

<http://dx.doi.org/10.7577/formakademisk.1880>

Janne Beate Reitan

Open access to scientific publishing

Interest in open access (OA) to scientific publications is steadily increasing, both in Norway and internationally. From the outset, FORMakademisk has been published as a digital journal, and it was one of the first to offer OA in Norway. We have since the beginning used Open Journal Systems (OJS) as publishing software. OJS is part of the Public Knowledge Project (PKP), which was created by Canadian John Willinsky and colleagues at the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia in 1998. The first version of OJS came as an open source software in 2001. The programme is free for everyone to use and is part of a larger collective movement wherein knowledge is shared. When FORMakademisk started in 2008, we received much help from the journal *Acta Didactic* (n.d.) at the University of Oslo, which had started the year before us. They had also translated the programme to Norwegian. From the start, we were able to publish in both Norwegian and English. Other journals have used FORMakademisk as a model and source of inspiration when starting or when converting from subscription-based print journals to electronic OA, including the *Journal of Norwegian Media Researchers* [Norsk medietidsskrift]. It is in this way that the movement around PKP works and continues to grow to provide free access to research. As the articles are OA, they are also easily accessible to non-scientists. We also emphasise that the language should be readily available, although it should maintain a high scientific quality. Often there may be two sides of the same coin. We on the editorial team are now looking forward to adopting the newly developed OJS 3 this spring, with many new features and an improved design for users, including authors, peer reviewers, editors and readers.

Two Reports on OA

The Ministry of Education [Kunnskapsdepartementet] (KD) has recently commissioned two reports on OA, both of which were launched last summer. One was by a national committee called the Brekke Committee [Brekke-utvalget], named after committee chairman Torkel Brekke from the University of Oslo. The committee should find common standards for open publication in Norway. A national archive and financing that rewards publishing in open journals are among the most important recommendations. According to Norwegian Minister of Education, Torbjørn Røe Isaksen, “The Government’s aim is that research funded by public money should be freely available to the same public. This will promote both academic work and the use of research in society. Therefore, we have been waiting for the committee’s work” (Regjeringen, 2016). The European Union (EU) has recently aimed to adopt full OA by 2020. The “EU’s objective of full transparency by 2020 are ambitious, and we think that Norway must support this goal,” as reported by Brekke (Regjeringen, 2016). Brekke also stated, “I have expectations that the recommendations will help us to speed up the work on open access in Norway and also contribute to this important work internationally” (Regjeringen, 2016).

The Brekke Committee’s key recommendations are as follows:

- Norway must support the EU’s ambitious resolutions and objectives of full transparency by 2020.
- The committee has proposed the introduction of a requirement that scientific articles must be stored in a national repository. This will affect payments to institutions (so-called performance-based redistribution).

- To allow researchers to meet this requirement, the committee proposes various measures to improve infrastructure and support services, including increased resources to maintain the Norwegian center for research data's [Norsk senter for forskningsdata (NSD)] (n.d.) register of good publishing channels, better functionality geared towards OA to research information systems at the Current Research Information System in Norway – CRISin (n.d.) and information measures in institutions to support researchers.
- To introduce an additional factor for open publishing (gold OA) in publishing indicator to make it more attractive to choose this rather than closed publication in subscription-based journals.
- Norway must engage actively in international cooperation in negotiations with publishers regarding the transition to OA.
- It is important that top leaders of research institutions be involved in the work ahead.
- The committee has proposed the establishment of a national steering committee at the top leadership level for monitoring the work ahead.

In addition to Brekke from the University of Oslo, the committee consisted of Petter B. Brandtzæg from SINTEF, Tove Klæboe Nilsen from the University Hospital of North Norway, John-Arne Røttingen from the University of Oslo and the Norwegian Institute of Public Health [Folkehelseinstituttet], Oddrun Samdal from the University of Bergen, Margunn Aanestad from the University of Oslo and John Waage Løvhaug from the Research Council of Norway (Regjeringen, 2016).

We at FORMakademisk hope the authorities follow up on these advices from the Brekke Committee. None of the participants seems to represent scientific editorial boards, which we see as a weakness when the topic is to develop common standards for open publishing. Especially, the “additional factor for open publishing” could have a substantial positive impact in that authors will choose to publish in FORMakademisk, which is an OA journal with a good academic reputation.

KD has also asked the Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education [Nordisk institutt for studier av innovasjon, forskning og utdanning (NIFU)] to investigate the introduction of a citation factor in publishing indicator in funding for universities and university colleges. This study was led by Gunnar Sivertsen from NIFU. He describes options that are simulated based on a combination of data from CRISin (n.d.) and a citation database based on Web of Science (Thomson Reuters, n.d.). The strengths and weaknesses of the alternatives are discussed, taking into account that educational institutions have different academic profiles and that a citation indicator may lack validity in a number of subjects. On this basis, the report provides specific recommendations about how a citation indicator may optionally be used to modify indicator publication points at the institutional level (Sivertsen, 2016a). The report *Emphasis on research quality [Vekt på forskningskvalitet]* (Sivertsen, 2016b) has clear reference to the report *Emphasis on research [Vekt på forskning]*, a new system for documenting academic publishing (Universitets- og høyskolerådet, 2004), where Sivertsen also was a key individual. To avoid introducing a citation factor that affects negative subjects with little tradition of citations, Sivertsen says, “Both the calculation of the institution factor and citation indicator keeps you outside the humanities and jurisprudence, pedagogy and education, media and communication, gender studies and social anthropology” (2016b, p. 40). This means that articles in FORMakademisk will probably not be covered by a possible citation indicator.

Two Debate Meetings about OA

NIFU, The Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions [Universitets og høyskolerådet (UHR)] and the Research Institutes Common Arena [Forskningssinstituttene fellesarena (FFA)] (Abelia, n.d.), in cooperation with the National publiseringsutvalget in UHR, were invited on September 1 to a seminar on how to achieve quality in publishing OA. Participants at this meeting were mainly employees at the library in the higher education sector, as well as people from the ministry. We received the invitation to the meeting via contacts at the Oslo School of Architecture and Design. It seems no editors were invited to the meeting. On behalf of FORMakademisk, I pointed out in the debate that the editorial office's efforts to maintain the high quality of the published science was not mentioned in the reports. After the meeting, I was approached by several individuals who supported this view, but this issue was not mentioned by those who are responsible for this. Among others present at the meeting was among others Bjørn Haugstad, Undersecretary of KD.

The Norwegian Journal Association [Norsk tidsskriftforening], of which FORMakademisk is a member, and the Norwegian Non-fiction Writers and Translators Association [Norsk faglitterær forfatter- og oversetterforening (NFF)] organized a breakfast meeting on 20 September. They asked whether OA means that scientific journals stand on the edge of a cliff or if this was simply an allegation, as Lars Egeland, Director of the Learning Centre and Library at Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences [Høgskolen i Oslo og Akershus (HIOA)] suggests (Egeland, 2016).

Nils Petter Gleditsch at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) stated that OA:

...has gained wind in its sails in the fight against rogue capitalists who have screwed up the prices of subscriptions so it has taken toll on library budgets ... But, this is not the situation Humanities journals in Norway! Here are the publishers associations, institutions and publishing houses with low incomes. (Egeland, 2016)

I agree thus far, but at the same time, those representing journals independent of publishers should be more active in asserting our opinions. There is a tendency for those representing the publishers, with the University Press [Universitetsforlaget] spearheaded, has the greatest capacity to participate in debates and hearings also in this country. Even though they do not to the same degree stack up financially to the journals they publish. In an article in the independent online newspaper Khronos by HIOA, Egeland writes,

Janne Beate Reitan told that FORMakademisk is a scientific OA journals in design and research in design education. The magazine struggling economy with a grant from the Research Council and a claim for the corresponding self-financing. The technology platform is operated by the HIOA library. FORMakademisk is an example of a journal that should be able to join an OA consortium thus gaining earnings for the operation of editorial tasks. (Egeland, 2016)

As the editor-in-chief of FORMakademisk, I pointed out at both these meetings that the editorial team's role is to maintain the same academic level in journals with OA as in those printed with subscription arrangements, was absent in both these reports.

Consultation statement from FORMakademisk

FORMakademisk pointed out the same argument in its consultation statement on the Brekke Committee's report, which we reproduce here:

FORMakademisk—Research Journal of design and design education—supports the proposal to establish a national consortium of humanities and social sciences journals with open access,

where the Research Council of Norway's publication support is included as a block grant and the remainder of the funding is raised at the institutional level based on an annual clearing of each institution's publishing scope.

It is important that the work of collecting the deductible for support from the Research Council not impose on the editors of each journal. Editors should get priority to spend time ensuring the quality of the editorial work and the published articles. Some of the revenue from publications should also go toward compensating the extensive and decisive efforts of editorial members to ensure the quality of the published articles. Today, only the costs of the production of journals are supported by the Research Council, not the editorial work. The new funding must therefore also secure financial support for the editorial work, which is a prerequisite for maintaining a high quality of what is published, in print and in open access.

FORMakademisk also supports the academic and professional councils of UHR in giving level 2 priority to channels with open access if they have the choice between several channels of similar quality. Furthermore, we advocate for the introduction of a separate factor for open publishing in the publishing indicator to encourage a greater degree of open publishing.

For FORMakademisk, it is still important to choose not to be affiliated with a publishing company to gain financial aid. (Regjeringen, 2016b)

We at FORMakademisk hope this consultation statement is read by the responsible authorities and that the editorial team's efforts will be appreciated largely to maintain a high level of scientific publication.

Count of editorial work

The Research Council of Norway now requires that Norwegian journals that receive production subsidies be published with OA for all. There is also increased pressure from the Research Council that Norwegian journals that receive support be published with OA for all (Egeland, 2016). However, financial support for scientific journals that comes from the Research Council only covers production, not editorial costs. There are large differences in the degree to which various educational and research institutions provide for editors, and editorial staff members are working to secure the editorial quality of scientific journals. Many are 'allowed' to use their own research time on this, something that goes beyond their own scientific production, which is what counts when it comes to publishing points. However, those who do all the work to actually consider and publish scientific articles that get publication points are not being favoured in any way. This stands in strong contrast to the scientific work of doctoral commissions or commissions for jobs and promotions, which of course are paid assignments. Editorial work should both be given exemption from teaching and tuition, count for promotion and pay off wage increases. This should the scientific journals' editorial teams claim from the government and fight for together!

Articles in this Issue

Cheryl Akner-Koler, Professor in Theoretical and Applied Aesthetics at the Department of Industrial Design, Konstfack, University College of Arts, Crafts and Design, Stockholm, and **Parivash Ranjbar**, Affiliated Researcher at Örebro University, School of Health Sciences, both from Sweden, present in their article *Integrating Sensitizing Labs in an Educational Design Process for Haptic Interaction* new design methods for educating designers that are needed to adapt the attributes of haptic interactions to fit the embodied experiences of users. This article presents educationally framed aesthetic sensitising labs: 1) a material lab exploring the tactile and haptic structures of materials, 2) a vibrotactile lab exploring actuators directly on the body and 3) a combined materials and vibrotactile lab embedded in materials. These labs were integrated in a design course that supports a non-linear design process for embodied explorative and experimental activities that feed into an emerging gestalt. A co-design process was developed in collaboration with researchers and users who developed

positioning and communications systems for people with deafblindness. Conclusion: the labs helped to discern attributes of haptic interactions that supported designing scenarios and prototypes showing novel ways to understand and shape of haptic interactions.

Ulf Rydningen, Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Technology, Art and Design, **Dorte Lybye Norenberg**, Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Health Sciences, and **Inger Marie Lid** (Professor at the Faculty of Health Sciences, all from Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, discuss in their article universal design as a theme in the higher education experience, with a three-year collaboration between programmes in occupational therapy and construction engineering. The purpose was to provide students with knowledge of each other's field of knowledge and methods to contribute to a shared knowledge base of universal design within each subject. By analysing specific areas/tasks, students should justify and critically reflect on universal design. Further, the purpose is to strengthen universal design as a theme in research and education. The article concludes that the students appreciated getting to know and work with each other, and they found that their own profession had a knowledge monopoly on universal design. Students found that other professions have different knowledge bases, and cooperation provided insights into the complementary knowledge that can be valuable in a future profession in connection with universal design.

Adedapo Adewunmi Oluwatayo, Lecturer at the Department of Architecture, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria, investigates in the article *Criteria for the Selection of Architects by First-Time Clients* the questions: which factors do individual clients consider when selecting an architect for the first time and how does the importance attached to these factors vary with the procurement method? These questions are answered in a questionnaire survey of recent clients of architects commissioned for residential projects in Lagos, Nigeria. The respondents were asked to rate the importance of certain criteria in their selection of architects. A principal component analysis of the variables investigated reveal that the factors defining the selection criteria used by these clients are the responsiveness, perceived professional competence, personality and prominence of the architect. Other factors are acquaintance with the architect and the budget of the client. The most important factor for each procurement method was identified. Only the factors within the control of the architect are considered in this study. The study identified areas that are most important to clients, which architects could improve on to enhance their chances of reaping from the new housing market. The findings of this study suggest areas that architects could improve on to improve their chances of being selected by clients in search of residential architectural services.

Book Reviews

Beata Sirowy, Senior Research Fellow at the Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Department of Landscape Architecture and Spatial Planning, has reviewed the anthology *Architecture Beyond Criticism: Expert judgment and performance evaluation* edited by Wolfgang F. E. Preiser, Aaron T. Davis, Ashraf M. Salama and Andrea Hardy and published by Routledge in 2015. She claims that both architectural criticism and building performance evaluation (BPE) aim to assess the quality of architectural works. Beyond this shared motivation, these domains seem to have little in common. The anthology puts this separation into question, arguing for the need to bridge the gap between architectural criticism and BPE. The major claim of this book is that that these two frameworks can not only co-exist but can also, to a great advantage, supplement each other, enabling comprehensive quality assessment in architecture and, in the long term, improving the quality of our everyday environments. She recommends this book to academic and professional audiences interested in the history and development of architectural criticism or building evaluation studies. One of its strengths is the variety of perspectives within—the book offers insights from around the globe, written by

researchers, curators, critics and professional architects at different stages in their professional and academic careers. Such diversity has implications for the final product—the book is to be read primarily as a document mapping the variety of perspectives within building evaluation studies and architectural criticism, rather than a systematic discussion of a framework for integrating the two domains. Yet, the idea of such a framework presented by the editors in the introduction is a worthwhile and promising attempt.

Good reading - in open access!

Oslo, December 2016

Janne Beate Reitan

Editor-in-chief of FORMakademisk

Janne Beate Reitan

Associate Professor, Dr.Ing.

Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Faculty of Technology, Art and Design, Department of Art, Design and Drama

E-mail address: Janne.Reitan@hioa.no

References

- Abelia. (n.d.). *FFA*. Retrieved from: <https://www.abelia.no/bransjeforeninger/ffa-forskningsinstituttene-fellesarena/>
- Acta Didactica Norge. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <https://www.journals.uio.no/index.php/adno>
- CRISTin. (n.d.). *Det nasjonale forskningsinformasjonssystemet*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cristin.no/>
- Egeland, Lars. (2016). Vitenskapelige tidsskrifter foran stupet? *Khrono*. Retrieved from: <http://khrono.no/debatt/vitenskapelige-tidsskrifter-foran-stupet>
- FORMakademisk. (2016). Økonomisk støtte til redaksjonelt arbeid i open access. *Høring Nasjonale retningslinjer for åpen tilgang til forskningsresultater. Høringssvar fra FORMakademisk - forskningstidsskrift for design og designdidaktikk*. Retrieved from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/horing-nasjonale-retningslinjer-for-åpen-tilgang-til-forskningsresultater/id2506787/?uid=bc7f4c1c-8eb4-44ee-923d-25580fc7d799>
- Norsk senter for forskningsdata. (n.d.). *Register over vitenskapelige publiseringskanaler*. Retrieved from: <https://dbh.nsd.uib.no/publiseringskanaler/Forside>
- Regjeringen. (2016, 23 June). *Mottok anbefalinger for åpen tilgang til forskning*. Retrieved from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/mottok-anbefalinger-for-åpen-tilgang-til-forskning/id2504079/>
- Sivertsen, G. (2016a). *Vekt på forskningskvalitet: En mulig utvidelse av publiseringsindikatoren med en siteringsindikator*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nifu.no/publications/1370527/>
- Sivertsen, G. (2016b). *Vekt på forskningskvalitet. En mulig utvidelse av publiseringsindikatoren med en siteringsindikator (Vol. 9). Arbeidsnota*. Retrieved from: <https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2394384/NIFUarbeidsnotat2016-9.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Thomson Reuters. (n.d.). *Web of Science*. Retrieved from: <http://thomsonreuters.com/en/products-services/scholarly-scientific-research/scholarly-search-and-discovery/web-of-science.html>
- Universitets- og høyskolerådet. (2004). *Vekt på forskning: nytt system for dokumentasjon av vitenskapelig publisering. Oslo: Universitets- og høyskolerådet*. Retrieved from: http://www.uhr.no/documents/Vekt_p_forskning_sluttrapport.pdf