceptable situation in relation to acquired benefits (reached audience, the rank of a journal, etc.). On the other hand, four authors were very aware of limitations and would prefer open access publishing with the
same high rank if possible. Two of them thought that it is very unfair that they cannot use their own work as they see fit, one was sure that the copyright should always stay with an author.

Despite experienced limitations only in four cases of thirteen published in commercial outlets, the authors considered publishing with open access outlet. Respondents from engineering field were most considerate in this respect and always published with high impact open access journal if one was available, but the high impact was always a priority for them. Similar considerations have won in another case as well – the suitability was rated above open access. In other cases the question of publishing in open access was not raised. One of the respondents thought that it may be a possibility in the future but had preferred conferences and journals.

3.2.3 Depositing a publication
Depositing in the University repository, BADA, is only partly seen as open access publishing. Respondents from engineering were most concerned about depositing copies in this outlet. In three cases depositing in BADA seemed unnecessary because the article was published in an open access journal, and in three cases it was deposited in the repository of another university (Gothenburg or Lund), one publication was deposited in Mandeley. In twelve cases the article was not deposited anywhere at all. Academic.edu was used as an alternative depository (two articles by one respondent in engineering) and temporarily in a blog.

One of the respondents was very upset by the fact that depositing and maintaining a personal web-site is always in the last place, because of a high work-load. It is a problem even to find time to register the publications in BADA at the end of the year, not to speak of any development or additional depositing later or earlier.

3.2.4 Other publishing habits
With regard to managing references, it occurred that only two respondents (one publishing most and the other having the least number of publications in the selection period) use the EndNote software, especially, for review articles. Eight did not use any bibliographic software at all and made their own references. Two of them admitted that they have used software before, but stopped as it takes too much time. One tried using EndNote but failed to get references in desired formats. One expressed a wish to get some tips on the matter.

Most of the respondents either do not use figures from other publications (do not do this kind of research, use their own figures, had not need so far) or are very reluctant to do so and use only rarely because of the work required to acquire permissions. They try to find alternative ways of representing the needed image without graphic reproduction (S3) or will leave this job to the publisher and co-authors. Only one thought that the figures should be treated as any other part of a publication and can be used if you put in a proper reference (S8). Another pointed out the difference between Swedish and American copyright laws and that there is no need for permission when using Swedish materials (S4).

3.2.5 Attitudes about open access
The actual behaviour of the respondents can be explained by their attitudes related to the open access. There was not a single one among eleven who did not support the idea of the open access as means to disseminate research results, especially, derived from publicly funded projects. Some were quite ardent in their opinions.

“This is a very good requirement. We are a university, not a company and everything that we do has to be transparent and highly visible.” (S3)
“I think it is obvious. I am employed by the state and therefore my results should come out for the benefit of the society. So this is not difficult for me. I think it’s harder to think that one should keep everything to oneself. You have to spread your research as much as possible.” (S2)

“I think this is natural. Why would we do research if we don’t spread. Spreading the articles has advantages to HB and research. Researchers want to get out with their results. What would be negative with that? I don’t understand.” (S1)

“It’s natural. It is a part of the review and research is cumulative. You have to see what other researchers do. And it is also a way to get citations. You want people to cite you. So people have to find what you have done. It is a two way street: you want to see what other people have done and you want other people to use your work.” (S11)

One of the respondents pointed out the contradiction between the new possibilities and increasing emphasis on the university strategies to publish in high ranked journals:

“Scientific publishing is getting to be more and more a game and researchers are getting published in other ways, which are more vital, e.g., conferences, blogs, own publishing in different ways. There are also people outside academia who are publishing interesting work. It can also be so that many of the prestigious journals are heavy with bureaucracy, since strategic effort is put on publishing in these journals and it will not be so interesting to publish in these journals because it will take so long time.” (S9)

S4 stressed the importance of the funders’ policy for the spread of open access:

“I think it is very important to get these decisions from funders, if we are serious about scholars and researchers to publish in open access. This is the way to make it happen.” (S4)

One also suggested dismantling the whole existing system as entirely inefficient and counter productive to research goals:

“Very good. I think that [open access] is the way it should be. Because it is a problem. It is a huge problem with... journals and all this bibliometrics is just a catastrophe. You have to present you research results because that is a part of the scientific discussion. That is the point of it all and it shouldn’t be limited by publishers. I mean all journals have editors and peer reviewers. One shouldn’t have to start a new journal when wanting to publish something controversial. There are so many barriers and when we now can publish digitally we should use that... But from the merits point of view it is a problem. No one reads the content they just count citations and such. For example older researchers who get Nobel Prize say that today it wouldn’t be possible to do the research they did then.” (S10)

The others were more restrained, just noting that it is “a good policy” and one noted that this policy

“should not be more demanding. One has to publish where the readers are. If no one reads it is not good. But the recommendation is important.” (S6)

It is worth noting here that not all respondents were well acquainted with the open access concept or felt some controversy in the issue. One of them was mainly in favour of open access for the sake of poor
countries and gave an individual definition of the open access with a reference to the Research Council (which actually was not correct – compare in p. 9):

“Our starting point in choosing a journal is high impact. No one ever will persuade me to look for something else… I am for open access – it is important for people from all countries to get access. But the definition of an open access is a different issue. My definition is the same that is on the VR (Research Council) homepage. Journals that own copyright, but give it back after some years are also open access. Elsevier is also open access because it is possible to buy back the copyright. Some say that open access means that the text is access to everyone from the first day, but this is not the case on the VR homepage.” (S6)

The other one noted that:

“…there is a positive ideal that attracts […] It’s totally right to make it accessible. But the question is: What does it mean? VR had a requirement to publish in open access but they had to go back on that demand since it doesn’t work like that in science.” (S8)

It is interesting that ardent supporters and careful doubters were found across different subjects and there was no clear pattern of attitudes towards the open access related to the field or institutional affiliation among our respondents.

3.2.6 Open access publishing channels

Despite some difference in opinions about the implementation of the open access, the respondents have rated the importance of publishing via open access channels as follows: “Important” - 1; “Very important” – 10 (though one was not sure how it corresponds with the business ideas of publishers on whom the researchers depend (S11).

The question on the preferences of the open access publishing channels included three options that were ranked by our respondents as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Pr1</th>
<th>Pr2</th>
<th>Pr3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payment for publication in journals that are then freely available</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication in free open access journals, that require no author payment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depositing publications in an open access institutional or disciplinary repository</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: the numbers do not add to 10 as several respondents gave equal priorities to two options.*

*Table 3: Ranking of open access publishing channels*

The highest priority for everyone was the publication in free open access journals, while the first option of payment solicited some indignation of the respondents:

“Why should we pay for journals when we don’t get paid for reviewing?” (S10)

“The first I don’t like at all. Why should I pay?… You shouldn’t pay to be a part of something. That feels a bit… to be able to pay a fee to be in? No, that sounds crazy.” (S2)
“Entirely against payment for publications. I would not pay tax money to a commercial journal.” (S6)

“This is not good for the weak actors. It means that you have to apply for money to publish. It also when it comes down to it, feeds the big publishers.” (S9)

On the other hand, one of the respondents thought prioritizing free open access journals raised the question about their ownership as there should be resources for publishing a journal (S8).

Three respondents gave equal priority (the first) to the publication in free open access journals and depositing publication in repositories. Two saw the payment for publications and publications in free open access journals as first options, but one made it conditional “if payment for publication makes the process quicker” (S7). One was in favour of free open access journals on condition that “open access has high impact” (S3).

One respondent preferred depositing publications as the most realistic possibility as open access does not have “high impact” (S11). Two respondents expressed the opinion that though good for open access, the repository option is not really a publishing (S2, S5).

The result of this ranking was quite surprising as it showed that at least the respondents in our group saw a huge difference between the journals charging authors for open access provision and genuine open access journals, which is entirely lost in most investigations conducted at the moment. It also confirmed our belief that a repository may not be equally attractive for researchers as a publishing channel because it is more associated (at least in some disciplines) with depositing in libraries rather than publishing. In addition, some respondents have experienced depositing publications in repositories as additional work that comes last in overloaded schedules; therefore, the results are not as reliable. But some respondents also pointed out that access to publications through multiple channels (databases, open access journal sites, repositories, author’s home page, etc.) increases discovery possibilities.

In two cases it was necessary to explain the nature of the proposed options and illustrate with life cases, as the respondents had no prior experience of some of them.

### 3.2.7 BADA’s role in supporting open access

The respondents rated the role of the University repository BADA as an open access channel favourably (to some extent it may be affected by the fact that some interviews were conducted by the responsible librarian). Two did not answer the question claiming that they lack data on how well it is used. Four thought that it served its function “Very well” and five “Quite well”.

The benefits of BADA were pointed out:

“You get the big picture on what articles researchers have published. It creates access in that way. When I search what other researchers have done it is not easy to find out.” (S8)

“Great visibility in Google and Google Scholar when I search them. So in that way it has good visibility.” (S9)

“It’s good as a channel. It was a lot of sending files to people so it is good to be able to say where they can go to find the files instead.” (S2)

“When it is BADA it is indexed well and people can find it. So that is really good. But then there are always small things that are not so good.” (S11).
The answers were followed by some critical comments and suggestions how to improve the BADA as a repository.

One of those who rated the function highest noted that “graphic design is bad. Presenting research online generally is bad at HB” (S10). The other one thought that it is not very suitable for art work (S2).

Several of the respondents pointed out that BADA is a good channel for visibility and statistics internally, but has some shortcomings. The following one was shared by two respondents (S5, S3):

“One can put into BADA everything that has been done. It should be different and possible to see what is published in peer reviewed journals and what is not. Not everything should be registered, especially something that is not essential. Maybe it should a better categorization and more concentration on peer-reviewed journals. Maybe that can be separated from other things. The whole is not so representative I think in international context.” (S5)

Some respondents talked about availability of full text in the repository, expressing it as a wish or as a personal problem, for which they need help:

“It should be full text, you should be able to download everything directly from BADA.” (S1)

“Supporting me as a researcher it is very well. But from University’s perspective the depositing of articles is weak. If the university is serious about depositing everything we still have some way to go.” (S4)

“Someone centrally should be able to check if it is time to publish full text in BADA. When we have published something, then we tend to go further and forget to publish again after six or more months.” (S6)

### 3.2.8 Open access to research data

Three of the questions referred to the treatment and access of the research data generated by our respondents.

Two of them said that their research is conceptual and theoretical, so no empirical data is generated. In three cases quantitative data were generated from experiments. Two researchers mentioned questionnaire data. Six had generated various kinds of qualitative data from observations, interviews, document analysis and so on. One in addition to more common qualitative data produced material samples and images.

Most of researchers kept the data stored after the end of a research projects for the periods from seven to sixteen years, though the raw experimental data was thrown out sooner, mainly because it was very difficult to store huge data files. Despite that, it was kept until the researchers decided that it was obsolete. The input files and software for repeated measurements was more important to keep for longer periods. In some areas, the law required keeping interview transcripts and questionnaires for ten years, but researchers get rid of the recordings sooner.

Most of the researchers stored the files in one or another way (on the computers, DVDs, CD-ROMs, or printouts) at home and in the office. In one case a department created the local library and database to store material samples. In another case, a research group had dedicated computers to store their data.
The respondent pointed out that it is almost impossible to get specialized storage spaces on the University level as research is not a priority of any of the university services, including IT service:

“We keep ours in the dedicated computers, but if something happens to it, it would be a catastrophe. We need a good data storage and preservation system and policy. I tried to get some space in the central serve, but in vain. It is not prioritized. We really need some safety net or place.” (S3)

The answer of the usefulness of the data collected by respondents for other researchers got some reserved answers. Three of the respondents thought that it would be useful to others, but two of them noted that there were never any requests for getting access to it. Two respondents working with quantitative data did not think that the raw data would be useful to other researchers. The analysed and published data will be re-used. However, some of their raw data is re-used through collaborative relationships and between the projects within the same group, which may be expanded and include external researchers working on similar topics.

One was sure that the data could and should be re-used by others and would like to have the data of other researchers too:

“Yes, someone could take the data and compare it to their experiments. Some of the data is of course in the articles but there is more data that could be interesting than is published. We clean the data a lot, like take out missing values and of course it could be useful to someone. I’d like to have that kind of data, what someone else has done. For example to compare what others have done with different techniques. I’ve thought about it, why it is not done more often.” (S11)

The re-use of qualitative data by other researchers was even more restricted, first of all, by commitment to confidentiality and ethical requirements. Besides, it was always collected using very specific instruments tailored for a well-defined problem. It is highly unlikely that it could be re-used for anything else.

However, one of the answers was quite different:

“We have a project now and the main goal is for the material to be used by others. The smart textiles sample collection that we work with... could be seen as data that could be used by someone else... What is interesting is the data [created] during the project before it is the final product. We don’t have good ways to take care of that material. Mostly it is all around in no order. We also use parts from previous projects in the next project.” (S2)

Three of the respondents were aware of the existence of research data repositories in Sweden and abroad (Svensk Nationell Datatjänst, Folkmines at Gothenburg University, Material Connection in New York and Paris). The others did not know of the existence of such repositories or were convinced that they did not exist. But one of the respondents tried to find out if it is possible to deposit the research data in Svensk Nationell Datatjänst but it occurred that: “My data will need more work – it should have better metadata for others to use it.” (S4)

3.2.9 Need for support
The need for support was divided into two parts. First, we tried to find out what are the problems experienced by researchers in publishing and seeking research funding as that might be the stages when institutional support could be most appreciated. We also asked about the ways of coping with these problems. In the second part we asked about library services desired by researchers.
3.2.9.1 Seeking research funding

There are two main problems connected to seeking research funding:

1. Increasing competition for external research funding related to the low competitive-ness of the University of Borås, which relates to the size and nature of the University, and to the lack of political influence in funding bodies and specificity of the research areas.

2. The lack of time related to searching for competitive ideas and writing applications.

The first problem can be exemplified by the following quotes from the interviews:

“First, the brand of HB is rather weak and it is difficult to compete with strong, big universities. So, national and international networking is hard struggle. No one is looking for Borås in the first place, when there are Chalmers, Lund and others. This means also much smaller amounts of financing. Our main policy should be strengthening the existing research groups, not creating many of those, but strengthening the ones that can attract others, that would be searched for in the first place.” (S3)

“Very hard competition. Big funders like VR and Riksbankensjubileumsfonden are very popular and there is hard competition. One has to apply many times. But there is another thing. We made an RB application and got to the next step. At this stage we got two reviewers who were from an entirely different area than our research was about... But we did not get money, then we remade the application and sent in again, but then we were turned down again. The problem is for those who work in small areas and there are no proper evaluators for their research. My area is small in Sweden and it is difficult to find the right expert, and they do not always find the international ones and cause problems.” (S5)

“There is a lot of competition. A problem for my area in Sweden and elsewhere is that there are no experts on the evaluation committees. VR also has removed this area as a subject, so you have problems when submitting. It is an advantage when there are people in your own area on committees.” (S4)

The other problem relates to internal conditions at the university and the workload of academics in the institutions:

“A professor does not have time to sit down and think because of everyday affairs. So, I use my personal time for this. It should be possible to diminish the loads to allow us this absolutely necessary time for idea generation... Even if sabbaticals were on offer, I would not be able to take one.” (S3)

“It is difficult to write a good application, it requires time that you never get paid for. So, if you work 40 hours a week then you have to work extra 20 hours to write an application... And then if you calculate that it is only 10% of applications that receive money from the traditional financiers so still no matter how good the application you still drown among other good applications.” (S8)

“The general problem is that I send applications for other people and this applies for everyone. There is too much external money and not enough internal money. The balance should be the opposite. Way too much time goes to writing applications... the first or
second year I was here I wrote 15 or 16 applications and I got money for one or two. So an extreme amount of time is used for this and it costs HB a lot of money to apply for money. I don’t know where the balance is. Riksrevisionen (Swedish National audit office) should talk about efficiency. It is extremely inefficient.” (S10)

One of the respondents did not experience any problems at all: “If one knows what he wants to do and who can finance, there is not problem to get money.” (S6) However, that person also holds a Chair at another large university. One of the seniors also perceived his problems in getting funding as a failure to present the methodological part of an application properly (S9). Another, who had only recently finished doctoral studies, did not have much experience in seeking funding. In that respondent’s situation the conditions are slightly different as doctoral students usually have dedicated funds for seeking smaller sums (S2).

The way to cope with the problem was universal: writing more applications using leisure time sometimes negotiated with family (S2, S4, S5, S8, S10). However one on the respondents stopped writing applications and used the 20% of development time to write articles. Another coping strategy was to strengthen one’s personal network:

“I try to solve the first problem by compensating the low brand with my own personal network and contacts. We have struggled already for four or five years to be acknowledged for what we are doing. The others behave the same way. We try to look for all possible solutions. Discipline, order, speed in implementation of ideas and working quickly – these are the means to employ.” (S3)

“...finding people in universities, working interdisciplinary. We should be better to find smaller research funders, but then you get only a few months and not three years.” (S4)

“It is an advantage to come from science. Also to network and working with Astra Zeneca which gives us medicine and we are within IT. We work with Stockholm University. We also try to write good applications, maybe fewer but better.” (S11)

One of the respondents mentioned that it is important to believe in the idea and adapt it to the funding agency:

“Before sending in application I look into the experts who will be doing the evaluation. So, I try to guess what can be the constellation of the evaluators. Most important is to believe in the idea. We still send in the application that was turned down by RB. It is now in VR and this is because I believe that it is the right idea and has to be done, despite huge competition in the VR.” (S6)

3.2.9.2 Support for publishing

The experienced publishing problems were not as extensively explained as the previous ones. But they also were reflected in the ideas about possible library support.

The main problems named by several respondents related to a choice of an appropriate journal. This problem had several aspects: finding the right journal (in terms of the subject, speed of publishing, allowing the desired size of an article, having high impact and being an open access journal). Only one respondent did not see any problems with choosing the publishing outlet as was well acquainted with all possibilities. Most of the others wished to have help in choosing a suitable journal and overcoming ISI limitations.
3.2.9.3 The criteria for allocating research funding

The question that revealed the greatest differences in opinions of the respondents related to the criteria for allocating research funding. The reactions ranged from total rejection of any criteria to an indifferent acceptance of anything.

Two of the respondents were indignant at seeing the list of suggested criteria:

“All forms of quantitative are stupid... The reason is that it is focus on wrong things. Number of publications leads to people to disregard difficult research problems... it is necessary to decide what HB and institutions should concentrate on and invest in. And there needs to be money in the position so that if you employ someone to do research there must be money to do that. More institutional money really. So you have to either centrally at HB or at the institution prioritize and dare to invest. Otherwise it is just rewarding something you have done in the past which is a very strange system.” (S10)

“I’m quite irritated of all these. I don’t think they say so much. It’s quantitative... To be active and to get some sort of results. So that you can see that something is produced. Also that you are active in the group and internationally active. To be active in the discussions that are on going in the house, nationally and internationally. This is very important I think.” (S2)

Others concentrated on the differences between the departments and tried to emphasize additional criteria or argue for their choice:

“There are cultural differences between engineering and other departments. It has most publications and partly that is because they mix teaching with research... We need also a model where monographs are taken into consideration and rewarded. Most of our doctoral students write a doctoral thesis of articles. But there must be room to write books as well and reward monographs. Monographs are more difficult to write than a number of articles. And if for example you write a book that is published by Routledge it is a great merit to get that.” (S9)

“But one shouldn’t just look at high impact journals when there are conferences which are harder to get in to than some of the journals. Some conferences have maybe 10% acceptance. Getting to one of those should be counted as a high ranking journal.” (S11)

“There are two reasons not to get money: if you already have external financing you shouldn’t receive internal financing and the other if you have a lot of citations... base allocation on internal applications that should be clear and show clearly what you want to do with funds.” (S8)

“In engineering, patents are a good indication of quality. I think that I am the only one in whole UB who has a patent. This is a difficult procedure, but this is a contact with professions.” (S3)

“We should publish locally in Sweden. If we only publish internationally then it becomes so thin. We should be publishing in journals and newspapers in Sweden and in Swedish – this is important for society.” (S5)

Without regard to the differences in the opinion the consensus was that there should be a complex and qualitative evaluation of research. One of the respondents proposed to use the international university ranking criteria and another measures applied by Högskoleverket. Within the suggested complex of the
criteria the overall highest weight was given to: the number of publications in highly ranked international journals; followed quite closely by the number of publications in general. External financing attracted for research projects was named as a third in the complex of criteria. The number of citations and the number of doctoral students remained in the last place. Most of the respondents rejected the number of doctoral students as a valid criteria for various reasons (schools with research rights will have more of them, this is already done by internal investment, etc.), but one thought that it should be the high priority indicator and relates to external financing. The opinions on the number of citations were divided – some respondents suggested that it should be the second most important criteria, while others took it away from the list.

3.2.9.4 Library support
The final questions (questions 16 to 18) in the interviews had to do with library support for researchers and whether the researchers had anything to add that had not been said before. Seven respondents answered that they wanted more help with information seeking and six said they wanted help with language control and checking.

Information about high ranking journals and journals within the University’s research interest was also something that was mentioned by several respondents. The respondents from the Department of Library and Information Science were those with most ideas how to improve the library services for researchers. The reason might be that they know more in general about libraries, their services and potential services since these questions lay within their expertise. They mentioned topics such as copyright advice, information and support on publishing, help with references, information on EU projects, calls for papers and application dates.

The respondents working in engineering would like to have access to a database of research funders. Since August 2011 the library offers access to such a database. They would also like the librarians to take part in some of the courses offered to the doctoral students. Some other respondents mentioned that they would like the libraries to provide information and lead discussions about publishing and related questions. It would seem that these might be some areas which are of interest for researchers and therefore should also be discussed with the doctoral students in workshops or in other forms. One researcher said that the library could find out the criteria for ranking of universities to use these criteria to evaluate and improve research at the University of Borås.

It is no surprise that a respondent at the School of Textiles mentioned the geographic location as a problem since they are not located near the Library. When the School of Textiles moves closer to the rest of the University in the autumn of 2013 this may no longer be a problem.

Table 4 shows in detail what kind of support researchers would like help from the library.
A respondent from the School of Textiles also suggested that the library should be responsible for a dissertation series and other publications such as research journals. The researcher suggested that the Library could use the Open Journal System to manage journals and support the University to publish its own journals.

The next question aimed to find out if the respondents had seen services to researchers at other libraries that the LLR could use as a model to develop their services. The respondents named some, such as information about high ranking journals, proof-reading and language support on how to write scientific articles and information about funders. One respondent mentioned that he would like to see more cooperation between the library and researchers and one very important statement was that it is not always clear what is the competence of the library staff. If it is not clear what the library can do then there is a lot to be done. When it comes to cooperation tasks, mapping a research field or finding new research from a field was mentioned.

The respondents were given the possibility, in the last question, to add whatever additional comments they felt would be useful. Most of them had nothing more to add but thought they had been able to say everything. A couple of respondents stated that the library and the University should promote the publishing policy and push for open access more than they do at the moment. One respondent said that the library should work more for getting scientific journals started at the University and use the Open Journals System to manage them. One respondent stated that in order to get researchers to self-archive the library should contact the researchers when embargo time is over. In reality it might be more effective if the researcher attached the article from the start. The librarian could then make the publication available when possible without further e-mail exchange.
In conclusion the respondents were very positive to the services the library already offers. They did not ask for anything extraordinary or unconventional. This might be proof that they do not have very good knowledge what they could ask as a service from the library which would mean that they do not know what kind of competence lays within the LLR organisation.

### 3.3 Questionnaire results

A questionnaire was developed using the results of the interviews. The online survey site, Survey Monkey (http://www.surveymonkey.com/) was employed to conduct a survey of 230 researchers at all levels in the institutions. A response rate of 26% was achieved. However, not all respondents answered all questions and the low response rate, after five reminders sent to non-respondents, suggests that the topic is either of little relevance or little interest to the majority of researchers. Some of the respondents replied by saying that they had not published in journals yet, they were not active researchers at the moment or that they did not think they had enough knowledge and understanding of open access to be able to answer the question satisfactory and therefore would not answer the questionnaire. A further problem with the low response is that the results cannot be generalised, since they will be biased towards the more productive of the researchers surveyed. The questionnaire is reproduced as Appendix 2. The respondents were distributed over the institutions in the University as shown in Figure 1 and by discipline category in Figure 2.

For Figure 2, the responses provided by respondents were grouped into the categories shown, thus, “Social sciences” includes education, library and information science, and management.

18% of respondents were Professors, 44% Universitetslektor, 33% Doctorand, and 4% were Universitetsadjunkt.

![Figure 2: Respondents by discipline](image)

As regards authorship, 69% of respondents reported that their work was usually collaborative and papers were co-authored. For 60% this affected the choice of research outlet for their work, since the
needs of co-authors needed to be taken into account, or because the work was outside the respondent’s usual area, or because a junior colleague needed a more prestigious journal than the senior partner would have been happy with.

3.3.1 Publishing practices
The results of the survey show that the main reasons for choosing a particular journal, conference or publisher to present their work were, first, the appropriateness of the choice for their target audience (35%) and, secondly, the reputation of the journal, publisher or conference (27%). This is not a surprising result, since the aim of publication, in general, is to inform the community of interest of the researcher’s work and, it is hoped, gain citations to that work as a consequence. To publish in a journal that was ‘out of scope’, would clearly be counter-productive. These survey results also confirm the findings of the interviews, reported above.

The delays between submission of a paper and its publication have been the subject of considerable research (e.g., Björk and Holmström 2006; Egge and Rousseau 2000) Here, researchers generally reported time-spans of between two months and two years (although one reported as long as three years). It is likely that the shorter time-spans are for conference papers, since these are frequently made available for conference attendees.

The vast majority of respondents (82%) reported no difficulty in finding an appropriate outlet for their work, and 69% of respondents had not considered publication in an open access publication.

In the majority of cases (71%), copyright in the research output was transferred to the publisher and about the same proportion were aware of the limitations this results in for the author (77%). Worryingly, some 23% were unaware of the limitations. Only 47% reported retaining a copy of the copyright transfer document.

Seventy percent of respondents said that they had deposited a copy of their publication in an institutional (usually BADA) repository. Some regarded their own PC or the institution’s shared filing system as a repository, which is not what is usually understood by the term. No one mentioned any disciplinary repository, but only 16 respondents answered this part of the question. Less than a third (29%) had placed their publication on an openly available Website and most of these (71%) had not received permission from the publisher before doing so.

In the past year, virtually all of the respondents had published in one way or another. The results are shown in Figure 3.

3.3.2 Open access
Almost 90% of respondents regarded open access by one means or another as ‘Very important’ or ‘Moderately important’ (87%) and only 13% (seven persons) regarded it as ‘Not very important’ or ‘Not at all important’. This suggests that the climate of opinion supports the institution’s policy towards open access, which is further supported by responses to the question about the institution’s and Vetenskaprådet’s open access policies. Thirty-six percent of the responses were positive and a further 36% were positive, but qualified in some way. For example,

“Good but difficult to follow as I am not sure of the quality in open access journals.”

“In principle a good policy but offers a limited outreach and impact of the research as the high-impact journals are not open access.”
The second quotation above appears to confuse the impact of a paper, with the impact factor of a journal. While there is a correlation, a quality paper, which is available through an open access journal is as likely to attract citations as one published in a high impact factor journal.

There also appears to be some uncertainty about the nature of open access: some seem to believe that open access equates with author charging:

“It is ok - I know that I have a responsibility to do that but today I have no financial possibilities to pay the charge for the review process.”

Others think only of repositories as the open access alternative:

“Good policy but often interferes with copyright requirements of established outlets.”

And one appears to believe that commercial journals pay fees for reviewing (which they do not), while only open access journals require the work to be done freely:

“I am a reviewer at an open-access journal, I don’t get any payment for the job to review manuscripts, I am supposed to do that instead of making dinner for my family.”

The responses to this question were categorised as ‘Positive’, ‘Qualified’, ‘Conflicted’, ‘Doubtful’ and ‘Indifferent’. The results are shown in Figure 4 below:
The preferred modes of open access are not surprising and are shown in Figure 5: the dominant first choice was publication in genuine open access journals without author charging, secondly depositing in an open repository, and only finally, accepting author charging as the mode.

Respondents’ attitudes towards open access were probed further by asking them to indicate the degree of their agreement with a number of statements. The statements and the responses are shown in Figure 6. It can be seen that the two statements that attracted the most positive reaction were:
A smaller proportion, but still more than 50% agreed that:

“open access will increase the number of citations to my work.”

More than 50% of respondents believed that open access will change the nature of scholarly communication and threatens commercial publishers, but the majority did not believe that it threatened the viability of scholarly and scientific societies. By a small majority, respondents agreed that open access publishing would dominate within the next ten years.

3.3.3 Other issues

3.3.3.1 BADA

Eighty-eight percent of respondents thought that BADA supported access to the University’s research output either ‘Very well’ or ‘Moderately well’. Only six respondents chose ‘Not very well’ or ‘Not at all’. However, ten persons chose to comment (although this was requested only of those who responded negatively) and the comments revealed some uncertainty about what BADA was and how it could be used. For example, five respondents said that they didn’t know anything about BADA, which, given its role, clearly needs to be addressed. Other respondents seemed to believe that publishers would not allow submission of full texts for copyright reasons, in spite of the fact that most publishers do permit deposit of at least the submitted paper.
3.3.3.2 Role of the library

Respondents were offered a number of possibilities for library support for research. The results are shown in Figure 7:

![Figure 7: Possible library support activities](image)

Support was found for the five items presented, with the continuation of BADA finding most support, closely followed by providing help with bibliographic management systems such as EndNote. The concern with the copyright issue was indicated by the 56% of respondents who wanted help with the self-archiving policies of publishers. Additional points made by a number of respondents included:

“I think assistance with research related information searches and ranking would be very useful. Also provision of bibliometric maps of different topic areas (and so on) are what I would hope that BLR will offer.”

“Language correction.”

“Help in storing or hosting data, i.e., search results that serve as dataset for reviews and synthesis work.”

and

“Bibliometric analyses of my work.”

3.3.3.3 Research funding and resource allocation

Sixty-seven percent of respondents reported that they had difficulty in getting funding for their research, either generally or because they were relatively new to research. Nine respondents made suggestions on how the situation could be improved, including:

“New researchers need more instruction/teaching regarding how to write applications. Researchers need time (funding) for writing applications. We also need better routines for collective production of applications.”
“...more immediately the university could prioritise research and allocate further funding to research and research support activities. Creation of collaborative network with top researchers and top research institutes will also give us a competitive edge and facilitate attracting research funds.”

“...only possible solution might be to keep submitting proposals.”

On resource allocation, respondents were offered the possibilities shown in Figure 8, where it will be seen that the most popular choice was the number of publications in peer-reviewed journals. However, 36% wanted something other than the choices offered: 23 responses were received, of which the commonest suggestion was that some combination of those offered (and other measures) would be appropriate. Four respondents suggested that the quality of research generally or the quality of research proposals should be the factor; three suggested that the relevance of the research to society was most appropriate; and a further three suggested that changing the system altogether was the answer. The suggested changes included:

"If the university is a small-scale one and needs support" is an important criterion, I think. Usually like from the philosophy of "money attracts money", big universities are allocated big resources and budgets. That is unfair that they already are institutionalized and recognized. What about the researchers in small cities addressing local needs?"

“There are so different cultural ways in what is to be seen as good research performance between different disciplines so the most just way to allocate resources is to give everyone with a PhD the same amount of money, for example 50% research in their duty (as in Norway).”

“I actually believe funding should be tied more to the volume and importance of basic education and training (e.g. HST of undergraduate training).”

[We explored the situation in Norway, referred to by one of the respondents and found that, in fact, the 50/50 allocation applies only to Professors and Associate Professors in the traditional universities. In the Norwegian högskolarna, the situation is much the same as in Sweden.]

3.4 Analysis of the BADA repository

A random sample of 300 items was drawn from the BADA repository, allowing us to generalise from the results to the repository collection as a whole, with confidence limits on the proportions of items in the sample of 4% to 5%. 
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The characteristics of the sample chosen for analysis were, type of publication, country in which the item was published or where a conference was held, whether or not the item could be positively identified, whether a journal was in the ISI listing, the University of Borås department with which the author was affiliated, the availability of the item, language of publication, year, and author(s). Notes were added where needed. Of the 300 items sample, one had been withdrawn from the repository, while six ‘handles’ led to no item; these were labelled as ‘missing’.

The type of material recorded in BADA is shown in Table 5. It will be seen that almost 30% of the items were conference or workshop contributions: however, it should be noted that 66 (77%) of these items could not actually be located. This point is discussed further below.

Two of the categories here may not be appropriate for BADA: publicity material is not, properly speaking, a ‘research output’, and the fact that a researcher has edited a number of issues of a journal may be relevant when considering that individual’s performance, but it does not constitute a record of their own research output.

The distribution of the 300 items by ‘availability’ is shown in Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open access</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>33.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription access</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item withdrawn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Availability of items entered in BADA

From the perspective of the investigation, the key characteristic is the extent to which an item is openly available, either through BADA, or some other source. Quite a high proportion of items (101 or 33.67% ±
5%) proved to be available through one or another mode of open access or another, as shown in Table 7 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open access availability</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BADA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project site</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher site</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author site</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUPEA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umea university</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Location of items identified in BADA as being “open access”

Rather worryingly, the research team was unable to find actual documents, or bibliographical records of those documents, for 21% (66) of the items. In Google searches for these items, very often the only location for the item was in the BADA database, meaning, effectively, that for the world at large, the item could not be found. Fifty-two of these items (79%) were conference or workshop presentations of one kind or another and if research carried out at Borås is to be made widely available, some means must be found to ensure that conference presentations are actually captured for open access availability through BADA. This point is pursued in the recommendations.

As far as the international accessibility of the research outputs is concerned, 61.3% of all items were published in the English language. Given that a significant proportion of the research carried out is intended to meet Swedish needs and/or is determined to a degree by Swedish culture, the English language proportion is probably satisfactory.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

Our conclusions and recommendations relate to the main areas considered by the investigation: the publishing policy of the University, research support and resource allocation, open access publishing, and the role of the library in research support.

4.1 The University’s publishing policy

The University’s publishing policy was generally known to exist, although some respondents were unaware of the detail, and generally approved. However, some difficulties were expressed regarding open access publishing, and it is clear that the requirement to deposit research outputs in BADA is not being followed effectively and is a contentious issue for some; for example, respondents who regarded their existing relationships with publishers as to be retained. Other Swedish universities, for example, Blekinge Tekniska Högskola, Chalmers and Malmö Högskola have recently adopted strong mandates of this kind. We recommend, therefore:
Recommendation 1: The University’s publishing policy should be strengthened by requiring all research outputs or (in the case of exhibitions, etc.) documentary evidence of those outputs to be deposited in BADA in full-text form. Where publishers’ embargos exist, it should be the library’s responsibility to determine when the paper, etc., can be made openly available.

4.2 Research support and resource allocation

There is general acceptance of the need for a transparent resource allocation model for research funding within the University, but also a general feeling that a “one size fits all” model is not appropriate when different departments do different kinds of work and have different publishing traditions.

Universities world-wide have been wrestling with this problem for some time (see, for example, Geuna and Martin 2001) and a common mistake (in our view) is that institutions attempt to adopt a local variant of the appropriate national research evaluation model. Those models, however, are based on past performance of the researchers involved in the process and one of the roles of resource allocation within the institution is to ensure future success. In the case of the universities like Borås, we suggest that this involves giving priority to those areas that have achieved doctoral education rights, and to those areas that are likely candidates for future applications for such rights. We understand that the University has recently adopted a new resource allocation model and that the following recommendation is thereby made redundant, but we feel that it is still worth making:

Recommendation 2: A resource allocation model for research should be developed which prioritises the continuation of and application for doctoral education rights, while preserving research that is directed at supporting the University’s goal of serving as a “university of the professions”.

One aspect of research support which can only be accomplished at the University level is that of providing effective systems for the management of research, including the archiving and preservation of research data for as long as may be desirable. At present, the situation is very diverse: some researchers maintain their own resources, some do not retain data, some use departmental IT resources, others are aware of repositories for such data. We recommend, therefore:

Recommendation 3: Consideration should be given to the adoption of a document management system (or enterprise content management system) such as Sharepoint from Microsoft, or KnowledgeTree Inc., or one of the open source alternatives, such as Alfresco, LogicalDoc or OpenKM for management of research and research data. The costs and benefits of such an action should be explored in association with representative of the departments.

4.3 Open access publishing

The deposit of publications in open access repositories (including BADA) has clearly not yet become part of the culture of the institution. It is well known (see, for example, Rowlands and Nicholas 2005; Van Westrienen and Lynch 2005) that gaining faculty participation in the process is one of the most problematical aspects of developing an institutional repository. Clearly, further action is needed to ensure compliance with the institution’s policy in this respect and recommendation 1, above, relates to this. However, we make further recommendation here:

Recommendation 4: Research staff needs to be made more aware of the need to deposit the full text of their publications in BADA. The role of the repository records in assigning
research resources and in relation to promotion procedures should be emphasised, as well as the benefits that come from having an internationally-visible archive of research outputs.

The possibility of the University publishing its own journals was mentioned by some respondents and, already, some journals are published. Bringing those journals together on a journal management system such as Open Journal Systems might result in benefits for the existing journals and encouragement for the development of others.

**Recommendation 5:** The potential of Open Journal Systems for managing the publication process of existing journals published in the University should be explored.

Both the interviews and the online survey revealed a degree of confusion about the nature and varieties of open access publishing, to that extent that we feel a programme of awareness raising is required. We know that the library is already involved in organizing seminars on the subject and we suggest:

**Recommendation 6:** In addition to any university-wide activity, seminars on the nature of open access publishing, etc., should be held in each Department, to ensure that all researchers are aware of the possibilities.

There appears to be a common misconception that the author of a paper has no choice but to accept the publisher’s terms regarding the transfer of copyright. However, in both the USA and Canada, professional bodies have evolved an “author’s addendum” to whatever copyright assignment agreement is signed with the publisher. The key terms of this addendum are shown in Appendix 3. Adoption of a similar addendum for Sweden might require negotiation at a national level and support from national agencies as well as from other universities. However, we recommend:

**Recommendation 7:** Researchers should be advised of the existence of the “author’s addendum” and its terms and of their right to require that publishers accept such an addendum.

**4.4 The role of the library in supporting the University’s publishing policy and in supporting research activity**

The role of the library in supporting the University’s publishing policy and in supporting research is known and appreciated. However, both the library and researchers have ideas on what further support services might be offered. At present, some services are offered to students which could be extended to researchers and new services (which would depend critically on the availability of resources) have been suggested.

**Recommendation 8:** Consideration should be given to expanding the role of the library in research support, provided that additional resources can be devoted to this. Specific topics suggested by respondents included: help with English writing; appointment of ‘research librarians’ to liaise with research groups in making proposals to funding agencies; considering recommendation 5 above; extending the scope of information literacy activities to researchers; providing bibliometric services to individuals and research groups; and provide advice on the national ranking criteria and their relevance to researchers.

It is evident that, in spite of efforts to convey what competencies the library has in respect of research support, many researchers are unaware of the possibilities. This suggests the need for a more active
‘public relations’ effort on the part of the library to demonstrate how it can more effectively support research activity.

**Recommendation 9:** The library should review how it disseminates information on the support it can give to research throughout the University and bring forward a plan for a support structure that can be provided to all researchers. This may take the form of a printed guide to research services, supported by existing and newly developed pages on the library Web site.

The recommendations made throughout the report have resource implications for the institution as a whole and for the library in particular. We recommend, therefore:

**Recommendation 10:** The resource implications of these recommendations, especially as they affect the library's functions, should be evaluated.
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7. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Interview guides

1. Interviews with policy makers

Interview schedule on policies

Our aim in this interview is to raise some issues relating to the University’s policy on the publication of research and the relationship of that policy to various other internal and external factors.

1. To begin with, I’d like to ask how the present publication policy came into being and what were its intentions?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

2. What are the main factors, as you see it, that determine what kind of policy is needed?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

3. The allocation of resources from government to Universities will be based in part on the University’s research performance – how do you see this affecting the publication policy?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

4. The different governmental and independent research funding agencies are likely to use similar models in allocating resources to projects. How do you see this affecting the University’s publishing policy?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

5. How do you see government and funding agency models affecting the publishing activities of the individual researcher?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

6. Can you envisage any conflicts between the aim of the University to serve the professions and its need to get research funds from government and other agencies?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

7. How should the University deal with those conflicts?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

8. What difficulties do you foresee, or currently experience, in harmonizing the University’s R&D policy with those external factors?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

9. What difficulties do you foresee, or currently experience, in harmonizing the University’s R&D policy with its publishing policy?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

10. Considering that one aim of the University’s publishing policy is to ensure that the work of the University is accessible to the relevant professions, how far do you think it has succeeded in that aim? Would you say it has been...?
very successful [ ]
partly successful [ ]
not very successful [ ]
not at all successful [ ]

[If the respondent uses other words, say, ‘Could you say, very successful...’ etc.]

10.1 Why is that?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

11. How do you monitor the extent to which the policy is succeeding?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

12. How successful do you believe the individual institutions with the University are in implementing the publishing policy?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

13. What do you think they should be doing to make the policy a success?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

14. Are sufficient numbers of staff registering and depositing full-text their research outputs in BADA?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

↓

How might they be further encouraged to deposit their publications?

15. Many institutions are now providing funds to ensure that research publications are made openly accessible, for example, by paying author charges. Does the University have any plans to support open access publishing in this way?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

16. Imagine that Swedish researchers in a particular field, say, electronic engineering, decided to establish an open access journal on the basis not of author charging but on the basis of subsidies from Universities – let us imagine that its name is the Swedish Journal of Electronic Engineering. What factors would affect whether or not you supported such a move?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

16.1 If such a journal came into existence would you then require researchers in this University, in that field of research to submit their papers first to this journal?
[Probe with ‘Why is that?’ – depending upon the response.]
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

17. What role do you see for the University’s library services in supporting the publications policy?
[Review the response and probe for further information or explanation as necessary.]

Thank you for your co-operation on this topic.
2. Interviews with researchers

Researchers’ interview schedule.
Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed. As the original e-mail said, we are carrying out this study to try to understand the factors that affect how researchers in the University publish the results of their work, with a view to informing University policy on the subject. You will not be personally identified in any report or journal paper that we produce as a result of the research. If we quote someone we will ensure that the quotation does not enable anyone to identify the person quoted. If there are doubts about this, we shall approach the person, explain the situation and seek their permission to quote.

1. We would like to begin by asking you to consider two of the publications that appear under your name in the BADA database (University’s institutional archive). We have deliberately chosen a couple of items that have been published in different places. [Some questions relate to journal papers only and, consequently, should be omitted when discussing some other type of publication.]

Item 1 (have a copy available and note the bibliographical details before the interview)

________________________________________________________________________________________
1.1 Why did you choose this [journal, conference, book publisher] for the publication of your work?________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________
1.2 How long did it take, from submission of the first version, to publication date?

________________________________________________________________________________________
1.3 Did you assign copyright to the publisher? _____________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________
1.4 What limitations result from you having assigned copyright in this way? ______________

________________________________________________________________________________________
1.5 Did you keep a copy of the agreement assigning copyright to the publisher? __________

________________________________________________________________________________________
1.6 Have you deposited any version of the publication in any disciplinary or institutional repository?

________________________________________________________________________________________
1.7 Have you posted the publication to any Web site: e.g., your own, your Institution’s, or any other?

________________________________________________________________________________________
1.8 Did you obtain the publisher’s approval before posting? _______________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________
1.9 Did you consider submitting your paper to an Open Access journal in the field? [Where possible say, “Such as...” and the name of an open access journal in the respondent’s field.]

________________________________________________________________________________________
1.10 This publication was the result of collaboration with others. How did that collaboration influence publishing choices and process?

________________________________________________________________________________________
Item 2 (have a copy available and note the bibliographical details before the interview)

2.1 Why did you choose this [journal, conference, book publisher] for the publication of your work?

2.2 How long did it take, from submission of the first version, to publication date?

2.3 Did you assign copyright to the publisher? ________________

2.4 What limitations result from you having assigned copyright in this way? ________________

2.5 Did you keep a copy agreement assigning copyright to the publisher? __________

2.6 This publication was registered by someone else (by you). Are you aware that you can also deposit full texts? register yourself? If yes to full text, then why have not done so?

2.7 Have you posted the publication to any Web site: e.g., your own, your Institution’s, or any other?

2.8 Did you obtain the publisher’s approval before posting? ________________

2.9 Did you consider submitting your paper to an Open Access journal in the field? [Where possible say, “Such as...” and the name of an open access journal in the respondent’s field.]

2.10 This publication was the result of collaboration with others. How did that collaboration influence publishing choices and process?

Next we have a few questions about preparing publications and the publication process.

3. Are you aware of the University’s publishing policy?

No /__/ Yes /__?

The University recommends and VR requires that you should make your publications available through open access: what do you think of this policy?

4. How important do you believe it is for research results to be freely available through such means as institutional repositories, disciplinary archives, researchers’ home pages, and OA journals? [Is it:]

Not at all important /__/ Not very important /__/ Moderately important /__/ Very important /__/

48
Which mode of open access is best in your opinion?

1. Payment for publication in journals that are then freely available.
2. Publication in free OA journals, that require no author payment.
3. Depositing your publications in an open access institutional or disciplinary repository.

5. In your opinion, how well does the University repository, BADA, support Open Access to the University’s research results? Would you say...

Very well / / Moderately well / / Not very well / / Not at all / /

6. How do you manage the references that you cite in your work? Do you do this on an ad hoc basis for each publication or do you use software such as EndNote, Reference Manager or a Web-based service such as Xyteror Mandeley?

7. When you use tables or diagrams from other authors’ work, how do you do about getting permission to use them in your publications?

8. What kind of data do you generate in the course of your research?

9. What happens to the data after you have completed the research?

10. Is it likely that the data you have produced could be used in further research by other researchers?

11. Is there any local, national or disciplinary repository for research data of this kind?

12. What are the major problems you encounter in getting financial support for your research?

13. How might these problems be resolved?

14. Resource allocation to Institutions might be associated with a variety of different measures of research performance, such as the number of publications in peer-reviewed journals. In your opinion, what would be the best model for the allocation of research resources?

A number of publications in general.
A number of publications in highly ranked international journals
External financing attracted for research projects
Number of doctoral students
Number of citations
Something else - such as?

15. What problems have you experienced in finding appropriate publication outlets for your work?

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

16. The library provides a variety of services supporting the educational programmes in the University. Now it needs to support, to a greater extent, the work of researchers. How do you think that might best be done?

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

17. Have you seen any examples elsewhere that could serve as a model for the development of library services in this direction?

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

18. Are there any other aspects of research and scholarly publication that we have not asked about, but which you believe to be important?

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time in participating in this interview. The results will be published in due course and all respondents will receive a copy of that report.
Appendix 2 – Survey on publishing practice

Research and the publication process
The Library & Learning Resources, together with the Bibliotekshögskolan is carrying out a study, funded by the University, to try to understand what factors affect how researchers in the University publish the results of their work. The aim among others is to adjust University policy on this subject. The information you provide is confidential and no individual will be identified in any report on this project.

To begin with, please consider your most recent publication of any kind, journal paper, book, book chapter, etc., and answer the first set of questions.

1. Why did you choose the particular journal, conference or publisher for the publication of your work? [Please choose at least one option]

| Reputaiton of the publisher or journal. |
| The Impact Factor of the journal. |
| The reputation of the conference. |
| The fact that the publication would be open access. |
| The appropriateness of the audience or readership. |
| There was a high probability of acceptance. |
| The time from submission to publication was acceptable. |
| I received an invitation to publish or present. |
| Other (please specify) |

2. How long did it take, from submission of the first version, to publication date?

3. Did you assign copyright to the publisher?

| Yes |
| No |
| Don’t recall |

4. Are you aware of the limitations that result from you having assigned copyright in this way?

| Yes |
| No |

5. Did you (or a co-author) keep a copy of the agreement assigning copyright to the publisher?

| Yes |
| No |
| Don’t recall |

6. Have you deposited any version of the publication in any disciplinary or institutional repository?

| No |
| Yes |
| If yes, please specify which repository. |
7. Have you posted the publication to any Web site: e.g., your own, your Institution’s, or any other?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please specify which web site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Did you obtain the publisher’s approval before posting the publication in any repository or Web site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. When you use tables or diagrams from other authors’ work, do you obtain permission to use them in your publications?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, I do this as part of the preparation process</th>
<th>Yes, but only when the publisher asks me to do so</th>
<th>No, I assume that is the publisher’s job</th>
<th>No, I assume that it is a form of quotation and permission is not needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Have you experienced problems in finding appropriate publication outlets for your work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Did you consider submitting your paper to an open access journal in the field?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please specify which journal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. When publishing as a co-author, does the collaboration influence publishing choices and process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please explain how your publishing choices and process is influenced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next we have a some questions about publications, open access, funding research and library services

13. Are you aware of the University’s publishing policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. The University recommends and Vetenskapsrådet requires that you should make your publications available through open access. What do you think of this policy?

15. How important do you believe it is for research results to be freely available through such means as institutional repositories, disciplinary archives, researchers’ home pages, and open access journals? Is it:
16. Please rank the three modes of open access publishing according to your opinion. 1 is your top choice and 3 is your last choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payment for publication in journals that are then freely available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication in free open access journals, that require no author payment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depositing your publications in an open access institutional or disciplinary repository.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. To what extent do you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree fully</th>
<th>Agree to an extent</th>
<th>Disagree to an extent</th>
<th>Disagree fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>open access is a desirable mode of publication for all research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open access will change scholarly communication in my field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open access will be the dominant mode of publishing within ten years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open access benefits me personally by making my work available to many more readers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open access will increase the number of citations to my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open access threatens commercial publishers in my field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open access threatens the viability of scholarly and scientific societies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. In your opinion, how well does the University repository, BADA, support open access to the University’s research results? Would you say...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "Not very well" or "Not at all", why is this?

19. Is there any local, national or disciplinary repository for preserving generated in your research?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that I'm aware of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please specify with the name of the repository.
20. Do you experience difficulties in attracting funding for your research?

| No, my kind of research does not need much in the way of funding. |
| No, I'm generally successful in getting support. |
| Yes, my field does not attract research funds easily. |
| Yes, I'm a new researcher and not know to the funding bodies. |

How might the problems you experience be resolved?

21. Resource allocation to Institutions might be associated with a variety of different measures of research performance, such as the number of publications in peer-reviewed journals. In your opinion, what would be the best model for the allocation of research resources?

| The number of publications in general |
| The number of publications in highly ranked international journals |
| External financing attracted for research projects |
| Number of doctoral students |
| Number of citations |
| Something else |

If "Something else", please specify

22. What kinds of services to researchers would you find it useful for the University Library to offer: [check all appropriate options]

| Help in identifying publication possibilities for your work |
| Assistance in the use of tools such as EndNote and Reference Manager |
| Help in identifying the self-archiving policies of publishers |
| Helping to gain open access for your publications through BADA |
| Providing an archive for research data |

Which other examples have you seen elsewhere that could serve as a model for the development of library services?

Finally, we have some questions about yourself

23. I work in (check the department you do your main work)

| BHS |
| HIT |
| IH |
| PED |
| THS |
| VHB |
| GF |
| Other (please specify) |

24. My faculty position is

| Universitetsadjunkt |
| Doktorand |
| Universitetslektor |
| Professor |
| Other (please specify) |
25. What is your discipline? That is, the subject of your highest degree, (e.g. Library and Information Science, Informatics, Healthcare, Pedagogy)

26. Normally my works are

- co-authored
- single-authored

Other (please specify)

27. In 2010/2011, I have (check all appropriate options)

- Published in a peer-reviewed journal
- Published in a non-peer-reviewed journal
- Presented a peer-reviewed conference paper
- Presented a non-peer-reviewed conference paper
- Presented an invited paper or keynote at a conference
- Published a monograph
- Contributed a chapter to a book
- Edited a collection of original contributions
- Produced a research report
- Published an article in a non-scholarly magazine
- Had work presented in an exhibition or installation
- Presented my work in a TV programme
- Had my work mentioned in other media, e.g., newspapers
- I didn't publish in this time period

Other (please specify)

Thank you for your time in completing this questionnaire. You will be notified when the results are published.
Appendix 3 – Canadian author’s addendum

The key terms of the addendum are as follows:

Notwithstanding any terms in the Publication Agreement to the contrary, AUTHOR and PUBLISHER agree as follows:

1. Author’s Retention of Rights. In addition to any rights under copyright retained by Author in the Publication Agreement, Author retains the right to (i) reproduce the Article in any material form for non-commercial purposes; (ii) to perform the Article in public for non-commercial purposes; (iii) to convert the Article by preparing derivative works; (iv) to make a sound recording, cinematographic film or other contrivance by means of which the Article may be mechanically reproduced or performed for non-commercial purposes; (v) to reproduce, adapt and publicly present the Article as a cinematographic film for non-commercial purposes; (vi) to communicate the work to the public by telecommunication for non-commercial purposes; and (vii) to authorize others to make any non-commercial use of the Article so long as Author receives credit as author and the journal in which the Article has been published is cited as the source of first publication of the Article. For example, Author may make and distribute copies in the course of teaching and research and may post the Article on personal or institutional Web sites and in other open access digital repositories.

2. Publisher’s Additional Commitments. Publisher agrees to provide to Author within 14 days of first publication and at no charge an electronic copy of the published Article in Adobe Acrobat Portable Document Format (PDF). The Security Settings for such copy should all be set to "No Security."

3. Publisher’s Acceptance of this Addendum. Author requests that Publisher demonstrate acceptance of this Addendum by signing a copy and returning it to the Author. However, in the event that Publisher publishes the Article in the journal identified herein in any form without signing a copy of the Addendum, Publisher will be deemed to have assented to the terms of this Addendum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/aspect</th>
<th>Hogskolan i Borås</th>
<th>Stockholms universitet</th>
<th>Chalmers</th>
<th>Hogskolan i Jönköping</th>
<th>Malmen Hogskola</th>
<th>BTH</th>
<th>SU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date last updated</td>
<td>4/1/2017</td>
<td>6/29/16</td>
<td>1/1/10</td>
<td>11/8/13</td>
<td>11/1/10</td>
<td>11/7/16</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>swe/eng</td>
<td>swe</td>
<td>swe/eng</td>
<td>swe</td>
<td>swe/eng</td>
<td>swe</td>
<td>swe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>All employees</td>
<td>Researcher, teacher</td>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Researcher, doctoral students, staff</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which material</td>
<td>Research articles, dissertations</td>
<td>All publications connected to employment, research articles, popular science, newspaper articles etc.</td>
<td>All research</td>
<td>Research articles, dissertations, other scientific works</td>
<td>Somewhat unclear, anecdotes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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