




Publication Pandemonium: An Asynchronous Online Quiz Competition for Open Access Week

Devon Olson, MLIS, AHIP^a, Sara B. Westall, MLIS, MS^b

^aResearch and Education Librarian, Library Resources, University of North Dakota School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Grand Forks, North Dakota,
<https://www.orcid.org/0000-0002-1682-0199>, devon.olson.2@und.edu

^bNE/SE Clinical Campus Librarian, University of North Dakota School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Library Resources, Fargo, North Dakota,
<https://www.orcid.org/0009-0001-1356-5823>, sara.westall@und.edu

Cite as: Olson D & Westall SB. Publication Pandemonium: An Asynchronous Online Quiz Competition for Open Access Week. *Hypothesis*. 2025;37(2). doi:10.18060/29028

 Olson, Westall. All works in *Hypothesis* are licensed under a [CC BY-NC 4.0 DEED Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). Authors own copyright of their articles appearing in *Hypothesis*. Readers may copy articles without permission of the copyright owner(s), as long as the author(s) are acknowledged in the copy, and the copy is used for educational, not-for-profit purposes. For any other use of articles, please contact the copyright owner(s).

Abstract

Open Access Week is an international event focused on issues of equity within the scholarly publishing system. At the University of North Dakota library, we see a diverse range of attitudes towards OA. To build OA support and combat misinformation, we designed an OA week quiz competition, “Publication Pandemonium”, with an asynchronous format designed to include our clinical sites. This event was an overwhelming success despite a short turnaround, with impressive turnout never before seen in our library programming.

Introduction

Open Access Week is an international event focused on issues of equity within the scholarly publishing system¹⁻⁴. At the University of North Dakota library, we see a diverse range of attitudes towards open access (OA). To build OA support and combat misinformation, we designed an OA Week quiz competition called “Publication Pandemonium” in an asynchronous format designed to include our clinical sites. This event was an overwhelming success despite being quickly launched, with impressive turnout never before seen in our library programming.

Experience

Our multiple choice, 14 question, online quiz was built using Springshare’s LibWizard survey tool. Questions in the quiz were designed to vary widely in difficulty, ranging in scope from basic OA terminology, including data management, to current events knowledge⁵⁻¹⁰. The quiz was open to faculty, staff and students all OA Week.

We also created a companion LibGuide and OA Week zine, covering all concepts and definitions required to correctly complete the quiz⁵⁻¹³ (see Appendix 1). All companion resources were linked together. For example, QR codes on the zine linked to the quiz and LibGuide.

Figure 1. Cover of the OA Week zine, featuring concepts covered in the quiz



Note: for full OA Week Publication Pandemonium zine pdf, see [University of South Dakota Scholarly Commons repository](#)

We partnered with our Associate Dean of Research and Senior Associate Dean of Education, Medical, and Faculty Affairs to strategize content, outreach, and funding for prizes, as well as our graphic design department to create visual marketing materials. Announcements were sent via school emails lists and newsletter, and on digital signage in the weeks preceding, during, and after the quiz was launched. Advertising for the quiz contained contextual information about OA, graphics of prizes, timeline information, and hyperlinked or QR codes to the quiz. Our advertising strategy was designed to reach all of our user groups.

Discussion

Our quiz had an overwhelming and diverse response rate of 54.

Table 1: Quiz participant demographics

Academic Program or Department/Office	Average score	Total participants	# of passing scores (<70%)	Program enrollment spring 2025	% of enrolled students participating with passing scores
Center for Rural Health	78.57%	1	1	n/a	n/a
Medicine	75.65%	22	18	276	7%
Indigenous Health	69.05%	3	2	54	4%
Occupational Therapy	66.43%	10	6	206	3%
Medical Laboratory Science	60.71%	2	1	269	0%
Physical Therapy	57.14%	8	4	318	1%
Alumni Affairs Office	50%	1	0	n/a	n/a
Biomedical Sciences	49.29%	3	2	37	5.41%
Public Health	45.24%	3	0	51	0%
Education Resources Office	42.86%	1	0	n/a	n/a

Note: Academic Programs are in bold font, while Departments and Offices are not in bold font.

Table 2: Quiz-related resource usage

Metric	Count: month of August 2024	Count: month of September 2024	Count: month of October 2024	Count: month of November 2024	Count: month of December 2024
LibGuides Views *the quiz was linked on this page	20	13	325	39	47
Zine Downloads *posted to the institutional repository in October	0	0	12	6	6

Multiple methods were used to determine winners and increase participation and fairness of the quiz. We had a high score bracket as well as a participation bracket, which awarded prizes to the program with the highest percentage of enrolled student participants.

Figure 2: Quiz winners' brackets

High-score bracket		Student winner	Students with same score	Score
Winner chosen at random from score-based pools 1 st prize received \$500 in funding for OA publishing, 2 nd and 3 rd prize received university merchandize	1 st prize	1 st year OT Doctoral Student	4	92.86% 13/14 correct
	2 nd prize	Medical student	11	85.71% 12/14 correct
	3 rd prize	Medical Student	8	78.57% 11/14/ correct

Participation bracket		Academic program winner	Quiz participants with passing scores	Enrolled students	% enrolled students participating with passing scores
Single academic program with highest participation by enrollment percentage Prize was \$500 in funding for OA publication	Winner	Medicine	18	276	7%
	Honorable mention	Biomedical Sciences	2	37	5.41%

Table 3: Correct and incorrect quiz response rate by question, most to least correct

	Question	Incorrect (%)	Correct (%)
11	What are the four FAIR data management principles?	7.4	92.6
12	University of South Dakota Scholarly Commons is a:	11.1	88.9
3	Is "Creating and Implementing an Indigenous Evaluation Framework" an open access article?	13.0	87.0
4	Is the Journal of Maternal Health, Neonatology and Perinatology an open access journal?	13.0	87.0
13	"Double-dipping" in the publishing world refers to:	18.5	81.5
14	Which of the following describes "platinum journals"?	24.1	76.0
2	Which of the following is not a real Creative Commons license?	27.8	72.2
7	Which journal publishers are currently implicated in a federal antitrust lawsuit?	27.8	72.2
10	Which of the following is true about the Nelson memo?	35.2	64.8
8	How much revenue in U.S. dollars did Elsevier make in 2023?	46.3	53.7
9	Which company had a higher profit margin in 2023 than Elsevier?	48.1	51.9
5	Which of the following is an open access database?	63.0	37.0
6	Which of the following is a real collection of works on University of South Dakota Scholarly Commons?	63.0	37.0
1	Which of the following is NOT an aspect of open access publication?	66.7	33.3

Note: For full questions and answers with rates of correct and incorrect answers, see Appendix 1.

Takeaways

The design of our event and quiz did not allow us to track whether responses were guesswork or the result of investigation and learning. However, the response data suggests a lack of OA conceptual knowledge and navigation skills. We will continue our response data analysis to help strategize instruction and outreach, and are planning follow-up workshops.

It is possible email issues restricted our engagement. Email lists initially excluded non-medical students and medical program residents have multiple emails to manage, which may explain their lack of participation despite a publication funding prize.

We received little anecdotal feedback and are wary of drawing too many causal conclusions from a single event. However, in future, we hope to do more targeted messaging and data collection throughout, using focus groups to test question difficulty and relevance.

We look forward to making this an annual event, increasing awareness and participation, creating additional tie-ins with programming such as workshops, and fun companion artefacts like zines and stickers.

CRediT Statement

Devon Olson: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Resources, Data Curation, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review & Editing, Visualization, Project Administration

Sara Westall: Conceptualization, Methodology, Resources, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review & Editing, Visualization, Funding Acquisition

References

1. Butler LA, Matthias L, Simard MA, Mongeon P, Haustein S. The oligopoly's shift to open access: How the big five academic publishers profit from article processing charges. *Quantitative Science Studies* [Internet]. 2023 Nov 1;4(4):778–99. doi:[10.1162/qss_a_00272](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00272)
2. Fyfe A, Coate K, Curry S, Lawson S, Moxham N, Røstvik CM. Untangling academic publishing: A history of the relationship between commercial interests, academic prestige and the circulation of research. *Zenodo* [Internet]; 2017 May. doi:[10.5281/zenodo.546100](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.546100)
3. Langham-Putrow A, Bakker C, Riegelman A. Is the open access citation advantage real? A systematic review of the citation of open access and subscription-based articles. *PLOS ONE* [Internet]. 2021 Jun 23;16(6):e0253129. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0253129](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253129)
4. Larivière V, Haustein S, Mongeon P. The Oligopoly of academic publishers in the digital era. *PLOS ONE* [Internet]. 2015 Jun 10;10(6):e0127502. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0127502](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502)
5. Nelson, A. Ensuring free, immediate, and equitable access to federally funded research. Office of Science and Technology Policy [Internet]. 2022. [Accessed 2025 Jun 9]. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/08-2022-OSTP-Public-Access-Memo.pdf>
6. Singh Chawla D. Academic publishers face antitrust lawsuit. *Chemical & Engineering News* [Internet]. 2024 Sep 18 [Accessed 2025 Jun 9]. <https://cen.acs.org/policy/publishing/Academic-publishers-face-antitrust-lawsuit/102/i29>
7. FAIR Principles. [Accessed 2024 October 20]. Available from: <https://www.go-fair.org/fair-principles/>
8. Piwowar, H., Priem, J., Larivière, V., Alperin, J. P., Matthias, L., Norlander, B., Farley, A., West, J., & Haustein, S. The state of OA: a large-scale analysis of the prevalence and impact of open access articles. *PeerJ* [Internet]. 2018 Feb;6:e4375. doi:[10.7717/peerj.4375](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4375)
9. Smith, A. C., Merz, L., Borden, J. B., Gulick, C. K., Kshirsagar, A. R., & Bruna, E. M. Assessing the effect of article processing charges on the geographic diversity of authors using Elsevier's "mirror journal" system. *Quantitative Science Studies* [Internet]. 2021 Dec;2(4):1123–1143. doi:[10.1162/qss_a_00157](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00157)
10. U.S. Copyright Office. More Information on Fair Use; [Accessed 2025 June 9]. Available from: <https://www.copyright.gov/fair-use/more-info.html>

11. US National Institutes of Health. NIH policy for data management and sharing. NOT-OD-21-013. 2020 [Accessed 2025 June 9]. Available from:
<https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-21-013.html>
12. Van Noorden, R. Open access: The true cost of science publishing. *Nature*, 2013 March;495(7442):426–429. doi:[10.1038/495426a](https://doi.org/10.1038/495426a)
13. Wall Kimmerer, R. (2022). Serviceberry: An economy of abundance. *Emergence Magazine*. October 26 2022. [Accessed 2025 June 9].
<https://emergencemagazine.org/essay/the-serviceberry/>