The language we use to describe Open Access publishing can activate bias against Open Access.

INTRO
Information provided online about open access is for the most part prohibitively complex and introduces contradictory interpretations that increase the cognitive load of readers; high cognitive load activates a phenomenon known as the status quo bias. The only reliable method of counteracting this bias in order to bolster the uptake of open access is to re-frame the language commonly employed in association with open access and to minimize the tiers of decisions expected of authors, which create a barrier rather than a gateway to open access engagement.

METHODS
1. Scanned text from publisher, library, and advocacy org websites.
2. Text analysis for complexity using Textstat.
3. Definitions coding for
   1. Parameters of Open Access mentioned.
   2. Whether “choice” language is used.
   3. Number of options for cost recovery.

RESULTS
• Over half (52%) of sources scored a graduate or above reading level for their OA webpages; all but one source scored at college level or higher. Higher reading level increases cognitive load for readers.
• Many library and advocacy group definitions include “squishy” language such as without most permission barriers.
• More parameters also increase cognitive load. The majority (55%) of sources included 8+ parameters for definitions of OA.
• Nearly three-quarters (72%) of sources described OA as a “choice” or “option”; more choices lead to high cognitive load and bias towards the status quo.