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Introduction to the Panel Discussion

This special session will take the form of a roundtable discussion with four panelists and a presider. The roundtable will consider the ways in which open access (OA) publications are transforming the kind of research that is possible, as well as necessitating new editorial practices.
The case for making scholarship available open access is gathering pace. The combination of the open access movement and the crisis in library budgets to meet the soaring costs of commercially-published academic journals has led to the rise of national-level, institutional and funding-council mandates for open access in the UK (High Education Funding Council for England, Research Councils UK), the EU (Horizon 2020) and Australia (Australian Research Council), as well as throughout many US institutions. Over the past 5 years, debates concerning open access publishing have moved away from discussing whether or not this may be possible (or desirable) within the humanities. In 2016, we have reached a position in which various different stakeholders (including publishers, scholarly societies, editorial networks, and university libraries) are co-ordinating their efforts to transition towards publishing that removes permission and price barriers to accessing academic research. There is a pressing need, therefore, for scholars to reflect upon the wider implications that this shift will have for academic publishing in literatures and languages, as well as interdisciplinary research in the humanities.

Open access is already having quite an impact on academic journal publishing within the humanities. As you may know, the open access (OA) movement has found substantial success for a number of years now in the natural sciences, particularly with the Public Library of Science (PLoS) journals and arXiv's pre-print repository. Although the humanities disciplines have lagged behind the sciences, we've now reached a tipping point in the open access movement, which had been aided by top-down OA mandates at national level, as well as scholar-led and grassroots academic publishing projects and presses. The number of platforms and presses is growing, and includes organizations and publishers such as the Open Library of Humanities, Knowledge Unlatched, Ubiquity Press, Open Book Publishers, Open Humanities Press, and the University of California's newly launched megajournal, Collabra. Meanwhile, a large number of individual journal titles are run by academics through the Open Journals Systems (OJS) open-source software produced by the Public Knowledge Partnership (PKP).

My own experience as a co-founder and director of the Open Library of Humanities has given me a fascinating insight into setting up a new open access publishing platform, as well as the editorial questions raised by publishing multi-disciplinary scholarship within a “megajournal” framework – that is, a journal which publishes across the humanities disciplines. With reference to the opportunities for literatures and languages scholarship, I think we are now ready to ask: What opportunities and challenges face the study of literature with such dissemination of research? How does literature sit within the broader humanities scholarly communities?

We are therefore in a position to assess a number of open access publishing platforms and journals, and critically consider the way in which scholarly editorial labor can adapt to open access. More specifically, I would like to use today’s discussion to consider the following questions:

- How are our current editorial practices affected by OA publishing?
- What kind of editorial measures should we be developing to maintain
academic quality and rigour in the scholarship we disseminate via OA publications? Do we continue using “traditional”double blind peer review? Do we allow peer reviewers to see one another’s reports, helping efficiencies and coherence in returning reports to authors? Do we trial/move towards post-publication peer review – as part of a broader shift towards openness throughout the research process (from inception of a scholarly idea, through to its public discussion, and final research)?

• How does the journal article or scholarly monograph as a scholarly output or object sit within, or relate to, the broader research process? Can we make this more open in English? Should we?

The recent launch of the MLA Commons similarly encourages us to reflect upon the ways in which we can foster not just open access but also open scholarship through more collaborative efforts and new platforms for scholarly dialogue. This raises the thorny question of whether humanities and literature scholars want their draft research to be open in the same way as STEM researchers (e.g. by publishing preprints as with the arXiv repository for physics, maths and computer science).

As an editor of an open access journal, I’m particularly interested in the following questions that I think have some real benefits to literary scholarship in the 21st century:

• What technological innovations are currently being trialled or soon-to-be launched, which could transform scholarly dialogue? E.g. Annotative functionality, social media buttons, customizable privacy settings etc.

• How do questions of subject-specific focus and interdisciplinarity impact upon the shaping of appropriate OA venues and practices? And what are the editorial implications of such interdisciplinarity?

• How can we maintain editorial rigor and quality, and respond to criticisms of online-only publishing as less prestigious than hard copy journals?

• What are the multimodal possibilities and benefits of digital publishing? How might literary studies interact with other disciplines such as Film, TV & New Media Studies, Dance Studies, Musicology, Drama & Performance, and Art History?

• What are the barriers to digital publishing and OA – how do we address perceived issues around quality, and the impact OA publishing might have on scholars’ careers (e.g. how can we ensure that OA publications contribute towards research assessment frameworks?)
Open Access, Digital Annotation, and Open Review

As a medievalist, I have been continually struck by similarities between premodern and digital textualities. Among the many commonalities, the prevalence of commentary is the one I will address today because it reflects a particular disposition towards writing and reading that I believe is at the core of open access and public scholarship movements. This privileging of space and opportunity for annotation and commentary reflects a simple, yet seemingly radical, ideal: scholarly writing is for readers. Scholarly work is published so that it can be read and used by others. There is, however, an uncomfortable by-product of this ideal: if scholarly work is made more accessible to readers, the work is made more vulnerable and its vetting is made more transparent.

When I think of textual vulnerability and transparency, I am reminded of the end of Troilus and Criseyde when Chaucer bids the poem goodbye with the encouraging nudge, “Go litel book,” releasing it to the world for its scrutiny, and possible derision. It is this recognition that the work is no longer his, that it is now for his readers, that resonates strongly with digital texts, which are available to an expansive readership and vulnerable to reuse, remix, and critique. While there are multiple implications for this vulnerability within the context of open access, I will limit my remarks to the relevance of annotation practices for innovations in peer review.

**Social Annotation**

Online commentary and dialogue enhance the social nature of reading. Reading has almost always been a social act, but reading hasn’t been this social since the Middle Ages. That said, there is an important distinction to be made between these two very different contexts. Whereas now the social nature of reading is enhanced through ubiquity and accessibility, reading during the Middle Ages was social because of scarcity and inaccessibility. Digital texts thrive on speed, scale, and access, offering multiple opportunities for encounters with readers. Medieval texts and readers were relatively scarce, raising the value and utility of the single book, which might be used by generations of commentators for interpretations of Aesop’s fables in the classroom to legal glosses on canon law. From these two very different contexts emerge an emphasis on commentary and annotation, which establish a text’s value and use.
Open Peer Review

Unfortunately, this social culture of commentary is often squandered, especially within traditional methods of double-blind peer review. I have therefore been persuaded, by Kathleen Fitzpatrick, Martin Paul Eve, and others, that open peer review (even in hybridized forms) offers more benefits than double-blind peer review for the following reasons [these are ideals that come with significant complications and qualifications, of course]:

1. **Open review makes commentary more transparent.** Open peer review is the equivalent of a Word Document that tracks changes, showing markup. Most medieval manuscripts and early printed books were developed in anticipation of this marked up state, with complex textual apparatus, including space for interlinear glosses and marginalia. Writers and reviewers are known to each other, which encourages dialogue. For example, the MLA Commons is currently hosting an open review of the volume *Digital Pedagogy in the Humanities*, which uses a commentary platform that allows for discussion between reviewers and writers. Such an open format also allows writers to evaluate the feedback intelligently. I have witnessed this evaluation take place in two open review platforms hosted by the journal *Postmedieval* and Media Commons Press. Writers can assess feedback by asking themselves questions such as, “Is this just one reviewer’s agenda or is this critique shared by others?” Perhaps most importantly, the transparency of open review reveals bias. If a reviewer has a clear bias, the community of reviewers can help to identify it.

2. **Open review enhances the utility and relevance of the commentary.** Within open review platforms, reviewers are often self-selected, based on their investment and expertise, as opposed to responding to a request from an editor to review a manuscript (which may not reflect the reviewer’s interests or expertise).

3. **Open review allows for a large number of reviewers.** Rather than be limited to a handful of reviewers, work shared in open review is crowdsourced and potentially subject to large volume of commentary. Reviewing as a task could then be distributed, making it less of a burden upon individual reviewers and enriching and enlarging the community invested in the work.

4. **Open review treats scholarly work as it really is: work-in-progress.** Finished work is a myth, despite our emphasis on “products.” An exciting new project, *The Open Access Companion to the Canterbury Tales*, reflects this unfinished, dynamic state, by referring to its first incarnation as its “first season,” recognizing that its value will be maintained or enhanced through its evolution in future “seasons.”

5. **Open review maximizes the value, relevance, and impact of the work.** Years ago, I remember asking a senior scholar about an argument he made in his first book and being shocked when he replied, “I don’t believe that anymore.” Now that I have published my own work and
have revised my thoughts about some aspects of it, I see this is natural consequence of doing scholarly work. We often change our minds, especially after hearing other reasoned critiques of our work. Open review formats could therefore continue “post-print,” making book reviews more significant and useful. The book review process would become more dynamic – authors (and other reviewers) could respond to/correct outrageous or uninformed claims in reviews.

**Open Review and Open Access**

It is important to stress that open access, even in its most liberal forms, does not require open review – double-blind processes can continue unabated. However, I want to end by suggesting that the democratic potential and ethic of access and openness is not fully realized without open review, which would provide opportunities for scholarly dialogue and critique throughout the writing process and beyond. Moreover, the quality, range, and significance of work, I believe, could be greatly enhanced, offering a distributed network of writers and reviewers, rather than small cohorts of experts and exclusive publishing priesthhoods.
Reflections on Open Access in 2016

Introduction

I’m not an open access person or “evangelist,” but would consider myself a member of the older academic generation, with some sense of what is going to have to change. It seems to me that being against open access is like being against the weather. The question is not whether we are pro- or con- open access publishing but, rather, “how are we going to be in it?” I want to suggest that oddly, the core of what we do as literary scholars will not change (despite what messianic maniacs say: remember MOOCS?)

Research

Open access is not going to change, profoundly, what we actually do in the humanities. It can make our scholarship be disseminated faster, be more informed, more global, more open, allows us wider access to texts, and essentially reflects digitally what we already do with paper. The question of whether articles might become “more populist/less niche” in digital publishing (for example, in a megajournal such as the Open Library of Humanities) is an interesting one. However, thus far, it seems that open access publishing does not pose a substantial threat to peer review.

When we turn to the question of publishing books open access, we can see that this is a more complex issue than journals. Journals sell next year’s issues on the basis of kudos, whereas books are a longer-term investment by publishers hoping to recoup their money through the text itself as well as scholarly kudos.

Teaching

Teaching is essentially the way in which disciplines are passed down (Professor Ben Knights makes this point in his “pedagogic criticism”). In the study of English, bodies of knowledge and pedagogic practices are inextricably linked. Subjects are produced in the dialogues of the corridor and classroom as much as in the monograph or learned journal. Professional debates embed and promote styles of pedagogy: intellectual history is simultaneously the history of educational practices. The disciplines of English are simultaneously bodies of knowledge and communities of practice, performing their own
protocols for argument and dialogue. And for the disciplines to thrive and develop, these communities of practice need to be interrogated and developed.

Will open access deeply change this? No. But it offers the advantages such as – crucially – ease of access to recent thought and the opportunity for shared and collaborative work, e.g. annotations of articles.

**Institutions**

Open access changes the institutions we deal with (publishers, appointment panels) but not what we do as scholars. The issue of academic prestige, or kudos, is a more complex one. Prestige is central to the way in which scholarship is assessed and reviewed and establishes how disciplinary parameters become shaped. This currently lies in print (hard copy), and has been denied to digital publishing, but why? I think this has something to do with the need of universities for traditional mechanisms that extend over centuries, and also reveals our fetish for paper.

**Publics**

There are manifest advantages to publics whose interest in literary scholarship can be hugely assisted by open access publishing. For teachers and school students, OA gives them access to the most recently published academic research – helping to build bridges between secondary and tertiary education. When it comes to the general public, access to research can help pre-existing publics inform themselves about relevant scholarly debates (e.g. Jane Austen fans) and builds important connections between fan-based communities, reading groups, and scholarly communities working within the academy. If we think of artists, for instance, open access affords an entry into recent work in specific areas. Another example is professional bodies who require access to scholarly materials for their own work but are hampered by not having university affiliated subscription membership for journals and books.

**Risks**

Finally, what are the risks of OA publishing for literary and humanities scholars? The risks in OA seem to stem from the opposition to it e.g. penalising young scholars: this penalisation might risk creating a disjunction over a generation. The argument is often rehearsed that young scholars cannot risk their research by publishing in open access journals (where such journals have been deemed by the academic establishment to be not as prestigious, as per the “paper fetish” cited above). But as I said at the beginning of my comments, this is like opposing the weather.
Open Access: Opportunities and Challenges—One Academic Librarian’s Perspective

Open access has the potential to expand avenues for both publishing and accessing scholarly material. Open access creates exciting new opportunities and faces several formidable challenges. I will share a few thoughts on these opportunities and challenges from my perspective as a librarian and print culture historian.

Opportunities

Changing Editorial Practices

Open access, and the corresponding efficiencies of the technology systems that drive many open access platforms, provides an opportunity for scholars to become more directly involved in what was formerly perceived as pedestrian and operational features of dissemination—the production, access, and financial models that undergird the work of the academy.

• Scholars, the producers of original scholarly content, are becoming more aware of both the positive and negative dynamics of for-profit commercial publishing in relation to scholarly communication and, most importantly, its potential for reach and broad impact. Escalating costs and demands weighed against contracting budgets and staffs of libraries, university presses, and publishing houses can now be a visible, direct consideration of scholars as they shape their research agendas.

• The efficiencies of new technologies have the potential to create new, more nimble, “faster to market” publications and linkages between publications and disciplines—allowing ideas and new research to get to center stage more efficiently.

• Of course, much early stage platform work remains to be done to get there.

Extending the Value of the Humanities Beyond the Academy

Open access offers new possibilities for the Humanities to reassert its value beyond the academy, more broadly throughout society. There are models aplenty, but a multidisciplinary approach like OLH’s megajournal concept is particularly poised to have impact in this important work.
• The natural sciences have done some incredible work in this area, for example, extending medical research and information into conversation not only with other researchers, but also the popular press and general public.
• Platform innovations will lead to repackaging and multi-packaging for various audiences.

Expanding Scholarly Access to Publishing Mechanisms  
Make a Real, Significant

Perhaps one of the most exciting aspects of the broader open access movement is its potential for enabling more diverse conversations and bringing more directly into current dialogue the voices of scholars who might struggle to gain access to traditional publishing mechanisms for geographic, financial, or “outsider status” reasons.

• Open access publishing platforms already do incredible work in engaging Majority World scholarship in some disciplines.
• The anticipated future expansion of “independent scholars,” outside of formal institutional structures, suggests that open access will have exponentially growing audiences not able to afford subscription material. The diversification of “alt-ac” academic careers, the DIY education movement (Khan Academy, EdX, Coursera, and others), and various independent credentialing programs suggest this trend will continue.
• With more quality scholarly material openly available, it is likely that the academy will have a new lens on the “gaps” in scholarship—and work sooner to incorporate under-represented perspectives and topics.

Challenges

Realities and Responsibilities: A Reckoning

Open access also faces serious challenges, including the highlighting of important realities and responsibility lines that the entire scholarly publishing ecosystem is coming to terms with.

• The ethics of a system where “free” content is provided and our institutions pay to buy scholarship back.
• “Consumer awareness” not unique to marketplaces around the academy; rather, it fits in with what is going in society more broadly—such as fair trade, the awareness of known producers, etc.
• These ethical questions are tugging on so many core threads that the very identity of “the scholar” is being explored, opening up controversial (and uncomfortable) debates about values, compensation/tenure, assessment, and the continuing value of organizational structures when doing “real” academic work.
• This period of instability will also continue for another 3-5 years, as structures are slow to change.
**Interoperability, Discovery, and Preservation Concerns**

The multiplicity that is so appealing in open access publishing (and, indeed, digital publishing broadly) also creates a set of serious challenges related to interoperability, discovery, and preservation.

- As a multitude of open publishing platforms continue to develop, the ability of various systems to provide seamless, deep interoperability and searching/discovery features *across systems* becomes more complicated. As smaller groups or individuals host publications too, the issue becomes even more complicated, making finding material in the future a challenge. Even the mega index commercial “discovery layers” available in many research libraries struggle to gather high visibility content; this will be compounded in the future.
- Discovery concerns include the lack of basic standardization (for example, DOIs, digital object identifiers), impeding access.
- Preservation concerns include the possibility of many “silos” of content that do not get folded into preservation and web archiving practices. Pop up, single issue, long term publications may or may not be archived locally in institutions or via big projects like the Internet Archive. There is no cohesive plan: pointing to a future role for scholarly associations.

**Librarian Perspective**

Open access has already changed the work of many academic librarians, depending on their institutional context, discipline foci, and personal affiliation. Open access publishing changes what and how we collect and shape collections; save, including web archiving; publish, including hosting publishing platforms and/or publications locally, sometimes in relationship with university presses, sometimes replacing them; and teach, directing researchers to new resources and providing instruction in open access publication and production directly.

For scholars not yet involved in open access, I would recommend that you consider starting a conversation with academic libraries, university presses, and scholarly societies. There are lots of on-ramps to open access: read open access publications, publish in an open access publication, volunteer to work on an open access journal, explore starting a new publication with collaborators.

**Print Culture Historian Perspective**

Finally, as a historian of texts, authorship, publishing practices, and reception, I am excited about the changing workflows and innovative technical features that characterize much of open access publishing. These new tools and methods are creating an amazing documentary record of how scholarly production happens.
Open access journal platforms are developed as collaborative spaces, providing a rich, detailed record of author, reviewer, editor, publisher interaction and exchange, illuminating the evolution of particular works of scholarship at an amazingly granular level. Additionally, online open access public projects like community transcription, community history, and community annotation projects provide a wholly new, dispersed, documented form of scholarly collaboration that is a treasure trove for historians to plumb.
Open Access and Career Advancement

With the growing move toward OA in the U.S. and in the humanities, we need to take care to consider the complications and implications. When it comes to career advancement and OA, especially with younger scholars, we find a particularly sticky situation.

The problem with OA and career advancement: the two don’t exactly go together – I’d like to posit a hopeful “yet” here, however.

We know OA is a good thing. Let’s say you publish an article – you do a lot of research, you write it, submit it, and wait (and repeat this a few times in my case); it’s years from start to publication. After all this time and effort, you want people to read it. Hence peer reviewed OA publications ensure the largest audience possible for your hard work – a nice payoff since we don’t get paid for academic publishing anyway.

But most academics don’t want to be the ones publishing OA books and papers since peer reviewed OA is still not considered as prestigious as traditional publishing in established journals or with established presses. This prestige has a real impact on people’s jobs – it’s how they get promoted. People get tenure by publishing in the best journals or with the best presses for their field. You want everyone to be able to read your work, but at the same time, you have to complete the steps that ensure your job security. The T&P (tenure and promotion) process in the humanities in the U.S. is tightly connected to publishing.

I am going to focus on OA in the humanities because we’re at MLA and I work in American literature. Prestige looks a little different here: it’s not really measurable by metrics since journals do not have impact factors as they do in sciences. So, it’s harder to convince T&P committees of the prestige of OA publications because they have no proof of prestige: they have not heard of these journals, they might not even know what OA is. In other words, to them, OA publishing possesses none of the intangible prestige that makes humanities publishing work.

Getting a job, getting promoted, or getting grants/fellowships are more likely when you have publications in high profile publications – this is especially relevant early in your career. Even when you’re on the other end, evaluating

---

applications for these positions and you see prestigious journals or presses on an applicant’s CV, you tend to value that candidate more.

So, prestige is our problem – the prestige of traditional journals and publishers is so compelling for career advancement that it troubles open access efforts.

I’ve come up with a few potential solutions to OA, the prestige problem, and career advancement:

1. It’s up to us to be the change we want to see. If we want OA and career advancement to positively influence each other, we have to take risks. But, as Barbara Fister argued in *Inside Higher Ed*, “it’s not ethical to ask young scholars to put their future at risk” since their positions are more tenuous (indeed, many “young scholars” are adjuncts or fixed-term faculty).²

Yale University librarian Susan Gibbons finds “junior faculty who are less inclined to publish in open access journals because they are focused on the career path and tenure track process. But once they get tenure, they feel like they have more freedom.”³ As Gibbons suggests, I think that mid-career and late-career folks need to make the effort. Rather than younger academics, established academics with less to lose should be the ones promoting OA publishing. They can give it the prestige it needs to benefit faculty at all stages.

Mid-career and late-career folks: consider it. Take the risk. Help the field. Make an effort to place work with OA presses (such as Open Library of Humanities).

2. Likewise, mid/late-career faculty should incentivize OA as department and committee chairs. Promotion and tenure, grant/fellowship, hiring committees, and so on should recognize efforts in and benefits of OA, peer-reviewed journals by encouraging it. Basically, gatekeepers should help promote OA by recognizing and giving greater value to such publications in their considerations.⁴ For example, put it in writing as the T&P Guidelines. OA publishing could also could be part of the service requirement: re-publication of peer-reviewed articles in an open access repository offers greater public good.

Again, here is where mid/late career faculty could make a big difference. If they could give extra weight to OA articles and books in tenure or grant-

---


awarding processes, changes could happen fast, and with no harm to the quality of humanities research. Talk to your department/committee chairs. Or if you are a chair yourself, consider incentives for OA.

Along those lines...

3. **Encourage faculty to publish with more prestigious/bigger presses with OA initiatives.** Junior faculty could publish with these presses and maintain prestige while advancing the recognition of OA publishing. Some examples: University of Michigan’s MPublishing and all the OA publications they offer (such as Open Humanities Press), or the brand new all-OA Amherst College Press. Or, faculty at all levels could publish with established presses that are partnering with OA initiatives. For example, consider participating in Knowledge Unlatched or publish with their consortium publishers including Duke, Rutgers, Cambridge, Penn State, and many more. This way, faculty do not need to fear for their promotion because of the imprimatur of these presses.

A few other ideas that are less focused on TT (tenure-track) faculty:

4. **Waiting on Millenials.** They are digital natives and are used to interactive technologies. They will have had access to OA materials their whole lives, like those already available through Google Books and green OA repositories. When they are humanities faculty members, they may refuse to support current publishing/promotion practices. Millenials might be the push we need for OA. This is sort of a waiting game, or a less active option, however.

5. **Create impact factors for humanities OA publications.** I’m no programmer, but why aren’t we seeing more push for this in the humanities? New metrics are happening in the sciences with Altmetrics and Impact Story. Altmetrics measures alternative forms of “impact,” through downloads and social media mentions. Something like this could greatly benefit the “prestige factor” of OA humanities publications.

6. **Encourage people at schools where tenure is different to publish OA materials.** For example, I work at a teaching-heavy institution where tenure is not the standard first book in six years. Junior faculty at places where publications in a wide variety of forms “count” for the promotion process could consider OA publishing since they might not have to worry as

---


much about prestige. Then again, the prestige problem works the other way: teaching-heavy institutions often have the lowest prestige even though their faculty ostensibly interacts with more students.

Finally, a word about early career faculty: a lot of us are contingent. In trying to cobble together enough sections to make a living, many adjuncts don’t have the time or energy to consider publishing, let alone OA publishing. How can OA advance their careers? I do not have answers here. But I’m interested in whether OA can offer any meaningful solutions to the precarious position of adjuncts and fixed-term faculty in American academia since so many of them are “younger” academics.
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