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Today

• Identifying potential target audiences
• Where is the greatest bang for buck?
• Mapping stakeholders
• Identifying messages that work
• Reaching the people who can effect change
• Practice your arguments
• Slides are available: https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/269325
Identifying targets
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Targets

- Undergraduates
- PhDs
- PostDoc/ECR
- Principal Investigators
- University Administration
- Funders
- Government
Where is the greatest bang for buck?

• Who/what is paying your salary? This changes the equation
  – How receptive are the audience?
  – How ‘productive’ are the audience?
  – How influential are the audience?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Receptive</th>
<th>Bang for buck?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>Medium – open to sharing concept. But is abstract</td>
<td>Vast majority walk away from university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD students</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>In reality most won’t continue in academia. Not big publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PostDocs</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Publish some work, but many will have moved on before next REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIs</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Should be primary focus-high publication and REFable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administrators</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>If message heard then big effect on institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Big effect on whole sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Big effect on whole country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Useful exercise

**Day 2 - Stakeholder Mapping**

"Building an open, information rich institution" five day workshop
FORCE11 Scholarly Communication Institute, San Diego, USA 31 July - 4 August 2017
Shared Google Drive- [https://goo.gl/Zb2zUy](https://goo.gl/Zb2zUy)
• What are the incentives to motivate faculty? How can we demonstrate benefit?
  – Try to identify those that may already be motivated
    • Find out about their motivations
      – Personal
      – External
        » E.g. requirements from funding policies
        » Hope for further funding
    • See whether those motivations are applicable to other faculty who are not yet engaged with OA

• Try to identify those that are not motivated
  • Do they lack information?
  • Do they simply not have or see the problem?
## Stakeholder mapping

- **Stakeholder Name**
- **What is important to the stakeholder?**
- **How could the stakeholder contribute to the project?**
- **How could the stakeholder block the project?**
- **Who does the stakeholder have influence over?**
- **Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Name</th>
<th>What is important to the stakeholder?</th>
<th>How could the stakeholder contribute to the project?</th>
<th>How could the stakeholder block the project?</th>
<th>Who does the stakeholder have influence over?</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT Manager/ Librarian</td>
<td>Staff Support</td>
<td>Troubleshooting, experience, copyright</td>
<td>Lack of policies that create an exclusive digital environment; lack of skills to get it started</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Find out how policy impacts all and its likely to work benefits of it to the policy and admin compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Considers this and needs to think about options</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate/Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>Buy in</td>
<td>Encourage faculty to participate</td>
<td>Lack of conversation, no follow through to get it off the ground</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Identify cost and find a way participants can adopt self-promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can create agreement to publish materials in the IL</td>
<td>No immediate release of materials</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Administrative Assistants</td>
<td>Ease</td>
<td>They do the day to day work to upload the materials</td>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Groups</td>
<td>Ease</td>
<td>Exposure/Publishing of these research projects</td>
<td>Increased materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attending a workshop on diversity of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Community</td>
<td>Access to Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Money Person (Budget Manager)</td>
<td>Making sure the work they(he/she) funded is widely public and recognised</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Cut funding/ grant</td>
<td>Everyone</td>
<td>Convince my colleagues that the benefit of this research is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1E6VLE8qf1_ch7M0dP8J2Ey_8spDZUrqnRKeUQyt8Rgc/edit#gid=83583857](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1E6VLE8qf1_ch7M0dP8J2Ey_8spDZUrqnRKeUQyt8Rgc/edit#gid=83583857)
Messaging
Hitting the target

• Where is the person you want to talk to coming from?
• What are their *a priori* ideas?
• What matters to them?
• What is convincing?
Communication

• Repeating a ‘myth’ and then explaining why it is wrong just cements the myth in a person’s mind.

• Facts actually can make an impression on people. But if the facts don’t fit into someone's existing worldview, a person tends to discount the facts when it comes to decision making.

• It can be more effective to share stories than to bombard people with facts.
Who are YOU to speak of this?

• Sometimes the messenger is the problem
• Who are the people and groups that enable or obstruct organizational change, information flow, and decisions?
• How do you influence these people?
• What is the most effective use of your time?
Which box is best?

Consider what is good bang for YOUR buck. Return on effort.
Benefits of OA

- Researchers in developing countries can see your work
- More exposure for your work
- Practitioners can apply your findings
- Higher citation rates
- Taxpayers get value for money
- Compliant with grant rules
- The public can access your findings
- Your research can influence policy
Arguments you are using

- Facts and figures?
- Social good agenda?
- Appealing to the ego
- Money/costs of publishing?

- Where do you get the information to back these claims?
It’s all about reproducibility

• The ‘for the greater good’ argument won’t necessarily wash

• If people haven’t seen this they don’t believe you

• Useful video: “Scientific Ecosystems and Research Reproducibility” – Marcus Munafo, University of Bristol, RLUK 2016 (36 mins) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TD2cUYVci28
Practise your argument

• Most objections are predictable and you can be ready

• Taxpayer argument
• Moral/Educational argument
• Labour argument
• Technological argument
• Economic/Impact argument
• Library-Economics argument
• Epistemological argument
• Media argument

https://www.martineve.com/2016/11/04/arguments-counter-arguments-and-political-alignments-for-and-against-open-access/
Strategies for engaging senior leadership

• Refer to doomsday scenarios and risks to reputations
• Provide high profile cases of fraudulent research
• Ask senior researchers to self-reflect and ask them to imagine a situation of being asked for supporting research data for their publication
• Refer to the institutional mission statement / value statement
• Collect horror stories of poor data management practice from your research community
• Know and use your networks – know who your potential allies are and how they can help you
• Work together with funders to shape new RDM policies

https://unlockingresearch.blog.lib.cam.ac.uk/?p=1435
Hopefully it won’t come to this

Mancheester cancer hospital fire 'may have destroyed vital research'

Cancer Research UK institute likely to have lost millions of pounds of life-saving equipment in blaze, says its director.

Years of research and millions of pounds of life-saving equipment are feared to have been destroyed in a devastating fire at a cancer hospital in Manchester, its director has said.

Prof Richard Marais, the head of the Cancer Research UK Manchester Institute, said researchers had been able to save 25 years of clinical samples, but that other vital work was lost in the “heartrending” blaze at Christie hospital.

“We’ve lost hundreds of thousands of pounds of vital reagents. We’ve probably lost a lot of small lab equipment, the small pieces where the ceiling collapsed at landed on them,” he said on Friday.

“We’re almost certainly lost data where computers have been ruined. We’re going to go in and salvage as much of that as possible.”

An investigation has been launched into cause of the fire, which started in the

https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/apr/28/manchester-christie-cancer-hospital-fire-research-equipment-destroyed
Take home message

• It is a case of horses for courses
  – Who is your audience
  – What is their motivation
  – Which arguments are likely to stick?

• Useful resources in this:
  – "Building an open, information rich institution"
    five day workshop
    FORCE11 Scholarly Communication Institute, San
    Diego, USA 31 July - 4 August 2017
    Shared Google Drive- https://goo.gl/Zb2zUy
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