

4-1-2009

The Ethics of Open Access to Research

Denise Troll Covey

Carnegie Mellon University, troll@andrew.cmu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.cmu.edu/lib_science


 Part of the [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Published In

Library 2.0 Symposium.

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at Research Showcase @ CMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Libraries by an authorized administrator of Research Showcase @ CMU. For more information, please contact research-showcase@andrew.cmu.edu.

The Ethics of Open Access to Research



Denise Troll Covey

Principal Librarian for Special Projects, Carnegie Mellon


Library 2.0 Symposium
Yale Law School – April 4, 2009



Epistemic regime

ACADEMY

Cognitive property (CP)




Gift economy

Monopoly of competence

LAW

Intellectual property (IP)




Market economy

Monopoly of copyright



Boundary object

Vehicle to deploy norms of one economy in another






Faculty research hybrid ethic

- Want academic exception and © ownership
 - Honor and propriety (CP / gift economy)
 - Academic freedom and control (IP / market economy)
- Resist loss of honor, propriety, autonomy, control
 - Efforts to help them manage copyright
 - Policies requiring retention or granting of rights
- Transfer copyright to publisher
 - Exercise autonomy, but lose control – *or do they?*
 - Retaining © < important than recognition and reward

Border disputes

Create and address
moral communities

- **Open access** is gift economy in market space
- Subversive, confrontational and competitive
- High priority for libraries, faculty, institutions





J articles on websites

- Are journal articles being self-archived on websites?

College	Articles		Faculty	
	Total	OA	Total	OA
Business & econ	1,415	16%	90	46%
Computer science	2,340	55%	205	67%
Engineering	4,713	24%	179	30%
Fine arts	200	17%	184	3%
Human./ social sci	2,419	40%	148	34%
Policy & mgmt	380	26%	54	17%
Science	3,414	41%	158	31%
TOTAL	14,881	32%	1,018	34%

Study conducted
2007-2008

346 faculty
self-archived
4,816 articles



alignment of OA articles

- Are the articles self-archived on websites legal?
 - Considered if OA was allowed and policy on pub PDF

College	Policy unknown	Aligned w policy	Not aligned
Business & econ	13%	67%	18%
Computer science	8%	53%	31%
Engineering	7%	56%	35%
Fine arts	15%	24%	58%
Human./ social sci	8%	21%	63%
Policy & mgmt	19%	29%	45%
Science	5%	65%	29%
TOTAL	8%	50%	38%

1,830 OA articles
are *not* aligned
with policy

Not shown:
4% where
policy is unclear
about version



how not aligned

- Biggest problem is self-archiving of publisher PDF when prohibited by policy – *the best gift*

College	OA prohibited	Pub PDF required	Pub PDF prohibited
Business & econ	7%		93%
Computer science	5%	25%	70%
Engineering	25%	14%	61%
Fine arts			100%
Human./ social sci	9%	1%	90%
Policy & mgmt	22%	2%	76%
Science	47%		53%
TOTAL	18%	9%	73%

1,830
prohibited
pub PDFs



Who cares if infringe their own gift?

- Public conscience has not been shocked
- Publishers care about impact on market, but response has been political, not punitive
- Faculty who knowingly infringe assume no harm to institution or to their reputation, recognition, reward
- Academy doesn't see it as serious breach of standards
 - Efforts to get faculty to retain rights or to license rights to institution, but won't interfere with faculty autonomy
 - If faculty infringe © the institution is not responsible

What about the library IR?

Carnegie Mellon

Research Showcase

[Home](#) [About](#) [FAQ](#) [My Account](#)


- If the library infringes © the institution *is* responsible
- Compliance v. alignment with publisher policy
 - Compliance - discourage participation, yield poor ROI, compromise our values
 - Alignment - support and educate the faculty, reduce risks and costs, be true to who we are

Core values of librarianship:
Access, service, public good, social responsibility,
democracy, preservation, professionalism



© infringement

- Is © infringement illegal? Yes
- Is © infringement unethical? Yes, but ...
 - Infringing one's *own* work given as a *gift* is different from infringing other's work or work produced for \$\$



-
- “Gifts must be permitted to circulate; the gift cannot be withdrawn from circulation (transformed into capital) without losing its status as a gift.”

McSherry, p. 81

Research is different

- Research is funded, conducted and published for the public good Stevan Harnad, *Ethics of Open Access to Biomedical Research*, August 2007
- Researchers are not paid by publishers; rewards are not proportional to sales; © is not incentive; publisher interest doesn't serve researcher interest Peter Suber, *SOAN*, November 2, 2008
- © is inappropriate and unnecessary for research Georgia Harper, *Open Access, Digital Copyright and Marketplace Competition*, 2009





Ethics: What is best for all concerned

- **Intentions** – must be self- and other-regarding
- **Foreseen consequences** – may reluctantly accept harmful consequences if cost doesn't exceed benefit
 - Do not sacrifice greater good for lesser good,
 - e.g., intrinsic (public good) for extrinsic (private gain) value
 - Reluctant acceptance is demonstrated in attempts to avoid or minimize harmful consequences
- **Unforeseen harmful consequences** = adjust course



OA border skirmish

• RESEARCHERS

- **Intention** = transfer © for broad distribution
- **Foreseen consequence** = recognition and reward
- **(Un)foreseen harmful consequence** = publishers holding gift hostage for ransom increasingly few can pay

• PUBLISHERS

- **Intention** = acquire © to distribute and earn \$\$
- **Foreseen consequence** = \$\$ and preserve record
- **(Un)foreseen harmful consequence** = authors stipulating terms for © transfer or rescuing hostages without negotiation



Alignment is best for all concerned


- Provides equitable access
- Encourages use and application for public good
 - Facilitates OA impact advantage for faculty
 - Showcases and preserves intellectual assets
- Minimizes harmful foreseen consequences
- Increases ROI in research and IR
- Sends signal to for-profit publishers
- Assists in hostage rescue





Librarianship as boundary object?

- IR as vehicle to deploy the values and norms of the gift economy in the research marketplace





Exercise and foster

- Civil disobedience

- In a democracy, when conscience and law clash we are **morally justified, if not duty bound, to follow our conscience**, not wait for law to change

Henry David Thoreau,
On the Duty of Civil Disobedience, 1849

- Moral courage


- When opposed and when success entails risk, act to preserve values of **honesty, fairness, respect, responsibility and compassion**

Moral Courage, a White Paper,
R. Kidder and M. Bracy, 2001

Why we need to defend core values

Picayune publisher policy demands and bogus assertions

- Self-archived articles must be managed over time
 - Different versions allowed and descriptive text required pre/post publication, different embargo periods, link to publisher PDF
- Need transfer of all © to publish
- No peer review without publishers
- Provide broad distribution
- Preserve scientific record
- Interlibrary loan of articles is unnecessary
- Permission required for fair use
- There are no orphan works



Publisher arguments against OA,
orphan works, Section 108



Thank you!

