

Self-Archiving and the Copyright Transfer Agreements of ISI-Ranked Library and Information Science
Journals

by

Anita Coleman

School of Information Resources & Library Science

University of Arizona

Email: asc@u.arizona.edu

This is a preprint version of a paper submitted to the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*.

Abstract

A study of ISI ranked Library and Information Science (LIS) journals (n=52) is reported. The study examined the stances of publishers as expressed in the Copyright Transfer Agreements (CTAs) of the journals towards self-archiving, the practice of depositing digital copies of one's works, preferably in an OAI-compliant open access repository. Results show that 62 % (32) do not make their CTAs available on the open web; 38 % (20) do. Of the 38 % that have CTAs available, two are open access journals. Even among the 20 journal CTAs publicly available a high level of ambiguity exists. Of the 62 % that do not have a public CTA, 40 % are silent about self-archiving. Closer examination augmented by publisher policy documents on copyright, self-archiving, and author instructions, reveals that only five, 10% of the ISI-ranked LIS journals, actually prohibit self-archiving by publisher rule. Copyright transfer agreements are a moving target and publishers appear to be acknowledging that copyright and open access can co-exist in the scholarly journal publishing arena. Given the ambivalence of journal publishers, the communities might be better off by self-archiving in open access archives and strategically building an LIS information commons through a society-led global scholarly communication consortium. The aggregation of OAI-compliant archives and development of disciplinary-specific library services for an LIS commons has the potential to increase the field's research impact and visibility besides ameliorating its own scholarly communication and publishing systems, and serving as a model for others.

Background

Copyright is the right to reproduce, distribute, adapt, display or perform the work. Usually a legal instrument is signed by the author by which the copyright is transferred from the author to the publisher; it goes by various names such as copyright transfer agreement (CTA), limited or full licenses, publisher agreement, and author agreement. In the U.S., the Copyright Act of 1976, that took effect in 1978, is one of several laws and certainly one of the most important, to protect authorship. Other laws for authorship protection in various situations are the right to publicity, trademark, patent, and trade secrecy laws. Together these laws are often known as laws that protect intellectual property rights. There is considerable legal literature about the many inconsistencies in these laws such as, the failure of copyright law to take into account the authorship process (Ginsberg, 1990; Litman, 1991; Boyle, 1992; Reichmann, 1993; Biagioli, 1998), the unduly expansionary nature of current attempts to reform copyright law in view of digital technologies (Boyle, 1997) and the need for more robust underlying theories for new copyright law (Trusow, 2003). For us, the case in point is that the 1976 Copyright Law is often considered to have “shifted the legal balance from publishers to authors” and “it is now standard practice for most publishers, particularly those of science, technology, and medicine (STM) journals, to require authors to transfer to them the copyrights the law has vested in authors.” (Bachrach et al, 1998).

Largely due to the STM serials price crisis but triggered by other problems such as publication delays in the scientific scholarly communication system and facilitated by advances in information and communication technologies digital repositories have emerged as alternative scholarly communication and publishing media. Also called open access archives because of the lack of tolls, fees, or other legal and economic restrictions to access the content they make available, digital repositories provide a

mechanism whereby scholars deposit an electronic copy of their work at the time they submit to journals for publication consideration. Whether scholars can legally do so having transferred copyright, other questions about academic copyrights, and attempts to reconcile copyright policy with electronic technologies for an open scholarly publishing system, have been raised in the contexts of specific nations or a group of countries (Oppenheim, 1996, Mossink, 1999). Scholarly communication is, however, a global enterprise, copyright models for open access have been proposed (Creative Commons, 2005) and global open access archives have been operating in disciplines like high energy physics and computer science for more than a decade now. Librarians have been active in the advocacy of digital repositories as a tool to transform scholarly journal publishing and communication. Yet, by 2002, there were no open access archives for LIS and the overwhelming majority of the ISI-ranked LIS journals were closed.

Making LIS research openly available and closing the gap were among the goals of dLIST, the Digital Library of Information Science and Technology. dLIST was established in 2002 as an OAI-compliant, subject-based, open access archive for the global Library and Information Science research and practice communities (Coleman & Bracke, 2003). LIS scholars were encouraged to participate by depositing digital copies of their scholarly works in dLIST, contributing to an LIS information commons and thereby building a global scholarly communication consortium, albeit loosely concomitant. However, for dLIST to be effective in facilitating the inclusion of peer-reviewed journal literature, the need for a deeper understanding of the self-archiving policies of LIS journals was recognized. The *dLIST* CTA study was undertaken in order to understand LIS publishers' stances as expressed in journal copyrights. The rest of this paper reviews the literature on self-archiving in the context of the Open Access (OA) movement, presents our analysis of ISI-ranked LIS journals (n=52), and discusses the results including their implications for academic authors and the journal publishers.

Literature Review

Self-archiving, whereby an author deposits digital copies of his or her works in a publicly available website, preferably one compliant with the Open Archives Initiative-Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH), is one of two key strategies for reaching the goals of the OA movement – the open availability of the research outputs of a discipline (BOAI, 2002; Eprints, 2005). The other strategy is open access publishing, through electronic journals openly available on the WWW. For Harnad (2004), self-archiving and publishing in open access journals are the “green” and “gold” roads to achieving open access of the refereed, research literature. There are many studies about OA and both components, open access publishing, through open access journals, and open access archiving or self-archiving, wherein authors deposit digital copies of their works for public web access, and the major stakeholders involved (authors and publishers) have been studied. Bailey's Open Access Bibliography (2005) provides a list of research studies and Suber's Open Access News weblog (2005) is an excellent current awareness tool for OA research, irrespective of their publication venue, closed or open.

For academic journal publishing, the Zwole Group (SURF, 2005) has recommended minimal items for agreement and some of these are presented in a modified form below:

1. Parties: who the agreement is between – e.g. author
2. Work: what the agreement refers to – e.g. article
3. Identification of Publication in which the work will be published – e.g. journal
4. Medium in which (a) initial publication and (b) potential future publication is authorized to take place – e.g. Website, print, cd-rom

5. Copyright ownership - Who has title? Form of copyright notice to appear in the publication
6. Rights held by the author include: right to be named as author on the work; educational uses by the author; posting to website - Own site, Institutional site, Public server; and creation of new works based on work such as books, public lectures, etc

The Zwolle Group derives its name from the first conference on copyright ownership in higher education that was held in Zwolle, Netherlands in 2001 and is funded by SURF (Netherlands) and JISC (UK). Their Copyright Management for Scholarship website tries to identify the rights of all stakeholders, universities and publishers besides just authors. Other rights that authors may hold as per copyright law include:

- Reuse and derivatives
- Moral rights - a specific cluster of rights under European law
- Integrity of work – right for the work not to be materially changed without consent
- Distance education at present/future institution
- Payment/other rewards (e.g., royalties) where applicable
- Waiver of author share of any copyright charges – an option for authors in some countries
- Reversion of rights to author (a) if the publication ceases to be commercially available or (b) rights are not used by publisher within specified period. Under US law, although the full term of copyright is now 70 years as in Europe, authors nevertheless have an opportunity to claim back rights 35-40 years after publication.

In the garden of open access Eden, copyright, considered a barrier to self-archiving is somewhat

contradictorily the “non-problem” and the “poisoned apple.” (Harnad, 1999; Eprints, 2005). Copyright should not be a problem because recent estimates reveal that over 90% of scholarly journal publishers in all disciplines allow some form of self-archiving; the majority of academic authors should feel free to self-archive. Yet the greater part of the peer-reviewed literature in many disciplines continues to be toll-gated and unavailable openly since authors feel that having transferred copyright to the publisher they no longer have the right to self-archive. Many studies have thus sought to develop an understanding of the attitudes of both publishers and authors towards self-archiving and copyright. Findings germane to our investigation of the self-archiving policies of publishers of ISI-ranked LIS journals are presented below.

Oppenheim et al (2000) reported on a study of 187 publishers in UK. The majority of them were scholarly journal publishers and corroborated the general view of the publishing industry as a small number of large publishers with a long list of smaller ones. There were three types of publishers, commercial, learned societies, and university presses. “Of the respondents, 70% either agreed or strongly agreed that copyright infringement was a key concern and over 60% of respondents believed that electronic distribution created unknown legal liabilities.” But publishers were aware of their own limitations; that is “fear over copyright implications can often arise as a result of poor education and awareness amongst publishers.” (p. 386). They also saw the need for users to be educated about copyrights.

The UK RoMEO project (August 2002-July 2003) conducted a comprehensive series of studies that examined the intellectual property issues faced by self-archiving academics from a variety of different perspectives – the academics, publishers, CTAs, OAI data and service providers (Gadd et al, 2003a-d; 2004a, 2004b). A summary of their key findings is available (Gadd et al, 2003e). Pertinent results are

summarized.

The RoMEO author survey elicited 542 respondents, of whom 540 were from 57 countries (Gadd et al, 2003a). Keeping in mind that copyright law varies by country and hence in conferring copyright ownership, there was considerable confusion among academics as to who they thought owned copyright; the majority thought they own it. Regardless, 90% still assign copyright in exchange for publication with 50% doing so reluctantly. Of those that retain copyright, the majority signed exclusive license agreements instead, most of which were as restrictive as copyright assignment. These findings led the team to ask what it is about copyright that academics want. They concluded that most academic authors are primarily interested in preserving their moral rather than economic rights, but “are often unaware that copyright, as well as offering protection for moral rights (in some cases) also grants them a series of exclusive “economic” rights to deal with the work, and if these are assigned on an exclusive perpetual basis, they are no better off than if they had assigned copyright itself.” (p. 261)

Eighty publisher CTAs were examined representing all disciplines and top-ranked ISI journals. 90% of them asked for copyright assignment (72 of the 80) but only 45% (36 of the 72) explained why they needed the copyright assignment; to protect against copyright infringement was the most popular reason given (20 of the 36). Of the 72 publishers asking for copyright assignment four also gave authors the alternative option of signing an exclusive license agreement; five of the remaining eight asked for an exclusive license and three asked for a non-exclusive license (Gadd et al, 2003a).

Exclusive licenses are another name for copyright assignment and Gadd et al (2003e) warn academics not to sign exclusive licenses. Although 42.5 % of the publishers allowed self-archiving there was no consensus on the conditions (which version and where) under which it could take place (Gadd et al, 2003d).

There is increasing evidence that the number of publishers who allow self-archiving is rising with the passage of time and as a function of publishers gaining experience with electronic technologies. The ISI study of open access journals by McVeigh (2004) suggests that over 55% of the journals and over 65% of the journal articles, indexed in *Web of Science*, are produced by publishers who allow some form of self-archiving. Rather ironically, the same study also reported that only 239 OA journal titles were indexed in the ISI citation databases representing approximately 2.6% of the nearly 9000 journals in the *Web of Science* and approximately 1% of the 20,000 journals in *ISI Web of Knowledge*.

Given the rise in publisher acceptance of self-archiving and the growing number of digital repositories, researchers have started to turn their attention to the self-archiving behaviors of faculty. In the US, Foster and Gibbons (2005) examined faculty work practices. They gathered observational data that would help them improve the growth of content in their institutional repository at the University of Rochester. Like subject-based or disciplinary archives, institutional repositories (IR) are also OAI-PMH compliant but unlike subject-based repositories, they are not cross-institutional and not all content need be open. Rather, they are restricted to members of the particular institution they serve. That is, only institutional members works can be deposited in IR (Crow, 2003; Lynch, 2003). In an ideal world, cross-institutional disciplinary repositories (also called centralized archives) are clearly better for the development of subject services that can aid, innovate and transform scholarship and research (Lynch 2003; Brogan, 2003). However, IR, after a slow start appear to be a viable and successful if also a controversial strategy for universities to regain control of the content they have traditionally given away to publishers (Kulkarni, 1995; Atkinson, 1996a, 1996b; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997; Agrawal, 2001; McSherry, 2001). Foster and Gibbons found “[f]aculty members think in terms of reading, researching, writing, and disseminating. They think about the specifics of

their research area, whether neutrinos, German film, prosody, or the Congressional Black Caucus. But say "institutional repository" to them, and there is little response.” Although the faculty in the study did not identify with the 'institutional repository' phrase, they cared a great deal about ownership and control of who has access to their intellectual works. Therefore, Foster and Gibbons support the recommendation of Gandel, et al (2004) to use “personal digital libraries or repositories” as the terminology to hook faculty participation in IR.

Swan and Sheridan (2005) conducted one of the largest studies of author self-archiving when they surveyed 1286 authors from many disciplines including LIS, about their open access archiving practices. They define self-archiving as an adjunct, complementary activity to scholarly journal publishing and “[i]n practice, this means depositing the file, which is usually the author’s final version of the article after peer review has been completed, in an open access archive or repository.” (p. 2) However, in the survey instrument they expand it to six ways in which a researcher can provide open access to articles by self archiving. “S/he can deposit a copy of an article on a personal or institutional website, or place it in an institutional open access archive, or put it in a subject based, centralized, open access archive (such as the physics archive, called arXiv, or Cogprints, the cognitive science archive). Articles may be in preprint (prepeer review or pre-refereeing) or postprint (after peer review or refereed) form.” (p. 26). *Where* a work can be self-archived and *which* version of the work can be self-archived are valid and critical variables for a deeper understanding of self-archiving.

The percentage of Library and Information Science self-archivers is as follows (Table 14, p.27) :

31 % self-archive preprint on a web site

32 % self-archive postprint on a web site

21 % self-archive preprint in an institutional archive

20 % self-archive postprint in an institutional archive

10 % self-archive preprint in a subject based archive

16 % self-archive postprint in a subject based archive

This means that approximately 32 % of LIS scholars responding are self-archivers and 68 % are non-archivers compared with 31% % of self-archivers in the total population of authors studied and 69 % of non-archivers. For comparative purposes, the percentages of self-archivers in the Humanities disciplines, who are generally considered to be less accepting of electronic technologies for scholarly communication and publishing are given below.

43 % self-archive preprint on a web site

45 % self-archive postprint on a web site

15 % self-archive preprint in an institutional archive

24 % self-archive postprint in an institutional archive

12 % self-archive preprint in a subject based archive

16 % self-archive postprint in a subject based archive

With regard to copyright, Swan and Brown found that over one quarter of authors responding, all disciplines, did not know who owned copyright. This is a number which rises when permissions and only self archivers are considered; 36% of those who self-archive, again all disciplines, did not know if they needed to ask for copyright permissions before self-archiving (p. 56).

40% of LIS respondents were unaware of self-archiving as an option for open access compared with 71% in all disciplines and 66% in the Humanities (Table 21, p. 43) and LIS archivers, like the majority

of the respondents who self-archived, were also depositing more postprints than preprints (p. 27).

Only 10% of all respondents in the Swan and Brown study (2005) were aware of the RoMEO/SHERPA directories; these are directories which categorize the self-archiving policies of publishers and their journals (SHERPA, 2005).

Research Question

What are publishers' stances towards self-archiving as expressed in their journal copyright transfer agreements?

Methods Used

The Thomson-ISI journals in the *Social Science Citation Index (SSCI)* in the Information Science, Library Science subjects category were selected for analysis (Thomson-Scientific, 2005). Thomson-Scientific, is better known as ISI, and thus we mix and use Thomson-ISI or ISI.

Three people conducted the web searches for the journals, publishers, CTAs, and supplementary documents (for example, copyright policies and manuscript submission guidelines). All three were also engaged in the subsequent analysis; a partial list was first analyzed by a graduate research student who had a law degree and was engaged in LIS graduate study. A larger list of 200 journals, including the 57 ISI-ranked journals, was searched for on the web during two different periods in Spring 2005 and analyzed by a graduate research student in LIS with a doctorate in anthropology. Finally, I re-did anew all the searches and analysis. A fourth person was responsible for design and development of the

dLIST Directory, a web-accessible database that shows the results of our findings for each journal.

Appendix 1 provides a description of the journal record in the *Directory*.

For purposes of the analysis, self-archiving was strictly defined as author deposit of author post print in an OAI-compliant, open access archive. But, as in other studies (Gadd et al, 2003a; Swan and Brown, 2005) varying levels of self-archiving are distinguished based on what version of the author's work (preprint and postprint) was allowed and where (personal or institutional website, institutional repository, and open access archive). This was expanded with a final two categories plus a distinction between institutional repositories and open access archives (an overlapping category). The categories used to indicate the journal's state of self-archiving are:

Author can archive pre-print and post-print;

Author can archive pre-print (i.e. pre-refereeing);

Author can archive post-print (i.e. final draft post-refereeing);

Author can archive in open access archives;

Author can archive in personal/institutional website;

Author can archive in institutional repositories;

Author cannot archive by Publishing rule

Ambiguous classification; (lack of information, contradiction, choice)

Unknown classification (when CTA is not found)

Results

There was a total of 57 journals on the Thomson-ISI list. 2 foreign language titles, the *ASIS monographs series* and two duplicate titles were dropped making the total number of journals available

for analysis 52 (n=52). A complete list of the journals studied can be seen in Table 1 which also shows the number and titles of LIS journals that do or do not make their CTAs available on the web. Table 2 categorizes the types of journal publishers, their names and the number of ISI-ranked LIS journals published by each type of publisher. Here is a quick summary of the findings with regard to self-archiving in CTAs:

- 20 journals make their CTAs publicly available (38%)
 - 2 of the 20 are open access journals;
- 32 journals make no CTA available (62 %);
 - 20 of the 32 are silent about self-archiving
- 1 journal CTA prohibits self archiving by publishing rule;
 - 4 others prohibit via other documents (10%)
- Irrespective of whether the CTA was publicly available or not, it is sometimes supplemented with other documents and it became difficult to limit the analysis to the CTA only;
- Varying levels of self-archiving are allowed;
- Whenever self-archiving is allowed, no matter the level, publishers would like information about copyright ownership and the full citation given.

Table 1: Availability of the CTAs of ISI-ranked LIS journals

Number of ISI-Ranked LIS Journals that have a CTA publicly available on the WWW	Number of ISI-Ranked LIS Journals that do not make their CTA publicly available on the WWW
<p style="text-align: center;">20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-----</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Aslib Proceedings</i> 2. <i>College & Research Libraries</i> 3. <i>Information Research</i> 4. <i>Information Society</i> 5. <i>Information Systems Journal</i> 6. <i>Information Systems Research</i> 7. <i>Information Technology and Libraries</i> 8. <i>Interlending & Document Supply</i> 9. <i>International Journal of Geographical Information Science</i> 10. <i>Journal of Academic Librarianship, The</i> 11. <i>Journal of Documentation</i> 12. <i>Journal of Health Communication</i> 13. <i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology</i> 14. <i>Journal of the Medical Library Association</i> 15. <i>Library Resources & Technical Services</i> 16. <i>MIS Quarterly</i> 17. <i>Online Information Review</i> 18. <i>Program-Electronic Library and Information Systems</i> 19. <i>Reference & User Services Quarterly</i> 20. <i>Scientometrics</i> 	<p style="text-align: center;">32</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-----</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Annual Review of Information Science and Technology</i> 2. <i>Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science</i> 3. <i>Econtent</i> 4. <i>Electronic Library, The</i> 5. <i>Government Information Quarterly (former title: Journal of Government Information)</i> 6. <i>Information Processing & Management</i> 7. <i>International Journal of Information Management</i> 8. <i>Journal of Information Ethics</i> 9. <i>Journal of Information Science</i> 10. <i>Journal of Information Technology</i> 11. <i>Journal of Librarianship and Information Science</i> 12. <i>Journal of Management Information Systems</i> 13. <i>Journal of Scholarly Publishing</i> 14. <i>Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association</i> 15. <i>Knowledge Organization</i> 16. <i>Law Library Journal</i> 17. <i>Libraries and Culture</i> 18. <i>Library and Information Science Research</i> 19. <i>Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services (former title: Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory)</i> 20. <i>Library Journal</i> 21. <i>Library Quarterly</i> 22. <i>Library Trends</i> 23. <i>Libri</i> 24. <i>Online</i> 25. <i>Portal: Libraries and the Academy</i> 26. <i>Proceedings of the ASIST Annual Meeting</i> 27. <i>Research Evaluation</i> 28. <i>Restaurator-International Journal for the Preservation of Library and Archival Material</i> 29. <i>Scientist</i> 30. <i>Social Science Computer Review</i> 31. <i>Social Science Information</i> 32. <i>Telecommunications Policy</i>

Table 2: Number of ISI-ranked journals published different types of publishers

Type of Publisher and their names	Number of LIS Journals
Commercial - Beech Tree, Blackwell, Elsevier, Emerald, Elsevier, Ergon Verlag, John Wiley and Sons, K.G. Saur Verlag, Information Today, Palgrave McFarland, Macmillan, ME Sharpe, Sage, Scientist, Inc., Springer, Taylor & Francis	37 (includes at least 6 journals published on behalf of scholarly societies)
LIS scholarly societies or professional associations - AALL, ALA, ASIS&T, AMIA, CAIS, CILIP, INFORMS, MLA, ISKO	15
University presses - Johns Hopkins, University of Chicago, University of Toronto, University of Minnesota, University of Texas	6 (includes 1 university research center publication)
Individual (T.D. Wilson, <i>Information Research</i>)	1

Only five journals (*Econtent*, *Law Library Journal*, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, *Information Systems Research*, *MIS Quarterly*), the first of which is trade and none of which are truly core LIS (one is legal librarianship, another is medical informatics, and the other two are business/management information systems focused) prohibit deposits in open access archives outright. **The majority of LIS journals are not averse to self-archiving.** To understand how this may be so, Table 3 provides a snapshot view of the self-archiving positions possible and the number of LIS journals that subscribe to them. A fuller discussion also follows dividing the 20 journals into two groups: the first presents the data for five journals that represent open access journals as well as two

ends of the spectrum of self-archiving and the second discusses the rest of the 15 journals in terms of specific ambiguities. Lastly, data collected for the 32 journals with no CTAs are briefly presented.

Table 3. Self-archiving stances expressed in the CTAs (and selected other documents) of ISI-ranked journals

No CTA = Unknown classification	Choice or contradiction = Ambiguous classification	Can archive pre print	Can archive post print	Can archive on personal or institutional website	Can archive in Institutional Repository	Can archive in an Open Access Archive	Cannot archive by publishing rule	Open Access Journal
32	14	47	45*	47	N/A**	39 *	5	2

* Since many journals (20) do not make their CTA or an author-self-archiving policy publicly available the numbers may be inflated; author self-archiving of postprints in open access archives was assumed as allowed by these journals.

** At the time we were planning the study (2004), Elsevier announced a policy of self-archiving of postprints but limiting “publisher's versions” to institutional repositories and so we added this category but it did not prove to be a useful distinction (IR versus subject-based, cross-institutional repositories) with other journals or publishers.

Two journals, *Journal of the Medical Library Association (JMLA)*, published by the Medical Library Association, and *Information Research (IR)* published by an individual, T.D. Wilson, are open access journals and their copyrights allow self-archiving. In both cases, author retains copyright but *JMLA* authors sign a Copyright License Agreement which includes an author's warranty and a Disclosure Statement. The *JMLA* author grants the Medical Library Association exclusive, world-wide first publication rights and other non-exclusive rights; *IR* articles are protected by the Attribution-No Derivatives-Noncommercial use Creative Commons License 1.0. *College & Research Libraries* published by a professional association, the American Library Association's (ALA) division of

Academic and College Research Libraries (ACRL), allows self-archiving as we have defined (see Figure 1). But this is a relatively new move made very recently following an announcement to become an open access journal (ACRL, 2005). At the other end of the spectrum is the *MIS Quarterly*, a university research center publication, which prohibits self-archiving by publisher rule. Similarly, although the CTA itself makes no mention, on a Copyright and Permissions page *Information Systems Research* published by INFORMS, a learned society of about 12,000 professionals and academics in operations research and organizational information systems, adds: “[a]s a further condition of final acceptance of a paper for publication in an INFORMS journal, the author(s) must indicate if their paper is posted on a working paper website, other than their own...Authors may post their working papers on websites after acceptance and prior to publication, as long as the sites are not copyrighted or do not serve as formal depositories.” (INFORMS, 2005)

Figure 1: Journal record for *College & Research Libraries* in the dLIST Directory

Journal: College & Research Libraries

Journal URL: <http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlpubs/crljournal/collegeresearch.htm>

Subject: Library and Information Science

Type: In ISI JCR, In ISI-SSCI

Publisher: Association of College & Research Libraries

Publisher URL: <http://www.acrl.org>

CTA URL: <http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/aboutacrl/resourcesforwork/acrlforms/Agreement-author-retain-copyright-form.pdf>

Date: 02/24/2005

Last Update: 11/10/2005

Special Notes: "In consideration of the Publisher's agreement to publish the Work, Author hereby grants and assigns to Publisher the right to print, publish, reproduce, or distribute the Work throughout the world in all means of expression by any method now known or hereafter developed, including electronic format, and to market or sell the Work or any part of it as it sees fit. Author further grants Publisher the right to use Author's name in association with the Work in published form and in advertising and promotional materials. Copyright of the Work remains in Author's name."

Self-Archiving Status: Author can archive in open access archives

Author can archive pre-print and post-print

Notes: ACRL encourages author self-archiving of its published articles in both institutional and disciplinary repositories." ACRL Press Release revised Nov. 8, 2005. URL: ACRL's "Principles and Strategies for the Reform of Scholarly Communication at:

<http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlpubs/whitepapers/principlesstrategies.htm>.

Color: █

Related Journals: *n/a*

15 journals are ambiguous in their CTA. We defined ambiguity as lack of information about self-archiving in the CTA or the presence of a contradiction or choice. Although these ambiguities can be clarified by considering other supplementary policy documents, especially those outlining manuscript submission instructions, authors may not always do so. Plus it was not always possible to reconcile the contradiction. Despite the ambiguities, it seems clear that all the 20 LIS journals with one possible exceptions allow self-archiving of pre prints and/or post prints in open access archives.

Scientometrics, a Springer publication, offers open choice for which the author pays (see Figure 2).

Asking LIS authors to pay \$3000 per article for open access seems a bit optimistic.

Fig. 2: Journal record for *Scientometrics* in dLIST Journal Directory

Scientometrics: An International Journal for all Quantitative Aspects of the Science of Science, Communication in Science and Science Policy

Journal <http://www.springeronline.com/sgw/cda/frontpage/0;11855;4-40109-70-35622572-0;00.html>

Subject: Library and Information Science

Type: In ISI JCR, In ISI-SSCI

Publisher: Springer

Publisher URL: <http://www.springeronline.com/sgw/cda/frontpage/0;11855;4-0-0-0-0;00.html>

CTA URL: <http://www.springer.com/sgw/cda/frontpage/0,,5-40359-12-161193-0,00.html>

Date: 02/26/2005

Last Update: 10/27/2005

Special Notes: "Springer Open Choice gives you the power to choose how you want your research to be published. As an author-focused publishing company, Springer believes that authors should have the right to determine what publication model best meets their needs. Springer Open Choice is exactly what it says: a choice. If making the published version of your article freely available is an important publication concern for you or your funding agency, then Springer Open Choice is the solution for you. Springer Open Choice makes the final, published version of the article available for free, with open access, directly from SpringerLink, to anyone, anywhere in the world. You still receive all the benefits of publication with Springer (see "Details" for a full listing), including print distribution."

Self-Archiving Status: Ambiguous classification

Notes: No traditional CTA is available on the journal website. Springer offers its authors Open Choice (see above) and the CTA URL points to the Open Choice License and price information is copied below. "Price and Payment Information The basic fee for Springer Open Choice is \$3,000 USD, which can be invoiced in Euros. The order must be placed, and payment received in full (if not ordered by an institution), prior to publication. Springer Open Choice may be ordered directly from SpringerOnline.com, we recommend that the contact author (or his/her institution) place the order. Payment can be made by any party via credit card (recommended, and mandatory for orders from individuals), check, or invoice but may not be split among parties. Invoicing will be done according to the location of the paying party (designated in the "Bill to" section of the Order Form). Customers providing payment from the Americas will be charged in US dollars, and customers providing payment from Europe, Africa, and Asia will be charged in Euros. VAT is not included in the \$3,000 price and will be added, at a standard rate, for customers who receive invoices in Euros."

Color: 
Related Journals: n/a

The six journals published by the commercial publisher Emerald - *Aslib Proceedings*, *The Electronic Library*, *Interlending & Document Supply*, *Journal of Documentation*, *Online Information Review*, and *Program* – are ambiguous because the CTA is called the Journal Article Record. *Information Systems Journal (ISJ)* published by Blackwell is an example of contradictory questionableness. The CTA specifically prohibits the self-archiving of postprints but Blackwell's Self-Archiving web page contradicts this; authors are allowed to self-archive preprints and postprints in OAA but postprints may have an embargo period depending on journal. The *ISJ* CTA mentions no embargo period. See Figure 3.

Fig. 3. Journal record for *Information Systems Journal* in dLIST Directory

Information Systems Journal

Journal URL: <http://disc.brunel.ac.uk/isj/>

Subject: Library and Information Science

Type: In ISI JCR, In ISI-SSCI

Publisher: Blackwell Publishing

Publisher URL: <http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/>

CTA URL: http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/pdf/isj_caf.pdf

Date: 02/25/2005

Last Update: 11/09/2005

Special Notes: "In addition to the rights stated above the author shall retain the following rights: The right, after publication by Blackwell Publishing, to use all or part of the Article and abstract, without revision or modification, in personal compilations or other publications of the author's own works, and to make copies of all or part of such materials for the author's use for lecture or classroom purposes (excluding the preparation of course pack material for onward sale by libraries and institutions), provided that the first page of such use or copy prominently displays the bibliographic data and the following copyright notice: '© [Year] Blackwell Publishing Limited'. (b) Prior to publication, the author may share with colleagues print or electronic 'preprints' of the unpublished Article, in form and content as accepted by Blackwell Publishing for publication in the Journal. Such preprints may be posted as electronic files on the author's own website for personal or professional use, or on the author's internal university, college or corporate networks/intranet, or secure external website at the author's institution, but not for commercial sale or for any systematic external distribution by a third party (e.g. a listserv or database connected to a public access server). Prior to publication, the author must include the following notice on the preprint. 'This is a preprint of an Article accepted for publication in [Journal Title] © [Year] Blackwell Publishing Limited'. (c) After publication of the Article by Blackwell Publishing, the preprint notice shall be amended to read as follows: 'This is an electronic version of an Article published in [include the complete citation information for the final version of the Article as published in the print edition of the Journal]'. The preprint can be replaced with the published version of the Article. Posting of the published Article on any other electronic public server can only be done with written permission from Blackwell Publishing."

Self-Archiving Status: Author can archive in institutional repositories
Author can archive in personal/institutional website
Author can archive pre-print and post-print
Blackwell also has a separate self-archiving page on its website -

Notes: <http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/static/selfarchive.asp>. According to it, 1) Authors are allowed to self-archive preprints and postprints in OAA but 2) postprints may have an embargo period depending on journal.

Color: 
Related Journals: n/a

The three ALA publications - *Information Technology and Libraries*, *Library Resources & Technical Services*, *Reference & User Services Quarterly* – are ambiguous because they give authors the choice of transferring full or limited copyright through 'licenses'. Authors may not know what this means in terms of self-archiving. Conversely, it can also be argued that by allowing authors to retain copyright, since all ALA publications appear to give the author the choice of two licenses for copyright one of which allows them to retain all rights, these journals technically do not prohibit author self-archiving (preprints and postprints) in open access archives.

Three journals published by Taylor & Francis - *Information Society*, *International Journal of Geographic Information Science*, *Journal of Health Communication* - allow self-archiving of post prints in open access archives after an embargo period but this is not clear just from the CTA.

Additional documents about the company's policy on self-archiving have to be consulted. Also, during the early period of the study one of the journals, *Journal of Health Communication*, appeared to invoke the Ingelfinger rule whereby self-archiving on the open web was considered to be a form of publication and the work would not be considered by the journal.

Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology published by a commercial publisher, Wiley, on behalf of a scholarly society, the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIS&T), allows self-archiving of preprints but not for "external systematic distribution." (see Figure 4) Two aspects of the *JASIST* CTA are puzzling; one, granting back 'preprint rights' is questionable (depends on when the CTA is signed) and two, the use of the listserv as one example of the external systematic distribution method by which preprints may not be distributed. Publishers such as Taylor & Francis also include this phrase but appear to view it differently as in the same section they

explicitly allow self-archiving in open access repositories (Taylor & Francis, 2005a; 2005b).

Fig. 4. Journal record for *Journal of Information Science and Technology* in dLIST Directory

Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology

Journal URL: <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/jissue/76504585>

Subject: LIS

Type: In ISI JCR, In ISI-SSCI

Publisher: Wiley (on behalf of ASIS&T)

Publisher URL: <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/>

CTA URL: <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/homepages/76501873/nscta.pdf>

Date: 02/25/2005

Last Update: 10/27/2005

Special Notes: "OTHER RIGHTS OF CONTRIBUTOR Wiley grants back to the Contributor the following: 1. The right to share with colleagues print or electronic "preprints" of the unpublished Contribution, in form and content as accepted by Wiley for publication in the Journal. Such preprints may be posted as electronic files on the Contributor's own website for personal or professional use, or on the Contributor's internal university or corporate networks/intranet, or secure external website at the Contributor's institution, but not for commercial sale or for any systematic external distribution by a third party (e.g., a listserv or database connected to a public access server). Prior to publication, the Contributor must include the following notice on the preprint: "This is a preprint of an article accepted for publication in [Journal title] □ copyright (year) (copyright owner as specified in the Journal)". After publication of the Contribution by Wiley, the preprint notice should be amended to read as follows: "This is a preprint of an article published in [include the complete citation information for the final version of the Contribution as published in the print edition of the Journal]", and should provide an electronic link to the Journal's WWW site, located at the following Wiley URL: <http://www.interscience.Wiley.com/>. The Contributor agrees not to update the preprint or replace it with the published version of the Contribution."

Self-Archiving Status: Ambiguous classification
Author can archive in personal/institutional website
Author can archive pre-print (i.e. pre-refereeing)

Notes: The 'granting back' of preprint rights is questionable – this may depend on when during the article consideration process CTA is signed by author. The interpretation of the "external systematic distribution" varies as some publishers such as Taylor and Francis also use it but don't appear to include institutional or subject repositories therein.

Color: 

Related Journals: n/a

32 journals (68%) make no CTA available; as noted earlier, two types of additional documents, Copyright Policy/FAQ/statements and Manuscript submission instructions/Author Guides were collected when available in order to find out what they might reveal about journal policies towards self-archiving. Majority are silent, some favor self archiving as we have defined it, one at least is misleading, and a couple prohibit.

20 of the 32, that is, 40 % of the total population studied, have no public expressions about self-archiving. They are *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, *Journal of Information Ethics*, *Journal of Information Science*, *Journal of Information Technology*, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, *Knowledge Organization*, *Libraries and Culture*, *Library Journal*, *Library Quarterly*, *Library Trends*, *Online*, *Proceedings of the ASIST Annual Meeting*, *Restaurator*, *Research Evaluation*, *Scientist*, *Social Science Computer Review*, *Social Science Information*. Figure 5 shows the record for *ARIST*.

Fig. 5: Journal record for *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* in dLIST Directory

Annual Review of Information Science and Technology

Journal URL: <http://www.asis.org/Publications/ARIST/NEWARIST/>

Subject: Library and Information Science

Type: In ISI JCR, In ISI-SSCI

Publisher: Information Today, Inc.

Publisher URL: <http://www.infotoday.com/>

CTA URL: <http://www.asis.org/Publications/ARIST/NEWARIST/instruction.html>

Date: 02/24/2005

Last Update: 11/09/2005

Special Notes: *n/a*

Self-Archiving Status: Unknown classification
Author can archive pre-print (i.e. pre-refereeing)

Notes: No CTA is available from the journal or the publisher web page. The CTA URL links to Instructions for Authors.

Color: 

Related Journals: *n/a*

Seven of the journals in this group belong to Elsevier. Elsevier, through a separate web document called the Copyright Policy appears to allow self-archiving of pre and post prints in open access archives for all its journals - *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *Government Information Quarterly* (former title: *Journal of Government Information*), *Library and Information Science Research*,

International Journal of Information Management, Telecommunications Policy, Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services (former title: *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory*), *Information Processing & Management*.

Libri explains that “The submission of the manuscript by the authors means that the authors automatically agree to assign exclusive copyright to K. G. Saur Verlag if the manuscript is accepted for publication.” (*Libri*, n.d.)

Two journals appear to prohibit author self-archiving by publisher rule (*Econtent* and *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association (JAMIA)*), although *JAMIA*, has its own open access preprint server. The final two journals - *Law Library Journal, Portal* - appear to allow self-archiving in open access archives. In the case of *Portal* the specific language used is “the open web.” (Johns Hopkins, 2005). The *Law Library Journal*, published by the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) is slightly more complex; although it appears to prohibit self-archiving by a publishing rule articulated on the Author's Guide (AALL, 2005a), a special Open Access Task Force has been appointed which will make its final report mid-2006 (AALL, 2005b), and at least one member of this committee has been experimenting with self-archiving in the Duke University institutional repository (Danner, 2004).

The *dLIST Journals Directory* (web-accessible database) is meant to be a tangible product of this work along with analysis of non-ISI ranked LIS journals; although they are not legal opinions or analyses, we hope that the learned societies and professional associations who publish journals and LIS journal publishers will consider supporting self-archiving and thereby leading the scholarly communication innovation in a multi and inter disciplinary field like LIS more explicitly. We also plan to encourage

scholars to consult the directory prior to self-archiving in dLIST. Public release of the *dLIST Journals Directory* is expected to be in Spring 2006 after a period of testing.

Discussion

Summarizing, the major findings are: 1) 62%, a majority of ISI-ranked LIS journals do not make their CTAs publicly available, 2) irrespective of the CTA, there is a high level of ambiguity, 67%, on the part of many publishers, most of which is neither negative nor prohibitive towards self-archiving, and 3) 40% are silent about self-archiving. These findings have important ramifications. The lack of a CTA clearly needs a follow-up study, but the high level of ambiguity and silence may mean that publishers and authors are waiting to see what the other party will do; in general, it appears that publishers of all types have not wanted to commit themselves and instead have provided room for authors to negotiate while they themselves gain electronic publishing experience and experiment with Internet technologies and newer business models. What we can reasonably extrapolate is that publishers and authors have at least this much in common: both would like to maximize access, that is both would like the work to be fully available to be largest possible audience.

The road ahead for LIS authors is quite clear. Authors, especially academic authors, who are driven to publish in ISI-ranked journals by tenure considerations can afford to be assertive by doing what OA advocates advise: when a CTA is offered, strike out the no-self-archiving clause should one appear and/or substitute a specific clause that permits self-archiving of author post prints in open access archives. And, when there is no CTA, just self-archive the author post print in an open access archive. According to US Copyright Law “A transfer of copyright ownership, other than by operation of law, is not valid unless an instrument of conveyance, or a note or memorandum of the transfer, is in writing

and signed by the owner of the rights conveyed or such owner's duly authorized agent." (US Copyright Office). Copyright transfer is not a legal requirement for publishing; publishers can publish without requiring and requesting copyright and when they do so, authors can also do what they want with the work such as self-archiving.

What is less clear is why professional associations and learned societies in North America, four of the five are ISI-ranked journal publishers – *AALL*, *ALA*, *ASIS&T*, and *CAIS* – have remained silent for so long and what they should do now. The fifth, the Medical Library Association, signaled early and clearly; their ISI-ranked journal, *Journal of the American Library Association*, formerly *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, went open in 2001/2002, and all back issues are openly available from 1911 onwards (Plutchak, 2005). From postings on electronic discussion lists, blogs, and other anecdotal evidence we know that ALA committees in ACRL and LITA, for example, have been discussing opening access to their publications. ALA-ACRL only recently announced that *College & Research Libraries* would become an open access journal after an embargo period but that authors could always self-archive pre prints and postprints in open access archives immediately (English, 2005). Although ASIS&T is not considered a major association (in terms of size and in comparison with the ALA, for example) its publications, many of which are ISI-ranked, are considered the most prestigious by LIS academic authors. Importantly, the society successfully represents the multi-disciplinary and cognate Information Sciences. There is a leadership opportunity for ASIS&T to shape the future of the field's scholarly journal publishing in the digital scholarly communication environment.

In discussing the future of scholarly journal publishing, Oppenheim et al (2000, p. 391) noted that at least three factors offer unique opportunities for not-for-profits to change the commercial journal

publishing model. These are the tensions between academics who would like to resist Internet commercialization and the giving away of their data, publishers who want to continue the traditional print journal model onto the electronic world, and librarians who are unable to purchase all the information that is being published in journals. They also highlighted the need for customized search engines, warned of the rise of commercial brands that would breed virtual communities, and called for a special committee to work on copyright that would consider all stakeholder needs. Five years later, we have Scopus and SpringerLink from the commercial publishing giants Elsevier and Springer respectively for all scientific communities, and INFORMS and IT Info Central who are trying to serve various Information Systems communities (Scopus, 2005; SpringerLink, 2005; INFORMS Online, 2005, ITI Info Central, 2005). Scopus is global, covers all disciplines (14, 200 titles representing 4000 international publishers), and includes the scholarship of selected open access archives. Elsevier also makes Scirus “the most comprehensive science-specific search engine on the Internet” openly available (Scirus, 2005). EBSCOHost's 2005 Christmas gift to librarians was the *Library and Information Science and Technology Abstracts (LISTA)* database, an abstracting and indexing database similar to *Library Literature* and *Library and Information Science Abstracts*. *LISTA* (2005) is an open access database portending comparable commercial disciplinary services for the LIS communities. Nevertheless, open access to the full-text of LIS refereed research remains elusive, if only because it is multi-disciplinary and interdisciplinary. The multi-disciplinary and interdisciplinary nature of LIS research also means that our OA will need to be pursued strategically. This could be done by building an information commons for LIS that draws from scholarship-friendly publishing practice (ALPSP, 2004). These principles allow an author to retain rights that are important to them such as reuse and open access and distribution of preprints. The LIS commons thus built may improve public perceptions of the research in the field and also help achieve improvements and economies of scale in our scholarly communication system. Coleman and Roback (2005) have proposed open access

federation for LIS, based on digital library aggregation services as a strategy and starting point for accomplishing these goals. Focusing my attention on academic research I offer the following recommendations:

- 1) Academic LIS scholars must continue to publish in ranked ISI journals but must also consciously adopt and deliberately pursue the complementary strategy of self-archiving in an OAI-compliant open access archive. They should also use digital repositories as personal digital libraries.
- 2) A scholarly communication consortium, is needed wherein journal publishers, of all types, work with OAI data and service providers to develop robust, value added subject aggregation services towards building the information commons for LIS. This is a leadership opportunity for the scholarly societies in the LIS professions and disciplines.

Bibliometrics provides the underlying explanatory theory for the prescriptive nature of the recommendations above. In 1989 Wallace pointed out bibliometrics and citation analysis could be useful for accomplishing a “major goal of information science” by “expanding understanding of the ways in which information resources are produced and used, and the ways in which production and use differ among different groups of people.” (Wallace, 1989, p. 26). In the 1980s citation studies showed us that the scholarly communication system was a much more loosely coupled one than envisioned. Starting in the 1990s and more so in recent years we are discovering that the system is also becoming unsustainable, in terms of economics, preservation, and information overload. All of these factors apply to the LIS scholarly communication sub-system too. 72% of LIS publications are uncited and although uncitedness does not equal lack of value or use it contributes to the image of LIS as a fragmented discipline (Schwartz, 1997). Schmidle and Via (2004) have documented the serials price increases in

LIS, and Davis (2005) has provided evidence of article duplication in LIS journals including ISI-ranked ones. Finally, Mary Munroe's web site (2005), commissioned by the Association of Research Libraries and the Information Access Alliance (2005), a group that seeks to apply anti-trust laws to mergers in academic publishing, shows fascinating timelines and stories of merger and acquisition in the academic publishing industry. Of the twelve large commercial publishers Munroe traces, many of the commercial ISI-ranked LIS journal publishers are represented: Blackwell, John Wiley and Sons, Reed Elsevier, Springer Science, Taylor & Francis, Thomson, Wolters Kluwer, and Verlagsgruppe George von Holtzbrinck GmbH. All this argues for careful, coordinated experimentation in LIS scholarly journal publishing.

Conclusion

Copyright and open access can co-exist. The findings tend to confirm this. The majority of the ISI-ranked LIS journals (90%) do not prohibit self-archiving defined in any way. Of the journals with CTAs (38%), the majority do not prohibit self-archiving as defined for the study: the practice of depositing author postprints in an OAI-compliant open access archive. Even among the 62%, the 32 journals that do not make CTAs publicly available, the majority of the 12 that discuss self-archiving have positive policies encouraging self-archiving. Publishers, it appears, have gained confidence with Internet and electronic publishing. When the preprint or postprint is self-archived publishers would like pointers to the journal home page and full citation after publication or the DOI (document object identifier) link. Authors should be emboldened that very few journals impose embargoes or prohibit self-archiving outright.

Only 52 ISI-ranked journals were investigated in the study. A search using DE=Library and

Information Sciences in *Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory 2005/2007* retrieved 3191 records of which 2809 journals are in English. It would therefore be fruitful to examine a random sample of the larger population of LIS journals to identify their copyright status and self-archiving policies. Does the high level of ambiguity and lack of CTAs continue to hold across the discipline? A follow-up publisher survey of all the ISI-ranked LIS journals, but especially the 32 that have no public CTA, will shed new light and is advisable, if not required. Copyright law is also national rather than international and this is another area for future investigations. How does the country of publication influence the copyright and self-archiving policies of journals? Other conceptual and empirical research may also be used to identify ways in which digital repositories can be better used to correct present imbalances and flaws for a transparent scholarly communication system; for example, the well-known ArXiv is not just an open access archive, rather it utilizes online peer review before accepting deposits. They can also investigate the influence of extensive article duplication and open access availability on impact factors and use, discover applications of bibliometric laws such as Bradford's distribution and obsolescence to the growth and use of open access archives, and undertake rigorous modeling and scenario planning for disciplinary scholarly communication. For example, what is the optimal size and nature of a scholarly communication system distinct from a scholarly publishing one for a multi-discipline such as LIS? Finally, a re-evaluation of the ISI-ranked journals in the LIS category is overdue. In pragmatic terms, the findings, I hope, send an unequivocal message to our societies, the journals, and the research communities. Authors and communities should adopt self-archiving. Journal editors and publishers must continue to make the scholarly journal publishing process more transparent in terms of copyright, explicitly encouraging authors reuse and distribution rights, and facilitating the most liberal interpretation of the fair use principle. They must also follow the dissemination principles recommended by the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers for scholarship-friendly journal publishing practice (ALPSP, 2004). The field must engage in coordinated

experimentation for the development of subject-based, federated, digital library/repository services, an LIS commons. In the process of its development and use we may also trigger more innovative, globally equitable, transparent, and sustainable models for LIS scholarly publishing and communication than the systems we now have in place.

Acknowledgments:

Thanks to William Hornbaker, the first DLIST Intellectual Property Intern who explored LIS journals and their CTAs in Spring 2003. Subsequent work done and discussions with Cheryl Malone, Jingfeng Xia, Paul Bracke, Shawn Nelson, and David Lehmann are also gratefully acknowledged. I am thankful to Don Kraft for his insightful questions about an early draft and encouragement to write it as a research paper. A discussion with Raym Crow reinforced the idea of LIS commons. Thanks to Danny Wallace, a graciously prompt and careful mentor, and to Alma Swan for quick clarifications. Thanks to Joseph Roback for the development of the *dLIST Directory* as a web accessible database.

References

AALL (2005a). Law library journal's author's guide. URL:

http://www.aallnet.org/products/lj_authors_guide.asp

AALL (2005b). Open access task force URL:

http://www.aallnet.org/committee/open_access_task.asp

ACRL. (2005). Open access comes to C&RL. <http://acrblog.org/2005/11/10/open-access-comes-to-crl/>

Agrawal, A. (2001). University to industry knowledge transfer: literature review and unanswered questions. *International Journal of Management*

ALPSP. (2004). ALPSP principles of scholarship-friendly journal publishing practice. Available online: <http://www.alpsp.org/2004pdfs/SFpub210104.pdf>

Atkinson, R. C. (1996a). Universities and the knowledge-based economy.

Available online: <http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/pres/comments/senate.html>

Atkinson, R.C. (1996b). The California solution.

Available online: <http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/pres/comments/science.html>

Bachrach, S., et al. (1998). Who owns scientific work? *Science* 281 (5382): 1451. Retrieved from

EBSCOHOST (subscription database).

Bailey, C. (2005). Open access bibliography: Liberating scholarly literature with e-prints and open access journals. Washington D.C., Association for Research Libraries. Also available online.

<http://www.escholarlypub.com/oab/oab.pdf>

Biagioli, M. (1998). The Instability of Authorship: Credit and Responsibility in Contemporary Biomedicine. *The FASEB Journal* 12 (January): 3-16.

BOAI (2002). Budapest open access initiative. <http://www.soros.org/openaccess/>

Boyle, J. (1992). A Theory of law and information: Copyright, spleens, blackmail, and insider trading. *California Law Review*, 80: 1413 - Retrieved from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, Law Reviews (subscription database).

Boyle, J. (1997). A Politics of intellectual property: Environmentalism for the Net. *Duke Law Journal* 47: 87-. Retrieved from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, Law Reviews (subscription database).

Brogan, M. L. (2003). A Survey of digital library aggregation services. Washington D.C.: Digital Library Federation. <http://www.diglib.org/pubs/brogan/brogan2003.pdf>.

Coleman, A. and Bracke, P. (2003). DLIST: Building an international scholarly communication consortium for Library and Information Science, pp. 311-332. In *Mapping technology on libraries and*

people: Papers presented at the First International CALIBER – 2003 (Ahmedabad, 13-15 February).

Editor-in-chief: T.A.V. Murthy. New Delhi, India, Information and Library Network Centre.

Coleman, A. and Roback, J. (2005). Open access federation for Library and Information Science: dLIST and DL-Harvest. D-Lib Magazine 11 (12) December.

<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/december05/coleman/12coleman.html>

Coleman, A. Malone, C.K. Xia, J., and Nelson, S. (2005). Copyright transfer agreements in an interdisciplinary repository. Poster presented at the ALISE Annual Conference, Jan 2005, Boston, MA.

<http://dlist.sir.arizona.edu/912/>

Creative Commons. (2005). <http://www.creativecommons.org/>

Crow, Raym. (2003). The Case for institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper.

<http://www.arl.org/sparc/IR/ir.html>.

Danner, Richard. (2005). Issues in the preservation of born-digital scholarly communications in law.

<http://eprints.law.duke.edu/archive/00000878/>

Davis, P. (2005). The Ethics of republishing: A Case study of Emerald/MCB university press journals. *Library Resources and Technical Services* 49 (2), April: 72-78.

English, R. (2005). Email communication on Scholcom-listserv, November.

Eprints. (2005). Self-archiving FAQ. URL: <http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/self-faq/>

Etzkowitz, H. and Leydesdorff, L. Editors. (1997). Universities and the global knowledge economy: A triple helix of university-industry-government relations. London: Pinter.

Foster, N.F., and Gibbons, S. (2005). Understanding Faculty to Improve Content Recruitment for Institutional Repositories. *D-Lib Magazine* 11 (1) January.
<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january05/foster/01foster.html>

Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., and Proberts, S. (2003a). "RoMEO Studies 1: The impact of copyright ownership on academic author self-archiving." *Journal of Documentation* 59(3): 243-277.

Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., and S. Proberts, S. (2003b). "RoMEO Studies 2: How academics want to protect their open-access research papers." *Journal of Information Science* 29(5): 333-356.

Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., and Proberts, S (2003c). "RoMEO Studies 3: How academics expect to use open-access research papers." *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science* 35(3): 171-187.

Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., and Proberts, S. (2003d). "RoMEO Studies 4: The author-publisher bargain: an analysis of journal publisher copyright transfer agreements." *Learned Publishing* 16(4): 293-308.

Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., and Proberts, S. (2003e). The Intellectual Property Rights Issues Facing Self-archiving: Key Findings of the RoMEO Project.

<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september03/gadd/09gadd.html>

Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., and Proberts, S. (2004a). "RoMEO Studies 5: The IPR issues facing OAI Data and Service Providers." *Electronic Library* 22 (2): 121-138.

Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., and Proberts, S. (2004b). "RoMEO Studies 6: Rights metadata for Open Archiving - the RoMEO Solutions." *Program* 3 (1): 5-14.

Gandel, P., Katz, R., and Metros, S. (2004). The "Weariness of the Flesh": Reflections on the life of the mind in an era of abundance. *EDUCAUSE Review* 39 (2), March/April: 40-51.

Ginsberg, J. C. (1990). Creation and commercial value: Copyright of works of information. *Columbia Law Review*, 90: 1865-. Retrieved from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, Law Reviews (subscription database).

Harnad, S. (1999). Re: The Copyright non-problem and self-archiving.

<http://www.ecs.soton.ac.uk/~harnad/Hypermail/Amsci/3841.html>

Harnad, S, Brody, T., Vallieres, F., Carr, L., Hitchcock, S., Gingras, Y., Oppenheim, C.,

Stamerjohanns, H. and Hilf, E. (2004). The green and the gold roads to Open Access. *Nature Web Focus*. <http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/9940/>

Information Access Alliance. (2005). <http://www.informationaccess.org/>

INFORMS (2005). Copyrights and Permissions. <http://isr.pubs.informs.org/copyrights.htm>

ITI Info Central. (2005). <http://www.iti-infocentral.com/>

Johns Hopkins. (2005). portal: Libraries and the Academy: Guidelines for contributors.

http://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/guidelines.html

Kulkarni, S. R. (1995). All Professors Create Equally: Why Faculty Should Have Complete Control over the Intellectual Property Rights in Their Creations. *Hastings Law Journal*, 47: 221- . Retrieved from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, Law Reviews (subscription database).

Libri. [n.d.] Libri: Instructions to authors. <http://www.librijournal.org/authorinst.html>

LISTA. (2005). <http://www.lisresearch.com/>

Litman, J. (1991). Copyright as Myth. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review*, 53: 235-. Retrieved from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, Law Reviews (subscription database).

Lynch, Clifford. (2003). Institutional Repositories: Essential infrastructure for scholarship in the digital age. *ARL Bimonthly Report* 226: February. <http://www.arl.org/newsltr/226/ir.html>.

McSherry, C. (2001) Who owns academic work? Battling for control of intellectual property.

Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

McVeigh, M. (2004). Open access journals in the ISI Citation Databases: Analysis of impact factors and citation patterns. <http://www.isinet.com/media/presentrep/essayspdf/openaccesscitations2.pdf>

Mossink, W. (1999). Copyright Policy for universities: A proposal from the SURF Foundation for a joint copyright policy for the Dutch universities. The Netherlands, SURF Foundation /IWI and Open Universiteit Nederland. URL:
<http://www.surf.nl/en/download/iwi%20auteursrechten%20UK%20def.pdf>.

Munroe, M. (2005). The Academic publishing industry: A story of merger and acquisition.
URL: <http://www.niulib.niu.edu/publishers/>

Oppenheim, C. (1996). Copyright in HEIs: a discussion paper. Strathclyde, Department of Information Science. URL: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/pub/copyright/charles1.htm> (this paper is no longer available on the JISC site and must be retrieved using the Internet Archive: <http://www.archive.org/>

Oppenheim, C., Greenlagh, C. and Rowland, F. (2000). The Future of scholarly publishing. *Journal of Documentation*, 56 (4), July: 361-398.

Plutchak, S. (2005). The Impact of open access. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 93 (4): 419-421. <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1250314>.

Reichmann, J.H. (1993). Charting the collapse of the patent-copyright dichotomy: Premises for a restructured international intellectual property system. *Cardoza Arts and Entertainment Law Journal*

13: 475- Retrieved from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, Law Reviews (subscription database).

Schmidle, D. J. and Via, B. (2004). Physician heal thyself: The Library and Information Science serials crisis. *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 4 (2), April: 167-203.

Schwartz, C. A. (1997). The Rise and fall of uncitedness. *College and Research Libraries*

Scirus. (2005). <http://www.scirus.com/>

Scopus. (2005). <http://www.scopus.com/>

SHERPA. (2005) Publisher copyright policies and self-archiving: the RoMEO/SHEPA list.

<http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php>

Springer Link. (2005) <http://www.springerlink.com/>

Suber, Peter. (2005). Open access news: News from the open access movement.

<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/fosblog.html>

SURF. (2005). Copyright management for scholarship. URL:

<http://www.surf.nl/copyright/keyissues/scholarlycommunication/agreements.php>

Swan, A., and Brown, S. (2005). Open access self-archiving: an author study. Technical Report.

UK: JISC. URL: <http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/10999/>

Taylor & Francis. (2005a). Taylor & Francis's position on Copyright and Author Rights. URL:

<http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authorrights.pdf>

Taylor & Francis. (2005b). Copyright FAQ. URL: <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/copyright.asp>

Thomson Scientific (2005). ISI Master journal list. <http://scientific.thomson.com/mjl/>

Trosow, S. E. (2003). The Illusive Search for Justificatory Theories: Copyright, Commodification and Capital. *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence* 16 (2): 217-241.

U.S. Copyright Office. (2005). Copyright Law of the United States of America and Related Laws Contained in Title 17 of the *United States Code*: Circular 92; Chapter 2 Copyright Ownership and Transfer. <http://www.copyright.gov/title17/92chap2.html#204>

Wallace, D. P. (1989). Bibliometrics and citation analysis. In Olsgaard, J. Editor. Principles and applications of information science for library professionals. Chicago: ALA. (p. 10-26)

Appendix 1: Codes and Analysis of CTAs

Each journal record (which is the result of the analysis) provides the following information:

Title of the journal

Journal URL

Subject: Currently most are categorized as LIS or IS (Information Systems)

Type: This indicates whether the journal is indexed in ISI-SSCI, ISI-JCR, and DOAJ

Publisher

Publisher URL

CTA URL

Date: this is the first date the journal CTA was analyzed

Update: the most recent date the journal CTA has been examined

Special Notes: Includes restrictions and conditions as found in the CTA, when available and usually directly copied

Self-Archiving Status: This indicates what version of the paper the author can archive and where he can archive it; There are 6 options:

Author can archive preprint and postprint;

Author can archive preprint (i.e. pre-refereeing);

Author can archive postprint (i.e. final draft post-refereeing);

Author can archive in open access archives;

Author can archive in personal/institutional website;

Author can archive in institutional repositories;

Author cannot archive by Publishing rule

Ambiguous classification; (if there is any contradiction or choice)

Unknown classification (when CTA is not found)

Notes: Relevant notes about the journal or the CTA or self-archiving status are recorded here.

Color: The color code is a shortcut to information about what version of a research paper that has been submitted for journal publication can be archived where as per the CTA.

Pale green means that the preprint can be archived in an open access archive;

Bright green means that the journal permits postprint to be posted but only on author/institutional websites.

Dark green means that the postprint can be posted in an open access archive.

Yellow (gold) means that the journal is an open access journal.

White (blank) means that no version can be archived anywhere on the web

Related Journals: this is used to link journal titles with changes