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1. Key Messages

The data presented here should be approached with due caution. We are dealing with a relatively small number of academics from a selection of higher education institutions (HEIs), so extrapolating these findings to academia as a whole would not be advisable. There are few non-participants in open access (OA) in the sample, so if there is a bias in the sample, it is towards those who already engage with OA. We can therefore feel more confident about the data regarding why academics do use OA as opposed to why they do not. There were however a large number of participants who did not always make their work OA. From them we should gain some insight into the barriers that currently exist to making work OA.

We know that three institutions from which the academics in this study were drawn have a policy or mandate requiring academic staff to make their work open access. Of those that did have an institutional policy (54 academics), only seven were confident of this. A similar picture existed with funder mandates. Of those that did have a funder mandate (65 academics) only 14 reported that they did. The majority of the academics in the study are engaged with open access, so we can conclude that these policies have had little impact on the uptake of OA. HEIs have failed to get the message of these mandates over to these engaged academics, so we can surmise that the message has also not got over to the less engaged.

The motivations for engaging with open access given by these academics tend to be internal, personal reasons, especially altruistic ones. Both chemists and economists see themselves as working for the wider public benefit. However, economists especially also give more selfish reasons, where OA is seen as conferring a personal benefit. External forces that attempt to push academics towards engagement with OA feature less prominently. One academic commented that the existence of an institutional mandate would make him feel less inclined to engage. However, these are academics who are already engaged, and may be enthusiastic, early adopters of OA. It may take more “push” to bring the others on board.

Quality is a concern for both chemists and economists. The need to publish in high-impact journals and the peer-review process are major concerns of academics when they choose not to participate in OA. These are however issues that would affect any new journal, in any medium. Reputation and the perception of quality take time to develop. However open-access journals need to ensure that they have adequate quality procedures in place with regard to issues like plagiarism and peer review.

The use of an open access option from a traditional journal was the least popular means of making work open access. This is in spite of this option offering a solution to the problem of quality. Cost was a major issue for academics when they choose not to make work open access. Most of these same academics reported that institutional support for payment of open access fees would encourage them to participate in future.

2. The Data

Some 82 chemists and 48 economists from 11 institutions completed the survey. Between them, these institutions put forward 304 research-active chemists and 208 research-active economists in the last RAE. If we take these latter figures as a proxy for the populations in question, then the confidence interval for the chemists’ data would be around 9% and around 12% for the economists’ at a confidence level of 95%. These figures strike a note of caution in themselves against making over-bold claims for these data. Subsets within the data will of course exhibit larger confidence intervals, so I will flag these in the report when they occur.
It is also worth noting that only two (4%) of the economist respondents reported that they had “not made any of their work Open Access by any means.” This compares to 22 chemists (27%) who reported this. It may of course be the case that economists make significantly greater use of OA than chemists, but, given the much smaller sample for the economist survey, it is worth bearing in mind that this particular data set is biased towards Open Access “enthusiasts”.

3. Institutional Repositories and Mandates

Over half the academics surveyed (59% of chemists and 67% of economists) were confident that their institution had a repository that made available the research outputs of the institution. However, as all the institutions in question have such a repository, that leaves a sizeable minority who were unaware of this fact.

Some HEIs have an open access policy or mandate that requires academics to make their work open access. Only 5 chemists and 4 economists from 6 institutions reported that their institution had such a policy or mandate. Only three of these institutions had mandates, with 4 chemists and 3 economists correctly identifying that their institution had one. From these three institutions there were 54 academics who participated in the survey. As no more than 3 academics from any institution reported that their institution had a mandate, there appears to have been a catastrophic failure of communication within institutions about this. The small numbers don't allow much analysis, but 4 of the seven academics were professors, indicating that there may be issues in cascading this information below senior levels in HEIs.

Funder mandates fared a little better. Some 10 chemists and 5 economists reported that their funding agency had a policy or mandate requiring them to make their work open access, with only 14 of the 65 that did have a mandate, reporting so. The single chemists who identified HEFCE and HEA as their current funder reported that they had a mandate. As did both chemists funded by MRC. Two of the four chemists funded by BBSRC reported a mandate, but only four out of 35 said EPSRC had a mandate. For the economists, one of two funded by the European Commission said this body had a mandate, and four of the ten funded by ESRC. Knowledge of funder mandates, while not extensive appears more evenly spread across the job roles, perhaps indicating that this information is communicated directly to individual researchers by funders, rather than relying on institutional channels. However, there is still clearly work to be done in this area, too.

4. Current open access outlets used by academics

Both sets of academics made broad use of the available outlets (Table 1). The economists appeared to be heavier users of the institution-based repositories, whether personal, departmental or institutional in scope. They also made heavier use of subject repositories. The chemists, on the other hand, made greater use of the external, journal-type outlets. However, the usage level of these was small, especially for the open access option from a traditional journal. As reported earlier, a reasonably-sized minority of chemists (22 individuals, 27%) had not made any of their work open access, compared to only 2 economists (4%).
Table 1: Have you made any of your work openly accessible by the following means:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional repository?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject repository?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully open access journal?</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access option from traditional journal?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental website?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal website</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not made any of my work open access</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Why academics make their work openly accessible

Academics who never make their work openly accessible were excluded from this section. Some 46 chemists and 45 economists responded to these questions. The respondents scored a series of statements against a five-point Likert-type scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree). The statements presented a range of potential motivations covering broadly altruistic reasons (“I believe the results of publicly-funded research should be publicly available”); selfish reasons (“it results in academic reward”); and external forces (“my institution has an OA policy or mandate”) (Table 2).

Table 2: When you Do make your work open access, what are your reasons?

Those agreeing/strongly agreeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helps me to get information out more quickly</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It improves accessibility to my work</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It increases the amount of publicity my work receives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It results in professional recognition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It results in academic reward</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results of publicly-funded research should be publicly available</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helps me to make contact with potential collaborators</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My subject area has a self-archiving culture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It can result in a citation advantage</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My institution has an OA policy or mandate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My funder has an OA policy or mandate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both sets of academics agreed in large part with the more altruistic statements. They were more likely to agree that “publicly funded research should be publicly available”; that OA “improves accessibility to my work”; and “helps get information out more quickly”; along with the more neutral statement “it increases publicity for my work”. The overwhelming majority of the economists agreed with these statements, and were also more likely to agree with more selfish statements - - , “it results in professional recognition”, “it results in academic reward”, “it helps me make contact with potential collaborators”. The chemists on the other hand tend to be much more neutral on these statements. These results confirm that the economists surveyed were open-access “enthusiasts”, though the extent that they are typical economists remains an open question.
The three statements indicating motivation flowing from external sources: “my subject area has a self-archiving culture”; “my institution has an OA policy or mandate”; and “my funder has an OA policy or mandate” do not elicit a high level of agreement. However, given these respondents’ low level of knowledge of these mandates, it is perhaps not surprising.

6. Why academics do not make their work OA.

Academics who always make their work openly accessible were excluded from this section. Some 67 chemists and 25 economists responded to these questions. Again the respondents scored a series of statements against a five-point Likert-type scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree). These statements presented a range of potential barriers and demotivators (Table 3). These ranged from reasons of indifference (“it is just not a concern of mine”); ignorance (“I do not know much about OA”); to legal and financial reasons (“I have concerns about copyright”); to the quality of journal or repository (“I need to publish in high-impact journals”).

| Table 3: When you Do Not make your work open access, what are your reasons? |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Those agreeing/strongly agreeing                | Chemists       | Economists     |
| It is just not a concern of mine                | Number 21      | Number 5       |
|                                                 | Percentage 31% | Percentage 20%|
| I do not know much about OA                     | Number 18      | Number 9       |
|                                                 | Percentage 27% | Percentage 36%|
| I do not know how to make my work OA           | Number 16      | Number 6       |
|                                                 | Percentage 24% | Percentage 24%|
| I need to publish in high impact journals       | Number 63      | Number 20      |
|                                                 | Percentage 93% | Percentage 80%|
| I have concerns about copyright                 | Number 23      | Number 10      |
|                                                 | Percentage 34% | Percentage 40%|
| It takes too much time and effort               | Number 19      | Number 7       |
|                                                 | Percentage 28% | Percentage 28%|
| It is too expensive                             | Number 39      | Number 10      |
|                                                 | Percentage 59% | Percentage 40%|
| I do not think I am allowed to because of       | Number 22      | Number 11      |
| publishers legal rights                         | Percentage 33% | Percentage 44%|
| I am concerned about the peer review process    | Number 35      | Number 6       |
| for OA journals                                 | Percentage 52% | Percentage 24%|
| I am concerned about plagiarism                 | Number 22      | Number 6       |
|                                                 | Percentage 33% | Percentage 24%|

Publication quality is clearly very important to both sets of academics. Large majorities of both chemists and economists agreed that they “need to publish in high impact journals.” Around half of chemists also agreed that they were “concerned about the peer review process for OA journals. The legal and financial reasons also figure here. Over half the chemists (59%) agreed that OA is “too expensive”. Some 40% of the economists also agreed with this, and similar numbers of economists also agreed with the statements, “I do not think I am allowed to because of publishers legal rights” and “I have concerns about copyright”. Both chemists and economists were broadly neutral with regard to the various reasons of ignorance and indifference.

7. Making work open access in future

Those academics who do not always make their work open access were also asked about their possible use of open access in future (Table 4). That is 67 chemists and 25 economists. As in previous results, the economists were more enthusiastic about open access. Institutional and departmental repositories were most popular among economists, and Institutional repositories among chemists.
Table 4: By what methods are academics likely to make your work openly accessible in future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional repository?</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject repository?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully open access journal?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access option from traditional journal?</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental website?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal website</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No plans to make any of my work open access</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These academics were also asked about what would encourage them to make their work open access in future (Table 5). Two statements were identified by a clear majority of both sets of academics. The first was for “a standard of practice in the community”. At present, the external influences on academics to engage with open access are fairly weak. The reasons academics give for making their work open access tend to be personal, largely altruistic ones. The culture of their subject area, or top-down “push” from institutions and funders are relatively weak motivators. It is perhaps once these things have become more widespread that a tipping point is reached where these things are seen as a “standard of practice”, that these “push” factors will have greater influence.

The second statement was for “institutional support for fee payment”. The open access option offered by traditional journals was one of the least popular options for making work openly accessible in this survey. And cost is clearly an issue for the academics that consider it. These academics are therefore looking to their institutions to come up with a solution.

Table 5: What would encourage academics to make their work OA in future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encouragement</th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't think anything would</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More information about open access</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A standard of practice in the community</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for open access within academic evaluation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support for fee payment</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support for depositing material</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassurance about copyright situation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sent to me about downloads</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An institutional mandate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A funder mandate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of institutional repository with others</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix: Frequency tables for survey questions

These first tables are based on the full sample of 82 chemists and 48 economists
Confidence interval 9% (chemists) and 12% (economists) at 95% confidence interval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research-active</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London School of Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham Trent University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Bath</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of East Anglia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Leicester</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Manchester</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Nottingham</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Southampton</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Sussex</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Job title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Institutional repository?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institutional mandate/policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding agency mandate/policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't have funding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Have you made work openly accessible by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional repository?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject repository?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully open access journal?</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access option from traditional journal?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental website?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal website</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not made any of my work open access</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Where has research data been openly published?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional repository</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental repository/website</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-based repository</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as Open Notebook Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal website</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not made any of my data openly accessible</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Where have working or discussion papers been published?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional repository</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental repository/website</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-based repository</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal website</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not published any working or discussion papers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These next tables are based on 46 chemists and 45 economists who make at least some work OA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14</th>
<th>Make work openly accessible in future by:</th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional repository?</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject repository?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully open access journal?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open access option from traditional journal?</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departmental website?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal website</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No plans to make any of my work open access</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15</th>
<th>What would encourage you to make work open access?</th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't think anything would</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More information about open access</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A standard of practice in the community</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition for open access within academic evaluation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional support for fee payment</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional support for depositing material</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reassurance about copyright situation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information sent to me about downloads</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An institutional mandate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A funder mandate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration of institutional repository with others</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16</th>
<th>Integration of repository with which systems would encourage you</th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant reporting system</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal bibliographic management system</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REF reporting system</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal website</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>When you Do Not make your work open access, what are your reasons?</th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is just not a concern of mine</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not know much about OA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not know how to make my work OA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I need to publish in high impact journals</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have concerns about copyright</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It takes too much time and effort</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is too expensive</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not think I am allowed to because of publishers legal rights</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am concerned about the peer review process for OA journals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am concerned about plagiarism</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table is based on 67 chemists and 25 economists who don’t always make their work OA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Chemists</th>
<th>Economists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It helps me to get information out more quickly</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It improves accessibility to my work</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It increases the amount of publicity my work receives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It results in professional recognition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It results in academic reward</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results of publicly-funded research should be publicly available</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helps me to make contact with potential collaborators</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My subject area has a self-archiving culture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It can result in a citation advantage</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My institution has an OA policy or mandate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My funder has an OA policy or mandate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number and Percentage:

- Chemists: Number 23, Percentage 50%
- Economists: Number 36, Percentage 80%