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Response rate: 19%

How much confidence can we have in this?
Population of 78,000 authors, 14,500 responses.

<1% confidence interval at 95% confidence level for population of all T&F authors.
We are confident the results are representative!

Representative of *what* exactly?

Representative of the *worldwide population of T&F authors*.

But, of course, **not** necessarily representative of **all** authors in the world.
Researchers already have access to most of the articles they need.
Open Access is the future. Do it now!

I am the editor of an open access journal myself, and I fully support the drive to liberalise and democratise access to data, research, and all types of knowledge.
This obviously comes from free-love-style academics whose grasp of reality departed decades ago. The whole world doesn't need access to my research; non-specialists cannot be expected to understand it but can be expected to misinterpret it and thus portray me or my colleagues as demons because of our findings or conclusions. Why would you promote this as
I would *like* to publish in open access, but because I do not have a research funder, I cannot afford to.

As a graduate student, my heart stops when I hear that OA journals want money in order to publish. I barely have money to eat!
Open access is a good for developing countries since they may not be able to pay for a subscription. But if they have to pay for publication, then it will be again a problem.

Open Access articles will be the way to go, especially in the developing countries!
Publishers, perform an invaluable role in maintenance of scientific standards and the protection of intellectual property.

Why should I have to pay to give the journal my hard work?

I recognize the value added by publishers, but I know many of my colleagues do not.
Licences

- Exclusive License to Publish: 22%
- CC BY-NC-ND: 28%
- Copyright Assignment: 23%
- CC BY-NC: 11%
- CC BY-ND: 8%
- CC BY: 8%

Most preferred licence
Licences

Exclusive License to Publish
- CC BY-NC-ND: 28% (Most preferred), 18% (Second most)
- CC BY-NC: 23% (Most preferred), 21% (Second most)
- CC BY-ND: 11% (Most preferred), 15% (Second most)
- CC BY: 8% (Most preferred), 13% (Second most)

Copyright Assignment
- CC BY-NC-ND: 28% (Most preferred), 18% (Second most)
- CC BY-NC: 23% (Most preferred), 21% (Second most)
- CC BY-ND: 8% (Most preferred), 13% (Second most)
- CC BY: 8% (Most preferred), 4% (Second most)
Licences

Exclusive License to Publish

- CC BY-NC-ND
  - Most preferred licence: 22%
  - Second most preferred licence: 29%
  - Least preferred licence: -9%

- CC BY-NC
  - Most preferred licence: 11%
  - Second most preferred licence: 15%
  - Least preferred licence: -9%

- CC BY-ND
  - Most preferred licence: 8%
  - Second most preferred licence: 13%
  - Least preferred licence: -8%

- CC BY
  - Most preferred licence: 28%
  - Second most preferred licence: 18%
  - Least preferred licence: -5%
Licences

Exclusive License to Publish

- CC BY-NC-ND: 3% prefers most, 33% second, 19% least.
- CC BY-NC: -9% prefers most, 10% second, 16% least.
- CC BY-ND: -6% prefers most, 8% second, 14% least.

Copyright Assignment

- CC BY-NC-ND: -9% prefers most, 21% second, 19% least.
- CC BY-NC: -17% prefers most, 21% second, 19% least.
- CC BY: -56% prefers most, 7% second, 4% least.

[n = 4552]
Licences

Exclusive License to Publish

CC BY-NC-ND

Copyright Assignment

CC BY-NC

CC BY-ND

CC BY

[n = 451]
It is acceptable for others to use my work for commercial gain

- Agree: 8% 10% 14% 24% 43%
- Disagree: 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

It is acceptable for others to use my work in text- or data-mining

- Agree: 19% 29% 24% 15% 13%
- Disagree: 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
It is acceptable for others to use my work in text- or data-mining.

All subjects

- 0%: 19%
- 10%: 29%
- 20%: 24%
- 30%: 15%
- 40%: 13%
- 50%: 5%
- 60%: 11%
- 70%: 14%
- 80%: 14%
- 90%: 15%
- 100%: 14%

0 % 10 % 20 % 30 % 40 % 50 % 60 % 70 % 80 % 90 % 100 %
It is acceptable for others to adapt my work
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>5 - very important</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 - not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rigorous peer review</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid publication of my paper</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of my paper post-publication</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed guidance on how I can increase the visibility of my paper</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-peer review services such as language polishing, matching my</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paper to a journal, and / or formatting my paper to journal style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of article metrics in addition to usage and citation, such</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as Altmetric or ImpactStory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated deposit of my paper (the Author Accepted Version) into a</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repository of my choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When publishing open access, I would find the following kinds of peer review suitable for my research…

% of authors who would **always** find this useful...

- F1000 research
- eLife
- PLoS One
- Rigorous Peer Review
All research outputs should be free for everyone to read online.
I actively choose to publish in Open Access journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My institution provides some funds towards OA fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3% 5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 % 10 % 20 % 30 % 40 % 50 % 60 % 70 % 80 % 90 % 100 %
My research funder provides some funds towards OA fees

3% 6% 20% 13% 58%

0 % 10 % 20 % 30 % 40 % 50 % 60 % 70 % 80 % 90 % 100 %

Always

Never
My institution requires me to publish in free to access journals

- Always: 3%, 4%, 9%, 9%, 74%
- Never: 0%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, 100%

meh

$$$

Open Access

$$$
“It's too early to know how much traction OA journals will gain, in part because tenure and promotion criteria are becoming more stringent and, on the surface, traditional.”
Open access survey: exploring the views of Taylor & Francis and Routledge authors

In the final weeks of 2012, and the early part of 2013, Taylor & Francis carried out a worldwide survey of authors from all of our Journals to explore their views on open access.

With over 14,700 authors responding, this is the largest single survey our Research & Business Intelligence Department has conducted to date.

Why did we conduct this survey?

With open access developing at an extraordinary rate, Taylor & Francis wanted to gain a greater insight into the views of our authors towards open access, and many related topics, such as peer review, licensing, reuse, and metrics.

“The results of this survey are important, as they represent the views of a wide sample of authors across the disciplines in relation to open access following announcement of the RCUK and Wellcome mandates after the publication of the Finch report in the U.K.”

Dr. David Green, Global Publishing Director at Taylor & Francis.

Survey and top-level results

We wanted to make the results of the full survey available for all to read and have produced this document providing extracts showing the raw results from all the questions in the survey along with details about the survey population and resulting sample.

A copy of the survey is provided in the Appendix at the link above.

This document is provided under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence.

Supplements

These supplement to the top-level report each look at specific questions in turn from the survey and provide a regional breakdown along with breakdowns for all countries and subjects with more than 100 respondents. Breakdowns have not been provided for authors from the fields of law and area studies as there were fewer than 100 respondents in these areas.

Supplement 1 - Regional and subject breakdowns of license preferences
Supplement 2 - Regional and subject breakdowns of attitudes towards re-use