

4-2006

## Periodicals Price Survey 2006: Journals in the Time of Google

Lee Van Orsdel

*Grand Valley State University, [vanorsdel@gvsu.edu](mailto:vanorsdel@gvsu.edu)*

Kathleen Born

*EBSCO Information Services*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/library\\_sp](https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/library_sp)



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

---

### ScholarWorks Citation

Van Orsdel, Lee and Born, Kathleen, "Periodicals Price Survey 2006: Journals in the Time of Google" (2006). *Scholarly Papers and Articles*. 26.

[https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/library\\_sp/26](https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/library_sp/26)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarly Papers and Articles by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gvsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gvsu.edu).

# JOURNALS IN THE TIME OF

While the struggle over open access plays out, librarians, vendors, and publishers continue to trade within a market dominated by all things electronic

# GOOGLE

By Lee C. Van Orsdel & Kathleen Born

It was a year of competing realities: the buying and selling of electronic journals continued apace, while the posting and crawling of every kind of free content on the web captured the imagination of the scholarly world. The former was overshadowed by the latter, and no wonder. Rival projects to digitize entire libraries full of books dominated headlines and spun off copyright arguments worldwide. Robust growth of open access repositories and the drift toward author self-archiving combined to populate the web with a surprising amount of free content that was initially available only through subscription.

With Google Scholar and Google Library underway, Google strength-

ened its claim as the ubiquitous front door to the web and all of its content. Who would have guessed that in June 2005 Google would account for over 56% of referrals to research articles in HighWire journals, while PubMed Central, a renowned life sciences repository, would account for less than 9%? If that stat isn't stunning enough, 72% of scholars surveyed for a report on self-archiving confessed to using Google

to find scholarly literature on the web. Journal publishers of all sizes and importance are shaping their business plans around this phenomenon, sharing metadata with Google and other web crawlers in hopes of drawing users to content behind their tollgates.

The Open Access (OA) movement again occupied center stage in the journals marketplace in 2005, eclipsing issues of price, publisher mergers, and big

**TABLE 1 AVERAGE 2006 PRICE FOR SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINES**

DISCIPLINE	AVERAGE PRICE PER TITLE	DISCIPLINE	AVERAGE PRICE PER TITLE
Chemistry	\$3,254	Math & Computer Science	\$1,278
Physics	2,850	Zoology	1,259
Engineering	1,756	Botany	1,238
Astronomy	1,724	Health Sciences	1,132
Technology	1,560	General Science	1,098
Biology	1,548	Geography	984
Geology	1,323	Agriculture	890
Food Science	1,292		

SOURCE: LJ PERIODICALS PRICE SURVEY 2006

*Lee C. Van Orsdel is Dean of University Libraries, Grand Valley State University, Allendale, MI, and Kathleen Born is Director, Academic Division, EBSCO Information Services, Birmingham, AL*



**TABLE 2 COST HISTORY GROUPED BY LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SUBJECT**

SUBJECT	AVERAGE NO. OF TITLES 2002-2006	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2002	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2003	% OF CHANGE '02-'03	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2004	% OF CHANGE '03-'04	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2005	% OF CHANGE '04-'05	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2006	% OF CHANGE '05-'06	% OF CHANGE '02-'06
Agriculture	189	\$631	\$686	9	\$777	13	\$834	7	\$890	7	41
Anthropology	53	300	342	14	372	9	397	7	416	5	39
Art & Architecture	65	134	144	7	160	12	172	7	185	8	38
Astronomy	24	1,256	1,353	8	1,500	11	1,577	5	1,724	9	37
Biology	265	1,089	1,206	11	1,316	9	1,427	8	1,548	8	42
Botany	69	880	939	7	1,036	10	1,134	10	1,238	9	41
Business & Economics	328	527	582	11	643	10	699	9	746	7	42
Chemistry	238	2,432	2,596	7	2,845	10	3,012	6	3,254	8	34
Education	109	300	328	9	366	12	405	11	442	9	47
Engineering	345	1,305	1,412	8	1,523	8	1,648	8	1,756	7	35
Food Science	18	897	969	8	1,085	12	1,188	9	1,292	9	44
General Science	72	810	886	9	954	8	1,013	6	1,098	8	36
General Works	74	181	197	9	217	10	232	7	241	4	34
Geography	68	746	819	10	882	8	937	6	984	5	32
Geology	99	1,012	1,081	7	1,171	8	1,260	8	1,323	5	31
Health Sciences	1,539	808	881	9	964	10	1,046	8	1,132	8	40
History	220	132	152	15	171	12	189	11	201	6	52
Language & Literature	319	120	135	12	153	14	166	8	176	6	46
Law	79	159	174	10	192	10	200	5	225	12	42
Library & Information Science	51	286	316	10	350	11	390	11	437	12	53
Math & Computer Science	210	981	1,047	7	1,134	8	1,205	6	1,278	6	30
Military & Naval Science	11	346	400	16	432	8	489	13	538	10	56
Music	44	96	105	9	110	5	127	16	130	2	35
Philosophy & Religion	141	156	174	12	195	12	211	8	226	7	45
Physics	253	2,178	2,333	7	2,538	9	2,695	6	2,850	6	31
Political Science	63	288	321	11	367	14	399	9	437	9	52
Psychology	160	358	388	8	437	13	471	8	516	10	44
Recreation	18	146	156	7	169	8	195	16	206	6	41
Sociology	314	332	365	10	412	13	452	10	491	9	48
Technology	181	1,151	1,241	8	1,360	10	1,464	8	1,560	7	35
Zoology	135	973	1,033	6	1,091	6	1,161	6	1,259	8	29

SOURCE: LJ PERIODICALS PRICE SURVEY 2006

deals. Public policy measures involving open access were taken up in venues all over the globe. Debate was vigorous and contentious in the United States and Britain, where sweeping initiatives were proposed. Even the Vatican weighed in, though on the side of restricting access, declaring that all Papal writings, old and new, were copyright protected and would no longer be openly accessible. It went so far as to send a bill for \$18,500 in copyright fees to an Italian publisher that printed portions of Pope Benedict's writings. Negative responses to the loss of access resonate with the language of OA, albeit with an evangelical twist.

Journal publishers responded to mounting interest in open access in a variety of ways—some friendly, some not. The American Chemical Society tried to persuade Congress to defund PubChem, an open access database established by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), claiming that free government information constitutes unfair competition; Congress denied the

request. A number of STM (scientific, technical, and medical) publishers initiated author-select models of OA, and experimentation continued with delayed OA, advertising, sponsorships, and other methods of expanding access to scientific output without jeopardizing the financial stability of publishers.

This year's periodicals price survey looks at these and other factors that are shaping the periodicals marketplace. Three Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) databases—Arts and Humanities Citation Index, Social Sciences Citation Index, and Science Citation Index—provide the bulk of titles used

**TABLE 3 AVERAGE PRICE PER TITLE BY COUNTRY 2006**

COUNTRY	NO. OF ISI TITLES	AVG. PRICE PER TITLE	COUNTRY	NO. OF ISI TITLES	AVG. PRICE PER TITLE
Russia	57	\$2,696	France	111	\$368
Netherlands	541	2,659	Spain	15	358
Ireland	38	2,563	Japan	79	357
Austria	25	1,646	Israel	13	315
Singapore	18	1,445	Czech Republic	15	296
Germany	387	1,383	Slovakia	6	294
Hungary	7	1,306	Canada	111	244
England	1,665	1,279	Scotland	12	231
Switzerland	93	1,240	Norway	11	225
New Zealand	24	959	Italy	50	195
China	17	762	South Africa	11	153
United States	2,443	713	Korea (South)	8	146
Sweden	7	406	India	7	134
Australia	45	377	Chile	6	133

AVERAGE COST OF AN ISI TITLE: \$1,104

SOURCE: LJ PERIODICALS PRICE SURVEY 2006



**TABLE 4 COST HISTORY BY CONTINENT/COUNTRY OF ORIGIN**

CONTINENT / COUNTRY	AVERAGE NO. OF TITLES 2002-2006	AVERAGE COST 2002	AVERAGE COST 2003	% OF CHANGE '02-'03	AVERAGE COST 2004	% OF CHANGE '03-'04	AVERAGE COST 2005	% OF CHANGE '04-'05	AVERAGE COST 2006	% OF CHANGE '05-'06	% OF CHANGE '02-'06
<b>NORTH AMERICA</b>											
United States	2,427	\$519	\$563	8	\$612	9	\$659	8	\$713	8	37
Canada	109	183	192	5	212	10	227	7	244	8	33
Other	8	100	102	1	112	10	120	7	107	-11	7
<b>Average for all North America</b>	<b>2,545</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>593</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>691</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>EUROPE</b>											
France *	104	263	309	18	375	21	383	2	368	-4	40
Germany *	363	997	1,095	10	1,281	17	1,380	8	1,383	0	39
Ireland *	38	1,884	2,073	10	2,218	7	2,420	9	2,563	6	36
Italy *	49	136	144	6	176	22	197	12	195	-1	43
The Netherlands *	543	2,015	2,177	8	2,350	8	2,495	6	2,659	7	32
Switzerland	90	831	862	4	981	14	1,092	11	1,240	14	49
United Kingdom	1,630	885	972	10	1,078	11	1,172	9	1,267	8	43
Other	165	1,046	1,130	8	1,256	11	1,204	-4	1,334	11	28
<b>Average for all Europe</b>	<b>2,981</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,194</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1,318</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1,403</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1,495</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>ASIA</b>											
Japan	79	306	311	1	319	3	343	8	357	4	16
Other	74	690	766	11	773	1	814	5	874	7	27
<b>Average for all Asia</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>536</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>617</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND</b>	67	374	436	17	488	12	531	9	580	9	55
<b>SOUTH AMERICA</b>	18	80	93	17	103	10	105	3	107	1	33
<b>AFRICA</b>	10	92	122	33	128	5	137	7	153	11	66

\* Included in European Monetary Union SOURCE: LJ PERIODICALS PRICE SURVEY 2006

in the study. In addition, we include data on titles in EBSCO Publishing's Academic Search Premier. The data are limited to prepriced titles (as opposed to standing-order or bill-later titles) that can be ordered through a vendor and are current as of February 14, 2006.

## State of the market

While the struggle over open access played out on national and international stages, librarians, vendors, and publishers continued to trade within a market dominated by all things electronic. List prices became a bit scarcer as price-by-negotiation deepened its hold on the market, brokered by a growing number of salespeople who deal directly with customers on behalf of the larger publish-

ers. Discounts from the major publishers for online-only seem to have stabilized at around 5% on average, while some of the largest publishers offer no discount at all.

Journal prices still have the power to shock. In January, the editor of *Journal of Economic Studies*, an Emerald Press title, resigned when he realized that his journal's \$9,859 sticker price was wholly out of line both with the market and with his own sensibilities. The title is not indexed in Social Sciences Citation Index, yet it cost around three times as much as the next most expensive journal in the field. The energy for dealing with a broken market, however, seems to be shifting toward institutional repositories and OA publishing models and away from the futile hope that

high-priced publishers will come to their senses and reduce journal prices.

Google is insinuating itself deeper into the business side of the journals market through AdSense, a service that matches ads to the keywords on an e-journal page. Since the publisher doesn't choose the ads, the appearance of influence on journal or editorial content by an advertiser is avoided altogether. When the user clicks through, both Google and the journal profit. *British Medical Journal*, *Journal of Clinical Investigation*, and *Journal of Medical Internet Research* use AdSense.

## Books upstage journals

Book digitization projects were all the buzz in 2005, and, for the first time in

**TABLE 5 COST HISTORY BY BROAD SUBJECT**

	AVERAGE NO. OF TITLES 2002-2006	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2002	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2003	% OF CHANGE '02-'03	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2004	% OF CHANGE '03-'04	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2005	% OF CHANGE '04-'05	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2006	% OF CHANGE '05-'06	% OF CHANGE '02-'06
<b>ARTS AND HUMANITIES CITATION INDEX</b>											
U.S.	416	\$89	\$95	6.7	\$103	8.4	\$110	6.8	\$116	5.5	30.3
NON-U.S.	603	156	178	14.1	205	15.2	220	7.3	230	4.5	47.4
<b>SOCIAL SCIENCES CITATION INDEX</b>											
U.S.	895	273	298	9.2	327	9.7	355	8.6	385	8.5	41.0
NON-U.S.	877	491	542	10.4	607	12.0	663	9.2	716	8.0	45.8
<b>SCIENCE CITATION INDEX</b>											
U.S.	1,386	807	871	7.9	942	8.2	1,013	7.5	1,093	7.9	35.4
NON-U.S.	2,301	1,392	1,497	7.5	1,633	9.1	1,745	6.9	1,866	6.9	34.1

SOURCE: LJ PERIODICALS PRICE SURVEY 2006



years, books upstaged the serials crisis in chatter around library water coolers. Google Library got the most press, because of its prestigious partners and because its presumptive strategy of digitizing works in and out of copyright made some publishers livid. October saw the launch of Open Library, a book digitizing project managed by the Open Content Alliance (OCA) and subsidized by Google rivals Yahoo and Microsoft. It is similar in scale to Google's, but more circumspect in its approach to copyrighted works—it will scan only with permission from the copyright holder.

[For more on the OCA project, see Spring 2006 *netConnect*, with this issue.] Book scanning projects may help prepare the market for journal publishers to begin integrating digitized books and journals into one package.

## Feeding the OPAC

Some time this summer, the TOCROSS project will release open source software that will be capable of delivering an RSS service to push publisher and e-journal table of contents data directly into library catalogs, allowing users to find journal articles just like they find

books. The Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) of the UK is developing the service with publisher Emerald and library supplier Talis.

## Bundles without borders

Bundles and big deals remained a staple despite protestations by librarians who see them as the Trojan horse of collection development. Librarians lament the lack of choice, loss of fluidity in materials expenditures, and nondisclosure agreements that prevent libraries and consortia from comparing purchase prices. Joined by economists and law-

## Periodical Prices for University and College Libraries

Table 8 gives price history by discipline for the journals found in EBSCO Publishing's Academic Search Premier. Price projections for 2007 are found in Table 7.

**TABLE 7 2007 COST PROJECTIONS BY TITLES IN ACADEMIC SEARCH PREMIER**

ACADEMIC SEARCH PREMIER	NO. OF TITLES	% OF LIST	2006 COST	% OF COST	PROJECTED % OF INCREASE	PROJECTED 2007 COST	% OF COST	PROJECTED OVERALL % INCREASE
U.S.	1,349	41.3	\$400	31.0	8.0	\$432	30.6	
NON-U.S.	1,919	58.7	\$92	69.0	10.0	\$98	69.4	9.4

SOURCE: LJ PERIODICALS PRICE SURVEY 2006

**TABLE 8 COST HISTORY FOR TITLES IN ACADEMIC SEARCH PREMIER**

SUBJECT	AVERAGE NO. OF TITLES 2002-2006	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2002	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2003	% OF CHANGE '02-'03	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2004	% OF CHANGE '03-'04	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2005	% OF CHANGE '04-'05	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2006	% OF CHANGE '05-'06	% OF CHANGE '02-'06
Agriculture	67	\$455	\$520	14	\$663	28	\$722	9	\$787	9	73
Anthropology	33	290	330	14	372	13	419	12	465	11	61
Art & Architecture	39	166	183	10	202	10	221	9	248	12	49
Astronomy	17	1,312	1,399	7	1,532	10	1,627	6	1,751	8	33
Biology	98	831	926	12	1,036	12	1,174	13	1,288	10	55
Botany	23	828	896	8	1,042	16	1,152	11	1,344	17	62
Business & Economics	106	228	254	11	288	13	317	10	348	10	53
Chemistry	61	1,974	2,133	8	2,519	18	2,634	5	2,806	7	42
Education	221	236	258	9	293	13	327	12	360	10	52
Engineering	182	712	778	9	861	11	948	10	1,009	6	42
Food Science	19	338	366	8	433	18	471	9	526	12	55
General Science	47	501	537	7	601	12	638	6	689	8	38
General Works	73	79	87	10	94	8	101	7	109	8	38
Geography	41	314	355	13	401	13	462	15	508	10	62
Geology	26	591	675	14	772	14	859	11	884	3	50
Health Sciences	724	501	572	14	641	12	717	12	796	11	59
History	209	145	164	14	181	10	201	11	222	11	54
Language & Literature	122	117	129	10	146	13	162	11	180	11	54
Law	81	210	230	10	250	8	273	9	298	9	42
Library & Information Science	52	125	128	3	137	7	145	6	153	5	22
Math & Computer Science	125	773	837	8	921	10	1,001	9	1,100	10	42
Military & Naval Science	17	150	179	20	195	9	222	14	234	5	56
Music	21	114	126	11	126	0	153	21	170	12	50
Philosophy & Religion	121	145	158	9	177	12	196	10	217	11	49
Physics	98	1,868	1,993	7	2,161	8	2,376	10	2,543	7	36
Political Science	84	229	256	12	283	11	315	11	353	12	54
Psychology	84	328	356	9	404	14	452	12	501	11	53
Recreation	13	136	146	8	163	11	179	10	201	13	48
Sociology	233	227	251	10	280	12	310	10	345	11	52
Technology	66	729	806	11	869	8	967	11	1,045	8	43
Zoology	40	622	690	11	779	13	858	10	930	8	50

SOURCE: LJ PERIODICALS PRICE SURVEY 2006



# Periodical Prices for High School and Small Public Libraries

Overall price increases in 2007 for titles in EBSCO Publishing's Magazine Article Summaries Ultra are expected to be in the range of 5%–8%, based in part on continuing double-digit inflation for British titles. Table 9 provides historical price data for titles in the index.

**TABLE 9 COST HISTORY FOR TITLES IN MAGAZINE ARTICLE SUMMARIES ULTRA**

MAGAZINE ARTICLE SUMMARIES ULTRA	AVERAGE NO. OF TITLES 2002–2006	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2002	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2003	% OF CHANGE '02–'03	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2004	% OF CHANGE '03–'04	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2005	% OF CHANGE '04–'05	AVERAGE COST PER TITLE 2006	% OF CHANGE '05–'06	% OF CHANGE '02–'06
U.S.	281	\$58	\$61	5	\$64	5	\$68	6	\$71	4	22
NON-U.S.	43	104	124	19	137	10	148	8	170	15	63

SOURCE: LJ PERIODICALS PRICE SURVEY 2006

yers, concerned librarians have a new strategy to try to break the choke hold big publishers have on the market. They are now speaking in terms of anticompetitive behaviors rather than antitrust, and several offices of state attorneys general are interested in the claims.

For the moment, nonetheless, the bundle is king. The largest publishers have already bundled their own content, and the next tier of publishers is trying to do the same. Smaller commercial, society, and foreign publishers want to shelter their titles with a publisher that can increase exposure and decrease vulnerability to cancellations. Some of the large houses are fostering these alliances. Springer, for example, has added scientific journals from Eastern and Central European, Russian, and Chinese publishing firms. Add to these new coalitions the steady rise in sales of legacy content from publisher digitization projects, and we can safely predict the number and size of bundles will increase.

## Digital insurance

Concern over archiving of digital content returned to the spotlight last year after a period of relative dormancy while libraries concentrated on the shift to online. Two major archival initiatives are in the works. Portico, developed by JSTOR and its partners, will be rolled out this summer when it begins loading archives directly from scholarly publishers. Controlled LOCKSS, or CLOCKSS, is in development by a coalition of librarians, publishers, and learned societies and is entering a two-year pilot phase. Both programs will provide member libraries with access to subscribed content in the event of a publisher failure or another trigger event that interrupts service.

## Good, bad, and medium

Distinguished economists Ted Bergstrom and Preston McAfee sent an open letter to university presidents and provosts last fall suggesting, among other things, that universities should bill publishers for faculty service if the cost of a journal exceeds a certain reasonable level (see "End Free Ride for Costly Journals," *LJ* 12/05, p. 88). To identify the worst offenders, Bergstrom and McAfee created a web site that charts the cost of around 5000 journals, using price per article and price per citation to rank each journal as good value, medium value, or bad value ([www.journalprices.com](http://www.journalprices.com)). The details have been debated, but one conclusion is unavoidable: an extremely high percentage of journals from the six largest STM publishers fall into the bad value category (74% on average), while an extremely

scholars to reconcile price to value before renewing a journal or donating time and expertise to help a journal succeed.

## OA makes an impact

As of mid-February, the *Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)* contained 2,044 peer-reviewed OA journals—about 600 more than this time last year. Some of them are demonstrating the power of open access by accruing impressive impact factors as young journals. In its second year of publication, PLoS Biology had an impact factor of 13.9, making it the highest ranked general biology journal in the world, and five OA journals from BioMed Central ranked in the top five journals in their specialties. These successes are backed by research showing that OA articles generate between 25% and 250% more citations than non-OA

**TABLE 6 2007 COST PROJECTIONS BY BROAD SUBJECT**

	NO. OF TITLES	% OF LIST	2006 COST	% OF COST	PROJECTED % OF INCREASE	PROJECTED 2007 COST	% OF COST	PROJECTED OVERALL % INCREASE
<b>ARTS AND HUMANITIES CITATION INDEX</b>								
U.S.	400	44.3	\$46,545	28.7	7.0	\$49,803	28.5	7.7
NON-U.S.	502	55.7	115,680	71.3	8.0	124,934	71.5	
<b>SOCIAL SCIENCES CITATION INDEX</b>								
U.S.	844	49.6	325,191	34.7	8.5	352,832	34.7	8.5
NON-U.S.	856	50.4	612,949	65.3	8.5	665,050	65.3	
<b>SCIENCE CITATION INDEX</b>								
U.S.	1,302	37.0	1,423,531	25.6	8.0	1,537,413	25.7	7.6
NON-U.S.	2,220	63.0	4,142,969	74.4	7.5	4,453,692	74.3	

PROJECTED OVERALL INCREASE FOR ALL ISI TITLES: 7.8%

SOURCE: LJ PERIODICALS PRICE SURVEY 2006

low percentage of titles from the non-profits are rated as bad (14%). Blackwell and Elsevier had the lowest percentages of bad titles (55% and 68%, respectively), while Sage, Springer, Taylor & Francis, and Wiley all had percentages in the mid-eighties. The data challenge librarians and

articles in the same journal from the same year. The oft-quoted report can be found at [eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/11688](http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/11688).

OA journals rely on advertising and grants/sponsorships to support themselves. Less than half charge author-side fees, a surprising finding in a report on



open access from the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP). In fact, the research found that subscription-based journals were far more likely to charge author fees than open access journals. According to the same report, however, a sobering 40% of OA journals in the study are not yet in the black.

### Scholars get smarter

The academy is slowly embracing open access, both in principle and in practice. A Center for Information Behaviour and the Evaluation of Research (CIBER) study released in October showed a significant increase in the number of scholars who know about OA. The study found that 29% of researchers surveyed had published in an open access journal, a jump of 18% over the year before. In a separate report from Key Perspectives in May, Alma Swan and Sheridan Brown indicated that 81% of authors surveyed would willingly archive their research in an OA repository if their funding agency or university mandated it. Only five research institutions currently mandate faculty to provide open access to their published scholarly output—none are in the United States.

### Funders get wiser

Ninety-three percent of scholarly publishers allow the posting of pre- or postprints of peer-reviewed articles on the author's web site or in an institutional repository, but so far only a small percentage of authors actually do it. For that reason, a growing number of large research foundations require open access to peer-reviewed journal articles resulting from funded research, usually between six and 12 months after publication. Publishers, which used to consider self-archiving by authors a nonstarter, now fear that the current self-archiving trickle will become a torrent; some are lengthening embargoes on self-archiving (longer delays before an author can post the article on the web). Scholars are caught in the middle between the funders and the publishers, but there is growing evidence that the funders can and will force their researchers to comply with mandates if they want continued funding.

### Publishers get bolder

Four of the large STM publishers now offer authors an open access option for all or some of their journal titles: Springer (Open Choice, 1200 journals), Blackwell (Online Open, 80 journals), Oxford (Oxford Open, 42 journals), and American Institute of Physics (Author Select, three journals). If the author pays a fee up-front (typically using grant funds), the article is put on the web free to all as soon as it is published. Publishers have also been exploring advertising and sponsorships to underwrite the cost of making the research articles in a journal free. Perhaps there is a role here for products like Google's AdSense.

### OA goes to DC

Back in 2004, Congress asked the NIH to develop a policy to give taxpayers access to medical research funded by the NIH and reported in peer-reviewed

(R-MS) introduced the CURES Act in December 2005. If passed, it will mandate that virtually all published medical research sponsored by the government would become open access within six months of publication. An even more far-reaching bill is expected to be introduced this spring. Either of these bills would override the existing NIH policy and assert the government's entitlement to use the content it funds, making publisher objections moot.

### OA abroad

The British spent the fall wrangling over a proposal from the Research Councils of the UK (RCUK) that would encourage authors who receive grants to place peer-reviewed findings in a system of open access repositories around the country. RCUK distributes £3.5 billion of government money to support medical research, generating about 130,000 articles

## BUNDLES AND BIG DEALS REMAINED A STAPLE DESPITE PROTESTATIONS BY LIBRARIANS WHO SEE THEM AS THE TROJAN HORSES OF COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

journals. The plan directed authors to archive their articles with PubMed Central, NIH's OA repository, within six months of publication. Under intense pressure from publishers, NIH posted a much weaker policy early in 2005. By the fall, less than 4% of eligible papers had been deposited, and the policy was widely recognized as a failure. At this writing, the report and recommendations to strengthen the policy were before a Congressional appropriations committee for review.

In yet another response to the NIH initiative, 57 societal publishers have offered to provide the NIH with links from PubMed Central into all NIH-funded articles in their journals at no charge. The offer appears to be generous and compelling. The difficulty is that it would prevent the NIH from addressing two other directives from Congress—permanent preservation on an NIH site and a common database for tracking and searching all NIH research.

Congress may not wait for full cooperation from the NIH. Senators Joe Lieberman (D-CT) and Thad Cochran

a year. Delay in implementing the new policy is apparently owing to strong opposition from a handful of society and STM publishers. The hope is that the RCUK will achieve what Parliament was too timid to do in 2004, likely out of fear of offending these same publishers, which have headquarters in their districts.

### What to expect in 2007

Academic libraries saw price increases just under 8% overall in 2006. Non-U.S. titles rose just over 8%, while U.S. titles rose just over 7%. Currency was not a big factor as most major STM publishers now price in U.S. dollars and the dollar was doing well against both the Euro and the pound when 2006 prices were set. For non-U.S. publishers that price in native currency, U.S. customers would have seen slightly more variance but only in the range of plus or minus a percent or two. For the second year in a row, price hikes were slightly lower than predicted. Barring a major upheaval in the world economy, it is probably reasonable to assume that increases for 2007 will remain in the range of 7%–9%. ■