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What is ALPSP?

- The international trade association for not-for-profit publishers
- Just under 250 members in nearly 30 countries
- ‘Shaping the future of scholarly and professional publishing’
- Lobbying and representation
- Research studies and other projects
- Training and development
- Information and advice
What scholars want from publishing

- Two ALPSP research studies:
  - ‘What Authors Want’ (1998/9)
    - 10,970 journal contributors questioned
    - 3,218 replies (29.3%)
    - 14,643 journal contributors questioned
    - 1,246 replies (8.5%)
      - Online form only – may have reduced response rate
What authors said they wanted: publishing objectives

1. Communication with peers (33%)
2. Career advancement (22%)
3. Personal prestige (8%)
4. Funding (7%)
5. Financial reward (1%)
What authors said they wanted: how objectives are achieved

1. Communication with widest possible audience
2. Publication in high-impact journals
2. Quality of peer review
3. Retrievability through A&I services
4. Speed of publication
5. Enhancement of personal publications list
Authors’ and readers’ views: importance of journal features

1. Peer review - A: 81%, R: 80%
2. Gathering articles together - A: 71%, R: 54%
3. Selection of relevant, quality-controlled content - A: 60%, R: 39%
4. Content editing/improvement - A: 50%, R: 39%
5. Language/copy editing - A: 46%, R: 34%
6. Checking citations/adding links - A: 46%, R: 28%
7. Maximising visibility - A: 44%, R: 20%
The ‘give it away’ movement: Open Archives

- Not necessarily free
- Self-archiving: personal, subject and institutional archives
- Preprint deposit does not seem to harm publishers (so far); postprints + sophisticated retrieval software could
- 32% of authors in our survey considered eprint archives important; only 11% deposited their articles
- 78% of readers did not look at preprint archives – many had never heard of them
The ‘give it away’ movement: Open Access

- Journals are free to the reader
- Costs are covered, but at a different point in the cycle (by authors, funders, institutions)
- Scales with research output (library funds don’t)
- May not work in all disciplines
- Removes some costs; additional savings may have to be made
- Profits may be lower
What publishers really do

- Create new journals
  - (What is a journal?)
- Manage peer review process
- Select and collect content
- Edit and improve content
- Quantity control
- Making visible – marketing
- Controlling access
- Preservation
Why publishers can’t just give it away

- It all costs money
  - Electronic publishing does not save as much as expected
  - For now, we have the costs of both print and electronic
  - Overheads, reinvestment and profit all need to be covered

- The costs have to be recovered at some point in the chain
  - Consumer, producer and/or sponsor pays
How publishers are reacting to market pressures

- Access to more content
  - Breadth - bundling
  - Depth - creating retrospective e-archives
- Access for more people
  - Consortia
  - Less developed countries
  - Archival access
- More liberal rights
  - Authors and institutions
- Experimentation with business models
  - Pay-per-view, online-only, open access
The ALPSP Learned Journals Collection

- Multi-publisher collection of members’ journals
- Subsets – health & life science; science & technology; arts, humanities & social science
- Single licence, standard terms & conditions
- www.alpsp-collection.org
Actual scholarly publishing practice

- 275 international journal publishers surveyed; 66% response rate
- 149 usable responses analysed (including all the major publishers)
  - 45% UK, 10% Europe, 35% USA
  - 31% commercial, 69% not-for-profit
  - 40% publish 5 or fewer titles
  - 8% publish 100 or more
- Hope to repeat every few years
What we found (1)

- 75% of titles are available online (83% in STM, 72% in HSS)
- Large publishers are most advanced in linking to and from citations and A&I
- Pricing models highly variable, but still mostly based on print
- Most offer list and/or subject bundles and consortia deals
- About 1/3 offer special arrangements for less developed countries
What we found (2)

- 85% of publishers have back volumes online, mostly from 1997 or 1998
- Over 20% have back files from pre-1995; several are retrodigitising from Vol 1 Issue 1
- 60% (more of commercial publishers) provide continuing access to previously subscribed issues
- 9% (as many as 43% of small NFP publishers) make archive freely available after a period
- Half have formal arrangements for long-term preservation
What we found (3)

- About 60% (particularly larger publishers) allow use for course packs, 50% for e-reserve, 40% for inter-library loan (paper) and 15% electronic.
- 17% do not require authors to transfer copyright (a further 9% would accept a licence instead).
- Just under 1/2 allow posting of published articles to web sites; about 1/3 (mainly large publishers) allow posting prior to publication.
- Over 80% allow re-use within author’s institution; 45% allow re-use within author’s own publications.
Other initiatives

- ALPSP model grant of licence
- Zwolle Group
  - Copyright management policies
  - [www.surf.nl/copyright/](http://www.surf.nl/copyright/)
- Project ROMEO
  - Self-archiving policies
  - [www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/ls/disresearch/romeo/](http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/ls/disresearch/romeo/)
- ALPSP Open Access research
  - Economic study
  - Test-bed project
Conclusion

- Publishers do listen to what authors and readers say they need
- Publishers’ practices are becoming steadily more scholarship-friendly
- What publishers do is valued by both authors and readers
- Somebody has to pay for it; new models may help, but they need to be explored carefully
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