

# Open Access: Background and Tools for Early Career Researchers in Social Sciences

## Workshop outline

---

### Philippe Joly

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin & WZB Berlin Social Science Center

Email: jolyphil at hu-berlin.de

### Workshop prepared for:

Berlin Summer School in Social Sciences

July 18, 2018 at 4 pm

Location: Luisenstr. 56, 10117 Berlin

Room: Festsaal

Number of participants: 30-40

## Concept

This workshop aims at giving early career researchers in social sciences a basic knowledge of open access (OA) publishing and at introducing them to useful tools. We address questions such as: What are the limitations of the closed publication system? What is OA publishing? What are the different types of OA publications? What are the available licenses for OA publications? What is the share of OA publications in the scientific literature and how is this changing over time? What sort of funding is available for OA publishing? The workshop is structured around a 45 minute presentation punctuated by group discussions and exercises. 90 minutes are planned for the whole workshop.

## Readings

In order to fully participate in the discussion, participants are encouraged to read the following text:

- (McKiernan et al. 2016)

## Bring your laptop!

Be sure to bring your laptop as we will try some online tools.

## Structure

### 1. What are the limitations of the closed publication system?

We start the workshop by discussing the limitations of the current subscription-based system. We explore publishers' current business model and examine its financial and ethical implications. Until recently, scholarly publication was funded almost exclusively through subscriptions. University libraries would strike "big deals" with publishers to get access to catalogs of journals for their users. While publishers could before be credited for formatting, printing, and distributing research papers, the actual value of this work has declined with the advent of digital communications. Nowadays, publishers act as gatekeepers, determining who has and who has not access to knowledge. A small number of publishers have established an oligopoly over high impact

factor journals and the price of subscriptions has skyrocketed over the years. Publishers benefit from the free labor of authors and reviewers.

## **2. What is open access publishing?**

In this section, we introduce the concept of open access. While most researchers have an intuitive notion of what open access is, not everyone agrees on a precise definition. We discuss three types of OA publications: gold, hybrid, and green. While touching the subject of green OA, we explain the difference between pre and postprints.

## **3. Which license should you choose?**

OA publications are usually available under a specific Creative Commons license. We discuss the different options: CC-0 and variants of CC-BY (-NC, -SA, -ND).

*Small group discussion: Pros and cons (time: 15-20 minutes; material: large sheets of paper, post-its, and markers)*

- Participants join in small groups and discuss what are the advantages and disadvantages of different models of OA publishing: green, gold, and hybrid.
- We regroup in plenary to share our main conclusions.

## **4. What is the share of open access publications in the scientific literature and what are their impact?**

We look at the spread of OA over time in different disciplines and across different types of OA publications. We also discuss the impact of OA papers in terms of citations. The share of OA articles has increased dramatically over the years, but the development has been slower in sociology and political science. In general, articles in OA appear to be more cited, than articles placed behind a paywall.

## **5. How to find funding for your open access publication?**

Authors interested in publishing in gold or hybrid OA usually have to pay “Article Processing Charges” (APC). We look at different funding options, including institutional publication funds.

*Small group discussion: Obstacles and strategies (time: 15-20 minutes; material: large sheets of paper, post-its, and markers)*

- Participants join in small groups and discuss what are the obstacles to the adoption of OA publishing in their own institution and what are the good strategies to promote OA publishing in their own institution
- We regroup in plenary to share our main conclusions.

## **6. Practical examples**

In the last section of the workshop, we go over practical topics that could be of interest for all PhD candidates. These examples are applicable from the moment you have a working paper to the final publication of your thesis.

## Uploading a preprint on SocArXiv and the Open Science Framework

Preprints allow researchers to publish early research findings and make them available for free. We look at a new preprint repository in social sciences, SocArXiv, and explain how to link preprints with supplementary documentation, data, and code on the Open Science Framework.

*Quiz (time: 5 minutes; material: laptops)*

- Using their laptops, participants search on share.osf.io to find some statistics and papers.

## Selecting an OA journal

There are hundreds of OA journal in social sciences. How to make a choice and how to not fall into the trap of predatory OA journals? We look at the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). For people interested in publishing in green OA, we explore the Sherpa/Romeo database.

*Quiz (5 minutes; material: laptops)*

- Using their laptops, participants search on doaj.org to find some statistics and journals.

## Publishing your dissertation in open access

Publishing your dissertation in OA is an excellent way to make your scientific contribution visible and return what you have learned to the community. We go over the “checklist” prepared by the fellows and mentors of the Freies Wissen Program (forthcoming)

## Further reading

### General resources on open science

- (Open Science MOOC 2018)
- (Bezjak et al. 2018)

### The limitations of the closed publication system

- (Buranyi 2017)
- (Larivière, Haustein, and Mongeon 2015)
- (Schiermeier and Mega 2017)

### Open access: definitions

- (Bourne et al. 2017)
- (Budapest Open Access Initiative 2017)
- (Fund 2018)

### Licenses

- (Klimpel 2012)
- (Redhead 2012)

## Diffusion and impact of OA publications

- (Björk 2016)
- (Piwowar et al. 2018)
- (J. P. Tennant et al. 2016)

## Reuse of the material

The contents of the workshop are under a CC0 1.0 license.

All the material of this workshop (including this outline, the slides, and the bibliography) can be cloned or downloaded from GitHub:

<https://github.com/jolyphil/oa-workshop>

## Acknowledgements

This workshop was prepared as part of the Freies Wissen Fellowship sponsored by Wikimedia Deutschland, the Stifterverband, and the VolkswagenStiftung.

This outline largely benefited from the webinar on open access presented by Christina Riesenweber (FU-CeDiS) and Agnieszka Wenninger (FU-CeDiS) on January 31, 2018, as part of the Freies Wissen Fellowship. Part of the references were found on the Open Science MOOC. Alessandro Blasetti (WZB) provided useful resources on OA licenses.

## References

- Bezjak, Sonja, April Clyburne-Sherin, Philipp Conzett, Pedro L. Fernandes, Edit Görögh, Kerstin Helbig, Bianca Kramer, et al. 2018. “Open Science Training Handbook.” <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1212496>.
- Björk, Bo-Christer. 2016. “The Open Access Movement at a Crossroad: Are the Big Publishers and Academic Social Media Taking over?” *Learned Publishing* 29 (2): 131–34. doi:10.1002/leap.1021.
- Bourne, Philip E., Jessica K. Polka, Ronald D. Vale, and Robert Kiley. 2017. “Ten Simple Rules to Consider Regarding Preprint Submission.” *PLOS Computational Biology* 13 (5): e1005473. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005473.
- Budapest Open Access Initiative. 2017. “BOAI15.” *Budapest Open Access Initiative*. <http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/boai15-1>.
- Buranyi, Stephen. 2017. “Is the Staggeringly Profitable Business of Scientific Publishing Bad for Science?” *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2017/jun/27/profitable-business-scientific-publishing-bad-for-science>.
- Fund, Sven. 2018. “Guest Post: From Supermarkets to Marketplaces — the Evolution of the Open Access Ecosystem.” *The Scholarly Kitchen*. <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2018/05/14/guest-post-supermarkets-marketplaces-evolution-open-access-ecosystem/>.
- Klimpel, Paul. 2012. “Freies Wissen Dank Creative-Commons-Lizenzen: Folgen, Risiken Und Nebenwirkungen Der Bedingung »Nicht-Kommerziell – NC«.” *Wikimedia Deutschland, iRights.info, and Creative Commons Deutschland*. [https://iriights.info/wp-content/uploads/userfiles/CC-NC\\_Leitfaden\\_web.pdf](https://iriights.info/wp-content/uploads/userfiles/CC-NC_Leitfaden_web.pdf).
- Larivière, Vincent, Stefanie Haustein, and Philippe Mongeon. 2015. “The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital Era.” *PLOS ONE* 10 (6): e0127502. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0127502.
- McKiernan, Erin C., Philip E. Bourne, C. Titus Brown, Stuart Buck, Amye Kenall, Jennifer Lin, Damon McDougall, et al. 2016. “Point of View: How Open Science Helps Researchers Succeed.” *eLife* 5 (July):

e16800. doi:10.7554/eLife.16800.

Open Science MOOC. 2018. <https://opensciencemooc.github.io/site/>.

Piwowar, Heather, Jason Priem, Vincent Larivière, Juan Pablo Alperin, Lisa Matthias, Bree Norlander, Ashley Farley, Jevin West, and Stefanie Haustein. 2018. “The State of OA: A Large-Scale Analysis of the Prevalence and Impact of Open Access Articles.” *PeerJ* 6 (February): e4375. doi:10.7717/peerj.4375.

Redhead, Claire. 2012. “Why CC-BY?” *Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association*. <https://oaspa.org/why-cc-by/>.

Schiermeier, Quirin, and Emiliano Rodríguez Mega. 2017. “Scientists in Germany, Peru and Taiwan to Lose Access to Elsevier Journals.” *Nature News* 541 (7635): 13. doi:10.1038/nature.2016.21223.

Tennant, Jonathan P., François Waldner, Damien C. Jacques, Paola Masuzzo, Lauren B. Collister, and Chris. H. J. Hartgerink. 2016. “The Academic, Economic and Societal Impacts of Open Access: An Evidence-Based Review.” *F1000Research* 5 (September): 632. doi:10.12688/f1000research.8460.3.