"All That Glitters Is Not Gold"

THE GOLDEN ROAD TO OPEN ACCESS MONOGRAPHS IN THE HUMANITIES

Marit Leenders S1531778

Book and Digital Media Studies

Supervisor: Adriaan van der Weel

Second Reader: Anniek Meinders

Date: 24 March 2016

Word count: 21205

Universiteit Leiden

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The electronic age has brought us several new and ground-breaking developments when it comes to access to information. One of these developments is the possibility to have direct access to such a large and ever increasing amount of information that no one will even be able to read everything. For academic research, the next step is to have free and direct access, and is called Open Access (OA). As with every development, OA comes with its own new ideas but also with difficulties and not all answers to these problems have been found yet. This thesis will touch upon several aspects of OA and aims to give a clear insight into publishing OA monographs in the humanities by discussing the advantages as well as the disadvantages of this development. It will then take a closer look at current initiatives that are trying to find their own way in a world that is predominantly focused on the sciences instead of the humanities.

Although information overload is not typical of the 21st century, as Ann Blair describes in her book *Too Much to Know*, nowadays it seems to be easier than ever to get access to these sources with information.[1] Within less than a second, an uncountable number of websites can be accessed, without even having to leave the room. Most of these sites can be found and read for free, such as Wikipedia. Other sources, however, can be hidden behind paywalls. Although the free websites are often ridiculed for not being trustworthy because they can be written by anyone and are often not checked for reliability, most people refuse to pay for information they think they can also get for free. Especially in a time in which not only text, but also books, films, and music can and is downloaded illegally without hesitation, it seems like these sources of textual information, and academic publications in particular, cannot stay behind in their availability. The main difference between the free and paid sources, however, is the quality and depth of the given content. For example, a free news website will provide its readers with only the bare facts, whereas the paid website offers a more detailed description with a richer background.

The expectation of free access also exists in the academic world. As a way around having to buy expensive books, students already turn to Google Books, in the hope that the one chapter they need is at least partially available. Even if this method is not used, the first place that is consulted when trying to find information is the Internet. Although a university library may contain the necessary books, it is more time efficient to type a phrase into a

---

[1] A. Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

search box and let the computer do all the hard work of spitting through all those titles that can be found online. Whether we like it or not, the Internet is often a good, if not better substitution for a library when it comes to finding information.

However, a problem arises when people face restrictions while searching for information online. Journals are often already freely available online via OA or after logging in via an institution that has already paid for the content, but the larger formats such as monographs are not, with the exception of some e-books. Online publications are relatively scarce for monographs, which makes it difficult, if not impossible to find the actual books online. This is therefore the first gap that has to be bridged: either digitising the already existing monographs – especially the older ones – or creating a suitable online copy that allows for the monographs to be found. Of course, e-books already exist, but not as widely spread as the digital journal yet. The next step would be to publish monographs via OA. Once online copies have become a more standard procedure for monographs, getting rid of the paywall can bridge the gap between the online searches and monographs. This gap still exists because academics can often get access to these sources through their university, but after they graduate or are not affiliated to the institution anymore, they lose this right, leaving them with the harsh reality that scientific publications are extremely pricey. The fact that these publications are mostly limited to a select group only is one of the reasons why the paywall that hides them from the general public is starting to get increasingly more old-fashioned and is slowly disappearing.

Consequently, a new solution had to be found to pay for the costs that were previously covered by the income provided through the paywall. The outcome of this was the search for a sustainable business model that was initiated by the growing expectation for free scientific publications and resulted in the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) in 2001. Since then, this search has grown from an idealistic to a realistic prospect. The initiative focuses on "free and unrestricted online availability",[2] which was from then onwards known as Open Access. The reason behind this initiative was that "[r]emoving access barriers to [scientific] literature will accelerate research, enrich education, share the learning of the rich with the poor and the poor with the rich, make this literature as useful as it can be, and lay the foundation for uniting humanity in a common intellectual conversation and quest for knowledge."[3]

---

[2] Budapest Open Access Initiative, 'Read the Budapest Open Access Initiative'
<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read> (18 June 2015).
[3] Ibid.

Furthermore, the BOAI states that the effect on material published in OA will also include "new visibility, readership and impact."[4] Since this first initiative was mostly focused on journals, they do not mention monographs in their description. However, the given reasons for making journals OA also hold for monographs. In light of enriching education, these longer publications allow readers to read the text in a certain context, because monographs, contrary to journal articles, can cover more and in-depth information on a subject. The possibility of being able to read or consult journal articles and monographs would therefore be a perfect combination to accomplish the various goals as given by the BOAI. These OA developments will not only affect the publications themselves by changing their accessibility and influence, but will eventually work their way through the entire scholarly world, as people all over the world will be able to get access to these publications. Although the BOAI did not invent the idea of OA, it did create a collaboration of several smaller projects, which consequently marked the beginning of more widespread and thus influential projects.

1.1 History

Although OA seems like a recent development, the very first notion of it goes back as far as the early days of the Web. As the Web improved, the academic fields that were closely working with it changed alongside it. Since the Internet offers a quick and cheap way of distributing material, it is no surprise that the publishing world sees it as a great opportunity to enhance their work in several ways. One of these ways is a new publishing model, defined by the BOAI as Open Access. The development of this innovative model can be divided into three phases, according to Mikael Laakso.[5] The first phase covers the time period of 1993 to 1999. These are the Pioneering years, and can be defined by publishing on technically simple platforms created by (groups of) scholars. These simple platforms were mostly maintained by volunteers and the free use of the editor's university web servers. The second period, ranging from 2000 to 2004 is called The Innovation period. Its distinctive characteristics are a strong growth for OA journals and articles and the occurrence of new business models. An example of a new model is the author charge, also known as Article Process Charges (APCs), which will be discussed in more detail later. This business model was invented by BioMed Central, which, together with the Public Library of Science, was one of the pioneering OA publishers that is still well-known today. Furthermore, already established printed journals started to digitise their articles, making a potential step towards OA easier. Although journals still

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] Laakso et al. 'The Development of Open Access Journal Publishing from 1993 to 2009', *PLoS ONE,* 6.6 (2011).

worked with toll access, which is the subscription model where users pay to get access to a publication, they started to offer authors the possibility to publish their articles in OA. This resulted in hybrid journals. These journals still use toll access to cover the costs, but also publish OA articles in these journals by using the author charge model. This created a new phenomenon: double dipping. The OA articles had to be paid for via APCs, and access to these journals containing the OA articles still had to be paid for via the subscription model. Consequently, institutions who paid for their articles to be OA, still had to buy the entire journal if they wanted access to the rest of the journal. In other words, for some articles the institutions had to pay twice, which is called double dipping. The main advantage of these hybrid journals, however, is that it offers the possibility of OA publishing on a relatively small scale without having to make the entire journal OA, which could be financially too risky for publishers. This increase of OA publications was combined with the expanding online global audience publishers were able to offer the authors. It was also the period in which the abovementioned Budapest Initiative was set up, together with several other groups that advocated the use of OA. The final phase are called the Consolidation years, from 2005 to 2009, when increasingly more infrastructure supporting OA appeared. Also, quality standards, licensing agreements and specific software were increasingly set and accepted. Well-established scientific journals started to use the author charge system as well, following BioMed Central, who started this earlier. Regarding the authors wanting to publish in OA, funding started to become included in research funds in some cases, making it easier to pay for the author charges. Over the course of these phases, OA had grown to be more widely accepted and used by a growing number of publishers. Since then, OA has seen the development of multiple business models and initiatives that have tried to other and perhaps better ways to finance OA publications.

1.2 Current State

That brings us to the present state of OA. The current goal of the Ministry or Education, Culture and Science in the Netherlands is that by 2024, all scientific publications will be available through OA. The development of 'free' material will be the future for the academic world, according to Dutch state secretary Sander Dekker.[6] This includes any sort of scientific publication, be it in the form of journals, monographs or other forms. The preferred method for the realisation of this goal is Gold OA, meaning that the author or affiliated institution is responsible for covering the costs that have to be made for the publication of the work and

---

[6] S. Dekker. 'Open Access van Publicaties' *Ministry of Education, Culture and Science*, 15 November 2013. p.1.

that the OA edition becomes available immediately when the paid format is published. The costs that are made when creating an OA publication are called the Article Processing Charges (APC). In Dekker's plan, any form of publication will be treated the same way, regardless of its format or field. However, there are major differences in the process of publishing a journal or a monograph. Although the technical aspect is the same, – why would an 80.000 word text be different from an 8.000 word one? – the ways of how they are used, distributed and read, differ highly. For instance, monographs are expected to be read in their entirety. However, reading a digital copy is almost impossible, which means that they still have to be printed. The costs of creating the physical copy, which also includes distribution etc., will therefore never disappear. Journals on the other hand, consisting of shorter articles, are often found and read on online platforms and therefore do not necessarily need to exist in a physical format.

A second division in scholarly publications is the field of expertise. This has a significant impact on how OA can work. In very general terms, this division consists of STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) and HSS (humanities and social sciences). Since monographs are virtually non-existent in the STEM fields, this side of the scholarly world will not be taken into consideration in the coming arguments. Also, this thesis will focus more on the humanities rather than the social sciences, because the research results of the latter are more often data oriented than the textual argumentative style of the humanities and are therefore more likely to be published in shorter articles. The significant differences between these STEM fields and the humanities when it comes to OA, will be discussed in greater detail later on. These differences should be taken into consideration when deciding on a new business model that will be introduced by OA.

Furthermore, the term Open Access is not as simple as it sounds. Although the general idea is to make scientific publications freely available, the ways of trying to complete this model vary widely. The most commonly known business models are Gold and Green. In short, the differences between the two varieties is that Gold needs authors or their institutions to pay for the costs of making an article OA by means of APCs which can then be published immediately. Green on the other hand is based on self-archiving and embargo periods of at least several months. In this latter model, authors first publish their work in a traditional way in journals or as regular monographs. After the embargo period, often 12-24 months but that depends on the field, the article or monograph can be uploaded to a digital repository, where it is free for everyone to read. Since this would either mean that the subscription costs still need to be paid, or that content will be old and sometimes already outdated by the time the

embargo period has passed, Gold is regarded as superior to Green, as it allows for the material to be published immediately and relieves the financial pressure on libraries, who are the main buyers of these products. Also, the prices of journals and monographs have already risen steeply in the past couple of decades, resulting in for instance the monograph crisis, which will be explained later on. Some have argued that OA might be a solution to this crisis, and this will be discussed in the next chapter. Green OA would do nothing to solve this crisis or save libraries from these high costs of buying the physical copy. Gold is a better fix in theory, but comes with a different set of problems. APCs are unaffordable in many disciplines or institutions. These charges are most likely no problem for the richer STEM disciplines, as these subjects are the political focus and therefore receive enough funding. This leaves the humanities with less funding, since this discipline is seen as less vital to invest in. Basically, the main difference between STEM and the humanities is funding. For instance: a professor of literature wants to do any sort of research on a literary based subject. The main item that is needed for this form of research is a library containing the necessary material and some time to spend researching it. In order to do this, not a lot of money is needed. So where to get the money to allow for this research to become published in OA? The costs of publishing an article quickly rise to thousands of euros, and the price of monographs is even more than ten thousand euros.[7] With a lack of sufficient funding, this is simply too much, which will consequently prevent a growth of OA publications in the humanities. This causes the field to fall behind in terms of technological developments. It is no surprise that people often joke that the humanity scholar has only just discovered how to use a computer. Since the differences between the disciplines can easily be overlooked in the process of making everything OA, and therefore creating problems that are not actually necessary, the following chapters will give an overview of several aspects of OA monograph publishing in the humanities, with a specific emphasis on the Gold variety.

2. Why or why not Open Access?

Before people can decide on the best suitable business model for the humanities monograph, one has to look at what OA can mean for the humanities and how the field can be enhanced by the implementation of this new form of publishing. Apart from feeling the pressure from the growing expectation to be able to find and read everything online, it is also important to

---

[7] OAPEN-NL, 'Samenvatting Eindrapport',
<http://www.oapen.nl/index.php?option=com_content&view=section&id=7&layout=blog&Itemid=54> (6 July 2015).

know where the strengths and weaknesses of OA lie. This is more important than trying to find a way to introduce OA into the humanities just because the government has decided to do this. Knowing the strengths and weaknesses can be useful when deciding on how to treat this new development that is praised by many, yet whose definite form remains unclear. Its advantages however, are easily explained. Especially in an age when everyone is used to having access to scientific publications from their own computers, it can be a major mistake not to follow the developments that OA is currently going through, even though it is predominantly focused on a different format and field. OA has different advantages for the humanities than for the STEM fields. For example, if fewer and fewer people visit the library for their research material and the monograph is not freely available online, the audience of this format will shrink. OA journals will gladly serve those who go online for information, but the OA monograph is not yet at the same level, because it has not been the centre of attention during the most crucial stages of the development of online publication. Although there is currently still a market for consulting paper copies, it is important to look at a future that is all about being able to find and read everything, anywhere. The question is thus: will monographs not fit in and disappear, will they be read and used differently, or will something happen that we cannot foresee yet? The coming chapter will focus on how and why OA can play a role in the future of the monograph, but also what the disadvantages are.

2.1 Research Access, Public Access and Re-use

Generally, the advantages of OA can be split into three parts: Research Access, Public Access and Re-use.[8] Although researchers often have access to many scientific publications, there are still a lot of boundaries, especially in the poorer regions of the world. OA can therefore play a large role in increasing Research Access. Especially those belonging to institutions in poorer countries may have some difficulty in getting access to the more prestigious and thus more expensive publications. Because these institutions are not able to afford the expensive monographs or journal packs that publishers offer, the academics of these institutions become the intellectual victims. Consequently, they cannot get access to these publications when writing their own work. This means that they cannot use references to these articles, which results in publishers finding their articles not worthy enough to be published. If an article does not refer to highly-regarded publications, it is seen as being of a lower quality, or even as not reliable. In the end, articles from academics linked to these institutions will not be published

---

[8] M.P. Eve, 'Co-operative funding for Gold Open Access in the Humanities', *UKSG,* 1 April 2015, <https://tv.theiet.org/?videoid=6699>, min.1:50. (6 July 2015).

in the influential journals. This means that these institutions will not make a big name for themselves including the level of prestige, will not get enough funding, and so a vicious circle appears. With OA however, researchers have the ability to build upon the findings of others, and even improve them, providing a more solid name for themselves and their institutions. This means that even those who are connected to institutions that do not have the opportunity to build up an extensive collection of sources, can get access to expensive journals and monographs with a high esteem. This will improve their research and the result of this can be noticed in many forms, for instance in an improvement of education.

The second use is Public Access. The most popular argument of why scientific publications should be open and free is because the research is paid for by the taxpayer, and should therefore also be available to them. It is claimed to be unfair to let the taxpayer pay a second time for content they have already paid for. Although giving the public access to scientific publications is highly beneficial for the humanities, the argument of the taxpayer is the wrong reason for promoting OA. It does not keep in mind all the costs of the procedures that have to take place in order for research to be turned into publishable content. So what is the real reason the public should be given access to scientific publications? It can be argued that scientific articles are too difficult for the general public to understand, making OA useless in this case. Although this may be true for fields such as medicine, the same does not necessarily go for the humanities, an area in which critical thinking is stimulated. During their time at university, students, but also academics, have access to articles that contemplate certain topics, allowing the readers to be a part of the ongoing discussion. However, as soon as they leave university and are not affiliated with an academic institution anymore, they are cut off from this information, which is the direct opposite of the initial goal of the humanities. Moreover, not taking part in the developments of OA, and thus not allowing people to continue to read said publications, can result in the humanities becoming irrelevant and invisible. If the group of readers only consists of academics, the arguments will predominantly be read by a limited number of people who all belong to the same group, in the same environment. The difference between the humanities and STEM here is that the research results of the humanities do not always have a physical outcome that can be noticed by having an influence on society, in contrast to for instance medicine with cures of diseases, or updates and proof of climate change. Consequently, the results of humanities-based research will not always be directly visible to society, and will thus remain within a selected group of those actually have access to the monographs with the research results. Since these monographs are often not available online, or only behind a paywall, it is difficult for most people to read

them, and thus to know what is happening within the humanities. As a result, people often think research with a humanities background has nothing substantial to add, while developments when it comes to medicine are widely discussed on for instance the news. Visibility of the subject plays a large role here. STEM subjects are vital to a world that would not be able to function without technology anymore and is becoming increasingly dependent on the sciences. The humanities, however, are often regarded as a field that people choose to be interested in.

Even within the university, OA can be useful. This is where the Re-use comes in. It often occurs that professors cannot send an article or monograph to their students because of copyright, even though it would be beneficial for the author to have his or her article as widely spread as possible. Currently, publishers own the rights to an article. That means that in the abovementioned situation, the professor would need to pay a fee in order to be able to distribute the article. With OA, however, there are no limitations to sharing an article or passages from a monograph. In short, the main issue here is copyright. Although re-use could be seen as a part of the previous two advantages, there is one major difference here: having access to a text is not the same as being able to use it for certain purposes. For example, people have experienced difficulty with text mining when trying to use articles that were already available online.[9] . Even when researchers have full, legitimate access to a text, whether it is via OA or subscription, it is still difficult to use it for a text mining purpose because of copyright rules. This incident took place in 2012, and things have changed since then: as of 30 September 2015, BioMed Central has released its articles and allows free re-use and distribution of the texts.[10] Since they are one of the largest players in the OA field, this is a significant development. Other publishers have also released their articles for this purpose.

Because OA publications ask for a different treatment when it comes to copyright compared to its paper equivalent, a new license has been set up: Creative Commons (CC). The reason why this is such an important license, is because of the ease of sharing and distributing material online. There are several types of the CC license, going from free to share, copy and alter as long as the author is mentioned, to free to share only.[11] These licenses reinforce the possibility of a wider access and re-use of the OA publications.

---

[9] 'Pushing the Frontier of Access for Text Mining: A Conversation with Heather Piwowar on One Researcher's Attempt to Break New Ground', *SPARC*, 17 May 2012 <http://www.sparc.arl.org/news/pushing-frontier-access-text-mining-conversation-heather-piwowar-one-researcher%E2%80%99s-attempt-break> (25 September 2015).

[10] BioMed Central, 'Using BioMed Central's open access full-text corpus for text-mining research', <https://www.biomedcentral.com/about/datamining> (30 September 2015).

[11] Creative Commons, 'Over de licenties' <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/> (2 February 2016).

2.2 How OA can 'save' the monograph

Besides the abovementioned arguments that are beneficial for the users of OA publications, the authors of these articles and monographs also find themselves benefitting from the results of the development to an open scientific world. One of the points OAPEN-NL – a project researching OA publications – mentions in their research paper about their project on OA monographs is that OA would address and solve the monograph crisis.[12] Before trying to solve it, it is important to know how it came into being and how it affects the monograph. This is necessary to understand the problems and therefore figure out how to 'save' the monograph. In short, this crisis was created by the rising costs of journals (STEM based journals being the most important), which meant that money had to be found from somewhere else in order to still be able to purchase these expensive journals. This somewhere else turned out to be the budget of the monographs, which often find their origin in the humanities. Since the STEM fields are regarded as more important than the humanities, a larger sum of money will go to the journals of the former field, rather than the monographs of the latter. Moreover, the costs of these monographs were rising at the same time as well because of the decreasing print-runs. This means that per copy, the monograph has to be more expensive to cover the costs of printing. This makes them too expensive for the individual buyer, and thus leaves publishers with organisations such as university libraries as their main clients. As a result, the average sales of monographs have decreased from 2.000 to 200 in only 30 years.[13] Clearly, this decline is problematic in the H(SS) field, where the monograph is seen as a standard to decide on the quality of an academic's work.

However, OAPEN-NL claims that OA is the solution for this troubling phenomenon and it comes in two parts.[14] The first advantage of this new form of publishing is the increased discoverability of the monograph. This means that when people search for a monograph online, they can easily find a link to it. Ideally, and this would be the case if it is published in OA, the monograph is freely accessible and can thus be read immediately. A higher discoverability therefore results in a wider audience. This means that besides those who already have access to the product through their institutions, people from other countries or disciplines, and the general public will also gain access. However, this does not imply that everyone, especially not the general public, will also read the available monographs. As has

---

[12] E. Ferwerda, R. Snijder, J. Adema, *A project exploring Open Access monograph publishing in the Netherlands: Final Report* (OAPEN-NL: The Hague, 2013), p.3.
[13] Ibid., p.16.
[14] Ibid.

been stated before, longer online texts are nearly impossible to read. Furthermore, it is easy to download a product for free, but it is another thing to actually take the time to read it. However, it offers people the chance to read about a subject in more detail – even if it is just a couple of pages – than for instance the Wikipedia page, which may only offer the most basic information. Moreover, the possibility and ease of searching within the entire monograph by simply typing the word improves the usability of the monograph itself. It can be daunting to find a certain passage in a book of hundreds of pages, especially when it may be possible to find a shorter article on the same subject in a journal. However, with the online version it is no longer necessary to skim through the chapters in search of that one argument or piece of text. This makes people more likely to turn to monographs again. Furthermore, in an age in which so much information can be found on almost all subjects, it becomes increasingly less necessary for people to take the time to read an entire monograph. Being able to search for key words online saves a lot of time and allows people to cover more text in a shorter amount of time. The second advantage that OAPEN-NL claims will save the monograph is that OA calls for a new business model.[15] Since a digital edition costs less money than a physical one, especially distribution-wise, this could mean that a more sustainable model can be found that is based on the cheaper online editions. This development offers the chance to look at the current position and situation of the monograph and how OA can play a part in creating a new business model. It is easier to change old standards and traditions when the entire situation changes. Moreover, the existing and upcoming models for the OA journals can be of use here for some aspects, while of course keeping in mind that the printed monographs still have to be accounted for.

The main issue with the monograph, apart from those created by the monograph crisis, is the lack of time people nowadays spend on reading actual books. Information has to be gathered as efficiently as possible, and a longer text does not play a role in this world, according to these people. This behaviour can be observed when looking at how for instance students search for information for their course work. Hardly any of them will voluntarily read an entire monograph, but will instead go for the more bite-sized articles in journals. However, as stated before, Google Books can often play a role in directing people to monographs. If a search engine provides the link to a monograph that covers the necessary subject, there would be nothing to prevent someone from using the monograph. Discoverability is the key in this situation. In fact, the only difference here between the paper

---

[15] Ibid. p.26.

and the digital copy would be that they are perceived differently. Whereas the paper copy is seen as one product, consisting of a large number of pages the user has to skim through if only specific parts are necessary, the digital version can be regarded as a source of information that can be just as easily used as any other digital source; the great number of pages is no longer a daunting. An online version will probably be seen as a collection of chapters, because the user is no longer able to see the physical proportions of the monograph. Instead, only part of it will be used, and often the chapters may have the same length that a journal article has. This difference of perception is created by the possibility of having a quick way of navigating through the monograph. Because these digital texts are not suitable for long-term reading, they also suit a different purpose. As with journal articles, they are used as a means to quickly find information, rather than to be read as a whole. These digital monographs can therefore be used for the same purpose as their shorter counterparts. Overall, an online copy makes the format more user-friendly and it becomes thus more likely that they will be used by a wider audience and if the visibility rises, the future of the monograph becomes more secure. Various initiative and potential business models that could help achieve the wider use of OA will be discussed in a later chapter.

Claims of the importance of OA for the humanities are supported by many, and if the possibility arises to help the monograph to stay into existence, it should be taken seriously. For instance, some have observed that "making monographs open access might be the only way of preserving the format."[16] This is in line with the results of OAPEN-NL discussed before, which has pointed out that there are several aspects of OA that can secure the future of the monograph. Others, like Geoffrey Crossick, author of the report 'Monographs and Open Access' commissioned by the Higher Education Funding Council for England, state that OA should not be viewed as a solution to save the monograph, a thought that is combined with an underlying fear of the future, but one should rather look at the possibilities and opportunities that OA has to offer. By doing this, the focus is not on trying to preserve the current format, but on the positive aspects and how to improve the monograph with the help of new developments. Crossick continues to claim it as "wrong" to resist the trend towards OA.[17]

These arguments underline the significance of OA in the humanities. Although there will always remain some disadvantages, such as publishers who find themselves unable to

---

[16] P. Jump, 'Monographs Have to Adapt to Keep a Place in the Future', *Times Higher Education*, 22 January 2015 <https://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/news/monographs-have-to-adapt-to-keep-a-place-in-the-future/2018050.article> (23 July 2015).
[17] Ibid.

adapt to a new business model and the unequal development of OA in various countries, the main point is that it will be beneficial for the scholarly world on multiple levels. However, not all disciplines will and should follow the same path. This means that the humanities should not simply follow the sciences in its path to free and open access, but other, more fitting solutions have to be found. As stated by Martin Paul Eve: "Currently, there is not enough innovation around ways to pay for OA in the humanities that are not just following the sciences".[18] This statement identifies one of the most important and tricky obstacles that the implementation of OA in this field presents: the fact that something may be successful in one field, does not immediately means that it will be just as successful in another field. Intensive research has to be carried out prior to deciding on how to proceed, because the abovementioned benefits for the humanities will only be effective if the right conditions are met.

2.3 The problem with (Gold) Open Access

Despite all the positive sounds coming from those supporting OA, there are also groups who still regard it as an ideology that is bound to fail. One of the main issues with the development is something that what many regard as a positive feature of OA, namely that it has a lot of benefits for many different groups. The problem that lurks here is that these widespread advantages may result in a lack of focus on the ultimate goal. All of the benefits listed in the second chapter can also be turned around and regarded as disadvantages. People are trying to solve many problems with OA – perhaps even too many problems. It should be the solution for the monograph/serial crisis, lead to a wider audience and more citations, help institutions who do not have enough money for a large number of subscriptions or the ability to perform high-quality research of their own, and on top of that, should give a boost to education by offering products for free. It has also been claimed to be unfair that research has been paid for by the taxpayer, yet they have to pay a second time if they want access to the results. Moreover, the fact that there are so many different models of OA (the most well-known being Gold, Green and the upcoming Platinum) only contributes to a lack of uniformity. This can already be seen when comparing the favoured model in different countries. Whereas Europe has mainly put their focus on Gold OA, the United States seem to opt for the other format; Green OA.[19] On the other hand, this wide range of possibilities allows for multiple scenarios

---

[18] M.P. Eve, 'Co-operative funding for Gold Open Access in the Humanities', min. 18:10.

[19] M. Stebbins, 'Expanding Public Access to the Results of Federally Funded Research', *The White House*, 22 February 2013
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2013/02/22/expanding-public-access-results-federally-funded-research>
(26 September 2015).

to be explored. This makes sure researchers of OA are not withheld by focusing on one specific model or solution.

Another phenomenon that plays a role in the relatively slow development of OA, but at the same is vital in the humanities, is the prestige that is associated with monographs. It has been mentioned before how monographs act as an object to carry prestige, and how publishing with a well-known publisher is beneficial for one's career. According to Curt Rice, this is exactly the problem: large, prestigious publishers are able to attract enough researchers without changing their publishing model from the established procedures – the subscription model – to the idealistic OA.[20] This allows them to continue to their business as usual. Even if they were to decide to change to Gold OA and charge the author with high APCs, they would most likely still continue to attract scholars. Again, this might not be a problem for those fields with enough funding to back this up, but this would be problematic for the humanities. The power to change and increase the development of OA is in the hands of those scholars who continue to publish with these publishers. A solution would be to stand up against these businesses and either boycott them or start a new initiative based on the experiences and needs of scholars. This has recently been done by Martin Haspelmath and Stefan Müller, who founded Language Science Press, and work according to a business model that is free for both author as well as reader. This will be discussed in greater detail in chapter four. However, when the opportunity arises to publish with one of the big names and thus a high level of prestige, it is difficult to refuse.

Regarding this publishing with big names, some publishers take advantage of the new business model. This is not merely limited to the bigger publishers, but also some new, smaller publishers use the OA model for their own causes. Instead of only accepting the best articles or monographs, they accept as many as possible, which results in a high income generated by process charges. These publishers are known as 'predatory publishers', and basically take advantage of the Gold OA business model and the pressure on academics to publish. This often happens in the form of fake publishers convincing academics to publish with them by sending e-mails in which they ask for content, but also in the form of publishers accepting anything in return for high APCs. There are multiple examples of the latter, in which, as a way to test the publishers, academics wrote articles full of nonsense, and sent it to

---

[20] C. Rice, 'One big problem with open access and why the best way to fix it isn't going to work', *Science in Balance*, 30 September 2014
<http://curt-rice.com/2014/09/30/main-problem-open-access-best-way-fix-isnt-going-work/> (26 September 2015).

multiple publishers. In one case, the nonsense article was sent to 304 journals, and more than half of them accepted the paper.[21] This says a lot about the peer review process, and that it may not be as rigorous as publishers present it to be. Although this phenomenon is mostly known in the journal publishing world, it has also occurred in monographs.[22] In one particular case, the publisher in question published monographs written by multiple authors. The several chapters were often hardly peer-reviewed and unedited. Of course, OA is more widely implemented in journals than in monographs, which explains why there are more predatory journal publishers. The other example is that of publishers actively asking for content they can publish. In order to do this, authors have to pay a certain sum, a fake APC. The problem with modern technology is that anyone can build a website and pretend they are an OA publisher.[23] Jeffrey Beall was one of those who received spam e-mails from these predatory publishers and decided to make an ever growing list of names, which he started in 2010.[24] Here, he lists publishers who, for whatever reason, are not trustworthy according to him. Although this initiative is praised by many, there are also some downsides to this blacklist. One of the flaws is that his ordeals are purely based on his own suspicions, without interaction with the publisher in question. This could affect new, start-up OA publishers, or those whose website is not up to standards with websites in the western world.

Still, since the pressure to publish is high, it can be tempting to accept such an offer, and OA has only made these practices easier for predatory publishers. However, it should be noted that OA itself does not necessarily have a negative effect on the publishing world, but it is some publishers who take advantage of the possibilities that OA has to offer. These publishers can have a negative influence on the perception of OA, making it more difficult to be embraced by some scholars. A positive side to these predatory publishers, however, is that people become extra wary of publishing in certain journals and want to make sure that everything happens correctly. Consequently, standards have been set to prevent this form of publishing on a large scale. Eventually, these predatory publishers will seize to exist on such a large scale. It is only now, when OA is still relatively new and unknown for scholars, that these publishers can take advantage of the naivety of scholars. That is also why big OA

---

[21] J. Bohannon, 'Who's Afraid of Peer Review?' *Science*, 4 (2013), pp. 60-65.
[22] J. Beall, 'Beall's List of Predatory Publishers 2013" *Scholarly OA*, 4 December 2012 <http://scholarlyoa.com/2012/12/06/bealls-list-of-predatory-publishers-2013/> (30 January 2016).
[23] D. Butler, 'Investigating journals: The dark side of publishing', *Nature*, 27 March 2013 < http://www.nature.com/news/investigating-journals-the-dark-side-of-publishing-1.12666> (16 November 2015).
[24] Scholarly Open Access, 'Home', <http://scholarlyoa.com/> (10 December 2015).

platforms such as OAPEN and DOAB only accept peer reviewed material. By doing this, they can maintain their credibility and a certain level on their platforms.

A less obvious phenomenon that can cause a problem if Gold OA were to be implemented into the humanities, is the rejection rate of material. This does not seem highly crucial at first, but when examining the numbers in closer detail, the effect of these rates becomes clear. The rejection rate is the percentage of articles or monographs that is rejected by the publishers. However, this rejected material is still screened and examined before the publisher comes to the conclusion that it will not be published. Consequently, time and money is spent on a product that will not be used. It would not be a significant problem if this rate was more or less the same throughout the various scholarly fields, but this turns out not to be the case. Whereas the rejection rate of the STEM fields lies somewhere between 20-40%, within the humanities the percentage lies around 70%.[25] As a result, the material that does get accepted has to cover the costs of those rejected and are thus more expensive to publish. Therefore, journal and monograph publishers with a high rejection rate that are based on Gold OA have to charge higher fees for the material that does get accepted. This can have major consequences for the price of the APC, which is often already too high for humanity scholars. Rita Gardner, director of the Royal Geographical Society, even states that the average of the cost per paper is £3,000, which, compared to the average of £1,500-£1,700 as calculated in the Finch Report, is extremely high for a field that already lacks funding.[26] The reason for this high rejection rate is not necessarily because the quality of the articles or manuscripts is not high enough, but simply because the humanities covers such a large variety of topics and publishers thus receive so much potential publishing material that not everything can be published in a journal that often covers only one subject. In the case of rejected manuscripts, this is often because the monograph is already in a tricky situation with the monograph crisis, so publishers try to only accept those manuscripts that are highly marketable; popular topics are thus preferred over the risky niche subjects. In short, Gold OA is the most efficient in a field with enough funding and relatively low rejection rates, such as the STEM field, and is potentially dangerous – in the model with APCs that is – for fields like the humanities.[27] If this teaches us one thing, it is that this shows once again that there are significant differences between STEM and the humanities that simply cannot be ignored.

---

[25] P. Suber, 'Promoting Open Access in the Humanities', *Syllecta Classica*, 16 (2005), pp. 231-246.

[26] B. Page, 'Learned Society warn of Open Access risks', *The Bookseller*, 9 July 2012 <http://www.thebookseller.com/news/learned-societies-warn-open-access-risks> (5 October 2015).

[27] P. Suber, Preface in *Open Access and the Humanities: Context, Controversies and the Future* by Martin Paul Eve (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. ix-xi.

The unequal development of OA in various countries has been mentioned before, and can be considered to be another problem, especially in the process of switching from toll (subscription) access to open access. The main issue here is that the two different models, the subscription model and any preferred model of OA, will have to live next to each other for a certain, unknown period of time. It is an ambitious goal for a county to set a date for wanting to reach 100% OA, but if other countries have a later date or even no date at all, this will result in a lot of financial pressure on universities and their libraries. These organisations will have to pay to see their monographs published, but will still need to pay the full price for those monographs whose publishers have not (fully) made the transition to OA yet. Especially in an international market, it will take a considerable amount of time before the business model has been fully switched to OA. This means that the transition period will be longer, making the process even more expensive.

However, the fact that the entire academic market in so internationally oriented can also be an upside. If a certain model turns out to be successful, it can easily be adopted by other countries. Moreover, research on OA can also quickly be shared with publishers, which only helps and smoothens the transition process. Nevertheless, there will be a transition period, but maybe we just have to accept it as something that is impossible to ignore or work around and simply have to focus on what has to be achieved in the end: free and unrestricted access to scientific work for everyone.

3. Paper vs. Digital

One of the problems with trying to move monographs towards OA is the place where they have to come from, namely the printed copy. When the major shift to OA began for journals, they already had a history of digital copies, but only behind paywalls. The main and basically only aspect that had to change here was the business model. Now for the monographs, they have an entirely different background. Coming from a history of prestige, the printed copy has always played an important role, which means that the digital copy never really became widely used and it was thus found unnecessary to create digital copies, until recently with the increasing popularity for ebooks. Moreover, whereas it is possible to read an entire article from a screen, it is nearly impossible to do the same with a monograph. This means that in order for a successful OA edition of a monograph to be made, the first step is to find the perfect way to make and publish a digital copy and realise how it will actually be used by the reader. Will it be used next to the physical copy and serve as an easy way to find specific passages? Or will it truly be able to exist on its own? The answers to these questions will have

an influence on what the final product will look like, and more importantly, which tools have to be implemented. Together with the step to digital access, the step to open access has to be made as well. This step has proved to be difficult, because many organisations look at OA from a journal perspective, since this was the first point of view that existed. That makes the step for monographs even harder, since the monograph has an entirely different background and use.

As has been discussed before, there are many advantages to introducing OA into the humanities. The format of the monograph itself, however, is often regarded as problematic. For instance, the 2014 policy for OA in the Research Excellence Framework (REF) of the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) explicitly excluded monographs and other long-length publications from their research. [28] The reason for this exclusion is based on the advice received from the Finch Report, which is strongly in favour of Gold OA. This was probably because the combination of monographs and the Gold business model was too difficult to handle. According to Kimberley Hackett, the policy advisor of the HEFCE, people had no confidence that a sustainable business model for the monograph had been developed and therefore wondered whether monographs should be made OA at all.[29] Because of all this, the REF focusses mainly on journals, which underlines the differences between the journal and the monograph, seeing that they are treated differently and the latter is even ignored in this particular case. Recently however, a new report has been produced that specifically focuses on monographs. Again, the simple fact that there are separate reports for the two forms, shows once again that they should not be treated the same way.

In their new project 'Monographs and Open Access', the HEFCE examines the exact status and culture of the monograph in the HSS field. They specify that the role of the monograph is to "offer the space to set out arguments and evidence in disciplines where that is necessary."[30] In other words, academics are offered the space to clarify their line of thought in greater detail than they would be able to in a shorter article. This immediately explains why these works are so vital and prestigious in this field. The books are not only a way of showing research results to the outside world, but also connect these results to several personal ideas and arguments, providing the reader with enough information to provoke a discussion, which can even result in a change in the field. By doing this, results of a research can be seen in a

---

[28] G. Crossick, *Monographs and Open Access: A Report to HEFCE*, (HEFCE, 2015) p.3.

[29] P. Jump, 'Open Access: Brought to Book at Last?', *Times Higher Education*, 18 July 2013 <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/open-access-brought-to-book-at-last/2005758.article> (20 July 2015).

[30] Ibid.

larger context. Since these monographs are clearly more than an enumeration of results followed by a short explanation, they are often seen as an indication of quality of the academic's work. The procedure of taking the published monograph as the standard for the esteem of its author has been used for such a long time that it has become difficult, if not nearly impossible, to change. If you want to be someone, you have to have written a monograph. This poses an extra problem for the humanities: the means to grand esteem are put under pressure by the difficult situation monographs are in. However, whatever digital format the monograph will end up in, it is most likely that the paper copy will continue to exist as long as the format of the monograph will be used by scholars. Such traditions will not fade easily.

3.1 Effect on physical copies

One of the questions OA publishers are concerned about is whether the free digital format will affect the printed copies, since it has been established that these will continue to play an important role, at least in the foreseeable future. In order to answer this, Ron Snijder of Amsterdam University Press (AUP) has conducted an experiment to find out what the effect of OA was on the sales of the physical copies when free access was given through the use of Google books and an institutional repository.[31] This free use can be compared to the effect OA may have on monographs. Over the course of nine months, the statistics of 300 monographs were followed. These monographs were grouped in three sets of 100 books. The first set was available via Google Books, the second via the AUP repository and the third via both channels. A fourth set of 100 monographs was used as a control group and could not be read via any of the two channels, but only existed in their paper form. The main question that needed to be answered was whether OA would have an influence on the sales figures and the citation rates of the monographs. Prior to the experiment, the prediction was that the sales figures, citation rates and downloads would be significantly higher for the sets that were fully accessible, via any of the channels. After these nine months, it turned out that although the number of pages read and the downloads were higher, the citation rate and sales figures of the physical monographs did not rise for any of the sets. Although the first intuition after these results would be that there is thus no benefits for the author, this is not true. Despite the lack of a higher citation rate, authors indirectly experience benefits from the results of OA publishing. While the average print run keeps shrinking over the years, OA may offer new

---

[31] R. Snijder, 'The Profits of Free Books: An Experiment to Measure the Impact of Open Access Publishing' *Learned Publishing,* 23 (2010), pp. 293-301.

possible readers and thus a wider discovery rate. Readers will therefore discover the monograph on a new medium, thereby possibly making the discovery rate for other monographs higher as well. By offering monographs online, it will become easier for readers to find them while searching for a certain subject. Consequently, links to for instance repositories or Google Books will sooner be given, leading to a digital copy of another monograph. Once a monograph is found, it is sometimes the case that links to other monographs are given, either in the sense of 'Customers who bought this item also bought', a line that is often used by online shops, but it would also be possible to highlight certain titles and therefore bring them to the attention of the reader. By doing this, a snowball-effect will be created, making the discovery rate of the monograph in general higher.

Regarding this discovery rate, it turned out that there was a significant difference in publishing via Google Books or the institution's repository. When the experiment's time period had passed, the monographs that were available via Google Books were accessed more frequently. The AUP repository, with an average count of 4 views per month, scored significantly lower compared to Google Books, which managed to attract an average of 90 views in the same period.[32] This means that Google Books attracts 20 times as many views. Of course, this can easily be explained. The repository is mostly used by those who are familiar with it and know where to find it. Google Books, on the other hand, is also used by the general public, who will find books by searching for them via Google. Snijder predicted that this growing audience would result in a rise of sales figures, particularly because reading a longer text from a screen can be tiring and it is easier than ever to order a book online. Once people discover an online monograph they need, they may buy the physical copy. At least, that is the idea behind the prediction of the rising sales. This prediction, however, turned out to be incorrect. Although the monographs were accessed more frequently, the sales figures of the paper copies did not rise. The reason Snijder gives for this, is the limited budget of the libraries.[33] However, some publishers have agreements with their clients when it comes to ordering paper copies when they have already bought access to the digital copy. Users can then order a paper copy for a reduced price. An example of such a publisher is Brill, who offers a paper copy via Print on Demand for a significantly lower price of €25.[34] Moreover, the high price of monographs prevents individual buyers from ordering a copy when the entire product is already at their hands, especially when only a limited number of chapters or even

---

[32] Ibid. p.300.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Brill, 'Brill MyBook', <http://www.brill.com/products/books/brill-mybook> (1 October 2015).

pages is needed. This teaches us that if monographs are to be published in OA, the extra readers or downloads will not be able to cover the extra costs of creating an additional print copy. The new, sustainable business model can therefore not rely on the advantages in terms of more sales that OA has on the monograph.

The same sort of research focused on the effect of OA on the print sales has also been conducted by OAPEN-NL.[35] In their project to find answers to some of the questions that are still asked about OA monographs publishing in the humanities, they came up with the same result as Snijder; OA has no effect on the sales of monographs, neither positive nor negative. Although the pilot of OAPEN-NL was aimed at increasing the general attention that monographs receive, either in the form of citation, visibility or discoverability, they found that not every aspect was equally influenced by the introduction of free digital copies. Surprisingly enough, OA also has no effect on the number of citations, although OAPEN-NL does explain that this might be due to the relatively short period of the experiment. This may lead some to say that there are no benefits for this field, but the lack of effect can easily be explained. Those who use monographs in a professional way, and are therefore expected to cite the sources, usually already have access to these works through their institutions, in theory. On the other hand, the number of downloads does rise. This means that the group of people who use these OA monographs presumably do this for non-academic purposes, which immediately explains why it has no effect on the sales figures or citations. A second reason for the higher number of downloads can be that those who already have access to the physical monograph, also downloaded a digital copy to be able to use its advantages, such as being able to search within the text. However, one aspect of this pilot that was quite noteworthy was the rise in visibility and thus discoverability of the titles. As with Snijder's experiment, the monographs that were freely available, were downloaded more often than the paper copies were sold. Clearly, this phenomenon should not be taken lightly and can mean a general increase of attention for the humanities, which is often overshadowed by the STEM fields in many aspects. Of course, a download often does not have the same value as buying a product, so the number of people who have actually read those downloaded copies may even be lower than those who read the physical copies. However, it does mean that people are able to find the digital copy, which means that the access to the monographs is good.

What should not be forgotten is that these experiments were conducted with the idea of establishing what OA can mean for the monograph. What these two experiments can teach

---

[35] E. Ferwerda et al., *A project exploring Open Access monograph publishing in the Netherlands: Final Report.* p.58.

us in the light of building a sustainable business model, is that although the monograph can clearly benefit from the effects of OA, the advantages can unfortunately not be used as an economic support in terms of extra sales through the extra attention that a monograph receives through a higher discoverability. However, it does function as a reminder of why OA is important to the humanities and that it can contribute to larger familiarity with the field in general. It also means that other aspects or variations of Gold OA have to be found in order to make the business model sustainable.

3.2 Effect on the Humanities

Monographs are almost immediately associated with the humanities. Consequently, what is harmful for the monograph, can also be harmful for the field it is primarily used in, especially since the format is not only used as a form for communicating research results to the rest of the world, but also carries prestige. Despite the important position of the monograph within the humanities, the high price have left them too expensive for the individual buyer, and also research libraries are struggling with fitting them into their budget. Consequently, the monograph crisis has resulted in a dramatic decrease of the number of sales; going from thousands per title to merely a couple of hundred. However, the total number of publications has doubled over the years.[36] This means that, although more different titles are published, the number of sales per title decreases. The increasing number of published monographs shows that the need for writing these large formats is still very much alive. On the other hand, it can also be seen as a desperate measure from the side of the publishers. Since they sell less copies per title, they have to find a way to compensate. By being able to offer more titles, they can increase the number of sold monographs, albeit from different titles. However, what do monographs even mean if they are only read by a couple of hundred people? It can be stated that the current focus on the paper monograph and its dissemination is thus failing. Monographs are mainly used by academics for their own careers, yet if no one reads them, why even bother writing them? Moreover, if the monograph cannot reach a large public, why would funders want to finance a product that is almost inaccessible for the majority of the people. Surely that money can be spent more efficiently in those fields that do attract a lot of attention.

---

[36] A. Muddit, 'Guest Post: Alison Muddit Interviews Geoffrey Crossick on an Age of Challenge and Opportunity: The HEFCE Report on Monographs and Open Access', *Scholarly Kitchen*, 19 October 2015 <http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2015/10/19/guest-post-alison-muddit-interviews-geoffry-crossick-on-an-age-of-challenge-and-opportunity-the-hefce-report-on-monographs-and-open-access/> (27 January 2016).

Furthermore, one of the main functions of the humanities is to inform and improve society by addressing social issues. Especially in a world that is very diverse in terms of history, culture and language, it is important to understand and respect the different traditions and lives. This can help the collaboration and trade between countries, which is beneficial on many different levels. Again, the statement of how important the humanities are would be very ironic if the largest part of society is not even able to get access to the research results and can therefore not participate in the critical thinking process that is so important for the humanities. The inaccessibility of research leads to an invisibility of the field, which can lead people who are not familiar with the field to believe that the humanities have nothing significant to add to society. This has even progressed so far that the Japanese government drastically wants to downsize or even shut down its humanities and social sciences faculties. 26 out of 60 national universities have confirmed that they intend to close down their humanities and social sciences departments, according to the plans of the Japanese Minister of Education Hakubun Shimomura.[37] The level of financial support depends on the decision the universities make. The Japanese government wants to focus on those field that are more useful to society (i.e. the STEM fields). This opinion is not only limited to the Japanese situation. Smaller, niche subjects are often dropped by various universities for being too expensive and attracting not enough students. What almost all these subjects have in common is that they are part of the humanities. Although the Japanese idea is of course an extreme opinion which has already received a lot of outraged comments, it also shows what the problem is of the humanities: they are invisible. It has been discussed before that technological or medical developments are more visible to society and thus more likely to get a lot of attention. They are consequently perceived as more important than the humanities, which people often only associate with subjects that are followed for fun.

Although Japan has already adjusted its statement on the lack of importance of the humanities after the comments it received from all over the world, there is no doubt that some faculties will indeed either shut down or shift their focus on a more STEM oriented subject.

One way of making the humanities visible again is by the use of OA. Instead of reaching only a couple of hundred readers, OA can help to increase this number by multiplying it by 20, according to research conducted by OAPEN. As has been stated

---

[37] "Japanese government asks universities to close social sciences and humanities faculties", *ICEF Monitor*, 17 September 2015
<http://monitor.icef.com/2015/09/japanese-government-asks-universities-to-close-social-sciences-and-humanities-faculties/> (27 January 2016).

numerous times before, the number of downloads is in no way the same as the number of readers, but it does indicate that research is getting spread all over the world, instead of to a couple of libraries only.

4. Gold OA

Going back to the origin of OA, there is one remarkable question that can be drawn from the development described in the introduction: where are the monographs in this story? Moreover, the main players in this relatively short history of OA seem to find their origin in the hard sciences, which often rely on journals. If the history is primarily, if not entirely, based on the focus on journals and is mostly initiated by publishers of the hard sciences, is there any space for the humanities monograph in the current model? Can the monograph simply join in, or should this field start from scratch and build up its own OA history, be it with a little help of the already established general developments? Currently, it is not clear what the future will bring, but whether the future will be the same for both fields is becoming less likely now that more research is being conducted on the ideal business model for the two different fields.

As stated before, the main issue with the 'ideal' business model, Gold OA, for the humanities are the high APCs that cannot be covered by the relatively low funding. The APCs, or BPCs (Book Processing Charges) in this case, prove to be too big an obstacle for this field. Martin Paul Eve has looked at this system in great detail and describes two major flaws.[38] The first one deals with symbolic value or prestige vs. the goods provided. Eve claims that the actual cost of a monograph and producing it has little to do with the actual services, but instead is based on the brand of the publishers and how peers value this. Consequently, you would pay more for a big name. The second flaw is the assumption that APCs/BPCs are a simple substitution for going from a subscription model to a model where the supply side has to pay. As stated before, with the subscription model, costs would be spread among all the institutions who paid to get access to a product. Therefore, every individual body pays a fraction of the costs. If the supply side has to pay, however, the charges are focused on the institution providing the product. This may seem beneficial for those institutions who do not produce a lot, since they will have access to all OA publications, but are not in the difficult position of having to pay for their own publications. The burden on those who do want many of their articles or monographs published is too high, according to

---

[38] M.P. Eve, 'Co-operating for gold open access without APCs', *Insights*, 28(1) (2015), pp. 73-77.

those who disagree with the current system of Gold OA. Eve even claims that the subscription model is cheaper for the research-intensive and starting institutions than the switch to a model in which the supplier has to pay the full price.[39]

Clearly, funding is a major issue when it comes to the implementation of Gold OA in the humanities, especially when it has to rely on APCs (since I will focus on monographs only, this phrase seems a little odd, so I will continue with the phrase Book Processing Charges (BPC)). Professor Crossick also agrees that BPCs are not the ideal solution for the humanities, but cannot say whether a definite substitution for this form will arise soon, although it will probably not be in the form of Green OA. This form often only accepts the 'bare' version without illustrations, or sometimes even the second to last version, which can obviously differ widely from the final version. He even proclaims that it is possible that there will not be one dominant business model to tackle the problem of OA publishing.[40] However, he does claim that by the mid-2020's, it is likely that digital copies of monographs will become the standard and even obligatory, together with maintaining the paper version. This will leave plenty of time, according to the HEFCE, to investigate the issues that have to be overcome in order to set up a plan for a smooth transition to OA in the coming years.[41] In the meantime, many different initiatives and funding organisations will arise to help the monograph adapt to its digital life, because if we wait for the perfect business model to arrive, the prestigious monograph may have no future at all. The developments of OA will continue no matter what.

4.1 Gold VS Green

If funding is the main problem, would this then be solved by opting for the Green variety instead? This form seems to have the preference in the US, so there are reasons to go for this business model. In order to be able to properly distinguish between the two forms and thus opt for the best possible solution, the details of Green OA have to be known, and it should be clear what it has to offer for the humanities. One important and obvious factor is that, in contrary to Gold OA, Green OA does not depend on money from the supply side. Instead, it is based on revenues from print and e-book editions, just like the traditional model: toll access. Where Green OA differs from toll access is that after a certain embargo period (often ranging from anywhere between 6 and 24 months, depending on the field), the article becomes

---

[39] Ibid., p.74.

[40] P. Jump, 'Monographs have to adapt to keep a place in the future', *Times Higher Education*, 22 January 2015 <https://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/news/monographs-have-to-adapt-to-keep-a-place-in-the-future/2018050.article> (2 August 2015).

[41] G. Crossick, *Monographs and Open Access: A Report to HEFCE*, (HEFCE, 2015) p.11.

available for free on a repository. This means there is thus a delay in publishing the OA copy. However, this copy sometimes differs from the paid version. Whereas the OA copy that is available via Gold OA is published in its final form, the one that is published via the Green model is often only presented in a pre-final or stripped-down version. Especially the option of publishing a pre-final version – i.e. pre-peer review – has caused some discussion: results may be very different between the pre-final and final version, as there is a possibility that not all data has been processed yet. Moreover, since the monograph is considered to be the golden standard in the humanities, functioning as an object of prestige, it is not imaginable that anything less than the perfect, final version is published.

The second possibility is that of the stripped-down publication. The problem with the 'bare' version may be a bigger issue with monographs than it is for journal articles. A stripped-down copy is bereft of additional illustrations, leaving only the text. Monographs take years to write, which makes it painful for authors to see their work presented in anything less than its full glory. Again, as is the case for publishing a pre-final version, an incomplete publication of an object that is regarded as prestigious is not particularly beneficial for the author, but neither is it useful for the reader. This is exactly what the problem is with Green, according to Martin Hall.[42] Although publishing on repositories is a good and simple way of making articles and monographs available for everyone, the incomplete version can and will be problematic for those who want to use it for academic or professional goals. Ultimately, they will still have to go for the complete version as published by the publisher. If their organisations cannot provide access through subscriptions, people will thus still run into a paywall. Furthermore, text mining – a part of re-use – as is discussed in the second chapter, is also one of the main advantages of OA. However, since the free Green OA publication does not offer the final results, text mining may be problematic. All these things combined may explain why Green OA is not very common for monographs.

Gold OA, however, is not a perfect solution either. The opinions widely differ on which of the two models is best suitable for the humanities. On the one hand, people argue that since Gold OA with its APCs will in no way work for the humanities, Green is a better deal. It relieves authors and organisations of the heavy, extra financial burden. On the other hand, however, it can leave authors with the responsibility of self-archiving, while at the same time keeping the embargo period in mind. This embargo period can offer an additional problem. Lengthy embargoes can reduce the value of the work, since, by the time it will be

---

[42] M. Hall, 'Green or Gold? Open access after Finch', *Insights*, 25(3) (2012), pp. 235-240.

freely available, the content is already old news. Also, contrary to journals, monographs have a longer shelf life. This means that they can be sold over several years, and thus continue to make money for a longer period. This makes it difficult to establish a suitable embargo period. However, as research conducted with Gold OA in mind pointed out, the availability of free monographs did not affect the sales figures, so this could also be the case for the Green model. This was indeed the case in the experiment conducted by AGORA, who have concluded that Green OA has a neutral, or even slightly positive effect on sales.[43] However, as has been mentioned before, research conducted by Ronald Snijder has pointed out that people may experience difficulty in finding the repositories on which content will be archived. Although this can of course be optimised, this is also a costly process that should not be overlooked.

So why have for example both the British and the Dutch governments advised to go for Gold OA rather than Green? The Brits have favoured this variety based on the advice given in the Finch report, which recommends the use of hybrid journals and APCs.[44] This model would be a relatively easy way for publishers to see their costs covered in advance. They would thus have to rely less on sales of the physical copies. This could in the long run be beneficial for those monographs that are currently considered to be difficult to sell, which is of course especially important for the niche subjects that are likely to suffer if publishers would only opt for the popular and successful titles. The same could not be said about the repository-based Green model. Furthermore, another clear reason not to go for Green is that, according to the report, the impact of repositories on researcher behaviour has proved to be too limited so far.[45] However, repositories can still have an important function in the future, claims the report. They can play a valuable role alongside the Gold model as a way of archiving publications and digitising material. By doing this, scientific material becomes easier to find, on the condition that the infrastructure of these repositories will improve. Although there has been a lot of criticism on the Finch report, the government will go with the recommendation of favouring hybrid journals or Gold over Green. Eventually, new ideas and initiatives will come into existence, and the definite form of OA – if there ever will be one – will become clear. Maybe this will be somewhat similar to these recommendations, but it is also possible that the development will go into another direction.

---

[43] AGORA, 'Open Access Business Models', <http://www.project-agora.org/experiments/open-access-business-models/> (14 October 2015).
[44] J. Finch, 'Accessibility, sustainability, excellence: how to expand access to research publications', p.7.
[45] Ibid. p.94.

Back to the Dutch state secretary Sander Dekker, who aims for 100% OA in 2024. He also considers Gold OA to be the ideal form. His main argument is that the embargo period will be too big an obstacle for those who rely on instant information. They will either be stopped by a paywall, or have to wait until the article is freely available, as would be the case with Green OA. Especially in the medical or educational field, he argues, this should not happen. Gold OA, on the other hand, allows for instant access from the moment the article or monograph is published.[46] Although there is a preference, this does not mean that there are no variations possible within Gold OA. Unfortunately, it is impossible to predict which business model will be successful, so the only option is to consider the advantages and disadvantages of both models and opt for the best one.

Still, many disagree with this black or white statement; either Gold or Green. The NWO has recently changed their statement, however. Whereas they did not have a clear preference at first,[47] they have now set stricter rules for OA publications.[48] They state it still does not matter whether authors opt for Green or Gold, but they do demand that the publications are immediately available, so embargo periods are not accepted anymore as of 1 December 2015 for research funded by the NWO. This, on top of the grand of €6,000 that is available for authors, the NWO seems to have a clear preference for Gold OA with APCs. The question is whether it is a smart move to force this on people. The reason for this change is that "if the latest knowledge is not available immediately or is only available against extra payment then this slows down progress in science."[49] This makes the NWO the first national research council to set such strict rules. The Research Council UK, on the other hand, decided to do it the other way around. Whereas at first they demanded publications to be Gold OA, they later softened this by allowing Green OA as well.[50] Although this leaves a lack of clarity, it also allows for a free interpretation of the concept of OA. Consequently, a lot of new initiatives try to find the ideal form of OA, which is not necessarily Gold OA in its original form – with APCs. This may be the best solution, as neither pure Gold nor Green OA seem to

---

[46] Rijksoverheid, 'Open Access: Going for Gold',
<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/toespraken/2014/01/28/open-acess-going-for-gold> (14 October 2015).

[47] 'Welke koers voor Open Access?', *ScienceGuide*, 22 October 2014
<http://www.scienceguide.nl/201410/welke-koers-voor-open-access.aspx> (14 October 2015).

[48] NWO, 'From 'as soon as possible' to 'immediate' Open Access',
<http://www.nwo.nl/en/news-and-events/news/2015/from-as-soon-as-possible-to-immediate-open-access.html> (7 December 2015).

[49] Ibid.

[50] R. van Noorden, 'UK open-access route too costly', *Nature*, 10 September 2013.
<http://www.nature.com/news/uk-open-access-route-too-costly-report-says-1.13705> (14 October 2015).

be perfect. As Frances Pinter puts it, one of the founders of such an OA initiative:

> You can't have a world where one discipline, like physical science, is motoring along with everything open because 90 per cent of its publications are article-length, while the humanities stay closed, shooting themselves in the foot because nobody gets access to their research. It is just inconceivable.[51]

In other words: the main goal, at least for the humanities, is to find a way to make OA work. Whether this is Green or Gold, is not the main priority. The most important point in the discussion is not to let the final goal of freely accessible publications get out of sight.

4.2 Funding of monographs by the NWO

It is argued that one of the ways to pay for an OA publication is by receiving funding from a national body. For the Netherlands, this is the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). Their Governing Board has made an amount of 5 million euros available for the funding of OA development. Half of this fund will be used to cover the costs of OA publications, while the other half is used to support and encourage other OA initiatives. By doing this, OA is given a special awareness and publishing in OA is boosted.

As can be found on their website, the NWO offers researchers a certain amount of funding for the OA publication of their monograph.[52] The reason they do this is because they claim that results of research that has been conducted using public funds should be available to this same public. A second motivation can be that the NWO realises and agrees that researchers in the humanities may experience difficulty when it comes to OA publishing due to struggling libraries, the declining book sales and the high BPCs. Because the physical copies are already problematic in terms of selling, publishers may be hesitant to publish new monographs, since it is not a given that enough copies will be sold. Asking for BPCs may cover these costs in advance, but are often too high. That is why the NWO offers extra funding for this open form of publishing. The maximum budget that can be requested per research project is 6,000 euros. According to the NWO, this will be enough to cover the

---

[51] P. Jump, 'Open Access: Brought to Book at Last?', *Times Higher Education*, 18 July 2013 <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/open-access-brought-to-book-at-last/2005758.article> (20 October 2015).

[52] NWO, 'Incentive Fund Open Access-publications', <http://www.nwo.nl/en/funding/our-funding-instruments/nwo/incentive-fund-open-access/incentive-fund-open-access---publications/incentive-fund-open-access---publications.html> (2 August 2015).

publication charges. This is based on research conducted by OAPEN-NL. In their search of the effect OA has on publishing, they have concluded that the average cost of publishing a monograph is 12,000 euros.[53] Roughly half of this is used for the first digital copy, which is published in OA. The rest is used for printing, binding and distributing the paper copies.

In order to receive this extra support researchers have to meet a couple of requirements. Firstly, the research in question already has to be funded by the NWO. This means that not everyone can access the additional fund, creating an obstacle for those who find their funding somewhere else. Research by OAPEN-UK has showed that this may be problematic in the field of the humanities. Although the research was conducted with British data, and therefore under different circumstances than may be the case in the Netherlands, it should not be regarded as entirely useless. In the OAPEN-UK HSS Research Survey, the origin of the funds used for supporting OA monographs was investigated. Only 22% used a research council grant, which would be the NWO in the case of the Netherlands. Almost half of the 690 respondents relied on core university funds.[54] This means that, according to the criteria of the NWO, the majority of the researchers would not be allowed to apply for the extra funding. This also shows that authors, or their institutions, largely have to pay for the BPCs without an extensive additional support. For a field that is already short on funding, the fact that the NWO only supports those who are already funded by them in the first place seems to be somewhat peculiar. Moreover, the extra support is only granted if no funding from a second body is received. This is in high contrast with the possible solution of Mercedes Bunz, who focuses on OA and academic publications at Leuphana University. She states that the current financial situation of supporting OA is "scattered all over the place".[55] According to Bunz, the national funding bodies have not been of great use during the setup of OA publishing. Although they do support the use of OA, they do not finance the actual process. Since the implementation of OA means that a digital copy has to be created alongside the physical one, publishers have to find the means to finance this additional process. Since the national research funds will not cover everything, Bunz argues that funding will have to come from various directions. This means that, contrary to what the NWO wants, Bunz expects that in order for OA to work, researchers have to apply for several funds, for instance

---

[53] E. Ferwerda et al., *A project exploring Open Access monograph publishing in the Netherlands: Final Report.* p.4.

[54]'OAPEN-UK HSS Researcher Survey Results' *OAPEN-UK,* p.25.

[55] Contributors to the OA monograph supplement: Davies, M.C.R., Ayris, P., Stone, G., Cheshire, J., Jackson, R., Hacker, A., Bunz, M., Ferwerda, E., Newton, H., Dacos, M., Mounier, P. and Neuman, Y., 'How should we fund open access monographs and what do you think is the most likely way that funding will happen?', *Insights*, 27(S) (2014), pp. 45-50.

already existing funds, funding from the university, or even crowd sourcing. The opinions of Bunz, who pleads for collaboration of multiple funding bodies, and the NWO, who wants to be the main body to provide for funding, seem to conflict, and although the 6,000 euros from the NWO seems to be covering the costs of publishing in OA, the 5 million euros that they have reserved for this will run out at some point. The combination of several sources, as is Bunz's theory, would therefore be more efficient. Moreover, it would prevent a monopoly position of the NWO, allowing other and perhaps smaller players a chance in the field. Working together is vital in this case to avoid the scattered mess Bunz refers to. There is, however, one thing that she fails to acknowledge. Although the principle of multiple funding bodies might seem ideal in theory – there are more possibilities to receive funds, and the bodies will not run out of money as quickly – the reality stops this from working. In order to receive funding for OA, researchers have to apply for this. They already have to apply for the funding for the research itself. Extra applications would only burden the researcher with more paperwork, making it a lengthy and tiresome process which only slows the research and its publication down. In the end, however useful Bunz's idea might sound, it will not work in practice.

At some point however, both the new initiatives as well as the already existing publishers have to find a way to make the business model sustainable, meaning that they have to be able to cover all the costs without significant, extra support from the government. For the publishers who mainly focus on humanity monographs, this means that BPCs are not ideal, since they ask too much from the scholars. Consequently, either more money has to be made somehow, or the main issue, the BPC, has to be tackled. There are currently several initiatives whereby libraries, who are the main clients when it comes to monographs, form an agreement on providing for the money that is necessary for OA publications. As stated before, half of the costs of a monograph go to creating an OA copy. Once the digital copy is finished, it can be distributed endlessly, which is one of the advantages of the online publications. Consequently, the costs of creating this copy only have to be made once. The idea is that if many libraries work together to finance this one amount, the cost for each single library will drop significantly. Examples of initiatives that work with this idea (e.g. Knowledge Unlatched and the Open Library of Humanities) and the results of their projects will be discussed in greater detail in the following sub-chapter.

4.3 Gold OA without APC/BPC

There are currently several initiatives that build on the idea of Gold OA without APCs/BPCs. Increasingly more researchers and publishers agree that although these author based charges may work in the STEM fields, the humanities will probably experience more difficulty with this solution. Since the general idea of Gold OA seems to be working – someone has to pay for the extra costs – a different answer has to be found to the question of how the humanities can survive in the development of OA that is so focused on the journal-oriented STEM fields. This has led many to reconsider the concept of the BPC. Especially since the costs of creating a digital and thus OA version of a monograph only have to be made once, the idea is that these costs can be evenly distributed between those who are currently the main consumers of the monograph: the libraries. Examples of initiatives that work with this tactic are Knowledge Unlatched (KU) founded by Frances Pinter, and whose first pilot started in 2014, and the Open Library of Humanities (OLH), which was launched in 2013. A third initiative, the Language Science Press (LSP), finds the ideal solution in Platinum OA, which is free for both the authors and readers. The founders of these initiatives have come to the conclusion that what might be working in one field, does not necessarily work in every other field, and were not afraid of trying to create a system of their own.

4.3.1 Knowledge Unlatched

> I'm not saying monographs will be the preferred format forever, [b]ut I'd prefer the academic community were given a choice of form of expression, rather than find that the long-form publication dies just because we couldn't think of a business model that made it work, especially in an open access environment.[56]

The main reason for founder Frances Pinter to establish KU, was to give authors of monographs the possibility to continue publishing their monographs in a period that was, and still is, dominated by journals. Although she underlines that the monograph may not be around for ever, and KU is not a long term saviour, it is definitely a way of introducing OA to monographs, which prevents them from disappearing on a short term basis. Currently, KU is in their second pilot phase. Many libraries have already showed interest and signed up for this

---

[56] M. Kelley, 'Can Open Access Save the Scholarly Monograph? ALA Midwinter Spotlight', *Publishers Weekly*, 5 December 2014
<http://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/libraries/article/64976-can-open-access-save-the-scholarly-monograph-ala-midwinter-spotlight.html> (3 September 2015).

second round during the first pilot, which would only become reality when at least 200 participants joined. The basic strategy of KU is that libraries have to register which books they want to have access to. In order for the book to become available, or unlatched as KU calls it, a certain amount of money has to be raised, which covers the costs of publishing a monograph. This is the Title Fee, and allows the publisher to create an OA publication of the monograph, but also includes a small percentage for KU itself.[57] Since the Title Fee is a fixed price, the amount every library has to pay drops when the number of interested participants rises. For example, a monograph generally costs 12,000 euros to produce. When 500 libraries work together to pay for this, the individual price will be a mere 24 euros. This business model is especially valuable for those libraries whose budget is too tight for the expensive monographs.

One potential downside of this initiative is that although the price per monograph significantly drops when more libraries work together, the paper copy cannot be neglected and has to be bought as well. Since these copies are being sold for extremely high prices, this can still become expensive given the large number of monographs the humanities has to offer. This means that the libraries have to pay for the Title Fee on top of the costs for the physical book. KU has found a solution to this: when libraries opt to order either a paper or digital copy via any channel, they do not have to pay an extra fee for the access to the OA publication. Consequently, if a library orders all of the available titles, no extra fee has to be paid for the OA copy. The costs of the OA publication will be spread among the other libraries. However, as stated before, the paper copy will continue to play a vital role for the humanities. In reality, this means that many libraries will order a paper copy of certain monographs, which leaves the group that actually pays for the OA publications significantly smaller. This may not be a problem since the initiative is worldwide and thus serves many different clients with different interests, but KU already states that this procedure will be altered and refined in future pilot phases.[58] On the other hand, maybe KU is used primarily for the OA versions only. In this case, libraries can go for titles they normally would not have acquired.

Furthermore, since the humanities cover such a large number of subjects, there are many niche subjects that will attract a limited audience. As it will be more beneficial for

---

[57] Knowledge Unlatched, 'How it Works', <http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/about/how-it-works/> (13 August 2015).
[58] Knowledge Unlatched, 'Pilot Project', <http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/about/pilot-project/> (3 September 2015).

libraries to go for the popular monographs, the niche subjects may find themselves in a difficult position. When not enough clients choose to pay for a monograph, therefore failing to unlatch it, the publisher will not receive the means to cover the costs of the OA publication. As a result, the less popular monographs may become the victims of this business model. Especially in a field that allows such a broad range of subjects, OA would help bring attention to these smaller and often little known areas of the scientific world. Instead of the limited audience a paper copy can reach, research could be shared with the entire world. Unfortunately, even these initiatives may not be the ultimate saviours of every available monograph, but in a world that is so strongly connected through the Internet, there is always a way to get in contact with researchers of even the most unknown work. So maybe this lesser known work can continue to exist online, and still reach its audience, without becoming the victim of the difficult situation of the monograph.

After a successful first pilot, a second pilot was set up to fix some of the issues that occurred during the first stage. In this initial stage, 13 publishers and 297 libraries participated, and an additional 50 publishers and 100 libraries signed up for the second round. From these growing numbers, it can be concluded that the first round was a success, but this can be seen in greater detail when examining the results that have been released after the first pilot. The initial goal was to attract 200 participants, who all had to pay $1,680 for the entire collection of 28 monographs, which would result in an average of $60 per title. These monographs were picked by librarians, so the collection was carefully selected for KU's main clients. However, more libraries joined, namely 297 from 24 different countries, bringing the costs per library down to $1,195 and the average per monograph down to roughly $40 per title. Besides the results of the library perspective, the results of the side of the users have also been released, which covers the number of downloads. The average number of downloads was 473 per title, coming from 138 different countries. Charles Watkinson, director of the University of Michigan Press was pleased with these results, but also questioned the actual meaning of the number of downloads: "We don't really know the relationship between downloads and impact. […] What are the individuals who download titles doing with them? Are they placing the same value on a free-to-download digital file as they would on a resource they've paid for?"[59] It will not be possible to get the actual numbers to find out what people

---

[59] M. Kelley, 'Can Open Access Save the Scholarly Monograph? ALA Midwinter Spotlight', *Publishers Weekly*, 5 December 2014
<http://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/libraries/article/64976-can-open-access-save-the-scholarly-monograph-ala-midwinter-spotlight.html> (2 October 2015).

do with the digital files after downloading, but it is safe to say that the number of unread downloads is higher than the number of unread physical copies. The question is whether this is a particularly bad thing. As concluded before by OAPEN, the number of downloads does not change anything about the sales figures of the print editions. So in that case it would not matter whether the downloaded monographs were actually read by all those who downloaded them. A high number of downloads does mean that people were able to find the monographs, and especially regarding the wide variety of countries, it can be said that at least from the user-perspective, the pilot has been successful. The second round, which is currently running, has scaled everything up: more participants, more monographs to choose from and more options (not just one package) and a higher fixed price per library that will result in a lower price per monograph. This round is scheduled to run until April 2016, when the second round of monographs will be unlatched.[60]

There is only one thing left now, and that is to wait and see how libraries and publishers will react in the future and whether they are willing to commit when the project moves from a pilot to a larger scale. Since the first pilot was successful, and the second has already attracted many interested libraries, it is probably not that much of a gamble of how it will work out after the pilot phase. Especially since Pinter has stated that they will definitely not rush things and will keep in close contact with the main clients of KU; the libraries. One example of this are the titles offered by KU. The pilot phase consisted of a limited list of books that libraries could unlatch, but how this will work during the real stages has not yet been set in stone. The definite procedures will be discussed with both the libraries and the publishers. The key feature of KU is its flexibility as soon as it turns out that an aspect does not work according to the wishes of those involved.[61]

4.3.2 Open Library of Humanities

A second upcoming initiative that tries to find a way around the standard Gold business model, is the Open Library of Humanities (OLH). It was founded by Martin Paul Eve and Caroline Edwards in 2013. Their initial focus was on finding a way to successfully introduce OA journals into the humanities in such a way that it did not put too much of a financial strain on the authors. As is the case for monographs, the APCs are considered too high for authors in the humanities field, who do not receive enough funding to cover these costs. Moreover, the

---

[60] Knowledge Unlatched, 'The New Collection', <http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/2015/06/new-collection/> (3 October 2015).
[61] Ibid.

serial crisis – which is said to have caused the monograph crisis – resulted in an inflation of the journal prices of 300%, which consequently meant an extreme increase of the prices.[62] The solution of the OLH was to create a mega-journal, a platform that has been launched in September 2015. The initiative received $90.000 over the course of 13 months from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to support the platform and editorial framework for this OA mega journal and to build a sustainable business model.[63]

Initially, the OLH was based on affordable APCs. It did not take long, however, for the founders to realise that Gold OA does not necessarily mean that the model where the author pays has to be used. They realised that in the traditional subscription model, libraries already have to pay for various subscriptions. If these journals were to become free via OA, libraries would have more money to spend. Eve sees this as the perfect opportunity for the libraries to work together to pay for the APCs. As is the case for KU, the OLH is based on Library Partnership Subsidies (LPS), meaning that several organisations work together to cover the costs of the APCs. Traditionally, people would buy material to gain access to a product, and those who do not pay, were not be able to get the same access. However, as co-founder Eve explains, the new model, LPS, is one where "as a group, we all pay a relatively modest amount in order to subsidise the work of publishers."[64] As an example, he says that if 400 libraries work together, each paying $875, the OLH will be able to publish 250 articles and 12 monographs with their partners, who mostly consist of university presses.[65] This comes down to $3,50 per article. Of course, if more libraries participate, this price will only decrease. However, just like the model KU uses, this only works if enough libraries take part in this initiative. As soon as the platform was launched, articles were available. This made the platform itself a mega journal. Articles can be published in this journal in two ways: via an already existing journal, or directly via the OLH. The advantage of this procedure is that it does not change anything about the level of prestige that scholars are after. They can still publish in prestigious journals, which will then be made accessible by the OLH. The theory behind this mega journal is that when libraries have to pay less for these journals, they can

---

[62] Open Library of Humanities, 'Background to the Project', <https://www.openlibhums.org/about/background-to-the-project/> (28 August 2015).

[63] The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, 'Open Library of Humanities Planning', https://mellon.org/grants/grants-database/grants/university-of-lincoln/11400663/ (30 August 2015).

[64] M.P. Eve, 'Co-operating for gold open access without APCs', *Insights*, 28(1) (2015), pp.73. (73-77).

[65] A. Koh, 'A Public Library of the Humanities? An Interview with Martin Paul Eve', *The Chronical of Higher Education* <http://chronicle.com/blogs/profhacker/a-public-library-of-the-humanities-an-interview-with-martin-paul-eve/56767> (30 August 2015).

spend more money on monographs again. After all, the high prices of the journals caused the monograph crisis.

Although the OLH currently mainly focuses on journal articles published in one mega journal, they will also consider monographs if enough parties are interested. The OLH has already found big parties to join their monograph publishing pilot, such as Oxford University Press and the OA-born Open Book Publishers. As soon as the optimum number of participants is reached, the pilot for monographs will be launched.[66] Especially for the humanities, a field where monographs play a vital role, the ability to offer OA publications is important, and maybe even more important than the humanity journals. However, OA is also more difficult for monographs, which is why the focus of the OLH initially was on journals. The announcement of the monograph publishing pilot was posted a year ago, and although there are no current updates yet, the number of participating libraries keeps growing. In the meantime, the initiative will gain more fame and thus more participants, making it more likely that the OLH will be successful in the future. Since the articles have only been recently published online, there are no results yet of how successful this initiative will be, but KU, which works with the same model, has already proved that LPS definitely works.

4.3.3 Language Science Press/Platinum OA

Besides the abovementioned initiatives that are based on the idea of sharing APCs among those interested, there is also a form of OA that intents to work without costs for either the author or reader. This variety, which can be explained as Gold OA without APCs, is called Platinum OA. It has been established earlier that creating and publishing a monograph costs €12,000, with half of this for the OA copy. So how is it possible for a publisher to publish a monograph without the author or reader having to pay? This will be examined by using the example of Language Science Press (LSP), a publisher in linguistics that works according to this model.

Founded by Martin Haspelmath and Stefan Müller, LSP publishes peer-reviewed OA books. The PDF versions are freely available on their website, and paper copies can be bought via Print-on-Demand (PoD). The reason for starting this new book imprint, which is associated with the Freie Universität Berlin, was because of the prices of some current publishers. These prices are the result of a phenomenon that has already been mentioned in the previous chapter: commercial publishers add a symbolic value – and thus not based on the

---

[66] Open Library of Humanities, 'Monograph Publishing Pilot',
<https://www.openlibhums.org/2014/07/02/monograph-publishing-pilot> (30 August 2015).

relevant costs – to their publications in the form of prestige, which is based on the well-known names of these publishers. These prestigious publishers then become more even prestigious because well-known and influential scholars publish with them. Since authors obviously want to be published by these prestigious names, publishers are able to ask high prices, which some authors are willing to pay. By doing this, these commercial publishers are exploiting their brands, according to Haspelmath.[67] Furthermore, he criticises the price of the actual monographs, since these are not based on the actual costs of the processes that have to take place. He explains that publishers also have no reason to make the books less expensive, because "there is no functioning market".[68] Everything is based on the prestigious names of these commercial publishers. These high prices that are out of proportion is why he decided to start his own imprint, with the idea that publishing prestigious work is ultimately the best way to make his imprint well-known and successful, while at the same time still being run by scholars themselves who know what other scholars expect. Haspelmath even underlines that scholars will be able to do most of the tasks more efficiently compared to commercial publishers, and the job of the publisher should therefore be in their own hands.[69] With the help of the technology available through the university, they can publish the OA monographs for an extremely low price. The fact that LSP can rely heavily on the help of fellow scholars, is because they are often already used to sharing material, although perhaps on different platforms. A publication is no longer necessarily used to share and spread one's research results, but mostly functions as a form of highlighting work to show scholars which monographs to read. This is what publishers do when accepting or rejecting a manuscript, but this task would be taken over by scholars in the case of LSP. Of course, who can decide better what to read than scholars themselves? That is one of the reasons why LSP is run by scholars instead of commercial publishers.

After receiving positive feedback from various colleagues, Haspelmath and Müller decided to start their own imprint. To support this initiative, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft has offered them €500.000. This does not seem like a large amount of money to support a new-coming publisher that promises to be able to publish monographs that "are of the same quality and prestige as the major publishers in the field".[70] However,

---

[67] M. Haspelmath, 'Freedom for Science Books', *TXT Magazine* (2015), p.75.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Language Science Press, 'About', <http://langsci-press.org/about> (1 September 2015).
[70] M. Haspelmath, 'A proposal for radical publication reform in linguistics: Language Science Press, and the next steps', *Diversity Linguistics Comment*, 1 December 2014
<http://dlc.hypotheses.org/631> (1 September 2015) .

Haspelmath claims that they will be able to create their monographs for a mere €500 per title. This is possible if the author uses the program LaTeX while creating it. This program allows its users to work with an advanced typesetting system. The second secret to this low price is to ask for the help of supporting scholars, but LSP also depends on a long-term supporting role from the Freie Universität Berlin. The main costs of creating the monographs will be typesetting, since the software to publish books (PKP's Open Monograph Press) is free.[71] Although it is still called typesetting, it clearly no longer has anything to do with the actual setting of type. Nowadays, what publishers mean with this process, is turning a standard text file, for instance written in Word, into a rich XML file. This file will then be translated into a product that is readable for people, rather than for machines. The estimated costs for this process is €1500 for 400 pages, according to Cambridge University Press.[72] With the abovementioned program, scholars can do this themselves instead of having to rely on others, which saves a lot of money. The fact that authors have full control over their monographs can thus be either a good thing, or a nuisance. On the one hand, authors do not have to pay a large sum to publishers, but on the other hand, this means that they have to do many things themselves. This includes typesetting, but also things like proofreading and selecting which titles to publish. Of course, not everyone is willing to make this sacrifice. Many people do not have the time or the need to put extra work into their own or others' manuscripts. However, this does means that the overall production costs can be kept low. This makes it easier to present an OA copy to the readers, since they do not have to find many ways to make up for the mere €500 that it costs to publish a monograph. The digital monograph plays the central role for LSP, which means that they do not print paper copies. Instead, physical books will be printed using PoD, so it will not be necessary for LSP to store them somewhere and distribute them. Consequently, this means that LSP does not have to include this in their budget.

So where are they now? Their first book was published in early 2014, and currently there are 23 titles available on their website. This number is still growing, and everything is easy to find and ready to be downloaded. The titles they publish do have to fall in one of the 15 series, which covers subjects such as Caribbean language studies and textbooks in Language Sciences. The series of textbooks is a recent addition. By including textbooks, LSP shows that the educational field can also benefit from OA, and not only scholars.

---

[71] Ibid.

[72] S. Müller, 'A Personal Note on Open Access', *Journal of Language Modelling*, 0(1) (2012), pp (7 September 2015).

As is stated in their project plan, linguistics is a discipline of the humanities that is most similar to the sciences and is therefore the ideal field to play a big role in leading the way to OA monographs in the humanities.[73] The theory behind LSP could then work for other disciplines as well, since the step from linguistics to the rest of the humanities is smaller than trying to use the same model that is made by and for the STEM fields. If the model of LSP would be used in the future for the entire humanities field, this means that commercial publishers will play no or no significant role in publishing monographs anymore. Instead, scholars will take over their place and work in line of their own wishes and preferences. According to Haspelmath and Müller, this is the answer to OA in the humanities: publishers driven by scholars, and buying the physical copies through PoD. The only obstacle that might be in the way of this development is the level of prestige, or rather the lack of prestige of these new, scholarly based publishers. Since publishing with an prestigious publisher is still the main way of distinguishing ones career, the transition to these smaller publishers will not be easily made. However, if they are run by scholars, attracting colleagues is a relative simple way of become more known throughout the field. Especially the combination of low costs of producing and being free for authors as well as reader while still offering full OA, is bound to attract authors. According to Haspelmath, scholars will realise that commercial publishers are not able to provide them with the most ideal conditions, and will thus move towards other players in the field that are more 'scholar-friendly'. As they transition from the old publishers to the new ones, they also transfer the prestige, making the new player more prestigious. At least in the field of linguistics, "a new era of 'scholar-owned publishing' has begun."[74]

The idea of scholars cutting themselves loose from commercial publishers has recently taken place in the Netherlands as well, again in the field of linguistics. This project is called LingOA and was initiated because of discontent with the OA strategy – and especially the high prices – of commercial publishers, one of which being Elsevier. The editorial boards of several journals decided to only publish with those publishers who accept the following four conditions: 1) a fair price per article; 2) articles have to be fully OA and thus freely available online; 3) ownership of the journals will rest with the editorial boards; 4) authors will retain the full copyright to their articles.[75] As the current publisher did not meet their points, the editorial boards decided to move to Ubiquity Press, which was founded in 2012, and aims to

---

[73] S. Müller and M. Haspelmath, 'A Publication Model for Open-Access Books in Linguistics' *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (1 March 2013), p.3.

[74] M. Haspelmath, 'Freedom for Science Books', *TXT Magazine* (2015), p.76.

[75] VSNU, 'Q and A LingOA', < http://www.vsnu.nl/en_GB/QALingOA.html> (12 October 2015).

make journals and books affordable and without barriers. The reason for this protest and the switch to a not-for profit publisher is the strong position the editorial boards find themselves in. The Netherlands is a big player in the linguistics field, which comes with a leading role in important developments such as OA. Moreover, the fact that all scientific publications have to be freely available in ten years' time, allows those in favour of OA to demand certain conditions.[76] The abovementioned points that the editorial boards requested is called 'Fair OA'. In short, this means that the titles should be in the hands of the editorial board, and not of the publisher. By doing this, the prestige is associated with the journal itself instead of the publisher. This means that the moment an editorial board decides to move to another publisher, as is the case for LingOA, the journal itself can stay the same. As for the financial picture, the NWO has granted €80.000 for the first five years of this project. Furthermore, during this period, the APCs will be paid for. After these five years, LingOA will collaborate with the Open Library of Humanities.[77]

4.4 The future of OA

Perhaps it is an idea to look at an example from outside the academic heavyweights such as the US and the UK. OA has already been the standard in Latin America for a while. The reason for this keen interest in free and open publications is that the government considers the dissemination of publications to be equally important as the actual research itself.[78] Important platforms such as SciELO (already launched in 1997) and Redalyc are considered as "extensions of [a] much larger investments in research".[79] That is why the government spends a significant sum on platforms such as these. The visibility of articles is here preferred over publishing with a large, prestigious name, only because OA allows researchers and the general public to have access to these titles. In terms of numbers, 85% of all academic publications in Latin America were available online in 2010.[80] The publishing field in Latin America is dominated by not-for-profit publishers and are often supported by universities and public institutions. Another important feature was the help from renowned peer-reviewed journals during the start-up period. Universities no longer spend their budget

---

[76] M. Dessing, 'Redacties wetenschappelijke tijdschriften verlaten hun uitgeverij', *Boekblad*, 12 October 2015 <http://www.boekblad.nl/user/authenticate/redacties-wetenschappelijke-tijdschriften.254230.lynkx> (12 October 2015).

[77] VSNU, 'Q and A LingOA'.

[78] N. Shockey, 'Open Access in Latin America: A paragon for the rest of the world', *SPARC* (17 August 2015) <http://sparc.arl.org/blog/open-access-latin-america-paragon-rest-world> (9 November 2015).

[79] Ibid.

[80] C. Adams, 'Open Access in Latin America: Embedded as key to visibility of research outputs', *SPARC* <http://www.sparc.arl.org/news/open-access-latin-america-embraced-key-visibility-research-outputs> (9 November 2015).

on buying access to these journals, but they now invest in producing these products themselves. This actually seems to be rather similar to the Language Science Press, the initiative of Martin Haspelmath. In his case, the university of Berlin also invests in this project in return for OA publications.

What can be concluded from the initiatives described above, is that they all steer away from the commercial publishers, and want to focus on a future in which publishers are run by and for scholars. University presses should also not be forgotten in the development of OA publishers. These not-for-profit publishers are focused on the quality of the publications rather than the revenue. Consequently, they will not simply accept OA publications because the supply side will pay for it anyway. For example, many university presses focus on OA only, such as UCL Press. This press was set up to be a full OA press, and with the support of University College London, will continue to develop as an OA press. This shows that OA in the humanities is very much alive. Scholars are trying to find the ideal business model, and are certainly not following the sciences in this development but instead are finding their own ways in the uncertainty of OA. Moreover, there is also a growing demand for OA publications from the reader-side. Although OA platforms are growing, there is a bigger need for scientific publications. This resulted in initiatives such as Sci-Hub,[81] Open Access Button,[82] and Research Gate.[83] These websites help the user in getting access to scientific publications when they run into a paywall or are denied access for any other reason. All of these initiatives support OA, and try to do what they can in asking for attention for this new form of publishing. In the meantime, they make it their mission to spread free knowledge for those who need it, just like OA will do one day.

5. Conclusion

This thesis touched upon multiple aspects of OA, and the situation of monographs in particular. By diving into the pros and cons of OA, together with facts and figures, a clear overview of the digital development has been given. Although there are as many different variations of OA as there are opinions, there is one thing that most people agree on: the humanities should accept OA as a possible future, whether we like it or not. Some even go as far as saying that OA is vital to the humanities. Without this development, the field, but more specifically the monograph, is bound to get into difficulty. The entire scientific world seems

---

[81] Sci-Hub, 'Home', <http://www.sci-hub.io/> (10 March 2016).
[82] Open Access Button, 'Home', <https://openaccessbutton.org/> (10 March 2016).
[83] Research Gate, 'Home', <https://www.researchgate.net/> (10 March 2016).

to adapt to this new form of publishing, so the humanities would be left behind if they decided not to join in. The effects of this can go a long way. Besides risking to be forgotten in a world that is increasingly focused on instant, digital content, the monograph as it currently exists is also becoming too expensive. This has even more far-reaching problems. As it is used now, the monograph acts as an object of prestige for those who have written one. The moment this format loses its value because no one will buy it any longer, the entire valuation system has to be reconsidered. Saving the monograph will prevent this, although it is of course not guaranteed that it will not change in the future anyway. The advantages thus seem to outweigh the disadvantages. The ability of spreading knowledge all over the world, educating those who previously had limited to no access to scientific publications, is more important than the threat of potential predatory publishers. Moreover, as OA continues to grow, academics will gain more knowledge about this form of publishing, and thus know what signs to look out for when it comes to publishers who are only in it for their own good. It is only during the initial stages of OA when those involved may not yet have the desired knowledge to distinguish between trustworthy and predatory publishers that the latter can take advantage of this naivety. It can therefore be said that some of the current disadvantages will no longer be a significant problem in the future.

However, it has to be stated that OA should not be considered as a way to save an otherwise doomed format, but it should be seen in the light of its advantages. It introduces new features that can improve not only the current monograph, but also various aspects of the humanities itself. Most notably, the understanding of social issues such as history, language and culture act as a counterweight to the result driven STEM fields. The humanities should remain relevant, and one way to achieve this is by making sure that the research results are available as widely as possible. OA is one way to accomplish this. As has been discussed, there are currently many different initiatives that focus on OA monographs. What may work in one field, does not necessarily work in another, which is why the focus should be on individual situations. Especially since funding is going to play a more significant role in the case of Gold OA, it is important for every party involved in the process of creating an OA monograph to be comfortable with the new financial situation. As the Gold OA model is focused on payment from the supply side, universities especially need to be familiar with the possibilities. However, this help does not have to be restricted to universities alone. Others who benefit from OA publications could also play a more significant role in the financial part of OA. For instance, fields such as law and medicine greatly benefit from the free articles, but can of course help in relieving the burden on the publisher or university/other institution. It is

clear that there are costs involved in OA publications, but not who will eventually pay for these. The help of other fields could for instance be carried out in a way similar to KU, but specified for certain areas. By doing this, OA can be supported by those who benefit from it, and as can be seen from the results of KU, this does not have to be extremely pricey. Since multiple groups benefit from OA, why should they not support each other? Especially those who do not produce but do consume can still contribute.

Furthermore, university presses, not-for-profit publishers and scholarly led publishers seem to play a more significant role in the future. These presses are often focused on quality rather than quantity, and are usually supported by affiliated universities. In the case of the scholarly led publishers, such as Language Science Press described in chapter four, the wish and need of the academic is much more important than the amount of published material. This feature is especially important for such a big change in business models where the financial responsibility is shifting towards the supply side. Moreover, academics realise that they have the power to refuse or even boycott a publisher if they do not agree with certain points, as was the case for several editorial boards who decided to leave Elsevier, for example. Scholarly led publishers, but also university presses know what is important for academics, and can act accordingly.

In any case, it seems like there is a definite opportunity for universities, but also for other fields, to play a role in the implementation of OA. As for now, it is perhaps best to support and follow as many initiatives as possible that dare to look beyond the known borders of OA (or maybe the lack of them) and simply wait and see where the developments will eventually take us. OA has already progressed so far that it seems impossible to stop now. One thing that OA has made people realise no matter what the future of OA publishing will be, is that the monograph needs to move to the digital platform. This way, the extensive knowledge that these monographs contain will become widely available. Combined with new features such as being able to search for words in the entire document and the ease of accessing a digital file, monographs will no longer be known as the long formats that can only be found in libraries. The step to digital has brought attention to the fact that in the current digital age, the paper book is no longer the only format the monograph can and maybe even should exist in.

OA will continue to grow and develop in the future. As it is still an ongoing process, it is impossible what the final result will be. In the meantime, the only thing we can do is to continue experimenting with new initiatives and business models and find out what the best format is for each and every situation. One thing that is clear, is that the process by no means

should be rushed. Therefore, the statement of Dutch state secretary Sander Dekker that was discussed in the introduction, should not be taken as strict as it initially sounds. The goal of 100% OA in 2024 should perhaps be taken as a guideline rather than a hard rule. It can be seen as a point in the future that publishers, but also academics, librarians and other institutions can work towards. Without this rough deadline, there would be no pressure move forwards. As for now, we can only continue working towards the future of OA publishing, in whatever form that will turn out to be.

6. Works Cited

Adams, C., 'Open Access in Latin America: Embedded as key to visibility of research outputs', *SPARC* <http://www.sparc.arl.org/news/open-access-latin-america-embraced-key-visibility-research-outputs> (9 November 2015).

AGORA, 'Open Access Business Models', <http://www.project-agora.org/experiments/open-access-business-models/> (14 October 2015).

Beall, J., 'Beall's List of Predatory Publishers 2013" *Scholarly OA*, 4 December 2012 <http://scholarlyoa.com/2012/12/06/bealls-list-of-predatory-publishers-2013/> (30 January 2016).

BioMed Central, 'Using BioMed Central's open access full-text corpus for text-mining research', <https://www.biomedcentral.com/about/datamining> (30 September 2015).

Blair, A., *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

Bohannon, J., 'Who's Afraid of Peer Review?' *Science*, 4 (2013), pp. 60-65.

Brill, 'Brill MyBook', <http://www.brill.com/products/books/brill-mybook> (1 October 2015).

Budapest Open Access Initiative, 'Read the Budapest Open Access Initiative' <http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read> (18 June 2015).

Butler, D., 'Investigating journals: The dark side of publishing', *Nature*, 27 March 2013 <http://www.nature.com/news/investigating-journals-the-dark-side-of-publishing-1.12666> (16 November 2015).

Contributors to the OA monograph supplement: Davies, M.C.R., Ayris, P., Stone, G., Cheshire, J., Jackson, R., Hacker, A., Bunz, M., Ferwerda, E., Newton, H., Dacos, M., Mounier, P. and Neuman, Y., 'How should we fund open access monographs and what do you think is the most likely way that funding will happen?', *Insights*, 27(S) (2014), pp. 45-50.

Creative Commons, 'Over de licenties' <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/> (2 February 2016).

Crossick, G., *Monographs and Open Access: A Report to HEFCE*, (HEFCE, 2015) p.3.

Dekker, S., 'Open Access van Publicaties' *Ministry of Education, Culture and Science*, 15 November 2013. p.1.

Dessing, M., 'Redacties wetenschappelijke tijdschriften verlaten hun uitgeverij', *Boekblad*, 12 October 2015.
<http://www.boekblad.nl/user/authenticate/redacties-wetenschappelijke-tijdschriften.254230.lynkx> (12 October 2015).

Eve, M.P., 'Co-operating for gold open access without APCs', *Insights*, 28(1) (2015), pp. 73-77.

Eve, M.P., 'Co-operative funding for Gold Open Access in the Humanities', *UKSG,* 1 April 2015, <https://tv.theiet.org/?videoid=6699>, min.1:50. (6 July 2015).

Ferwerda, E., R. Snijder, J. Adema, *A project exploring Open Access monograph publishing in the Netherlands: Final Report* (OAPEN-NL: The Hague, 2013), p.3.

Finch, J., 'Accessibility, sustainability, excellence: how to expand access to research publications', p.7.

Hall, M., 'Green or Gold? Open access after Finch', *Insights*, 25(3) (2012), pp. 235-240.

Haspelmath, M., 'A proposal for radical publication reform in linguistics: Language Science Press, and the next steps', *Diversity Linguistics Comment*, 1 December 2014 <http://dlc.hypotheses.org/631> (1 September 2015) .

Haspelmath, M., 'Freedom for Science Books', *TXT Magazine* (2015), p.75.

'Japanese government asks universities to close social sciences and humanities faculties', *ICEF Monitor*, 17 September 2015 <http://monitor.icef.com/2015/09/japanese government-asks-universities-to-close-social-sciences-and-humanities-faculties/> (27 January 2016).

Jump, P., 'Monographs Have to Adapt to Keep a Place in the Future', *Times Higher Education*, 22 January 2015 <https://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/news/monographs-have-to-adapt-to-keep-a-place-in-the-future/2018050.article> (23 July 2015).

Jump, P., 'Open Access: Brought to Book at Last?', *Times Higher Education*, 18 July 2013 <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/open-access-brought-to-book-at-last/2005758.article> (20 July 2015).

Kelley, M., 'Can Open Access Save the Scholarly Monograph? ALA Midwinter Spotlight', *Publishers Weekly*, 5 December 2014 <http://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/libraries/article/64976-can-open-access-save-the-scholarly-monograph-ala-midwinter-spotlight.html> (3 September 2015).

Knowledge Unlatched, 'How it Works', <http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/about/how-it-works/> (13 August 2015).

Knowledge Unlatched, 'Pilot Project', <http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/about/pilot-project/> (3 September 2015).

Knowledge Unlatched, 'The New Collection',
<http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/2015/06/new-collection/> (3 October 2015).

Koh, A., 'A Public Library of the Humanities? An Interview with Martin Paul Eve', *The Chronical of Higher Education*, 21 April 2014
<http://chronicle.com/blogs/profhacker/a-public-library-of-the-humanities-an-interview-with-martin-paul-eve/56767> (30 August 2015).

Laakso et al. 'The Development of Open Access Journal Publishing from 1993 to 2009', *PLoS ONE,* 6.6 (2011).

Language Science Press, 'About', <http://langsci-press.org/about> (1 September 2015).

Muddit, A., 'Guest Post: Alison Muddit Interviews Geoffrey Crossick on an Age of Challenge and Opportunity: The HEFCE Report on Monographs and Open Access', *Scholarly Kitchen*, 19 October 2015 <http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2015/10/19/guest-post-alison-muddit-interviews-geoffry-crossick-on-an-age-of-challenge-and-opportunity-the-hefce-report-on-monographs-and-open-access/> (27 January 2016).

Müller, S., 'A Personal Note on Open Access', *Journal of Language Modelling*, 0(1) (2012), pp.

Müller, S., and M. Haspelmath, 'A Publication Model for Open-Access Books in Linguistics' *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (1 March 2013), p.3.

Noorden, R. van,'UK open-access route too costly', *Nature*, 10 September 2013.
<http://www.nature.com/news/uk-open-access-route-too-costly-report-says-1.13705> (14 October 2015).

NWO, 'From 'as soon as possible' to 'immediate' Open Access',
<http://www.nwo.nl/en/news-and-events/news/2015/from-as-soon-as-possible-to-immediate-open-access.html> (7 December 2015).

NWO, 'Incentive Fund Open Access-publications',
<http://www.nwo.nl/en/funding/our-funding-instruments/nwo/incentive-fund-open-access/incentive-fund-open-access---publications/incentive-fund-open-access---publications.html> (2 August 2015).

OAPEN-NL, 'Samenvatting Eindrapport',

> <http://www.oapen.nl/index.php?option=com_content&view=section&id=7&layout=
> blog&Itemid=54> (6 July 2015).

'OAPEN-UK HSS Researcher Survey Results' *OAPEN-UK,* p.25.

Open Access Button, 'Home', <https://openaccessbutton.org/> (10 March 2016).

Open Library of Humanities, 'Background to the Project',

> <https://www.openlibhums.org/about/background-to-the-project/> (28 August 2015).

Open Library of Humanities, 'Monograph Publishing Pilot',

> <https://www.openlibhums.org/2014/07/02/monograph-publishing-pilot> (30 August
> 2015).

Page, B., 'Learned Society warn of Open Access risks', *The Bookseller*, 9 July 2012

> <http://www.thebookseller.com/news/learned-societies-warn-open-access-risks> (5
> October 2015).

'Pushing the Frontier of Access for Text Mining: A Conversation with Heather Piwowar on

> One Researcher's Attempt to Break New Ground', *SPARC*, 17 May 2012
> <http://www.sparc.arl.org/news/pushing-frontier-access-text-mining-conversation-
> heather-piwowar-one-researcher%E2%80%99s-attempt-break> (25 September 2015).

Research Gate, 'Home', <https://www.researchgate.net/> (10 March 2016).

Rice, C., 'One big problem with open access and why the best way to fix it isn't going to

> work', *Science in Balance*, 30 September 2014
> <http://curt-rice.com/2014/09/30/main-problem-open-access-best-way-fix-isnt-going-
> work/> (26 September 2015).

Rijksoverheid, 'Open Access: Going for Gold'

> <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/toespraken/2014/01/28/open-acess-going-
> for-gold> (14 October 2015).

Scholarly Open Access, 'Home', <http://scholarlyoa.com/> (10 December 2015).

Sci-Hub, 'Home', <http://www.sci-hub.io/> (10 March 2016).

Shockey, N., 'Open Access in Latin America: A paragon for the rest of the world', *SPARC*,

> 17 August 2015
> <http://sparc.arl.org/blog/open-access-latin-america-paragon-rest-world> (9 November
> 2015).

Snijder, R., 'The Profits of Free Books: An Experiment to Measure the Impact of Open

> Access Publishing' *Learned Publishing,* 23 (2010), pp. 293-301.

Stebbins, M., 'Expanding Public Access to the Results of Federally Funded Research', *The White House*, 22 February 2013 <https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2013/02/22/expanding-public-access-results-federally-funded-research> (26 September 2015).

Suber, P., 'Promoting Open Access in the Humanities', *Syllecta Classica*, 16 (2005), pp. 231-246.

Suber, P., Preface in *Open Access and the Humanities: Context, Controversies and the Future* by Martin Paul Eve (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. ix-xi.

The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, 'Open Library of Humanities Planning', <https://mellon.org/grants/grants-database/grants/university-of-lincoln/11400663/> (30 August 2015).

VSNU, 'Q and A LingOA', < http://www.vsnu.nl/en_GB/QALingOA.html> (12 October 2015).

'Welke koers voor Open Access?', *ScienceGuide*, 22 October 2014 <http://www.scienceguide.nl/201410/welke-koers-voor-open-access.aspx> (14 October 2015).