



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The deliverance of open access books : examining usage and dissemination

Snijder, R.

Citation

Snijder, R. (2019, January 29). *The deliverance of open access books : examining usage and dissemination*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/68465>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/68465>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/68465> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Snijder, R.

Title: The deliverance of open access books : examining usage and dissemination

Issue Date: 2019-01-29

11 References

- About - Creative Commons. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://creativecommons.org/about>
- Abrizah, A., & Thelwall, M. (2014). Can the impact of non-Western academic books be measured? An investigation of Google Books and Google Scholar for Malaysia. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65(12), 2498–2508. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23145>
- Adema, J., & Ferwerda, E. (2014). Publication Practices in Motion : The Benefits of Open Access Publishing for the Humanities. In P. Dávidházi (Ed.), *New publication cultures in the humanities : Exploring the Paradigm Shift* (pp. 133–148). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Ahmed, A. (2007). Open access towards bridging the digital divide—policies and strategies for developing countries. *Information Technology for Development*, 13(4), 337–361. <https://doi.org/10.1002/itdj.20067>
- Alexandre-Benavent, R., Valderrama Zurián, J. C., Alonso-Arroyo, A., Miguel-Dasit, A., González de Dios, J., & de Granda Orive, J. (2007). [Spanish versus English as a language of publication and impact factor of Neurología]. *Neurología (Barcelona, Spain)*, 22(1), 19–26. Retrieved from <http://europepmc.org/abstract/MED/17315099/reload=0>
- Alonso, C. J., Davidson, C. N., Unsworth, J. M., & Withey, L. (2003). *Crises and Opportunities: The Futures of Scholarly Publishing*. American Council of Learned Societies. Retrieved from http://www.acls.org/uploadedFiles/Publications/OP/57_Crises_and_Opportunities.pdf
- American Library Association. (2014). Privacy : An Interpretation of the Library Bill of Rights. Retrieved March 5, 2017, from <http://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/librarybill/interpretations/privacy>
- Antelman, K. (2004). Do Open-Access Articles Have a Greater Research Impact? *College & Research Libraries*, 65(5), 372–382. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.65.5.372>
- Archambault, É., Caruso, J., & Nicol, A. (2014). *State-of-art analysis of OA strategies to peer-review publications* (Vol. 1). Retrieved from http://science-metrix.com/files/science-metrix/publications/d_2.1_sm_ec_dg-rtd_oa_policies_in_the_era_update_v05p.pdf
- Archambault, É., Côté, G., Struck, B., & Voorons, M. (2016). Research impact of paywalled versus open access papers. Retrieved from <http://www.1science.com/oanumbr.html>
- Armstrong, C., & Ford, H. (2006). Africa and the digital information commons: An overview. *The Southern African Journal of Information and Communication*, 7(7), 4–21. Retrieved from <http://idl-bnc.idrc.ca/dspace/handle/10625/40002>
- Association of Research Libraries (ARL) :: ARL Statistics 2009-10. (2012). Retrieved May 14, 2012, from <http://www.arl.org/stats/annualsurveys/arlstats/arlstats11.shtml>
- AUP. (2012). Amsterdam University Press. Retrieved November 17, 2011, from <http://www.aup.nl>
- Bakos, J. Y. (1991). A strategic analysis of electronic marketplaces. *MIS Quarterly*, 15(September), 295–310. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249641>
- Bell, S., Shaw, B., & Boaz, A. (2011). Real-world approaches to assessing the impact of environmental research on policy. *Research Evaluation*, 20(3), 227–237. <https://doi.org/10.3152/095820211X13118583635792>
- Benneworth, P., & Jongbloed, B. W. (2009). Who matters to universities? A stakeholder perspective on humanities, arts and social sciences valorisation. *Higher Education*, 59(5), 567–588. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9265-2>
- Bennink, R., Meijer, I., Wameling, F., & Zuijdam, F. (2008). *De maatschappelijke kwaliteit van onderzoek in kaart Een handreiking*. Utrecht. Retrieved from http://www.qanu.nl/comasy/uploadedfiles/MKO_handreiking_definitief.pdf

- Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities. (2003). In *Conference on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities (20-22 Oct 2003, Berlin)*. Berlin: Max Planck Gesellschaft. Retrieved from <http://openaccess.mpg.de/286432/Berlin-Declaration>
- Bernal, I. (2013). Open Access and the Changing Landscape of Research Impact Indicators: New Roles for Repositories. *Publications*, 1(2), 56–77. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications1020056>
- BioMed Central Ltd. (2014). BioMed Central | Using BioMed Central's open access full-text corpus for text mining research. Retrieved from <http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/datamining>
- Boldrin, M., & Levine, D. K. (2002). The Case Against Intellectual Property. *American Economic Review*, 92(2), 209–212. <https://doi.org/10.1257/000282802320189267>
- Bollen, J., Van de Sompel, H., Hagberg, A., & Chute, R. (2009). A principal component analysis of 39 scientific impact measures. *PloS One*, 4(6), e6022. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0006022>
- Bollen, J., Van de Sompel, H., & Rodriguez, M. A. (2008). Towards usage-based impact metrics. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM/IEEE-CS joint conference on Digital libraries - JCDL '08* (p. 231). New York, New York, USA: ACM Press. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1378889.1378928>
- Bonn, M., & Furlough, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Getting the word out: academic libraries as scholarly publishers*. Chicago: American Library Association. Retrieved from www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org/acrl/.../9780838986981_getting_OA.pdf
- Book Industry Communication. (2010). BIC Standard Subject Categories – an Overview. Retrieved February 9, 2012, from <http://www.bic.org.uk/7/BIC-Standard-Subject-Categories/>
- Borgman, L. C. (1999). What Are Digital Libraries?: Competing Visions. *Information Processing & Management*, 35, 227–243. Retrieved from <http://libezproxy.open.ac.uk/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ589995&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Bornmann, L. (2014). Alternative metrics in scientometrics: A meta-analysis of research into three altmetrics. *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:1407.8010*, 103(3), 1123–1144. Digital Libraries; Physics and Society. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1565-y>
- Budapest Open Access Initiative. (2012). Ten years on from the Budapest Open Access Initiative: setting the default to open. Retrieved April 29, 2014, from <http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/boai-10-recommendations>
- Bulger, M. E., Meyer, E. T., De la Flor, G., Terras, M., Wyatt, S., Jirotko, M., ... Madsen, C. M. (2011). Reinventing Research? Information Practices in the Humanities. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, (April), 83. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1859267>
- Cabezas-Clavijo, Á., Robinson-García, N., Torres-Salinas, D., Jiménez-Contreras, E., Mikulka, T., Gumpenberger, C., ... Gorraiz, J. (2013). Most borrowed is most cited? Library loan statistics as a proxy for monograph selection in citation indexes. Digital Libraries. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1305.1488>
- Calver, M. C., & Bradley, J. S. (2010). Patterns of citations of open access and non-open access conservation biology journal papers and book chapters. *Conservation Biology: The Journal of the Society for Conservation Biology*, 24(3), 872–80. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01509.x>
- Carmody, T. (2011). This Is Why We'll Never Have Innovative E-Books | WIRED. Retrieved October 29, 2017, from <https://www.wired.com/2011/08/this-is-why-we-ll-never-have-innovative-e-books/>
- Carroll, M. W. (2006). Creative Commons and the New Intermediaries. *Michigan State Law Review*, 2006(1), 45–65.
- Central Intelligence Agency. (n.d.). The World Factbook – COUNTRY COMPARISON :: INTERNET HOSTS. Retrieved December 5, 2016, from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2184rank.html>

- Chan, L., & Costa, S. (2005). Participation in the global knowledge commons. *New Library World*, 106(3/4), 141–163. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03074800510587354>
- Chan, L., Cuplinskas, D., Eisen, M., Friend, F., Genova, Y., Guédon, J.-C., ... Velterop, J. (2002). Budapest Open Access Initiative. Retrieved from <http://www.soros.org/openaccess/read.shtml>
- Chellappa, R. K., & Sin, R. G. (2005). Personalization versus privacy: An empirical examination of the online consumer's dilemma. *Information Technology and Management*, 6(2–3), 181–202.
- Chodorow, S. (1999). The Specialized Scholarly Monograph in Crisis: Or How Can I Get Tenure If You Won't Publish My Book? Retrieved March 12, 2012, from <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/specscholmono/chodorow~print.shtml>
- Christian, G. E. (2008). Open Access Initiative and the Developing World. *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*, 18(2), 1–22. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/paper=1304665>
- Collins, E., & Milloy, C. (2012). A snapshot of attitudes towards open access monograph publishing in the humanities and social sciences – part of the OAPEN-UK project. *Insights: The UKSG Journal*, 25(2), 192–197. <https://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.25.2.192>
- Collins, E., & Milloy, C. (2016). *OAPEN-UK final report: A five-year study into open access monograph publishing in the humanities and social sciences*. Retrieved from <http://oapen-uk.jiscbooks.org/files/2016/01/OAPEN-UK-final-report-single-page-view.pdf>
- Corrado, E. M. (2007). Privacy and Library 2.0: How Do They Conflict? In *ailing into the future: charting our destiny: proceedings of the Thirteenth National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries*. Association of College and Research Libraries.
- Costas, R., Zahedi, Z., & Wouters, P. (2014). Do 'altmetrics' correlate with citations? *Extensive comparison of altmetric indicators with citations from a multidisciplinary perspective* (CWTS Working Paper Series No. CWTS-WP-2014-001). Leiden. Retrieved from <http://www.cwts.nl/pdf/CWTS-WP-2014-001.pdf>
- COUNTER Online Metrics. (2014). COUNTER | About Us. Retrieved March 1, 2015, from <http://www.projectcounter.org/about.html>
- Cross, R. L. (2011). Digital books and the salvation of academic publishing. *The Bottom Line*, 24(3), 162–166. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08880451111185991>
- Daigle, L. (2004). WHOIS Protocol Specification. Retrieved March 22, 2015, from <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3912>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). User acceptance of computer technology: a comparison of two theoretical models. *Management Science*, 35(8), 982–1003.
- Diez, M. L. A., & Dempsey, L. (2006). The Library Catalogue in the New Discovery Environment: Some Thoughts. Retrieved March 7, 2017, from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue48/dempsey>
- DOAB: Directory of Open Access Books. (n.d.). Retrieved November 29, 2012, from <http://www.doabooks.org/>
- Emery, C., Lucraft, M., Morka, A., & Pyne, R. (2017). *The OA effect: How does open access affect the usage of scholarly books?* <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5559280.v1>
- Ernø-Kjølhed, E., & Hansson, F. (2011). Measuring research performance during a changing relationship between science and society. *Research Evaluation*, 20(2), 130–142. <https://doi.org/10.3152/095820211X12941371876544>
- Falagas, M. E., Zarkali, A., Karageorgopoulos, D. E., Bardakas, V., & Mavros, M. N. (2013). The Impact of Article Length on the Number of Future Citations: A Bibliometric Analysis of General Medicine Journals. *PLoS ONE*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0049476>

- Ferwerda, E. (2014). Open access monograph business models. *Insights: The UKSG Journal*, 27(s1), 35–38. <https://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.46>
- Ferwerda, E., Snijder, R., & Adema, J. (2013). *OAPEN-NL - A project exploring Open Access monograph publishing in the Netherlands, Final Report*. The Hague. Retrieved from <http://oapen.org/download?type=export&export=oapen-nl-final-report>
- Finch, J., Brindley, L., Blackman, T., Duffy, M., Waelde, C., England, J., ... Hall, M. (2013). Open Access Publishing - Presentations from the Academy's 'Implementing Finch' Conference held on 29th and 30th November 2012 at the Royal Statistical Society in London. *Academy of Social Sciences Professional Briefings*, (01), 1–32.
- Garfield, E. (2006). The history and meaning of the journal impact factor. *Jama*, 295(1), 90–93.
- Geyer-Schulz, A., Neumann, A., & Thede, A. (2003). Others also use: A robust recommender system for scientific libraries. In *International Conference on Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries* (pp. 113–125). Springer. Retrieved from <http://www.em.uni-karlsruhe.de/>
- Ghosh, S. B., & Kumar Das, A. (2007). Open Access and Institutional Repositories A Developing Country Perspective: a case study of India. *IFLA Journal*, 33(3), 229–250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0340035207083304>
- Gibbons, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London [u.a.: Sage.
- Giménez-Toledo, E., & Román-Román, A. (2009). Assessment of humanities and social sciences monographs through their publishers: a review and a study towards a model of evaluation. *Research Evaluation*, 18(3), 13. <https://doi.org/10.3152/095820209X471986>
- Glänzel, W., & Gorraiz, J. (2015). Usage metrics versus altmetrics: confusing terminology? *Scientometrics*, 102(3), 2161–2164. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1472-7>
- Glänzel, W., & Schoepflin, U. (1999). A bibliometric study of reference literature in the sciences and social sciences. *Information Processing & Management*, 35(1), 31–44.
- Gläser, J., Glänzel, W., & Scharnhorst, A. (2017). Towards a comparative approach to the identification of thematic structures in science. *Scientometrics*, 111(2), 981–998. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2295-0>
- Google Books. (n.d.). Reports for previews - Books Help. Retrieved April 18, 2012, from <http://support.google.com/books/direct/bin/answer.py?hl=en-GB&answer=106172>
- Granados, N. F., Gupta, A., & Kauffman, R. J. (2006). The Impact of IT on Market Information and Transparency: A Unified Theoretical Framework. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 7(3), 148–178.
- Grant, J., Brutscher, P.-B., Guthrie, S., Butler, L., & Wooding, S. (2010). *Capturing Research Impacts: A review of international practice*. Santa Monica: RAND. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/documented_briefings/DB578.html
- Greco, A. N., & Wharton, R. M. (2008). Should university presses adopt an open access [electronic publishing] business model for all of their scholarly books? In L. Chan & S. Mornati (Eds.), *ELPUB2008. Open Scholarship: Authority, Community, and Sustainability in the Age of Web 2.0 - Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Electronic Publishing held in Toronto, Canada 25-27 June 2008* (pp. 149–164). Toronto. Retrieved from http://elpub.scix.net/data/works/att/149_elpub2008.content.pdf
- Griffiths, J. R., & Brophy, P. (2005). Student searching behavior and the web: use of academic resources and Google. *Library Trends*, 53(4), 539–554.
- Guerrero-Bote, V. P., & Moya-Anegón, F. (2012). *Relationship between Usage and Citation and the influence of language*. Retrieved from http://ebrp.elsevier.com/pdf/2012_Proposal-anegon_bote_morales.pdf

- Guibault, L. (2011). Owning the Right to Open Up Access to Scientific Publications. In *Open Content Licensing :from Theory to Practice* (pp. 137–167). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.oapen.org/record/389501>
- Hall, G. (2013). The Unbound Book: Academic Publishing in the Age of the Infinite Archive. *Journal of Visual Culture*, 12(3), 490–507. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470412913502032>
- Hall, S. (2016). Will Google ever reopen signups for its Google Play Books self-publishing platform? Retrieved May 14, 2017, from <https://gt05google.com/2016/12/28/will-google-ever-reopen-signups-for-its-google-play-books-self-publishing-platform/>
- Hammarfelt, B. (2014). Using altmetrics for assessing research impact in the humanities. *Scientometrics*, 101(2), 1419–1430. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1261-3>
- Harnad, S., Brody, T., Vallières, F., Carr, L., Hitchcock, S., Gingras, Y., ... Hilf, E. R. (2004). The Access/Impact Problem and the Green and Gold Roads to Open Access. *Serials Review*, 30(4), 310–314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.serrev.2004.09.013>
- Harnad, S., Brody, T., Vallières, F., Carr, L., Hitchcock, S., Gingras, Y., ... Hilf, E. R. (2008). The Access/Impact Problem and the Green and Gold Roads to Open Access: An Update. *Serials Review*, 34(1), 36–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.serrev.2007.12.005>
- Harzing, A., & van der Wal, R. (2008). Google Scholar as a new source for citation analysis. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*, 8(1), 61–73. <https://doi.org/10.3354/esep00076>
- Haustein, S., Larivière, V., Thelwall, M., Amyot, D., & Peters, I. (2014). Tweets vs. Mendeley readers: How do these two social media metrics differ? *IT-Information Technology*, 56(5), 207–215.
- Herb, U. (2010). Alternative Impact Measures for Open Access Documents? An examination how to generate interoperable usage information from distributed open access services. In *WORLD LIBRARY AND INFORMATION CONGRESS 76TH IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE AND ASSEMBLY* (Vol. in press, p. 165–178 ST–Open Access Statistics: Alternative I). Retrieved from <https://www.ifla.org/past-wlic/2010/72-herb-en.pdf>
- Herb, U., Kranz, E., Leidinger, T., & Mittelsdorf, B. (2010). How to assess the impact of an electronic document? And what does impact mean anyway?: Reliable usage statistics in heterogeneous repository communities. *OCLC Systems Services*, 26(2), 133–145. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10650751011048506>
- Hietanen, H. A. (2008). Creative Commons' Approach to Open Content. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1–88. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1162219>
- Hilton III, J. L., Lutz, N., & Wiley, D. (2012). Examining the reuse of open textbooks. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 13(2), 45–58.
- Hilton III, J., Wiley, D., & Hilton, J. (2011). Free E-Books and Print Sales. *Journal of Electronic Publishing (JEP)*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0014.109>
- Hilton, J. (2011). Free E-Books and Print Sales. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0014.109>
- Holmberg, K., & Thelwall, M. (2014). Disciplinary differences in Twitter scholarly communication. *Scientometrics*, 101(2), 1027–1042. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1229-3>
- Hong, L., Convertino, G., & Chi, E. H. (2011). Language Matters In Twitter: A Large Scale Study. In *Fifth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media Language* (pp. 518–521).
- Houghton, J., Rasmussen, B., Sheehan, P., Oppenheim, C., Morris, A., Creaser, C., ... Gourlay, A. (2009). Economic implications of alternative scholarly publishing models: Exploring the costs and benefits. *Victoria*, (January), 287. Retrieved from http://ie-repository.jisc.ac.uk/278/1/EI-ASPM_Summary.doc
- Howard, B. (2012). Eric Hellman of Unglue.it on e-books, the creative commons, passionate authors and life after Amazon. Retrieved July 18, 2016, from <http://teleread.com/eric-hellman-of-unglue-it-on-e-books-the-creative-commons-passionate-authors-and-life-after-amazon/>

- International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. (2016). IFLA Code of Ethics for Librarians and other Information Workers (full version). Retrieved March 5, 2017, from <http://www.ifla.org/publications/node/11092#privacy>
- International Monetary Fund. (2010). World Economic Outlook Database April 2010 -- WEO Groups and Aggregates Information. Retrieved from <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2010/01/weodata/groups.htm>
- Jackson, R. (2014). The publisher journey for OUP. *Insights: The UKSG Journal*, 27(s1), 21–25. <https://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.117>
- Jaeger, P. T., McClure, C. R., Bertot, J. C., & Snead, J. T. (2004). The USA PATRIOT Act, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and information policy research in libraries: Issues, impacts, and questions for libraries and researchers. *The Library Quarterly*, 74(2), 99–121.
- Jeckmans, A. J. P., Beyé, M., Erkin, Z., Hartel, P., Lagendijk, R. L., & Tang, Q. (2013). Privacy in recommender systems. In *Social media retrieval* (pp. 263–281). Springer.
- JISC - OAPEN-UK. (n.d.). Retrieved November 29, 2012, from <http://oapen-uk.jiscbooks.org/>
- Jones, C. E. (n.d.). The ancient world online. Retrieved October 5, 2017, from <http://ancientworldonline.blogspot.com/search?q=oapen>
- Jump, P. (2011). Monographs finally join citations database. *Times Higher Education*, (October 2011), 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/417771.article>
- Kelty, C. (2016). It's the Data, Stupid: What Elsevier's purchase of SSRN also means. Retrieved July 25, 2016, from <http://savageminds.org/2016/05/18/its-the-data-stupid-what-elseviers-purchase-of-ssrn-also-means/>
- Kim, M. (2007). The Creative Commons and Copyright Protection in the Digital Era: Uses of Creative Commons Licenses. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 187–209. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00392.x>
- Knöchelmann, M. (2017). Open Access Book Publishing and the Prisoner's Dilemma: A Theoretical Approach to a Description of the Slow Scalability of Open Access Book Publishing. In *BOOC*. UCL Press. <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781911307679.11>
- Knowledge Exchange. (2010). The Impact of Open Access Outside European Universities. *Business*, 13. Retrieved from <http://www.knowledge-exchange.info/Default.aspx?ID=412>
- Kortekaas, S., & Kramer, B. (2014). Thinking the unthinkable – doing away with the library catalogue. *Insights: The UKSG Journal*, 27(3), 244–248. <https://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.174>
- Kousha, K., & Thelwall, M. (2009). Google book search: Citation analysis for social science and the humanities. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(8), 1537–1549. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21085>
- Kousha, K., Thelwall, M., & Rezaie, S. (2011). Assessing the citation impact of books: The role of Google Books, Google Scholar, and Scopus. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62(11), 2147–2164. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21608>
- Kumar, R., Raghavan, P., Rajagopalan, S., & Tomkins, A. (1999). Trawling the Web for emerging cyber-communities. *Computer Networks*, 31(11–16), 1481–1493. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1389-1286\(99\)00040-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1389-1286(99)00040-7)
- Lamothe, A. A. R. A. (2010). Electronic Book Usage Patterns as Observed at an Academic Library: Searches and Viewings. *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research*, 5(1), 1–16. Retrieved from <http://journal.lib.uoguelph.ca/index.php/perj/article/viewArticle/1071>
- Landes, W. M., & Posner, R. A. (1989). An Economic Analysis of Copyright Law. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 18(2), 325.
- Landry, R., Amara, N., & Lamari, M. (2001). Climbing the Ladder of Research Utilization: Evidence from Social Science Research. *Science Communication*, 22(4), 396–422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547001022004003>

- Landry, R., Lamari, M., & Amara, N. (2003). The Extent and Determinants of the Utilization of University Research in Government Agencies. *Public Administration Review*, 63(2), 192–205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6210.00279>
- Lessig, L. (2004). The Creative Commons. *Montana Law Review*, 65(1), 1–13.
- Leydesdorff, L., & Etzkowitz, H. (1996). Emergence of a Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations. *Science and Public Policy*, 23, 279–286. Retrieved from <http://dare.uva.nl/record/16759>
- Library Partners – Google Books. (n.d.). Retrieved April 3, 2016, from <https://www.google.com/googlebooks/library/partners.html>
- Linden, G., Smith, B., & York, J. (2003). Amazon.com recommendations: Item-to-item collaborative filtering. *IEEE Internet Computing*, 7(1), 76–80. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MIC.2003.1167344>
- Linmans, A. J. M. (2009). Why with bibliometrics the Humanities does not need to be the weakest link. *Scientometrics*, 83(2), 337–354. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-009-0088-9>
- Loren, L. P. (2007). Building a Reliable Semicommons of Creative Works: Enforcement of Creative Commons Licenses and Limited Abandonment of Copyright. *George Mason Law Review*, 14(100), 271–328. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.957939>
- Lyall, C., Bruce, A., Firn, J., Firn, M., & Tait, J. (2004). Assessing end-use relevance of public sector research organisations. *Research Policy*, 33(1), 73–87. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(03\)00090-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(03)00090-8)
- Lynch, C. (2002). Digital Collections, Digital Libraries and the Digitization of Cultural Heritage Information. *First Monday*, 7(5), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v18i5.4366>
- Maron, N., Mulhern, C., Rossman, D., & Schmelzinger, K. (2016). *The Costs of Publishing Monographs: Toward a Transparent Methodology*. Retrieved from <http://www.sr.ithaka.org/publications/the-costs-of-publishing-monographs/>
- McCollough, A. (2017). Does It Make a Sound: Are Open Access Monographs Discoverable in Library Catalogs? *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 17(1), 179–194. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2017.0010>
- Mendez, M., & Chapman, K. (2006). The use of scholarly monographs in the journal literature of Latin American history. *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship*, 7(3). Retrieved from http://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/content/vo7no3/mendez_moi.htm
- Moghaddam, G. G., & Moballeghi, M. (2007). The importance of aggregators for libraries in the digital era. *Interlending & Document Supply*, 35(4), 222–225. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02641610710837536>
- Mönnich, M., & Spiering, M. (2008). Adding Value to the Library Catalog by Implementing a Recommendation System. *D-Lib Magazine*, 14(5/6). <https://doi.org/10.1045/may2008-monnich>
- Morisson, H. (2016). Dramatic Growth of Open Access September 30, 2016. Retrieved May 22, 2017, from <http://poeticeconomics.blogspot.com/2016/10/dramatic-growth-of-open-access.html>
- Morrison, H. (2012). *Freedom for scholarship in the internet age*. Simon Fraser University. Retrieved from <http://summit.sfu.ca/item/477>
- Mounier, P. (2011). Freemium as a sustainable economic model for open access electronic publishing in humanities and social sciences. *Information Services and Use*, 31(3), 225–233. <https://doi.org/10.3233/ISU-2012-0652>
- Nederhof, A. J. (2006). Bibliometric monitoring of research performance in the Social Sciences and the Humanities: A Review. *Scientometrics*, 66(1), 81–100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-006-0007-2>
- Nederhof, A. J. (2011). A bibliometric study of productivity and impact of modern language and literature research. *Research Evaluation*, 20(2), 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.3152/095820211X12941371876508>

- Neslin, S. A., Grewal, D., Leghorn, R., Shankar, V., Teerling, M. L., Thomas, J. S., & Verhoef, P. C. (2006). Challenges and Opportunities in Multichannel Customer Management. *Journal of Service Research*, 9(2), 95–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670506293559>
- Neslin, S. A., & Shankar, V. (2009). Key Issues in Multichannel Customer Management: Current Knowledge and Future Directions. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 23(1), 70–81.
- Newman, M. E. J., & Girvan, M. (2004). Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical Review E*, 69(2), 026113. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.69.026113>
- Nijboer, J. (2004). Big Brother versus anonymity on the Internet: implications for Internet service providers, libraries and individuals since 9/11. *New Library World*, 105(7/8), 256–261. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03074800410551002>
- Norris, M., Oppenheim, C., & Rowland, F. (2008). Open Access Citation Rates and Developing Countries. In *ELPUB 2008 Conference on Electronic Publishing* (pp. 335–342). Toronto, Canada. Retrieved from http://elpub.scix.net/data/works/att/335_elpub2008.content.pdf
- OAPEN-UK. (2014). *Researcher survey 2014* » OAPEN-UK. Retrieved from <http://oapen-uk.jiscebooks.org/research-findings/researcher-survey-2014/>
- OAPEN.nl website - English. (n.d.). Retrieved November 29, 2012, from http://www.oapen.nl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=58:english&catid=49:english&Itemid=63
- OAPEN Consortium. (2011). *OAPEN Final Report*. Retrieved from http://project.oapen.org/images/documents/oapen_final_public_report.pdf
- OAPEN Foundation. (2016). Organisation | OAPEN. Retrieved May 31, 2016, from <http://oapen.org/content/organisation>
- Ochsner, M., Hug, S. E., & Daniel, H.-D. (2012). Indicators for Research Quality for Evaluation of Humanities Research : Opportunities and Limitations. *Bibliometrie - Praxis Und Forschung*, 1(4), 1–17.
- Ochsner, M., Hug, S., & Galleron, I. (2017). The future of research assessment in the humanities: bottom-up assessment procedures. *Palgrave Communications*, 3, 17020. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2017.20>
- OCLC. (2016). OCLC WorldCat Discovery - Open access collections in WorldCat KnowledgeBase, 1–4. Retrieved from <http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/oclc/worldcat-discovery/openaccess.pdf>
- Open Access Publishing in European Networks. (2010a). About OAPEN - Open Access Publishing in European Networks. Retrieved from http://project.oapen.org/about_OAPEN.asp
- Open Access Publishing in European Networks. (2010b). OAPEN Library. Retrieved April 24, 2013, from <http://www.oapen.org>
- Papin-Ramcharan, J., & Dawe, R. A. (2006). The Other Side of the Coin for Open Access Publishing – A Developing Country View. *Libri*, 56(1), 16–27. <https://doi.org/10.1515/LIBR.2006.16>
- Pazzani, M. M. J., & Billsus, D. (2007). Content-based recommendation systems. In *The adaptive web* (pp. 325–341). Springer.
- Pinter, F. (2012). Open Access for Scholarly Books? *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 28(3), 183–191. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-012-9285-0>
- Pinter, F. Google Scholar Indexes Open Access Books – Knowledge Unlatched (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/2015/10/google-scholar-open-access-books/>
- Pinter, F. (2018). Why Book Processing Charges (BPCs) Vary So Much. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0021.101>
- Pochoda, P. (2013). The big one: The epistemic system break in scholarly monograph publishing. *New Media & Society*, 15(3), 359–378. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812465143>
- Podlubny, I. (2005). Comparison of scientific impact expressed by the number of citations in different fields of science. *Scientometrics*, 64(1), 95–99. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-005-0240-0>

- Poynder, R. (2014). Open and Shut?: The Open Access Interviews: Paul Royster, Coordinator of Scholarly Communications, University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Retrieved September 7, 2014, from <http://poynder.blogspot.co.uk/2014/08/the-open-access-interviews-paul-royster.html>
- Priem, J., Piwowar, H. A., & Hemminger, B. M. (2012). Altmetrics in the wild: Using social media to explore scholarly impact. *Digital Libraries*. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1203.4745>
- Priem, J., Taraborelli, D., Groth, P., & Neylon, C. (2011). altmetrics: a manifesto – altmetrics.org. Retrieved December 6, 2011, from <http://altmetrics.org/manifesto/>
- Prins, A., Costas, R., Leeuwen, T. Van, & Wouters, P. (2014). Using Google Scholar in research evaluation of social science programs , with a comparison with Web of Science data. In *STI - Proceedings of the science and technology indicators conference 2014, Leiden "Context Counts: Pathways to Master Big and Little Data"* (pp. 434–443). Universiteit Leiden - CWTS. Retrieved from <http://sti2014.cwts.nl/download/f-y2w2.pdf>
- Provan, K. G., Veazie, M. A., Staten, L. K., & Teufel-Shone, N. I. (2005). The use of network analysis to strengthen community partnerships. *Public Administration Review*, 65(5), 603–613.
- Redhead, C. (2012). Why CC-BY? - OASPA. Retrieved September 7, 2014, from <http://oaspa.org/why-cc-by/>
- Ricci, F., Rokach, L., Shapira, B., & Kantor, P. B. (Eds.). (2011). *Recommender Systems Handbook*. Boston, MA: Springer US. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-85820-3>
- Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York [etc.]: The Free Press.
- Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences. (2010). *Quality indicators for research in the humanities*. *Humanities*. Amsterdam. Retrieved from <https://www.knaw.nl/shared/resources/actueel/publicaties/pdf/quality-indicators-for-research-in-the-humanities>
- Salager-Meyer, F. (2008). Scientific publishing in developing countries: Challenges for the future. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(2), 121–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.03.009>
- Scale, M.-S. (2008). Facebook as a social search engine and the implications for libraries in the twenty-first century. *Library Hi Tech*, 26(4), 540–556. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07378830810920888>
- Schafer, J. Ben, Konstan, J., & Riedl, J. (1999). Recommender systems in e-commerce. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM conference on Electronic commerce* (pp. 158–166). ACM.
- Schaffer, T. (2004). Psychology citations revisited: behavioral research in the age of electronic resources. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 30(5), 354–360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2004.06.009>
- Serenko, A., Bontis, N., & Moshonsky, M. (2011). Exploring the Role of Books as a Knowledge Translation Mechanism: Citation Analysis and Author Survey. In *Americas, The* (p. 11). Retrieved from http://aisel.aisnet.org/amcis2011_submissions/23/
- Shen, Y. (2007). Information Seeking in Academic Research : *Information Technology and Libraries*, 26(March), 4–14. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rzh&AN=2009564395&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live>
- Shneiderman, B., & Dunne, C. (2013). Interactive Network Exploration to Derive Insights: Filtering, Clustering, Grouping, and Simplification. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* (Vol. 7704 LNCS, pp. 2–18). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36763-2_2
- Snijder, R. (2010). The profits of free books: An experiment to measure the impact of open access publishing. *Learned Publishing*, 23(4), 293–301. <https://doi.org/10.1087/20100403>
- Snijder, R. (2013a). A higher impact for open access monographs: disseminating through OAPEN and DOAB at AUP. *Insights: The UKSG Journal*, 26(1), 55–59. <https://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.26.1.55>
- Snijder, R. (2013b). Measuring monographs: A quantitative method to assess scientific impact and societal relevance. *First Monday*, 18(5). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v18i5.4250>

- Snijder, R. (2014a). Modes of access: the influence of dissemination channels on the use of open access monographs. *Information Research*, 19(3), 166–183. Retrieved from <http://www.informationr.net/ir/19-3/paper638.html>
- Snijder, R. (2014b). The Influence of Open Access on Monograph Sales: The experience at Amsterdam University Press. *LOGOS: The Journal of the World Book Community*, 25(3), 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1878-4712-11112047>
- Snijder, R. (2015). Evaluating the Impact of the FWF-E-Book-Library Collection in the OAPEN Library: An Analysis of the 2014 Download Data. *D-Lib Magazine*, 21(7/8). <https://doi.org/10.1045/july2015-snijder>
- SNSF. (2015). Pilot project OAPEN-CH - SNF. Retrieved May 9, 2017, from <http://www.snf.ch/en/funding/science-communication/oapen-ch/Pages/default.aspx>
- Spaapen, J., & van Drooge, L. (2011). Introducing “productive interactions” in social impact assessment. *Research Evaluation*, 20(3), 211–218. <https://doi.org/10.3152/095820211X12941371876742>
- SPARC Europe. (2015). The Open Access Citation Advantage Service. Retrieved October 29, 2015, from <http://sparceurope.org/oaca>
- Springer. (2017). Book Production Workflow. Retrieved October 29, 2017, from <http://www.springer.com/authors/book+authors/helpdesk?SGWID=0-1723113-12-803305-0>
- Steele, C. (2008). Scholarly Monograph Publishing in the 21st Century: The Future More Than Ever Should Be an Open Book. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0011.201>
- Sterling, G. (2013). Topsy Becomes Definitive Twitter Search Engine. Retrieved from <http://searchengineland.com/topsy-becomes-definitive-twitter-search-engine-171120>
- Stremersch, S., Verniers, I., & Verhoef, P. C. (2007). The Quest for Citations: Drivers of Article Impact. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(3), 171–193. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.71.3.171>
- Suber, P. (2008). Gratis and libre open access. *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, (124). Retrieved from http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4322580/suber_oagratiss.html?sequence=1
- Suber, P. (2012). *Open Access*. Cambridge: MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.4271/2004-01-2697>
- Suber, P., Brown, P. O., Cabell, D., Chakravarti, A., Cohen, B., Delamothe, T., ... Watson, L. (2003). Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing. *Access*, 3(December 2012), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.4403/jlis.it-8628>
- Suzor, N. P. (2014). Free-riding, cooperation, and “peaceful revolutions” in copyright. *Harvard Journal of Law and Technology*, 28(Fall), 0–74.
- Swan, A., & Hall, M. (2010). Why Open Access can change science in the developing world. *Public Service Review: International Development Online*. Retrieved from <http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/9949>
- Tang, R. (2008). Citation Characteristics and Intellectual Acceptance of Scholarly Monographs. *College & Research Libraries*, 69(4), 356–369. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.69.4.356>
- Tennant, J. P., Waldner, F., Jacques, D. C., Masuzzo, P., Collister, L. B., & Hartgerink, C. H. J. (2016). The academic, economic and societal impacts of Open Access: an evidence-based review. *F1000Research*, 5(632), 632. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.8460.3>
- Thelwall, M. (2016). Interpreting correlations between citation counts and other indicators. *Scientometrics*, (Thelwall 2006). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-1973-7>
- Thelwall, M., Haustein, S., Larivière, V., & Sugimoto, C. R. (2013). Do altmetrics work? Twitter and ten other social web services. *PloS One*, 8(5), e64841. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0064841>
- Thelwall, M., & Sud, P. (2014). No citation advantage for monograph-based collaborations? *Journal of Informetrics*, 8(1), 276–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2013.12.008>
- Thompson, J. B. (2005). *Books in the Digital Age: The Transformation of Academic and Higher Education Publishing in Britain and the United States*. Malden, Mass.: Polity Press.

- Total number of Websites - Internet Live Stats. (n.d.). Retrieved July 11, 2018, from <http://www.internetlivestats.com/total-number-of-websites/#trend>
- UNESCO. (2010). *UNESCO Science Report: The Current Status of Science around the World*. Paris: United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organisations. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/science-technology/prospective-studies/unesco-science-report/unesco-science-report-2010/>
- Van Noorden, R. (2014). Elsevier opens its papers to text-mining. *Nature*, 506(7486), 17–17. <https://doi.org/10.1038/506017a>
- Vascellaro, J. E. (2009). Facebook, the Search Engine? - Digits - WSJ. Retrieved November 17, 2011, from <http://blogs.wsj.com/digits/2009/08/11/facebook?-the-search-engine/>
- Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science*, 46(2), 186–204.
- Verleysen, F. T., & Weeren, A. (2016). Mapping Diversity of Publication Patterns in the Social Sciences and Humanities: An Approach Making Use of Fuzzy Cluster Analysis. *Journal of Data and Information Science*, 1(4), 33–59. <https://doi.org/10.20309/jdis.201624>
- Wakita, K., & Tsurumi, T. (2007). Finding community structure in mega-scale social networks. *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 1275. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1242572.1242805>
- Walker, S. R. (2009). Bioline International: A case study in open access and its usage for enhancement of research distribution for scientific research from developing countries. *OCLC Systems & Services*, 25(2), 125–134. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10650750910961929>
- Wang, P., Dervos, D. a., Zhang, Y., & Wu, L. (2007). Information-seeking behaviors of academic researchers in the Internet Age: A user study in the United States, China and Greece. In *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (Vol. 44, pp. 1–29). <https://doi.org/10.1002/meet.1450440273>
- Ware, M., & Mabe, M. (2015). *The STM report: An overview of scientific and scholarly journal publishing*. Retrieved from http://www.stm-assoc.org/2015_02_20_STM_Report_2015.pdf
- Wasserman, M. (1998). Reprint: How Much Does It Cost to Publish A Monograph and Why? *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0004.104>
- Wasserman, S., & Faust, K. (1994). *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from www.cambridge.org/9780521387071
- White, H. D., Boell, S. K., Yu, H., Davis, M., Wilson, C. S., & Cole, F. T. H. (2009). Libcitations: A measure for comparative assessment of book publications in the humanities and social sciences. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(6), 1083–1096. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21045>
- WHOIS - Wikipedia. (n.d.). Retrieved November 23, 2011, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Whois>
- Williams, P., Stevenson, I., Nicholas, D., Watkinson, A., & Rowlands, I. (2009). The role and future of the monograph in arts and humanities research. *Aslib Proceedings: New Information Perspectives*, 61(1), 67–82.
- Willinsky, J., & Parry, F. (2006). The Access Principle: the case for open access to research and scholarship. *Access*, 49, 165–168. Retrieved from <http://www.equinoxjournals.com/LHS/article/viewPDFInterstitial/1629/2724>
- Winkmann, G., Schlutius, S., & Schweim, H. G. (2002). Citation Rates of Medical German-Language Journals in English-Language papers - Do They Correlate With the Impact Factor, and Who Cites? *DMW - Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift*, 127(04), 138–143. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2002-33307>

- Withey, L., Cohn, S., Faran, E., Jensen, M., Kiely, G., Underwood, W., ... Keane, K. (2011). Sustaining Scholarly Publishing: New Business Models for University Presses. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 42(4), 397–441. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.42.4.397>
- World Bank. (2011). *The Little Data Book on Information and Communication Technology 2011. Communication* (Vol. 42). Washington: World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-8248-6>
- World Bank, & Lewandowski, C. M. (2010). *The Little Data Book on Information and Communication Technology 2010. Communication* (Vol. 42). Washington: The World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-8248-6>
- Wouters, P., Thelwall, M., Kousha, K., Waltman, L., De Rijcke, S., Rushforth, A., & Franssen, T. (2015). *The Metric Tide: Literature Review (Supplementary Report I to the Independent Review of the Role of Metrics in Research Assessment and Management)*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.5066.3520>
- Zuccala, A. A., & White, H. D. (2015). Correlating Libcitations and Citations in the Humanities with WorldCat and Scopus Data. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics (ISSI), Istanbul, Turkey, 29th June to 4th July, 2015* (pp. 305–316). Istanbul: Bogazici University. Retrieved from <http://forskningsbasen.deff.dk/Share.external?sp=S73e8693d-a836-422a-8d40-48edao88e60c&sp=Sku>
- Zuccala, A., Van Someren, M., & van Bellen, M. (2014). A machine-learning approach to coding book reviews as quality indicators: Toward a theory of megacitation. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65(11), 2248–2260. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23104>