

FSD2268

**Open Access to and Reuse of Research
Data 2006**

Codebook



FINNISH SOCIAL SCIENCE DATA ARCHIVE

The bibliographic citation for this codebook:

Open Access to and Reuse of Research Data 2006 [codebook]. Finnish Social Science Data Archive [producer and distributor], 2018.

This codebook has been generated from the version 1.0 (30.7.2007) of the data.

Finnish Social Science Data Archive
FIN-33014 University of Tampere

FSD User Services:
asiakaspalvelu.fsd@uta.fi
+358 40 190 1442

Aila Data Service Portal:
<https://services.fsd.uta.fi/>

Finnish Social Science Data Archive
<http://www.fsd.uta.fi/en/>

To the reader

This codebook is part of the data FSD2268 archived at the FSD (Finnish Social Science Data Archive). The dataset has been described in as much detail as possible in Finnish and English. Variable frequencies, variable and value labels, and missing values have been checked. If necessary, the data have been anonymised. The data and its creators shall be cited in all publications and presentations for which the data have been used. The bibliographic citation may be in the form suggested by the archive or in the form required by the publication. The bibliographic citation suggested by the archive:

Borg, Sami (University of Tampere) & Kuula, Arja (University of Tampere): Open Access to and Reuse of Research Data 2006 [dataset]. Version 1.0 (2007-07-30). Finnish Social Science Data Archive [distributor]. <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:fsd:T-FSD2268>

The user shall notify the archive of all publications where she or he has used the data. The original data creators and the archive bear no responsibility for any results or interpretations arising from the reuse of the data.

The codebook contains information on data content, structure and data collection, and includes a list of publications wholly or in part based on the data, according to publication information received by the FSD. The second part of the codebook contains information on variables: question texts, response options, and frequencies. The third part contains indexes.

Variable distributions presented in this codebook have been generated from the SPSS files. Distribution tables present variable values, frequencies (n), frequency percentages (%), and valid percentages (v. %) which take into account missing data. All distributions are unweighted. If the data contain weight variables, these will be found at the end of the variables list. In some cases frequency distributions have been substituted by descriptive statistics. Categorised responses to open-ended questions are not always included in the codebook. Distributions may contain missing data. The note "System missing (SYSMIS)" refers to missing observations (e.g. a respondent has not answered all questions) whereas "Missing (User missing)" refers to data the user has defined as missing. For example, the user may decide to code answer alternatives 'don't want to say' or 'can't say' as missing data.

The codebook may contain attached files, the most common one being the questionnaire.

Contents

- 1 Study description** **1**
 - 1.1 Titles 1
 - 1.2 Subject description 1
 - 1.3 Structure and collection of the data 3
 - 1.4 Use of data 4

- 2 Variables** **5**

- 3 Indexes** **49**
 - 3.1 Variables in the order of occurrence 49
 - 3.2 Variables in alphabetical order 55

Chapter 1

Study description

1.1 Titles

Titles and data version: Open Access to and Reuse of Research Data 2006

Titles and data version in Finnish: Tutkimusaineistojen säilytys ja avoin saatavuus 2006

This codebook has been generated from the version 1.0 (30.7.2007) of the data.

1.2 Subject description

Other material

Background information: a Finnish summary of OECD's recommendation "Principles and Guidelines for Access to Digital Research Data from Public Funding"

Authoring entity

Borg, Sami (University of Tampere. Finnish Social Science Data Archive)

Kuula, Arja (University of Tampere. Finnish Social Science Data Archive)

Copyright statement for the data

According to the agreement between FSD and the depositor.

Depositor

Kuula, Arja (Finnish Social Science Data Archive)

Date of deposit

7.6.2007

Keywords

advantages; computer science; data; data archives; digital archiving; disadvantages; ethics of science; financing; OECD; open access; recommendations; research; research centres; scientific cooperation; use

Topic Classification

Fields of Science Classification: social sciences

CESSDA Classification: information society (including Internet use); information technology

Series description

The data belong to the series:

Individual datasets

Individual datasets that do not belong to any series.

Abstract

The aim of this survey was to chart how the universities in Finland have organised the depositing of digital research data and to what extent the data are reused by the scientific community after the original research has been completed. The respondents were professors of human sciences, social sciences and behavioural sciences in Finnish universities, and representatives of some research institutes. Opinions were also queried on the OECD guidelines and principles on open access to research data from public funding.

First, the respondents were asked whether there were any guidelines or regulations concerning the depositing of digital research data in their departments, what happened to research data after the completion of the original research, and to what extent the data were reused. Further questions covered how often the data from completed research projects were reused in secondary research projects or for theses. The respondents also estimated what proportion of the data collected in their departments/institutes were reusable at the time of the survey, and why research data were not being reused in their own field of research. Views were also investigated on whether confidentiality or research ethics issues, or problems related to copyright or information technology formed barriers to data reuse.

Opinions on the OECD Open Access guidelines on research data were queried. The respondents were asked whether they had earlier knowledge of the guidelines, and to what extent its principles could be implemented in their own disciplines. Some questions pertained to the advantages

and disadvantages of open access to research data. The advantages mentioned included reducing duplicate data collection and more effective use of data resources, whereas the disadvantages mentioned included, for example, risks connected to data protection and misuse of data. The respondents also suggested ways of implementing the Open Access guidelines and gave their opinions on how binding the recommendations should be, to what extent various bodies should be involved in formulating the guidelines, and how the archiving and dissemination of digital research data should be organised. Finally, the respondents estimated how the researchers in their field would react to enhancing open access to research data, and also gave their opinion on open access to the data they themselves have collected.

Background variables included the respondent's gender, university, and research field.

1.3 Structure and collection of the data

Country: Finland

Geographic coverage: Finland

Analysis or observation unit type: Individual, Organization

Universe: Professors of human sciences, social sciences, and behavioural sciences in Finnish universities

Collection date: 9.11.2006 – 5.12.2006

Data collector(s): University of Tampere. Finnish Social Science Data Archive

Data producer(s): Finnish Social Science Data Archive; Ministry of Education

Mode of data collection: Self-administered questionnaire: Web-based (CAWI)

Type of research instrument: Structured questionnaire

Time period covered: 2006

Time method of the data collection: Cross-section

Response rate: 28.4%

Number of variables and cases: The data contain 86 variables and 150 cases.

Sampling procedure: Total universe/Complete enumeration

The professors' email addresses were collected from their departments' web pages.

The web survey was conducted on the 9th of November 2006 using automatic mailing. The server sent a personal message to each respondent. A reminder was sent on the 28th of November. 150 of the total of 528 professors responded.

80% of the responders were professors in the universities of Helsinki, Jyväskylä, Tampere, and Turku.

1.4 Use of data

Related publications

Borg, Sami & Kuula, Arja (2007). Julkisrahoitteisen tutkimusdatan avoin saatavuus ja elinkaari. Valmisteluraportti OECD:n datasuosituksen toimeenpanomahdollisuuksista Suomessa [verkkodokumentti]. Tampere: Yhteiskuntatieteellinen tietoarkisto. Yhteiskuntatieteellisen tietoarkiston julkaisuja; 6. http://www.fsd.uta.fi/julkaisut/julkaisusarja/FSDjs06_OECD.pdf [viitattu 7.9.2007]

Updated list of publications in the study description at

https://services.fsd.uta.fi/catalogue/FSD2268?lang=en&study_language=en

[Käytän ja kuvailun oheismateriaalit]

Borg, Sami & Kuula, Arja (2007). Julkisrahoitteisen tutkimusdatan avoin saatavuus ja elinkaari. Valmisteluraportti OECD:n datasuosituksen toimeenpanomahdollisuuksista Suomessa. Tampere: Yhteiskuntatieteellinen tietoarkisto. Yhteiskuntatieteellisen tietoarkiston julkaisuja; 4.

Location of the data collection

Finnish Social Science Data Archive

Weighting

There are no weight variables in the data.

Restrictions

The dataset is (B) available for research, teaching and study.

Chapter 2

Variables

[FSD_NO] FSD study number

Question

FSD study number

Descriptive statistics

statistic	value
number of valid cases	150
minimum	2268.00
maximum	2268.00
mean	2268.00
standard deviation	0.00

[FSD_VR] FSD edition number

Question

FSD edition number

Descriptive statistics

statistic	value
number of valid cases	150
minimum	1.00
maximum	1.00
mean	1.00
standard deviation	0.00

[FSD_PRO] FSD processing level

Question

FSD processing level

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
A (see codebook)	1	150	100.0	100.0
B (see codebook)	2	0	0.0	0.0
C (dataset has not been checked at FSD)	3	0	0.0	0.0
		150	100.0	100.0

[FSD_ID] FSD case id

Question

FSD case id

Descriptive statistics

statistic	value
number of valid cases	150
minimum	1.00
maximum	150.00
mean	75.50
standard deviation	43.45

[ID] Original case id

Question

Original case id

Descriptive statistics

statistic	value
number of valid cases	150
minimum	4.00
maximum	153.00

(continued on next page)

(cont. from previous page)

statistic	value
mean	78.50
standard deviation	43.45

[Q1] Respondent's university

Question

Respondent's university

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Åbo Akademi University	1	4	2.7	2.7
University of Helsinki	2	37	24.7	25.0
University of Joensuu	3	11	7.3	7.4
University of Jyväskylä	4	30	20.0	20.3
University of Kuopio	5	5	3.3	3.4
University of Lapland	6	1	0.7	0.7
University of Oulu	7	10	6.7	6.8
University of Tampere	8	28	18.7	18.9
University of Turku	9	21	14.0	14.2
University of Vaasa	10	1	0.7	0.7
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	2	1.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q2] Respondent's gender

Question

Respondent's gender

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Female	1	58	38.7	39.2
Male	2	90	60.0	60.8
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	2	1.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q3] Research field the respondent represents**Question***Research field the respondent represents***Frequencies**

label	value	n	%	v. %
Economics	1	3	2.0	2.0
Business administration, economic geography	2	0	0.0	0.0
Law	3	0	0.0	0.0
Social services	4	22	14.7	14.9
Psychology	5	15	10.0	10.1
Education	6	20	13.3	13.5
Political science, public administration	7	10	6.7	6.8
Communication, information sciences	8	3	2.0	2.0
Statistics	9	0	0.0	0.0
Philosophy	10	1	0.7	0.7
Languages	11	39	26.0	26.4
Arts, literature	12	11	7.3	7.4
Theology	13	0	0.0	0.0
History, archaeology	14	8	5.3	5.4
Cultural studies	15	7	4.7	4.7
Other field	16	9	6.0	6.1
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	2	1.3	—
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q4] Does your department have any guidelines or regulations on the preservation of digital research data?**Question***Does your department have any guidelines or regulations on the preservation of digital research data?***Frequencies**

label	value	n	%	v. %
Yes	1	15	10.0	10.2
No	2	132	88.0	89.8
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	3	2.0	—
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q5_1] How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected remain in the hands of the original researcher(s)

Question

How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected remain in the hands of the original researcher(s)

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very common	1	84	56.0	59.2
Reasonably common	2	37	24.7	26.1
Not very common	3	10	6.7	7.0
Not at all common	4	6	4.0	4.2
Can't say	5	5	3.3	3.5
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	8	5.3	—
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q5_2] How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are deposited in the department/institute, without further processing or documentation

Question

How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are deposited in the department/institute, without further processing or documentation

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very common	1	14	9.3	10.5
Reasonably common	2	24	16.0	18.0
Not very common	3	27	18.0	20.3
Not at all common	4	52	34.7	39.1
Can't say	5	16	10.7	12.0
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	17	11.3	—
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q5_3] How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are archived in the department/institution and described in a catalogue/database

Question

How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are archived in the department/institution and described in a catalogue/database

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very common	1	7	4.7	5.2
Reasonably common	2	11	7.3	8.1
Not very common	3	25	16.7	18.5
Not at all common	4	75	50.0	55.6
Can't say	5	17	11.3	12.6
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	15	10.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q5_4] How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are archived at the university archive

Question

How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are archived at the university archive

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very common	1	3	2.0	2.3
Reasonably common	2	4	2.7	3.0
Not very common	3	14	9.3	10.6
Not at all common	4	93	62.0	70.5
Can't say	5	18	12.0	13.6
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	18	12.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q5_5] How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are archived at a data archive

Question

How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are archived at a data archive

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very common	1	6	4.0	4.5
Reasonably common	2	10	6.7	7.5
Not very common	3	19	12.7	14.2
Not at all common	4	80	53.3	59.7
Can't say	5	19	12.7	14.2
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	16	10.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q5_6] How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are destroyed

Question

How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are destroyed

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very common	1	2	1.3	1.5
Reasonably common	2	24	16.0	18.2
Not very common	3	14	9.3	10.6
Not at all common	4	54	36.0	40.9
Can't say	5	38	25.3	28.8
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	18	12.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q5_7] How common a practice in your department/institute? No digital data collected for our research (e.g. theoretical studies or studies using statistical or already existing data)

Question

How common a practice in your department/institute? No digital data collected for our research (e.g. theoretical studies or studies using statistical or already existing data)

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very common	1	5	3.3	4.4
Reasonably common	2	15	10.0	13.3
Not very common	3	21	14.0	18.6
Not at all common	4	58	38.7	51.3
Can't say	5	14	9.3	12.4
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	37	24.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q6_1] Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the original researchers themselves use the data for further research

Question

Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the original researchers themselves use the data for further research

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very true	1	61	40.7	43.3
More or less true	2	71	47.3	50.4
Not very true	3	9	6.0	6.4
Not true at all	4	0	0.0	0.0
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	9	6.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q6_2] Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data are submitted, if requested, to other researchers studying a similar subject

Question

Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data are submitted, if requested, to other researchers studying a similar subject

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very true	1	14	9.3	10.1
More or less true	2	61	40.7	44.2
Not very true	3	56	37.3	40.6
Not true at all	4	7	4.7	5.1
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	12	8.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q6_3] Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, students can use the data for their theses

Question

Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, students can use the data for their theses

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very true	1	18	12.0	12.8
More or less true	2	61	40.7	43.3
Not very true	3	53	35.3	37.6
Not true at all	4	9	6.0	6.4
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	9	6.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q6_4] Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data are rarely, if ever, reused

Question

Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data are rarely, if ever, reused

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very true	1	8	5.3	5.7
More or less true	2	56	37.3	40.0
Not very true	3	63	42.0	45.0
Not true at all	4	13	8.7	9.3
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	10	6.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q6_5] Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data may be used in other ways

Question

Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data may be used in other ways

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very true	1	6	4.0	5.6
More or less true	2	10	6.7	9.3
Not very true	3	41	27.3	38.3
Not true at all	4	50	33.3	46.7
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	43	28.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q7_1] After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For doctoral theses?

Question

After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For doctoral theses?

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very frequently	1	9	6.0	6.3
Fairly frequently	2	25	16.7	17.5

(continued on next page)

(cont. from previous page)

label	value	n	%	v. %
Not very frequently	3	57	38.0	39.9
Not at all frequently	4	39	26.0	27.3
Can't say	5	13	8.7	9.1
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	7	4.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q7_2] After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For other research?

Question

After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For other research?

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very frequently	1	10	6.7	7.0
Fairly frequently	2	32	21.3	22.5
Not very frequently	3	59	39.3	41.5
Not at all frequently	4	28	18.7	19.7
Can't say	5	13	8.7	9.2
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	8	5.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q7_3] After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For Bachelor's or Master's theses?

Question

After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For Bachelor's or Master's theses?

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very frequently	1	8	5.3	5.6
Fairly frequently	2	31	20.7	21.7

(continued on next page)

2. Variables

(cont. from previous page)

label	value	n	%	v. %
Not very frequently	3	55	36.7	38.5
Not at all frequently	4	36	24.0	25.2
Can't say	5	13	8.7	9.1
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	7	4.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q7_4] After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For teaching?

Question

After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For teaching?

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very frequently	1	12	8.0	8.5
Fairly frequently	2	41	27.3	28.9
Not very frequently	3	58	38.7	40.8
Not at all frequently	4	18	12.0	12.7
Can't say	5	13	8.7	9.2
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	8	5.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q8] As regards digital data that have been collected in the department/institute for research which is completed, estimate the proportion of data that are reusable

Question

As regards digital data that have been collected in the department/institute for research which is completed, estimate the proportion of data that are reusable

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Over 75% of the data are reusable	1	8	5.3	6.0
51 - 75% of the data are reusable	2	20	13.3	14.9

(continued on next page)

(cont. from previous page)

label	value	n	%	v. %
25 - 50% of the data are reusable	3	21	14.0	15.7
Under 25% of the data are reusable	4	45	30.0	33.6
Can't say	5	40	26.7	29.9
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	16	10.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q9_1] How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Subject matter not relevant for current studies

Question

How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Subject matter not relevant for current studies

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very important reason	1	20	13.3	14.7
Fairly important reason	2	38	25.3	27.9
Not very important reason	3	37	24.7	27.2
Not at all important reason	4	28	18.7	20.6
Can't say	5	13	8.7	9.6
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	14	9.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q9_2] How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Confidentiality and data protection issues (information given to participants on data use, identifiers in the data)

Question

How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Confidentiality and data protection issues (information given to participants on data use, identifiers in the data)

Frequencies

2. Variables

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very important reason	1	28	18.7	20.1
Fairly important reason	2	32	21.3	23.0
Not very important reason	3	33	22.0	23.7
Not at all important reason	4	28	18.7	20.1
Can't say	5	18	12.0	12.9
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	11	7.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q9_3] How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Other legal issues (e.g. intellectual property rights)

Question

How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Other legal issues (e.g. intellectual property rights)

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very important reason	1	13	8.7	9.6
Fairly important reason	2	28	18.7	20.6
Not very important reason	3	34	22.7	25.0
Not at all important reason	4	43	28.7	31.6
Can't say	5	18	12.0	13.2
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	14	9.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q9_4] How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: At the time of data collection, no agreements were made on copyright

Question

How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: At the time of data collection, no agreements were made on copyright

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very important reason	1	24	16.0	17.4

(continued on next page)

(cont. from previous page)

label	value	n	%	v. %
Fairly important reason	2	42	28.0	30.4
Not very important reason	3	29	19.3	21.0
Not at all important reason	4	26	17.3	18.8
Can't say	5	17	11.3	12.3
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	12	8.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q9_5] How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: IT issues (e.g. obsolete formats, damaged data)

Question

How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: IT issues (e.g. obsolete formats, damaged data)

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very important reason	1	7	4.7	5.1
Fairly important reason	2	46	30.7	33.3
Not very important reason	3	38	25.3	27.5
Not at all important reason	4	27	18.0	19.6
Can't say	5	20	13.3	14.5
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	12	8.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q9_6] How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Concerns about the usability of data (insufficient documentation of data and data files)

Question

How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Concerns about the usability of data (insufficient documentation of data and data files)

Frequencies

2. Variables

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very important reason	1	18	12.0	13.0
Fairly important reason	2	56	37.3	40.6
Not very important reason	3	29	19.3	21.0
Not at all important reason	4	17	11.3	12.3
Can't say	5	18	12.0	13.0
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	12	8.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q9_7] How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Concerns related to research ethics

Question

How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Concerns related to research ethics

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very important reason	1	11	7.3	8.3
Fairly important reason	2	20	13.3	15.2
Not very important reason	3	26	17.3	19.7
Not at all important reason	4	46	30.7	34.8
Can't say	5	29	19.3	22.0
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	18	12.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q9_8] How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Other reason

Question

How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Other reason

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very important reason	1	7	4.7	15.6
Fairly important reason	2	3	2.0	6.7
Not very important reason	3	3	2.0	6.7

(continued on next page)

(cont. from previous page)

label	value	n	%	v. %
Not at all important reason	4	4	2.7	8.9
Can't say	5	28	18.7	62.2
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	105	70.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q10] Is this survey the first time you receive information on the OECD guidelines on open access to research data?

Question

Is this survey the first time you receive information on the OECD guidelines on open access to research data?

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Yes	1	117	78.0	80.7
No	2	28	18.7	19.3
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	5	3.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q11] In your opinion, to what extend can the OECD guidelines be implemented in your own research field?

Question

In your opinion, to what extend can the OECD guidelines be implemented in your own research field?

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Can be implemented fully or nearly so	1	21	14.0	15.3
Can be implemented for the most part	2	79	52.7	57.7
Can be implemented only partly	3	25	16.7	18.2
Can be implemented only in small part or not at all	4	12	8.0	8.8
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	13	8.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q12_1] Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Reducing duplicate data collection efforts

Question

Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Reducing duplicate data collection efforts

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant benefit	1	52	34.7	36.4
Fairly significant benefit	2	55	36.7	38.5
Neither significant nor insignificant benefit	3	23	15.3	16.1
Fairly insignificant benefit	4	11	7.3	7.7
Very insignificant benefit or no benefit at all	5	2	1.3	1.4
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	7	4.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q12_2] Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Financial benefits gained through more effective use of data resources

Question

Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Financial benefits gained through more effective use of data resources

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant benefit	1	44	29.3	31.0
Fairly significant benefit	2	61	40.7	43.0
Neither significant nor insignificant benefit	3	22	14.7	15.5
Fairly insignificant benefit	4	13	8.7	9.2
Very insignificant benefit or no benefit at all	5	2	1.3	1.4
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	8	5.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q12_3] Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Increasing communication and co-operation within the scientific community

Question

Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Increasing communication and co-operation within the scientific community

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant benefit	1	47	31.3	33.1
Fairly significant benefit	2	64	42.7	45.1
Neither significant nor insignificant benefit	3	24	16.0	16.9
Fairly insignificant benefit	4	4	2.7	2.8
Very insignificant benefit or no benefit at all	5	3	2.0	2.1
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	8	5.3	—
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q12_4] Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Enabling scrutiny (and repeatability) of research results

Question

Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Enabling scrutiny (and repeatability) of research results

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant benefit	1	36	24.0	25.4
Fairly significant benefit	2	66	44.0	46.5
Neither significant nor insignificant benefit	3	28	18.7	19.7
Fairly insignificant benefit	4	9	6.0	6.3
Very insignificant benefit or no benefit at all	5	3	2.0	2.1
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	8	5.3	—
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q12_5] Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Improving the quality of research

Question

Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Improving the quality of research

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant benefit	1	31	20.7	21.7
Fairly significant benefit	2	52	34.7	36.4
Neither significant nor insignificant benefit	3	35	23.3	24.5
Fairly insignificant benefit	4	20	13.3	14.0
Very insignificant benefit or no benefit at all	5	5	3.3	3.5
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	7	4.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q12_6] Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Improving the quality of teaching

Question

Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Improving the quality of teaching

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant benefit	1	19	12.7	13.5
Fairly significant benefit	2	54	36.0	38.3
Neither significant nor insignificant benefit	3	46	30.7	32.6
Fairly insignificant benefit	4	13	8.7	9.2
Very insignificant benefit or no benefit at all	5	9	6.0	6.4
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	9	6.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q12_7] Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Diversity of research designs and questions (e.g. comparison over time) which the use of archived data allow

Question

Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Diversity of research designs and questions (e.g. comparison over time) which the use of archived data allow

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant benefit	1	52	34.7	37.1
Fairly significant benefit	2	63	42.0	45.0
Neither significant nor insignificant benefit	3	13	8.7	9.3
Fairly insignificant benefit	4	10	6.7	7.1
Very insignificant benefit or no benefit at all	5	2	1.3	1.4
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	10	6.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q12_8] Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: More equal access to data for different groups

Question

Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: More equal access to data for different groups

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant benefit	1	47	31.3	33.3
Fairly significant benefit	2	51	34.0	36.2
Neither significant nor insignificant benefit	3	30	20.0	21.3
Fairly insignificant benefit	4	7	4.7	5.0
Very insignificant benefit or no benefit at all	5	6	4.0	4.3
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	9	6.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q12_9] Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Other benefit

Question

Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Other benefit

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant benefit	1	7	4.7	18.4
Fairly significant benefit	2	2	1.3	5.3
Neither significant nor insignificant benefit	3	11	7.3	28.9
Fairly insignificant benefit	4	2	1.3	5.3
Very insignificant benefit or no benefit at all	5	16	10.7	42.1
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	112	74.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q13_1] Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Concerns about inadvertent misuse of data, and consequent mistakes

Question

Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Concerns about inadvertent misuse of data, and consequent mistakes

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant barrier	1	14	9.3	9.9
Fairly significant barrier	2	51	34.0	35.9
Neither significant nor insignificant barrier	3	42	28.0	29.6
Fairly insignificant barrier	4	24	16.0	16.9
Very insignificant barrier or no barrier at all	5	11	7.3	7.7
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	8	5.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q13_2] Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Resources needed by researchers to document and process their data for reuse

Question

Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Resources needed by researchers to document and process their data for reuse

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant barrier	1	24	16.0	17.0
Fairly significant barrier	2	51	34.0	36.2
Neither significant nor insignificant barrier	3	38	25.3	27.0
Fairly insignificant barrier	4	19	12.7	13.5
Very insignificant barrier or no barrier at all	5	9	6.0	6.4
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	9	6.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q13_3] Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Resources needed by researchers to give advice on the reuse of their data

Question

Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Resources needed by researchers to give advice on the reuse of their data

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant barrier	1	15	10.0	10.6
Fairly significant barrier	2	59	39.3	41.8
Neither significant nor insignificant barrier	3	36	24.0	25.5
Fairly insignificant barrier	4	24	16.0	17.0
Very insignificant barrier or no barrier at all	5	7	4.7	5.0
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	9	6.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q13_4] Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Data sharing increases the risks related to data protection, confidentiality and research ethics issues

Question

Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Data sharing increases the risks related to data protection, confidentiality and research ethics issues

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant barrier	1	24	16.0	17.1
Fairly significant barrier	2	43	28.7	30.7
Neither significant nor insignificant barrier	3	36	24.0	25.7
Fairly insignificant barrier	4	26	17.3	18.6
Very insignificant barrier or no barrier at all	5	11	7.3	7.9
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	10	6.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q13_5] Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Loss of competitive advantage as the researcher allows others to use the data he/she has collected

Question

Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Loss of competitive advantage as the researcher allows others to use the data he/she has collected

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant barrier	1	9	6.0	6.4
Fairly significant barrier	2	26	17.3	18.6
Neither significant nor insignificant barrier	3	41	27.3	29.3
Fairly insignificant barrier	4	33	22.0	23.6
Very insignificant barrier or no barrier at all	5	31	20.7	22.1
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	10	6.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q13_6] Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Research participants/respondents were not informed that the data collected from them would be archived for the use of the scientific community

Question

Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Research participants/respondents were not informed that the data collected from them would be archived for the use of the scientific community

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant barrier	1	49	32.7	35.0
Fairly significant barrier	2	44	29.3	31.4
Neither significant nor insignificant barrier	3	18	12.0	12.9
Fairly insignificant barrier	4	17	11.3	12.1
Very insignificant barrier or no barrier at all	5	12	8.0	8.6
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	10	6.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q13_7] Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Other barrier

Question

Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Other barrier

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very significant barrier	1	1	0.7	3.6
Fairly significant barrier	2	2	1.3	7.1
Neither significant nor insignificant barrier	3	9	6.0	32.1
Fairly insignificant barrier	4	1	0.7	3.6
Very insignificant barrier or no barrier at all	5	15	10.0	53.6
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	122	81.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q14_1] How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by each university separately

Question

How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by each university separately

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good means	1	17	11.3	12.1
Fairly good means	2	50	33.3	35.7
Neither good nor bad means	3	41	27.3	29.3
Fairly bad means	4	28	18.7	20.0
Very bad means	5	4	2.7	2.9
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	10	6.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q14_2] How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by the Finnish universities together

Question

How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by the Finnish universities together

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good means	1	59	39.3	42.1
Fairly good means	2	59	39.3	42.1
Neither good nor bad means	3	15	10.0	10.7
Fairly bad means	4	7	4.7	5.0
Very bad means	5	0	0.0	0.0
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	10	6.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q14_3] How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by research funders

Question

How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by research funders

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good means	1	22	14.7	15.7
Fairly good means	2	52	34.7	37.1
Neither good nor bad means	3	36	24.0	25.7
Fairly bad means	4	25	16.7	17.9
Very bad means	5	5	3.3	3.6
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	10	6.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q14_4] How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Research grants include funds for preparing the data for sharing and archiving

Question

How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Research grants include funds for preparing the data for sharing and archiving

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good means	1	62	41.3	44.6
Fairly good means	2	50	33.3	36.0
Neither good nor bad means	3	18	12.0	12.9
Fairly bad means	4	8	5.3	5.8
Very bad means	5	1	0.7	0.7
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	11	7.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q14_5] How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by the National Advisory Board on Research Ethics

Question

How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by the National Advisory Board on Research Ethics

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good means	1	41	27.3	29.5
Fairly good means	2	61	40.7	43.9
Neither good nor bad means	3	26	17.3	18.7
Fairly bad means	4	10	6.7	7.2
Very bad means	5	1	0.7	0.7
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	11	7.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q14_6] How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Universities incorporate open access principles in undergraduate and graduate education

Question

How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Universities incorporate open access principles in undergraduate and graduate education

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good means	1	43	28.7	30.7
Fairly good means	2	57	38.0	40.7
Neither good nor bad means	3	35	23.3	25.0
Fairly bad means	4	5	3.3	3.6
Very bad means	5	0	0.0	0.0
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	10	6.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q14_7] How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Increasing teaching and learning materials on research data ethics and confidentiality issues

Question

How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Increasing teaching and learning materials on research data ethics and confidentiality issues

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good means	1	32	21.3	23.2
Fairly good means	2	65	43.3	47.1
Neither good nor bad means	3	32	21.3	23.2
Fairly bad means	4	9	6.0	6.5
Very bad means	5	0	0.0	0.0
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	12	8.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q14_8] How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Increasing teaching and learning materials on digital data life cycle issues

Question

How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Increasing teaching and learning materials on digital data life cycle issues

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good means	1	30	20.0	21.6
Fairly good means	2	68	45.3	48.9
Neither good nor bad means	3	37	24.7	26.6
Fairly bad means	4	4	2.7	2.9
Very bad means	5	0	0.0	0.0
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	11	7.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q14_9] How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Archiving data for the use of the scientific community is acknowledged to be scientific merit

Question

How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Archiving data for the use of the scientific community is acknowledged to be scientific merit

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good means	1	45	30.0	32.8
Fairly good means	2	52	34.7	38.0
Neither good nor bad means	3	25	16.7	18.2
Fairly bad means	4	14	9.3	10.2
Very bad means	5	1	0.7	0.7
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	13	8.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q14_10] How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Other means

Question

How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Other means

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good means	1	5	3.3	18.5
Fairly good means	2	1	0.7	3.7
Neither good nor bad means	3	13	8.7	48.1
Fairly bad means	4	0	0.0	0.0
Very bad means	5	8	5.3	29.6
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	123	82.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q15] How binding should the guidelines on open access to data be? An example: a dataset collected with public funding, without confidentiality or copyright problems, and not actively used by the research group 5 years from the collection.

Question

How binding should the guidelines on open access to data be? An example: a dataset collected with public funding, without confidentiality or copyright problems, and not actively used by the research group 5 years from the collection.

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Researchers should be obliged to allow access to the data	1	29	19.3	20.9
Researchers should be advised to allow access to the data	2	104	69.3	74.8
Researchers should not be put under any obligations	3	6	4.0	4.3
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	11	7.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_1] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Academy of Finland

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Academy of Finland

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	92	61.3	65.7
To a fairly large extent	2	37	24.7	26.4
To a small extent	3	8	5.3	5.7
Not at all	4	3	2.0	2.1
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	10	6.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_2] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Tekes (Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation)

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Tekes (Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation)

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	60	40.0	45.1
To a fairly large extent	2	44	29.3	33.1
To a small extent	3	18	12.0	13.5
Not at all	4	11	7.3	8.3
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	17	11.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_3] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: National Archives Service

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: National Archives Service

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	67	44.7	48.9
To a fairly large extent	2	47	31.3	34.3
To a small extent	3	20	13.3	14.6
Not at all	4	3	2.0	2.2
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	13	8.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_4] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: National Advisory Board on Research Ethics

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: National Advisory Board on Research Ethics

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	70	46.7	51.5
To a fairly large extent	2	48	32.0	35.3
To a small extent	3	15	10.0	11.0
Not at all	4	3	2.0	2.2
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	14	9.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_5] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Ministry of Education

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Ministry of Education

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	35	23.3	25.5
To a fairly large extent	2	44	29.3	32.1
To a small extent	3	41	27.3	29.9
Not at all	4	17	11.3	12.4
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	13	8.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_6] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Other ministries

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Other ministries

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	7	4.7	5.2
To a fairly large extent	2	21	14.0	15.7
To a small extent	3	71	47.3	53.0
Not at all	4	35	23.3	26.1
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	16	10.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_7] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Finnish Council of University Rectors

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Finnish Council of University Rectors

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	18	12.0	13.4
To a fairly large extent	2	45	30.0	33.6
To a small extent	3	52	34.7	38.8
Not at all	4	19	12.7	14.2
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	16	10.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_8] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Individual universities

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Individual universities

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	40	26.7	29.2
To a fairly large extent	2	57	38.0	41.6
To a small extent	3	31	20.7	22.6
Not at all	4	9	6.0	6.6
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	13	8.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_9] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Science and Technology Policy Council of Finland

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Science and Technology Policy Council of Finland

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	21	14.0	15.7
To a fairly large extent	2	65	43.3	48.5
To a small extent	3	34	22.7	25.4
Not at all	4	14	9.3	10.4
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	16	10.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_10] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Research societies and associations

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Research societies and associations

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	23	15.3	16.8
To a fairly large extent	2	55	36.7	40.1
To a small extent	3	42	28.0	30.7
Not at all	4	17	11.3	12.4
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	13	8.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_11] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Statistics Finland

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Statistics Finland

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	40	26.7	29.2
To a fairly large extent	2	42	28.0	30.7
To a small extent	3	36	24.0	26.3
Not at all	4	19	12.7	13.9
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	13	8.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_12] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Sector research institutes

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Sector research institutes

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	21	14.0	15.9
To a fairly large extent	2	46	30.7	34.8
To a small extent	3	47	31.3	35.6
Not at all	4	18	12.0	13.6
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	18	12.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_13] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Other research institutes

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Other research institutes

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	15	10.0	11.5
To a fairly large extent	2	49	32.7	37.4
To a small extent	3	50	33.3	38.2
Not at all	4	17	11.3	13.0
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	19	12.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q16_14] To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Other bodies

Question

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Other bodies

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
To a large extent	1	6	4.0	23.1
To a fairly large extent	2	2	1.3	7.7
To a small extent	3	2	1.3	7.7
Not at all	4	16	10.7	61.5
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	124	82.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q17_1] Specify three bodies which you would consider as the most important for drawing up the guidelines: The most important

Question

Specify three bodies which you would consider as the most important for drawing up the guidelines: The most important

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Academy of Finland	1	61	40.7	45.2
Tekes (Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation)	2	1	0.7	0.7
National Archives Service	3	10	6.7	7.4
National Advisory Board on Research Ethics	4	14	9.3	10.4
Ministry of Education	5	13	8.7	9.6
Other ministries	6	0	0.0	0.0
Finnish Council of University Rectors	7	1	0.7	0.7
Individual universities	8	21	14.0	15.6
Science and Technology Policy Council of Finland	9	1	0.7	0.7
Research associations and societies	10	3	2.0	2.2
Statistics Finland	11	6	4.0	4.4

(continued on next page)

(cont. from previous page)

label	value	n	%	v. %
Sector research institutes	12	1	0.7	0.7
Other research institutes	13	0	0.0	0.0
Other body	14	3	2.0	2.2
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	15	10.0	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q17_2] Specify three bodies which you would consider as the most important for drawing up the guidelines: The second most important

Question

Specify three bodies which you would consider as the most important for drawing up the guidelines: The second most important

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Academy of Finland	1	31	20.7	23.1
Tekes (Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation)	2	14	9.3	10.4
National Archives Service	3	15	10.0	11.2
National Advisory Board on Research Ethics	4	24	16.0	17.9
Ministry of Education	5	13	8.7	9.7
Other ministries	6	0	0.0	0.0
Finnish Council of University Rectors	7	6	4.0	4.5
Individual universities	8	16	10.7	11.9
Science and Technology Policy Council of Finland	9	3	2.0	2.2
Research associations and societies	10	6	4.0	4.5
Statistics Finland	11	4	2.7	3.0
Sector research institutes	12	1	0.7	0.7
Other research institutes	13	0	0.0	0.0
Other body	14	1	0.7	0.7
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	16	10.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q17_3] Specify three bodies which you would consider as the most important for drawing up the guidelines: The third most important

Question

Specify three bodies which you would consider as the most important for drawing up the guidelines: The third most important

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Academy of Finland	1	10	6.7	7.5
Tekes (Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation)	2	17	11.3	12.8
National Archives Service	3	17	11.3	12.8
National Advisory Board on Research Ethics	4	24	16.0	18.0
Ministry of Education	5	13	8.7	9.8
Other ministries	6	1	0.7	0.8
Finnish Council of University Rectors	7	6	4.0	4.5
Individual universities	8	21	14.0	15.8
Science and Technology Policy Council of Finland	9	5	3.3	3.8
Research associations and societies	10	9	6.0	6.8
Statistics Finland	11	7	4.7	5.3
Sector research institutes	12	1	0.7	0.8
Other research institutes	13	1	0.7	0.8
Other body	14	1	0.7	0.8
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	17	11.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q18_1] The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: National data archives for different disciplines handle the archiving and dissemination.

Question

The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: National data archives for different disciplines handle the archiving and dissemination.

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good way	1	63	42.0	45.0
Fairly good way	2	43	28.7	30.7
Neither good nor bad way	3	21	14.0	15.0
Fairly bad way	4	9	6.0	6.4
Very bad way	5	4	2.7	2.9
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	10	6.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q18_2] The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: Each university has its own data archive.

Question

The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: Each university has its own data archive.

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good way	1	22	14.7	15.8
Fairly good way	2	68	45.3	48.9
Neither good nor bad way	3	19	12.7	13.7
Fairly bad way	4	20	13.3	14.4
Very bad way	5	10	6.7	7.2
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	11	7.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q18_3] The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: University departments/institutes handle the archiving and dissemination.

Question

The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: University departments/institutes handle the archiving and dissemination.

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good way	1	19	12.7	13.7
Fairly good way	2	33	22.0	23.7
Neither good nor bad way	3	38	25.3	27.3
Fairly bad way	4	40	26.7	28.8
Very bad way	5	9	6.0	6.5
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	11	7.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q18_4] The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: The researcher himself/herself handles the archiving and dissemination.

Question

The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: The researcher himself/herself handles the archiving and dissemination.

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very good way	1	12	8.0	8.6
Fairly good way	2	18	12.0	12.9
Neither good nor bad way	3	26	17.3	18.6
Fairly bad way	4	52	34.7	37.1
Very bad way	5	32	21.3	22.9
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	10	6.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q19] Your estimate on the general attitude of researchers in your research field towards enhancing open access to digital research data generated with public funding

Question

Your estimate on the general attitude of researchers in your research field towards enhancing open access to digital research data generated with public funding

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Great majority supports enhancing open access to data	1	36	24.0	25.4
Majority supports enhancing open access to data	2	49	32.7	34.5
Attitudes are fifty-fifty for and against	3	41	27.3	28.9
Majority opposes enhancing open access to data	4	16	10.7	11.3
Great majority opposes enhancing open access to data	5	0	0.0	0.0
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	8	5.3	–
		150	100.0	100.0

[Q20] What is your attitude to open access to digital research data collected in your own research?

Question

What is your attitude to open access to digital research data collected in your own research?

Frequencies

label	value	n	%	v. %
Very positive	1	47	31.3	32.9
Fairly positive	2	61	40.7	42.7
Neither positive nor negative	3	22	14.7	15.4
Fairly negative	4	11	7.3	7.7
Very negative	5	2	1.3	1.4
System missing (SYSMIS)	.	7	4.7	–
		150	100.0	100.0

Chapter 3

Indexes

3.1 Variables in the order of occurrence

FSD study number [FSD_NO]	5
FSD edition number [FSD_VR]	5
FSD processing level [FSD_PRO]	6
FSD case id [FSD_ID]	6
Original case id [ID]	6
Respondent's university [Q1]	7
Respondent's gender [Q2]	7
Research field the respondent represents [Q3]	8
Does your department have any guidelines or regulations on the preservation of digital research data? [Q4]	8
How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected remain in the hands of the original researcher(s) [Q5_1]	9
How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are deposited in the department/institute, without further processing or documentation [Q5_2]	9
How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are archived in the department/institution and described in a catalogue/database [Q5_3]	10
How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are archived at the university archive [Q5_4]	10
How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are archived at a data archive [Q5_5]	11
How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are destroyed [Q5_6]	11
How common a practice in your department/institute? No digital data collected for our research	

3. Indexes

(e.g. theoretical studies or studies using statistical or already existing data) [Q5_7]	12
Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the original researchers themselves use the data for further research [Q6_1]	12
Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data are submitted, if requested, to other researchers studying a similar subject [Q6_2]	13
Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, students can use the data for their theses [Q6_3]	13
Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data are rarely, if ever, reused [Q6_4]	13
Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data may be used in other ways [Q6_5]	14
After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For doctoral theses? [Q7_1]	14
After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For other research? [Q7_2]	15
After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For Bachelor's or Master's theses? [Q7_3]	15
After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For teaching? [Q7_4]	16
As regards digital data that have been collected in the department/institute for research which is completed, estimate the proportion of data that are reusable [Q8]	16
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Subject matter not relevant for current studies [Q9_1]	17
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Confidentiality and data protection issues (information given to participants on data use, identifiers in the data) [Q9_2]	17
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Other legal issues (e.g. intellectual property rights) [Q9_3]	18
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: At the time of data collection, no agreements were made on copyright [Q9_4] . .	18
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: IT issues (e.g. obsolete formats, damaged data) [Q9_5]	19
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Concerns about the usability of data (insufficient documentation of data and data files) [Q9_6]	19
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Concerns related to research ethics [Q9_7]	20
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Other reason [Q9_8]	20
Is this survey the first time you receive information on the OECD guidelines on open access to	

research data? [Q10]	21
In your opinion, to what extent can the OECD guidelines be implemented in your own research field? [Q11]	21
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Reducing duplicate data collection efforts [Q12_1]	22
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Financial benefits gained through more effective use of data resources [Q12_2]	22
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Increasing communication and co-operation within the scientific community [Q12_3]	23
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Enabling scrutiny (and repeatability) of research results [Q12_4]	23
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Improving the quality of research [Q12_5]	24
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Improving the quality of teaching [Q12_6]	24
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Diversity of research designs and questions (e.g. comparison over time) which the use of archived data allow [Q12_7]	25
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: More equal access to data for different groups [Q12_8]	25
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Other benefit [Q12_9]	26
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Concerns about inadvertent misuse of data, and consequent mistakes [Q13_1]	26
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Resources needed by researchers to document and process their data for reuse [Q13_2]	27
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Resources needed by researchers to give advice on the reuse of their data [Q13_3]	27
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Data sharing increases the risks related to data protection, confidentiality and research ethics issues [Q13_4]	28
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Loss of competitive advantage as the researcher allows others to use the data he/she has collected [Q13_5]	28
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Research participants/respondents were not informed that the data collected from them would be archived for the use of the scientific community [Q13_6]	29
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Other barrier [Q13_7]	29
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to	

3. Indexes

research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by each university separately [Q14_1]	30
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by the Finnish universities together [Q14_2]	30
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by research funders [Q14_3]	31
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Research grants include funds for preparing the data for sharing and archiving [Q14_4]	31
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by the National Advisory Board on Research Ethics [Q14_5]	32
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Universities incorporate open access principles in undergraduate and graduate education [Q14_6]	32
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Increasing teaching and learning materials on research data ethics and confidentiality issues [Q14_7]	33
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Increasing teaching and learning materials on digital data life cycle issues [Q14_8]	33
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Archiving data for the use of the scientific community is acknowledged to be scientific merit [Q14_9]	34
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Other means [Q14_10]	34
How binding should the guidelines on open access to data be? An example: a dataset collected with public funding, without confidentiality or copyright problems, and not actively used by the research group 5 years from the collection. [Q15]	35
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Academy of Finland [Q16_1]	35
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Tekes (Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation) [Q16_2]	36
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: National Archives Service [Q16_3] ...	36
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: National Advisory Board on Research Ethics [Q16_4]	37
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to	

digital research data generated with public funding: Ministry of Education [Q16_5]	37
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Other ministries [Q16_6]	38
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Finnish Council of University Rectors [Q16_7]	38
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Individual universities [Q16_8]	39
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Science and Technology Policy Council of Finland [Q16_9]	39
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Research societies and associations [Q16_10]	40
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Statistics Finland [Q16_11]	40
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Sector research institutes [Q16_12] . . .	41
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Other research institutes [Q16_13]	41
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Other bodies [Q16_14]	42
Specify three bodies which you would consider as the most important for drawing up the guidelines: The most important [Q17_1]	42
Specify three bodies which you would consider as the most important for drawing up the guidelines: The second most important [Q17_2]	43
Specify three bodies which you would consider as the most important for drawing up the guidelines: The third most important [Q17_3]	43
The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: National data archives for different disciplines handle the archiving and dissemination. [Q18_1]	44
The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: Each university has its own data archive. [Q18_2]	45
The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: University departments/institutes handle the archiving and dissemination. [Q18_3]	45
The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: The researcher himself/herself handles the archiving and dissemination. [Q18_4]	46
Your estimate on the general attitude of researchers in your research field towards enhancing	

3. Indexes

open access to digital research data generated with public funding [Q19] 46
What is your attitude to open access to digital research data collected in your own research?
[Q20] 47

3.2 Variables in alphabetical order

After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For Bachelor's or Master's theses?	15
After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For doctoral theses?	14
After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For other research?	15
After the original research is completed, how frequently are the digital data collected in the department/institute reused: For teaching?	16
As regards digital data that have been collected in the department/institute for research which is completed, estimate the proportion of data that are reusable	16
Does your department have any guidelines or regulations on the preservation of digital research data?	8
FSD case id	6
FSD edition number	5
FSD processing level	6
FSD study number	5
How binding should the guidelines on open access to data be? An example: a dataset collected with public funding, without confidentiality or copyright problems, and not actively used by the research group 5 years from the collection.	35
How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are archived at a data archive	11
How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are archived at the university archive	10
How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are archived in the department/institution and described in a catalogue/database	10
How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are deposited in the department/institute, without further processing or documentation	9
How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected are destroyed	11
How common a practice in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data collected remain in the hands of the original researcher(s)	9
How common a practice in your department/institute? No digital data collected for our research (e.g. theoretical studies or studies using statistical or already existing data)	12
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Archiving data for the use of the scientific community is acknowledged to be scientific merit	34

3. Indexes

How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by each university separately	30
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by research funders	31
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by the Finnish universities together	30
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Guidelines and principles established by the National Advisory Board on Research Ethics	32
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Increasing teaching and learning materials on digital data life cycle issues	33
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Increasing teaching and learning materials on research data ethics and confidentiality issues	33
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Other means	34
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Research grants include funds for preparing the data for sharing and archiving	31
How good or bad do you regard the following means to be for implementing open access to research data in your field: Universities incorporate open access principles in undergraduate and graduate education	32
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: At the time of data collection, no agreements were made on copyright	18
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Concerns about the usability of data (insufficient documentation of data and data files)	19
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Concerns related to research ethics	20
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Confidentiality and data protection issues (information given to participants on data use, identifiers in the data)	17
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: IT issues (e.g. obsolete formats, damaged data)	19
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Other legal issues (e.g. intellectual property rights)	18
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are not reused: Other reason	20
How much does the following explain why the digital data collected in your research field are	

not reused: Subject matter not relevant for current studies	17
In your opinion, to what extent can the OECD guidelines be implemented in your own research field?	21
Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, students can use the data for their theses	13
Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data are rarely, if ever, reused	13
Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data are submitted, if requested, to other researchers studying a similar subject	13
Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the data may be used in other ways	14
Is the following true in your department/institute: After the original research is completed, the original researchers themselves use the data for further research	12
Is this survey the first time you receive information on the OECD guidelines on open access to research data?	21
Original case id	6
Research field the respondent represents	8
Respondent's gender	7
Respondent's university	7
Specify three bodies which you would consider as the most important for drawing up the guidelines: The most important	42
Specify three bodies which you would consider as the most important for drawing up the guidelines: The second most important	43
Specify three bodies which you would consider as the most important for drawing up the guidelines: The third most important	43
The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: Each university has its own data archive.	45
The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: National data archives for different disciplines handle the archiving and dissemination.	44
The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: The researcher himself/herself handles the archiving and dissemination.	46
The archiving and dissemination of digital research data for reuse can be organised in many ways. What is your opinion on the following: University departments/institutes handle the archiving and dissemination.	45
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Academy of Finland	35
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Finnish Council of University Rectors ..	38

3. Indexes

To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Individual universities	39
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Ministry of Education	37
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: National Advisory Board on Research Ethics	37
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: National Archives Service	36
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Other bodies	42
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Other ministries	38
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Other research institutes	41
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Research societies and associations ...	40
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Science and Technology Policy Council of Finland	39
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Sector research institutes	41
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Statistics Finland	40
To what extent should the following bodies take part in drawing up the guidelines on access to digital research data generated with public funding: Tekes (Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation)	36
What is your attitude to open access to digital research data collected in your own research?	47
Your estimate on the general attitude of researchers in your research field towards enhancing open access to digital research data generated with public funding	46
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Concerns about inadvertent misuse of data, and consequent mistakes	26
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Data sharing increases the risks related to data protection, confidentiality and research ethics issues	28
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Loss of competitive advantage as the researcher allows others to use the data he/she has collected	28
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Other barrier	29
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Research participants/respondents were not informed that the data collected from them would	

be archived for the use of the scientific community	29
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Resources needed by researchers to document and process their data for reuse	27
Your opinion on how significant a barrier the following is to enhancing open access to data: Resources needed by researchers to give advice on the reuse of their data	27
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Diversity of research designs and questions (e.g. comparison over time) which the use of archived data allow	25
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Enabling scrutiny (and repeatability) of research results	23
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Financial benefits gained through more effective use of data resources	22
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Improving the quality of research	24
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Improving the quality of teaching	24
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Increasing communication and co-operation within the scientific community	23
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: More equal access to data for different groups	25
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Other benefit	26
Your opinion on how significant a benefit enhancing open access to digital research data would be for: Reducing duplicate data collection efforts	22