

TITLE: Slavic Studies¹ and the World: Embracing the Revolution of Open Access Publishing.²

AUTHOR: Jon Giullian³

ABSTRACT: This study discusses patterns of open access publishing in Slavic studies. The purpose of this study is to gauge the level of open access publishing among Slavic studies scholars; to identify what types of documents are being made available; to observe which disciplines are most active in making their documents freely available; and to determine which venues are most active for documents related to Slavic studies.

KEYWORDS: Slavic studies, open access.

Introduction

On December 26, 2007, the United States passed the “Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2007 (H.R. 2764) requiring the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to provide open access to the results of publicly funded research. This law requires researchers to deposit electronic copies of their manuscripts into PubMed Central, the National Library of Medicine’s electronic repository.⁴

In 2008 publishers have coalesced to fight back. Arguing that the NIH Public Access Policy undermines “their subscription base and their economic viability,” publishers are attempting to overturn the current policy through a new piece of legislation dubiously called the Fair Copyright in Research Works Act.⁵

On November 2, 2008, Peter Suber, independent policy strategist for open access to scientific and scholarly research literature, sent an open letter to presidential hopefuls John McCain and Barack Obama. In his letter, Suber encourages the next president elect of the United States to actively support open access in the form of a “national commitment to make non-classified results of federally funded research freely available online.”⁶ Although open access has been gaining momentum for a number of years, university scholars and librarians

across the country hope that President Obama's program for change will include this type of commitment to open access.

In the absence of a national commitment, American scholars and universities have been forging ahead with open access initiatives. In the area of policy, several institutions in the United States have joined a slew of similar organizations worldwide to create open access archiving policies. The Registry of Open Access Repository Material Policies (ROARMAP), documents fifty-seven mandates and eleven proposed mandates from universities and funding institutions across the globe.⁷ In particular, the Harvard University Faculty of Arts and Sciences recently adopted a policy of open access to the "fruits of their research." According to this policy:

Each faculty member grants "to the President and Fellows of Harvard College permission to make available his or her scholarly articles and to exercise the copyright in those articles. In legal terms, the permission granted by each Faculty member is a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit. The policy will apply to all scholarly articles written while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles completed before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreements before the adoption of this policy."⁸

Although the mandate includes an "opt-out provision," Harvard faculty are automatically "opted-in" unless they make a specific request to "opt-out." According to Stevan Harnad,⁹ the Harvard policy is a bold step forward by one of America's leading academic institutions toward broader open access to academic scholarship. A little closer to home, the University of Kansas has also taken steps toward open access with a proposed multi-institutional mandate that is documented in the ROARMAP.

As a librarian in Slavic and Eurasian studies, my interest in Open Access revolves around my discipline; specifically, to what degree scholars in the field in the United States are embracing Open Access. This study attempts to answer several questions, which include:

1. Who, among North American scholars in Slavic and Eurasian studies, is publishing or depositing their works in open access venues?
2. What types of documents are being made available?
3. What patterns, if any, have emerged? (E.g. Which disciplines or regions within Slavic and Eurasian studies have posted the most open access documents?)

My hypothesis is that relatively few scholars in Slavic and Eurasian studies are currently publishing or depositing their works in open access venues. Hopefully, the results of this study will help scholars of Slavic and Eurasian studies consider open access as a way to make their research available to a broader audience as well as a way to self-archive¹⁰ their own work.

Methodology

The present study uses the checklist method, a long-established method for analysis of library collections. The key component of this method is of course the checklist. This study uses the 2003 Directory of Members from the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (or AAASS). The 2003 directory contains the names of 2,886 individuals and was selected because it represents the largest body of scholars, professionals, and students of Slavic and Eurasian studies in North America. The directory also includes a fair number of scholars from Europe and elsewhere. Although somewhat outdated, the 2003 edition is the last printed version of the directory; and it was not feasible to generate a printed version of the new online version of the directory.

Data for the study was generated by searching the names of all 2,886 individuals in the union catalog of digital resources called OAIster. Originally developed by the University of Michigan and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, OAIster currently provides access

to more than 18 million records of digitized books and articles, born-digital texts, audio files, images, movies, and datasets. OAIster is freely available online, but it is important to note that OAIster includes records for open access documents as well as documents with restricted access.

The process of searching OAIster involved several nuances that deserve to be mentioned. First, OAIster treats multiple terms in each field as phrase. Because author names could appear in standard or inverted order, queries in OAIster followed a standard pattern below:

Ronelle Alexander	OR	Alexander, Ronelle
(Standard order)		(Inverted order)

If the AAASS directory included middle names or initials, queries were repeated with the middle name or initial. Second, even though OAIster includes records for both “open access” and “restricted access” documents, only documents that were found to be “open access” were included in the data sample.¹¹ Finally, queries sometimes returned records of documents authored by different people with the same name. This was especially the case with common names such as Michael Smith. In some cases, additional terms were added to the query. In other cases we used additional data from the directory to help us identify the correct individual. Although time consuming false hits, generally, were easy to eliminate since most of them were related to the hard or natural sciences.

Results

Queries in OAIster returned records of open access documents for three-hundred sixty (360) AAASS members. This is approximately twelve and one half percent (12.5%) of the total number of members listed in the directory. Three-hundred four (304) of those members are from North America while the remaining fifty-six (56) members come primarily from Europe and Japan. Data from individual records of “open access” documents were compiled into a spreadsheet and then sorted and quantified by category. Categories include: academic rank,

institution, country, subject, region, type, and source/data contributor. These results were then compiled into a series of tables that provide a snapshot of current open access activity among AAASS members in North America and worldwide.

Academic Rank

When sorted by academic rank, the results suggest that senior scholars are leading the way to open access in Slavic and Eurasian Studies. According to data in Table 1, scholars at the rank of full professor are responsible for over 35 percent of the open access documents produced by AAASS members. This is more than twice the number of scholars at the rank of associate professor; and nearly three times the number of scholars at the rank of assistant professor.

AAASS members and their open access documents		
Table 1. Who produces the most?		
Profession / Title	Number	Percent of members
Professor, Full	129	35.6%
Professor, Associate	59	16.3%
Professor, Assistant	45	12.4%
Student	30	8.3%
Professor, Emeritus / Retired	20	5.5%
Lecturer	19	5.2%
Professor, Adjunct	12	3.6%
Researcher	12	3.3%
Administrator	6	1.7%
Librarian / Information Specialist	6	1.7%
Other	21	5.8%

Proponents of open access frequently mention the need for established scholars to lead the way into open access. Why? In part because scholars at the full professor level are not dependent upon publishing in the top-tier journals in order to be promoted with tenure. Having already achieved the highest level of rank within the current system, they could potentially promote open access by publishing their works in open access venues rather than in commercial journals. In contrast, scholars at the Associate and Assistant Professor levels must publish their work in the top-tier journals of their field in order to get tenure and be promoted. Although more evidence

is needed to show that seasoned scholars have “embraced” open access to a greater degree than their junior colleagues, the data suggest that senior scholars do indeed “lead the pack” in open access publishing and/or self-archiving within the field Slavic and Eurasian studies.

Institutions

When sorted by institution (Table 2), data indicate that the University of California at Berkley and the University of Michigan have the highest number of AAASS members who have deposited open access documents. They are followed by Harvard University, Ohio State University and others. The University of Toronto emerged as the top Canadian institution, which is not surprising since Toronto is a hub of scholarly activity for Slavic and Eurasian studies. While this list of top schools is encouraging, even more heartening is the overall number of institutions whose scholars in Slavic and Eurasian studies have made works freely available. In North America alone, 304 AAASS members from 167 colleges, universities and other institutions have made works available in open access venues. This number is not insignificant, considering the relatively small number of colleges and universities with programs in Slavic and

AAASS members and their open access documents	
Table 2. Who has the most scholars?	
Institution (2003 data)	Number of members
U of California - Berkeley	13
U of Michigan	12
Harvard U	9
Ohio State U	8
U of Pittsburgh	8
U of Toronto	7
U of Washington	7
Indiana U	6
U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	6
Yale U	6
Georgetown U	5
Stanford U	5

Eurasian studies. This number suggests that open access is gaining momentum in Slavic and Eurasian studies across North America. This is indeed encouraging.

Subjects

The data in Table 3 show which disciplines account for the largest number of open access documents created by AAASS members. Top disciplines include history, political science, language and literature, and economics. Since these four subjects have always dominated Slavic and Eurasian studies in North America it is not surprising that open access publishing data follow the same general pattern. The language and literature category may be somewhat low since many scholars of language and literature do not belong to AAASS but rather to another organization, the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (ATSEEL). Were the study to include members of both AAASS and ATSEEL, the number of open access documents in language and literature would probably be higher.

AAASS members and their open access documents		
Table 3. Which disciplines are ahead?		
Subject	Number	Percent of members
history	153	42.5%
political science	111	30.8%
language & literature	60	16.7%
economics	34	9.4%
culture & arts (art architecture, cinema, music)	16	4.4%
sociology	15	4.2%
anthropology & folklore	13	3.6%
military studies	11	3.1%
libraries, information, & publishing	7	1.9%
geography & environment	6	1.7%
demography & ethnic studies	5	1.4%
ethnic studies	3	0.8%
communications	2	0.6%
area studies	1	0.3%
Total	437	
Members	360	100.0%

Regions

Data in Table 4 show the percent of scholars whose open access documents are related to a specific region. Although the arrangement is somewhat arbitrary, it attempts to reflect the topics found in open access documents that were identified. For example, documents that specifically focused on the Balkans as a whole were included in a separate category for the Balkans. Because many of the documents for Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia addressed all three regions, they were combined into one category. For the same reason, the Czech Republic and Slovakia were combined into one category. It is no surprise that the majority of documents are related to Russia and the Soviet Union. What is encouraging is the fact that nearly every country of the region is represented to some degree.

AAASS members and their open access documents		
Table 4. How many regions are represented		
Subject	Number	Percent of members
Balkans	3	0.8%
Baltic Republics (Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania)	10	2.8%
Belarus	1	0.3%
Bosnia, Croatia, Serbia, or former Yugoslavia	22	6.1%
Bulgaria or Macedonia	4	1.1%
Central Asia	12	3.3%
Czech Republic & Slovakia	13	3.6%
Eastern Europe	31	8.6%
EU, NATO, UN, Globalization	12	3.3%
Former Soviet Union (post-1991)	10	2.8%
Hungary	10	2.8%
Poland	21	5.8%
Russia	189	52.5%
Slavic	10	2.8%
Slovenia	8	2.2%
Soviet Union (pre-1991)	50	13.9%
Ukraine	8	2.2%
Total	414	
Members	360	100.0%

Document types

The results for document types (Table 5) show that open access documents produced by AAASS members consist primarily of scholarly articles and theses/dissertations. Of the individuals whose documents were retrieved by OAIster, sixty eight percent have scholarly articles in open access venues; seventeen percent have a thesis or dissertation in open access venues. The overwhelming predominance of articles was a surprise. The high number of theses and dissertations, on the other hand, was expected given the recent trend in thesis and dissertation publishing. Because theses and dissertations are generally published in few copies,

AAASS members and their open access documents		
Table 5. Which document types predominate?		
Subject	Number	Percent of scholars
audio	4	1.1%
books	7	1.9%
column / newsletter	9	2.5%
images	13	3.6%
papers (conference, discussion, position, working)	20	5.6%
presentations	7	1.9%
reviews	11	3.1%
scholarly articles	245	68.1%
summaries	1	0.3%
surveys	1	0.3%
thesis / dissertation	62	17.2%
video	1	0.3%
web site	7	1.9%
Total	388	
Members	360	100.0%

it makes perfect sense to make them freely available. I had anticipated that more documents of so called “gray literature” would appear in open access venues. But in fact, “gray literature” was scarce. This may be due to the fact that “gray literature” may be posted more randomly on the Web and, thus, not harvested by OAIster. If this is indeed the case, one wonders whether how much gray literature is being archived. The results for visual documents (images) also bear

mention. Nearly all image records retrieved from OAIster came from the University of Washington Libraries Digital Collections. Although the number of AAASS members who submitted images is relatively low, the actual number of image records is high (Table 5a below).

AAASS members and their open access documents	
Table 5a. Who submitted images?	
Name	Number of images
James E Augerot	110
Eloise M. Boyle	91
William Craft Brumfield	1143
Ann Kleimola	79
Lauren Leighton	49
Walter Gerald Moss	31
Guntis Smidchins	520
Susan Nicole Smith	5
Robert W. Smurr	960

Source / Data contributors

Data in Table 6 show the top venues for open access documents among Slavic and Eurasian scholars. The University of Michigan Library Repository tops the list with 55 AAASS members (out of the total 360) whose documents are available there. Next is the University of California

AAASS members and their open access documents	
Table 6. Where do they post the most?	
Source/Data Contributor	Number
University of Michigan Library Repository	55
University of California eScholarship Repository	35
Revue.org: Fédération de Revues Scientifiques en Sciences Humaines et Sociales	33
Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers (HUSCAP)	29
Research Papers in Economics (RePEc)	24
Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) Repository	22
Deep Blue at the University of Michigan	21
ScholarlyCommons@Penn	16
Archive of European Integration (AEI)	15
Library and Archives Canada Electronic Theses Repository	13
Persée: Périodiques Scientifiques en Édition Électronique	13

eScholarship Repository with 35, Followed by the French organization, Revues.org, with 33.

Others include: Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers

(HUSCAP) with 29, Research Papers in Economics (RePEc) with 24, The Defense Technical

Information Center (DTIC) Repository at 22, Deep Blue at the University of Michigan with 21,

The Scholarly Commons at Penn (Pennsylvania University) at 16, and The Archive of European

Integration (AEI) from the University of Pittsburgh with documents from 15 different scholars in

Slavic and Eurasian studies.

Conclusion

Now that all this data has been collected and analyzed, what is the overall significance? In other words, why does it matter? First, open access venues are important for Slavic and Eurasian studies because they make material available to small audiences scattered all across the globe. For example, *Slovene Linguistic Studies* (*Slovenski jezik*, a joint publication by the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts and the University of Kansas, is a print-based journal that has been digitized and deposited in KU's digital repository, KUScholarWorks. When asked why it was decided to make the journal open access, co-editor from the University of Kansas, Marc L. Greenberg, explained that the goal was to promote the study of Slovene language and linguistics, not to make a profit. Open access is a way to make the content of the journal available not only to scholars but also to Slovene language enthusiasts worldwide and for whom a subscription to the print copy would be either impossible or cost-ineffective. Open access digital copies of *Slovene Linguistic Studies* make distribution easy without affecting the financial integrity of the journal. Indeed, institutional repositories and other open access venues can serve as a way to disseminate scholarship to parties that would not have access through traditional publishing models. In other words, open access broadens the reach of scholarly communication.

Second, over the past two decades, and especially since 2000, the cost of scholarly journals has skyrocketed. In a recent issue of *CRL News*, the price increase for journals in physics was compared to the price of gas. Had the price of gas increased at the same rate as physics journals, gas would now cost over 12 dollars per gallon. If the trend continues, research collections in North America and worldwide will continue to shrink indefinitely. Combined with other economic woes which are now headed in our direction, libraries will be unable to provide the amount of research materials that scholars have come to expect; that is, unless other avenues of publishing, such open access, can fill the gap.

Third and finally, although open access is currently just a drop in the bucket compared to commercial journal publishing, the results of this study are encouraging. They suggest that the movement toward open access is not isolated or dominated by any one group or country. Rather, a growing number of Slavic Scholars are self-archiving their work and depositing copies of the research in open access repositories. Combined with institutional mandates, such as the one undertaken by Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University, open access publishing may see a surge in growth in coming years. After all, universities (and other institutions) are the ones who support the research; so why not be the ones who also make it available to the world? When we publish we help to ensure that our collections do not perish.

¹ Various terms have been used to designate the Slavic-related areas of study. They include: Russian and East European Studies, Slavic Studies, Slavic and East European Studies, Soviet Studies, etc.” Because of recent political developments many institutions have added the terms “Eurasian” or “Central Asian” to their names. This paper uses the terms “Slavic Studies” and “Slavic and Eurasian Studies” interchangeably to designate the field of study.

² This document is an electronic post-print of an article published in the conference proceedings noted below. Giullian, Jon (2010). “Slavic Studies and the World: Embracing the Revolution of Open Access Publishing,” *Globalization and the Management of Information Resources: Papers from the International Conference, Sofia, Bulgaria, 12-14 November 2008*. Herbert K. Achleitner and Alexander Dimchev, eds., pp. 181-190. Sofia, Bulgaria: “St. Kliment Okhridskii” University of Sofia, 2010. Typographical errors have been corrected in this version. NOTE: Cites to this article should be made to the version published in the proceedings.

³ Jon Giullian <jgiullian@gmail.com>, Librarian for Slavic and Eurasian Studies, Watson Library, 1425 Jayhawk Blvd., Rm. 519, Lawrence, KS 66045.

⁴ McLennan, Jennifer. "Public Access Mandate Made Law." *The Alliance for Taxpayer Access*, 26 Dec 2007. Accessed 7 Nov 2008: <http://www.taxpayeraccess.org./media/release07-1226.html>

⁵See: Weiss, Rick. "Kicking the Doorstep on Open Access." *Science Progress*, 22 Sep, 2008. Accessed 7 Nov 2008: <http://www.scienceprogress.org/2008/09/kicking-the-doorstop-on-open-access>. See also: "NiH Public Access Policy: Public Access Plan in Effect to Make NIH-funded Research Available for September 16, 2008." *Alliance for Taxpayer Access*. Accessed 7 Nov 2008: <http://www.taxpayeraccess.org./nih.html>.

⁶ Suber, Peter. "An open letter to the next President of the United States." *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, issue #127, 2 Nov 2008. Accessed 7 Nov 2008. <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/11-02-08.htm>

⁷ "ROARMAP (Registry of Open Access Repository Material Policies)." *Open Access and Institutional Repositories with EPrints*. Accessed 7 Nov 2008: <http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/policysignup/>

⁸ "Agenda." *Faculty of Arts and Sciences Regular Meeting*, 12 Feb 2008. Accessed 7 Nov 2008: http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~secfas/February_2008_Agenda.pdf. Subsequent to the first writing of this article and presentation, access to the document referenced was blocked. See the "Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences Open Access Policy at <http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hfaspolicy>.

⁹ Stevan Harnad is the author of the Open Access Archivangelism Blog (<http://openaccess.eprints.org>) and a vocal advocate for Open Access. He is the former moderator of the American Scientist Open Access Forum, Professor in Electronics and Computer Science at the University of South Hampton, U.K. (<http://www.ecs.soton.ac.uk/people/harnad>)

¹⁰ "To self-archive is to deposit a digital document in a publicly accessible website, preferably an OAI-compliant Eprint Archive. Depositing involves a simple web interface where the depositor copy/pastes in the 'metadata' (date, author-name, title, journal-name, etc.) and then attaches the full-text document. Self-archiving takes only about 10 minutes for the first paper and even less time for all subsequent papers. Some institutions even offer a proxy self-archiving service, to do the keystrokes on behalf of their researchers. Software is also being developed to allow documents to be self-archived in bulk, rather than just one by one." See "Self Archiving FAQ." *Open Access and Institutional Repositories with EPrints*. Accessed 26 Nov 2008: <http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/self-faq/#self-archiving>

¹¹ Examples include records submitted by commercial database providers, such as Project Muse, JSTOR, University of Chicago Journals, etc.