



Bulgarian Author Open Access Awareness and Preferences

Journal:	<i>Library Management</i>
Manuscript ID	LM-08-2019-0059.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Open Access, research impact, self-archiving, journal publication, European Union, Bulgaria

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Bulgarian Author Open Access Awareness and Preferences

1. Introduction

At a meeting of the European Union Competitive Council (E.U.) on May 27, 2016, member states agreed to the ambitious goal of making all scientific research papers published by faculty at public universities freely available by 2020 (Enserink, 2016). To facilitate achievement of the goal, Plan S, coordinated by Science Europe, proposed implementation details and funding requirements. These announcements and plans represent a strong push from European research funding agencies for immediate open access to the results of publicly funded research in Europe.

Open access allows the fruits of research to be read and used by the people who paid for it, not only those who are fortunate enough to be associated with an institution that is able to afford to pay for journal subscriptions. There are two primary strategies in place to make research available open access, commonly referred to as green and gold. Green open access refers to articles available via open access repositories. Gold open access refers to articles available via open access journals. In addition to these two models, many subscription journals accept a fee from the author to make the article open access, commonly referred to as the hybrid model.

As part of the E.U. goal, member countries were encouraged to consider implementation strategies to meet the goal. To date, Bulgaria is far from achieving the E.U. goal due to the lack of a national open access policy and a lack of infrastructure and scholarly communication services at universities across the country (Todorova, 2018). A 2017 government publication--"National Strategy for the Development of Scientific Research in the Republic of Bulgaria 2017-2030"--is expected to result in increased access to, and impact of, Bulgarian research. A key report recommendation is participation in the E.U. initiative "European Open Science Cloud" ((Castelli *et al.*, 2018<https://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/index.cfm?pg=open-science-cloud>)).

By describing the results of a survey of faculty in a broad range of disciplines at six universities in Bulgaria, this paper seeks to inform policy makers, research funders and universities in Bulgaria about the level of awareness of the E.U. goal and faculty preferences for achieving it. The paper seeks to answer these five research questions:

- RQ1: To what extent do Bulgarian faculty make their research open access?
- RQ2: To what extent are Bulgarian faculty aware of the European Union Competitive Council open access 2020 goal?
- RQ3: To what extent do Bulgarian faculty support open access and the European Union Competitive Council open access 2020 goal?
- RQ4: What factors are important to Bulgarian faculty when choosing a journal?
- RQ5: Do Bulgarian faculty have a preference for green or gold open access in order to achieve the European Union Competitive Council open access 2020 goal?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Open access support

1
2
3 A number of surveys of faculty in Europe and across the globe have found that while
4 researchers support the idea of open access generally, there is also a lack of understanding of
5 open access journal publishing and open access repositories and a relatively small percentage
6 of articles are being deposited to open access repositories or published in open access journals.
7 In a survey of 38,358 authors around the world, authors agreed that open access journal
8 publishing was beneficial to their field; however, only 52% of those authors had published an
9 article in an open access journal (Dallmeier-Tiessen *et al.*, 2011). The study found that authors
10 are also reluctant to pay open access article processing charges and are concerned with the
11 quality of open access journals. To date, there is no formal research that seeks to determine the
12 degree to which researchers are aware of the E.U. Competitive Council goal.
13
14
15

16 *2.2 Journal characteristics and open access*

17 Authors have long identified journal prestige and readership in one's discipline as important
18 journal characteristics when they choose a journal in which to publish (Rowlands, 2005;
19 Boukacem-Zeghmouri *et al.*, 2018). Several recent studies ask authors to weigh the importance
20 of the open access availability of the journal and whether the journal permits deposit of articles
21 to open access repositories. Tenopir *et al.* (2016) and Wolff *et al.* (2016) in interdisciplinary
22 surveys of researchers found that open access and permission to deposit are among the least
23 important factors for authors when considering where to publish.
24
25
26

27 *2.3 Repository awareness and article deposit rates*

28 Studies have also found a lack of awareness of institutional repositories and of their purpose in
29 making scholarly articles and other research openly available (Hahn and Wyatt, 2014; Mischo
30 and Schlembach, 2011). Institutions that have open access policies in place and offer deposit
31 services have demonstrated a higher rate of article deposit than those that do not
32 (Vincent-Lamarre *et al.*, 2015; Zhang *et al.*, 2015; Daoutis and Rodriguez-Marquez, 2018). It
33 wasn't until the National Institutes of Health in the United States began requiring deposit of
34 articles to PubMed Central that deposit rates increased significantly (Suber, 2008). Schöpfel *et*
35 *al.* (2016), in a survey of 432 directors of French public research laboratories associated with
36 the French Research Center CNRS, found the directors to be "more supportive of open
37 repositories (green road) than of OA journal publishing (gold)."
38
39
40
41

42 *2.4 Open Access in Bulgaria*

43 In recent years, Bulgarian authors have published a number of open access related books and
44 papers on themes such as: open access definitions and key terms (Trencheva 2013);
45 implementation of open access principles and a national open access roadmap (Stanchev *et al.*,
46 2018); open access strategies, business models, and work plans (Stanchev, 2014); copyright
47 and licensing best practices (Todorova *et al.*, 2017; Simeonov and Stanchev, 2011); policy
48 options (Castelli *et al.*, 2018); libraries and open access (Todorova 2012; Arsenova 2015); open
49 access and scientific communications (Dimchev, 2013); and Bulgarian open access journals
50 (Trencheva and Todorova, 2014; Trencheva *et al.*, 2019). This paper is intended to continue
51 these conversations to help researchers, project managers, and librarians obtain knowledge
52 about open access policies, strategies, and best practices.
53
54
55

56 **3. Methodology**

1
2
3 In April 2019, the authors distributed a survey to faculty in all academic ranks at six Bulgarian
4 universities to learn the extent to which Bulgarian authors currently make their research openly
5 available, ascertain their awareness of the E.U. goal, their support of the goal, and their
6 preferences for achieving it. The six universities, from a total of 50 Bulgarian universities, were
7 selected because it was expected that they would be willing to participate in the study and be
8 responsive to requests for participation. The survey included a total of 21 questions in three
9 sections: 1. Demographic Information, 2. Research Practices and Open Access Benefits, and 3.
10 Awareness of and Attitudes Concerning the European Union Goal of Open Access. Three of the
11 questions were matrix tables that contained a total of 23 statements with responses ranked on a
12 5-part likert scale. Two were open-ended questions.
13
14
15

16 The web-based survey was developed using Qualtrics software. The authors used the
17 Dallmeier-Tiessen *et al.* (2011) survey as a starting point. The authors obtained feedback from
18 faculty and postdoctoral students at the University of Library Studies and Information
19 Technologies to refine aspects of the survey structure, flow, and question design. The survey
20 language was Bulgarian. The authors translated the questions and responses to English, the
21 primary author's native language, for the purpose of analysis. The survey was distributed to all
22 faculty members (584) at the University of Library Studies and Information Technologies,
23 Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen, New Bulgarian University, and the University of
24 Chemical Technology and Metallurgy using official institutional email lists and to selected faculty
25 at The National Academy for Theater and Film Arts "Krastyo Sarafov" and The University of
26 Veliko Tarnovo "St. St. Cyril and Methodius". Invitations to participate were sent to the
27 population twice in the period between 19 March to 15 May 2019.
28
29
30
31

32 In total, 269 surveys were started. Of these, 19 answered that they have either not published
33 anything in the last 2 years or were not planning to publish in the next 2 years, leaving 250
34 respondents eligible to answer the survey questions. Another 28 respondents did not respond to
35 any of the remaining questions. They were also removed, resulting in 222 total responses under
36 consideration and a response rate of 46.1%: $269-19-28/584=46.1\%$. To de-identify survey
37 results, the authors used the "Anonymize Response" feature in the Survey Termination section
38 of the Qualtrics Survey Flow to disassociate responses from the individual survey link and scrub
39 the IP address.
40
41
42

43 **4. Findings**

44 **4.1 Demographics**

45 The first section of the survey asked a series of demographic questions. Out of the 219
46 respondents who disclosed gender (3 chose not to disclose), 145 (66%) are female, and 74
47 male (34%). Participants are in the following age ranges--less than 30 years of age (5 of 219;
48 2%), 30-39 (46 of 219; 21%), 40-49 (83 of 219; 38%), 50-59 (56 of 219; 26%), 60 and over (29
49 of 219; 13%). Three respondents chose not to disclose their age range. Respondents were
50 closely split in terms of the length of time that they have been employed in research. The largest
51 group of respondents have been employed in research for 20 years or more (69 of 221; 31%),
52 46 of 221 (21%) between 15 and 19 years, 40 of 221 (18%) between 10 and 14 years, 36 of 221
53 (16%) between 6 and 9 years, and 30 of 221 (14%) for 5 years or fewer. One respondent chose
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

not to disclose length of tenure or highest degree achieved. The highest educational degree achieved by 169 of the 221 (76%) of the respondents is a PhD degree, 21 (10%) have a Doctor of Science (DSc) degree, and 31 (14%) have a Masters degree. In Bulgaria, a PhD is awarded to students who have completed their doctoral studies and defended a PhD thesis. A DSc is awarded after the defense of a second Doctor of Science thesis.

4.2 Open Access Awareness and Preferences

The authors included a question to ascertain the degree to which authors are aware of arguments in favor of open access. Seventy-three percent of survey respondents indicate that they are either extremely aware (19%) or very aware (54%) of arguments in favor of open access and 97% indicate that they are at least slightly aware of such arguments (Table 1). Researchers who have been employed for ten years or more are more aware of arguments in favor of open access (81% are very aware or extremely aware) than those who have been employed for fewer than ten years (53%).

[Table 1]

Table 2 offers insight as to whether researchers believe open access benefits their research field. 81% believe their research field benefits from open access to research, 7% respondents do not, and the remainder, 12% are not sure. No respondents said that they do not care about this at all. Sixty percent of respondents indicate that members of the public who do not otherwise have access to research benefit by open access to the research in their field, and 27% indicated that they are not sure whether the public benefits from open access to the research in their field. Eight percent responded that they do not think the public benefits from open access to the research in their field. There were no significant differences based on how long the respondent has been employed as a researcher.

[Table 2]

While respondents are aware of open access generally, Table 3 demonstrates a lack of awareness of the E.U. goal for open access to publicly funded research by the year 2020. Results are evenly split between those who have heard of the goal--37%--and those who have not--37%. Sixteen percent of respondents are not sure if they have heard of the goal and 11% are not interested. There are no significant differences in terms of researcher's length of tenure.

In spite of the relative lack of awareness of the E.U. goal, Table 4 shows that once the goal is explained, respondents support it. Eighty-two percent of respondents answered that they either "support" or "fully support" the goal. Seventeen percent are undecided and only 3 respondents "do not support" or "actively do not support" the goal. Of those who had previously heard of the goal, 90% say that they "support" (35%) or "fully support" it (54%). Only 9% of the respondents who have heard of the goal said that they are undecided about it. Respondents who were not previously aware of the goal are also generally supportive but do not "fully support" the goal as much as those who have previously heard of it.

[Table 3]

[Table 4]

4.3 Open Access Participation: Repositories

Of the six institutions, only New Bulgarian University (NBU) has an institutional repository. NBU is also the only institution that suggests that their faculty deposit their research articles to the repository. Table 5 shows that 67% of NBU respondents deposit articles to their institutional repository often or almost always and 89% of NBU respondents deposit articles to the repository at least sometimes. Fifty-three percent of all university respondents indicate that they deposit articles to an institutional repository at least sometimes. A significantly higher percentage of respondents who have been employed for 10 years or more deposit to an institutional repository at least sometimes (59%) compared with researchers who have been employed for fewer than 10 years (36%).

[Table 5]

Table 6 shows that almost exactly the same percentage of respondents who say that they deposit to institutional repositories deposit to disciplinary repositories. Again, those who have been employed as researchers longer are more likely to have done so. Sixty-one percent of respondents who have been employed for 10 years or more deposit to a disciplinary repository at least sometimes compared with researchers who have been employed for fewer than 10 years (15%).

[Table 6]

In order to comply with a potential requirement to deposit research articles to an open access repository, 75% of respondents say that having a publisher deposit the version of record--a final published version of the article--on their behalf to an open access repository would be important or very important (Table 7). Seventy percent find that a publisher depositing a post peer review version of articles would be important or very important. In comparison, fewer respondents say that requiring the author to deposit the version of record (59%) or the accepted manuscript version of the article that is accepted for publication and includes all changes made as a result of the peer review process (48%) to be important or very important. Regardless of whether it is the publisher or researcher who is responsible for deposit, researchers have a slight preference that the version of record of an article is deposited rather than the accepted manuscript version.

[Table 7]

4.4 Open Access Participation: Journals

Respondents were asked a series of questions to determine how often they publish articles in open access journals, publish articles open access in hybrid journals, and the factors they would consider important in a scenario that required open access publication. Only 6% of respondents say they never publish an article in an open access journal and only 17% rarely do so (Table 8). Seventeen percent of respondents say that they almost always publish articles in an open access journal, 29% do so often, 31% do so sometimes, and 17% do so rarely. There is little difference based on how long the researcher has been employed or the age of the researcher.

1
2
3
4 [Table 8]
5

6 Table 9 demonstrates that respondents publish in a hybrid journal and pay a fee to make their
7 article available open access in that journal less often than they publish articles in open access
8 journals. Sixty-three percent have rarely (21%) or never (42%) paid a fee to publish open
9 access in a hybrid journal. Sixteen percent publish articles open access in hybrid journals often
10 (8%) or almost always (8%).
11
12

13 [Table 9]
14

15 Table 10 demonstrates what authors would find important if they were required to publish their
16 articles open access. Eighty-nine percent of respondents believe that the provision of financial
17 support to pay open access fees is an important (50%) or very important (39%) factor in such a
18 scenario. Respondents show a slight preference for fees to be made available to publish articles
19 in an open access journal (84%) than for fees to be made available to publish open access in a
20 hybrid journal (77%). Fifty-six percent of respondents agree that making the open access
21 availability of an article a basis for future funding is either important (43%) or very important
22 (13%) and 30% are neutral in regard to this factor.
23
24

25 [Table 10]
26
27

28 *4.5 Journal Preference*

29 Table 11 provides insight into what authors consider important when choosing a journal in which
30 to publish. Respondents indicate that the prestige of the journal is the most important criteria.
31 Ninety-two percent say that this is important or extremely important and only 1% say that this is
32 less important or irrelevant. Other prestige related factors are also considered especially
33 important or very important: the prestige of the journal within the respondent's discipline (90%),
34 the impact factor of the journal (86%), and the importance of the journal for receiving promotion
35 or tenure (86%) all receive high marks. Whether or not the journal is open access and the
36 journal's copyright policy are among the least important factors for authors.
37

38 [Table 11]
39
40

41 **5. Discussion**

42 Researchers at Bulgarian universities are aware of arguments in favor of open access and
43 believe that open access especially benefits researchers in their research field. Ninety-seven
44 percent of respondents are at least slightly aware of arguments in favor of open access, 81%
45 believe that open access to research benefits those in their discipline, and 60% believe that it
46 benefits the general public. These numbers correspond to recent research by Odell *et al.* (2017)
47 which found that 89% of survey respondents at Indiana University - Purdue University
48 Indianapolis had previously heard of open access. Dallmeier-Tiessen *et al.*, in a 2011 global
49 study, found that 89% of published researchers thought that open access journals are beneficial
50 to their field.
51
52

53
54 In terms of open access publishing habits, Bulgarian authors may be more likely to publish in
55 open access journals than authors generally. Only 23% of respondents say they never publish
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 articles in open access journals or rarely do so. Seventeen percent of respondents say that they
4 almost always publish articles in an open access journal, 29% do so often, and 31% do so
5 sometimes. The SOAP survey distributed in 2010 found that only 52% of respondents had
6 published at least one article in an open access journal (Dallmeier-Tiessen *et al.*, 2011). The
7 Schöpfel *et al.* 2014 survey of research laboratory directors in France found that only 30% of
8 respondents had paid for an article to be open access (2016).
9
10

11 Bulgarian researchers also appear quite willing to meet the terms of potential open access
12 policies that would require article deposit to an open access repository. Of the six institutions
13 included in the survey population, only NBU has an institutional repository and sixty-seven
14 percent of NBU respondents say they deposit articles to the repository often or almost always.
15 Eighty-nine percent of NBU respondents say they deposit articles at least sometimes.
16 Surprisingly, 53% of all respondents said they deposit articles to an institutional repository at
17 least sometimes. The fact that five of the six institutions did not work at a university with an
18 institutional repository suggests that some of the respondents consider the practice of making
19 an article available on a personal or departmental website, sometimes referred to as “grey”
20 open access, as equivalent to green. In order for the number of Bulgarian articles in repositories
21 to increase, Bulgarian universities must implement and promote institutional repositories and
22 build services that support article deposit. It also appears that outreach to new faculty is needed
23 to encourage article deposit to open access repositories. A significantly higher percentage of
24 respondents who have been employed for 10 years or more deposit to an institutional repository
25 at least sometimes (59%) compared with researchers who have been employed for fewer than
26 10 years (36%).
27
28
29
30
31

32 While respondents were aware of open access generally, respondents were not very aware of
33 the E.U. goal that the results of publicly funded research should be open access by the year
34 2020. In spite of the relative lack of awareness of the E.U. goal, once it was explained,
35 respondents were supportive of it. In order to determine whether Bulgarian faculty have a
36 preference for green or gold open access in order to achieve the E.U. goal, the survey asked
37 respondents to indicate how important different factors would be in order for them to comply
38 with a requirement to deposit research articles to an open access repository or publish their
39 articles open access. In terms of green open access compliance, respondents said that having
40 a publisher deposit articles to an institutional repository on their behalf would be preferable to
41 doing it themselves.
42
43
44

45 Researchers have only a very slight preference that the version of record of an article is
46 deposited rather than an accepted manuscript version. The high number of neutral responses to
47 questions about requiring authors to deposit an article to an institutional repository, and
48 negotiating the right to deposit suggests that respondents would be willing to take these actions
49 if they were required to do so, but not otherwise. The neutral responses may also suggest a low
50 level of understanding of the details of open access policies and potential means of compliance.
51
52
53

54 The authors were surprised to find that the consideration of open access publishing of articles in
55 promotion and tenure reviews was the least important factor for researchers when considering
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 whether or not to publish an article open access. Respondents indicate that the prestige of the
4 journal is the most important criteria when considering a publishing outlet, which corresponds
5 with other research. The Act for the Development of Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria
6 requires Bulgarian researchers to publish articles in journals that have an impact factor (a
7 measure of prestige) and are indexed in SCOPUS, Web of Science and other databases
8 (<https://rio.jrc.ec.europa.eu/en/library/act-development-academic-staff-republic-bulgaria>). Many
9 of the open-ended responses to the question of which journal factors are important when
10 considering publication reiterated the importance of impact factor and that the journal is well
11 indexed. Whether or not the journal is open access and the journal's copyright policy are among
12 the least important factors for Bulgarian authors.
13
14
15

16 **6. Conclusion**

17 For this article, the authors surveyed faculty at six Bulgarian universities to determine their
18 awareness of the E.U. Competitive Council goal of open access to publicly funded research by
19 2020, support for the goal, and preferences for achieving it. In response to the E.U. goal, and
20 especially an internal desire to transform the country into an attractive center for advanced
21 scientific research and new technology development, to strengthen the integration of Bulgarian
22 science in society, and to increase the country's international reputation in the science sector,
23 Bulgaria has achieved some success in moving towards open access to research. At this time,
24 only one Bulgarian university--NBU--has an open access policy, and very few have an
25 institutional repository. However, since December 2018, the University of Library Studies and
26 Information Technologies and University of Chemical Technology and Metallurgy have
27 partnered in the National Scientific Program „Information and Communication Technologies for
28 a Single Digital Market in Science, Education and Security (ICTinSES, 2018-2020)“, financed by
29 the Bulgarian Ministry of Education and Science. One of the main tasks of this project is to
30 establish institutional repositories at the two universities and a green open access policy that
31 applies to both. These could be in place as early as the end of 2020.
32
33
34
35
36

37 Bulgarian researchers are aware of arguments in favor of open access and believe that it
38 benefits researchers in their discipline. Only a little more than a third of Bulgarian faculty,
39 however, are familiar with the E.U. goal of open access to all publicly funded research by 2020.
40 Once the goal is explained, however, faculty support it. Although it seems likely that Bulgarian
41 authors may not understand the intricacies of green and gold open access, it does appear that
42 they are prepared to meet the E.U. goal by either publishing in open access journals (the gold
43 method) or depositing articles in open access repositories (the green method).
44
45
46

47 A high percentage of Bulgarian researchers say that they already publish in open access
48 journals at least sometimes, even though open access is considered among the least important
49 factors for faculty when considering where to publish their research. Bulgarian authors
50 understandably believe that, if publishing open access is to be required of Bulgarian faculty,
51 financial support needs to be available to pay article processing charges. Although only one
52 Bulgarian university has an open access policy, and there are relatively few institutional
53 repositories in operation, Bulgarian faculty appear willing to deposit their research to such
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

repositories. Respondents from New Bulgarian University, the only university surveyed that has an institutional repository, deposit their articles to a repository at least sometimes.

On the basis of the survey results, the authors recommend the following next steps to increase open access to Bulgarian research:

- The development of training and continuing education programs to improve the Bulgarian research community's awareness of the benefits of open science, open data, and open access.
- The development of local institutional repositories or a centralized repository for the long-term storage and dissemination of scholarship.
- The development of a community-wide metadata standard and file-naming system for research deposited to open access repositories.
- The establishment of scholarly communication and repository services related to research processes and self-archiving.

~~A limitation of this study is that faculty at two of the largest and most prestigious universities in Bulgaria—Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski” and American University in Bulgaria—were not surveyed.~~ There is a need for follow-up and other future research on open access in Bulgaria. Research on the training and continuing education of Bulgarian researchers to improve awareness of open access publishing and depositing would be useful. An article in Bulgarian for the Bulgarian research community and government about the findings and recommendations of this paper is also in order.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

~~This paper is a part of research activities in the frame of the National Scientific Programme „Information and Communication Technologies for a Single Digital Market in Science, Education and Security (ICTinSES)“, financed by the Ministry of Education and Science, Bulgaria.~~

7. References

- Arsenova, Iskra. (2015). Public libraries attitudes towards Open Access: The case of Bulgaria. *Media and Information Literacy in Knowledge Society and Libraries*, 27–33. Belgrade, Serbia.
- Boukacem-Zeghmouri, C., Dillaerts, H., Lafouge, T., Bador, P., & Sauer-Avargues, A. (2018). French publishing attitudes in the open access era: The case of mathematics, biology, and computer science. *Learned Publishing*, 31(4), 345–354. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1169>
- Castelli, D., Dillo, I., Hanslik, S., Rabfogel-Scheer, J., Stanchev, P., & von Voigt, G.. (2018, October 30). The European Open Science Cloud: Domestic experiences vs the pan- European experiences. Presented at The European Open Science Cloud: Austria takes initiative, Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from https://eosc18-ati.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/k_eosc18_ati/Praesentationen/Panel_EOSC_OCT18.pdf
- Dallmeier-Tiessen, S., Darby, R., Goerner, B., Hyppoelae, J., Igo-Kemenes, P., Kahn, D., ... van der Stelt, W. (2011). Highlights from the SOAP project survey. What scientists

1
2
3 think about Open Access publishing (p. arXiv:1101.5260). Retrieved from
4 <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1101.5260.pdf>

- 5 ● Daoutis, C. A., & Rodriguez-Marquez, M. D. M. (2018). Library-mediated deposit: A gift
6 to researchers or a curse on Open Access? Reflections from the case of Surrey.
7 Publications, 6(2), 20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications6020020>
- 8 ● Dimchev, A. (2013) Open access to information and its role in Sofia University „St.
9 Kliment Ohridski“. The Experience of the Library and Information Sciences Specialty. In
10 an A n n u a i r e de l'Universite de Sofia „St. Kliment Ohridski“, Faculte de Philosophie
11 livre des Sciences de L'information et des Bibliothèques, Vol. 5, pp. 5-55.
- 12 ● Enserink, M. (2016). In dramatic statement, European leaders call for 'immediate' open
13 access to all scientific papers by 2020. Retrieved June 28, 2019, from Science | AAAS
14 website: [https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/05/dramatic-statement-european-](https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/05/dramatic-statement-european-leaders-call-immediate-open-access-all-scientific-papers)
15 [leaders-call-immediate-open-access-all-scientific-papers](https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/05/dramatic-statement-european-leaders-call-immediate-open-access-all-scientific-papers)
- 16 ● Hahn, S. E., & Wyatt, A. (2014). Business faculty's attitudes: Open Access, disciplinary
17 repositories, and institutional repositories. Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship,
18 19(2), 93–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08963568.2014.883875>
- 19 ● Mischo, W. H., & Schlembach, M. C. (2011). Open Access issues and engineering
20 faculty attitudes and practices. Journal of Library Administration, 51(5–6), 432–454.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.589349>
- 22 ● Odell, J., Palmer, K., & Dill, E. (2017). Faculty attitudes toward Open Access and
23 scholarly communications: Disciplinary differences on an urban and health science
24 campus. Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication, 5(1), eP2169.
25 <https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2169>
- 26 ● Republic of Bulgaria. (2017). National strategy for development of scientific research in
27 the republic of Bulgaria 2017-2030 (Better science for better Bulgaria). E + E, 52(9–10),
28 35–49. [https://rio.jrc.ec.europa.eu/en/library/act-development-academic-staff-republic-](https://rio.jrc.ec.europa.eu/en/library/act-development-academic-staff-republic-bulgaria)
29 [bulgaria](https://rio.jrc.ec.europa.eu/en/library/act-development-academic-staff-republic-bulgaria)
- 30 ● Rowlands, I., & Nicholas, D. (2005). Scholarly communication in the digital environment.
31 Aslib Proceedings. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00012530510634226>
- 32 ● Schöpfel, J., Ferrant, C., André, F., & Fabre, R. (2016). Ready for the future? A survey
33 on open access with scientists from the French National Research Center (CNRS).
34 Interlending & Document Supply, 44(4), 141–149. [https://doi.org/10.1108/ILDS-06-2016-](https://doi.org/10.1108/ILDS-06-2016-0023)
35 [0023](https://doi.org/10.1108/ILDS-06-2016-0023)
- 36 ● Simeonov, G. & Stanchev, P. (2011, September 11). Open Access and institutional
37 repositories in Bulgaria. 165–170. Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria.
- 38 ● Stanchev, P., Damyanova, M., Zherkova, Y., Karova, Z., Jecheva, G., Pavlov, R., &
39 Simeonov, G. (2018, September 27-29). Open science, open data, open access. Digital
40 Presentation and Preservation of Cultural and Scientific Heritage, 8. Burgas, Bulgaria:
41 Institute of Mathematics and Informatics BAS.
- 42 ● Stanchev, P. (2014). Business models for Open Access. Copyright and licensing under
43 Open Access. Presented at the UNESCO Digital Presentation and Preservation of
44 Cultural and Scientific Heritage Conference, Sofia, Bulgaria.
- 45 ● Suber, P. (2008). An open access mandate for the National Institutes of Health. Open
46 medicine : a peer-reviewed, independent, open-access journal, 2(2), e39–e41.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Tenopir, C., Dalton, E., Fish, A., Christian, L., Jones, M., & Smith, M. (2016). What motivates authors of scholarly articles? The importance of journal attributes and potential audience on publication choice. *Publications*, 4(3), 22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications4030022>
 - Todorova, R. & Partulova, M. (2017). Discovering the efficient path to scientific research: The new Bulgarian university library experience. LIB2017-2291. Athens: ATINER. Retrieved from <https://www.atiner.gr/papers/LIB2017-2291.pdf> (accessed on 21 August 2019)
 - Todorova, T. (2012). University libraries and Open Access to information. *New Information Technologies in Educational Process: Proceedings from 6th Scientific Seminar of ULSIT*, 315–323. Sofia: Za Bukvite-O pismeneh.
 - Trencheva, T. (2013). Open access to scientific information. *Za Bukvite-O Pismeneh*, 206.
 - Trencheva, T. & Dimitrova, S. (2019). Comparative study of the Bulgarian Open Access Journals in DOAJ for the period 2002-2018: EDULEARN19 Proceedings до 11th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies, Palma de Mallorca (Spain), 1st-3rd July 2019, 6035-6044. Palma de Mallorca: IATED.
 - Trencheva, T. & Todorova, T. (2014). Open access to scientific information: Comparative study in DOAJ. *Library Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-08-2013-0070>
 - Vincent-Lamarre, P., Boivin, J., Gargouri, Y., Larivière, V., & Harnad, S. (2016). Estimating open access mandate effectiveness: The MELIBEA score. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(11), 2815–2828. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23601>
 - Wolff, C.; Rod, A.B.; Schonfeld, R.C. Ithaka S+R US Faculty Survey 2015. 2016. http://www.sr.ithaka.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/SR_Report_US_Faculty_Survey_2015040416.pdf (accessed on 29 April 2019).
 - Zhang, H., Boock, M. and Wirth, A.A., 2015. It Takes More than a Mandate: Factors that Contribute to Increased Rates of Article Deposit to an Institutional Repository. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 3(1), p.eP1208. <https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1208>

Table 1. Awareness of arguments in favor of open access.

	Employed for 10 years or more (%)	Employed fewer than 10 years (%)	All lengths of employment (%)
Extremely aware	24	8	19
Very aware	57	45	54
Moderately aware	14	29	18
Slightly aware	5	15	8
Not aware at all	0	3	1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2. Open access benefits.

	Benefits the discipline (%)	Benefits the public (%)
Yes	81	60
No	7	8
I am not sure	12	27
I am not interested	0	5

Library Management

Table 3. Awareness of the E.U. open access goal.

	(%)
Yes	37
No	37
I am not sure	16
I am not interested	11

Library Management

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 4. Support for E.U. open access goal.

	Aware of E.U. goal (%)	Not aware of E.U. goal (%)	All respondents (%)
Fully support	54	30	38
Support	35	53	44
Undecided	10	15	17
Do not support	1	1	1
Actively do not support	0	1	.5

Table 5. How often researchers deposit articles to the institutional repository.

	New Bulgarian University (%)	Other universities (%)	Employed for 10 years or more (%)	Employed fewer than 10 years (%)	All respondents (%)
Almost always	26	14	15	6	15
Often	41	13	30	9	17
Sometimes	22	21	17	21	21
Rarely	7	18	13	24	17
Never	4	34	26	39	30

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 6. How often researchers deposit articles to a disciplinary repository.

	Employed for 10 years or more (%)	Employed fewer than 10 years (%)	All respondents (%)
Almost always	21	8	17
Often	19	5	15
Sometimes	21	21	21
Rarely	20	32	24
Never	19	33	23

Library Management

Table 7. Factors important to researchers in depositing articles to an institutional repository, if doing so is required

	Irrelevant or Less Important (%)	Neutral (%)	Important or Very Important (%)
Publisher deposits a final published version of the article to an open access repository	5	20	75
Publisher deposits a post peer review version of the article to an open access repository	8	22	70
The author is required to deposit the final version of the article in an open access repository	7	34	59
The author is required to deposit a post peer review version of the article to an open access repository	15	37	48
The author is required to negotiate the right to deposit the article to an open access repository	19	39	41

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 8. How often researchers publish articles in an open access journal.

	Employed for 10 years or more (%)	Employed fewer than 10 years (%)	All respondents (%)
Almost always	15	24	17
Often	33	20	29
Sometimes	30	35	31
Rarely	17	15	17
Never	5	6	6

Library Management

Table 9. How often researchers publish articles open access in a hybrid journal.

	Employed for 10 years or more (%)	Employed fewer than 10 years (%)	All respondents (%)
Almost always	8	8	8
Often	6	9	8
Sometimes	21	23	22
Rarely	20	22	21
Never	44	38	42

Table 10. Factors important to researchers in a case where publishing journal articles open access is required.

	Irrelevant or Less important (%)	Neutral (%)	Important or Very important (%)
I'm given financial support to pay fees for publishing in an open access or hybrid journal of my choice.	4	7	89
I'm given financial support to pay fees for publishing in an open access journal.	6	11	84
I am able to publish the results of my research in the journal of my choice.	3	13	84
I'm given financial support to pay fees for publishing in a hybrid journal.	6	16	77
The future funding of research is tied to whether the results of previous research are published open access.	13	30	56
Only articles that are published open access are considered in promotion and tenure reviews.	25	33	42

Table 11. How do you assess the importance of these criteria when choosing a journal in which to publish your research papers?

	Irrelevant or Less important (%)	Neutral (%)	Important or Extremely important (%)
Influence, prestige of the quality of the journal	1	7	92
Importance and influence of the journal in my scientific community	3	7	90
Impact factor of the journal	6	7	86
Significance and prestige of the journal for academic growth, assessment, and promotion and tenure	5	8	86
Lack of publication fees for the journal (e.g., fee for article submission, fee for page count, fee for color images, etc.)	10	15	76
Speed of publication of the article	9	23	69
Likelihood of article acceptance in the journal	12	19	69
Positive experience with publisher/editor(s) of the journal	12	20	68
Copyright policy of the journal	12	23	65
Recommendation of the journal by colleagues	17	18	65
The journal is open access	12	26	62
The journal corresponds to the scientific policy of my organization	15	26	60