



## RCUK senaste nytt

28 juni publicerade RCUK – paraplyorganisation för de åtta engelska forskningsråden – sitt länge väntade policydokument. I juni 2005 publicerade man ett första förslag som sedan varit tillgängligt för synpunkter. Förslaget täckte såväl OA-tidskrifter som egenarkivering och slog fast fyra principer:

- Ideas and knowledge derived from publicly-funded research must be made available and accessible for public use, interrogation and scrutiny, as widely, rapidly and effectively as practicable.
- Published research outputs must be subject to rigorous quality assurance, through effective peer review mechanisms.
- The models and mechanisms for publication and access to research results must be both efficient and cost-effective in the use of public funds.
- The outputs from current and future research must be preserved and remain accessible for future generations.

RCUK bekräftar sin tidigare ståndpunkt vad gäller publiceringskostnader – author-pays. Författarens institution beslutar om och hur detta skall ske.

Vad gäller egenarkivering är råden eniga om att deras forskare, när så krävs, skall deponera i ett lämpligt öppet arkiv enligt varje råds bedömning.

Som tidigare förutspått bekräftar RCUK nu behovet av separata policies för olika ämnesområden. Varje forskningsråd formulerar alltså sin egen policy och ansvarar för råd och stöd till sina forskare. Glädjande är att tre av råden kräver OA deposition och ett

av råden ger en stark rekommendation.

1. **AHRC – Arts & Humanities RC** - står bakom de övergripande principerna. Kommer med sin policy slutet av 2006 efter konsultationer.
2. **BBSRC – Biotechnology & Biological Sciences RC** - kräver deposition från 1 oktober 2006 och åtar sig att förhandla för sina forskare.
3. **CCLRC - Council of the Central Laboratory RC** – uppmuntrar starkt omedelbar deposition
4. **EPSRC – Engineering & Physical Sciences RC** – inget beslut nu, för komplicerat. Beslut väntas först sent 2008
5. **ESRC – Economic & Social RC** - kräver deposition från 1 oktober 2006
6. **MRC - Medical RC** - kräver deposition från 1 oktober 2006
7. **NERC – Natural Environment RC** – ännu ej beslut. Kommer så fort som möjligt
8. **PPARC – Particle Physics & Astronomy RC** - står bakom de övergripande principerna men har inte fattat något beslut.

RCUK initierar också ett forskningsprojekt för att klargöra verkningarna av förändringar i publiceringsmodeller. Tre förlag, MacMillan, Blackwell och Elsevier, har redan sagt sig villiga att medverka. Man har också diskuterat med The Royal Society. Projektet skall redovisas sent år år 2008.

RCUK kommer också att arrangera en workshop för lärda sällskap för att diskutera hur de påverkas av egenarkivering. Med förlagen kommer de att ta upp diskussioner om copyright och licenser.

Läs mer: <http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/access/>

## Royal Society: EXiS (Excellence in Science) Open Choice

Världens äldsta vetenskapliga sällskap började 21 juni testa en ny publiceringsmodell. Får den måne samma livskraft som deras *Philosophical Transaction*, världens (näst) första vetenskapliga tidskrift med start år 1665?

Författare kan välja ExiS Open Choice, och få sina accepterade artiklar omedelbart fritt tillgängliga online i stället för efter 12 månader, vilket är RSs nuvarande embargo. Avgiften per A4-sida är £300 (\$553) och erläggs av författaren/na eller anslagsgivare. Rejection rate för RS tidskrifter ligger på 75%.

Den höga avgiften har fått kritik, men styrelsen för publiceringsverksamheten, huvudsakligen akademiker, hävdar att man lagt sig på en realistisk nivå, beräknad att ge kostnadstäckning om alla skulle välja ExiS och

prenumerationsintäkterna bli noll. I startskedet kommer man inte att ge möjlighet till avgiftsbefrielse, men för framtiden räknar man med att avgiften måste kunna täcka publiceringskostnaden för forskare som inte kan betala.

Royal Society har aviserat vissa förändringar vad gäller copyright och licenser.

De planerar också att se över sina prenumerationspriser i relation till erfarenheterna med ExiS, men några beslut härvidlag har ännu inte fattats. £300 per sida blir alltså en extra inkomst för RS, som ju kommer att ha sin prenumerationsintäkt ograverad ett bra tag framöver. Den höga sidavgiften riskerar att resultera i en låg efterfrågan och "bevisa" att författare inte är intresserade av OA.

Inom ExiS åtar sig RS att för författarens räkning deponera förlagets slutliga, redigerade PDF för ExiS i ett lämpligt öppet arkiv om författaren så önskar.

Läs mer på <http://www.royalsoc.co.uk/news.asp?id=4838>

## Oxford Journals erfarenheter av OA

Oxford Journals har i en enkät undersökt författarattityder till *NAR - Nucleic Acids Research* (IF 7,6), som blev full OA år 2005. Tidigare tillämpade man 6 månaders embargo. Författaravgiften för medlemmar är £500 och för icke-medlemmar £1000. Man har låga avgifter eller avgiftsbefrielse (£0-3350) för författare från utvecklingsländer eller övriga författare utan finansiering. År 2005 begärde ca 8% avgiftsbefrielse och för 2006 är prognosen ca 15%. NAR accepterar ca 1300 artiklar per år.

På frågan om man skulle publicerat i NAR även om den inte varit OA svarade

79% JA, 7% NEJ och 14% VET EJ.

Majoriteten betalade avgiften via sina forskningsanslag.

På frågan om deras institution uppmuntrade dem att publicera OA svarade 22% JA, 37% NEJ och 49% VET EJ.

Frågan om publiceringsavgifter inkluderas i forskningsanslaget besvarades så här:

Publiceringskostnader specificerade för OA 4%

Ospecificerade publiceringskostnader 61%

Blandade kostnader, som kan inkludera publ. kostnader 41%

Vet ej 6%

Vad gäller egenarkivering hade majoriteten publicerat slutversionen på sin personliga webbsida, det närmast vanligaste var på institutionens webbplats. Deposition i universitetsarkiv eller ämnesarkiv var betydligt ovanligare.

(The Impact of Open Access on Authors. NAR Author and Reader

Survey, Claire Saxby, Oxford Journals.

[http://www.oxfordjournals.org/news/oa\\_workshop.html](http://www.oxfordjournals.org/news/oa_workshop.html))

Vad gäller val av Oxford Open modellen (49 titlar deltar) var under perioden januari till april 2006 acceptansen inom medicin 4,6% av publicerade artiklar, inom naturvetenskap 11,3% och inom samhällsvetenskap och humaniora 2,2%.

(Experimenting with Open Access Publishing: Overview. Martin Richardson, Oxford Journals.

[http://www.oxfordjournals.org/news/oa\\_workshop.html](http://www.oxfordjournals.org/news/oa_workshop.html))

Information om Oxford Open <http://www.oxfordjournals.org/oxfordopen/>

## OA i Japan

I rapporten "*Survey Report on Research Activities and Open Access (OA)*", som publicerades mars 2006 av Committee on International Scholarly Communication (SPARC Japan), Japan Association of University Libraries och National

Institute of Informatic presenteras data från en enkät bland japanska forskare.

[http://www.nii.ac.jp/sparc/doc/oa\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://www.nii.ac.jp/sparc/doc/oa_report_en.pdf)

Enkäten utfördes i december 2005 och ställdes till ett randomiserat urval forskare från National University Corporations och Inter-University Research Institute Corporations. Antal svar var 639, en svarsfrekvens på 30,7%. Några resultat:

23% av de japanska forskarna kände till OA. 16% av dessa hade publicerat i en OA tidskrift de senaste 3 åren. Av dem som aldrig publicerat i en OA tidskrift svarade 45% att de bara kunde betala under USD500 för publicering. 18% kunde betala USD500-1000. Endast 11% svarade att de inte ville betala publiceringavgifter.

Om anslagsgivaren skulle kräva OA-publicering svarade 63% av dem som kände till OA att de villigt skulle göra detta och 43% av dem som inte kände till OA. Relativt många, 32% svarade VET EJ.

20% hade egenarkiverat antingen pre- eller postprints de senaste tre åren.

## National Institutes of Health - obligatorium?

Representanthusets budgetkommitte vill uppdraga åt NIH att göra skattefinansierad medicinsk forskning fritt tillgänglig för alla. Om förslaget går igenom betyder det att NIH måste kräva att forskare som får NIH-anslag deponerar den slutliga accepterade versionen i PubMed Central. I nuvarande NIH-policy är deposition frivillig och

har en accepterad embargo tid på 12 månader. Hittills har mindre än 5% av möjliga artiklar deponerats, och man vill därför skärpa kraven. Över 60 000 artiklar per år baseras på NIH-stödd forskning. Även det nya förslaget accepterar max 12 månaders embargo, men därefter gives ingen pardon.

Förslaget skall nu upp i representanthuset och har starkt stöd av bl a The Alliance for Taxpayer Access, ATA, <http://www.taxpayeraccess.org/> som uppmanar både HRs och senatens budgetkommittéer att sänka embargo tiden till 6 månader och helst eliminera den.

## **The Federal Research Public Access Act FRPAA**

Budgetkommitténs förslag om obligatorisk deponering i PubMed Central av NIH-stödd forskning stärker också Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006 (FRPAA), en motion från senatorerna John Cornyn (R) och Joseph Lieberman, (D) Enligt FRPAA skall de federala myndigheter som betalar över USD 100 miljoner per år till extern forskning ombesörja att artiklar som baseras på dessa anslag blir fritt tillgängliga för alla på Internet inom 6 månader från publiceringsdatum.

Peter Suber har informerat om att Springer kontaktat ordföranden i den senatskommitté som bedömer FRPAA och invänt mot det föreslagna embargot på 6 månader. Springer anser att det är för lång tid för forskarna och för kort tid för förlagen. De föreslår istället en policy som kräver omedelbar OA och som också klargör att publicering i sakkunnigbedömda tidskrifter är en oskiljaktig del av forskningsprocessen och att publiceringskostnaderna därför skall finansieras via en speciell overhead på offentliga forskningsmedel, [http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2006\\_06\\_11\\_fosblogarchive.html](http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2006_06_11_fosblogarchive.html) - 115025133781474470

Stevan Harnad har publicerat tio kommentarer till Springers förslag rörande FRPAA <http://openaccess.eprints.org/index.php?/archives/96-FRPAA-and-paying-publishers-to-self-archive.html>

## **University of California: Policy för vetenskaplig kommunikation**

Den 17 april antog The UC Academic Council de förslag som lagts fram av kommittén för vetenskaplig kommunikation <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/scsc/reports.html> och beslöt att vidarebefordra förslagen till the Academic Assembly tillsammans med en rekommendation att presidenten för UC utser en arbetsgrupp för att se över UC Faculty Scholarly Work Copyright Rights Policy samt att policyn antas och implementeras så snabbt som möjligt.

Från copyrightförslaget:

"In order to facilitate scholarly communication and maximize the impact of the scholarship of UC faculty, the Academic Council's Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC) proposes that the Academic Council consider the following recommended UC copyright policy change:

"A faculty member's ownership of copyright is controlled by the University of California Policy on Ownership of Copyright [<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/copyright/>]. University of California faculty shall routinely grant to The Regents of the University of California a limited, irrevocable, perpetual, worldwide, non-exclusive license to place the faculty member's scholarly work in a non-commercial open-access online repository. In the event a faculty member assigns all or a part of the faculty member's copyright rights to a publisher as part of a publication agreement, the faculty member must retain the right to grant this license to the Regents."

Faculty can opt out of this agreement for any specific work, or invoke a specific delay before such work appears in an open-access repository. The Regents will direct the Academic Senate, in collaboration with UC Administration, to establish support and control mechanisms for the use of scholarly work covered by this policy. No income will accrue to the Regents, the University or the Academic by this non-exclusive copyright license."

## Stigande Impact factors för OA-titlar från BMC

20 juni meddelade BMC att elva av deras OA tidskrifter fått sin första IF. BMC har nu nio titlar som rankas bland de främsta tio i sin respektive ämneskategori i JCR 2005 och tio titlar med IF >3.

Flaggskeppet *Genome Biology* har IF 9,71 och rankas bland de tio främsta inom området Genetics and Heredity (124 titlar) och som nummer fyra av 139 inom Biotechnology & Applied Microbiology.

## PLoS modellen

<http://www.plos.org/journals/model.html>

PloS finansieringsmodell för OA bygger på att deras utgifter för publicering (online hosting, arkivering, mm) delvis skall finansieras av artikelavgifter som betalas av författarna eller deras anslagsgivare.

Efter tre år i drift har PloS kommit fram till att de måste anpassa priset bättre till de faktiska publiceringskostnaderna. Från 2006-07-01 kommer man att ta ut en artikelavgift på USD2500 för sina

flaggskepp PLoS Biology och PLoS Medicine. Samma avgift kommer man att ta för PLoS Clinical Trials. För PLoS Computational Biology, PLoS Genetics och PLoS Pathogens blir avgiften USD2000. PLoS artikelavgifter har hittills legat på USD1500.

Enligt PLoS är de nya priserna fortfarande fördelaktiga jämfört med de avgifter traditionella prenumerationstidskrifter tar för färgbilder, utökad sidantal, särtryck mm. PLoS erbjuder obegränsat utrymme och obegränsad access.

Författare utan finansieringsmöjligheter får avgiftsbefrielse. Redaktörer och referenter får ingen information om författarnas betalningsmöjligheter. Publiceringsbeslut påverkas alltså inte av detta. Enligt PLoS skall avgiften inte vara ett hinder för publicering. Som ideell organisation vill de hålla avgifterna så resonabla som möjligt och utvecklar ny teknologi för att förbättra kostnadseffektiviteten.

Det måste påpekas, att det inte på något sätt är anmärkningsvärt att en tidskrift inte går ihop de första åren. Normalt behövs ca sju år för en ny tidskrift att nå dit och PLoS ger inte bara ut nya tidskrifter utan använder dessutom en helt ny modell för publicering och har på kort tid etablerat verkliga kvalitetstidskrifter med höga impact factors: PLoS Biology ligger på 14,7.

## Finlands universitetsrektorers råd

Den 23 maj i år undertecknade Finlands universitetsrektorers råd the **Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities**. Rådet representerar samtliga 21 finska universitet.

## Ny OA infrastruktur i Finland

Det finska utbildningsdepartementet finansierar nya OA initiativ. I april startade

OA-JES. Det koordineras av FinnOA och är ett samarbete mellan Helsingfors universitet, Helsingfors tekniska högskola, Finlands nationalbibliotek och Vetenskaplig samfundens delegation. Målen är att:

- hjälpa universitet och forskningsinstitut att sätta upp öppna arkiv
- informera forskare om att open access är en del av forskningsprocessen samt
- erbjuda en användarvänlig plattform för OA-tidskrifter från finska lärda samfund.

Departementet kommer dessutom att från 2007 finansiera en digital infrastruktur för Helsingfors universitets centrala campus. Man har två avsikter med detta. Dels vill man stödja vetenskaplig

OA publicering, vilket inkluderar öppna arkivtjänster för forskarna och för institutionernas tidskrifter, dels vill man bygga en stödstruktur för tillgänglighet och bevarande av institutionernas primärforskningsmaterial. Idén är att erbjuda en fullständig uppsättning tjänster för fakulteternas publikations- och forskningsmaterial.

<http://www.openaccess.fi/info/english.html>

## Humaniora och samhällsvetenskap OA-initiativ i Finland

Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, ett oberoende institut inom Helsingfors Universitet, har startat en ny open access serie COLLeGIUM - Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences.

Serien baseras på de konferenser som arrangeras vid Collegium. Den första volymen är betitlad *The Travelling Concept of Narrative*, och är redigerad av Matti Hyvärinen, Anu Korhonen och Juri Mykkänen. Alla artiklar i serien har genomgått internationell sakkunnigbedömning. Se: <http://www.helsinki.fi/collegium/e-series/>

## EU kommissionens rapport

Rapporten "*Study on the economic and technical evolution of the scientific publication markets in Europe*"

([http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/pdf/scientific-publication-study\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/pdf/scientific-publication-study_en.pdf)) har varit tillgänglig för synpunkter från 31 mars till 15 juni i år. 164 svar har kommit in och man planerar att göra svaren tillgängliga via en speciell webbplats samt via SINAPSE <http://www.europa.eu.int/sinapse>.

Man planerar också en konferens på ämnet under januari/februari 2007. Ansvarig för frågor om vetenskaplig kommunikation är nu Celina Ramjoué, [celina.ramjoue@ec.europa.eu](mailto:celina.ramjoue@ec.europa.eu). Ytterligare kommentarer och synpunkter kan skickas till henne eller till [rtd-scientific-publications@ec.europa.eu](mailto:rtd-scientific-publications@ec.europa.eu).

## JISC rapport

JISC har nyligen publicerat en mycket gedigen rapport som beskriver de tekniska, organisatoriska och ekonomiska modeller som kan användas för att stödja de tjänster som byggs över de öppna arkiven i UK.

*Linking UK Repositories: Technical and organisational models to support user-oriented services across institutional and other digital repositories. Scoping Study Report.* Alma Swan (Key Perspectives



Ltd) Chris Awre (University of Hull)

[http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded\\_documents/](http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/)

[Linking\\_UK\\_repositories\\_report.pdf](http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/Linking_UK_repositories_report.pdf)

## Library Journal: översikt tidskriftspriser 2006

*Journals in the time of Google*. Library Journal Periodicals Price Survey for 2006 Lee C. Van Orsdel and Kathleen Born. Library Journal Apr 15, 2006 , 31:7; s. 39.

“Vem skulle ha trott att Google vid juni 2005 stod för 56% av hänvisningarna till forskningsartiklar i tidskrifter publicerade av HighWire Press medan mindre än nio% gick till PubMed Central” skriver Van Orsdel och Born.

Generellt låg prishöjningarna för universitets- och högskolebibliotek strax under 8% och man antar en prisökning för 2007 på mellan 7 och 9%. Några exempel på genomsnittligt prenumerationspris 2006: Kemi USD 3 254, fysik USD 2 850 för en fysiktidskrift, jordbruk USD 890.

Författarna tror att paketinköpsmodellen kommer att förbli standard åtminstone två år framåt och kan t.o.m. komma att öka, eftersom små förlag, lärda samfund och andra kommer att vilja skydda sina titlar hos större förlag, som kan öka deras synlighet och minska risken för uppsagda prenumerationer.

Författarna konstaterar att övergången till OA tycks öka och att fler författare dels publicerar OA, dels känner till OA. Fler anslagsgivare kräver OA och de stora kommersiella förlagen experimenterar med OA. Politikerna har tagit tag i frågan om OA-publicering av offentlig finansierad forskning.

---

Nyheter och Notiser är sammanställda av **Ingegerd Rabow**, projektledare ScieCom, förste bibliotekarie Lunds Universitets Bibliotek, Biblioteksdirektionen  
[Ingegerd.Rabow@lub.lu.se](mailto:Ingegerd.Rabow@lub.lu.se)

Conference Report:  
Third Nordic  
Conference on  
Scholarly  
Communication, Lund  
24-25 April, 2006

**T.D. Wilson**, Professor  
**E. Maceviciute**, Professor

Information Research, an  
international electronic  
journal



This third Nordic conference, organized by the University of Lund Libraries, was an extremely successful event, with over 200 participants from twenty-one countries. Though most of the participants were from the Nordic countries, the overall 'feel' was of a truly international gathering. The organizers are to be congratulated for impeccable management of the conference, the excellent food, and arrangements overall.

The speakers were a mixture of well-known figures, such as Dr. Eugene Garfield and Jean-Claude Guedon, along with representatives of the Nordic countries, who are well known in their own fields, such as Mathias Klang of the University of Gothenburg and Bo-Christer Björk of Hanken in Helsinki, and others from around the world, equally well known in their specialisms, such as Mark Patterson of the Public Library of Science and Mark McCabe of Georgia Institute of Technology.

Rather than simply go through the list of contributions and report briefly what was said, we have chosen to pull together some of the overall ideas that were presented and debated.

First, different models of the scholarly communication process were offered, from the commercial to the 'public good' concept. Derk

Haank, CEO of Springer Science+Business, offered the '**Open Choice**' strategy of the company, whereby, for a payment of \$3,000 per paper, those papers would be **offered on open access**. Well, that might be fine for the very high cost subject areas such as fundamental physics, astronomy and pharmaceutical chemistry, but Mr. Haank is in 'cloud cuckoo land' if he believes that the average humanities or social science faculty member is going to find that amount of money from his or her grant to pay for publication. It also seemed that everybody offering authors' fee option forgot that this money should be coming from the same source as present subscription fees - university (or other research institution) budgets, and that the only thing it does is 'closing' the access on the entry rather than on the point of use. 'Open Choice' comes across as a public relations strategy, rather than as a serious alternative to other open access models.

Unfortunately, the research councils and higher education bodies, especially in the UK, appear to be ready to accept the 'author pays' model as the only model worth supporting. **Astrid Wissenburg** of the Economic and Social Research Council in the UK, was unable to say at the conference what the new research councils' **policy on open access** is going to be, but rumour has it that 'author payments' built into research grants will be the main instrument. She expressed worries that this might affect those who will be working on a basis other than research grants, and one can predict that those worries will come to fruition. On the international level, the inequalities among countries will be even more striking than at present. **Mark McCabe** of the Georgia Institute of Technology addressed this issue **from an economic modelling standpoint**, demonstrating that Haank's \$3,000 per paper made little sense, since, economically, price ought to relate to demand and papers offered to high readership journals should be charged more than those offered to low readership journals. The economic models supporting his argument were well founded and impossible to dispute. Maximum social value was open on both sides: input as well as output, and it was entirely incompatible with any profit maximizing model. In response to a question, he also noted that the 'subsidised journal' model, operated, among others, by *Information Research*, maximises social value and is the model that ought to be supported by the research councils. Research funding agencies, please note!

Another paper with an 'economic' flavour was that by **Bo-Christer Björk**, on **benchmarking scientific journals** from an author viewpoint. Björk presented a model of the factors that could affect choice of outlet for a scientific paper (the net value of submission) and illustrated this with reference to journals in the field of information technology in construction. He elaborated the characteristics of journals from an author point of view under the headings of *infrastructure*, i.e., what kinds of aids to the author

exist, such as tracking systems for showing the current state of a submission; *readership*, involving such things as the size of the readership of a journal and citations to it; *prestige*, measured, for example by the Journal Impact Factor; and *performance*, in terms of, for example, delays in publication and quality of the review process. He suggested that authors should be evaluating journals from this perspective and choosing the optimum journal to which to submit rather than necessarily striving continuously for the top-ranked journal (almost by definition, these journals have the longest delays in publication). He also emphasized that there is no one 'fit for all' journal value or choice model and that each decision is based on the current need of an individual researcher. So, young researchers starting their career and eager to build up the publication list ought to opt for journals with a shorter processing period than the top-ranked journals, which may take up to three years (the case for *MIS Quarterly*) to publish.

The **Public Library of Science** was discussed by **Mark Patterson** who explored the **barriers to and drivers behind open access** publishing. He noted that the drivers were mixed in character, including not only ventures of the same kind as PLoS, but also the efforts being made by some of the commercial publishers and the policies of funding agencies such as the Wellcome Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. He also set out the success of the first journal to be published by PLoS - **Biology**, noting that it now had a Journal Impact Factor of 13.9, which makes it the top-ranked journal in its group. (Just as an aside, the second ranked journal (FASEB Journal) has a JIF of 6.820). PLoS operates on an 'author pays' model, but waives its charges for those who cannot pay. This is mainly possible because they received start-up support from charitable foundations totally \$9,000,000.

Another model was that of the **Scielo Open Access** as implemented in Brazil. **Lewis Joel Greene** discussed one of the main problems experienced by **open access journals under Scielo** - that of getting their existence noted. Of the 115 journals in Scielo, only 35 are covered by either Web of Science or PubMed. However, when their existence is known, usage soars. He noted that, between 2002 and 2005, usage of Scielo journals (as measured only by 'hits') by developed country sites increased by only 1% in 2002, 5% in 2003, 32% in 2004, and 62% in 2005. The picture is even more dramatic for hits from developing countries, although Brazil alone accounted for more than 23,000,000 of the total of 24,000,000 hits in 2005.

Making maximum use of the information available in open access sources was the subject of **John Wilbanks's** paper on the **NeuroCommons**. The idea behind the NeuroCommons is that facts in what are, to all intents and purposes, large databases of textual data, can be harvested and compared with one another, using natural language processing software (commercial publishers often

ban the use of such software on their sites, hence the need for open access) to create a Semantic Web of neurological research. Thus, rather than needing to dig into the research literature, the neurological scientist would be able to discover from the NeuroCommons, what facts have been shown to be associated in which studies and with what degree of validity and reliability. This 're-use' of data, it would seem, would also maximise social value. This was very **enthusiastic and competent presentation** that also inspired many members of the audience.

Many open access systems operate under the **Creative Commons** licensing scheme and **Mathias Klang**, of the University of Gothenburg, set out the basic principles of the scheme. He noted that there was a general misunderstanding of the relationship between the **Creative Commons** licence and copyright as preserved in national laws. Essentially, the answer was that, if a Creative Commons licence is infringed, the author will still have the right to pursue the offender under his or her national copyright legislation. In other words, under whatever terms of the licence, the author retains full copyright. There does not have to be any additional provision allowing or requiring usage of Creative Commons in the existing national legislation.

One of the alternatives to open access publishing is open archiving and two speakers addressed this issue: **Jean-Claude Guedon** proposed that repositories could develop into primary publication sources as authors found that their work was accessible and cited by doing so. He noted that in some fields, with well established repositories (fundamental physics for example), citations to journal articles were now being cited well before the journal actually published the item, because of their appearance in the repository. He suggested that rather than pre-publication peer review operating, process of open post-publication review could emerge in these repositories.

How one persuades people initially to contribute to repositories is a prevailing problem and **Alma Swan** partly addressed this issue **in her presentation**. She believed that the mandating of deposition by universities is key to the success of repositories: however, even where mandates exist, those managing the repository (often librarians) are having difficulty in getting acceptance. Swan presented her ideas within an evolutionary science analogy and suggested that the open access model, in its various forms, was likely to emerge successful from the evolutionary battle.

Finally, what does all of this have to do with the assessment of individuals or academic units? **Eugene Garfield** returned to one of his main interests, the **identification of 'Nobel class' scientists**, showing, for the ISI data for 1967, that scientists appearing in the

top 50 list, by number of citations, included a very significant number of Nobel laureates. He noted, however, that the Nobel committee does not rely upon citation data in its deliberations and urged, generally, than in research assessment, numerical indicators of performance, such as citation counts and the Journal Impact Factors, should be taken for what they are, indicators, and need the support of qualitative data - just as the Nobel Committee relies on such data in making its awards. Curiously, however, in answer to a question, he suggested that the research councils in the UK could replace the existing Research Assessment Exercise procedures, by a metrics-driven approach.

The other speaker on this general topic of assessment was **Grant Lewison**, who presented **some alterative metrics** to those derived from citation that would be supplementary measures of overall impact of research. For health related information he took into account the government policy documents, standards, clinical guidelines, textbooks, as well as mass media, such as newspapers and television or radio broadcasts. The impact of research on these particular types of documents and information sources manifests in different ways that require specific approach and interpretation of measurements. It is worth conducting these measurements as they reflect a broad impact of research institutions and researchers not only on scholarly community but on the society as a whole, sometimes in the ways that affect the majority of inhabitants. Lewison called for wider research on this impact in other countries that would allow comparisons on the international level.

In all, as we said at the start, this was a very good conference and we look forward to the next!

How to cite this review:

Wilson, T.D. & Maceviciute, E. (2006). "Conference Report: Third Nordic Conference on Scholarly Communication, Lund 24-25 April, 2006" *Information Research*, 11(3) conf 1 [Available at <http://InformationR.net/ir/11-3/conf1.html>]

John B.  
Thompson at  
Lund University

**Catta Torhell**, Head of  
Library Services within  
the Faculty of  
Humanities and  
Theology, Lund  
University



John  
B. Thompson

The Faculties of Humanities and Theology invited Professor John B. Thompson to a conference on scholarly publishing within humanities and social sciences April 26th 2006. His lecture was called *Academic Publishing at the Crossroads*. John B. Thompson, who is a very well known Cambridge sociologist and also one of the founders of Polity Press, has spent a few years to examine the transformation of academic and higher education publishing in Britain and the US. He was very surprised by the fact that colleagues within the academic world knew so little about the conditions for scholarly publishing and that so little research has been done in this field. He says "those whose lives are spent within higher education know surprisingly little about this industry upon which their own activities – and to some extent their careers and livelihoods – depend". The result of his research was published last year in an almost 500 pages volume called *Books in the Digital Age – The Transformation of Academic and Higher Education Publishing in Britain and the United States*, Polity Press 2005. The book has been described as a "landmark study" on the publishing industry and is mentioned with great respect by scholars, publishers, librarians and others.

In his introduction to the book John B. Thompson states that “the book publishing industry today is going through a process of change which is probably as profound as anything it has experienced since Johann Gutenberg adapted the traditional screw press for the purposes of manufacturing printed texts”. In his attempt to explain the key changes that are transforming the book publishing industry today he is concentrating on different publishing fields. The field of academic publishing (scholarly publishing and college textbook publishing) “cannot be understood without considering the relations between this field, on the one hand, and the field of higher education (including the world of university libraries) at the other. These fields are not the same, they have different social and institutional characteristics, but they are locked together through multiple forms of interdependency.” (Page 7) Besides, there are some broader developments that have had an impact on all publishing. Thompson is mentioning four important changes that have influenced the whole publishing industry. First, the growing concentration of resources – even if he at the same time claims that the growing concentration of power and resources has been less noticeable in academic publishing partly because of the distinctive role of university presses. The second development is the changing structure of markets and channels to markets, and he specially mentions the changes in the retail business i.e. bookshop chains and online bookshops. The third development is the globalization of markets and publishing firms. This development is closely connected to the rise of English as the de facto international language, but he also states that even publishers working in languages other than English are finding that the conditions in which they operate are changing, partly as a result of the growing dominance of English and the increasing international circulation of ideas, authors and content. (Page 9) The fourth development is the impact of new technologies.

The book is divided into four parts. The first part gives a concentrated history lesson to the publishing business, starting with the close relation between printers and publishers, (Cambridge University Press is still operating both a publishing and printing division!) followed by a description of the publishing cycle (the decisions to take on a project, financial decisions, decisions about stocks etc.), the publishing chain and the economics of publishing. The first part ends with a very close look at the development of the publishing field since 1980. This is an important background in order to understand the big changes within the publishing industry.

The second part – from my point of view maybe the most interesting – is called “The Field of Academic Publishing”. This is the part where John B. Thompson examines the conditions for the scholarly monograph in all its details and shows us how complex the relation is between university presses, libraries, scholars and university decision makers. There are around one hundred university presses in the English-speaking world and many of them have faced great



difficulties during the last years. John B. Thompson points out some interesting differences between the university presses. While the presses in US are operating mostly at the North American market and are often getting support from their host institutions, the UK university presses are operating on an international market and are left with little understanding and support from their universities.

The decline of the scholarly monograph has been well known since the middle of the 1980's, and at his lecture in Lund as well as in his book John B. Thompson urges the scholars themselves to take greater responsibility for the whole system of scholarly communication and the tenure system which he argues is too dependent on the publication of scholarly monographs specially in humanities and social sciences. He quotes Stephen Greenblatt, former president of MLA, who in a letter to the members in 2002 wrote: "faculty members find themselves in a maddening double bind. They face a challenge – under inflexible time constraints and with very high stakes – that many of them may be unable to meet successfully, no matter how strong or serious their scholarly achievements, because academic presses simply cannot afford to publish their books." (Page 179)

In the third part of his book, "The Field of Higher Education Publishing", John B. Thompson is looking into the business of textbook publishing. In the same way as academic publishing has to be understood within the academic community, higher education publishing has to be understood in relation to the pedagogical activities of higher education. It is very impressive to see, once again, that John B. Thompson has not left any aspect of this field of publishing unexamined. Especially the development of additional material to textbooks is of great interest. First floppy discs, laser discs, CD-ROMs, and today dedicated or companion websites. In addition to the discussion on textbooks he also looks in to the used books market or the second-hand book market and the implications for the publishers within higher education publishing.

"The Digital Revolution" is the title of the last part of the book. To write a book on the developments within the digital publishing world is almost a mission impossible. The business is changing rapidly and some of the companies that Thompson mentions is already out of the market, but this doesn't change the fact that this book is the most comprehensive overview on digital publishing that I have ever read.

I should have mentioned earlier that Thompson has interviewed 230 publishers and scholars within the industry for this book. In the beginning of the chapter on the digital revolution he quotes a joke that has been running among publishers for a few years stating that "the only way to make money out of electronic publishing is to organize conferences on it!" This quote says a lot about the

difficulties within electronic publishing and I would strongly recommend everybody – scholars, publishers, librarians – to read *Books in the Digital Age* in order to become better discussion partners in the development of new ways to shape the future arena for academic and higher education publishing.

#### References:

Thompson, John B., *Books in the digital age : the transformation of academic and higher education publishing in Britain and the United States* . Polity Press, 2005

ISBN: 0-7456-3477-X ISBN: 0-7456-3478-8 (pbk.)

Greenblatt, Stephen, A Special Letter from Stephen Greenblatt, 28 May 2002, [http://www.mla.org/scholarly\\_pub](http://www.mla.org/scholarly_pub)