

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research

CUNY Graduate Center

2012

Publish. Perish? The Academic Author and Open Access Publishing

Polly Thistlethwaite
CUNY Graduate Center

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_pubs/86

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

Publish. Perish? The Academic Author and Open Access Publishing

Polly Thistlethwaite

During the September 2011 dissertation deposit period—my first as Acting Chief Librarian at the City University of New York’s Graduate Center (CUNY)—I found my inbox visited by humanities faculty email expressing anxieties about my institution’s requirement that graduating doctoral students upload a PDF of their dissertation to ProQuest Electronic Thesis Depository. I traced my colleagues’ anxieties to warnings reported by other academics on various listservs. For example, English professor and academic career advisor Kathryn Hume posted a blog in August 2011 entitled, “The Perils of Publishing Your Dissertation Online.” She baldly warns: “You could ruin your chances of getting tenure if your thesis is freely available.”¹ Hume’s blog cites American literature Professor Leonard Cassuto’s similar concerns where he advises in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*: “Don’t make your dissertation available online. Book editors seem unanimous on that point for obvious reasons. Many university libraries routinely add dissertations to their electronic holdings. If yours does, then opt out. If your thesis is already online, then have it taken down. Information may want to be free, as the earliest hacker generation first avowed, but if it’s free, then you can’t expect a publisher to pay for it, even in a later version.”² These warnings are born, of course, through historical experience with academic review for tenure and promotion. At the same time, the concerns presume a self-evident and uniform truth. This is to say, Hume and Cassuto echo longstanding sensibilities associated with the arbitration of academic authorship and

institutional protocols, specifically those related to scholarly publishing and academic review.

Are these concerns warranted? This essay addresses this question and others raised around academic authorship as it is increasingly situated online, particularly as it relates to one of the first and most significant acts of academic publishing: the dissertation. In today's media environment, discussions about open access publishing prove to be both fractious and transformative. How, then, might a new academic author negotiate this rapidly shifting terrain?

A History of Access

In 1939, University Microfilm (later, University Microfilm International, UMI) launched *Dissertation Abstracts*, the primary finding tool for North American dissertations. This resource, then-as-now, is crucial to any comprehensive literature review. Universities sought to make graduate works discoverable—to liberate them from un-indexed obscurity— but no single public institution or university coalition was equipped to support such a large-scale feat of scholarly communication. Instead, Ann Arbor, Michigan, entrepreneur Eugene Power financed and assembled a central repository to collect, preserve, describe, and distribute North American dissertations to scholars anywhere.³ Power provided means —book format annotation, annual indices, and ready-made catalog cards for libraries purchasing dissertations— to facilitate subject-based discovery. From its beginnings, UMI sold its index to nearly every academic library and, additionally, sold selected dissertation copies on-demand to interested

scholars and to libraries in microform (film or fiche, and eventually print). In this manner, UMI simultaneously built both a successful business and an essential academic resource. ProQuest (UMI became Bell & Howell in 1971 and, in 2001, ProQuest) continues to sell dissertations to university libraries and to interested readers.

During the 1980s, *Dissertation Abstracts* revised its microform cache into an electronic one, evolving its formats and distribution methods. In 1997 ProQuest's by-then online index introduced free 24-page previews and added (for sale) full-text PDFs that supplemented microform and print formats. ProQuest's secret to success in this niche market is that the company never assumed a dissertation writer's copyright. In other words, ProQuest has only licensed with writers for non-exclusive distribution of works thereby allowing writers to retain sole ownership and copyright.⁴ Graduating students have always been free to deposit dissertations with ProQuest while leaving another copy in a university's library or repository. It is only later that writers hand over copyright to academic publishers who demand copyright ownership, ostensibly in order to satisfy publication standards for tenure and promotion.

In 1997 Virginia Tech University (VTU) became the first institution to require that dissertations be uploaded to an online university repository, in lieu of a paper version being deposited in the library. Between 1997 and 2007 readership of Virginia Tech's dissertations skyrocketed 701 percent.⁵ Commonplace search engines discovered VTU dissertations freely available to web searchers sufficiently skilled and motivated to find them. VTU's open access dissertation publishing model demonstrated quick transformations in access with the open online dissertations garnering 145,000 percent more visitors than their paperbound counterparts.⁶ While the VTU results are

extraordinary, open access publishing steadily gathers larger audiences than print and exclusively licensed works. The increased frequency of citation of any open access work over traditionally published works is repeatedly found to be significant, ranging from 25 to 250 percent, depending on the discipline.⁷ This easier encounter with material through open access publishing promotes wider readership, and greater impact for scholarly work over print-only or licensed works. This new kind of access is both challenging and altering the way academic value is assessed.

ProQuest and repository-based electronic theses and dissertations provide access to a particular class of unedited, non-peer-reviewed, and (as some view it) unpublished, works. Moreover, and in addition to its on-demand sales, ProQuest now licenses its entire authorized full-text dissertation repository to libraries, a popular resource now indispensable for any comprehensive literary review. In 2006, ProQuest added an open-access option to its dissertation publishing service. Any dissertation author, in other words, may pay the \$95 open access publishing fee to guarantee perpetual non-toll open access for any reader who discovers the work.

Supplementing ProQuest's successful commercial full-text dissertation database, a growing number of universities sponsor online repositories for dissertations and other scholarly work. Since the 1930s when ProQuest began, technology has developed so that universities can now self-publish scholarly work in digital formats. Crucially, authors and librarians describe the publications' contents so that the work is discoverable through search engines. The project to make dissertations accessible has become a massive collaborative effort.

Yet, we must return to the concerns expressed on humanities listservs. The academic relationships among publications, tenured positions, and budgetary constraints are already fraught with anxieties. With graduate student enrollments high during and leading up to fall 2011, a wave of new PhDs is about to flood a stagnant university market.⁸ Academic unemployment alarms are blaring. In tandem with the glut of graduates, trimmed library budgets allow for fewer book purchases. This institutional budget slashing follows decades of rising journal prices that bit into library book spending.⁹ Universities scaled back funding for presses while publishers' lists were cut and shaped to increase income from sales. Academic presses slowed production to levels below that which can support book-for-tenure standards, especially for this newly minted super crop of doctoral-degree graduates.¹⁰ Scholarly e-publishing shaped itself in this recession environment to rely on tightly controlled access to and draconic licensing of every use of a published work. Academic publishers re-formed lists to appeal to wider markets, reducing publication for title with smaller market predictions. While access may be immediate it is inconvenient, expensive, and restricted.¹¹ How can current academic standards be maintained when models of scholarship, publication, and funding are irrevocably altered?

Addressing these new uncertainties, advisors (as seen in the listservs referred to above) caution newly degreed scholars to withdraw dissertations from online repositories, or to embargo them from view for a given period of time. The gesture is intended to calm publishers who may fear over-exposure of a competitive, yet unpublished work, and to protect new graduates bound to have a tough time in this down academic market with a book contract, let alone without one. To threaten the relationship between publishers and

authors, as advisors see it, puts new scholars in peril. Though instability fogs the future of publication and academic review, publishers and academic reviewers attempt to forge clarity by reinforcing traditional processes. The result is, though, that many dissertations, innovative if imperfect early academic works, remain hidden from the digital light of day.

Despite the anecdotal and empirical evidence of threats to and unease with the current state of academic publishing, recent surveys indicate that the great majority of academic presses continue to accept books and articles derived from manuscripts previously published electronically. Angela McCutcheon's 2010 survey of authors indicates, for example, that publishers refuse fewer than two percent of book proposals because of previous appearance as an online dissertation.¹² The 2011 Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (NDLTD) survey of 48 academic publishers indicate that 96 percent affirmed that they do not disqualify books and articles from consideration if these works have previous iterations in an electronic thesis.¹³ In fact, this statistic reflecting increased acceptance of electronic dissertations and theses is up from 82 percent in 2001.¹⁴

This survey-based evidence that measures key data is under-cited in the critiques of online dissertation depositing practices. In March 2012, for instance, the American Historical Association (AHA) moved to make constituents aware that "there is evidence to suggest that some university press editors are reluctant to consider for publication those studies that have been posted online and made generally accessible to the public." The statement urges universities to develop policies that balance individual rights to control of a work with "promoting the interests of the historical profession to disseminate scholarship as widely as possible."¹⁵ An article that accompanies the AHA statement

cites Jennifer Howard's fairly reported anecdotal evidence about publishers being both frightened by the competition posed by theses and dissertations previously published electronically, and welcoming popular works previously published electronically, but overlooks the empirical evidence supplied by current surveys of publishers and reports made by their author clients.¹⁶

As practices shift, misunderstandings—as I argue here—arise. The University of Nebraska Press prompted the Society for the Study of Women Writers, whose journal they publish, to announce in fall 2011: “Henceforth, we will no longer be able to consider any works that have been previously published. Publication, according to our definition of the term, includes print publication as well as electronic publication in any and all forms (for example, a blog, a personal or professional website, a conference website, a social networking site, an online journal, etc.). Essays that duplicate or closely resemble chapters of dissertations that have been uploaded to the web will be excluded as submissions, as will essays that have been published as parts of dissertations available in hard copy from UMI.”¹⁷ Here the press is excluding iterations of previously published online work because they fear competition, or perhaps because they believe ProQuest's author license assumes exclusive distribution rights to works derived from dissertations. Varieties of interpretation stand at the heart of argument about online and open access publishing.¹⁸

Similarly, advisors continue to urge writers to “take dissertations down” from electronic repositories, or call for libraries to revert to paper- and microform-based storage instead of engaging in contemporary modes of discovery and distribution. These advisors and writers seek to impose embargoes on work that would, without the new

forms of electronic repositories, ultimately remain obscure. But, and as the McCutcheon survey shows, 76 percent of universities either automatically impose or allow students themselves to impose embargoes, providing some publication delay.¹⁹ In addition to preserving exclusive access for reviewing publishers, electronic publication delays give dissertation authors time to resolve use rights for excerpted content, for example, while meeting a deposit deadline for graduation. The 2011 NTDLT survey indicates that only 7 percent of university book presses (but none of the journal publishers) find restricted access, or publication delay, key to publisher review and acceptance. The delay-embargo option, a feature of nearly every repository whether it is announced or not, is key to easing the anxieties of advisors and students if not their publishers, even though publishers make little of them in actual practice. With every author bestowed complete control over the appearance and distribution of a work, the number of dissertations embargoed at my institution is up from less than 2 percent to 12 percent of total deposits, between 2008 and 2011. Perhaps more significantly, authors are at greater rates (from less than 1 percent of deposits in 2008 to 23 percent in 2011) opting to prevent ProQuest dissertation sales by third parties such as Amazon.com and Google Books. This allows works to be discovered by third party search engines and to appear in and to be sold by ProQuest's resources, but not vended through popular book sales sites. The open access dissertation publishing is up over the same period, too, from less than 1 percent to 6 percent.²⁰ Together this suggests a variety of strategies are at play in negotiating a shifting and uncertain terrain of academic publishing.

The Dissertation and Standards for Publication

Doctoral dissertations are produced as a requirement for a degree. Dissertations are shaped and adjudicated by a committee of author-selected faculty advisors. Like academic pre-prints, dissertations have been vetted and improved by a committee of advisors, but they have not endured the academic trials that accompany publication: editorial selection, peer review, content editing, and copyediting. Libraries are the standard resting place for dissertations that are traditionally submitted in typescript, bound, and shelved to preserve them, and to limit distribution to wide-ranging audiences (wider distribution is the traditional role of publishers). This process preserves and geographically fixes the work so that it may be accessed and retrieved only occasionally by readers who have the time and motivation to conduct on-site review during regular and (more-and-more) limited library hours.

University press representatives and academic advisors both repeatedly point to—now as in pre-internet times—the quality of a standard six-chapter dissertation, and most importantly, to the extensive revision required to transform any dissertation into an academic press title.²¹ And though new authors (and perhaps their advisors) live in hope for only minor revisions of a dissertation-derived first book, dissertations and pre-prints are not accepted unmodified for the market. A publisher's attention and peer review usually, and considerably, improves a work; publishers are not merely re-printers who contribute artwork, production, and marketing. According to the 2011 NDLTD survey, 27 percent of university presses report that submissions are considered only if the manuscript is substantially different from the electronically published dissertation.²² This

reconfirms well-entrenched wisdom proffered by academic advisors and suggests that open access changes little in the dissertation-into-book process.²³

Fortunately, leading academic presses continue to experiment with business models that embrace varieties of open-access publishing. Minnesota, Michigan, New York University, California, Indiana, Florida, Purdue, MIT, Fordham, and Penn State university presses (among others) offer small and large open access runs of backlisted titles. No evidence of commercial ruin has thus been seen as a result of this experimentation. In 1994, the National Academies Press began publishing all new work from the National Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Medicine, the National Academy of Engineering, and the National Research Council for free, online in downloadable PDFs.²⁴ Yet, experiments with open access may not always promote reductions in costs of production and distribution. Hybrid open access publishers may, on the one hand, inflate costs for some titles to maintain profits while, on the other hand, make other titles free or offer a handful of open access titles “free with purchase” of a mandatory package deal. The system is imperfect and in progress, but these experiments are paving the way for significant revision of academic publishing and review.

Despite its reputation for radicalism, the academy can cling to conservative ideals, particularly where the processes of scholarship are concerned. In this down-market environment—one that coincides with the possibilities of quick and easy access to academic work—some advisors continue to insist on pre-digital modes of publication and review. There are those, of course, who seek to revise these earlier models; notably revisionists are often scholars involved now in new media and digital studies. Resistance to open access publishing bubbles to the surface when new modes of publishing

challenge academic markets *and* the institutional systems they maintain. Twenty-first century technologies enable new processes of academic review. Rather than call for retreat, the academy can more productively ask: In what way might we put this new technology in the service of bettering contemporary scholarship, intellectual curiosity, and the dissemination of ideas?

Kathleen Fitzpatrick, the Modern Language Association's Director of Scholarly Communication, argues that traditional publishing models are unsustainable and must be transformed. The traditional publishing model, Fitzpatrick argues, works to suppress scholarship and to narrow its form. Authority may better be conferred, and improvements in works achieved, by open and public comment than by closed anonymous adjudication. Peer review conducted openly in conjunction with the digital public appearance of a work (and not privately in advance of its academic debut, or its pre-natal demise), might usefully expand academic discourse and engage a larger-than-academic public.²⁵ Tellingly, Fitzpatrick's book is already in its second printing with NYU Press; this printing that follows an initial publication online, in the digital scholarly network MediaCommons (an open access peer-to-peer review format). Open access publishing can accommodate a blind peer-review process, but it also allows for new varieties of academic review. Fitzpatrick reconsiders peer review and academic review—assessments, publication vetting, tenure, and promotion—as practices that must be transformed to ensure the future relevance of scholarly work. The public, shared impact of academic work, not its marketability, its profits, and certainly not the meager royalties academic authors garner, best gauge the values of scholarship.

Futures

Academic publishers and, de facto, academic authors, are in the midst of a great shift. Scholarly production already assumes a mix of technologies, methods, and formats likely to diversify further. Publishers must accommodate new forms of production and manage competition by adding value in new ways, perhaps in collaboration with libraries and repositories. This is something of an uphill battle. Academic publishers provide ample anecdote about the threat open access publishing.²⁶ While some embrace experimentation with open access publishing, some leading academic publishers doubt its quality, efficiency, and sustainability.²⁷ Institutional realignment, some of which is underway, is bound to be disconcerting for some stakeholders

As academic presses draw back traditional production of scholarly monographs, , new forms of publication emerge, and the mix of options thickens. A next step may be for publishers to contribute expertise in the mechanisms of open access publishing, or university presses collude with university libraries to do the same. Spending to support open access publishing generally shifts—from a subscription model to one where publication costs are paid by funders, authors, or their institutions. University press subsidies and library spending can be shifted to provide support where it is needed.

Unless academic authors hire agents, like fiction writers, and manage to reach general readerships, they profit only modestly from traditional publication, or they do not directly profit at all. Scholarly book authors and editors usually garner modest royalties compared to trade counterparts. Academic authors of articles and book chapters routinely cede copyright and exclusive distribution rights to publishers in exchange for selecting,

vetting, editing, marketing, production, indexing, and distribution. Publishers apply copyright to sell back books as well as journal subscriptions to university libraries and readers. Distribution garners readership, contributes to the public good, and offers individual reward that is administered by university employers in the form of job retention and promotion. But then, in a skewed turn of events, university libraries buy back at high-price the products of their academic's free labor. In other words, the academy pays twice—three times if you count the often donated work of peer review. In this cycle where commercial publishers' profits are often enormous, the question is begged: Why do academic authors sacrifice profit?²⁸ The answer: Because academic jobs and careers depend on peer assessment, a collective valuation traditionally exercised only on published works.

To put it bluntly, academic authors have a lot to figure out. Decisions about dissertation publishing loom large when advisors warn against open access in any form based on nervousness expressed by academic publishers. Academic advisors absorb publishers' anxieties that are subsequently passed along to students, even though surveys of scholarly publishers indicate that revised dissertations first published online continue to be welcomed with little apprehension. Depending on the plans an author has for a dissertation, the publishing politics at work in an author's discipline, the interest an author holds in reshaping academic publishing, and, the stock an author holds in survey data over anecdotal evidence, open-access publishing may just be the ticket for a strong future career in academia. If, however, authors continue to resist open access publishing and to elect long embargoes, the outcomes will only stave off short-term anxieties.

It may be more productive to consider how scholarship may be rewarded by open access publishing. The results are already clearly demonstrated. Open access publishing for journal article and book chapters is now common, and often mandated by science funders. “Gold” open access publishing and “green” self-archiving with institutional and subject-based repositories allow multiple routes for discovery and download, while maintaining academic reviewers’ prestige values associated with leading subject-based journals.

And, yet, academic reviewers must play an active role in these transformations since they are key to this process of academic reform. The very same advisors who now shape critical decisions for the untenured are also those who eventually evaluate, years later, the academic careers for others. Many issues remain to be resolved. Will scholars write for greater readership and impact or will they attempt to satisfy discipline-specific, sometimes idiosyncratic notions about academic prestige? Will the academy support work that combines formats and disciplines, or will academic reviewers continue to value traditionally published texts more than new forms of scholarly production? How large is the gamble an untenured academic must undertake in order to resist old-guard models? Will academic presses embrace open access, or will they cling to digital rights management schemes to preserve licensing and subscription income? Will presses and advisors continue to threaten against online publishing and publicity for work exposed online during development? Academics decide now to make their work search engine-discoverable by a world-wide audience or to keep it under-the-radar to be discovered and read only by those with the licensed indexes, interlibrary loan privileges, and the good fortune to find it. Scholars who would choose to collaborate on non-traditional projects

may be pressured instead to produce in text only. Student bloggers who share work in progress openly may learn to fear overexposing their own ideas before they are engraved in text. Students and their advisors love to read every dissertation they can get their hands on, but negotiate fear and warning about overexposing their own.

The mechanisms of scholarly production and communication are in flux. But no matter how the technology changes, academic success remains tied to peer evaluation of scholarly activity. While advisors are insightful about traditional methods for the academic-review process, academic authors are urged time and again to attend to discipline-specific and local-evaluation practices that only satisfy near-term goals. While scholarship sustains multiple points of view, and the academy will increasingly trade in a mix of formats. As new modes of scholarly production emerge, new, careful, and fair valuations of it must be practiced by academic reviewers.

¹ Kathryn Hume, “The Perils of Publishing Your Dissertation Online,” guest post, to *The Professor Is In*, ed. Karen Kelsky, August 24, 2011, accessed February 20, 2012, <http://theprofessorisin.com/2011/08/24/the-perils-of-publishing-your-dissertation-online/>.

² Leonard Cassuto, “From Dissertation to Book,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 30, 2011, accessed February 20, 2012, <http://chronicle.com/article/From-Dissertation-to-Book/127677/>.

³ Austin McLean, “Extending the Reach and Impact of Graduate Works,” ProQuest, August 25, 2011, 5, accessed April 30, 2012,

<http://www.infodocket.com/2011/08/25/new-white-paper-from-proquest-scholarly-publishing-extending-the-reach-and-impact-of-graduate-works/>.

⁴ Until 1999 UMI licensed exclusively for microform distribution only. Austin McLean, email message to author, January 30, 2012.

⁵ Based on analysis of VTU server logs, the author explains. Angela M. McCutcheon, *Impact of Publisher's Policy on Electronic and Dissertation (ETD) Distribution Options within the United States*. (PhD diss., Ohio University, 2010), 24, accessed March 31, 2012, http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=ohiou1273584209.

⁶ John H. Hagen, "Over 10 Million WVU ETDs Served," March 23, 2009, accessed March 24, 2012, <http://www.libraries.wvu.edu/open-access/files/over10millionwvuetdsserved.pdf>.

⁷ A. B. Wagner, "Open Access Citation Advantage: An Annotated Bibliography," *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship* (2010), accessed April 30, 2012, <http://www.istl.org/10-winter/article2.html>.

⁸ 100,000 new PhDs met with only 16,000 new professorships in 2009 according to Edudemic.com, accessed March 30, 2012, <http://edudemic.com/2012/01/phd-job/>.

⁹ Between 1986 and 2008, academic library spending on serials rose 374 percent, and spending on books rose only 86 percent. "ARL Statistics 2007-2008," Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C., accessed March 31, 2012, <http://www.arl.org/stats/annualsurveys/arlstats/arlstats08.shtml>.

¹⁰ Kathleen Fitzpatrick, "Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy," *ADE Bulletin* 150 (2010): 41-54, accessed March 30, 2012, http://www.ade.org/cgishl/docstudio/docs.pl?adefl_bulletin_c_ade_150_41.

¹¹ On digital rights management, for example, see Barbara Fister, "First Thoughts on Sustaining Scholarly Publishing| Peer to Peer Review," *Library Journal*, March 10, 2011, accessed March 30, 2012,

http://www.libraryjournal.com/lj/newslettersnewsletterbucketacademicnewswire/889625-440/first_thoughts_on_sustaining_scholarly.html.csp.

¹² McCutcheon, "Impact of Publishers' Policy," 145..

¹³ Gail McMillan, et al., "An Investigation of ETDs as Prior Publications: Findings from the 2011 NDLTD Publishers' Survey," *Proceedings of the 14th International Symposium on ETDs* (2011). Cape Town, South Africa, accessed March 31, 2012, http://dl.cs.uct.ac.za/conferences/etd2011/papers/etd2011_mcmillan.pdf

¹⁴ Gail McMillan, "Do ETDs Deter Publishers?," *College and Research Libraries News*, 62, no. 6 (2001): 620-621, accessed March 31, 2012,

<http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/staff/gailmac/publications/pubrsETD2001.html>.

¹⁵ "Statement on Electronic Publications of Theses and Dissertations," AHA Professional Division, March 19, 2012, accessed March 30, 2012,

<http://historians.org/grads/StatementonElectronicPublicationThesesDissertations.cfm>.

¹⁶ Debbie Ann Doyle, "AHA Today: Publishing Your Dissertation Online – Understanding Policies," American Historical Association, March 27, 2012, accessed March 30, 2012, <http://blog.historians.org/publications/1605/publishing-your-dissertation-onlineunderstanding-policies>.

¹⁷ *Society for the Study of Women Writers Newsletter*, Fall 2011, 2, accessed March 31, 2012, <http://public.wsu.edu/~campbelld/ssaww/ssaww12-2.pdf>.

¹⁸ The University of Nebraska Press declined to comment on their practices.

¹⁹ McCutcheon, "Impact of Publishers' Policy," 163.

²⁰ ProQuest, data transfer to author, May, 2012.

²¹ Jennifer Howard, "The Road from Dissertation to Book has a New Pothole: the Internet," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 3, 2011, accessed March 31, 2012,

[http://chronicle.com.ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/article/The-Road-From-Dissertation-](http://chronicle.com.ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/article/The-Road-From-Dissertation-to/126977/)

[to/126977/](http://chronicle.com.ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/article/The-Road-From-Dissertation-to/126977/) Survey evidence is reinforced anecdote, "Mr. Alexander, the Penn State press director, says that for many presses, the decision becomes easier—and more

likely to go the author's way—when the proposed book differs significantly from the graduate-school version. "The more crucial question for us, especially in the case of

a dissertation, is whether the author can explain the extent to which and how the submission differs from the original version," he said via e-mail. A work written to

satisfy a graduate committee should probably look very different from a book meant for a somewhat wider audience. That was true long before electronic repositories,

and it holds true for dissertations in any format." and Leonard Cassuto, "It's a

Dissertation, Not a Book," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 24, 2011, accessed March 31, 2012, <http://chronicle.com/article/Its-a-Dissertation-Not-a/128365/>.

²² Gail McMillan et al. ,2011. "An Investigation of ETDs as Prior Publications:

Findings from the 2011 NDLTD Publishers' Survey, *Proceedings of the 14th*

International Symposium on ETDs. Cape Town, South Africa, accessed March 31,

2012, http://dl.cs.uct.ac.za/conferences/etd2011/papers/etd2011_mcmillan.pdf

²³ William P. Germano, *From Dissertation to Book* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

²⁴ "Sustaining Scholarly Publishing: New Business Models for University Presses. A Report of the AAUP Task Force on Economic Models for Scholarly Publishing,"

March 7, 2011, accessed April 30, 2012,

<http://mediacommons.futureofthebook.org/mcpres/sustaining/new-approaches-to-scholarly-publishing/publishing-open-digital-plus-paid-print-editions/>.

²⁵ Kathleen Fitzpatrick, *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy* (New York: New York University Press, 2011), published 2009 for open peer review,

<http://mediacommons.futureofthebook.org/mcpres/plannedobsolescence/>

²⁶ Cassuto (May 2011) cites Chris Chappell, an associate editor at Palgrave

Macmillan, "The more of your book that has been previously published," "the less exciting it becomes for us." Leonard Cassuto, "From Dissertation to Book," *The*

Chronicle of Higher Education, May 30, 2011, accessed February 20, 2012,

<http://chronicle.com/article/From-Dissertation-to-Book/127677/>. And, "If authors have

an opt-out option, I would recommend that they do opt out, at least until their first book is published," says Ann Donahue, a senior editor at Ashgate Publishing Group,

which puts out a number of books that began life as dissertations. Jennifer Howard,

"The Road from Dissertation to Book has a New Pothole: the Internet," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 3, 2011, accessed March 31, 2012,

<http://chronicle.com.ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/article/The-Road-From-Dissertation-to/126977/>.

²⁷ Stanford G. Thatcher, "The Challenge of Open Access for University Presses,"

Learned Publishing, 20:3 (2007): 165-172,, accessed March 30 2012,

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1087/095315107X205084>.

²⁸ Scientific, technical, and medical journal publishers have steadily profited 30 percent or more annually, in recent years. Heather Morrison, "The Enormous Profits of STM Scholarly Publishers," *The Imaginary Journal of Poetic Economics*, January 7, 2012, accessed March 30, 2012,

<http://poeticeconomics.blogspot.com/2012/01/enormous-profits-of-stm-scholarly.html>.