

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-09789-6 - Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts,
Controversies and the Future
Martin Paul Eve
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

OPEN ACCESS AND THE HUMANITIES

If you work in a university, you are almost certain to have heard the term ‘open access’ in the past couple of years. You may also have heard either that it is the utopian answer to all the problems of research dissemination or perhaps that it marks the beginning of an apocalyptic new era of ‘pay-to-say’ publishing. In this book, Martin Paul Eve sets out the histories, contexts and controversies for open access, specifically in the humanities. Broaching practical elements alongside economic histories, open licensing, monographs and funder policies, this book is a must-read for both those new to ideas about open-access scholarly communications and those with an already keen interest in the latest developments for the humanities. This title is available as open access via Cambridge Books Online.

MARTIN PAUL EVE is a lecturer in English at the University of Lincoln and is the author of *Pynchon and Philosophy* (2014) and editor of the open-access journal of Pynchon scholarship, *Orbit*. Eve is well known for his work on open access, which includes appearing as an expert witness before the UK House of Commons Select Committee BIS Inquiry into Open Access, being a steering-group member of the OAPEN-UK project and a member of the HEFCE Open Access Monographs Expert Reference Panel, and founding the *Open Library of Humanities*.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-09789-6 - Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts,
Controversies and the Future
Martin Paul Eve
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-09789-6 - Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts,
Controversies and the Future
Martin Paul Eve
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

OPEN ACCESS AND THE HUMANITIES

Contexts, Controversies and the Future

MARTIN PAUL EVE



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-09789-6 - Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts,
Controversies and the Future
Martin Paul Eve
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107484016

© Martin Paul Eve 2014

Preface © Peter Suber 2014

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

A version of this publication is available as open access via Cambridge Books Online and is published under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike licence which permits re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the same Creative Commons licence is included and the original work is properly cited. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode>

The images, found on p. 91, that constitute the Creative Commons License Buttons reproduced within this work are the trademarks of the Creative Commons organization. They are here used in accordance with the Creative Commons' Policies on trademark usage, available here: <http://creativecommons.org/policies>. These elements remain the intellectual property of Creative Commons and are not included in the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike license applied to the rest of this work.

First published 2014

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-107-09789-6 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-107-48401-6 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

The advice and opinions expressed in this book are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views or practices of Cambridge University Press. No representations are made by the Press about the suitability of the information contained in this book, and there is no consent, endorsement or recommendation provided by the Press, express or implied, with regard to its contents.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-09789-6 - Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts,
Controversies and the Future
Martin Paul Eve
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

For Helen

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-09789-6 - Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts,
Controversies and the Future
Martin Paul Eve
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-09789-6 - Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts,
Controversies and the Future
Martin Paul Eve
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Contents

<i>Preface by Peter Suber</i>	<i>page</i> ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xii
<i>Citing this work</i>	xv
1 Introduction, or why open access?	I
2 Digital economics	43
3 Open licensing	86
4 Monographs	112
5 Innovations	137
<i>Notes</i>	152
<i>Glossary of open access terms</i>	179
<i>Bibliography</i>	182
<i>Index</i>	201

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-09789-6 - Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts,
Controversies and the Future
Martin Paul Eve
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

To begin with such a practical self-criticism would make a
real difference in the way we do our work.

Jerome McGann, 'Information Technology and the Troubled Humanities', p. 110

Preface

Open access benefits the sciences and humanities about equally, but has been growing faster in the sciences. That may seem odd until we realise that benefits aren't the only factors affecting growth. Sunlight benefits all plants about equally, but some plants live in dry climates, some at high altitudes, some in rocky soil.

Open access (OA) helps readers find, retrieve, read and use the research they need. At the same time, it helps authors enlarge their audience and amplify their impact. Those are the main benefits. But these benefits lead to others. If OA helps readers and authors of research, then it helps advance research itself and all the benefits that depend on research. In the case of the sciences, that can mean new medicines and useful technologies, and in the case of the humanities it can mean enriched education, politics, compassion, imagination and understanding.

One of the most compelling arguments for legislated OA policies is that governments should assure public access to the results of publicly funded research. This argument is widely effective because it aims to accelerate the research we've already decided to fund with public money, increase the return on the public's large investment in research, and improve fairness to taxpayers. There's no downside for the public interest, only an incomplete upside. There is more public funding for scientific research than for humanities research. Far more. Call this a dry climate for the humanities.

Journals in the humanities have higher rejection rates than journals in the sciences. This is not because they are more rigorous, but because they cover wider topics and receive correspondingly more submissions per published paper. In any case, their higher rejection rates affect their ability to charge fees to cover the costs of production. (Charging

these fees is the best-known but not the most common business model for OA journals.) If someone on the author side of the transaction, such as the author's employer or funder, pays an article processing charge, then no one needs to pay on the reader side, and the work may become OA. But the fee for an article must cover the costs of vetting all the articles rejected for every one accepted. Hence, fee-based OA journals with high rejection rates must charge higher fees than other journals. The fee-based model works best in well-funded fields with relatively low rejection rates, and worst in fields like the humanities. This is a dry climate combined with the difficulty of transplanting a misty-climate crop to a dry climate.

Journal articles tend to be primary literature in the sciences and secondary literature in the humanities. In the sciences, books tend to synthesise research published in articles, while in the humanities articles tend to report on the history and interpretation of books. Tenure in the sciences depends more on published articles than on books, while tenure in the humanities depends more on published books than on articles. This would just be an observation about disciplinary differences if it weren't for the inconvenient fact that OA for books is objectively harder than OA for articles. The production costs of a book are significantly higher than the production costs of an article. Hence, it's significantly harder to find the business models or subsidies to pay for OA books than those to pay for OA journals. To top it off, academic monographs can pay royalties, in theory, even if they seldom do so in practice. By contrast, scholarly articles never pay royalties, which is the main reason why the worldwide OA movement has focused on articles. Hence, author consent for OA is easier to win for articles than for books.

Despite these obstacles, OA for books is feasible and growing, thanks to many innovative start-ups including the Open Library of Humanities, founded by Martin Eve and Caroline Edwards. However, even progress for OA books doesn't change the fact that scholars in the humanities have reasons to publish in genres where OA is more difficult, like farmers with reasons to plant higher up the mountainside.

I'll add one more difference between the disciplines and then stop. Certain myths and misunderstandings about OA are more tenacious and widespread in the humanities than in the sciences. This adds

Preface

xi

needless obstacles to the growth of OA. For example, by percentages more humanists than scientists believe that publishing in a high-prestige non-OA journal rules out making the same work OA through an online repository, that even well-implemented OA risks copyright infringement, that most OA journals charge author-side fees, that most fees at fee-based OA journals are paid by authors out of pocket, that most non-profit society publishers fear and shun OA, and that most OA publishers are lax with quality control.

I'd like to think that these myths and misunderstandings are more common in the humanities merely because humanists have had less time than scientists to catch up with the relatively recent advent of OA. But that's not true. They've had exactly as much time. Nor is the explanation that humanists are more careless readers of contracts, policies, statutes, or studies of OA itself. I suspect the true explanation is that humanists have had fewer working examples of OA to prove the concept and prove that the sky does not fall. They've had fewer working examples to dispel misunderstandings, generate enthusiasm and inspire commitment. If so, then the humanities labour within a vicious circle in which the slower growth of OA causes a slower growth of good understanding, and vice versa. By contrast the sciences enjoy a virtuous circle in which the faster growth of OA causes a faster growth of good understanding, and vice versa. This is rocky soil for the humanities.

But the same explanation contains a ground for hope. There was a time when the growth of OA in the sciences was also slow, and kept slow by a vicious circle. In fewer than twenty years, however – long in internet time, short in the history of scholarship – the vicious circle in the sciences became a virtuous circle. This reversal is not logically impossible. It requires steady growth in working examples, to feed understanding, and steady growth in understanding, to feed working examples.

The good news is that we see this growth today in the humanities. Martin Eve is among the leaders in making this happen. He's a leader in providing working examples, and a leader in correcting myths and misunderstandings, without underestimating genuine difficulties, through his articles, blog posts, public speaking and now through this book.

PETER SUBER
DIRECTOR, OFFICE FOR SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Acknowledgements

There are many individuals and groups who have positively contributed not only to this book, but to my discovery of and immersion in open access. Although it may be clichéd and/or trite, I would like to thank all those who have participated in the discussions around and practical implementations of open access.

There are also, however, some figures from whom I have received individual assistance and I would like to acknowledge them more specifically here, with apologies to those I have no doubt omitted. Firstly, I thank Caroline Edwards for being my co-conspirator on the OLH project and with whom I planned this volume. She is not only a rigorous, sharp and quick thinker but a kind friend and an excellent colleague. I also, of course, thank Peter Suber for his generous preface to this book but also for his untiring efforts to make open access a reality.

I would furthermore like to acknowledge the help of Ellen Collins for the contribution that her literature review into OA monographs made to this book and for her comments on my write-up of the OAPEN-UK project. Likewise with respect to OAPEN-NL and OAPEN-UK, I owe a debt to Eelco Ferwerda, Caren Milloy and Graham Stone. With regard to the sections on the commodity form of open-access articles, I thank Joss Winn, an astute thinker in the Marxist tradition. For invitations to other various panels, projects and discussions that have informed this book, I would like to thank Geoff Crossick, Ben Johnson, Chris Wickham, Nigel Vincent, Ben Showers, Kitty Ingliss, Jane Harvell, Ann Rossiter, Neil Jacobs and Michael Bhaskar.

Acknowledgements

xiii

Elsewhere, in no particular order, I would like to thank the following for conversations, ideas and projects: John Willinsky, Alex Garnett, Juan Pablo Alperin, Don Waters, Kathleen Fitzpatrick, Cameron Neylon, Adam Hyde, Mike Taylor, Jane Winters, Tim Hitchcock, Liz Sage, Joe Brooker, Martin McQuillan, Roger Luckhurst, Hilary Fraser, James Baker and Ernesto Priego. For reading early drafts of this book, I thank Ruth Charnock and James Emmott. I thank all my friends and colleagues at Lincoln who have put up with me banging on about open access, but especially Siân Adise-shiah, Christopher Marlow, Rebecca Styler, Amy Culley, Owen Clayton, Hannah Field and Agnes Woolley.

I am immensely grateful to Cambridge University Press for their support of this volume and particularly to Richard Fisher, Linda Bree, Anna Bond, Jessica Murphy and Frances Brown. It is, of course, difficult to write about or criticise scholarly publishing within the confines and power structures of that very system. I am a believer, however, that the amplificatory power of good presses is real and that through this route this book will reach readers who would otherwise remain in the dark. While, therefore, it was a condition of this book that it be written as close to neutrality as possible, it was nonetheless brave of Cambridge University Press to let me go ahead with the project. The Press have also extremely kindly agreed to make this book open access at launch (including a form of open licensing) while selling electronic and physical copies. I was offered a royalty, but have instead chosen to donate any authorial proceeds to Arthritis Research UK, without whose work I could neither live nor work. Please do support the project by buying a copy if you are reading this online. If you are reading in print, thank you but please don't forget that there is also a searchable electronic version available to you freely.

Some portions of the writing here have appeared before in other forms, either on my personal website or elsewhere. Most notably, the meditations on peer review in Chapter 5 appeared in a significantly altered form, yet clearly enough for the genesis to be seen, as 'Before the Law: Open Access, Quality Control and the Future of Peer Review', in *Debating Open Access*, edited by Nigel Vincent and Chris Wickham (London: British Academy), pp. 68–81. Some

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-09789-6 - Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts,
Controversies and the Future
Martin Paul Eve
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

xiv

Acknowledgements

of the remarks on collective/collaborative funding initiatives appeared within my 'All That Glitters: Investigating Collective Funding Mechanisms for Gold Open Access in Humanities Disciplines', *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 2, 3 (2014).

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Helen Eve, for her spark, patience and love and without whom I almost certainly would not have become an academic. This book is dedicated to her.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-09789-6 - Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts,
Controversies and the Future
Martin Paul Eve
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Citing this work

As per the provisions of section 3.a.1.A.i of the CC BY-SA license, when attributing this work, I request that you reproduce the following elements in your citation: Martin Paul Eve, *Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts, Controversies and the Future* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014) and the URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316161012>. If a derivative, you should acknowledge this fact. Although I cannot legally enforce it under the license, I would be grateful if you would summarise any changes made in a derivative.