
Grant agreement no. 230220

SOAP

Study of Open Access Publishing

Theme: Science in Society

Topic: SIS-2008-1.3.1.1 Coordination and support actions on the scientific publishing system in connection with research excellence and dissemination and sharing of knowledge

SOAP SURVEY DATA RELEASE NOTES



Contact: info@project-soap.eu

Abstract:

This document discusses the format of the SOAP project data released to the public at the SOAP Symposium on 13 January 2011. These data are being released with the aim of maximising the scientific return on Community research investment by facilitating future academic investigations and by providing small and large publishing enterprises access on equal footing to important market intelligence. As this document explains, the data released are aggregated as much as necessary to ensure the anonymity of survey respondents.

CONTENT

INTRODUCTION	3
DETAILS OF THE SOAP SURVEY.....	3
DATA FILTERING AND AGGREGATION.....	5
THE CORE DATA OF THE SURVEY	5
TAGS FROM THE FREE-TEXT ANSWERS	11
PROVISIONS FOR DATA REUSE.....	13
FURTHER INFORMATION AND HELP.....	13
APPENDIX I - THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE.....	14
APPENDIX II - AGGREGATED FIELDS	20
APPENDIX III - AGGREGATED COUNTRIES	21
APPENDIX IV - TAXONOMY OF RESEARCH FIELDS USED IN THE SURVEY.....	22

INTRODUCTION

The SOAP (Study of Open Access Publishing) project is financed by the European Commission under the Seventh Framework Programme, Science and Society, and runs from March 2009 to February 2011. The project is co-ordinated by CERN, the European Organization for Nuclear Research, and is a partnership of publishers (Springer, Sage, BioMed Central), libraries (the Max Planck Digital Library of the Max Planck Society) and funding agencies (the UK Science and Technology Facilities Council)¹. The aim of the project is to describe the *supply* and *demand* for open access publishing, thereby providing facts for funding agencies, publishers and libraries to base their strategic decisions with respect to open access publishing.

A central part of the SOAP project is a large-scale survey of the attitudes of scientists towards open access publishing. The project has separately released a set of results from the analysis of this survey. In addition, since a key objective of the SOAP project is to make the survey data available for further investigation by academics, funding agencies, publishers and libraries alike, the SOAP project is releasing a dataset into the public domain. The present document describes these data as released.

This document discusses the format of the SOAP project data released to the public at the SOAP Symposium on 13 January 2011. These data are being released with the aim of maximising the scientific return on Community research investment by facilitating future academic investigations and by providing small and large publishing enterprises access on equal footing to important market intelligence. As this document explains, the data released are aggregated as much as necessary to ensure the anonymity of survey respondents. Typical examples of analyses which can be performed in aggregated form on these data are the understanding of the demand for open access journals in a specific field, and the corresponding potential business models on the supply side, or the difficulties encountered in a given country to access funding potentially needed to adopt existing open access publishing outlets.

The structure of this document is as follows. After this introduction, details on the survey are recalled. A discussion follows on filters applied to the data to remove those not relevant for the scope of reuse, as well as the process to aggregate part of the data, in order to specifically protect the anonymity of survey respondents. The central part of the document is then a detailed field-to-field discussion of the data, followed by a description of the analysis of free-text answers. Appendices give further details on the survey data and their filtering.

At the time of this release, in January 2011, data are made available in CSV (comma-separated-values format) as well as MSExcel formats (.xls and .xlsx).

DETAILS OF THE SOAP SURVEY

The SOAP survey was mainly distributed via mailing lists of the publishers participating in the consortium, via members of the OASPA (Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association) and via public mailing lists and newsletters concerned with scholarly communication² or specific research fields, as well as targeted mailings to authors in specific scientific communities. The three largest mailing lists used are, respectively, those of SOAP partners SAGE, Springer and BioMed Central, with 800k, 250k and 170k addresses. The fourth largest mailing was run

¹ For further information: <http://soap-fp7.eu>

² In addition, a targeted mailing from the European Commission to Project Co-ordinators and Marie Curie Alumni collected additional data to an analogous questionnaire. The responses received from that questionnaire are only presented in aggregated form in other deliverables of the project and will not make the object of a data release *per-se*.

through Thomson Reuters to 70k authors in fields where, after the first three months of the survey live time, a relatively low response rate was observed. We estimate that about 1.5 million individuals have been exposed in one way or another to the survey.

The text of the e-mail soliciting responses and/or the corresponding text posted in newsletters and mailing lists is the following

Your views on open access publishing are needed!

The SOAP Project (), funded by the European Commission, would like to announce the release of an online survey to assess researchers' experiences with open access publishing. This survey aims to inform the most comprehensive analysis of attitudes to open access publishing to date and is seeking views from a wide a range of interested parties. It is primarily aimed at active researchers in public and private organizations, from all research fields in science and the humanities and focuses on publication of research articles in (open access) peer-reviewed journals.*

If you would like to contribute to shaping the public discourse on open access, please visit <<URL of the survey>>. It should take 10-15 minutes to complete. We would appreciate if you would share this link with your colleagues and collaborators so that the views of your discipline are properly represented.

The survey outcome will be made public and the resulting insights as well as recommendations will be openly shared with the European Commission, publishers, research funding agencies, libraries and researchers.

Thanks in advance, the SOAP Project Team info@project-soap.eu

(Note: The SOAP consortium is coordinated by CERN, the European Organization for Nuclear Research. It represents key stakeholders in open access, such as publishers BioMed Central, SAGE and Springer; funding agencies (the UK Science and Technology Facilities Council) and libraries (the Max Planck Digital Library of the Max Planck Society). The project runs for two years, from March 2009 to February 2011.*

Upon landing on the survey site, respondents were shown the following text.

This survey is being conducted by the SOAP (Study of Open Access Publishing) project, financed by the European Commission. The study is investigating publishing practices and attitudes towards open access publishing. More information about the SOAP project can be found on the project's public website.

This survey is primarily aimed at active researchers in public and private organisations, from all fields of the research in the sciences and humanities. It focuses on publication of research articles in peer-reviewed journals. All responses will be confidential and submitted anonymously. It should take about 10-15 minutes to complete. Results will be made publicly available in the second half of 2010.

In total, the survey was “live” for almost seven months, from April 28th, 2010 to November 17th, 2010, even though the vast majority of the responses were collected in the first three-four months.

The survey is implemented through the popular SurveyMonkey tool, and Appendix I details the entire set of questions seen by respondents, as well as the particular logic applied to skip some questions not relevant for particular demographics, identified according to the responses to some of the questions in the survey.

DATA FILTERING AND AGGREGATION

The scope of the release of this data is to allow third parties to evaluate the demand by researchers for open access publishing and their experience so far with the payment of fees which could be required to publish, as well as the opinion guiding their choices. Therefore a subset of data regarding all the respondents who did NOT describe themselves as researchers has been removed from the data³. In total, 43'033 responses are retained.

The answer to some other questions not immediately relevant to the aggregated study of the demand for open access publishing have been removed from the data sample to protect the anonymity of the respondents, these include the gender of the respondents and whether they serve on the editorial boards of one or more (open access) journals.

Three additional steps have been taken to further filter the data and aggregate populations with low statistics to further protect the anonymity of the respondents. These are the following

- Respondents who have spent between 14 and 24 years in research and respondents who have spent 25 or more years in research have been aggregated in a single group.
- Respondents in a sub-field of research where a total of less than 50 answers were received were aggregated into the corresponding higher-level taxonomic field (e.g. ... Maritime engineering and technology is merged into Engineering or ... Military history into Historical and Philosophical Studies). All such fields are summarised in Appendix II. These changes affect 957 respondents.
- Respondents from countries with less than 80 answers have been aggregated in two groups, the “Other EU countries” and “Other countries” groups. This change affects 1'783 answers, or 4% of the total. All countries that have been aggregated are listed in Appendix III together with the corresponding number of respondents.

THE CORE DATA OF THE SURVEY

A column-by-column discussion of the data is presented in the following. First, the name of the data field as released is given. Then, a link to the original survey question, as presented in Appendix I is given. The data ranges, i.e. all different possible entries in the data, are listed. Notes on the treatment of the data are provided.

Data field	Line Number
Survey question	-
Data range	-
Notes	-

Data field	Main research field
Survey question	2. Please select your main research field from the drop-down list
Data range	Drop-down menu from a pre-set taxonomy. All possible terms appearing in this data column are in Appendix IV, left-hand side.
Notes	Respondents could select a research field or a sub-field. In either case the

³The survey had three additional options: “I am in the publishing industry”; “I am a librarian”; “I work in another field and am interested in open access”.

	high-level field is given in this column.
Data field	Main research sub-field
Survey question	2. Please select your main research field from the drop-down list
Data range	Drop-down menu from a pre-set taxonomy. Retained terms are in Appendix IV.
Notes	Respondents could select a research field or a more specific sub-field. If the total number of respondents in a given subfield is less than 50, only the main field is given here, as presented in Appendix II.
Data field	Secondary research field
Survey question	2. Do you wish to include another field of research or add a field that you cannot find in the drop-down list?
Data range	As above
Notes	As above
Data field	Secondary research sub-field
Survey question	2. Do you wish to include another field of research or add a field that you cannot find in the drop-down list?
Data range	As above
Notes	As above. In addition, respondents were also given the possibility to enter a free-text description of their secondary field, which is removed from this data for ease of handling.
Data field	Type of institution
Survey question	3. Which of the following best describes your institution?
Data range	One of the following: University or college Hospital or medical school Research institute Government Industrial/commercial Other
Notes	-
Data field	Years in research
Survey question	4. How many years have you been employed in research?
Data range	One of the following: Fewer than 5 years 5-14 years 15 years or longer
Notes	The original survey had two categories, “from 15 to 25 years” and “25 years or longer”. These are aggregated in a single data range.
Data field	Country
Survey question	5. In which country do you work?
Data range	List of countries
Notes	Countries with less than 80 answers are aggregated in “Others” and “Others EU”, as presented in Appendix III
Data field	Peer-reviewer
Survey question	22. Do you provide peer review services for one or more journals?
Data range	Yes/No
Notes	-

Data field	Ease of access to scientific journals
Survey question	7. How easily can you gain online access to peer-reviewed journal articles of interest for your research?
Data range	One of the following: Very easily Quite easily With some difficulties I can rarely access the articles I need I do not know
Notes	-

Data field	OA journals in field of research
Survey question	8. Do any journals in your research field publish open access articles?
Data range	One of the following: Yes No I do not know
Notes	In the original survey this was the first question where open access is mentioned and a definition was provided for the recipients: Many of the questions that follow concern open access publishing. <i>For the purposes of this survey, an article is open access if its final, peer-reviewed, version is published online by a journal and is free of charge to all users without restrictions on access or use</i>

Data field	OA beneficial
Survey question	9. Do you think your research field benefits, or would benefit from journals that publish open access articles?
Data range	One of the following: Yes No I do not know I do not care
Notes	A following question gave respondents the opportunity to qualify their answer.

Data field	OA beneficial reason - 1; OA beneficial reason - 2; OA beneficial reason - 3
Survey question	After the answer to the above question, respondents were presented with a text box asking: 9. Can you briefly explain your opinion?
Data range	Free text, converted into pre-assigned tags listed in the following section.
Notes	To allow quantitative analyses of the results, and protect the anonymity of the respondent, the free text answers have been read and aggregated into "tags", as discussed in the following section. A maximum of three different tags are retained.

Data field	Aware of OA literature
Survey question	10. When you are reading a journal article, are you generally aware whether it is open access or not?
Data range	Yes/No
Notes	-

Data field	Source of awareness
Survey question	11. How do you know whether the article is open access?

Data range	One or more of the following: I had prior knowledge that the article or journal was open access It is clearly indicated on the Web page linking to the article It is clearly indicated in the article itself Other
Notes	This question was not presented to those answering no to the previous question. In the original survey, respondents could add comments if they selected “other”. These comments are all aggregated under “other” in these data.

Data field	Five-year articles
Survey question	12. How many peer reviewed research articles (open access or not open access) have you published in the last five years?
Data range	One of the following: 0 1-5 6-10 11-20 21-50 More than 50
Notes	If the answer is zero the original survey skipped all questions reported in the following data fields, with the exception of the last one.

Data field	Factors to select a journal: Organisation policy Positive experience Relevance for community Open Access Recommendation by colleagues Speed of publication Prestige Likelihood of acceptance Absence of fees Copyright policy Impact Factor Importance for career
Survey question	13. What factors are important to you when selecting a journal to publish in? - The journal fits the policy of my organisation - Positive experience with publisher/editor(s) of the journal - Relevance of the journal for my community - The journal is an open access journal - Recommendation of the journal by my colleagues - Speed of publication of the journal - Prestige/perceived quality of the journal - Likelihood of article acceptance in the journal - Absence of journal publication fees (e.g. submission charges, page - charges, colour charges) - Copyright policy of the journal - Journal Impact Factor - Importance of the journal for academic promotion, tenure or assessment
Data range	Graded scale for each factor: Extremely important Important Less important

	Irrelevant
Notes	Factors were presented in random order and answers were not compulsory.

Data field	Who decides where to submit?
Survey question	14. Who usually decides which journals your articles are submitted to? (Choose more than one answer if applicable)
Data range	One or more of the following: The decision is my own A collective decision is made with my fellow authors I am advised where to publish by a senior colleague The organisation that finances my research advises me where to publish Other
Notes	In the original survey, respondents could add comments if they selected “other”. These comments are all aggregated under “other” in these data.

Data field	Five years OA articles
Survey question	15. Approximately how many open access articles have you published in the last five years?
Data range	One of the following: 0 1-5 6-10 More than 10 I do not know
Notes	If the answer is zero the following two questions are asked, then the survey jumped to the last data field presented here. If the answer is “I do not know”, then the survey jumped to the last data field presented here.

Data field	Reason not to publish OA ?
Survey question	16. Has there been a specific reason why you have not published an article by open access?
Data range	Yes/No
Notes	This question is only asked to those who have published zero OA articles. A following question gave respondents the opportunity to qualify their answer.

Data field	Not OA reason - 1; Not OA reason - 2
Survey question	If the answer to the above question is positive, respondents were presented with a text box asking: 16. If so, please give your reason(s) in the textbox provided.
Data range	Free text, converted into pre-assigned tags listed in the following section.
Notes	To allow quantitative analyses of the results, and protect the anonymity of the respondent, the free text answers have been read and aggregated into “tags”, as discussed in the following section. A maximum of two different tags are retained.

Data field	Publication fee charged for the last OA article
Survey question	17. What publication fee was charged for the last open access article you published?
Data range	One of the following: No charge Up to €250 (\$350) €251-€500 (\$350-\$700)

	€501-€1000 (\$700-\$1350) €1001-€3000 (\$1350-\$4100) More than €3000 (\$4100) I do not know
Notes	-

Data field	How was the fee covered
Survey question	18. How was this publication fee covered? (Choose more than one answer if applicable)
Data range	One or more of the following: My research funding includes money for paying such fees I used part of my research funding not specifically intended for paying such fees My institution paid the fees I paid the costs myself Other
Notes	This question is not asked to those who either were charged a zero fee or did not know about a fee. In the original survey, respondents could add comments if they selected “other”. These comments are all aggregated under “other” in these data.

Data field	Ease to obtain funding to pay OA fees
Survey question	19. How easy is it to obtain funding if needed for open access publishing from your institution or the organisation mainly responsible for financing your research?
Data range	One of the following Easy Difficult I have not used these sources
Notes	This question is not asked to those who either were charged a zero fee or did not know about a fee.

Data field	<p>Researchers should retain the rights to their published work and allow it to be used by others;</p> <p>Researchers should retain the rights to their published work and allow it to be used by others;</p> <p>Publicly-funded research should be made available to be read and used without access barriers;</p> <p>It is not beneficial for the general public to have access to published scientific and medical articles;</p> <p>It is not beneficial for the general public to have access to published scientific and medical articles;</p> <p>OA publishing undermines the system of peer review;</p> <p>OA publishing leads to an increase in the publication of poor quality research;</p> <p>OA publishing is more cost-effective than subscription-based publishing and so will benefit public investment in research;</p> <p>If authors pay publication fees to make their articles OA, there will be less money available for research.</p>
Survey question	23. Listed below are a series of statements, both positive and negative, concerning open access publishing. Please indicate how strongly you agree/disagree with each statement.

	<p>Researchers should retain the rights to their published work and allow it to be used by others;</p> <p>Researchers should retain the rights to their published work and allow it to be used by others;</p> <p>Publicly-funded research should be made available to be read and used without access barriers;</p> <p>It is not beneficial for the general public to have access to published scientific and medical articles;</p> <p>It is not beneficial for the general public to have access to published scientific and medical articles;</p> <p>OA publishing undermines the system of peer review;</p> <p>OA publishing leads to an increase in the publication of poor quality research;</p> <p>OA publishing is more cost-effective than subscription-based publishing and so will benefit public investment in research;</p> <p>If authors pay publication fees to make their articles OA, there will be less money available for research;</p>
Data range	<p>Graded scale for each factor:</p> <p>Strongly agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Neither agree nor disagree</p> <p>Disagree</p> <p>Strongly disagree</p>
Notes	<p>Statements were presented in random order and answers were not compulsory.</p>

TAGS FROM THE FREE-TEXT ANSWERS

Two of the survey questions retained in the present data set allowed free-text answers to fully capture respondents' opinions:

Question 9: Do you think your research field benefits, or would benefit from journals that publish open access articles? Can you briefly explain your opinion?

Question 16: Has there been a specific reason why you have not published an article by open access? If so, please give your reason(s)

In order to allow quantitative analyses of the results, and protect the anonymity of the respondent, the free text answers have been read and aggregated into "tags". To ensure consistency, this process has been performed by a single person, with consensus of the SOAP consortium on the scope of the operation and the validation of an exhaustive set of examples to formulate the relevant tags after a pre-analysis of several thousands answers.

The following tags have been used for Question 9, corresponding to the data fields **OA beneficial reason - 1; 2; 3** following the data field **OA beneficial**, where respondents had a **positive** attitude towards open access.

Accessibility: refers mostly to technical barriers of accessibility. It has been used for example when a respondent has said that OA would be beneficial as it removes the need to log in on

different publisher sites or these can be accessed anywhere, also from home and when travelling. The tag has also been used if the word or concept of ‘access’ is mentioned but no further explanation is provided, for example if the answer has only been ‘(because of) ease of access’.

Financial issues: includes everything related to money: when OA is seen as a better model or solution because of a reason related to financial issues. E.g. ‘OA is good because it is free’, ‘it is cheaper’, ‘libraries are struggling with current subscription fees’, or if there is an idea that a researcher cannot get the information she wants because of lack of individual or library resources.

Individual benefit: publishing in OA journals is perceived as an asset for an individual researcher to gain more visibility, recognition, readership, citations than the traditional journals. This also includes a saving of time to the individual in the research and publishing process, but does not include the individual benefit a researcher gains when accessing other people’s work, what is included in the “scientific community benefit” tag.

Public good: any benefit to people outside the scientific community. It refers often to moral good, the concept of ‘right’ or ‘fair’. Used for example if developing countries or less privileged entities are mentioned. It is also used for matters of ‘principle’ e.g. statements as ‘all knowledge should be free’ or if public funding/tax-payers are mentioned. It also refers to a concept of ‘general good’ with no other specific reason.

Scientific community benefit includes all concepts where OA is perceived to benefit the scientific community e.g. by seamless/fast sharing results/methods/information as well as fostering social exchange among researchers. The tag also includes concepts of OA seen as a modern/future/better solution for publishing or when the respondent agrees with OA in principle under condition of quality/peer-review/impact factor comparable or better than traditional or established journals.

Other: includes all the other goals and ideas. It also includes lack of awareness and other less-frequent concepts.

The following tags have been used for [Question 9](#), corresponding to the data fields **Reasons – 1; 2; 3** following the data field **OA beneficial**, where respondents had a **negative** attitude towards open access.

Green OA enough: OA publishing is not necessary as (in the discipline or in principle) repositories or other systems are sufficient.

Fairness/Vanity press expresses doubts that only rich institutes/researchers can afford the publication fee and thus, publish, and/or OA journals would have low/no threshold to accept material.

Low quality: OA journals are perceived/assumed by the respondent to be of low quality for one or more reasons, or she thinks that is the prevailing opinion.

No or bad peer-review: OA journals are perceived/assumed no/low-quality/unreliable peer-review.

Not needed: OA journals are not needed for personal or general reason, mostly either for inflation of journals or because the respondent has access to all needed scientific information.

Presence or amount of fees: negative opinions connected to the concept of paying to publish or the amount of fees.

Profit driven: OA publishers perceived as profit-driven, with additional doubts on the real costs of OA publishing.

Unsustainable for publishers/societies: concern on financial sustainability of journals, business models and publishers, most often learned societies.

Other (negative): any other reason, e.g. doubts long-term preservation of the content of OA journals archiving or risks of misunderstanding if articles were accessible to anyone, and other less-frequent concepts.

The following tags have been used for Question 16, corresponding to the data fields **Not OA reason – 1; 2** following the data field **Reason not to publish OA?**

Accessibility: the author has had a bad experience with an OA journal, their paper has not been accepted or the respondent thinks there are no OA journals on their field.

Funding: publication fees or lack of funding for it was mentioned.

Habits: respondents prefer to publish their papers only in certain established/traditional journals.

Journal quality: OA journals are perceived/assumed not to be of good quality or they do not have an impact factor.

Next time': respondents intend to start publishing in OA journals or are already doing so for their next article.

Unawareness: the respondent is not been aware of OA or OA journals on their field.

Other: issues such as, but not limited to, the use of green OA to achieve widespread distribution, the inflation of OA journals, the decision taken by other co-authors and other less-frequent concepts.

PROVISIONS FOR DATA REUSE

All copyright and related rights to these data are waived under a CC0 waiver⁴.

FURTHER INFORMATION AND HELP

Can be obtained by writing to info@project-soap.eu, with the understanding that after the end of the funding for the project, support will be on a best-effort basis from former project partners.

⁴ <http://creativecommons.org/about/cc0>

APPENDIX I - THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

This text reproduces for reference the entire set of questions asked in the online survey.

<p>*1. Are you involved in research?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> I am an active researcher</p> <p><input type="radio"/> I am in the publishing industry</p> <p><input type="radio"/> I am a librarian</p> <p><input type="radio"/> I work in another field and am interested in open access</p> <p>[If the answer is anything other than “I am an active researcher”, the survey jumps to Q5.]</p>
<p>*2. Please select your main research field from the drop-down list.</p> <p>[Extensive two-level drop-down list of research fields follows]</p> <p>* Do you wish to include another field of research or add a field that you cannot find in the drop-down list?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p>[If the answer is “Yes”, the same list of field is presented for a second choice, plus a text box for “Other”]</p>
<p>* 3. Which of the following best describes your institution?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> University or college</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Hospital or medical school</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Research institute</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Government</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Industrial/commercial</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Other</p> <p>* 4. How many years have you been employed in research?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Fewer than 5 years</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 5-14 years</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 15-24 years</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 25 years or longer</p>
<p>* 5. In which country do you work?</p> <p>[Drop-down list of countries of the world follows]</p> <p>6. Please indicate your gender (this question is optional)</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Male</p>

<input type="radio"/> Female
<p>* 7. How easily can you gain online access to peer-reviewed journal articles of interest for your research?</p> <input type="radio"/> Very easily <input type="radio"/> Quite easily <input type="radio"/> With some difficulties <input type="radio"/> I can rarely access the articles I need <input type="radio"/> I do not know
<p>Many of the questions that follow concern open access publishing. For the purposes of this survey, an article is open access if its final, peer-reviewed, version is published online by a journal and is free of charge to all users without restrictions on access or use.</p> <p>* 8. Do any journals in your research field publish open access articles?</p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> I do not know
<p>* 9. Do you think your research field benefits, or would benefit from journals that publish open access articles?</p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> I have no opinion <input type="radio"/> I do not care
<p>Can you briefly explain your opinion? [Text box follows]</p>
<p>* 10. When you are reading a journal article, are you generally aware whether it is open access or not?</p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No [If the answer is 'No', the survey jumps to Q12.]
<p>* 11. How do you know whether the article is open access? (Choose more than one answer if applicable)</p> <input type="checkbox"/> I had prior knowledge that the article or journal was open access <input type="checkbox"/> It is clearly indicated on the Web page linking to the article <input type="checkbox"/> It is clearly indicated in the article itself <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) [Text box follows]

*** 12. How many peer reviewed research articles (open access or not open access) have you published in the last five years?**

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-20
- 21-50
- More than 50

[If the answer is "0", the survey jumps to Q20.]

*** 13. What factors are important to you when selecting a journal to publish in?**

[Each factor may be rated "Extremely important", "Important", "Less important" or "Irrelevant". The factors are presented in random order.]

Importance of the journal for academic promotion, tenure or assessment

Recommendation of the journal by my colleagues

Positive experience with publisher/editor(s) of the journal

The journal is an open access journal

Relevance of the journal for my community

The journal fits the policy of my organisation

Prestige/perceived quality of the journal

Likelihood of article acceptance in the journal

Absence of journal publication fees (e.g. submission charges, page charges, colour charges)

Copyright policy of the journal

Journal Impact Factor

Speed of publication of the journal

Other (please specify)

[Text box follows]

*** 14. Who usually decides which journals your articles are submitted to? (Choose more than one answer if applicable)**

- The decision is my own
- A collective decision is made with my fellow authors
- I am advised where to publish by a senior colleague
- The organisation that finances my research advises me where to publish
- Other (please specify)

[Text box follows]

*** 15. Approximately how many open access articles have you published in the last five years?**

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- More than 10

<input type="radio"/> I do not know [If the answer is “0”, Q16 is asked then the survey jumps to Q20. If the answer is “I do not know”, the survey jumps to Q20. Otherwise the survey jumps to Q17.]
<p>* 16. Has there been a specific reason why you have not published an article by open access? If so, please give your reason(s) in the textbox provided.</p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No Reason(s) for not publishing by open access [Text box follows]
<p>* 17. What publication fee was charged for the last open access article you published?</p> <input type="radio"/> No charge <input type="radio"/> Up to €250 (\$350) <input type="radio"/> €251-€500 (\$350-\$700) <input type="radio"/> €501-€1000 (\$700-\$1350) <input type="radio"/> €1001-€3000 (\$1350-\$4100) <input type="radio"/> More than €3000 (\$4100) <input type="radio"/> I do not know [If the answer is “No charge” or “I do not know” the survey jumps to Q20.]
<p>18. How was this publication fee covered? (Choose more than one answer if applicable)</p> <input type="checkbox"/> My research funding includes money for paying such fees <input type="checkbox"/> I used part of my research funding not specifically intended for paying such fees <input type="checkbox"/> My institution paid the fees <input type="checkbox"/> I paid the costs myself <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) [Text box follows]
<p>* 19. How easy is it to obtain funding if needed for open access publishing from your institution or the organisation mainly responsible for financing your research?</p> <input type="radio"/> Easy <input type="radio"/> Difficult <input type="radio"/> I have not used these sources
<p>20. Are you on the editorial board of one or more journals?</p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No [If the answer is “No”, the survey jumps to Q22.]
<p>21. Are you on the editorial board of any fully open access journals?</p> <input type="radio"/> Yes

<input type="radio"/> No
22. Do you provide peer review services for one or more journals?
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
<p>* 23. Listed below are a series of statements, both positive and negative, concerning open access publishing. Please indicate how strongly you agree/disagree with each statement.</p> <p>[Each statement may be rated “Strongly agree”, “Agree”, “Neither agree nor disagree”, “Disagree” or “Strongly disagree”. The statements are presented in random order.]</p> <p>Researchers should retain the rights to their published work and allow it to be used by others</p> <p>open access publishing undermines the system of peer review</p> <p>open access publishing leads to an increase in the publication of poor quality research</p> <p>If authors pay publication fees to make their articles open access, there will be less money available for research</p> <p>It is not beneficial for the general public to have access to published scientific and medical articles</p> <p>open access unfairly penalises research-intensive institutions with large publication output by making them pay high costs for publication</p> <p>Publicly-funded research should be made available to be read and used without access barrier</p> <p>open access publishing is more cost-effective than subscription-based publishing and so will benefit public investment in research</p> <p>Articles that are available by open access are likely to be read and cited more often than those not open access</p>
<p>Thank you for participating in the survey.</p> <p>* Would you like to contribute further to the SOAP project? We are looking for volunteers to help the SOAP team explore open access attitudes and publishing practices within different research communities. If you choose to volunteer, you will be automatically entered into our prize draw to win an Apple iPad. You may then be contacted by a member of the SOAP team to follow up your responses to the survey in more depth.</p> <input type="radio"/> Yes, I want to volunteer <input type="radio"/> No, I don't want to volunteer [if the answer is “No, I don’t want to volunteer” the survey jumps to the final page.]
<p>Thank you for choosing to help the project further.</p> <p>To participate in the follow-up study, please enter your email address below. By doing so, you are granting permission for a member of the SOAP team to contact you. Not everyone who volunteers will be contacted.</p> <p>Your email address will not be stored with the information you have already given when the survey responses are analysed by the project team. The address will not be used for any purpose other than contacting you within the context of the SOAP project, will not be made</p>

available to anyone outside the SOAP project, and will be deleted at the end of the project.

*** Enter your email address here:**

[Text box follows]

APPENDIX II – AGGREGATED FIELDS

High-level taxon	Specific field	Respondents
Architecture, Building and Planning	... Building	49
	... Landscape design	15
Astronomy and Space Science	... Astrobiology	17
	... Astronautics and space travel	12
Chemistry	... Industrial chemistry	41
	... Marine chemistry	15
	... Organometallic chemistry	45
	... Petrochemical chemistry	9
	... Structural chemistry	26
Creative Arts and Design	... Cinematics and photography	40
	... Fine art and design	48
	... Imaginative writing	17
	... Performing arts	38
Engineering and Technology	... Maritime engineering and technology	20
Historical and Philosophical Studies	... Local history	24
	... Military history	36
Language and Literature Studies	... Ancient language studies	24
	... Greek, Latin and classical studies	33
Law	... Collective goods	5
	... Commercial law	18
	... Constitutional and administrative law	46
	... European Union law	26
	... Equity and trusts	4
	... Family law	7
	... History of law	11
	... Intellectual property	44
	... International law	49
	... Land law	8
	... Law of obligations	6
Mass Communications and Documentation	... Publishing	19
Medicine, Dentistry and Related Subjects	... Aural and oral sciences	43
Physics and Related Sciences	... Acoustics	25
	... Environmental physics	48
	... Marine physics	14
	... Radiation physics	44
Psychology	... Evolutionary psychology	31
Total		957

APPENDIX III – AGGREGATED COUNTRIES

Estonia	71	Kazakhstan	15	Saint Lucia	3
Lithuania	69	Mauritius	14	Angola	2
Kenya	66	Zambia	14	Antigua and Barbuda	2
Jordan	63	Burkina Faso	13	Chad	2
Sri Lanka	59	Luxembourg	13	Eritrea	2
Bangladesh	55	Bolivia	12	Honduras	2
Vietnam	55	Mozambique	12	Korea, North	2
Morocco	52	Senegal	12	Kyrgyzstan	2
Peru	51	Syria	12	Lesotho	2
Ethiopia	47	Azerbaijan	11	Mauritania	2
Uruguay	45	Bahrain	11	Namibia	2
Latvia	42	Afghanistan	10	Papua New Guinea	2
Nepal	41	Botswana	9	Republic of the Congo	2
Iceland	40	Malawi	9	Rwanda	2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	36	Uzbekistan	9	Seychelles	2
Cyprus	36	Benin	7	Suriname	2
Belarus	35	Guatemala	7	Tajikistan	2
Cuba	35	Libya	7	The Gambia	2
Ghana	35	Moldova	7	Belize	1
Albania	34	Yemen	7	Bhutan	1
Uganda	34	Barbados	6	Cape Verde	1
Jamaica	32	Madagascar	6	Dominica	1
Malta	32	Burundi	5	East Timor	1
Trinidad and Tobago	32	El Salvador	5	Equatorial Guinea	1
Sudan	31	Panama	5	Laos	1
Tanzania	31	Qatar	5	Mongolia	1
United Arab Emirates	31	The Bahamas	5	Nicaragua	1
Armenia	29	Andorra	4	Niger	1
Georgia	29	Brunei	4	Saint Kitts and Nevis	1
Iraq	28	Cambodia	4	Sierra Leone	1
Costa Rica	24	Cote d'Ivoire	4	Somalia	1
Ecuador	24	Dominican Republic	4	Swaziland	1
Kuwait	24	Mali	4	Togo	1
Lebanon	23	Myanmar (Burma)	4	Vanuatu	1
Zimbabwe	21	Dem. Republic Congo	3		
Cameroon	17	Gabon	3	Total	1783
Macedonia	17	Haiti	3	Total EU	263
Oman	16	Paraguay	3	Total Others	1520

APPENDIX IV – TAXONOMY OF RESEARCH FIELDS USED IN THE SURVEY

High-level taxon	Specific field
Agriculture and Related Sciences	... Agricultural sciences
	... Agriculture
	... Animal science
	... Food science
	... Forestry
	... Veterinary medicine
Architecture, Building and Planning	... Architecture
	... Planning (urban, rural and regional)
Astronomy and Space Science	... Astronomy
	... Astrophysics
Biological Sciences	... Bioinformatics
	... Botany and plant biology
	... Developmental and reproductive biology
	... Ecology
	... Genetics
	... Marine and freshwater biology
	... Microbiology and immunology
	... Molecular biology, biophysics and biochemistry
	... Neuroscience
	... Zoology
Business and Administrative Studies	... Accounting
	... Business studies
	... Finance
	... Human resource management
	... Management studies
	... Marketing
	... Tourism, transport and travel
Chemistry	... Analytical chemistry
	... Applied chemistry
	... Biomolecular chemistry
	... Bio-organic chemistry
	... Environmental chemistry
	... Inorganic chemistry
	... Macromolecular and materials chemistry
	... Materials science
	... Medicinal chemistry
	... Organic chemistry
	... Pharmaceutical chemistry
	... Physical chemistry
	... Polymer chemistry
... Theoretical and computational chemistry	
Creative Arts and Design	... Music

Earth Sciences	... Atmospheric sciences
	... Geochemistry
	... Geographical and environmental sciences
	... Geology
	... Geophysics
	... Ocean sciences
Education	... Academic studies in education
	... Training teachers
Engineering and Technology	... Aerospace engineering
	... Biomedical engineering
	... Chemical, process and energy engineering
	... Civil engineering
	... Communications technology
	... Electronic and electrical engineering
	... Materials engineering
	... Mechanical engineering
	... Nanotechnology
	... Production and manufacturing engineering
Historical and Philosophical Studies	... Ancient history
	... Archaeology
	... History (including economic and social history)
	... History of art and architecture
	... History of science
	... Philosophy
... Theology and religious studies	
Language and Literature Studies	... Eastern, Asiatic, African, American and Australasian languages and literature
	... English language and literature
	... European languages and literature
	... Linguistics
Law	... Criminal law
Mass Communications and Documentation	... Information services and librarianship
	... Journalism
	... Media studies
Mathematical and Computer Sciences	... Applied mathematics
	... Artificial intelligence
	... Computer science
	... Information systems
	... Operational research
	... Pure mathematics
	... Software engineering
... Statistics	

Medicine, Dentistry and Related Subjects	... Anatomy, physiology and pathology
	... Clinical dentistry
	... Clinical medicine
	... Complementary medicine
	... Medical technology
	... Nursing
	... Nutrition
	... Oncology and carcinogenesis
	... Ophthalmics
	... Paediatrics and reproductive medicine
	... Pharmacology, toxicology and pharmacy
	... Psychiatry
	... Public health and epidemiology
	... Sports science
Physics and Related Sciences	... Applied physics
	... Atmospheric physics
	... Atomic and molecular physics
	... Computational physics
	... Electromagnetism
	... Laser physics
	... Mathematical and theoretical physics
	... Medical physics
	... Nuclear and particle physics
	... Optical physics
	... Plasma physics
	... Quantum theory
	... Solid state physics
	Psychology
... Clinical psychology	
... Cognitive psychology	
... Developmental psychology	
... Educational psychology	
... Forensic psychology	
... Neuropsychology	
... Occupational psychology	
... Organisational psychology	
... Personality psychology	
... Social psychology	

Social Sciences	... Anthropology
	... Criminology
	... Cultural studies
	... Economic sociology
	... Economics
	... Ethnic studies
	... Gender studies
	... Human and social geography
	... Political sociology
	... Politics
	... Social policy
	... Social theory
	... Social work
	... Sociology

