Open Access and the Humanities

Monographs
- Literary critic, acknowledged as different
- Agar, WRACU standpoint
- Higher training, funded by new publishers
- Monograph investigations, Chapman's manuscript
- Monograph models, effective reading (quantifiable)
- Different disciplines, and value-creation slow

Pronounced objections in hums
- Open access
- Commercial publishers
- University presses
- Learned societies
- Librarians

Monograph Investigations
- OA! OA! OA! (open OA comparison)
- OA! OA! OA! (open OA comparison)
- OA! OA! OA! (open OA comparison)
- OA! OA! OA! (open OA comparison)
- OA! OA! OA! (open OA comparison)
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Monographs
- monopoly, non-monopoly as different.
- only non-commercial: journals.
- high barriers to entry, few publishers
- low barriers to entry, many publishers
- open access.
- good visibility of non-commercial monographs
- different, not much use.

Monograph Investigations
- CACOR (society & business)
- CACOR UK (political & non-political)
- OA Monograph Project

Monograph Models
- book publishing change
- print vs. online
- institutional subsidy
- subscription
- collective funding (zooniverse)
Pronounced objections in hums

- Researchers
- Commercial Publishers
- University Presses
- Learned Societies
- Librarians
Monographs

- Monographs acknowledged as different
  - e.g. HEFCE mandate
- Higher barriers to entry for new publishers
- Open source platform development in infancy
- Production toolchain likewise
- Different discoverability and value-conferral sites
Monograph Investigations

- OAPEN-NL [gold OA comparison]
- OAPEN-UK [gold OA matched-pair comparison]
  - and qualitative programme
- HEFCE Monograph project
Monograph Models

- Book processing charge
- Print subsidy
- Institutional subsidy
- Freemium
- Collective funding (consortial)
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