



**Augmenting Print:  
Planning for Online Journal Publishing  
by Social Sciences and Humanities  
Journals in Canada**

Rowland Lorimer, Lindsay Lynch, and Johanne Provençal  
Canadian Association of Learned Journals/  
L'association canadienne des revues savantes  
and Simon Fraser University

*We gratefully acknowledge support provided by the SSHRC  
President's Research Fund for this study.*

## CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b>	2
<b>Introduction</b>	5
<b>The Survey</b>	7
Respondents	8
A Missing Professional	9
<b>Respondent population</b>	10
<b>Results</b>	11
Technology and Business Models	11
Financing	12
Fairness	12
External Financial Realities	13
SSHRC Funding Criteria and Funding Levels	13
Supporting an Evolving Journal Community	16
CALJ/ACRS Communication	17
Systematic Differences	17
A Word of Caution	17
Size	18
Language	18
CALJ/ACRS Membership	19
Position	19
<b>Discussion</b>	19
Policy and Program Challenges in Face of New Technology	22
Journal Funding Compared to Research Funding	24
<b>Implications and Recommendations</b>	26
Changes to SSHRC Funding: Recommendations 1 to 4	26
Taking Advantage of Technological Change	27
Barriers to Full Exploitation of Online Publishing	28
Technological and Training Needs: Recommendations 5 to 7	29
The Need for Experimentation	29
Early Adoption and Innovation: Recommendations 8 and 9	30
Choice of Publishers	30
Access to Publicly Funded Research: Recommendation 10	30
<b>Appendix 1: Survey Questions and Summary of Quantitative Results</b>	31

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document reports the findings of a survey of Canadian social science and humanities (SSH) journal editors and staff, in the main, managing editors. The report was prepared for the purpose of consulting with the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) on contemplated changes to the funding structure for scholarly journals in Canada. The study was funded by SSHRC in order that data could be collected and analyzed to inform revision to SSHRC's policy and the Aid to Research and Transfer Journals (ARTJ) program in advance of the next competition for funding (deadline of June 2007).

SSHRC's planned program changes are meant to respond to evolving publishing technology. The contemplated policy and program changes will directly affect recipients of assistance from the ARTJ program. Specifically, the new policy will make online and open access journals eligible for SSHRC funding. These changes will affect current grant recipients by:

1. Increasing the competition for funding;
2. Changing the criteria used to determine the amount of support provided to individual journals; and
3. Recasting entry-level eligibility for SSHRC support.

A web-based survey of CALJ/ACRS members and SSHRC grant recipients was carried out between June 22 and August 6, 2006. The survey reports on the attitudes mainly of journal editors and managing editors on issues relating to SSHRC funding criteria and funding levels, journal management, support for an evolving journal community, back issue digitization, communication within CALJ/ACRS, and the development of copyright guidelines.

The key findings to note are:

1. Respondents to the survey see the primary role of journals as a quality assured venue for the publication of research as well as a means for the dissemination of that research to the academy and the public.
2. The SSH journals community is open to change. Members

support online and open access journals becoming eligible for SSHRC funding and are themselves interested in creating online-compatible files.

3. The SSH journals community calls for fairness in the allocation of funds. While members support online and open access journals being eligible for SSHRC funding, they expect such journals to meet the same quality criteria as print journals and to bring forth other sources of funding (e.g., university and association support, private sector funding).
4. Increased funding from SSHRC is needed. Journals are facing increased financial constraints from all sides; online back-issue dissemination is likely to further diminish subscription revenues; and, by changing eligibility criteria, the number of eligible and worthy applicants will increase in the next competition.

In view of these key findings, the following recommendations are made to assist SSHRC to change its policies and redefine the elements and evaluation criteria for the ARTJ program:

1. Online journals should be made eligible for assistance from SSHRC's ARTJ fund.
2. For the next round of grants, funding for online journals, on a journal-by-journal basis, should match the percentage funding of costs provided to print and print plus online journals.
3. Given the decision of SSHRC's adjudication committee in the last round of grants to allocate ARTJ grants in such a way that all recipients received ten percent less than their defined needs, followed by subsequent cuts; and given that there will be a greater number of applicants to the program in the upcoming round of grants as a result of deeming online journals eligible; **funding to ARTJ should be increased by 25 percent beyond the current budget of \$2.2 million plus that granted to online journals.**
4. Given that as part of the assessment process, journals are rated for quality, the cluster of variables identified in this survey should be used to measure quality, in addition to criteria already used

by SSHRC. Those variables are the breadth of institutions and individuals that submit to the journal; existing financial support including earned revenues; usage, submission rates, citation rates, and rejection rates.

5. SSHRC should fund training opportunities for journal editors and managing editors to master an accepted online publishing system such as OJS on the understanding that the online publishing system trained for will be implemented by the journal beginning within four months of training.
6. SSHRC should fund technical assistance for journals adopting a recognized online publishing system over a period of two years at the rate of approximately \$2,000 per journal. (It is estimated that one technician could handle technical support for twenty journals.)
7. It would be useful for preference to be given to technicians associated with established and being-established Canadian journal-publishing services such as the founding partners of Synergies or the University of Toronto Press given the expected close collaboration each has or will have with Canadian SSH journals with resulting economies of scale.
8. SSHRC should provide opportunities through ARTJ for those already engaged in online publishing to engage in experimentation aimed at maximizing the prestige of journals and disseminating knowledge derived from scholarly research.
9. Eligible experimentation should encompass technology as well as the organization of journal operations and dissemination.
10. SSHRC should assist indirectly in the creation of effective and innovative Canadian SSH journal publishers who can provide services equivalent to publishers such as Blackwell and Cambridge University Press and should favour such publishers in its policies if only to address its responsibilities of making public research supported by public funds. At the same time, as long as journal revenue is used as a criterion for determining the value of a grant to a journal, journals should be free to choose the organization with whom they publish **provided that reporting criteria can be maintained.**

## INTRODUCTION

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) has given notice that the eligibility criteria for funding research and transfer journals will change to include online journals for the next round of grants in 2007. Online journals may be subscription-based or open access, the latter of which is defined by the Budapest Open Access Initiative as:

freely available on the public internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. The only constraint on reproduction and distribution, and the only role for copyright in this domain, should be to give authors control over the integrity of their work and the right to be properly acknowledged and cited (BOAI FAQ, Accessed August 21, 2006, <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/boaifaq.htm>).

As is evident in this study, the Canadian social science and humanities (SSH) journal community sees this announced intention of change in eligibility for funding as appropriate. At the same time, there are a variety of emergent issues that deserve attention. These issues include:

1. A likely increase in the number of journals seeking funding;
2. The need for increased funding to the Aid to Research and Transfer Journals (ARTJ) program to take into account funding shortfalls and cuts as well as new participants (and the always expanding number of active researchers who have an obligation to disseminate the results of publicly funded research);
3. The criteria to be used to determine the amount of support provided to individual journals. The current formula is revenue based and most journal revenue comes from subscriptions. Open access online journals do not have subscription revenue. Some have direct financial support while others have only in-kind support. In the latter case, under current rules, although they might be deemed eligible, the formula for calculating support would yield them no financial support.

4. The need to recast entry-level eligibility for SSHRC support.

Currently there exists a barrier to receiving funds in the form of a minimum subscription requirement of 200. While survey respondents support this barrier to entry for subscription-based journals, again, open access journals do not have subscribers hence, according to the current model for funding, they would not qualify.

Given such issues, it is clear that there will be adjustments to the ARTJ program. It is also the case that there has been some slippage in the application of SSHRC policy with certain journals receiving support that are published by foreign for-profit entities whose financial operations are unavailable to SSHRC assessors, yet this information is required in the SSHRC application forms.

This study represents an attempt to assess the needs and attitudes of the Canadian SSH journal community with emphasis on those journals currently receiving grants from SSHRC's ARTJ program and the members of the Canadian Association of Learned Journals/L'association canadienne des revues savantes (CALJ/ACRS). It was undertaken in the context of SSHRC's policy and program development process, which relies on staff and a 22-member Council. The Council is composed largely of academics, often with limited experience and understanding of the business dynamics and operations of scholarly journals. The purpose of the study is also to communicate the views of SSH journals among members of the journal community and to make recommendations to SSHRC that are based on the responses to the survey.

The critical policy issue that stimulated this study is this. In past years, adjustments have been made to SSHRC's journals program by means of a process that has not explicitly included the journal community. No doubt, SSHRC staff members collect information, discussion takes place, recommendations are brought forward and duly passed, but all this happens within SSHRC and behind closed doors. At no time is the journal community systematically and openly consulted and, in particular, there is no formal consultation between SSHRC and the Canadian Association of Learned Journals/L'association canadienne des revues savantes. Such a model of top-down policy and program formation courts displeasure in stakeholder communities.

In view of the anticipated changes to the program, it would seem that better policy could be developed and such policy could be more smoothly implemented were CALJ/ACRS to have input to the policy and program development process based on information gathered from the journal community. Recognizing that CALJ/ACRS membership was in the order of 60 percent of Canadian SSH journals, and that for various reasons CALJ/ACRS coffers were not overflowing, in May 2006, the incoming President of CALJ/ACRS sought funds from the SSHRC President's Fund. This study was given a small grant to undertake a survey of Canadian SSH journals, both members and non-members of CALJ/ACRS.

## THE SURVEY

This report summarizes and analyzes the findings of a web-based survey carried out between June 22 and August 6, 2006. The journals contacted to complete the survey included those that received SSHRC funding for the 2004-2005 fiscal year and all current members of the CALJ/ACRS (overall N=183). As well, a handful of responses were collected from journals that were informed about the survey by a member-journal of the initial contact group (N=3). The responses of individuals who represent multiple journals were weighted accordingly in the analysis.

The survey was divided into seven parts which address a variety of issues related to journal publishing.

1. Respondent Identification
2. SSHRC Funding Criteria and Funding Levels
  - a. Subscriber-minimum desirability
  - b. Basic eligibility criteria for open access journals
  - c. Adequacy of criteria for calculating financial support
  - d. Perceived need for increased funding
  - e. Alternatives for allocating funds
  - f. Uses for funds allocated to online initiatives
  - g. Interest in producing online-compatible files
3. Journal Management
  - a. Perceived role of journals

4. Supporting an Evolving Journal Community
  - a. Interest in SSHRC support for online-only journals
  - b. Interest in SSHRC support for open access journals
  - c. Appropriate eligibility criteria for open access journals
  - d. Additional sources of support for open access journals
  - e. Assessing content and management of open access journals
  - f. Addressing revenue implications of free public access to back issues
5. Back Issue Digitization
  - a. Interest in a proposed Google initiative
6. CALJ/ACRS and Communication
  - a. Interest in receiving CALJ/ACRS emails
  - b. Interest in participating in the CALJ/ACRS listserv
7. Copyright
  - a. Interest in developing guidelines on copyright and commercial usage

The questions required respondents to indicate the extent to which they agreed with statements (strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree), to indicate the level of importance of a given variable, or to rank order the importance of a set of alternatives. Percentages were calculated for each categorical response to determine the consensus attitude within the SSH journals community. In some cases responses were assigned numeric values on a five-point scale (1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree), which allowed the mean response to be calculated and compared in the analysis. Respondents were also invited to elaborate on their responses and those elaborations were used to inform the analysis of the results.

### **Respondents**

Two groups were targeted to respond to the questionnaire on behalf of their journal. First were journal editors (in chief). Second were managing editors. In Canada, those playing these two roles have the lion's share of responsibility for the operation and reputation of a journal. As an academic, the editor—who is usually a senior academic of some standing in any established journal—oversees the peer review process. He or she may also seek out contributions on thematic issues that deserve attention

by researchers. In carrying out both these tasks, he or she contributes to the official record of research to which the journal contributes. The subject matter normally found in a journal; the prestige of the editor and the journal; elapsed time between submission and publication; and circulation, determine the reputation of the journal and affect submissions, further circulation and citations.

Customarily, the managing editor has overall administrative responsibility for running the journal. This includes the processing of articles and peer review, overseeing and sometimes participating in editing, layout and production, subscriptions management, marketing, and financial management. The term of an editor is, most often, limited—three years is not uncommon. On the other hand, to some extent the managing editor's term depends on the success he or she has in running a journal. Often the longest serving person on the masthead of a journal is the managing editor.

### **A Missing Professional**

It is quite uncommon to find a volunteer academic on an editorial board or board of directors, or a paid staff member who is the journal *publisher*. In Canadian SSH journal circles, the term “publisher” is often used to refer either to a printer or to an organization that manages journal subscriptions, printing and distribution, in which case, often, such an organization serves in that capacity for more than one title. For example, a journal managing editor might say: “Our publisher is the University of Toronto Press, Journals Division.” To some extent, the lack of a volunteer or paid staff member of the journal designated “publisher,” who considers the journal's strategic interests and is well informed about general market trends, evolving practices, pricing policies, marketing, copyright issues, digital rights management, leaves this function unaddressed—except to the degree that such organizations as University of Toronto Press (UTP) and members of journal boards are able to address them as extensions of their roles. Such considerations are relatively infrequent with the possible exception of UTP given that, quite properly, the focus of concern of the editor is the contents of the journal and the focus of the managing editor is to work within the parameters set by the journal and the market, SSHRC, the editor, and the contributors.

The responses of those surveyed reflected this dual focus. Managing editors, in general, have a primary concern with ensuring that sufficient revenue will be in place for the journal to survive. They understand and work within a subscriptions/grants/rights sales business model. While they understand open access, author charges, online publication and know that science journals have embraced these processes and technologies, they are, in general, uncertain about how a smooth transition can be effected from print to online publishing and from a subscriptions-based model to, for example, open access online publishing. Editors, on the other hand, are concerned that the considerable work in selecting and publishing the best research be funded adequately so that the value of the journal as a known peer-reviewed research repository and disseminating entity is not undermined.

## **RESPONDENT POPULATION**

The survey questionnaire and responses to it are included in Appendix 1 of this report. The report and the survey can also be found on the CALJ/ACRS website.

The responding population was comprised of 123 individuals representing 125 journals, with a total of 155 responses (three individuals represent more than one journal and as such their responses were multiplied by the number of journals they represent). In terms of the population of journals contacted this represents a healthy response rate of 67 percent. Of the 155 responses, 28 percent represent journals receiving \$25,000 to \$30,000 from SSHRC, 53 percent receiving <\$25,000, and 19 percent receiving no funding. French-language journals represent 14 percent of the responses and 54 percent are from CALJ member journals. Responses from journal editors account for 41 percent, managing editors 43 percent, while 3 percent of respondents represent both positions for a given journal, and a further 13 percent of responses were from a journal staff member other than the editor or managing editor.

## RESULTS

The respondents to this survey have a clear view of the purpose of scholarly journals. They believe that the primary value of a journal is “to create a venue for the publication of research results.” Ninety-four percent of respondents see this as extremely important and a further four percent see it as somewhat important. Next and almost equally, respondents see “ensuring the peer-reviewed publication of the best research available” as either extremely important (92%) or somewhat important (6%). Sixty percent indicate that “the maximization of knowledge dissemination within the academy and through public availability” is extremely important (and 27% indicate that it is somewhat important). These values are followed, in order, by other functions: “to maximize the dissemination of knowledge within the academy” (at 59% and 38% for extremely and somewhat important respectively), “to stimulate research into a particular area of inquiry” (at 50% and 43%) and “to serve as a venue for a core constituency of scholars and authors” (at 38% and 44%).

Perhaps the most important finding of the survey, given the context of technological change and SSHRC’s desire to change eligibility requirements is that 87 percent of respondents are positively inclined towards including online open access journals as eligible for SSHRC funding. They also support the legitimacy of subscription-based online journals—78 percent support the funding of non-open access online journals. And with respect to their own operations, 88 percent are positive and eight more percent are neutral about their willingness to adopt an article production system that can generate online-compatible files.

### **Technology and Business Models**

The main issue with respect to technological change appears to be how to marry technological possibility with financial management to develop a sustainable business model. Financial issues are a main concern. All respondents indicate that funding from SSHRC should be increased. When asked to choose a justifiable percentage increase, from 0 percent to 25 percent, the higher the increase, the greater number of journals in favour of it (none recommended 0%, 10 respondents recommended 5%; 13 recommended 10%; 13 recommended 15%; 14 recommended 20%; and

62 recommended 25%). Seventy-one percent of respondents are at least somewhat in favour of an increase in SSHRC funding equal to the funds granted to newly qualifying online journals. (It is important to bear in mind that subscription increases do not net major revenue increases for small circulation journals.)

### **Financing**

A sense of the pressing concern of maintaining revenues to cover expenses can be gained from the responses to a question asking journals to rank allocation alternatives for any increased funding. Highest ranked is a split of 75/25 for across-the-board (allowing journals to allocate funds as they see fit) and online initiatives, respectively. Next was a preference for a 50/50 across-the-board/online initiatives split, followed by a one hundred percent across-the-board increase. The final alternative, allocating funds in a 25/75 split, was ranked last. The closeness of the rankings—the means for the first three are 1.96, 2.34, and 2.66—may be seen as an indication that some funds would likely be spent on online initiatives no matter how increases in funding are allocated. However, the gap between the above three means and the mean for a 25/75 split between across-the-board and online initiatives (3.32) can be interpreted as giving a sense that general-purpose funds are needed. Some might also say that some journals do not see the need for great expenditures on online initiatives. Still others might see such responses as short-term thinking.

### **Fairness**

The responding journal editors and managing editors appear to call for fairness in the allocation of funds to journals by SSHRC. While strongly accepting online journals as legitimate, they believe online journals should bring other funding to the table. Seventy-four percent believe that they should bring association support; 79 percent recommend university support; and 45 percent recommend private sector funding. These sources are not atypical for print journals. And in response to a question of the percentage funding that should be provided to online journals (given the context that “SSHRC provides 35 percent of revenue to print journals”<sup>1</sup>) the overwhelming response (64%) is for “the same percentage level of support provided to print journals.” Fourteen percent recommend lower or nothing; 21 percent recommended higher (4% recommended zero and 6% recommended 100%).

---

<sup>1</sup>Lorimer, R. & Lindsay, A. (2004). Canadian Scholarly Journals at a Technological Crossroads. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 29 (3&4), 253-75.

### **External Financial Realities**

Some of the major factors contributing to increased financial constraints for journals include inflation, the increasing Canadian dollar, increased competition for funding from SSHRC, and the cost of publishing both in print and online as opposed to print only. When asked to identify additional major external factors that affect their journal financially, other than the four listed above, the most frequently cited responses, in rank order, are:

1. Declining subscriptions (institutional and individual)
2. Insufficient university or association support
3. Increasing distribution costs (postage)
4. Salaries for support staff (editorial, technical)
5. Fluctuating association membership

### **SSHRC Funding Criteria and Funding Levels**

The survey brought forward a number of other findings. Fifty-five percent of respondents strongly agree with SSHRC's current policy, which requires print journals to have at least 200 subscribers to determine basic eligibility for support. A further 21 percent somewhat agree with this policy. Specific comments relating to this question could be broadly classified into four categories:

1. *A Cut-off Is Necessary*: The most commonly occurring comments emphasized the need for a measurable indicator to establish demand for the journal. A bottom line of subscribers was perceived as a vote of credibility for a journal's editorial and managerial quality. Some comments suggested that academic merit alone is not enough, and that subscriptions reflect a legitimately run operation.
2. *Discrimination Against Specialized Disciplines*: Despite the high level of support for the 200-subscriber minimum, concern was expressed regarding the challenge that this policy presents to journals catering to small but specialized disciplines and to new journals. It was suggested that this policy "places obstacles before scholarly diversity" and that small journals with few subscribers are the ones most in need of financial assistance.

3. *Quality Not Quantity*: A handful of individuals commented that a journal's quality is not synonymous with the number of subscribers, and that the academic quality of a journal and effective journal management should receive more consideration than the number of subscribers.
4. *Evolving Metrics*: A few individuals expressed concern that the number of print subscribers is no longer a valid metric given that libraries offer free access online to many journals. It was recommended that metrics which take into account both print and online use be employed instead of print subscriptions alone.

More than half of the responding journals (36% and 26% strongly or somewhat, respectively) feel that earned and donated income are valid criteria upon which SSHRC should base its funding levels. However, quality and demand are also emphasized as being important considerations when calculating funding levels.

The vast majority of respondents believe that open access journals should be subject to the same basic eligibility criteria as print journals in terms of academic quality and financial support. Most importantly, they believe that new, reliable methods of assessing quality and demand are necessary to compensate for the absence of a minimum subscriber base. In rank order these alternate methods of assessment include:

1. Overall, the breadth of institutions and individuals submitting to a journal is the most important factor to consider (mean 1.52) as 62 percent deem this criterion "extremely important" with a further 28 percent considering it "somewhat important."
2. Existing financial support is also considered "extremely important" by 41 percent of respondents (mean 1.84).
3. Usage (mean 1.97), submission rates (2.00), citation analysis (2.09), and rejection rates (2.20) are considered "somewhat important" to respondents as criteria that are seen to reflect the quality of a journal.
4. Attitudes towards membership in an aggregation of journals vary greatly and the mean value of 3.11 suggests a mild negativity to this variable as a criterion of quality.

In general, respondents comment that online-only and open access journals should be subject to quality criteria equivalent to those of print journals.

To assess perceived needs in entering and operating in an online environment, respondents were asked to rate the importance of the following alternatives for funding eligibility. The order and mean rankings were as follows:

1. Back issue digitization was the most important with a mean value of 1.50
2. Journal hosting fees ranked second (mean 1.64)
3. Hardware purchase ranked third (mean 2.35), followed by
4. Training to understand and use online journal publishing software purchase (mean 2.74).

The already mentioned willingness among respondents to adopt an article production system that is capable of generating online-compatible files (alongside of print journals) that meet international standards for searchability if funding is made available to assist in doing so is overwhelming. A notable majority of respondents (70%) strongly agree with this proposition, and a further 17 percent somewhat agree that they would be willing to adopt such a system. Many individuals comment that they have already pursued this initiative or are in the process of doing so. There was some anxiety among these individuals about the possibility of being forced to switch to a different production system – they do not wish to be penalized for having been proactive in this regard.

A second cluster of respondents express interest, but present a set of conditions that would need to be met before they would consider adopting a new production system. An emphasis on funds to assist in doing so is the primary condition, which, considering the fact that this condition was included in the initial proposition, illustrates that financial constraints are a clear dictator of the progress of these journals. The ability to still accept paper submissions is also important to at least two journals, as are training, workload, loss of subscribers, and issues of copyright in considering going online.

With respect to the top four priorities chosen by respondents and their rank order, CALJ/ACRS is already investigating options for back-issue digitization in collaboration with Google, as outlined later in this report.

The anticipated journal hosting fees that organizations will charge to host journals are a real cost and journals are wise to plan for such costs. The placement of hardware as a third priority is a bit difficult to interpret. It may be that most journals are working with fairly outdated equipment and any chance to upgrade is an important priority. It may also be that journal representatives feel that, in going online, they will need more sophisticated equipment. While training was identified as a fourth priority, it should not be assumed that it is not important. In CALJ/ACRS discussions, the need for training has been obvious.

### **Supporting an Evolving Journal Community**

Given the break-even financial realities of many journals—a financial state encouraged by SSHRC's funding of not-for-profit enterprises and its criteria for continued support—the opportunity for SSHRC to provide financial incentives to journals to embrace the online environment exists. Journals were asked whether a premium should be added to a basic SSHRC grant for those journals who make their back issues publicly available online without charge. Such funding would help see journals through a transition period and could be based on documented back issue sales, which for some journals, are somewhat substantial. Nearly 45 percent of respondents strongly favour this idea, with an additional 18 percent somewhat in agreement. Several journals comment that royalties from back issue sales provide a significant source of revenue, and that although creating online copies of the issues is desirable, they are not keen on making them freely available in exchange for a *one-time* SSHRC premium. For some journals the cost of securing rights from authors is also a concern.

As mentioned above, over the past year, Google has expressed interest in digitizing the back issues of those Canadian SSH journals that have been unable to accomplish this themselves. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of interest or lack thereof in such a partnership. Fifty-one percent of respondents, that is 89 responding individuals, are interested in this idea (25% strongly interested, 26% somewhat interested), with a further

12 percent neutral on the matter (many of which have already taken the initiative to digitize their back issues). There appears to be a moderate correlation between the degree of interest in having a premium added to grants for journals that make their back issues publicly available online for free and the degree of interest in having Google digitize back issues. These findings indicate a notable desire within the journal community to maximize dissemination of their scholarly material.

### **CALJ/ACRS Communication**

The survey ended with three questions dealing with CALJ/ACRS and its members. The Canadian SSH journal community is interested in improving communication among CALJ/ACRS and its members. Over 58 percent of respondents indicate some degree of interest in having more than one (up to three) journal contacts able to receive routine and informative email from CALJ/ACRS. Similarly, 60 percent agree to some extent that it would be useful to have these same individuals able to participate in the CALJ/ACRS member listserv (only 14% and 12%, respectively, express any level of disagreement with either of these ideas). When asked if it would be useful for CALJ/ACRS to develop guidelines on copyright and commercial usage fees, the majority of respondents express some level of agreement with this proposition (34% strongly agree, 24% somewhat agree). There is virtually no disagreement (4%), but a substantial number of respondents are neutral on the issue (37%).

### **Systematic Differences**

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to the mean response for each question according to journal size, language, CALJ membership, and respondent position to determine if there were any systematic differences in the data gathered.

### *A Word of Caution*

It is important to bear in mind that the statistical tests used to compare responses based on the above variables must be interpreted with caution as the data have been artificially quantified using, in most cases, a five-point scale where positive responses were coded as 1 (strongly agree) or 2 (somewhat agree), neutral responses were coded as 3, and negative responses were coded as 4 (somewhat disagree) or 5 (strongly disagree). The

results of this test are meant only to aid in providing general conclusions, which can be interpreted in the context of this survey. As such, the statistics themselves (degrees of freedom, F statistic, p-value) are not provided, but rather a general description of the observed differences.

#### *Size*

Large journals appear to be more strongly in favour of a 200-subscriber minimum (mean 1.42) compared with smaller journals (mean 2.11). Responses of journals not receiving SSHRC funding were similar to large journals in this case. However, the non-SSHRC-funded journals were less in favour of an across-the-board increase in funding than SSHRC-funded journals, regardless of size, and were much more strongly in favour of a 75/25 split. This may be explained by the fact that non-SSHRC-funded journals are already embracing online publication. In the same vein, non-SSHRC-funded journals were less interested in using such funds for training and hardware purchase, but more interested in using funds for back issue digitization and hosting fees, suggesting that they are already set up to go online, but are in need of money to continue with their efforts.

The greatest level of support for providing a premium for back issue digitization was from the smaller journals (mean 1.93), followed by large journals (mean 2.72). Non-SSHRC-funded journals were slightly negative towards this suggestion (mean 3.76). Similarly, smaller journals were positive towards the possibility of partnering with Google to get back issues digitized for free, while large journals and non-SSHRC-funded journals were slightly negative towards this proposition.

#### *Language*

In general, Canadian French-language journals have strong provincial support and as a community have been active in participating in *Érudit*, a digital repository for online access to journal content funded by le Fonds québécois de recherche sur la société et la culture. As such, differences of opinion between French and English/bilingual journals are not surprising. French-language journals are less inclined to have SSHRC base its level of financial support for a journal on earned and donated income (mean 3.16). They are less interested in receiving funding specifically for online initiatives and are more interested in funds for hardware purchase. They are less

concerned with citations as a measure of quality and look more favourably on aggregation. French-language journals are strongly in favour of having a premium added to SSHRC grants to cover the cost of back issue digitization, and are more positive towards working with Google to have back issues digitized.

#### *CALJ/ACRS Membership*

Interestingly, there were some differences of opinion between CALJ/ACRS member journals and non-member journals. CALJ/ACRS members were more positive towards SSHRC funding online-only journals (mean 1.75) compared with non-member journals (mean 2.49). CALJ/ACRS members were also more positive towards submission rates and rejection rates as measures of quality, compared with non-members.

#### *Position*

The responses of editors and managing editors to the quantifiable results (i.e., those on a five-point scale) did not appear to differ significantly.

## **DISCUSSION**

The position of editors and managing editors as persons focussed primarily on the production of knowledge in journal form is reflected in their vision of the purpose of scholarly journals. In general, that view stresses the creation of a credible (peer-reviewed) record of the best research. Next in importance is dissemination to scholars and to the public.

Some sense of what journal editors and managing editors see as the best research can be gleaned from their ranking of factors that reflect the quality of an online journal. Here they rank as highest the breadth of institutions and individuals that submit to the journal, followed by existing financial support, followed in turn by usage, submission rates, citation analysis and rejection rates. Given the vagaries of comparing print and online journals, this cluster of variables appears to have merit as a measurement package to ensure fairness in the allocation of grants.

Clearly salient in moving forward to include online journals as eligible for SSHRC funding is an understanding of the perspectives of the current

journal community. There are three important elements. First, journals accept online and (online) open access journals as *bona fide* journals and they are open to incorporating online publication as part of their operations. The second important element is that as not-for-profit entities, few journals have access to retained earnings from which they can draw should revenues take a sudden downturn. This scarcity of resources appears to cause journal editors and managing editors to be both cautious and a little anxious with respect to change, especially when financial models assuring the maintenance of the revenue-earning status quo is not being proposed as a foundation for change. Of specific concern are a loss of subscription revenue, loss of back-issue sales revenue, loss of rights sales, and a diminution of grants based on an unexpanding envelope of funds and an expanding number of applicants.

The third important element that informs the perspectives of the current journal community is a concern for the fair allocation of existing resources. Given their acceptance of online and open access online journals, they call for measures that both allow such journals to compete for funding and, recognizing the shortfall in the last round of SSHRC grants, they call, in no uncertain terms, for an increase in overall funding to ARTJ.

In the context of fairness and the realities of journal operations it is useful to bring forward a point that arose in the requested commentary that was part of the survey. Unlike research grant programs, funding to journals from ARTJ requires both continuity and stability. Establishing a journal requires a considerable expenditure of effort and building it as a credible knowledge resource through attracting good research, garnering citations, and building a readership, takes an even greater effort that must take place over a long term. The process is not unlike establishing a brand: once a title is established it becomes an accepted long-term fixture in the research community that it serves. Commercial journal publishers spin off titles from existing journals and carry titles for numbers of years at a loss as they build a user base, sometimes by providing free subscriptions to subscribers of established journals. **For these and other reasons, the success rate of journals in receiving applied for grants should be closer to the success rate of institutions rather than individuals or even research groups.** Certainly, measures should be in place for ensuring that journals

are performing their intended functions well, but comparing success rates in ARTJ to research granting programs is an unsound comparison.

The challenge for SSHRC and the journal community is to ensure a smooth transition to a new technological reality without the loss of valuable intellectual resources (i.e., good, recognized journals). For journals to embrace online publishing requires understanding of, familiarity with, and trust in a new technology (with which some are relatively unfamiliar) and the evolution of a business model that will see them thrive. The majority of respondents to this survey accept that. SSHRC and the journal community share a responsibility not to undermine the invaluable ongoing intellectual resource that Canadian SSH journals represent and on which many Canadian scholars and students depend. It would thus seem desirable for journals to have funds to allow them to respond to the demands of their readerships, which for the present time, appear to call for both print and online access. As time passes, ARTJ should respond to subscription and usage pattern changes.

This survey did not ask journals to state their intentions in maintaining print, converting to online publishing, or combining both. The reason for this is that the question is hypothetical and depends on both usage and funding. Were SSHRC to provide a level of funding that made combining online and print production impossible, journals would be forced to choose. In face of continuing demand for both print and online access for journals that are available in both forms, it would be a wise policy for SSHRC not to force many journals to choose between technologies. The results of this survey suggest that the issue should be decided on a foundation of ensuring that journals can serve their primary role as a quality assured venue for the publication of research followed by adherence to the principle of maximizing the dissemination of knowledge within the academy and to society as a whole. This means tracking usage patterns in the face of choice. Online usage patterns can be tracked readily; print usage patterns are more difficult and rely on indirect measures.

SSHRC is proposing nothing more than making online journals eligible for funding. As we have seen, this has implications for all ARTJ applicants and for assessment criteria. As this survey shows, Canada's SSH journals are open

to using new technologies, but given their relatively fragile financial status, it is reasonable that they want to see a clear path that will preserve their journal and allow it to take advantage of new technology. The scholarly community should be grateful for this concern. The alternative—an unstable environment in which journals appear and disappear, and a peer-review filtering process performed by journals that either disappears or is difficult to corroborate—is not in the interests of researchers, universities, the public, or SSHRC.

### **Policy and Program Challenges in Face of New Technology**

Developing sound policy for taking advantage of new technology by augmenting print production demands careful and cautious action. Consideration of the open access model reveals some unexpected shoals that require careful navigation in taking advantage of technological change.

The principle of open access appears to maximize the dissemination of knowledge. Knowledge is created and vetted and then it is distributed free of charge. Open access replaces the knowledge market with a kind of knowledge commons where there are no buyers, just providers and users. True, the users and patterns of use can provide a measure of the value of the knowledge being produced (alongside the cluster of other variables identified in this survey as reflecting the quality and demand of a journal) but there is no market per se. Effectively, such an organization has elements similar to those of a command economy. The pursuit of the general interest is defined, enacted and evaluated for the most part by the producing community. To avoid the pitfalls of a command economy, usage and assessment feedback from those served must be strong elements as representatives of demand.

Nor would it be wise for SSHRC to exist as equivalent to a single surrogate buyer in the marketplace. To do so would just trade a command economy for a monopsony. Economists point out that the inefficiencies of a monopsony are similar to those of a monopoly: Effectively, because the monopsonistic entity has no competition, the user-market has no power.

It can be argued, on the basis of SSHRC's practice of bringing in peer reviewers, that the peer-review process in which a new set of researchers is

brought in to assess journals every three years counteracts the inefficiencies of an essentially monopsonistic structure. To some degree, that is the case. It also could be argued that were open access to be adopted, it would be important to have several sources of funds (e.g., SSHRC, universities, research entities, or associations) each with assessment procedures. While assessment works on quite different principles to a marketplace, there is some validity to claiming that assessments represent the preferences of the user community. However, the desirability of several funding sources begs the question: If the Canadian journal community were to move to open access, which entities would step forward in a timely way to complement SSHRC's journal funding program? The obvious answers are the examples given above— universities, research entities, and disciplinary associations—who often own journals and universities who may earn a certain prestige from being the home of a journal. It is not clear that any group is ready and willing to step immediately into a created breach. Stable, adequate funding from universities for journals is not a main characteristic of journal/university relations according to this survey. **The importance of stability in journal funding seems to recommend caution and incremental change.**

Three policy alternatives to unfettered open access present themselves as ways of effecting a smooth transition from the current state of Canadian SSH journal production and dissemination to one that takes fuller advantage of online technology. First is providing open access to a restricted market—e.g., Canada, or the Canadian academy. Both restrictions do not affirm maximization of knowledge dissemination. Second is reducing production costs to approximately one-third of their current level and existing purely on SSHRC grants. This would require the cessation of print production, curtailing professional editing and layout, and underfunding peer review. Third is time-delayed open access in which, after a period of time, research is made publicly available at no cost to the user. This practice is becoming established both through journals opening access to back issues and through authors making their work available through institutional repositories. It seems a reasonable compromise. It can also be combined with such initiatives as providing free access to developing nations, adding value to the journal through the semi-automated publication of dissertation abstracts, and so forth. And as stated, future policy and program design can be determined on the basis of a cluster of quality/demand measures and ensuring a venue for peer-reviewed publication and wide dissemination.

### **Journal Funding Compared to Research Funding**

Respondents to this survey underlined the importance of avoiding the weaknesses that seem endemic to the funding of research by SSHRC. Were SSHRC to demand open access as a condition of receiving assistance from ARTJ—which, according to SSHRC spokesperson, David Moorman, it is not doing—effectively on offer would be an opportunity to increase dissemination in trade for a monopsony position with regard to the funding of journals for an agency that dispenses grants in a manner that many established researchers regard as a lottery. Even if SSHRC were successful in obtaining funds to underwrite the whole of Canadian SSH journal publishing (probably around \$5 million per annum) for the SSH community to throw its research communication lot in with a single agency that funds research occasionally and partially does not bode well for maximizing a stable and organized system for disseminating research.

A counter argument can be mounted in favour of SSHRC providing all needed funds. Surely if the principle of dissemination of knowledge is seen to have sufficient strength, then mechanisms would be put in place to guarantee sufficient funds. There might even be a back-up system where a general agency could take responsibility for ensuring peer-reviewed publication of deserving research—something beyond self-archiving. Another version of the same argument would propose that with increased responsibility would come an increased ability of SSHRC to obtain from government the necessary funds to support SSH research communication more properly. The difficulty here is the monopsonistic position of SSHRC and its ability to respond both in dollars and informed decision-making to “perceived need.” Given a) the budget share of the journals program; b) the percentage allocation of research grants allotted to research dissemination within research grants and no real attempt on the part of SSHRC to see any of that funding supporting journals; and c) the general lack of concerted determined action to address partial funding and valid and reliable peer review, there is no reason to place the fate of Canadian SSH journal publishing any further in SSHRC’s hands. This is not to say that SSHRC is not an ally. Rather it is to recognize the capacities and tendencies necessarily inherent in the operations of a funding body such as SSHRC.

There are other issues external to the SSHRC debate that are relevant to the development of an appropriate online publishing model. One such issue

is the common perception of associations that their journal is a significant tangible benefit of membership. They fear losing members should their journal be made publicly available—although not all associations offer their members a journal subscription. Also, in owning a journal, most associations take their proprietorship seriously. They oversee the management of the journal and play a significant role in such important processes as the appointment of the editor. Their sense of proprietorship might diminish if all funding for the operation were to come from a single external source whose decision to fund would decide the fate of their journal.

A second issue is the distinction between the role of journals and institutional repositories. Journals should be clearly distinguished from institutional repositories. Journals make public peer-reviewed research which meets the standard of the title that is publishing that research. A person accessing scholarly journals is assured that the article he or she examines has been judged as meeting the basic standards of other researchers and has been judged a contribution to knowledge. This filtering function concentrates evaluation in the hands of a few, led by an editor who is perceived by his/her peers as fair and broad minded. In terms of cost effectiveness for the research community as whole—and for society—this process has much to recommend it.

Institutional repositories are new on the scene and they appear to be evolving into records of work and work in progress, teaching materials, and marketing sites for entrepreneurial academics. As such, they may play a valuable role in universities promoting themselves and in knowledge sharing among faculty members—especially for their instructional content. The ability of an instructor to view a set of lectures given at MIT in a course in his/her field is surely of considerable value—MIT was an early advocate of making course materials publicly available online. However, institutional repositories should not be taken as a substitute for journals effectively because there is no external quality control. The efficacy and efficiency of the filtering process disappears. Moreover, it would be ill advised for institutions to exercise any control over repository content and quality because to do so would play into the politics of academic institutions, which, generally speaking, are not viewed with pride by members of the academy.

## IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report makes ten recommendations. Recommendations one through four address the question of changes to SSHRC policy on the criteria used to determine funding to scholarly journals. Recommendations five through seven address the issue of technological and training needs of the journal community. Recommendations eight and nine address the needs of journals already engaged in open access and other technological innovation/experimentation that improves journal operations and maximizes the dissemination of knowledge. Recommendation ten addresses the issue of public access to publicly funded research. The results of this survey suggest the following:

### Changes to SSHRC Funding: Recommendations 1 to 4

1. Online journals should be made eligible for assistance from SSHRC's ARTJ fund.
2. For the next round of grants, funding for online journals, on a journal-by-journal basis, should match the percentage funding of costs provided to print and print plus online journals.
3. Given the decision of SSHRC's adjudication committee in the last round of grants to allocate ARTJ grants in such a way that all recipients received ten percent less than their defined needs, followed by subsequent cuts; and given that there will be a greater number of applicants to the program in the upcoming round of grants as a result of deeming online journals eligible; **funding to ARTJ should increase beyond the current budget of \$2.2 million plus that granted to online journals by 25 percent.**
4. Given that as part of the assessment process, journals are rated for quality, the cluster of variables identified in this survey should be used to measure quality, in addition to criteria already used by SSHRC. Those variables are the breadth of institutions and individuals that submit to the journal; existing financial support including earned revenues; usage, submission rates, citation rates, and rejection rates.

### *Taking Advantage of Technological Change*

Journals exist within a quickly changing technological and organizational environment. Some of the more important changes combine with the results of this survey to recommend action for adapting to this environment while maintaining the principles identified by survey respondents as top priorities. Numerous change elements are in place for the journal community:

- i *Production Management*: The technology for managing submissions, including initial editorial assessment, peer reviews, editing, layout, proofing, and publication in print and online is in place. It is free, simple to use, and arguably introduces production efficiencies. The technology is user-friendly: Needed training time to become an adept user is one day if accompanied by subsequent online assistance.
- ii *Metadata*: The technology for publishing current issues online that allow the creation and identification of critical metadata that is compliant with international standards so that published material is visible to search engines is also available at no charge and is also easy to use.
- iii *Partial Public Access*: The technology for making certain content available only to subscribers and other content available to all Internet users is also available at no charge.
- iv *Other Research and Publication Tools*: Other technology is available that enhances these basic functions including automated thesis abstract publication, secure archiving, and a research support tool.

All these functions are included in Open Journal Systems (OJS) and OJS is or will be supported by up to 18 different Canadian universities which expect to provide hosting services to journals. (Developed in Canada, it is being used world wide by perhaps as many as one thousand journals.) Other technology exists that supports one or more of these functions.

Technology exists for destructive or non-destructive scanning of back issues using Optical Character Recognition (OCR) software that allows the resulting digital files to be uploaded and renders the content word-searchable. While scanning back issues and uploading them to a

journal site is not without cost, Google has offered to provide this service, as part of a pilot project, to Canadian SSH journals for no fee in return for restricting searchability to Google's search engine. Journals are free to participate in this project and to withdraw at any time should they be unhappy with Google's performance. Journals would retain copyright, but should a journal withdraw, the files created by Google would not be forwarded to the journal. On the other hand, were Google to withdraw the service, all electronic files would be turned over to participating journals. Finally, journals would be free to create a table of contents complete with abstracts, key words, and a link to the co-hosted Google/Journal content.

Currently, hosting services for journals exist at various universities including Simon Fraser University, University of Calgary, University of Athabasca, University of Toronto, Université de Montréal, Université Laval, UQAM, and the University of New Brunswick. With the funding of Synergies, such hosting will become more robust and sophisticated searches presenting metadata in a number of formats will be possible.

Very few Canadian SSH journals lack a website of some kind. However, a substantial number lack a website that provides access to peer-reviewed content either to subscribers or non-subscribers.

#### *Barriers to Full Exploitation of Online Publishing*

Many journal editors and staff members believe that they lack the time and/or the opportunity needed to master a journal publishing system such as OJS. Some lack the resources to hire additional staff for a transition period. In addition, some do not have ready access to technical assistance should they find themselves unable to complete a task.

Some journal editors believe that online availability of articles will lead to lower subscription rates that, in turn, will lower their SSHRC grant or render their journal ineligible for assistance. Some of this group also lack the financial resources to invest in gearing up for online publication.

The above barriers can be addressed successfully by providing

- i Training opportunities
- ii Financial assistance
- iii Technical help and hosting assistance

Training opportunities and technical assistance for OJS can be delivered by at least two institutions (Simon Fraser University and the University of New Brunswick) and by individuals in most major Canadian cities including Vancouver, Edmonton/Athabasca, Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal, Fredericton, and Halifax.

#### **Technological and Training Needs: Recommendations 5 to 7**

5. SSHRC should fund training opportunities for journal editors and managing editors to master an accepted online publishing system such as OJS on the understanding that the online publishing system trained for will be implemented by the journal beginning within four months of training.
6. SSHRC should fund technical assistance for journals adopting a recognized online publishing system over a period of two years at the rate of approximately \$2,000 per journal. (It is estimated that one technician could handle technical support for twenty journals.)
7. It would be useful for preference to be given to technicians associated with established and being-established Canadian journal-publishing services such as the founding partners of Synergies or the University of Toronto Press given the expected close collaboration each has or will have with Canadian SSH journals with resulting economies of scale.

#### ***The Need for Experimentation***

Technological change patterns have been identified by research. Developers find early adopters (or vice versa) and early adopters help pave the way for other groups to follow. This pattern is certainly visible in online journal publishing. Although online publishing is stable and archivable (e.g., LOCKSS) in the sense of providing a reliable publishing environment, opportunities for enhancing the representation of knowledge are continuously evolving including an expanding media palette using colour, sound, image and movement, 3D representation, and collaborative writing and editing. Given the leadership shown by various Canadian academics in journal publishing, Canada would benefit from the funding of applied research in this area.

**Early Adoption and Innovation: Recommendations 8 and 9**

8. SSHRC should provide opportunities through ARTJ for those already engaged in online publishing to engage in experimentation oriented to maximizing the prestige of journals and disseminating knowledge derived from scholarly research.
9. Eligible experimentation should encompass technology as well as the organization of journal operations and dissemination.

*Choice of Publishers*

Given that the first two goals of scholarly journal publishing are (1) creating a credible record of knowledge and (2) disseminating that knowledge to those who can benefit by it; and given that the main criterion SSHRC uses for determining the value of the grant received is based on earned revenues—which, in the main, come from subscriptions—it would seem inconsistent to restrict the opportunity for journals to contract with organizations that can maximize their circulation.

**Access to Publicly Funded Research: Recommendation 10**

10. SSHRC should assist indirectly in the creation of effective and innovative Canadian SSH journal publishers who can provide services equivalent to publishers such as Blackwell and Cambridge University Press and should favour such publishers in its policies if only to address its responsibilities of making public research supported by public funds. At the same time, as long as journal revenue is used as a criterion for determining the value of a grant to a journal, journals should be free to choose the organization with whom they publish **provided that reporting criteria can be maintained.**

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Survey Questions and Summary of Quantitative Results**

Please provide the following personal information to help us keep track of your responses.

Name of Respondent

Journal

Email address

What position do you hold at the journal?

40.6% Editor-in-Chief

43.2% Managing Editor

2.6% Both

13.5% Other

#### **Financial status of journals**

There are at least four major factors contributing to increased financial constraints for journals. They are:

- (a) inflation;
- (b) the increasing Canadian dollar, which diminishes the revenues of journals from foreign sources;
- (c) an expected increase in the number of journals applying for support from SSHRC for the 2007 competition, especially if the fund is opened to open access and online journals; and
- (d) the costs of publishing in print and online, as opposed to in print only.

1.1 Are there any other major external factors that affect your journal financially?

1.2 What percentage of diminishing revenues can your journal reasonably meet by increasing subscription fees? (Please explain.)

**SSHRC funding criteria and funding levels**

2.1 SSHRC requires print journals to have at least 200 subscribers to determine basic eligibility for support. Please indicate the extent to which you agree that this is an advisable policy.

- 55.2% strongly agree
- 20.7% somewhat agree
- 10.3% neither agree nor disagree
- 8.3% somewhat disagree
- 5.5% strongly disagree

2.2 What basic eligibility criteria do you think would be appropriate to use in supporting open access journals?

2.3 SSHRC's level of financial support is based on earned and donated income. Please indicate the extent to which you agree that this is an advisable policy.

- 36.4% strongly agree
- 26.6% somewhat agree
- 16.8% neither agree nor disagree
- 12.6% somewhat disagree
- 7.7% strongly disagree

2.4 Please name other criteria that your journal thinks SSHRC should consider.

2.5 SSHRC's annual expenditure for research and transfer journals is \$2.2 million. Based on your operations, by what percent do you think it should be increased?

- 7.4% chose a 0% increase
- 7.4% chose a 5% increase
- 9.6% chose a 10% increase
- 9.6% chose a 15% increase
- 10.4% chose a 20% increase
- 45.9% chose a 25% increase

2.6 Over and above the \$2.2 million, SSHRC is considering plans to expand the journal program to encompass open access and online-only journals. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statement: *Overall funding of the program should be increased by the amount provided to open access and online-only journals.*

60.8% strongly agree  
 10.5% somewhat agree  
 7.7% neither agree nor disagree  
 10.5% somewhat disagree  
 10.5% strongly disagree

2.7 If SSHRC increased journal funding, please rank in order the following alternatives for allocating that increase (1 being the most important and 5 being the least important).

	<i>Mean Rank</i>
An across-the-board increase	2.66
A division of the increase into 50% across-the-board and 50% for online initiatives.	2.34
A division of the increase into 75% across-the-board and 25% for online initiatives.	1.96
A division of the increase into 25% across-the-board and 75% for online initiatives.	3.32
Other (please specify in the box below).	

2.8 If some funds were to be allocated for online initiatives, how would you rate the importance of the following uses being eligible for such funds?

	<i>Mean Score</i>
Training to understand and use online journal publishing software such as OJS	2.74
Back issue digitization	1.50
Journal hosting fees	1.64
Hardware purchase	2.35
Other (please specify)	

2.9 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement:

*My journal would be willing to adopt an article production system that is capable of generating online-compatible files (alongside of print files) that meets international standards for searchability if additional funding were made available to assist in doing so. (OJS and Érudit offer this.)*

- 70.1% strongly agree
- 17.4% somewhat agree
- 7.6% neither agree nor disagree
- 2.1% somewhat disagree
- 2.8% strongly disagree

### **Journal Management**

3.1 Please rate the importance of the following statements as they relate to the role of a journal:

	<i>Mean Score</i>
To create a venue for publication of research results	1.10
To serve as a publication venue for a core constituency of scholars and students	1.90
To ensure the peer reviewed publication of the best research available	1.13
To stimulate research into a particular area of inquiry	1.61
To maximize the dissemination of knowledge within the academy	1.47
To maximize the dissemination of knowledge within within the academy and through public availability	1.57
Other (please specify in the box provided below)	

### **Supporting an Evolving Journal Community**

4.1 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement:

*Online-only journals that are not open access that contain peer-reviewed content are bona fide scholarly journals that contribute to scholarly discourse and therefore should be eligible for SSHRC funding. (Open access means that all content is publicly available on the Internet without fees.)*

- 37.8% strongly agree
- 40.6% somewhat agree
- 5.6% neither agree nor disagree
- 8.4% somewhat disagree
- 7.7% strongly disagree

4.2 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement:  
*Open access online journals that contain peer-reviewed content are bona fide scholarly journals that contribute to scholarly discourse and therefore should be eligible for SSHRC funding.*

- 44.4% strongly agree
- 42.3% somewhat agree
- 6.3% neither agree nor disagree
- 2.8% somewhat disagree
- 4.2% strongly disagree

4.3 Data from 2003 indicate that, on average, SSHRC support accounts for about 35% of journal revenue. Which of the following does your journal believe that SSHRC should provide to open access journals?

- 6.4% chose 100% of support
- 7.9% chose 75% of support
- 1.4% chose 67% of support
- 5.7% chose 50% of support
- 64.3% chose same as for print
- 2.9% chose 33% of support
- 7.1% chose 25% of support
- 4.3% chose 0% of support

4.4 What other sources of support does your journal believe open access journals should be bringing forward as part of their funding? (Please choose all that apply.)

- 73.5% Association support
- 79.4% University support
- 45.2% Private sector funding

4.5 In determining whether support should be given to online-only and open access journals as part of SSHRC's assessment of content and management, please rate the importance of the following variables your journal believes are important to consider?

	<i>Mean Score</i>
Usage (as measured by article hits, machine-generated versus person generated hits, number of distinct users)	1.97
Citation analysis	2.09
Submission rates (both all submissions and those that go to peer review)	2.00
Rejection rates	2.20
Membership in an aggregation of journals (i.e., Érudit, JSTOR)	3.11
Submission sources (i.e., from a wide variety of institutions and a range of academics at various stages of their careers)	1.52
Existing financial support as reported in submitted documents	1.84
Other (please specify in the box provided below)	

4.6 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement:  
*In the interests of maximizing the dissemination of knowledge, a premium added to a basic SSHRC grant should be given to those journals that make their back issues publicly available via online publication without charge to assist in defraying the costs of doing so.*

- 45.1% strongly agree
- 17.6% somewhat agree
- 4.2% neither agree nor disagree
- 6.3% somewhat disagree
- 26.8% strongly disagree

### **Back Issue Digitization**

5.1 Google has shown some interest in financing back issue digitization in exchange for non-exclusive access. Would your journal be interested in participating in a project to have the back issues of your journal digitized free of charge if CALJ/ACRS could work out terms which allowed you to maintain ownership but granted Google non-exclusive unrestricted access? In this proposition, I am:

- 25.0% strongly interested
- 26.5% somewhat interested
- 12.5% neutral
- 3.7% somewhat uninterested
- 32.4% strongly uninterested

**CALJ/ACRS and Communication**

6.1 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: *It would be useful for each journal to be able to name up to three contact names to receive email from CALJ/ACRS (rather than just 1).* (If you agree, please include the contact names in the boxes provided below.)

- 41.8% strongly agree
- 16.4% somewhat agree
- 28.4% neither agree nor disagree
- 6.0% somewhat disagree
- 7.5% strongly disagree

6.2 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: *It would be useful for the same three contact names to be able to participate in the CALJ/ACRS member listserv.*

- 43.8% strongly agree
- 16.2% somewhat agree
- 27.7% neither agree nor disagree
- 4.6% somewhat disagree
- 7.7% strongly disagree

**Copyright**

7.1 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: *It would be useful for CALJ/ACRS to develop guidelines on copyright and commercial usage fees.*

- 34.5% strongly agree
- 23.7% somewhat agree
- 37.4% neither agree nor disagree
- 2.9% somewhat disagree
- 1.4% strongly disagree