Culture Unbound:

Journal of Current Cultural Research

Thematic Section:

Publishing for Public Knowledge

Edited by

Johan Fornäs, Martin Fredriksson,
Eva Hemmungs Wirtén & Naomi Stead

Extraction from Volume 7, 2015

Linköping University Electronic Press
Culture Unbound: ISSN 2000-1525 (online)
URL: http://www.cultureunbound.ep.liu.se/
©2015 The Authors.

Culture Unbound, Extraction from Volume 7, 2015

Thematic Section: *Publishing for Public Knowledge*

Culture Unbound
Journal of Current Cultural Research

Publishing for Public Knowledge

By Johan Fornäs, Martin Fredriksson, Eva Hemmungs Wirtén & Naomi Stead

Academic publishing is a strange business. One might hope and expect that most scholars, regardless of discipline, would see it as one of their major academic duties to share their findings, and to interact with their peers and the general populace, via literal public-ation – the making-public of new knowledge. But even with such lofty ideals, the *realpolitik* of where, when, and how academics publish their scholarly work – based on the contemporary pressures and tensions of funding environments, the quantification and metricisation of scholarly work, and mechanisms for recognition and career reward – can lead to some curious and even perverse effects.

Academics seem to operate according to an inverted economy in comparison to the rest of the publishing industry: while most professional or semi-professional writers expect to be paid for their publications, academics are not only happy to give their texts away for free, they are often also prepared to pay to have them published. This does not mean that academics go unrewarded: if the average academic's annual income is compared with her annual production of text the result would probably be that academics are paid more per published page than most other authors. The difference is that while most professional writers live from selling their texts, academics are not paid to produce text but to produce knowledge. Finding an output for that knowledge is a secondary concern in the sense that the texts will be produced regardless of whether there is a (commercial) demand for them or not – and that is as it should be. And yet the academic author still has to publish – supposedly both high a quality and quantity of texts – in order to satisfy the financiers and ensure future funding. This is what makes many academics willing to sign any publishing contract placed before them, regardless of the economic conditions, as long as it ensures them publication in a journal with high impact factor. Academic authors thus work according to the logic of 'Publishing for public knowledge' in the regard that the value of the text depends not on direct economic compensation but on how widely spread and quoted it is. But while this is partly motivated by the honourable wish to contribute to the public good, the public domain, and to advance the stock of human knowledge per se, academic attitudes to publishing are also framed and conditioned by other, less 'disinterested' and more instrumental aims.

However, most commercial publishers act according to a proprietary logic where the value of the text as a commodity depends on the publisher's capacity to sell it at the highest possible price to the largest possible audience. In effect, this

Fornäs, Johan, Martin Fredriksson, Eva Hemmungs Wirtén & Naomi Stead: "Introduction: Publishing for Public Knoowledge", *Culture Unbound*, Volume 7, 2015: 558-564. Published by Linköping University Electronic Press: http://www.cultureunbound.ep.liu.se

means withholding it from broad, free public dissemination and reserving it for an exclusive circle of paying customers. The logic that drives this economy nevertheless relies on the inverted economy of the academic author, as it essentially involves proprietizing and commodifying the products of free labour: labour undertaken not only by the authors who write the articles but also by reviewers who evaluate them and guest editors who compile them. This is of course a bargain for commercial publishers who can package the final product and sell it to university libraries at a profit. '[t]he average U.S. research library now spends more than 65 per cent of its annual budget on subscriptions to the content of electronic materials and databases, a cost which has increased 402 per cent since 1986', according to Jafaar Aksikas and Sean Johnson Andrews (2014: 742). The (profitable) business model of academic publishers thus relies on a logic of selling access to research back to the same academic institutions that funded it in the first place.

The effect of all this has been that members of the general public, those who do not have access to an academic library with bulk journal subscriptions, can only access the research on an individual dowload basis, where the cost of downloading a single article can be shockingly high. Likewise, scholars and academics in less well-resourced academic contexts, where libraries can not afford journal subscriptions, are also unable to access it. The audience for such publications is thus doubly truncated: not just solely academics, but solely academics with institutional positions in wealthy, well resourced, usually developed countries. This hardly equates to any known definition of a 'public'.

Given that academic research is most often funded, directly or indirectly, by government funding, that is *public* money, the ironies and disparities of the model are clear. The political importance of access to new knowledge, and the power disparities underlined by the current system, are particularly acute in the case of medical research. In the case of Australia, for example, much medical research is funded by the National Health and Medical Research Council – a public agency. But while this research, with its cutting edge new knowledge on the causes and treatment of illness, can be accessed by doctors and medical researchers, it can largely not be accessed by the ordinary people who are sick – and seeking to inform themselves of the nature of their illness and their options for dealing with it. Clearly, in such cases, knowledge is power. While people might once have believed in a paternal and infallible medical profession to look after them, the public that funds such research often has a powerful, even life-or-death justification for accessing its results.

All this is of course old news to most academics. Recently the rather perverse model of academic publishing described above has been challenged not only by individual scholars but also by universities, funding institutions and policy makers. There is currently an increasingly mainstream trend towards Open Access publishing: a movement, and a critical position, that *Culture Unbound* was relatively early to adopt. It is still very much an open question what shape Open Ac-

cess will take as it continues to evolve, and how it will be financed. Many journals, such as *Culture Unbound*, are available free of charge, which of course requires other sources of funding. In the case of *Culture Unbound* that funding comes from Linköping University and the Swedish Research Council. Some might criticize such initiatives for contributing to an increased drain on the public purse. This position, however, reflects a rather naïve understanding of academic publication – which has never been able to carry its own costs on a free and private market, but has always relied on subscription fees from libraries that are in most cases publicly financed anyway. In that regard a *direct* public funding of academic journals might very well be more cost efficient than an indirect reallocation of public funds though a semi-commercial market.

In many ways, Open Access scholarly publishing is subject to the same tensions facing all online publishing – in the digitial environment everyone wants content but no one wants to pay. Nevertheless, as many have realized, Open Access publishing has new forms of commercial potential due to the possibility of charging the authors instead of the readers. There has recently been a rise of mega journals: huge depositories publishing texts. The articles are peer reviewed but the process is much quicker and less selective than used to be the case with traditional journals, which formerly staked their credibility on high rejection rates and exclusivity. In 2014, fourteen of the largest mega journals together published more than 33 000 articles, and the biggest, PLOS ONE, alone published 30 000 articles (Björk 2015). Despite the distaste with which such practices might be viewed in some academic circles, they are not illegal, nor even unethical, and clearly cater to a desperate need for publications. Another more shady example of how it is possible to profit from academics' need to publish are the 'literary agents' who have sometimes contacted the editors of *Culture Unbound* with offers to pay for publishing opportunities:

> Sir many […] authors wish and ask me publish their papers at foreign journals so we decided start Literary agency, sir I am making list of foreign journals for publishing papers, if I send paper as per Your guidelines will you publish it, I will edit as per your requirement and send you processing fee. I will take my charge from authors, Sir

It is difficult to determine exactly what is being offered here – is it freelance editorial services, funded at the expense of the author, or is it a straight up bribe, a payment for publication in a journal which (importantly) is known to be selective, and not pay-per-publication? In any case, the rise and apparent viability of such rent-seeking 'middle men' bespeaks a rampaging market for facilitators, and vehicles, of academic publication. This bears upon wider geo-political boundaries as would-be scholars in the 'global South' seek the publication credentials necessary for access to the PhD scholarships, academic jobs, and funding available in research institutions in developed countries.

Between the Publishing Industry and University Economics

The desperate need to publish that haunts many academics also drives both the old publishing industry and the new models for Open Access publishing. This grows out of new expectations that scholars meet within the internal economics of the academy, which are changing just as fast as those of the publishing industry. On the one hand, neo-liberal efforts to commercialise and privatise universities have intensified. In Sweden, for instance, strong protests have temporarily halted a government reform that would open the door to sell out higher education and research to private foundations, but despite such strong resistance many still point to the UK as a deterring example in deregulating universities. *Public universities* cannot any longer be taken for granted, but need to be argued and fought for. Many feel a growing need to engage in the struggle for open, public universities against the insidious effects of privatisation and commercialisation. The *public* in this sense should not be reduced to consumers of commodities, nor be confined within national boundaries – instead publicness must allow for multiplicity and mobility along all possible dimensions, crossing intersecting identity orders such as nationality, ethnicity, class, gender or age as well as research areas (disciplines and themes) and academic levels (from students to senior faculty).

The kind of work prioritised by cultural researchers aims to produce *public knowledge*, open for sharing by any interested member of the general and global public, thus making 'unbound' what would otherwise be monopolised by closed elites. In the current situation, new threats but also new tools for such critical knowledge have appeared. On the other hand, the spread of new, social and digital media have also paved the way for new ways of making research public through Open Access and other forms of publishing. Publications such as academic journals are not just neutral tools for sharing results, but also core elements of the ambition to construct a universal but diverse intellectual sphere of knowledge. There is a need to acknowledge the new opportunities and threats facing academic publishing today, not least for those engaged in Open Access journals.

That is what we tried to do when we made 'Publishing for Public Knowledge' the theme of a workshop celebrating *Culture Unbound's* fifth anniversary, which was held in Norrköping in November 2014. This special issue is an output from that event, where we have invited the speakers from the workshop to develop their presentations into articles dealing with problems facing academia and academic publishing today.

The Contributions

In 'How Green is this Paper' Toby Miller, somewhat provocatively, asks if all these publications are really needed; and if digital publishing is more environmentally sound than printed publication. Academia certainly seems to be suffering

from a publication glut that has been spurred on by the cult of digital publishing, which is often portrayed as virtually free of costs, both economically and environmentally. Miller discards this as a myth and concludes that digital publishing also has significant environmental impact. This calls for more concern with what is published and why.

In her article 'Swedish Publications in a Global World' Jenny Björkman discusses how new demands from funding bodies – who now increasingly require 'international impact' in addition to other traditional measures of quality – works to change the landscape of academic publishing. While the monograph traditionally has been the norm for publishing within the humanities and parts of the social sciences, there has recently been a shift towards publishing research results in articles in academic journals. If Miller discussed how this leads to a growing number of publications, Björkman argues that it also fosters a growing specialization in academic publishing where academics are becoming more focused on narrow issues and problems and increasingly loses the capacity to engage with social and cultural concerns on the more general level that is necessary to engage in public debate. The generalist public intellectual risks giving way to the highly specialised, but also narrow, disciplinary expert.

The flipside of this drive towards internationalization is that it tends to create an increasingly monolinguistic publication environment where the highest ranked publication channels only publish texts in English. Roman Horak discusses this dilemma in a Cultural Studies context in his contribution 'Translation, Cultural Translation and the Hegemonic English'. The hegemony of English is indeed very predominant in Cultural Studies, with its strong foundations in British academia. Horak's article engages with the issue of translation, both as a linguistic practice but also as a cultural transformation that may challenge not only the hegemony of the English language but also the perspectives on knowledge inherent in established academic traditions. Hopefully a proliferation of academic journals, English speaking as well as others, might contribute to such a development.

Eva Hemmungs Wirtén gives another perspective on the appropriation of knowledge. Her article 'The Patent and the Paper: A Few Thoughts on Late Modern Science and Intellectual Property' takes Marie Curie's choice not to patent her discovery of Radium as an example to discuss knowledge as a property or a public good. The decision not to patent radium and the processes of its extraction, is one of the most famous of all decisions in the history of science and is often seen as a prime example of the scientific ethos of openness. At the same time some of Curie's contemporaries also criticised that decision for enabling various misuses of Radium, which quickly became an ingredient in cosmetics and various kinds of 'miraculous' health cure. Just as with 'mega journals', this raises the question of whether making all knowledge free and public necessarily promotes the public good, or if it may in some cases corrupt or endanger that knowledge.

Geoff Stahl's contribution 'Performance Anxiety: Audit Culture and the Neoliberal New Zealand University' is a concrete example of how university economics affect publishing strrategies. He gives a detailed, empirical account of how the bibliometrical urge plays out in a research environment, in this case in academia in New Zealand. In 2002 New Zealand introduced the Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF): a new auditing regime that made research output, and not education as had previously been the case, the most important source for evaluating researchers and allocating funds. This is a clear empirical example of how mechanisms for resource-allocation within the universities contribute to an increase in publications. The question is of course whether that really ensures more and better research, or if it simply increases quantity.

If the universities and funding agencies require growing numbers of publications, preferably in Open Access, it should also lie in their interest to promote a growing number of OA journals. Jenny Johannisson addresses the role of the universities when she discusses 'Open Access Scholarly Publishing on the Competitive Market'. She looks at the drive towards OA academic publishing from a university management perspective, drawing on her own experience as a journal editor and deputy vice chancellor at a Swedish university. Johannisson argues that the universities have an important role to play in funding and in other ways enabling researchers to develop journals as part of their everyday academic tasks.

It is one of the more pressing tasks ahead for academics and universities to address what our future infrastructures of information and knowledge should look like. But to look to the future it is necessary to see the past: many of the highly topical questions addressed in this special issue of *Culture Unbound* are not new. Academic publishing in its present form rests on a tradition going back many hundreds of years. It is possible to learn from that history, even though the present comes with its own challenges. *Culture Unbound* is committed to uphold such a 'split-vision' of past and future, and to continue to encourage a creative and proactive discussion on how public knowledge comes about and how we might continue to defend its value. We do so with a largely new editorial team. With the five year anniversary workshop 'Publishing for Public Knowledge' in 2014 *Culture Unbound* welcomed Eva Hemmungs Wirtén as new Editor in Chief, following Johan Fornäs who founded the journal in 2009. Also in 2015, Johanna Dahlin succeeded Martin Fredriksson as Executive Editor, a role Martin had carried off brilliantly from the very beginning of the journal's existence. And finally, after a three-year tenure, Naomi Stead is about to take her leave as *Culture Unbound's* Associate Editor with this last 2015 issue. We will miss her generous input of ideas and astut readings of texts, but we welcome Stead and Fornäs to the editorial board. We are also convinced that our new associate editor and latest addition to the editorial team, James Meeese from Unversity of Technology in Sydney, will make a new and creative contribution to the new editorial troika that will make its distinctive mark on *Culture Unbound* for the years to come.

Johan Fornäs is professor at the Department of Media and Communication Studies at Södertörn University in South Stockholm. With a background in musicology and cultural studies, he is since 2015 member of Academia Europaea and has previously been vice-chair of the Association for Cultural Studies ACS, founding director of the Advanced Cultural Studies Institute of Sweden ACSIS, founder and chief editor of *Culture Unbound*, and board member of Riksbankens Jubileumsfond. His current research has three main strands, dealing with mediatisation theory, with cultural theory, and with identities, symbols and narratives of Europe. E-mail: johan.fornas@sh.se

Martin Fredriksson is assistant professor and Marie Curie fellow at the Department of Culture Studies (Tema Q), Linköping University. He is currently visiting researcher at Westen Sydeny University where he is conducting a project about 'Commons and Commodities: Knowledge, Natural Resources and the Construction of Property' funded by the Swedish National Research Council. He was *Cuture Unbound's* executive editor between 2009 and 2015. E-mail: martin.fredriksson@liu.se

Eva Hemmungs Wirtén is Professor of Mediated Culture at the Department of Culture Studies, (Tema Q), Linköping University. She has written extensively on the cultural history of international copyright and the public domain. Her most recent book is *Making Marie Curie: Intellectual Property and Celebrity Culture in an Age of Information* (University of Chicago Press, 2015). Her current research is on patents as scientific information and the intersection of bibliography, intellectual property, and material culture. E-mail: eva.hemmungs.wirten@liu.se

Naomi Stead is Associate Professor in the Research Centre ATCH (Architecture | Theory | Criticism | History) in the School of Architecture at the University of Queensland, Australia. Her research interests broadly lie within the architectural humanities and the cultural studies of architecture, in its production, mediation and reception. E-mail: n.stead@uq.edu.au

References

Aksikas, Jafaar & Sean Johnson Andrews (2014): 'Neolberalism, Law and Culture: A Cultural Studies Intervention after "the Cultural Turn"', *Cultural Studies*, 28:5-6, 742-780.

Björk, Bo-Christer (2015): 'Have the "Mega-journals" reached the Limits of Growth?',*Peer J*, 26 May 2015.

Culture Unbound
Journal of Current Cultural Research

Translation, Cultural Translation and the Hegemonic English

By Roman Horak

Abstract

This brief chapter problematizes the hegemonic position of the English language in Cultural Studies, which, in the author's view, can be understood as a moment that stands against a true internationalisation of the project. Following an argument referring to the necessary 'translation' process (here seen as 're-articulation', 'transcoding' or 'transculturation') Stuart Hall has put forward almost two decades ago, the essay, firstly, turns to the notion of 'linguistic translations', and deals, secondly, with what has been coined 'cultural translation'. Discussing approaches developed by Walter Benjamin, Umberto Eco and Homi Bhabha, the complex relationship between the two terms is being investigated.

Finally, in a modest attempt to throw some light on this hegemonic structure, central aspects of the output of three important journals (European Journal of Cultural Studies, International Journal of Cultural Studies, Cultural Studies), i. e. an analysis of the linguistic and institutional backgrounds of the authors of the ten most-read and most-cited essays, are presented.

Based on these findings I argue that it is not simply the addition of the *discursive field* (language) to the *academic space* (institution) that defines the mechanism of exclusion and inclusion. Rather, it is the *articulation of both moments*, i.e. that of language and that of the institution, which – in various contexts (but in their own very definite ways) – can help to develop that structure which at present is still hindering a further, more profound internationalisation of the project that is Cultural Studies.

Keywords: Scholarly publishing, translation, hegemonic English, Cultural Studies

Horak, Roman: "Translation, Cultural Translation and the Hegemonic English", *Culture Unbound*, Volume 7, 2015: 565-575. Published by Linköping University Electronic Press: http://www.cultureunbound.ep.liu.se

Translation, Cultural Translation and the Hegemonic English

Almost twenty years ago, more precisely in the summer of 1996, Handel K. Wright gave a sensational keynote lecture as part of the first Crossroads in Cultural Studies Conference. Written in a style that was ironic, yet at the same time astutely provocative, the lecture – which was published one and a half years later, in the first issue of the newly founded *European Journal of Cultural Studies* – challenged the universally shared assumption that the origins of cultural studies lay in Great Britain, and more precisely at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at the University of Birmingham. Wright claimed that there were other 'origins', supporting his claim with reference to various comparable projects in Denmark in the 1920s, North America in the 1930s and Kenya in the 1970s. Although the list might also be extended to include, for example, the movement propagating working-class culture and education in Vienna in the inter-war years, Handel Wright's argument has both its charms and a serious hidden agenda, yet should not be misunderstood as a carping attempt to disparage the work of the founding generation of British Cultural Studies. As far as Wright was concerned, the aim of his lecture/text was to help augment the international orientation of the Cultural Studies project. Employing the ruse of re-writing traditional history, he was endeavouring to facilitate a broader, more international future for the project, and to maintain the momentum of its progressive and interdisciplinary orientation.

Wright, who was employed at the University of Tennessee at the time when he published the paper in the *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, rightly criticised the Anglocentrism of Cultural Studies. Making reference to the work of Kuan-Hsing Chen, among others, he proposed, as an alternative, a departure from both Anglocentrism and Eurocentrism (Wright 1998: 48).

From the perspective of the tradition of the work of the CCCS, at the latest since the 1980s (I need mention only the names of Stuart Hall and Paul Gilroy), this is a thoroughly praiseworthy approach. I allow myself to add that an internationalisation of Cultural Studies (however we may evaluate it) has indeed occurred, at least rudimentarily, over the past two decades, and I cite here its developments in South America and Asia as a paradigm.

What Wright did not challenge, despite all his discussion of the limitations of Anglocentric and Eurocentric politico-cultural dominance, was the linguistic hegemony of English. The fact that this linguistic hegemony is accompanied by a rather hermetic discursive field is hereby only mentioned at this point, although I shall return to the topic later.

The same year (1996) that Handel Wright delivered his stunning lecture also saw the publication of a volume of essays edited by David Morley and Kuan-

Hsing Chen, entitled *Stuart Hall. Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, which contained the reprint of an interview with Stuart Hall which had been conducted by Chen on the occasion of the Trajectories Conference (organised by the Institute of Literature at the National Tsing Hua University in Taipei, Taiwan) in July 1992. This conference is remarkable insofar as it was the first international Cultural Studies conference to be held outside the English-speaking world.

The interview was entitled 'Cultural Studies and the Politics of Internationalization' and, like Handel Wright's lecture, it dealt with questions about the future orientation and direction of the Cultural Studies project. More so than in the case of Wright, the focus was on the politics of Cultural Studies, with hegemony a central notion and the spirit of Antonio Gramsci (at least in English translation) hanging in air.

Hall dismisses considerations and questions about the 'origins' of Cultural Studies as unproductive – a point, incidentally, in which his argumentation resembles that of Handel Wright. His response to a question concerning the relevance of British Cultural Studies was that it would be much more important to observe the changes that it was undergoing. Its approaches, paradigms and research topics had changed since the 1960s, and although what characterised it now (1992) could be viewed in relation to the earlier work, present-day practice occupied a different space, which did not, however, mean that all ties had been severed. British Cultural Studies was at any rate needed if it produced good work (Hall 1996: 394).

The early 1990s saw the expansion of Cultural Studies, above all in the United States (where one might almost describe it as having become an academic fashion at that time), but also in northern Europe and Asia. In the interview there is talk of an internationalisation and even a globalisation of the project. According to Hall, work in Cultural Studies was being done in many countries. However, this was not occurring as a process of simple, unchallenged acceptance *(appropriation/imitation)*, but rather a process where practitioners everywhere adopting a certain paradigm and transforming it in their own way according to their own respective interests. In order to describe the process, Hall makes use of the term 'translation', which he elucidates as follows.

The term, according to Hall, should naturally not be understood in a narrowly traditionalist way, but resembles the terms 're-articulation', 'transcoding' or 'transculturation', which are also used in other contexts in Cultural Studies. The term 'translation' ought not to be understood as if there were an original, the translation of which would then be a copy of the former. Such an understanding, Hall argues, derives from a time when people still adhered to a notion of teleology that has become redundant today. Hall makes reference to the notion of 'identity', which comes from teleological discourse, but which is not used in the same way by him, making it necessary to place the term 'identity' in inverted commas.

> And I use 'translation' in quotation marks too: translation as a continuous process of re-articulation and re-contextualization, without any notion of a primary origin. So I am not using it in the sense that cultural studies was 'really' a fully-formed western project and is now taken up elsewhere. I mean that whenever it enters a new cultural space, the terms change; and, exactly as you find in any re-articulation and disarticulation, some elements remain the same, because clearly there are certain points, certain terms and concepts in common, but there are also new elements which change the configuration. (Hall 1996: 393 f.)

Let us now examine this central term in Hall's argumentation, that of 'translation', by taking a step back. Modern translation science distinguishes between 'translation between languages' and 'translation between cultures'. The latter – which is the one that concerns Hall – involves a metaphorical extension of the classical term 'translation'.

For our purposes, both variants are significant, even if in the case of 'translation between languages' it is usually literary translation that is intended and theorised about, whereas in our everyday Cultural Studies practice we deal with academic texts.

There is not room here for a detailed debate on the complex issues of translation. A few points, however, shall be raised in order to be able to elaborate on the main topic of this essay, that is, the structures of inclusion/exclusion and the hegemonic English within the transdisciplinary practice of Cultural Studies.

Umberto Eco, referring to 'translation proper', discusses translation as negotiation. This negotiation involves a number of parties. Eco mentions the original text, an author, the cultural frame within the text is situated, on the other side there is the destination text, the cultural milieu in which the text is being translated, the publishing industry. The translator is then the negotiator between the parties involved.

In Ecos words: "Negotiation is a process by virtue of which, in order to get something, each party renounces something else, and at the end everybody feels satisfied since one cannot have everything" (Eco 2004: 6. See also Eco 2008, 2009).

In relation to literary translation, Walter Benjamin speaks of a 'task'. In the kind of literary translation with which he is concerned "the life of the originals attains its latest, continually renewed, and most complete unfolding" (Benjamin 1996: 255), and this effectively helps to keep the text alive. Since Benjamin proceeds from the assumption that a translation always comes later, there is a temporal distance between the composition of the initial text and its translation, so that the translation may be not only between languages but also between epochs. If it is true, as Benjamin thought, that all languages intend the same, yet in their imperfection can only approximate an ideal (pure) language which they are actually unable to attain, then this fact has serious consequences for translation.

For him, the focal point is not the question of how to achieve the greatest possible faithfulness in translation, or of the freedom of the translator, but rather the

fact that a moment of pure language becomes reality in the process of translation. Benjamin's concept of language creation has exerted a considerable influence on recent translation theory, of which I refer here solely to Homi Bhabha's notion of cultural translation.

Whereby we have already arrived at the second notion. As Birgit Wagner, the Viennese scholar of Romance Studies, has pointed out (correctly, in my opinion), the term 'cultural translation' is a metaphorical extension of the notion of translation. In one essay, which deals with Homi Bhabha's reflections on the subject, she writes:

> If 'translation' generally denotes the process of casting a text from one natural language into another, then cultural 'translation' looks away from language – and above all from the differences between languages – and usually signifies the translation of the ideas, values, patterns of thinking, patterns of behaviour and practices of one cultural context into that of another. Cultural translation in this sense may be achieved through literary and cinematic representation, but also through the practices of everyday life and politics. (Wagner 2009: 1)

We are now able to ask what this entails for the world of academic disciplines. Literal translation is a matter for translation science, which in recent times has also undergone a process of reform. Within this discipline it is Translational Studies (Cf. Bassnett 1998, 2002, Venuti 2000) – inspired and informed by the debates of Post-Colonialism and Gender Studies – which has come closest to a more comprehensive notion of translation, "yet it too still remains attached to definite achievements in translation and to concrete languages, and in so doing circles within the orbit of the textual sciences." (Wagner, *loc. cit.*)

However, in metaphorical use, it is not so clear where the term belongs academically. To quote Birgit Wagner again:

> On the other hand, the metaphorical extension of the notion of translation is the responsibility of every concrete specialist discipline, and eventually of none at all: the term serves as a perfect example of a transdisciplinary challenge, and frequently also of a transdisciplinary challenge whose demands are excessive. (Wagner *loc. cit.*)

Against this background, it is neither a coincidence nor surprising that Stuart Hall, a leading representative of the transdisciplinary subject of Cultural Studies, makes use of this metaphorically broad term of 'translation' when it is a matter of propagating and reforming of the field of Cultural Studies, as we have seen above.

Both of the notions of translation are of central significance to the task of internationalising and globalising the practice of Cultural Studies; and we will have to ask ourselves how the problematics of translation (in both of its senses) contribute to the development of structures of exclusion and/or inclusion. In other words, following a dictum of Marx, we shall now ascend from the abstract to the concrete.

Let us therefore enter the empirical-factual world and begin with the rather banal statement that English is the dominant world language at present (and has been for some considerable time now), illustrated by the circumstance that more

texts are translated from the English language than into it (and this applies above all to literature). I would here dare to remark that talk of Eurocentrism – though it is politically important – tends to obfuscate rather than illuminate this circumstance, because use of the term 'Eurocentrism' only serves to conceal the dominance of the English language behind a cloak of invisibility. This should not be misunderstood as the maudlin complaint of an author with German as his mother-tongue. On the one hand, the present author is anglophile to a high degree, while on the other hand it is not a good thing for English to be playing this role of *lingua franca*. This may be illustrated by a small example from my academic practice. For well over a decade now, I have worked for the European Commission as an evaluator of research applications. In accordance with the logic of the bureaucratic-centralistic administration of knowledge, not only are the exposés presented in English, but the critical evaluators' reports also have to be composed in a peculiarly created and bureaucratically standardised English, which has little in common with the living language of literature, science or everyday life. *Brunglish* (i.e. Brussels' English) is an ironic expression for it, and in this context Brunglish trumps English every time, as a Scottish colleague painfully experienced when his Final Report had to be corrected from pure English to Brunglish by his vice-chair (the person who has to supervise a certain number of evaluators and monitor the reports' final linguistic form). The casualness with which the said colleague accepted this act of linguistic vandalism still astonishes me even today.

In such situations one feels transported back to the Middle Ages, or to early modern times, to a time when it was Latin, as the international language, that made communication possible, above all among the elites. However this comparison is somewhat flawed, since Latin is (and was at that time) a language which, although it constituted a cultural space, cannot be allocated to any particular geographico-physical space (nor could it be at that time).

It is a quite different matter with English. English is the language of the only political world power remaining since the collapse of so-called real Socialism almost a quarter of a century ago. If we recall the debate about economic multicentrality – following Asia's economic boom (now also already in decline) – we can see that the political (and cultural hegemony) of English continues.

Without pandering to the simple argument about the Americanisation of culture, it must be stated that the said linguistic dominance – which is the only thing that we are dealing with here – also has consequences that cannot be overlooked for the sciences, although the consequences may be less serious for the formal-abstract/abstracting natural sciences, than for the humanities and social sciences, for which the work on the text represents an important moment in the production of knowledge.

In this connection, if the humanities and social sciences, and in particular the transdisciplinary discipline and political practice of the Cultural Studies project, seek to be understood internationally, then questions naturally begin to arise about

the process of inclusion and exclusion already mentioned above. In my opinion, it is no coincidence that these questions have hardly been addressed at all.

A rapid and unsystematic glance at the great majority of current (and recent) publications in the broad field of Cultural Studies suffices to illustrate the scope of the problem. What we find there in the respective references are – with the exception of articles by celebrated international stars – almost exclusively texts by English-language authors, or by those who teach and carry out research at universities in the English-speaking world.

I would now like to flesh out this preliminary finding – which is actually only an initial and, please note, unsystematic observation – more empirically, with the request that what follows should not be misunderstood as a strict or methodically comprehensive investigation. Nonetheless, it cannot be denied that 'something is coming into view' here – to borrow the words of the great recently deceased filmmaker Harun Farocki.

In order, therefore, to bring some light to the darkness, I picked up three of the most important internationally oriented Cultural Studies magazines, and skimmed through the *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, the *International Journal of Cultural Studies* and *Cultural Studies*.

On the homepages of all three journals a service is offered which not only flatters the vanity of the authors concerned, but which is also very useful for our present purposes, namely a listing of the most-cited and most-read articles, available for any particular sampling date. Despite the fact that I am not quite sure how the administrators obtained this information about the said articles, that is, about who has really read which (most-read) essay, a glance at these lists produces some very interesting insights.

I examined the ten most frequently mentioned texts, firstly from the perspective of the author's mother-tongue and then with regard to his or her academic location, i.e. the university or other institution at which they were working.

I started with the mother-tongue/ native language aspect: the first publication to be examined was the *European Journal of Cultural Studies*. In the category of most-cited articles, the top 10 articles (sampling date: September 2014) were written by a total of 17 authors, of whom only 4 did not have English as their mother-tongue (one was a native Turkish speaker, one was Belgian and two had Dutch as their mother-tongue). As far as the category of most-read essays was concerned, there were 14 authors, and once again there were only 4 who were not English native-speakers (all them were Dutch).

Turning to the *International Journal of Cultural Studies* (sampling date: September 2014), we find that the most-cited articles were written by 11 different authors, of whom 3 were not English native-speakers (one was Greek and two were Dutch). The ten most-read articles were written by 13 authors, 6 of whom evidently did not have English as their mother-tongue (being Spanish, Korean, Singaporean, Greek, Dutch and Belgian).

Lastly, I turned my attention to the oldest and probably also most influential journal, *Cultural Studies*. Here the results obtained (sampling date: 28 October 2014) were as follows: of the top 10 most-cited articles (which were written by 13 different authors), only 2 were written by non-English-language authors (both of them from South America, with Spanish as their mother-tongue). Among the most-read essays, a still more unequivocal picture emerges: they were written by 11 authors, only one of whom was not a native-speaker of English (Spanish).

To sum up: the 60 articles examined (including ovelaps, a number of articles appeared both among most read and most cited) were written by 64 authors (considering overlaps between most read and most cited articles) of whom 18 did not have English as their mother-tongue. This is not a strictly empirical finding, yet the picture that emerges is clear, more than 70% are English native speakers.

In my opinion, what we have here is a *discursive field* which produces structures of inclusion/exclusion. Within the logic of western and European dominance, they prolong the anglophile orientation and thereby the continuing hegemony of the Anglo-American character of the Cultural Studies project. To express it more concisely: anyone who has English as their mother-tongue is in, anyone who does not is out.

A glance at the institutional locations of those authors who wrote the 60 essays that were examined should help to support my argument and at the same time sharpen the focus of discussion. First of all, returning to the *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, we find that of the 10 most-cited articles, only one single essay had authors (dual authors) from an academic workplace that does not lie in an English-speaking country. They work, respectively, at the University of Amsterdam and at the University of Brussels. In the case of the 10 most-read essays there were two authors who worked elsewhere, namely at the University of Amsterdam and at CEMRI Universidade Aberta, Lisbon. In the case of the *International Journal for Cultural Studies*, the following picture emerges: all the most-cited articles were written by authors who are teaching at an English-language university, with one author also recording an additional affiliation with the University of Athens (Greece). As far as the most-read articles were concerned, there was one essay, composed by two authors, who work at the Singapore University of Technology and Design (where English is an official language together with Malay, Mandarin and Tamil) and at the Shungshin Women's University in Korea, respectively. The rest of the authors are employed in the Anglo-American countries.

As far as *Cultural Studies* is concerned, everything is very clear. All the authors – of both the most-cited and the most-read articles – work at English-language universities. A synopsis likewise gives an unequivocal result. Of all the 64 authors mentioned there are solely 7 (among whom I include a colleague who records her affiliation not only with Lancaster University, but also with the University of Athens) who are not working at an academic institution in an English-speaking country.

I do not wish to overvalue these results of a minimal random sampling, still less is it my intention to attribute them to the policies of the respective editors. That would be more than unfair, because they are of course making every effort to open up the Cultural Studies project internationally. After all, the magazine *Cultural Studies* has devoted special issues to e.g. the status of Cultural Studies in the Nordic countries, or in German-speaking countries, among other things. The *European Journal for Cultural Studies* also makes it possible, for instance, for colleagues who are not working at a university in America, Britain, Canada, Australia etc., to design themed issues of the journal.

However, faced by the unequivocal nature of the facts, it should be stated that – as we mentioned earlier – there are unequivocal mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion at work here.

On the one hand, it is a linguistic moment. The dominance of authors whose first language is English has created a *discursive field*, and as we have shown it has become rather difficult for those who are non-native English-speakers to enter that field, or even to contribute to its development. Language evidently still has great power here, including that of including some and excluding others. As far as language is concerned, Cultural Studies continues to be a very English discipline.

On the other hand, the institutional dimension also plays a formatively influential role here. It defines, more so even than knowledge of the English language (as a mother-tongue), what is adjudged to constitute Cultural Studies internationally. The *institutional* and *academic field* is dominated by Anglo-American universities, is hegemonially effective and moreover, as an essentially closed space, it is constantly reinforcing and perpetuating itself.

One might argue that the very presence of Cultural Studies representatives at Anglo-American universities provides the project with 'outside' stimuli and the potential for expansion. That may well be the case, except that, firstly, not everybody is able to migrate to the USA, to England, Australia or Canada etc., even if only temporarily; and secondly, such a perspective demonstrates a certain disdain for the necessity of a textual, institutional, linguistic etc proximity to the respective subject of research, a moment which, in my opinon, is of fundamental significance in Cultural Studies.

I would like to finish by summarising my argumentation and presenting my conclusion. It is not simply the addition of the *discursive field* (language) to the *academic space* (institution) that defines the mechanism of exclusion and inclusion, which has been the subject under consideration here. Rather, it is the articulation of both moments, i.e. that of language and that of the institution, which – in various contexts (but in their own very definite ways) – can help to develop that structure which at present is still hindering a further, more profound internationalisation of the project that is Cultural Studies.

The 'translation process' of Cultural Studies, the necessity of which was stated by Stuart Hall more than two decades ago, is certainly occurring, and I would

even dare to claim that it is growing. The aforementioned examples of editorial activity by the journals examined above point in this direction, as does that of *Culture Unbound*, the journal whose 6-year existence we are rightly celebrating here, and these have made a great contribution to a real internationalisation of our project.

Finally, one ought not to forget the Movements project and the journal *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* which is associated with it. What is taking pace there is indeed "a transborder collective undertaking to confront Inter-Asia cultural politics" (Editorial statement 2014: 171), accompanied by a very effective special formation of Cultural Studies.

Nonetheless, all this should not make us overlook those powers and structures, briefly outlined by me here, which are hindering and counteracting the further international development of Cultural Studies. Linguistic translation, as well as cultural translation, is indeed occurring, yet both of them come up against their limitations where the Anglo-American hegemonial structure becomes most influential.

Raymond Williams once said that Cultural Studies should be "one project and many formations". Let us allow the project to grow, and render as many formations as possible visible.

Prof. Dr. Roman Horak is professor and Head of the Department of Cultural Studies at the University of Applied Arts Vienna. He is currently on the editorial committee of 'Culture Unbound' and the 'European Journal for Cultural Studies' and a board member of the 'Association for Cultural Studies' (ACS). His research focuses on the politics of the popular. He has published 16 books and over 100 articles in academic journals and books in 6 languages. His latest international publication is *About Raymond Williams* (ed. with L. Grossberg & M. Seidl), Routledge 2010.

References

Bachman-Medick, Doris (2006): *Cultural Turns. Neuorientierung in den Kulturwissenschaften*, Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Bhabha, Homi (1994): *The location of culture*, London & New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, Susan (2002): Translation Studies, London & New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, Susan (1998): 'The Translational Turn in Cultural Studies', Susan Bassnett, Andre Lefevere (eds.), *Constructing Cultures*, Clevedon: Cromwell Press, pp. 123-145.

Benjamin, Walter (1999): 'Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers', *Gesammelte Schriften. Bd. IV-1*,: Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 9 -21. (Engl.: 'The Task of the Translator', *Selected Writings. Volume 1, 1913 – 1926*, ed. by Marcus Bullock & Michael W. Jennings, Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1996, p. 253-263).

Eco, Umberto (2004): *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation*, London: Phoenix,

Eco, Umberto (2008): *Experiences in Translation*, Toronto-Buffalo-London: University of Toronto Press 2008. (Based on lectures presented Oct. 7, 9 & 13 1998 at the University of Toronto).

Eco, Umberto (2009): *Quasi dasselbe mit anderen Worten. Über das Übersetzen*, Munich: DTV. (Italian: *Dire quasi la stessa cosa. Esperienze die traduzione*, Milano: Bompiani 2003)

Editorial statement (2014): Inter-Asia Cultural Studies: Movements, vol. 15, Number 2 June.

Hall, Stuart (1996): 'Cultural studies and the politics of internationalization: an interview with Stuart Hall by Kuan-Hsing Chen', David Morley, Kuan-Hsing Chen (eds.): Stuart Hall. *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, London & New York: Routledge, pp. 392-408

Wagner, Birgit (2009): 'Kulturelle Übersetzung. Erkundungen über ein wanderndes Konzept', *Kakanien Revisited* (23/07/2009), pp. 1-8. http/www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/postcol/Bwagner2.pdf (as of 27 October 2014)

Venuti, Lawrence (2000)(ed.): *The Translation Studies Reader*, London & New York: Routledge

Wright, Handel K. (1998): 'Dare we de-centre Birmingham? Troubling the 'origin' and trajectories of cultural studies', *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, Vol. 1 (1), pp. 33-56.

Culture Unbound
Journal of Current Cultural Research

Swedish Publications in a Global World

By Jenny Björkman

Abstract

This paper is about the problems of publishing in a global academic world. The Swedish monograph is slowly in decline in Sweden. The international peer-reviewed article is taking its place.

Yet just as the monograph has had problems, this newer trend has multiple new quandaries. Instead of being read by a larger international audience, some articles tend to stay unread when neither the national nor the international public can find the results. Social scientists and humanities lack a specific venue or scene where results can be discussed by both experts and the public, such as *Science* or *Nature*. This is a problem since the public miss out on important, often tax-funded, knowledge, but also because academics miss out on having an audience and the impact that comes from meeting with the public.

Secondly many journals are so specialised that they influence not only the public's understanding of research and their view on research but also the research and the researchers. Furthermore academics lack both the time to read all relevant articles and to write longer and more complex works, which would be beneficial to both the public and scholars as well. Therefore the race to get published, i.e. achieve excellence and have more impact, tends to affect the research. Researcher may even choose their subjects and how they write about them in order to get published rather than focusing on interesting questions.

Naturally possible solutions have been discussed, such as open access books and more stringent demands on the impact of the research and relevance to the public. However there are still no absolute answers.

Keywords: Peer review, publishing, internationalisation, impact, excellence.

Björkman, Jenny: "Swedish Publications in a Global World", *Culture Unbound*, Volume 7, 2015: 576-587. Published by Linköping University Electronic Press: http://www.cultureunbound.ep.liu.se

The decline of the monography

There was a time when Swedish scholars in both humanities and social sciences reported their research in monographs. Theses and other studies used to appear in books – monographs – and were issued either in the universities' own series or even by commercial publishers. Here, discursive accounts of the research findings, often in Swedish, were allowed. To disseminate the findings and internationalise the research and reach non-Swedish speakers who might be interested, there was the briefest of abstracts in English.

Although more books are published today than ever, the academic monograph has lost ground in Sweden. According to the (as yet incomplete) Swedish database over Swedish research literature, SwePUB, of the 636 books published in 2012 half were monographs.

Above all, however, the qualification value of monographs has declined. This is evident at Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ) from the past few years' applications for printing grants (or 'production grants' as they are now called) from researchers already in receipt of RJ grants. In principle, after the experts' assessment and the authors' revisions, if any, RJ approves all such applications. Although the rules remain unchanged, the number of applications and, accordingly, printing grants awarded have fallen since 2000, and since 2009 the decline appears to be a constant at roughly half of what it used to be.

Quite simply, there is less pressure to write monographs because they (as well as the anthologies and the essays they contain) are no longer seen as valuable as before, especially since the time allowed to write them is short and it takes time to write a monography. This is not only a Swedish development. (Lambert 2015) The timeliness here is crucial. Many final reports received by RJ (every project financed by RJ has to write a final report where the main results and publications are listed) show how researchers, despite their initially high ambitions to write monographs summarising project results and explaining arguments in depth, cannot manage it during the project period (normally three years). This is a growing trend. Researchers now focus on articles instead, preferably for journals that are international and peer-reviewed, with a high rank in one of the many rankings of such journals that exist today.

Thus, while the aim of a project always used to be a monograph, these days it is three to five articles published in high-ranking journals. The requirement that researchers should, right from the start, think through their own 'publication strategy' accelerates this trend since articles, after all, are faster to write and hopefully get published more promptly – and finally reach a more international audience. This internationalisation is a goal not only for RJ but also for politicians and university

administrators and decision-makers. Articles seems to be a safer strategy than the more risky project of writing one monograph, even if it is in English.

Therefore the monograph is abandoned, perhaps in a bottom drawer. Perhaps it will be printed one day. Yet the danger is, of course, that in-depth analyses are delayed or never appear at all because of the demand to which many researchers feel they are subject: publish or perish.

The internationalisation that writing articles represents is good, as is the increasingly rapid rate at which they often appear — good both for the individual researchers' qualifications and for making the research more international. Internationalisation in the form of a brief, meagre abstract was far too limited and, in any case, so many internationally interesting research projects are under way in Sweden that the results should also be disseminated outside the Swedish-speaking region. Swedish researchers are getting better at presenting their results in a global world and thinking of their research as part of an international field, which is also good. An example of the latter is that almost every recent application for RJ's Research initiation award – where researchers apply for conferences, seminars and workshops, and create new researcher networks – are international and there is a lot of collaboration between Swedish scholars and international colleges.

It must be said that many of the often thick tomes that used to be written seldom had a substantial numbers of readers. According to a popular saying only the mentor, professor, examination board and dissertation opponent reads the thesis, and even though that is not true, statistics from Svenska förläggareföreningen (the Swedish Association for Publishers) tell us that only about 1000 copies of books classified as "kvalificerad facklitteratur" (qualified non-fiction) were sold 2012 and 2013 and almost 3000 ex belonging to the category "humaniora" (including dictionaries and citation books) were sold (Wiberg 2014: 18, 54).

Ideally articles put a premium on what is clear-cut and concise, even though everyone knows this is not always the case (Östlund 2015). Additionally, articles are scrutinised in what are often very detailed processes of peer reviews. These processes have now become the hub of much academic assessment — both for funding applications (i.e. advance peer review before the study) and for article reviews (after the study, since that is what is assessed). Obviously monographs have also been peer reviewed, such as for a university press series, but these publishers have only recently begun to work in Sweden.

Despite these positive aspects of the new publishing landscape, this trend has some problems. I will discuss some of these problems in this article, such as: the lack of a scene or venue; specialisation; and timeliness. In my conclusion I will try to discuss some possible solutions.

The lack of a scene

At best, monographs in Swedish reached a broader Swedish public. Articles in English (or German or French) may be rendered useless, i.e. they will not be read at all since neither the English-speaking audience nor the Swedish will actually read the articles.

Non-fiction books in Swedish, i.e. the academic monographs as well as books from well-known publishers, were once reviewed in the major specialist journals and sometimes even in the general daily press, bringing about a shared discussion of the research, at least for humanities and social sciences researchers. Many of the older Swedish academic journals served an important role in unifying the researchers and consolidating the field; through these journals one could get a good overview of the field, since this was where debates took place, PhD-defences were assessed and major works in that specific field were reviewed. However, those days are now past.

Presently, with research fragmented in articles from all over the world – or the internet – there is a risk that public debate on research, if not disappearing altogether, could possibly become more elusive. This is because the articles are so numerous and yet also harder to find, despite open access, partly owing to the lack of major, shared journals for the humanities and the social sciences that everyone reads, or at least is required to read.

For scientists, there are journals like *Science* and *Nature* — the kind that are lacking for social sciences and humanities. This absence threatens to erode academic discussion both across disciplinary boundaries and with the public, especially since coverage of non-fiction books in the daily press in Sweden has shrunk in the past decade and in many cases has vanished altogether (for ex. Holmberg 2010, Grahn 2015). By extension, this is causing problems with providing the Swedish public with new knowledge.

Monographs in past times contributed, at best, to academic discussion *both* in the specialist press and outside academia. Books were reviewed and discussed. However articles from various highly reputed international peer-review publications nowadays seldom reach researchers outside the inner circle, and only in exceptional cases do the results published by humanities and social sciences researchers in international peer-review journals actually reach the daily press.

It may not be feasible to reverse this trend. Yet syntheses, studies of both breadth and depth, and discussions across subject boundaries and between disciplines are still needed, maybe more than ever, as is public discussion about research, national and international alike.

The acceleration of specialisation

As far as the accelerated degree of specialisation is concerned, the problems are more numerous and perhaps also more severe. Just as for scientists, what is published in journals for humanities and social sciences researchers is highly specialised. This is unavoidable, and with more researchers and subject areas, specialities have proliferated. According to the Swedish Higher Education Authority, the number of researchers with PhDs has risen markedly in the past few years and this rise is continuing. A foundation such as Riksbankens Jubileumsfond is of course influenced by this. In the beginning of the 1980s 20-30% of all applications were granted, from 2010 and onward between 5-10% were granted (Samuelsson 2014: 14).

This means that there are more authors who want to, and should, be published in the existing journals. In the globalised research community that is beginning to emerge, the number of scholars who want to be published in the journals will also become more numerous. There are, quite simply, an enormous number of researchers whose work is published on a large scale.

Thus, the increase in specialities is hardly surprising. It is a matter of being able to find and see what one is interested in, as well as getting a chance to reach out and be published, as the great majority of researchers want.

The classification of journals is not merely about whether they cover art history or political science. The historical journals serve as an example. In the international journals, besides every conceivable geographic and chronological speciality, there are also special journals for social history, urban history as well as the history of individual towns and cities, family history, historical demography, economic history, environmental history, historiography, history of science and medicine, different kinds of ethnic history and, of course, numerous journals focusing on women's history.

Moreover, this is far from being a complete list since historians also write in journals about completely different subjects. No one can read all journals, but it is hard work just to read the ones that you should in order to keep up with your field, let alone other fields that could be of interest. According to Swedish ethnologist Orvar Löfgren, who has interviewed scholars in different disciplines about their academic work, scholars tend to read not the full articles but only the abstracts (Löfgren 2015).

Early in 2013, the problems caused by this type of specialisation were noted by the cancer researcher David Rubenson (Stanford Cancer Institute) in *The Scientist* (Rubenson 2013). Rubenson refers to a crisis not only in popular dissemination but of scientific communication, and in his view extreme specialisation is in danger of bringing about formerly unknown difficulties in this communication. According to Rubenson, we even risk creating a communication crisis for science in which the growing number of specialisations and the proliferation of researchers that has

taken place at the same time entail a risk of ever more knowledge becoming unintelligible to almost everyone in the field concerned, except for a very few initiates.

What he is referring to is not the fact that the public miss out on research findings and new knowledge, but that there is a danger of researchers failing to understand one another. In Rubenson's view, this risks hampering rather than enabling research across subject boundaries and between different subjects. To make interdisciplinary research possible, researchers must be able to talk to and understand one another. According to Rubenson, researchers seldom do this nowadays, owing to the rigid specialisation resulting from, for example, the new publication patterns.

Marc Kirschner has pointed towards a similar problem in biomedical science where the increasing tendency is to equate significance to any medical relevance. Scholars and journals fail to see and acknowledge what could be new and important questions if they are seen as being too speculative or even considered to be low-impact. The need to highlight high-impact science makes science too narrow, especially since one wants to promote what can actually be achieved, what he calls feasible goals (Kirschner 2013). This topic was also discussed by Bruce Alberts at a seminar held by the Swedish Young Academy, (video here: http://www.sverigesungaakademi.se/665.html).

A Finnish professor of political science has witnessed to the same phenomenon. Göran Djupsund admits that his younger colleagues are superb in their own areas, but he thinks they lack basic knowledge of everyday politics and how it works. The specialisation directs the researchers away from their own countries and their local problems. The researchers simply lacked the time to ponder these matters when they were intensively engaged in becoming specialists in order to obtain qualifications. To be excellent is to reach success in terms of international publications, writes Djupsund. This is good, but in Djupsund's view it contains a latent and unintended mechanism that has adverse effects in the long-term, which is the ever-accelerating specialisation of research. This is not good. In order to get published the researchers and the researcher groups have become very narrow, and possess extremely advanced expertise in a very limited field (Djupsund 2015: 61-66).

Although most stakeholders (from politicians to researchers) would like to see generalists and researchers with broader knowledge, who are interdisciplinary in some sense, the danger is that what we will get are extreme specialists or even blinkered nerds. According to Göran Djupsund, local knowledge (knowledge that might be of interest to the citizens, the local politicians and public administrators) may be at risk. This also tends to limit the public's interest in research and science, since this kind of research does not concern them, or so they think. When RJ talks to Swedish researchers in political science they also discuss this problem.

To RJ relevance and out-reach is important, however in an evaluation of environmental social science in Sweden it was shown that this is not something that can easily be gained through requirements or demands in the applications. Although RJ

did not demand societal relevance in our projects, evaluations have shown that projects funded by RJ (only 4) had more relevance than others (*Mobilising Swedish Social Science Research on Sustainability*, 2010). There are other ways to encourage scholars to reach out and to be relevant other than demands of societal use (*nytta*) in the applications.

The lack of time and demand to perform on a yearly basis

Syntheses and broad overviews are one way that scholars can reach out and remove themselves from the trap of specialisation. There has also been a call for syntheses and broad overviews in humanities and social sciences. However, few people have time to carry out the big, in-depth syntheses and wide-ranging overviews at present. Modern-day economics of publishing calls for peer reviewed articles in internationally recognised journals, and scholars think they are supposed to "deliver" or "produce" one article a year. (Even these expressions bare witness to a way of thinking about the academy and scholar activities). These articles, well-composed in many respects, serve as tasty morsels: there is an abundance of everything, but it is only digestible in small mouthfuls, and this may be a problem for the scholarly pursuit of knowledge itself. Compare this to Lövgren's testimony on scholars who read more abstracts than articles.

The race to get published yearly and to be excellent has actually changed academic life according to two researchers in business administration, Nick Butler and Sverre Spoelstra. According to them, decisions about what to research and where to publish the results are increasingly being made according to diktats of journal rankings and managing editors of premier outlets. In the field of their research, critical management studies, this is a threat to what used to be key elements of the academic life (Butler & Spoelstra 2014). Butler and Spoelstra have also seen that this game of excellence tends to master its players, instead of the other way around (Butler & Spoelstra 2012; Butler & Spoelstra 2015).

Bruce Alberts, former editor-in-chief at *Science*, has argued in a similar fashion at a seminar called Publish or Perish. He meant that the impact race also led to strange priorities in the journals. Cancer research was more often considered high impact, and he had seen examples of articles that did not get published since they were supposedly low impact. This in turn had an influence on what young scholars tended to do their research on (http://www.sverigesungaakademi.se/665.html).

Perhaps the Swedish researchers' lack of time and/or weak incentive to write syntheses in fact impedes their international careers. Researchers, owing to the pressure to get published at regular intervals, no longer have the time to write more extensively and they do not manage to implement factual comparisons, or synthe-

sising and more discursive in-depth writings. This could possibly make the particularities of Swedish research more interesting internationally (see for example Kirschner 2013).

The lack of time and peer reviews

The pressure on academic journals, where more and more academics are supposed to be assessed as fast as possible, also puts pressure on reviewers and editors. The question becomes whether the academic culture of publishing is broken. (Whithouse 2015) This idea has led to a series of studies in recent years which have questioned the system of peer reviewing. In 2013 this was discussed in *PLoS Biology* when two researchers (the biologists Adam Eyre-Walker and Nina Stoletzki) investigated a number of articles and examined the peer-review process they had undergone. They looked at 6,000 published articles from two databases and were able to show that the same articles often received different assessments. As the Uppsala University historian Rolf Torstendahl stated that there is no congruence between minimum requirements and optimum norms, and this is naturally a problem although perhaps not news to many humanities and social sciences researchers (Torstendahl 1988:72). Most of the assessments were also subjective, as Eyre-Walker and Stoletzki wrote (Eyre-Walker & Stoletzki 2013). This sentiment has often been repeated, but the authors also addressed questions on how we should evaluate science and research in the future. The problems of peer reviewing, especially in open access journals, have also been addressed by John Bohannon (Bohannon 2013; see also D. Butler 2013 or Kendall 2015 who address the problem with publishing consultants).

For anyone who has been personally engaged in peer review and assessment, the difficulty in finding reviewers also arises. For researchers, the problem is not only the time they spend on reviewing their colleagues' work as peers, but also the time it takes to get their own work reviewed. This issue has been studied by Liv Langfeldt and Svein Kyvik. In their research they estimated that the time a professor dedicated to review tasks is about one month per year which is quite a lot, especially since administrators as well as the academics themselves want to devote their time to other things as well. The time spent on evaluations implies less time for research, and with peer reviews increasing, the time for research tends to decrease. Langfeldt and Kyvik also noted that the highest ranking academics handle the most prestigious and power-performing evaluation-tasks, leaving the less prestigious and less power-performing to lower ranking and more junior researchers. Additionally evaluation does not just mean evaluating journals. Scholars also evaluate as examiners, staff selectors, grant distributors, editors, referees, prize awarders and evaluators for research organisations, policy advisors and such (Langfeldt & Kyvik 2011: 199-212).

The time-consuming peer review processes today are faced with competition from bibliometrics as a way to do things faster. Metrics seems to be a way to get away with assessing research without reading, thus making the process faster. However assessing research without reading is not a very wise way to do things, and there has been a lot of criticism against the use of metrics in academia (See for example Smith 2013, Kirschner 2013, Anderson 2013).

What can be done?

Some solutions have been proposed. Open access led by libraries' efforts to avoid exorbitant costs of academic, and especially scientific, journals may be one. Most funders in Sweden — not least RJ — have rewarded open access. There are several key arguments for open access. The importance of openness and access, including the added value of increasing the dissemination of research – not at least in the world outside of Europe and where ordinary books really are expensive – is often mentioned.

Open access not only makes high class research available to researcher and students but also to a general public. For scholars this increased reach means a possibility to get more impact and more citations. Peter Suber has called this 'the access revolution to reach more readers' (Suber 2012).

There are, of course difficulties with open access, as Bohannon pointed out. In a Swedish context Katarina Bernhardsson among others have pointed to a counterargument which discusses the risk of information overload. Accessibility is not enough – because how can we ensure that mass online publications get found and read? Therefore we shall return to the problem with which we opened this paper.

Bernhardsson argues that the answer is in the context, by which she means an inclusion in a selection and editing procedure (more peer reviewing of course). The risk today is that publishers are disappearing, and their jobs are disappearing with them (Bernhardsson 2015: 156-157). However publishers – in one way or another – as well as librarians are crucial if we want research to reach a broader audience and have more of an impact.

For some time, there has also been plans to make the open access publication of monographs possible. This cannot, of course, solve the problem of researchers' time shortage, but it may possibly help monographs become revalued, which is no small feat. This could possibly encourage scholars to write monographs as well as articles. The idea is that research funded with tax revenues should be made available with open access. All books published should undergo a peer review. This idea is of course nothing new, but having it become a requirement may make it easier to assign value to monographs and place them on the same level as articles.

In Sweden a national consortium has been set up to organise special processes for books published with open access, as well as helping guide people through the

open access jungle. This consortium is called Kriterium. To obtain the Kriterium stamp of approval, all publications will undergo a stringent peer review process following the new guidelines. The books will be available in print as well as in open access. A goal for Kriterium is to strengthen the book as a way of academic publishing (More on the goals here: http://www.kriterium.se/site/about/).

Just as many journals and publishing houses have begun to charge for publication (so that the costs, rather than being incurred by journals or publishers, are transferred to researchers themselves), so the public inquiry on the matter has recommended a charge for a peer-review process (The sum of 10,000 Swedish kronor has been mooted, but the funders are expected to pay it and treat anything in excess of this as costs that should be funded by a consortia and regarded as a national infrastructure for research). On the other hand, publishing houses according to the Consortium should not charge for open access publication since they, so to speak, get peer reviews of manuscripts free-of-cost (see *A National Consortium for Open Academic Books in Sweden* 2013).

Today there are new models of book-processing charges (BPS) in the English-speaking world. The idea is that you pay to be published – a rather unusual thought in many countries. As Katarina Bernhardsson points out this has long been the case in Sweden. We already have a tradition of printing or producing grants. One reason for this is that our language region is too small to enable academic books to be sold in large editions and generate profits for publishers (Bernhardsson 2015: 158-159).

However maybe we should start considering other new solutions in this digital era. Scholars can meet both the public and other scholars on websites such as the Conversation, where all material is open access. Such venues can be international as well as national or both.

There are ongoing discussions in Sweden on another kind of platforms where academic journals can meet and cooperate, such as www.cairn.info. This is one way of helping both scholars and the public to get access to an enormous amount of articles as well as getting those small but sometimes essential academic journals funded. As was pointed out by Elliott Shore, there is an increasing need for humanities to take a greater part in the ongoing conversation on the internet. This must not only be done through the monograph (See ARL Fall Forum 2014). Funders such as Riksbankens Jubileumsfond must also pay more attention to both funding research and learning how this research can reach an audience, i.e. how it is published.

And in the future scholars will of course still be read, but not necessary only in books. According to Sarah Thomas, Vice President for Harvard Library, we are still in the early stages of sorting out how we can communicate academic development more effectively. Her colleague Robert Darnton does not fear the disappearance of the physical book. Instead he sees the printed and online versions as allies. According to Sarah Thomas, the uniqueness of the online book is that it is not static or

bound between covers. It can be changed over time, and other authors can contribute. In the future perhaps scholars will publish digital projects instead of books, as has already been suggested (Lambert 2015).

The question remains as to how publication patterns should be shaped to satisfy both researchers' demands for internationalisation, qualifications and peers reviews, as well as the research requirements of an arena in which results and questions are allowed to be discussed more generally. How can we avoid too many narrow specialisations while still promoting in-depth analyses and internationalisation? Additionally how do we stop the quest for publication merits which threaten academic core values?

These are the challenges for the future of publication patterns for researchers in social sciences and humanities where the funding bodies such as Riksbankens Jubileumsfond should take part.

Jenny Björkman has a PhD in History and is a Communication Manager at Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ), the Swedish Foundation for Humanities and Social Sciences. As well as funding research, RJ seeks to influence research policy in various ways. Björkman has edited their annual year book since 2010. Last year in 2015 the book focused on research and research funding, and the title is 'Thinking Ahead: Research, Funding and the Future'. Jenny.bjorkman@rj.se

References

A National Consortium for Open Academic Books in Sweden: An investigation funded by National Library of Sweden, Swedish Research Council and Riksbankens Jubileumsfond 2013.

Anderson, Warwick (2013): "Quality not quantity: measuring the impact of published research", *the Conversation*, http://theconversation.com/quality-not-quantity-measuring-the-impact-of-published-research-18270.

Bernhardsson, Katarina (2015): "Open access: expansion from articles to books?", Jenny Björkman & Björn Fjaestad (eds) *Thinking Ahead. Research, funding and the future*, Makadam förlag Stockholm.

Bohannon, John (2013): "Who's afraid of Peer Review?" *Science*, vol. 342, no 6154:60-65.

Butler, Declan (2013): "The Dark Side of Publishing: The explosion in open-access publishing has fuelled the rise of questionable operators", *Nature* vol. 495:433-435.

Butler, Nick & Sverre Spoelstra (2012): "Your excellency" *Organization* November 2012 19: 891-903.

Butler, Nick & Sverre Spoelstra (2014): "The Regim of excellence and the Erosion of Ethos in Critical Management Studies" *British Journal of Management* vol. 24 issue 3: 38–550.

Butler, Nick & Sverre Spoelstra (2015): "Faran med excellent forskning" http://debatt.rj.se/?p=306

Djupsund, Göran (2015): "Features common to excellent research", Jenny Björkman & Björn Fjaestad (eds) *Thinking Ahead. Research, funding and the future*, Makadam förlag Stockholm.

Eyre-Walker, Adam & Nina Stoletzki (2013): "The Assessment of Science: The Relative Merits of Post-Publication Review, the Impact and the Number of Citations" *Plos Biology* 11(10).

Lars Grahn (2015), "Kritiken av kritiken gäller mer än skönlitteratur", *Dagens Nyheter* 2015-03-18, http://www.dn.se/kultur-noje/kulturdebatt/kritiken-av-kritiken-galler-mer-an-skonlitteratur/.

Holmberg, Gustav (2010): http://www.gustavholmberg.com/tomrum/2010/08/04/kultursidor-och-facklitteratur/.
Kirschner, Marc (2013): "A Perverted View of "Impact"", *Science* 14, 2013.
Kendall, Graham (2015): "The future of scientific publishing: let's make sure it's fair as well as transparent", *the Conversation*, http://theconversation.com/the-future-of-scientific-publishing-lets-make-sure-its-fair-as-well-as-transparent-48900.
Lambert, Craig (2015): "The Wild West of Academic Publishing" *Harvard Magazine*, January-Februari 2015.
Langfeldt, Liv & Svein Kyvik (2011): "Researchers as evaluators: tasks, tensions and politics" *Higher Education* 2011, vol. 62, issue 2.
Löfgren, Orvar (2015): "Applying for research funds — an emotional chapter" Jenny Björkman & Björn Fjaestad (eds) *Thinking Ahead. Research, funding and the future*, Makadam förlag Stockholm.
Mobilising Swedish Social Science Research on Sustainability – en Evaluation of Sweidsh Social Science Research on Sustainability, R3:2010, Stockholm.
Publish or perish? a seminar held by the Swedish Young Academy (http://www.sverigesungaakademi.se/665.html).
Rubenson, David (2013): "Opinion: Communication Crisis in Research", http://www.thescientist.com/?articles.view/articleNo/34196/title/Opinion--Communication-Crisis-in-Research/ .
Samuelsson, MarieLouise (2014): *Riksbankens Jubileumsfond: 50 år av nyfikenhet*, Stockholm.
Smith, Timothy (2013): "Scientists must share early and share often to boost citations" *the Conversation*, http://theconversation.com/scientists-must-share-early-and-share-often-to-boost-citations-18699.
Suber, Peter (2012): *Open Access*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012.
Torstendahl, Rolf (1988): "Minimumkrav och optimumnormer i svensk historieskrivning 1920-1960", Rolf Torsendahl & Thorsten Nybom (eds.) *Historievetenskap som teori, praktik, ideologi*, Stockholm.
Wiberg, Erik (2014): Bokförsäljningsstatistiken. Svenska Bokhandlareföreningen och Svenska Förläggareföreningen, Stockholm: http://www.forlaggare.se/sites/default/files/bokforsaljningsstatistiken_rapport_140924.pdf .
Andrew Whitehouse (2015): "The scientific publishing culture is broken – can it be rescued?", t*he Conversation*, http://theconversation.com/the-scientific-publishing-culture-is-broken-can-it-be-rescued-38525.
Östlund, Helena (2015) "Ett hav av olästa texter", *Curie*, http://www.tidningencurie.se/22/nyheter/nyheter/2015-11-03-ett-hav-av-olasta-forskartexter-.html

Culture Unbound
Journal of Current Cultural Research

How Green Is This Paper?

By Toby Miller

Abstract

The increasing governmentalization and commodification of knowledge are putting intense pressure on scholars to write and publish more, and in accordance with conventions that are not of their own making, due to benchmarks of success set by the applied sciences that suit business and the state. These tendencies are also producing a potentially unsustainable environmental burden that may be increasing, not decreasing, as we move more and more into an online publishing world. This recognition leads to three provocations: 1) There is too much scholarly publication to keep up with, and too much pressure to publish; 2) The future of all academic publishing will largely be determined by the sciences; and 3) We must consider the relative merits of publishing electronically rather than on paper in terms of the environment—in other words, asking "how green is this paper?"

Key words: govermentality; commodification; over-production; scholarly publishing; environmental impact

Miller, Toby: "How Green Is This Paper?" *Culture Unbound*, Volume 7, 2015: 588-599. Published by Linköping University Electronic Press: http://www.cultureunbound.ep.liu.se

How Green Is This Paper?

Research academics love to publish.[1] The best I know seek three groups to set agendas for their work and read it: other scholars, the general public, and stakeholders, such as policymakers and social movements. Undertaking and disseminating such research is easier since the advent of the worldwide web, but it has become ever more tightly governed by the attitudes of bureaucratic evaluators and the restraints of capitalism, in the form of intellectual property. Publishing is in many ways less a pleasure and more a task—a metrication rather than a passion, an act of obedience, not knowledge—and driven by bureaucratic fiat as opposed to autonomous choices of topic and outlet.

Clearly, the utopias of free inquiry and communication, both seemingly enabled by the internet, have homologous dystopias of ownership and control. That awkward dynamic is far from new, as I shall explain, but it comes with a particular political economy in our neoliberal conjuncture of intensive governmentalization and commodification of knowledge and pressure on scholars both to write and publish more and to do so in accordance with conventions that are not of their own making, due to benchmarks of success being set by applied sciences to suit business and the state. It also produces a potentially unsustainable environmental burden that may be increasing, not decreasing, as we move into an online publishing world.

Utopia and Dystopia

The tendency to regard each emergent medium of communication as awe-inspiring and world-changing relies on recurring myths of technological power. The long history of this fetish is evident as far back as Socrates' dialogue with Phaedrus (Plato 2008).

Socrates referred to the 'propriety and impropriety of writing.' He related the story of an Egyptian king complaining to the god who had invented the new art that it 'will create forgetfulness in the learners' souls, because they will not use their memories; they will trust to the external written characters and not remember of themselves.' The flipside of this was a more demotic, less hierarchical worldview, of course—the word would make people free, as they became able to tell their own stories and promote their own priorities.

In 1620, Francis Bacon declared that printing, alongside gunpowder and the compass, had 'changed the whole face and state of things throughout the world' (1854). By the 19th century, it was a commonplace that books contained the entirety of human knowledge, which was therefore available to all those who could read. A utopian discourse about this notion of free information has recurred ever since with the advent of each communications innovation, alongside dystopic corollaries.

The latest media technologies are said to obliterate geography, sovereignty, and hierarchy in an alchemy of truth and beauty that is ideal for scholars wishing to spread the word. Two and a half billion research papers are downloaded each year,

Google Scholar trawls well over a hundred million manuscripts, and we now see collaborations where the list of an article's authors and institutions can take up more pages than the manuscript itself—my current record viewed had over three thousand writers of a short physics essay (Ware and Mabe 2015; ATLAS Collaboration 2010).

A deregulated, individuated, technologized world makes consumers into producers, frees the disabled from confinement, encourages new subjectivities, rewards intellect and competitiveness, links people across cultures, and allows billions of flowers to bloom in a post-political cornucopia. It is a bizarre utopia. People fish, film, fornicate, and finance from morning to midnight. Consumption is privileged, production is discounted, and labor is forgotten. True believers love to refer to the scholars participating in this world as learning to share (McKenna 2015).

Powerful communications institutions cleave to themselves a sense of universal enlightenment. So Facebook features "Peace on Facebook" and claims the capacity to 'decrease world conflict' through intercultural communication, while Twitter modestly announces itself to be 'a triumph of humanity' ('A Cyber-House' 2010). *Time* magazine exemplified this love of a seemingly immaterial world when it chose "You" as 2006's "Person of the Year," because "You control the Information Age. Welcome to your world" (Grossman 2006). On the liberal left, the *Guardian* placed someone called "You" at the head of its 2013 list of the hundred most important folks in the media ('Media Guardian' 2013).

Given the technology and the will, all should therefore be well in publishing for public knowledge. But it's not, because of fatal flaws in the utopic predictions made for cultural and communications technologies and shifts in the political economy of scholarly publishing.

The principal fatal flaw is that machinery and purchasing, not democratic political-economic activity, is taken as a guiding light in such utopias. The current favorites are technology and consumption, rather than activism and citizenship; bureaucratic forms and norms, not research and autonomy. The wonderfully named Progress and Freedom Foundation's *Magna Carta for the Information Age*, for instance, proposes that political-economic gains made for democracy since the 13th century have been eclipsed by technological ones:

> The central event of the 20th century is the overthrow of matter. In technology, economics, and the politics of nations, wealth—in the form of physical resources—has been losing value and significance. The powers of mind are everywhere ascendant over the brute force of things. (Dyson *et al*. 1994)

The Foundation has closed its doors, no doubt overtaken by progress, but its ahistorical Whiggish discourse of unfurling liberty for all continues to ring loudly in our ears, tinnitus-like.

George Orwell accurately described technologically determinist fantasies about forms of communication seventy years ago. His words resonate today, and with the same arid irony that first animated them (1944):

> Reading recently a batch of rather shallowly optimistic "progressive" books, I was struck by the automatic way in which people go on repeating certain phrases which were fashionable before 1914. Two great favourites are "the abolition of distance" and "the disappearance of frontiers." I do not know how often I have met with the statements that "the aeroplane and the radio have abolished distance" and "all parts of the world are now interdependent"

The real power resides not in the seeming autonomy granted to scholars by internet publishing but in the dominant audit culture of many university systems and the concentrated power of for-profit publishers. Since returning to the UK after thirty years, I have been astonished by the authority exercised by bureaucrats, the complicit and credulous conduct of faculty, and the near-unanimity of will directed towards state norms of measurement and faith in what are deemed to be corporate forms of life. The same experience attends my renewed experiences in Australia. I am also staggered by the mergers that see a few publishing companies devouring profits from the labor of faculty who have been driven by bureaucrats to over-produce.

Provocations

I have three provocations about academic publishing:

1) There is too much scholarly publication to keep up with, and too much pressure to publish

2) The future of academic publishing will largely be determined by the sciences; and

3) We must consider the relative merits of publishing electronically rather than on paper in terms of the environment—in other words, asking "how green is this paper?"

First Provocation: There is too much scholarly publication to keep up with, and too much pressure to publish

This point may seem obvious to many critics, but it is worth repeating, because the systems of value that dominate research schools assume there can never be too much publishing. Secondly, putting some numbers to the argument strengthens it.

In 1870, just 840 papers were published on the topic of mathematics. A hundred and twenty-five years later, the annual number was 50,000. Scientific output doubles every five years, and the number of patent applications filed in the major centers—the US, Japan, and China—increased by 40% between 1992 and 2002. The total is about a million a year, a quarter of which are international (Miller 2012, World Intellectual Property Organization 2014). In 2006, 1.3 million scholarly articles appeared in 23,750 journals. By the end of 2013, there were 26,529 journals in print and 4,267 solely on line, which represented an average annual growth rate of 3.5% since 1800. Perhaps a quarter of these publications are classified within the

humanities (Colquhoun 2011, National Science Communication Institute 2015: 28).

In 2004, worldwide sales of English-language science, technical, and medical serials were conservatively valued at UK£5 billion. The International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers estimates that there were:

> about 28,100 active scholarly peer-reviewed English-language journals in late 2014 (plus a further 6450 non-English-language journals), collectively publishing about 2.5 million articles a year. The number of articles published each year and the number of journals have both grown steadily for over two centuries, by about 3% and 3.5% per year respectively, though there are some indications that growth has accelerated in recent years. The reason is the equally persistent growth in the number of researchers, which has also grown at about 3% per year and now stands at between 7 and 9 million, depending on definition, although only about 20% of these are repeat authors. (Ware and Mabe 2015: 27)

The US National Institutes of Health support approximately 65,000 published papers annually. The average number of articles that scientists read each year was 150 in 1977, 216 in 2003, and 270 in 2014 (Ware and Mabe 2015). Three decades ago, a former director of Yale's library system put it this way: 'we're drowning in information and starving for knowledge' (Campbell 1985).

Today's researchers experience simultaneous, potentially contradictory, desires: citational obedience, innovation, application, bureaucratic control, and dominance of the English language. This is part of the deprofessionalizing proletarianization of scholarly life. It is easy to complain about it—and easy to mock such complaints—but the point is worth making nonetheless.

I currently undertake scholarly mentoring for faculty based in Australian, British, and Colombian universities, and formerly did so in US ones for a decade and a half. I'm struck by the pressures they confront from state and university bureaucrats and themselves to undertake instrumental, careerist publishing. There is a particular desire on the part of faculty in Latin America to publish in Anglo journals legitimized by what they call 'ISI,' the *Index of Scientific Periodicals*.[2] This pressure blends with, and is sometimes enabled by (sometimes leavened by) a love of inquiry. It can also overdetermine that love: in China, corrupt research is reportedly rife due to publishing incentives that stretch all the way to favorable housing deals (Qiu 2010), though I personally have benefited from wonderful environmental research done there that is clearly independent. The conjuncture also presents new, ghastly software opportunities such as *Publish or Perish*, which promises to forward your tenure prospects regardless of the esteem of where you publish (http://www.harzing.com/pop.htm).

In all these countries, I see the passion for knowledge and the wish to share it with the public being overrun by measurements of control that are beloved of the bureau. The loss of autonomy and the rise of obedience are prominent and disturbing. The rush to publish is occasioned not so much by the opportunity provided by

new forms of communication as by the will to direct faculty in specific directions and govern their work lives.

Second Provocation: The Future is About the Sciences

The sciences have long been dominant forces in expenditure and decision-making at Research One universities. As corporations disinvest in research and development, universities have become more and more important as sites of innovation—this is spectacularly true over the past decade, with the rise of nanotechnology (World Intellectual Property Organization 2015). Such a tendency increases the expectations of governments and educrats alike that research will generate commodifiable products.

At the same time, science is soaking up larger and larger slices of college resources. This has a notable effect on publishing, where science journal pricing continues to spiral, destroying the ability of university libraries to buy books in the numbers they used to do. For example, an annual subscription to the monthly *Journal of Comparative Neurology* costs US$28,787 (Lambert 2015). As a consequence, several humanities and qualitative social-science areas are having to confront their investment in the monograph, notably the Modern Language Association, since literary criticism and theory doesn't sell (the collapse of the market is blamed by many publishers on prolix prose and an overreaching by critics who anoint themselves experts on everything). In addition, the National Endowment for the Humanities, which underwrote the publication of hundreds of books from the mid-1970s, was crippled by the Republican Party from the mid-1990s, eroding a routine means of supporting humanities books (Miller 2000). Finally, library budgets have swung radically away from buying books and towards subscribing to databases (Miller 2012). And today, governments, most importantly the US Federal administration, are refusing to keep paying from the public pot for the profit of private presses via grants for research, professorial salaries, and library acquisitions—all minus public access (McKenna 2015).

Alongside these financial pressures, many university presses object to the onus of US Research One tenure decisions being placed on their shoulders. If junior professors get a book contract, they get tenure; if they don't, they're shown the door. The collision of these two economic drives—for quality presses to save money and junior faculty to secure jobs—has produced the idea of accepting books for publication but not actually publishing them in the old-fashioned way; they remain in electronic limbo except for the few copies that need to be printed to satisfy tenure and promotion committees and loved ones. As you may have noticed, for-profit houses like Routledge and Palgrave are signing up almost any proposed monograph. That high-volume, occasional-hit stratagem is unlikely to continue for long.

We are in a truly political-economic crisis, with interlacing monetary and governmental components. Author-pays practices are therefore on the rise. Inevitably

controversial, in one sense they formalize the reality that academics provide publishers with labor for free or below cost, especially as manuscript reviewers for journals. This has been accepted in science circles for a long time; many journals outside the humanities and social sciences require subvention by authors to defray the cost of paper, illustrations, reprints, on-line archiving, and so on. Consider the price for publishing with the nominatively-determinist American Astronomical Society: it includes paying US$27 for each 350 words and every figure or table plus US$30 for *errata* (http://iopscience.iop.org/0004-637X/page/Article%20charges). This is not always popular, but nor is it seen as vanity publishing.

Meanwhile, many disreputable science journals write to academics every day inviting them to offer their important work in return for a fee. This notorious practice led to the acceptance by the *International Journal of Advanced Computer Technology* of a paper comprised of the words 'Get Me Off Your Fucking Mailing List' repeated 863 times. The journal's reviewer graded the manuscript 'excellent' and its editor promised publication—in return for US$150. Such arrangements are far from atypical, and prey on the need of inexperienced researchers to appear in virtual print (Stromberg 2014; http://scholarlyoa.com/publishers/). Unscrupulous publishers also hijack journals by setting up titles that closely trope those of legitimately prestigious outlets (http://scholarlyoa.com/other-pages/hijacked-journals/). Since most predatory scholarly publishers are on-line only, this utopic development is scarred from the first by a dystopic other story. Once more, cybertarian fantasies of the internet are compromised by the desire for profit, thanks to '[o]verzealous open-access advocates' (Beall 2012).

Beyond obviously piratical conduct, we need to look out for what is happening with the major publishing players in the sciences, namely Elsevier (whose profit margin exceeds Apple's), Springer, Wiley, Taylor & Francis, and Sage (Smart 2015, Schmitt 2014). These firms have grown in size via mergers that swallow small publishers—Informa, which owns Taylor & Francis, made US$616 million from academic publishing in 2014 (Informa 2015). They benefit from the pressure that governments and university administrators put on young academics to publish at all costs. Against such tendencies, movements such as the American Society for Cell Biology's San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment recruit scholars to resist the bizarre dedication to impact factors and other warlock scientism that are so beloved of bureaucrats and play into the hands of corporations waiting to benefit from the over-production of knowledge (American Society for Cell Biology 2013). We also see important resistance from the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (http://www.sparc.arl.org/).

Whether it is to do with the political economy of mergers, public policy, library purchases, legitimate and predatory practice, or smart activism, science publishing will decide much of our future. For example, the University of Minnesota Press, a noted house for media and cultural studies, is partially underwritten by the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory, the test used pretty much around the world

to determine whether people are mad, and which psychologists at the University update when new income streams are required. Income from the Inventory helps fund the books it publishes.

Proposals are circulating for several different science-scholarship business models that might support cultural-studies style work, which in the US in particular has few external grants available to underwrite it. These ideas include allocating funds: to libraries, as before, to support the system overall by purchasing titles; to authors, to underwrite publishing by offering production subsidies; and to researchers, to underwrite reading through consumption subsidies. In addition, there are initiatives such as entirely open-access publishing funded by a capitation fee, calculated as per progressive taxation and paid by all research institutes, be they universities or free-standing entities (Smart 2014; Kennison and Norberg 2014).

Third Provocation: We must consider the relative merits of publishing electronically rather than on paper in terms of the environment—how green *is* this paper?

Given the massive expansion of scholarly publishing, what is the impact on the environment? Common sense suggests that on-line research and publishing will diminish the carbon footprint of print. Early comparisons of the environmental impact of printed newspapers versus electronic consumption support this view. Amongst British book buyers, recent research found that 80% believed electronic communications were less environmentally-destructive than paper ones. Sixty-five percent of publishing's carbon footprint comes from paper, and e-book readers require one-off transportation (obtaining the devices) and no pulping, bleaching, or printing. A Kindle, for example, is supposed to offset the carbon footprint of its production within a year, and over a lifetime, save the carbon needed to make twenty books (Maxwell and Miller 2012).

But there is no accepted measurement system for readers, publishers, scholars, policymakers, librarians, and salespeople to calculate the renewable virtues of paper versus the electrical vices of electronics and *vice versa*, while there are dozens of competing environmental-certification systems.

Because young trees are most efficient at absorbing carbon emissions, their regular replenishment, as undertaken by the paper industry, rather than reliance on elderly branches and roots, may be effective. And we know that the use of digital devices in the US generally relies on coal-powered electricity at some point in the supply chain. Web publishing does not encourage planting, so it does nothing to remove carbon from the atmosphere, unlike printing. And when comparisons are made, the time of day that electricity is used for reading, especially via mains power, must be factored into determining environmental impacts. Current research suggests that reading on line for half an hour equates to ninety minutes watching television or the printing of a newspaper (Maxwell and Miller 2013).

Conclusion

So where do my provocations leave us? Our publishing political economy is a stratified domain that is structured in dominance, and the utopic promises of new technologies for publishing are outweighed by a dystopic reality.

As a consequence, we need to confront the following factors:

- the governmentalization and commodification of scholarly life
- the trends set by science; and
- the environmental impact of what we do

We must rethink the interaction of for-profit publishers and professional associations, create independent not-for-profit alternatives[3], and address the interests of junior scholars—give them pragmatic advice at the same time as we urge them to transcend it. This is part of the idea of *gestión cultural*—tough to translate, it is a blend of cultural policy, administration, activism, and development.

If we don't do such things, the bright promise of open access, the proliferation of ideas, and democratized publishing will drag us down a very dismal alley, in fact a narrow *cul-de-sac* that leads to an array of goggle-eyed Anglo bureaucrats armed with energy-gorging measuring sticks, licking their unproductive lips just as their counterparts in corporate publishing do. Should we refuse a golden age of expression and its explosion of outlets if it is tied so tightly to an increasing governmentalization, Anglicization, and commodification of academic life?

Toby Miller is Emeritus Distinguished Professor, University of California, Riverside; Sir Walter Murdoch Professor of Cultural Policy Studies, Murdoch University; Profesor Invitado, Escuela de Comunicación Social, Universidad del Norte; Professor of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies, Cardiff University/Prifysgol Caerdydd; and Director of the Institute of Media and Creative Industries, Loughborough University London. The author and editor of over forty books, his work has been translated into Spanish, Chinese, Portuguese, Japanese, Turkish, German, Italian, Farsi, and Swedish. His most recent volumes are *The Sage Companion to Television Studies* (co-edited 2015), *The Routledge Companion to Global Popular Culture* (edited 2015), *Greening the Media* (co-authored 2012) and *Blow Up the Humanities* (2012).

Notes

[1] I do so via the culturalstudies podcast http://culturalstudies.podbean.com/ and publication in the *bourgeois* and activist press. I also edit journals and books and write scholarly articles, chapters, and monographs. Many of these works are available freely and many are not. Apart from books, I put all of them that I can up on my personal website http://tobymiller.org/, with the implied copyright claim that this constitutes a body of work comprised of my writings. I have never selected an outlet or a topic to benefit my career.

[2] Now known in English as the Thomson Reuters Web of Science.

[3] Thank goodness for projects like *Culture Unbound*.

References

'A Cyber-House Divided' (2010): *Economist*, 4 September 2010, 61-62.

ATLAS Collaboration (2010): 'Charged-Particle Multiplicities in pp Interactions at √s = 900 GeV Measured with the ATLAS Detector at the LHC', *Physics Letters B*, 688, 21-42.

American Society for Cell Biology (2013): *San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)* http://www.ascb.org/dora/ (accessed 14/12/15).

Bacon, Francis (1854): *Novum Organum. Francis Bacon, Selections. The Works*, 3 vols. Basil Montague (trans and ed), Philadelphia: Parry & Macmillan.

Beall, Jeffrey (2012) 'Predatory Publishing', *The Scientist*, 1 August 2012: http://www.the-scientist.com/?articles.view/articleNo/32426/title/Predatory-Publishing/.

Campbell, Colin (1985): 'Torrent of Print Strains the Fabric of Libraries', *New York Times*, 25 February 1985: http://www.nytimes.com/1985/02/25/us/torrent-of-print-strains-the-fabric-of-libraries.html?pagewanted=all.

Colquhoun, David (2011): 'Publish-or-Perish: Peer Review and the Corruption of Science', *Guardian*, 5 September 2011: http://www.theguardian.com/science/2011/sep/05/publish-perish-peer-review-science (accessed 14/12/15).

Dyson, Esther, George Gilder, George Keyworth, & Alvin Toffler (1994): *Cyberspace and the American Dream: A Magna Carta for the Knowledge Age*, version 1.2, Progress and Freedom Foundation http://www.pff.org/issues-pubs/futureinsights/fi1.2magnacarta.html (accessed 14/12/15).

Grossman, Lev (2006): '*Time*'s Person of the Year: You', *Time*, 13 December 2006: http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1570810,00.html (accessed 14/12/15).

Informa (2015): 'Informa PLC Full Year Results for 12 Months to 31 December 2014' http://informa.com/Documents/Investor%20Relations/2015/Full%20Year%202014%20Results/Informa%202014%20Full%20Year%20Results%20Press%20Release.pdf. (accessed 14/12/15).

Kennison, Rebecca & Lisa Norberg (2014): *Publishing and Archiving for Humanities and Social Sciences: A White Paper*. K/N Consultants http://knconsultants.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/OA_Proposal_White_Paper_Final.pdf (accessed 14/12/15).

Lambert, Craig (2015): 'The "Wild West" of Academic Publishing', *Harvard Magazine*, January-February 2015: http://harvardmagazine.com/2015/01/the-wild-west-of-academic-publishing (accessed 14/12/15).

Maxwell, Richard & Toby Miller (2012): *Greening the Media*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Maxwell, Richard & Toby Miller (2013): 'Books: Culture, Economy, Environment', Joshua S. Hanan & Mark Hayward (eds): *Communication and the Economy: History, Value and Agency*, New York: Peter Lang, 167-86.

McKenna, Laura (2015): 'The Convoluted Profits of Academic Publishing', *The Atlantic*, 17 December 2015: http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2015/12/the-convoluted-profits-of-academic-publishing/421047/ (accessed 17/12/15).

'Media Guardian 100': (2013) *Guardian*, 2 September 2013: http://www.theguardian.com/media/series/mediaguardian-100-2013.

Miller, Toby (2000): 'The National Endowment for the Arts in the 1990s: A Black Eye on the Arts?', *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43:9, 1429-445.

Miller, Toby (2012): *Blow Up the Humanities*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

National Science Communication Institute (2015): *Mapping the Future of Scholarly Publishing* http://nationalscience.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/OSI-report-Feb-2015.pdf (accessed 14/12/15).

Orwell, George (1944): 'As I Please', *Tribune*, 12 May 1944: http://telelib.com/authors/O/OrwellGeorge/essay/tribune/AsIPlease19440512.html (accessed 14/12/15).

Plato (2008): *Phaedrus*, Benjamin Jowett (trans), Charleston: Forgotten Books.

Qiu, Jane (2010): 'Publish or Perish in China', *Nature*, 463, 142-43.

Schmitt, Jason (2014): 'Academic Journals: The Most Profitable Obsolete Technology in History', *Huffington Post* 23 December 2014: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jason-schmitt/academic-journals-the-mos_1_b_6368204.html (accessed 14/12/15).

Smart, Pippa (2014): 'The Big Picture: Scholarly Publishing Trends 2014', *Science Editing*, 1:2, 52-57.

Stromberg, Joseph (2014): ''Get Me Off Your Fucking Mailing List' is an Actual Science Paper Accepted by a Journal', *Vox*, 21 November 2014: http://www.vox.com/2014/11/21/7259207/scientific-paper-scam (accessed 14/12/15).

Ware, Mark & Michael Mabe (2015): *The STM Report: An Overview of Scientific and Scholarly Journal Publishing*. International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers http://www.stm-assoc.org/2015_02_20_STM_Report_2015.pdf (accessed 14/12/15).

World Intellectual Property Organization (2014): 'US and China Drive International Patent Filing Growth in Record-Setting Year', http://www.wipo.int/pressroom/en/articles/2014/article_0002.html (accessed 14/12/15).

World Intellectual Property Organization (2015): *World Intellectual Property Report: Breakthrough Innovation and Economic Growth*: http://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo_pub_944_2015.pdf (accessed 14/12/15).

Culture Unbound
Journal of Current Cultural Research

The Patent and the Paper:
A Few Thoughts on Late Modern Science and Intellectual Property

By Eva Hemmungs Wirtén

Abstract

Marie and Pierre Curie's decision not to patent the discovery (1898) and later isolation (1902) of radium is perhaps the most famous of all disinterested decisions in the history of science. To choose publishing instead of patenting and openness instead of enclosure was hardly a radical choice at the time. Traditionally, we associate academic publishing with "pure science" and Mertonian ideals of openness, sharing and transparency. Patenting on the other hand, as a byproduct of "applied science" is intimately linked to an increased emphasis and dependency on commercialization and technology transfer within academia. Starting from the Curies' mythological decision I delineate the contours of an increasing convergence of the patent and the paper (article) from the end of the nineteenth-century until today. Ultimately, my goal is to suggest a few possible ways of addressing the hybrid space that today constitute the terrain of late modern science and intellectual property.

Keywords: academic publishing, patenting, intellectual property, Marie Curie

Hemmungs Wirtén, Eva: "The Patent and the Paper: a Few Thoughts on Late Modern Science and Intellectual Property", *Culture Unbound*, Volume 7, 2015: 600-609. Published by Linköping University Electronic Press: http://www.cultureunbound.ep.liu.se

I

In 1898, Marie and Pierre Curie discovered that *pechblende*, a byproduct of the radioactive disintegration of uranium, traditionally used for the decoration of Bohemian glassware and viewed as nothing more than waste following this production, proved to contain two new elements, polonium and radium. We now know that this was the birth of a new science, one Marie Curie later baptized *radioactivity*—a science that would turn out as much foe as friend. The Curies announced their discovery in three *notes* published in the *Comptes Rendus*, the journal of the French Academy of Sciences. As the nineteenth century drew to a close and the twentieth dawned, it was clear to them as well as the international scientific community at large that the *journal* was the obvious choice when it came to announce discoveries and claim scientific authority. Indeed, during the twentieth-century the scientific journal would dominate research to the point of exclusivity and the scientific peer-reviewed article become the common denominator by which the measurement and evaluation of scientific output and excellence took place; establishing a "virtual monopoly on expert scientific authorship" (Csiszar 2010: 403). However, modern information is made up of a cornucopia of documents, which to some extent seem to have broken this monopoly in favor of "a mixed economy of genres that include preprint archives, working papers, and patent documents" (Csiszar 2010: 428, n.14).

In this exploratory paper, I rely on the Curies famous decision not to patent radium or the process of its extraction in order to query the relationship between the paper (i.e. the scientific article) and the patent, two types of documents that traditionally have been considered antithetical, on either side of sciences "pure" and "applied." In the current debate on enclosure/openness there is little doubt that intellectual property, and especially perhaps patents, symbolizes the truly dark underbelly of an ongoing commodification of research and higher education (Greenberg 2007; Rader 2010; McSherry 2001). Rent-collecting demons known as patent "trolls" and the impenetrable layers of counter-productive patent "thickets" (Lemley 2013) that hinder, rather than encourage innovation, have come to illustrate everything that has gone haywire in the intellectual property system. And rightly so. But there is another, and perhaps complementary way of looking at patents that has all but been forgotten in the consensus around their general badness: historically, patents were part of public knowledge. They still are. And yet, somehow they are not. I am acutely aware of the fact that very few—including myself—primarily associate patents with this original ideology of openness. Perhaps this is why Judge Newman's declaration that the "study of patented information is essential to the creation of new knowledge, thereby achieving further scientific and technological progress" (cited in Rimmer 2008: 176) is such an important reminder to reclaim this earlier history. The purpose of this essay, then, is not to offer an apologia for patents, but rather to suggest a modest re-thinking of

the dichotomy between paper/patent and enclosure/openness in order to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of what public knowledge might be and how we best might continue to defend it.

II

The work that resulted in those three *Comptes Rendus* articles took place in a small, glassed-in space used as a storage room for machines, a cold and drafty makeshift laboratory located on the premises of the *École Municipale de physique et de chimie industrielles* (EPCI), Pierre Curie's academic home for more than twenty-three years. Later, this insufficient shed would become part of the Curie myth, as if driving home the point that the Curies' discoveries were all the more impressive because they were denied proper facilities and worked outside the establishment rules.

Marie and Pierre Curie's collaboration was consolidated during roughly a six-year period beginning in 1897 and ending with the 1903 Nobel Prize in Physics, which the husband-and-wife team shared with Henri Becquerel. Theirs was depicted as a unique marriage, and the couple became the target for innumerable at-home articles in the French and international press. Journalists found them endlessly fascinating. He was something of an outsider. The son of a 1871 communard, Pierre Curie was home-schooled and never attended any of the *Grand Ecoles*. Marie Sklodowska, his wife and mother of their two daughters Irène and Eve, had arrived in Paris from Poland and was working on her thesis at the Sorbonne. They were certainly illustrious, but more than anything, they were *modern*.

This most famous of all scientific partnerships came to an abrupt end on April 19, 1906, when Pierre Curie slipped and was run over by a horse-drawn carriage while crossing the rue Dauphine. Newspapers spared no detail of how the scientist's head was crushed under the wheel and held nothing back when recapitulating the dramatic moment when the identity of the victim was revealed. A heavy *camion*, a slick pavement, and at age thirty-nine, Marie Curie was a widow with two young daughters to support. Almost immediately succeeding her husband as Professor at the Sorbonne, Marie Curie now embarked on the path to becoming the world's most famous female scientist.

Fast-forward to 1923, almost twenty years after her husband's death, when Marie Curie would tell the story of the discovery of radium and the birth of the science of radioactivity to the world. If she was famous already at the time of the first Nobel in 1903, this was nothing to her status in the beginning of the 1920s, when she had morphed into an international celebrity of the highest order. She had achieved an unparalleled accomplishment by receiving a second Nobel in 1911, this time in Chemistry and without having to share the honor with anyone. She had toured the U.S. to enormous fanfare and had joined the League of Nations' recently formed *Commission Internationale de Coopération Intellectuelle* (CICI)

in order to work for international cooperation in science and research following the First World War.

And in 1920, she had also been offered the opportunity to write a biography of her late husband Pierre for the book series "Les Grands Hommes de France." Managing their public personas in print was something scientists were increasingly willing to do, and readers had a huge appetite to take it all in, and (like today) the biography was a popular genre in which to do so. Curie now found herself in the position to ensure Pierre Curie a well-deserved place in the company of immortal "Great Men," like Descartes, Talleyrand and Racine. And yet, because his work and life was so tightly bound to hers, she was also offered—under the most acceptable of forms—the possibility of overseeing her own legacy. The story was hers to write and leave to posterity. Nobody could contradict her.

One of the most important passages from *Pierre Curie* articulates what we could call the Curie's scientific ethos, setting the benchmark standard for a particular kind of scientific disinterestedness.

> Our investigations had started a general scientific movement, and similar work was being undertaken in other countries. Toward these efforts Pierre Curie maintained a most disinterested and liberal attitude. With my agreement he refused to draw any material profit from our discovery. We took no copyright, and published without reserve all the results of our research, as well as the exact processes of the preparation of radium. In addition, we gave to those interested whatever information they asked of us. This was of great benefit to the radium industry, which could thus develop in full freedom, first in France, then in foreign countries, and furnish to scientists and to physicians the products which they needed. This industry still employs today, with scarcely any modifications, the processes indicated by us (Curie 1923: 111).

As she enumerated the dos and the don'ts, Curie situated scientific practice within a gift/market dichotomy upholding two distinct systems of credit and reward. Intellectual property represented an "interested" perspective where you "reserve advantage." Choosing to "publish without reserve" and keeping "no detail secret," instead epitomized the values of disinterestedness. Abstaining from proprietary shackles on radium spurned more innovative activity in both science and industry. The industry could then develop "in full freedom, first in France, then in foreign countries." This is not the time nor the place to go into details on how this text ended up the way it did in *Pierre Curie*, what importance the "I" and the "me," and the "we," and the "our" had to the consolidation of scientific authority and autonomy. Suffice to say that a lot of interest went into the production of disinterestedness. Twenty years after the fact, Marie Curie made it very clear that choosing to publish without reserve was a deliberate rejection of keeping advantage through intellectual property.

III

Of course, this separation of publishing and patenting in *Pierre Curie* was a bit more complicated than Marie Curie made it out to be. Pierre Curie had in fact patented several instruments that brought him an extra income that was far from negligible (Hemmungs Wirtén 2015: 20) and while the ethos of the scientific community of the time was openness, patenting was becoming increasingly important. Paul Lucier describes the double bind of nineteenth-century scientists: "any scientist who patented research put at risk his professional integrity. Still, if a scientist wanted to protect his rights as a discoverer, he would have to patent" (Lucier 1996: 154). As so often was is the case, things tend to come in shades of grey rather than just black and white.

The relinquishment made by the Curies in their negation of patenting is disinterestedness in action: a principle which, together with communism, universalism and organized skepticism, echoes Robert Merton's (1968) famous four pillars of the scientific ethos. But not everybody was as convinced as Curie that gifting radium had been a sensible thing to do. In 1941, T Swann Harding saw Curie's actions not so much giving away as abandoning, letting a dangerous element loose rather than controlling it by expertise. He wrote:

> A false sense of ethics induced Mme. Curie not to patent her discovery and thereafter to see that it was used beneficially for mankind. This meant giving her discovery over to every quack and commercial faker who chose to exploit the public by means of it. […] Her inverted and distorted sense of probity turned radium over to rascals (Swann Harding 1941: 386).

Regardless of how you view the Curies' choice of non-patenting, when I began working on Curie from the perspective of intellectual property a few years ago, the decision not to patent radium was foremost in my mind. While I have worked on intellectual property my whole academic career, I have mainly done so on copyright and remained in the sphere of media and the cultural industries. For the past few years, however, I have increasingly wanted to move into slightly different intellectual properties (patents and trademarks) and into a slightly different arena, one John Willinsky (2006: 17) terms "the know-biz" industries.

So, Curie became a vehicle for me to think about what is happening in academia around these issues today, where the action of non-action seemed refreshingly out of sync with the present situation. One where "publish or perish" has been supplanted with "patent or perish." With Steven Shapin's eloquent description of the relationship between the past and the present in mind, I too felt that

> it is inevitable that we write about the past as an expression of present concerns, and "we *can* write about the past to find out about how it came to be that we live as we now do, and indeed, for giving better descriptions of the way we live now (Shapin 2008: xiii).

So, exactly how *do* will live now? Let me attempt an answer to that question by returning once more to the Curies and what I think is a telling snapshot example

of our life right now in this intersection of publishing and patenting. The shed within the *École Municipale de physique et de chimie industrielles*, the one where the discovery of radium took place, is long gone. The school on these premises where Marie and Pierre Curie discovered and later isolated (1902) radium, still stands, but today under the name *École Supérieure de Physique et de Chimie Industrielles de la Ville de Paris* [ESPCI Paris Tech]. With the addition of the penultimate Americanized label of excellence attached to it [Paris Tech], the school markets itself on its website by connecting publications with patents. "The researchers of the school construct the knowledge of tomorrow and publish *1 article daily* in the best international scientific journals, they invent the industry of the future and *deposit 1 patent a week*" (ESPCI 2015). Assigned different roles, "constructing the knowledge of tomorrow" by publishing, versus "inventing tomorrow's industry" by depositing patents, the balance between the two is seven articles to one patent per week. The contrast and the quantification is perhaps eye-catching but hardly unique for ESPCI Paris Tech in the "the late age of information" (to paraphrase David Jay Bolter's (2001) expression "late age of print").

Not only is that quantification in itself quite remarkable, but it is also ironic that it is articulated by the very school (granted, one that belonged in the "applied" category) where that famous decision of non-patenting occurred, a story that the school uses to good effect in its own narrative on its illustrious heritage.

ESPCI's identity relies on patents and articles as complementary, not antithetical and the school quite seamlessly brings together the two practices—publishing and patenting—that Curie wanted to separate so badly in *Pierre Curie*. And still, the process is one where the paper "comes first" and the patent "follows." This is a trajectory that no longer follows. In the late modern university, scientists may well find themselves working under the premises of flows going in just the opposite direction: signing non-disclosure agreements because patents, not publications, are the expected outcome of their research funding. So, while the distinction between publishing and patenting was never absolute, incompatibility now seems to have turned into compatibility and divergence into convergence. Thus, the ESPCI just seem to be doing more or less what all universities do today: compare, number and measure both types of documents within the framework of an overarching metrics culture.

IV

As I was preparing this paper for *Publishing for public knowledge* it struck me that the theme of this workshop expressed a kind of implicit agreement on what public knowledge is. Few of the speakers or members of the audience would oppose or argue *against* the values of openness and academic freedom outlined in the workshop invitation. We have little difficulty thinking of publishing as (at least ideally) a vehicle for the promotion and wider dissemination of knowledge

and science—despite the deeply flawed current economics of publishing and its abundance of legal snafu. But arguing that *Patenting for public knowledge* is important or even possible is almost inconceivable. Thirty years of intellectual property expansionism has certainly made most of us who work in this field both weary and skeptical that there is any good to be had from the patent system, or entertain the notion that we could actually learn more about the evolution of the idea of public knowledge by looking at it from the perspective of patenting.

T Swann Harding felt that Curie would have shown more interest in the well-being of the general public if she had decided to control radium by one or several patents rather than letting it roam "free." What he suggested was patenting as a form of "defense," and one early example of such a strategy is the 1923 University of Toronto patent on insulin (Cassier 2008; Weiner 1987). The university patented because the university and the scientists in questions were the best stewards of the knowledge, or so the argument went. We generally think of university patenting as quite a recent affair, with the controversial Bayh-Dole Act from 1980 as a watershed moment in this history. Bayh-Dole opened the door for federally funded U.S. universities to patent their research and has come to epitomize the collision between an earlier "gift-economy" and an incoming culture of propertization (Rai & Eisenberg 2003; Rooksby 2013; Etzkowitz 1994; Metlay 2006; Popp Berman 2008).

So we really start out thinking that patents have nothing to do with public knowledge, in fact, that they might undo it altogether. But bear with me just for a little while longer while I point out a few crucial aspects that we associate with publishing that are actually present also in patenting. Not a revolutionary suggestion by any means, but one that might offer us the keys to a complementary space that seems particularly rewarding in its potential to query the notion of what "public knowledge" is and how it comes about.

We might consider that both patents and articles are claim-making texts: whether or not we consider the journal article and the patent application complementary or ideologically incompatible, both make claims. Just as a scientific publication needs to conform to a narrative logic and generic conventions (the order in which the argument is made, the length of the text) does a patent application preclude certain rhetorical stances and highlight others (Myers 1995). Such claims are authored: writing an article or a patent application, is in both cases mediated via authorship. Such a category includes individuals as well as groups, and in the case of patents, lawyers and patent examiners who act as both readers and authors and whose role in the proliferation of scientific authorship still remains underexplored. But authors or inventors cannot make claims in secret. Disclosure is the backbone of the journal article and the patent application alike, where the "limited monopoly" or exclusive right to control the exploitation of the patented invention for a twenty-year period rests on "the disclosure of technical information." Disclosure implies the presence of readers, readers who can judge and evaluate the

claims within certain practices of reading and evaluation. In academia these include well-known processes of peer-review and in terms of patents the examination and evaluation of an application *before* awarding a patent. Patent agents formed a new profession as did patent examiners (Swanson 2009). What sort of expertise did they engender? Why and when did it appear? Such knowledge links to storing and archiving, as patents passed through patent offices that competed and collaborated with bibliographic institutions, they too became bibliographical institutions that collected the growing pool of information needed to establish what in patent-speak is known as "prior art," because failure to do so might invalidate the patent. Equally, failure to "know the field" is just as dangerous in scientific publishing, and can only be avoided by careful and methodical database searches that have much in common with the preparations undertaken when writing a patent application. These are just a few overlaps, a few points of comparison suggesting that to follow the paper trail of patents historically means rethinking, not only one of the most contentious intellectual property rights today, but also our perception of openness and public knowledge, and, in extension also the role played by secrets and secrecy.

V

If the paper and the patent are both part of the infrastructure of research and both have something to do with the construction of public knowledge, should we then just learn to love the patent and stop worrying? Not quite. It is undeniable that the acceleration in university patenting, the metrics culture in general and the corporatization of higher education is deeply problematic. Patenting is one part of the problem, no doubt. But there are other, perhaps even more worrying tendencies. Silence, for instance. Because if both the patent and the paper was about making knowledge available, the presence of trade secrets and confidentiality agreements has increasingly turned laboratories into walled and privatized spaces within universities. The old chronology—where the paper took precedence—no longer automatically holds. The conditions for what we think of as "public," in the dissemination of knowledge is one of the most pertinent and controversial questions facing research and higher education today. It is one that scholars and scientists encounter on a daily basis, but that also reverberate into the ideological cornerstones of basic science and research. A further understanding of the complexities involved in the shared history of publishing and patenting can provide new insight into current processes of enclosure/openness within knowledge intensive milieus. These developments require further study in order to assess the impact on future knowledge production, but I believe it is essential that we revisit and rethink some of our own assumptions on what public knowledge is when we do so.

Eva Hemmungs Wirtén is Professor of Mediated Culture at Linköping University, Sweden. She is the author of *No Trespassing: Authorship, Intellectual Property and the Boundaries of Globalization* (2004) and *Terms of Use: Negotiating the Jungle of the Intellectual Commons* (2008). Her most recent book is *Making Marie Curie: Intellectual Property and Celebrity Culture in an Age of Information* which was published by The University of Chicago Press in the Spring of 2015. Full CV at www.evahemmungswirten.se

References

Bolter, David J. (2001): *Writing Space*. LEA, Mawhah, NJ.
Cassier, Maurice (2008): "'Patenting in the Public Interest:' Administration of Insulin Patents by the University of Toronto," *History of Technology* 24: 2, 153-171.
Curie, Marie (1923): *Pierre Curie.* New York: Macmillan.
Csiszar, Alex (2010): "Seriality and the Search for Order: Scientific Print and Its Problems during the late Nineteenth Century," *History of Science* 48: 3-4, 399-434.
ESPCI (2015): *L'ESPCI ParisTech : un modèle d'exception* https://www.espci.fr/fr/espci-paristech/, last accessed May 11, 2015.
Etzkowitz, Henry (1994): "Knowledge as Property: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Debate over Academic Patent Policy," *Minerva* 32: 4, 383-421.
Greenberg, David (2007): *Science for Sale.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Hemmungs Wirtén, Eva (2015): *Making Marie Curie: Intellectual Property and Celebrity Culture in an Age of Information*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lemley, Mark A. and A Douglas Melamed (2013): "Missing the Forest for the Trolls," *Columbia Law Review* 113:8, 2117-2189.
Lucier, Paul (1996): "Court and Controversy: Patenting Science in the Nineteenth Century," *The British Journal for the History of Science* 29: 2, 139-154.
McSherry, Corynne (2001): *Who Owns Academic Work?* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
Merton, Robert (1968): *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
Metlay, Grischa (2006): "Reconsidering Renormalization: Stability and Change in 20th-Century Views on University Patents," *Social Studies of Science* 36:4, 565-597.
Myers, Greg (1995): "From Discovery to Invention. The Writing and Rewriting of Two Patents," *Social Studies of Science* 25: 1, 57-105.
Popp Berman, Elizabeth (2008): "Why Did Universities Start Patenting? Institution-Building and the Road to the Bayh-Dole Act," *Social Studies of Science* 38: 6, 835-871.
Rader, H. ed. (2010): *The Commodification of Academic Research.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
Rai, Arti K. and Rebecca S. Eisenberg (2003): "Bayh-Dole Reform and the Progress of Biomedicine," *Law and Contemporary Problems* 66, 289-314.
Rimmer, Matthew (2008): *Intellectual Property and Biotechnology*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
Rooksby, Jacob H. (2013): "Myriad Choices: University Patents Under the Sun," *Journal of Law and Education* 42: 2, 313-326.
Shapin, Steven (2008): *The Scientific Life*: *A Moral History of a Late Modern Vocation.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Swann Harding, T. (1941): "Exploitation of the Creators," *Philosophy of Science* 8:3, 385-90.
Swanson, Kara W (2009): "The Emergence of the Professional Patent Practitioner," *Technology and Culture* 50: 3, 519-548.
Weiner, Charles (1987): "Patenting and Academic Research: Historical Case Studies," *Science, Technology and Human Values* 12: 1, 50-62.
Willinsky, John (2009): *The Access Principle. The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship*. MIT press, 2009.

Culture Unbound
Journal of Current Cultural Research

Open Access Scholarly Publishing on the Competitive Market: University Management as Obstacle and Enabler

By Jenny Johannisson

Abstract

This article explores the relation between university management and open access scholarly publishing in Sweden. Open access is generally promoted in Swedish national research policy, referring to internationally adopted recommendations on free access to knowledge by researchers and citizens alike. In principle, the conditions for universities to not only promote but also actively contribute to open access by hosting open access scholarly journals could therefore be deemed adequate. In reality, however, many universities choose to adapt only to external systems of assessment and disregard internal demands from the research community. Since hosting open access scholarly journals is not favored by existing external systems of assessment, university management that does not also act on internal demands from the research community runs the risk of becoming an obstacle rather than an enabler of open access scholarly publishing.

Keywords: Scholarly publishing, open access, university management

Johannisson, Jenny: "Open Access Scholarly Publishing on the Competitive Market: University Management as Obstacle or Enabler", *Culture Unbound*, Volume 7, 2015: 610-617. Published by Linköping University Electronic Press: http://www.cultureunbound.ep.liu.se

Introduction

In late modern Western democracies, making university-based research public is, or rather should be, a major concern for researchers, policy-makers, and citizens alike. While traditions vary across different disciplinary domains, publishing research in the text-based format could be considered a fundamental aspect of scholarly communication. That scholarly publications contribute to promoting public knowledge can of course be questioned from several perspectives. One perspective concerns the restricted access to scholarly publications implied by the specific qualifications necessary to actually understand the content of scholarly communication in general. Scholarly communication usually involves a discussion amongst peers in a given disciplinary domain, which presupposes a high level of expertise that excludes not only the public but also the majority of researchers from other disciplinary domains than the one at hand. Another perspective concerns the channels through which scholarly texts are communicated, be it a journal article or a monograph. Since scholarly text-based communication is still primarily legitimized by being published by more or less formalized bodies external to the researcher – preferably in the shape of a commercial publishing house – access to scholarly publications is restricted by the fees or other conditions that these external bodies stipulate. Bringing these two perspectives together and taking us back to university-based research, public research policy tends to promote an increasingly selective view of which communication channels should be considered legitimate, while the legitimate communication channels demand increasingly specialized content. When scholarly publishing has thus more or less turned into an intellectual asset on a global, competitive market, open access is introduced as the savior that will bring scholarly publishing back to its true objective, that is, to make knowledge public.

In this article, I will provides some reflections on open access scholarly publishing in relation to university management, drawing mainly on three personal and quite different experiences: first, the instigation and establishment of *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidskrift*, a Nordic peer-reviewed and open access journal in the cultural policy research field, second, the instigation and establishment of *Culture Unbound*, and, finally, my more current experience of acting as a deputy vice-chancellor for research at my university. While intended for publication in an open access scholarly journal, this article should be considered essayistic rather than scholarly, since it is not based on the systematic study of empirical material generated within a specified research design. The experience that I will allow to dominate the text is that of being deputy vice-chancellor. When speaking from that position, my text should be considered explicitly political in that it argues for a specific standpoint that is based on values rather than theory. But I am still also a researcher, and my article will of course also be research based. The research that I will refer to has mainly been generated by my own discipline, that is, Library and Information Sci-

ence (LIS). This is no coincidence; scholarly publishing is a very interesting research field that definitely deserves to be elaborated further, from many different disciplinary and theoretical perspectives, and the little research that has been done so far has to a large extent emanated from LIS.

My main concern is to reflect on how university management, in a Swedish context, deals with the issue of open access scholarly publishing. Open access scholarly publishing could of course include any kind of scholarly publication provided by any relevant agent in the open access format, but I will mainly refer to open access scholarly journals instigated and owned by a university. As a researcher, my interests primarily lie in public policy making, preferably in the cultural policy field. Drawing on a perspective generated by this interest, my article concerns the relation between public policy making in the field of research and higher education in Sweden of today, and the policies on open access scholarly publishing generated by university management. I am interested in exploring how university management aims at promoting as well as prohibiting specific forms of behavior concerning open access scholarly journals. This interest concerns a very fundamental aspect of our Western notion of scholarly research, namely what kind of behavior is promoted and prohibited when scholars communicate their research to others; the cultural politics of scholarly communication, so to speak. Is university management primarily an obstacle to open access scholarly journals or could (and should) it work as an enabler of such activities? In this article, university management includes all those functions at different levels within a university that have formal power over strategic decision-making and, perhaps most importantly, resource allocation. Administrators, researchers and teachers at a university have more or less access to (or interest in) processes led by university management. In some way or other, however, decisions made by university management have consequences for every employee. Management decisions thus provide one important framework for what is possible and impossible (or at least very difficult) to do within a university. Both university staff and university management also have to relate to decisions made by the Swedish national government, in particular, of course, in the policy field of research and higher education.

Open access and public policy making

When writing this article, I started with searching for some kind of general mapping of Swedish university policies towards open access scholarly journals, and, more specifically, analyses of tendencies in such policies. I could find neither, which, to my mind, again points to the need for more research on scholarly publishing. Instead, I have to turn to the more general tendencies in public policy making relevant to both universities and the format of open access.

In Sweden, as in most Western countries, the general tendency in public policy making directed at academic research could be summarized in the following guiding principles: first, universities are considered agents on the competitive market and thus universities are rewarded with public funding when they deliver specific achievements; second, concerning scholarly publishing, these achievements are mainly delimited to articles in international peer reviewed journals in English, preferably included in Web of Science; and, finally, when auditing the specific achievements of specific universities, quantitative rather than qualitative indicators are applied, using the amount of articles and, in particular, the amount of citations of articles as the basis for developing the indicators. The underlying rationale referred to when public policy makers – and university managers – argue in favor of these guiding principles is that they are the best available in a system that positions external quality assurance as a necessary condition for high academic quality at any individual university or in any individual piece of research. This rationale is not least evident in the recent bills on research and innovation that the Swedish government has provided. From 2010 and onwards, a specified part (as of today, 10 percent[1]) of national research funding is allocated according to bibliometric indicators. University policies on internal resource allocation have more or less adopted the same model, as Gustaf Nelhans and Pieta Eklund (2015) show in a report on bibliometrics as a tool in university management. Also at my own university, the local resource allocation model mirrors the national model. And hey, we all want quality, don't we?

The consequences of the aforementioned guiding principles are well known in a Swedish university context. Only certain research fields, such as medicine, deliver in a way that is considered satisfactory by the system. The humanities and large parts of the social sciences are financially punished for applying different guiding principles when publishing research, for example by publishing a monograph rather than an article, or in Swedish rather than in English. Drawing on personal experience with establishing a Nordic scholarly journal on cultural policy research, that publishes articles in English but primarily articles in the Scandinavian languages, such a journal was possible to instigate in 1995 but would be extremely difficult to instigate today. I am happy to say, though, that the journal is still published, due to the contributions of four Nordic universities of which my own university is one.

The definition and use of quantitative indicators when measuring academic quality and using the results as one component in the allocation of national research funding has fuelled intense and well-known debate and critique from researchers, universities and national research funding bodies. The Swedish Research Council (2015b) has recently presented a model for evaluating quality in research at Swedish universities that relies more on peer review of actual research content than on bibliometrics as a tool for quality assessment. Having said this, however, I would argue that one basic problem remains: public policy makers and university manage-

ment still primarily aim at adapting to a system that is considered external to themselves, rather than at transforming the system by relying more heavily on internally generated guiding principles for defining and achieving high academic quality. In his doctoral thesis, Gustaf Nelhans (2013) promotes an understanding of citation practices that emanates from STS, Science and Technology Studies, which considers citation practices as created, upheld and transformed in interaction between the researcher, the article and the citation index, rather than an understanding of such practices as the mere application of objective quality criteria for when choosing who to cite or not. Transferred to a more general context of scholarly publishing, I would argue that policy makers, university managers and researchers tend to forget that they contribute to reproducing the existing system by not challenging its absolute and putatively objective character. I would also argue that when a university decides to instigate and own an open access scholarly journal it can be an important way of recognizing the transformative power that university management potentially can exercise; an act of resistance, so to speak, against the general trend amongst universities to merely adapt to external demands.

Digitization and public knowledge

A force that has greatly contributed to enabling the existing system of governance in Swedish and Western public research policy is digitization. In order for bibliometrics to be used as a tool for quality assessment on any greater scale, digital tools are a prerequisite for enabling the aggregation and analysis of the "big data" on publishing. Digitization has of course also been a prerequisite for the massive expansion of scholarly publishing at a general level, that is, a prerequisite for there being any big data available at all. But simultaneously, digitization has also provided us with new tools to access a much greater amount of scholarly publications than previously. The open access movement could be considered an initiative taken to counteract the negative effects of the centralization of power over academic content to commercial publishing houses. Following the Berlin Declaration adopted in 2005, several universities have now integrated open access as an important criterion in their own strategies on scholarly publication. It has helped, of course, that the major national research funding bodies, as well as the European Union, have since 2010 and onwards introduced this as a prerequisite for acquiring public funding (see Francke 2013).

In Sweden, where the longstanding although not unquestioned guiding principle in research policy is that universities should primarily be a concern for public policy, the open access movement resonates well with the more general principle in public policy making: that publically funded activities should all aim at strengthening democracy, which in the case of universities implies that every citizen (not only every researcher) should have access to relevant information and knowledge generated by those bodies. Or put in more crude terms: when the tax payers pick up the

bill, they should also have access to what they are paying for. Certainly, what could (for the lack of a better term) be called the research community, has an equally longstanding tradition of arguing that the autonomy of both the individual researcher and of the research practice is crucial if wanting to achieve high academic quality, which has also contributed to the official view on scholarly publishing. In the Swedish Higher Education Act (Swedish Code of Statutes (SFS) No. 1992:1434), it is stated in the sixth paragraph of the first chapter that the general principles for research at universities should be that the research problem as well as research methods should be chosen freely, and that research results should be published freely.

In what could be considered a prolongation of the open access movement, Swedish government and Swedish national funding bodies are now increasingly demanding not only publication of research results in the open access format,[2] but also that the research data that underlie the publications are stored in a way that make them accessible, not perhaps to the public but to other researchers. In addition to expanding the body of research data accessible to the research community, such a development could potentially make the research process more transparent, thereby discouraging research misconduct. Within the academic profession, several researchers already use (and more voices are heard in the favor of using) the institutional digital archive that each university upholds, not only as a tool for keeping track of the universities' publications as well as a tool for parallel publishing, but also as a pre-print archive. The pre-print archive and new tools for communicating research that, for example, social media provide, increasingly strengthens the possibility for researchers to receive and give response to scholarly work that has not even been submitted for publication. Thus it would seem that taken together, the new and different tools that digitization provides researchers and university management with, could potentially both strengthen and transform our production, dissemination and use of scholarly publications.

The need to work both with and against conformity

As always, however, other forces are simultaneously at work. One of them, again, is partly generated by the research community itself. In her report on the approach of university libraries to issues of publication, Helena Francke (2013) shows not only that the way in which open access is actually practiced varies greatly between different research fields, she also reminds us of the results in her doctoral thesis on open access scholarly journals, namely that the new medium has not transformed the genre of scholarly journal articles in itself (Francke 2008). The sometimes expressed fear that digitization and open access contributes to watering down quality criteria established by the research community thus seems somewhat unfounded. Concerning the role of the university as instigator and owner of scholarly open access journals, Francke (2013) also provides some support for my initial expectation,

that is, that university management tends to consider this an activity that often interferes with the general strategy of promoting publication in high-ranked scholarly journals that always seem to be published by "someone else", that is, by a body external to the university. Several researchers have instigated open access scholarly journals at Swedish universities, but few of them persist over time. As I know from experience, it takes a lot of hard work to keep a journal like *Culture Unbound* going. University management is sometimes reluctant to let members of staff give priority to such work, since it seemingly interferes with the task of doing research and achieving points granted by external systems of assessment. When taking such a position, university management becomes an obstacle to open access scholarly publishing.

To conclude, I would recommend that any university manager should resist such simplistic conclusions, drawn against the backdrop of a simplistic view of university management. Any university that wants to make a claim on high academic quality has to not only deliver according to criteria set by the research policy system, but also according to criteria set by the research community. If a gap or blind spot is discovered, where existing research has no outlet or where a new outlet would promote research further, I would encourage any university manager to enable an attempt at using the university as a host of such an outlet in the open access format. I think that *Culture Unbound* is an example that proves my point.

Dr. Jenny Johannisson is an associate professor of Library and Information Science at the University of Borås. She is chair of The International Conference on Cultural Policy Research (ICCPR) and primarily does research on local and regional cultural policy against the backdrop of globalization processes. Johannisson is currently on a three year assignment as deputy vice-chancellor of research at her university.

Notes

[1] An additional 10 percent are allocated according to the indicator of external research funding. A total of 20 percent of national research funding is thus allocated according to specific achievements by the universities (Proposition 2012/13:30, *Forskning och innovation*).

[2] Again, Swedish research policy follows EU recommendations. In February 2015, the Swedish Research Council delivered suggested guidelines for open access to both research data and scholarly publications. The guidelines promote open access to research data generated from publically funded research as soon as possible, while full open access to scholarly publications based on such research should should be achieved by 2025 (Swedish Research Council 2015a).

References

Francke, Helena (2008): *(Re)creations of scholarly journals: Document and information architecture in open access journals*. Borås: Department of Library and Information Science/Swedish School of Library and Information Science University College of Borås/Göteborg University. Diss. http://hdl.handle.net/2320/1815

Francke, Helena (2013): *Publicera! Svenska forskningsbiblioteks arbete med publiceringsfrågor*. Stockholm: Svensk Biblioteksförening. http://www.biblioteksforeningen.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/PUBLICERA-2013-WEB-slutversion-130427.pdf

Nelhans, Gustaf (2013): *Citeringens praktiker: Det vetenskapliga publicerandet som teori, metod och forskningspolitik*. Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet, Humanistiska fakulteten, Institutionen för filosofi, lingvistik och vetenskapsteori. Diss. http://hdl.handle.net/2077/33516 , http://hdl.handle.net/2320/12620

Nelhans, Gustaf & Eklund, Pieta (2015): *Resursfördelningsmodeller på bibliometrisk grund vid ett urval svenska lärosäten*. Borås: Högskolan i Borås (Vetenskap för profession, 30). http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:hb:diva-21

Swedish Code of Statutes (SFS) No. 1992:1434. *Swedish Higher Education Act*.

Swedish Research Council (2015a). *Förslag till Nationella riktlinjer för öppen tillgång till vetenskaplig information*. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council. https://publikationer.vr.se/produkt/forslag-till-nationella-riktlinjer-for-oppen-tillgang-till-vetenskaplig-information/

Swedish Research Council (2015b): *Research quality evaluation in Sweden – FOKUS. Report of a government commission regarding a model for resource allocation to universities and university colleges involving peer review of the quality and relevance of* research. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council. https://publikationer.vr.se/en/product/research-quality-evaluation-in-sweden-fokus-2/

Culture Unbound
Journal of Current Cultural Research

Performance Anxiety: Audit Culture and the Neoliberal New Zealand University

By Geoff Stahl

Abstract

This essay considers the role of audit culture and research output measurement regimes in Aotearoa/New Zealand. It explores the nature of neoliberalism and how it has worked its way into research and publishing, as well as departmental and teaching, contexts. This forms an important part of what Alison Hearn has called the promotional university, complete with bibliometrics and the attendant disciplinary mechanisms that work to produce "productive" researchers.

Keywords: audit culture, neoliberalism, research output measurement, academic publishing, Aotearoa/New Zealand

Stahl, Geoff: "Performance Anxiety: Audit Culture and the Neoliberal New Zealand University", *Culture Unbound*, Volume 7, 2015: 618-626. Published by Linköping University Electronic Press: http://www.cultureunbound.ep.liu.se

Performance Anxiety: Audit Culture and the Neoliberal New Zealand University

The neoliberal university, and the attendant rise of auditing mechanisms that is part and parcel of a deepening of managerial culture now a central force as so many tertiary institutions, has lately been the subject of a number of scholarly articles, academic think-pieces, and newspaper editorials. The symposium held at Linköping University in November 2014, dedicated to examining publishing and its relation to public knowledge, allowed scholars from a number of countries to consider, as well as challenge, this phenomena in more detail, with a number of those participating drawing on personal accounts of the pernicious ways in which audit culture and its imperatives have been utilised as disciplining tools. As a way of contributing to this discussion, focusing on a phenomenon that is strengthening its grip on more and more tertiary institutions around the world, I want to briefly consider the PBRF, the Performance Based Research Fund, which is New Zealand's own take on auditing techniques designed to enumerate and evaluate research quality, as it has had a series impact on publishing and thus academics', as well was universities', relationships to public knowledge. The PBRF is similar in many respects to managerial regimes introduced in other countries, such as the UK's REF and Australia's ERA, but it is worth outlining some of its imperatives in a local context, how some of these have been put into practice in certain institutions, and point to some of its consequences, as they are germane to larger debates and discussions being had about a changing research and publishing environment in the contemporary university. As a part of an ongoing reconfiguration of the tertiary sector along neoliberal lines, where notions of accountability, responsibility, entrepreneurialism proliferate, the PBRF, as with other audit regimes, has notable impact not only upon research and publishing but on scholarly culture more generally.

The model for audit regimes was started in the UK in the 1980s, with the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) instituted in 1992, later renamed the Research Excellence Framework (REF) beginning in 2008. In Hong Kong, the Quality Assurance Audit was begun in 2007. In Australia, following the RAE model, initiated the ERA in 2007. Across the Tasman, New Zealand's PBRF was introduced in 2002, by the then Labour government as a way of addressing concerns about accountability and quality in the tertiary sector, but of also tying funding to research outputs rather than student population numbers, relying on notions of accountability and the potential for developing funding partnerships (this emphasis tends to favour the hard sciences over the social sciences and the humanities, with both the latter further marginalized in funding). The model adopted was based on comparisons made between a number of quality-evaluation models found in other coun-

tries, with particular focus on Australia, the UK, and Hong Kong as countries with similar tertiary institutional structures. As with many other audit mechanisms, the PBRF is based on the principle of peer review, with expert panels, made up of regional and international scholars, with different disciplinary groupings assigned the task of grading evidence portfolios (EPs) submitted by individual researchers. In the most recent round, completed in 2012, EPs were made up of three main sections: a list of nominated research outputs (NROs, which includes quality-assured books, articles, chapters, and so on); peer esteem (PE, which includes prizes/awards, invitations to review, requests to give addresses, evaluate grant proposals, favourable citations); and contributions to the research environment (CRE, which includes external funding grants, supervisions, facilitating research networks, etc.). After the most recent round, numerous modifications were made in order to better streamline the various processes for the 2018 deadline.

The PBRF is tied to individual grades in the first instance, unlike many other quality-evaluation exercises elsewhere, which tend to be aggregate grades based on preferentially selected portfolios of a programme or department. In the PBRF, an academic's EP is given a letter grade (A, B, C, "research inactive," or "emerging researcher"), with differential funding tied to each letter grade. Programme members' grades are then clustered together and given a cumulative ranking, then placed in a league table model which pits these programmes against similar programmes at other universities in New Zealand (though these are often difficult to weigh as equivalent across institutions; for example, the Media Studies programme at Victoria University is the only stand alone media studies programme in the country, with other programmes in New Zealand bringing together in their programmes some combination of film, communications, journalism, English literature, and/or television studies).

In New Zealand, the PBRF has become the preferred instrument of the new managerialism that has encroached upon many contemporary universities. It is operationalized around research 'outputs' and 'outcomes', further entrenching rhetorically and materially the cultures of quantification and instrumentalization benchmarks that have become hallmarks of the neoliberal university. The PBRF now provides one of the primary means for supporting research in tertiary education institutions (amounting to approximately 20% of research funds). Its centrality to research funding has also become even more salient due to a situation wherein the ruling conservative National government has frozen university funding for the past five years (and having recently been re-elected, there is no indication this will change). As part, and some might suggest the preferred goal, of this calculus, the PBRF engenders different scales of competition and productivity, as well as instituting a means for more directly monitoring and disciplining those who are not performing up to pre-determined standards.

With that background context and a rough sketch of what has previously been at stake in the New Zealand university system, let me illustrate with an anecdote

some of the consequences of the PBRF as a disciplining mechanism. In 2009, Victoria University of Wellington, where I lecture in Media Studies, ran a mid-cycle 'mock PBRF' internal round. As the PBRF is on six-year cycle, this mid-point exercise was in anticipation of the round ending in 2012. At this particular juncture, Victoria, which had ranked fourth in the previous PBRF round (out of eight institutions), introduced an interim intervention, in which academic staff we asked to submit for internal consideration their portfolios in progress. Many staff were initially suspicious and skeptical, in no small part because the PBRF process is meant to be confidential (and not tied to promotion, a point I'll get to later), and felt this was an effort on behalf of the university to circumvent this, and in part because staff were asked to do this at a time when they were at the tail end of a year of teaching and thus in the midst of grading or trying to finish up various research/writing projects. As a result, many staff did the bare minimum required. The internal review panels were made up of senior staff, Deans and heads of various university research committees. Shortly thereafter, once these portfolios, such as they were, had been vetted, it was estimated by the union that more than half of the university's academic staff received a form letter advising them that their grades were not at the level Vic would like them to be (the preferred grade being a 'B'). This lot of staff were advised that they had three months to improve their grade or face probation and increased surveillance of their progress, with meetings with Heads of School on a regular basis. The union dutifully took notice of this, highlighting the bad faith in which the process unfolded, and eventually forced the University to withdraw the letters.

In the long run, however, this mid-cycle review and this disciplinary threat appeared to have had the desired effect. At the end this last round, completed in 2012, Victoria University climbed the ranks to "number one" research institute in New Zealand. That 'victory', however, was one which was forged out of academics working furiously to produce portfolios which could be anywhere from 40,000 to 60,000 words in length, in which they were required to dip into a litany of synonyms and superlatives to describe research as 'innovative', 'groundbreaking', 'creative', 'influential', etc. This was complemented by a phalanx of people, postgraduate students and editing and PR professionals, conscripted to search out further and expand up research-relevant material (citations, various other bibliometrics, etc). Various schools around the university dipped into their research funds, or were given access to newly released monies, to hire a cadre of postgraduate students to serve as editors who met with staff to discuss how best to recast their portfolios to play to their "strengths." The university then hired a number of external editors, to give the final portfolios a rhetorical spit and polish. In the mad rush to the finish line, there was money made available to staff for tutorial buy-outs, publishing subventions, and the hiring of research assistants to aid and abet the process. The situation at other universities was much the same. There were, as one might expect, departmental restructurings and job losses, as well as strategic

hirings, around the country. There were also number of attempts to 'game the system', which were noted in the national newspaper as well, engendering a tiny scandal, which universities quietly failed to address. In the end, results were engineered in some fashion or other at all universities, and each institution chose to spin the results in whatever way was most favourable to particular strengths.

In a slightly more insidious way, this sense of inter-institutional competition can work intra-institutionally against the camaraderie of a School, a programme or department, particularly in a context where individuals rather than entire programmes are being graded. As Julie Cupples (2012) has argued about the PBRF, this means that workplace collegiality and responsibility are threatened by the way in which 'the top-down surveillance of the PBRF is matched by lateral surveillance', disciplined subjects working to also discipline others (Cupples 2012: 18). Such lateral surveillance is for Cupples, citing Mark Andrejevic, an outcome of 'the increasingly elaborate and productive specification of the monitored body… a "redoubling of the panoptic gaze"' (ibid). Indeed, 'the self-inciting spiral of productivity' in which we get caught up makes lateral surveillance a defining aspect of this form of governmentality. This is the ideological dimension of the PBRF as institutional incarnation of neo-liberalism:

> We internalise a set of expectations, pressuring ourselves and those around us. Arguably, the PBRF apparatus relies on these forms of sideward monitoring, simply because it can only be concerned with outputs, not input behaviours. The danger in such processes is that we make our actions legible and calculable in order to gain the recognition that the PBRF requires of us but also lose sight of alternative ways of being in the academy. (ibid)

The lingering effect of the mid-cycle 'mock PBRF' and the final outcome is one founded increasingly on the university's attempts to mobilize academics' research labour in a way that took advantage of the PBRF-as-neoliberal-tool's destabilising effects. This particular mid-cycle moment referred to earlier was revealing, and the union's swift response took them by surprise, notably with regard to the uneasy situation of academic labour in New Zealand, where there is no tenure and unions have been gradually weakened through over thirty years of successive neoliberal governments. This also in relation to an evaluative mechanism marked by an unevenness in terms of the disciplines it tends to prefer (science, maths, medicine tend to perform better in terms of outputs than humanities subjects), gender (where male academics have been seen to "outperform" female academics), and the seniority of staff (statistically senior staff do better than junior staff). With regard to this last point, in these academic auditing exercises and the larger institutional contexts in which they are deployed, recently hired academics, as emerging researchers, can also find themselves in an unpredictable academic climate, just finding their footing at the same time being made aware of the increasingly precarious nature of academic labour in New Zealand. In this context, they are placed in a position of tallying up academic outputs as part of the PBRF exercise

in a situation that can be unsettling. Emerging researchers find themselves in the uneasy position of simply 'perpetuating the individualistic and competitive goals of the system' (Tynan and Garbett 2007: 412), in which the university is increasingly framed as an individually competitive one.

Along these lines, as Lisa Lucas has argued, the REF in the UK allowed universities to differentiate themselves from one another based on 'research esteem' and that these feelings have trickled down to departments and individual academics. The emphasis placed on the "academic currencies" of publications in international refereed journals and research grants disadvantage those who are unable or unwilling to play the 'research game' (Lucas 2007). The kind of intellectual capital being accrued through quality publications is one form these currencies take. Another form emerges out of a system that in New Zealand works to further divide and conquer, where the ongoing commodification of research and publishing has led, as some have commented in reference to the fetish for bibliometrics in these exercises, to a sort of citational bloat or padding, a consequence of a system that seeks to evaluate quality on the basis of peer esteem.

As a counterpoint, and site of resistance to these regimes, Hine Jane Waitere, et al, conclude a discussion of how best to work in New Zealand universities to preserve the integrity of an academic identity with a powerful suggestion, and with particular reference to Maori and gender politics as critical vantage points:

> Our identities as academics from our particular backgrounds are realised, revitalised and affirmed in community. Collective support is a part of indigenous values, expressed in the Maori language as *whanaungatanga*. Feminism espouses non-hierarchical, non-individualised ways of working and the working class ethic affirms solidarity. Early career academics require mentoring and support to understand the research process. And academics arriving in this country from overseas should be able to count on hospitality (in Maori, *manakitanga* – the caring that should be shown by the hosts to the visitors) to enable them to feel at home in a new environment. Our stories exemplify the core value of community within academia, which should be preserved at all costs from the abrasive and destructive impact of PBRF. (Waitere et al 2011: 215)

Or as Tynan and Garbett assert (in making a claim for more collaborative work, but one which should resonate also for those who work solo, but not necessarily alone):

> We may not be as powerless as we thought. We have, in using our voices here, challenged the order of the way things are done. On one level we have entered the system, recognised the game for what it has to offer, but have refused to lose ourselves within it. We have realised that we want more than a step up the ladder and, certainly, more than a list of research outputs. The total sum of what we represent and give in the higher education system will not be measured by research alone. (Tynan and Garbet 2007: 423)

Taking on board some of these suggestions is strategically useful as working to develop a bulwark against the always expanding regimes of accountability and managerialism that are colonising all aspects of university life. However, it is

worth noting, that in terms of incentivising research and publications, the PBRF as a disciplining mechanism is not entirely without merit. It certainly encourages staff to complete articles, book chapters and even books (although, those are not strictly encouraged, as peer-reviewed work is deemed to have more academic capital), and universities did find ways to facilitate this. At the same time, as much as the process was driven by top-down managerialism and its imperatives for more and more quality-assured outputs, there was across universities throughout New Zealand many attempts to approach the process from the bottom up, where colleagues would work together on portfolios, and where senior staff could take leadership roles to mentor junior staff in how best to maximise the number and reach of their publications.

To reiterate, the PBRF, a very blunt instrument, may not be entirely negative in its ability to affect research outcomes. As Cupples and others have noted, it does appear to produce productive subjects. It appears as a not-so-ironic catalyst for academic publishing, with countless articles appearing in a range of disciplines, from nursing to geography, political science, accounting, to education focusing on the PBRF. As Cupples also argues,

> surveillance and audit breed counter-surveillance and counter-audit, and managerial strategies become hybridised by tactics. By such means, university faculty and students in New Zealand and elsewhere have increasingly turned their gaze on managers, scrutinising their activities as far as is possible, questioning their motives and their authority. (Cupples 2012: 21)

This is perhaps too hopeful a turning of the tables, in my estimation, but it points to moments and potential modes of resistance, however temporary they may prove. In part, this is because the PBRF has changed the institutional habitus at universities throughout New Zealand, in ways both Foucault and Bourdieu would have no doubt recoiled. I make reference to that earlier anecdote, because in the wake of this particular process, a disingenuous one I should add as staff had no idea that the results would be mobilized in such a threatening and coercive way, Victoria has used the very content of that letter as a warning to staff no enriched as of as we embark on the next internal mid-cycle, where senior lecturers and above are expected to attain a 'B' grade or expect disciplinary action. And while the PBRF, we have been told, was never meant to be explicitly tied to promotions, we are now instructed to fill out our promotion applications using the PBRF template listing our preferred publications.

While we may find these metrics of quality problematic and paradoxical in the ways they interpellate us as researchers and academics, let me finish on a slightly more positive note. I occasionally teach a course on advertising and consumer culture, the last week of which I dedicate to the neoliberal self and the neoliberal university, drawing upon two articles by Alison Hearn, highlighting in particular her updating of Andrew Wernick's notion of promotional culture. The articles are two sides of the institutional coin, and can be usefully articulated to one another,

one which talks about the branded self, 'Brand You', the other which considers in more detail 'Brand U' as in the promotional university. I like to also share with them some of the promotional ads, both video and still images, that the university has produced over the years. They are full of the kind of motivational and aspirational rhetoric you would expect from a university, slogans such as "Know Your Mind," and in this respect are not much different from other universities around the world. As you might also imagine, however, the 'success' of Victoria as a research institution was embraced by the university (and, I should note, some staff) and wholeheartedly foregrounded in recruitment campaigns nationally and internationally. As Hearn reminds us, citing Carrocci, in these promotional campaigns students are 'rhetorically positioned as the subjects of transformation' (Hearn 2010: 213) and are sold the idea that university experiences and credentials will add to their potential as highly individuated, promotional selves. The university experience is presented as a 'lifestyle choice, where brochures brag of… great social and sports events, and plentiful student services, so students will not have to compromise their already well-established consumer lifestyles' (ibid). In these contexts, where students (and staff as we are all too aware) are expected to entrepreneurialize themselves, they are encouraged, as Hearn notes, drawing from Coté and Allahar, to be 'architects of their own destiny' (ibid: 213). 'Know Your Mind' indeed.

I think it is incumbent upon us to enlighten students about the changing terms of the contracts, between them and the university, between the university and academics, and between us and them, contracts increasingly shaped by discourses of individualism, and, more so, entrepreneurialism, with contract being a word I use noting its many connotations, formal and informal, legal and social, etc., noting how their terms and conditions can always be subject to adjustment and sometimes contestation. Usually, for example, at this point in the course, I like to remind students that academic staff, too, are being evaluated, 'graded,' for their research, and that there's a reason some people 'disappear;' not for being poor teachers, but for not abiding by the rules of the research 'game,' of 'failing to fulfil their contract' with the university. The idea here is to make students aware of the changes that have been unfolding at the university for some time, but to alert them also to the particular modes of interpellation increasingly defining the academic apparatus, as well as indicate that we, staff and students alike, are all being hailed as subjects in/to/of the neoliberal university. Here, their situation can be effectively if unevenly articulated to that of academics as well, and there might be found here moments of solidarity, glimpses of another way of collectively being good university citizens. This has the potential to be a political position that confounds the dominant logic which does its utmost to coerce us into becoming rational agents working under a managerial aegis gaining capital, cultural and intellectual, only to better position themselves and their labour aspirationally, thereby becoming better saleable commodities in the marketplace, all of us. The project

now seems to be one in which we better understand the ways and means of becoming simultaneously productive and ethical subjects, as students and academics finding creative and constructive ways to better resist and push back against the managerial imperatives of the neoliberal university, becoming more responsible and less accountable, in ways which preserve and call attention to the democratic and empathetic modes of engaging with peers, reaching across the many different constituencies at the institution, as well as tending to the learning and researching environment in which we do what we do.

Geoff Stahl is a Senior Lecturer in Media Studies at Victoria University of Wellington, Aotearoa/NewZealand. His work focuses on urban culture and popular music, as well as advertising and semiotics. Publications include Understanding Media Studies (Oxford University Press 2010) and Poor, But Sexy: Reflections on Berlin Scenes (Peter Lang 2014) and the co-editor of Made in Australia and New Zealand: Studies in Popular Music (Routledge, forthcoming 2017). In Culture Unbound (Volume 1, 2009), he edited the thematic section 'City of Signs/Signs of the City', including his own article 'Urban Signs/Signs of the Urban: Of Scenes and Streetscapes'.

References

Cupples, Julie (2012): 'Giving an Account of Oneself: The PBRF and the Neoliberal University', *New Zealand Geographer*, 68, 14-23.

Hearn, Alison (2008): 'Meat, Mask, Burden: Probing the Contours of the Branded Self', *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 8.2, 197-217.

Hearn, Alison (2010): 'Through the Looking Glass: The Promotional University 2.0', Melissa Aronczyk & Devon Powers (eds): *Blowing the Up the Brand: Critical Perspectives on Promotional Culture*, New York: Peter Lang, 197-219.

Lucas, Lisa (2007): 'Research and Teaching Work within University Education Departments: Fragmentation or Integration?', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 31.1, 17-29

Tynan, Belinda, and Dawn Garbett (2007) 'Negotiating the University Research Culture: Collaborative Voices of New Academics', *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26.4, 411-424.

Waitere, H.J., Jeannie Wright, Marianne Tremaine, Seth Brown and Cat Jeffrey Pausé (2011): 'Choosing Whether to Resist or Reinforce the New Managerialism: The Impact of Performance-based Research Funding on Academic Identity', *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30.2, 205-217.