January 2007

Self-archiving and the Copyright Transfer Agreements of ISI-ranked library and information science journals

Anita Coleman
University of Arizona, acoleman@lpts.edu

Recommended Citation

Anita Coleman. "Self-archiving and the Copyright Transfer Agreements of ISI-ranked library and information science journals" *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (2007): 286-296. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20494

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

by

Anita Coleman

School of Information Resources & Library Science

University of Arizona

Email: asc@u.arizona.edu

This is a preprint of a paper accepted for publication in the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology,* 2006.

Abstract

A study of Thomson-Scientific ISI ranked Library and Information Science (LIS) journals (n=52) is reported. The study examined the stances of publishers as expressed in the Copyright Transfer Agreements (CTAs) of the journals, towards self-archiving, the practice of depositing digital copies of one's works in an OAI-compliant open access repository. 62 % (32) do not make their CTAs available on the open web; 38 % (20) do. Of the 38 % that do make CTAs available, two are open access journals. Of the 62 % that do not have a publicly available CTA, 40 % are silent about self-archiving. Even among the 20 journal CTAs publicly available there is a high level of ambiguity. Closer examination augmented by publisher policy documents on copyright, self-archiving, and instructions to authors, reveal that only five, 10% of the ISI-ranked LIS journals in the study, actually prohibit self-archiving by publisher rule. Copyright is a moving target but publishers appear to be acknowledging that copyright and open access can co-exist in scholarly journal publishing. The ambivalence of LIS journal publishers provides unique opportunities to members of the community. Authors can self-archive in open access archives. A society-led global scholarly communication consortium can engage in the strategic building of the LIS information commons. Aggregating OAI-compliant archives and developing disciplinary-specific library services for an LIS commons has the potential to increase the field's research impact and visibility. It may also ameliorate its own scholarly communication and publishing systems and serve as a model for others.

Background

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

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

mechanism whereby scholars deposit an electronic copy of their work at the time they submit to journals for publication consideration. Whether scholars can legally do so having transferred copyright, and other questions about academic copyrights, besides attempts to reconcile copyright policy with electronic technologies for an open scholarly publishing system, have been raised in the contexts of specific nations and a group of countries (Oppenheim, 1996, Mossink, 1999). Scholarly communication is, however, a global enterprise, copyright models for open access have been proposed (Creative Commons, 2005) and global open access archives have been operating in disciplines like high energy physics and computer science for more than a decade now. Librarians have been active in the advocacy of digital repositories as a tool to transform scholarly journal publishing and communication. An analysis of the CTAs of LIS journals is thus timely and relevant.

Research Questions

The overarching question investigated in the study being reported is this: What are publishers' stances towards self-archiving as expressed in journal CTAs? Subsidiary questions include the following: Is the use of the CTA a standard practice in LIS? How open are publishers in the sharing of information about their journal CTAs? What are the major types of academic journal publishers? [1] To answer these questions the literature on copyright and self-archiving in the context of the Open Access (OA) movement is briefly and selectively reviewed. The methods used and the analysis of the ISI-ranked LIS journals (n=52) are then presented followed by the results and a discussion which includes the implications of the findings for academic authors and journal publishers.

[1] These questions arose out of the author's role as founder of dLIST, the *Digital Library of Information Science and Technology*. It was established in 2002 as an OAI-compliant, subject-based open access archive for the global Library and Information Science research and practice communities. At the same time, the need for a deeper understanding of the self-archiving policies of LIS journals was recognized (Coleman & Bracke, 2003; Coleman et al., 2005).

Literature Review

Self-archiving, whereby an author deposits digital copies of his works in a publicly available website, preferably one compliant with the Open Archives Initiative-Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH), is one of two key strategies for reaching the goals of the OA movement – the open availability of the research outputs of a discipline (BOAI, 2002; Eprints, 2005). The other strategy is open access publishing, through electronic journals openly available on the WWW. For Harnad et al (2004), self-archiving and publishing in open access journals are the green and gold roads to achieving open access of the refereed, research literature. There are many studies about open access and both components, open access publishing, through open access journals, and open access archiving or self-archiving, the practice by which authors deposit digital copies of their works for public web access, and the major stakeholders involved, authors and publishers, have been studied. Bailey's *Open Access Bibliography* (2005) provides a list of research studies and Suber's *Open Access News* weblog (2006) is an excellent current awareness tool for OA research, irrespective of their publication venue, closed or open.

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

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

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

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

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

In the garden of open access Eden, copyright, considered a barrier to self-archiving is somewhat contradictorily the "non-problem" and the "poisoned apple." (Harnad, 1999; Eprints, 2005). Copyright

should not be a problem, because estimates reveal that over 90% of scholarly journal publishers in all disciplines allow some form of self-archiving; the majority of academic authors should feel free to self-archive. Yet the greater part of the peer-reviewed literature in many disciplines continues to be toll-gated and unavailable openly since authors feel that having transferred copyright to the publisher they no longer have the right to self-archive. Studies have thus sought to develop an understanding of the attitudes of publishers and authors towards self-archiving and copyright.

Oppenheim et al (2000) corroborated the general view of the publishing industry as a small number of large commercial publishers with a long tail of smaller self-published scholarly societies, universities, and others. "Of the respondents, 70% either agreed or strongly agreed that copyright infringement was a key concern and over 60% of respondents believed that electronic distribution created unknown legal liabilities." But publishers were aware of their own limitations; that is "fear over copyright implications can often arise as a result of poor education and awareness amongst publishers." (p. 386). They also saw the need for users to be educated about copyrights.

The UK RoMEO project (August 2002-July 2003) conducted a comprehensive series of studies that examined the intellectual property issues faced by self-archiving academics from a variety of different perspectives – the academics, publishers, CTAs, OAI data and service providers (Gadd et al, 2003a-e; 2004a, 2004b). They found 90% of authors still assign copyright in exchange for publication with 50% doing so reluctantly (Gadd et al, 2003a). Of the eighty publisher CTAs examined, representing all disciplines and top-ranked ISI journals, 90% asked for copyright assignment (72 of the 80) and although 42.5 % of the publishers allowed self-archiving there was no consensus on the conditions (which version and where) under which it could take place (Gadd et al, 2003d).

Evidence is increasing, however, that with the passage of time and as a function of publishers gaining experience with electronic technologies, the number of publishers who allow self-archiving is rising. The ISI study of open access journals suggests that over 55% of the journals, and over 65% of the journal articles indexed in *Web of Science*, are produced by publishers who allow some form of self-archiving (McVeigh, 2004).

Given the rise in publisher acceptance of self-archiving and the growing number of digital repositories, researchers have started to turn their attention to the self-archiving behaviors of faculty. In the US, Foster and Gibbons (2005) examined faculty work practices and gathered observational data that would help them improve the growth of content in their institutional repository at the University of Rochester. Like subject-based or disciplinary archives, institutional repositories (IR) are also OAI-PMH compliant. Unlike subject-based repositories, they may not be cross-institutional and not all content need be open. Rather, they are restricted to members of the particular institution they serve. That is, only institutional members works can be deposited in IR (Crow, 2003; Lynch, 2003). In an ideal world, cross-institutional disciplinary repositories, also called centralized archives, are clearly better for the development of subject services that can aid, innovate and transform scholarship and research (Lynch 2003; Brogan, 2003). But IR, after a slow start do appear to be a viable if also a controversial strategy for universities to regain control of the content they have traditionally given away to publishers (Kulkarni, 1995; Atkinson, 1996a, 1996b; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997; McSherry, 2001; Agrawal, 2001). Foster and Gibbons found "[f]aculty members think in terms of reading, researching, writing, and disseminating. They think about the specifics of their research area, whether neutrinos, German film, prosody, or the Congressional Black Caucus. But say "institutional repository" to them, and there is little response." Although the faculty in the study did not identify with the 'institutional repository' phrase, they cared a great deal about ownership and control of who has access to their

intellectual works. Therefore, Foster and Gibbons support the recommendation of Gandel, et al (2004) to use "personal digital libraries or repositories" as the terminology to hook faculty participation in IR.

Swan and Sheridan (2005) in one of the larger studies of author self-archiving surveyed 1286 authors from many disciplines including LIS, about their open access archiving practice. Over one quarter of authors responding did not know who owned copyright, a number that rises when permissions and only self-archivers are considered; 36 % of those who self-archive did not know if they needed to ask for copyright permissions before self-archiving (p. 56). *Where* a work can be self-archived and *which* version of the work can be self-archived continued to be critical variables for a deeper understanding of self-archiving. Only 10% of all respondents were aware of the RoMEO/SHERPA directories; these are directories that categorize the self-archiving policies of publishers and their journals (SHERPA, 2005). However, the LIS journals coverage of the directories is inadequate and provided another impetus for the study reported herein.

Methods Used

A search using DE=Library and Information Sciences in *Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory 2005/2007* retrieved 3191 records of which 2809 journals are in English (2005). Rather than selecting all LIS journals or a random sample of LIS journals from the *Ulrich* list, ISI-ranked LIS journals were chosen as the population for the investigation. This is because ISI-ranked journals are often considered to be a representative holding, if not also the best quality, of the current literature, news, and research in the disciplines they cover, including LIS. The correct name for ISI is Thomson-Scientific, but since they are better known as ISI, Thomson-ISI or ISI is the preferred terminology used. Only the journals in the ISI index, *Social Science Citation Index (SSCI)* in the Information Science, Library Science

subjects category (n=57) were selected for analysis (Thomson-Scientific, 2005).

Three people conducted web searches for the journals, publishers, CTAs, and supplementary documents (for example, copyright policies and manuscript submission guidelines) at different times (fall 2004, spring 2005 and fall 2005). All three were also engaged in the analysis conducted each semester. Appendix A provides the list of fields for which data was collected and the categories and codes used in the analysis; the most relevant analytical categories are explained below.

For purposes of the analysis, self-archiving was strictly defined as author deposit of author post print in an OAI-compliant (open access) archive. But, as in other studies (Gadd et al, 2003a; Swan and Brown, 2005) varying levels of self-archiving are distinguished based on what version of the author's work (preprint and postprint) was allowed and where (personal or institutional website, institutional repository, and open access archive). A distinction was also made between institutional repositories and open access archives. The final two categories are: unknown, when no CTA was found, and ambiguous, in cases of doubt. The categories used to indicate the journal's state of self-archiving are:

Author can archive pre-print and post-print;

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

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

Author can archive in open access archives;

Author can archive in personal/institutional website;

Author can archive in institutional repositories;

Author cannot archive by Publishing rule

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

Unknown classification (when CTA is not found)

The categories used to indicate the type of publisher are: commercial publishers, self-publishing scholarly societies, university presses, and others.

Results

There were a total of 57 journals on the Thomson-ISI list. 2 foreign language titles, the *ASIS monographs series* and two duplicate titles were dropped making the total number of journals available for analysis 52 (n=52). A complete list of the journals studied can be seen in Table 1. It also shows the number and titles of LIS journals that do or do not make their CTAs available on the web. Table 2 categorizes the types of journal publishers, their names and the number of ISI-ranked LIS journals published by the different types. Here is a quick summary of the findings with regard to self-archiving in CTAs and types of publishers:

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

about copyright ownership and the full citation given

- 37 journals are by commercial publishers (71%) but 8 of the 37 are on behalf of scholarly societies; another 8 are self-published society journals (15%), 6 (12%) by university presses, and 2% (one) is published by an individual.

[TABLE1]

[TABLE2]

Only five journals (*Econtent, Law Library Journal, Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, Information Systems Research, MIS Quarterly*), the first of which is trade and none of which are truly core LIS (one is legal librarianship, another is medical informatics, and the other two are business/management information systems focused) prohibit deposits in open access archives outright. **The majority of LIS journals are not averse to self-archiving.** To understand how this may be so, Table 3 provides a snapshot view of the self-archiving positions possible and the number of LIS journals that subscribe to them. A fuller discussion also follows dividing the 20 journals into two groups: the first presents the data for five journals that represent open access journals as well as two ends of the spectrum of self-archiving, and the second discusses the rest of the 15 journals in terms of specific ambiguities. Lastly, data collected for the 32 journals with no CTAs are briefly presented.

[TABLE3]

Two journals, *Journal of the Medical Library Association (JMLA),* published by the Medical Library Association, and *Information Research (IR)* published by an individual, T.D. Wilson, are open access journals and their copyrights allow self-archiving. In both cases, author retains copyright but *JMLA*

authors sign a Copyright License Agreement that includes an author's warranty and a Disclosure Statement. The *JMLA* author grants the Medical Library Association exclusive, world-wide first publication rights and other non-exclusive rights; *IR* articles are protected by the Attribution-No Derivatives-Noncommercial use Creative Commons License 1.0 and no instrument appears to be signed by authors. *College & Research Libraries* published by a professional association, the American Library Association's (ALA) division of Academic and College Research Libraries (ACRL), allows self-archiving as defined in this study. But this is a relatively new move made very recently following an announcement to become an embargoed open access journal (ACRL, 2005). At the other end of the spectrum is the *MIS Quarterly,* a university research center publication, which prohibits self-archiving by publisher rule. Similarly, although the CTA itself makes no mention, on a Copyright and Permissions page *Information Systems Research* published by INFORMS, a learned society of about 12,000 professionals and academics in operations research and organizational information systems, adds: "[a]s a further condition of final acceptance of a paper for publication in an INFORMS journal, the author(s) must indicate if their paper is posted on a working paper website, other than their own...Authors may post their working papers on websites after acceptance and prior to publication, as long as the sites are not copyrighted or do not serve as formal depositories." (INFORMS, 2005)

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

Scientometrics, a Springer publication, offers open choice for which the author pays although asking LIS authors to pay $3000 per article for open access seems a bit optimistic.

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

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

Three journals published by Taylor & Francis - *Information Society, International Journal of Geographic Information Science, Journal of Health Communication* - allow self-archiving of post prints in open access archives after an embargo period but this is not clear just from the CTA. Additional documents about the company's policy on self-archiving have to be consulted. Also, during the early period of the study one of the journals, *Journal of Health Communication,* appeared to invoke

the Ingelfinger rule whereby self-archiving on the open web was considered to be a form of publication and the work would not be considered by the journal.

Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology published by a commercial publisher, Wiley, on behalf of a scholarly society, the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIS&T), allows self-archiving of preprints but not for "external systematic distribution." Two aspects of the *JASIST* CTA are puzzling; one, granting back 'preprint rights' is questionable as it depends on when the CTA is signed and two, the use of the listserv as one example of the external systematic distribution method by which preprints may not be distributed is confusing. Publishers such as Taylor & Francis also include this phrase but appear to view it differently as in the same section they explicitly allow self-archiving in open access repositories (Taylor & Francis, 2005a; 2005b).

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

20 of the 32, that is, 40 % of the total population studied, have no public expressions about self-archiving. They are *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science, Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, Journal of Information Ethics, Journal of Information Science, Journal of Information Technology, Journal of Management Information Systems, Journal of Scholarly Publishing, Knowledge Organization, Libraries and Culture, Library Journal, Library Quarterly, Library Trends, Online, Proceedings of the*

ASIST Annual Meeting, Restaurator, Research Evaluation, Scientist, Social Science Computer Review, Social Science Information.

Seven of the journals in this group belong to Elsevier.[2] Elsevier, through a separate web document called the Copyright Policy, appears to allow self-archiving of pre and post prints in open access archives for all its journals - *Journal of Academic Librarianship, Government Information Quarterly (*former title*: Journal of Government Information), Information Processing & Management, International Journal of Information Management, Library and Information Science Research, Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services* (former title: *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory), Telecommunications Policy*.

Libri explains that "The submission of the manuscript by the authors means that the authors automatically agree to assign exclusive copyright to K. G. Saur Verlag if the manuscript is accepted for publication." (Libri, n.d.) This is misleading as authors may agree but if no transfer instrument is executed an agreement is irrelevant.

Two journals appear to prohibit author self-archiving by publisher rule, *Econtent* and *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association (JAMIA),* although *JAMIA*, has its own open access preprint server. The final two journals - *Law Library Journal, Portal* - appear to allow self-archiving in open access archives. In the case of *Portal* the specific language used is "the open web." (Johns Hopkins, 2005). The *Law Library Journal,* published by the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) is slightly more complex; although it appears to prohibit self-archiving by a publishing rule articulated on the Author's Guide (AALL, 2005a), a special Open Access Task Force has been appointed which will

[2] Elsevier, unlike most other journals in this category, mentions CTAs but chooses not to make them publicly available.

make its final report mid-2006 (AALL, 2005b). At least one member of this committee has been experimenting with self-archiving in the Duke University institutional repository (Danner, 2004).

Discussion

Summarizing, the findings are

1) 62%, a majority of ISI-ranked LIS journals do not make their CTAs publicly available;
2) 67%, irrespective of CTAs, are ambiguous, but the ambiguity is neither negative nor prohibitive towards self-archiving in OAI-compliant or open access archives;
3) 40% are silent about self-archiving;
4) 90% appear to permit self-archiving in some form or another; and
5) 71%, a majority of ISI-ranked LIS journals are by commercial publishers, 15% are self-published scholarly society journals, 12 % by university presses, and 2% (one journal) by an individual.

These findings have several interpretations and important implications. One interpretation of the lack of CTAs and the high ambiguity is liberality; a generosity and silent courtesy on the part of the publishers who do not explicitly prohibit author self-archiving. On the other hand, the high level of ambiguity and silence may also mean that publishers are waiting to see what authors will do. In general, it appears that publishers of all types have not wanted to commit themselves and instead have provided room for authors to negotiate while they themselves gain electronic publishing experience and experiment with Internet technologies and newer business models. What can be reasonably extrapolated from these findings is that publishers and authors have at least this much in common: both would like to maximize access. That is, both would like the works to be fully available to be largest possible audience.

The road ahead for LIS authors is quite clear. Authors, especially academic authors, who are driven to publish in ISI-ranked journals by tenure considerations can afford to be assertive: when a CTA is offered, strike out the no-self-archiving clause should one appear and add a specific clause that permits self-archiving of author post prints in open access archives. When there is no CTA, just self-archive the author post print in an open access archive. According to US Copyright Law "A transfer of copyright ownership, other than by operation of law, is not valid unless an instrument of conveyance, or a note or memorandum of the transfer, is in writing and signed by the owner of the rights conveyed or such owner's duly authorized agent." (US Copyright Office, 2005). Copyright transfer is not a legal requirement for publishing; publishers can publish without requiring and requesting copyright. When they do so, authors can also do what they want with the work such as self-archiving. Especially given that one of the advantages of open access is increased impact (Pringle, 2004).

What is less clear is why professional associations and learned societies in North America, four of the five are ISI-ranked journal publishers – *AALL, ALA, ASIS&T*, and *CAIS* – have remained silent for so long and what they should do now. The fifth, the Medical Library Association, signaled early and clearly; their ISI-ranked journal, *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, formerly *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association,* went open in 2001/2002, and all back issues are openly available from 1911 onwards (Plutchak, 2005). From postings on electronic discussion lists, blogs, and other anecdotal evidence it appears that ALA committees in ACRL and LITA, for example, have been discussing opening access to their publications. ALA-ACRL only recently announced that *College & Research Libraries (C&RL)* would become an open access journal after an embargo period. However, *C&RL* authors are encouraged to self-archive pre-prints and post-prints in open access archives immediately (English, 2005). ASIS&T is not considered a major association, in terms of size and in

comparison with the ALA or MLA but its publications, many of which are ISI-ranked, are considered the most prestigious by LIS academic authors. There is a leadership opportunity for ASIS&T to shape the future of the field's scholarly journal publishing in the digital scholarly communication environment.

In discussing the future of scholarly journal publishing, Oppenheim et al (2000, p. 391) noted that the tensions between academics who would like to resist Internet commercialization and the giving away of their data, publishers who would like to continue the traditional print journal model onto the electronic world, and librarians who are unable to purchase all the information that is being published in journals offer unique opportunities for not-for-profit scholarly societies to change the commercial journal publishing model. They also highlighted the need for customized search engines, warned of the rise of commercial brands that would breed virtual communities, and called for a special committee to work on copyright that would consider all stakeholder needs. Five years later, we have Scopus and SpringerLink from the commercial publishing giants Elsevier and Springer for all scientific communities, and INFORMS and IT Info Central who are trying to serve various Information Systems communities (Scopus, 2005; SpringerLink, 2005; INFORMS Online, 2005, ITI Info Central, 2005). Scopus is global, covers all disciplines (14, 200 titles representing 4000 international publishers), and includes the scholarship of selected open access archives. Elsevier also makes Scirus "the most comprehensive science-specific search engine on the Internet" openly available (Scirus, 2005). EBSCOHost's 2005 Christmas gift to librarians was the *Library and Information Science and Technology Abstracts (LISTA)* database, an abstracting and indexing database similar to *Library Literature* and *Library and Information Science Abstracts. LISTA* (2005) is an open access database portending comparable commercial disciplinary services for the LIS communities. Nevertheless, open access to the full-text of LIS refereed research remains elusive, if only because it is multi-disciplinary

and interdisciplinary. The multi-disciplinary and interdisciplinary nature of LIS research also means that OA may need to be pursued strategically. Federated, disciplinary, digital library aggregation services with the goal of an LIS information commons may be a solution (Coleman & Roback, 2005) but the prescriptive nature of this discussion is better understood using bibliometrics.

In 1989 Wallace pointed out bibliometrics and citation analysis could be useful for accomplishing a "major goal of information science" by "expanding understanding of the ways in which information resources are produced and used, and the ways in which production and use differ among different groups of people." (Wallace, 1989, p. 26). In the 1980s citation studies showed us that the scholarly communication system was a much more loosely coupled one than envisioned. But in the 1990s and more so in recent years we are discovering that the system is also becoming unsustainable, in terms of economics, preservation, information overload and noise. All of these factors apply to the LIS scholarly communication sub-system too. 72% of LIS publications are uncited and although uncitedness does not equal lack of value it contributes to the image of LIS as a fragmented discipline (Schwartz, 1997). Schmidle and Via (2004) have documented the serials price increases in LIS, and Davis (2005) has provided evidence of article duplication in LIS journals including ISI-ranked ones. Mary Munroe's web site (2005), commissioned by the Association of Research Libraries and the Information Access Alliance (2005), a group that seeks to apply anti-trust laws to mergers in academic publishing, underscores the critical need for a balanced publishing ecology in LIS. Of the twelve large commercial publishers Munroe traces, many of the commercial ISI-ranked LIS journal publishers are represented: Blackwell, John Wiley and Sons, Reed Elsevier, Springer Science, Taylor & Francis, Thomson, Wolters Kluwer, and Verlagsgruppe George von Holtzbrinck GmbH. The majority of the ISI-ranked LIS journals are by commercial publishers. Careful, coordinated experimentation can help ensure that the balance between society publishers, university publishers, and commercial publishers is a healthy

one for LIS research and scholarship besides improving the visibility of the research in the field.

Conclusion

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

Only 52 ISI-ranked journals were investigated in the study. It would be fruitful to examine a random sample of the larger population of LIS journals to identify their copyright status, self-archiving policies, and determine if the high level of ambiguity and lack of CTAs continue to hold. A follow-up publisher survey of all the ISI-ranked LIS journals, but especially the 32 that have no public CTAs, may shed new light especially on the question of whether the use of a CTA is standard a practice in LIS. Copyright law is also national rather than international and this is another area for future investigations. How does the country of publication influence the copyright and self-archiving policies of journals? Other conceptual and empirical research could identify ways in which digital repositories can be better used to correct present imbalances and flaws for a transparent scholarly communication system. For

example, the well-known ArXiV is not just an open access archive; rather it utilizes online peer review before accepting deposits. As the amount of information produced continues to escalate, it will also become important to investigate the influence of open full-text availability and extensive article duplication on impact factors and use, discover applications of bibliometric laws such as Bradford's distribution and obsolescence to the growth and use of open access archives, and undertake rigorous modeling and scenario planning for sustainable disciplinary scholarly communication. For example, what is the optimal size and nature of a scholarly communication system distinct from a scholarly publishing one for a discipline such as LIS? Finally, similar studies in other categories/disciplines of ISI-ranked journals will add to knowledge about disciplinary differences.

In pragmatic terms, the findings offer an unequivocal message to the information professions, their journals, and respective research communities. Authors and research/practice communities can consciously adopt and deliberately pursue the complementary policy of self-archiving, while publishing in ISI-ranked journals, and using digital repositories as "personal digital libraries". The field can engage in synergetic experimentation, possibly led by a scholarly society, a global scholarly communication consortium that includes publishers of all types, for building the LIS commons and developing subject-based, open access, federated, digital library/repository services. In the process of its development and use we may also trigger more innovative, globally equitable, transparent, and sustainable models for scholarly publishing and communication than the systems we now have in place.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to William Hornbaker, the first dLIST Intellectual Property Intern who explored LIS journals

and their CTAs in Spring 2003. Work by and discussions with Cheryl Malone, Paul Bracke, Jingfeng Xia, Shawn Nelson, and David Lehmann are gratefully acknowledged. Thanks to Don Kraft for his insightful questions about an early draft and encouragement to write the research paper, Danny Wallace, a graciously prompt and careful mentor, Alma Swan for quick clarifications, Raym Crow for advice about the commons, Joseph Roback for technical support, and the anonymous reviewers for constructive criticism.

References

AALL (2005a). Law library journal's author's guide. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.aallnet.org/products/llj_authors_guide.asp

AALL (2005b). Open access task force. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.aallnet.org/committee/open_access_task.asp

ACRL. (2005). Open access comes to *C&RL*. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://acrlblog.org/2005/11/10/open-access-comes-to-crl/

Agrawal, A. (2001). Research on university-to-industry knowledge transfer: Framework of existing literature and unanswered questions. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 3 (4): 285-302.

Atkinson, R. C. 1996a. Universities and the knowledge-based economy.: Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/pres/comments/senate.html

Atkinson, R.C. 1996b. The California solution. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/pres/comments/science.html

Bachrach, S., et al. (1998). Who owns scientific work? *Science* 281 (5382): 1451. Retrieved Dec. 11, 2005, from EBSCOHOST (subscription database).

Bailey, C. (2005). Open access bibliography: Liberating scholarly literature with e-prints and open access journals. Washington D.C., Association for Research Libraries. Retrieved December 11, 2005,

from http://www.escholarlypub.com/oab/oab.pdf

Biagioli, M. (1998). The Instability of authorship: Credit and responsibility in contemporary biomedicine. *The FASEB Journal* 12 (January): 3-16.

BOAI (2002). Budapest open access initiative. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.soros.org/openaccess/

Boyle, J. (1992). A Theory of law and information: Copyright, spleens, blackmail, and insider trading. *California Law Review,* 80: 1413 – [n.p.] Retrieved December 11, 2005, from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, Law Reviews (subscription database).

Boyle, J. (1997). A Politics of intellectual property: Environmentalism for the Net. *Duke Law Journal* 47: 87-[n.p.]. Retrieved from December 11, 2005, from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, Law Reviews (subscription database).

Brogan, M. L. (2003). A Survey of digital library aggregation services. Washington D.C.: Digital Library Federation. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.diglib.org/pubs/brogan/brogan2003.pdf

Coleman, A. and Bracke, P. (2003). DLIST: Building an international scholarly communication consortium for library and information science, pp. 311-332. In *Mapping technology on libraries and people: Papers presented at the First International CALIBER – 2003 (Ahmedabad, 13-15 February).* Editor-in-chief: T.A.V. Murthy. New Delhi, India, Information and Library Network Centre.

Coleman, A. and Roback, J. (2005). Open access federation for library and information science: dLIST and DL-Harvest. *D-Lib Magazine* 11 (12) December. Retrieved December 23, 2005, from http://www.dlib.org/dlib/december05/coleman/12coleman.html

Coleman, A. Malone, C.K. Xia, J., and Nelson, S. (2005). Copyright transfer agreements in an interdisciplinary repository. Poster presented at the Association for Library and Information Science Education Annual Conference, Jan 2005, Boston, MA. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://dlist.sir.arizona.edu/912/

Creative Commons. (2005). Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.creativecommons.org/

Crow, R. (2003). The Case for institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.arl.org/sparc/IR/ir.html.

Danner, R. (2005). Issues in the preservation of born-digital scholarly communications in law. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://eprints.law.duke.edu/archive/00000878/

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

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

Eprints. (2005). Self-archiving FAQ. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from

http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/self-faq/

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

Foster, N.F., and Gibbons, S. (2005). Understanding faculty to improve content recruitment for institutional repositories. *D-Lib Magazine*11 (1) January. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january05/foster/01foster.html

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

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

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

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

Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., and Probets, S. (2003e). The Intellectual property rights issues facing self-archiving: Key findings of the RoMEO project. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september03/gadd/09gadd.html

Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., and Probets, S. (2004a). "RoMEO Studies 5: The IPR issues facing OAI data and service providers." *Electronic Library* 22 (2): 121-138.

Gadd, E., Oppenheim, C., and Probets, S. (2004b). "RoMEO Studies 6: Rights metadata for open archiving - the RoMEO solutions." *Program* 3 (1): 5-14.

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

Ginsberg, J. C. (1990). Creation and commercial value: Copyright of works of information. *Columbia Law Review*, 90: 1865-[n.p.]. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, Law Reviews (subscription database).

Harnad, Stevan. (1999). Re: The Copyright non-problem and self-archiving. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.ecs.soton.ac.uk/~harnad/Hypermail/Amsci/3841.html

Harnad, Stevan, Brody, T., Vallieres, F., Carr, L., Hitchcock, S., Gingras, Y., Oppenheim, C., Stamerjohanns, H. and Hilf, E. (2004). The Green and the gold roads to open access. *Nature Web Focus*. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/9940/

Information Access Alliance. (2005). Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.informationaccess.org/

INFORMS (2005). Copyrights and permissions. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://isr.pubs.informs.org/copyrights.htm

INFORMS Online (2005). http://www.informs.org/ Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://isr.pubs.informs.org/copyrights.htm

ITI Info Central. (2005). Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.iti-infocentral.com/

Johns Hopkins. (2005). portal: Libraries and the Academy: Guidelines for contributors. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/guidelines.html

Kulkarni, S. R. (1995). All professors create equally**:** Why faculty should have complete control over the intellectual property rights in their creations. *Hastings Law Journal*, 47: 221-[n.p]. Retrieved December 11, 2005 from from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, Law Reviews (subscription database).

Libri. [n.d.] Libri: Instructions to authors. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.librijournal.org/authorinst.html

LISTA. (2005). Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.lisresearch.com/

Litman, J. (1991). Copyright as myth. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review*, 53: 235-[n.p.]. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, Law Reviews (subscription database).

Lynch, Clifford. (2003). Institutional repositories: Essential infrastructure for scholarship in the digital age. *ARL Bimonthly Report 226*: February. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.arl.org/newsltr/226/ir.html.

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

McVeigh, M. (2004). Open access journals in the ISI citation databases: Analysis of impact factors and citation patterns. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.isinet.com/media/presentrep/essayspdf/openaccesscitations2.pdf

Mossink, W. (1999). Copyright policy for universities: A proposal from the SURF foundation for a joint copyright policy for the dutch universities. The Netherlands, SURF Foundation /IWI and Open Universiteit Nederland. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.surf.nl/en/download/iwi%20auteursrechten%20UK%20def.pdf.

Munroe, Mary. (2005). The Academic publishing industry: A story of merger and acquisition. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.niulib.niu.edu/publishers/

Oppenheim, C. (1996). Copyright in HEIs: a discussion paper. Strathclyde, Department of Information Science, UK. URL: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/pub/copyright/charles1.htm (this paper is no longer available

on the JISC sit). Retrieved December 11, 2005, from the Internet Archive: http://www.archive.org/

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

Plutchak, S. (2005). The Impact of open access. *Journal of the Medical Library Association,* 93 (4): 419-421. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1250314.

Pringle, J. (2004) Do open access journals have impact? *Nature* (Web Focus). Retrieved 24 February 2006, from http://www.nature.com/nature/focus/accessdebate/19.html.

Reichmann, J.H. (1993). Charting the collapse of the patent-copyright dichotomy: Premises for a restructured international intellectual property system. *Cardoza Arts and Entertainment Law Journal* 13: 475- [n.p.]. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, Law Reviews (subscription database).

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

Schwartz, Charles, A. (1997). The Rise and fall of uncitedness. *College and Research Libraries* 58: 19-29.

Scirus. (2005). Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.scirus.com/

Scopus. (2005). Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.scopus.com/

SHERPA. (2005) Publisher copyright policies and self-archiving: the RoMEO/SHEPA list. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php

Springer Link. (2005) Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.springerlink.com/

Suber, Peter. (2005). Open access news: News from the open access movement. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/fosblog.html

SURF. (2005). Copyright management for scholarship. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.surf.nl/copyright/keyissues/scholarlycommunication/agreements.php

Swan, A., and Brown, S. (2005). Open access self-archiving: an author study. Technical report. UK: JISC. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/10999/

Taylor & Francis. (2005a). Taylor & Francis's position on Copyright and author rights. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authorrights.pdf

Taylor & Francis. (2005b). Copyright FAQ. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/copyright.asp

Thomson Scientific (2005). ISI Master journal list. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from

http://scientific.thomson.com/mjl/

Trosow, S. E. (2003). The Illusive search for justificatory theories: Copyright, commodification and capital. *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence* 16 (2): 217-241.

Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory, 2005-2007. (2005). Online. Retrieved May 29, 2005.

U.S. Copyright Office. (2005). Copyright law of the United States of America and related laws contained in Title 17 of the *United States Code:* Circular 92; Chapter 2 Copyright ownership and transfer. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from http://www.copyright.gov/title17/92chap2.html#204

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

Appendix 1: Data collected and categories, fields, and codes used in the analysis of CTAs

Title of the journal

Journal URL

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

Type: This indicates whether the journal is indexed in the following categories/services:

ISI-SSCI

ISI-JCR

DOAJ

Publisher:

Type of publisher: This indicates the type of publisher and there were 4 categories:

Commercial, Scholarly society (self-published)

Scholarly society (commercially published)

University Presses

Individual

Publisher URL:

CTA URL:

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

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

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

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

Author can archive preprint and postprint;

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

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

Author can archive in open access archives;

Author can archive in personal/institutional website;

Author can archive in institutional repositories;

Author cannot archive by Publishing rule

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

Unknown classification (when CTA is not found)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Related Journals: Changed journal titles (former titles, etc.)

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

Number of ISI-Ranked LIS Journals that have a CTA publicly available on the WWW	Number of ISI-Ranked LIS Journals that do not make their CTA publicly available on the WWW
20	32
----------	----------
1. *Aslib Proceedings* 2. *College & Research Libraries* 3. *Information Research* 4. *Information Society* 5. *Information Systems Journal* 6. *Information Systems Research* 7. *Information Technology and Libraries* 8. *Interlending & Document Supply* 9. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* 10. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, The* 11. *Journal of Documentation* 12. *Journal of Health Communication* 13. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 14. *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 15. *Library Resources & Technical Services* 16. *MIS Quarterly* 17. *Online Information Review* 18. *Program-Electronic Library and Information Systems* 19. *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 20. *Scientometrics*	1. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* 2. *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science* 3. *Econtent* 4. *Electronic Library, The* 5. *Government Information Quarterly (former title: Journal of Government Information)* 6. *Information Processing & Management* 7. *International Journal of Information Management* 8. *Journal of Information Ethics* 9. *Journal of Information Science* 10. *Journal of Information Technology* 11. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science* 12. *Journal of Management Information Systems* 13. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 14. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 15. *Knowledge Organization* 16. *Law Library Journal* 17. *Libraries and Culture* 18. *Library and Information Science Research* 19. *Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services (former title: Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory)* 20. *Library Journal* 21. *Library Quarterly* 22. *Library Trends* 23. *Libri* 24. *Online* 25. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 26. *Proceedings of the ASIST Annual Meeting* 27. *Research Evaluation* 28. *Restaurator-International Journal for the Preservation of Library and Archival Material* 29. *Scientist* 30. *Social Science Computer Review* 31. *Social Science Information* 32. *Telecommunications Policy*

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

Type of publisher and their names	***Number of LIS Journals***
Commercial – Beech Tree, Blackwell, Elsevier, Emerald, Ergon Verlag, John Wiley and Sons, K.G. Saur Verlag, Information Today, Palgrave, McFarland, Macmillan, ME Sharpe, Sage, Scientist, Inc., Springer, Taylor & Francis	37 *(includes journals published on behalf of scholarly societies - AMIA, ASIS&T, CILIP, ISKO*)*
Self-published scholarly societies or professional associations – AALL, ALA, CAIS, INFORMS, MLA*	8
University presses – Johns Hopkins, University of Chicago, University of Toronto, University of Minnesota, University of Texas	6
Other – Individual, T.D. Wilson	1

* AALL – American Association of Law Libraries, ALA – American Library Association, AMIA, American Medical Informatics Association, ASIS&T – American Society for Information Science and Technology, CAIS - Canadian Association for Information Science, CILIP – The Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, ISKO – International Society for Knowledge Organization, INFORMS – INFORMS Information Systems Society, MLA – Medical Library Association

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

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

* Since most journals (32) do not make their CTA publicly available the numbers may be inflated; self-archiving of postprints in open access archives was assumed as allowed by these journals.

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