

Open Access Publishing in the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada

Taylor Price

Department of Sociology

Lakehead University

Word Count: 42826

Acknowledgements

The larger research project of which this thesis is only a part was made possible by the research team consisting of principle investigator Antony Puddephatt, along with Kyle Siler and Neil McLaughlin. This larger project on open access in Canada was funded by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and my own particular thesis research received additional funding by SSHRC. Some of the transcriptions of interview data were commissioned to TranscriptHeroes.ca

CONTENTS	
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	3
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW – OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING IN THE DIGITAL AGE	9
<i>Academic Literature and Communication Networks</i>	12
<i>Open Access Publishing Practices</i>	20
<i>The Emergence of Open Access Publishing</i>	25
CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	32
CHAPTER 4: METHODS.....	49
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS & ANALYSIS.....	64
SECTION A – IDEALS OF OPEN ACCESS.....	66
<i>Antecedent Academic Ideals of Open Access</i>	67
<i>Open Access as in Free</i>	70
<i>The Accessibility of Open Access</i>	73
<i>Reprise – Open Access Ideals and Practical Philosophies</i>	76
SECTION B – LEGITIMACY	81
<i>Boundaries of Inclusivity</i>	86
<i>Boundaries of Exclusivity</i>	96
SECTION C – RESISTANCE.....	103
<i>Resistance and Extended Rationality</i>	104
<i>Resistance to Capitalist Profit-Motives</i>	109
<i>Resistance to Access Barriers</i>	112
<i>Resistance to Academic Traditions</i>	114
I. Graduate and undergraduate authors	114
II. Researchers from developing countries.....	116
III. Bringing in community members.....	116
IV. Challenging academic publication norms	117
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION.....	119
APPENDIX A – EARLY OPEN ACCESS TIMELINE	124
APPENDIX B – INTRODUCTION LETTER	126
APPENDIX C – CONCENT LETTER	128
APPENDIX D – FINAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	129
WORKS CITED	130

Open Access Publishing in the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada

“In mass communication we have unlocked a new social force of as yet incalculable magnitude. In comparison with all previous social means for building or destroying the world this new force looms as a gigantic instruments of infinite possibilities for good or evil. It has the power to build loyalties and to undermine them, and thus by furthering or hindering consensus to affect all other sources of power. By giving people access to alternative views mass communication does of course open the door to the disintegration of all existing social solidarities, while it creates new ones. It is of the first importance, therefore, that we understand its nature, its possibilities, and its limits and the means of harnessing it to human purposes” (Wirth 1948:12).

The publishing practices of scientists and academics have profound effects on the way that science and academia internally progress and influence external public debates. The culmination of empirical, theoretical, and reflexive work provides the foundation of an academic discipline. Those who are able to access this stock of work may come to do something with it, such as contribute to the discipline or apply these disciplinary-based insights to some applied problem. Contemporary digital networks enable information to flow freely, enabling interested people to become knowledgeable about some particular subject. Peer-review is a basic component of the information that is published under the auspices of science, social science, or the humanities. Such standards of peer-review are considerably less strenuous in popular publications, thus providing a rationale for the higher quality of scientific and scholarly research articles. However under the current system, research articles that abide by standards of peer-review, are, by and large, accessible only to those with university library credentials or with a personal subscription. Personal subscriptions to scientific periodicals are often too expensive, even according to the academics who need them, and a majority of individuals do not have access to a university library. Thus, many interested readers of recently published work in the sciences and humanities are effectively excluded from accessing such information. The current status of most research

being difficult to access flies in the face of academic values related to widespread consideration and critique.

Open access provides a way for getting information out to any person who is interested in it, and who also has an internet connection. Open access is a way of publishing articles and books that enables people to access the work freely and without price barriers (Suber 2012:5). This is made possible by the affordances of internet and digital technologies, but the vision behind open access publishing was pronounced much earlier through the practical efforts of publishing the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* in 1665 (Willinsky 2009:ch.13) as well as Karl Popper's vision of the open society (1963) and Robert Merton's norms of science (1973[1942]). The philosophy of open-access runs parallel to these efforts and pronouncements by maintaining that "a commitment to the value and quality of research carries with it a responsibility to extend the circulation of such work as far as possible and ideally to all who are interested in it and all who might profit by it" (Willinsky 2009:5). As will be shown in the following discussion, open access journals are conceptualized exactly to enable individuals to benefit from access to academic work who could not access it due to paywalls and other restrictions.

This research project intends to uncover the experiences of the editors of open access journals in order to learn the practical philosophies behind open access, and what motivates these editors to continue their open access ventures. Much is said about open access, but little research searches out the people on the ground to find out what is actually going on. Using a symbolic interactionist framework (Mead 1934; Blumer 1969; Prus 1997) and a grounded theory methodology (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Glasser 1978; Charmaz 2014) I explore the various competing philosophies, continuing struggles, and successes experienced by open access editors.

As such, this thesis hopes to present the realities of open access as an enacted social phenomena. The findings in this thesis can be used to check and improve the accuracy of academic conceptions of open access. More generally, these findings are useful since they can be applied to other fields of cultural production that confront and attempt to subvert a dominant logic tending to privilege capitalist profits rather than cultural innovation.

Many fields of scientific and academic study have implemented open access strategies. The implementation of open-access is most apparent in the physical and medical sciences with the widespread popularity and use of open access resources such as arXiv and PubMed. The social sciences and humanities (SS&H), on the other hand, have lagged behind these fields in implementing open access publication outlets to a great degree (Eve 2014). Research has been done on the Canadian context of open access book publishing in the humanities (Kwan 2011), yet there is no research on open access in the social sciences in Canada, nor on open access *journals* of any variety in Canada. Further, there have been no research projects that aim to reach an understanding of the motivations and ideals of open access editors within any discipline.

The literature review section of this thesis will delineate the dimensions and varieties of open access publishing and situate the current project in regards to the sociology of knowledge and social theories of the internet. Basically, this project recognizes that academic and scientific work is completed by fallible humans who have been socialized within a particular discipline (Latour 1987); that fields external to academic ones may come to influence their social structures and cultural values (Bourdieu 1969:90); and finally, that methods of publication and dissemination have effects on what scientists and academics say as well as how they say it (Eisenstein 1979; Thompson 2005). This project situates open access publishing within academia

where certain individuals perceive it to be revolutionary (Harnad 1991) and readily applicable to the non-capitalist potential of internet networks (Wright 2010:327).

Internet theorists propose that the internet is a self-organizing techno-social system (Fuchs 2010) and open licencing theorists propose that open content creation networks are self-correcting social systems (Raymond 1998) – meaning that interested people will organize themselves online and any infrastructural or cultural issues will be resolved through improving the communication platform they use. This conception appears to be a real application of Habermas' (1984[1981]) “ideal speech situation” (25), but while these benefits are supposed to be self-manifesting, outright “open revolutions” in academic practice are still forthcoming. This thesis seeks to uncover the contentious situation of open access publishing from the point of view of journal editors struggling for recognition in the social sciences and humanities.

To understand the reality of open access strategies of publishing in the social sciences and humanities, this project takes up an interactionist framework of data collection and analysis (Blumer 1969). The project was guided by sensitizing concepts (Blumer 1969:148; Faulkner 2009:82-5) that directed the development of research questions about the different experiences and practical philosophies underlying the actions of open access editors in the SS&H. The research questions at the outset of this project were: what are the different competing philosophies behind open access publishing? What are the varying strategies to make open access journals succeed? And, what are the daily struggles and rewards of those who are implementing an open access publication?

Though classical interactionist tenants guided the conceptualization and analytical strategies of this research project, recent critiques and updates to interactionism were found to be beneficial in understanding the structural position of the individuals in my sample, and their

awareness of issues related to dominance and subordination. Lonnie Athens' (2015:14) radical interactionism takes subordination and domination to be the kernel, or essence, of every social interaction, even if the individuals interacting do not define their relations as consisting of sub- and super-ordinate roles. The individuals in my sample are part of an organization that is necessarily subordinate to the prestigious journals and academic association in their discipline. Their relative subordinate position is internalized by them because domination is omnipresent for them, while at the same time, being considered unjust and worth resisting. Bourdieu's (1969; 1993) field theory provides the conceptual tools to understand how these editors plan to act within their discipline considering their marginal position within academic publishing. Bourdieu's theory coupled with Athens' (2015) radical interactionism provides a suitable theoretical schema to understand the power relations that are inherent to scientific and academic groups (Puddephatt 2013), and how they manage economic, social, and symbolic capital to overcome their marginal position. This emergent theoretical approach to analysis enabled the experiences, ideologies, and structural constraints of the individuals in my sample throughout their attempts to subvert the capitalist sub-logic within the overarching cultural logic of academic publishing.

Some of basic ideals of open access publishing emerged in the interviews, and revolve around improving access to academic work by removing price barriers, but also toppling barriers to public engagement and refraining from the over-use of jargon. While taking these ideals into consideration, open access editors also adhere to academic visions of excellence. Therefore, open access ideals of free accessibility and easy accessibility emerged out of the dominant paradigm dictating academic standards of originality, peer-review, and open critique.

The second section presents strategies that these editors employ for their journals to succeed. In order to achieve legitimacy, open access journals must form associations with reputable scholars and scholarly organizations, all the while actively disassociating themselves with publishers of ill repute. In other words, they engage in “boundary work” (Gieryn 1983; 1999) to include prestigious academic individuals and organizations, while, at the same time, excluding the for-profit entities also present in their disciplinary field. This boundary work is a conscious attempt to gain a legitimate position within their discipline. Ultimately, by constructing boundaries including powerful players while excluding other groups that seek out profit, they invest and attempt to attain profit in regards to what Bourdieu (2004) calls scientific capital (55) or academic capital (1988:84). Academic capital represents the position of an individual or an organization within an academic or scientific field relative to others, larger stocks of academic capital mean that the individual or organization has a reputation *and* ability for dealing with topics in an exemplary matter and thus is readily brought to bear on important disciplinary topics.

The final section explores the forms of resistance that these journal editors perpetuate. Open access is primarily a means of resisting profit interests in academic publishing. These editors also resist other typical access barriers to academic work and academic traditions that are seen to hinder excellence. One way in particular that open access journals typically challenge academic traditions is by expanding the stock of relevant authors for their journal. Many of the journals in my sample have published articles by knowledgeable individuals who are outside academia. By considering the multiple forms of resistance and the underlying ideals, motivations, and social boundaries that are enacted by open access editors the theory proposed is that open access editors perform and enact an “extended rationality” (Chang 2004:418) in

academic publishing by making use of the spaces of possibility provided by the internet (Wright 2010:327). They challenge conventional ways of doing things in order to extend the benefits of academic publishing to broader audiences. Further they empower knowledgeable individuals outside of academia to publish within their journal, therefore extending the benefits of disseminating knowledge to those who have been typically excluded from academic conversations. Open access publishing is guided by an ethos and a practical rationality that extends the benefits of access to and engagement with academics and academic work.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW – OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING IN THE DIGITAL AGE

Science and intellectual development is an inherently social process (Merton 1973; Collins 1985; Latour 1987). As such, scientific and academic values promote widespread testing, consideration and criticism of ideas (Merton 1973[1942]; Popper 1963). At the same time, science and academia have always been the sites of norms which can be considered counter to these ideal values (Mitroff 1974). Contemporary academic and scientific publishing practices are no different due in part to their current inseparability with capitalist interests. Ideally, academic publishers are in place to provide information to anyone who might be interested in it. The real state of affairs is that for-profit publishers exert control on the majority of widely-read and prestigious peer-reviewed journals. As a result, the costliness of these journals has been found to stifle the ability of scientific dialogues to be broadly tested, considered, and criticized by large groups of people (Research Information Network 2009). Even many professional researchers are not able to access all the articles they need due to price barriers to peer-reviewed research articles (Suber 2012:30-1).

Open access is a concept that has been increasingly encountered by academics throughout the information revolution. The concept has proven to be complex, nuanced, and, at times, unwieldy. Simply stated, open access involves the removal of price and permission barriers to research (Suber 2012:8). The removal of price barriers to academic research is a pragmatic affordance of the new digital communication structures of the internet that work to accelerate “the research process and [make] researchers and practitioners more productive” (Crawford 2011:4). Subscription costs to academic journals have never been used to pay the researchers who publish their work there nor their peers who review their work.¹ Rather, these fees are allocated to pay for the production of physical texts, mailing, editorial staff, copy editing, and maintaining organizational infrastructure. By publishing articles online, the costs associated with creating a physical text and disseminating it are replaced by much cheaper domain-hosting costs (Willinsky 2009:72-3). The second novelty that is tied into Suber’s definition of open access is the alleviation of strict copyright rules in regards to academic work. Many journals continue to use traditional copyright practices to regulate the ways that people can make use of their articles. However, many open access advocates argue that traditional copyright is detrimental to the universalist and communist aspirations of scholarly research (Merton 1973[1942]; Willinsky 2009:41-2) and urge journals to opt for a less restrictive copyright licence for their articles. Creative Commons licensing is a less restrictive alternative to classical copyright. This form of copyright licensing has developed a popular following in academic circles because it aims to disseminate findings more widely compared to classical copyright dissemination restrictions. These two affordances of online publishing spur the access principle, “namely, that a

¹ A study by Research Information Network (2008) found that that £1.9 billion [2.9 billion USD] a year is donated by peer-reviewers in terms of the time they donate; let alone the researchers/authors who actually conduct the research.

commitment to the value and quality of research carries with it a responsibility to extend the circulation of this work as far as possible, and ideally to all who are interested in it and all who might profit from it” (Willinsky 2009:5).

The open access publishing movement provides ideals and tools to improve the current state of academic and scientific affairs in regards to widespread accessibility. However, academic norms across disciplines are not moving in a hurry. Physical sciences, such as biomedicine and physics, have adopted open access publication mediums to the greatest degree (Laakso and Björk 2012; Björk et al 2010; Gargouri et al 2012) and the social sciences and humanities have lagged behind in enabling open access (Norris 2008; Swan 2010). Indeed, open access to social science and humanities journals is at 2.6%, while, at the same time, open access to general science and technology articles in the last 10 years is over 50%. Further, the absolute number of open access articles is rapidly growing (Archambault et al. 2014:19). In the following, I will consider the contradictory interests and values that are at play in scientific and academic publishing ventures, and survey the current literature to consider how open access contributes to the social development of knowledge.

Beyond detailing the practices of open access publishing and its potential benefits and shortcomings, this literature review will consider studies focused on the perceptions of, and the motivations behind, open access publishing. Currently, there is no focused study on the motivations of any group of people who are attempting to achieve open access publishing at the journal level. Perhaps these motivations seem self-evident to the researchers who write about open access publishing. However, academic definitions of open access that have become cemented in the literature may be far removed from the actual understandings of those who are realizing open access in pragmatic ways. I hope to provide a voice for open access editors who

publish in the social sciences and humanities. These fields currently privilege the most prestigious and expensive peer-reviewed journals and therefore acutely disadvantage open access journals from achieving prominence in their field. The individuals interviewed all express an intense commitment to disseminating their work to the broadest possible audience, considering dominant communication norms in a digital networked society, and eschewing all profit motives. These particular individuals provide an exemplary case of understanding the motivations and challenges of publishing an open access journal because they are disadvantaged to the greatest degree relative to the other major academic fields in the physical sciences. Therefore, this literature review will set up the guiding questions of this research project; what are the perspectives of those attempting to realize open access journals in fields where for-profit journals are the most dominant? Why do they continue to publish considering their marginal and subordinate position within the uneven field of academic publishing?

Academic Literature and Communication Networks

Physical copies of written work have been the dominant mode of knowledge dissemination for a significant part of the last 500 years, or since the invention of the Gutenberg printing press. For most of this period, the field of academic publication consisted of small publishing houses. This was until the 1960s, when publishing companies began to consolidate and create powerful publication conglomerates (Thompson 2005:203-9). This resulted in the transformation of intellectual publishing from a ‘cottage industry’ to a full-blown capitalist enterprise, which is arguably at odds with the nature of intellectual norms and objectives. Questioning the pragmatic and ethical legitimacy of capitalist interests in academic publishing lead some to consider their commitment to traditional publishing practices in the face of new, more egalitarian, alternatives (Willinsky 2009:34).

The internet as a space of possibilities was gestating within the 1960s as well. ARPANET, the technical foundation and precursor to the internet, was being developed in the United States for defense purposes (Federal Communications Commission 2007). The application of these digital communicative networks to enable the quick dissemination of information among a large group of serious researchers was the ultimate vision of Tim Berners-Lee, a developer and founder of the public World Wide Web (Cern 2016). As the internet became publically accessible academics immediately saw it as a communicative publication infrastructure which could re-enable a non-capitalist ‘cottage industry’ of academic knowledge by publishing new autonomous journals online.²

The World Wide Web has come to be conceptualized as a self-organizing techno-social system (Fuchs 2010:123) situated within a broader social system of informational capitalism (Castells 2010); meaning that order spontaneously emerges out of complex processes of interaction in informational networks (see Fuchs 2010:11-17 for a comprehensive list of characteristics). The rise of the contemporary “networked society” has had subtle-but-revolutionary implications for the everyday experiences of those who form a part of it (Rainie and Wellman 2014). Therefore the internet is not simply a tool for cognition, or surfing for information, but also a medium for communication, cooperation, and collaboration (Fuchs 2010). In the year 2002 alone, humans produced 5 exabytes of data, that’s equivalent to the information stored in the Library of Congress 37,000 times over (Lyman and Hal 2003). As of 2013, humans had produced 4.4 zettabytes or 4400 exabytes total throughout our history on the planet, and it is projected that by 2020 humans will have produced 44 zettabytes of data (International Data Corporation 2014). Producing information is not something that is necessarily done from scratch,

² The first of which include *New Horizons in Adult Education*, *Electronic Journal of Communication* and *Postmodern Culture*.

information is produced today by building off of others' work and "re-mixing" previously created content. Remixed music stands as a classic example, but on the internet any form of information can be remixed; such as comics,³ images,⁴ videos,⁵ or academic and scientific research findings.⁶

Changes in media-user rights have enabled remixing as a form of cultural production and, as mentioned above, Suber's (2012) basic vision of open access deems that increasing the scope of media-user re-use rights is an integral aspect of opening access to academic information. In an effort to formally allow people to distribute content without pre-emptively restricting its modification and re-distribution the legal organization of the Creative Commons (CC) was formed.⁷ Commons-based peer production has flourished in open source communities, leading to the success and socio-cultural impact of Linux and Wikipedia (Benkler 2006:59-90; Wright 2010:194-203). The Creative Commons is really a generic and more precise extension of the open-source software philosophy and its trademark "copyleft" publication license into other cultural realms. Copyleft is based around the idea that any interested person ought to be able to build off the work of others, be it software code or mechanical patents, and they ought to publish their work in a way which allows others to interrogate and build off of the ideas there. The ideal is basically that if you enable people to personally develop and re-distribute existent intellectual property, then an interested collection of "selfish agents attempting to maximize utility... [will produce] a self-correcting spontaneous order more elaborate and efficient than any amount of

³ For example "Stare dad" https://www.reddit.com/r/stare_dad

⁴ <https://madewith.unsplash.com/>

⁵ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MX0D4oZwCsA#t=21>

⁶ <http://neomam.com/interactive/13reasons/>

⁷ On the coat-tails of the less formal "copyleft" license.

central planning could have achieved” (Raymond 1998:n.p.); a productive, emergent, and self-correcting system (Suber 2008).

The association between Creative Commons licensing and open-source software is a complex topic, but the point is that academic journals have recently begun to adopt CC licenses⁸ for their publications as opposed to classical copyright. The *Directory of Open Access Journals* (DOAJ) is a search engine of nearly all open access journals in all scientific and academic disciplines. The DOAJ lists the most popular publishing license for articles in open access journals as CC-BY, which requires only attribution, or as commonly understood by academics, citation, to the original author when re-using the journal articles. This license represents the distinctive feature of what open access scholars call *libre* open access, meaning that there are some additional forms of free usability beyond simple readability; this legally allows individuals to, for example, create a visual depiction of an article, or translate it into another language or multimodal version of the work. *Gratis* open access, on the other hand, is more restrictive in that it *only* allows for free online readability (Crawford 2011:15) and citing in further publications. CC licencing gives agency to publishers or authors to decide if others should be allowed to redistribute the work with, or without, attribution, whether a user can make modifications to the work or translate it into another medium (an academic article into a ‘whiteboard’ video⁹, for example). This appears to represent the distancing of knowledge production with the typical capitalistic concerns related to copyrights and patents. Instead, aligning with the scientific norm of communism, CC licences offer a recognition “that scientific advance involves the

⁸ For an overview and a critical position on creative commons see Corbett 2011, and see <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/> for CC varieties

⁹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3IfIdT-MXxE>

collaboration of past and present generations” (Merton 1973[1942]:275)¹⁰ and the recognition that classical copyrights are antithetical to this purpose (Swartz 2008; Willinsky 2009:42).

While often left implicit, an important aspect of what makes open access “open” is machine-readability. Making a document, or digital file, machine-readable means that the file is embedded with accompanying information that computers can read and “understand.” This language, or metadata, works much the same way as a barcode does in that it allows a computer to identify an item along with its characteristics. Most online journals use PDFs (portable document files) to disseminate their work. However, others may not readily access an article online unless their computer can find it and so the file must also include computer-readable metadata including the author’s name, discipline, key terms, date of publication etc. Without this metadata it would be much more difficult, if not impossible, for most people to search for and find an article through an internet search engine.

The final way that scientific and academic journal content can be more or less “open” is in regards to augmented reading experiences. Various resources are being implemented by digital publishers so that people are able to more easily understand the ideas presented in some piece of work. Most scientific and academic articles are highly specialized and it takes time to develop the conceptual tools necessary in order to thoroughly understand an article’s contents and importance. PDF and HTML articles can include hyperlinks that are embedded in the text so that a reader can quickly access the work or concept that an author is referencing, in a similar fashion as Wikipedia. Additionally, a reader may get in contact the author herself through electronic correspondence. This system of hyperlinks works to “expedite what has always been intended with journal literature, namely, that sources can be consulted and authors contacted”

¹⁰ See also <https://creativecommons.org/videos/building-on-the-past/>

(Willinsky 2009:156). In a study on users' perceptions of digital library resources, hyperlinking was shown to be the most useful value-added feature of online reading for academics (Tenopir, Hitchcock and Pillow 2003:15). Other programs can identify key passages enabling interested readers to easily skim an article for its important contributions.¹¹ These new abilities for easier comprehensibility may provide a way for the "common reader" to access technical work and develop scholarly reading habits, such as checking sources, seeing how the paper itself has been cited, interrogating the subject area, or reading through a scholar's research history (Willinsky 2009:157, 165-6).

Therefore, the driving force of the open-access movement is "accessibility" in the two-fold sense of enabling people get to the work and then understand it. Open access publication strategies are novel in regards to the typical practices of scientific and academic knowledge dissemination. Steven Harnad (1991) has even argued that moving scientific and academic research online is provoking a McLuhan-eque (1962) revolution in practice and thought. And indeed, the substantive ways academics and scientists engage with their peers' work to progress in their fields has changed to a certain extent since the internet came into existence in the 1990s. As previously discussed, theorists propose that the internet is a self-organizing techno-social system (Fuchs 2010) and open licencing theorists propose that open content creation networks are self-correcting social systems (Raymond 1998) – meaning that interested people will organize themselves online and any infrastructural or cultural issues will be resolved through improving the communication platform they use. This conception appears to be a real application of Habermas' (1985:25) "ideal speech situation," but while these benefits are supposed to be self-manifesting, outright "open revolutions" in academic practice are still forthcoming.

¹¹ Instagloss.com serves as one example.

The potential of open publishing seems to enable an ideal social infrastructure for scientific and academic discussions, but open access has actually had a very minimal effect on the actual practices of scientists and academics, especially those in the social sciences and humanities (Norris 2008). The general lack of enthusiasm for these open projects begin to appear rational upon considering the state of the field of science and academia. Particularly the “*structures* which orient scientific practice and whose efficacy is exerted at the micro-sociological level” (Bourdieu 2004:32) in regards to individual decision-making about where to submit their work for publication. Symbolic capital in intellectual fields, or scientific capital, is derived from the institution an individual is associated with (Burriss 2004) and, most importantly for our purposes, the journals they are able to publish in (Bourdieu 2004:60-1; Herb 2010). Nearly all of the top-tier journals that imbue high levels of symbolic capital to the people who are able to publish there are owned by profit-driven publishers. And so it is a considerably risky career move for an academic to boycott these publishers and make use of open access alternatives entirely. From the point of view of an intellectual habitus, “it’s hard to dislodge two centuries of practice in a decade of experimentation” (Crawford 2011:26).

Even for researchers who are intensely committed to reading and publishing in open access journals, they must continue to make use of research articles from proprietary publishing houses because open access journals make up less than 20% of the research literature (Scopus 2016). This doesn’t account for the number of all journal *articles* that are open access, though researchers have found that science articles are 20.4% open access (Bjork et. al 2010) and this number is considerably lower in the social sciences (Norris 2008). There is simply too much important information behind journal paywalls to disregard. This leads to difficult situations for researchers who must manage their research budgets to pay for access to relevant literature. If a

researcher cannot afford to access some essential source which signals to others that they have the “right” form of social capital then it is likely that they will cite the article without reading it, or at most only relying on the abstract or some secondary source. If the source is disregarded by the researcher, that disregard may seriously compromise research questions and, potentially, harm human research subjects.

The danger of relying too heavily on open access literature is apparent in the story of Ellen Roche. Roche participated in a laboratory experiment attempting to understand the natural defenses of healthy people against asthma. The researchers administered a drug that induced a mild asthma attack called hexamethonium to the participants. Print articles from the 1950s showed that this chemical compound could cause fatal lung inflammation in certain people. However, the director of the experiment only made use of literature from one textbook and open access sources such as PubMed, which did not contain such warnings about the chemical compound. Unfortunately, Roche was sensitive to this chemical causing intense lung inflammation, ultimately resulting in her death (Suber 2001).

As heavy reliance on solely open-access publications is considerably risky, actual practices of academics stand in the way of the full-blown infrastructural and conceptual revolution that Harnad (1991) proposed. However, there is another way of conceptualizing the space of potentialities inherent to open access publishing. Open access publishing can represent a form of “interstitial social transformation,” made possible in:

a system within which there is some kind of dominant power structure or dominant logic which organizes the system, but that system is *not so coherent and integrated that those dominant power relations govern all of the activities within it...* This need not imply that such interstitial practices are subversive or that they necessarily corrode the logic of the system, but simply that they are not directly governed or controlled by the dominant... principles of social organization (Wright 2010:323, italics added).

Wright (2010) goes on to identify the internet as an inherently interstitial space (327) and uses Wikipedia as an example of the “anti-capitalist potential of information technology in general and of the internet in particular” (194). The potential for interstitial spaces to result in egalitarian and emancipatory social transformations is inherently dependent on civic and state support to maintain the social processes within these spaces. Open access is not yet provoking rapid and revolutionary changes in scholarly publishing, but its efficacy in improving academic communication networks has been recognized by state governmental bodies. The internet has been recognized as a highly efficient network for delivering important information. Hence, policies have begun to be implemented which support open access publishing for publically funded research. On the other hand, those with profit-interests have conceptualized the internet as a social space with unprecedented advantages for *creating monopolies over information* through the maintenance of massive profit-oriented information storehouses (Frölich 1996:296), such as Amazon. These two competing rationalities of support and subversion of open networks online situate the environment of the open access movement in scholarly publishing. In the following, I will delineate the concrete practices that make up the open access publication movement, before situating it historically.

Open Access Publishing Practices

The previous discussion has considered the vision and ideals of the open access movement. Now we must consider the *actual practices* of open access publishing. The two forms of practice distinguished in the open access literature are publishing in open access journals and self-archiving intellectual peer-review work online. These practices are termed “*gold*” and “*green*” paths to open access respectively.

Gold open access was the first approach to open access, and the form that most academics are familiar with; this is open accessibility at the journal level. Gold open access

journals perform peer review and disseminate research online for free. There are various degrees of gold open access. A journal must attempt to economically sustain itself and in doing so, they may compromise their open access vision to a certain degree. They may have embargos on open access, meaning that paying subscribers first get access to the physical and digital articles and non-subscribers must wait a certain number of months before the articles are put online for free. Lower degrees of open access are typically associated with methods of generating revenue streams so that journals may remain sustainable. In every case, some form of income is necessary for these journals. There are two main ways in which gold open access journals fund themselves: article processing fees and institutional subsidies. Article processing fees (APCs) are also known as author-side fees. These are paid by the author, his/her institution, or research funds, in order to enable the publication to appear in an open format; many open access journals offer to waive such fees in cases of economic hardship. Some open access journals are subsidized by universities, academic associations, or from profitable projects conducted by professional associations.

Gold open access encompasses journals with many different practices and so there are distinctions between various types of ‘gold’ open access journals. Tom Wilson (2007) distinguishes between gold journals that charge APCs and those that do not. He reserves the term *brass* open access for the former and *platinum* open access for the latter; though the usefulness of this conceptualization has been debated (Harnad 2007; Beall 2012). The *Directory of Open Access Journals* is an online resource which enables academics to identify and explore gold open access journals and distinguish between those that charge APCs and those that do not.¹² Another distinction which has proven useful in conceptualizing gold open access publishers is the

¹² The average APC across open access journals is \$906 USD (Solomon and Björk 2012)

difference between *true* open access journals and *partial or hybrid* journals. True open access journals make all of their archival and new content completely available for free. Hybrid journals, on the other hand, only make a partial amount of their articles openly accessible. As such, these journals allow authors to pay an extra fee to make their articles open access. If they do not have the money or are not willing to pay, their article remains behind the journal's paywall. Finally, gold journals may be either born open access or flipped to open access. Flipping a paid subscription-based journal to an open access journal is a significant decision because it removes many of the ways that journals derive income (Haggarty 2008; Willinsky 2009:61). Further, digitizing archives in order to make previous issues openly accessible is a major hurdle for transitioning journals, and the open access movement generally, due to previously agreed upon copyright claims.

Many gold open access journals have experienced challenges in maintaining a legitimate scholarly image due to their relation to fraudulent and predatory publishers attempting to exploit and profit off of desperate academics. These *predatory publishers* claim to complete peer-review and promise quick publication – for a fee. To conceive of these publications generously one may define them as a brass open access publication. However, predatory publishers conduct little to no peer-review and have ultimately created an internet domain and academic-looking website in order to draw in naïve academics and profit from charging them APCs. Xia et al. (2014) found that so-called predatory journals attract particularly young and inexperienced researchers from developing countries while legitimate open access publications attract authors with articles appearing in significantly more prestigious publication outlets. However, due to their association with these unethical publishing outlets – simply by being an electronic academic publication – legitimate open access publications and the authors who publish their work there face

discrimination by academics and tenure committees who use proprietary journals as their proxy measures for success (Eve 2014:14). While some resources have been developed in order to aid academics and tenure committees in appreciating the difference between predatory and legitimate academic publications, such as OASPA.org and Beall's (2016) list,¹³ predatory journals continue to proliferate (Shen and Björk 2015). Hence, open access activists still face resistant challenges in their attempts to promote legitimate open access journals and change the general perception of online academic publications.

For some proponents, green open access, or self-archiving, appears to be the most straightforward method of achieving widespread access to academic work. Steven Harnad (1999) has proposed that academics and scientists need not heed to the profit-motives of journal publishers because they never publish their work to profit, but rather to make progress in their field. Academics may refuse to give the copyright on their research to a publisher, or, at the very least, publish the pre-refereed version in an open access repository. In this way, academics can take an active role in keeping interested others up-to-date on their research, and in broadening their audiences, all the while continuing to benefit from the prestige associated with publishing in top-tier journals. Another important virtue of self-archiving has to do with the preservation of knowledge. Archiving preserves knowledge through duplication (Eve 2014:11)¹⁴ and provides permanent addresses for research (Björk et. al 2014).

Many journals have accommodated the demands of open access advocates, by allowing authors to self-archive their work online, in other words, implementing green open access policies. But neither Harnad's (1995) proposal to remove profit interests from academic

¹³ There is some contention related to the reliability of Beall's list, see Crawford 2016.

¹⁴ This is also the guiding philosophy behind LOCKSS (<http://www.lockss.org/about/what-is-lockss/>)

publishing nor the development of self-archival policies on the part of journals has managed to subvert the typical practices of academics. Tellingly, 62% of the journals listed in the *SHERPA/RoMEO*¹⁵ green open access policy database allow self-archiving of peer-reviewed papers, and of those papers which may be self-archived only 12% are freely available online (Laasko 2014). Apparently, academics *en masse* are not willing to go through the self-archival policies of the journals they publish in and then make a digital copy openly accessible. Journals sometimes make this process more difficult for academics by imposing embargos on their ability to archive their work. Some publishers might only allow pre-peer-reviewed or non-paginated copies of their articles to be archived, reserving official copies of articles for paying customers. So while green open access has its virtues, on its own, it has not and cannot “change the current subscription model, and won’t provide near-term cost savings for libraries” (Crawford 2011:17; see also Suber 2005).

Much of the discussion of gold and green open access as two mutually exclusive categories for realizing open access have overlooked another type of academic publication, one that is extremely important for academics in the social sciences and humanities – monographs. This is typical of:

the bulk of scholarship, buzz, and discussion surrounding OA in the academic world [which] has been focused on journals, and then largely on scientific, technical, and medical journals rather than those in the humanities and social sciences. As a result, much of the information available and many of the scenarios proposed do not necessarily apply to [humanities nor social science] scholarly monograph[s] (Kwan 2011:1.3).

Writing books is an essential part of being a successful academic in the social sciences and humanities. Yet getting books published and subsequently read is becoming much more difficult because libraries are allocating most of their funding to pay for journals, causing a steady

¹⁵ A database of peer-reviewed journals’ copyright and self-archival policies.

decrease in the number of books that they ultimately purchase and make available to their patrons (McPherson 2003).

Publishing book-length investigations imbues an academic with a sort of scientific capital that is generally more important for the careers of social scientists and humanities scholars than physical scientists. And there are an extra set of challenges for book publishers to adhere to the principles of open access because in contrast to journal publications, monograph authors are supposed to get royalties from the publisher's profits, and so publishers are reluctant to allow readers free online access since this might negatively affect their sales. Further, readers are used to paying to read monographs, so they may be skeptical about the quality of the work when it is given away for free (Eve 2014:116). Contrary to these speculations, research focusing on the reality of these worries concluded that there is “no significant effect of Open Access on [monograph] sales” (Snijder 2014:13; Kwan 2011:3.2) and there is actually a significant increase in digital usage (Eve 2014:123; Kwan 2011:3.1). The Public Knowledge Project developed what is called the “Open Journal System,” an open source platform for open access journal publications. They also developed an open source platform for books, “The Open Monograph Press.” These “open systems” allow publishers and editors to manage “the editorial workflow required to see [journals,] monographs, edited volumes and, scholarly editions through internal and external review, editing, cataloguing, production, and publication” (Public Knowledge Project 2014). Gold, green, and monograph publishing are the umbrella terms encompassing most of the actions that comprise the open access movement.

The Emergence of Open Access Publishing

The emergence of the serials crisis and how this prompted a reflexive open-access movement in order to historically situate the present study, which examines the experiences, viewpoints, practices, and motivations of open access editors in the social sciences and humanities in

Canada. The open access movement was so defined in order to propose an alternative to the profit-driven motives in academic and scientific publishing in the face of what has been termed the “serials crisis.” The serials crisis is in reference to research libraries being unable to afford access to all of the information that their patrons require. This situation often results in classifying research journals in an order of importance and discontinuing subscriptions to journals that active researchers may require and may not be able to afford on their own. The extent of the serials crisis is well understood:

Among [the Association of Researcher Libraries] member libraries in the period 1986-2003, the price per subscription of serials rose by 215%. Notably, the Consumer Price Index rose by only 68% during the same period. *Member libraries paid 260% more for their serial subscriptions in 2003 than in 1986 despite having increased the number of subscriptions by only 14%.....*Cost increases have not been distributed equally across disciplines. STM journals show some of the steepest prices and price increases. In 2004, according to Library Journal (Chart 3), the average price to large university libraries for a chemistry journal was \$2,695, up from \$1,995 in 2000; the average price for a physics journal was \$2,543, up from \$1,865. Conversely, the average 2004 prices for music and art journals were \$106 and \$136, respectively (Panitch and Michalak 2005).

Even though humanities journals are less costly than the STM journals both humanities and social sciences scholars are unlikely to be able to access all of the papers and monographs they might need because of the increasing proportion of library budgets that are going toward STM publications.

Repercussions of the serials crisis cascade across the library budget. The imbalance in serials pricing by discipline means that subscriptions to less expensive journals, frequently in the humanities, may be at risk as libraries seek ways to support the costly core journals upon which scientific research depends. Disciplines dependent on monographs are also at a disadvantage... [M]onograph inflation has been much less than for serials; yet, with limited budgets going to subsidize key serial subscriptions, the number of monographs purchased by libraries has not grown (Panitch and Michalak 2005).

Further, this ‘crisis’ is experienced at all tiers of scholarly institutions, though it is experienced most acutely in developing countries. “In 2008, Harvard subscribed to 98,900 serials... The best-funded research library in India... subscribed to 10,600. Several sub-Saharan African university libraries subscribed to zero [journals], offering their patrons access to no

conventional journals except those donated by publishers” (Suber 2012:30-1). Still, all academic libraries are experience the need to prune their subscription lists, some libraries cancel all subscriptions from publishers that are considered to regularly price-gouge their customers in an attempt to set a new precedent (Siler 2016). Indeed, this is a troubling situation especially considering that research output is at an all-time high. Meaning that more research is being produced at one time than ever before in history while accessibility rates are also at an all-time low (Suber 2012:41-2).

Open access advocates are not uniform in their emphasis on particular solutions to the serials crisis and ideals of open access are still emerging. With the dawn of internet technologies, scholars saw the potential for research dissemination in a digital environment and began to publish peer-reviewed work there instantly. However, open access wasn’t constructed as a distinct movement until an understanding of the serials crisis began to crystallize, caused largely by the supposedly unethical profit-motives of scholarly publishers. It is in the contradiction of these tendencies of for-profit peer-reviewed publications that informed the first influential statement urging widespread support for open access initiatives: *The Budapest Open Access Initiative* (2002).¹⁶ The conflict occurring between academic institutions and for-profit publishers is unique, in that the individuals who are directly confronting the serials crisis and managing its impact are not the end users of academic publications, namely academics and scientists, but

¹⁶ Two other important statements on open access followed this one. *The Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing* (2003) emerged from an assortment of physical scientists and humanities scholars specifically addressing the bio-medical community and urging them to endorse open access publication strategies to publish original research. Finally, *Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities* (2003) contains much of the same content about what open access means and the social emancipation which can follow from its widespread implementation in the social sciences and humanities. These two more recent statements do not explicitly define open access as a movement in conflict with the profit motives of dominant publishing companies.

instead, librarians. This has lead academics to be markedly ignorant of the costs of the materials they need in order to do their work (Suber 2012:41). While, on the other hand, academics, specifically, those who take on editorial responsibilities, are the individuals practicing and promoting open access. These editors are situated between the needs of their field and their fellow colleagues; they experience encouragement from librarians to publish online for free, and competition over authors and readers with prestigious for-profit publishing companies.

Historically, biomedicine is the discipline that has utilized gold open access to the greatest extent (Laakso and Björk 2012) and mathematics, physics, and astronomy have tended to utilize green open access (Björk et al 2010; Gargouri et al 2012). These fields of study typically have larger research budgets and shares of their institutional budgets compared to the social sciences and humanities. As a result, these researchers can afford to allocate some of their large research budgets to ensuring that their research is disseminated to the widest extent possible. Researchers often do this by paying article processing fees in open access journals such as PLoS one. Or an institution may allocate some of the funds for their physical science departments to maintaining a paper repository such as arXiv.com at Cornell University, which costs \$826,000 per year to operate (arXiv 2015). Physical scientists can usually afford to open access to their research by drawing from their operating grants. Even for social science and humanities scholars with funding open access fees can be a considerable drain on their research budgets. Open access article processing charges are typically around \$2-3,000US per article, especially for the top-tier journals, such as, in my own field within sociology, *Symbolic Interaction*.¹⁷

¹⁷ <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/%28ISSN%291533-8665/homepage/FundedAccess.html>

While open access to research in these aforementioned disciplines are not perfect, the physical sciences are considerably more open than other disciplines. Consider Jack Andraka, a 15-year-old who managed to develop a fast and inexpensive way to detect pancreatic cancer due to simply having access to scientific works. In his own words “If a 15 year old who didn’t know what a pancreas was could find a new way to detect pancreatic cancer, think of what we could all do together” (Andraka 2013:12:32). And indeed, “evidence shows that usage increases when access is more convenient, and maximizing usage of the scientific record benefits all of society” (Lawrence 2001:521), which is apparent across disciplines (Hajjem, Harnad, and Gingras 2005). The social sciences and humanities have yet to make such a breakthrough with the help of some interested novice, but as this single case shows, there are real intellectual benefits to be had by opening access to wider audiences.

Scientific and academic funding agencies have recognized the benefits of open access to individual researchers, disciplines, and the public at large, and have figured into what has been understood as the “tipping point of consensus reached in 2013,” poising open access as an inherent public good (Eve 2014:7). Since 2013, all major funding agencies in the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States, The Research Council UK, The Tri-Council, and National Science Fund respectively, have implemented policies urging scientists and intellectuals to publish their publically funded research findings in an openly accessible format immediately or within 6 months, for UK funded research (Research Council United Kingdom 2013), and within 12 months in the US and Canada (Canadian Government 2015; Lucibella 2015) upon publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Considering these new policy changes, the landscape and

Other examples: *Studies in Symbolic Interaction* open access fee is “\$1,595 USD” (<http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/openaccess.htm>), *Social Science and Medicine* open access fee is “3200, excluding taxes” (<https://www.elsevier.com/journals/social-science-and-medicine/0277-9536/open-access-options>).

practices of academic publishing may change and have repercussions for the open access policies of dominant scientific and academic publishers, and may improve the status of relatively new open access journals across disciplines.

As mentioned above, the physical sciences have made the largest investments in enabling open access to their work by investing in online repositories and high-ranking journals, but there is currently little comparable movement in the social sciences and humanities (Eve 2014:24). However, it is interesting to note that the first open access journals were in the fields of social sciences and humanities (SS&H); these include *New Horizons in Adult Education*, *Phycology*, and *Postmodern Culture* (Open Access Directory 2015). While SS&H scholars may have been some of the first to implement open access publication strategies, nearly half of these early efforts (OA journals published before 1997) in the SS&H failed (see appendix A). Even though these early efforts did not remain sustainable, the desire to adhere to “the access principle” (Willinsky 2009) in SS&H has not waned. What’s more is that the desire to realize open access in SS&H is supported by empirical evidence showing the benefits to individual researchers as well as their fields more generally. This research shows that, generally, open access articles are cited more often than toll access articles of a similar quality (Swan 2010). A study focusing on the relative citation advantage across disciplines of ecology, applied mathematics, sociology and economics, showed that sociology has the highest citation advantage from being open access, followed by economics, then applied math, and finally ecology, though all disciplines benefitted (Norris 2008:123). This means that openly accessible research is more readily engaged with and has more apparent effects on the subsequent research literature. This finding is rendered even more important, and perhaps ironic, since sociology, the discipline with the highest open access advantage, had the lowest number of open access articles at the time of this research.

The social context of knowledge production is a social issue for individuals and groups at various social positions. Institutions external to science, particularly publishers and printing press companies, can spur or impede scientific advance to a significant degree (Eisenstein 1979:638). The insights of the sociology of knowledge necessarily come to bear on this topic since there are obvious inequalities in knowledge acquisition, spurred by the dominant cultural logic of capitalism (Manheim 1965[1929]). Further, as there are obvious income inequalities across disciplines, and as there are more pronounced advantages for those disciplines with smaller budgets, it is worth considering struggles in fields of knowledge production from the perspective of those who are the most disadvantaged. The scholarly literature on open-access has covered the harrowing experiences of academics who are unable to access relevant research articles (Swan and Brown 2004; Schroter and Tite 2006; Park 2009; Research Information Network 2009), the perceptions of various groups of academics towards open access publications (Schroter and Tite 2006; Park 2009; Migheli and Ramello 2014), the struggles of librarians attempting to address the serials crisis (Richard, Koufogiannakis, and Ryan 2010), the state of open access publishing for monographs in Canada (Kwan 2011).

Despite all of this important research, there has still been little focused attention on the experiences of editors who are attempting to realize open access publishing at the journal level (For exception see Willinsky and Mendis 2007). This seems curious, since research articles are said to a considerably achievable goal, or in metaphorical terms, the “low hanging fruit,” of the open access movement (Suber 2012:17) but continue to be neglected by publishers and journals dealing with social science and humanities scholarship. Considering the disadvantaged position of open access journals, there continue to be many intense and resilient challenges for those who are trying to publish journal articles and achieve legitimacy using an open-access format, even

after the supposed “tipping point of consensus” about the beneficial nature of open access publishing (Eves 2014:7). Considering the uneven use of open access publishing for research articles at the journal level between the physical sciences, on the one hand, and the social sciences and humanities, on the other, it will prove insightful to interrogate the social contexts of open access journals within the social sciences and humanities in Canada. This research project attempts to provide some much needed focus on the underlying motivations and ideals that propel the open access movement at the journal level. By approaching the problem with a sociological framework of symbolic interactionism, I hope to better understand the collective struggles and overlapping yet diverse meanings and practical philosophies of open access journal editors in the SS&H.

CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Symbolic interactionism was named by Herbert Blumer (1969:47-8) as a style of social inquiry that relies on intimate, first-hand observations in naturalistic settings, coupled with the mission to represent the beliefs of research participants to the most faithful extent possible (Charmaz 2014:263). The perspective is guided by three assumptions. These are: (1) that individuals react to others and to their environment based on the meanings that they have for them, (2) that the meaning of such things are derived from social interaction, (3) and that these meanings are handled and modified by groups of people over the course of many interactions (Blumer 1969:2-7). Attending to processes of important symbols and meaning-making activities of groups of

people is of serious consequence in understanding how communities or societies are constructed and reproduce. Indeed, the representational symbols that people use in order to express their selves, communicate with others, and plan their actions are not merely conceptual tools, they are essential to the development and maintenance of human group life (Durkheim 2008[1912]; Strauss 2008[1959]). Communities organize around certain dominant significant symbols. However, language is dynamic and so any symbol can have various definitions based on the situations in which it is used. Practices and significant symbols develop, combine, and affect one another, novel ones emerge and may eventually come to be generic throughout society (Mead 1938:641). Therefore, the significant motivations and symbols that maintain groups and societies are constantly being enacted and are always up for revision.

This thesis takes up the theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism to guide the development of its research questions, data collection strategies, and analytical tactics. The major strength of interactionist research owes to its ability to achieve intimate familiarity with the individuals at the focus of the study. Interactionist research attempts achieve a thorough understanding individual experiences of social phenomena while giving a voice to those who collectively experience and enact such phenomena to conceptualize the generic aspects of some social phenomena.

The interactionist framework makes non-Cartesian assumptions about individuality: individuals are understood to be products of their social environments, rather than atomistic solipsists. Individuals, according to this conceptual scheme, are imbued with a self and individuality through the internalization of social interaction, they develop a personal conception of self through the reactions of others as well as their personal reactions to their own habitual and unplanned actions (Mead 1934:174). The practice of symbolic interactionist research makes

these assumptions about its subjects in order to respect “the experiential essences of the human condition” (Prus 1997:6), while at the same time looking out for generic social processes which are “transsituational elements of interaction... denoting parallel sequences of activity across diverse contexts” (Prus 1987:251). The current project assumes that by investigating the significant symbols of those who enact editorial roles for open access journals, we shall learn about the various social and ideological dimensions of open access that work to ensure its continued existence. Stability is an achievement, to be a continuing open access journal in the social sciences and humanities is significant considering their marginal position within dominant academic practices.

Interactionist premises, along with much of the interactionist spirit, is attributed to the historic influences of early University of Chicago pragmatists and Chicago School sociologists. Interactionist research has even been said to be “a way of empirically studying the nature of the individual initially raised by Dewey and Mead” (Dennis 2011:468). Mead and Dewey were heavily influenced by pragmatist philosophies. Pragmatism is a social philosophy that assumes the meaning of some doctrine is the concrete consequence of adopting it (James 1907:45-6). Knowledge is derived out of everyday practices, accomplished by fallible agentic individuals who effectively develop their claims to knowledge in a series of failures and successes (Dewey 1896; Popper 1963; Latour 1987). As knowledge, meanings, and self-perceptions are always prone to revision, the best way to understand any particular thing is to understand the experiences of those who take it up. In the words of John Dewey (1905): “if one wishes to describe anything truly, his task is to tell what it is *experienced as being*” (393, emphasis added). Further, our research goal is to understand how these mutual experiences of social life are taken up and coalesce into joint action (Blumer 1969:71-2). In order to understand social life and

generic experiences inherent to particular circumstances, research guided by naturalist pragmatist interactionist philosophical principles attempts to guard against falling into the trap of construing facts and concepts as fixed entities, this is accomplished by attending to dynamic processes of interaction and recognizing pluralist nature of knowledge production (Shalin 1986:18). The application of pragmatist philosophy to the social sciences and symbolic interactionism in particular thus provides epistemological support for the agentic character of individual action, the social nature of generic ideals, as well as the precarious nature of significant ideals and practices.

The second major influence for interactionist scholarship comes from the Chicago School sociologists of the twentieth century. Chicago School sociology considered the city as the sociologist's laboratory. Chicago School researchers used ethnographic methods in order to analyze city life as it naturally occurs. These sociologists were not attempting only to develop a scientific understanding of their city, instead, as Smith (1988) argues in his book on the subject, "the principal object of the Chicago sociologists was not "the city" but human nature and the social order as it was and might be" (11). To research generic forms of human nature, these sociologists developed projects to uncover the intricacies of social life, typically of those individuals within groups that experience considerable problems in urban settings.

The ways in which various degrees of social domination and marginalization are experienced in naturally occurring social interactions is a common thread throughout much interactionist scholarship. These studies provide a voice for marginal groups in society and shine a human light on those who are generally discounted. By focusing on groups and actions that are collectively defined as deviant we may come to understand the objective circumstances that have led to a certain group's marginalization and the commonalities between deviant groups as well as

dominant ones. We may come to learn about dominant trends in society by studying those who are most disadvantaged by it because they are able to experience the socio-cultural logics of both dominant and subordinate groups. The argument for privileging the standpoint of those in subordinate positions can be traced back to Hegel's "master-slave dialectic" (1977[1807]:118-9). Hegel claimed that those in subordinate positions are able to develop a more complete knowledge, since they must face the conditions of their own knowledge as well as the knowledge of the dominant groups. Simmel (2012[1908]) made the same claim while writing about the "objectivity the stranger" (362). Marx (2012[1845]) argues that taking the standpoint of the proletariat is necessary because it supposedly represents the interests of the majority of members of modern societies, and, therefore the direction of social progress. Harding's (2001) more recent formulation of strong objectivity emphasizes the necessity of bringing in perspectives of marginalized categories of people to bear on academic theories and conceptualizations, particularly the perspectives of women and non-white individuals on academic theories. Thus, widely divergent perspectives are generally considered to provide critical retorts and alternative possibilities in regards to emergent and taken-for-granted academic knowledge.

Often, the individuals who experience some acute social problem form part of marginalized or deviant social groups. For those who are considered deviant and thus marginalized, interactionist research on the histories and experiences of these individuals may work to promote understanding and empathy in regards to their challenges and social exclusion as well as knowledge about approaches to potentially improving the collective state of marginalized groups. Interactionist researchers attempt to depict a faithful rendition of the real experiences of actual people in human society in order for marginalized groups to be understood on their own terms, rather than having deductive categories imposed upon their complex

experiences. This pragmatic logic in interactionist scholarship can be partially attributed to Mead as he argued that science was a necessary component for societies to collectively, and intelligently deal with the inequalities inherent to modern industrial society (da Silva 2008:170). Early influential Chicago School sociologists “must be seen as American liberals wrestling with inherited dilemmas and modern choices” (Smith 1988:28). As a result, interactionist research substantiates its relevance as a potentially emancipatory force in society.

Interactionist studies often focus on the perspectives of the deviant, the marginalized, or “the underdog” in a sympathetic way, though with care to avoid sentimentality and to refuse to

investigate some matter that should properly be regarded as problematic. We are sentimental, especially, when our reason is that we would prefer not to know what is going on, if to know would be to violate some sympathy whose existence we may not even be aware of (Becker 1967:246).

By producing information about some sub-ordinate group of people interactionist studies depict those in a way that might challenge the hierarchy of credibility that privileges those who occupy dominant positions in society (Becker 1967:241-2). The emphasis on the ability for social relations to be understood and for these insights to contribute to a virtuous democratic society was equally pronounced in the early part of the twentieth century (Wirth 1948) as it is now (Burawoy 2005; Puddephatt and Price forthcoming).

The classic Blumerian interactionist theoretical framework has not been adopted uncritically. Critiques have been waged against interactionism in regards to its ability to offer explanations for power relationships among broad and narrow social strata such as class conflict, political relations or marriage (Stryker 1980:150; Cast 2003; Zeitlin 1973:216-8). Thus interactionist research is said to be unable to connect its findings, derived from everyday social interaction, to adequately account for macro social categories such as class, race, and gender. This project overcame the potential astructural bias of interactionism by pairing Athens’ radical

interactionism with concepts from Bourdieu's theory of fields to connect the subjective experiences of my participants with their objective subordinate position within their disciplinary field.

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) define a "field" as "a set of objective historical relations between positions" (97) where positions of the active entities depend on the distribution of different forms of capital within their field. Fields are conceptually isolated socio-cultural spheres but do not solely consist of human actors and groups. Situations that occur within a field occur at the intersection of individuals, groups, discourses, and non-human entities (Clarke 2005). Field analysis is used in this project in order to treat open access journals as analytically distinct within their discipline and to delineate the cultural ideals that guide the actors under study as well as the various intersections they emphasize between their field and other adjoining ones (Bourdieu 1969; Martin 2003). Fields are conceptually isolated for analytical convenience, and it should be readily recognized that these fields often experience influences from external socio-cultural formations.

The fields relevant to this research project or not merely convenient conceptual categories. Rather, as theorized by Thomas Gieryn (1983), disciplinary fields are defined and demarcated in practical ways (781) by scientists and academics presenting ideals of scientific or academic work "to promote *their* authority over designated domains of knowledge" (783, emphasis added). This project shares a similar outlook by exploring images and ideologies of science and academia that the editors in my sample readily make use of in an effort to demarcate their journal as operating within the ideological and structural parameters of their discipline. They ensure the work they publish is in accord with epistemological standards of their colleagues and form associations with educational organizations in order to avoid public contests of their

legitimacy. Gieryn's (1999) research focuses on how individual scientists demarcate science and maintain their credibility among the public. This project places greater emphasis on exploring the ways these editors maintain an organizational persona that demarcates itself within a scholarly field. Rather than simply holding an *individual* position of authority in the field, they are striving to create a collective organization that is in a super-ordinate position in their discipline and are able to wield authority over their disciplinary colleagues. This project shares Gieryn (1999:14) assumption that scholarly demarcations are situationally enacted and, thus, are different from one situation to the next. These journals are in a similar situation and so they all similarly demarcate boundaries of inclusivity that are positively associated with their disciplinary tradition. On the other hand, they must also demarcate exclusionary boundaries separating them from groups they deem unethical and unproductive to disciplinary advancement.

The economic component of Bourdieu's theory of fields takes into account not only financial or physical forms of capital, but social, cultural, and symbolic forms of capital. Economic capital provides the basic materials for social fields to remain relatively autonomous and sustainable. Economic capital includes financial assets and the potential their human workforce, or human capital (Becker 1975). Social capital is defined as "the aggregate of actual or potential resources linked to... a durable [accessible social] network" (Bourdieu 1986:n.p). Cultural capital is the ability to play a social role with the level of seriousness that dominant others expect (Bourdieu 1984:54). Finally, symbolic capital includes all markers of "reputation for competence and an image of respectability and honourability that are easily converted into political positions as a local or national notable" (Bourdieu 1984:291), examples of forms of symbolic capital are diplomas, honours, or trophies.

The positive associations open access editors form with external organizations can be thoroughly analyzed using a Bourdieusian framework that “explains the interrelatedness of social position, resources and cultural competence” (Husu 2013:265). When social positions and resources are managed properly within an academic field, the individual or organization that manages those resources accrues academic legitimacy. In other words, what Bourdieu (2004) has termed “scientific capital.... [A] set of properties which are the product of acts of knowledge and recognition performed by agents engaged in the scientific field” (55). In other words, scientific capital is developed through peer-to-peer interaction, and endows an individual with “specific categories of perception that enable them to make the pertinent distinctions, in accordance with the principle of pertinence that is constitutive of the nomos of the field” (*ibid*). In sum, actively managing academic resources and acting in ways that are perceived to be virtuous by one’s peers provides one with a plus in regards to their personal scientific capital, and therefore their influence within their discipline. This definition of scientific capital does not simply apply to the physical and social sciences but can also be applied to humanities scholars as well. Bourdieu also did develop a concept of “academic capital,” and the definition is remarkably similar to his scientific capital. “Academic capital is obtained and maintained by holding a position enabling domination over other positions and their holders” (Bourdieu 1988:84) and attaining these positions requires a significant amount of time (87). More academic capital translates into a higher relative position within academia as well as additional responsibilities that are considered prestigious. However, developing scientific and academic capital and experiencing upward social mobility in some discipline is not so straightforward as to equal the addition of competencies and time. There are structural constraints that tend to privilege those who are already in a position of dominance in some field to the disadvantage of those who may have the same abilities but

receive unequal rewards on account of the marginal position they occupy (Merton 1973[1968]; Bourdieu 2001). As such, Bourdieu's work is an important complement to interactionist approaches, overcoming interactionism's astructural theoretical framework, especially when it comes to cultural realms of production such as science and academia (Puddephatt 2013).

These aspects of academic capital are arguably generic to all scientists and scholars. Considering that my research sample consists of individuals within disciplines of social science and humanities the concept of "scientific capital" will be used interchangeably with "academic capital" in order to discuss the similar ways that social scientists and humanities scholars develop their claims to legitimacy within their field. The concepts of fields and capital will not be used to measure the level of objective influence that the individuals and journals in my sample have upon their respective disciplines. Instead, disciplinary fields will be considered from the point of view of my research participants. This method effectively collects information about their conceptions of the fields and players that they confront in their attempts to succeed as an academic journal.

Bourdieu provides a conceptual bridge between the interactionist collection and analysis of individual experiences with their place in diffuse forms of power and social structures. By focusing on fields, a certain social sphere can be conceptually isolated while recognizing that the social sphere under analysis is also prone to external influences as well as internal pressures. These forms of capital align well with the strategies that editors implement for their success. They must ensure financial sustainability, social connections, cultural competencies, and a level of symbolic prestigiousness in order to succeed in their goal to address their discipline. The theoretical framework for this project in its final form makes use of Bourdieu's theory of fields and capital to provide conceptual categories for Athens' (2015) radical interactionism, or the

theory that all interpersonal interactions contain an ever-present, and constantly revisable, power relationship. Recent interactionist conceptions of power from Prus (1999), Hall (1985; 1997), and Athens (2015) will be considered to define and rationalize the radical interactionist approach taken up in this research project.

Robert Prus identifies power roles and conceptualizes situational definitions of power in line with classic interactionist tenets. Prus (1999) defines power as an intersubjectively defined social role. Prus' (1999:152-155) conceptualization of power follows the basic tenets of symbolic interaction by representing power as that which is defined as such over the course of two or more people interacting. There is a binary relationship between those in a particular situation who have power and those who do not; Prus (1999:153) terms these roles "*tactician*" and "*target*," respectively. As these roles are constantly being defined and reworked through interaction, there is the possibility that one individual may occupy the role of target at one moment and tactician in another, based on the circumstances. For example, an individual may occupy a target role as a low-level employee at work, however, this person's may find some sensitive information about his manager that enables him to interactionally accomplish actions as a tactician in his workplace in order to negotiate a better wage. Prus' (1999) conception of the interactive accomplishment power is detailed and meaningful, however rigid adherence to classic interactionist principles causes researchers to fall into the trap of linguistic nominalism; meaning that power only exists as people define it as such. Yet, power may be only partially perceivable or ignored as natural. Rigidly following the classical interactionist interpretation of power may cause researchers to be too complicit in assuming that there is an absence of power relations among those in a group who define themselves as equal.

Peter Hall's research overcomes this shortcoming through his exploration of institutionalized power structures, their situational enactment and accompanying experiences. By drafting and implementing institutional mandates, mission statements, and codes of conduct, managerial agents are effectively exerting meta-power, or relational control, over a group of individuals. Practices related to the concretization of higher and lower power positions in a social organization provide a means of criticizing the linguistic nominalism of Prus' (1999) understanding of power. "Asymmetric relationships are not only sustained in direct contact. Rather, power is maintained and reproduced more readily and with greater consequence by having the resources to create conditions for others which institutionalize its expression" (Hall 1997:415). The power dynamics of social organizations can be analyzed as exerting power at a variety of interactional levels. Power can be exerted in structural ways at the dyadic level, such as in a marriage (Harris 2001), and at wider organizational and macro levels, involving the coordination small groups, or large multitudes of actors (Hall 1985; Hochschild 1979; Blumer 1990; Prus 1999: 209-249). Further, individuals and groups within organizational structures do not merely take power relationships for granted but may act to resist dominant players and social forces through critical and creative actions, including protesting, proposing, betraying, and sabotaging (Lombardo and Kvalshaugen 2014) or creating and enacting a culture of resistance (Herman and Musolf 1998) to perceived large-scale social realities.

Athens' (2002; 2005; 2010; 2015) conceptualization of "radical interactionism" refines this position of meta-power beyond organizations and theorizes that domination and subordination are the basic components of human interaction by taking up Robert Park's (1952[1934]:161) conception of dominance as integral to a sustainable society (See also Park and Burgess 1924:668). This theory recognizes that power is indeed interactionally

accomplished, however, power may exist and exert influence over people in unconscious, habitual, structurally cultivated practices. When power is not explicitly defined by actors, interactionists are too complicit in the assumption that it is not there at all, and that many if not most interactions that comprise social life are not conflictual but cooperative, friendly, or indifferent. Mead (1934) and Blumer (1969) are both considered to be guilty of wearing “rose coloured glasses” in regards to the workings of society, and see conflict and domination as only one possible instance of social action, and thus, not necessarily relevant to *all* social action. In critiquing these classical assumptions Athens redefines G.H. Mead’s base unit of social life, the social act, as being one in which there is *always* a super- and sub-ordinate relationship involved (Athens 2002). He builds on Mead’s understanding of the implicit meaning embedded in social actions, whether or not they are within our conscious awareness, and by this, power can be manifested in social acts no matter if actors are aware of these qualities or not, overcoming the problem of linguistic phenomenism.

By assuming super- and sub-ordinate roles in each and every social act, Athens (2005) moves beyond the problem of only some actions being characterized by power, awakening us to the power-laden features of all social acts, and hence, all complex social institutions that grow out of these base units of analysis. Though Athens would concede to the classic interactionist point that ideals and practices are always up for revision. So, too, is power always problematic, never a *fait accompli*. “The important complicating factor is that groups or individuals can bring different kinds of force to the table.... Domination of social action is replete with vagaries that open the door to the unexpected” (Athens 2010:220). These relationships power even permeate social groups that attempt to divulge themselves of such biases, including scientists and academics (Puddephatt 2013).

Sociality is the nature of social actions to have effects in multiple socio-cultural spheres at one time. Mead's (1932) definition of it is the "presence of things in two or more different systems, in such a fashion that its presence in a later system changes its character in the earlier system or systems to which it belongs" (92). Thus, an independent object in one system, say a physiological disruption in an individual, has effects upon the wider social-interactional system; for example, if the individual had to excuse himself, hurry, or curtail a discussion with another prematurely. The physiological process is thus occupying not just the biological organism but also the social situation, thus affecting it in turn. Indeed, Mead saw many layers of reality being connected through action; hence inorganic, organic, human, and social systems would all be seen as connected and hence mutually impacting (Latour 1991). The social realm of science is no exception to the rule of sociality, influences within and outside of scientific communities effect the research that is pursued, published, and adopted for further research. By updating this conception of sociality in science with Athen's (2007:147) conception of domination we can better understand the multiple super-subordinate contact points within and between science and other social domains (Puddephatt 2013:62-4). Sociality does not only reference the various overlapping social systems that effect one another but the effects of non-human entities upon particular communities. Non-human components of socio-cultural formations such as computer software and major communication mediums have contribute something unique to the ways that individuals work and communicate (McLuhan 1962; Eisenstein 1979); they also effectively exert power over individuals by dictating how they work and communicate (Fischer and Dirsmith 1995).

Since power can be derived from many heterogeneous sources, which may be more or less relevant at different times, it can be very difficult to presume the outcome of dominance by

trusting in initial distributions of power. Blumer (1969) emphasizes the “formative” character of interaction, in that the outcome of a dialogue, the emergent meaning, is always greater than the individual component parts of each actor could predict beforehand, initial meanings. The interaction adds value and determines what types of new objects will form from the initial conditions, often in novel, unexpected ways. This idea appears to be influenced by Mead's (1938) conception of emergence, which is as “when things get together, something arises that was not there before” (461). Chang (2004) explains that Mead's “emergent objects” are always dependent on two things: (1) the past conditions that make the emergent event possible; and (2) the interaction that takes place and brings the particular emergent into being. Emergence is thus the key to novelty, innovation, and change, in the physical world as well as the social world of human actors. In Darwin's theory of evolution, new forms arise as a result of interactions that occur out of past forms. Yet predicting the emergence of new forms purely from the understanding of past forms alone would be impossible without the benefit of hindsight. Mead (1932) points out that since emergents are by definition unpredictable from past conditions, they have the power to reshape not only the future, but also how we conceive of the past. We must “make room” for present objects, and reconstitute the past as necessary to explain how they have emerged causally.

Resistance or alternative movements poise themselves in a position of challenging a value or practice which was taken-for-granted, and thus introduce a new object that others must “make room for” or reject. The practical acceptance of culturally-engrained ideals represents what Chang (2004) would term “conventional rationality” (418). In contrast, new, emergent, social movements are inherently creative. They give rise to the possibility of creative acts which are different from conventional or habitual ideals and actions. These critical movements hope to

inspire a general revolution that, once accomplished, will not only facilitate individuals to learn about new ideas, possibilities, and opportunities thus securing advantages for new people to have been excluded under the reigns of conventional rationality, but also seek “to change the basis of power or type of force upon which the... group’s ranking in a community rests” (Athens 2015:158). In other words, social movements guided by extended forms of rationality are unprecedentedly emancipatory (Chang 2004:418-20). These movements give rise to the possibility of creative acts, which are different from conventional or habitual social actions (Joas 1993) and attempt to secure these possibilities. For example, by pointing to the injustice experienced by forgotten others, social movements attempt to attain advantages for those who have been systematically disadvantaged. Or, irresolvable problems in one field of science might find their solution through the advances in separate fields, such as the invention of new technological instruments that enable formerly abandoned scientific inquiries to continue in new and unexpected ways.

Since emergence underlines change that can happen at the physical, individual, and social (micro to macro) level, and this theory states that such change is in some measure always unpredictable, clearly it would have important repercussions for the distribution of power in the social and political order. Power, as Athens (2015) defines it, is heterogeneous and comes in many forms; it is impossible to tell what types of resources, ideas, or other forms of capital will be most important in the (re)establishment of a particular dominance order through continual interactions within it. The fact that even with full knowledge of such resources, we still cannot wholly predict emergent objects from past conditions, means that power looks even more unstable and dependent on the happenstance of contingent change through the interaction of disparate forces. Further, Chang (2004) highlights the power of interpretive agency on the part of

human actors to reshape situations in often profound ways as opportunities for change arise. While Chang emphasizes the human capacity for defining situations, and re-framing events to one's advantage, of course, the distribution of resources prior to these opportunities greatly determines one's power to do such defining and pursue relevant lines of action accordingly.

In sum, interactionist concerns to understand the practical ideologies of individuals who are experiencing similar forms of marginalization are guided by the initial formulation of the research subject and sensitizing concepts. This project aspires to get close and dig deeply into the real experiences of open access journal editors in the social sciences and humanities in Canada in order to understand their collective struggles, common ideologies and practices. To do so, the organization that maintains their journal is conceptualized as positioned relatively low within the disciplinary field and maintained by interested individuals who vie for profits in regard to their journal's academic capital. Their practical philosophies and associated practices are worked out through interactions with others in their field who wield power over them in regards to their ability to offer economic, symbolic, or human capital. Thus, their experiences are defined within power relations. This research asks questions guided by the radical interactionist frame work such as:

how do scientists make choices about where to compete... choosing either high risk, high reward, or low risk "safe bets" as their preferred modus operandi? How might these choices reflect their earlier acquired dispositions from their prior scientific enculturation with super- or subordinate research cultures? (Puddephatt 2013:70).

Thus this project attempts to detail the experiences, strategies of success, and the power relations that are present in these editors' confrontations with dominant cultural forms throughout their practice of publishing an open access journal.

CHAPTER 4: METHODS

The theoretical framework of radical symbolic interactionism has methodological implications in regards to choosing the population to be researched, developing research questions, and verifying potential answers to those questions. This research project attempts to understand the circumstances and experiences of those who are marginalized within the field of academic publication. It does this through qualitative data collection and analysis. The methods that necessarily follow the research questions guiding this project are qualitative because these methods provide access to dynamic meanings through careful analysis and systematic comparisons. This focus and approach is connected to the tendency of pragmatist and interactionist research detail practical problems of society, and research libraries currently experiencing significant difficulty providing materials that academics need for their work. Open access publications are a potential solution to this state of affairs because they make it possible to provide nearly-unhindered access to cutting edge academic and scientific work. For academics and scientists to progress their disciplines, they must have access to their colleagues' work. This is in order for their theorizing and empirical efforts to have a component of disciplinary culmination. Additionally, the dominant socio-cultural logic that they confront can be understood as the most resistant challenge that they face.

This research seeks to provide insight about open access, within a particular range of disciplines, and at a particular moment in the so-called open access movement. Scientific and academic publishing are enacted phenomena and are conceptualized by actors who are thoroughly socialized in the norms of their particular discipline (Latour 1987). By attempting to develop a general conception of the effects of longstanding scientific and academic traditions becoming exposed to new communicative technologies, this research hopes to contribute to

discussions about the socialization of scientists and intellectuals, their philosophical ideals, and the ways in which individuals and groups define and maintain boundaries between validated and non-validated forms of knowledge (Gieryn 1983; 1999). This research project emphasizes the subjectivity of the individuals in my sample and analyzes their orienting values and ideals, and their strategies to succeed in a field obstinate power differentials. This emphasis will work to develop an understanding of the generic ideals and the academic capital held by open access editors in the social sciences and humanities. The research did not seek to understand the interactive processes by which meanings arise and are worked out, but instead, how open access editors define their current environment and plan to act towards it.

Much is said about open access in the scholarly literature but it is impossible to tell how much is based on practical-empirical encounters with open access philosophies and ideals as they are enacted in social life. Interactionist scholarship compels researchers to attend to the philosophies of research subjects, but also how they put their philosophies to practice. The two general methods that interactionists use to achieve these goals are exploration and inspection, “representing respectively depiction and analysis” (Blumer 1969:46). These are oscillatory practices of furthering comprehension and refining guiding concepts. Exploration involves becoming familiar with a social setting or group. This is done through direct observation of groups in their natural settings and focused discussions with informants. As familiarity with a particular research area is achieved the researcher begins to test out potential focuses of inquiry. As open access is a marginal philosophy that attempts to subvert the capitalist logic of academic cultural production, radical interactionism figures into the methodological implications by paying special attention to how these marginalized identities are experienced and challenged through agentic social action within an objective set of power relations.

The researcher uses “artful prob[es]” (Blumer 1980:418) to consider potential focuses of inquiry while, at the same time, deriving and abandoning conceptual tools that aid understanding of these potential lines of inquiry. All key concepts are derived through close scrutiny of the data though some concepts may be used that are derived from significant theories present in the sociological literature. However, a researcher must remain constantly vigilant about maintaining a skeptical stance toward these theories. Any pre-established theories that are used “must earn their way into [the] analysis through their theoretical power to illuminate [the] data” (Charmaz 2014:201). Faulkner (2009:82-4) shows that core analytical schemas may be derived from thick exploration of the social setting under scrutiny *and* that major sensitizing concepts, derived from established sociological theories, may be “exploited” for use as they become necessary and useful for understanding and theory-building. In the case of the present research thesis, Bourdieu’s concepts about fields and forms of capital ended up to be thickly exploited in the final analysis as a way of explaining the experiences of the power relationships experienced and taken up by my respondents. Though my participants did not cite Bourdieu in our conversations, their strategies to succeed always took account of their relative position in their disciplinary field, the powerful individuals and groups at play, and the various resources they have at their disposal. Legitimacy, or a journal’s accepted status in their discipline, ended up as a concept derived through thick exploration, or close scrutiny of detailed data to develop emergent conceptual categories not derived from the scholarly literature (Faulkner 2009:85).

To understand the unique experiences of the open access editors who make up my sample this research asks: (1) what are the different competing philosophies behind open access publishing? (2) What are the varying strategies to make open access journals succeed? (3) What are the daily struggles and rewards of those who are implementing an open access publication?

Therefore, philosophy, strategy, success, and struggle were the sensitizing concepts that provide “a general sense of reference and guidance in approaching empirical instances” (Blumer 1969:148) without providing absolute prescriptions of what to see and how to understand the emergent findings.

Concepts of varying complexity are imagined and tested out with the ultimate goal of uncovering generic patterns of interaction and social action especially relevant to the population at the focus of the project (Blumer 1969:43). These findings are presented as closely to the way in which I myself encountered and dealt with them theoretically. Thus, the analytical process of exploration and inspection provides a way for a researcher to validate his own findings and for readers to check his analytical steps and potential missteps (Blumer 1980:413).

The analytical process is guided by the methodological approach of grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Glaser 1978; Charmaz 2014) by making constant comparisons within and between cases, using a coding schema in order to reach an overarching understanding of the collected data, and testing these understandings against new data or by revisiting previously collected data. Theoretical sampling refined emergent sub-categories and related dimensions between open access journals (Strauss and Corbin 1998:201-215). This research was able to achieve a fair level of breadth and depth in gaining an appreciation of the various philosophical and pragmatic approaches to realizing open access at the journal level. Research ethics were considered at all levels of this research, from conceptualization, recruitment, gaining informed consent, to conducting and analyzing the interviews. This research received ethical clearance from the author’s Ethics Review Board at his home institution, Lakehead University. Ethical considerations will be mentioned as they become relevant throughout the discussion of the present research methods.

This is an interview-based qualitative research project that focuses on the various philosophies, values, behaviors and beliefs of a culture-sharing group (Creswell 2013:90), specifically open access editors. I was interested in exploring how they understand their relative position in regards to the various fields they compete in; such as disciplinary fields, institutional fields, (inter)national-political fields etc. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992:105). In order to approach answering the guiding research questions, my research population was delimited along three lines. The population parameters were set to encompass (1) open access editors (2) publishing within disciplines of the social science and humanities and (3) publishing within the country of Canada. The first focus on SS&H scholars is due to the fact that open access faces less acceptance and support within these fields compared to the physical sciences (Swan 2010; Eves 2014). Secondly, empirical research on journals within these disciplines is lacking in the open access research literature. Thirdly, by attaining, exploring, analyzing, and presenting this information to interested scholars a more generic conceptualization of the philosophies and motivations can be developed. Limiting the research population to SS&H journals in Canada worked to eliminate extraneous variables, facilitate the development of rapport, while, at the same time, having a large receptive population to draw from. It is simpler to develop rapport and easily understand the points of view of those who share a similar culture (Miller and Glassner 2011), specifically Canadian academic culture. It was also assumed that these editors would be more likely to partake in research because they have a stake in the way others are educated about open access publishing in academia, therefore having positive effects upon response rates. The strategy to get such a focused sample limited the potential extraneous variables present in my sample and enabled the achievement of depth in my interviews. The findings may prove worthy of use for the further development of national open access to research policies (see Canadian

Government 2015) and may prove useful for international comparisons; thus the project hopes to contribute to a Canadian Sociology grounded in Canadian society (Matthews 2014:110).

At the outset of this project there were 50 open access journals within this project's particular population limitations according to the *Directory of Open Access Journals*, a search engine of most open access journals with useful search features. This appeared to be a manageable population for this project. The goal at the outset of this project was to attain 20 interviews (40% response rate) with open access editors who performed editorial duties for journals falling within the above parameters. To recruit participants for this study all 50 of these journals and their basic dimensions were listed and the editor contact details that were publically listed on the journal websites were recorded. An e-mail was sent to every active editor of each journal explaining the purpose of the research and requesting an interview which would last approximately one hour (see appendix B). A small proportion of these editors responded within a few days. When a response was received a small amount of back-and-forth between myself and the potential interviewee ensued where we decided upon an appropriate date and time for their interview and these research participants gave their informed consent to participate in the project (see appendix C). Interviewees were allowed to choose between three mediums in which to conduct their interview, e-mail, telephone, or Skype. If I did not receive a response, contact details were re-checked for accuracy and a follow-up e-mail was sent a second time at least two weeks following the original e-mail requesting the non-responsive editors to participate in the study. If there was no response to a second e-mail, the recruitment process for that potential respondent ceased.

Of the 50 potential editors to be interviewed 11 accepted the interview request, though one of these respondents changed their mind and eventually declined to be interviewed, and

another interviewee stopped responding to e-mail queries. At the time interviews for this project were being conducted, two open access journals had recently started up on our campus, they are currently completing the requirements to be listed in the DOAJ. In-person interviews were conducted with the two editors of these new journals. Thus, a response rate of approximately 20% was achieved. 11 complete semi-structured interviews were conducted over the course of January 30th 2015 until February 11th 2016 with 12 open access journal editors within the social sciences and humanities; one journal had two active editors participate in a single interview. All of the editors who participated were active researchers and/or teachers at the time of their interviews. The oldest journal published its first issue in 1996, and transitioned from a print-only into an open access publication in the mid-2000s. The rest of the journals were “born open access” during the 2000s or 2010s.

All of the journals claim to follow the same academic principles as the hegemonic publications in their fields, though none has an official calculation of their impact factor, a significant symbol of academic influence. Even though all of these journals are marginal, or at best semi-peripheral, to their general discipline, they continue to sustain their operations. They maintain the existence of their publication by successfully vying for authors and funding. Therefore, a considerable and necessary number of academics and institutions recognize the relevant contribution the journal makes to a research field and its associates.

Technological communications devices figure largely into my research methodology for two main reasons. First, open access journal editors are familiar with communication technologies, they make use of them as part of their everyday practices. Second, my research population is highly dispersed across Canada, the second largest nation in the world, therefore these mediums enabled to me access a highly dispersed population without the associated travel

costs. For these two reasons it was decided that conducting technologically-mediated interviews would be the most appropriate strategy for collecting my data. Four interviews were conducted over the telephone, three over skype, one over e-mail, and three were conducted face-to-face.

The interviews were semi-structured, composed of open ended questions (Appendix D). The interview schedule was designed around key questions (Singleton and Straits 2010:266) about the basic structure of the journal, the everyday practices of those who are affiliated with it, as well as the challenges and successes that these journal editors experienced. Telephone and in-person interviews were audio-recorded. Interviews conducted through skype were recorded with a desktop recorder, providing an audio-video recording of our interview. Finally, e-mail interviews are conducted through written correspondence, and are therefore self-transcribing. Each interviewee was made aware that their interview would be recorded in their recruitment letter and I asked their permission to be recorded during our conversation before the interview officially commenced. These interviews with open access editors form part of a larger SSHRC-funded project on open access publishing. As interviewees would bring up subjects that were not covered in the interview schedule I would ask further open-ended questions in order to gain clarification on those subjects. When these emergent topics figured largely into our discussions I would work them into the interview schedule for my following interviews.

The interview method of this research project was devised in order for my interviewees to discuss their personal experiences editing for an open access journal in the social sciences or humanities. Special attention was paid to the attitudes that the editors expressed towards myself so that I could ensure that what they were relaying to me were their own thoughts rather than what they believe I want them to say, or to prevent them from curtailing their discussion of something that is potentially offensive. Allowing the participants to choose between telephone,

Skype, or e-mail as their interview medium gives agency to my participants and thus works to level the power relationship and achieve truthful and thorough dialogue (James and Busher 2009:91-5). The participants are able to answer from a quiet personal space and are given some measure of control over the research situation unavailable to face-to-face interviewees. An added benefit of providing options in regards to the communication platform is that it has been found to increase response rates (Sturges and Hanrahan 2004; Deakin and Wakefield 2014:609).

There was a simultaneous involvement between data collection and analysis (Glaser 1978:46-7). Throughout the research process there were conscious attempts to improve my interviewing style and schedule by considering the unforeseen discussion topics, implicit difficulties, and explicit criticisms of my interviewees. The open-ended nature of my interview schedule allowed me licence to improvise off of our conversation to dig deeper into telling statements and probe into silences (Charmaz 2014:85). It must be noted that I was not the sole facilitator in the conversation. In some cases my interviewees would go on tangents about subjects that may not be directly relevant to the interview situation, or they would comment on my interviewing approach. In every case these interviewees were given a degree of power in directing the conversation and provide feedback on the interview experience. In one case, my interviewee refused to answer certain questions because he didn't see a clear linear progression between my progressive line of questions. By taking his advice, and asking certain questions closer to the end of the interview, I was able to get detailed answers from him. From that point on I asked questions in this re-worked order and the flow of my subsequent interviews was noticeably improved. Therefore, there is a significant level of reliability in my interview transcripts as to the depth of experience expressed by my interviewees and an active identification and management of bias in my interview apparatus (Holstein and Gubrium 2011).

After each of my research interviews were completed, the interview recordings were transcribed verbatim. Six interviews were transcribed by myself and five interviews were transcribed by a reputable transcription company. Digital transcript files were kept in computers with security features that prevented anyone without a password to access them. Memos were written after each interview considering the important discussion topics along with comparisons and contrasts with previous interviews, relevant literature, and my own expectations.

Memo-writing was an essential practice of this research project. “Memo writing is the methodological link, the distillation process, through which the researcher transforms data into theory” (Lempert 2007:345). This practice was undertaken at all stages of this research project. This process was sometimes mechanical, in that I would compel myself to write memos after work sessions even if I did not think I had anything significant to write about, and sometimes spontaneous (Glaser 1978:83), where an insight would come suddenly at an inopportune time, such as drifting off to sleep. The most formal memos emerged through brief notes written to myself during the interviews, and after axial codes were developed and selective coding began. The brief notes taken during these practices were later transformed into comprehensive memos about what I had learned, refinements to the interview schedule or codes, and potential theoretical leads. This habitual practice provided “a space to become actively engaged [with my primary research] materials, to develop [...] ideas, to fine-tune [...] subsequent data-gathering, and to engage in critical reflexivity” (Charmaz 2014:162-3).

The analytic strategy guiding the memo-writing practices of this project was constant comparison and contrast within and between cases. Before any codes were tested out and applied to my interview transcripts there had been thorough comparison of similar instances in my transcripts as well as considerably unique instances. This effort was undertaken in order to

develop a holistic conception of my interview transcripts before fragmenting them into isolated components.

After the interview transcripts were read thoroughly, and familiarity was gained, they were uploaded to qualitative analysis software NVivo9. The NVivo project files were stored within a password-protected file. Each transcript was read in its entirety while phrases, single and multiple sentences were coded. During this process of open coding (Strauss 1987:59-64) dimensional information about the journals were identified such as their founding date, their primary audience, institutional/organizational associations, writing style, level of volunteer and paid work, submission and rejection rates, peer-review processes, as well as the motivations, values, and adopted roles of open access editors across interviews (Silverman 2003:357). The codes introduced to decipher the experiences of my respondents were “subject to ongoing revision or adjustment so that one might more fully and accurately develop concepts that better approximate the situations of the other” (Prus 1997:244). Open codes were provisionally tested throughout this exploratory phase.

Open codes were conceptualized through close adherence to the particular words, phrases, and larger thoughts of my respondents. What these open access journal editors said became the “grist for analysis” (Charmaz 2014:273). Open codes were developed by exploring the words of my participants and labelling exchanges using relevant categorical terms. The codes represented the words of my respondents, often in the form of a sentence or two, sometimes a conversational exchange. The grouping of similar instances allowed the various uses to which are particular concept is put. By understanding the dimensions of these concepts individual stories can be understood in generic and dimensional ways.

Conceptual validity was ensured by adhering to words of my respondents and subjecting them to microanalysis, this is one of the primary methods of digging deeply into the empirical instances recorded during the course of a research project. Strauss and Corbin (1998:65-69) define microanalysis as a process of “mining data” where researchers unpack the deep and complex meanings out of small bits of data. Phrases are considered for their potential insights, then, a researcher directs focus to particular significant words used by a respondent to decipher the possible meanings as well as the variable contexts that this participant, and others use it in. Microanalysis promotes reliability by grounding guiding concepts and concerns of researchers within the dimensions that have effects on how people use these concepts. Understanding the variable nature of concepts enables researcher to qualify and expand certain conceptual tools and uncover linkages between the different dynamic concepts people at the focus of the study use.

Computer software aided the analytical process of this thesis in keeping the codes uniform, and allowing every instance of a code to be grouped within one document. A major benefit of using computer software to analyze research is its ability quickly search all of the transcripts and memos for key words and phrases to be sure that a category or subcategory has been exhaustively represented (Weitzman 2003:319). Every code was entered individually and no automatic coding was performed. The analysis of the transcripts was completed with the original non-lexical sounds, run-on and spliced sentences from our conversations. These conversational occurrences were kept in the presentation of data when possible, though in some cases some transcript excerpts were edited for ease of presentation and compression when the complexity of the ideas contained could be maintained.

After the interview transcripts were exhaustively subjected to open coding. The codes and potential theoretical approaches to the interview transcripts were organized along the most

salient categories. This process worked to define what grounded theory scholars have termed axial codes (Strauss and Corbin 1998) or focused codes (Charmaz 2014). These codes are the core categories of the project because they form the axes around the initial concepts that were uncovered through interrogation of the data and open coding. They allow a researcher to analyze and sift a considerable amount of data in order to arrive at a precise but general conception of the subject matter at hand (Charmaz 2014:138). As the axial categories are related to subcategories their depth and structure can be understood, aspects that appear significant but are underdeveloped warrant and guide further investigation and collection of data (Strauss and Corbin 1998:142).

The final core categories, or axial codes, that were identified in consideration of the goals of understanding the experiences of open access editors in the social sciences and humanities in Canada are: philosophy, legitimacy, and resistance. Under these axial codes the rest of the codes were regrouped or abandoned as necessary. From that point, the subcategories were refined through the process of abductive logic and selective coding with the goal of achieving theoretical saturation. Abductive logic allows grounded theorists to “go beyond induction,” by “paying attention to data that do not fit under existing interpretive rules or earlier inductive generalizations” (Charmaz 2014:201). Abductive logic in grounded theory is also derived from the pragmatist roots of the theoretical framework employed for this study. Charles Pierce’s (1931) conception of abductive logic derived from inductive propositions that enable a researcher to derive testable hypotheses that tested against the empirical instances that have been collected. This method of testing my core categories and related subcategories to empirical tests was accomplished as I recoded all of my transcripts over selective coding. This involved searching for interview segments that confirmed and disconfirmed the theoretical apparatus

being developed to interpret my data. As missing details, contexts, and dimensions were searched out the core categories of this thesis were fleshed to an extent that allowed all of my categories and subcategories to be applicable to the generic theory applied to them, presented in the conclusion of this report.

The dataset provided enough cases so that the analysis did achieve theoretical saturation (Glasser 1978:124-126; Glasser and Strauss 1967:61-2, 111-2; Charmaz 2014:213-6) when it came to understanding the overarching subcategories which fall within the philosophies, means of achieving legitimacy, and forms of resistance of Canadian open access editors in the social sciences and humanities. The sample proved to be adequate to achieve this ends because cases converged to a significant degree, enabling my claims to be checked by the epistemological standard of the interactionist method (Bowen 2008:140) and readers (Blumer 1980:413). This means that after reaching an understanding of my core concepts, as I continued to collect fresh data I was not learning anything new about these three core categories. As such, I no longer needed to collect more interviews to develop an interesting and well supported argument (Wiener 2007:306; Thorne and Darbyshire 2005); the core categories were sufficiently saturated for data collection to cease.

In analyzing the interview responses of the open access editors in my sample I refrained from deleting any identifying information. This ensured that every possible detail from my interview was maintained throughout analysis. However, in order to present quotations that bear upon topics of my research, identifying information was removed from the quotations and the names of my respondents are substituted with pseudonyms. A random name generator¹⁸ was used in order to give my interviewees their pseudonyms. The names of individual respondents

¹⁸ <http://www.fakenamegenerator.com/>

are found in brackets following their quotations; the names of individuals who make up my sample are: Christopher, Tameka, Richard, Laurie, John, Ruth, Tina, Edwin, Daniela, Willie, Aaron, and Priscilla. Before moving onto the findings section I would like to express the indebtedness I feel for these individuals who donated their time to share with me their personal experiences, hardships, and a few laughs.

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS & ANALYSIS

The following chapter is broken up over three sections that detail the core categories that were arrived at in the final analysis of this project. These are: (1) the philosophies and ideals of open access enacted by these editors, (2) their strategies to achieve legitimate status in their discipline, and (3) open access publishing as resistance.

Essential to the conception of open access that all of the editors in my sample held are (a) open academic articles as costless, and (b) academic articles as accessible. These editors believe that individuals in society ought to be able to access and read the information that they are interested in through digital communication networks at no cost. Some editors consider accessibility in a two-fold sense, meaning that the articles may be obtainable, but the information contained therein must also be cognitively accessible to experts *and* lay readers alike. Thus, this section presents the essential components of open access across my sample and the dimensions of open access that vary. These findings are used to consider potential shortcomings and blind spots in the current academic literature on open access that can be introduced and refined.

The second findings section details the strategies that open access editors employ to achieve a status as a legitimate publication addressing their discipline. This section employs Bourdieu's (1984; 1986; 1993) conception of fields and forms of capital as well as Gieryn's (1983; 1999) conception of "boundary work" in science. The analysis focuses on the practical and ideological boundaries that open access editors draw including and excluding institutional players and individual agents to align their venture with the disciplinary vision of progress to include knowledgeable agents while excluding any sort of profiteering motivation.

The final findings section considers open access publishing as a force of resistance in academia. Open access editors situate themselves as subordinate to prestigious capitalist

publishers, academic institutions, and renowned academic authors in their discipline. They experience dominance through readers who dismiss their contributions or lump these journals along with “predatory journals,” journals that do not peer-review their articles and pry on naïve academics for profit. The editors in my sample actively resist these generic assumptions they encounter in their disciplinary field. These editors do not simply resist negative connotations of open access, but they also take a critical stance in regards to certain academic traditions. Their resistance against profit motives extends access to academic work to massive groups of people, and, on the other hand, their resistance to academic traditions extends the group of acceptable authors for an academic journal. Many of the journals in my sample extend authorship to community members who are knowledgeable about a particular subject that is in vogue in their discipline. Therefore it is argued that these editors enact a form of “extended rationality” as opposed to the “conventional rationality” (Chang 2004:418), as is normally enacted within their disciplinary field.

SECTION A – IDEALS OF OPEN ACCESS

This section delineates the ideals of open access that are apparent across my sample as well as the variable dimensions of open access. To the editors I interviewed, the ideal open access journal is one that has *no* accessibility barriers beyond access to a computer and publishes original, peer-reviewed academic work. Studying the abstract objects (Blumer 1969:10) that these editors enact such as “openness” and “accessibility” is the essential starting point for an interactionist study because understanding their ideals provides information about the “orientational content of group life” (Prus 1997:62). In Blumer’s (1969) words: “in order to understand the action of people it is necessary to identify their world of objects” (11). Ideals inform action, *symbols are used for practical purposes*. In other words, ideals are the foundation from whence social practices are constructed. To be sure, ideals vary depending on the unique individual who makes use of them, but by understanding the convergences and divergences of ideals within a social group can make apparent the essential and variable components of collective ideals.

The two major ideals of the open access philosophy contained within my sample can be made apparent through microanalysis (Strauss and Corbin 1998:65) of my e-mail respondent’s definition of open access. “All Open Access has ever meant to me is this: **Produce the best quality journal that we can in our field that is available to anyone who can log onto a computer**” (John, bold in original e-mail interview transcript). First, the journal is *available to anyone who can log into a computer*, meaning that it is *digitally accessible*. Considering a fragment of this phrase “available to anyone” points to the second major component of the open access philosophy, accessibility. Accessibility is often used in a two-fold sense by open access editors. First, the journal’s articles are *available* to anyone who is interested in accessing them

without restrictions such as fees or memberships. All published articles are always available on the webpages of these journals to anyone with an internet connection. Some editors even choose to produce physical copies of their journals so as to take advantage of multiple dissemination strategies. The second way in which “available” can be understood is in regards to *comprehensibility*. Considering that open access publishing opens up academic literature to the general public, some open access editors ensure that the information in their pages is appropriately contextualized and defined so that lay readers can understand the major thrust of each article. Before entering into a thorough discussion of the open access ideals held by the open access editors in my sample it should be noted that practices of open access publishing are composed of a set of *new* ideals that are situated within the historical context of academia. Therefore to understand these new ideals, the antecedent context in which they arose must be presented first (Blumer 1969:20).

Antecedent Academic Ideals of Open Access

More general academic ideals are antecedent to those of open access publishing in specific, and inform much of its spirit. There are two main academic standards that open access editors appeal to when developing their journals. First, they consider their niche in the contemporary literature to ensure that they stand to make a needed contribution to their discipline. Second, they have high quality standards relating to the quality of the research accepted for review and publication. All of the journals in my sample maintain their claim to quality and thoroughness through their commitment to peer-review conventions in academia.

Every one of the editors in my sample expressed a commitment to making a contribution to the literature in their field that they personally understood to be necessary and worthwhile. In

his initial considerations to formulate a journal, one editor understood that the type of work he appreciates has been

under-represented because there's a bit of a - it's almost forbidden [to use this theoretical lens], you know, it's considered a fallacy. [But] there's a lot to be learned from [this approach], I suppose I could say, that wasn't being reflected in the discipline (Willie).

These sorts of conceptualizations were common for open access editors conceptualizing their new publications. When asked what advice they would give to an editor who plans on launching an open access journal, my respondents all gave similar responses which is basically to know

what your topic is and how that fits into, y'know, within a niche in the literature, whether the journal is really needed, or a new area, or whatever. So y'know, the same issues that are involved the development of any journal apply to open-access journals (Christopher).

So academic conventions, particularly for new journals to make original and innovative contributions to their field, guide the ways in which editors conceptualize and realize their journals. By taking these concerns seriously, open access journal editors work to solidify their organizational identity as one that has connections to historical academic traditions and contemporary progressions within some disciplinary tradition.

The rationale that these editors cite when conceptualizing the academic niche that they want to address relates to improving the state of their discipline. They recognize that by providing a publication venue for a particular academic niche can improve the state of their discipline by enabling a dialectic between researchers developing this emergent niche as well as those who consider the merits of this new niche in light of classical standards. However, deciding upon a niche of which there is little or no need will weaken an academic discipline. Upon asking one of my interviewees the advice he would give to someone who is developing a new open access journal, he relays:

I would even caution against starting an open access journal... don't saturate the market. Only do it if you're offering something unique. If you're looking to aggrandize yourself or whatever, go volunteer at another journal. There's tons of- if you're doing it because you think it would be a

nice gold star on your CV, in many ways you're hurting the academic market. It's better to get behind the open access stuff that's out there than create another simulacrum – I think is the word – or whatever, doppelganger of something out there and diluting the work. 'Cause if push comes to shove, you have- journals have to publish, right? So if people are, instead of the best of the best going to certain OJS journals, it gets spread out against twenty; you're getting the dreck out there instead of quality work. And it's not necessarily on purpose it's because publish or perish in kind of a weird way (Richard).

Therefore the topical originality that these journals claim is the starting point of their claims to legitimacy that will be discussed further in the next section. For now it suffices to say that if a topic can be identified and claimed that has real import in their discipline then journals are able to situate their open access ideals within antecedent academic ideals.

As these editors conceptualize their publications and challenge certain academic conventions, their commitment to standards of academic knowledge verification, especially double-blind peer-review figure largely into their vision of what constitutes an authentic open access publication. As stated by one of my respondents, peer review improves the quality of an article, and this is essential because “[q]uality is the only edge a journal has” (John). Every one of the editors interviewed adhered to standards of peer-review for deciding what articles are ultimately published. One of my respondents describes this sort of tension as requiring creative energies and an innovative spirit: “I think it's creative in the sense that it's - it's a slightly more exciting format... but we still - we still have fairly traditional values around peer review and that kind of thing” (Willie).

Academic conventions figure largely into the conceptualizations and enactments of these journals. However, it must be noted that the major emphases of an open access philosophy in my sample is on *free* and *easy* accessibility. Therefore the open access philosophy holds ideals of (1) free accessibility, (2) digital accessibility, and, in some cases, (3) broad comprehensibility, situated within historically precedented academic standards. These ideas can be considered inherent considerations of those who want to realize open access projects and an exhaustive

conceptualization of the ideals held by the open access editors in my sample. Finally, it should be noted that the ideals discussed within this section are based on editors of pure, as opposed to hybrid, open access journals that abide by classic academic standards, as opposed to preying on naïve or desperate academics for profit. Qualifying my sample in such a way depicts the type of adherence to open access these editors enact in their journals. The findings in this section can improve academic conceptions of open access and avoid conflating potentials with practical definitions. The final subsection discusses Peter Suber's (2012) definition of open access in light of the ideals and practical definitions of the editors in my sample.

Open Access as in Free

The essential ideal of open access that is common across my entire research sample is that open access journals ought to achieve unhindered digital dissemination by placing their articles online free of charge. In the words of one of my respondents: "Information should have zero marginal costs to access it" (Christopher). This respondent goes on to compare his publishing practices to other academic publishers who do charge their readers. "[Dominant publishers] are there to maximize profit, and I don't think that should be the model for research. [They] should be there to, basically, to make research available to the widest possible number of people" (Christopher). Another editor who sees the obvious advantage of "open-access [as] simply being open and free" and describes himself as "a big believer in the principle of open access" who is "excited about the prospects of what can happen when a journal is in the world as opposed to behind a pay wall" (Willie). This editor situates the majority of contemporary academic work within

an economy based on scarcity. And so you have to hunt the stuff down and find it and it's in a niche environment. And the internet is an economy of abundance.... I think scholarly exchange is - it's an intellectual economy - it's not a monetary economy. And I think it does - I think the [current status of scholarly exchange] does fly in face of the whole idea of open access (Willie).

Open accessibility to academic work is the opposite of the current state of affairs in academia according to this editor. By offering digital documents that cost nothing to replicate (Suber 2012:45), this ideal inherently challenges the current structure of an “academic economy” and the practical conventions related to exchanging academically-validated ideas.

These editors attempt to challenge larger cultural norms that tend to privilege the most expensive journals effectively excluding potential readers without academic credentials. These academic and scientific editors break “down those barriers of knowledge. Instead of always hogging the knowledge for ourselves it provides an opportunity for more people to just have access to it, and that’s important” (Tameka). These journal editors each believe something along the lines of this respondent’s claim: “everyone should have access to this information and it should be accessible to people of lower income levels” (Tina). These editors consider most people unable to afford access to academic journals that might interest them. They often cite students, non-profit researchers, or First Nations peoples as deriving significant benefits from the open access medium. In one journal that focuses on indigenous peoples, the editor states:

in the world of indigenous people you’re talking about lots of people who don’t have access through mainstream channels. And there’s a lot of work that’s happening at the grassroots [level] and so we felt that it was really important that the work that was published in the journal was accessible – sort of – at all levels, to academics to government policy makers as well as to communities, [and] community leaders... I think that there’s also the potential that you will have that broader reach, ‘cause if it’s a print journal that’s only through academic libraries only people within academia or who have some other reason to seek it out are going to find it. Whereas ours, from looking at our Facebook page, a lot of the people who like the journal aren’t necessarily academics, most of them are community people or work for non-profits or that kind of thing and I think we would miss those people entirely if we had a traditional pay model (Priscila).

As one of my respondents muses: “we know that like great minds live in people that don’t have any money” (Ruth). Interested people of varying socio-economic status may prove to be important in uncovering the blind-spots of theories and alternate interpretations of findings (Collins 1990; Harrding 2001). Therefore, open access ventures begin by simply putting their

information online for free, but do so, particularly, to resist capitalist interests that have lasting impacts upon scholars, marginalized groups, and public dialogue.

One editor discusses profit motives as antithetical to academic ideals of producing consistently good work.

I've talked to the other editors [working for for-profit publishers] and they haven't felt any control – editorial control – being placed on them except for they've had huge pressure to expand the number of times they publish. ... Now they publish six times a year. And quite frankly the quality's gone down because they have to generate enough stuff. (Laurie).

Removing profit-oriented interests from academic publication ventures is the basic ideal of open access publishers. Removing price-barriers extends access of peer-reviewed work to academics, policy makers, and interested members of the public. Many of whom may have been marginalized, or denied access and the benefits associated with it, from cutting edge scientific and academic dialogues. Therefore, free accessibility and goes “hand-in-hand with the whole concept of [making] knowledge accumulative” (Ruth). This is supposed to counteract the organizational forms of bias and exclusion that are always present in scientific communities (Crane 1972; Mitroff 1974) and promotes skepticism of academically-validated findings (Willinsky 2009:156) that are typically uncritically trusted by non-experts (Giddens 1991:196). This represents a dramatic change to the “contagion process” of knowledge dissemination (Crane 1972:70-2), through making use of the non-capitalist interstitial space of the internet (Wright 2010:327), that is related to *both* formal and informal communication systems in academia by introducing a *public network* aspect to it. Therefore, open access provides a method to achieve a public-mission of a discipline (Puddephatt and Price forthcoming).¹⁹ Researchers are able to access and more easily build off of humanity's collective stock of knowledge when information is able to be disseminated widely (Lawrence 2001:521; Hajjem, Harnad, and Gingras 2005). For

¹⁹ Such as Burawoy's (2005) call for public sociology.

my respondents, making information easily accessible makes it more likely that people will read and cite it (Swan 2010) and give it a higher likelihood of influencing groups of people. In the apt words of one of my respondents: “of course, it’s much easier to have open-access when you’re not interested in maximizing your revenues” (Christopher).

The Accessibility of Open Access

The second major ideal that these editors hold beyond online accessibility: *ease* of accessibility. However, there are various ways in which the term “available” can be qualified. The ideas contained within peer-reviewed articles must be digitally accessible to an internet user as well as cognitively accessible to the reader. The twofold emphasis of ease of accessibility in regards to technological infrastructure, as well as writing styles, were expressed equally by the open access editors in my sample and will be discussed in turn.

The following exchange emphasize the ease of accessibility of the technological medium:

Taylor – What is the ideal form of open-access to you?

Christopher – Well I think that we have the ideal form. Yeah, we’re basically there, you don’t need a password, none of that. Our articles come up on search engines. I guess, we don’t have our own website for it, it’s under the website of [our affiliate], we should have our own website, I guess. But there’s no, uh, restrictions on anything. We have the whole archive back to [our first issue]. What more open-access could one have really? (Edited for clarity)

A barrier as considerably small as needing to set up a user account to access the articles is perceived as a hindrance to free accessibility and broad dissemination; no open access journals encountered (including those beyond my sample) during this research erected such a barrier. Besides that, this editor and others in my sample perceive an ideal open access publication as one with a website that appears along with relevant search terms in a search engine, with every issue freely available on their website.

Even if a website is designed without accessibility barriers, such as the ones described by Christopher, these editors must exert constant vigilance in order to ensure that their user interface does not come between an interested reader and the information embedded within one of their articles. In the words of another of my respondents:

I do think the other thing that really helped us was having an established publishing platform. Because to have the technical side working well is also really important because if you launch on your own website and it doesn't work properly, or it crashes all the time people, will get frustrated and they won't give you a second chance. So I think having the technical side taken care of is important (Priscilla).

These editors all similarly express that the internet enables the free flow of information so that the online economy of ideas is one of “abundance” (Willie). In order to compete in this sort of economy, information must flow freely, or else potential readers will seek out their information from a less challenging source.

Opening accessibility to cutting-edge, academically validated information can help to improve the lot of marginalized populations who have few economic resources. By publishing online for free these editors believe that the potential academic and public impact of their publication is increased. However, for these editors, publishing online for free is only one method of empowering others with access to peer-reviewed research, some open access journals even publish hardcopies. Reconsidering a quote from above: “in the world of indigenous people you're talking about lots of people who don't have access through mainstream channels” (Priscilla). Indeed, there are uneven internet permeation rates across Canadians, primarily leaving indigenous peoples on the have-not side of the digital divide (McMahon 2014). This means that, counterintuitively, physical dissemination methods may run parallel to and help realize the accessibility ideal of open access. As one of my participants relays:

We also sell hardcopies, but I think we're just trying to reach as many students as possible... hard copies of our issues [are sold] solely at the cost of producing them. But they're all free on our website and free for download, to whoever wants to see them (Aaron).

There are many ways to make academic work *accessible* to interested readers. Making the work as accessible as possible is often a concern for these editors when they are embarking on publishing their new journals. “The whole point of open access is to be accessible, readable, free, easy, not easy as in content, but like, easy as in accessibility, I suppose” (Ruth, edited for clarity).

However, this quote illustrates a point of contention within my sample. Many of my respondents expressed that publishing freely accessible peer-reviewed research online also brings with it the responsibility of publishing articles that are *cognitively accessible* to interested lay people.

The internet is an economy of abundance and I - I want to see scholarly communication - I want to see how it fares in that kind of an economy. Because I think the need to - the rhetorical need to actually appeal to an audience will change the way scholars communicate for the better. Scholars can communicate the way they do in the typical formats because they have a captive audience and their readers need to read - they have to read that material, right? And they kind of take advantage of that, and scholarship has a reputation for being boring. I think if you - I think one of the biggest drivers of change in scholarly communication is getting out via new media into the wider networked culture. And once you're out there as a scholar, it changes how you understand communication. And you have the opportunity to speak to a lay audience, you have the possibility of, you know, your research getting picked up, linked to, aggregated, cited, far more rampantly than it might be in a closed scholarly environment (Willie).

By knowing that they are writing to massive audiences, including people with varying levels of education, academics may delineate their findings in clear and generally accessible terms so that more people may understand the importance of their work. Many of the editors in my sample want to find a happy medium between peer-reviewed research standards and widespread comprehensibility. One editor goes as far to say that:

Christopher -We're not a, not an academic journal. We actually want to be read,
Taylor – [laughs]

Christopher – uh, by people and that's why we're, uh, open-access and so we're not as worthy as the most prestigious journal in [our field], far from it, we're a journal that focusing on, uh, [a particular] issue, uh, from an applied perspective. We want to have articles that are of use to policy makers, as well as academic[s]. Our articles are not just like op-eds. Y'know, they're, they're research articles and synthesis articles. They're, they're serious pieces. But they're not,

let's say, uh, and some of them are really kind of frontier knowledge as well – but we like to make them accessible.

These journals adhere to academic standards of knowledge production but do not want to limit themselves by being defined as “merely academic.” These editors speak of high academic standards as indispensable to what they do. However, as the previous quotes show, being considered purely academic can discourage a general audience from reading through the work they publish; diminishing the impact of their publication. Enabling access to and critiques from a wide array of individuals, each occupying varying social positions, and holding social values to various degrees, helps to qualify and validate the generality of any research findings. Publishing important work that has generic public import is a goal for any academic journal, but these goals have the potential to pervert their original goal of publishing important work.

Reprise – Open Access Ideals and Practical Philosophies

Considering the fact that these journals are less worthy compared to the most prestigious journals in their fields, perhaps it is the unintended consequences of *these* ideals that result in their subordinate status in their discipline. These journals operate without profits and rely heavily on the volunteer hours of a small number of academics. As a result, they will not be able to provide monetary incentive to potential staff, thus turning away some of the best people. “It was possible to create a journal for very little money” (Willie) was a constant theme expressed by many of my interviewees. As noted by another open access editor: “there are some issues with open access journals, just because in the way that we did, anyone can pick up an open access journal and produce a pile of crap” (Richard). However, they are able to offer tangible rewards to scholars such as experience publishing articles, and successful young editors can gain symbolic capital and pragmatic editorial expertise. One of the editors in my sample is young up-and-coming academic who

just had a job interview for a tenure track job and it really- it's [being an open access journal editor] something they kept bringing up. It differentiated me from the other candidates. And when [another one of the editors] goes out and does interviews I'm sure it'll be a "oh this is a very neat thing on your CV too" (Richard).

Conversely, it ought to be noted that this criticism is challenged by others on grounds that it is "well established that there's no clear correlation between price and quality" (Crawford 2011:44) of academic journals.

The second potential pitfall of abiding to the ideals of open access described above is that a commitment to enabling broad comprehensibility may compromise the integrity of the subject matter contained in the article, turning off serious academics from reading the research. While some journal editors in my sample did express a commitment to this vision of accessibility, none of them expressed it as a prerogative of some academic ideal. These editors believe that there are multiple venues for various levels of scholarship, and that they are symbiotic, rather than antagonistic, within their discipline.

I can remember we had one article that was very heavy economic theory and a lot of math a lot of that kind of thing. And so we had suggested that this might not be the right audience for that particular paper.... But that being said we've published things with very sophisticated statistics and that kind of thing as well. But we do like to make sure, and also because it's an international audience things are contextualized well so people from various backgrounds can read it and understand it (Priscilla).

Indeed, open access scholars have considered both of these arguments and have classified them as myths that exaggerate, or describe completely false, consequences of various forms of open access publications (Crawford 2011:46-52). In order to prevent these types of shortcomings, in every case, these editors ensure that they abide by academic standards. This is the third essential component of the "open access philosophy" enacted by my research participants.

Open access editors conceptualize and implement their journals so that anyone on Earth with a reliable internet connection can access the information they publish for free. Their ideals are situated with classical academic and scientific concerns, all the while, they adhere to what

they identify as novel ideals inherent to open access publishing. Collecting information on the enacted ideals of open access editors and analyzing them provides accurate information about what is actually going on in regards to open access publication organizations. There has been an increasing amount of scholarship on the topic of open access publishing, defining concepts, delineating possibilities and pitfalls, describing strategies and challenges to open access publishing. However, the literature on open access publishing relating to ideals and motivations are often far removed from the *actual practices* of those who are realizing it, or if they are not far removed, the authors do not explain the methods in which they developed these understandings. The methodological implications of symbolic interactionism compel researchers to develop an understanding of the ideological bedrock that individuals use to construct their actions. Therefore this section will consider the emphases that open access editors place in conceptualizing their organizational publishing venture in light of the popular academic definition of open access within the literature.

This section critiques the basic and often cited definition of open access and offers a moderate revision in light of the practical philosophies of the open access editors in my sample. The definition referenced here is from Peter Suber's (2012) book on open access. This book defines as "digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions" (Suber 2012:4). Captured within this definition is the true emphasis placed on open access by editors in my sample as improving readership generally, and occasionally, enabling authors to retain copyrights, meaning that they may publish their articles in a different publication or medium (Daniela, Richard, Tameka, and Aaron). However, there is more to this definition. Suber (2012:5) continues to develop a conception of open access that prevents the harms of classical copyrights. When open access publications do not remove permission barriers related to the re-

use of findings by others, Suber (2012) claims that this “harms research authors by limiting the usefulness of their work, harms research readers by limiting the uses they may make of works even when they have access, and thereby harm research from both directions. OA removes these barriers” (5). However, this statement appears to be far removed from the ways that open access editors understand changes to re-use rights.

The following statement contains an ideal of re-usability that most open access editors believe to be worthwhile. Open access editors do not make these sorts of considerations when conceptualizing and implementing their journals. Therefore this section concludes by arguing that the basic definition of open access ought to be updated to emphasize changes to copyright practices that effect authors and de-emphasize reader re-use rights, considering the enacted visions of those who actually realize open access publishing. Richard’s statement below stands in for the general attitude held by the open access editors in my sample in regards to article re-use rights.

Taylor – Does your journal use copyright or creative commons licensing or do you prefer one or the other?

Richard – To be completely honest, I don’t think it’s something we concern ourselves very much. I think it’s listed on our website I think we have a DC-NA-something-something. Frankly I think the license that, not like we’d hunt down someone who took their article and publish it somewhere. If they tried to pass it off and publish it in a closed-access [toll-access] journal they might have issues, it hasn’t happened yet. But it’s not like we’ll flip out if someone takes it and uses it as the basis for a chapter in a book. I mean that’s the whole entire point of open access to get your stuff out there. I think the only thing we ask for is recognition in like a subscript or endnote that it was published in our journal first. And again, if they forget that I don’t think anyone here would become predatory or aggressive about licensing issues. It defeats the whole purpose.

The whole purpose being to get information out into the minds of interested people and *removing barriers for others to access the work*.

Open access proponents often consider reader re-use rights to contain some of the most interesting and empowering possibilities of open access publishing (Carroll 2011; Molloy 2011; Steele 2012), though this is not a consideration of those in my sample who actively realize an

open access publication. Another editor expresses a similar one as the editor above in regards to Creative Commons licences for the academic work they publish.

I don't think we had a lot of discussion about, we just sort of looked through them and I mean, we don't want our articles being used for commercial purposes 'cause that's against the access-ethics sort of thing. But we did want to allow them to be republished elsewhere if that's what the author wanted to do (Priscilla).

I explained to her that the Creative Commons license that her journal currently uses allows readers to re-mix the contents of their articles into other mediums, then I asked if she had encountered readers doing anything like that. “We've never had anyone bring to us.... I can't even imagine what- how it would be adapted, but perhaps someone will do it one day” (Priscilla). Readers re-mixing academic content was considered unimaginable to this respondent and no editors have been made aware of interested readers re-mixing their content. Obviously, this is not conclusive evidence that people do not remix academic content, however, this is not a salient need of those who are actually realizing open access publications. Including a strong emphasis, as opposed to a light possibility, on reader re-use rights in open access publishing is indeed far removed from the ways in which people who develop open access publications actually *develop* their journals in line with their ideals. Furthermore, when re-use rights are provided, it has been found that readers are *extremely* unlikely to even take advantage of their new capabilities provided by Creative Commons' copyright strategies (Hargittai and Walejko 2008). Therefore, including such a strong emphasis on this mere possibility of open access publishing is unfounded and ought not to be so readily emphasized throughout all definitions of open access. Reader reuse rights are a possibility for open access publications rather than an inherent outcome.

SECTION B – LEGITIMACY

“I wouldn’t be surprised if you found things of yeah there’s always this kind of legitimacy thing.... I would not be surprised that that was a theme in your research” (Richard).

A legitimate academic or scientific journal addresses a particular niche, publishes peer-reviewed reports, and is commonly read and cited by established academics. This section will go beyond the ideal standards these editors perceive to be legitimate to include the additional but essential practical aspect of achieving legitimacy as an academic publication. The practical methods of achieving legitimacy include defining the social boundaries of their organization, maintaining academic integrity over time, and developing stocks of academic capital. Their position as a new open access journal in their disciplinary field tends to disadvantage them in their attempts to claim a status as a legitimate journal.

The editors in my sample create positive associations, or define boundaries of inclusivity, with educational institutions, academic associations, the individual members of their editorial board, and academic indexes. These editors also create boundaries of exclusivity by defining their operation in contrast to predatory and for-profit publishers. Boundaries capture the social process of relationality (Emirbayer 1997) by conceptualizing the important symbols of particular social circles that conflict between with other socio-cultural practices (Lamont and Molnár 2002). In the case of academics, boundaries depend on organizations and driving principles that

are at the heart of their discipline (Gieryn 1983; 1999). These editors retain control over their publication and actively manage their claims to legitimacy. Journals that are well-regarded in their respective fields have longstanding claims to legitimacy, whereas many of the journals in my sample published their first issues relatively recently. Therefore they occupy an objectively low position, in regards to access to large stocks of the various types of capital as Bourdieu understands them, but they manage what they do have to accrue more academic or scientific capital. More academic capital results in upward mobility in status in a field within academia as well as additional responsibilities that are considered to be prestigious (Bourdieu 1988:84). As journals gain academic capital they must maintain associations with groups and individuals that provide them with the various forms of capital, while, at the same time, isolating themselves from those players in academic publishing that are associated with unethical practices in academic publishing.

The inclusive boundaries that these editors demarcate provide their organization with varying types of capital. Bourdieu's (1984; 1986; 2004) five-fold distinction of capital includes (1) economic capital or financial assets, (2) human capital or workforce potential, (3) social capital or network connections, (4) cultural capital or normative competency, and (5) symbolic capital or significant distinguishing markers. The first association that open access journal editors form is with an educational institution or academic association. This association primarily works to secure the economic capital necessary to start their journal. Though this association also provides symbolic capital in parallel to the organization's level of prestige as well as access to networks of potential human capital. The editorial board of a journal is a big priority for a journal because endorsements from leading academics provides a symbolic distinction to a journal. This group of people may also be called on to provide their services to the journal, but as the

discussion of this association will show, the editorial board's primary function is symbolic. The final positive association that will be discussed is between the journal and its authors and reviewers. Authors and reviewers are the prime suppliers of human capital, they provide original research articles and peer-review them. Secondary to the human labour that they provide these individuals may also endow a journal with symbolic capital depending on their academic stature. Finally the cultural capital, or normative competency, that these editors accrue is related to what Bourdieu (1988:84; 2001:51) defined as cultural capital unique to intellectual endeavours and institutions, academic or scientific capital.

Interestingly, these editors do not gain any form of legitimacy from positively associating their journal with the so-called open access movement. The open access movement appears to have improved the lot of many of these journals by providing the technological infrastructure that publishes their journals online; the Public Knowledge Project's *Online Journal System*, and Berkley University's *B-Press* are two of the dominant platforms in open access publishing and my sample. The open access movement may provide an infrastructure to publish academic material online, however, according to the editors in my sample, relative to traditional publishing forms, open access publishing platforms do not provide the symbolic capital that is absolutely necessary for these ventures to achieve widespread recognition and acceptance in their discipline.

Managing these varying types of assets requires developing fair and synergistic relationships with those who fall within the borders demarcating this academic venture. However maintaining these resources also requires excluding particular others who threaten the ideological-practical cohesiveness of the organization. When social positions and resources are managed properly within an academic field, the individual or organization that manages those

resources accrue academic legitimacy or what Bourdieu (2004) has termed “scientific capital” or “a set of properties which are the product of acts of knowledge and recognition performed by agents engaged in the scientific field,” hence developed through peer-to-peer interaction, “and therefore [endows an individual with] specific categories of perception that enable them to make the pertinent distinctions, in accordance with the principle of pertinence that is constitutive of the *nomos* of the field” (55).

Before presenting the findings, my choice of terminology should be adequately rationalized. In discussing the problem of being recognized by their peers as a publication worthy of their attention, the editors in my sample did indeed use some other words to discuss this same idea. Some of the other words used in this regard are: authentic, credible, serious, real. However, “legitimate” was the word that was used the most frequently compared to the others. Further, legitimacy goes beyond adhering to academic or scientific norms, or to be “credible” or “authentic,” and it appears to capture a more general kind of acceptance into a discipline. This terminology also connects with the radical interactionist framework to view those who challenge certain social norms using the cultural logic of that social group as a “legitimate dominative encounter” (Athens 2015:167). The forms of dominance that these editors challenge will be discussed further in the next section, though situating the open access movement as occurring within the social *and* cultural parameters of academia and science situates that its claims to legitimacy are based upon widespread assumptions *already present* within their community.

To reinforce this conception of legitimacy, consider two quotes containing mentions of “legitimacy” from my interviewees. “I mean these guys [predatory publishers] are the reason why there is a legitimacy issue” (Richard). The simple existence of predatory open access journals effects the legitimacy of authentic and credible open access journals. This is because

they are lumped into the same category as illegitimate and unethical publications. Therefore they have been given an illegitimate persona regardless of the academic standards they abide by.

Another quote:

We have a very large editorial board. Members from countries all over the world. So I think they're really important in personally promoting the journal in their country and in their field. I think the personal touch is important for establishing yourself as a legitimate journal. There's fly-by-night ones that aren't really good in terms of their standards. So I do think that that's helped. So mainly we've used- we have a fairly large network of people and that's been the main way that we've got other people involved (Priscilla).

In order to contradict the appearance of illegitimacy, editor emphasises the importance of networks and personal encounters to promote their open access journal. This gives their journal an appearance of legitimacy because there are established academics who accept a formal association with the journal. This conceptualization points to the rationale behind adopting “legitimacy” as a core category. Legitimacy is worked out over time through many interactions. A legitimate journal goes beyond recognizing a potential need in the research literature and publishing reliable findings related to these topics, they are also widely recognized as such by established scholars in their discipline.

Now, to consider some contrasting quotes. Two of my interviewees did not use the term legitimacy throughout our interview, but instead relied on the concept of “credibility.” “I think that's one of the struggles open access journals have is not the credibility of what they publish, but the credibility within an academic tenure system” (Edwin). In this case, the editor is using the perception of dubious credibility to consider open access journals' continuous undervaluation in his discipline. While credibility is emphasized in this quote, this editor's sentiment points towards the structural position of open access journals. The second editor who relied on the term “credibility” to discuss the relative position of open access journals presents his view thusly,

I don't even know how to like, you know, identify what that issue is. It's - I guess, it's the overall issue of the credibility of open-access, which is constantly evolving and increasing, but it's still -

it's still there, you know, in peoples' minds I think it touches on something that's really important which is credibility and where does your open-access journal fit within the grand scheme of things? (Willie).

Again, this editor references open access journals' relative structural position and points to the perceived credibility as a *reason* for this particular positioning. Therefore, aligned with my conceptualization above, authenticity and credibility are indeed components of a journal's claim to legitimacy. To be authentic and credible according to peers in a particular discipline are necessary but not sufficient conditions to be perceived as "legitimate." Legitimacy is developed through sustained interactions with important and new scholars within a particular discipline. The following section will present the ways in which open access journal editors attempt to achieve legitimacy in their field. They do so by defining cultural and social boundaries around their publication and maintaining these boundaries in order to maintain and develop their academic capital.

Boundaries of Inclusivity

The first major association that these journals form is between their organization and an educational/research institution such as a university. Open access journals derive economic capital by forming associations with research institutions and academic-scientific funding agencies such as the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC),²⁰ or other institutions that provide funds to academic ventures such as universities or non-profit organizations. Other journals partner with academic associations, or may be completely independent. The major positive social boundary between a journal and its host institution often provides the journal with steady funding and develops the academic reputation of the host institution. Their reputations are reciprocal the journal is a reflection of its hosts and vice versa.

²⁰ This organization is funded by the government of Canada

These institutions and associations are often the first major investors in an academic journal. They not only lend financial support to the academic venture, but they also lend their symbolic capital and social capital. They provide symbolic support because, while the journal is young, the institution that supports it has a longstanding history of enabling the production and dissemination of good research. These associations and institutions provide social capital by virtue of being active in academic networks, thereby enabling access to a broad network of advisors and human capital. A majority of the journals in my sample received this initial form of support from the editor's educational institution or academic association.

The primary method of accruing symbolic capital that was common to all of the journals within my sample is to achieve and maintain a prestigious editorial board. Having a list of famous academics on a journal's editorial board was identified by all of my interviewees to be one of the major strengths of their journals. One of my respondents substantiates my use of the conceptual divisions of capital by using them to conceptualize his own journal's strategies to succeed.

We wanted to have like a full-on, you know, powerhouse of a journal. And the way to do that for us was to get a really strong editorial board. So we pooled our resources in terms of cultural capital, academic capital - that was the big kind of - it's not literally funding but it's capital and so we capitalised our project with the intellectual capital of our editorial board and that was one of the big - the big priorities.... [So now] we have an advisory board and an editorial board, and we made kind of an advisory board of like the most famous people we could think of (Willie).

The editorial board provides symbolic capital to the journal, and urges others in the same field to take this new journal seriously. The individuals that lend their symbolic capital to the journal may also draw upon the pragmatic aspects of their scientific capital in order to advise its founders on strategies to succeed as well engage their networks to garner the interest of authors in the discipline.

We have an editorial board of about 50 people who are involved with the journal and I think that made a huge difference cause, one, it gives you a broad base for advice what the journal should

be what its policy should be, so you get a sort of breadth of knowledge. And then, you get the sort of networking opportunities. People who would take advertisements to a conference they were going to, that sort of personal touch that I really think helps establish you as a legitimate journal and a place that authors should consider publishing with (Priscilla).

These boards also provide networks of potential reviewers “we have 25 people on our advisory board so I’ll say, “here’s a couple of articles, here’s their abstract, if you know someone or if you’re interested in reviewing it let me know”” (Edwin). Indeed, securing a prestigious editorial board is always one of the “big priorities” for open access editors and is essential to securing the future of their journal. Journal editors may engage these networks in order to find reviewers or complete tasks. However, the role of the editorial board is primarily symbolic.

In choosing the members of the editorial board of an open access journal, individuals who are chosen are supposed, primarily, to provide symbolic support to open access journals. In one case, those with the highest relative amount of symbolic capital tend to lend the least amount of labour whereas those with the least amount of relative symbolic capital must provide the most amount of labour because they are still in the process of proving themselves in their field.

And so we got a great wish-list of people involved, and we made that special designation - some journals have advisory and editorial, some just have just editorial boards - we wanted to have a-kind of like that, sort of, echelon of people involved and then not really ask them - ask too much of them. But they lend their intellectual [read symbolic] capital to the project by being on our masthead, and then we have another roster of - in our editorial board, of people who are not as well established, a little younger, who do a little bit more work for us in terms of peer review and that kind of thing and who may have edited issues and things like that (Willie).

In the case of another journal that recognized that they needed

to expand our editorial board” when they asked many of their prestigious colleagues to add their names to their editorial board “they say “yes, you can [use my name,] I trust you”, but then they say “don’t send any papers to review” (Daniela).

The capital, symbolic and otherwise, provided to journals by their editorial boards are integral to their success. However the symbolic nature of a particular editorial board member appears to outweigh the contributions this person makes vis- à-vis their human capital potential. All the open access journal editors I spoke to who were founding members of their journals discussed

their intense search for of top-tiered researchers to be included in their editorial board. These editors often attribute their journal's continued success to the initial symbolic investment that these individuals of the editorial board provide to their academic venture.

These journals develop their symbolic capital and networking capabilities, or social capital, by becoming included in academic indexes.

I mean for me it's not that much important. But it's important to the writer. If you're for example one- since I am in Sweden, Sweden look for the ISI, Scopus, but also Norwegian index. But if I want to attract somebody from Australia they have their own index. And so indexes comprise a complex system in which it's hard to compete. If you want to really attract the international community then it's important to be part of different indexes from different part of the world because Sweden will not rely on index in India, right? (Daniela, edited for clarity).

The inclusion in academic indexes provides a readily apparent symbol of their existence within the boundaries of academia. One editor emphasizes the ability of indexes to improve the dissemination of their articles.

I think that's important for one, increasing your exposure so people have a better chance of finding you and establishing yourself as a legitimate academic journal.... We're part of I think sociological abstracts and – I'm pulling up our webpage, we get our numbers through the publishing platform that we use – ProQuest, EBSCO. So those are two of the big popular ones and interdisciplinary ones which is also important for our journal 'cause it's not just one discipline (Priscilla).

On the other hand, simply being included in an index improves the perceived legitimacy of a journal, even if they are not particularly interested in being widely cited. In the case of a graduate journal, being included in academic indexes

is one the things that we learned from [our librarian mentors] and y'know we never would have thought of indexing if it hadn't been for [them] and the idea is yeah we're a teaching journal but yeah it would be nice if someone publishes something if it actually gets out there. I mean DOAJ [Directory of Open Access Journals] is- putting our stuff in DOAJ and having our stuff picked up by ProQuest and EBSCO is a good thing, but I really think it goes back to the legitimacy issue again that [my co-editor] and I bring up- brought up. Again we're fighting a double-fronted battle here with being a graduate journal but also being an open-access journal. And it's one of these things that y'know you need DOIs you need indexing if you want to be taken seriously. It's one of the things just to boost the legitimacy (Richard).

The appearance of legitimacy is dramatically increased based on a journal's inclusion in

particular academic indexes.

In the case of the journal in my sample that identifies with radical scholarship, the founding editor did not make any attempts to be included in these academic indexes due to the interrelationships between academic indexes and for-profit companies. “We do, you know, we’ve got connections with ERIC, we certainly appear in Google scholar. So, you know, like it appears in places but it’s not indexed... And that does hurt us, you know, in some quarters” (Laurie). These cases prove especially enlightening in regards to perceived the advantages and disadvantages to a journal’s claims to legitimacy that follow based on the symbolic outcomes of being included in academic indexes.

However, there is a completely different approach to indexes which is present in my sample; the total disregard of them. The editors who perceive little importance in their journal’s inclusion in academic indexes do so because they themselves do not use them and they believe that popular search engines such as Google do a good job of enabling people to find research articles online. The following exchange is typical of this attitude in my sample (Christopher, John).

Taylor – is it important for your journal be indexed in various indexes?

Christopher – not really, that’s an academic thing as well. I guess there’s nothing wrong with it but we really haven’t bothered to try. So I guess we, y’know, we could but, I don’t know, I find nowadays indexes are kind of redundant. If you want, just google something and it comes up.

Therefore, most of the respondents in my sample expressed that developing a positive association between their journals and academic indexes improved their claims to legitimacy. On the other hand, certain journals were indifferent to the possibility of being included in academic indexes. It should be noted that these indifferent editors did work for journals that can be considered to be widely recognized as legitimate within their research field and thus are no longer attempting to gain or improve a legitimate status in their discipline.

The open access editors in my sample draw important boundaries around academic human capital. These editors draw boundaries around authors and reviewers that will imbue their publication with legitimacy owing to the intellectual work that they complete and objectify as research articles published within this particular publication. One editor discusses the difficulty new journals often encounter in collecting content for their first issue.

The first issue was pretty difficult because you're no-one - you don't really exist yet, so nobody knows who you are and you have to kind of cobble together your first issue through networking and connections and things like that, and not everybody has time to kind of just produce a paper on spec for your first issue (Willie).

These authors are producing “on spec” or based on speculation of the journal’s future success. Publishing a paper in a journal that has yet to prove its mettle in academic circles is a considerable risk for academics who are also attempting to establish themselves, or those attempting to maintain a standard of excellence on their *curriculum vitae*. These journal editors mobilize resources that they do have, mainly members of their editorial board, to solicit submissions from academics who have proven their legitimate status. Publishing articles by leading scholars is considered to be a “big strength” (Christopher) of many of the journals in my sample, indispensable to their methods of establishing themselves as legitimate publications in their fields.

Aside from authors who produce their content, these journals require credible academics to lend their time to review the papers. Abiding by academic standards of peer-review was equally emphasized by all of my interviewees. Peer-reviewers for academic journals are anonymous. In every case, the editors in my sample express a deep commitment to seeking out the best possible reviewers for each individual article. However, it can be difficult for them to find reviewers considering that many academics are still skeptical of the ultimate worth of new open access journals in their discipline. The novelty of open access journals often prevents their

ability to readily attract reviewers. “It’s difficult to attract the reviewers. Why they should spend their valuable time for a journal which is open access?” (Daniela). As mentioned before, editorial board members often provide symbolic support as opposed to human labour and so these editors must seek out new potential reviewers themselves. Peer-reviewers are always volunteers and so some editors have difficulty motivating them to review their papers on time, “especially in summertime being like ok, guys- everybody edit your... edit this paper, and they’re like I just want to go to camp.... Getting feet on the ground is tough” (Ruth). However, motivating peer-reviewers appears to be considerably more difficult for young academic journals compared to established ones.

Our experience has been the best. Some other journals have experienced a lack of motivation on the part of editors, key reviewers, etc. Academics are a fairly lazy group. it [sic] can be difficult to get them to do anything on time. Some journals have suffered from this. [But for us it is] rarely a problem, most are back in time. (John).

The intensity of challenges related to a journal’s ability to secure good authors and reviewers is directly related to their widespread acceptance as a legitimate journal in their discipline, or not.

Open access editors maintain and develop their journal’s claim to legitimacy by ensuring that their actions are coherent with their philosophies and maintaining the boundaries they have conceptualized between their own publication and others in their field. The editors in my sample are constantly vigilant in regards to maintaining their integrity as an academic journal that is free and of considerable quality.

Always cross your “T”s and dotting your “I”s because people are watching you.... in terms of your audience or people who are funding you, or whatever, you know, people are always looking for opportunities to shit on your parade. Being diligent... is huge. Like [my co-editor] said, you have to find a niche in the market and I think that’s why we’ve done well. Is that easy to do? No (Tameka).

It is a taxing job to ensure that an academic publication meets disciplinary standards.

Willie – I want to be careful because things could slip through. Let's say you're going to guest edit an issue of [my journal] and then - you know, like, remember that paper you wrote, you know, it's

- you should submit that and then maybe you might do a review of it and then somebody else might do a review of it and who is that other person? Is his office like over there?

And, you know, then it's like that world is just - that's too small. We want it to be - so if you have proper diversity then you've just got to watch out for that - that is a challenge. Better quality control, peer review - maintaining you know a rigorous standard of peer review is really important and something that takes constant vigilance.

Taylor – And I suppose its effort too - it's always more effort to reach out further, particularly under a time crunch.

Willie: Yeah. Yeah, something's going to give in terms of like, you know, timelines and ease of operation, the peer review process might be the first kind of thing to give a little.

By managing a journal well, and for a significant period of time, a journal may then become established in its discipline.

Establishing recognition of the quality of your journal always takes long time. But then what will happen is that in time the quality of a journal will convert itself into the value it provides to a discipline... So I think in long term open access journals will add much more value to the scholarly literature than they do today, because if they will survive 5, 10 years then they will actually have some voice in the publishing industry (Daniela, edited for clarity).

Though simply being a quality peer-reviewed journal is not enough. Beyond simply adhering to academic norms and maintaining a standards of quality, the individuals behind open access journals must consider how they will draw attention to their journals and stay on top of the minds of their colleagues.

A recently appointed editor of an open access journal discusses his experience of learning about the journal he came to edit and his continuing struggle to spread awareness of it.

We try and produce at least one blog post a week and that drives a lot of the traffic to our website. We notice that that draws it to our issues, like our previous issues as well. So social media's been big. I found that through developing the student association that a lot of people really didn't know that we existed and I really didn't know that the journal existed before last year before I saw the advertisement [for the editorial job he currently occupies]. So I think engaging directly with the students and the various student associations will increase our profile greatly and will be a big tool and that's sort of the main thing what we're pushing this year to increase our traffic and our audience.... the biggest hurdle [has been] getting the word out. So developing a strong, coherent marketing strategy and executing it has been the biggest challenge. Once people hear about us and do some research on what we are they get really excited and want to get involved, but it's that hurdle of getting them to hear about us has been our biggest challenge (Aaron).

This editor was not aware of the journal on his campus until they put out a call for a new editor. Developing the presence of the journal in a discipline must be actively pursued by those who are interested in realizing the journal's potential. "You just don't put it up there, you have to send, send notification of the free online availability to people. Otherwise, how are people going to find it?" (Christopher). Another editor perceives the necessity of promotion but has concerns about realizing these practices.

There needs to be more attention and resources allocated to this- to promoting the actual presence of the journal, in a sense, getting out there, so we're more top of mind with uh both, uh researchers as well as students, from that perspective. [And unfortunately] we don't have the same degree of administrative infrastructure that could help us to push the journal further into the market as it were (Edwin).

Indeed, the restrictions on promotion experienced by these open access journals ultimately come down to the fact that these editors do not have the time, and perhaps the ability, to widely promote their journal, further, they don't have funds to spend on promotional campaigns.

These journals must maintain their adherence to academic standards and develop promotional strategies within their discipline. As the core ideal of the open access philosophy is to enable information to be accessible online without cost barriers, these journals must also maintain their adherence to their non-profit vision for their journal. Often, new journals face struggles in regards to maintaining their organization economically. Three journal editors (Daniela, Laurie, Priscilla) in my sample tell stories of being approached by for-profit publishers looking to partner with their organization or to buy out their journals. These editors declined in every case because they want to maintain the integrity of their non-profit academic publication. To these editors, maintaining their integrity as a non-profit journal lends credence to their legitimacy as a peer-reviewed publication. Therefore the open access editors in my sample are constantly vigilant in regards to upholding the visions and philosophical ideals that lead them to adopt open access publishing for their journal. However, the boundaries that define these

journals are not constructed solely by the editors who conceptualize them but also the researchers that engage with open access journals.

Open access journals are ultimately effected by organizations that fall outside of their control and outside of their discipline. Particularly relevant to my sample is the Social Science and Humanities Research Council, appointed by the Canadian “federal government to represent the interests of the academic, public and private sector” (Social Science and Humanities Research Council 2016). “I think that SSHRC is a major funder in this whole area could make a significant difference, in terms of how that’s perceive, from that sort of creditability perspective” (Edwin). At the time of my research interviews, the Canadian government was a Conservative minority that had been cutting funds to social programs, especially those providing support to First Nations communities (Howe 2006; Frenette 2014). Therefore continued funding in these disciplines represents the attribution of legitimacy that these external organizations can imbue onto journals.

These editors forecast that communication norms in scientific and academic fields are converging around digital technologies. Editors of open access journals that have not yet been widely recognized as having a legitimate status often emphasize that their publication medium is likely to become the norm in regards to the future of academic publication and reading. “There are certainly inherent biases, and people won’t necessarily name that out loud, but I think certainly, I think the momentum is with open access, I think that’s certainly the direction things are going in terms of information” (Edwin). This journal editor expresses dissatisfaction with the inherent biases within academia and scientific publications, however, social trends make it plain that the internet will be the dominant communication platform for the international human

community (Rainie and Wellman 2014). Another interviewee emphasizes the possibility of digital communication networks along with the convenience internet users are used to.

I do think [open access] is a trend that will stay. I guess the thing I see the most akin to it is cable television versus Netflix. I do think people are getting fed up with having to pay so much for things, like, I know a number of academics said they had a subscription to a particular journal and they had to let it go because it became inordinately expensive to have a personal copy and it also inconvenient to go to the library to read it. So I do think that the pendulum is swinging more toward the open access model (Priscilla).

Thus, the editors of journals that are relatively new to their fields situate their publication within the hierarchy of other journals and within mass communication norms. The fact that they are taking advantage of open digital dissemination networks at this particular moment in history supposedly facilitates their sustained survival. They believe that open access will come to be the norm, or at least a taken for granted and commonly practiced occurrence, in academic publishing. If there is any need whatsoever for their niche in the present, and in the future, their claim to legitimacy will be constantly bulwarked by their continuing interactions with scholars in their discipline.

Boundaries of Exclusivity

The boundaries that demarcate academic publications from non-academic publications cannot be measured by some objective test. This project shares Gieryn's (1999:14) assumption that scholarly demarcations are situationally enacted and vary from one situation to the next. The journals in this sample are all in a similar situation, therefore they all similarly demarcate their journals' social boundaries. They must construct boundaries of inclusivity around academic standards of peer-review and originality, but they must also demarcate boundaries of exclusivity between their own ventures and for-profit and predatory publishers. These journals, then, are not only defined as "academic" or "scientific" but "non-profit" and "not-predatory." Open access editors have the following general conceptions about for-profit and predatory publishers: for-

profit publishers, while often making valuable contributions to academic dialogues, may work to pervert adherence to the goal of promoting new ideas; predatory publishers do not attempt to develop and improve academic dialogues, and further, tarnish the reputations of authors who publish with them.

The open access editors in my sample often express that for-profit publishers have certain advantages that open access journals do not have because they are able to afford support staff that improves the quality and promotion of the journal. However, these editors also recognize that when profit motives figure into academic publications there can be negative repercussions on the quality of work that they publish. Profit motives in academic publishing can compromise the integrity of the subject matter that gets published along with compromising the capabilities of interested people to access research. All the journals in my sample expressed a deep commitment to refrain from partnering with for-profit publishers. However, there are two extremes in regards to the ways that these editors consider forming partnerships with another dominant for-profit player and their service in academic publishing, specifically Thompson-Reuters' calculation of impact factor.

Refraining from forming associations between their journal and profit-based organizations, such as Thompson-Reuters, and their approved calculation of impact in the scholarly literature, can disadvantage open access journals from succeeding. The consideration to be ranked along with other journals in their field is a consideration that all of the journal editors in my sample make. As one editor explains:

we are going to move into the ranking process, uhm, which is a philosophical shift, y'know in terms of the open acce- in some ways in terms of just having as many people appropriate- I mean once you get into that ranking game as it were, um, then it starts to take on a life of it's own, and philosophically, one has to address the question of whether, the acceptability of certain kinds of ideas, uh, the circle starts to close within that ranking wad around what's acceptable and so forth

and it can be hard for new ideas or just completely different context to come in and work with that and so [shrugs] we'll see. We'll see (Edwin).

The same philosophical ideals that lead these editors to adopt the open access publication format also lead them to reject common measurements of academic success. One editor recognizes that her stubbornness to refrain from entering the so-called ranking game has disadvantaged her journal in certain regards.

And so part of what happens is that some folks don't publish in our journal because they're at universities where people actually care about this stuff [impact factor] and, you know, and put lots of pressure on – particularly my Australian and British colleagues, huge amount of pressure in terms of what, you know, where they publish (Laurie).

However, adherence to this philosophical ideal has not been detrimental to this journal's goal of addressing its discipline. "But in our field, I think that people know us. We certainly get cited lots and frankly we often get the more radical, critical stuff" (Laurie). Therefore, this journal and other in my sample are able to operate within its niche which erects boundaries that separate it from other academic organizations that have profit motives.

The following case is used to provide an illustration of the degree of contrast present in my sample related to the approaches to partnering with for-profit companies. Another editor expresses distrust with corporate publishers and the for-profit company that controls impact factor, however, at the time of our interview, her journal had recently applied for a Thompson-Reuter's impact factor to be calculated. In thinking about this state of affairs she expresses a disunion between her ideals, the mission of the journal, and entering a profit-driven "ranking game."

Priscilla – I'd say impact factors are one of the challenging things that we've been working on recently. Because picked up by Thomson- to get an official impact factor- [Thompson-Reuters] is very selective about what they'll pick. So if you're a smaller niche journal and you're not associated with one of the big publishers it's actually hard to get into their system. So we have put in an application for one, though we're also looking at the alternative, looking at Altmetrics and things like that. But *there is sort of an argument that the traditional impact factor by a for-profit company kind of goes against the open access model*. So it is one of the tricky things because we have been asked by authors about an impact factor and on funding applications

they'll ask for measures of what your impact is. So to date we've had to use other things like we get our readership numbers, how many downloads we've have, you can look on google scholar to see how many times your article has been cited by other people and some things like that. But it's hard to get an official one

Taylor – Yeah, that is an interesting challenge. Have you considered any alternatives? I know some people have suggested alternatives to impact factor, have you looked into any of those?

Priscilla – Yeah, we're just now looking into the Altmetrics, it seems to be the popular one for open access. So we likely will implement that which gives you a little bit more information about what your reach is and it does pick up on non-traditional publishing platforms like blogs and social media and things like that which in the modern world is part of the impact you're having (emphasis added).

Therefore, this editor expresses that her application for an impact factor is based on the need to appeal to conventionally recognized signals of academic success. However, at the same time, she expresses discomfort with the journal's association with Thompson-Reuters and states that she is considering alternative forms of measuring impact that are removed from this profit-based company. This editor is interested in understanding the impact that her journal has, on academia, but also on groups of people who do not cite work in academic papers but may do so on their Facebook walls and Twitter profiles.

Before applying for an official impact factor to be calculated, this journal took the initiative to measure their impact by measuring the number of article downloads and surveying authors about their experience subsequent to their article being submitted and published.

We did a survey of authors as part of the SSHRC grant 'cause we were trying to show our impact. And it was all very positive. People said they'd never had an article that was so widely read, 'cause they also get their download numbers. And they are very pleased about how many downloads they've had of their articles (Priscilla).

Thus, there are multiple strategies to understand the impact a journal has that falls outside of dominant profit-based impact calculating companies and open access journals typically make full use of these before defeatedly conceding to partnerships with for-profit companies such as Thompson-Reuters.

The two cases of Laurie and Priscilla presented above represent the extremes of rejection and relative adherence to conventions in academic publishing that support profit-based companies to operate within these social circles. As Priscilla had actually applied for a Thompson-Reuters ranking, there is some resentment here, as it subverts the ultimate ideals of the open access philosophy. However, this journal is attempting to succeed in a field that has dramatic advantages for accruing academic capital for those who are able to enter what Edwin calls “the ranking game,” and play it well. This is a method of survival for this journal, though Priscilla and Laurie also express that it might be possible for their journals to survive *without* associating with this profit-based company. Again, these two cases represent the extremes apparent in my sample in this regard. Most of the journals in my sample fall closer to the former case eschewing any association with for-profit journals and for-profit ranking companies. All of the journals in my sample are able to succeed to various degrees, and continue publishing, while adhering to their anti-profit values in their actions of academic publishing.

The second major boundary of exclusivity that these editors draw is between their own publications and predatory publications. Predatory journals solicit articles from active scholars and promise quick peer-review and subsequent publication for a price. The catch is that, while the websites of these apparently academic journals often appear to be legitimate, the articles they publish have not actually undergone thorough peer review and therefore the research articles are likely to be discounted. Open access journal editors consider the state of rampant predatory publishing when they are conceptualizing the methods for their journal to sustain itself.

We had the conversation about ads, do we want ads? Do we want to charge for submission? And we immediately threw that overboard. There’s a lot of predatory open access journals out there and we didn’t want- legitimacy, the appearance of legitimacy is very important- so we didn’t want to give a reason for people to doubt us, and to doubt what we’re trying to do (Richard).

This editor goes on to describe the ways in which predatory publishers compromise the perceived integrity of open access publications by constantly spamming academic emails soliciting submissions.

Richard – I just got an email in our shared [---] account this morning and just from one of these- we get predatory emails all the time because they send these bots to our website and they get [our journal's] email address. Again, all the time, and it pisses me off to no end. I mean these guys are the reason why there is legitimacy issue. These, excuse my language, pieces of shit.

Tameka – yeah, you can quote that Taylor [laughs]

Richard – please quote that

Taylor – Okay I will.

Another editor echoes this concern. “I get too many e-mails from predatory open-access journals and so I don’t think that soliciting academics online is an efficient way to drive submissions. So that is the area actually where we struggle, to attract good writers” (Daniela, edited for clarity). Therefore, not wanting to associate themselves with predatory journals may cause disadvantages in attempting to solicit good work from active scholars. These journals put out calls for submissions on their own websites. None of them have steady mailing lists for soliciting articles because this is a common method of solicitation of non-legitimate academic journals. These editors head off any such comparative association by refraining from advertising their calls in such a way.

Instead, one of the ways these editors attract writers and solicit quality work is by doing so in person.

I think that the thing that made a really big difference for us was just having that network of people who were involved in the journal.... People who would take advertisements to a conference they were going to, that sort of personal touch that I really think helps establish you as a legitimate journal and a place that authors should consider publishing with (Priscilla).

Soliciting research articles in person can counteract skepticism because editors are able to describe their journals and provide an example of the integrity of the journal by responding to

questions of the academics they solicit. However, the environment of predatory publishing effects the preconceptions of open access journals even when editors attempt to solicit materials in person, and so they must actively define the socio-cultural boundaries where their journal lies in these interactions. For one example, an editor tells a story of attempting to solicit an article at an academic conference.

An issue for me is actually the general overall image of open access journals. So when I say we have open-access people say “mmm how much we are charging,” and I say “we don’t charge anything.” They go “ah!” Because they expect, many of- they are right, many of the open access journals charge (Daniela, edited for clarity).

These editors face difficult and persistent challenges to their claims to legitimacy each time an academic encounters their journal. Therefore, they actively confront and manage the assumptions of others so as to separate their organization and journal practically and isomorphically from predatory journals.

Even when there are difficulties in sustaining their journals financially, these editors have difficulty rationalizing the use of author processing fees or advertisements because of the opportunity costs related to simply appearing similar to predatory journals, even slightly. Further, these editors claim legitimate status when they are attempting to solicit articles from academics in person. They do so by discussing the merits of their journals with academics who are skeptical of their worthiness.

To conclude, in order to deal with the common pejorative conception of open access journals, these editors must not merely express the differences which differentiate them from dubious journals, predatory and not, they must form positive associations with social groups in order to express a commitment to their ideals and gain human capital in order to actually complete the pragmatic aspects of their mission. Their strategy to erect conceptual and practical boarders for their own operations that include valuable academic groups and individuals, while at

the same time, separating them from supposedly unethical social spheres currently present within academic fields maintains their claims to legitimacy and works to invest the various types of capital already at their disposal.

As discussed in the previous section on the ideals and motivations of open access editors these individuals must make concessions and compromises throughout the conceptualization and implementation of their journals in order to sustain their survival as an academic publication. These methods of realizing their academic publication often partially comprise of resistant acts. Open access editors resist tendencies in academic publishing to privilege journals published by wealthy for-profit publishers and to discount new free academic journals. Further, these editors view open access publishing as providing the opportunity to develop their discipline in line with its own standards and producing coherent innovations.

SECTION C – RESISTANCE

Open access publishing can be seen as an act of resistance, or to the open access editors in my sample multiple acts of resistance rather than one. The theoretical lens of radical interactionism (Athens 2015) employed for this project emphasizes the forms of resistance that are present in interactions and how power relations play out in spite of resistance. There are varying types of resistance that may occur in any cultural field, though the open access editors working within the

social sciences or humanities attempt to resist profiteering and academic conservatism in their respective disciplines. Open access editors resist capitalist interests from creating barriers to preventing access to peer-reviewed research and influencing the work that they do publish. For the most part, dissemination practices of academic disciplines are organized around profiteering publication houses. Open access editors resist profit motives in academic publishing primarily by constructing profit motives in academic publishing as unethical and offering a non-profit alternative. Further, these journals do not take norms internal to academia uncritically. Similar to the cases of scientists that Gieryn (1983:787-8) details, these editors do not only resist external forces but they must resist internal pressures of academia that they deem to be disadvantageous to their goal of producing and disseminating a particular type of research.

The open access medium allows a journal to reach wider audiences, engage with new authors, and it provides the editors with a creative space to experiment with new forms of academic work. The editors in my sample believe that major publication companies often maintain their dominance by making relatively conservative choices about the research that they publish (Siler, Lee, and Baro 2015). Thus some attempt to counteract this by publishing especially critical and radical pieces of work along with more traditional scholarship.

Resistance and Extended Rationality

Open access editors define their operations directly in contradiction to profiteering and academic conservatism, and they do so in order to provide peer-reviewed information to massive amounts of people and to include new voices in academic dialogues. Their vision relies on open access publishing because they believe that open accessibility at the journal level “brings democracy to the scientific world” (Daniela). The ideals they espouse attempt to secure privileges related to knowledge production and consumption to groups of people who are systematically excluded by

paywalls and scholarly norms. The type of resistance that is apparent across cases in my sample speaks to new possibilities enabled by novel communication platforms and the extended benefits that these new and emergent social products can provide to groups of people who did not have the benefits associated to access to scholarly material beforehand. George Herbert Mead's (1934; 1938) theory of emergence and Chang's (2004) theory of conventional versus extended rationality will be presented in order to define the analytical lens used to explore and inspect the types of resistance posed by the individual editors in my sample.

Mead's (1938:641) theory of emergence provides an interpretive lens to understand novelty, innovation, and change, in the physical world as well as the social world of human actors. In Darwin's theory of evolution, new forms arise as a result of interactions that occur out of past forms. Yet predicting the emergence of new forms purely from the understanding of past forms alone would be impossible without the benefit of hindsight. The same issue arises in the emergence of scientific and academic theories; they are dependent on the previous conditions of knowledge and our relation to the material and/or scholarly world, but one cannot predict future knowledge from past conditions. "Emergents" are by definition unpredictable from past conditions, they have the power to reshape not only the future, but also how we conceive of the past. We must "make room" for present objects, and reconstitute the past as necessary to explain how they have emerged causally.

Chang (2004) explains that Mead's "emergent objects" are always dependent on two things: (1) the past conditions that make the emergent event possible; and (2) the interaction that takes place and brings the particular emergent into being. In the case of human social interaction, for example, Blumer (1969) emphasizes the "formative" character of interaction, in that the outcome of a dialogue (emergent meaning) is always greater than the individual component parts

of each actor could predict beforehand (initial meanings). The interaction adds value and determines what types of new objects will form from the initial conditions, often in novel, unexpected ways. Indeed, Mead saw many layers of reality being connected through action; hence inorganic, organic, human, and social systems would all be seen as connected and hence mutually impacting (Latour 1993). It is through their novel interaction that new emergent objects begin to take shape and evolve.

Conceptualized this way, open access editors are guided by a vision of “extended rationality” derived from their criticism of “conventional rationality” (Chang 2004:418). Extended rationality enables actors to take account of their environment to a greater degree than the established conventional rationality. As new forms of thought emerge that recognize and promote understanding with those who might have been considered deviant and marginal, previously excluded groups of people come into considerations about how society ought to move forward, thus *extending* benefits to new groups of people. The theory of extended rationality was derived from George Herbert Mead’s conception of emergence. An organism learns, internalizes, and reacts to its environment, however, an individual can only react to facets of its environment if he or she is cognitively sensitive enough to uncover it. “If ... there is an increase in the diversity of sensitivity there will be an increase in the responses of the organism to its environment, that is, the organism will have a correspondingly larger environment [in mind]”. (Mead 1934:245).

Chang (2004) develops this theory to account for the potentials that extended forms of rationality to promote criticism and resistance to conventional social processes.

extending [role-taking] beyond the [considerations of the] conventional level helps to develop a larger environment in Mead’s sense. And a larger environment means a larger space for agency, more challenge, more stimulation, more facilitating conditions for response, a greater likelihood of formulating sophisticated, novel courses of action, and more possibilities of success (Chang 2004:419).

One of the editors in my sample emphasizes this in his conception of his journal's potentials to innovate within an academic discipline.

I think the fact that it's a small scale kind of a shoestring adventure has allowed us to grow and adapt, you know, into things - it's allowed us to be unconventional in a way. You know we're - we don't have a very strong - we're not a part of the scholarly publishing orthodoxy so we're, I think, one of the - and this partly open-access, I think we have - I think the open access environment affords a lot of autonomy and a lot of creativity when it comes to how you understand your journal, you know (Willie).

New practices and assumptions that benefit extended groups of people are guided by a more open, more inclusive, form of rationality in academic publishing. This relatively extended form of rationality is understood to be becoming increasingly accepted over time. Some perceive the coming social change, and the imposition of extended rationality upon the current conventional rationality through the philosophies of younger generations:

Tameka – I don't see- unfortunately, I don't see people in my field, especially the older academics being very receptive to it. It's just a foreign territory for them, I think for the older – perhaps – generation of academic. By all means when I start talking to younger people like myself and our cohort [mid to late 20s], yeah, there's an acceptance there, they understand the philosophy behind it and they support that element....

Richard – I really think this is the explosion of open access publishing and I think at the end of our academic careers and lifetimes and all that stuff, we'll hopefully see open access become the golden standard. Right now, we're at the beginning of a new wave.

However, these forms of extended rationality, while resonating philosophically with many people, are unlikely to revolutionize academic publishing and liberate it from non-academic influences. From the same respondent:

I hope there's a paradigm shift where open access becomes more recognized and becomes a little bit more legitimized. Do I actually see it happening? I don't think so. I'm just going to be honest, I'd like to think so, but if I sit here and really want to be truthful, I don't think it'll ever beat out the toll access just because money talks, money walks, and all that stuff. What I would- do see happening is just maybe as it becomes just a little bit more pervasive and accepted by a new generation of scholars that maybe, it'll never be equal weight maybe it'll be "hey this is worth more than treating it as quote unquote a blog post." It's not a blog post, it's peer reviewed, and blah blah blah (Richard).

This section will consider open access publishing as an act of resistance enacted by open access editors. The resistance of open access editors is multi-layered in regards to the social spheres that it attempts to effect. The medium of open access publishing provides possibilities for those who want to develop their field of research to disseminate their findings more broadly as well as criticize academic norms through their actions. Open access editors experience asymmetric relations of power in their field which tend to favor those who adhere to rigid static intellectual standards and, especially, those who are associated with major intellectual publication houses. Open access editors experience these fields of power on an individual level and attempt to bring justice to fields of academic publishing by making use of a publically accessible medium. These editors situate themselves within external social forces and make decisions which they believe will provide the highest exposure for their journal and effect public and academic discourses. They all commonly decide to make use of internet technologies, in order to align with democratic ideological communication norms of science, and to define themselves in opposition to capitalist influences upon knowledge development.

By taking up these values and technologies, open access editors attempt to develop new norms in academia and popular society. Their common aspirations are to extend the collective benefits of access to cutting-edge peer reviewed knowledge, which are too often currently isolated to those with academic credentials, to every person with access to the internet, thus empowering all interested individuals who happen upon their publication. Their work provides means of empowerment for individuals searching for knowledge as well as those who wish to participate in academic dialogues. So, even though they face the dominance of for-profit publishers in their attempts to address their field, their mission has a vision which has broad beneficial social ramifications and therefore, supposedly, cannot be denied for long.

Resistance to Capitalist Profit-Motives

Open access editors take a critical-ethical stance in regards to those seeking to derive profit from academic labour because these practices limit the influence that any particular research article might have. As one of our respondents stated in reference to corporate publishers, they “are there to maximize profit and I don’t think that should be the model for research. [Publishers] should be there to, basically, to make research available to the widest possible number of people” (Christopher). This particular attitude was apparent across all of the cases in my sample, though at varying degrees of intensity. Typically, experimental or critical journals were the sites of the most aggressive anti-corporate philosophy. For example, one of our respondents who edits a journal that privileges critical pieces told us that during journal steering meetings

we talk about hegemony and we talk about resistance. And that we want to resist the corporatization of knowledge, we want to resist- we want to make sure that knowledge is freely available.... So I just have so many ethical problems with what an individual has to pay, what a library has to pay (Laurie).

Their openly critical approach to publishing may cause difficulties gaining widespread acceptance and support, but at the same time, the journal fills a structural hole (Burt 2004) in their discipline which makes them “attractive to a group of people who also are trying to push back against, sort of, the neo-liberal publishing model” (Laurie).

Less academically-radical open access journals also define their operations in contrast to corporate intellectual publishers. One editor publishing in the humanities compares the current state of affairs in academic publishing to a “knowledge racket”. In his words: “one imagines "Pauly" explaining to "Tony" [The Sopranos] about this racket where we start a journal, government tax-dollars pay for the research, we publish the papers and charge people to see them even though they've already paid for it!” (John, square brackets in original e-mail correspondence). So the moral vision underpinning the actions of open access editors can be said

to actively resist capitalist interests from influencing how their journal operates and disseminates information:

We have [had] a couple of offer[s] about selling our journal but then at the end of the day we don't want to do that [...] because we don't want to lose the control.... I know for example Elsevier [...] has certain kind of right over the journals [making cage with fingers]. And that, for example, says 'okay reduce the lead time, okay. Twelve weeks is too long make it eight weeks or six, and then what can an editor do? (Daniela).

Another editor echoes this concern:

At almost every single big conference I'm at, you know, one of the reps [from a dominant corporate publisher are] often saying "So, you know, do you want to come and join us?" 'Cause they want to, sort of, corner the market [in her discipline]. And we're just not interested. (Laurie).

Therefore, both of these editors encounter opportunities to partner with corporate publishers and benefit from having the financial support they are able to offer. However, they also perceive this partnership to be corrupting. They forecast that academic concerns will no longer be the top priority of the journal; they also think they will be forced to prioritize the interests of their corporate-capitalist partner. Therefore by eschewing profit motives these journals may contribute something to their discipline that would not have existed otherwise, further the information that they do publish is readily available to a considerably larger number of people compared to toll-access publications.

These editors also consider more general social conceptions related to capitalist consumer culture as causing challenges for them in gaining footing as a legitimate publication. For example, one editor states:

I think that there's a stereotype ...that more expensive things are worth more, but I think there's a stereotype against things that are free. ...like what's it worth if nobody has to pay for it? (Ruth)

By actively resisting wider capitalist cultural norms, and refusing to cater to them these journals present themselves as a free service, and hence, free of corporate influences.

The moral vision that inspires their resistance is not only anti-capitalist but anti-establishment more generally. These editors seek to rid their publication of influences external to

scientific and academic norms. In one case, a journal planned to publish a piece of research that contradicted a political organization. According to this interviewee:

We were publishing an article by, literally, a world class scholar from [a university] that reassesses [certain published findings] and saying that it was [very different] than the official numbers... and we were pressured by [---] not to publish the article. They came into our office and said don't publish it... And it wasn't clear if they were saying don't publish it now or never publish it. But we basically said "no no, we're publishing it," we went ahead anyway (Christopher).

Therefore this journal is a case of resisting dominant interests that may be subverted through original research reassessing certain "official" findings. This editor speaks to the necessity of resisting external influences from covering up information that can enlighten members of society and compel them to critically evaluate corporate organizational proclamations and underlying interests.

A journal with a vision to promote research on a marginalized population does "letter writing campaigns with the work that we do for culturally based equity for [---], and so a lot of [people] will submit letters" (Tina). These letters are not only sent to the Canadian government but are published in the journal for the public to read. Profit-driven organizations, wider social trends, and institutional interference tends to influence the operations of academic journals and therefore their final products. These editors attempt to isolate their journals from these influences to the greatest extent possible. The ultimate reasoning behind resisting capitalist and institutional influences is to develop an autonomous intellectual or applied research journal that has impact and is readable to any interested person. This underlying motive is ultimately supposed to extend the benefits of access to academically-validated research to unprecedented numbers of people and therefore having widespread social ramification that may work to improve the lot of disadvantaged groups and improve levels of equality in regards to the acquisition of reliable information.

Resistance to Access Barriers

Open access editors continually resist barriers to knowledge accessibility. They do this by publishing their issues online for free, breaking down those barriers to knowledge. For many of my respondents, the benefit of this is that people of lower income levels, marginalized populations, relevant non-profit organizations, and simply those who might be interested can access the work and benefit from the knowledge. Another approach that of these editors employ to improve the accessibility of their articles is through paying special attention to the level of writing that is used in their journal. Some editors believe that overly technical and jargon-y articles cannot be read by everybody, and that this language should be avoided when trying to reach large audiences.

We want to meet a standard academic level but yes we do want to make sure that readers from other backgrounds have enough contextualization of the issue and the background information... so that people who aren't from academia can read it and understand the bulk of what's in there (Priscilla).

An interdisciplinary journal rationalizes their use of simple language in their published articles. “there is a serious accessibility vision in the whole like aspect of it because we just want everybody to be able to read it because it's not aimed at one discipline” (Ruth). And so many of the editors we spoke to want their journals to have a general impact upon their society, not a strictly academic impact.

Editors in my sample placed a considerable emphasis upon improving access to peer-reviewed journals to the public and non-profit-based researchers.

Our philosophy is we believe that everyone should have access to this information and it should be accessible to people of lower income levels. And I think sometimes with journals like that it's a barrier. It's a barrier to – and even for – like for example, like not for profit organizations want to do research and want to be – you know, have that research to like back up their causes and like find more funding and things like that. I think charging those processing fees could be a barrier to those organizations (Tina).

This emphasis on the priority of enabling access to non-profit organizations who may not be able to afford access to the research that will help them with their missions was repeated by multiple respondents. For one further example, consider the words of this respondent.

“We realized that there would be people from uhm non-profit organizations that would likely want to be exposed to the material and uh, as you know from most academic journals uhm unless you’re a university student or something like that it can be very expensive or impossible to actually get hold of the information” (Edwin).

As mentioned earlier, there are multitudes of people who can benefit from accessible peer-reviewed research articles, including non-profit researchers, students, and community members. In the words of one of the individuals in my sample who edits for a journal that often focuses on indigenous peoples’ issues:

in the world of indigenous people you’re talking about lots of people who don’t have access through mainstream channels. And there’s a lot of work that’s happening at the grassroots and so we felt that it was really important that the work that was published in the journal was accessible sort of at all levels, to academics to government policy makers as well as to communities, community leaders and. And that was why we decided it should be open access (Priscilla).

Therefore, these editors format their journals so that they may have a public impact when the research they publish is suitable to their interests.

While promoting their presence with academics and laypeople online these editors do indeed exhibit resistant tendencies to academia as well as academic publishing considering dominant practices. These journals resist the either-or open-closed schema by providing a physical copy to purchase, and at the same time, a free copy. The physical copies of open access journals symbolize their alternative status to for-profit publishers who *only* have pay-for-access models, or partial open access provided by article processing charges. By promoting their journal online they promote their journal to authors and readers as an alternative to dominant publications. They claim to offer something new that cannot be accessed in the costly academic literature, challenge and resist conceptions of researchers that prestigious and expensive journals

are the best sources of information, thus necessarily extend academic dialogues, and the potential benefits associated with access to these discussions, to new socio-cultural domains.

Resistance to Academic Traditions

Open access editors seek to expand their readership numbers and hope to be read beyond individuals within their own particular scholarly niche. Sometimes open access journals go further than just expanding their readership, but also try to include new kinds of authors, thus further expanding “access” for new people to have a voice in the scholarly literature. These might be authors who are systematically disadvantaged in society or academia and are systematically excluded from having a voice in the research literature. These are often about research subjects that are intimately relevant to their lives. There are three ways in which open access journals have expanded the parameters of authorship from my sample of respondents, which are to include: (1) graduate and undergraduate authors, (2) authors from developing countries, and (3) community member or social activist authors.

I. Graduate and undergraduate authors

The first, and most prominent, approach to bringing in new perspectives to the research literature is to give graduate and undergraduate students a voice in academic literature. Three journals from our sample were considered graduate or undergraduate journals. These journals are typically conceptualized as ‘teaching journals,’ enculturating young scholars into the craft of academic publishing. The mandates of these journals were the same across cases. As explained by the editor of an undergraduate journal:

I mean, yeah, it’s like there’s two mandates [---], basically, so like one is that we’re giving undergrads the venue to get the experience that they might require after graduation, right, like if they’re going to continue in academia, become a doctor or whatever they’re going to do, they might have to publish a paper someday, right. So basically it’s just giving them that good knowledge and the, you know, the wherewithal to go through that in the future (Ruth).

As such, they often try and mimic the top journals in their field, and try to publish only quality research papers.

Our M.O is to teach graduate students the culture of publication while giving them a forum to publish their work in an understanding and teaching environment that has some sort of legitimacy and quality to it. Rather than just a “hey everyone submit and you’ll get a publication no matter what” the idea is to mimic and to emulate as much as possible the top journals in our field keeping in mind that this is first steps for many of the authors. So no we’re not looking for the big fish we’re looking for the good work but from graduate students (Richard).

Though, starting up and maintaining a journal that challenges academic norms about who ought to be publishing in peer-reviewed publications constantly faces resistance from those in dominant positions. As Richard details the formation of the journal.

I mean in terms of the graduate aspect we got actually push back – when we initially brought the idea to the department – we got pushback from the faculty. It was very minimal and they changed their tune very quickly... The initial response was why bother publishing in a graduate journal? If you have quality work you should take that work to [---], the best journal in the field and try there. You aren’t going to get interest. But as we trembled along and pushed along anyways the tune changed very quickly. So I mean there was- that was a little unexpected. We expected to get y’know a little pat on the head “good doggy this is such a wonderful idea.” And it was “no” but like why? There was that, and it’s still there to a degree, from our department absolutely not but that feeling is still there. It might- that might not be generalizable to all open access journals. Again a graduate journal thing (Richard).

Therefore the editors of graduate and undergraduate journals attempt to extend benefits of publishing in a peer-reviewed journal to individuals who had very little chance at succeeding before these journals were implemented. To do so they must confront and resist conceptions of undergraduate work as “of lower repute” (Ruth) Publishing in a journal that specifically hosts graduate and undergraduate work can provide benefits to the young authors that are able to publish there. They may gain experience as an academic author and peer-reviewer. The lines on their CV that reference their graduate and undergraduate publications distinguish them for their peers and thus instills novel advantages for them when applying for their graduate studies.

II. Researchers from developing countries

Some open access publications are explicit in their mission to give equal consideration to work from researchers from developing countries, considering their actions as

social entrepreneurship... [in order] to really help the people who have the same struggle that we had... I always give the opportunity to people from [developing] countries too, because I'm at the end of the day struggling when I submit a paper to the top journals" (Daniela).

These journals are not meant to inherently privilege research from developing countries over that from developed countries. Rather, they disregard the geographic and cultural origins of some article that gets submitted and judges the merits on the articles based solely on the content.

This editor perceives her actions as a form of resistance to the common practices of dominant international publications.

I know several journals for example that have pay clear attention to these specific countries. I don't need to name them here. But when they get uhm, paper from that country or several of those countries they say oh you have to be careful if It's possible do desk rejection.... if I am sure about the quality why not? I can publish it. I always give the opportunity to people from those countries too because I'm at the end of the day struggling when I submit a paper to the top journals too (Daniela).

Therefore this editor conceptualized the open access platform to provide benefits for researchers who were not able to find an academic publication that would host their research and provide them a voice in the literature. Though this editor does discuss difficulties in appealing to developing country researchers, particularly considerable levels of plagiarised submissions, her goal is one inspired by promoting the well-being of those who are excluded from academic networks.

III. Bringing in community members

Some open access journals call out for authors who are not professional academics or even researchers at all. Rather, they are people who are systematically excluded from partaking in serious intellectual and political discussions, but whose voices nevertheless matter greatly. For example, one editor considers her journal as a site for

honouring the different perspectives of people. So not only researchers but also of, like, community members. We try to get submissions in different languages. And actually, one of the most unique things about our journal is that we've invited children to participate. One of our editions was a special edition by children and youth, and so we invited submissions from across the country and it was actually peer reviewed by other children.... I mean people think children and youth are not capable of doing those kinds of things, but we totally don't agree and think that children and youth have really strong voices and opinions and are able to think for themselves and be active citizens. So we're hoping to do more editions like that one (Tina).

Therefore open access journals provide opportunities for people to disseminate knowledge that would not have otherwise been possible.

IV. Challenging academic publication norms

Beyond promoting marginalized voices in intellectual publications, a majority of the journal editors interviewed for this project felt like their journal enabled them to innovate within their discipline while still adhering to respectable academic norms. All editors, for example, ensured double-blind peer-review processes for all of their article submissions. In the words of one of our respondents: "The open access environment affords a lot of autonomy and a lot of creativity when it comes to how you understand your journal... [and] unless you're - unless you're really committing horrible crimes against scholarly proprietary, then you're okay" (Willie). This journal publishes interviews with prominent academics and an informal blog on their website alongside original peer-reviewed research articles. Another journal challenges typical academic representational boundaries by publishing research guided by disciplinary questions but using experimental methodologies and pushing representational boundaries. "We're seen as on the cutting edge because we've published epic poetry where somebody represented their research in a giant epic poem. Like we're willing to take those sorts of risks" (Laurie). A third journal publishes graduate work,

we knew we wouldn't be a subscription journal, okay, because we're a graduate level journal. So that's where the whole open access element came in. It was really the only platform that worked for us given the type of journal we are (Richard).

By publishing material that does not have a mainstream academic audience these editors take risks, but they also see that publishing online for free enables work to be published that would not be published otherwise.

New open access journals have the opportunity to revise typical policies related to peer-review and copyrights. All of the journals in my sample complete normal double-blind peer-review for all of their published articles. However, being an online journal makes it possible for articles to be published immediately upon completion of the peer-review process.

Taylor – And have you seen any major differences, maybe just from an author’s perspective in publishing. Such as in the way that you experienced publishing in a more traditional journal and the ways that authors experience publishing in your open access journal?

Priscilla – I think the time frame of it is the main one. We get back to people within 2 months. And then I think the longest an article has ever spent in our system between being accepted and actually being published I think is 6 month but usually we’re less than that. Usually we’re more like 3 or 4. And that just that everything happens so much fast. Like as soon as I get the peer review reports in I can give it to the author the same day. The incremental publishing is nice because people aren’t waiting on a whole issue to be ready before seeing it in print. We publish it as soon as we have it copy edited and ready to go. So that also speeding things up

The final way in which these journals are critical of academic traditions relates to a journal holding copyrights of an author’s work. Many of these journals expressed distaste for those who attempt to claim copyright over a researchers work. One editor states:

we don’t want our articles being used for commercial purposes cause that’s against the access-ethics sort of thing. But we did want to allow them to be republished elsewhere if that’s what the author wanted to do.... [Including] republishing [the article] in its original form or in a slightly adapted form in a book chapter (Priscilla).

These journals are challenging the parameters of what constitutes acceptable content for a periodic academic publication and they often cite digital medium they use as spurring these sorts of experiments.

To conclude this section, open access editors rely on a form of extended rationality that provides benefits related to having access to academic literature to individuals and groups who did not previously have access to read or submit to a peer-reviewed journal. These editors

accomplish a multileveled form of resistance that considers dominant trends for academic journals to partner with capitalist organization to be unproductive to disciplinary advance. Thus, the resistance that these editors enact is majorly directed toward ridding academic publishing of capitalist influences. All barriers that compress the potential influence some journal might have are considered and demolished by the editors in my sample. They do so by taking account of a larger stock of their environment than is conventional in their field (Chang 2004:419) in order to both transcend the interests of their group (ibid 420) while improving the internal state of affairs in regards to communication practices in the social sciences and humanities.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

The ideals of open access publishing that propel the open access movement are free and easy accessibility, compressibility, and adherence to academic standards of quality and excellence. Open access editors are motivated to create their open access publication outlets in order to address their disciplinary colleagues and make progress in their field. They recognize open

access publishing as a relatively inexpensive medium with considerably broad reach. As such, they choose to adopt it for their journal and subsequently, develop their own accordant philosophy of open access publishing. An important point developed in the first findings section of this thesis is that the scholarly definition of open access needs to be qualified due to the emphases that open access editors, those who *pragmatically realize this concept*, place in their open access ventures. In some cases these editors believe in re-conceptualizing how journals deal with author copyrights; in particular, instead of reserving copyright, the journal allows the author to retain copyright. This means that an author is empowered to republish their work as they see fit without seeking permission. Open access journals do not consciously attempt to expand reader re-use rights in regards to academic work and therefore this emphasis in the definition of open access might be re-worked.

In order to develop their reputation and status as a legitimate publication in their field, open access editors define the boundaries of their journal's social connections and form symbiotic relationships with organizations and individuals in which they exchange all forms of capital. Open access journals do not always emphasize the boundaries of their operation falling within the culture of open access per se. Instead, their emphases lie in within their situatedness in academic ideals, and through distancing from profit-seeking. In order to cement themselves in a discipline and academic culture, open access journals form associations with educational and research institutions, individuals who make up their editorial board, and academic indexes. These connections provide the journals with pluses in terms of their economic, symbolic, human, social, and cultural capital. The successful management of these forms of capital enables journals to accrue significant level of academic and scientific capital (Bourdieu 1988:84; Bourdieu 2004:55), defined as meta-capital of the economic, social, cultural, and symbolic capital within

academic disciplines that are intimately related to the perceived legitimacy of a particular publication. Due to their structural position relative to other journals, some editors may feel they have to contravene, in certain ways, their commitments to the ideals of open access for the greater benefit of the journal. For example, the major measurement of disciplinary impact of any particular peer-reviewed is Thompson-Reuters' impact factor. However, as noted by many of my respondents, forming a partnership with this company taints their network's non-capitalist ideal. Many open access journal editors instead opt for alternative measurements of impact or eschew quantifying their impact at all.

Over time, open access journals attempt develop their reputation as a legitimate publication in their discipline. The open access journals that make up my sample are considered to be marginal publications to the mainstream in their discipline. They do abide by quality academic standards but have not yet been widely recognized nor had a significant impact on their discipline. The journals with a higher degree of legitimacy in my sample may not directly compete with the most prestigious journals in their discipline, but they do have a history of engaging with academics within a particular discipline and are readily recognized as legitimate by important disciplinary players, such as renowned scholars and tenure committee members. As many of the journals in my sample are not considered to have mature claims to legitimacy in their fields, they provide rationales about the likelihood of developing their legitimate status in the future. They do social forecasts in order to understand the relevant urgency of their particular publication's niche and they also consider wider social trends related to increasing permeation of internet technology and its habitual international use for communication. Further, all of the journals bulwark their claims to legitimacy by emphasizing their status as legitimate open access publications who refuse to partner with for-profit publishers. Editors of journals have been

approached by for-profit companies looking to partner with them. In every case these editors declined because they felt it would ultimately compromise their claims to legitimacy that is based on non-capitalist publishing practices in the social sciences and humanities.

The editors in my sample were found to mount a certain degree of resistance in their acts of publishing. They consistently resisted any capitalist motivations from influencing the work that they publish. They resist barriers to widespread accessibility such as cost barriers and comprehensibility barriers. These editors resist academic conventions by claiming a niche that may not be readily supported, or vehemently opposed, in their discipline. And, finally, these editors resist tendencies for academics to speak for various public or civil groups by enabling knowledgeable individuals outside of academia to author peer-reviewed articles. As such, open access editors enact an ethos of academic conduct that extends the benefits of access to cutting-edge work outside of academia to anyone who is interested. In effect, their acts of resistance provide opportunities for knowledge to be produced and to be read that would not have been possible without their open access journals. Resistance is integral to open access publication ventures because their ideals are inherently opposed to the status quo in academic publishing. As these journals confront groups within and without academia they attempt to change academic conventions so that academia and other social groups may benefit.

The shortcomings of this project are due to the trade-off discussed in the methods section of the paper. This is an interview-based qualitative research project and so I was not able to observe my participants as they went about their daily activities as an open access journal editor. These ethnographic findings could work to bulwark the findings related to the constant resistance that these editors must mount in order to challenge dominant practices in academic publishing. By relying solely on the words of my respondents, I was not able to check the veracity of the

claims that they make. As such, as editors discuss their status in their field it is possible that they have exaggerated the extent to which they are endorsed by academics in their field. Though, this was kept in mind throughout considering that these journals are indeed marginal within mainstream academic dialectics. However, even though the information gathered could have been more detailed and the relative positions of these journals within their fields could have been placed more accurately, the project still has the virtue of expressing the convergent and divergent experiences of open access editors across a wide variety of disciplines. The breadth of cases and the depth of information that was achieved through the interviews does enable a conception of open access as it is experienced and enacted by individuals within the social sciences and humanities that can be supported by the empirical findings of this project, and further supported or rejected by future projects.

There are a number of topics that emerged throughout the course of this project that could not be adequately pursued. The ideals of open access that are presented may be readily apparent and exhaustive in regards to the sample that I collected, however the project's n is not very large. Future research is required via surveys and larger sample to more finely understand the essential components and variable dimensions of open access. Particularly, this research points towards a potential for reader re-use rights to be an inessential component of open access publishing contra the common definitions in the academic literature. Therefore this argument to revise the basic definition of open access should be taken as a tentative argument that will require more respondents to corroborate. A large survey of open access editors could provide a more general understanding of open access ideals as they may appear beyond my research parameters to also include the "hard" sciences. A qualitative project focusing on open access editors in the physical sciences may shed light on alternative dimensions of open access. The editors in my sample

identified the perceptions of academic tenure committees in regards to open access journals is considered a significant barrier to their success. Perhaps surveying tenure and promotion committees may provide accounts of the status of open access from the point of view of established academics discussing the merits of some hiring candidate's CV. Finally, as one of the editors in my sample claims that the choice to publish within Canada was in order to derive benefit from Canada's national symbolic-academic capital; this invites questions about schemas of national academic identities generally and how new open access publications may take advantage, for better or worse, of the nation they publish within.

The present project has reached an understanding of open access as a medium that extends benefits of access to peer-reviewed research to new social groups, while at the same time, facing obvious socio-cultural disadvantages. It is hoped that this project will contribute to scholarly conceptions of open access publishing by deriving conceptions as they are actually conceptualized and enacted by individuals who are on the ground realizing the open access movement in scholarly publishing. There is a considerable need to reach an understanding of the complexity of the effects that this social phenomena is having in academia, and in other forums, in order to understand its social impact and potential future trajectory through intellectual cultures.

APPENDIX A – EARLY OPEN ACCESS TIMELINE

(Adapted from Suber's FOS timeline <<http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/timeline.htm>>.)

* - social science/humanities journals

Note: 7/16 – nearly half – of early SS&H journals failed

1987

*New Horizons in Adult Education [Continuing]

1990

*Psychology [until 2002]

*Postmodern Culture [continuing]

- *Electronic Journal of Communication [Continuing]
 *Bryn Mawr Classical Review (Classical Studies) [Continuing]
- 1991
 *Surfaces (Humanities) [1997]
 *EJournal (multi-disciplinary, interested in theory and practice surrounding the creation, transmission, storage, interpretation, alteration and replication of electronic "text," broadly defined. We are also interested in the broader social, psychological, literary, economic and pedagogical implications of computer-mediated networks.) [until 2003]
Mp_arc (mathematics pre-print archive)
arXiv (began as physics archive then expanded to include astronomy, mathematics, computer science, nonlinear science, quantitative biology and, most recently, statistics)
This is one of the biggest precipitating factors which led to the open access movement in scientific publishing
- 1992
 *Public-Access Computer Systems Review (digital libraries, electronic publishing, the Internet, and online catalogs.) [Until 1998]
 *Logic Journal of the IGPL [Continuing]
- 1993
 *Education Policy and Analysis Archives [Continuing]
 *Electronic Journal of Analytic Philosophy [Until 1997]
- 1994
 Electronic green journal (Environmental protection studies) [Continuing]
 *Electronic journal of sociology [Until 1998]
 Florida Entomologist (founded 1917 transitions to OA, by 1999 all previous issues are OA)
- 1995
 *Information Research [Continuing]
 *Journal of computer-mediated communications [Continuing]
Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy
- 1996
 *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures [continuing]
Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations launched
 Journal of Clinical Investigation transitions to OA (archives available going back to first issue in 1925)
 *Romanticism and Victorianism on the Web [continuing]
 *The Nordic Journal of Philosophical Logic [ceased open access edition in 1999, was published with toll access through Francis and Taylor until it ceased entirely in 2002.]

APPENDIX B – INTRODUCTION LETTER

Lakehead
UNIVERSITY

Department of Sociology

Tel (807) 343-8530
Fax (807) 346-7831

COVER LETTER AND INTRODUCTORY INFORMATION FOR THE RESEARCH STUDY:

OPEN-ACCESS PUBLISHING: COSTS, BENEFITS AND ACADEMIC POLITICS

Dear potential participant,

We would like to invite you to participate in our research by providing a short interview that asks about your views on the subject of open-access scholarly publishing. You are being invited to participate in this research because of your position as an interested stakeholder in the development and future of open-access publishing.

The principal investigator for this research is Dr. Antony Puddephatt, associate professor in the department of Sociology at Lakehead University. This research is being funded by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Our research aims to explore the rise of the open-access movement in academic publishing, focusing particularly on the context of the social sciences and humanities in Canada. First, we are interested in the perspectives about open-access from various interested stakeholders across Canada and beyond. Second, we aim to identify the challenges and strategies of those attempting to realize open-access in arenas where traditional publishing remains dominant.

Your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary, and you are free to decline to answer any questions, or to withdraw from the interview at any time. We will ask you a series of open-ended questions about open-access, how it relates to your own sphere of work, what you see as the costs/benefits, and where you see the future of open-access generally. This interview should last no more than 30 minutes. If you consent, we would like to digitally record the interview so that we can more easily transcribe it and analyze it at a later date.

There are no foreseeable risks to participating in this research. The benefits of participation are being able to enter into a dialogue about open-access scholarly publishing, and getting your views across, which helps inform our research, which we aim to disseminate widely through both scholarly and public channels in the future.

If you agree to participate, we will maintain your anonymity and confidentiality, by removing your name and eliminating any identifying information in the interview transcripts. In reporting findings, we will identify respondents only by their gender and institutional role, unless we get explicit consent from you to do otherwise at some point in the research process.

The data will be stored and maintained digitally by Dr. Antony Puddephatt at Lakehead University, Dr. Neil McLaughlin at McMaster University, and Dr. Kyle Siler at the University of Toronto. A student researcher, Mr. Taylor Price will also have access to this data throughout the research project. Once the research is complete, Dr. Antony Puddephatt will store the data in his office for a minimum of 5 years as per Lakehead University ethics policy.

If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact the Principal Investigator, Dr. Antony Puddephatt. Phone: (807) 343-8091 Email: apuddeph@lakeheadu.ca

This study has been approved by the Lakehead University Research Ethics Board. If you have any questions related to the ethics of the research and would like to speak to someone outside of the research team please contact Sue Wright at the Research Ethics Board at 807-343-8283 or research@lakeheadu.ca.

Thanks so much for your consideration to help us learn more about open-access publishing!

Sincerely,

Antony Puddephatt
Principal Investigator
Taylor Price
Research Assistant

APPENDIX C – CONCENT LETTER

Lakehead
UNIVERSITY

Department of Sociology

Tel (807) 343-8530
Fax (807) 346-7831

CONSENT FORM:

OPEN-ACCESS PUBLISHING: COSTS, BENEFITS AND ACADEMIC POLITICS

Dear potential participant,

By signing this consent form, you agree that:

You have read and understood the cover letter of information for this study, and that you agree to participate. You understand the potential risks and benefits as outlined in the attached letter. You understand that you can withdraw from this study at any time, and choose not to answer any question(s) for any reason. You also understand that you will remain anonymous in any publication or presentation of our findings. You must explicitly agree to have your identity revealed.

The data collected from this study will be stored securely at Lakehead University for a period of 5 years, under the care of Dr. Antony Puddephatt.

If you have any interest in reading the results of the research to come out of this study, please let me know by contacting me via email. I will be sure to send any and all relevant research results to you as we publish them.

Sincerely,

Antony Puddephatt,
Principal Investigator
Taylor Price,
Research Assistant

I, _____, hereby consent to participate in an interview for the research study "Open Access Publishing."

APPENDIX D – FINAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Q: How did you become involved with (journal title)

Q: How did (journal title) become open-access

Alternatively: what prompted the decision to start an open-access journal?

Q: What is the economic model of the journal, how did you arrive at that arrangement?

Q: How do you deal with submissions? How many do you typically get and accept?

Q: How do you try to attract good authors/researchers and compete with more established traditional journals?

Q: What is your peer review process? How long does it typically take?

Q: Is maintaining a strong impact factor important to this journal? If so, why? If not, why not?

Q: How important is it to you that your journal is indexed?

Follow-up: what sorts of indexes do you think are best to be included in for your journal to reach the largest possible audience?

Q: What form of licensing does your journal use (Copyright/Creative Commons)? What are your thoughts on alternative forms of 'open' licensing? What licenses does your journal use? How did your journal reach that decision?

Q: Has your journal experienced any major challenges? How did you approach resolving these problems?

Q: What are some other common issues you or others that you know have experienced hosting an open-access journal?

Q: what have you done to address (previously mentioned issues)? What was the result?

Q: What are your journal's major strengths? In what have you been particularly successful?

Q: What is an ideal form of OA (in the social sciences/humanities) to you? How did you come to think of OA in this way?

Q: When do you think that OA is less than ideal?

Q: What advice would you give someone who has recently started an OA journal?

Q: What was the hardest day/week you have had as an OA journal editor?

Q: What was the best day/week/month you have had as an OA journal editor?

Q: Have you worked with toll-access journals before? What was that like? What were the differences/similarities to OA publishing, if any? In your opinion, what give OA journals an edge over traditional journals, if any?

Q: What do you think the state of OA publishing will be 20 years from now?

WORKS CITED

Andraka, Jack. 2013. "Paywalls vs. Open Access." <<https://youtu.be/ZKIi2f143w0?t=12m32s>>.

Archambault, Éric, Didier Amyot, Philippe Deschamps, Aurore Nicol, Françoise Provencher,

Lise Rebout, and Guillaume Roberge. 2014. "Proportion of Open Access Papers Published in Peer-Reviewed Journals at the European and World Levels – 1996-2013: version."

Science-Metrix version 11p. <http://science-metrix.com/files/science-metrix/publications/d_1.8_sm_ec_dg-rtd_proportion_oa_1996-2013_v11p.pdf>.

Athens, Lonnie. 2002. "Domination: The Blind Spot in Mead's Analysis of the Social Act."

Journal of Classical Sociology 2(1): 25-42.

- . 2005. "Mead's Lost Conception of Society." *Symbolic Interaction* 28(3): 305-325.
- . 2010. "Human Subordination from a Radical Interactionist's Perspective." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 39(3): 339-369.
- . 2015. *Domination and Subjugation in Everyday Life*. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- arXiv. 2015. "Membership Program FAQ." <<https://arxiv.org/help/support/faq>>.
- Beall, Jeffery. 2012. "Defining Platinum Open Access." <<http://scholarlyoa.com/2012/05/08/defining-platinum-open-access/>>.
- Beall, Jeffery. 2016. "Beall's List." <<http://scholarlyoa.com/publishers/>>.
- Becker, Howard. 1967. "Whose Side Are We On?" *Social Problems* 14(3):239-247.
- Becker, Gary. 1975. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Benkler, Yochai. 2006. *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities. 2003. <<http://openaccess.mpg.de/Berlin-Declaration>>.
- Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing. 2003. <<http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/bethesda.htm>>.
- Björk, Bo-Christer, Mikael Laakso, Patrik Welling, and Patrik Paeteau. 2014. "Anatomy of Green Open Access." *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 2: 237- 250.
- Björk, Bo-Christer, Patrik Welling, Mikael Laasko, Peter Majlender, Turid Hedlund, and Guðni Guðnason. 2010. "Open Access to the Scientific Journal Literature: Situation 2009."

PLoS one

5(6):

e11273.

<<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0011273>>.

Blumer, Herbert. 1969. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Berkley: University of California Press.

---. 1980. "Mead and Blumer: The Convergent Methodological Perspectives of Social Behaviorism and Symbolic Interactionism." *American Sociological Review* 45(3): 409-419.

---. 1990. *Industrialization as an Agent of Social Change: A Critical Analysis*. New York: A. de Gruyter.

Bornmann, Lutz and Ruedieger Mutz. 2014. "Growth Rates of Modern Science: A Bibliometric Analysis Based on the Number of Publications and Cited References." *Working paper* <<http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.4578>>.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1969. "Intellectual Field and Creative Project." *Social Science Information* 8(2): 89-119.

---. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

---. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." Pp 241-258 in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* edited by J. Richardson. New York: Greenwood. <<https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/fr/bourdieu-forms-capital.htm>>.

---. 1988. *Homo Academicus*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

---. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

---. 2004. *Science of Science and Reflexivity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Bourdieu, Pierre and Luc Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bowen, Glen. 2008. "Naturalistic Inquiry and the Saturation Concept: A Research Note." *Qualitative Research* 8(1): 137-152.
- Budapest Open Access Initiative. 2002. <<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>>.
- Burawoy, Michael. 2005. "For Public Sociology." *American Sociological Review* 70: 4-28.
- Burris, Val. 2004. "The Academic Caste System: Prestige Hierarchies in PhD Exchange Networks." *American Sociological Review* 69(2): 239-264.
- Burt, Ronald. 2004. "Structural Holes and Good Ideas." *American Journal of Sociology* 110(2): 349-399.
- Canadian Government. 2015. "Open Access." <<http://www.science.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=75F21A63-1>>.
- Carroll, Michael. 2011. "Why Full Open Access Matters." *PLOS biology* 9(11): e1001210. <<http://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.1001210>>.
- Cast, Alicia. 2003. "Power and the Ability to Define the Situation." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66(3): 185-201.
- Castells, Manuel. 2010. *The Rise of the Network Society* 2nd edition. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cern. 2016. "The Birth of the Web." <<http://home.cern/topics/birth-web>>.
- Chang, Johannes Han-Yin. 2004. "Mead's Theory of Emergence as a Framework for Multilevel Sociological Inquiry." *Symbolic Interaction* 27(3): 405-427.
- Charmaz, Kathy. 2014. *Constructing Grounded Theory* 2nd edition. London: Sage.
- Clarke, Adele. 2005. *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory after the Postmodern Turn*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Collins, Harry. 1985. *Changing Order: Replication and Induction in Scientific Practice*. London: Sage.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.
- Corbett, Susan. 2011. “Creative Commons Licences, the Copyright Regime and the Online Community: Is there a Fatal Disconnect.” *Modern Law Review* 74(4): 503-531.
- Crane, Diana. 1972. *Invisible Colleges: Diffusion of Knowledge in Scientific Communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crawford, Walt. 2011. *Open Access: What You Need to Know Now*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- . 2016. ““Trust me”: The Apparent Case for 90% of Beall’s List Additions.” <http://walt.lishost.org/2016/01/trust-me-the-apparent-case-for-90-of-bealls-list-additions/>.
- Creswell, John. 2013. *Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches 3rd Edition*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- da Silva, Filipe. 2008. *Mead and Modernity: Science, Selfhood, and Democratic Politics*. Plymouth: Lexington.
- Deakin, Hannah and Kelly Wakefield. 2014. “Skype Interviewing: Reflections of Two PhD Researchers.” *Qualitative Research* 14(5): 603-616.
- Dennis, Alex. 2011. “Pragmatism and Symbolic Interactionism.” Pp. 463-474 in *The Sage Handbook of The Philosophy of Social Sciences* edited by Ian Jarvie and Jesús Zamora-Bonilla. Los Angeles: Sage.

- Dennis, Alex and Peter Martin. 2005. "Symbolic Interactionism and the Concept of Power." *The British Journal of Sociology* 56(2): 191-210.
- Dewey, John. 1896. "The Reflex Arc Concept in Psychology." *Psychological Review* 3: 357-370.
- . 1905. "The Postulate of Immediate Empiricism." *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods* 2(15): 393-399.
- Durkheim, Emile. 2008[1912]. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eisenstein, Elisabeth. 1979. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe*, 2 volumes. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Emirbayer, Mustafa. 1997. "Manifesto for a Relational Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 103(2): 281-318.
- Eve, Martin Paul. 2014. *Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts, Controversies and the Future*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Faulkner, Robert. 2009. "Improvising on Sensitizing Concepts." Pp. 79-91 in *Ethnographies Revisited: Constructing Theory in the Field*, edited by Antony Puddephatt, William Shaffir, and Steven Kleinknecht. London: Routledge.
- Federal Communications Commission. 2007. "Internet History: From ARPANET to Broadband." *Congressional Digest* 86(2): 35-64.
- Fine, Gary Alan. 1991. "On the Macrofoundations of Microsociology: Constraint and the Exterior Reality of Structure." *The Sociological Quarterly* 32(2): 161-177.

- Fischer, Michael and Mark Dirsmith. 1995. "Strategy, Technology, and Social Processes Within Professional Cultures: A Negotiated Order, Ethnographic Perspective." *Symbolic Interaction* 18(4): 381-412.
- Frenette, Yves. 2014. "Conscripting Canada's Past: The Harper Government and the Politics of Memory." *Canadian Journal of History* 49(1): 50-65.
- Fröhlich, Gerhard. 1996. "Netz Euphorien: Zur Kritik digitaler und sozialer Netz(werk)metaphern." Pp. 292-306 in *Philosophie in Österreich. Edited by Alfred Schramm*. Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky.
- Fuchs, Christian. 2010. *Internet and Society: Social Theory in the Information Age*. New York: Routledge.
- Gargouri, Yassine, Vincent Larivière, Yves Gingras, Les Carr, Stevan Harnad. 2012. "Green and Gold Open Access Percentages and Growth, by Discipline." Pp. 11 in *17th International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators (STI)*. <<http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/340294/>>.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Gieryn, Thomas. 1983. "Boundary Work and the Demarcation of Science from Nonscience: Strains and Interests in the Professional Ideologies of Scientists." *American Sociological Review* 48(6): 781-795.
- . 1999. *Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Line*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Glaser, Barney. 1978. *Theoretical Sensitivity*. Mill Valley: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, Barney and Anselm Strauss. 1967. *Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

- Habermas, Jürgen. 1984[1981]. *The Theory of Communicative Action* 2 volumes. Boston: Beacon.
- Haggarty, Kevin. 2008. “Case Studies in Open Access Publishing Number Five. Taking the Plunge: Open Access at the *Canadian Journal of Sociology*.” *Information Research* 13(1). <<http://www.informationr.net/ir/13-1/paper338.html>>.
- Hajjem, Chawki, Stevan Harnad, and Yves Gingras. 2005. “Ten-Year Cross-Disciplinary Comparison of the Growth of Open Access and How it Increases Research Citation Impact.” *IEEE Data Engineering Bulletin* 28(4): 39-47. <<http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/262906/>>.
- Hall, Peter. 1985. “Asymmetric Relationships and Processes of Power.” *Studies in Symbolic Interaction* 1: 309:-344.
- . 1997. “Meta-Power, Social Organization, and the Shaping of Social Action.” *Symbolic Interaction* 20(4): 397-418.
- Harding, Sandra. 2001. “Feminist Standpoint Epistemology.” Pp. 145-168 in *The Gender and Science Reader* edited by Muriel Lederman and Ingrid Bartsch. New York: Routledge.
- Hargittai, Eszter and Gina Walejko. 2008. “The Participation Divide: Content Creation and Sharing in the Digital Age.” *Information, Communication, and Society* 11(2): 239-256.
- Harnad, Stevan. 1991. “Post-Gutenberg Galaxy: The Fourth Revolution in the Means of Production of Knowledge.” *Public-Access Computer Systems Review* 2(1): 38-53. <<http://cogprints.org/1580/1/harnad91.postgutenberg.html>>.
- . 1995. “Overture: The Subversive Proposal” Pp. 11-12 in *Scholarly Journals at the Crossroads: A Subversive Proposal for Electronic Publishing* edited by Ann Shumelda

Okerson and James O'Donnell. Washington: Office of Scientific and Academic Publishing.

---. 1999. "The Copyright Non-Problem and Self-Archiving." <http://www.ecs.soton.ac.uk/~harnad/Hypermail/Amsci/0449.html>.

---. 2007. "There is no 'Platinum' Road to OA." <http://users.ecs.soton.ac.uk/harnad/Hypermail/Amsci/6442.html>.

Harris, Scott. 2001. "What Can Interactionism Contribute to the Study of Inequality? The Case of Marriage and Beyond." *Symbolic Interaction* 24(4): 455-480.

Hegel, George Wilhelm. 1977[1807]. *The Phenomenology of Spirit*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Herb, Ulrich. 2010. "Sociological Implication of Scientific Publishing: Open access, science, society, democracy and the digital divide." *First Monday* 15(2). <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2599/24040%5C>.

Herman, Nancy and Gil Musolf. 1998. "Resistance Among Ex-Psychiatric Patients: Expressive and Instrumental Rituals." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 26(4): 426-449.

Hochschild, Arlie. 1979. "Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure." *American Journal of Sociology* 85(3): 551-575.

Holstein, James and Jaber Gubrium. 2011. "Animating Interview Narratives." Pp 149-167 in *Qualitative Research 3rd Edition*. Edited by David Silverman. London: Sage.

Howe, Brian. 2006. "What's Behind Stephen Harper's Anti-Aboriginal Agenda?" *Canadian Dimension* 40(5): 16.

Husu, Hanna-Mari. 2013. "Bourdieu and Social Movements: Considering Identity Movements in Terms of Field, Capital and Habitus." *Social Movement Studies* 12(3): 264-279.

- International Data Corporation. 2014. “Data Growth, Business Opportunities, and the IT Imperatives.” <<http://www.emc.com/leadership/digital-universe/2014iview/executive-summary.htm>>.
- James, Nalita and Hugh Busher. 2009. *Online Interviewing*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- James, William. 1907. *Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Joas, Hans. 1996. *The Creativity of Action*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kim, B.S.K., B.R Brenner, C.T.H Liang and P.A Asay. 2003. “A Qualitative Study of Adaptation Experiences of 1.5-Generation Asian Americans.” *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 9(2): 156-170.
- Kwan, Andrea. 2011. “Open Access and Scholarly Monographs in Canada.” <publishing.sfu.ca/2013/08/open-access-and-scholarly-monographs-in-canada/>.
- Laakso, Mikael. 2014. “Green Open Access Policies of Scholarly Journal Publishers: A Study of What, When, and Where Self-Archiving is Allowed.” *Scientometrics* 99: 475-494.
- Laakso, Mikael and Bo-Christer Björk. 2012. “Anatomy of Open Access Publishing: A Study of Longitudinal Development and Internal Structure.” *BMC Medicine* 10:124. <<http://bmcmmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1741-7015-10-124>>.
- Lamont, Michèle and Virág Molnár. 2002. “The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:167-95.
- Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lawrence, Steve. 2001. “Online or Invisible?” *Nature* 411(6837): 521.

- Lempert, Lora. 2007. "Asking Questions of the Data: Memowriting in the Grounded Theory Tradition." Pp. 245-195 in *Handbook of Grounded Theory* edited by Antony Bryant and Cathy Charmaz. London: Sage.
- Lombardo, Sebastiano and Ragnhild Kvålshaugen. 2014. "Constraint-Shattering Practices and Creative Action in Organizations." *Organization Studies* 35(4): 587-611.
- Lucibella, Michael. 2015. "National Science Foundation Issues Open Access Policy." <<https://www.aps.org/publications/apsnews/updates/access.cfm>>.
- Lyman, Peter and Hal Varian. 2003. "How Much Information?" <<http://groups.ischool.berkeley.edu/archive/how-much-info-2003/>>.
- Manheim, Karl. 1965[1929]. *Ideology and Utopia: an Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Martin, John Levi. 2003. "What is Field Theory?" *American Journal of Sociology* 109(1): 1-49.
- Marx, Karl. 2012[1845]. "The German Ideology." Pp. 142-145 in *Classical Sociological Theory* third edition, edited by Craig Calhoun, Joseph Gerteis, James Moody, Steven Pfaff, and Indermohan Virk. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Matthews, Ralph. 2014. "Committing Canadian Sociology: Developing a Canadian Sociology and a Sociology of Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology* 51(2): 107-127.
- McLuhan, Marshall. 1962. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- McMahon, Rob. 2014. "From Digital Divides to the First Mile: Indigenous Peoples and the Network Society in Canada." *International Journal of Communication* 8(1).

- McPherson, James. 2003. "A Crisis in Scholarly Publishing."
<<https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/october-2003/a-crisis-in-scholarly-publishing>>.
- Mead, George Herbert. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1938. *The Philosophy of the Act*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Merton, Robert. 1973. *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1973[1942]. "The Normative Structure of Science." Pp. 267-278 in *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations* edited by Norman W. Storer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1973[1968]. "The Matthew Effect in Science." Pp. 439-459 in *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations* edited by Norman W. Storer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Migheli, Matteo and Giovanni B. Ramello. 2014. "Open Access Journals and Academics' Behaviour." *Economic Inquiry* 52(4): 1250-1266.
- Miller, Jody and Barry Glassner. 2011. "The "Inside" and the "Outside": Finding Realities in Interviews." Pp. 131-148 in *Qualitative Research* 3rd edition. Edited by David Silverman. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Mitroff, Ian. 1974. "Norms and Counter-Norms in a Select Group of the Apollo Moon Scientists: A Case Study of the Ambivalence of Scientists." *American Sociological Review* 39(4): 579-595.

- Molloy, Jennifer C. 2011. "The Open Knowledge Foundation: Open Data Means Better Science." *PLOS Biology* 9(12): e1001195.
<<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3232214/>>.
- Norris, Michael. 2008. "The Citation Advantage of Open Access Articles." <<https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/handle/2134/4089>>.
- Open Access Directory. 2015. "Timeline before 2000." <http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Timeline_before_2000>.
- Panitch, Judith, and Sarah Michalak. 2005. "The Serials Crisis: A White Paper for the UNC-Chapel Hill Scholarly Communications Convocation." <<http://www.unc.edu/scholcomdig/whitepapers/panitch-michalak.html>>.
- Park, Ji-Jong. 2009. "Motivations for Web-Based Scholarly Publishing: Do Scientists Recognize Open Availability as an Advantage?" *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 40(4): 343-369.
- Park, Robert. 1952[1934]. "Dominance." Pp 159-164 in *Human Communities: The City and Human Ecology*. New York: Free Press.
- Park, Robert and Ernest Burgess. 1924. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pierce, Charles. 1931. *Collected Papers*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Popper, Karl. 1945. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. New York: Harper and Row.
- . 1963. *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*. New York: Basic.
- Prus, Robert. 1987. "Generic Social Processes: Maximizing Conceptual Development in Ethnographic Research." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 16(3): 250-293.
- . 1997. *Subcultural Mosaics and Intersubjective Realities: An Ethnographic Research Agenda for Pragmatizing the Social Sciences*. New York: SUNY.

- . 1999. *Beyond the Power Mystique: Power as Intersubjective Accomplishment*. New York: SUNY.
- Public Knowledge Project. 2014. "Open Monograph Press." <<https://pkp.sfu.ca/omp/>>.
- Puddephatt, Antony. 2013. "Toward a Radical Interactionist Account of Science." *Studied in Symbolic Interaction* 41: 53-82.
- Puddephatt, Antony and Taylor Price. Forthcoming. "Symbolic Interaction, Public Sociology, and the Potential of Open Access Publishing."
- Rainie, Lee and Barry Wellman. 2014. *Networked: The New Social Operating System*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Raymond, Eric. 1998. "The Cathedral and the Bazaar." *First Monday* 3(3). <<http://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/578/499>>.
- Research Council United Kingdom. 2013. "RCUK Policy on Open Access." <<http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/openaccess/policy/>>.
- Research Information Network. 2008. *Activities, Costs, and Funding Flows in the Scholarly Communications System*. <<http://www.rin.ac.uk/our-work/communicating-and-disseminating-research/activities-costs-and-funding-flows-scholarly-commu>>.
- . 2009. *Overcoming Barriers: Access to Research Information Content*. <http://www.rin.ac.uk/system/files/attachments/overcoming_barriers_report.pdf>.
- Richard, Jennifer, Denise Koufogiannakis, Pam Ryan. 2010. "Librarians and Libraries Supporting Open-Access Publishing." *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 39(3): 33-48.
- Salager-Meyer, Françoise. 2008. "Scientific Publishing in Developing Countries: Challenges for the Future." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 7:121-132.

- Schroter, Sara, and Leanne Tite. 2006. "Open Access Publishing and Author-Pays Business Models: A Survey of Authors' Knowledge and Perceptions." *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 99(3):141-148.
- Scopus. 2016. "Content." <<https://www.elsevier.com/solutions/scopus/content>>.
- Shalin, Dmitri. 1986. "Pragmatism and Social Interactionism." *American Sociological Review* 51(1): 9-29.
- Shen, Cenyu and Bo-Christer Björk. 2015. "'Predatory' Open Access: A Longitudinal Study of Article Volumes and Market Characteristics." *BMC Medicine* 13(1): 1-15.
- Siler, Kyle. 2016. "Cuts to Journal Subscriptions an Opportunity, Not a Crisis: Costs and Benefits of Cuts Must Be Weights Accordingly." *University Affairs* <<http://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/cuts-to-journal-subscriptions-an-opportunity-not-a-crisis/>>.
- Siler, Kyle, Kirby Lee, and Lisa Bero. 2015. "Measuring the Effectiveness of Scientific Gatekeeping." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112(2): 360-5.
- Silverman, David. 2003. "Analyzing Talk and Text." Pp. 340-362 in *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials Second Edition*. Edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Simmel, Georg. 2012[1908]. "The Stranger." Pp. 361-365 in *Classical Sociological Theory* third edition, edited by Craig Calhoun, Joseph Gerteis, James Moody, Steven Pfaff, and Indermohan Virk. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Singleton, Royce and Bruce Straits. 2010. *Approaches to Social Research: 5th Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Smith, Dennis. 1988. *The Chicago School: A Liberal Critique of Capitalism*. New York: St. Martin.
- Snijder, Ronald. 2014. “The Influence of Open Access on Monograph Sales.” *LOGOS: The Journal of the World Book Community* 25(3): 13-24.
- Social Science and Humanities Research Council. 2016. “Governance.” <http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/governance-gouvernance/index-eng.aspx>.
- Solomon, David and Bo-Christer Björk. 2012. “A Study of Open Access Journals Using Article Processing Charges.” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 63(8): 1485-1495.
- Steele, Robert David. 2012. *The Open-Source Everything Manifesto: Transparency, Truth and Trust*. Berkley: Evolver.
- Strauss, Anselm. 2008[1959]. “Membership and History.” Pp. 240-245 in *Social Theory Roots and Branches* 3rd edition. Edited by Peter Kivisto. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1987. *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin. 1998. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Sturges, Judith and Kathleen Hanrahan. 2004. “Comparing Telephone and Face-to-Face Qualitative Interviewing: A Research Note.” *Qualitative Research* 4(1): 107-118.
- Stryker, Sheldon. 1980. *Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version*. Menlo Park: Benjamin Cummings.
- Suber, Peter. 2001. “The Ellen Roche Story.” *Free Online Scholarship Newsletter* August 23, 2001.
- <https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4725003/suber_roche.htm?sequence=1>.

- . 2005. "Helping Scholars and Helping Libraries." *SPARC Open Access Newsletter* 84.
<<http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/04-02-05.htm#libraries>>
- . 2008. "Open Access and the Self-Correction of Knowledge." *SPARC Open Access Newsletter* 122.
<https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4391168/suber_selfcorrect.html?sequence=1>.
- . 2012. *Open Access*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Swan, Alma. 2010. "The Open Access Citation Advantage: Studies and Results to Date."
<<http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/268516/>>.
- Swan, Alma, and Sheridan Brown. 2004. "Authors and Open Access Publishing." *Learned Publishing* 17(3):219-224.
- Swartz, Aaron. 2008. "Guerrilla Open Access Manifesto."
<https://archive.org/stream/GuerillaOpenAccessManifesto/Goamjuly2008_djvu.txt>.
- Tenopir, Carol, Brenda Hitchcock and Ashley Pillow. 2003. *Use and Users of Electronic Library Resources: An Overview and Analysis of Recent Research Studies*. Washington: Council on Library and Information Resources.
<<http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub120/pub120.pdf>>.
- Thompson, John B. 2005. *Books in the Digital Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Thorne, S and P. Darbyshire. 2005. "Land Mines in the Field: a Modest Proposal for Improving the Craft of Qualitative Health Research." *Qualitative Health Research* 15(8): 1105-1113.

- Weitzman, Eben. 2003. "Software and Qualitative Research." Pp. 310-339 in *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials Second Edition*. Edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Wiener, Carolyn. 2007. "Making Teams Work in Conducting Grounded Theory." Pp. 293-310 in *The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory*. Edited by Antony Bryant and Kathy Charmaz. London: Sage.
- Willinsky, John. 2009. *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Willinsky, John and Ranjini Medis. 2007. "Case Studies in Open Access Publishing Number Three: Open Access on a Zero Budget: A Case Study of *Postcolonial Text*." *Information Research* 12(3).
- Wilson, Tom. 2007. "Green, Brass and Platinum – Three Routes to Open Access." < <http://info-research.blogspot.ca/2007/11/green-brass-and-platinum-three-routes.html>>.
- Wirth, Louis. 1948. "Consensus and Mass Communication." *American Sociological Review* 13(1): 1-15.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 2010. *Envisioning Real Utopias*. New York: Verso.
- Xia, Jingfeng, Jennifer Harmon, Kevin Connolly, Ryan Donnelly, Mary Anderson, Heather Howard. 2014. "Who Publishes in "Predatory" Journals?" *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 66(7): 1406-1417.
- Zeitlin, Irving. 1973. *Rethinking Sociology: A Critique of Contemporary Theory*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.