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## Participation: OA policy vs. ResearchGate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URI Open Access Policy</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResearchGate</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of faculty in population study contributing full-texts of articles to the URI OA Policy and ResearchGate (n=558)

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.
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.