February 2009

Back Talk: Open Access, the Turning Point, and Methadone

Anthony (Tony) W. Ferguson

University of Hong Kong, ferguson@hkucc.hku.hk

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>

Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ferguson, Anthony (Tony) W. (2009) "Back Talk: Open Access, the Turning Point, and Methadone," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 21: Iss. 1, Article 15.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.2498>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

a message that there was no full-text access available although we had a record for the journal in the catalog indicating full access to the resource! The reason for this “behavior” was that the SFX link resolver and A-Z list were rooted in the **Ex Libris** knowledge-base, which at that time consisted of only 15,000 titles. With our 25,000 electronic journal titles, this meant that there was a 10,000-title gap between our resource discovery tools, MARC record service and the A-Z list. This also left reference librarians and users wondering why a journal displayed in the catalog was neither listed in the A-Z list nor found by the link resolver.

This presented us with a dilemma on two levels: 1) We did not want to provide a gateway to our collection that was inaccurate and non-representative of our collection; and 2) We did not want to switch to **Serials Solutions** A-Z list because this would present a change in the interface. This change might confuse our patrons, who were used to the customized **MetaLib** interface, consistent with our SFX link resolver.

Working with our Systems Administrator we found a creative solution to the problem of asynchronization between the A-Z journal title list and catalog-based access to the online journals. Instead of using a canned A-Z list from either **MetaLib** (which was inaccurate) or **Serials Solutions** (which presented a mishmash of interfaces), we decided to leverage the catalog. Retaining the shell of the customized **MetaLib** interface (see Figure 1), behind the scenes we redirected the queries on the page of **CSUN List of Electronic Periodicals** from the **MetaLib** A-Z list to instead searching the catalog by either *title*, *key word*, *subject* or *ISSN/e-ISSN*. The **MetaLib** interface had two basic sections: the first provided several different search types (*title*, *title keyword*, *subject*, and *ISSN*) with associated search boxes for the user to enter their search terms; the second was a *browse by title* option, with the alphabet represented in a table form at the bottom of the page. The inputs from the main search forms were all passed to a common **Javascript** function for processing prior to submission. This made it possible

Figure 1 — CSUN List of Electronic Periodicals

The original **MetaLib** interface (Aug. 2005). Searches go to **MetaLib** A-Z list.

to switch from passing the inputs to the **MetaLib** e-journal list, to submitting them to the catalog. The *alphabetical browse* function was also relatively easy to replicate in the catalog by submitting a title browse search for the specific letter chosen by the user and limiting the search to electronic journals. Voila! The patron received accurate search results and the library a comprehensive listing of its electronic periodicals. Moreover, by redirecting the search to the catalog, the user gained the capability of drilling down into the database for expanded title and subject browsing. And to respect users’ habits and the integrity of the library’s Website, we retained the look

of the page as if the query went into the **MetaLib** knowledgebase (see Figure 2).

This solution is just one example of the “out of the box” thinking that takes place at the library of **California State University, Northridge**. I feel very fortunate to work in an environment where innovative thinking is a standard practice. As Cataloging Coordinator at **CSUN**, I know all too well that the best solutions come from collaboration and a flow of ideas. At a time when changes in information technology happen so rapidly and when it is paramount to be on the cutting edge for the benefit of our users, conferences play a significant role in disseminating fresh ideas, introducing new products, and providing forums for discussions and networking opportunities for librarians and vendors. 🍂

Figure 2 — CSUN List of Electronic Periodicals

Familiar interface but searches go to the catalog (May 2008)

Back Talk from page 94

But I also think we are gradually ambling toward an OA scholarly communication paradigm which is not dependent upon page charges — but we are not there yet. To use a very crass analogy, paying publishers to provide for open access is like giving crack addicts methadone. The addicts are still addicted but to a controlled substance in the hope that they will find something more socially acceptable and sustainable to do with their lives while they are eased off their need for crack. In this case we are in the paying publishers article charges to ease them into the OA world — with perhaps the unspoken hope that they will, like **Google**, find a different way of getting the money they need with which to pay the bills, e.g., advertising or by making subscription based e-journals outshine their OA equivalents. 🍂

Endnotes

1. See **Answers.com**: <http://www.answers.com/topic/turning-point>.

Back Talk — Open Access, the Turning Point, and Methadone

Column Editor: **Anthony (Tony) W. Ferguson** (Library Director, University of Hong Kong; Phone: 852 2859 2200; Fax: 852 2858 9420) <ferguson@hkucc.hku.hk>

The dictionary definition for the concept of a Turning Point is “The point at which a very significant change occurs; a decisive moment.”¹ I wondered this past week as I read about the **Springer Open Access (OA)** agreement with the **California Digital Library** whether or not OA as a central feature of academic publishing was about to hit its turning point:

OAKLAND — The **University of California** libraries and **Springer Science+Business Media (Springer)** have concluded a groundbreaking experimental agreement to support open access publishing by **UC** authors. The arrangement is part of the journals license negotiated by the **California Digital Library** on behalf of the ten campuses of the **University of California**.

Under the terms of the agreement, articles by **UC**-affiliated authors accepted for publication in a **Springer** journal beginning in 2009 will be published using **Springer Open Choice** with full and immediate open access. There will be no separate per-article charges, since costs have been factored into the overall license. Articles will be released under a license compatible with the **Creative Commons** (by-nc: Attribution, Non-commercial) license. In addition to access via the **Springer** platform, final published articles will also be deposited in the **California Digital Library's eScholarship Repository**. (For the entire press release go to <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/article/19335>.)

In that same news announcement, the justification given by **Ivy Anderson**,

director of collections for the **California Digital Library** agreement with **Springer** for taking this course of action certainly seems to signal a turning point change in how at least a significant number of academics in California are viewing OA: “Faculty members have told us that they want open access publishing options in order to increase the impact of their published work and eliminate barriers to educational and research use ... Just as importantly, they want these options in the journals in which they routinely publish, without disrupting their normal research activity.” (Press release)

For me, these words of support for OA come on the heels of emailed comments from a leading science professor here in Hong Kong who said of the professed benefits of open access publishing:

To my mind, the incremental benefits of open access over more traditional means of disseminating the results of research are really rather marginal. Perhaps I am looking at this from the perspective of science/engineering, but the tax-paying public is not really going to benefit. We need to be accountable, of course, but Joe Blow in the street isn't gonna want to read our papers. Potential collaborators can and do get together at disciplinary conferences.

There are better ways for employers to seek qualified candidates. [He also said in another part of his email] I guess I would rather see the resources for whatever this might cost be used for the direct costs of research, rather than paying journals!

When I read these comments I perceived that he had indeed hit

several raw nerves related to the typical arguments put forward in favor of OA:

- To justify OA in the name of the non academic public who doesn't want to read research journals is meaningless.
- Using university/public funds to pay publishers to allow OA isn't as good as paying scholars to do research.
- Scholars interested in collaboration find each other at conferences, not through the published literature.

So on the one hand we have scholars in California in favor of OA (or at least willing to go along with this OA experiment) and a fairly typical “doubting Thomas” in Hong Kong questioning the value of the whole enterprise. For me I fear that over simplifications of OA's benefits or weaknesses simply cloud some of the most important points:

- OA communicates more widely than traditional academic publishing. While we may tout the importance of the public having access to research produced with the public dollar as a way of convincing governmental funding agencies to require OA publishing, what OA will really do is share research findings with scholars who have little hope of reading very expensive journals because they are not at the top 500 universities in the world which are able to buy into the old scholarly paradigm of paying a handful of academic publishers enormous sums of money to share research results. OA, on the other hand, will involve the minds of thousands of more scholars globally and will enrich the entire academic enterprise.
- The open Web communicates more widely than traditional academic publishing. If the Web didn't exist it would be simple to agree with the point of view that “It is cheaper for the top universities to pay the major STM publishers to pay costly STM serials subscriptions than to give each of their scholars money with which to pay the many times very costly OA fees.” But the Web has changed everything. Today's students/tomorrow's scholars start with the Web and only resort to the information found in the expensive journals much later on in the research process. OA academic information will be discovered much earlier and by more people than it was in the old days (20 years ago).

So where are we? Are we at the OA turning point? Especially for libraries, I think we have to recognize that OA is a revolutionary alternative scholarly communication paradigm compared to the current one where scholars are paid to do research and they publish in journals which survive on the money funneled through academic libraries to academic publishers.

continued on page 93

ADVERTISERS' INDEX

41	ABC-CLIO	87	BASCH SUBSCRIPTIONS, INC.	2, 23	IGI GLOBAL
53	ACCESSIBLE ARCHIVES	3	BLACKWELL BOOK SERVICES	71	INTELECOM
75	THE ACQUISITIONS INSTITUTE AT TIMBERLINE LODGE	95	BOOK HOUSE	96	MIDWEST LIBRARY SERVICE
79	ALCTS PUBLISHING	83	THE CHARLESTON ADVISOR	9	OECD
7	AMBASSADOR BOOKS AND MEDIA	10	THE CHARLESTON REPORT	19	THE OPTICAL SOCIETY
25	AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PHYSICS	61	CHOICE MAGAZINE	15	PALGRAVE MACMILLAN
29	AMERICAN PHYSIOLOGICAL SOCIETY	11	COLD SPRING HARBOR LAB PRESS	45	PROJECTMUSE
35	ANNUAL REVIEWS	57	EASTERN BOOK COMPANY	49	RITTENHOUSE
39	ASBMB	33	EBSCO INFORMATION	91	SCHOLARNEXT CONSULTING
37	ASME INTERNATIONAL	21	ENTREPRENEURIAL CONFERENCE FOR LIBRARIANS	17	SWETS
5	ATG	13	IEEE	31	WILEY
				27	YBP

For Advertising Information Contact: **Edna Laughrey**, Ads Manager,
<elaughrey@aol.com>, Phone: 734-429-1029, Fax: 734-429-1711; or **Toni Nix**,
<justwrite@lowcountry.com>, Phone: 843-835-8604, Fax: 843-835-5892.