

Remarks on the current academic publishing landscape

Peter K. Austin
SOAS, University of London
SAB meeting, Helsinki 2022-10-20



© Peter K. Austin 2022

Creative commons licence

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs

CC BY-NC-ND

www.peterkaustin.com

Preamble

- commentary based on almost 40 years of experience in academic publishing in various capacities
- I have been a book editor since 1983, (co-)edited 16 books
- on Linguistics Board of Cambridge University Press since 2010
- Managing Editor of journal *Language Documentation and Description* 2003-2022 (21 issues, more than 250 papers)
- in 2015, established *EL Publishing*, free platinum open access online publishing platform – in 2022 we moved LDD journal to Uni Virginia and now concentrate on eBook and multimedia publication
- the opinions expressed here are solely mine and not those of the University of Helsinki SAB or my former employer

The old days (1980s) – books

- academic publishing dominated by a few publishers, mostly university presses, or niche commercial
- input quality (reviewing, editing) determined by academics, who provided free labour
- output quality (sub-editing, design, layout) managed in-house by salaried professionals
- generally exclusive copyright held by publisher, royalties paid, but only after threshold (300+)
- books in series typically purchased by University Libraries under standing orders, individuals purchase single items

The old days (1980s) – journals

- journal publishing by professional societies, often in collaboration with book publishers, either university presses, or niche commercial
- input quality (reviewing, editing) determined by society academics, who provided free labour
- output quality (sub-editing, design, layout) managed in-house by publisher salaried professionals
- generally exclusive copyright held by publisher, royalties paid to society, none to authors
- journals subscriptions typically purchased by University Libraries under standing orders, individuals subscribe via professional society

Factors in environment in 2022

- disengagement of content ownership (copyright) from content distribution (licencing) – push for open access
- ecology of publishing vehicles has changed radically through industry restructuring and technological change (advent of digital, web, social networks)
- changes in multilingual publishing
- changes in publication genres and accessibility
- shifts in traditional publisher economic models
- free labour foundation under pressure
- importance of ranking by indexers (Scopus, World of Science) – with pushback
- role of citation indexes and metrics in evaluation

Open Access

- copyright versus licencing – role of Creative Commons
- Types of OA:
 - Gold – free to reader, mostly author pays
 - Green – self-archiving via repository or website, no charge
 - Hybrid – some articles/chapters OA, others not
 - Bronze – free to read on publishers page (e.g. html), no download or reuse
 - Diamond/platinum – no fees, rely on funding sources (institutions, grants)
 - Black – sharing of unlicensed content via paywalled sites

Planning for Open Access

- Institutions can choose to think about developing policies, principles, and practices for implementation of OA
- Alternative is “free for all” that advantages authors who can access funding to pay author fees of technically-qualified research assistants
- Free resources available to institutions (2018-2019)

Resources

JISC guide to preparing institutions for OA

<https://www.jisc.ac.uk/sites/default/files/oa-top-tips.pdf>



Produced in association with



RLUK Research Libraries UK









SCONUL



Resources

<https://radar.brookes.ac.uk/radar/items/695b9555-c2f4-4aae-9107-176fa04531b4/1/>

 GUEST

-  Dashboard
-  Login to openEQUELLA
-  Search
-  Oxford Brookes Research
-  Student Research
-  Learning and Teaching
-  Special Collections and Archives
-  Podcasts

CIAO - Collaborative Institutional Assessment of Open Access. (Pilot version)

Description

CIAO is a benchmarking tool for assessing institutional readiness for Open Access (OA) compliance. This the pilot version and we are interested in receiving feedback on how it has been used and how it can be developed. The tool is based on the CARDIO (Collaborative Assessment of Research Data Infrastructure and Objectives-<http://cardio.dcc.ac.uk>). This tool has been produced as part of the JISC OA Pathfinder: Making Sense: a researcher-centred approach to funder mandates. The project runs from June 2014 – June 2016 and will explore researcher behaviours using sensemaking techniques, trying to get researchers to comply with UK research open access mandates because they want to rather than having to. The lead institution is Oxford Brookes University, associates are Nottingham Trent University and University of Portsmouth. This resource includes information on how it can be used and contact information. Editable version added 31 July 2015

Details

Owner: Unknown user
Collection: OER
Version: 1 (show all)
Status: Live

Ecology of publisher vehicles

- Advent of “free” gold/platinum open access publishers, e.g. *Language Science Press* (2013), *LD&C* journal, *Cambridge Scholars Press*
 - controlled by academics
 - may be no explicit fees to authors (but see below) or readers
 - LSP funded by institutional networks through [Knowledge Unlatched](#), owned by Wiley
 - “Our vision is a sustainable market where scholarly books and journals are freely accessible for each and every reader around the world.”

The LSP model

- Input quality (reviewing, editing) as per traditional model
- Output quality: design and layout pushed down to author + volunteer non-professional proof readers
- Heavy reliance on free labour or externally-funded support
- Potential for discrimination against ECRs and those without technical skills or funding

An alternative – Aperiio model

- Platinum OA publisher through **joint venture** by University of Virginia Library and Ubiquity Press
- UVa controls input quality, Ubiquity manages design and layout, cataloguing, indexing, web distribution
- UVa pays fee for service to Ubiquity
- e.g. LDD journal

Service providers as publishers, e.g. Intech Open (2018)

Books Book Series Journals Publish About News **IntechOpen** Author Panel Sign in Search

We are **IntechOpen**
— the world's leading publisher
of **Open Access books**

[SUBMIT YOUR WORK](#) →

[EXPLORE PUBLICATIONS](#) →

InTech Open payment

In order to help Authors identify appropriate funding agencies and institutions, we have created a list, based on extensive research on various OA resources (including [ROARMAP](#) and [SHERPA/JULIET](#)) of organizations that have funds available. Before consulting our list we encourage you to petition your own institution or organization for Open Access funds or check the specifications of your grant with your funder to ascertain if publication costs are included. Where you are in receipt of a grant you should clarify:

- Does your institution already have a budget for covering Open Access publication costs?
- Does your grant list Open Access publication fees as legitimate direct/indirect costs?

If you are associated with any of the institutions in our list below, you can apply to receive OA publication funds by following the instructions provided in the links. Please consult the Open Access policies or grant Terms and Conditions of any institution with which you are linked to explore ways to cover your publication costs (also accessible by clicking on the link in their title).

InTech Open funders

EUROPE

Book Chapters and Monographs

- European Cooperation in Science and Technology (COST)
- European Research Council
- Horizon 2020 (See also [IntechOpen's Compliance](#) and [H2020 Manual](#))
- Humanities in the European Research Area
- JPI Climate

FINLAND

Book Chapters and Monographs

- Academy of Finland

Interlude: would you buy a used publication from us?

Email message from *Brill* 25 September 2022

Convert your publication to Open Access

Have you already published a book, journal article, chapter, or collected volume with Brill and would you like to make it available in Open Access?

Brill offers authors and editors the option to convert published books and chapters to Open Access at a reduced rate. The discount is based on the year of publication. Until December 31, 2022, we offer an additional discount of 20%.

Your publication is eligible if:

- It is a monograph, journal article, chapter, or edited collection
- The e-book is available
- It is not a translation or edited collection of previously published material

Changes in multilingual publishing

Digital publishing increases opportunities for publishing in a wide range of languages and extending communication with more diverse audiences:

- disaggregation of books and journals to individually distributed articles means they can potentially be in any language, not one (or two) for the whole volume
- Improvements in free machine translation technologies open greater access to multilingual publications
- journals accept submissions in multiple languages, e.g. [LDD](#) in Spanish, French, English or [Living Languages - Lenguas Vivas - Línguas Vivas](#) in English, Spanish, Portuguese
- abstracts in multiple languages, including local lingua francas of the languages and cultures researched, so available to community members and diaspora, e.g. LDD

Changes in publication genres

Digital publishing is being used to create opportunities for a **wider range of publication types**, and for making spaces for a **wider range of potential authors**:

- multimedia publishing of audio-visual resources and dataset publishing (e.g. links to repositories and archives) improves research transparency and opportunities for reproducibility
- new research output genres reduce barriers to entry for both content and authorship, e.g. LDD introduced [Language Snapshots](#) series: 1,500-2,000 word reports on language ecologies as a vehicle for the kinds of data and analysis MA or PhD students and post-docs (including those from the Global South) typically collect but cannot publish as there were no outlets for this kind of research writing

Free labour problem

- Editors find it increasingly difficult to get timely reviews, especially from mid-career or senior colleagues (work does not “count”, lowered moral expectation as “good citizen”)
- In some cases, PhD students or post-doc researchers are making reviewer value judgements – is this good for the discipline?
- The “Reviewer 2 must be Stopped” problem
- Payment for reviews (common in Bangladesh) raises issues of principle and practice
- Need better ways for institutions (employers) to value and recognise support for publication via editing and/or reviewing, or different review methods

Who is Reviewer #2? Literally, Reviewer 2 is the anonymised moniker given to the second peer to review a research paper. In common parlance, Reviewer 2 can be summarised as possessing the following qualities:

- Grumpy
- Aggressive
- Vague
- Unhelpful
- Overbearingly committed to a pet discipline
- Overly focused on a particular methodology
- Inflexible
- Unwilling to give the benefit of the doubt
- Unwilling to view the authors of a submitted paper as peers.

If you need examples, go on over to [Shit My Reviewers Say](#). Just a quick scroll through is enough to make non-academics shake their heads in sympathy.



Group by Ayşe Pinar Saygin

Reviewer 2 Must Be Stopped!

Public group · 88.3K members

Join Group



About

Discussion

Featured

Topics

Events

Media

Questions

Open Peer Review (PLOS)

- Established in sciences for 30+ years
- Various models:
 - publishing peer review content
 - open commenting from the wider community
 - open discussion between authors, editors, and reviewers
 - open review before publication through preprints
 - post-publication commenting
 - sharing author or reviewer identities
- What about Humanities and Social Sciences?
- Role of service providers like Academia.edu and ResearchGate – institutional policies?

Ranking and metrics

- ranking and metrics controlled by indexers (Scopus, World of Science)
- role of citation indexes (h-index) and metrics in evaluation
- **note:** increasing importance of ORCID (should institutions mandate?)
- relatively crude quantitative measures
- another approach?

Alternative metrics

Measuring societal impact of research – tracking news, blogs, tweets, posts, or policy -- <https://guides.library.cmu.edu/biblio/altmetrics>

Carnegie Mellon University / LibGuides / Measuring Your Research Impact / Emerging/Alternative Metrics

Measuring Your Research Impact: Emerging/Alternative Metrics

This guide introduces the Carnegie Mellon University community to available research metrics resources

Introduction

Author Level, Article Level, and Unit Level Researcher Metrics

Journal Level Metrics / Rankings / Impact Factor

Emerging/Alternative Metrics

Use Cases

What are alternative metrics?

How a scholar's work is viewed by colleagues via subsequent citation represents only part of its impact. An intriguing addition to the measure of a scholar's work can be tracked as it is mentioned in the news, blogs, tweets, posts, or policy. There is a societal impact and for now, it's been dubbed "alternative metrics." In addition, online social networks of scholars (such as Mendeley) can track important exchanges of information. For now, the metrics from online social networks are also considered to be alternative metrics. These metrics are focused on the article level regardless of the publishing venue.

How alternative metrics can help ...

- [Altmetric Explorer for Institutions: A Guide for Researchers](#)
- [A Guide to Using Altmetric data in your NIH](#)

Alternative Metrics Tools

Altmetric Altmetrics are metrics and qualitative data that are complementary to traditional, citation-based metrics. They can include (but are not limited to) peer reviews on Faculty of 1000, citations on Wikipedia and in public policy documents, discussions on research blogs, mainstream media coverage, bookmarks on reference managers like Mendeley, and mentions on social networks such as Twitter.

Kudos is an easy to use tool to generate descriptions of your work for the general reader via social media

SciVal enables you to visualize research performance, benchmark relative to peers, develop collaborative partnerships and analyze research trends

VOSviewer is a tool for constructing and visualizing bibliometric networks

Further Information

- [altmetrics: a manifesto](#)
A vision for alternative metrics written about five years ago.
- [Numbers behind Numbers: The Altmetric Score and Sources Explained - Fran Davies](#)
An article that describes the ever-present donut.
- [Stacy Konkiel's "What Are Altmetrics?"](#)

Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (COARA) coara.edu

- January 2022 began drafting an agreement for reforming research assessment – July 2022 draft presented to 350+ organisations from 40+ countries
- Recognise diverse outputs, practices and activities that maximise quality and impact of research
- Platform for piloting and experimentation, developing new assessment criteria, methods and tools, and for joint, critical reflection, exchange of good practices and mutual learning

Summary and conclusions

- Winds of change blowing through publishing landscape
- For institutions and individuals, there are various challenges to think about:
 - OA
 - publishing vehicles
 - resource implications: funding, skills
 - “free labour” issues, input quality control
 - evaluation, and possible alternatives to metrics

Kiitos. Tack. Thank you.