

Open Science and Open Access – researchers' perspective

Zakaria Babutsidze

SKEMA Business School

Université Côte d'Azur

Open Science and Open Access – researcher's perspective

Zakaria Babutsidze

SKEMA Business School

Université Côte d'Azur

What do researchers want?

- Wide access to their research
 - Necessary to maximize the impact of their work
- Fair evaluations within their organizations
 - Promotions, career plan etc.

What is necessary?

- This requires assessing the quality of researcher's work
- How do we judge the quality of scientific contribution of a researcher?
 - Publications
 - Quantity and, more importantly, quality
 - Citations
 - Particularly later in the career
- The assumption is that citations were perfectly correlated with the quality/impact of the journal
- However, recent years has shown that this correlation is not perfect

What is necessary?

- There is also imbalance between how much more you have to work to get to top journals
- This is not sufficiently compensated by citations drawn from wider exposure
- As a result, many researchers doubt the publication strategy oriented at top journals
- They have a feeling that they can make greater impact by targeting different outlets
- But evaluating citations from different places is hard
 - It is easier to use publications than citations for evaluation

So, we stick to publications!

- Major reputable Publications are in hands of (very) profitable large corporations
- Their pricing policies undermine knowledge diffusion practices
- This closes down the science
- Publishers provide an alternative: open access
 - Gold
 - Immediately available to readers in the published version (post-print)
 - Too expensive!
 - Green
 - Availability in institutional repositories after an embargo period
 - Can be pre-print or post-print

This is not enough!

- Researchers actively look for other ways to disseminate their work
 - Supporting open journals
 - However, these are all new, and building reputation takes (very) long time
 - Working paper series
 - Institutionally supported actions
 - These however undermine double-blind reviews and are not accepted in every discipline
 - Supporting piracy (to a certain level)
 - Lots of researchers use Sci-Hub
 - We are happy to send copies of our papers privately to a reader who requested it

Important role of evaluators

- Do not discard lower-impact publications
 - Examine citations they generate
- Researchers recognize that allowing everything for free is not optimal
 - This does not allow for evaluation of the quality of the output
- I would argue there is an optimal point in the middle for generating the impact
 - We should work on designing optimal evaluation procedures and metrics
- This is particularly important for developing countries because accessing to the walled knowledge is very expensive
 - For developing countries not only dissemination, but also access is important

Scientific piracy tendencies (Timus & Babutsidze 2016)

Table 3: Top downloading countries

Country	No of downloads	No of yearly downloads / UACES member
Spain	308	22
Italy	289	18
Germany	176	5
Ukraine	144	173
Poland	103	9
Brazil	96	-
Turkey	90	9
France	76	8
Russia	65	26
Belgium	59	2
Hungary	57	10
China	54	26
United States	51	6

Scientific piracy tendencies (Babutsidze 2018)

Tabel 3. Top downloading countries

Country	# of downloads	# of yearly downloads / 1mln inhabitants	# of yearly downloads / # of registered economics institutions
China	266	0,470	2,014
Indonesia	264	2,535	5,510
United States	160	1,204	0,122
Iran	140	4,338	5,695
Russia	131	2,191	0,847
Brazil	83	0,994	0,862
Pakistan	83	1,094	2,075
Malaysia	65	5,249	2,137
France	64	2,326	0,354
Germany	60	1,786	0,201

Strong open movement & “ignorant” audience?

Table 4. Online accessibility of most pirated economics articles

Article	Availability online
Helpman et al. (2010)	pdf freely available on Stephen Redding’s webpage
Gentzkow and Shapiro (2011)	pdf of a version freely available as an NBER working paper
Acemoglu et al. (2015)	pdf freely available on MIT economics department webpage
Welch (2004)	pdf freely available on Ivo Welch’s webpage
Manova (2012)	pdf freely available on Kalina Manova’s webpage
Voigtlander and Voth (2012)	pdf freely available on Nico Voigtlander’s webpage
Cronqvist and Siegel (2015)	pdf of a working paper version freely available on SSRN
Aguiar et al. (2015)	pdf of a working paper version freely available on Minneapolis FED website
Akerman et al. (2015)	pdf of a working paper version freely available on IZA website

What to do?

- I would argue that some kind of quality-weighted citations would be the best way to evaluate researchers
- In such case you let researchers decide
 - Either they pursue top-quality publications chasing better exposure and better quality citations (quality approach)
 - Or they concentrate on lower tier (open) journals and accentuate the number of publications (quantity approach)
- This might involve training/educating researchers about pros and cons of both of these approaches, but:
 - This leaves them freedom of decision
 - Obliges them to take the ownership of their career
 - And opens door to open science