

JISC Gold Open Access project Stakeholder Analysis (Deliverable D2)

On behalf of

Seb Schmoller

David Jennings, DJ Alchemi Ltd

Caroline Sutton, Co-action

Nicky Ferguson, Clax Ltd

Lead partner –

Association for Learning Technology (ALT)

Version	Date	Author	Notes
1.0	2012-09-23	Caroline Sutton	For review
2.0	2012-10-19	Caroline Sutton	Revised following review, edits marked in red text
2.1	2012-10-23	Caroline Sutton	Revised and formatted by Nicky Ferguson

Notes:

- This document is an interim deliverable for the Gold Open Access project (http://www.alt.ac.uk/Gold_Open_Access) conducted by ALT between August 2012 and early 2013, commissioned by the Open Access Implementation Group (<http://open-access.org.uk>)
- This is an analysis of the stakeholders in the process of a scholarly society considering moving a journal to Open Access. (It is not a general overview of all stakeholders in Open Access).
- This document may be downloaded from the ALT Repository at <http://repository.alt.ac.uk/id/eprint/2238>
- The document is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution licence <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/uk/>

Stakeholder	Interest/Motivation	How can they have an impact on process/ assessment?	How critical to process / level of decision making authority
Individuals			
Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholastic prestige • Reputation • Advancement of field • Expectation for something in return for membership dues paid, e.g. journal(s); conference(s); access to research grants, awards; professional development (webinars etc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers can play several roles in this process. They may be members of a society, authors, members of a board, part of a publications committee, etc. In relation to which roles they play, their impact can vary. • Need to balance possible multiple roles in process of assessing OA. 	Variable
Within Societies			
Paid Executives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicates the society's cause/mission. • Represents the society in various forums. • Desire to do a good job. • In some cases focused on keeping the society afloat financially. In other cases may not have a full picture of the society's financial position. • Where journal represents important source of revenue, will consider journal strategically within overall business model. • Concerned with the future existence of society, its role in the scholarly community, and how the journal relates to this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must have buy in to the idea. Enthusiasm or reluctance can spill over to board or members. • May be the person to do the leg work in an assessment of options. • May negotiate publishing contract. • Personal views can have an impact on judgment or objectivity, though not necessarily. • Overall decision making authority in relation to adopting an OA policy or transitioning a journal to OA will vary from society to society. 	High
Other staff	Similar to above	Similar to above	Medium
Board members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for sustainability and successful achievement of society's mission and aims. • Responsible for financial health of organisation. • Where journal represents important source of revenue, will consider journal strategically within overall business model. • Concerned with the future existence of society, its role, and how the journal relates to this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will in most cases make the final decision to transition or not. • Decision (either way) must be justified to the members, with solid argumentation. • Must take responsibility for financial impact of any decision. 	High

Stakeholder	Interest/Motivation	How can they have an impact on process/ assessment?	How critical to process / level of decision making authority
Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scholastic prestige Reputation Advancement of field High impact Expectation for something in return for membership dues paid, e.g. journal(s); conference(s); access to research grants, awards; professional development (webinars etc) Meet colleagues physically at meetings – national and international Possibility of advancement to Board member May be OA advocates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members must feel comfortable with either solution. Can leave society if in doubt, or if feel dues are spent inappropriately. Can initiate interest in open access, and exert pressure upon board and/or publications committee to consider a transition. New board can be elected if majority opinion against decision, though typically publishing is only one aspect of the society's work, and board elections may be on long and/or phased timetable. May regard print subscription to society journal as a major membership benefit, which may be lost if a move to OA also involves move to online-only. However, a new benefit such as a reduced fee (or no fee) could likewise serve as a benefit. 	Medium-High
Publications Committee (or equivalent)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charged with the success and sustainability of society's journal(s). May not be wholly appraised of financial situation of society. Where journal represents important source of revenue, will consider journal strategically within overall business model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In most cases (?), PC must recommend decision, must justify to board and members. May be the initiator of an assessment process re. OA. May carry out the assessment. May negotiate publishing contract on behalf of society. Personal views can have an impact on judgment or objectivity, though not necessarily. Overall decision making authority in relation to adopting an OA policy or transitioning a journal to OA will vary from society to society, e.g. in relation to whether journal is a core or peripheral activity for society. 	High
Subscribers			
Individual	Access to literature.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to be pleased with transition to open access, as this involves open access. May choose to terminate an optional print subscription if journal moves to OA, which in turn may have an impact on society's/ journal's financial status. 	Low
Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Membership benefit Access to literature Prestige, associated with society and journal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subscription may be a 'member benefit' that will need to be addressed with a transition to OA. Members vary in their opinions of how important such a benefit is. In the event of the transition, should support the idea that member fees or other society income is directed to the journal (in the case of a journal that will not operate an APC-model). 	Medium

Stakeholder	Interest/Motivation	How can they have an impact on process/ assessment?	How critical to process / level of decision making authority
Institutional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide researchers and students with access to necessary literature • Meet budget restrictions • Need/interest in archiving content • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely to be highly supportive of transition to OA. • Library or institution may choose to cancel a print subscription to content if an OA version is available, with potential financial implications for journal/society. • Institutions (former subscribers) may or may not make funds available to cover OA charges. 	Low/Medium
Current Publisher			
Prof. publ with an OA program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire to retain publishing contract with society. • Desire to recover costs of publishing journal and generate profit. • General considerations in relation to signal effects of introducing an OA program, OA in a specific subject area or for a specific journal. • Desire to maintain and even grow current submission levels. • Desire to maintain quality of submissions and even improve this. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publisher's willingness to discuss an open access solution constructively and openly may have an impact upon society's choice and decision. • Publisher's experience with managing open access publishing portfolio will have an impact upon level of knowledge in such discussions. • At the end of the day the society will decide, but publisher can be supportive or non-supportive. 	Medium
Prof. publ without an OA program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire to retain publishing contract with society. • Desire to recover costs of publishing journal and generate profit. • General considerations in relation to signal effects of introducing an OA program, OA in a specific subject area or • General considerations in relation to future of company more generally and how OA may/will impact the company financially. • Desire to maintain and even grow current submission levels. • Desire to maintain quality of submissions and even improve this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be unwilling to discuss OA solution due to lack of experience/knowledge. • Reluctance adds layer of complexity to OA transition, as society will need to move to new publishing house. • If society chooses to move to an OA solution, this will also entail a move in publisher, and with it the need to consider different options, and negotiate final contract, etc. • A move in publisher provides an opportunity to renegotiate a contract and in some cases could lead to a reduced price compared to what a society currently pays for member subscriptions. • The entrance of Open Access Key (see below) may make it easier for this group of publishers to consider introducing a gold OA program. 	Medium
Self-published by society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment status • May have invested time in building up the journal and are concerned about momentum being maintained. • General considerations in relation to future of society and journal generally and how OA may/will impact the society/journal financially. • Desire to maintain and even grow current submission levels. • Desire to maintain quality of submissions and even improve this. • Those managing the publication of the journal are ambassadors for the journal and by extension the society. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The move to OA can affect workloads and possibly jobs (e.g. if subscriptions no longer sold). Also requires technical adjustments to platform to accommodate open access. • Shift in workloads can provide space for staff to work on other activities. • At the end of the day the publications committee or board will decide, but staff on journal can be influential in swaying opinion. • Enthusiasm or reluctance can spill over onto editorial team and authors. 	Medium

Stakeholder	Interest/Motivation	How can they have an impact on process/ assessment?	How critical to process / level of decision making authority
Journal-related			
Editor-in-Chief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reputation • “Face” of the journal • Small financial interest (if receive stipend) • Ambassador (intellectual guarantor) of the journal • Interest in strong submission levels to journal • Interest in journal's strong reputation. • Likely interested in journal's impact factor. • Likely to be nervous about having to get to grips with new processes and systems • Possibly concerned not to have their voluntary efforts exploited commercially. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the face of the journal, how the Editor-in-Chief speaks about a transition or remaining with a subscription model will have an impact on the views of others. • Editor-in-chief is on the front lines and in direct contact with publishing authors. • Critical that the Editor-in-chief supports the transition to OA and other changes related to the transition (i.e. if a move in publisher becomes necessary), or choice to remain TA. • Some Editors-in-chief may be the driving force in raising the issue of transitioning the journal to OA and to pushing this forward with society. 	High
Subject or other editors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reputation • Ambassadors for the journal • Lend name and reputation to journal • Interest in strong submission levels • Career development • Possibly concerned not to have their voluntary efforts exploited commercially. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to the Editor-in-chief, the messaging about the journal's business model or status as OA or TA will impact others' views. • Like Editor-in-chief, are on the front lines and in direct contact with publishing authors. • In some cases pressure to consider or transition to OA can come from the subject or other editors. 	High
Editorial Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ambassadors for the journal • Lend prestige to journal and vice versa • Career development • Probably diverse in views, depending to some extent on their field • Probably indifferent to business planning matters Possibly concerned not to have their voluntary efforts exploited commercially. 	Similar to above.	Medium/High
Reviewers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editorial quality • Reputation of field • Possibly concerned not to have their voluntary efforts exploited commercially. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With a possible move to an OA publishing model, reviewers must feel secure that editorial quality has been maintained. Current lack of knowledge or negative information about some OA publishers might cast doubts. These need to be addressed in the case of a transition. • Alternatively, some researchers might feel more inclined to review if they are avid supporters of OA, or have had positive experiences of publishing with other OA journals. 	Medium

Stakeholder	Interest/Motivation	How can they have an impact on process/ assessment?	How critical to process / level of decision making authority
Authors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV value of publication (Prestige of journal, possibly represented by impact factor (and/or other indexing) • Dissemination/readership • Rapid publication process • Quality of review • Rejection risk • Technical features of journal • Author charges, and whether they have access to funds to cover these. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willingness/ability to pay APCs, where these are applied, can impact the submission levels to the journal if these are weighted heavily in overall selection criteria. • In some cases an OA status and perceived benefits can override other journal features. • May be reluctant/unable to publish with a gold OA journal that levies an APC if they are outside of an institution with funds, or without grant funding, etc. It is likely that researchers in the social sciences and humanities may be especially vulnerable to this situation, as well as some other fields. 	Medium
Readers (see also subscribers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy access to literature at lowest possible cost. • Access to trustworthy literature. • Ease of sharing and dissemination 	Same as individual subscribers above.	Low
Funding Bodies			
EC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire to achieve maximum impact in relation to money spent to fund research. • Desire to support SMEs and those outside the “academic access cloud” (including public bodies) through access to research literature. • Interest in achieving the “Fifth freedom”, (free movement of knowledge) by improving “working conditions for researchers and increase knowledge transfer between universities and business as a way to reverse the ‘brain drain’ of European talent” • Economic development of the EU through developing a knowledge economy, supported by OA. • Currently argue that OA supports innovation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EC and other funders can influence decisions indirectly through policies and by making funds available to cover OA charges. • The EC can also put pressure on Member States to adopt policies or to work towards goals set by the EC. 	Medium
Wellcome Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the Wellcome Trust website: “It is a fundamental part of our charitable mission to ensure that the work we fund can be read and utilised by the widest possible audience. We therefore support unrestricted access to the published outputs of research through our open access policy.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like EC, can influence decisions indirectly through policies and by making funds available to cover OA charges. • Wellcome Trust’s position as largest funder of medical research puts it in a stronger position to influence society actions than the EC. • Action to launch an OA journal together with two other funders directly influences society journals in the biomedical fields. • Recent action to write to publishers and monitoring of compliance among researchers, further strengthens impact. • Policies support OA publishing but also OA choice (hybrid) journals. • Policies provide authors with possibility to choose green when gold is not available. 	Medium/High

Stakeholder	Interest/Motivation	How can they have an impact on process/ assessment?	How critical to process / level of decision making authority
RCUK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To expand access to results of publicly funded research. Rigorous quality assurance. Efficient & cost effectiveness Long-term preservation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy supports both OA publishing as well as offering OA choice. Policy provides for the costs of OA publishing. 	Same as above
Other stakeholders			
Libraries - Acquisitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide researchers and students at institute with the greatest possible access to literature at the lowest price. Subscriptions do create jobs on the library side, and at a higher level, acquisitions officers, for example, may be fearful for their jobs. Managing OA fees entails new activities and work, which is often placed within the library. Managing budgetary pressures, particularly in cases where libraries are expected to use existing budgets to cover subscriptions costs as well as APC charges. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In their current roles, librarians are in direct contact with researchers and can make recommendations for publishing or not in different outlets. Librarians can indirectly impact researchers through advocacy work and information sharing. Librarians may be a driving force on campuses to establish OA funds. 	Medium
Central Funds Managers (may be librarians)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assist researchers in covering fees in quality journals within budgetary limitations. To avoid unnecessary bureaucracy or administration in the management of funds and fees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds managers are gatekeepers to funding, willingness to cover fees in different areas can encourage or discourage societies to transition journals. Face challenges in establishing administration around APC charges. May find it easier to establish funds and support gold OA with the entrance of Open Access Key (OAK) to marketplace. An indirect impact on the decision making of societies in relation to adopting green or gold OA policies. 	Medium
Repository Managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need/interest in populating institutional repository. Desire to profile the institution's research outputs. Desire to reduce bureaucracy and administration. As much standardization across publishers as possible in relation to self-archiving policies. Budgetary constraints. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely support gold and green OA. Gold OA, if under a CCNC, CCBY or similar license, may make self-archiving easier. Are on the frontlines of making researchers aware of OA, and can be influential through information sharing. As such may have an indirect impact on authors of articles and society members. The decision of an individual society is unlikely to be highly influenced by repository managers. 	Low
Research or Research Support Unit/Scholarly Communications Office/Similar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing useful and accurate information to students and researchers. In some cases may be managing an institution's central funds, and will have same motivations as those listed above. Preserving the prestige and impact of institution. Likely motivated to support green and gold OA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to be supportive of OA generally and as such can be a motivating force. The information provided to students and researchers can have an impact on shaping opinion. 	Medium

Stakeholder	Interest/Motivation	How can they have an impact on process/ assessment?	How critical to process / level of decision making authority
Third parties / Intermediaries (e.g. Ebsco, Swets, Ingenta)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To generate profit via sale of subscriptions. To bundle content across publishers and offer curation services that are useful and attract subscribers. May lose income if journal moves to OA. Can continue to package content even under OA and different licenses. May consider entering into APC management services to offset loss of subscription income. If such third parties enter the APC marketplace, they may experience a conflict in interests; the expansion of the APC market may imply a challenge to the subscription content they manage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can exert influence through lobbying, otherwise limited impact. By including OA content, can offer subscribers more content without needing to charge more. If choose to enter APC market and offer a service that is perceived as useful/money-saving by publishers and/or funders of APC charges, this may be encouraging to societies considering whether to move to gold OA. 	Low (could be higher if they entered the APC market)
Open Access Key (OAK)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial interest in expansion of gold; as gold OA expands, the market for OAK's services expands. Building relationships with libraries and publishers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If OAK's services are perceived as useful/money-saving for librarians and/or publishers, this can help promote a transition to gold OA. OAK is likely to be considered useful/money-saving by libraries, small OA publishers, and legacy publishers who are moving into gold OA publishing but as yet do not have experience in managing APCs. 	Medium
Subscription Agents	Financial interests in selling subscriptions/licenses.	Same as Third parties above.	Low
Indexing Bodies	To index high quality material that allows organisation to in turn sell licenses to database or otherwise market services.	Transition to OA might make it easier to pick up content, but such bodies are generally neutral in relation to business models or distribution models (OA vs TA).	Low
Databases	Same as indexing bodies.	Same as above.	Low
Search Engines (e.g. Google)	Interest in gaining as full access as possible to electronic information.	Search Engines tend to prefer OA content (e.g. Google Scholar), as there are no barriers to accessing any of the content. This can indirectly encourage societies to consider OA, but is unlikely to be a primary consideration.	Low
Publishers' associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To represent the interests of members on key issues that matter to them. In the case of trade associations, such interests are highly related to financial interests. The extent to which an association works for different forms of OA, or against them, reflects the perceptions of members' interests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can play an important role in providing information to members. Recently have played a role in shaping governmental policies through lobbying activities. Act as opinion-builders. Societies may be direct members of such societies, or are influenced by them via their publisher who is a member. 	Medium

Stakeholder	Interest/Motivation	How can they have an impact on process/ assessment?	How critical to process / level of decision making authority
Pro-OA associations (e.g. SPARC Europe)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To move the Open Access movement forward. To expand green and gold OA To lobby for the expansion of OA. Networking Advocacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opinion-building and lobbying efforts can have an indirect impact on societies. Provide members (primarily libraries) with information and tools to encourage OA. Similar to above, have played a role in shaping governmental policies through lobbying activities. By encouraging institutional policies on OA, may have an indirect impact on members of societies, authors of articles submitted to a society journal, etc. 	
Other Users of Research			
Policy practice communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to research on issues of relevance to inform work. As low cost access as possible to research. Ability to re-use figures/tables/etc. May have an interest in contributing content to a journal. 	As a user rather than contributor to research literature, have a limited ability to impact the decisions of an individual society in relation to adopting a gold or green OA policy.	Low
Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to research on issues of relevance to inform work. As low cost access as possible. Tend to be reluctant about linking directly to research articles, generally only reference them. 	Same as above. However, some journalists have chosen to write occasionally or extensively on OA matters and have become key opinion-makers.	Low/Medium
Practice communities (e.g. General Practitioners, Clinicians, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to research on issues of relevance to inform work. As low cost access as possible to research Ability to re-use figures/tables/etc. May have an interest in contributing content to a journal. 	Same as policy practice community.	Low
General Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to research on issues relevant to them; e.g. patients or families dealing with a specific condition. As low cost access as possible to research For some, interest in access may be related to their position as a tax-payer and the opinion that if their taxes have funded research, they should have access to it. 	Same as policy practice community.	Low
Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to research on issues of relevance to inform work. As low cost access as possible to research Ability to re-use figures/tables/etc. That the research that is funded by government is available to the widest possible audience, and its use is maximized to the benefit of society. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A government's ability to influence the decisions of societies to adopt OA policies can be great, if the government chooses to adopt policies in this direction or to exert pressure through creating public inquiries, etc. Recent developments in the UK following the Finch Report and the Horizon 2020 proposal in the European Union are examples of this. Making funds available to cover APCs can offer encouragement to some societies to consider moving to gold OA. 	Low//High (depending on government policy and engagement with the issue - currently high in the case of the UK government)

