Welcome to the June 2011 issue of ScieCom info. Nordic-Baltic Forum for Scientific Communication.

There has been a lot of international concern about Elsevier's recently changed Open Access Policy. We can now publish a formal statement made by the Swedish national OpenAccess.se programme, run by the Swedish National Library to promote OA to research results produced by Swedish researchers. The Steering Committee is deeply concerned about any changes that restrict availability and strongly objects to Elsevier's new policy. "OpenAccess.se Statement: Concern about Elsevier's Open Access Policy."

An Open Access Policy has now been adopted by the Karolinska Institute (KI), Stockholm. The Policy will be in effect from July 1, 2011. KI encourages its researchers to make their publications to the greatest possible extent freely available, taking into account publisher terms and relevant demands of grant-awarding bodies and government authorities. es. Read KI's Open access Policy here

The DOAJ team in Lund is happy to announce that the DOAJ site is now available in French. Other languages will follow. http://nile.lub.lu.se/ojs/index.php/sciecominfo/article/download/5146/4602

Will the more mundane communication channels have any roles in scholarly publishing? Will they seriously challenge the old academic publishing traditions? We hope to inspire lively discussions with the article "Taking new routes: Blogs, Web sites, and Scientific Publishing "by Helena Bukvova, a researcher and lecturer at the Dresden University of Technology. Helena Bukova presents several new aspects of web usage for researchers.

We continue to follow the promising OA developments in Denmark. Lise Mikkelsen has earlier reported on the hearing process for the first draft of the "Recommendations for implementation of Open Access in Denmark". The final version has now been released. In "Central Open Access activities in Denmark" Lise Mikkelsen takes us through the key events related to the final Recommendations, and presents some of the main areas in the Danish Open Access Committee's final recommendations for implementing a national OA-policy in Denmark.

"Promote a national open access policy and create the necessary conditions for an efficient implementation of it" is one of the most important goals for the new strategy recently adopted by the Steering Committee for the Swedish OpenAccess.se programme. The main purpose of the Programme is to help increasing the share of freely available research publications on the Internet. "Strategy for the OpenAccess.se programme 2011-2013" was adopted at the Committee's May 23rd meeting. The new strategy also defines goals for specific areas as well as the means to reach them.

Jan Erik Frantsvåg has earlier presented, "The Open Access publication fund at the University of Tromsø". (LÄNK). His colleague Leif Longva now reports on "Doctoral theses are now submitted electronically at the University of Tromsø". It all started in late 2007, when an electronic submission portal for master theses was introduced. The great success of this portal led them to consider doing the same for doctoral these. They had been surprised to notice that doctoral candidates were reluctant to include their theses in the Munin open archive. Encouraged by the earlier success the library launched a similar service for doctoral theses.

We hope that you will have a god read. Your comments and ideas are very welcome

Ingegerd Rabow
Editor-in-chief

Vol 7, No 1 (2011)

Table of Contents

News & Notices 2011:2

The Swedish national OpenAccess.se programme expresses concern about Elsevier's recently changed OA-policy

The following statement was approved by the Steering Committee at its meeting on May 23, 2011:

OpenAccess.se Statement: Concern about Elsevier's Open Access Policy
Elsevier recently changed its policy concerning authors' rights to self-archive articles. This change will seriously hinder universities and research funders in their attempts to increase dissemination and availability of research results - open access.

Elsevier has a general policy concerning self-archiving which implies that authors can deposit a copy of an article on a personal web page or in an open archive. However, according to the new policy, Elsevier requires specific agreements with universities or research funders if there is an open access mandate to deposit and disseminate articles in a specific open archive (e.g. PubMed Central or in an institutional repository). These agreements may involve long embargo periods and restrict availability of research results.[1]

The national programme OpenAccess.se promotes free access on the Internet to research results produced by Swedish researchers. The Steering Committee of OpenAccess.se is deeply concerned about every action to restrict availability of the scientific output. The Committee is also concerned by the uncertainty Elsevier causes considering an author's right to self-archive.

The Committee's interpretation of Elsevier's new policy is that universities having a mandate to deposit research publications in a specific repository are the only ones affected. The open access mandates of the Swedish research funders are not affected since these mandates do not include directives for systematic distribution in a specific open archive. In this case Elsevier's general policy concerning self-archiving applies.

SPARC, SPARC Europe and COAR have made a joint statement with the purpose to clearly recommend that universities and others do not conclude specific agreements with Elsevier.[2] The question has been discussed within the Steering Committee of OpenAccess.se and the Committee has agreed upon the following statements:

- We strongly object to Elsevier's new policy which requires separate agreements for author's rights and we urge Elsevier to withdraw the new clause.

- We recommend Swedish universities with open access mandates to not conclude separate agreements with Elsevier. Instead, this issue should be transferred to the negotiations of the national license agreements with Elsevier.

The Karolinska Institute has adopted an Open Acess Policy

Karolinska Institutet has adopted an Open Access Policy that will take effect on July 1, 2011:

Policy
Karolinska Institutet (KI) defends the independence of science and strives both for recognition of its research and the transmission of research results to a broader public. In keeping with KIs mission to improve human health, an active interaction with the global research community and a constant bi-directional flow of knowledge and ideas are key components of success. Open and free access (Open Access) to the results of KI:s research contributes to this exchange of knowledge.

---

[1] "Elsevier believes that individual authors should be able to distribute their AAMs for their personal voluntary needs and interests, e.g. posting to their websites or their institution's repository, e-mailing to colleagues. However, our policies differ regarding the systematic aggregation or distribution of AAMs to ensure the sustainability of the journals to which AAMs are submitted. Therefore, deposit in, or posting to, subject-oriented or centralised repositories (such as PubMed Central), or institutional repositories with systematic posting mandates is permitted only under specific agreements between Elsevier and the repository, agency or institution, and only consistent with the Publisher's policies concerning such repositories."
http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/postingpolicy

[2] http://www.sparceurope.org/news/public-response-on-behalf-of-sparc-sparc-europe-and-coar-regarding-publishers-self-deposit-policies

KI encourages its researchers to make their publications to the greatest possible extent freely available taking into account publisher terms and relevant demands of grant-awarding bodies and government authorities.

Through the Association of Higher Education (SUHF), KI has signed the Berlin Declaration and thereby supports the promotion of Open Access.

Adoption
 The University Library at KI has been given the task of developing systems, processes and services which facilitate for researchers at KI to efficiently follow the requirements of the grant-awarding bodies as well as the above policy.

In order to increase accessibility to KIs research, the electronic publication of the extensive summary of all doctoral and licentiate theses is also obligatory according to a previous decision of the Board of Education at KI." See also: http://kib.ki.se/en/oa

In connection with the policy decision KI now offers an open archive, where KI's researchers and research students can parallel publish their articles. Take a look at this brand new archive: here

Contact: Caroline Karregård: caroline.karregard@ki.se

DOAJ site now available in French

The aim and goal of DOAJ is to disseminate and make research visible and available to the scholarly community. To increase the usage even more DOAJ has now initiated cooperation with partners in different countries to translate the DOAJ site into their languages. The first finished translation has been made by France. Have a look at the DOAJ site in French:
http://www.doaj.org/doaj?func=home&uiLanguage=fr

Tremendous growth of gold OA over the past decade

In the following article "The Development of Open Access Journal Publishing from 1993 to 2009", published June 13 in PLoS ONE, the authors Mikael Laakso, Patrik Welling, Helena Bukvova, Linus Nyman, Bo-Christer Björk and Turid Hedlund have been able to demonstrate the tremendous growth of gold OA over the past decade.

PLoS ONE 6(6): e20961.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0020961

TAKING NEW ROUTES: BLOGS, WEB SITES, AND SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING

Helena Bukvova

1 Scientific publishing

Scientific publishing plays an important role in the academic research process (Shugan, 2004). While the results of non-academic research are likely to be kept secret, it is necessary that the findings from academic research are made public. This way the results can be quickly and easily picked up and used by other scientists. From this viewpoint, scientific publishing appears like an altruistic exercise for the sake of common progress. However, publishing also has a very pragmatic function within the scientific community: it provides a foundation for the building of individual reputation, thus creating awareness within the community (Heimeriks & Vasileiadou, 2008). As such, scientific publishing is well established, with accepted procedures and platforms. However, as I wish to discuss in the following, there are limitations to what it can achieve. Or, to put it another way, I believe that due to the technology development, in particularly the Internet, the traditional scientific publishing can be sensibly supplemented and improved.

To understand the role of scientific publishing, it is helpful to view it from a historical perspective. David (2004) offers a helpful discussion of the development of scientific publishing. He suggests, that scientists have been encouraged to move away from their first secretive attitude due to the sponsorship and patronage of wealthy elites. Besides reaping direct benefits of research efforts, these patrons also profited by improving their image, if they sponsored a successful researcher. As science became more granular and complex, the success and value of research results could only be judged by other scientists. Thus in order to secure the scientists' reputation - and by projection the image of their patrons - it became necessary to make research results available to peers. Hence according to David (2004), publishing of research results evolved as means of establishing reputation. The altruistic element of supporting progress by making findings quickly available became relevant after research began to be financed by the state (David, 2004).

Traditionally, there are three types of platforms for scientific publishing: conferences, journals, and books. Conferences are events requiring the presence of scientists, where findings are presented personally by scientists. Conferences allow for a quick dissemination of findings as well as for personal contact among scientist. Journals aim to publish original, relevant, and rigorous findings. To ensure quality, journals use a blind peer review process. The journal rank and impact play a particularly important role regarding the scientists' reputation, though these measures are far from uncontroversial (e.g. Starbuck, 2005, Oswald, 2007). Finally, books can be used to publish complex and extensive information on topics from academic research. The importance and specification of these platforms differ across disciplines. These traditional platforms have been effected by the technological development, in particularly of the Internet. Conferences can be supplemented by online resources, journal articles and books are made available in electronic form. This has improved the dissemination of scientific publications worldwide. Furthermore, the Internet has been a key element in the development of new form of journal publishing, which calls for an unlimited availability of scientific publications: Open Access (Bernius & Hanauske, 2007, Willinsky, 2005, Hedlund, Gustafsson, & Björk, 2004, Björk et al., 2010).

Thus in summary, it is possible to derive several functions of publishing within the scientific community. First, research results are promptly circulated, improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the joint research efforts of the community. Second, the published results can be evaluated by other scientists, thus minimising mistakes and maintaining high quality standards. This function is partially implemented even before publication through peer review processes. Third, scientists acquire awareness of their peers and their peers' work though reading of publications and conference attendance (Tenopir, King, Edwards, & Wu, 2009). Thus the publication and dissemination of results helps to create ties that bind the scientists in the community (Heimeriks & Vasileiadou, 2008). Fourth, a scientist's publications serve to establish the reputation of the scientist as they are accepted as a record of his or her research output (Pastowski, 2003).

There are of course limitations and problems in the publishing system, for example the question of access to already published work, problems with quantitative

evaluation of impacts, or the publish-or-perish attitude (Young, Ioannidis, & Al-Ubaydli, 2008). Besides these, I also see functions that are not covered by the system. These I would not call limitations, as they were originally not in the scope of the publishing system. Firstly, scientific publications are addressed to the scientific community. It is not their aim to inform the general public. The general public often lacks access to the publications as well as the background to understand them. Secondly, the form of a scientific publication is clearly defined. Although besides the results of original research, other publications are accepted by the community, the scope of publication types is limited. Thirdly, while through the engagement of scientific publications it is possible to find scientists working in a particular area, each publication represents but a small portion of their work. Although the pieces may be quantified and summed into measures of overall output, qualitatively, viewing simply the publishing output is insufficient to evaluate a scientist's work.

In the following section, I will discuss one aspect of the current development of online information and communication technologies: the emergence of individual spaces for user generated content, e.g. weblogs, personal web pages, or profiles on social networking platforms. In these spaces, Internet users including scientists are free to publish any content they choose. While it is possible to see these spaces as alternative platforms for scientific publishing, I see them as a supplement rather than as a substitute. If the scientific publishing system is not viewed only as a means of disseminating research-related content, but also as a networking foundation, then the use of individual online spaces can be seen as a supportive element that provides even those function that I considered missing.

2 Blogs, Web Pages & Co.

The Internet, with its time- and space-independent accessibility appears to be a perfect medium for the dissemination of information. In the past, it was possible for individuals to programme their own HTML web pages and thus create an individual space online. Through the recent development in the direction of so-called Web 2.0, creating online content has become even easier. There are now many platforms where Internet users can create content of different form. These include weblogs, social networking systems, microblogs, bookmarking areas, and more. Most of these platforms target a general audience, but some also focus directly on the scientific community. But if scientists are free to publish any content they want online, what impact can this have on the established system of scientific publishing?
Before I discuss the relationship of online user-generated content, I will first briefly introduce some of the platforms that scientists can use to publish information about themselves and their work: personal web pages, weblogs, microblogs, social networking systems, and resource-management platforms. Both within the web presence of their institution and in private, scientists can create web pages to present themselves. Although web pages theoretically offer high flexibility, their design can be limited by the owner's programming and administrative skills or institutional policies (for research on personal web pages see Döring, 2006, Hawisher & Sullivan, 1999, Hess, 2002, Dillon & Gushrowski, 2000, Miller, 1995, Saint-Georges, 1998). Weblogs or blogs for short are web pages with a list of dated entries that are typically displayed in a reverse chronological order (Alcock, 2003, Herring, Scheidt, Bonus, & Wright, 2004, Williams, 2008). Most blogs combine text, images, and links to other blogs and web pages and allow the readers to comment blog postings, generally in a mediated manner, where the blog host retains control (for research on blogs and blogging see Wang, Jiang, & Ma, 2010, Hendricks, 2010, Kjellberg, 2010, Ferguson, Clough, & Hosein, 2010, Ewins, 2005, Luzón, 2009, Blood, 2002, Herring, Scheidt, Wright, & Bonus, 2005, Nentwich, 2010). Microblogs are platforms where users can post short messages (e.g. 140 characters on Twitter). Messages are posted in reverse chronological order (Boyd, Golder, & Lotan, 2010, Honeycutt & Herring, 2009), similar to blogs (for research on microblogs see Honeycutt & Herring, 2009, Java, Song, Finin, & Tseng, 2007, Mischaud, 2007, Herwig, Kittenberger, Nentwich, & Schmirmund, 2009). Social Networking Services (SNS) offer their users the opportunity to create personal profiles and connect to other users (Boyd & Ellison, 2008). Their content is typically semi-structured. Increasingly, SNS also support the creation of communities of interests among their members (for research on SNS see Boyd & Ellison, 2008, Möslein, Bullinger, & Söldner, 2009). Increasingly, other platforms also offer the opportunity to create a personal profile or connect to other users. These features have been added by platforms originally focusing on management of resources, like citations (e.g. Mendeley, CiteULike) or presentations (e.g. SlideShare) (Farooq, Ganoe, Carroll, & Giles, 2007).

In a recent study, I have examined how scientists use the Internet to publish information about themselves and their work. The most important finding of my research was the complexity and the variety in ways scientists deal with the opportunities offered by the Internet. Firstly, the type of content that scientists publish on the profiles can be manifold. (1) It can serve as the identification of the scientist who owns the space, e.g. the scientists photo, affiliation, or contact data. (2) The content can be also related to the owner's activities, e.g. research work. (3) The scientist might also present content regarding his or her

achievements, e.g. career milestones, publications, or important findings. (4) The content might also be related to the scientist's area of expertise. The content can be discussed with different depth and breadth and infused with varying degree of personal views and opinions. Viewing the ways the scientists combine these different types of content, I have identified six patterns describing the function of online spaces belonging to scientists:

- **Presence**: Spaces of this type provide only a minimum of information, identifying the owner and making him or her present in the virtual environment. Such spaces can be found on any kind of platforms.

- **Visit card**: On these spaces, content is provided that identifies and describes the scientist owning the spaces and potentially also his or her achievements (often in the form of a curriculum vitae) (compare Miller, 1995, Saint-Georges, 1998). These spaces are often on institutional web sites or SNS.

- **Knowledge base**: These are spaces that offer content elaborating on topics related to their owner's area of expertise. They may focus on the dissemination of facts or may also present the scientist's opinions (compare Blood, 2002, Herring et al., 2004, Nentwich, 2010). These spaces are mostly found on blogs, but institutional or private web pages as well as potentially SNS can also host them.

- **Personal journal**: Some spaces can serve as the presentation of the scientist's activities (compare Blood, 2002, Herring et al., 2004, Nentwich, 2010). This can be done with more elaboration for example on blogs or in a briefer form on microblogs.

- **Notebook**: Scientists may also combine the presentation of content related to their areas of expertise and the description of their activities. By doing so, they create spaces that present facts combined with personal experiences (compare Halavais, 2006).

- **Coffee house**: Scientists may also create spaces, where they can interact actively with interested individuals (compare Halavais, 2006). Platforms hosting such spaces have to provide means of discussion, e.g. a forum or a comment function.

Scientists, however, do not have to select just one of these patterns and implement them in the space of their choice. They are free to choose from a range of platforms, create multiple profiles and spaces, and

connect them with hyperlinks to create networks. This way, they can reach a broad audience, comprised of close colleagues, known and unknown peers from related disciplines, as well as the general public and peers from unrelated disciplines (compare Pearson, 2009).

3 Publishing as Self-Presentation

The online presentation of content generated by individual scientist can take numerous forms. The content can cover different topics, vary from brief to elaborate, be contained in a single space or spanned across several platforms and linked into a complex network. All these forms have one characteristic in common: as the spaces belong to an individual scientist, so is the content published there connected to their owner. On some spaces (e.g. SNS profiles or personal web sites) the scientist is in the center of attention, while on others (e.g. blogs focused on presentation of facts) he or she is in the background. This is not unlike in the traditional scientific publishing, where published results are always connected to the author. Therefore, both scientific publishing as well as online generation of content by scientists can serve not only to disseminate facts and findings, but also to present the person of the scientist who authored them.

In scientific publishing, the content of a publications is in the foreground. Therefore, while scientific publishing is a foundation for awareness within the scientific community and a crucial factor in determining a scientist's reputation, a single publication represents only a 'breadcrumb'. Through the reading of publications, scientists are able to connect an author's name to a certain area of expertise. However, to acquire further information about the author's person, the scientists have to look elsewhere. A face-to-face meeting at a conference is an option, but not a sufficient one given the disciplinary breadth and geographical spread of the scientific community. But scientists can use online spaces to collect the 'breadcrumbs' and connect them to other relevant contents, thus creating a complex self-presentation. Some scientists do so by providing a publication list alongside wit personal information or a curriculum vitae. Others prefer to present their expertise through topic discussion or activity logs. In whatever form, an online space can serve as an information point for fellow scientists, who wish to find out more about their peers.

Unlike scientific publishing, online content generation is not bound by strict norms and procedures. Scientists are free to publish on their spaces practically anything they consider fit. This would mean, that scientists could avoid peer review and publish content that was not tested against the quality standards of the

community. While this is possible, I believe that it is less problematic than it appears. Firstly, the content published online is technically available to the scientific community and can thus be read, evaluated, and commented. Secondly, the scientific community - just like any other community - operates on the principles of supply and demand. If most members of the community do not consider individual spaces as suitable platforms for scientific publishing, there will be little demand for them and, consequently, a decreasing supply of such publications. Instead of viewing the potential dangers of unregulated publishing on individual online spaces, I wish to point to the opportunities they offer. As I noted above, the traditional publishing has a limited number of well-defined publication types. While these forms have proved suitable for the dissemination of research results, they do not cover all types of communication that scientists might like to engage in. These may include open discussions of scientists opinions, presentations of practical topics, or dealing with areas not directly connected to research. However, scientists are free to use online platforms like blogs to present and even discuss such topics with interested audience.

The target audience of a scientist's individual online space may also differ from the audience of traditional scientific publishing. As I have pointed out, scientific publications target mainly scientists. If scientists want to address a general audience, they have to find alternative publishing channels. Given the current popularity of the Internet, a blog or a personal homepage appear to be suitable publishing platforms.

4 Conclusion

Scientific publishing with its processes and structures has evolved over centuries to fit the needs of the scientific community. It may thus appear, that scientific publishing as we know it today is a perfect system and should not be interfered with. However, not even scientific publishing is exempt from the influence of constant technological or social development. Or to put it another way: perfect as it may seem, it can surely be improved.

I have pointed out, that while scientific publishing appears to be mainly concerned with securing high quality of research findings and disseminating them to the scientific community, it also plays a crucial role in helping to form the community. This is done through creating awareness and influencing reputation. I have also noted, that the functions of scientific publishing could be further developed by targeting a broader audience, offering new publication formats, and presenting authors' work beyond single publications.

It appears to me, that author-controlled spaces for user-generated content such as blogs, web pages, SNS etc. are suitable 'sandboxes' for trying out new ways to further develop scientific publishing. These spaces allow publication of different contents including text, pictures, audio, and video, thus supporting creative forms of publication. What gets published on these spaces is not limited by existing processes and rules of scientific publishing. This way, these rules and processes can be challenged and rethought. The spaces are bound to an individual scientist and typically offer communication functions like forums or comment fields. Other members of the scientific community are thus given the opportunity to discuss and provide feedback to what has been published on the space. And best of all - these spaces are already being used by scientists. Of course not all scientists are present on the Internet and only a minority is involved in intensive content production like blogging. Even so, this still adds up to a considerable amount of virtual spaces managed by scientists, who engage in a variety of ways to publish content about themselves and their work. Thus there is an abundance of examples online that can be used to observe new ways of content generation, examine their potential for scientific publishing, and - last but not least - to participate.

We are presented with scientific publishing as a result of tireless work of generations of scientists. As it is crucial to scientific research, we must use it well. But we ought to do more than that: we should actively engage in improving and honing the system of scientific publishing and thus contribute to better science.

References

Alcock, M. (2003). Blogs - what are they and how do we use them? *Quill, 103*(8).

Bernius, S., & Hanauske, M. (2007). Open access, *WIRTSCHAFTSINFORMATIK, 49*(6), 456–459.

Björk, BC., Welling, P., Laakso, M., Majlender, P., Hedlund, T., & Guðnason, G. (2010, Jan). Open Access to the Scientific Journal Literature: Situation 2009. *PloS one, 5*(6), http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20585653.

Blood, R. (2002). *The Weblog handbook: Practical advice on creating and maintaining your blog.* Cambridge, MA, USA: Perseus Publishing.

Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. B. (2008). Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13*(1), 210–230.

Boyd, D. M., Golder, S., & Lotan, G. (2010). Tweet, Tweet, Retweet: Conversational Aspects of Retweeting on Twitter. In *Proceedings of the 43rd hawaii international conference on system sciences* (pp. 1–10). Honolulu, HI, USA.

David, P. A. (2004). Patronage, Reputation, and Common Agency Contracting in the Scientific Revolution: From Keeping 'Nature's Secrets' to the Institutionalization of 'Open Science'. *SIEPR Policy paper No. 03-039.*

Dillon, A., & Gushrowski, B. (2000). Genres and the Web - is the home page the first digital genre? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 51*(2), 202–205.

Döring, N. (2006). Personal Home Pages on the Web: A Review of Research. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 7*(3).

Ewins, R. (2005). Who are You? Weblogs and Academic Identity. *E-Learning, 2*(4), 368–377.

Farooq, U., Ganoe, C., Carroll, J., & Giles, C. (2007). Supporting distributed scientific collaboration: Implications for designing the CiteSeer collaboratory. In *40th annual hawaii international conference on system sciences* (pp. 26–26). Waikoloa, HI, USA.

Ferguson, R., Clough, G., & Hosein, A. (2010). Shifting themes, shifting roles: the development of research blogs. In *Proceedings of the 17th association for learning technology conference* (pp. 111–117). Nottingham, UK.

Halavais, A. (2006). Scholarly blogging: moving toward the visible college. In A. Bruns & J. Jacobs (Eds.), *Uses of blogs* (pp. 117–126). New York, NY, USA: Peter Lang.

Hawisher, G. E., & Sullivan, P. A. (1999). Fleeting images: Women visually writing the Web. In G. E. Hawisher & C. L. Selfe (Eds.), *Passions, pedagogies, and 21st century technologies* (pp. 168–291). Logan, UT, USA: Utah State University Press.

Hedlund, T., Gustafsson, T., & Björk, BC. (2004). The Open Access Scientific Journal: An Empirical Study. *Learned publishing, 17*(3), 199–209.

Heimeriks, G., & Vasileiadou, E. (2008, Mar). Changes or transition? Analysing the use of ICTs in the sciences. *Social Science Information, 47*(1), 5–29.

Hendricks, A. (2010). Bloggership, or is publishing a blog scholarship? A survey of academic librarians. *Library Hi Tech, 28*(3), 470–477.

Herring, S. C., Scheidt, L. A., Bonus, S., & Wright, E. (2004). Bridging the gap: A Genre Analysis of Weblogs. In *Proceedings of the 37th hawaii international conference on system sciences.* Maui, HI, USA: .

Herring, S. C., Scheidt, L. A., Wright, E., & Bonus, S. (2005). Weblogs as a bridging genre. *Information Technology & People, 18*(2), 142–171.

Herwig, J., Kittenberger, A., Nentwich, M., & Schmirmund, J. (2009). *Microblogging und die Wissenschaft - Das Beispiel Twitter* (Technical report). Institut für Technikfolgen-Abschätzung.

Hess, M. (2002). A Nomad faculty: English professors negotiate self-representation in university Web space. *Computers and Composition, 19*(2), 171–189.

Honeycutt, C., & Herring, S. C. (2009). Beyond Microblogging : Conversation and Collaboration via Twitter. In *Proceedings of the 42th hawaii international conference on system sciences.* Los Alamitos, CA, USA: IEEE Press.

Java, A., Song, X., Finin, T., & Tseng, B. (2007). Why We Twitter: Understanding Microblogging. In *Proceedings of the 9th webkdd and 1st sna-kdd 2007 workshop on web mining and social network analysis.* New York, NY, USA: ACM.

Kjellberg, S. (2010). I am a blogging researcher: Motivations for blogging in a scholarly context. *First Monday, 18*(8). http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2962/2580

Luzón, M. J. (2009). Scholarly Hyperwriting : The Function of Links in Academic Weblogs. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 60*(1), 75–89.

Miller, H. (1995). The Presentation of Self in Electronic Life: Goffman on the Internet. In *Embodied knowledge and virtual space conference.* London: .

Mischaud, E. (2007). *Twitter: Expressions of the Whole Self - An investigation into user appropriation of a web-based communications platform.* Master thesis, London School of Economics and Political Science.

Möslein, K. M., Bullinger, A. C., & Söldner, J. (2009). Open Collaborative Development: Trends, Tools, and Tactics. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 5610/2009*, 874–881.

Nentwich, M. (2010). Web 2.0 and academia. In *Proceedings of the 9th annual ias-sts conference ,'Critical issues in science and technology studies* ,(pp. 66–78). Graz, Austria:

Oswald, A. J. (2007). An Examination of the Reliability of Prestigious Scholarly Journals: Evidence and Implications for Decision-Makers. *Economica*, *74*(293), 21–31.

Pastowski, S. (2003). Der Markt für Hochschulleistungen - Implikationen für das Qualitätsmanagement aus Sicht des Stakeholder-Ansatzes. In *Tendenzen im dienstleistungsmarketing - vom marketing zum management* (Fließ, S. ed., pp. 139–166). Duv.

Pearson, E. (2009). All the World Wide Web's a stage: The performance of identity in online social networks. *First Monday*, *14*(3-2).

Saint-Georges, I. de. (1998). Click Here if You Want to Know Who I am. Deixis in Personal Homepages. In *Proceedings of the 31st hawaii international conference on system sciences* (pp. 68–77). Kohala Coast, HI, USA.

Shugan, S. M. (2004). Consulting, Research and Consulting Research [Journal article]. *Marketing Science*, *23*(2), 173–179.

Starbuck, W. H. (2005). How Much Better Are the Most-Prestigious Journals? The Statistics of Academic Publication. *Organization Science*, *16*(2), 180–200.

Tenopir, C., King, D. W., Edwards, S., & Wu, L. (2009). Electronic journals and changes in scholarly article seeking and reading patterns. *Aslib Proceedings*, *61*(1), 5–32.

Wang, X., Jiang, T., & Ma, F. (2010). Blog-supported scientific communication: An exploratory analysis based on social hyperlinks in a Chinese blog community. *Journal of Informatio n Science*, *36*(6), 690–704.

Williams, A. (2008). Internet-based tools for communication and collaboration in chemistry. *Drug Discovery Today*, *13*(11/12).

Willinsky, J. (2005). The unacknowledged convergence of open source, open access, and open science. *First Monday*, *10*(8), http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1265

Young, N. S., Ioannidis, J. P. A., & Al-Ubaydli, O. (2008). Why Current Publication Practices May Distort Science. *PLoS Med*, *5*(10).

Helena Bukvova is a researcher and lecturer at the Chair of Information Management, Dresden University of Technology, Germany. She holds a Dimploma-Degree in Business Informations and is currently a PhD student. Her resaerch work is concerned with e-Collaboration in different settings, including in particular e-Learning and scientific communication.

CENTRAL OPEN ACCESS ACTIVITIES IN DENMARK
Lise Mikkelsen

Background

The interest for Open Access in Denmark has developed quickly within the last couple of years. This article will look at the key events on a national level that has resulted in this interest. Furthermore I will present some of the key areas in the Danish Open Access Committees final recommendations for implementation of Open Access in Denmark.

Timeline

This timeline shows important events in relation to the increasing interest for Open Access in Denmark.

2007
In 2007 the Danish Minister of Science, Technology and Innovation and his European colleagues signed The European Council Conclusions on access to scientific knowledge in the digital age.

2009
The European Commissions sends out a follow up questionnaire to CREST members and observers on the Council conclusions on scientific information in the digital age: Access, dissemination and preservation.

August 2009
The Danish Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation establishes the Danish Open Access Committee. The Committees primary task is to investigate how Denmark can implement the European Commissions conclusions and in a second phase implement the necessary changes.

May 2010
The Danish Open Access Committee sends out "Recommendations for implementation of Open Access in Denmark" in a public hearing process.

August – October 2010
The committee discusses the 42 answers and decides to make a revised version of their recommendations in order to reply to some of the views and concerns[1] .

Furthermore the committee is asked to make a suggestion for a national Open Access strategy.

December 2010 - February 2011
The Open Access Committee delivers a suggestion for a national Open Access strategy and the revised version of their recommendations to the Danish Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation. The recommendations are coordinated with other activities in the Agency. Furthermore the Agency plans that the first half of 2011 should be used for discussing the recommendations. After 6 months the minister is expected to decide on a national strategy.

March 2011
The Open Access Committee delivers their final recommendations to The Danish Agency for Science and Technology[2] .

24 may 2011
A Workshop on alternative business models for scientific publishing took place at The Royal Library. The workshop had international presentations from Salvatore Mele (CERN), Bo-Christer Björk (Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki), Caroline Sutton (Co-Action Publishing/OASPA), Jana Simniok (Springer), Gunnar Sivertsen (Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education), Barbara Kalamenos (STM) as well as two Danish presentations, breakout sessions and presentations of the results from these sessions. It seems to be accepted that Open Access is here to stay and that a solution is needed for Danish journals. The big questions are what kind of solution(s)? and how it should be financed?

10 June 2011
An Open Access Conference is planned to take place in order to initiate the debate with relevant stakeholders on how to improve the sharing of scientific knowledge.

---

[1] Recommendations for implementation of Open Access in Denmark – Extraction of comments from the hearing process. ScieCom info, Vol 6, No 4 (2010) http://www.sciecom.org/ojs/index.php/sciecominfo/article/view/4759 All answers are available at: http://www.fi.dk/viden-og-politik/strategier-og-handlingsplaner/open-access/hoeringssvar-open-access

[2] Recommendations for implementation of Open Access in Denmark - Final report from the Open Access Committee. 2011 http://www.fi.dk/viden-og-politik/strategier-og-handlingsplaner/open-access/recommendations-for-implementation-of-open-access-in-denmark-final-report-from-the-open-access-committee.pdf

The Recommendations

In the Open Access Committees final report 16 recommendations are introduced. The recommendations can be grouped into six categories: 1) Politics 2) Repositories, interoperability and dissemination 3) Long term preservation of publications 4) Coordination on national and international level and information 5) Primary research data 6) Danish journals and monographs.

Politics

The first three recommendations concern coordinated Open Access politics on three levels: 1) national 2) research councils and foundations and 3) Universities and other research institutions. The need for an Open Access policy seems evident and necessary for the implementation of a national strategy for Open Access. The turning point will be how strict the national Open Access policy will end up being. Will it be a mandate or a recommendation that the results of public financed research should be made freely available for all?

Repositories, interoperability and dissemination

The Committee recommends that public research grants should recommend that the results of Danish public funded research should be made available in the research institutions' research databases and/or via a common research portal based on the Danish National Research Database. The Committee focuses on green Open Access which makes the necessary infrastructure in terms of repositories and the national research database into central elements.

Long term preservation of publications

The Open Access Committee recommends that a long-term preservation service is established. In Denmark we have the PINDAR archive but the archive needs to be developed further into a fully comprehensive long-term preservation service for the universities' publications in order to secure that digital publications can be read and utilised in perpetuity.

Coordination on national and international level and information

If it is decided to implement the Committee's recommendations there are of course a need for coordination of activities on a national level. At the same time national solutions must live up to national standards whether we talk about technical interoperability or the creation of Open Access mandates. Furthermore it is recommended that an information campaign is carried out with debate and dialogue about Open Access, targeted at research environments in the form of e.g. information material and conferences.

Primary research data

The Committee has a recommendation regarding national planning of Open Access to and long-term preservation of primary research data. It is recommended to gather stakeholders within the field of primary research data in order to secure interdisciplinary collaboration. This collaboration will coordinate how Danish research data are to be archived in order to ensure present and future access.

Danish journals and monographs

The committee recommends that journals and monographs are treated separately and that the relevant stakeholders prepare a proposal on how Danish journals and monographs can make the transition to Open Access.

Conclusions

The European Commissions Conclusions on scientific information in the digital age is a key event in bringing the question of Open Access on a national and political level. There is still a long way but there seems to be light ahead of the tunnel as the Danish Minister of Science has stated: "*Open Access is emerging all over the world and will give opportunities for inspiration and development… Denmark can not stand back and say no thank you. We have to get on the train*"[3] (translated from Danish).

Lise Mikkelsen Danish Agency for Libraries and Media, Special consultant, Digital infrastructure

---

[3] Gratis artikler / Charlotte Sahl-Madsen, Videnskabsminister. Politikken d. 26. marts 2011

sciecom**info**
Nordic-Baltic Forum for Scientific Communication

STRATEGY FOR THE OPENACCESS.SE PROGRAMME 2011-2013
Adopted by the Steering Committee for OpenAccess.se at their meeting 2011-05-23.

Open access not only entails increased visibility for individual researchers, their institutions, funders, and nations, but also increased access to research results both for researchers and for all other interested parties. The importance of these issues for Sweden as a research nation is further emphasized by some marked developments within the research system:

- Intensified globalisation of both the implementation and the use of research
- Sharpened global competition for research excellence between institutions and countries
- Stronger demands on research to be relevant and useful for society.
- A rapid development towards a more and more computer-based and digitally communicated science,"e-science".

There is now a strong official support for open access in Sweden, a relatively well developed infrastructure of repositories, an increasing number of open access journals, and, in general, a quickly growing share of freely available publications. Focus is on articles and conference reports, but an open access model can also be applied to, for example, monographs, research data, and learning resources.

Aim

The Programme promotes open access to the works produced by researchers, teachers and students by supporting open access publishing at Swedish institutions of higher education.

Priorities

The foremost priority for the Programme is to help increasing the share of freely available research publications on the Internet.

The conditions constantly improve for reaching a breakpoint in the next couple of years, when more than half of the yearly production of Swedish, publicly funded research publications will be freely available. After that everything points to an even faster development towards open access. It is important that the increased accessibility is equally distributed between the higher education institutions and is supported by efficient dissemination routes

Quality requirements

The move towards increased open access must be handled with full regard to other important demands that can and should be addressed to the scholarly publication system:

- It must guarantee scientific quality and promote higher quality.
- It must have economic sustainability and be able to handle an increased research production with cost-efficiency.
- It must be efficient and flexible for both authors and users.
- Long-term accessibility to research publications must be guaranteed

Means

The Programme shall support both publishing in open access journals and parallel publishing in open archives. For a foreseeable future these two roads will run parallel. Developments can be furthered by:

- Clear requirements for open access from higher education institutions and research funders
- Information to researchers about open access to increase their understanding of its benefits.
- Simple but powerful services to make parallel publishing easier for researchers
- Licensing agreements and economic solutions for making it easier for researchers to publish in OA-journals can be implemented both locally and nationally, for example through the E-license consortium.

Goals for specific work areas

Detailed goals for the three work areas are presented below.

A. Policy

Goal: Promote a national open access policy and create the necessary conditions for an efficient implementation of it.

A national open access policy adopted by the

government should provide authority and clarity to the continuing work with open access. Sweden would also be able to comply with the requirements of the European Council decision of 2007[1]. The Programme is prepared to take an active part in this work.

The policy must:

- Clarify what goals are desired by supporting open access and how these relate to other goals for the development of Swedish research and higher education, such as a strengthening of quality, internationalization, or the relations between research and society.

- Roughly outline what measures have to be taken and how various stakeholders must cooperate to move developments toward open access.

Goal: Promote the provision of clear open access policies that require open access at higher education institutions and from research funders.

Today there are different kinds of open access policies issued by higher education institutions and research funders. If these policies are to have any effect, they must clearly require researchers to use existing possibilities to make their work open access, without hazarding their free choice of the publication channels most suited to their demands for quality and credit. An open access policy must also entail more coordination of the open access support given by higher education institutions and funders.

B. Information and advice.

Goal: Ensure that all researchers in Sweden know what open access publishing is and what it means.

The Programme shall take care that the information about open access has high quality, that it is widely disseminated, and that the researchers' open access publishing is encouraged and simplified.

Milestones

The Programme website www.openaccess.se shall give ample and updated information to both researchers and the general public about open access, and offer both a first introduction and more in-depth

knowledge. When higher education institutions and funders want to inform about open access on their own websites they are free to link to, www.openaccess.se

Higher education institutions and research funders will coordinate information campaigns on open access for researchers. All Programme participants will inform about open access via their own channels.

Efforts must be made to increase the visibility of the information in the open archives.

There will be support for introducing licensing agreements that facilitate open access publishing for researchers into the e-licenses consortium negotiations.

There must be good channels and meeting places for active discussions and competence development for those who work with open access in Sweden. The blog "Open Access in Sweden" and "Meeting-place Open Access" are two important information channels. The Programme shall contribute to information efforts on open access at both European and international levels.

C. Infrastructure and user services

Goal: Promote the development of an infrastructure and user services for open access in Sweden, both with a high degree of user-friendliness and quality.

Milestones

SwePub must have a more complete coverage and higher data quality. The database must be good enough to be used both for reporting purposes and as a stimulant for an increase of open access publications.

Parallel publishing shall be simplified by a continued development of the services offered by the open archives at the higher education institutions. The goals are better user-friendliness and quality. It is also important to be able to handle or link to research data and learning resources,

There must be more coordinated support for establishing new Swedish open access journals in relation to DOAJ and to the journal support systems currently used by research funders.

The majority of Swedish research journals shall either be open access or allow parallel publishing within a maximum of six months after publication.

There must be a considerable amount of monographs published as open access or as parallel publishing.

The e-publishing done by higher education

---

[1] Reinforce national strategies and structures for access to and dissemination of scientific information by … defining clear policies for dissemination and access to scientific information…" Council Conclusions on scientific information in the digital age; access, dissemination and preservation, 2832nd COMPETITIVENESS (Internal market, Industry and Research) Council meeting Brussels, 22 and 23 November 2007

institutions shall be included in the work-flow used by The National Library for digital harvesting and preservation and will be supported by the coming law on legal deposit of electronic documents..

There shall be established models for linking open access publications to open research data in cooperation between involved institutions and authorities.

There shall be access to standardized and coordinated usage data for open archives.

Note: This document was created after discussions in the Steering Committee 18 January 2011, in the Working Group for Information and Advice 10 February 2011, and in the Working Group for Infrastructure and User Services 22 February, The decision to approve and adopt this strategy was taken by the Steering Committee 23 May, 2011.

Read the Swedish version here:
http://www.kb.se/dokument/Om/Strategi_for_OpenAccess_se_2011-2013.pdf

DOCTORAL THESES ARE NOW SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TROMSØ

Leif Longva

Success with master theses

In the fall of 2007, an electronic submission portal for master theses was introduced at the University of Tromsø (UiT). As from January 2008 and onwards, all master theses have been submitted for evaluation through this portal. The rationale for this was partly to introduce a unified and efficient tool for administrating the submitted theses, and partly to get rid of the extra effort needed for the students to submit their theses to UiT's open archive, Munin.

The submission portal has been a great success. The students love the 24/7 submission service, and the possibility to submit from home or elsewhere. From the perspective of Munin, the success was tremendous. Prior to the advent of the submission portal, it was a tiresome job to try to encourage the students to do the extra effort of submitting their theses to Munin. And the result was slim – approximately 15% of the theses produced were made available in Munin. This percentage rose to approximately 70 as a result of the submission portal. (The students are free to decide not to have their thesis publicly available in Munin, and approximately 30% chose not to, for various reasons. Some of these theses may be made available at a later point of time.)

Munin is based on DSpace, and the submission portal is also based on DSpace. The DSpace submission form is adjusted to fit the needs of information for all involved parties. As the theses are approved, and all the administrative tasks are taken care of, the administrative staff clicks the Done-button. This results in an export of theses from the submission portal's DSpace to the Munin DSpace, limited to the theses for which the submitting student has chosen to accept inclusion of his/her thesis in Munin. Next to a bibliographic control, the theses are made public in Munin.

Doctoral theses

When introducing the Munin open archive, we believed the doctoral candidates would jump on the ability to get their theses made publicly available. Doctoral theses are, after all, thoroughly quality controlled research, and to a large extent, these theses have very limited channels of dissemination. So we were somewhat surprised when we realized that many doctoral candidates were reluctant to have their thesis included in Munin.

In Norway, there are mainly two formats used for doctoral theses. It may be a stand alone monograph, or, most common and increasingly it may be a collection of articles, accompanied by an essay synthesizing the research elaborated in the articles. Some of the monograph type theses may end up as published books through a scientific publisher, while close to all the articles in the theses are either published or planned to be published in scientific journals. We (the Munin staff) realized that our ability to include published and planned to be published material in Munin, would be subject to the publishers' policies. It came as a bigger surprise that many doctoral candidates did not even want to include the synthesis part of their theses in Munin, for the reason that it might expose some results, closer outlined in the (published or unpublished) articles. In fact, many doctoral students never responded to our e-mails, where we invited them to have their thesis (or part of it) included in Munin. We believe the main reason for this was the fear of violating publishers' rules. To some extent we experienced such no-response also from candidates with monograph type theses.

Electronic submissions of doctoral theses

Encouraged by the submission portal's success for the master theses, the library launched a project to introduce a similar service for the submission of doctoral theses. As for master theses, this portal was designed to be beneficial for the students, the administrative staff at the faculties, as well as for the dissemination of the documents through Munin. In the spring of 2010, two faculties were invited to join a pilot project, namely the Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education and the Faculty of Science and Technology, and they both agreed to join. Through this pilot, we were able to gain experience and reveal weaknesses to be improved, before launching the portal as the single tool for submitting doctoral theses at UiT.

Again DSpace was used as the tool for the submission portal. In fact, it is the same DSpace instance as the submission portal for master theses. This DSpace thus has two different submission forms, adjusted to the

needs of handling master theses and doctoral theses respectively.

The pilot project was encouragingly evaluated early 2011, and thus the submission portal was launched as a tool also for the remaining faculties of UiT from the spring of 2011.

As per early June 2011, 55 doctoral theses have been submitted through the portal. Very few of the submitting students have expressed problems or dissatisfaction with the submission tool. Also, the administrative staff of the faculties is satisfied. The submission portal enables them to streamline their routines in the handling of the submitted theses.

So what are the effects of the submission portal, on the dissemination of the theses through Munin? Here too, the effect is positive. Through the submission portal, we get access to each and every thesis submitted and approved by the evaluating committee. As soon as the thesis is accepted and may be presented, and the administration at the faculty has finished their tasks, it is exported to Munin. In the submission form, the student are asked to enter all the information the Munin staff needs, in order to decide what may be included in Munin or not, and when. Therefore, the effort we previously had to spend in contacting and communicating with the candidates is now saved. The students submitting their theses must state how they view the option of including their thesis in Munin. It is no longer as easy as before to just ignore this question. If everything goes smoothly, and the information given by the student is sufficient, we may have the thesis publicly available in Munin two or three weeks prior to the presentation and defence of the thesis.

Out of the 55 theses submitted so far, 30 has been approved and finalised by the faculty administration. The remaining 25 are still in the pipeline. Out of the 30 finalised, 24 has been made public in Munin,

which means 80%. And the remaining 6 are all in the category of being made available later, rather than never. 80% "success rate" is very good, compared to approximately 50% in the pre submission portal period. And the 80% is achieved with much less effort than the previous 50%.

Still there are obstacles in the road. The students are still as anxious as before to disseminate anything that may infringe on publishing agreements or jeopardize publishing plans for what is unpublished. We at Munin are of course eager not to impose any such problems for the doctoral candidates and their article co-authors. So we still need to communicate with the candidates on these issues.

With the submission portal, several routines around the doctoral theses may be improved. For instance, it is common to write a press release for each candidate presenting his/her thesis. With the submission portal, all the information needed to produce such press releases is easily found. Furthermore, electronic submission enables easy electronic communication with the evaluating committee. Big files may cause problems for e-mail sending, so developing a service for log in access for authorized persons may be of value.

Disseminating doctoral theses in Munin is still not effort- and obstacle less, even with the submission portal. But the conclusion, so far, is easily drawn: With the submission portal the University of Tromsø has become much more efficient in disseminating its doctoral theses (as well as master theses). The University now disseminates a much higher percentage of the theses, and does so more rapidly and with less effort compared to the pre portal period.

Leif Longva University of Tromsø, Munin repository manager