International Journal of
Education Policy & Leadership

IJEPL
Volume 15(5)
2019

Perceptions of Educational Leadership Faculty Regarding Open Access Publishing

Jayson W. Richardson, *University of Kentucky*
Scott McLeod, *University of Colorado Denver*
Todd Hurst, *University of Kentucky*

Abstract There is a dearth of research on the perceptions of faculty members in educational leadership regarding open access publications. This reality may exist because of a lack of funding for educational leadership research, financial obstacles, tenure demands, or reputation concerns. It may be that there are simply fewer established open access publishers with reputable impact factors to encourage publication by members in the field. The current study seeks to answer the following question: "What are the perceptions of educational leadership faculty members in UCEA about open access publishing?" The results are based on responses from 180 faculty members in the field of educational leadership.

Keywords Open access; Faculty; Publishing

Introduction

Opportunities for scholars to publish their work, reach new audiences, and report out their findings in different—and potentially interactive or multimedia—formats have expanded over the past few decades. This shift has been enabled by concurrent growth in the internet, social media, and other digital information channels. One of

Jayson W. Richardson, Scott McLeod, & Todd Hurst. (2019). Perceptions of Educational Leadership Faculty Regarding Open Access Publishing. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership 15*(5). URL: http://journals.sfu.ca/ijepl/index.php/ijepl/article/view/817 doi: 10.22230/ijepl.2019v15n5a817

the most significant evolutions in academic publishing has been the rise of open access journals, blogs, databases, and other publishing repositories that are freely available to the world at large in contrast to being locked behind a publishing house password or paywall.

While for some, the idea of open access publishing merely means another avenue in which research can be published, for others it takes on greater moral and ethical urgency in the form of a publishing "movement" (Furlough, 2010, p. 2624). That movement became a revolution for many in 2013 following the suicide of Aaron Swartz, a noted programmer, entrepreneur, internet activist, and open access advocate. Swartz faced criminal charges after writing computer code that connected to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology library and found academic journal articles then distributed copies of those articles to the general public (Cohen, 2013). This act circumnavigated the paywall set up by publishers, thus giving readers access to paid, copyrighted content for free. The news of Swartz's suicide spread through numerous researcher communities and prompted the development of the Twitter hashtag #pdftribute, which academics from around the world then used to post public links to research articles that often had been previously guarded behind a paywall. The tragic event brought national light to an issue that has continued to garner traction from academic communities in a variety of scholarly disciplines. As such, a growing number of researchers are wondering if the traditional system of subscription- and fee-based academic journals is still relevant for today's more accessible, hyper-connected world and if the work of academics and universities should be open and free to all.

The concept of open access publishing is not new. Since the 1990s, numerous journals have been created with the specific intent of being available to everyone, not just those individuals or institutions with deep financial resources (Laakso, Welling, Nyman, Björk, & Hedlund, 2011). Although these original open access journals often were formed by "individual scholars on tailor-made [technology] platforms" (p. 8), the landscape of open access publishing has changed drastically in the intervening years. What was once a niche segment within the academic community is now a growing portion of all journal articles published. This emergence of open access opportunities and outlets has left many to consider the larger potential impacts of open access publishing on academic research. While some scholars believe that open access will have a positive overall impact on research and scholarship (Yiotis, 2013), others question the concept and see more potential harm than positive benefits (Butler, 2013; Haug, 2013).

The adoption of open access as a norm of publication varies widely based on the field of study. Sunje Dallmeier-Tiessen, Bettina Goerner, Robert Darby, Jenni Hyppoelae, Peter Igo-Kemenes, Deborah Kahn, Simon Lambert, Anja Legenfelder, Chris Leonard, Salvatore Mele, Panayiota Polydoratou, David Ross, Sergio Ruiz-Perez, Ralf Schimmer, Mark Swaisland, and Wim van der Stelt (2011) noted that findings from the Study of Open Access Publishing (SOAP) suggested that a distinction exists between those publishers that focus on science, technology, and medicine and those publishers that focus primarily on the social sciences and humanities. A few larger publishers, such as the Public Library of Science (PLoS) or the

International Union of Crystallography (IUCr), dominate open access publishing in the former disciplines. These entities have multiple journals and produce numerous articles each year. Open access publishers in the social sciences and humanities, however, tend to be smaller organizations and may only have a single journal. This distinction has led to very different landscapes for open access publishing across academic disciplines. Three major factors appear to encourage or dissuade faculty from pursuing open access opportunities, especially in the social sciences: cost, career implications, and professional reach. Each of these aspects will be discussed in the following sections.

Cost

One significant advantage that an open access journal provides is the removal of financial barriers to information access for the consumer. While this may seem straightforward on its face, the reality of the journal subscription model elicits a "Jekyll and Hyde" (Rowlands & Nicholas, 2005, p. 486) mentality in researchers. On the one hand, most researchers want their findings to be accessible to the broadest audience possible. However, this reality does not necessarily translate to the journals in which authors choose to publish. For example, in a survey of more than 5,500 academic researchers, Ian Rowlands and David Nicholas (2005) found that 74 percent of the participating scholars agreed that high journal prices created a barrier to information access. From that same population, however, only 25 percent of respondents reported that their choice to publish in a given journal was related to its affordability.

In contrast, Stefanie Warlick and KTL Vaughan (2007) interviewed 14 authors who had multiple open access publications and found that cost often was a significant factor in those authors' choices regarding where to publish. One interviewee in their study remarked, "As an author, I deliberately publish in journals that are affordable to readers" (p. 386). This altruistic conception of publishing was echoed by Alma Swan and Sheridan Brown (2004) who noted that the "principle of free access for all readers was an important reason" (p. 220) to publish in open access journals.

Malcolm Campbell (2004) identified the negative impact that journal subscriptions have on academic growth at colleges and universities, noting that the rising cost of subscriptions limits the ability of libraries to house wide-ranging subject areas. In addition to inhibiting access to research by campus faculty, Campbell argued that open access journals are fundamental to the future of student learning as well noting that limiting access to research prohibits undergraduate students from interacting with a wider range of scholarly material. Campbell (2004) said, "Students need to have unencumbered access to the research literature in order to engage in research and become scientific leaders in the 21st century" (p. 0560).

In order to remain sustainable, publishers have utilized a variety of mechanisms to fund open access publishing, including institutional membership plans and assistance from research funders. One of the most popular structures has proved to be an author pays model, in which the researcher pays an upfront cost to subsidize the journal's cost associated with publication and dissemination. While this approach allows for free access to publications—and potentially broader access—academic authors often do not believe that the burden of financing publication should be

placed on them (Nariani & Fernandez, 2012; Rowlands & Nicholas, 2005; Schroter, Tite, & Smith, 2005).

Another concern is that the author pays model may present barriers to researchers (Schroter et al., 2005). The obvious barrier of acquiring funding for the publication process comes to mind immediately. In fact, as a respondent in Sara Schroter, Leanne Tite, and Richard Smith's (2005) survey indicated, if author fees are too high, they might "skew" (p. 2) the type of publications that get submitted, causing further marginalization within the research community of authors of niche topics or in non-grant funded areas. To the extent that this occurs, important research may never reach an open access audience.

The author pays model is not universal to all open access journals. A study by William Walters and Anne Linvill (2010) concluded that only 29 percent of open access journals use an author pays model; however, "those journals represent 50% of the articles" (p. 382). These data underscore the dominance of larger publishing houses in the production of open access journals and articles. As noted above, these publishers tend to focus on science, technology, and medical fields and rely on author pays models of financing. These models may be more feasible within those fields as they tend to receive more research grants in general and because many research grants in those areas require publications to be shared in open access venues (Furlough, 2010; Stebbins, 2013). Faculty members in certain academic fields thus have some advantages regarding both their ability to fund their own publications and the disciplinary expectation that they will do so.

Another concern is the risk of submitting one's work to a nefarious journal. This issue is omnipresent for university faculty members who are often formally (and informally) judged by their peers. Regularly, academics are inundated with emails requesting that they submit their work to questionable journals that are low-quality, are not actually peer reviewed, and/or have a fee structure intended to earn a huge profit for the journal's owner. To help authors navigate this predatory journal terrain, the work of Jeff Beall (2017) has been and continues to be invaluable. Although his original, university hosted site was taken down due to legal issues, his work lives on in a website titled *Beall's List of Predatory Journals and Publishers,* currently hosted on Weebly.com by an anonymous author. This website anonymously hosts a version of Beall's legacy site and is regularly updated. Beall (2017) reflected on his work with predatory journals and stated, "What I learned from predatory publishers is that they consider money far more important than business ethics, research ethics, and publishing ethics and that these three pillars of scholarly publishing are easily sacrificed for profit" (p. 275).

Bringing attention to predatory journals has not prevented the practice, given the publish-or-perish mentality of university faculty members. Specifically, the high number of publications required by candidates seeking tenure produces temptations to continue publishing in these journals. Unfortunately, it is a regular practice that has implications for success in an academic career and is perpetuated across campuses in the United States and internationally (Cadez, Dimovski, & Gross, 2017).

Career implications

The nature of modern academe, which places a high value on frequent publication,

has added to the current "crisis" (Rowlands & Nicholas, 2005, p. 486) regarding open access publication outlets versus subscription-based journals. The choices that faculty members make regarding where to publish can impact retention, promotion, and tenure considerations within their departments and colleges as well their potential impact within their larger professional communities. Bo-Christer Björk (2004) identified institutional and disciplinary expectations as barriers because of academic reward systems in which publishing in open access journals is a very low priority. In contrast, Rajiv Nariani and Leila Fernandez (2012) found that open access journals were not necessarily barriers to promotion and tenure. However, the Nariani and Fernandez study was focused on academics publishing in medical journals.

One way that open access journals may positively impact career status is that they sometimes allow authors to publish more quickly. Researchers often perceive a decreased turnaround time when publishing in open access journals (Nariani & Fernandez, 2012; Swan & Brown, 2004). Warlick and Vaughan (2007), however, warned against using the speed of publication as a "point of promotion" (p. 5) for open access publication, noting that speed of publication is becoming a less significant issue overall and that some benefits of open access journals may be a result of entirely different publication models. As an example, while traditional journals rely on a "filter then publish" paradigm (i.e., peer review occurs before publication), the journal PLoS ONE utilizes a "publish then filter" (Shirky, 2008, p. 81) approach, posting un-reviewed articles online and then relying on perceptions of quality and impact to emerge through open forum discussions and post-publication peer review (Warlick & Vaughan, 2007). This process is similar to the workings of many academic blogging communities, in which researchers have an uninhibited ability to publish data, research, and other scholarly ideas on their individual blogs and then receive feedback from other connected colleagues through comments, hyperlinks, related blog posts, and other interactions.

Ted Youn and Tanya Price (2009) identified a shift in tenure criteria emphasis beginning in the 1980s from teaching and service to research productivity, as measured by the number of publications one is published in. The enumeration of scholarly articles and the journal ranking that those works are published in (i.e., top-tier, second-tier, etc.) became the leading factor in tenure evaluations (Green, 2008; Hodge & Lacasse, 2011). Concomitantly, some tenure criteria might be undergoing yet another change in which publication and journal rank may not be an overly dominant criterion for scholarly productivity. As open access journals gain popularity and legitimacy, publications in open access journals might weigh more favorably in tenure decisions, especially in specific fields.

For example, institutes of higher education appear to be more accepting of open access and more committed to furthering it. Harvard University's Faculty of Arts and Sciences and Stanford University's School of Education both instituted policies in 2008 that encourage open access by requiring that any publication written by their faculty members must be archived in a university-level open access repository (Furlough, 2010). Many other universities now do the same, either by mandate or invitation, giving interested faculty members a free outlet in which they can make their work more accessible to the public. Although institutional repositories may not

be as easily findable or visible as open access journals, their growing number indicates institutional support for faculty members' open access efforts.

Tenure decisions are also impacted by data on journal quality and impact. As such, open access journals are often disadvantaged when juxtaposed with popular print journals. For example, the h-index used by Google is widely accepted but flawed by design. As Emilio Delgado-López-Cózar and Álvaro Cabezas-Clavijo (2012) highlighted,

> The fact that the h-index has little discriminatory power emphasizes the need for using additional indicators ... Google has chosen a five-year time frame for calculating the h-index. While this time frame is suitable for basic science journals with an international scope, it seems insufficient for the case of national journals, and especially for those in the fields of Social Sciences and Humanities. (p. 422)

Thus, authors are forced to articulate why open access journals that may be relatively new, more selective, or limited in comparison to popular journals might not meet the criteria that traditionally reflects the impact of the scholarly work, yet still add value to one's academic dossier. With that said, it is often easier to locate altmetrics (e.g., downloads, shares on social media) from open access journals. However, to date, it is unclear how altmeterics impact tenure decisions.

Professional reach

Scholarly authors want to have the best chance possible for their peers to read and cite their research. The best indicator of whether a given journal will be read is arguably its impact factor. Studies have shown that author perceptions of open access journal impact factors are wide-ranging. Nariani and Fernandez (2012) conducted semi-structured interviews with scholarly authors who had articles published by open access publishers such as PLoS, BioMed Central, and Hindawi. Their findings indicated that many respondents mentioned concerns over the impact factor of open access journals. While some believe that open access journals are too new to receive credible impact factors (Nariani & Fernandez, 2012), the reality might be quite different. William Walters and Anne Linvill (2010) found that the proportion of open access journals with impact factors—as represented in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)—is roughly equivalent to the proportion of all journals with impact factors: about 11 percent. This finding may indicate that if open access journals were as prevalent as traditional journals, impact factor alone may not be a defining feature.

Impact factor, calculated by dividing the number of times a journal has been cited in a calendar year by the total number of articles published within a window of time (usually two or five years), provides limited context other than the average citation of articles per year in a given journal. Impact factor was "developed to meet the disciplinary norms of fields" (Hodge & Lacasse, 2011, p. 581). Impact factor was not designed to serve beyond an indicator of literature disseminated and is not intended to be used as a value-added marker as part of tenure or promotion evaluation. Nevertheless, it is a common indicator of professional impact and productivity.

Whether based in fact or perception, many authors indicate that impact factor is the most important consideration in choosing where to publish (Furlough, 2010;

Nariani & Fernandez, 2012; Park & Qin, 2007; Warlick & Vaughan, 2007). While impact factor is an important contributor to the citation frequency of journal articles, ultimately there is no clear way to determine the true reach of an article as measured by how many people had the opportunity to read it (Warlick & Vaughan, 2007). In a broad survey of open access authors, Swan and Brown (2004) found that 71 percent of respondents believed that open access could account for broader readership of articles and 64 percent believed that the open access model could lead to greater citations. Similarly, Jill Russell and Tracy Kent (2010) noted that if "more people can find and read a piece of work, the more chance there is of it being cited" (p. 97).

A corollary effect of the reach of open access journals, institutional repositories, and other outlets is that it allows important scholarly work to impact researchers in geographic areas that have diminished access to subscription-based publications. John Willinsky (2006) noted that access to subscription-based research literature by universities in developing countries was so limited that their libraries often had access to only a few dozen or several hundred journals and sometimes as few as one journal per discipline. However, a decade later, international open access initiatives such as HINARI, AGORA, OARE, and ARDI are helping to close some of the research access gap in developing countries, but much remains to be done (Ware & Mabe, 2015). International collaboration and outreach concerns may present moral and ethical concerns compelling enough to prompt some authors to choose open access journals. For instance, Nariani and Fernandez (2012) highlighted a case in which a researcher intended for her research to be "read by aboriginal community researchers and hence decided to publish in an open access journal" (p. 8).

Perceptions of educational leadership faculty regarding open access publication

Given the growing prevalence of open access journals and institutional repositories, it is important to understand what researchers think about these new publishing outlets. Given the wide variety of supports and expectations regarding open access publication, the ways in which faculty members think about and act upon open access opportunities are deeply influenced by the resources, cultures, and communities of their academic disciplines. As Walters and Linvill (2010) noted, some fields such as the biosciences tend to have faculty who "value rapid publication, strongly prefer online formats, and tend to be at least somewhat knowledgeable about open access" (p. 78). Faculty members in the biosciences thus may be more likely to publish in open access journals due to cultural norms within that scholarly community. This reality holds true across science, technology, and medical fields, as there are large, established open access publishing venues available to these faculty and financial incentives to do so. In the social sciences, however, these cultures and support systems may not be as robust.

Currently there is a dearth of research on educational leadership faculty members' perceptions regarding open access publication. Compared to disciplinary fields such as the hard sciences, educational leadership scholars have more limited access to overall funding for research and to other financial streams that could remedy potential obstacles to open access such as authoring fees. Additionally, there are fewer

established open access educational leadership outlets with robust bibliometrics (e.g., impact factor) to encourage faculty to publish in those journals. That said, both the increased global emphasis on education reform and the implementation of research-based best educational practices encourage the need for the wider dissemination of educational research.

Education leadership faculty prepare future generations of faculty members, and their perceptions of open access publication opportunities will in turn influence their students. This study aimed to uncover how educational leadership researchers think about open access publication and to consider whether there is a future for open access within the field.

Although research regarding open access research has emerged from other relevant social sciences fields (e.g., educational technology, management, social work) in recent years, the open access trend has been sparsely investigated through the lens of educational leadership. Given that school leaders and teachers often seek opportunities to bridge the research-practitioner gap, maximizing the opportunities that becomes available through open access journals would not only benefit domestic education policy but might extend research beyond borders and have an international impact on sharing knowledge (Ion & Iucu, 2014; Yancovic-Allen, 2018). A core goal of scholarly work is to have the research consumed by an audience outside of just other academics. In educational leadership, research is often intended to influence policy, practice, and ultimately improve teaching and learning in schools. However, if the research in the field of educational leadership is locked behind a paywall, that influence is ultimately limited to those who have access, which often does not include policymakers, teachers, and leaders. Thus, understanding how open access is viewed in the field opens the door to more constructive discussions about accessibility.

Methods

The population for this descriptive case study consisted of all educational leadership faculty members at the 98 University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) institutions and affiliates as of January 2015 (University Council for Educational Administration, 2015). The UCEA is a consortium of mostly major American research universities' educational leadership programs and includes several programs in other countries. Faculty members in these programs represent the bulk of the top educational leadership researchers in the word and were determined to be the optimal population of study for this topic. Participant recruitment occurred over three rounds spaced two weeks apart. In each round of recruitment, an email with a survey link was distributed to the list of UCEA faculty members. After three recruitment rounds 180 completed surveys were received, a response rate of 16.1 percent. This response rate is likely higher, given that the UCEA membership list included some non-faculty members (e.g., administrative and support staff) as well as scholars who were no longer faculty members at the listed institution. Email addresses that were returned as invalid were recorded and the population number was adjusted accordingly. Table 1 indicates the population totals and overall return rates after each round of recruitment.

Table 1. Population and return rate

Round	Population	Returned accounts	Adjusted population	Surveys completed	Response rate
1	1,261	95	1,166	86	7.4%
2	1,166	36	1,130	152	13.4%
3	1,130	9	1,121	180	16.1%

Note: Includes fully and partially completed surveys

Various survey industry experts consider a response rate of 16.1 percent to be good. For example, SurveyGizmo (2018) reported that the response rate for external surveys (i.e., not sent to employees) averages about a 10–15 percent return rate. Additionally, as noted by Stuart Watt, Claire Simpson, Chris McKillop, and Viv Nunn (2002) online surveys may introduce some level of selection bias. Hence there may be less variance in the data due to the modality of the survey. Given the context of the current survey, it may be that those who have little to no experience with open access publications may be underrepresented in this data set.

Three previous research studies that focused on open access publishing in other disciplines informed survey development. Where possible, items from these existing studies were adopted. At other times, items were slightly adapted to fit the context of the field of educational leadership. In the first study, Warlick and Vaughan (2007) looked at motivating factors of open access publishing by faculty members in the field of biomedicine at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. From this survey, items were pulled relating to factors that influence submission, general attitudes toward open access publishing, incentives and disincentives for open access publishing, department and university acceptance of open access publishing, and the frequency of publishing in open access outlets. In the second study, Nariani and Fernandez (2012) researched authors' perceptions regarding publishing in open access journals and their reasons for choosing those outlets. From this study, items were pulled that focused on the factors that influence the selection of open access journals as well as barriers to open access. In the third and final study, Schroter, Tite, and Smith (2005) explored business scholars' attitudes about open access publishing. From this study, relevant questions were pulled on familiarity with, support for, and reservations about open access publishing; willingness to submit to open access journals; and attitudes regarding payment of a processing fee to publish in open access journals. Finally, questions were added to ascertain participants' actions, such as the number of open access articles respondents had published and the names of the open access journals they were published in.

After the survey was compiled, the think-aloud technique was used with three educational leadership faculty members to cognitively validate the survey in the specific context. From this process, wording was adjusted slightly to clarify various questions and the order in which the questions were presented was adjusted.

Results

The respondent pool for this study was roughly balanced in terms of gender, with 55.7 percent self-identifying as female and 47.3 percent self-identifying as male. The ages of respondents ranged from 31 years old to 74 years old. The average age was

52.0 years. Table 2 shows respondents' racial and/or ethnic self-identification. The vast majority of participants in the survey classified themselves as White. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the demographics of the participants in this study reflect a similar representative makeup with over 70 percent of faculty members in postsecondary institutions identifying as White and approximately 40 percent identifying as male. In comparison to the NCES 2016 study of full-time faculty, the academic ranks of these respondents differed slightly, but are within 10 percent of the national population of faculty members.

Table 2. Race/ethnicity of respondents

Race/ethnicity	*n* (%)
White	119 (78.3%)
Black or African American	16 (10.5%)
Hispanic	14 (9.2%)
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1 (0.7%)
Asian	1 (0.7%)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0 (0.0%)
prefer not to answer	1 (0.7%)
Total	**152**

Table 3 details the academic rank of survey respondents. Just over a third (34.4%) of the respondents were full professors. About a quarter of the respondents were associate professors and another quarter of respondents were assistant professors. The remaining respondents were distributed among the categories of visiting professors, clinical professors, lecturers, adjunct professors, and other instructors.

Table 3. Academic rank of respondents

Rank	n (%)
Professor	52 (34.4%)
Associate Professor	42 (27.8%)
Assistant Professor	39 (25.8%)
Visiting Professor	1 (0.7%)
Clinical Professor	6 (4.0%)
Lecturer	3 (2.0%)
Adjunct Professor	2 (1.3%)
Other	5 (3.3%)
prefer not to answer	1 (0.7%)
Total	**151**

Years of service at respondents' current institutions ranged from 1 to 46 years, with the mean term of service at the current institution being 10.6 years. Years of service at any higher education institution ranged from 1 to 51 years, with the mean number of total service years being 14.1 years. Respondents reported that they specialized in a variety of content areas within the broader field of educational leader-

ship. These areas included general K–12 leadership; mentoring; international trends; organizational change; teacher leadership; science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM); social justice; school culture; departmental leadership; school finance; policy; women in leadership; school reform; the superintendency; technology; ethics; law; race; evaluation; higher education; philosophy of leadership; and research methodology.

A sizable majority of UCEA institutions are represented in the results. Of the 98 UCEA member universities, 69 institutions (70.4%) were represented by at least one respondent in this study. Eleven faculty members opted not to report their institutional affiliation. One institution had five respondents, five institutions had four respondents, and ten institutions had three respondents. All other institutions had one or two respondents. It should be noted that the focus of this study was the field of educational leadership and not an investigation of specific institutions. Additionally, given that educational leadership faculty members are somewhat mobile and may move institutions regularly, the focus on the institution is less interesting than the focus on the faculty member. Hence, the data herein are presented holistically rather than disaggregated by institution.

To better understand faculty values around broader, more generalized publishing concerns, respondents were asked a series of questions about elements that they valued when considering where to submit their academic writing. These responses are detailed in Table 4. Over 75 percent of responding UCEA faculty members placed value on their articles being freely available. Similar or even higher percentages of faculty members placed value on the journal's impact factor, the number of downloads the article receives, the number of times that the article is cited, and the number of times the article is shared. Nearly a quarter (23%) of UCEA faculty respondents said that they were either neutral about or did not value a journal's impact factor. A crosstab analysis by academic rank showed that 95 percent of this group of respondents comprised tenured faculty members.

Table 4. Values regarding article dissemination

I value …	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
number of times my article is shared	126 (87.5%)	11 (7.6%)	7 (4.9%)
number of times my article is cited by other researcher(s)	124 (86.1%)	13 (9.0%)	7 (4.9%)
journal's impact factor	111 (77.1%)	16 (11.1%)	17 (11.8%)
number of times my article is downloaded	110 (76.4%)	26 (18.1%)	8 (5.6%)
accessing my article free of charge	110 (76.4%)	29 (20.1%)	5 (3.5%)

Next, participants were asked about their experiences with and belief systems regarding open access journals. Table 5 shows that about 40 percent of respondents indicated that they had published in an open access journal at least once.

Table 5. Respondents who have published in an open access journal

Response	*n* (%)
No	87 (58.8%)
Yes	61 (41.2%)
Total	148

Respondents were also asked to list the titles of the open access journals in which they had been published. Responses varied and included some educational leadership journals, but most of the journals reported were in other fields. Table 6 lists the journals reported by survey respondents.

Table 6. Open access journals in which respondents have published

Journals in educational leadership	Journals in education	Journals outside of education
• *Education Leadership Review* • *Educational Policy Analysis Archives* • *International Journal of Educational Administration* • *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation* • *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration* • *Journal of Educational Leadership in Action* • *Journal of Ethical Educational Leadership* • *Nordic Policy Study Journal* • *School Administrator* • *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration*	• *Current Issues in Education* • *Curriculum without Borders* • *Distance Learning* • *Education and Culture* • *Educational Researcher* • *Excellence in Higher Education* • *Interchange: A Quarterly Review of Education* • *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy* • *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teacher and Learning* • *Journal of Educational Controversy* • *Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technologies* • *Pedagogy* • *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education* • *Workforce Education*	• *Advancing Women in Leadership* • *Connections* • *Contemporary Athlete* • *Forum on Public Policy* • *Inter-American Journal of Philosophy* • *Journal of Applied Research on Children* • *Journal of Intelligence* • *Qualitative Report*

Respondents were asked about their personal experience with author pays publication models. Only 21 (8.2%) of educational leadership faculty respondents reported that they had paid to publish an article in an open access journal. Most of those who did pay said that the expense was less than U.S.$100, although one faculty member paid more than U.S.$1,000 to publish an article. Respondents also were asked if they would pay to publish future articles. Only 15 of the participating educational leadership faculty members (11.6%) reported that they would pay a fee to publish a future study. Of those expressing willingness, no one reported that he or she would pay more than U.S.$500 and most said that they would only pay any amount that was less than U.S.$100.

Survey participants were asked why they might or might not consider publishing in an open access journal. As noted in Table 7, most educational leadership faculty cited wider circulation and faster publication times as reasons to publish in an open access journal instead of a traditional subscription-based journal. Between 20 percent and 25 percent of respondents believed that open access journals drive innovation and have higher readership. Over half of the respondents disagreed that open access journals were cited more often than traditional journals.

Table 7. Reasons to publish in open access journals v. subscription-based journals

Open access journals …	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
offer wider circulation	113 (78.5%)	19 (13.2%)	12 (8.3%)
have faster publication times	84 (58.7%)	50 (35.0%)	9 (6.3%)
offer higher visibility	64 (44.4%)	39 (27.0%)	41 (28.5%)
have a larger readership	37 (25.7%)	66 (45.8%)	41 (28.5%)
drive innovation in research	31 (21.5%)	62 (43.1%)	51 (35.4%)
are cited more heavily	11 (7.7%)	57 (39.9%)	75 (52.5%)

Additionally, faculty colleagues at UCEA institutions were asked to contrast publishing in open access journals with publishing in traditional subscription-based journals. As noted in Table 8, over 40 percent of faculty members said that they felt open access publications are of lower quality and have lower production standards. Over half of the respondents indicated that publishing in open access journals had at least some fundamental benefits compared to subscription-based journals.

Table 8. Publication beliefs about open access journals vs. subscription-based journals

Open access journals …	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
are of lower quality	62 (43.1%)	50 (34.7%)	31 (21.5%)
have lower production standards	58 (40.3%)	51 (35.4%)	35 (24.3%)
offer no fundamental benefits	16 (11.1%)	49 (34.0%)	79 (54.9%)

In order to gain greater understanding about overall perceptions of open access publishing, educational leadership faculty members were asked to indicate if open access journals were of high, neutral, or low quality along various criteria. Table 9 details that the responses were split relatively evenly. That is, respondents tended to equally agree and disagree that open access journals have high-quality reviews, are of high quality, and have high-quality articles. Perceptions about the reputation of open access journals were skewed slightly to the negative side, with over 30 percent of educational leadership faculty members reporting that the reputation of open access journals is low.

Table 9. Perceptions of open access publishing

Faculty perceptions	High quality	Neutral	Low quality
quality of the reviews	30 (21.3%)	81 (57.5%)	30 (21.3%)
quality of the journal	31 (22.1%)	72 (51.4%)	37 (26.4%)
quality of articles in the journal	31 (22.0%)	78 (55.3%)	32 (22.7%)
time to publication	55 (39.3%)	75 (53.6%)	10 (7.1%)
reputation of the journal	29 (20.7%)	67 (47.9%)	44 (31.4%)

Slightly more than a third of participating faculty believed that articles in open access journals undergo the same review process as articles in traditional journals (see Table 10). However, respondents' answers to additional questions show that approximately 80 percent of them did agree that open access journals had the potential to be high quality and rigorous, even if that was not always true in practice. Two-thirds of respondents also reported that open access publishing might allow them to share their work easier.

Table 10. Perceptions of open access publishing

In contrast to traditional journals, open access publishing …	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
can be as high quality	115 (81.6%)	15 (10.6%)	11 (7.1%)
can be as rigorous	110 (78.0%)	16 (11.4%)	15 (10.6%)
undergo the same peer-review process	53 (37.6%)	57 (40.4%)	31 (22.0%)
allow me to share my work easier	94 (66.7%)	31 (22.0%)	16 (11.4%)

When asked about submitting future articles, over a third (35.9%) of faculty members at UCEA institutions reported that it was unlikely that they would submit their work to an open access journal; this is over four times the number (8.5%) who reported that they were unlikely to submit to a traditional subscription-based journal. The remaining participants were undecided as to the outlet for their next article submission.

Respondents noted that publishing in an open access journal is often different than publishing in a traditional subscription-based journal. To a considerable extent, participants' concerns focused on the differences between free open access journals and pay-to-publish open access journals. Paying to publish was primarily seen as a negative aspect that may lend itself to lower standards, questionable peer reviews, and substandard ethics. In contrast, publishing in open access journals that do not impose charges on authors was viewed positively. In other words, some of the potential affordances of open access journals—easier access, greater reach, additional applications in the field, et cetera—were easier for educational leadership faculty members to see once they got past the "pay to publish" model of open access publishing.

While participating educational leadership faculty were able to note many positive benefits associated with open access publishing, a number of concerns also were expressed and are summarized in Table 11. In addition to benefits and concerns, respondents articulated many areas in which they had questions, including copyright, the peer-review process, who pays in open access models, whether open access articles are acceptable for non-tenured faculty, and the ranking of open access journals.

Table 11. Concerns about publishing in open access journals

Positive aspects	Negative aspects
• accessibility • greater appeal to practitioners • free for the reader • greater readership • quicker route to publication • more people have access • easier to have our work found and used • larger audience	• less likely to receive serious peer reviews • peer reviews are less rigorous • if charged, who pays? • open access system is too loose • not part of the scholarly tradition • risk of scams • less prestige • greater onus on author for editing and formatting • less oversight by academic community

Table 12 details respondents' beliefs about their intra-institutional peers regarding open access publishing. Respondents tended to report that many aspects of open access were not viewed highly by their institutional colleagues, with the exception of time to publication. Most aspects were perceived to be low or uncertain by the respondents' academic associates.

Table 12. Institutional peers' perceptions of open access journals

Aspect of open access journals	High view	Neutral	Low view	Uncertain
quality of the reviews	11 (8.0%)	36 (26.1%)	40 (29.0%)	51 (37.0%)
quality of the journal	9 (6.5%)	32 (23.2%)	52 (37.7%)	45 (32.6%)
quality of articles in the journal	11 (8.0%)	34 (24.6%)	45 (32.6%)	48 (34.8%)
time to publication	28 (20.4%)	45 (32.9%)	11 (8.0%)	53 (38.7%)
reputation of the journal	9 (6.5%)	34 (24.6%)	52 (37.7%)	43 (31.2%)

Respondents also were asked about institutional perceptions regarding open access publishing. As detailed in Table 13, slightly more than half of the respondents disagreed that their institution—at the system level—would equally value an open access journal publication compared to a traditional journal publication. Over half of the respondents also disagreed or expressed uncertainty regarding institutional mindsets about the quality, rigor, and peer-review process of open access publishing.

Table 13. Institutional perceptions of open access publishing

In contrast to traditional journals, my institution's perception of open access publishing is that it …	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Uncertain
can be as high in quality	38 (27.5%)	27 (19.6%)	31 (22.5%)	42 (30.4%)
can be as rigorous	33 (12.9%)	28 (20.3%)	35 (25.4%)	42 (30.4%)
undergoes the same peer-review process	23 (16.7%)	32 (23.2%)	43 (31.2%)	40 (29.0%)
equally values submissions to either	16 (11.6%)	24 (17.4%)	64 (46.4%)	34 (24.6%)

With regard to retention, promotion, and tenure, only 19 (13.9%) faculty members at UCEA institutions agreed that tenure committees view open access publishing positively, and nearly three times as many (n = 55, 40.2%) disagreed with that statement. Another quarter of participants were uncertain whether publishing in an open access journal had a positive or negative impact on a faculty member's tenure case.

When looking at institutional support generally, 28 percent of the participants reported that they would feel supported if they submitted future articles to open access journals. In contrast, 76 percent of the respondents reported that they would feel supported if they submitted a future article to a traditional subscription-based journal. Approximately one-fourth of participants felt that their institution would not support submissions to open access journals.

Faculty members at the 98 UCEA institutions were asked to describe statements made, implicitly or explicitly, in their department, college, or university about open access publishing. These comments ranged from full support to absolutely no support. On the supportive side, some faculty members noted how their institution was in support of open access publishing and that their "university is willing to pay costs if they met certain requirements." Other faculty noted that there is "increasing openness to less traditional outlets such as open access, but the author is expected to make the case for the venue and value."

In contrast, other faculty members noted that their university "will not provide financial support if there is a cost [because the university] generally sees open access journals as low quality … [it] raises questions in the P&T [promotion and tenure] process." The issue of tenure pressures and journal choice was common in the responses. For example, one survey participant noted that "I just target high tiered journals for my work and only journals that are highly/historically well regarded in my field if I am interested in getting tenure." Concerns also were noted about so-called "predatory journals," which are perceived to be of low quality, to have questionable peer-review procedures, and to be focused on profit. One respondent said, "Basically, there is a perception that one pays to get published." Another said that open access journals are "described as low hanging fruit by some."

Some educational leadership faculty members noted that open access publishing is much different than the pay-to-publish model. Although some respondents noted that high-quality open access outlets do exist (e.g., *AERA Open*, *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*), there was an earnest concern about the rigor, peer-review process,

and authenticity of open access journals. One respondent quipped that educational leadership faculty should not "do it for it won't count for promotion; but you can put grey matter and fugitive literature up there." Nevertheless, one theme that developed from the open responses was that these discussions are rarely happening at the department or institutional level. Finally, the study aimed to understand UCEA faculty members' perceptions of how they believed their educational leadership peers at other institutions, not just their own university, felt about open access publishing. Table 14 details those findings. Slightly more than 12 percent reported that their peers believed that open access publishing increased one's reputation in the field.

Table 14. Peers' perception of open access publishing

My peers in educational leadership believe …	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Uncertain
open access publishing can be high quality	*n* = 49 (36.6%)	*n* = 32 (23.9%)	*n* = 12 (9.0%)	*n* = 41 (30.6%)
open access publishing can be as rigorous as traditional journals	*n* = 41 (30.6%)	*n* = 33 (24.6%)	*n* = 22 (16.4%)	*n* = 40 (29.9%)
open access articles undergo the same peer-review process as traditional journals	*n* = 22 (14.9%)	*n* = 38 (28.4%)	*n* = 32 (23.9%)	*n* = 42 (31.3%)
submissions of articles to an open access journals are equally valued as submission to a traditional journal	*n* = 16 (11.9%)	*n* = 27 (20.2%)	*n* = 52 (38.8%)	*n* = 39 (29.1%)
open access publishing positively impacts a person's reputation in the field	*n* = 17 (12.7%)	*n* = 42 (31.3%)	*n* = 40 (29.9%)	*n* = 35 (26.1%)
open access journals are viewed less favorably in the field	*n* = 37 (27.8%)	*n* = 38 (28.6%)	*n* = 17 (12.8%)	*n* = 41 (30.8%)

Discussion and recommendations

The participants in this study represented a wide cross-section (70%) of UCEA institutions and all faculty career stages. The findings seem to indicate that educational leadership faculty members, like their colleagues in many other academic disciplines, are conflicted about the professional value and viability of open access publication. The responses described above illustrate a broad range of beliefs, perceptions, and comfort levels regarding open access journals. The discussion below highlights some key issues and makes a few recommendations for further work.

Unlike members of other fields who share similar translational issues that prevent research from reaching practice, educational leaders have a more pressing demand to promote knowledge mobilization throughout the field. Research suggests that "the total (direct and indirect) effects of leadership on student learning account for about a quarter of total school effects … Leadership effects are usually largest where and when they are needed most" (Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004, p. 5). Kenneth Leithwood, Karen Seashore Louis, Stephen Anderson and Kyla Wahlstrom (2004), reporting on American educational leaders, continue to state that "especially when we think of leaders in formal administrative roles, the greater the challenge the greater the impact of their actions on learning" (p. 5). By not disseminating their research more widely, faculty members in the field

of educational leadership may be limiting the potential scope and scale of the impacts of collective research efforts.

Through an exhaustive literature review of knowledge mobilization in education, Haylen Perines (2016) concluded that the goal of educational research is to change practice, question established paradigms, and inspire innovation that is reflective of the current needs of the always-changing landscape. Germaine to the current study, Perines noted that research is meant to serve the needs of those beyond academia, not for promotion or publication purposes. Open access thus is a vital topic of discussion for the field of educational leadership.

Promisingly, this study's data indicate that there does not appear to be widespread antipathy toward publication in open access journals. Few of the responding educational leadership faculty members believed that open access journals offer no benefits whatsoever, and only a minority believed that open access journals have lower production standards than their subscription-based counterparts. Similarly, a large majority of educational leadership faculty indicated that they believed that open access journals can be as rigorous and as high in quality as traditional journals and can allow scholars to share their work more easily. Moreover, over 75 percent of respondents indicated that they valued free access to their work by others and noted that open access journals offer wider circulation.

Despite these indications of amenability toward open access publishing, educational leadership faculty members also articulated concerns about placing their scholarship in open access venues instead of traditionally accepted subscription-based journals. One of the primary concerns articulated by respondents was that of peer and institutional perceptions. Even if educational leadership faculty members themselves see potential value in open access publishing, they might believe that their local or global colleagues or their university do not. For instance, approximately a third of respondents indicated that they believed that local peers held negative views regarding the quality and reputations of open access journals and the quality of articles and reviews in those journals. Similarly, only a small percentage of responding faculty indicated that institutional perceptions of open access journals' quality, rigor, and peer-review process were equivalent to subscription-based journals. Responses were slightly more positive regarding perceptions by peers at other institutions. However even the large numbers of respondents indicated neutrality or even uncertainty about what their professional colleagues felt regarding open access publication.

Other primary areas of concern seem to revolve around cost and impact factor. Many of the educational leadership faculty respondents indicated that they were hesitant about "author pays" open access publication models, even though some already had paid such fees. However, when participants were asked about open access journals that did not charge publication fees, they perceived greater benefits and expressed more positive beliefs about open access opportunities. The issue of impact factor is a challenging one nevertheless. While some research has indicated that there may be marginal impact factor differences between open access and subscription-based journals (Walters & Linvill, 2010), traditional subscription-based journals may have impact factor advantages due to greater longevity or familiarity and, in this instance, faculty perception may be more important than reality. Unsurprisingly,

many educational leadership faculty respondents indicated that journal impact factors were a driving factor when considering where to publish their work, similar to other academic disciplines (see, e.g., Furlough, 2010; Nariani & Fernandez, 2012). Once they were tenured, however, concerns about a journal's impact factor diminished significantly.

The concerns respondents expressed are not unique to educational leadership. Faculty in other academic disciplines have been wrestling with these same challenges and tensions and have been working on a variety of initiatives to increase access to their scholarly research. Considering these common concerns and potential solutions, several arguments can be made for the greater utilization of open access platforms by educational leadership scholars, and the data indicates some receptivity to the concept.

First, similar to other academics, educational leadership researchers recognize the value of increased access to their work. Several studies have found that open access publications receive greater numbers of citations and downloads (Willinsky, 2006). This is true across a wide variety of disciplines, indicating that the utilization of open access journals can be a significant means of achieving greater exposure and reach in educational leadership. As the number of open access education journals with respectable impact factors continues to increase—despite counterfeit claims, at times—options for the publication of high-quality scholarship concurrently proliferates.

Second, as the field of educational leadership continues to strengthen its social justice orientation, it is imperative to openly confront the reality that passwords and paywalls limit access and they inevitably privilege more affluent institutions and scholars who can afford subscription-based journals. Year after year, work about marginalized students, educators, and communities is published in venues that are inaccessible to those same constituents. Primary publication outlets may be beneficial for professionals navigating complex tenure pathways, but they come at a cost to scholar-colleagues in developing countries; education practitioners who wish to understand research-based best practices in learning, teaching, and schooling; parents and advocacy groups who wish to better influence local, state, and national education reform and policymaking; and other individuals and community organizations who have interests in educational scholarship. Greater presence in institutional repositories, in open access journals, and on social media platforms—and perhaps the intentional creation of and commitment to some new open access educational leadership publishing venues—could help further social justice covenants and alleviate disparities in access by those whom educational leaders are trying to serve.

Third, given that tenured educational leadership faculty typically have greater perceived freedoms regarding publication outlets, there is an opportunity for them to help spark some much-needed conversations, create new structures and expectations, and model the way when it comes to open access in educational leadership scholarship. Instead of asking newer scholars who are facing uncertain tenure paths to be leaders in this area, experienced researchers can take the lead and initiate dialogues regarding open access. A national-level committee dedicated to conversation and the deeper exploration of the issues surrounding open access publication might be a good place to start. Policy groups such as the American Educational Research

Association (AERA), UCEA, as well as government agencies that grant funding (i.e., NSF, the United States Department of Education), could leverage their reach to facilitate meaningful conversations that push the practice.

Finally, at least some educational leadership faculty are already publishing in open access venues. Over 40 percent of respondents indicated that they already had written for an open access journal, and some are sharing their scholarship in institutional repositories, on blogs, and across various social media platforms. Greater encouragement, guidance, and assistance by professional organizations such as the UCEA, the International Council of Professors of Educational Leadership, and the British Educational Leadership, Management & Administration Society, and major partners such as the Wallace Foundation can help cultivate greater access and tap into the numerous publishing platforms, indexing tools, and groundbreaking thinking and research—both in education and in other disciplines—that would further this work.

Opening access to the world's information continues to expand at exponential rates as we collectively contribute to our globally shared "information commons" (Bollier, 2002, p. 268). Openness, transparency, and connectedness are underpinning concepts of the internet and the hyper-connected world of mobile devices and digital environments that we all now inhabit. Many educational leadership scholars are interested in greater reach and increased citations of their work and have concurrent social justice commitments that may not have manifested themselves yet in open access venues. Additionally, educational leadership faculty may have far fewer concerns or negative perceptions about impact factor once tenured, and some already are publishing in open access outlets. Given these circumstances, it may be time to devote greater disciplinary attention and energy at the national and institutional levels to exploration of the affordances of open access publishing.

Websites

American Educational Research Association, www.aera.net/Publications/Journals/AERA-Open
Agora, www.agora-journals.fao.org/content/en/journals.php
ARDI, www.wipo.int/ardi/en
Bealle's List of Predatory Journals and Publishers, www.beallslist.weebly.com
British Educational Leadership, Management & Administration Society, www.belmas.org.uk
Educational Policy Analysis Archives, www.epaa.asu.edu/ojs/
HINARI, www.who.int/hinari/en/
International Council of Professors of Educational Leadership, www.icpel.org
NSF, www.nsf.org
OARE, www.unenironment.org/explore-topics/environment-under-review/what-we-do/information-management/online-access-research
Wallace Foundation, www.wallacefoundation.org

References

Beall, J. (2017). What I learned from predatory publishers. *Biochemia Medica, 27*(2), 273–278.

Björk, B.-C. (2004). Open access to scientific publications — an analysis of the barriers to change? *Information Research, 9*(2), paper 170. Retrieved February 13, 2019 from http://www.informationr.net/ir/9-2/paper170.html.

Björk, B.-C., & Solomon, D. (2014, March). *Developing an effective market for open access article processing charges*. Retrieved November 10, 2018 from https://www.fwf.ac.at/fileadmin/files/Dokumente/Downloads/Dev_Effective_Market_OA_Article_Processing_Charges.pdf.

Bollier, D. (2002). Why we must talk about the information commons. *American Library Association, 96*(2), 266–282. Retrieved February 13, 2019 from http://www.ala.org/aboutala/offices/oitp/publications/infocommons0204/brollier.

Butler, D. (2013). The dark side of publishing: The explosion in open-access publishing has fuelled the rise of questionable operators. *Nature, 495*(7442), 433–435.

Cadez, S., Dimovski, V., & Gross, M.Z. (2017). Research, teaching and performance evaluation in academia: The salience of quality. *Studies in Higher Education, 42*(8), 1455–1473.

Campbell, A.M. (2004). Open access: A PLoS for education. *PLoS Biology, 2*(5), 0560–0563. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0020145

Cohen, N. (2013, January 14). A data crusader, a defendant and now, a cause. *New York Times*. Retrieved January 20, 2013 from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/14/technology/aaron-swartz-a-data-crusader-and-now-a-cause.html.

Dallmeier-Tiessen, S., Goerner, B., Darby, R., Hyppoelae, J., Igo-Kemenes, P., Kahn, D., Lambert, S., Legenfelder, A., Leonard, C., Mele, S., Polydoratou, P., Ross, D., Ruiz-Perez, S., Schimmer, R., Swaisland, M., & van der Stelt, W. (2011). Open access journals — what publishers offer, what researchers want. *Information Services & Use, 31*(1/2), 85–91. doi: 10.3233/ISU-2011-0624

Delgado-López-Cózar, E., & Cabezas-Clavijo, Á. (2012). Google Scholar metrics: An unreliable tool for assessing scientific journals. *El Profesional de la Información, 21*(4), 419–427.

Furlough, M. (2010). Open access, education research, and discovery. *Teachers College Record, 112*(10), 2623–2648.

Green, R.G. (2008). Tenure and promotion decisions: The relative importance of teaching, scholarship, and service. *Journal of Social Work Education, 44*(2), 117–127.

Haug, C. (2013). The downside of open-access publishing. *The New England Journal of Medicine, 368*, 791–793.

Hodge, D.R., & Lacasse, J.R. (2011). Ranking disciplinary journals with the Google Scholar H-Index: A new tool for constructing cases for tenure, promotion, and other professional decisions. *Journal of Social Work Education, 47*(3), 579–595.

Ion, G., & Iucu, R. (2014). Professionals' perceptions about the use of research in educational practice. *European Journal of Higher Education, 4*(4), 334–347. doi: 10.1080/21568235.2014.899154

Laakso, M., Welling, P.B., Nyman, L., Björk, B.-C., & Hedlund, T. (2011). The development of open access journal publishing from 1993 to 2009. *PLoS ONE, 6*(6). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0020961

Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning: A review of research for the Learning from Leadership Project*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.

Nariani, R., & Fernandez, L. (2012). Open access publishing: What authors want. *College & Research Libraries, 73*(2), 182–195. doi: 10.5860/crl-203

Park, J.H., & Qin, J. (2007). Exploring the willingness of scholars to accept open access: A grounded theory approach. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing, 38*(2), 55–84. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/C972-1321-8720-314M

Perines, H. (2016). Knowledge mobilization in education. Connection between the research the policy and practice: A theoretical approach. *Revista Páginas de Educación, 10*(1), 137–150. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.22235/pe.v10i1.1362

Project SOAP. (2011). Highlights from the SOAP project survey: *What scientists think about open access publishing*. Retrieved February 13, 2019 from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/15be/b47a3d27b152e91fa8721bb6e3de10de4be4.pdf

Rowlands, I., & Nicholas, D. (2005). Scholarly communication in the digital environment: The 2005 survey of journal author behaviour and attitudes. *Aslib Proceedings, 57*(6), 481–497. doi: 10.1108/00012530510634226

Russell, J., & Kent, T. (2010). Paved with gold: An institutional case study on supporting open access publishing. *Serials, 23*(2), 97–102. doi: http://doi.org/10.1629/2397

Schroter, S., Tite, L., & Smith, R. (2005). Perceptions of open access publishing: Interviews with journal authors. *British Medical Journal, 330*(7494), 756–759. doi: 10.1136/bmj.38359.695220.82

Shirky, C. (2008). *Here comes everybody: The power of organizing without organizations*. New York, NY: Penguin.

Stebbins, M. (2013). *Expanding public access to the results of federally funded research*. Washington, DC: The White House. Retrieved September 30, 2015 from http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2013/02/22/expanding-public-access-results-federally-funded-research.

SurveyGizmo. (2015). *What is a good survey response rate?* Retrieved December 12, 2017 from https://www.surveygizmo.com/resources/blog/survey-response-rates/.

Swan, A., & Brown, S. (2004). Authors and open access publishing. *Learned Publishing, 17*(3), 219–224. doi: 10.1087/095315104323159649

University Council for Educational Administration (2015). UCEA member university directory. Retrieved January 1, 2015 from https://members.ucea.org/member-directory/organizations.

Walters, W.H., & Linvill, A. (2010). Characteristics of open access journals in six subject areas. *College & Research Libraries, 72*(4), 372–392. doi: 10.5860/crl-132

Ware, M., & Mabe, M. (2015). *The STM report: An overview of scientific and scholarly journal publishing*. Retrieved February 13, 2019 from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/scholcom/9.

Warlick, S., & Vaughan, KTL. (2007). Factors influencing publication choice: Why faculty choose open access. *Biomedical Digital Libraries, 4*(1), 1. doi: 10.1186/1742-5581-4-1

Watt, S., Simpson, C., McKillop, C., & Nunn, V. 2002. Electronic course surveys: Does automating feedback and reporting give better results? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *27*(4), 325–337.

Willinsky, J. (2006). *The access principle: The case for open access to research and scholarship*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Yancovic-Allen, M. (2018). Pre-service elementary teachers' perceptions of conducting and consuming research in their future professional practice. *Teachers and Teaching, 24*(5), 487–499. doi: 10.1080/13540602.2018.1438389

Yiotis, K. (2013). The open access initiative: A new paradigm for scholarly communications. *Information Technology and Libraries, 24*, 157-162. doi: 10.6017/ital.v24i4.3378

Youn, T.I.K., & Price, T.M. (2009). Learning from the experience of others: The evolution of faculty tenure and promotion rules in comprehensive institutions. *Journal of Higher Education, 80*(2), 204–237.