

LSU Health Science Center

LSU Health Digital Scholar

Library Faculty Posters and Presentations

Other Departments

5-4-2022

The Knowledge, Attitudes, And Practices Of Faculty Towards Scholarly And Predatory Open Access Publishing

Julie H. Schiavo

LSU Health Sciences Center - New Orleans, JSchia@lsuhsc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholar.lsuhscc.edu/lib_pps



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Medical Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schiavo, Julie H., "The Knowledge, Attitudes, And Practices Of Faculty Towards Scholarly And Predatory Open Access Publishing" (2022). *Library Faculty Posters and Presentations*. 4.
https://digitalscholar.lsuhscc.edu/lib_pps/4

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Other Departments at LSU Health Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Faculty Posters and Presentations by an authorized administrator of LSU Health Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact DigitalScholar@lsuhsc.edu.



The Knowledge, Attitudes, And Practices Of Faculty Towards Scholarly And Predatory Open Access Publishing

Julie H. Schiavo EdD, MLIS, AHIP

LSUHSC-NO Libraries

jschia@lsuhsc.edu

Introduction

Health sciences faculty are required to publish their scholarly research

They may choose traditionally published or open access publications

Publishing is a business, and quality varies widely

It can be difficult to tell the difference between reputable and disreputable publishers

There can be damaging consequences based on that choice



Problem Statement & Aim of the Study

The problem addressed in this study was the lack of knowledge about the motivations and behaviors of faculty when choosing publication venues for their research

This study aimed to establish an understanding of why a faculty member might choose to a particular venue for their research

Research Questions

How familiar are health sciences faculty members with the open access model of scientific publishing?

How familiar are health sciences faculty members with predatory publishers?

What are health sciences faculty members' opinions regarding publishing in possibly predatory publications?

Research Design

A qualitative study was used to gather a comprehensive understanding of the knowledge, attitudes, and behavior of the faculty members.

Constructivist approach: as people have experiences and reflect upon them, they build their own representations and integrate new information into their pre-existing schemas.

Research Design



Interviews were conducted with 22 faculty members in a large health sciences center in the southern United States

Interviews were conducted via Zoom over a two month period in 2021

Interviews were recorded and transcribed. Using thematic coding, six themes developed.

Participants

Participants were required to be involved in scholarly publishing but not required to have knowledge of the differences between traditional, open access, or predatory publishing

Participants had a wide range of publication experience from 5-42 years (M=22)

Representing six different disciplines: allied health, dentistry, graduate studies, medicine, nursing, and public health

A decorative graphic in the bottom right corner consisting of two parallel lines, one purple and one yellow, that bend at a 90-degree angle.

Findings

A decorative graphic in the bottom right corner consisting of two parallel lines, one purple and one yellow, that bend at a 90-degree angle.

Findings

A decorative graphic in the bottom right corner consisting of two parallel lines, one purple and one yellow, that bend at a 90-degree angle.

Findings

Limitations



Term “predatory” has negative connotations, yet it is the currently the accepted term for the phenomenon



Many different types of scholarly open access publications but participants were not aware of the basics. As a result, the decision was made to utilize a simple description of open access

Conclusion

Faculty need further training in scholarly publishing

There must be some reform of the publication process in order to ensure equal access to scientific information

OA was believed to be the reforming movement, but it has not developed as intended due to the rise of predatory practices of some publishers

With understanding and innovation, the scientific conversation can extend to all, regardless of their location, finances, or privileges.



Questions?

Thank you!

Julie H. Schiavo EdD, MLIS, AHIP
LSUHSC-NO Libraries
jschia@lsuhsc.edu
<https://www.linkedin.com/in/julie-h-schiavo-mlis/>