

and functionalities, and strategic choices, raising questions of ownership and governance.

Publishing and Organizational Governance

What would it mean to re-envision the publication program, and with it AAA at large, as a service-providing rather than product-producing program? How might this re-envisioning help us address questions of how “open” an organization we can manage to be? I propose that the question of financing OA should be approached not through the narrow lens of publications financing but through a comprehensive reexamination of publishing and other services within AAA at large.

One place to start is to rethink our role as members. Consider sec-

tion selection. Like others, I have on occasion been guilty of selecting my sections on the basis of my current mood or a search for the lowest cost when renewing my membership. We thus cast ourselves as *consumers* of the products of AAA. Might our relationship to the association be organized instead in ways that position us more as partners than as consumers? For instance, what if we were to redesign our membership model (and the reallocation model with it) from one in which we select among variably priced, competitively member-seeking sections to a model in which all sections charge the same basic membership rate (perhaps a minimal \$10 or \$15 encouraging membership in multiple sections)? Or what would happen if the cost of a basic

AAA membership was raised (preserving the sliding scale options) but was automatically inclusive of three section memberships?

My aim is not to advocate for these particular models. Indeed, anticipating the potential impact would require that someone perform well-informed financial projections. However, even if we were to arrive back at place close to where we began, I believe such an exercise could help catalyze a re-envisioning of AAA as a member organization. My intention is to prompt an exploration of ways to rebalance the association's heavy reliance on the financial structures of the publishing program and with it to open the door toward more fruitful discussions about OA. A service-oriented model does not dictate

that we adopt an OA model. That is for us to choose. But it does require that we consid-



er what kind of service organization we have been and would like to become. By broadening the lens to consider financial frameworks beyond those bounded by the publications program, and by revisiting models of membership pay structures, we would be better positioned to engage members as partners in formulating accountable stances in determining which content and services could and should be OA. ■

Melissa Cefkin is a research scientist in IBM's Almaden Services Research group and is a member of the AAA Committee for the Future of Print and Electronic Publishing.

The State of Open Access Anthropology

CHRISTOPHER KELTY
RICE U

Much of the recent debate about open access (OA) in anthropology has centered around whether or not AAA (or any scholarly society) should go OA.



Christopher Kelty

But OA is happening, whether or not scholarly societies are promoting it. Individual scholars are self-archiving on their websites and in institutional repositories (such as the recently announced Mana'o project). Workshops, conferences and meetings are increasingly placing talks and papers online. Presses (such as the Australian National University Epress) are going OA. Our new contractor for publication, Wiley-Blackwell, allows authors to pay for an article to be available OA. AAA section publications are experimenting with OA, such as through *American Ethnologist's* book reviews and *Cultural Anthropology's* recent “Coke

Complex” issue. Primary sources are going OA, such as the anthropological papers of the American Museum of Natural History. There are distinctions between the definition of OA in all these cases, but they generally include free, unrestricted availability of research. The Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), which hews to a purist line of OA, lists some 60+ OA journals relevant to anthropology and ethnology—at least 80% of which are non-English and non-US.

What does this mean?

The first thing it means is that scholarly societies (and scholarly publishers) no longer have a monopoly on making research available. We have reached a point with information technology, the Internet and the applications we use daily where it is possible to publish something—and potentially reach a huge audience—literally by pushing one button. Welcome to the age of 1-Click publishing.

But such a click hardly counts as publication. Indeed, putting something on the Internet doesn't make it good (sometimes it means the opposite). But the fact that we can publish this way,

and the fact that we are doing so, opens up an opportunity to rethink the meaning of publication and the role of scholarly societies in the process. One of the spurious criticisms made of OA is that it threatens peer review. The logic behind this argument is related to 1-click publishing—that OA means bypassing the

vice that often goes unnoticed, unremunerated and underappreciated: they instigate, provoke, encourage, thematize, edit, facilitate, fund, promote, network, market, copyedit, talk about, hold conferences about and otherwise *give life* to our research. The value in what they do comes not from the fact that they make research

The value in what [scholarly societies] do comes not from the fact that they make research available but because of all the human labor they provide *making our research better and making it thrive.*

entire infrastructure of publishing, which includes much more than just making something available. However, no OA advocate would ever support this claim; OA is supposed to be about making *really good* research really widely available.

What, then, is that “infrastructure” of publishing, and how can we understand where the costs and the value come from? Scholarly societies like AAA and especially its sections do an incredible ser-

available but because of all the human labor they provide *making our research better and making it thrive.*

It should therefore be clear why the publication issue and the governance and sustainability issues facing AAA are one and the same. If members perceive that they pay membership fees only to receive their own research (wheth-

See *State of OA* on page 10

State of OA

Continued from page 9

er in print or in digital form) and it is clear that they could make that research available through OA channels, then indeed there no longer appears to be any reason for AAA to exist. But if members perceive that they pay membership fees to AAA and its sections in order to sustain the infrastructure that makes our research better, makes it accessible beyond the membership, promotes it, and allows a hundred other services that are currently not accounted for in any meaningful way, then perhaps our yearly membership fee will come to seem extremely reasonable.

Good research is good because it is part of a social process that stretches from pedagogy and constant interaction with peers, to delivering work at confer-

ences and workshops, to having work peer reviewed, edited and checked, and to having it promoted, discussed, cited, taught and examined by others in subsequent inspired research. Without that framework, the effort of making research good is considerably higher. This is not, and has never been, a particularly profitable activity—but it is a cost-saving one. As Cefkin makes clear in her contribution in this series, if we start to rethink how we account for the costs that we bear as individuals, that our institutions bear, and that AAA bears, perhaps thinking in terms of a service model (making research better, rather than “producing” research), then we can start to capture some of the value that otherwise disappears from our accounting.

Working with Wiley-Blackwell

Such discussions, and the experiments that might follow, are all

the more crucial in the wake of the Wiley-Blackwell partnership. For example, I have never objected to peer reviewing before—it is a scholarly duty. But then again, I have never been asked to do it for a multinational corporation with shareholders and an enormous profit margin. I might now ask: why am I doing it for free, for Wiley-Blackwell? Why isn't Wiley-Blackwell paying me to peer review? Where is the line between a service that benefits me and anthropology and one that benefits Wiley-Blackwell? We could, one might argue, think of Wiley-Blackwell as providing only the tools for peer review and marketing, and not the service of peer review itself—but if this is so, then it should be clear that peer review is a service AAA provides to Wiley-Blackwell, and for better or worse, it should be a commodity for which AAA asks a fair price or a fair discount, and one that is continuously discussed

with and within the membership in a open and transparent way. If not, we are faced (as I suspect we are) with a contractual obligation that blurs the line between commodified services purchased from Wiley-Blackwell and the autonomy and decision-making power that should reside with AAA. This requires being more explicit about governance of the process through which research goes from raw to cooked, and how that process is social, costly and essential to everyone's work. We should be paying dues to *publish* our research, not to *purchase* it from someone else. ☐

Christopher Kelty is currently visiting assistant professor of history of science at Harvard and assistant professor of anthropology at Rice University. His book Two Bits: The Cultural Significance of Free Software will appear in print and in open access form from Duke University Press in the spring of 2008.

Process, Access and Value

DON BRENNIS
UC SANTA CRUZ

As Jason Cross notes, this is a very opportune moment to think through the shape and trajectory of publications within AAA. As someone involved in the original AnthroSource proposal but,



Don Brenneis

more significantly, as a former editor (of *American Ethnologist*) for whom journal editing was a deeply collaborative intellectual

pleasure and as someone involved in our university's development of digital publishing, I am very appreciative of my colleagues' contributions and of the chance to add a few further thoughts.

I'll briefly note three observations. First, articles have careers; they move from initial inklings

and meeting papers through drafts, submissions, revisions, edits, publication and, with any luck, citational afterlives (as both Chris and Melissa have noted here). A crucial element of almost all these stages is that they are, at the least,

dialogic. Published articles reflect the complex intersections of individual inspiration, craft and scholarship with advice, challenge and support from colleagues. Open access (OA) can indeed help make this social dimension of scholarship less invisible.

Second, the multiple stages of such processes are not frictionless, that is, there are very real costs in terms of time, judgment, tact and technical expertise. Some of this work is free and voluntary (even if, by many reports, more difficult to engage than has been the case in the past). Other parts of the process depend primarily on paid labor, whether in the quotidian routines of managing the peer review process, the delicate conversations

around copyediting and revision, or the coding and searchability preparation that contributes to the usefulness of online publication. There is a range of hidden costs in the process, whether in print or online, and real value is added to the quality of scholarship by such work. Similarly, translation—a key element of access and participation for a wider world anthropological community—is rarely cost

anticipated had to do with how best to convince academic personnel committees of the value of how quality is assessed in emergent forms of scholarly publication and circulation.

Being explicit about how we reshape peer review in OA publications (and I agree fully with Chris that it remains both possible and central to such dissemination) is critical. A failure to make explicit

COMMENTARY

free. How we get a concrete sense of costs and then develop the strategies and resources for meeting them is crucial for making OA publication of high quality and democratically available scholarship possible.

Finally, publication is, as we all know, multifunctional. It not only disseminates our science and scholarship, contributing to ongoing research and pedagogy. It also is a key element of both individual and—especially in the UK but increasingly here as well—program evaluation. Perhaps the stickiest issue in discussions over the last few years on a special committee of the University of California Academic Senate on scholarly communications in which I par-

how the process works—and that it constitutes a serious warrant of accomplishment and value—and the concomitant devaluation of peer review could open the door for much less effective and palatable forms of evaluation, for example citation indexes and impact factors, bibliometric practices that, for a variety of reasons, are particularly inappropriate for work in anthropology. ☐

Don Brenneis is a professor of anthropology at UC, Santa Cruz, and is a former editor of American Ethnologist and past president of AAA. He is currently writing a book on peer review and the production and circulation of knowledge in and around anthropology.