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## Participation: OA policy vs. ResearchGate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of faculty in population study contributing full-texts of articles to the URI OA Policy and ResearchGate (n=558)</th>
<th>% of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URI Open Access Policy</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResearchGate (articles published after March, 2013)</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population study results
Percent of faculty in population study contributing full-texts of articles to the URI OA Policy, RG (articles published after March 2013), both, and neither (n=558)
Authors think ResearchGate offers more benefits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>DigitalCommons@URI</th>
<th>ResearchGate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connected with other researchers</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared my work more broadly</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased the visibility and impact of my work</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracked statistics on downloads of my work</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archived my work for the long term</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey: Benefits of having articles available in DigitalCommons@URI (n=68) and ResearchGate (n=55)
Authors dislike sharing manuscript versions:

- Preference for final published version of record
- Not wanting multiple versions of same work available
- Not wanting version with potential errors and typos to be publicly available
- Manuscript often messy => potentially misunderstandings by readers
- Manuscript does not share pagination of final version => difficult to cite
- Not having ready access to accepted manuscript version, especially when not corresponding author
- Time and effort to reassemble manuscript, e.g. reintegrating figures and tables into text
Authors are confused about copyright:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Open Access Policy</th>
<th>ResearchGate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal under copyright law</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violates the copyright of the publisher</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey: Opinion of legality of complying with the OA Policy (n=131) and posting article full-texts on ResearchGate (n=126)
Sharers gonna share...

Statistical analysis revealed that having shared research on one platform meant an author was more likely to have shared on the other.

“Sharing” by Ryan Roberts is licensed under CC BY-NC 2.0.
Conclusions:

- URI faculty who posted articles to RG *more* likely to have complied with OA Policy, not *less*.
- Only a minority of faculty are sharing their work through either service.

=> Academic networks not a threat to OA.

=> We need to recruit more faculty to share their work in general.
Conclusions:

- Strong preference for sharing publisher PDF; aversion to sharing author manuscript versions.
  
  => Education and outreach to authors around options for legally sharing articles is needed.

  => Green OA through IRs will remain an activity of a minority of authors?

  => Supports efforts to hasten the transition to Gold OA publishing system.