

Opening Eyes: How Open Access Changed Scholarly Publishing

Margaret Driscoll, *San Jose State University*

Abstract

The world of scholarly publishing has experienced a whirlwind of change with the advent and phenomenal growth of Open Access journal publishing. Academic scholars must now take into account a number of issues when preparing research for publication. A particular journal's impact and the level of prestige it holds in one's discipline, as well as the rigorousness of its peer review process, must be considered as these can impact the scholar's career via the tenure and promotion process. This article reviews the rapidly changing landscape of scholarly publishing and provides information for scholars on trends in Open Access journal publishing. The author addresses a variety of issues of concern to academic scholars including various peer review processes employed by electronic journals, emerging impact factor algorithms, and changing attitudes towards electronic publishing on the part of university administration, tenure and promotion reviews, as well as scholars themselves.

Introduction

The world of scholarly publishing is undergoing significant change from print to open access. Cassella and Calvi (2009) identified a large set of 'disruptive forces' impacting scholarly publishing including: technological, economic, distributional, geographic, interdisciplinary, societal, and above all, Open Access content. The Open Access (OA) movement was made possible by developing technologies that allow digital delivery of documents. According to Suber, "Open-access (OA) literature is digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions. What makes it possible is the internet and the consent of the author or copyright-holder" (Cornwell & Suber, 2008).

OA journals have been in existence since 1987 (Suber, 2009), yet academic scholars remain hesitant to fully accept OA as a means for disseminating research findings (Kiernan, 2000; Maron & Smith, 2008; Sweeney, 2001). Traditional scholarly publishing officially began in 1665 when the first issue of *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* was printed. This journal holds the distinction of being the world's oldest scientific journal in continuous publication. The purpose of this landmark journal and subsequent academic publications was to inform interested readers of current scientific discoveries as well as research-based models and concepts. The heritage of the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* include the principles of research dissemination and the concept of peer review ("*Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*," 2009). Scholarly publications that reflect these principles are highly respected.

Electronic journals have struggled to focus on two important elements of scholarly publishing: peer review and journal impact. However, both principles have developed significantly in OA journaling. Information on the challenges and benefits of publishing in OA journals can be provided by librarians. Librarians can also provide academic scholars eye-opening insights regarding the changing landscape of scholarly OA publishing.

Peer Review

Scholars around the world have long considered the presence of a rigorous peer review process to be an essential factor in journal quality and importance. Peer reviews confirm that: a) the research methods employed are appropriate to the project and are properly controlled, and b) conclusions made by the researcher are soundly supported by the actual research conducted. The role of publishing in peer reviewed/refereed publications to the tenure, promotion, and merit review process was given the highest importance by survey respondents (Speier, Palmer, Wren, & Hahn, 1999). It stands to reason that the presence of a peer review/referee policy sets the stage to define a journal's quality and reliability, whether the journal is in print or electronic format.

Electronic publishing of scholarly journals preceded the OA movement. Opinions on electronic publishing were at best neutral and in many cases negative as compared to print publications in the late 1990s (Speier, Palmer, Wren, & Hahn, 1999). Their report noted that faculty respondents did not perceive electronic journals to be as high quality as their paper counterparts. Responses in this survey were, however, significantly more favorable towards established, well-respected print journals that had evolved to include an electronic format. Thus, it appears that the opinion of electronic journals at that time was based on the perceived quality of the journal itself rather than the digital format *per se*.

While established scholarly journals expanded their publications to include the digital realm as an additional access point for print and database subscription holders, the OA movement ushered in a bevy of journals which were published exclusively online and digital and which were openly available without subscription. Due to the newness of OA journal publishing, it was often unclear whether these online, freely available journals were peer reviewed or refereed.

Open Access and Peer Review

Funded by the Open Society Institute (OSI) and the *Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition* (SPARC) the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) was launched in 2003 by Lund University to “increase the visibility and ease of use of open access scientific journals, therefore promoting their increased usage and impact” (Directory of Open Access Journals, 2009). DOAJ was implemented in two phases: first, the directory itself, followed by a comprehensive search system for article-level content discovery. At launch DOAJ contained information on 350 OA journals defined as “quality controlled scientific and scholarly electronic journals that are freely available on the web” (Directory of Open Access Journals, 2009). DOAJ titles passed the 2,000 mark by May 2006 (“DOAJ Titles — Pass 2,000,” 2006), and recently announced it had doubled its coverage to 4,000 journals (Bjornshauge & Johansson, 2009).

Not all OA journals are listed in DOAJ; however, DOAJ is one major index of OA journals. Over time DOAJ has become a standard for libraries wishing to provide access to OA journals. Many academic libraries program DOAJ into their link resolvers providing researchers access to articles published in OA journals alongside articles published in established print journals. Providing access to OA journal articles in this manner not only serves as endorsement of their scholarly value, but also acts to promote their existence.

Given the neutral-to-negative perception of digital content previously mentioned, it is not surprising that scholars might miss the fact that, initially, DOAJ aimed to represent only quality controlled electronic journals. But what does ‘quality controlled’ mean in the Open Access

digital world? Are OA journals peer reviewed or refereed? The Directory specifically requires that the journals listed must exercise peer-review or editorial quality control (also known as refereeing). To determine whether the ‘quality control’ required by DOAJ can be easily ascertained journal by journal, the author conducted a review of DOAJ titles by select academic discipline (see Table 1).

Table 1: Analysis of DOAJ Titles Posting Review Policies (in English)

DOAJ Titles by Academic Disciplines	Peer Review /Referee Info in English	% of Total Titles	Review Policies Posted	% of Titles with Info in English
Archaeology (22 journals)	14	63.6%	5	35.7%
Arts (31 journals)	22	71.0%	20	90.9%
Business and Management (93 journals)	70	75.3%	38	54.3%
General Works: Multidisciplinary (57 journals)	41	71.9%	34	82.9%
Health Sciences				
Nursing (28 journals)	12	42.9%	11	91.7%
Public Health (127 journals)	98	77.2%	69	70.4%
History (127 journals)	60	47.2%	40	66.7%
Languages and Literatures (158 journals)	80	50.6%	53	66.3%
Linguistics (115 journals)	70	60.9%	42	60.0%
Mathematics (139 journals)	128	92.1%	90	70.3%
Political Science (116 journals)	77	66.4%	47	61.0%
Sciences				
Genetics (34 journals)	33	97.1%	27	81.8%
Microbiology (35 journals)	30	85.7%	22	73.3%
Physiology (28 journals)	28	100.0%	23	82.1%
Biochemistry (34 journals)	28	82.4%	21	75.0%
Biotechnology (27 journals)	24	88.9%	20	83.3%
Chemistry (General) (70 journals)	59	84.3%	34	57.6%
Environmental Sciences (77 journals)	58	75.3%	46	79.3%
Social Sciences				
Education (299 journals)	182	60.9%	147	80.8%
Library and Information Science (96 journals)	40	41.7%	31	77.5%
Psychology (106 journals)	58	54.7%	43	74.1%
Sociology (76 journals)	39	51.3%	27	69.2%
Totals/Averages	1251	70.1%	890	71.1%

Data was obtained by visiting each journal's website to locate information specifically outlining the existence of a peer review or referee process. DOAJ represents journals from around the world which contain content and journal information in multiple languages. Only journals which had peer review or referee information presented in English were included in the statistics.

A review of the data shows that the extent to which the OA journals listed in DOAJ post a peer review or referee process and policy information varies by discipline. However, a majority of these titles meet the DOAJ quality control guidelines. Given peer review's significance to academics wishing to publish, it seems warranted to recommend that all OA journals clearly post the policies and processes which make them 'quality controlled,' including a description of what type of peer review process is used. Such transparency could go a long way towards affirming the academic quality of OA journals.

The technological ability to easily share documents in electronic format via email, as well as the ability to provide online access to articles under consideration for publication, present new and more open methods of conducting review. Hodgkinson (2007) outlined various types of review practiced in digital publishing:

- Traditional – before publishing, by expert
- Open – before publishing, by expert, reviews available for readers; after publishing, comments by readers allowed (i.e., BMJ)
- Open and permissive – before publishing, at least three reviews (whether positive or negative) of editorial board members, reviews available for readers; after publishing, comments by readers allowed (i.e., Biology Direct)
- Community – manuscript is public while discussed by community (and reviewed by invited reviewers), afterwards the final version is published (i.e., Journal of Interactive Media in Education, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics)
- Permissive, post-publication commentary – minimal criteria for acceptance of paper; after publication scientific community comments and annotates articles (i.e., PloS ONE)
- No peer review, post-publication commentary (i.e., Nature Proceedings, Philica)

Given the vast disparity in control and review methods indicated by Hodgkinson, it becomes even more important for OA journals to specify how submitted materials are reviewed and refereed. Hodgkinson further stated, "I think that if there is doubt in the integrity of peer review (and there is more and more doubt), this increases the imperative for exposing pre-publication review processes." It may at times be valid for scholars to question whether publishing in OA journals will represent their authority and the importance of their research to their peers and administrators, but this need not be the case if pre-publication information is comprehensive and readily available.

Impact Factor

Researchers have long hoped that their findings would have an effect on both current and future intellectual inquiry. The effect or 'impact' they seek is measured by the degree to which their work is seen, read, used, built-upon, cited, and applied by other researchers in the discipline (Harnad, 2003). A number of proprietary international indexes (i.e., ISI Web of Science) have evolved to report the impact of individual academic journals. These indexing organizations have

developed citation tracking algorithms to calculate the ‘impact factor’ of various journals based on the number of times articles published therein are cited in subsequent published literature. The impact factor of a journal as a whole will determine its prestige in comparison with other journals in the discipline, and thus a hierarchy is created based on desirability for researchers’ submission of work. Additionally, it should be noted that the proprietary impact factor indexes are discipline-specific and are generally not available without paid subscription, thus adding to the mystery of scholarly publishing.

The proprietary indexes register and calculate citations for a rolling two year period after initial article publication; thus new journals, regardless of format, are inherently handicapped. This has made it extremely difficult for new journals, whether digital or print, to enter the high-stakes game of publishing important research by eminent academics. Since OA journals were all new on the scholarly publishing scene early in the game, this more severely affected their ability to compete and become accepted by scholars based on traditional impact factors.

Regarding the impact factor of new OA journals, it is interesting to note that entire editorial boards of print journals resigned and established OA journals in protest against high prices and limited online access policies. Suber (2008) compiled a list of journal declarations of independence which began as early as 1989, and SPARC published “Declaring Independence” in 2001 to offer information and assistance to scientists wishing to exercise control of their journals. One would think that these experienced editorial boards would guarantee the high quality of any newly established OA journals immediately, but it is unknown whether this was indeed the case.

New ways of looking at the research impact of OA journals have been and continue to be explored (Armbruster, 2009; Banks & Dellavalle, 2008; Harnad & Brody, 2004; Saxby, Creaser, Nicholas, Huntington, & Jamali, 2006). Lawrence (2001) presented the first major findings regarding the increased impact of online journal articles (not specifically OA journals), and Harnad (2003) clearly explained that the true research impact of open access was vastly superior to that of the classic impact for print journals. Understanding that new research builds on existing research, as indeed all creative works build on the past, the level of **access** to research is important in calculating the **impact** it can have. Harnad contended that the *limited access* of subscription-based print journals caused *limited research impact*. The complete cycle for print publications takes 12 to 18 months, not counting the length of time actually conducting research. Along with costly subscription requirements, the research-to-publication cycle plays a part in limiting the research impact of print journals. *Unlimited access*, Harnad further stated, leads to *greater research impact*. Compared to print journals, electronic and OA journals have a much shorter research-to-publication cycle, thus making findings available more quickly in addition to being freely available without costly subscription. Several studies reviewed by Harnad in 2003 indicated that for equivalent articles available by open-access (including self-archiving in OA repositories) the impact was increased on average 336% compared to subscription access. More recently, Bhat (2009) looked at the influence of peer review on citations in the OA environment and found that refereed articles were cited twice as often as (non-refereed) working papers.

An excellent resource for following the impact factors of scholarly publications in the sciences is maintained by The Open Citation Project located at <http://opcit.eprints.org>. Another excellent resource on impact factors is Eigenfactor.org. While covering both natural and social sciences, thus being more interdisciplinary, Eigenfactor metrics take into account the entire network of scholarly publishing by weighing not only the number of citations but also where

they come from (i.e., being cited in a prominent journal carries more weight than being cited in a less prominent journal).

Academic Tenure and Promotion

Academic tenure, promotion, and merit policies include an analysis of research, publication, and presentation as important indicators of faculty activity beyond course development and classroom instruction. Educational institutions, especially research-based universities, often consider the specific journals in which a scholar has published in order to determine merit. Over the years this practice has caused scholars to carefully select the journals to which they submit, often ruling out OA journals due to a perception of lesser quality which could negatively impact their bid for tenure or academic promotion.

Webber (2005) stated that “It was obvious to me that the universities’ review procedures for tenure and promotion, or at least committee members’ perceptions of the review procedures, were created during an era when print journals were the primary publication venue for refereed articles” (p. 8). Since electronic journals are forcing a reconceptualization of academic publishing, it may be time to determine exactly what aspects of traditional print publishing continue to warrant consideration for tenure and promotion, and then balance those aspects with the new possibilities inherent in digital publishing. Options available in electronic publications may allow for manuscripts to move beyond text to utilize more dynamic communication tools such as sound, video, and animation; hence increasing their value. Webber proposed a framework for assessing electronic journals and print journals that takes into account an article’s level of academic quality together with its projected level of impact.

More recently Mercieca and Macauley (2008) stated that “academic promotion processes may be in conflict with increasing support for open access modes of publication,” noting that promotion, tenure and funding allocations are often linked to publication in a few, leading, refereed journals (p. 244). In an effort to expand the scope of academic publication, the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) initiative drafted a list of 19,533 peer reviewed journals with four tiers of quality rankings, based on how each compares with other journals, instead of its relevance or importance in a particular discipline (p. 245). OA journals were not fully represented in the ERA list, but further work is being done to increase the number of OA journals on the list due to new understandings of the research impact of open access articles.

As stated earlier, journal impact factors have been used to identify whether a scholar has published in a prestigious venue, and this ranking can affect committee decisions on granting tenure and/or promotion. Banks and Dellavalle (2008) identified emerging alternatives to the traditional impact factor which could be used as new measures of scholarly merit for tenure and promotion. These alternatives can be applied to OA journals as well as traditional print publications, thus leveling the playing field for OA journals.

A growing number of major universities have committed to supporting OA publishing – the worldwide tally of Open Access mandatory policies reached 100 with the University of Salford (UK) announcement in October 2009 (“100th Open Access Mandate Reached!”, 2009). Additionally, five major US universities have signed a compact to give institutional support for OA journals by underwriting journal processing fees (Hadro, 2009). There is no doubt that scholars will take another look at the emerging OA venue with the growth in administrative support for digital publishing. However, additional work is being done by the Modern Language Association to encourage tenure committees to be more open to scholarship that differs from the

traditional norms (Jaschik, 2009). Rutgers (2009) and other universities are beginning to rewrite their academic promotion policies to include equal weight to electronic publication, which gives indication that eyes are beginning to be opened to the new role of electronic scholarship.

Conclusion

The perception of OA journals by scholars and academic institutions has developed into a growing, although still early and hesitant, acceptance. Librarians can play a crucial role in opening eyes to the expanding horizons that publishing in Open Access journals can offer scholars. Educational efforts can include announcing the new and exciting advances in direct access to OA journal articles through library subscription database searches, providing information on peer review policies and the resulting quality control of OA journals, and linking to emerging metrics for impact factors (taking into consideration how increased access improves research impact). Encouraging new directions in administrative support for the free flow of information via OA repositories and electronic publishing which will surely affect tenure and promotion committee attitudes towards digital scholarship.

References

- 100th Open Access mandate reached! (2009, October). *Open Access Week - October 19-23, 2009*. Retrieved from <http://www.openaccessweek.org/2009/10/19/100th-open-access-mandate-reached/>.
- Armbruster, C. (2009). Whose metrics? On building citation, usage and access metrics as information service for scholars. *SSRN eLibrary*. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1464706.
- Banks, M. A., & Dellavalle, R. (2008). Emerging alternatives to the impact factor. *OCLC Systems & Services*, 24(3), 167-173. doi: 10.1108/10650750810898200
- Bhat, M. H. (2009). Effect of peer review on citations in the open access environment. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, 11(1), 1-6. Retrieved from <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/~mbolin/hanief.htm>.
- Bjornshauge, L., & Johansson, A. (2009, April 1). Now there are 4000 journals in the Directory of Open Access Journals. *Directory of Open Access Journals - News*. Retrieved from <http://www.doaj.org/doaj?func=loadTempl&templ=090401b>.
- Cassella, M., & Calvi, L. (2009, August). *New journal models and publishing perspectives in the evolving digital environment*. Paper presented at the IFLA General Conference, Milan, Italy.
- Cornwell, R., & Suber, P. (2008). Perspective on open-access publishing: An interview with Peter Suber. *Innovate: Journal of Online Education*, 4(4). Retrieved from <http://www.innovateonline.info/index.php?view=article&id=564>.
- Directory of Open Access Journals (2009). *About*. Retrieved from <http://www.doaj.org/doaj?func=loadTempl&templ=about>.
- DOAJ titles — Pass 2,000. (2006). *Information Outlook*, 10(5), 9.
- Hadro, J. (2009). Five universities sign open access funding compact. *Library Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6696797.html>.

- Harnad, S. (2003). The research-impact cycle. *Information Services & Use*, 23(2/3), 139-142.
- Harnad, S., & Brody, T. (2004). Comparing the impact of Open Access (OA) vs. non-OA articles in the same journals. *D-Lib Magazine*, 10(6). Retrieved from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/june04/harnad/06harnad.html>
- Hodgkinson, M. (2007, June 28). Open peer review & community peer review. *Journalology*. Retrieved from <http://journalology.blogspot.com/2007/06/open-peer-review-community-peer-review.html>.
- Jaschik, S. (2009, May 26). News: Tenure in a digital era. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/05/26/digital>.
- Kiernan, V. (2000). Rewards remain dim for professors who pursue digital scholarship. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46(34), A45-46.
- Lawrence, S. (2001, May 31). Free online availability substantially increases a paper's impact. *Nature*. Retrieved from <http://www.nature.com/nature/debates/e-access/Articles/lawrence.html>.
- Maron, N. L., Smith, K. K. (2008, November). Current models of digital scholarly communication: Results of an investigation conducted by Ithaka for the Association of Research Libraries. *Association of Research Libraries*.
- Mercieca, P., & Macauley, P. (2008). A new era of Open Access? *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, 39(4), 243-252.
- Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. (2009). *About*. Retrieved from <http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/site/misc/about.xhtml>.
- Rutgers, State University of New Jersey, Office of the President. (2009). *Academic Reappointments/Promotions*. Retrieved from <http://ruweb.rutgers.edu/oldqueens/FACpromotions.shtml>.
- Saxby, C., Creaser, C., Nicholas, D., Huntington, P., & Jamali, H. R. (2006). *Assessing the impact of open access: Preliminary findings from Oxford Journals*. Oxford Journals. Retrieved from http://www.oxfordjournals.org/news/oa_report.pdf.
- Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition. (2001). *Declaring independence*. Retrieved from <http://www.arl.org/sparc/DI/>.
- Speier, C., Palmer, J., Wren, D., & Hahn, S. (1999). Faculty perceptions of electronic journals as scholarly communication: A question of prestige and legitimacy. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 50(6), 537-43. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(1999)50:6<537::AID-ASI9>3.0.CO;2-6
- Suber, P. (2008, April 30). Lists related to the Open Access Movement. *Lists Related to The Open Access Movement*. Retrieved from <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/lists.htm#declarations>.
- Suber, P. (2009, February 9). Timeline of the open access movement. *Timeline of the Open Access Movement*. Retrieved from <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/timeline.htm>.

Sweeney, A. E. (2001). E-scholarship and electronic publishing in the twenty-first century: Implications for the academic community. *Educational Media International*, 38(1), 25-38.

Webber, C. F. (2005). A revolution in academic publication. *Education Libraries*, 28(2), 5-10.