Communication, collaboration, and curation in scholarly publishing

Abstract

Why do we carry out research, and how much of our research time is spent directly in service of this activity? Methods of recognition and reward in scholarship have long roots, and although some administration is necessary, it is reasonable to wonder if exercises to measure research "impact" have exceeded their original scope of taking the temperature of research activity and instead become goals in themselves.

Scholarship and the dissemination of its ideas should be a key part of any university's mission, changing teaching and research from a linear progression to a continuous cycle. Decisions about the mechanisms, operations, and costs of academic publishing should therefore be led by academic demands rather than commercial interests.

Why do we publish? What is publishing for? The answers to these questions may seem so obvious as not to merit discussion. However, the goals of academics and publishers are not always aligned, and an exploration of the overlap and divergence of their goals helps us make intelligent decisions and advocate energetically to ensure that publication serves scholarship, and not the other way around.

In this session, I will begin by tracing the origin and evolution of several key themes within publishing, and reflecting on the extent to which they continue to support the aims and values of academic research, before opening the topic up for questions and discussion.

Introduction

The academic book is under threat...

- Obsolescence because of changes in format, though both radio and vinyl indicate that obsolete media forms have always had curious afterlives.[1]
- Budgetary pressures on university presses and libraries
- Exponentially rising costs of journals (especially in the sciences) - cutbacks managed by reducing the number of monographs purchased. Even though ILL filled the gap for readers, but it was devastating for presses: instead of all/most libraries buying copies, in a consortial arrangement, only one would.
- We work and study within a system whose gears often grind, in which much human talent and effort is wasted or unacknowledged, and in which even those who succeed may be troubled by feelings of imposterism.

Some of the difficulties:

- finding content
- accessing content
- evaluating content
- publishing own content[2]

Do any of these sound familiar? They were listed as the key challenges faced by a clinical researcher, though they are relevant to all disciplines.

We publish for six main reasons …

1. To be recognised
2. To be read and cited by others
3. For quality control
4. To participate in the scholarly record
5. For career advancement and prestige
6. To participate in scholarly discussion

And there are also two "elephant in the room" themes...

---

[1] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy. 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

[2] Kavanagh, Suzanne (2014) What do researchers want... and what are we doing about it? *Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers blog* https://blog.alpsp.org/2014/03/what-do-researchers-want-and-what-are.html (accessed 2020-10-29)

1: We publish to be recognised

Authorial primacy

In the words of Kathleen Fitzpatrick, "[a]uthorial primacy is the very currency of scholarship".[3] We publish in order to gain recognition for our research, and as the basis of citation and attribution of ideas. She describes the transition from print to digital as "likely to entail much more than a mere change of medium — it has the potential to profoundly alter the very process of knowledge production."[4] The Internet has exploded the production and dissemination of ideas, showing both the need for quality and editorial control, and also making it possible to exchange information in a wide variety of media formats. And social media has transformed the flow of information from unidirectional (publisher to reader) to participative. Houman Barekat explains that "[b]y releasing text to be read and commented upon[,] online authorship becomes ongoing, process-oriented work taking place in a community of interested readers.[5]

Changing concepts of authorship

Many of our assumptions about a book arise from print culture (social processes that existed alongside the new technology of print), such as: that it was written by the author named on the cover, published by the organization named on its spine, that the copy we hold is complete and identical to every other copy available, and that those facts together cause us to grant authority to the text.[6]

We also live with another legacy of print culture: the idea of a finished work. Though revisions may be made in subsequent editions, written texts are generally thought to be complete and stable. Indeed, [w]e rely on such stability as a sign of a text's authority.[7] In academia, we also focus on completion as the most significant moment in the writing process; when our projects attain their final purpose: the entry of a new item on the CV. It is no wonder that many academics are anxious about writing: even if it's happening, it's not finished, and until completion, we get no credit for our work, and haven't accomplished anything.

Increasing collaboration in reading and writing

A shift from *read-only* to *read-write* forms of publishing may threaten our concepts of authorship and ownership of ideas, by revealing the extent to which we all stand on the shoulders of giants[8]. However, the digital environment also creates opportunities, such as overlay publications (whose editors locate suitable material from open access repositories and public domain sources, read it, and evaluate its worth[9]) and open peer review, increasing transparency and accountability. Breaking down the process of writing into smaller blocks may come with fears about exposing our writing process, and in so doing, reveal its false starts and dead ends, but also a richer exchange in which peer comments and questions help us refine our ideas. Collaborative writing may also increase creativity, deepen analysis, and promote a more enjoyable work process by reducing isolation and loneliness.

---

[3] Barekat, Houman (2012) The Read-Write Generation. *Los Angeles Review of Books* https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/the-read-write-generation

[4] Barekat, Houman (2012) The Read-Write Generation. *Los Angeles Review of Books* https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/the-read-write-generation

[5] Barekat, Houman (2012) The Read-Write Generation. *Los Angeles Review of Books* https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/the-read-write-generation

[6] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy.* 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

[7] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy.* 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

[8] "If I have seen further, it is only by standing on the shoulders of giants." Sir Isaac Newton

[9] Overlay journal. *Wikipedia* https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Overlay_journal (accessed 2020-11-05)

As Fitzpatrick observes, our current understanding of authorship is caught between two regimes: a system of knowledge production informed by Enlightenment-era notions of the self, and a world of "technologies that lend themselves to the distributed, the collective, the process-oriented, the anonymous, the remix." As we step into the future increasingly governed by the latter, we move, in some ways, back to an earlier era: a move away from a culture of isolated reading — the individual reader, alone with a book or a screen — towards a more communal engagement, the coffee-house or fireside model of public reading and debate in which literary culture historically originated.[10]

This remix culture could see a new era of open texts, as in the Middle Ages. Our authorship practices may evolve as our values shift from focusing on the production of unique, original new arguments and texts to consider instead curation as a valid form of scholarly activity, in which the work of authorship lies in the imaginative bringing together of multiple threads of discourse that originate elsewhere, a potentially energizing form of argument via juxtaposition. This kind of scholarly remixing involves finding the best of what has been published in the digital network and bringing it together, with commentary for one's readership [like the Talmud]. It could also resemble a post-hoc mode of journal or volume editing, creating playlists, of sorts, that bring together texts available on the web in ways that produce new kinds of interrelationships and analyses among them.[11]

Contributions to research

Beyond their own publications, there are many ways in which academics contribute to research: peer review; serving on editorial boards and as editors; volunteering in their scholarly community or association; helping plan conferences; and participating in promotion, tenure, and hiring committees.[12] Contributions to research are also made by people who aren't themselves researchers, such as librarians and archivists.

CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) includes 14 scholarly contributor roles, including writing (both original draft, and review and editing), funding acquisition, project administration, and supervision. You can start using these immediately, simply by allocating the terms appropriately to your contributions within research outputs. Some publishers are starting to integrate CRediT into their submission and peer review systems.

Another way of recognising research contributions is through ORCID. An ORCID iD is a unique and persistent identifier for researchers, in any discipline or country. The ORCID infrastructure is owned by the scholarly community, with universities and publishers supporting it through membership fees. It's free to register for an ORCID iD, which as well as being an identifier is also an account you can use to log in to other academic systems, which can (with your permission) add details of your activities to your record.

2: We publish to be read and cited by others

To achieve this, our work needs to be discovered and accessed.

---

[10] Barekat, Houman (2012) The Read-Write Generation. *Los Angeles Review of Books* https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/the-read-write-generation
[11] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy.* 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/
[12] Meadows, Alice (2020) Beyond publication — increasing opportunities for recognizing all research contributions. *The Scholarly Kitchen* https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2020/08/12/beyond-publication-increasing-opportunities-for-recognizing-all-research-contributions/

Discovery of research works depends on where the works are catalogued and indexed, and where we are searching for them. For example, much content on JSTOR is archival, with more recent content being added as the moving wall for each title advances[13], so searching only there means we'll miss much content published within the last 2-3 years. Library discovery interfaces tend to search what their library users have access to, rather than all publications that exist. And what about content in other languages and licensing jurisdictions?

Once we know a work exists, our access to it depends on its format (print or physical object, or digital resource), and a route to this access (library membership or access via SCONUL, University Single Sign-On login with permissions to access subscription content). Access may also be restricted to use only within a library or on-campus, geofencing of some digital resources, or limits on the numbers of simultaneous users; not to mention travel/cost/pandemic barriers).

Having accessed a work, do we then have permission to save a copy, share it with a colleague, cite a phrase, re-use a passage, use an image in a lecture? Are we able to discover, access, and re-use datasets and other sources used in the work? For example: archival content, maps, statistics, primary sources, legislation… Do we have permission to carry out text and data mining? TDM is a collection of computational and algorithmic methods that enable researchers to extract information from large collections of machine-readable texts, such as looking for frequencies of words, variant spellings, or comparing legal and financial details across a corpus of works.

Open access has two main dimensions: access and permissions

Gratis open access means that there is no payment barrier to access. *Libre* open access refers to scholarly reuse permissions. Unlike traditional copyright limits on sharing, passing on, copying, or adding to a virtual learning environment, an open licence such as Creative Commons explicitly permits these uses, often on condition of attribution (CC BY), no derivative works (CC ND), or non-commercial use only (CC NC).

3: We publish for quality control

The main mechanism of quality control in scholarly communications is peer review. Although peer review tends to be associated with journal publications rather than books, all works undergo peer scrutiny, often several times: a colleague may give an update on their research at a seminar, present and respond to questions at a conference, and explore ideas on social media, in addition to any formal review.

Fitzpatrick describes the origins of peer review in seventeenth-century academic book publishing, "where the establishment of editorial peer review was linked to the royal license that was required for the legal sale of printed texts. This was a form of state censorship, intended to prevent sedition or heresy"[14]. This kind of review was for the purpose of censorship rather than quality control; making sure that a text did not make unacceptable claims. Contemporary academic peer review for quality control "did not become a universal part of the scientific method, and thus of the scholarly publishing process, until as late as the middle of the twentieth century… The history of peer review thus appears to have been both longer and shorter than we may realize.[15]

---

[13]JSTOR The evolution of ideas. *JSTOR* https://about.jstor.org/l/the-evolution-of-ideas/ (accessed 2020-09-17)
[14] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy* 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/
[15] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy* 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

Much of contemporary peer review is done anonymously, allowing it to be used to repress alternative ideas, especially in niche fields where researchers know each other and are engaged in competition and rivalry. Fiona Godlee observes that anonymous review "has the effect of giving reviewers power without responsibility"[16]. Such blind peer review, where the comments of the reviewers are not made known to the author or readers, can involve very few words or supporting evidence, but have the effect of recommending that an editor decline a work for publication. "[B]lind review can only correct for ad hominem bias on the part of reviewers, and cannot compensate for the reviewer who operates within a cloud of intellectual bias."[17]

This lack of transparency in peer review has the potential to erode trust[18], as it does not reveal conflicts of interest, can abuse power dynamics (such as reviews being performed by graduate students but not being officially recognized), obscures policy and procedures, and omits the importance of on-boarding or training to ensure shared practices and adherence to common standards.

Peer review provides assurance that a publication from a scholarly publisher is trustworthy. Achieving this trustworthiness requires integrity in all the critical mechanics of peer review, increasing trust in both the process and the publications produced.[19]

Increasing transparency in peer review

Opening up peer review has two dimensions: the people involved, and the decisions they make. Identifying the people involved and making their comments public helps keep the process honest: peer reviewers may choose their words more carefully and provide more evidence for their decisions if they know these can be read widely. On a more positive note, it also allows peer review to become a conversational process, rather than simply a pass/fail exercise.

Open decision-making makes it clear which aspect of the work is being assessed, such as:
- Methodology - is the approach appropriate and thorough?
- Are the conclusions evidence-based and reliable?
- Is the literature review rigourous?
- How easy is it to understand the author's argument - is their writing cogent?
- How might the evidence and ideas asserted in the work be used to further our knowledge?

The comments of the reviewers should be used to support the evaluation of the work based on such criteria, as well as giving the author constructive feedback on specific strengths and weaknesses, which can then be addressed in a new version of the work.

The pass/fail approach of peer review as a gateway to publication is too blunt to allow us to know why a particular work was accepted or not. Taking into account the dimension of prestige, often based on an economics of scarcity (a legacy of print-based publishing with its systems determined by the fact that there are a limited number of pages, a limited number of journals, and a limited number of books that can be produced) means that much sound research is not accepted for formal publication.

---

[16] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy* 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

[17] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy* 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

[18] Meadows, A., Wallace, J., Wulf, K. (2020) Trust as an Ethic and a Practice in Peer Review. *The Scholarly Kitchen* https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2020/09/21/trust-as-an-ethic-and-a-practice-in-peer-review/ (accessed 2020-10-21)

[19] Durante, D. (2020) The Economics of Trust in Peer Review. *The Scholarly Kitchen* https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2020/09/23/the-economics-of-trust-in-peer-review/ (accessed 2020-10-21)

There is also a developing market for deceptive/unscrupulous publishers who exploit researchers' desire to be published by charging authors a publication fee, carrying out little or no quality control, and publishing potentially unsound research. Increasing transparency helps challenge deceptive publishing practices. Separating out the fact that a work has been published from assumptions about what peer review has been carried out increases our confidence in the quality control process and allows us to assess the value of the work directly, rather than by proxy.

Flipping the model so that all research can be published in a repository, and then adding layers such as peer review and overlay publications helps overcome the bottleneck, improve transparency, and ensure a closer connection between an academic's scholarly recognition and their quality of thought, without proxy measures such as the prestige of the publisher.

Digital technologies permit a review process that is better suited to the promotion of good ideas: making them widely accessible, inviting diverse perspectives on them, then using this feedback to improve the work. Just as we have learned to read Wikipedia differently from a traditional encyclopaedia, following the history and discussion pages to follow the intellectual discourse behind each entry.

To quote Fitzpatrick again: "The internet… has… disrupted our ability to draw an association between the fact that a scholarly text has been published and the quality of work it may therefore contain… [perhaps] the time has come for us to consider whether, really, we might all be better served by separating the question of credentialing from the publishing process, by allowing everything through the gate, and by designing a post-publication peer review process that focuses on how a scholarly text should be received rather than whether it should be out there in the first place."[20]

Our sacred cows

This change towards seeing "peer-review as part of an ongoing conversation among scholars rather than a convenient means of determining "value""[21] can be threatening to those of us who are accustomed to the status quo, and particularly the power and prestige associated with succeeding in the current system.

4: We publish to participate in the scholarly record - copyright, citation, preservation

"Access to data tomorrow requires decisions concerning preservation today." — Blue Ribbon Task Force on Sustainable Digital Preservation and Access[22]

Arising as it does from the world of print publication, copyright entwines the concept of authorship attribution, and restrictions on copying or re-using a work. These two aspects are becoming more independent in the digital world, and the divergence of its application in scholarly and trade publishing is becoming increasingly apparent.

I learned a lot from Aileen Fyfe's writing about the history of copyright in academic publishing. This description is adapted from her text: "The first copyright act, for 'the Encouragement of Learning', was

---

[20] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy* 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

[21] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy* 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

[22] [Cited in] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy* 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

passed in 1710. Its protections gave authors and their publishers a way to make a living from their work. However, unlike in the commercially-focused book trade, for academic authors copyright is less about pursuing commercial profit and more about obtaining recognition for their ideas. During the period when scholarly communication depended on printing presses, authors "presenting" a paper to a learnèd society were making a gift of their work in return for social prestige. Although the society paid the author no fee, the society ensured that the author's ideas were recorded, dated, and attributed to them. Publication costs were covered by the society, texts were circulated to the membership, and there was no expectation that sales would generate a profit for either publisher or author. Efforts to reprint, reuse, and share research papers were encouraged, as long as credit and priority were appropriately attributed. The Royal Society expected no payment from those who reprinted or reused the Transactions papers, for it wished to encourage the circulation of knowledge. But it did expect attribution and acknowledgement. There were occasions when the Society did see reprinting or reuse as a threat, but the perceived threat was to reputation, not to income. Learned societies had traditionally seen publishing as a means of sharing knowledge with the scholarly community, and of generating individual and institutional prestige, aided by reprinting and reuse. But by the 1950s and 1960s, learnèd societies faced increased pressure to make their publishing activities financially sustainable; and the example of new commercial players suggested publishing could even become profitable. This led to a shift from publishers holding copyright jointly with authors to the introduction of copyright transfer, as publishers' ownership of copyright would give them control over income from 'secondary rights, such as reprinting, reproduction and electronic document delivery'.[23]

In an age when digital publishing is becoming the norm, we see more than ever the gap between copyright laws invented to protect revenue and at a time when making copies was expensive, and the dimensions in the academic context of wishing to receive credit for one's works but allow these to circulate freely and thus enrich the scholarly conversation. When considering matters of copyright, it's helpful to separate these two aspects.

Citations form the backbone of the scholarly record, and are intimately linked to the persistence and preservation of that record, and the right of a researcher to be recognised as the intellectual parent of an idea.

Metadata trail

Access is not just a matter of the availability of a work, but also "depends on the ability to discover and retrieve documents of interest, and then follow a trail through the scholarly record. That trail is built of metadata."[24]

Universities, publishers, and other scholarly organisations support community-owned infrastructure such as Crossref and ORCID by paying membership fees. Members register persistent identifiers and metadata, making all of this information openly available and reusable, and committing to maintaining these records for the long term.

ORCID provides a persistent digital identifier (an ORCID iD) that you own and control, and that distinguishes you from every other researcher. You can connect your iD with your professional information

---

[23] Fyfe, Aileen (2019) What the history of copyright in academic publishing tells us about Open Research *LSE Impact of Social Sciences blog* https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2019/06/03/what-the-history-of-copyright-in-academic-publishing-tells-us-about-open-research/ (accessed 2020-10-21)
[24] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy* 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

— affiliations, grants, publications, peer review, and more. You can use your iD to share your information with other systems, ensuring you get recognition for all your contributions, saving you time and hassle, and reducing the risk of errors.

Crossref makes research outputs easy to find, cite, link, assess, and reuse. Publishers register content with Crossref in order for this metadata to be openly available to the world, and to register a DOI for each work.

Assigning persistent identifiers to research entities allows the creation of connections between them, across time and space.

Even in a world where author attribution and identification of works are reliable, preservation and persistence of content are essential in order for citations to be meaningful and actionable. These are challenges in both print and digital media, and publishers who want to ensure long-term access to and availability of their content need to invest in mechanisms (both technical and social) to this end.

Fragility and developing new practices

Fragility is not limited to any particular medium: books are subject to crumbling paper or bindings, pages marked, torn, or lost; while digital resources may be deleted, erased, or rely on outdated software or hardware. As Fitzpatrick writes, "We have centuries of practice in preserving print – means of collecting and organizing print texts, means of making them accessible to readers, means of protecting them from damage, all standardized across many libraries with frequently redundant collections. But it took centuries to develop those practices, and we simply do not have centuries, or even decades, to develop parallel processes for digital preservation. We now must think just as carefully, but much more quickly, about how to develop practices appropriate to the preservation of our digital heritage."[25]

Print and digital preservation

University and national libraries contribute to long-term storage and access to print and digital media, caring for vellum manuscripts and 1980s computer programs alike. They also contribute financially to projects such as LOCKSS (Lots Of Copies Keeps Stuff Safe) which archives digital journal content.

Publishers commit to codes of practice such as COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics), including aspects such as pledging to maintain the academic record. This means that once a document has been published, it cannot be unpublished, by the authors or anyone else. If the authors or the publisher believe that for some reason a published document should no longer be used, they can issue a retraction notice, but the original document should still be accessible.

Alongside the technical solutions to preservation of citations and publications, it's just as important to develop socially organised preservation systems, so that these practices become part of our culture rather than remaining peripheral or administrative concerns. Fitzpatrick suggests that "planning for the persistent availability of digital resources as part of the process of their creation will provide the greatest stability of the resources themselves at the least possible cost".[26]

---

[25] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy* 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/
[26] Planned Obsolescence (book). *Wikipedia* https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planned_Obsolescence_(book) (accessed 2020-10-21)

Who pays for long-term storage, preservation, and access to content? Long-term stewardship of assets is expensive, and the investment must be ongoing. A key benefit to institutions that participate in such knowledge infrastructure is their ability to help shape that common good.

5: We publish for career advancement and prestige

The nature of work expected from an academic can be imagined as a three-legged stool of research, teaching, and service. Academic culture has established ways (albeit imperfect) to measure and subsequently reward research and teaching. However, we still lack mechanisms to recognise and reward the service element: the "invisible labor without which the entire scholarly enterprise would collapse"[27].

Macfarlane and Burg published a paper entitled "Women professors and the academic housework trap"[28] describing academic housework as reviewing, mentoring, advising, committee work, and a range of other also unrewarded but necessary activities. The authors found that women are more likely to emphasise the importance of academic citizenship, especially mentoring, compared to their male counterparts, and they argue that the academy "need[s] to understand that professors have a broad range of orientations connected with intellectual leadership in addition to publication and income generation"[29]. We must measure and reward what we value, rather than value what we measure.

Closely allied to our career success is the prestige of the institutions where we are educated and employed, and that of the publishing houses where our research outputs are hosted. The prestige of a publisher is has two dimensions: editorial processes such as proofreading and peer review, and selectivity (based on volume of submissions and competition for acceptance). However, the publisher is no longer the only avenue for vetting and disseminating research, and many print legacy restrictions on how much could be published in a journal or the length of a book are becoming redundant.

How to tackle the relationship between capital and prestige?

How can we move from proxy prestige values to explicit, authoritative statements about research activity? Maybe we can start with recognising our own resistance to change: "Those who have become well-established in [a discipline's] current form are not merely being asked to share their advantages; dismantling the canons through which they have become established is actually an act of direct disempowerment, both personal and institutional."[30] As Richard Wynne has observed, we could start by making "assertions" about research activity to researchers' ORCID records, such as ""this research is novel", "this publication was peer reviewed", "this research was funded by y", "this research is based on these data", "these findings are statistically sound", "this research was undertaken rigorously", etc. The hope is that by making such "assertions" more transparent, open, attributable and granular, the readers of

---

[27] Kennison, Rebecca (2020) comment on Meadows, Alice (2020) Beyond publication — increasing opportunities for recognizing all research contributions. *The Scholarly Kitchen* https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2020/08/12/beyond-publication-increasing-opportunities-for-recognizing-all-research-contributions/ (accessed 2020-10-27)

[28] Macfarlane, Bruce; Burg, Damon (2019) Women professors and the academic housework trap. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 41 (3) pp 262-274 https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2019.1589682 (accessed 2020-11-13)

[29] Macfarlane, Bruce; Burg, Damon (2019) Women professors and the academic housework trap. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 41 (3) pp 262-274 https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2019.1589682 (accessed 2020-11-13)

[30] Garnett, Liz (2020) Music Theory's White Racial Frame: Thoughts on Knowledge and Power. *Helping You Harmonise* http://helpingyouharmonise.com/whiteframe5 (accessd 2020-10-30)

the future (human and machine) will be able to reach better conclusions about where society invests its limited research resources."[31]

We can also reduce our reliance on metrics such as Impact Factor or monograph sales in favour of "replacing [them] with better and fair quality assessments"[32] such as the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)[33], and the Humane Metrics in the Humanities and Social Sciences Initiative (HuMetricsHSS)[34]. The HuMetricsHSS initiative endeavours "to help create and support frameworks that enable members of the academy writ large to reflect upon and identify the core values that animate their work, to consider how their values align with those of the institutions in which they work, and to develop indicators of impact that demonstrate how these values are enacted in the practices and the products of their work."

6: We publish to participate in scholarly discussion

A major impediment to the free flow of ideas and argument in scholarship is the length of time it takes to get works published. Whether monographs or journal articles, there can be delays of several months between final agreement on the version of the author's accepted manuscript and the appearance of the published work. Any embargo on open access extends the time during which the content is hidden away.

Digital publication allows the many stages and formats of publication to be atomised and examined, increasing transparency around publishing decisions, allowing peer review to become an exchange rather than a dead end, and supporting the freer flow of academic conversation.

Kathleen Fitzpatrick's monograph *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy* was openly peer-reviewed online at MediaCommons Press, two years before publication. The manuscript is still available for open discussion on the website http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/. Alessandra Tosi comments that "putting up a draft manuscript of the book up for open public review and debate allowed Fitzpatrick to demonstrate one of the key points of the book - that scholars have a lot to gain from openly sharing their work on digital platforms, and that open debates should become a part of the publishing process itself."[35]

The internet opens up new possibilities of textual forms and what counts as "published", which can then be linked together to create "new forms of networked arguments."[36]

[31] Wynne, Richard (2020) comment on Meadows, Alice (2020) Beyond publication — increasing opportunities for recognizing all research contributions. *The Scholarly Kitchen* https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2020/08/12/beyond-publication-increasing-opportunities-for-recognizing-all-research-contributions/ (accessed 2020-10-27)

[32] Hagve, Martin (2020) *The money behind academic publishing* Tidsskr Nor Legeforen https://www.doi.org/10.4045/tidsskr.20.0118

[33] Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) https://sfdora.org/ (accessed 2020-11-13)

[34] HuMetricsHSS https://humetricshss.org/ (accessed 2020-11-13)

[35] Tosi, Alessandra. "Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy". Times Higher Education. Retrieved 16 March 2014. - cited in https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planned_Obsolescence_(book) (accessed 2020-10-27)

[36] Planned Obsolescence (book) *Wikipedia* https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planned_Obsolescence_(book) (accessed 2020-10-27)

"Data" is anything you can formalise through language. Texts and records are data[37] as are drone footage, maps, archives, catalogues, audio and video files… Most research projects produce large amounts of data in addition to formal prose outputs. Publishing this content in a repository takes advantage of existing storage and discovery technology, including DOI registration and participating in preservation protocols. The contributors' work is credited, and the data is available for future access and reuse.

The FAIR principles aim to improve the **F**indability, **A**ccessibility, **I**nteroperability, and **R**euse of digital assets.[38] The principles refer to three types of entities: data (or any digital object), metadata (information about that digital object), and infrastructure.

- Findable - The first step in (re)using data is to find them. Metadata and data should be easy to find for both humans and computers.
- Accessible - Once the user finds the required data, she/he needs to know how can they be accessed, possibly including authentication and authorisation.
- Interoperable - The data usually need to be integrated with other data. In addition, the data need to interoperate with applications or workflows for analysis, storage, and processing.
- Reusable - The ultimate goal of FAIR is to optimise the reuse of data. To achieve this, metadata and data should be well-described so that they can be replicated and/or combined in different settings.

Elephant in the room

The room is / almost all / elephant. / Almost none / of it isn't. / Pretty much / solid elephant. / So there's no / room to talk / about it. / by Kay Ryan"[39]

7: Economics - how much does/should scholarly publishing cost, and who pays?

The rise of commercial publishing since the end of WWII was spearheaded by (Ian) Robert Maxwell (1923-1991)"[40]. Then there is the monographs crisis. "During the last decade or more, university presses have been publishing fewer scholarly monographs in the humanities and are printing fewer copies of those they do publish."[41] This was written by the president of the American Historical Association in 2003! More recently, Martin Paul Eve writing in 2017: "the entirety of the United Kingdom's current yearly book purchasing budget in libraries – across all types of book, not just academic research monographs – would barely stretch to cover the books published by just the four biggest academic presses in the UK."[42]

---

[37] Giglia, Elena (2020) Texts as data: towards a FAIRer, open landscape in the Humanities. Presentation at OASPA conference (online) 24 September 2020. Recording https://copyright.wistia.com/medias/cftispev1o starting at 18:54 (accessed 2020-11-09)

[38] GO FAIR "FAIR Principles" *Go FAIR website* https://www.go-fair.org/fair-principles/ (accessed 2020-11-09)

[39] Tweet by @JessDeWahls https://twitter.com/JessDeWahls/status/1313606737447006213 (accessed 2020-11-17)

[40] The Editors of Encyclopædia Britannica (6 June 2020), *Robert Maxwell.* https://www.britannica.com/biography/Robert-Maxwell (accessed 2020-20-29)

[41] McPherson, James M. (2003) A Crisis in Scholarly Publishing. *Perspectives on History, the newsmagazine of the American Historical Association* https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/october-2003/a-crisis-in-scholarly-publishing (accessed 2020-10-30)

[42] Eve, Martin Paul (2017) Open Access Publishing Models and How OA Can Work in the Humanities. *Bulletin of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 43 (5) pp16-20 https://doi.org/10.1002/bul2.2017.1720430505 (accessed 2020-11-05)

The rise of open access has prompted many questions about the economics of publishing, particularly around commercial business models. A common strategy has been to shift costs from readers (subscriptions) to authors (publication fees); mixed business models that combine freemium OA with a print-sales strategy; or alternatives such as a membership structure or consortia (such as Knowledge Unlatched, Open Library of Humanities).

The loss of subscription revenue is particularly challenging for learnèd societies, which are now exploring alternative sustainability strategies. And there is increased scrutiny about the costs of publishing and what is being paid for.

8: Politics and governance - Who knows? Who decides? Who decides who decides?[43]

Closely related to the economics of publishing is the politics of how decisions are made, by whom, and for whom. Sometimes reduced simply to cost, there is a disparity between the goals of academics seeking audiences and professional recognition, and publishing businesses, who primary duty is to their shareholders. Kathleen Fitzpatrick suggests that thinking creatively about the future of publishing will require thinking creatively about the future of the academy as a whole, centreing publishing ventures as part of the infrastructure of the institution, as a key element in its research mission. This would require universities to recognize "that their mission extends to include not just the production of new knowledge through the research done by its faculty, but the communication of that new knowledge via university-based publishing systems"[44].

Redistributing budget, staff, and skills from subscription access and acquisitions budgets towards the establishment of a new generation of university presses also liberates the university (specifically the library) from a client-vendor relationship in which costs are spiralling despite stagnant or dwindling budgets, and towards a collaborative, community-managed infrastructure in which ownership and responsibility are brought back in house. "Involvement from the university press in the design, implementation, and promotion of the institutional repository — reimagined and rebranded as an institutional publishing system — might help transform it from an attic into which random items are shoved (and promptly forgotten) into an active, developing form of publication."[45] Some fear that "the university press will devolve into a vanity publishing outfit, required to publish anything that comes its way, thus conferring no particular prestige on its titles, and bringing no prestige to its institution. All of this only obtains, however, if the purpose of the press is to be excellent, rather than to facilitate the conversations that take place among the university's scholars and between those scholars and their colleagues around the world."[46]

Jane Winters expects that the "[OA] mandate will be extended to books for the third REF in the mid-2020s… [so we have] between five and 10 years to think about what will most effectively serve the humanities... and to experiment with new ways of publishing books... Notable examples include Knowledge Unlatched, punctum books, Open Humanities Press, Open Book Publishers and OpenEdition, among

[43] Zuboff, Shoshana (2019) *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: the fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. Profile Books, London. 978-1781256848

[44] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

[45] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

[46] Fitzpatrick, Kathleen (2011) Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy 978-0-814-72787-4 and http://mcpress.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/

others"[47] and she emphasises the role of learnèd societies in exploring and developing different approaches. One example is the Royal Historical Society's decision to close its long-running monograph series, Studies in History, and to launch a fresh open-access alternative, New Historical Perspectives. NHP is aimed at early career researchers (within 10 years of PhD), and the RHS is developing a scheme to cover costs. "The goal is rather to embed open access within the publishing practices of early career historians, including a peer review process that allows authors to workshop their book with leading researchers in their field."[48]

A distributed publishing model built from repositories, university presses, and overlay publications allows greater price transparency about the costs of maintaining each element, direct governance by stakeholders, creation of feedback loops within the community, and encourages interoperability and bibliodiversity (the diversity of academic content[49]). "Ideas about new forms of... governance are on the rise, suggesting alternatives to... monopolies. Could this help us reimagine, reconstitute, and rebalance skewed power dynamics?"[50]
As Shearer et al put it: "The shortcomings [of the mainstream system for research communications] are well known… We must start now to shift our resources towards open, community-based infrastructures and services whose values align with those of research and society."[51]

How can I get involved?

See associated doc: How can I get involved?

[47] Winters, Jane (2020) "Learned Societies, Humanities Publishing, and Scholarly Communication in the UK" https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11885.003.0034 *in* Eve, Martin Paul & Gray, Jonathan (eds) *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access* https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11885.001.0001 (accessed 2020-11-17)
[48] Winters, Jane (2020) "Learned Societies, Humanities Publishing, and Scholarly Communication in the UK" https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11885.003.0034 *in* Eve, Martin Paul & Gray, Jonathan (eds) *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access* https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11885.001.0001 (accessed 2020-11-17)
[49] Giménez Toledo, Elea; Kulczycki, Emanuel; Pölönen, Janne; Sivertsen, Gunnar (2019) Bibliodiversity – What it is and why it is essential to creating situated knowledge. *LSE Impact of Social Sciences blog* https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2019/12/05/bibliodiversity-what-it-is-and-why-it-is-essential-to-creating-situated-knowledge/ (accessed 2020-11-05)
[50] Mozilla Foundation (2020) Data Futures - Research to shift power through data governance. *Mozilla Foundation* https://foundation.mozilla.org/en/initiatives/data-futures/ (accessed 2020-11-05)
[51] Shearer, Kathleen; Rodrigues, Eloy; Amaro, Bianca et al (2020) COVID-19 has profoundly changed the way we conduct and share research. Let's not return to business as usual when the pandemic is over! https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2020/09/24/covid-19-has-profoundly-changed-the-way-we-conduct-and-share-research-lets-not-return-to-business-as-usual-when-the-pandemic-is-over/ (accessed 2020-11-09)