

Elena Šimukovič, M.A. (LIS)

ORCID: [0000-0003-1363-243X](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1363-243X)

Doctoral student at the Department of Science and Technology Studies, University of Vienna

Supervisor: Univ.-Prof. Dr. Ulrike Felt

# Of hopes, villains and Trojan horses – Open Access academic publishing and its battlefields

Doctoral research proposal

30 April 2016

## Abstract

In this doctoral research proposal the author deals with “Open Access”, a vision of a free online availability of scholarly journal literature that has been put forward in the early 2000s. More than a decade later, Open Access has gathered momentum and became a widespread phenomenon with several (inter-)national strategies currently being pursued towards a radical transformation of the academic publishing world. Should the extreme scenario as proposed by some actors succeed, budgets of academic libraries would be fully shifted from conventional journal subscriptions model (“pay-to-read”) towards publishing all research articles in Open Access journals (“pay-to-say”). However, the effects and dynamics that such a transition would unleash in the global knowledge regime remain largely unexplored. In order to answer the research questions, ongoing negotiations on Open Access publishing between the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU) and the academic publisher Elsevier as well as Dutch researchers’ perceptions on the implications of these negotiations for their own publication practices will serve as empirical basis. Situational analysis developed by Adele E. Clarke (2005) will be used as an overall frame for data collection and analysis.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

## **Table of Contents**

Introduction.....	1
State of the Art.....	3
Research questions.....	6
Research design.....	7
Theoretical framework.....	7
Materials and methods.....	9
Timeline.....	12
Schematic structure.....	13
Ethical considerations.....	13
Bibliography.....	14

## Introduction

*"What I strongly believe is that the publishing world is a reflection of the scientific world. We are the results of what the scientific world is making. So as such it is almost like a commercial answer to what is happening. What you are seeing today, is an evolution. Some are saying a revolution, I don't think so, I think it's an evolution. And changes are coming."* - Stephane Berghmans (VP Academic & Research Relations EU, Elsevier), Open-Access-Tage 2015, Zurich, September 2015

At the beginning of this millennium, a vision of a free and unrestricted online availability of peer-reviewed journal literature was proposed and labelled "Open Access". It aims at converging an old tradition of scholarship – namely, publishing the fruits of research for the sake of inquiry and knowledge – with a new technology, the internet, in order to create "an unprecedented public good" (BOAI, 2002). More than a decade later, the academic publishing system is supposed to be approaching a radical change where a transformation from the conventional journal subscription model towards full and immediate Open Access is expected to occur (cf. Bruch et al., 2016; Butler, 2016; LERU, 2015).

During the last years research funders and science policy-makers in Europe and beyond were increasingly coupling their funding requirements to Open Access mandates and setting target values for a given year. If carried to extremes, all research publications resulting from publicly funded projects would then be available online for free. Indeed, several national strategies on the share of Open Access publications have been already passed: 60% by 2019 and 100% by 2024 in the Netherlands, 80% by 2020 and 100% by 2025 in Austria, 80% by 2018 and 100% by 2021 in Slovenia, 100% by 2025 in Sweden, – just to name a few (cf. Bauer et al., 2015). Moreover, a wave of "open" initiatives in higher education and research can be observed, including "Open data", "Open educational resources" and "Open Innovation" (Corral & Pinfield, 2014). Together with "Open Access" and "Open Science" among the priorities of the Dutch Presidency of the Council of the European Union in the first semester of 2016 (European Commission, 2015), it conveys the impression that "open" has become a remedy for all ills or at least a necessary attribute in contemporary discourses.

Insofar, making publicly funded research accessible to the public seems to be a reasonable claim. However, translating this basic principle into practice is by no means a straightforward task and leads to disagreements within the ranks of Open Access advocates themselves (e.g. Harnad, 2012). Points of contention set out at the very implementation models of the Open Access vision – whether the "Green" road with embargoed "self-archiving" of author manuscripts in online

repositories at no cost, or the “Gold” road with Open Access journals with potentially lower reputation or extra costs, or opting for the “Hybrid” offer to “ransom” individual papers in conventional subscription journals and yet the highest (monetary) cost (cf. Crawford, 2011; Suber, 2012).

However, the issues at stake go far beyond available funds or individual preferences. For instance, given the way of functioning in Gold Open Access journals charging author-side fees for accepted publications, an affiliation to an institution and/or willingness to pay the required amount (often in the range of an average monthly salary) are strong prerequisites in order to be published. The fees increase considerably if one chooses a Hybrid journal (cf. Rieck *et al.*, 2016). Therefore, the transition from “pay-to-read” to “pay-to-say” principle might be expected as generating new forms of inequalities (Bonaccorso *et al.*, 2014; Czerniewicz & Goodier, 2014; Hofmann, 2014) or even a new geography of knowledge asymmetries with scholars in the “center” and in the “periphery” of scholarly communication (Canagarajah, 2002). Speculating further on, one could anticipate reinforcing the so-called Matthew effect (Merton, 1968) known from the studies on sociology of science and bibliometrics where well established and highly cited researchers would gain even more visibility with Open Access movement missing to deliver its promise to “democratise” science as a social system.

Furthermore, the publishing activity can be considered a major ordering force in the research enterprise as not only a technology of articulation that transports ideas and knowledge about the world, but also a machinery for distribution of resources and “a regulatory mechanism in the allocation of privileges” (Herb, 2010, Scientific capital and scientific communication, para.3). Given this central role, it is then surprising that reflections on power or risks in such a massive transformation towards the “Open Access world” via paid Gold and Hybrid Open Access routes as it has been proposed recently and is currently pursued in several arenas (Schimmer *et al.*, 2015; LERU, 2016) are hardly articulated. What would this world look like the very next day? As such, the issues of this kind rather present sites of “discursive silence” (Clarke, 2005) where positions and statements can be expected and yet “loudly missing”.

Thus, looking at the Open Access debates from the perspective of Science and Technology Studies (STS) gives rise to a number of questions. What particular values and understandings of science, (scientific) knowledge and society are inscribed into the definitions of Open Access? Who is given a voice and who is silenced? *Cui bono?* - or to whose benefit (Star, 1995) – are we primarily striving for an “open” world? And what implications would it have for knowledge production in different locations, career stages and research fields?

The issues raised in the proposed doctoral project will be addressed by conducting a case study on the negotiations between the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU) and the academic publisher Elsevier. The recent dispute between the two parties over contractually agreed Open Access publishing options for all Dutch universities is currently in the spotlight as it is expected to create a precedent for other countries to follow (Butler, 2016; Ministry for Education, Culture and Science, 2014). In order to answer the research questions, situational analysis (Clarke, 2005) will be used as an overall frame. The value of the proposed doctoral project lies in the combination of resources in STS and Library and Information Science (LIS) and will be supported by author's background in both fields.

### **State of the Art**

Since the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) declaration in 2002 there have been many institutions and initiatives of different kinds involved in fostering access to peer-reviewed research literature. The numbers of Open Access journals and articles have been steadily growing and legal, technical and other conditions improving (Björk, 2013; Laakso *et al.*, 2011). Even more, according to the International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical (STM) Publishers, Open Access has been a dominant topic in the academic publishing industry during the last years and “will continue to be one of the defining features of the next stage of STM publishing” (Ware & Mabe, 2015, p. 157).

However, the symbolic unity of the Open Access movement rather reveals an arena of divergent developments drifting apart one shared common goal. In the past years, the term “Open Access” has proliferated and became a patchwork with highly complex manifestations of Green, Gold, Hybrid, Diamond, Platinum and other routes along with its sub-species and intricacies of embargo periods or reuse rights (cf. Crawford, 2011; Fuchs & Sandoval, 2013; Suber, 2012). This diversification can be well illustrated by the “Open Access Spectrum” developed by the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) and the Public Library of Science (PLoS), both organisations in support of Open Access. The guide comprises a range of options on six criteria and suggests to “move beyond the seemingly simple question” of “Is this journal Open Access?” towards a more productive one, namely “How Open Is It?” (SPARC & PLoS, 2014).

So far, the community of scholars and professionals in LIS, a “home discipline” and one of the core groups behind the Open Access movement, has been mainly focusing on empirical research. This includes large-scale surveys on drivers and barriers for Open Access publishing (e.g. Kuipers & van der Hoeven, 2009), studies on costs and economics of Open Access (Björk & Solomon, 2014; Kingsley, 2007; Larivière, Haustein, & Mongeon, 2015), the role of academic libraries (cf. Brintzinger, 2010; Gradmann, 2008; Guédon, 2001; Pinfield, 2013), policies of journal publishers

(Antelman, 2006; Laakso, 2014) as well as disciplinary requirements for Open Access infrastructures (e.g. Meier zu Verl & Horstmann, 2011; Taubert, 2014).

Efforts in favour of Open Access have been made by established researchers, too. One of the most prominent examples is the boycott of the Dutch academic publisher Elsevier started by a mathematician and Fields Medal winner Timothy Gowers in January 2012. The initiators of the protest regarded Elsevier's business practices as "an exemplar of everything that is wrong with the current system of commercial publication of mathematics journals" (The Cost of Knowledge, 2012, p. 4). The boycott has spread out among research communities counting more than 15.500 signatories (as of 10 February 2016) publicly declining to publish, referee and/or do editorial work in journals published by Elsevier. Due to the events taking place at that time, the protest was even coined "the Academic Spring" - following the namesake of the series of uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa against authoritarian regimes known as the "Arab Spring" (Anderson, 2012; Brienza, 2012; The Economist, 2012).

However, the issue of "openness" and its battles did not attract much attention in the realm of STS or related fields. Bearing this in mind, Hagner (2015, p.67) argues that the intellectual capacity of arts and humanities and particularly science studies would be most qualified to address the complexities of Open Access and the "epochal changes" in the business of academic publishing. Noteworthy, an emergent line of work with a particular interest in discourse analysis can be observed at the intersection of LIS, philosophy and culture studies. An important contribution to this includes Jutta Haider's work on the conceptions of "information poverty" and the development discourse in Open Access debates. She demonstrates how discursive procedures such as a dichotomy reducing the world to polar opposites, temporal distancing and a linear storytelling, technological determinism equating technology and progress, and an emphasis on potential damage of information poverty were used to establish Open Access publishing (Haider, 2008, 2012). Similarly, Janneke Adema (2015) investigates the reasons and motivations behind Open Access, the potentials and pitfalls of "open's openness", a genealogy of openness and secrecy as well as the neoliberal discourse in Open Access. Further on, by looking at Open Access as a concept and practice Adema argues for an alternative, more radical version "embracing its own inconsistencies and battling with its own conceptions of openness" (Adema, 2014).

In contrast to the often assumed strict demarcation line between the interests of publishers and researchers in Open Access advocacy materials, lectures from the history of science suggest quite the opposite. Building upon the establishment of the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* in 1665, which is widely regarded as the first scientific journal, Bazerman (1988) demonstrated how the organization of scholarly communication and the role set of the scientist have co-evolved together. Developing standards of public argument and adhering to them,

reconfiguration of the participants into general and specialized audiences as well as emergence of citation practices are only few examples of how an increasing professionalism had influence on the social structure of the scientific community (pp. 128-150).

This line of argumentation is also supported by Hagner (2015) who argues for overwhelmingly common rather than conflicting interests between academic publishers and authors in the history of their relationship. He further offers criticism on the enlightenment-like expectations on the liberation of knowledge as well as commodification and the neoliberal agenda behind Open Access. From this viewpoint, as humanities scholars have been relatively resistant to the “imported” logic from STM fields and pervasive influence of “academic capitalism” in terms of maintaining local languages in scholarly communication and publishing “lengthy” books, they can serve as an example of alternative power relationships in contrast to globally operating corporations and large investors behind them (Hagner, 2015, pp. 129-130).

In assessing potential benefits and disadvantages of Open Access publishing for different groups, contributions with a focus on inclusion and exclusion as well as its regional or social characteristics can be found in the literature. In a case study for South Africa, Czerniewicz and Goodier (2014) illustrate how conceptions and “misconceptions” of Open Access along with policy interventions have led to a confusion among academics and a shift from a democratic access-to-knowledge imperative to a discourse of regulatory compliance. Moreover, they stress that the production of scientific knowledge is concentrated in the Global North with the Open Access movement further reinforcing its dominant position. The visibility of “southern” or “periphery” research is thus likely to be worsened through new bottlenecks to participation and further exacerbation of geopolitical knowledge inequality (Czerniewicz & Goodier, 2014; Bonaccorso et al., 2014).

Similarly, Tüür-Fröhlich (2012) sheds light on gender inequalities in scholarly communication. By asking “How open are the 'open initiatives' for women?” she indicates different levels of awareness and the need for training in Open Access and publication techniques among male and female respondents. In a scientometric study on the potentials of Open Access to enhance the visibility and thus the careers of female scholars she further finds out that the investigated sample of journals in social sciences could be labelled as “women friendly”. By allowing access to research publications independently of times and spaces, “open” initiatives therefore are believed to enhance female voices in scholarly communication.

In summary, it can be stated that there have been only a few scattered efforts to address more far-reaching effects on the ecosystem of scholarly communication (to be) triggered by an Open Access publishing regime. Even more so, the issues at stake desire closer attention from scholars, research administrators, academic publishers, science policy-makers and other actors. The project

at hand thus aims at broadening the scope of debates by looking at imaginaries of an “Open Access world” and its implications for various and potentially vulnerable groups.

## **Research questions**

The main research question of the proposed project is following:

### ***How is Open Access academic publishing re-ordering the scientific system?***

The ultimate interest of this project is to analyse how Open Access academic publishing has to find an arrangement with existing orders of the scientific system or develop new ones. The proposed transition to full Open Access and its expected results will be given particular attention.

This includes following sub-questions:

- What expectations towards the scientific system are expressed through the shift to Open Access academic publishing?

The purpose of this question is to explore what kinds of deficiencies of the current scientific system Open Access publishing aims to address and which (better) qualities it is supposed to achieve (e.g. to save costs, enhance visibility, democratize scientific knowledge, broaden participation or help “developing world”). Furthermore, how problems and solutions are narrated and embedded in broader narratives on the place of research in contemporary societies.

- How is Open Access imagined by different actors?

The purpose of this question is to explore how the notions of “openness” and “Open Access” are understood, used and negotiated by different actors, including potential tensions or (dis)agreements between these different visions. How are “scripts” of a good publishing system or particular values expressed through these imaginaries of Open Access? What kinds of uses and their users are projected? Which alternatives are envisaged and which ones closed down?

- How does Open Access affect actual publication practices?

The purpose of this question is to explore how “users” and “producers” of scientific knowledge do react to, i.e. embrace, ignore or resist, Open Access publishing in their actual practices. This includes researchers at different career stages, within different institutions and research fields. How does Open Access publishing fit with their scholarly practices and epistemic cultures? What factors do play a role? Who benefits, who is disadvantaged and who remains agnostic and under which circumstances? And what implications does it have in different domains?



## Research design

### Theoretical framework

In order to address the main research question and to analyse the ways how Open Access participates in re-ordering the scholarly communication system the concept of *knowledge regime* (cf. Felt *et al.*, 2016) will be used. Building on “technopolitical regimes” developed by Gabrielle Hecht (2001), the “regime” metaphor allows for three different notions to be considered. First, its political parlance that refers “to the people who govern, to their ideologies, and to the various means through which they exert power”; second, the prescription of policies, practices and broader visions of the sociopolitical order; and third, the contested nature of power where regimes have “to contend with varying forms of dissent or resistance, both from outside and from within the institutions they governed” (p. 258).

By analogy, the term “knowledge regime” aims both to evoke the similarity with political regimes and to convey the difference that “knowledge” makes. With regard to the case study to be conducted in the doctoral research project, the conditions and mechanisms under which certain policies and agreements between different actors (people and institutions) come into being and are executed at local, institutional and individual levels will be examined. The ways how such prescriptions are perceived as implicating academic publishing practices and the rearrangement of Open Access and the scholarly communication system will be central in analysing this regime.

The role of design choices as prescriptions of certain orders was also argued by sociologists of technology. According to Akrich (1992), every technology and technical object is shaped by decisions of its designers. They define and project users and representations of uses, including “specific tastes, competences, motives, aspirations, political prejudices” as well as “assume that morality, technology, science, and economy will evolve in particular ways” (p. 208). In other words, designers *inscribe* their visions of the world into the object. New technologies and technical objects may thus “not only lead to new arrangements of people and things” but also “generate and ‘naturalize’ new forms and orders of causality” or a specific “geography of responsibilities” (p. 207). Therefore, the concept of *scripts* will be used to analyse how “designers” of Open Access inscribe their visions into academic publishing technologies and predetermine its users and settings of use.

Following the argumentation and visionary claims in favour of Open Access, the notion of *master narratives* and other associated concepts will be utilized. As Felt and colleagues put it, “Master narratives serve simultaneously as prior framing, starting-point, justification, and mode of sense-making for the policy domain” (2007, p. 76). Master narratives mobilised in the Open Access publishing controversy will be scrutinised to dismantle different actors, positions and arenas where

Open Access is negotiated. As “each narrative offers its own heroes, villains and victims, and its own lasting moral prescriptions for confronting other crises” (2007, p. 74), the concept will allow to look at how certain kinds of master narratives are constructed and imposed.

According to Viehöver (2001), public narratives often represent *problem narratives* used by actor networks to assert a common standpoint on a problem, its causes and consequences. Building on problem narratives, *solution narratives* are developed and political actions justified by means of moral models and conclusions. Following Somers (1994), he further argues for the close relation between public and meta narratives: the stronger a public narrative is bound to a socially recognised meta narrative at a specific point in time (such as creation and modernisation myths or ideologies), the more it can be expected to gain acceptance (Viehöver, 2001, pp. 183-184). In this regard, the way how Open Access is narrated and embedded in broader discourses on the place of science and research in contemporary societies will be explored.

Furthermore, the concept of narratives is closely linked to *discourse coalitions* proposed by Maarten Hajer (1993). Hajer suggests to define a discourse coalition as “the ensemble of a set of story lines, the actors that utter these story lines, and the practices through which these story lines get expressed” (2006, p. 71). Politics is then viewed “as a process in which different actors from various backgrounds form specific coalitions around specific story lines” and the story lines, in turn, “are the medium through which actors try to impose their view of reality on others, suggest certain social positions and practices, and criticise alternative social arrangements” (ibid.). Formation of discourse coalitions around specific problem and solution narratives will be examined in the context of Open Access debates.

Finally, the multiplicity of “open” initiatives in scholarly communication and research raises questions about the use of the “openness” notion itself. This issue will be addressed by employing the concept of *buzzwords* as defined by Bernadette Bensaude Vincent (2014). Building on this definition, buzzwords can be characterised by their future-orientation, i.e. urging towards a desirable future that shapes the present; inconsistency of meaning and interpretive flexibility allowing to translate and adapt them to various niches; and a crisis as their context of emergence. As such, buzzwords raise high expectations, are value-laden and short-lived. Taking various “open” movements together they can be seen in “a cluster of meaning” that mobilises people with divergent motivations around a matter of concern by setting attractive goals and agendas or may even “become mainstream by creating unstable collectives through noise” (p. 239).

## Materials and methods

In order to answer the research questions, the negotiations on Open Access publishing between the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU) and Dutch academic publisher Elsevier<sup>1</sup>, as well as Dutch researchers' perceptions of the implications of these negotiations for their own publication practices will serve as empirical basis.

### *Case study*

The controversy between the two parties is currently in the spotlight as pilot agreements with several major publishers have recently been reached and a “transition to open access would make the Netherlands an interesting test case for other countries” (Ministry for Education, Culture and Science, 2014). In this regard, Austria was mentioned by Gerard Meijer, the lead negotiator on the side of VSNU, as a potential next candidate to follow suit (Bohannon, 2015).

The course of events in the current VSNU-Elsevier dispute can be dated back to the announcement to regulate Open Access to research publications in the Netherlands. In a letter to the Parliament in November 2013, Dutch Secretary of State for Education, Culture and Science, Sander Dekker, urged for a political intervention in accordance with the European Commission's call on the Member States to define and coordinate an Open Access policy. A goal for the Netherlands was set to switch entirely to Open Access by 2024 and to achieve 60% of all research articles funded from the Dutch public purse to be available in Open Access by 2019.<sup>2</sup>

Shortly after, the VSNU took up negotiations with major academic publishers on renewal of library subscriptions which would integrate Open Access publishing components for Dutch authors at no additional cost. In 2014 and 2015, agreements with several publishers including Springer, Wiley and Sage were reached. However, the negotiations between VSNU and Elsevier could be rather described as an ongoing battle ranging from the phases of “an impasse” (November 2014) to “a deadlock” (June 2015) and eventually taking “a constructive turn” (November 2015). While negotiations were interrupted and resumed, researchers in the Netherlands were asked to boycott Elsevier by giving up their editor-in-chief posts as well as to stop reviewing and publishing for its journals. This call might be exemplified most notably by a resignation of the full editorial board from a prominent linguistics journal after failed renegotiations on journal ownership and pricing terms.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Elsevier B.V. (Elsevier), part of the RELX Group, is an academic publisher and scientific information provider with headquarters in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, and offices worldwide. For company information see <https://www.elsevier.com/about/company-information> [last checked on 01/02/16]

2 For an English version of the letter see Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (2014).

3 See response from Elsevier on 4 November 2015: <https://www.elsevier.com/connect/addressing-the-resignation-of-the-lingua-editorial-board>

Finally, an “agreement in principle” between VSNU and Elsevier has been reached in December 2015 for the upcoming three years starting in 2016.<sup>4</sup>

At science policy level, efforts towards a coordinated action on Open Access publishing have been made, too. For instance, “Open Access” and “Open Science” were set among the priorities for the Dutch Presidency of the Council of the European Union in the first semester of 2016. This agenda was supported by the League of European Research Universities (LERU, 2015, 2016) urging Dutch policy-makers and the European Commission to redirect research funding “to research, not to publishers”. Joint statements by the Dutch Secretary of State Dekker and his British counterpart Clark as well as Commissioner Moedas were released, announcing “shared common goals” on Open Access to publications and data (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, 2015) and calling on scientific publishers “to adapt their business models to new realities” (European Commission, 2015). As Dutch Presidency has started in January 2016, further developments particularly at European level are expected to take place over next months.

### *Data*

As a recent controversy where different positions are articulated and values made explicit, the negotiations between VSNU and Elsevier offer a broad range of materials for a case study. Following data will be collected:

- Documents including official statements, press releases and newsletters by involved organisations,
- Presentations and talks at academic publishing conferences and related workshops,
- Written communication in discussion forums, national and international media coverage, as well as an echo in social media channels and blog posts,
- Semi-structured one-to-one interviews with the key actors in the negotiations (approx. 4-5 interviews, audio-recorded, verbatim transcription, memory minutes),
- Semi-structured one-to-one interviews with Dutch researchers on implications of the VSNU-Elsevier agreement on Open Access in their daily practices (approx. 10-12 interviews, audio-recorded, verbatim transcription, memory minutes).

The STS department at the University of Vienna maintains connections to visiting professors and fellow researchers in Dutch universities and research institutions. Together with the professional network of the author it will facilitate establishing contacts to potential interviewees and access to

---

<sup>4</sup> The agreement allows to publish in Open Access in a selection of journals with no additional costs for individual researchers with a Dutch affiliation. Details of the agreement were announced in March 2016.

the field. The exact number of interviews will be decided in the process in order to gather multiple perspectives and to cover a broad range of positions on Open Access.

### *Methods*

Situational analysis developed by Adele E. Clarke (2005) will be used as an overall frame for data collection and analysis. Having its roots in grounded theory and symbolic interactionism, situational analysis can be seen as a “theory/methods package” where epistemological and ontological questions of how and what can be known are inseparable and mutually dependent (Clarke, 2005, p. 2; Clarke, Friese & Washburn, 2015, p. 78). As in the case of the proposed doctoral project, situational analysis is particularly advantageous for multi-site research where multiple kinds of data from the situation of inquiry will be examined (Clarke, 2005, p. 165).

With a focus on a particular situation and the complexities that constitute it, situational analysis “intentionally seeks to represent *all* the social worlds and discourses in an arena, amplifying the silent and silenced, specifying implicated actors and actants, and seeking out their (usually quite marginalized) discourses” (Clarke, 2005, p. 178, emphasis in original). This capacity allows to address the multiplicity of discourses, positions and narratives on Open Access in the first place. Keeping the “situatedness” of the controversy in mind, it further helps to approach Open Access publishing negotiations in a more sensitive manner, taking conditional and constitutive elements into account and going beyond the usually one-sided “pro” and “contra” arguments. Identifying “sites of discursive silence” and actors or issues not (yet) articulated in discourses is expected to offer novel insights into ongoing debates.

Using grounded theory approaches, narrative materials will be collected until the level of saturation has been reached and no considerable new perspectives are added with new data. After the initial coding, focused coding with most significant and/or frequent codes will be pursued (Charmaz, 2006). The immersion in the data through the coding exercise allows then to proceed with the actual mapping of narrative discourses. For this purpose, Clarke offers three main types of maps. Each of them is capable to foreground specific aspects in the analysis and can be used in a complementary way. Situational maps are a good starting point as they aim to depict all major discourses as well as human and nonhuman actors articulated and implicated in discourses. Draft versions of situational maps will be produced at an early point in time as they are likely to indicate new data sources and directions for further “theoretical sampling” (Clarke, 2005, pp. xxxi-xxxii).

Social worlds/arenas maps are intended as meso-level cartographies of collective commitments, shared ideologies and going concerns. Studying social worlds and the discourses they produce in the Open Access controversy will shed light on power relations and kinds of representations these

social worlds are “authorized” to produce. The emergence of new actors or arenas where Open Access is contested or re-negotiated will be captured. Social worlds/arenas maps can be also done from the perspective of one particular social world in the arena and then compared to those of the other worlds. This approach will be used to compare the perspectives of key negotiators and other actors or collectivities in the VSNU-Elsevier case.

Finally, positional maps aim to represent the heterogeneity of positions in discourses itself. This type of maps is particularly useful to identify “comfortably contradictory” or absent positions that can be expected yet not articulated in discourses. Together with locating positions along contested issues or axes this approach will help to reveal any potential blind spots in the often heated Open Access debates. Even more, positions on the very notions of “openness” and a good publishing or scientific system will presumably trigger further analytical inquiry.

### Timeline

Task / Duration	2015	2016				2017				2018			
Literature review along the project	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		
Preparation of exposé	■												
Public presentation (FÖP)		■											
Preparing and conducting fieldwork (questionnaires, contacting interviewees, collecting materials)			■	■	■	■	■						
PhD summer school in Raach (presenting specific thesis chapters)			■			■					■		
Attending academic conferences			■	■		■			■	■			
Writing phase (overview and history of Open Access publishing)				■	■								
Data analysis and situational maps					■	■	■	■					
Annual progress reports							■				■		
Writing phase (methods, first draft of analysis chapters)					■	■	■	■					
Writing phase (analysis, conclusions, introduction)								■	■	■	■		
Writing phase (revision, copy editing)											■	■	
Submitting thesis to committee													■

**Schematic structure***Initial schematic structure and intended order of chapters (tentative)*

1. Introduction
2. State of the Art
  - 2.1. Main lines of debates on Open Access relevant to the topic
  - 2.2. Role of publishing in the scientific system
3. Theoretical framing
  - 3.1. Knowledge regimes and the publication system as a major ordering force
  - 3.2. Publication system as a technology: designers, users and the notion of “script”
  - 3.3. Discourse coalitions, buzzwords and master narratives
4. Research questions
5. Materials and methods
6. Empirical analysis
  - 6.1. Expectations towards the scientific system
  - 6.2. Open Access imaginaries
  - 6.3. Open Access and publication practices
7. Discussion and conclusions

**Ethical considerations**

Interview partners will be given a short summary of the project and an informed consent will be signed before the interview clarifying the issues of anonymity and how I can use the collected data in my doctoral thesis.

## Bibliography

- Adema, J. (2014). *Open Access*. Critical Keywords for the Digital Humanities. Retrieved from [http://cdckeywords.leuphana.com/open\\_access/](http://cdckeywords.leuphana.com/open_access/) [accessed on 14/06/15]
- Adema, J. (2015). *Knowledge Production Beyond The Book? Performing the Scholarly Monograph in Contemporary Digital Culture* (PhD Thesis). Coventry University, Coventry. Retrieved from <http://curve.coventry.ac.uk/open/items/8222ccb2-f6b0-4e5f-90de-f4c62c77ac86/1/>
- Akrich, M. (1992). The de-description of technical objects. In W. E. Bijker & J. Law (Eds.), *Inside technology. Shaping technology/building society. Studies in sociotechnical change* (pp. 205–224). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Anderson, K. (2012). *The “Academic Spring” — Shallow Rhetoric Aimed at the Wrong Target*. The Scholarly Kitchen blog. Retrieved from <http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2012/04/12/the-academic-spring-shallo-rhetoric-aimed-at-the-wrong-target/>
- Antelman, K. (2006). Self-archiving practice and the influence of publisher policies in the social sciences. *Learned Publishing*, 19(2), 85–95. doi:10.1087/095315106776387011
- Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU). (2015). *Dutch Universities and Elsevier reach agreement in principle on Open Access and subscription*. The Hague/Amsterdam. Retrieved from [http://vsnu.nl/en\\_GB/news-items/nieuwsbericht/241-dutch-universities-and-elsevier-reach-agreement-in-principle-on-open-access-and-subscription.html](http://vsnu.nl/en_GB/news-items/nieuwsbericht/241-dutch-universities-and-elsevier-reach-agreement-in-principle-on-open-access-and-subscription.html)
- Bauer, B., Blechl, G., Bock, C., Danowski, P., Ferus, A., Graschopf, A., . . . Welzig, E. (2015). *Recommendations for the Transition to Open Access in Austria*. doi:10.5281/zenodo.34079
- Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science. Rhetoric of the human sciences*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bensaude Vincent, B. (2014). The politics of buzzwords at the interface of technoscience, market and society: the case of 'public engagement in science'. *Public understanding of science*, 23(3), 238–253. doi:10.1177/0963662513515371
- Berghmans, S. (2015). *Changes in Scientific Communication – a culture of openness* [video recording]. Zürich: Open-Access-Tage 2015. Retrieved from <https://cast.switch.ch/vod/clips/1kn6m93rdb/>
- Björk, B.-C. (2013). Open Access - Are the Barriers to Change Receding? *Publications*, 1(1), 5–15. doi:10.3390/publications1010005
- Björk, B.-C. & Solomon, D. (2014). *Developing an Effective Market for Open Access Article Processing Charges*. Final Report to a consortium of research funders comprising Jisc, Research Libraries UK, Research Councils UK, the Wellcome Trust, the Austrian Science Fund, the Luxembourg National Research Fund and the Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics. Retrieved from <http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/About-us/Policy/Spotlight-issues/Open-access/Guides/WTP054773.htm>
- Bohannon, J. (2015). In unique deal, Elsevier agrees to make some papers by Dutch authors free. *Science News*. doi:10.1126/science.aad7565
- Bonaccorso, E., Bozhankova, R., Cadena, C. D., Čapská, V., Czerniewicz, L., Emmett, A., . . . Tykarski, P. (2014). Bottlenecks in the Open-Access System: Voices from Around the Globe. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 2(2). doi:10.7710/2162-3309.1126
- Brienza, C. (2012). Opening the Wrong Gate? The Academic Spring and Scholarly Publishing in the Humanities and Social Sciences. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 28(3), 159–171. doi:10.1007/s12109-012-9272-5
- Brintzinger, K.-R. (2010). Piraterie oder Allmende der Wissenschaften? *Leviathan*, 38(3), 331–346. doi:10.1007/s11578-010-0095-5



- Bruch, C., Geschuhn, K., Hanig, K., Hillenkötter, C., Pampel, H., Schäffler, H., . . . Tullney, M. (2016). *Empfehlungen zur Open-Access-Transformation: Strategische und praktische Verankerung von Open Access in der Informationsversorgung wissenschaftlicher Einrichtungen. Empfehlungen der Ad-hoc-AG Open-Access-Gold im Rahmen der Schwerpunktinitiative „Digitale Information“ der Allianz der deutschen Wissenschaftsorganisationen*. Retrieved from <http://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?gs-1/12962>
- Budapest Open Access Initiative. (2002). *Budapest Open Access Initiative*. BOAI declaration. Retrieved from <http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/>
- Butler, D. (2016). Dutch lead European push to flip journals to open access. *Nature*, 529(7584), 13. doi:10.1038/529013a
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing. Pittsburgh series in composition, literacy, and culture*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London, Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- Clarke, A. E. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- Clarke, A. E., Friese, C., & Washburn, R. (Eds.). (2015). *Situational analysis in practice: Mapping research with grounded theory*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: Left Coast Press.
- Corrall, S., & Pinfield, S. (2014). Coherence of "Open" Initiatives in Higher Education and Research: Framing a Policy Agenda. In Maxi Kindling & Elke Greifeneder (Eds.), *iConference 2014 Proceedings: Breaking Down Walls. Culture - Context - Computing* (pp. 293–313). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/47316>
- Crawford, W. (2011). *Open access: What you need to know now. ALA Editons: special reports*. Chicago Ill.: American Library Association. Retrieved from <http://lib.myilibrary.com/?id=309349>
- Czerniewicz, L., & Goodier, S. (2014). Open access in South Africa: A case study and reflections. *South African Journal of Science*, 110(9/10), 1–9. doi:10.1590/sajs.2014/20140111
- European Commission. (2015). *Commissioner Moedas and Secretary of State Dekker call on scientific publishers to adapt their business models to new realities*. Brussels. Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/moedas/announcements/commissioner-moedas-and-secretary-state-dekker-call-scientific-publishers-adapt-their-business\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/moedas/announcements/commissioner-moedas-and-secretary-state-dekker-call-scientific-publishers-adapt-their-business_en)
- Felt, U., Igelsböck, J., Schikowitz, A., & Völker, T. (2016). Transdisciplinary Sustainability Research in Practice: Between Imaginaries of Collective Experimentation and Entrenched Academic Value Orders. *Science, Technology & Human Values*. doi:10.1177/0162243915626989
- Felt, U., & Wynne, B. (2007). *Taking European knowledge society seriously: Report of the Expert Group on Science and Governance to the Science, Economy and Society Directorate, Directorate-General for Research, European Commission* ([1st ed.]). *EUR (Series): Vol. 22700*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Fuchs, C., & Sandoval, M. (2013). The Diamond Model of Open Access Publishing: Why Policy Makers, Scholars, Universities, Libraries, Labour Unions and the Publishing World Need to Take Non-Commercial, Non-Profit Open Access Serious. *tripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique*, 11(2), 428–443. Retrieved from <http://triplec.at/index.php/tripleC/article/view/502>
- Gradmann, S. (2008). Ist elektronisches Publizieren eine Aufgabe von Bibliotheken? Abweichlerische Gedanken zu einer scheinbaren Selbstverständlichkeit. In E. Hutzler, A. Schröder, & G. Schweikl (Eds.), *Bibliotheken gestalten Zukunft. Kooperative Wege zur Digitalen Bibliothek* (pp. 149–156). Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

- Guédon, J.-C. (2001). *In Oldenburg's long shadow: Librarians, research scientists, publishers, and the control of scientific publishing*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries. Retrieved from <http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/in-oldenburgs-long-shadow.pdf>
- Hagner, M. (2015). *Zur Sache des Buches*. Göttingen: Wallstein.
- Haider, J. (2008). *Open Access and Closed Discourses. Constructing Open Access as a 'Development' Issue* (Dissertation). City University London, London. Retrieved from <http://lup.lub.lu.se/record/1544653>
- Haider, J. (2012). Open Access hinter verschlossenen Türen oder wie sich Open Access im und mit dem Entwicklungsdiskurs arrangiert. In U. Herb (Ed.), *Saarbrücker Schriften zur Informationswissenschaft. Open initiatives. Offenheit in der digitalen Welt und Wissenschaft* (pp. 65–84). Saarbrücken: Universaar. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10760/17229>
- Hajer, M. (1993). Discourse Coalitions and the Institutionalisation of Practice: The Case of Acid Rain in Great Britain. In F. Fischer & J. Forester (Eds.), *The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning* (pp. 43–67). London: UCL.
- Hajer, M. (2006). Doing discourse analysis: coalitions, practices, meaning. In Brink, Margo van den & T. Metzger (Eds.), *Netherlands geographical studies: Vol. 344. Words matter in policy and planning. Discourse theory and method in the social sciences* (pp. 65–74). Utrecht: Koninklijk Nederlands Aardrijkskundig Genootschap; Netherlands Graduate School of Urban and Regional Research.
- Harnad, S. (2012). *Finch Report, a Trojan Horse, Serves Publishing Industry Interests Instead of UK Research Interests*. Retrieved from <http://openaccess.eprints.org/index.php?/archives/904-Finch-Report,-a-Trojan-Horse,-Serves-Publishing-Industry-Interests-Instead-of-UK-Research-Interests.html>
- Hecht, G. (2001). Technology, Politics, and National Identity in France. In M. T. Allen & G. Hecht (Eds.), *Technologies of power. Essays in honor of Thomas Parke Hughes and Agatha Chipley Hughes* (pp. 253–294). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Herb, U. (2010). Sociological implications of scientific publishing: Open access, science, society, democracy and the digital divide. *First Monday*, 15(2). doi:10.5210/fm.v15i2.2599
- Hofmann, J. (2014). Open Access: Ein Lackmustest (Preprint version). In T. Dreier, V. Fischer, A. van Raay, & Spiecker gen. Döhm, Indra (Eds.) (2016), *Studien zur Informationsfreiheit. Informationen der öffentlichen Hand. Zugang und Nutzung* (1st ed.). Baden-Baden: Nomos. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2515844>
- Kingsley, D. (2007). The journal is dead, long live the journal. *On the Horizon*, 15(4), 211–221. doi:10.1108/10748120710836237
- Kuipers, T. & van der Hoeven, J. (2009). *Insight into digital preservation of research output in Europe: Survey report D3.4*. Retrieved from [http://www.parse-insight.eu/downloads/PARSE-Insight\\_D3-4\\_SurveyReport\\_final\\_hq.pdf](http://www.parse-insight.eu/downloads/PARSE-Insight_D3-4_SurveyReport_final_hq.pdf)
- Laakso, M. (2014). Green open access policies of scholarly journal publishers: a study of what, when, and where self-archiving is allowed. *Scientometrics*, 99(2), 475–494. doi:10.1007/s11192-013-1205-3
- Laakso, M., Welling, P., Bukvova, H., Nyman, L., Björk, B.-C., & Hedlund, T. (2011). The development of open access journal publishing from 1993 to 2009. *PLoS ONE*, 6(6), e20961. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0020961
- Larivière, V., Haustein, S., & Mongeon, P. (2015). The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital Era. *PLoS ONE*, 10(6), e0127502. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0127502
- League of European Research Universities (LERU). (2015). *Christmas is over. Research funding should go to research, not to publishers!: Moving Forwards on Open Access*. LERU Statement for

- the 2016 Dutch EU Presidency. Leuven. Retrieved from <http://www.leru.org/index.php/public/extra/signtheLERUstatement/>
- League of European Research Universities (LERU). (2016). *The academic world urges publishers to enter a brave new world*. Retrieved from <http://www.leru.org/index.php/public/news/the-academic-world-urges-publishers-to-enter-a-brave-new-world/>
- Meier zu Verl, C., & Horstmann, W. (Eds.). (2011). *Studies on Subject-Specific Requirements for Open Access Infrastructure*. Bielefeld. doi:10.2390/PUB-2011-3
- Merton, R. K. (1968). The Matthew Effect in Science: The reward and communication systems of science are considered. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 159(3810), 56–63. doi:10.1126/science.159.3810.56
- Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. (2014). *Open Access to publications*. Parliamentary document. Retrieved from <https://www.government.nl/documents/parliamentary-documents/2014/01/21/open-access-to-publications>
- Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. (2015). *Non-paper on open science: open access to publications and data*. Retrieved from <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/publicaties/2015/03/23/non-paper-open-access-to-publications-and-data>
- Pinfield, S. (2013). Is scholarly publishing going from crisis to crisis? *Learned Publishing*, 26(2), 85–88. doi:10.1087/20130204
- Rieck, K., Haslinger, D., Meischke-Ilic, S., Kirindi-Hentschel, Ü., & Reckling, F. (2016). *Austrian Science Fund (FWF) Publication Cost Data 2015*. Report. Retrieved from <https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.3180166.v1>
- Schimmer, R., Geschuhn, K. K., & Vogler, A. (2015). *Disrupting the subscription journals' business model for the necessary large-scale transformation to open access*. doi:10.17617/1.3. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/11858/00-001M-0000-0026-C274-7>
- Somers, M. R. (1994). The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. *Theory and Society*, 23(5), 605–649. doi:10.1007/BF00992905
- SPARC & PLoS. (2014). *HowOpenIsIt? Open Access Spectrum*. Version 2.0. Licensed under CC BY. Retrieved from [https://www.plos.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/hoii-guide\\_V2\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.plos.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/hoii-guide_V2_FINAL.pdf)
- Star, S. L. (Ed.). (1995). *Ecologies of knowledge: Work and politics in science and technology*. SUNY series in science, technology, and society. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Suber, P. (2012). *Open access. MIT Press essential knowledge*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Taubert, N. (2014). Green Open Access in Mathematik und Astronomie. In H. Parthey & W. Umstätter (Eds.), *Wissenschaftsforschung: Jahrbuch 2013. Forschung und Publikation in der Wissenschaft* (pp. 41–77). Berlin: wvb.
- The Cost of Knowledge. (2012). *Statement of Purpose*. Retrieved from <https://gowers.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/elsevierstatementfinal.pdf>
- The price of information: Academics are starting to boycott a big publisher of journals (2012, February 4). *The Economist*. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/node/21545974>
- Tüür-Fröhlich, T. (2012). The European sciences: How "open" are they for women? A review of the literature. In U. Herb (Ed.), *Saarbrücker Schriften zur Informationswissenschaft. Open initiatives. Offenheit in der digitalen Welt und Wissenschaft* (pp. 85–106). Saarbrücken: Universaar. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10760/16938>

Viehöver, W. (2001). Diskurse als Narrationen. In R. Keller, A. Hirsland, W. Schneider, & W. Viehöver (Eds.), *Handbuch Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse. Band I: Theorien und Methoden* (pp. 177–206). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Ware, M., & Mabe, M. (2015). *The STM Report: An overview of scientific and scholarly journal publishing*. Fourth Edition. Retrieved from [http://www.stm-assoc.org/2015\\_02\\_20\\_STM\\_Report\\_2015.pdf](http://www.stm-assoc.org/2015_02_20_STM_Report_2015.pdf)