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Abstract

Scholarly communication of all types is changing dramatically with the introduction of electronic technologies. This new environment means that stand-alone print publishing risks being left behind, and as many STM journals acquired or launched by commercial publishers have been subject to dramatic price rises in the last few years, there has been much talk of ways to by-pass commercial publishers.

The scholarly publishing market is fertile ground for innovation and there has been a lack of objective research regarding the UK university press. Despite the many changes that have occurred in the scholarly publishing industry in recent years, university presses in the UK that have not been in the forefront of innovation have remained minor players. The research focused on the university press, it's current situation and it's role in the electronic future.

The research included: case studies that were conducted at both UK and USA university presses, along with the corresponding libraries, a questionnaire which was sent to academic authors that had published with both a university press and a commercial publishing house, and both qualitative and quantitative questionnaires sent to all operating UK university press directors.

The thesis argues that university presses (in particular the smaller presses), as not-for-profit organisations, are in a prime position to increase their power in the scholarly publishing system and can make changes to provide valued services to the Higher Education Community.

Findings show that university presses, both in the USA as well as the UK, have faced, and continue to face change. Lack of funding and HEI support continues to make the traditional publishing role of the university presses difficult, and, in many cases, has caused the closure and sale of university presses in the UK. The university press continues to play an important role, and will continue to do so in the near future. However, in order for smaller university presses in the UK to remain sustainable, they must continue to adapt to, and take advantage of, change, recognise the value they add to the scholarly communication system and not rely on others to improve their situation. They cannot remain static in a changing environment.

Through the work with university presses three potential business plans are proposed for a UK organisation of university presses, along with two business models to help the presses adapt to the changing environment and continue to play a role that is required by the HEI.

Based on the results and conclusions of the research, recommendations are made to stakeholders and ideas for further research are identified.

Key Words: University press, scholarly publishing, electronic publishing, Higher Education Institutions, institutional repositories, business models.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1. Background

Academic and scholarly publishing (primarily the publishing of full text new material) is in a state of flux [1]. Access to digital resources of scholarly material has increased significantly in the past few years and affects Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), and both not-for-profit and commercial publishers in a number of ways [2].

Scholarly communication of all types is changing dramatically with the introduction of electronic technologies. The traditional output of scholarly publishing, namely, books/monographs and journals, have all been affected by these technologies [3].

This new environment means that stand-alone print publishing risks being left behind [4]. Currently users, typically represented by librarians, are faced with a number of choices that allow selection from a multitude of sources and can also find substitutes when necessary. In order to stay both current and relevant, publishers, librarians and scholars will need to make great efforts to ensure material is easily accessible.

Scholarly journals in the fields of science, technology and medicine (STM), many acquired or launched by commercial publishers, have been subject to dramatic price rises in the last few years, causing libraries of Higher Education Institutions to struggle with these price rises (and also with slowly increasing budgets), while still needing to cater for larger student populations that have increasing demands and expertise. The tensions caused by this conflict between the price rises
imposed by commercial publishers and the limited budgets of HEI libraries have caused real friction and much talk of ways to by-pass commercial publishers.

New electronic technologies have been viewed as a solution to this so-called scholarly communication crisis, and amongst reactions to this problem have been the exploitation of the Web as a publishing medium, including initiatives such as the development of e-print archives (e.g. ArXiv for physics articles [5]), the growth of electronic journals, the use of personal web pages, and open access and the Open Archives Initiative [6], [7]. New players, such as ebrary [8], Netlibrary [9] and XanEdu [10], have entered the market, with varying success, offering services to Higher Education staff and students in the form of electronic libraries. Other services, such as SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition) [11], have also been initiated to challenge the current pre-eminent role of commercial publishers.

Kohl [12] argued that academia has lost control of scholarly publishing. He described academic publishing as a big business whose market is dominated by commercial publishers, and, as a result, focus has shifted from scholarly communication to the generation of profit. SPARC is not alone in arguing the need to restore scholarly publishing to its primary academic purpose.

Recognising these increasing problems, the Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) [13] initiated a number of projects to tackle the scholarly communication crisis, and the UK House of Commons Science and Technology Committee launched an inquiry in 2004 into the prices and accessibility of scientific journals (see Appendix A).

The scholarly publishing market is fertile ground for innovation [14]. In the current rather heated atmosphere, there has been a lack of objective research regarding the roles and needs of the key stakeholders, i.e., funders, readers, librarians (facing slow-growing budgets while coping with growing numbers in students and their demands), academics as authors (who have a wide variety of reasons and needs to publish), and in the words of Law:
"... moving to an electronic publishing environment... will still require intermediaries who can assist movement along the information chain, leaving them (academic authors) free to concentrate on research and scholarship." [15]

Despite the many changes that have occurred in the scholarly publishing industry in recent years [16], university presses in the UK that have not been in the forefront of innovation have remained minor players. This is in contrast to some of the bigger university presses and libraries in the UK and USA that have adopted a pro-active stance regarding electronic publishing. Examples of such initiatives are Project Muse, launched in 1995 by the Johns Hopkins University Press [16], and the university press and libraries collaboration at Penn State University [17].

With the introduction and increased use of electronic resources in UK Higher Education, the role of the university press is shifting, and the position of university presses needs consideration. As Law argued:

"...revivifying the concept of the university press in an electronic world is attractive." [18]

Kohl and many others have reasoned that publishers fulfil a much needed role in the process of scholarly communication [19]. What needs to be considered is the extent to which university presses in the UK are taking advantage of the evolution of scholarly communication and in the shift from traditional print material of scholarly works to the electronic environment.

University presses are not-for-profit organisations that are linked to Higher Education Institutions. They are characterised by typically investing in long-term scholarly projects. The UK in 2002 had 20 university presses, and in 2004 only seventeen. University presses, as not-for-profit organisations, in theory should be in a prime position to increase their power in the scholarly publishing system and provide valued services to the Higher Education community. However, because of financial difficulties, most university presses need assistance to do so.
The research examines the university press and its potential role in the UK for the delivery of scholarly information to the Higher Education community in the electronic environment, and analyses changes in the university press that have occurred in recent years. While including the larger presses, namely, Oxford and Cambridge University Presses in the study, these are atypical and indeed are seen by many as typical commercial scholarly publishers. Therefore, the research focuses on the small university press. These presses tend to publish in niche subject areas and may have a role for improving the scholarly communication process.

1.2. Aims and Objectives

The aims of the research were to analyse the extent to which university presses in the UK are taking advantage of the evolution in scholarly communication and the shift from traditional print material of scholarly works to the electronic environment, and to discover what role university presses can potentially play in the future.

The objectives of the research were as follows:

- To examine the current state of play of scholarly publishing, focusing particularly on the university press situation in the UK.
- To study the advantages and disadvantages of university presses publishing electronically, including the best practices and lessons learned in electronic publishing, the common problems, and possible solutions.
- To develop one (or more) appropriate business plan(s) for the collaboration of UK university presses.
- To consider the reasons academics publish with university presses, and the value academics gain from publishing with university presses, and,
- To develop and test appropriate business models to aid university presses in the UK in adjusting to the electronic environment, to improve business practice, and assist them in becoming sustainable for the future.
1.3. Hypotheses

The study focuses on the following hypotheses:

1. University presses are in a prime position to increase their power in the scholarly publishing system and could use electronic publishing to do so.

2. University presses need to experiment with and get involved in electronic publishing ventures and ensure these support and help further the mission and goals of the presses.

3. University presses need to collaborate with each other and with their parent Higher Education Institutions in the use of electronic publishing.

Although these hypotheses are not testable by statistical means, to test the broad validity of these statements a number of research questions were addressed:

a. What is the current environment of the university press?

b. What action are the presses taking to adapt to a changing environment?

c. How active are presses in utilising electronic publishing technologies?

d. How do presses view electronic publishing as beneficial?

e. How do presses collaborate with each other and with the parent HEI?

f. What can university presses do to further adapt, survive and improve their role in the current changing situation?

g. What is the future of the small university press?

The research focuses on university presses. An area of potential study was e-learning material, as this material is becoming increasingly important as a method of teaching as well as a source of income. The role of the university press in promoting and selling e-learning material has not been considered here. Instead, the research remained focused on the traditional output of books/monographs and journals. Throughout the thesis, some sections focus on books, and others on journals. It was decided that rather than look at one or other in depth, both would be studied to provide an overall picture of university press publishing.
The following chart shows the structure of the thesis, the order and contents of the chapters, and how each chapter relates to the thesis as a whole. This structure will appear at the beginning of each chapter.
References:


15. Law, ref. 3, p. 72.
18. Law, D, ref. 3, p. 68.
Chapter 2
An Overview of Scholarly Communication and Scholarly Publishing
2.1. Scholarly Communication

The term ‘scholarly’ denotes activities that entail research or investigation in an academic environment, and particularly in Higher Education. ‘Communication’ is to transmit information, and can be achieved in a variety of ways. ‘Scholarly communication’ is, therefore, the transmission of academic debate, research, exchange and investigation, that is, the system by which academic output is created, evaluated and disseminated. Feather and Sturges [1] discussed the formal and informal mechanisms of scholarly communication and defined formal scholarly communication as public and permanent ways of transmitting information, such as, conference papers, journal articles, and monographs/books. Informal scholarly communication is more transient, including face-to-face conversation, telephone exchanges, and social exchanges. However, Graham argued that there are not two, but three stages of scholarly communication – informal, the initial dissemination of research through conferences and pre-prints, and formal publication [2].

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) refers to scholarly communication as the:

"...formal and informal processes by which the research and scholarship of academic staff, researchers, and independent scholars are created, evaluated, edited, formatted, distributed, organised, made accessible, archived, used, and transformed." [3]

In a study [4] addressing the work of the Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) Scholarly Communications Group, scholarship was described as the creation, development, and maintenance of the intellectual infrastructure of disciplines.

Kling and McKim framed scholarly communication as a social process, and stated that effective communication through publication must satisfy three criteria: trustworthiness, publicity, and accessibility [5]. This scholarly communication chain starts with the author and ends with the reader, however there is a variety of
intermediaries; editors, referees, publishers, librarians, subscription agents, electronic archives etc. [6].

In the electronic environment, scholarly communication methods are inevitably different from traditional methods. Formal electronic communication includes electronic conference proceedings, electronic journals, Web pages, electronic books, electronic abstracting and indexing services, and e-print servers, while informal communication can include electronic mail (email), discussion lists, and videoconferencing.

2.2. Scholarly Publishing

Scholarly publishing is one formal aspect of scholarly communication. Scholarly publishing is a means of communicating scholarship [7], and has been defined as the process through which newly discovered knowledge is refined, certified, distributed to and preserved for researchers, professionals, students, and the public [8]. It involves the publishing of all scholarly materials, both commercial and not-for-profit.

Publishing has been defined as the:

"...hard currency of science...the primary yardstick for establishing priority of discovery." [9]

The terms academic, scholarly, and professional publishing all overlap. In this thesis, the term ‘scholarly publishing’ is used.

The main products of scholarly publishing have traditionally been books/monographs and journals. Other publications include theses, conference papers, reports, patents, etc. These, originally produced in print format, have become increasingly available in electronic format.
The electronic journal (e-journal) has been defined as an edited package of articles distributed to subscribers in electronic form and which may or may not be peer-reviewed.

The electronic book (e-book) describes a text available in electronic form [10], and can include reference works, textbooks, and monographs. E-books are delivered via the Web and/or for use on a hand-held device [11]. Other electronic formats such as repositories are becoming common for facilitating scholarly communication. For further discussion regarding electronic publishing, see Chapter Three.

Scholarly communication and publishing are undergoing significant changes as a result of increasing electronic networking. Feather [12] argued that while electronic scholarly communication will handle information in more diverse ways than have previously been feasible and bring greater similarity to communication in different subjects, the impact of the electronic environment still remains unknown. At present, different subject disciplines vary in their use and adoption of electronic technologies for scholarly communication.

2.3. The Scholarly Communication Crisis

The so-called and well-recognised scholarly communication ‘crisis’ includes numerous issues. Over the last two decades, it has been addressed numerous times and in numerous ways [13], [14].

Briefly, the ‘crisis’ involves: an increase in volume of published output (a combination of the increase in research and the assessment mechanisms inherent in Higher Education); price rises of journal subscriptions; decline in monograph sales; commercial publisher mergers and acquisitions of publishing houses and individual titles; reductions of purchases and subscription cancellations resulting from decreases in real terms of budgets; and a relative absence of competition, [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], [21]. The scholarly communication crisis has often been referred to as the serial or journal crisis, as the price rises in journal subscriptions have been said to fuel the problems. A study reporting the results of
specialist opinion regarding current trends in the UK stated that the most significant problem was the increasing cost of journals and the associated problems of sustaining availability [22]. Although this argument is plausible, decreases in budgets have also exacerbated the problems.

While some have argued that for many generations, scholarly publishing was dominated by learned societies and university presses, [23], with commercial publishers entering the market in the mid 20th Century to provide for the increase in output [24], [25], [26], others have stated that science publishing, in particular, began in Germany with commercial publishers [27], [28].

Although commercial publishers may have always provided a publishing service to Higher Education, rapidly rising prices have been attributed to the transference of scholarly journal production from not-for-profit scholarly societies and university presses to commercial publishers [29], with library budgets being able to afford less and less of scholarship [30]. However, this argument is unconvincing, as commercial publishers offered a service that the not-for-profit presses struggled to, filling an important gap in the market. As the number of academic researchers increased, so did the material being published. This created a need for an increase in the number of, and bigger, journals, costing more to produce [31].

This scholarly communication crisis has affected all formal academic published output: monographs, books and journals; these are covered briefly in the following sections.

2.3.1. Monographs

A monograph is a book recording primary research, a lengthy detailed text on a specific academic subject, intended for other researchers and bought, primarily, by academic libraries [32]. Once the primary output and important component of, in particular, humanities disciplines, monograph printing has decreased in recent years. With the increase in cost and the decrease in sales as libraries focused on journals, monographs have faced decline [33], [34].
The ARL has recorded the increase in monograph costs and the decrease in sales in US research libraries since 1986 [35]. Between 1986 and 2001, expenditures on monographs increased 29 percent while the libraries purchased 21 percent fewer titles, and in 1996, university press monograph sales had dropped to an average 800 copies per title [36]. In the UK, this is now believed to be nearer 400 or even 250 copies per title.

2.3.2. Books

Tinerella argued that book (text and general academic works) prices were also rising exponentially, costing 50 percent more than in 1990 [37]. Although book prices fluctuate by discipline, Cummings et al. reported that in general, prices have risen by an annual average of 7.2 percent since 1963 [38].

Statistics from the Library and Information Statistics Unit (LISU) [39], [40], [41], [42], [43], [44], reported trends in British and USA academic books used for and within Higher Education (see Tables 2.1 and 2.2) and provided figures demonstrating the steady increase in numbers of academic books [45] and their prices since 1991:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Titles</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>10,561</td>
<td>12,622</td>
<td>9,218</td>
<td>12,005</td>
<td>12,767</td>
<td>13,473</td>
<td>12,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>22,943</td>
<td>27,872</td>
<td>21,219</td>
<td>23,285</td>
<td>23,431</td>
<td>38,044</td>
<td>40,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Data Taken From [46], [47], [48], [49], [50], [51]. Number of Book Titles in Britain and the USA from 1991 to 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain (£)</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>41.65</td>
<td>38.73</td>
<td>41.51</td>
<td>41.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA ($)</td>
<td>40.62</td>
<td>43.56</td>
<td>52.70</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>55.52</td>
<td>63.39</td>
<td>64.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Average Book Price in Britain and the USA from 1991 to 2003 (see references above).
The number of academic books has increased steadily, with few fluctuations since 1991. As the number of faculty has increased, and the pressure to publish for assessment purposes has also increased, this has naturally led to an increase in faculty output. LISU stated that during the 1990s there were significant price rises, but that in more recent years this has slowed considerably.

Even though, as far back as 1993, the Follett Report recognised the increase in the cost of printed material and commented on the pressure faced by libraries from rapid inflation costs [52]; increases in academic book prices are broadly in line with general inflation rates in the UK, and are:

"...considerably less extreme than increases in periodical prices." [53]

As library budgets are spent on maintaining subscriptions to periodicals, book purchases suffer, affecting university press print runs and sales [54].

2.3.3. Journals

A journal is a collection of articles based on scholarship and published in successive parts [55]. Many organisations, including The Wellcome Trust and The Association of Research Libraries, have produced statistics demonstrating the rise in the number of journals published, the number of journals available online, and the price increase of these journals [56], [57].

The ARL showed that US research library expenditures for journals have increased rapidly. At a rate of nearly 10 percent a year, the unit cost of a serial title was reported in 2001 as having increased by 147 percent [58]. Between 1986 and 2001, ARL libraries spent 124 percent more to purchase 7 percent fewer titles. A leaflet produced by SPARC Europe confirmed this trend:

"Journals purchased by UK academic libraries have gone up in price an average of 11 percent a year since 1992, while the consumer price index in the UK has increased by only 2-7 percent a year." [59]
Unlike books, journal prices have risen faster than general inflation. Beckett in 2002 stated that since 1986, the average journal price had risen by 215 percent [60], while Falk in 2003 argued that printed STM journals had seen a 200 percent increase over the previous decade [61]. Discussing price rises, Case stated that between 1973 and 1987, commercial publisher profits also increased, between 40 percent and 137 percent [62].

Libraries and their institutions have struggled for a number of years to keep up with the increasing volume and cost of scholarly resources:

"Academic libraries in the UK spent 19 percent more per FTE (Full Time Equivalent) student to purchase 18 percent fewer journal titles per FTE student in 1999 – 2000 than in 1999 – 1992." [63]

Many have argued that commercial publishers are the biggest cause of the price rises [64]. Data from Elsevier, a world leader in scientific journal publishing (see section 2.5.), supports such a claim. Elsevier have increased journal costs at a dramatic rate since 1991 [65]. Meek [66] provided the following (though dated) examples of Elsevier titles shown in Table 2.3. No up to date price comparisons could be located, the reason for this could be that the discussion has shifted to the open access debate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>Annual Subscription 1991 (£)</th>
<th>Annual Subscription 2001 (£)</th>
<th>Percentage Increase (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brain Research</td>
<td>3,713</td>
<td>9,148</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Virological Methods</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience Letters</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventative Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: Taken from [67]. Increase in Annual Journal Subscription Cost Between 1991 and 2001.
The high prices charged by some commercial publishers may be due to the size and low circulation of their journals. Tenopir argued that commercial journals tend to publish in highly specialised scientific areas in which the readership is small, and are therefore likely to have small circulation, high unit costs, and correspondingly high prices [68]. Watkinson pointed out that publishers raise prices to achieve a level of profit allowing for investment in new journals and the continuance of existing journals [69].

While it seems scholarly communication has been in crisis for many years, it appears to have worsened in the last decade. Arguments continue against commercial publishers, with the focus on exorbitant price rises and an unbalanced market. The Wellcome Trust published a report into the publishing industry, revealing that a commercial market dominates scientific publishing:

"...intent on improving its market position." [70]

The report stated that commercial publishers dominate the market, even though many of the top journals are published by not-for-profit organisations [71]. In 2002, the UK government initiated an investigation through the Office of Fair Trading into scholarly publishing and concluded that the STM journal market was not working well [72], and further, in 2004, continued concern was expressed for STM publishing with the UK House of Commons Science and Technology Committee conducting an inquiry into the journal market [73] considering potential solutions to the problems. Its report is discussed briefly in Appendix A.

While the problems are associated mainly with STM output, it has been reasonably argued that the same price rises affect humanities disciplines [74].

Many initiatives by the academic community are underway with the aim to improve the situation, these include: commercial journal boycotts, the development of new journals to replace high priced existing ones, and publishing papers on the web (for further details, see Chapter Three). However, journal subscriptions continue to decline slowly. Odlyzko argued that if journal
subscription decline continues at a gradual 3-5 percent per annum, it will take between 14 and 23 years to lose half its circulation [75].

If the main concern is the high price of journals that out-price the library market, but authors continue to submit articles to these journals, and libraries continue to subscribe, allowing other purchases to suffer, the academic community’s desire for cost-effective communication will continue to be difficult to achieve. Stakeholder cooperation and the benefits of electronic technologies allow for many new possibilities, and stakeholders that were once minor players may have greater opportunities to play major roles (see Chapter Three). As Lipscombe wrote:

"The Golden Age of monographs might be over, but the Golden Age of publishing has arrived." [76]

Scholarly publishing has undergone, and continues to undergo, significant change [77]. Arguably, some of the more recent changes have been caused by the introduction of electronic technologies, and many remain hopeful that these technologies may prove a potential solution to the current problems [78], [79]. However, new technologies also bring obstacles and challenges [80].

2.4. The Impact of Electronic Technology

Electronic publishing exists in many forms, such as electronic journals, electronic books, pre-prints, electronic repositories, web pages, etc. The transition to the use of electronic technologies for the publication of scholarly material (e.g., print on demand), and the publication of this material in electronic format (e.g., electronic journals), has offered a number of new opportunities to alleviate what are viewed as the current problems in scholarly communication (see Chapter Three).

Many new initiatives have been introduced with varying success (e.g., SPARC and PLoS), collaboration has been created amongst stakeholders, and libraries have collaborated with consortia deals [81] (see Chapter Three). The majority of initiatives do aim to deal with some of the problems within scholarly
communication. However, electronic technologies are also presenting their own problems (e.g., high set-up costs, time required for transferring systems or incorporating technology changes, and the training of staff). While there are assumptions that electronic technologies hold potential for greater productivity and dissemination amongst the academic community, currently, it is generally the large commercial publishers that have led the way in using electronic technologies [82], offering electronic journals, increasingly in bundles (this ties down the libraries and can squeeze out smaller publishers). Also, Falk argued that price rises are occurring in the electronic journal market just as with print journals [83], and The Wellcome Trust argued that electronic publishing is not challenging the dominating role of commercial publishers [84].

Although electronic technologies and networking have not always had the desired effects [85], new technologies have initiated changes that have helped Higher Education gain some control over the publishing process [86]. There has been a rise in library and faculty boycotts of expensive journals, a shift to electronic only journals, a number of pressure groups has been established, and authors are posting their material on personal web pages or institutional and disciplinary repositories (see Chapter Three).

A shift to electronic products brings many advantages; however, print has served the scholarly community well and many have no desire to abandon it yet [87]. It is, therefore, unlikely that print will be replaced with electronic products in the near future [88].

Some authors [89], [90] convincingly argued that scholarly communication will continue but will adapt appropriately to a changing environment, however, Fisher [91] believed electronic documents must have the same qualities as print material if they are to be successful in a scholarly environment. Roberts [92] added that while the Web increases the number of avenues for enhancing scholarly communication, it does not mean older systems will — or ought — to completely disappear. He commented that while Web access has great potential, it remains a relatively privileged domain. Treloar argued that other technologies will be introduced and surpass current Web capabilities, making a shift easier because of
advanced technologies, or more difficult as foundations from which we are now working become obsolete [93].

2.5. Publishers

Commercial publishers continue to dominate the scholarly publishing world. For example, Reed Elsevier, (the Anglo-Dutch publishing firm employing over 37,000 staff and specialising in science and medicine, law, education, and business), owns 23 percent of the STM market [94] and has been criticised for imposing the largest price rises (see Chapter 2.3.3). However, Elsevier, amongst others, has argued that price rises have been due to the increase in usage [95], improved quality, and size of the journals.

While a number of libraries has recently cancelled Elsevier titles, and collaborated in objection to publishing mergers [96], [97], the results of such action are yet unmeasured [98], [99].

Learned societies and university presses continue to provide valuable services to Higher Education, but have been limited in their response to the current climate, not taking advantage of potential opportunities [100]. Many of the smaller publishers have had to adapt to remain in business. However, as print runs have decreased, unit costs have increased [101], making publishing an ever more difficult business. While some university presses and learned societies continue to fulfil the required role of peer-review in an academic environment (see Chapter Four), it has been argued that they are not aggressive enough to take on commercial publishers [102].

The Wellcome Trust report stated that commercial publishers continue to dominate the market because price has previously been an unimportant factor for the research community (see Chapter Five), with some authors remaining unaware and unconcerned about the state of academic publishing [103]. However, news of initiatives has spread and faculty involvement in initiatives has increased.
Although electronic technologies increase the chances for anyone to be a publisher, few believe that traditional publishers should be completely eliminated from electronic publishing. Scholars, publishers, research librarians and learned societies are all components in this single system and depend on each other [76]. Peek argued that the publisher:

“...not only legitimises a scholar’s work but adds value by enhancing quality.”

[104]

Law noted:

“In moving to an electronic publishing environment, academic authors will still require intermediaries who can assist movement along the information chain, leaving them free to concentrate on research and scholarship.” [105]

Tenopir and King agreed:

“The advantages and commitment that formal publishing brings are historical and far-reaching. They touch all parts of the publishing process...the formality and regularity of the process brings legitimacy and constancy to scholarly journals.”

[106]

2.6. Co-operation

The traditional roles of stakeholders in the scholarly communication system are being eroded and none of these stakeholders can function alone. All require input from each other and face pressure in the current environment [107]. They must therefore work together for an improved system. Many have argued that if the scholarly communication crisis is to be challenged or solved, co-operation is necessary between Higher Education Institutions, scholars and publishers, [108], [109]. Olivieri stated that:

“...resistance on any side leads to stalemate and failure.” [110]
It is in all parties’ interests to work together to ensure all stakeholders benefit from changes, and for any system to be successful.

“We are all confronting business decisions that will profoundly change the face of the industry... (it is) imperative that we maintain strong links with each other... in order to take scholarly publishing to the next level.” [111]

More than ever before publishers, librarians, Higher Education Institution administrators and authors are working together and it is argued that this cooperation will, to some extent, determine the future of the stakeholders in the system [112]. Indeed, by working together, the academic community will be able to create more effective change.

While many initiatives have been implemented to date with varying success:

“...with initiatives... showing no signs of relaxing and libraries sensing an historical opportunity to gain greater influence and recognition, a revolution cannot be discounted.” [113]

The numerous reactions to the crisis, co-operative initiatives, and the development of electronic publishing are discussed further in Chapter Three.
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Chapter 3
Literature Review: Electronic Publishing and Open Access Initiatives
3.1. **Introduction**
This chapter gives a brief overview of electronic publishing, provides a definition for the thesis, discusses the effect of, and use of, electronic publishing in academe, and takes a look at the changes electronic publishing has brought to scholarly communication and publishing, in particular the e-book, and electronic journals. The main body of the chapter focuses on the open access and Open Archives Initiatives.

3.2. **Electronic Publishing**
There are many definitions of electronic publishing, as the type of activity and format vary according to use and situation. Electronic publishing is defined in The Concise Oxford Dictionary as:

"The issuing of text in machine readable form rather than on paper." [1]

Card and Feldman offer further insight in their definition:

"Either the application of modern technology to print production processes (e.g., desktop publishing) or, the development of information products which are themselves electronic." [2]

The latter definition includes both the use of electronic technologies to improve traditional publishing practices, as well as producing material in electronic form. The thesis has adopted this definition, and is more specifically described by Romans:

"The integrated production of documents on demand, using digitally stored documents, computerized composition and electronic printing systems. The providing of information in electronic form to readers or subscribers of the service. A generic term for the distribution of information that is stored, transmitted and reproduced electronically." [3]
Electronic publishing refers not only to text, but can include a variety of media and formats, and indeed certain material and publications used in academe may be more effectively published in an electronic environment than in print [4]. There are many forms of electronic scholarly publications (see Chapter Two) [5].

As a working definition for this thesis, and in order to ensure the respondents understood what was being discussed, throughout the research and thesis electronic publishing refers to: the production and/or distribution of material in and through electronic formats, primarily via the Web.

3.3. Electronic Publishing in Academe

An historical turning point occurred in the early 1990s with the introduction of the Internet. The Internet is a publicly accessible international computer network that links thousands of individual networks together [6], and the World Wide Web (WWW) is a collection of text and multimedia documents, files, and other network services linked on the Internet to allow for the retrieval of information by intuitive searches.

"The Web represents the application of hypertext technology and a graphical interface to the Internet to retrieve information that is contained in specially formatted documents that may reside in the same computer or be distributed across many computers around the world." [7]

This new technology seems to offer limitless opportunities, and continues to change the way scholars communicate, both formally and informally [8], [9]. The new culture created by such technologies included a 'free' information expectation (as costs remained invisible to users), and a change in perception regarding the identification, retrieval, and assimilation of information [10] (for further detail see Chapter Two).

The trusted print system of scholarly publishing evolved slowly over centuries and resulted in accepted and understood mechanisms for ensuring quality control. With the introduction of the Internet, electronic scholarly publishing became
possible, and rather than focusing primarily on the main products of scholarly publishing, namely, journals and books/monographs, network-based publishing and multi-media created new possibilities:

"Perhaps at no other time in the history of Higher Education has the academic community been faced with an issue that so fundamentally tugs at the historical roots of how academia has gone about its individual and collective business... The nature of social discourse and organisational structure may be significantly altered as publishing moves from a print-based paradigm to an electronic one." [11]

As discussed in Chapter Two, this new environment allowed for the creation of different rules and opportunities, exposed many of the limitations of the print system [12], and introduced new features not possible in a print world [13], [14]. Rush [15] argued that electronic publishing has the potential to foster a more equitable relationship among people by offering an exceptional opportunity to expand the range of scholarly communication, improve the ability to locate relevant research, and dramatically improve communication and scientific progress [16]. New technologies do not just provide other means of communication, but also change the way that people speak and interact, and the way scholarly information is used and accessed [17], [18], [19].

Peek [20] argued that the information revolution is the key to changing the current system and had the Web not emerged, alternative forms of scholarship would not have found expression. Quite rightly, Bennett argued that scholarly publishing, as we now know it:

"...with its long history and sense of tradition is fast becoming unrecognisable." [21]

However, while the traditional system is undergoing change, it continues to operate, and challenges as well as new opportunities have presented themselves [22], including the pressure to keep up to date with the rapidly changing technologies and markets [23].
Since the early 1990s, many new models and initiatives to combat the 'crisis' in scholarly communication have been introduced. Each of the developments has been influenced by similar factors: the rising costs of journal subscriptions; the effect of these rises on acquisitions; budget declines in real terms faced by libraries; and the lengthy time it takes for research papers and articles to appear published, and therefore available, to academics and other researchers [24]. The academic community itself, recognising these problems, has initiated changes, many of which are based on exploiting new technology [25].

The wide availability of, and seemingly free access to the Internet has provided opportunity for, and fuelled changes in, primarily, journal publishing, in the hope that new models and initiatives will improve the current situation. Many have expressed concern that the existing business models used by journal publishers in particular are increasingly inflexible and expensive, and fail to meet the needs of users [26]. Many of the changes and ideas are not new [27], [28], but have gained momentum in the last couple of years due to decreasing costs of, and the increasing availability of technology.

Such initiatives can be grouped under a number of headings: new online publishers, (such as HighWire Press [29] and BioMed Central [30]); pressure groups and the creation of competition (such as the Public Library of Science [31] and SPARC: the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition [32]); institutional repositories and e-print archives (such as ArXiv [33], E-Lis [34], and Dspace [35]); and the creation of new community models (such as CIAO [36], Columbia Earthscape [37], and MIT CogNet [38]). Print on demand, another initiative, utilises electronic capabilities and is increasingly used for print products. Print on Demand is discussed in detail in Chapter Twelve.

Some authors argued the great potential of electronic technologies for offering new services [39], while others went a step further, viewing electronic technologies as a potential solution to the crisis within the scholarly communication system (see Chapter Two), [40], [41], [42], and increasing the
number of options and opportunities for scholars to disseminate their material [43]. As Rowland stated:

"The facilities of the Web provide a mechanism for academics to regain control over their own communication system from the commercial publishers." [44]

While the majority of the debate has been concerned with electronic journals (e-journals), and open access, and the possibility of these for solving the current serials crisis, electronic books (e-books), while not generally viewed as a solution to the crisis, are increasing in availability. There are also many digital publishing projects based at HEI libraries which have taken advantage of new technologies and have initiated experimental solutions [45]. For example, Highwire Press at Stanford University [46], Project Muse at Johns Hopkins University Library and Press [47], [48], and the Internet Library of Early Journals at Oxford, Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds University Libraries [49], all use different models, funding, and approaches, but are all ways the scholarly community is taking action [50]. Libraries have also begun to boycott those large commercial publishers that charge increasingly high prices for journals [51], [52].

Figure 3.1 shows a map of some of the initiatives taken to improve the scholarly communication crisis made possible by electronic technologies. These are grouped under the primary output of scholarly publishing: books and journals.
At present, both traditional print and new electronic products operate and exist simultaneously, most leading peer-reviewed journals are now available online, and libraries have taken advantage of consortia and bundle deals to access more material than they had subscribed to in print. However, in many cases, these deals are priced by the publisher at a rate above what the library (or consortia) currently spends with that publisher, and the rate of increase in cost to libraries for electronic access continues to be greater than the increase in library budgets [53].

However, many of the changes have not yet had the desired effect, and the 'crisis' remains:

"Journals still fail to arrive, prices continue to increase over the rate of inflation each year and the budget that research organisations have to spend on journals fails to keep pace with those price increases." [54]

The influence of electronic technologies on the scholarly communication and publishing system has been discussed in great detail and at great length. The Scholarly Electronic Publishing Bibliography documents a comprehensive overview of references to selected English-language articles, books, and other printed and electronic sources for understanding scholarly electronic publishing efforts on the Internet [55].

3.4.  

Electronic Books

An electronic book (e-book) consists of the text of a book in digital format made available to read on a desktop or a designated e-book reading device (reader). E-books have been available for many years, but have had limited success, as readers and e-book companies have come and gone, and sales have fluctuated. In academe, e-books have seen some success, but mainly through the library market as HEI libraries have experimented with e-books.
There have been, and continue to be, many overviews of e-books, e-book technology, and e-book use [56], [57], [58]. Indeed, Lynch [59] stated that there are more papers written about e-books than there are e-books available!

E-books are convenient, and offer enhanced features, such as annotation, searching, and dictionaries; they do not wear out, won’t need to be replaced, and eventually may offer additional savings with the reduction of processing costs [60]. E-books are portable and provide instant access [61]. However, additional short-term costs may be accrued, and there is also a perceived lack of flexibility and tailoring to individual needs. The expense of technology, inadequate screen resolutions, and the lack of availability of titles in the right format may also restrict use [62]. The technology is, however, improving, as screens now weigh less and are much thinner, giving the appearance of print books. There are still many variations between e-book readers in both hardware and software, many readers have come and gone [63], and many failed technologies and experiments have been reported [64].

There has been, however, a number of initiatives amongst Higher Education libraries to test the e-book market in an academic environment [65]. Ventures such as Netlibrary (OCLC acquired Netlibrary after bankruptcy was declared, [66]), Questia (which provided e-books in the humanities and social sciences and offered a large library, but found it difficult to attract customers to become profitable [67]), and Ebrary, all provided services offering e-books to libraries, much the same as print books are offered, and experienced varying success. Several commercial publishers and university presses (including Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, and Edinburgh University Press [68]) have worked with Netlibrary and other e-book services. In particular, the Chicago Digital Distribution Center (CDDC) has established ‘BiblioVault’, a scholar’s portal and short-run digital printing system, for 5,000 university press e-books from 22 scholarly publishers [69].

Studies of e-books in Higher Education report both positive and negative experiences. A study conducted at Columbia University between 1995 and 1999 found that users preferred to print longer sections of text, or read an existing
printed version rather than read on screen, and general use of an e-book was to skim rather than read the text [70]. Dillon reported a study at the University of Texas at Austen that found shorter texts to be more acceptable [71]; and a joint project between Cranfield University and Butterworth-Heinemann reported that students preferred the convenience and ease of use of traditional printed text, but valued the e-book as a reference tool to be consulted when required [72]. Nelson and O’Neill also reported that users preferred a large collection of e-books and tended to print out sections to read [73].

Other studies reported high usage and enthusiasm toward e-books. The California State University conducted a study on the use of Netlibrary e-books in its libraries. The study included a mix of subject material available in e-book format and reported title usage by 94 percent of respondents. However, the majority of books used were manuals in the computing science discipline, supporting the idea that use of reference works in e-book format was likely to be successful. The self-selecting user survey reported that 62 percent of respondents would rather use print, but that 62 percent would use e-books again [74].

A UK study at the University of Surrey concerned with desktop e-book readers tested the use of engineering reference books for post-graduate distance learning courses of books on reading lists. The study reported that the students were keen to use more, but that further promotion and training were necessary [75]. This study, however, only tested e-books that were likely to have high usage, and a small population sample that was well suited to the use of e-books. Therefore, while e-books may be useful for reference material and certain subjects, they may be inappropriate for other academic disciplines.

Other studies demonstrated that the technology used for e-books was a hindrance to student use. A study at Bell University during 2002 tested the learning and usability of e-books, however, the sample size was small with only 91 respondents participating. The study reported that students were dissatisfied with e-books due to the poor representation of the text, stating they preferred to use a print textbook [76]; and McKnight and Dearnley reported two pilot studies conducted in 2000, which evaluated the Rocket e-book reader and the Glassbook reader, reporting
that while students showed interest in both formats, there were concerns with usability [77].

Changes continue to occur in the e-book industry. At the beginning of 2004, it was announced that six leading STM publishers were participating in an e-books library service [78], and a new e-book reader was announced early 2004 that resembled a print book, and operated using four AAA batteries [79]. Although some believe the print book to be lasting and durable [80], and there has been no rapid adoption of e-books or a change in reading habits [81], improvements in technology may mean e-books still have a future [82]. While there are many providers of e-books, a study conducted by the Primary Research Group found Netlibrary and e-books in the public domain the most popular for use in libraries [83].

The results of these studies demonstrate that certain types of material may be more suitable for electronic format, such as reference works and user manuals, with longer texts preferred in print. However, many of the sample sizes were small and therefore some of the results are unreliable. Armstrong and Lonsdale [84] argued that traditional print on paper format favours longer works, while electronic media are 'disposed to chunks of content'.

Currently, sales and usage remain slow in an unstable market. Aggregations rather than single books have proved more useful, and people tend to use e-books through libraries rather than individual purchases, indicating that paying by subscription is a more successful method than transactional payment [85]. This also demonstrates the necessary role of intermediaries such as the library, rather than the targeting of individual users.

While industry forecasts continue to predict an increase in e-book use and sales, and many publishers are involved in, or experimenting with, e-book production and delivery, it is interesting to note that a majority of publishers is considering online delivery rather than delivery via hand-held readers [86]. Lugg and Fischer state that:
"At present both opportunities and risks are modest – a good time to experiment.”

[87]

There is clearly potential in some niche markets, especially reference works in Higher Education. The Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) established an e-Books Working Group. This group has been working on ensuring that the Higher and Further Education communities are able to select from an e-book collection that meets their needs, along with flexibility with economic models [88].

Subba Rao stated in 2003 that e-books are rapidly becoming a “viable alternative” and it is clear they have many advantages over the traditional print medium [89]. However, e-books have been “long promised and slow to deliver” [90] and Phillips argued that e-book sales are not even modest [91]. Chen argued that if e-books are to become accepted, a revolutionary change is still required [92] and Esposito stated:

"The electronic book... has arrived, but it has not come very far.” [93]

It seems that what is important is the book as artefact. Paper has proved its popularity¹ [94], and the argument that is more likely is that e-books will be a supplement to print rather than a substitute [95], and will in no major way challenge the current scholarly publishing system.

3.5. Electronic Journals

Electronic only journals that have no paper equivalent are increasing in number. The growth of this medium and the acceptance of e-journals are reflected by the rise in number and use, and in the increasing percentage of peer-reviewed electronic publications [96]. True to form, Okerson and O'Donnell expected electronic dominance to occur for journals long before it would for books [97], and Odlyzko estimated the usage of electronic forms of scholarly information to

be growing at 50-100 percent each year. While this appears to be the case, he stated in 2002, however:

"Print usage has shown little change." [98]

While Graham [99] argued that nearly all journal publications used by UK scholars are now produced in an electronic format, electronic journals generally derive their stature and impact from their print versions [100] and many remain as parallel editions to the print version. However, in many cases, an electronic version will contain multi-media, more content, and may also be published earlier than a print edition [101], [102].

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory [103], [104] recorded information on over 27,000 serials, either exclusive online serials, or in addition to a print copy. LISU quoted Ulrich’s Figures in the growth of online serials as 3,838 in 1993, 5,517 in 1996, and 27,083 in 2002 [105]. However, the majority of publishers still publish a print edition, and while many thought electronic versions would be cheaper, library costs have risen as many continue to subscribe to both the print and electronic versions [106]. However, Halliday and Oppenheim stated that initiatives such as SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition) have demonstrated that cost and price are not closely related and prices could be much lower [107].

Electronic-only journals have become widely accepted and used [108]. They are reported as being the first port of call for many, legitimate publications for the next generation of scholars [109], [110], [111], and even provide great improvements to scholarly communication [112]. Electronic journals increase access and availability [113], with correlation reported between the number of times an article is cited and its availability online [114].

However, a number of electronic only journals reported difficulty in receiving submissions, with the main reason a perception, probably incorrect, that Higher Education assessment criteria do not include electronic submissions [115] (see Chapter Five). Successful e-journals such as The Journal of High Energy Physics
and *New Journal of Physics* reported authors making good use of the added functionality provided, and new open access journals have also proved successful (see Chapter 3.8.).

In 2002, Tenopir [116] predicted that the trend of parallel publishing would continue, with e-only journals continuing to be new and/or small circulation journals. However, new e-only journals are proving to be widely used and accepted (see Chapter 3.8.).

While electronic technologies have already brought benefits to the scholarly community [117], the cost, pricing [118], [119], technical infrastructure required, and ever increasing volume of material are all issues that need addressing. There continues to be an:

"...unpredictable character of scholarly publishing as a whole." [120]

While the potential for change is large, the current traditions and inertia of the system causes change to be slow, with many electronic publications currently operating as they did in print and much of the information accessed electronically being outside the 'formal' scholarly publication process. Many of the initiatives and experiments seem to be occurring through trial and error, and Halliday and Oppenheim stated that although the crisis was the impetus for the implementation of digital technology and electronic publishing, it has done little to relieve the problems [121]. More recent initiatives, such as open access and the Open Archives Initiative (see below) have created some change.

### 3.6 The Open Archives Initiative

Harnad discussed the transition to open access (free access of research material and papers to the end-user [122]) beginning spontaneously as researchers posted papers on home pages. This, however, was not ideal, as locating the papers using a search engine proved difficult [123]. The Open Archives Initiative (OAI), launched in 1999 [124], created:
"... A convention for tagging the critical metadata identifying papers as research articles... so that all papers that were compliant with the OAI convention would become 'interoperable', meaning that they could be harvested, searched and retrieved as if they were all in one virtual archive.” [125]

The Open Archives Initiative aimed to develop and promote standards for interoperability for the effective and efficient dissemination of material [126]. Free software to create OAI-compliant university eprint archives (also known as institutional repositories) [127] was then developed, enabling authors to deposit their articles. OAI - PMH (the OAI Protocol for Metadata Harvesting) is the harvesting protocol for metadata used as a basis for more than 140 sites and various related software developments [128].

The software allows authors to deposit articles before (pre-print) and/or following (post-print) refereeing and acceptance by a journal. The articles can be electronically deposited in e-print archives (some of which are discipline-based) or institutional repositories (based at the author's institution, and attempting to include all intellectual output of an institution). These articles are then 'harvested' into a global virtual archive, making the full content accessible and searchable online for free.

Harnad stresses that there are two routes to open access; the submission of an article to an open access journal (see Chapter 3.8), or posting the article in a repository and continuing to submit it to a toll-access journal. The latter, though once thought to destroy the dominant role of commercial publishers [129], does not affect research assessment or possibilities for promotion and tenure [130] and requires no sacrifice from either the authors or the journals, as the traditional system continues to operate. Open access journals can offer peer-review (while many do, it is not obligatory), and make the articles free at the point of use. These journals are described more fully in Chapter 3.8.

To help organisations and institutions in selecting an appropriate software system for open access archives/repositories, the Open Society Institute (funded by the Soros Foundation, a group of autonomous foundations and organizations in more
than 50 countries) launched a second edition of a guide to assist such organisations in January 2004 [131]. McKiernan has presented details of OAI service providers, detailing the repositories [132], [133]. One example of open archives software is the Eprints software, created so that institutions can build OAI-compliant archives quickly, easily and for free [134] and ensuring all archives can be searched seamlessly.

Repositories are emerging worldwide in a variety of forms. Examples include the University of California eScholarship Repository [135], and the SHERPA (Securing a Hybrid Environment for Research Preservation and Access) project [136]. This JISC-funded project is part of the series of FAIR projects [137], [138], and aims to create 13 UK institutional open access e-print repositories that comply with the OAI-PMH using the eprints.org software [139]. At the beginning of 2004, nine institutions had enlisted as partners with SHERPA [140], and six institutional repositories had been set up at HEI libraries [141].

A number of sites list the operating archives/repositories, but none agree on Figures. The Eprints UK project site listed 18 UK repositories at the beginning of 2004 [142], McKiernan [143] listed 22 as of September 2003, six of which were based at institutions that have a university press. The Institutional Archives Registry listed details of 143 repositories at the beginning of 2004, with 26 in the UK [144], and at the same time, the OAIIster site listed 247 institutional archives worldwide [145]. A more recent report listed 108 institutional or departmental archives worldwide [146].

The Open Archives Initiative has proved to be a valuable vehicle to promote open access. While OAI and open access are different entities, they work together for the same aim: free access to research literature.

Although institutions have never been able to afford access to all the refereed literature, the ability of institutions today to make the literature available is declining further. Harnad has stated that the solution would be for all the refereed literature to be made freely available online, making it accessible to all those with access to reliable information communications technology [147]. Harnad [148]
has argued the existence of the 'Faustian bargain', which refers to the traditional system favouring the journal publisher whose profits can only be made by restricting access to those who pay for it (however, see Chapter 2.3.3). He has argued that all other initiatives are "too little, too late", and the scholarly communities can initiate this change themselves without needing to wait for the current system to change [149]. However, while the academic community can implement some changes, it is unlikely that the traditional established system of scholarly publishing will change dramatically overnight.

3.7. Open Access through Archiving - Institutional and Disciplinary Repositories

Institutional repositories are digital archives of material created by an institution's faculty utilising Open Archives Initiative compliant software (e.g., Dspace). Preprints refer to articles posted before they are submitted to a journal, and e-prints refer to articles that are posted on such repositories following journal submission. The first repositories were set up in research centres and were subject based, but now many institutions are establishing their own repositories [150] as a strategy for accelerating change [151]. The functions of an institutional repository are to increase the impact of an author's work, to preserve the intellectual output of an institution/subject, increase the visibility of the institution and therefore its prestige, and ultimately to reform scholarly communication and publishing [152].

Institutional repositories are often operated by an institution's library supported by institutional funding, and there is a variety of both open source and commercial software platforms that are available for setting up and implementing institutional repositories [153]. The two leading software packages are Dspace and Eprints (both are free and are working towards collaboration [154]). Others include CDSware, bepress, Fedors, OPUS, i-Tor, Ebrary, Ingenta etc. [155]. Nixon [156] compared the platforms and commented that the type of software used is not as important as which software is most appropriate for the institution. The Budapest Open Access Initiative has released a guide to help institutions in selecting appropriate software [157].
Figure 3.2 shows the growth of all research-institutional archives [158].
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Figure 3.2: The Growth of all Research-Institutional Archives.

A number of institutional repository projects and services have been implemented. Among these are DSpace, JISC FAIR projects (ePrints UK, SHERPA, DAEDALUS etc.), eScholarship, CARL (Canadian Association of Research Libraries) Institutional Repositories Pilot Project, Ohio State University Knowledge Bank [159], and DARE, a project to have all Dutch university libraries implement institutional repositories [160].

The Dspace software platform and service was developed in November 2002 as one institution’s reaction to the crisis in scholarly communication [161]. A joint venture between MIT libraries and the Hewlett-Packard Company, with a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Dspace software and repository was developed for MIT to:
"... Manage, host, preserve, and enable distribution of the scholarly output of MIT’s faculty." [162]

The Dspace repository collects unpublished works in all disciplines from MIT faculty and staff and makes it available free of charge over the World Wide Web. The works can be subsequently submitted for peer-review and published in a traditional journal [163]. Other institutions can implement the Dspace system to create their own repositories for their own specific needs.

EScholarship is an institutional repository also established in reaction to rising costs of scholarly journals. Based at the University of California Digital Library, the repository [164], [165], [166]:

"...provides university departments, centers and research units direct control over creation and dissemination of the full range of scholarly output, from pre-publication materials through journals and peer-reviewed series." [167]

In just under two years, the repository has seen almost 500,000 downloads of entire papers or articles [168], and has more recently added peer-reviewed journals In collaboration with the library, the University of California Press has provided 1,500 monographs for use on eScholarship [169].

Disciplinary repositories such as E-Lis and ArXiv.org are digital repositories also utilising OAI software. They collect material on a specific subject. E-Lis is an electronic open access archive for depositing published or unpublished material in librarianship, information science and technology with the goal to promote communication in the field by the rapid dissemination of papers. However, at the start of 2004, E-Lis contained only 437 articles, owing to poor marketing [170].

ArXiv.org began as an e-print archive for high-energy physics in 1991 and has since expanded to include other cognate fields. Now hosted at Cornell University [171], it is probably the best-known electronic archive and distribution server for preprints [172]. Papers are submitted to the archive in electronic form, and made
available on a server in advance of, as well as post, refereeing. This system currently enables users to submit and obtain information free of charge and is delivered directly to the desktop. However, while the system is price-free, it is not cost-free. ArXiv has operated with a substantial amount of annual funding and Kling et al pointed out that total set-up and development costs have been millions of dollars [173]. Graham [174] believed that ArXiv had not ‘killed off’ any physics journals or led to a decrease in the prices of these journals, and Ware has noted that the success of ArXiv has not been repeated in other subject disciplines [175]. Odlyzko further added:

“.... Pre-prints in most areas are still a small fraction of what gets published.” [176]

However, ArXiv remains the primary means of communication for physicists with tens of thousands connecting every day [177]. This rapid dissemination of material to the physics community has increased access, and been of benefit to many researchers.

PubMed Central is another open access initiative. Operated by the US National Library of Medicine, this digital archive of life science journal literature was launched in 2000. It provided free full text articles and became OAI compliant in October 2003. In this case, all of the posted material is reviewed before being placed in the archive [178]. While PubMed Central is a widely used repository, some have argued that the subject area of medicine, is the reason for its success [179]. This could be because of the need to access new information and research results quickly and easily.

While institutional repositories in principle provide many advantages (e.g., there is evidence that material in an e-print repository receives more citations than similar material submitted in a subscription journal [180],) deposits remain low with an average of only 290 records per institution and some argue that they are inappropriate for some disciplines [181]. Even though institutional repositories have shown little evidence of leading a dramatic reform in scholarly communication to date, the majority of institutions already have, or are
considering, implementing such a repository and funding bodies are offering financial support [182].

The costs for developing, operating and maintaining an online repository/archive are not small and are discussed further in Chapter Twelve. The infrastructure for repositories/archives must be established and HEIs must have archiving policies in place. Currently the biggest obstacle to the success of institutional repositories seems to be adoption by faculty [183], [184]. Institutional repositories are therefore still under development [185]. While the UK has only a small number of established institutional repositories along with a series of linked projects, internationally, Australia, one of the leading countries in respect to institutional repositories, has institutional archives at all major research universities [186], and learned societies are also creating repositories [187]. Institutional Repositories are discussed further in Chapter 11.6.

3.8. Open Access Journals

Open access journals are traditional journals, mainly electronic, but sometimes hybrid (both print and electronic), that are free to the end-user. Velterop gave three criteria for a journal to be open access: free accessibility to all articles, the depositing of all articles in an archive/repository, and copyright granted for the right to copy or disseminate [188]. However, this is not strictly correct as some open access journals offer only a proportion of free articles (see Chapter 3.11.).

While many journal publishers currently offer delayed free access, making issues of journals free after six months or a year, this can still, however, in fast moving topics, cause material to be out of date when the majority gain access.

The Directory of Open Access Journals [189] listed 1130 open-access journals in June 2004, containing 49,400 articles. While currently the majority of open access journals seem to be in the science disciplines, new humanities open access journals have also been established [190]. While self-archiving into an open access repository can be done at no cost to the academic (except maybe time), open access journals continue to require the publishing processes (the
management of peer review, providing editorial oversight, and ensuring the highest production standards), In order to cover these costs, many open access journal publishers have adopted the author-pays model. Rowland has argued:

"... Since publication largely benefits the author... it is logical that the author should pay." [191]

One example of an open access journal charging author fees is the *Florida Entomologist* [192], which made all articles freely accessible on the Internet [193]. The Entomological Society of America (ESA) reported that due to declining revenue from library subscriptions, an Immediate Free Web Access (IFWA) fee to be paid by authors was imposed ($100 for articles and $50 for scientific notes). During the first two months of the new service, 13 percent of articles were being paid for by authors, with this figure rapidly rising to 59 percent [194]. Walker reasoned that this system is successful because of an authors' need for attention and recognition [195]. In 2002, the journal was made freely accessible on BioOne with the IFWA fees covering all costs.

The Public Library of Science also introduced author fees for its new open access journals. With a $9 million grant from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation and in-kind support from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, PLoS launched a not-for-profit scientific publishing venture which supported open access and aimed to make the world's scientific and medical literature freely accessible to scientists and to the public [196]. The organisation called for authors to boycott publishers of scientific journals that refused to make papers freely available on the Web after six months, and an open letter has been signed by nearly 34,000 scholars and students from 180 countries. However, because of limited response from publishers, PLoS developed its own open access journals: *PLoS Biology* and *PLoS Medicine*. These journals retain rigorous peer review and high editorial and production standards and are made available in print as well as online, with the authors retaining copyright [197].

PLoS has adopted the model whereby expenses will be recovered by imposing a modest charge to authors. Author submissions were charged at $1,500; however,
at the beginning of 2004, PLoS also announced institutional membership fees whereby institutions could pay an annual fee and in return their researchers received a discount on the publication fee [198].

After *PLoS Biology* was made available online, the web site received over 500,000 hits in the first 8 hours and reported high refereeing standards, publishing only 22 percent of papers that were submitted to it [199]. PLoS has also been joined by an alliance with SPARC (see Chapter 3.12.) with the aim to broaden support for open access publishing [200].

BioMed Central is an independent online commercial publishing house providing immediate free access to peer-reviewed biomedical research. BioMed Central reported over 200,000 users and offered more than 100 online open access research journals in 2004. In January 2002, BioMed Central also started charging processing fees to cover the cost of free online access. Authors were charged $500 to submit a paper; however, institutions can also pay a membership fee (demonstrating a commitment to submit papers), whereby all members can publish papers for free. With the charging of author fees and institutional memberships, as well as web site advertisement, running costs have been shifted to the individuals and institutions that use it for publishing [201]. More recently, BioMed Central introduced a new model whereby an institution’s renewal fee is based on the number of articles published by that institution in the previous year multiplied by the article processing charge. This ensured, argued BioMed Central, that those institutions publishing few articles do not subsidise those publishing more [202].

The author fee model to cover the costs of open access journals has been recognised as a potentially viable model. Support from key groups such as the National Institutes of Health, the Howard Hughes Medical Institution and a number of academic institutions [203] gave it further credibility with the aim to improve the chance of success. JISC has also signed an agreement with BioMed Central so that article-processing charges are:
".... waived for all UK Higher Education staff when publishing in any of BioMed Central’s 90+ peer-reviewed journals." [204]

The Wellcome Foundation has also expressed willingness to cover open access fees when awarding grants, and several UK research councils are considering whether to follow suit (see also Appendix A for the results of the House of Commons Inquiry). However, this approach favours only those who receive external funding for research, i.e., primarily the physical and social sciences. While open access reduces the problems for less wealthy organisations in the access of research and increase in impact, it does require a telecommunications infrastructure, and funding, implying that researchers in less developed countries will be less able to submit articles because there are no organised systems of institutional support. Open access may therefore be limited to rich researchers or those that have institutional or research funding [205].

To tackle this problem, Bioline International has developed an open access OAI-compliant e-prints repository for bioscience especially from developing countries [206], PLoS and BioMed central offer waivers to developing countries to ease such a burden [207], and many major private and public funders and research agencies have committed to providing funds to cover the costs of open access publication for less-developed countries. The Wellcome Trust has estimated such costs to be minimal [208]. As libraries save money from journal subscriptions, these funds could cover the costs of article submissions. However, libraries may be under pressure to subscribe to further journals if others are cancelled, and as open access journals appear and co-exist alongside subscription-based journals some are concerned about the need to continue to pay for traditional journals as well as author fees.

A number of established journals and publishers are also moving to, or experimenting with, the open access model, including University Presses (see Chapter 3.11.). Some offer the author a choice: to pay an author fee and have their material available through open access, or not pay and have their paper remaining behind a subscription [209].
While author fees have been argued as having potential to restore competition in scholarly publishing [210], and as journals compete for authors and offer incentives such as quicker peer-review, a high impact factor, lower fees, or prestige, Dryburgh argued that if the author fees model is to become commercially attractive, open access publishers need to differentiate themselves and therefore offer higher quality services, enabling them to command higher fees. He also postulated that the increase in freely available material would:

"...increase the attrition rate of the print subscription." [211]

An author charging model can be flexible, with a fee required for submission or for acceptance following peer-review, and to date, a number of open access journals have seen success [212]. Such flexibility however, means income cannot be predicted as it could with the traditional subscription model, making the publishing process difficult, and even jeopardising the publishing business [213], [214]. Odlyzko stated that there will be no capital to invest in new journals or to cater for long-term needs such as preservation [215]. Indeed, one large commercial publisher believes that the author-pays model will not be successful, and while the Internet allows the publishers to serve the industry better, open access is restricting and may lead to the publishing of lower quality research [216]. 48 not-for-profit publishing groups agreed and stated that societies will lose a key source of income if author fees are adopted across the board [217]. Further experimentation with the author pays model is required.

Commercial publishers have nevertheless initiated change in a number of ways to cater for the electronic needs of the academic community. Elsevier has developed ScienceDirect, a subscription-based service providing electronic access to over 6.5 million articles online at a cost of £200 million to create and maintain, (including a cost of £24 million to digitise backfiles) [218]. It had previously stated it would not experiment in open access, but has since partly backtracked and now offers limited open access, stating it will:

"Adapt and invest accordingly." [219]
While free for readers and users, creating archives for open access, or creating new open access journals, is not however, free for producers and does require financial and human resources. While a Wellcome Trust Report stated that open access is economically feasible [220], the director of Rockefeller University Press stated that the long-term financial health of the open access enterprise has yet to be secured. He argued that the model might yet prove to be unsustainable. While praising open access initiatives, he argued that the tried and tested subscription model will not be destroyed until these new models are proven to survive [221]. The ALPSP is one group that has offered workshops on evaluating journals for open access and has looked at the economics of operating such journals2. However, more experimentation and testing of the open access journal model will be required for publishers to feel comfortable with such shifts in publishing practice.

Open access, both through archiving and the creation of new journals, continues to be supported by many established groups and organisations, and changes are occurring constantly in this area [222]. In a report published at the beginning of 2004, industry analysts predicted that open access will gain legitimacy as it is supported by major institutions worldwide [223]. The Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI - launched in 2002 by the Open Society Institute) consists of a statement of principle, strategy and commitment to making research articles in all fields publicly available on the Internet, recommending the two complementary strategies to achieve open access, i.e., self-archiving (depositing electronic articles into electronic archives) and the launch of open access journals. BOAI argued that these changes are within the reach of the scholar and change can therefore be initiated straight away. As of January 2004, the declaration had been signed by 3,390 authors and researchers [224].

The BOAI is promising because it mobilises the financial resources required to help make the transition possible for new journals, assists existing journals in changing their business model, and supports HEIs in self-archiving [225].

---

2 An ALPSP seminar entitled 'How to Evaluate Journals as Potential Open Access Candidates' took place on the 1-2nd July 2004 at the Novartis Foundation, London, UK.
Berlin declaration [226] followed in support of the BOAI and was signed by Germany’s principal scientific and scholarly institutions.

In December 2003, the House of Commons Science and Technology Committee in the UK launched an inquiry into the prices and accessibility of scientific journals [227], [228], addressing whether the government should support open access (see Appendix A). While archives/repositories and open access journals have many benefits for the academic community, the risks for the publishing industry are high, as discussed previously. Elsevier wrote a paper for the House of Commons inquiry addressing the possible implications of open access journals for the traditional publisher and the academic community and discussed the role of *ScienceDirect*. Elsevier stated that the role publishers’ play is vital to ensure the wide dissemination of research. [229]. However, Jan Velterop of BioMed Central argued that Elsevier based its calculations on the inefficient operations of traditional publishing and that open access can ultimately reduce costs so that the UK will eventually pay less [230]. The committee’s report, discussed further in Appendix A, came out heavily in favour of open access.

At present, while many institutions support open access, (including BioMedCentral addressing what they state are the common myths of anti-open access arguments [231]), the existing archives are not being used to their capacity. The Directory of Open Access Journals, while listing 1130 open-access journals, does not yet come close to the available 24,000 toll-access journals. Harnad postulated that members of the research community are waiting for radical transitions without acting themselves [232], while Parks stated that there is little incentive for players to move to an open access model [233]. Although open access has many advantages, more investigation is needed [234], along with more support from academic authors [235]. Whilst the use of archives and open access journals for posting or submitting articles amongst academics is occurring, usage is low, and therefore there is limited data from which to draw conclusions.

As the producers of articles, authors have a key role to play in any new model or system of scholarly communication if change is to become permanent. There still seems to be what Steele calls almost a schizophrenic nature amongst academics;
wanting published works to be accredited but complaining about high costs, and preferring free access but not utilising it [236]. With the role of publishers continuing to be valued, new initiatives should work with publishers rather than against them [237].

3.9. Authors and Open Access

A study conducted with academic authors in the faculties of economics and law at Brescia University in Italy supported Steele’s view (see Chapter 3.8.) and reported that while 44 percent of authors knew about the existence of open access initiatives and archives, only 4 percent had used them to deposit their material, while 33 percent who claimed to have used free material on the web had used an open access disciplinary archive [238].

A study conducted at the University of Edinburgh focused on the nature and volume of research material posted and available online at the university websites. Results showed a distinct difference between academic disciplines in the percentage of scholars self-archiving their material on departmental and personal Web sites. 14.8 percent of scholars had self-archived in science and engineering, 3.2 percent in social science and humanities faculties, and 0.3 percent in medicine and veterinary medicine. It was also found that even within these disciplines, there was a wide distribution of values [239]. The study concluded that there was a direct correlation between the willingness to self-archive and the existence of subject-based repositories:

"Most of the academic units that have a high percentage of self-archiving scholars already have well-established subject repositories set up in that area.” [240]

However, the report also found that scholars are more likely to post material on their own web pages until subject repositories become established and trusted as persistent and comprehensive. Projects such as SHERPA can help with this.

Brown and Swan reported the results of a survey of academic authors that had published material on an open access basis (154 authors) with those who had not
(157 authors) [241]. The final report stated that three quarters of respondents felt open access publishing would limit the potential impact of their work even though the few studies conducted demonstrate the opposite [242]. The authors believed that publication fees should come from research grants, the institution, or the library. The vast majority of authors were willing to deposit articles if required, but continued to value the roles played by publishers. The report concluded that:

"There are some cultural and behavioral barriers to overcome, largely on the part of authors but also on the part of institutions, if open access is to flourish.... most importantly of all, authors are not familiar enough with the open access journals in their field to submit work to them." [243]

Although institutional repositories and open access journals have not been utilised to capacity, there is evidence to suggest that if academic authors were educated further in the use and benefits of such actions, usage may increase.

3.10. Higher Education Institutions and Academic Libraries

In the fight against commercial publisher price rises, one particular group within the Higher Education community has proposed or taken direct action: academic librarians. One long-standing argument is for universities to become their own publishers. Okerson and others [244],[245], argued the case back in 1991 for libraries, computer centres, and university presses to work together to produce and distribute a university’s intellectual output. Today, HEIs are pursuing a number of strategies for alternative publishing, including open access and the development of institutional repositories. Faculty on many occasions have resigned from high priced journal editorial boards (see Chapter 3.12.), or have refused to send their articles to high priced journals [246]. The Queensland University of Technology in Australia also recently developed an institutional mandate for self-archiving [247] (see also the House of Commons Recommendations on mandating open access in Appendix A).

A number of university libraries, faculty and administrators has reported the cancellation of Elsevier titles. Cornell University, University of California, Duke
University, Harvard University, North Carolina State University, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill have ended many print subscriptions to expensive journal titles [248]. The University of California at Berkeley has ended all print subscriptions to Elsevier journals, saving $432,000 per annum. While this represents a large saving, the library still receives Elsevier electronic titles costing over $1 million per annum [249]. Princeton University library has also cancelled many print subscriptions to journals, relying on electronic versions only and has reported cost savings [250]. The university has also considered the purchase of e-books, but because of unsatisfactory display technology and e-books being sold as bundles rather than on an individual title basis, they are currently unaffordable [251].

The university senate of The University of Connecticut has called for faculty to familiarise themselves with the business practices of journals in their fields and to boycott journals that do not encourage wide dissemination. The senate also called for libraries to provide information to help faculty make such decisions, and for departments and administrators to reward such stands by providing financial support for publication [252]. Suber has detailed such stands by US universities since October 2003 on his web page [253].

Case [254] argued that strategies such as cancellations have had limited effectiveness in moderating prices, and no impact on the growing concentration of the publishing industry; cancellations result in increased prices for the rest of the community, exacerbating existing high prices.

Stanford University Libraries launched HighWire Press, an online publisher, in 1994, and announced its first co-published journal in 1995. HighWire Press is the largest repository of free full-text life science articles worldwide, with over 600,000 free online texts, and offers over 4,500 Medline journals, 543 HighWire-hosted journals and uses a variety of models, including: free full text, abstract only, pay per view, and subscription. However, the majority of journal articles are only available free after a period of time, typically between three and 12 months.
A number of HEI libraries and presses have also developed discipline-specific virtual communities to provide resources electronically (including links to electronic journals, books, up-to-date news, jobs, research tools and organisational links). These are either provided free or via subscription to institutions. Columbia Earthscape, Escholarship, MIT CogNet [255], and Project Euclid [256] are all examples of such and are operated by university libraries, university presses, learned societies and other organisations for the benefit of the academic community on a not-for-profit basis.

The eScholarship repository was established in 2002 and includes peer-reviewed online journals with the number of papers having increased to 2,600 with more than 400,000 downloads [570]. CIAO (Columbia International Affairs Online) has been developed by Columbia University Press, the Academic Information System, and the Columbia University libraries. Utilising each organisation’s strength, with start up funds from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, it is sold on an annual subscription basis to institutions. When discussing CIAO, Wittenberg commented:

“It is often more effective to create partnerships among leaders in the field than try to remain completely independent.” [258]

Both Higher Education Institutions and their libraries are taking action where possible. As these efforts increase, more research and data will be available to the research community. However, such initiatives in collaboration with established publishers will help to ensure the standard of quality remains.

3.11. University Press Initiatives

Many university presses are beginning to experiment with open access, some of which have been mentioned previously. Gradmann stated that individual university presses were too weak (economically and technically) to change existing parameters in scholarly communication [259]. However, the Director of Rockefeller University Press in the USA stated that the not-for-profit sector is the natural ally of open access [260], and many presses are taking initiatives in this
area. While a number of university presses have been active in promoting free back content, they have continued to hold copyright with the aim of preventing misuse. A number of presses (and indeed commercial publishers) also encourage posting their articles on university sites [261]. However, while the majority of publishers see open access as a threat, and many university presses continue to charge for online material (e.g., Project Muse [262]), a number of university presses are making the leap to an open access model.

Oxford University Press felt a responsibility as a university press to explore the open access journal model and announced an experiment to move one part of one of its journals, *Nucleic Acids Research*, to an author-pays open access model [263]. This journal will be freely available as soon as it is published from January 2005. The press has plans to include other issues in the scheme within five years if the initial experiment is successful [264]. The press has also developed another open access journal, *Evidence-based Complementary & Alternative Medicine*, in collaboration with a research centre [265].

Oxford University Press is also in partnership with Oxford University Library Services in support of the SHERPA Project, offering access to articles authored by Oxford University faculty which will then be searchable through the pilot institutional repository [266].

In the USA, Columbia University Press publishes the *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, which provides free full texts online [267].

In the UK, The Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) has offered short-term funding to four publishers to assist them in making journals freely available through open access models; however, university presses have not taken advantage of these funds. Those that were granted the funds were the Public Library of Science, Institute of Physics Publishing, *The Journal of Experimental Botany* at Lancaster University, and the International Union of Crystallography [268].
Many commercial publishers allow researchers to post preprints or post-prints on online repositories [269]. Elsevier has also been experimenting with open access, allowing partial open access for its authors, as well as operating ChemWeb, BioMedNet and ElsevierEngineering.com. These provided free access to content, and permitted authors to self-archive. However, recently Elsevier closed these services due to the high investment required [270].

Willinsky argued that scholarly associations can publish open access journals using cost savings from the library community dropping print editions, direct support from libraries, and charging author fees [271]. However, Harnad stressed that it is not yet a safe time for university presses to adopt open access journals. Harnad believed that the safest and best way for university presses to take advantage of open access is to:

".... provide it for their own article output (through self-archiving)." [272]

Harnad argued that open access self-archiving must come first, and then, as toll access journals are cancelled, revenue will be released to pay for author and institution charges for open access journal publishing. While university presses have a potential role in helping HEIs with open access, and Prosser has argued that open access will provide new revenue streams for small publishers [273], there is a potential threat to the press’ business, as discussed earlier. Bailey argued that in order to create a successful scholarly electronic publishing system, university presses and scholarly societies must make greater commitments to electronic publishing efforts [274], but Lamb stated that presses require new strategies to deal with such changes [275].

In the field of institutional repositories, there are opportunities for collaboration with publishers, in particular the university press. As many believe that the value publishers add is still required for online material [276], publishers working in open archives and open access areas may build the confidence of users, and increase trust in such initiatives. While many commercial publishers have no motivation at present to change the tried and tested subscription based model, the
academic community, and in particular the university press, can take advantage of technological advances and initiatives.

3.12. SPARC

SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition) was launched by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) in 1998 [277]. A coalition of research universities and libraries, SPARC aims to support increased competition in scholarly publishing and actively promotes open access journals and the development of institutional repositories. Its membership numbered approximately 300 international institutions and library consortia in early 2004 [278].

SPARC encourages competitive publishing by promoting lower-cost open access journals, enhancing the scholar’s role in adopting new communication technologies and communities, and in raising academic conscientiousness in publishing issues and solutions [279]. Frazier said:

"SPARC has set out to change the world of scholarly communication by collaborating with publishers who share its core values; seeking partners who are committed to encouraging liberal access to information for education and research; increasing the speed with which new knowledge is disseminated in society; and creating a much more affordable model for distributing information among research institutions." [280]

A complete list of SPARC partners is on the web [281], and in January 2004, the site listed 25 partners, including many alternative open access journals, scientific communities (BioOne and Project Euclid), the Public Library of Science, MIT CogNet, eScholarship, The Directory of Open Access Journals, Columbia Earthsape and BioMed Central.

To date, SPARC has initiated a number of successful alternative peer-reviewed journals to compete with particularly expensive journals. These new journals are reasonably priced, thus saving library funds and causing price moderation and
even cancellations by commercial publishers [282]. SPARC also assists not-for-profit and independent publishers in becoming major players in science publishing. In support of this scheme, Tenopir and King argued:

“If all journals were priced like professional society publications, the serials crisis would disappear overnight.” [283]

Although this has not occurred, SPARC has created some success. One example is the journal Organic Letters launched in 1999 and developed in competition to Tetrahedron Letters. The journal is 80 percent cheaper than its competitor, and saw an increase in submissions by 15 percent in 2003 compared to 2002. The website averages 200,000 hits each month [284].

SPARC has also helped to establish services such as BioOne [285], a linked database of journals in the biological sciences that is more cost-effective for libraries and was established as a not-for-profit corporation in 2000 [286]. BioOne also hosts three open access publications and collaborates with PubMedCentral.

Another venture of SPARC has been the manual, ‘Gaining Independence: A Manual for Planning the Launch of a Non-profit Electronic Publishing Venture’ [287]. This is a step-by-step guide for the creation of a business plan for start-up and early-stage electronic publishing ventures, including the creation of digital repositories and journals. The manual aims to help universities, libraries, societies and others think about, plan and implement scholarly publishing alternatives. While SPARC works primarily with publishers as partners, a SPARC programme, ‘Create Change’, focuses on faculty, researchers, university administrators and editorial board members, stimulating discussion and action and making them aware of the options available for influencing scholarly communication [288].

SPARC Europe was launched in July 2001 with LIBER (the principal association of major research libraries of Europe) and is sponsored by CURL (Consortium of University Research Libraries), JISC, and SCONUL (Society of College, National
and University Libraries). SPARC Europe aims to accomplish the same goals in the European scientific journals marketplace and has introduced advocacy initiatives tailored to the European research and library communities.

SPARC claims benefits for all stakeholders involved [289]. However, while providing cheaper access to a number of similar journals, libraries have been unwilling to cancel well-established commercial journals. This results in increased costs as libraries choose to subscribe to both or simply continue a subscription to the traditional journal. While subscriptions of some commercial journals have decreased, it must be remembered that this drop may be due to the current crisis and fall of budgets. What needs to be discovered is if the cancellations have accelerated since SPARC was established.

University presses seem ideally placed to become partners with SPARC. SPARC does work with a number of university presses in the USA. MIT CogNet and the Journal of Machine Learning Research are initiatives of MIT Press, Project Euclid is a collaboration of Duke University Press and Cornell University Libraries, and Columbia Earthscape is a collaboration of Columbia University libraries, computer centre and university press [290]; all are supported by SPARC. Such initiatives have been limited in the UK and while SPARC has reported success, that success has been limited. New journals are difficult to create, and authors and readers prefer to use journals with an established track record.

3.13. Conclusions

Electronic publishing initiatives and the open access debate have grown dramatically in the last couple of years. (For a timeline of the open access movement see [291]). There is now increasing attention and contributions from national newspapers, MPs, investment analysts, as well as publishers and the academic community [292]. Changes to traditional models now seem possible and achievable. John Cox, a consultant to the publishing industry stated:

"The open-access method...is the most articulate and serious threat to the conventional publishing model that we've seen." [293]
Awre has argued [294] that open access, in its many forms, is here to stay, but that its business models and technical solutions still require development. Rowland et al. discussed some of these issues in a JISC-funded project concerned with e-print delivery models (see [295]).

Before open access is to have the desired and necessary effect, some steps (e.g., the adoption of self-archiving policies at HEIs, the encouragement of self-archiving by research funding agencies, and support of self-archiving by journal publishers adapting their copyright policies) still need to be taken by a number of key players, and indeed, changes with publishers (particularly not-for-profit presses), rather than without, should be initiated.

Some authorities [296] have argued that, like many of the other initiatives, open access is a temporary solution to the crisis and does not take account of the possibility that author fees may be unaffordable for some, or that in the future Web access may not be free. It must also be remembered that some scholars have limited or no access to Web technologies, and may therefore be just as disadvantaged as they are in the print world. Dickson reported that the Royal Society, while in favour of open access, argued that it would be a threat to the scientific community, stating that funders of research may have to limit the number of researchers they support, and learned societies may be forced to reduce the number of activities supported by their publishing income [297].

The open access debate and many of the other initiatives are attempts to implement changes to journal publishing and do not consider book publishing - an important component of scholarly publishing. While authors generally do not receive any form of payment from journal publishing, book authors have traditionally received royalties for their work. While a number of electronic ventures for book publishing (such as e-books, chapters provided online, etc.) have been implemented, the focus of debate is the journal market because of the success and growing acceptance of journals in electronic format. However, while requiring different approaches and models, the general improvement of scholarly communication should incorporate both journals and books.
Not all new initiatives and new models have been dealt with here. There are variations between disciplines, as well as a number of initiatives that have been discontinued. Among these was PubScience, a government run website offering free access to scientific and technical articles. PubScience was discontinued due to lobbying from commercial publishers; these publishers have been reported as planning action against other such services [298]. In addition, Figaro (the creation of an affordable and effective publishing and communication environment for scholars in Europe) [299] offered a variety of possibilities which constituted methods for the gradual change of the publication behaviour of scientists, enabling them and their organisations to become publishers [300]. However, funding for Figaro ceased in July 2003 when one of the partners pulled out, proving the need for financial support for all new initiatives.

Advocacy groups such as SPARC, and institutional repository platforms have to date moved slowly, and are increasing expenses to universities (technology, submission costs, new subscription costs, etc.). While the ‘crisis’ is continuing to be fuelled, these changes are a step in the right direction and large commercial publishers are beginning to take notice of their force. Elsevier’s share price is under pressure, with a number of city analysts having stated that open access will lead to lower profits [301]. PLOS has the support of 30,000 scientists throughout the world, and even though no boycott may have occurred, open access journals are proving successful and accepted (e.g., PLoS Biology), major private funders in the USA and UK are offering funds to pay for open access publication as part of research grants, and Dspace has a strong partnership with Hewlett Packard.

These new initiatives have contributed towards some solution of the scholarly publishing crisis by causing publishers to rethink pricing, and by making the academic community more aware of action that can be taken. Change will always prove difficult, not only because of academic tenure and the ‘publish or perish’ culture that has developed (see Chapter 5), but because many academics view these initiatives as additional rather than replacement services. Cost, lack of demand, doubt, conservatism, and funding difficulties are reasons such initiatives have not always had the desired effect.
There is determination on the part of some in the academic community to facilitate change. However, there are many issues that need addressing (technical, legal, managerial, economical, preservation, etc.). Changes to an established system cannot be expected overnight, and in some cases may not be desirable. As new problems arise, these will be dealt with until a new system, in whatever form, proves successful, sustainable and accepted. What these initiatives have proved is that change is occurring, the changes are real, and that collaboration between all players in scholarly communication is key to ensuring the success of any, or a number of alternative models.
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Chapter 4
The University Press
4.1. **Role and Mission of the University Press**

A university press has been defined as a:

"...publishing house associated with a university and always bearing the university's name in its imprint." [1]

A university press is a publishing house organised by, and usually based at, an Institution of Higher Education to publish scholarly material, usually books and journals, primarily for academic and scholarly use. Many university press authors are traditionally academics.

University presses are generally unique in the publishing world mainly because they have as their mission an unprecedented commitment to scholarly and academic work, have high quality peer-review, a commitment to publish longer scholarly works, publish works in niche subject areas, with many printing in small print runs. As not-for-profit organisations, university presses:

"Do not aim to make profits but price on a cost recovery basis... Many of the presses are living on the financial brink." [2]

Each university press is unique, yet the presses tend to be grouped together as a unit, with strengths and weaknesses often perceived to be shared [3].

In this thesis, the university press is defined as a **publishing house associated with a Higher Education Institution, bearing its imprint, and primarily devoted to publishing scholarly, low-profit works.**

Perhaps the best explanation of a university press mission came from Gilman, the first president of Johns Hopkins University, who said in 1878:

"It is one of the noblest duties of a university to advance knowledge, and to diffuse it not merely amongst those who can attend the daily lectures – but far and wide." [4]
Some authors [5], have explained that the primary mission of the university press is to further scholarly knowledge and research as a primary vehicle for the dissemination of ideas. Originally founded as the scholarly publishing division of universities, they were to be:

“A refuge for academics whose scholarship was worthy of being in print but often overlooked by mainstream publishers.” [6]

Freeman [7] added that university presses were created to ensure that the best research would be available to the widest audience, independent of commercial considerations. With no other type of publisher placing such singular emphasis on editorial quality, university press profits were frequently nonexistent, and financial crises frequent. Jeanneret argued that scholars’ needs cannot always be served by commercial publication, and the unique feature of a university press is its provision of scope for the free exercise of scholarly objectivity [8]. Fisher of Cambridge University Press stated that the imperative of any university press is dissemination [9].

The university press served the overall mission of the institutions to which the presses belonged. Day argued that an integral part of the university’s mission is to make public the works of its scholars. A university press plays a:

“...major role in helping the institution look outwards and in enhancing the institutions prominence beyond its own campus.” [10]

The benefits of a press to its parent institution are the expanding of scholars’ work across the globe, the creation and upholding of a national and international reputation that encourages graduate student enrolment and young faculty to seek employment, and enabling the institution to fulfil the third of its basic functions - the dissemination of ideas [11].
Jeanneret stated that although dissemination of a scholar's work is vital, a press serves its institution well by:

"...increasing enormously the academic effectiveness of scholars whose work it publishes." [12]

Many authors, however, comment that the press is very much kept in its place, [13], [14], and in practice, there often seems to be a lack of support from many institutions. While Day commented that the university press is the third leg of the stool, complementing the teaching and research of the university, he also stated that for the majority of presses, the:

"...position or standing within the university is peripheral." [15]

Considering the importance of publishing in the academic world, it would be thought that the press would be a core part of the HEI, however, it is generally not.

The university press performs three basic functions essential to the current system of scholarly communication. These functions are the selection, refinement, and marketing of scholarly material. As Jeanneret argues, the extensive editorial function is:

"One of the most vital and significant aspects of the work of that institution... the outstanding feature of a university press book is probably the thoroughness of the editorial preparation." [16]

Zeigler, the design and production manager at Indiana University Press, stated:

"Our imprint is our guarantee to the reader that this work has been carefully screened and prepared." [17]

More recently, Davidson and others also commented on the vital role the university press plays [18], [19], [20]:
"At present university press publishing provides the most careful, impartial, and efficient system of brokering, networking, evaluating, editing, publishing, and distributing serious scholarship." [21]

However, these roles have always been filled by commercial scholarly publishers. What makes a university press unique is its relationship with the Higher Education Institution to which it is affiliated and at which it is often based, and its willingness to invest in projects commercial publishers would not consider. Danesi, commenting on his personal experience of publishing with a variety of publishers, said:

"The publisher of choice, because it is considered.... to be the scholarly source of dissemination par excellence, is, of course, the university press." [22]

The AAUP (Association of American University Presses) published a document entitled 'The Value of University Presses' [24]. It consisted of 24 statements under the headings of 'University Presses and Society', 'University Presses and Scholarship' and 'University Presses in the University Community'. The list was based on the frequent misunderstandings that arise within and between university presses and the wider university community, and emphasised the new roles presses play in the changing environment of scholarly publishing.

The document discussed the value of the work presses undertake and their benefit to broader society: presses contribute to the diversity of cultural expression, work alongside other institutions, preserve the work of local cultures in publishing regional works, bring attention to minority issues, bring international works to a national audience, and publish diverse works. The second section, 'University Presses and Scholarship', focused on the value added to scholarly works by maintaining and providing quality material, the publishing and funding of emerging subjects and scholarship thus furthering new research, the funding of long-term or multi-volume works that may not otherwise be accepted, and the exploration of new technologies working in collaboration with other groups and

---

1 The Association of American University Presses (AAUP) was founded in 1937 by 17 university presses. It is currently managed by a board of directors, has 9 staff members, and works through 12 committees.
institutions. The final section, 'University Presses in the University Community', stressed the reputation a press gives a university providing advice to academic staff and students on issues regarding publishing, editorial work and intellectual property [25].

4.2. History and Current Situation of the University Press: UK and USA

Although Thatcher stated [26] that university presses were originally set up to publish scientific journals, these journals began to appear in the 1660s when both Cambridge and Oxford university presses were well established. Meadows stated that presses traditionally focused on the humanities and social science disciplines [27]; however, the University of Toronto Press was established to publish theses and exam papers [28]. Many university presses were established because of the difficulties scholars experienced getting their scholarly material published [29], and it seems the scholarly monograph (a work covering just one aspect of research in great detail) was the main initial product of the university press [30], [31].

In the early days of their existence, the process of scholarly communication and publishing for university presses was simple. Described as a cycle, scholars pursued research and delivered it to the university press, the press would select the material to publish, and go on to publish the scholars' research. The publications would be purchased by the library and would therefore then be accessible to the community of scholars [32].

"More than 1,000 orders for every title were standard. Operating almost on automatic pilot, a cosy triangular relationship developed among university faculties, university presses and university libraries." [33]

Pochoda [34] and Kerr [35] provided histories of US university presses and explained that until the late 1950s, university presses in the USA were regarded and operated as 'vanity presses', publishing local books and those of their own faculty, but even before that, in the 1930s, many presses suspended operations for financial reasons. A wider search for books outside the institution only began in
the late 1950s, and following that, Pochoda described the 1960s as a 'boom period', due to the rise in American university enrolment and the increase in state and federal financial support for Higher Education.

This 'boom period' was followed by cutbacks, not only federal, but also from parent institutions. As a result, several small presses closed and many faced the prospect of retrenchment and sometimes termination, while others took advantage of the changes occurring in commercial publishing, stepping into the trade arena and developing non-book activities [36], [37].

The decrease in institutional support (and the pressure from HEIs to become sustainable or profitable, though many argued they were never intended to be so [38]), the significant decrease in scholarly monograph purchasing, and the STM journals crisis discussed in Chapter Two, reduced the amount of money available for the purchase of books, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, and thereby caused many presses to struggle. Freeman also ascribed the problems to the introduction of the photocopier, which increased the number and use of course-packs and inter-library loans [39]. There was also the continued pressure to offer discounts to remain in competition with commercial publishing ventures. However, prices were probably already lower than commercially produced books.

Today, the university press field continues to change. While there is a large number of university presses, there are many prestigious UK and USA Higher Education Institutions that do not have a university press [40]. In general, publications about university presses have focused on the US situation; only one article was found that detailed the UK university press situation [41].

In 1996, Davies reported UK university press publishing as proliferating, with many HEIs wanting to be involved in publishing. In 1996, there were 21 operational presses, with two recently having been bought by commercial firms (Leicester University Press, was bought from the university by Pinter Publishers and was subsequently sold to Cassell Academic; today, it functions as an imprint of Continuum; and Bristol Classical Press was bought by Duckworth) [42].
Since 1996, other presses have been sold or shut down; University College London Press, set up in 1991 as a profit-oriented business, ran for just four years. The press published an average of 80 books per annum but proved unprofitable and was sold to Taylor and Francis and then Cavendish. The press never had any direct relationship with the HEI, nor was it governed by an editorial board, but given the licence to use the University College name.

Open University Press (an independent publisher not affiliated to the Open University after it was sold to management in 1988 because it lost money), was sold to McGraw-Hill Education [43] with the plan to keep the imprint of the university press. SOAS was another such press, as was Hull (which published around twelve books per annum, but was closed down in 2000, as it was not financially viable). The University of North London (UNL) Press was the first polytechnic press; founded in 1986, it published an average of 22 books per annum, but also proved unsustainable [44], and Keele University Press was acquired by Edinburgh University Press. Aberdeen University Press, not mentioned in Davies’ article, became a Maxwell company. However, while some were closing their doors, others were being created. The University of York Music Press, Cranfield University Press, University of Birmingham Press, Sheffield Hallam University Press, and Northumbria University Press (recently established in June 2004) were all set up after 1996.

In April 2002, there were 20 operating UK university presses. However, since then, others have closed: Sheffield Hallam University Press, Bath University Press, and Greenwich University Press. Therefore, at the time of writing, (June 2004) there were 17 university presses operating in the UK (for further detail see the UK university press table in Appendix B). Sheffield Hallam University Press closed in July 2003. The reason for closure was the retirement of the director, and the cost of replacing his skills required the university to invest in the press, which it had never done. The university was also cutting back due to financial constraints and a press was not considered part of core business. Bath University Press had not been actively publishing since 2002 and did not have a press director, and Greenwich also ceased activity for financial reasons.
The two best-known university presses in the UK are Cambridge University Press (with its first book being printed in 1584) [45] and Oxford University Press (receiving a decree confirming its privilege to print books in 1586 and printing its first book soon after). Printing was introduced to England in 1476, making these presses certainly the oldest in England and possibly the oldest general presses in the world. Both Oxford and Cambridge University presses have a documented history [46], [47], [48]. Others do not, no doubt because they are so small and young.

Oxford University Press is the world’s largest university press and has a number of international offices. The press is a department of the university and policy of the press is controlled through a board of delegates comprised of academic staff. The press provides the university with financial return, transferring 30 percent of annual post-tax surplus to the university [49]. Both the university and its press have charitable status [50]. University presses in the UK claim not-for-profit status, but, in general, the majority of university presses are operated as businesses with the aim to be sustainable and to grow.

Liverpool University Press was the third UK university press to be established (1899), followed by Manchester University Press in 1903. Manchester publishes an average of 120 titles per annum along with seven journals. It has a presence in 60 countries and is self-supporting. The University of Wales Press was established in 1922 and has an average output of 60 titles per annum. It operates on a grant from the university. Edinburgh University Press is another well-established press in the UK, now a fully independent company [51], dating back to 1950. It publishes 80 titles per annum and 33 journals.

Exeter University Press was set up in 1990. However, recently it reported a management buyout. The university reported that the press had run into financial difficulty:

"...including an accumulated trading deficit in excess of £500,000." [52]
The reasons given for this deficit were volatility of the US market, dependence on a small range of titles, and the broader monograph crisis.

Other UK presses are relatively small and were established only recently. The University of Hertfordshire Press (operated with one staff member until recently), and Nottingham University Press were established in 1992. Between the years 1993 and 1996, Birmingham (with only one staff member who recently left the press; with anecdotal evidence suggesting the university was not committed to the press, there was a sense of impending change, and the lack of staff caused others to struggle to complete tasks), Bristol (The Policy Press), Luton, Middlesex, Imperial College Press (a joint venture with a commercial publisher, World Scientific), and the University of York Music Press were established. More recently, Cranfield University Press has become active, and in 2004 Northumbria University Press was established [53]. Another HEI in the UK has recently been investigating the idea of establishing its own imprint [54]. The university press landscape has changed and is continuing to change.

Many UK university presses act as departments of their parent institutions, e.g., Oxford, Cambridge, Manchester, Exeter and Birmingham. Others are limited companies, such as Edinburgh University Press. Smaller presses include Nottingham, Cranfield, York, Birmingham, Hertfordshire, Luton, and Middlesex; some of these publish single figure numbers of books each year and many focus on niche subjects. (Information taken from individual press catalogues and Websites. For further information of operational UK university presses see Appendix B).

Other publishers in the UK claim the title ‘University Press’ but are not linked in any way to a Higher Education Institution, e.g., MCB University Press is a private venture originally established by two professors from Bradford University and now uses the trading name of Emerald [55].

Unlike the AAUP in the US, the UK does not have an organisation for collaborative projects and meetings. The Association of Learned Professional and Society Publishers (ALPSP) however, was established in 1972, and represents UK
not-for-profit academic and professional publishers [56]. Seven UK university presses are currently members of the ALPSP. The ALPSP has a learned journals collection allowing small and medium publishers to group their journals together in order to offer an improved service to library consortia and compete with commercial publishing deals [57]. The ALPSP also runs courses such as scholarship friendly publishing, digitising journal back-files, managing risk, digital rights management, understanding libraries, outsourcing, open access, institutional repositories and archives, and electronic publishing strategy [58].

The first university press to be established in the USA was at Cornell University in 1869. However, its doors closed in 1884, and it was not re-established until 1930. The oldest continuously running university press in the United States is at Johns Hopkins University, which established the press in 1878. It was a priority:

"...to have a press in order to provide a vehicle for the publications of its graduate faculty." [59]

Chicago, California and Columbia presses followed in 1893. After the turn of the century, Princeton, Yale and Harvard were established [60]. In 1935, there were 17 university presses in the USA publishing five or more books and by 1949, this number had risen to 30. The first established university presses in the United States, namely Johns Hopkins, Chicago, California, Columbia, Princeton, Yale and Harvard:

"...remain the seven largest university presses, the only ones with revenues in excess of $9 million per year." [61]

An example of a private press in the USA is Princeton University Press, established in 1905. It is not supported or owned by the university. Its only connection to the university is through its editorial board, with members appointed by the president of the university.

The AAUP was established in 1937 and listed 121 members in the 2002 Directory [62] including university, museum, professional, and scholarly association
presses. 86 university presses have been identified from this list with member presses ranging in size. The smallest domestic presses are Akron, Alaska and Scranton with a title output of three, seven and twelve respectively. The three largest member presses are California, Chicago and Yale, reporting title outputs of 297, 272 and 301 respectively (see Appendix C).

“Presses represent an array of universities – large and small, public and private – with some publishing only two or three titles annually vs. ones that issue 200 or more books per year.” [63]

There is a number of other US university presses that are not affiliated with the AAUP. Some of these institutions are private colleges and schools. Two UK presses, Oxford and Cambridge, are also members of the AAUP.

In terms of book output of university press members of the AAUP, 28 university presses can be called ‘large’ (more than 100 title output), with 27 ‘medium’ (between 50-100 title output) and 31 smaller presses (1-49 title output). However, none compare to the size of Oxford and Cambridge University Presses.

The university press situation in the USA is not dissimilar to the UK. Many presses have been shut down for various reasons and others more recently established, e.g., Clark Atlanta University Press [64]. Some of the larger US presses have become more commercial, publishing trade books, whereas the smaller presses tend to publish regional works and works in niche subject areas.

While the biggest differences between UK and USA university presses are the endowment funds and subsidies the US presses receive, these subsidies are generally at most 10 percent of the presses’ income [65], and Bartlett stated that subsidy as birthright is outdated [66]. The UK and US press situations are similar, and indeed, Australian presses have reported facing the same problems [67].

It is plausible to say that the biggest problems facing university presses today are financial, mainly due to the decrease of HEI subsidy and support that many presses had come to rely on [68]. The focus on profits to sustain publishing
activities has altered or distorted the mission of the press [69]. However, these difficulties seem to have always existed for the university press [70], and while some presses have closed, others have survived and implemented changes as required [71], [72].

Many large and small presses in the USA and UK have reacted imaginatively to the scholarly communication crisis (discussed in Chapter Two) by reducing the number of fields in which they publish, becoming more specialised, raising standards and turning a significant slice of their publishing programme over to books that are designed for non-academic audiences [73]. In both the USA and UK, a number of university presses have been forced to become more like general trade and textbook publishers in order to remain in business, increasingly competing with the trade-publishing world, though not always with success [74], [75], [76], while still trying to fulfil their traditional roles as academic publishers. Kasdorf stated:

"...they suddenly had to pay their way. They rolled up their sleeves and rose to the occasion, developing excellent lines of regional titles, trade books, midlist books...and still struggled to bring out those important monographs." [77]

Thus, many trade titles were being accepted as a means to provide the funds to publish the more costly scholarly works [78]. While this is not ideal, and distracts somewhat from the scholarly mission of a university press, it is necessary for some to remain in business. Purdue University Press recently introduced a scheme for users to become 'press pilots', paying a membership fee and receiving discounts from the press books [79]. Other presses have hired staff from the commercial publishing industry [80].

In the UK, shifts have been seen in cuts of print runs of scholarly monographs, a move to other types of works, and a rise in journal publishing [81]. Manchester and Edinburgh University Presses report a reverse in the ratio of monograph to textbook publishing from 80:20 to 20:80 respectively [82]. Other UK presses have followed similar patterns, while some have always focused on publishing in a niche subject area. The University of Hertfordshire Press publishes books on the
social, cultural and political aspects of the Romani, Liverpool concentrates on the public sculpture of Britain and local and regional publishing, The University of Birmingham Press specialises in European studies, and religion and theology, and The University of Wales Press publishes Welsh language titles and has a focus on Europe.

While traditionally many smaller university presses have either attained 'break-even' point or have relied on subsidy from their parent institutions and funding from outside sources, today many, if not all, university presses are expected to break-even, and 'ideally ensure some surplus for future development' [83]. This requirement to take higher fiscal control adds to their problems [84], and with singular emphasis on editorial quality, smaller university press profits are frequently nonexistent, and financial crises common. The shift to trade publishing and a focus on works with a wider audience mean possibilities and opportunities for self-sufficiency, or even profit, are more favourable. However, many presses no longer view the possibility of being entirely self-sustaining, and constantly seek new sources of funding, implying that the primary mission of scholarly publishing is impossible without support [85].

The dual publishing role of scholarly and trade works has helped to maintain the publication of traditional scholarly works that are too expensive to print without subsidies. It indicates that, while not ideal, if presses are to remain true to their mission, subsidies or other sources of funding are essential [86], [87].

While presses have experienced constant change and taken advantage of change, many also remain true to their original scholarly mission. Woodward from the University Press of Kansas stated:

"We’ve remained true to our scholarly standards, but to survive, we’ve also become rapacious opportunists.” [88]
Rollans, Director of University of Alberta Press, had similar feelings:

"There's a two-headed mandate at a university press, to represent the university and also to be part of the commercial world." [89]

At the 2001 AAUP meeting [90], members were urged to cultivate a global view, and step into areas where commercial publishers were becoming weak. They were also urged to move away from the traditional scholarly monographs that still take up space on their lists and to take advantage of the opportunities to 'fill the gaps' of a failing commercial book publishing culture.

The appropriateness of such a shift is controversial [91], [92], [93], [94], even though university presses have always been in a difficult situation. Advantages of taking on trade and other titles have been given as: increases in sales (Northwestern University Press quoting a sales increase of 50 percent in the year 1997 to 1998 [95]); extra attention to university press books with more reviews in the consumer press; record numbers of books being published; a growing appreciation for trade publishing and its strengths and weaknesses; the important cultural contribution of publishing for a wider audience; rising sales; and decreases in returns.

Thatcher stated that while the university press has traditionally occupied a unique position between the worlds of commerce and scholarship, to fulfil its responsibility to publish books by and for scholarship that would not otherwise be published, presses now find themselves actively engaged in:

"Fulfilling all the functions of a profit-oriented business, while at the same time maintaining a paramount interest in the editorial and scholarly integrity of their respective institution imprints, and, hence, their reputations." [96]

Barnes argued that entering the world of trade publishing has 'changed the game completely' and that:

"University presses have come a long way, from the image of bespectacled eccentrics publishing hefty, obscure tomes behind ivy-covered walls." [97]
Others have gone further, suggesting that the press is a financial burden to the university and should be disposed of “as quietly and expeditiously as possible” [98].

While the university press has had to adapt throughout its history in order to survive, the university press currently seems to be at particular risk. The Research Support Library Group Committee Report claimed that university presses were once a successful part of academia but have fallen by the wayside, and proposed the re-development of university presses [99].

Overall, there seems to be two schools of thought. There are some that believe the university press will survive: presses have always been on the financial brink, they have always faced crises, but have used inventive ways to make up the shortfall and adapt to change [100], [101], [102], [103], [104]. Others believe that the university press is dying out and new electronic technologies can take their place [105], [106].

4.3. *Electronic Publishing at University Presses*

For this thesis, electronic publishing is defined as the *production and distribution of material in and through electronic formats, primarily via the Web.* This definition was used throughout this study.

Electronic and networked technologies have affected Higher Education and academic publishing, in particular the university press, in both positive and negative ways. Some believe that electronic technologies may take over the role of the university press (e.g., Hall argued that Institutional repositories would take over the role of the university press [107]). However, electronic technology could provide a chance for the university press to step forward in the scholarly market and take control.

In the last few years, many new communication technologies have been introduced to Higher Education and to publishing. Watkinson correctly noted
that although the information revolution has opened the door to new opportunities, most university presses have not been in a position to take advantage of them. Saunders commented on the exceptional innovation of some presses, but mentioned that despite these projects, the presses:

"...have not distinguished themselves as leaders in new technology." [109]

Bartlett stressed that presses lacked the financial resources and influence to make an impact, and have found it difficult to get involved in electronic publishing [110].

While electronic technologies have brought new opportunities to publishing, there are arguments both for and against the appropriateness of electronic publishing technologies for the university press [111]. There is also difficulty for smaller presses to publish electronically due mainly to the investment required in both equipment and staff expertise. However, electronic publishing has proved successful for reference works and encyclopaedias for some university presses [112].

Branin [113] argued that electronic networked communication is an opportunity to bring publishing back to the academy, and Freeman discussed the vital role that university presses can play in the new environment for the HEI:

"Such endurance also suggests that university presses...are uniquely well suited to performing this crucial task...a successful transition to electronic publishing in academia will depend in part on the degree to which university presses are incorporated into the process.... university presses offer a great deal of expertise that can help to ensure that such a transition is successful." [114]

Some authors believe electronic technologies will advance the mission of the press to disseminate [115]. Watkinson [116] agreed that university presses could help solve the problems of scholarly communication by embracing new technologies and thereby increase the dissemination of scholarly works. Others discussed the advantages of certain electronic technologies such as print on
demand, and that the younger generation of scholars and the new generation of students may prefer the use of the new technologies in their work [117].

As early as 1993, university presses in the USA had begun to experiment cautiously with new publishing technologies. California had the first plan for electronic publishing, and was quoted as being:

"...anxious not to be left behind." [118]

However, they subsequently stated that they probably started too early. The University Press of Virginia published the first online book by a university press, in collaboration with the library’s Electronic Text Centre in 1995 [119]. The University of Michigan Press is said to have set up the first exclusively electronic journal published by a university press in 1995 [120].

A large number of university presses are currently using electronic technologies. The majority of presses have Web presence in the form of an online catalogue, and many presses are now offering online journals, online ordering, the downloading of e-books and the opportunity to read online chapters and books. The AAUP Website adventurously stated:

"University presses are at the cutting edge of electronic publishing." [121]

This may be the case for some, but certainly not for all. In 1999, an AAUP survey showed that US presses were adopting a variety of electronic publishing projects, but there were also many obstacles to developing such projects. The AAUP questionnaire sent to all AAUP member presses in 2000 focused on electronic technologies and received a 70 percent response rate. Results showed that 56 percent of presses had experimented in some way with electronic formats and many presses were taking initiatives in electronic publishing [122], [123]. They reported that university presses were undertaking electronic projects in substantial, though not overwhelming, numbers. 40 percent of the university presses surveyed had published some form of electronic product, often reference works and mainly in CD ROM format.
“Respondents generally deemed e-projects only moderately successful from the vantage point of sales, and many presses claimed that they would be more likely to publish in electronic formats if there were a greater, and clearer, consumer demand.” [124]

However, there did appear to be broad agreement that new technologies have the potential to help presses disseminate information more effectively. The majority of presses also predicted that efforts in electronic publishing would either remain constant or increase.

Johns Hopkins’ Project Muse began in 1993. Established as a joint project by the university press and the library, Project Muse aimed to publish 43 journals online [125]. Interest in Project Muse exceeded expectations, with a large number of consortia requesting subscriptions. At the beginning of 2002, the project had over 100 journals online with approximately 1000 subscribers [126]. Staff working on Project Muse believed university presses have advantages that are not available to commercial publishers, including the relationship with the university community, opportunities to work with libraries and chances to experiment. Another example of a joint press and library project is Stanford’s Highwire Press, set up in 1995 as a separate department of the university. Escholarship [127] and Project Euclid [128] are also initiatives of university presses.

Several university presses have also offered e-books to libraries and students in a variety of ways with a variety of payment models through Netlibrary and Questia. In 2000, 37 university presses named Netlibrary as a distributor of their titles. Bartlett commented that such ventures could help presses:

“...resolve one of their most nagging dilemmas: what to do about that back list of scholarly titles that they wanted to keep available to scholars even though they had outlived their print life.” [129]

Flowers [130] listed the benefits of Netlibrary and the attraction of its programme to the university press.
Other major university presses have launched electronic publishing projects; amongst these is Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Cog Net [131], digitising material in the field of cognitive science. Columbia University Press, working with the university library, is now focused on electronic publishing in international studies, earth sciences, geography and ecology. They also launched Columbia Earthscape with the aim of linking researchers, teachers and students. Ciao [132], a project also run by Columbia, is funded by subscription sales and publishes scholarship on international affairs. The University of Chicago Press launched the Chicago Digital Distribution Center (CDDC), a short run digital printing facility and ‘Bibliovault’ (an electronic repository for out of print books and new press titles). The centre also offers services to other scholarly presses [133]. Rockefeller University Press now has open archives for three of its research publications and is active in back-file conversion [134]. A number of US university presses also list books with Amazon.com, an online bookseller and distributor [135].

In the UK, Cambridge and Oxford University Presses are leading the electronic publishing initiatives. In 1998, Cambridge University Press launched Cambridge Journals Online [136], offering full access to around 50 leading journals. Boyle, the Journal Marketing Manager, stated:

“The Web has become a key resource for many of our customers, and we are...delighted to launch this new...service. We are amongst the first publishers to provide Web access to journals...confident it will be welcomed...it demonstrates our ongoing commitment to adapting in order to meet market needs.” [137]

More recently Cambridge University Press has utilised print on demand technology, having over 2,000 books available through print on demand [138]. As of June 2004, seven UK presses were working with Lightning Source to fulfil print on demand orders [139].

Oxford University Press has also been working with new technologies. As well as offering more than 190 full text online journals, Oxford University Press is well known for its dictionary databases. The Oxford English Dictionary is available
online, the Concise English Dictionary, Oxford Thesaurus and Oxford Spellchecker have been licensed for three hand-held devices, Oxford Reference Online was launched in March 2002 [140], and Oxford Scholarship online was launched in October 2003. Oxford also has other online publishing projects underway.

Many of the small UK university presses are also involved in the publishing of electronic journals or have an electronic project underway. Some presses such as Birmingham offer electronic journals, though some do not publish journals and therefore face barriers with author permissions and infrastructure when it comes to publishing reference and other works electronically.

Firenze University Press was established as a digital press project of the University of Florence in Italy in 2000. Based within the university library system, it aimed to support academics in publishing and accessing electronic publications [141]. The Australian National University also recently established an E-press, stating that the traditional university press had declined and in Australia in particular:

"....the situation has been exacerbated by the lack of a global market for most Australian material and a decline in the number of outlets for scholarly monographs. The few remaining academic presses face a difficult future.” [142]

In reaction to these problems, from acceptance that the operational overheads of traditional university presses were no longer affordable, and the realisation that electronic technologies offered an alternative, the E-press was developed as a new model of scholarly publication within a digital repository environment [143]. The press offers full publishing services for both print and electronic formats, a print on demand service, and offers online content free of charge.

There are many other projects and initiatives in electronic publishing at university presses [144-148].
Although Baker [149] commented in 2001 that no university press had electronic publishing as an integral part of its publishing programme, since then numerous projects have been initiated, many as collaborative projects with other presses and libraries (see Chapter 4.4.) with varying levels of success. An EPS report stated that some publishers are making a profit electronically [150]. It is clear that there is growth in the adoption of electronic technologies in many aspects of university press publishing operations.

Duxbury stated that:

"Useful, innovative application of the Web by university presses can be groundbreaking." [151]

However, the cautious adoption by some presses, and the limited resources available, support the statement made by Watkinson that many presses are not in a position to take advantage of electronic technologies as much as they should.

Changes are required if university presses are to adopt and utilise electronic technologies. Roles are changing amongst staff, with the need for new staff skilled in different areas. Websites must be maintained, and on-demand printing and e-journals need to be understood and managed. It is now part of the press role to keep abreast of such developments.

Ketterman [152] commented that these challenges provide opportunities, and while there are disadvantages that are very real, there are also many advantages [153]. Givler stated that US university presses had become resourceful, adapting to technological change, but that presses must continue to rise to meet the challenges they face [154].

On the other hand, Meyers [155] has argued that publishers must become more flexible in their responses to technological, political and economic shifts. So far, presses seem to be adapting to some of the new, whilst holding on to elements of the past which have served the industry well [156]. As presses continue to produce both print and electronic products, the challenges of print publishing
remain, and electronic publishing brings a whole new set of issues to be solved [157]. Whilst print and electronic co-exist, there will be a greater financial burden and consequential difficulties for presses [158].


The roles of the stakeholders that play a part in scholarly communication have altered in a variety of ways, especially with the introduction of electronic technologies [159]. Stakeholders have taken on new roles and increasingly worked with others. The argument that each stakeholder in the system of scholarly communication, namely, the university press (or publisher in general), the author, the library, HEI administrators and the intermediary, has been too self-focused is raised in many discussions, and collaboration amongst these groups has been argued as a way to overcome current obstacles and move forward [160], [161], [162], [163], [164], [165], [166], [167], [168], [169], [170], [171].

University presses have often discussed the need for further HEI support and funding as fundamental to their success but the relationship is often reported as strained. Davidson discussed the need for administrators to play a role:

"...if we believe in the value of scholarship, then we who hold leadership roles in our profession must devise the best ways to support university press publishing."

[172]

However, it is wrong to assume that HEI administration can continue to provide financial support when HEI funding is also decreasing. Litchfield argued that presses need to initiate discussion with HEI officials and indicate their mutual aims in order to continue to have input into the scholarly system [173], and Davidson also stated that the presses can do more to give themselves greater visibility [174].

Regarding library relations, a common view is that the library and the press have different roles to play and have different needs. Others have stated that university
presses have the best understanding of the academic library market and mission [174], and that collaboration makes sense.

In 1991, the results of a study showed that fewer libraries had direct relationships with university presses than five years earlier [175]. In more recent times, however, there has been a number of collaborative projects, helping both to successfully fulfill their missions [176], [177]. Jensen of the University of Nebraska Press commented:

"We have come full circle and have realised that our roles are complementary rather than competitive." [178]

Ketterman added that university libraries and presses are facing similar hardships and have a similar stake in the outcome of the crisis:

"If librarians are the guardians and if the scholarly book and journal publishers the gatekeepers, then it makes sense for us to be allies... collaboration doesn’t diminish our status. Rather, it strengthens our case and demonstrates that university presses, too, have a vision beyond the short-sighted view of our own self-interest." [179]

The University of North Carolina Press and its library have held annual meetings since 1993 to learn about each other’s work, and it is not uncommon to find librarians and university presses working together on many projects today [180]. The University of Cincinnati Digital Press was established in 1994 and was the first US university press based at a library. The library added a number of important functions to the press, including preservation, indexing, and construction of bibliographies [181].

Over 1,500 books from The University of California Press have been available on the Web free of charge through an ongoing partnership between the press and California Digital Library [182]. The Press has also launched a joint project with a local association to produce the association’s web-based community initiative [183]. In the UK, the Cranfield University library director is also the director of the university press.
Academic libraries and university presses at ten large universities in the United States have been working on a joint project to put hundreds of scholarly books into electronic form. The aim is that the university presses will offer all books in electronic form in a version that could be linked to a joint online library catalogue that is already operating.

Penn State University Press has built a working relationship with the libraries that has resulted in a number of joint projects [184], along with the realisation that both the press and library have unique abilities and roles to share.

In 2003, the AAUP and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) issued a joint statement defining the complementary roles of the press and library in Higher Education. The statement showed a strengthened commitment to cooperation and joint action, and a commitment to work together to ensure a strong system for the future. It named 2004 as the ‘Year of the University Press’, wherein libraries aimed to help raise the visibility of the university press [185].

Ekman commented that an early lesson learnt from electronic publishing projects is that collaboration among stakeholders is important [186]. However, individual projects do not always have the desired effect or create change. What might be required is group effort from all presses in order to make the necessary impact. Substantial effort is required if university presses are to maintain their place in the changing market; social aspects, as well as business, technical, economical and management issues need to be considered [187].

Collaboration has also been initiated between university presses [188]. The AAUP in the USA fosters collaboration in a variety of ways [189], and a number of US university presses are working together on electronic projects.

Seven university presses, supported by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, have launched a cooperative venture with the American Council of Learned Societies to develop frontlist and backlist electronic books in history [190]. The History Ebook project involves Columbia, Rutgers, Harvard, Johns
Hopkins, Michigan, Oxford, and New York university presses and is creating Web access to history e-books [191].

4.5. The Future of University Presses in an Electronic Environment

University presses in the USA have clearly benefited from membership in the AAUP and from collaboration with each other. There is no evidence, however, to suggest that UK university presses are collaborating. Bennett [192] argued that joint ventures bring a range of benefits and create competitive advantage, driving the industry forward. However, each press must retain its individuality and remain flexible and attentive to the market. If university presses are to take advantage of the current climate in scholarly publishing, they will need enthusiasm, influence, and concerted action in order to establish the level of organisation required to compete with established commercial channels and new Web-based initiatives. Other authors have argued that a balance of cooperation and competition is required [193], while many authors continue to stress the need for further subsidy from the HEI [194].

Rix predicted that the smaller university presses will be completely different entities publishing through and with new technologies [195]. There is clearly a role for university presses to adopt electronic technologies in a more comprehensive way.

Many authors argued that the university press will continue to have a vital role in any system of scholarly communication, whether print or electronic [196], [197]. However, presses must adapt to changes and re-tool. Electronic technologies add new duties and responsibilities to the role of the press, but the new opportunities to improve business practice need to be utilised.

Lipscombe [198] argued that presses must be creative in order to survive in the current environment, and Fisher [199] suggested publishers would need to create new business models for the electronic age. As noted earlier, social aspects, as well as business, technical, economical and management issues need to be considered [200], [201].
In contrast to the attitude most have regarding the future of the university press, Bailey stressed the need for change:

"We should take pride in our willingness and determination to do what needs to be done, to use whatever techniques will make that possible, to change, to accept risk, to be committed to higher purposes beyond our own survival. Only in that way will we survive in spirit, and deserve to survive." [202]
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Chapter 5

Academic Authors
5.1. *Academic Authors*

Academics can be defined as those primarily employed by a Higher Education Institution to teach and conduct research [1]. Academics are also required to be authors, publishing results of research and other work. Academic publication accomplishes three objectives important to scholarship: the certification, dissemination, and archiving of research. Publication also advances the state of knowledge in a subject discipline and provides the mechanism to assess the quality of contributions [2]. Authors continue to argue the importance of publication today [3], [4], [5]. Meadows stated that publication:

"...is as vital for research as the actual investigation itself, for research cannot properly claim that name until it has been scrutinized and accepted by colleagues." [6]

Academics choose to have their work published in several ways; as books, conference papers, reports, and in refereed or non-refereed journals. In many disciplines, it is refereed journal articles that are viewed as most prestigious [7], [8] and therefore this chapter concentrates on academic authors publishing articles in scholarly journals.

Academics publish to communicate their ideas and the results of research to scholarly and professional communities [9]. However, the publication of textbooks, monographs, and articles in peer-reviewed learned journals, has always been regarded as a mark of success in an academic career [10]. Peer-review refers to the quality control mechanism determining what articles are published. Once an article is submitted, it is typically reviewed by other academics (usually anonymously) to determine its credibility for publication.
5.2. Patterns and Reasons for Publishing

A number of studies have researched the factors that motivate academics to publish in academic journals and reported similar findings. Meadows [11] discussed the urge to establish priority of discoveries, recognition through enhancing personal prestige, promotion, and improved access to funds, as key factors. Pedersen [12] offered other reasons for publishing, one being the desire for immortality in print, and another the resolution of ‘priority of discovery’ disputes. Law discussed similar reasons: to transmit knowledge, peer esteem, record precedence, personal promotion, and to archive knowledge [13]. Tenopir [14] discussed the reasons as being: recognition for career advancement, including tenure, promotion and salary increases (‘publish or perish’), the desire to contribute to the body of knowledge in a particular discipline, and to be recognised for their contribution by their peers. McKnight and Price reported similar results with reasons for publishing as: dissemination of research, the advancement of new ideas, and career advancement [15]. Harnad et al believed research impact to be the reason academics publish, whether that be for assessment purposes or other [16].

In 1996, Strauch and Hunt [17] reported the primary motives as: having discoveries to communicate, the satisfaction of the final product, and occasionally, the financial rewards. However, the argument of financial reward is unconvincing, as many argue that scholars do not publish for financial reward [18], [19], and in general, academics are rewarded in an indirect way, such as through promotion and tenure. While authors do receive some royalties for books published, the amounts are generally minimal [20], and in some fields of journal publishing it is becoming increasingly common for scholars to pay to reach their audience (see Chapter Three). In support of this argument, Schauder [21] surveyed 743 senior academics in Australia, the UK, and the USA and reported that 76 percent of respondents were never paid for their articles while 19 percent had been charged a fee to publish.

In 1999, the ALPSP conducted a large-scale survey of contributors to journals [22] to discover what factors motivated researchers to publish in journals and how
they decided where to publish. Questionnaires were sent to 11,500 contributors in the UK, USA, and elsewhere, with a response rate of just under 30 percent. Results support those already discussed, stating that authors published for communication with peers, career advancement, personal prestige, and funding [23]. The main factors in achieving overall publishing objectives were to reach the widest possible audience, the quality of peer-review, and the impact factor of the journal [24].

The building of author reputation and career progression are given as key reasons for publication by the majority of authors. The results of the ALPSP study stated that 53 percent of authors agreed that scholarly publishing is changing its function from knowledge dissemination to the building of an author’s reputation [25]. Pedersen [26], Tenopir and King [27], and Su [28], argued that publication is no longer just a means of communication, but has come to be the most important way of evaluating academics, and can be a major factor in professional advancement. Rowland supported this argument:

"The scholarly publishing system is now concerned at least as much with scholars' career progression as with the dissemination of knowledge." [29]

Where academics publish has also been the topic of discussion. In general, authors do not consider whether a journal is for-profit or not-for-profit when they submit a paper for publication, choosing high quality journals for their best work [30]. The report of the National Enquiry found the following factors affected selection of a journal: publisher’s reputation (63 percent), likelihood of acceptance (23 percent), and the speed of publishing [31].

McGarva [32] argued that the international reach of a journal is the most important factor when authors consider where to publish. However, the ALPSP survey [33] concluded that considerations such as the perceived reputation of a journal determined the decision of where articles were published. Matters of concern in the publishing process for academic authors were: copyright and publication delays [34].
5.3. Publish or Perish

The number of published articles and the rate at which academic authors publish has been increasing dramatically over the past few years [35], [36], [37], [38], [39], [40]. While Tenopir and King have stated that the number of articles being published has increased more or less in line with the number of researchers conducting research [41], one of the much discussed reasons for the rise in literature is that academic success is increasingly measured in terms of the number and quality of publications, with institutional rankings being increasingly based on publication output [42], [43], [44], [45]. The reward system for academics in many countries depends on traditional publication as a defining criterion for rank and status [46].

Although not new, the term 'publish or perish' has become the motto of academia. Tenure, promotion, and appointments have become increasingly dependent on publication. Harnad has argued, however, that scholars are not simply looking to advance their careers but wish to make a contribution to human knowledge [47]. While this may be a strong reason to publish, there is no doubt that academic reward systems based on publication have placed increasing emphasis on publication for many academic authors and departments.

5.4. Academic Evaluation Systems: The Research Assessment Exercise

For UK scholars, the 'publish or perish' tradition has been exacerbated by the introduction of the UK Research Assessment Exercise (RAE). Implicitly the RAEs required at least four research related articles to be published in recognised peer-reviewed journals by each academic over a given period of time. Departmental funding is related to the RAE outcome, adding to the pressure.

Pedersen [48] argued that the Research Assessment Exercise has been one of the most influential reasons for the growth in academic publishing from UK academics in the last ten years. The RAE rating has become a major preoccupation for most UK university departments [49], and has been criticised as increasing the pressure to publish a certain amount, by a certain date, in a
reputable (i.e., peer-reviewed) journal [50]. It has also been reported by academic publishing houses that the workload:

"...peaked before the... deadline – with little work required for the rest of the year." [51]

In addition to journal articles, multi-authored books have also increased, giving a number of authors their required publications [52].

5.5. **Electronic Publishing and Academic Authors**

Taylor has said that the:

"...academic market is fertile ground for electronic innovation." [53]

The introduction of the World Wide Web connects academics in ways not previously known. Rapid growth of information and communication technology has influenced the mechanisms of knowledge distribution (i.e., publications and publication outlets) used by academics and researchers.

The literature is full of descriptions of the initiatives, discussions and information regarding academic authors publishing in electronic format [54], [55], [56], [57], [58], [59], [60], [61], [62]. Dixon [63] raised a valid point in stressing that the pressure to publish could be alleviated somewhat by the straightforward and simple electronic submission and refereeing of articles, speeding up the publication process.

The number and availability of online journals continues to rise, and the speed of technology allows ease of access and use. However, growth in the submissions by scholars to electronic journals has been slow [64], and it seems the assessment mechanisms continue to give academics concern about the viability of electronic journals [65], and many publishers therefore continue to offer both print and electronic publications.
Early experiments with electronic journals revealed author reluctance to publish in this medium [66]. However, even back in 1992, Okerson concluded that:

"...scholars are publishing in this medium already, and readers are willing to read in it." [67]

Initial author reluctance may have been due to the lack of available electronic journals [68]. More recent estimates, however, suggest that many exclusive online journals exist and well over half the current scholarly journals have an electronic equivalent [69]. This should give authors more incentive to publish their work through the electronic medium. However, this does not seem to be the case.

Bence and Oppenheim [70] conducted a study of nearly 5,500 journal articles in the business and management area that were published in different formats. They reported that while assessment boards did not judge electronic submissions as less worthy than traditional print articles, the authors still held the general belief that articles submitted to electronic journals were viewed as less prestigious.

Pedersen [71] found similar results. She conducted a study at Ulster University and Robert Gordon University in the UK and reported that 93 of authors chose to publish in print format. Those that published electronically did so because the journal that accepted their article was dual publication; the authors had not specifically chosen to publish electronically. Again, McNeil [72] supported this finding and stated that dual publication appeared to be the requirement of the customer. McKnight and Price reported results of a survey conducted in 1999 at 111 different institutions. It considered British author attitudes and perceptions of publishing in traditional and electronic formats [73]. They reported a:

"...small but increasing willingness to submit articles to electronic journals but also suggest continuing concern about the permanence of such media." [74]

Nelson [75] reported the results of a small-scale study of 38 academic staff at the University of West of England. Four stated they would submit to e-journals, while four said they would not. Five stated it depended upon the status of the journal.
Two already actively published their work on personal Websites and also accessed work from others electronically. Other support came from Fine who conducted a study of Canadian authors regarding electronic publishing and found that 61 percent of respondents had taken an informal route to electronic publishing, with only 16 percent submitting to formal peer-reviewed electronic journals. The authors saw little difference in quality, but 80 percent believed it was more credible to publish in non-electronic formats [76].

Steele commented that academics have an overwhelming preference for electronic access but continue to print the content [77]. Swan and Brown in 2003 reported results of an ALPSP study [78] with responses from 1,250 authors worldwide showing that having a print version was still more important than an electronic version, with 68 percent wanting both formats available. The authors reported that when submitting papers to electronic journals important factors were the guaranteed availability of back issues with a preference for the electronic version being made freely available. Author concerns with e-journals were uncertainty of continuing access and archiving and preservation. The traditional tasks undertaken by publishers were still highly valued in an electronic environment and almost all respondents wanted the peer-review system to remain [79]. Indeed, peer-review seems to be vital to the scholarly publishing system, aiming to ensure quality of publications [80], [81].

The report of the National Enquiry [82] concluded that authors were willing to consider alternative modes of publication providing the form of the product did not prejudice a faculty committee’s assessment of the work. It is clear that scholars need to know they are assessed on the quality of the completed research rather than on the form of publication.

The Research Assessment Exercise has influenced not only the trends of scholarly publishing in terms of when and what scholars publish but has also affected the format in which articles are published. Although RAE guidelines stated that refereed journal articles that are published through electronic means will be

---

treated on the same basis as those appearing in printed journals\(^2\), this message does not seem to have reached academic authors, or more likely, is not believed. Pedersen supported this view from the results of a survey [83] of 100 academic staff conducted at Aberdeen University in 1997. It showed the:

"...primary reason cited for non-publication in electronic journals was that the RAE does not value them as highly as print journals." [84]

Strauch and Hunt [85] further confirmed this in 1996 and argued that many academic departments did not find electronic publishing worthy of professional 'credit' towards tenure and promotion. While electronic journals are more accepted and used today and the number of electronic journals has risen dramatically in the last decade, they continue to have varying acceptance according to discipline, and:

"...have yet to be fully accepted as legitimate publication outlets by the various scholarly communities." [86]

The main concern about the electronic journal is, therefore, that they are not peer-reviewed and therefore not deemed high quality. This view may have arisen due to the term being applied to other electronic formats (e.g., newsletters). However, many electronic journals are simply electronic versions of print copies, and continue to be refereed in the same way. There are also many electronic only journals that are rigorously peer-reviewed (e.g. Information Research). It seems that while many electronic journals are rigorously peer-reviewed today, a large proportion of scholars remains confused about the format, quality, and acceptance by review boards and university senior management, creating a culture that they are of lesser value.

Although authors are increasingly submitting to electronic journals and these journals are becoming more widely recognised, the process has been slow. In order to address continued author concerns, the reward system may need to be changed. The ESPERE project [87] conducted between 1996 and 1997 looked at

\(^2\) For further details regarding the 2001 Research Assessment Exercise see www.hero.ac.uk/rae/
the possibility and desirability of establishing an electronic peer-review system. Eight biomedical publishers and 200 editorial board members were surveyed. Responses of 116 questionnaires showed that publishers are:

"...keen to move forward and use electronic methods for submission and review." [88]

Hamad et al offered more recent suggestions for a web-based assessment system [89], involving open peer-review once the article has been made publicly available (see also the House of Commons Report discussed briefly in Appendix A).

5.6. Publishing with University Presses

University presses are generally not-for-profit publishing houses associated with a Higher Education Institution. In disagreement with others (see chapter 5.2.) Speier et al [90] concluded that the quality of the outlet is one of the primary factors when publishing for many authors, and the medium or format is not as important as the legitimacy of the outlet.

The relationship between academic authors and publishing houses, whether a university press or a commercial publisher, has not been discussed in great detail, nor have studies been conducted in this area. One author [91] discussed personal experiences of publishing with a trade publisher, commercial publisher, and a university press. Another discussed the change in author relationships with university presses over a number of years, with authors taking on more responsibility throughout the publication process [92]. Jones conducted a study of 30 US university presses, both large and small. Questionnaire results showed that between 1980 and 1995, the responsibility given to authors had increased greatly (such as providing camera-ready copies, paying indexing permission and reproduction costs, and the cost of the title subsidy, as well as a change in the royalties received by authors) [93].
Dougherty argued that university presses have many advantages to offer authors. University presses can make long-term commitments, can nurture long-term work, e.g., series, can reach new and multiple markets, and have the means to produce beautiful, lavish books and journals [94]. However, do these benefits attract authors? McKnight and Price argued that a successful strategy for scholarly journal publishers in particular would be greater consultation with authors [95].

The author experience of publishing with a university press in comparison to a commercial publishing house has not been considered hitherto.

5.7. Conclusions

The role of the academic author has changed, and continues to change, as publication is increasingly viewed as a means of assessment in Higher Education, and as electronic publishing technologies improve and become more widely available. It is clear that the two primary motivating factors of career advancement and contribution to the discipline are independent of the publication medium.

Some believed electronic publishing was a way to circumvent exorbitant prices of serials (see Chapter Two) and Rohe and others argued that electronic technologies have made it possible for scholars to take control of scholarly publishing [96], [97]. While there is increasing adoption of electronic publishing by academic authors as new initiatives are introduced (e.g. open access [98]), some disciplines are active in such ventures, while others are not.

While the research assessment system in the UK does accept electronic peer-reviewed submissions, there is a need for a culture change in order for academics to publish more frequently in this medium. A new assessment mechanism may be required in order for change to be adopted.

Odlyzko [99] stated that the growth of online material will accelerate and that the attraction of a larger audience on the Web, and the danger that anything not on the Web will be neglected, will increase scholars’ use of electronic publishing. However, Odlyzko continues,
"The large majority of scholarly publications are likely not to change much for several decades. However, there will be growing pressure to make them easily available. In particular, scholars are likely to press even harder for free circulation and archiving of preprints. The realisation will spread that anything not easily available on the Web will be almost invisible." [100]

The electronic publishing of scholarly material is increasingly within the reach of academics with the introduction of the e-print, open archives initiatives, and individual author Websites. The changes in open access (see Chapter Three) improve the scholars' research impact by making their work instantly available and freely accessible to all. However, the key to the success of electronic publishing remains with the two predominant players. Authors must write and readers must read what is written.
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Chapter 6
Methods
6.1. Introduction
The successful study of university press practice, the current situation of university presses, and attitudes toward electronic publishing requires methods for collecting both qualitative and quantitative data, such as interviews, case studies and questionnaires. This combined approach aids appropriate data analysis and interpretation. This chapter discusses the research methodology employed, the research design, the pilot study, sampling techniques, and data analysis of the results. The aim of the research was to consider the university press in the electronic environment, and to consider the future of the university press in such an environment.

6.2. The Research Framework
The literature (see Chapters Two to Five) revealed the following:

- There is an overall lack of support for the university press.
- Electronic publishing has not been well utilised hitherto by the majority of university presses.
- While electronic publishing initiatives solve some short-term problems, so far they are generally not integrated or large enough to make the required impact in, or changes to, scholarly publishing.
- The majority of UK university presses are small and are not utilising electronic publishing to further press mission and goals.
- USA presses collaborate through the AAUP; UK presses have no similar vehicle for collaboration.
- No research has been conducted regarding publishing with a university press in comparison to a commercial publisher.
- University presses must be creative in order to survive in the current environment.

An abbreviated Table based on [1] (see Table 6.1), was created which lists issues that need to be addressed along with the information required to address them in order to aid the selection of appropriate research methods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue to Address</th>
<th>Information Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding and support from HEIs for university presses</td>
<td>- Funding and financial situation of university presses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relationship with HEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic publishing not being utilised at the university press</td>
<td>- Electronic publishing initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Effect of electronic publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Attitudes and views of electronic publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small UK presses not utilising electronic publishing</td>
<td>- Comparison of USA and UK university press electronic publishing initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Barriers to electronic publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overview of UK university press situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No research regarding academic authors publishing with the university press in</td>
<td>- Reasons authors publish with a university press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparison to a commercial publisher</td>
<td>- Experiences in publishing with a university press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are university presses doing to remain sustainable and increase their</td>
<td>- University press changes and future plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power in the scholarly publishing system?</td>
<td>- Business plans, strategies or models in action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Issues Found in Literature that Need Addressing and the Information Required to Address them

6.3. **Objectives of Research and Stakeholders**

The key stakeholders of the research consisted of academic authors, particularly those that have published with a university press and another publishing house, university press staff (more particularly the directors of the university presses), and university library professionals with a university press affiliated to their institution. The research design was built around these three stakeholder groups.
The methodology was designed around the following main research objectives:

**USA and UK University Presses:**
- Assess the current situation in UK university press publishing.
- Compare the UK situation to the USA situation, including both university presses and their corresponding libraries.

**Academic Authors:**
- Consider the views of academic authors and the value gained from publishing with university presses.

### 6.4. Research Design

This section provides an overview of the methods adopted for data collection in order to produce appropriate results specific to the questions, ensuring validity of the research. Validity refers to:

"The degree to which a measure assesses what it should/is supposed to."[2]

The design and results of the pilot study are also discussed.

### 6.4.1. Previous Research Strategies

In order to ensure that appropriate methods were selected for the research, analysis of research strategies adopted in previous studies regarding university presses, libraries and academic authors was undertaken. The majority of studies in similar areas has been exploratory and narrative, and has been conducted using qualitative methods through questionnaire survey and interview. For examples, see Table 6.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Sample Population</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAUP [3]</td>
<td>University press publishing</td>
<td>121 Member presses of AAUP</td>
<td>Annual postal questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett (CHOICE Magazine) [5]</td>
<td>Electronic publishing at university presses</td>
<td>121 Member presses of AAUP</td>
<td>Postal questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppenheim, Greenhalgh &amp; Rowland [6]</td>
<td>Future of the UK electronic publishing industry</td>
<td>2,894 scholarly publishers in the UK (6.5 percent response rate)</td>
<td>Postal questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schauder [7]</td>
<td>Motives for academic authors to publish</td>
<td>742 senior academics in Australia, UK &amp; USA</td>
<td>Postal questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan and Brown (ALPSP) [8]</td>
<td>Motives for academic authors to publish</td>
<td>11,500 contributors to journals: USA &amp; UK (30 percent response rate)</td>
<td>Postal questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan and Brown (ALPSP) [9]</td>
<td>Author views of the electronic publishing of learned journals</td>
<td>14,500 authors: worldwide (9 percent response rate)</td>
<td>Questionnaire on ALPSP website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan and Brown (JISC/OSI) [10]</td>
<td>Author survey regarding open access publishing</td>
<td>8059 authors: worldwide (8 percent response rate)</td>
<td>Email invitations for online questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Previous Methods Adopted for Similar Areas of Study
6.4.2. Research Strategy

It is vital that the research design be kept simple and clear with the selected methods most likely to achieve the objectives of the research [11]. The use of a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods provided the necessary detail for the scope of the study [12].

To study in depth the practices, views and developments of university presses and university libraries in electronic publishing, qualitative methods were judged to be most appropriate and were adopted as the primary tool for the research. Qualitative data has been described as:

"... a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes in identifiable local contexts." [13]

"... not merely the reporting of events; rather, the context, description, process and participant perspective must be analysed in a meaningful and coherent manner." [14]

"Developing a detailed understanding of individuals’ views, attitudes and behaviour." [15]

Qualitative data are collected in a natural setting, and offer flexibility. Research questions should be general enough to permit exploration while remaining sufficiently focused to delimit the study.

A number of methods, allowing triangulation, add variety and reliability to the research. Reliability is the extent to which the procedure would produce the same results regardless of the situation or time [16]. This offers cross-validation (comparing one result to another and examining the correlation), with the aim to complement rather than overlap [17], [18].

"The best option is for a range of approaches that will allow flexibility in understanding problems and offering multiple insights into their solution." [19]

"The adoption of two or more methods, or triangulation, ensures reliability." [20]
Limited quantitative methods were also adopted allowing for the use of different methods for the study of a single problem, in order to support the qualitative results and theories. The primary reason for adopting a mainly qualitative approach was the need for exploration. However, the use of some quantitative methods could lead to greater reliability in the research findings.

The methods adopted for this study consisted of a literature review; five case studies conducted in the USA and five in the UK involving university presses and their affiliated Higher Education Institution libraries; an academic author questionnaire; and both a quantitative and qualitative questionnaire completed by UK university press directors. Case studies were selected as they provide an in-depth look into one particular case or organisation, in this study, the university press. Each case can then be compared to others. Case studies were conducted in the USA and compared to the UK to assess the electronic publishing initiatives of both. A number of presses in Europe was considered relevant for study. However, due to time, financial and travel constraints, these were not conducted. Observation of press staff was considered as a method used as part of the case studies to gain further insight into attitudes towards electronic publishing. However, it was decided this method would not be used, as attitude is difficult to measure by observation, as well as time consuming.

In the use of all methods, the ethics of research were considered and appropriate action taken, i.e., the promise of anonymity to all respondents.

The data were collected using the methods described below. Some of the results were analysed using the software analysis package Atlas/ti (see Chapter 6.7.5), and business plans, business models, and recommendations were generated from the results. Reasons for selecting these methods are provided in the following sections.
6.4.3. The Literature review

A literature review was conducted to accomplish the following objectives:

- Discover what has been previously written on the subject of university presses and scholarly electronic publishing.
- Analyse the studies and methods that have been adopted previously in this area.
- Generate statements from the existing literature about what is happening and what needs to be done in order to improve the current situation (see Chapter One).

Four key search terms were adopted throughout the research, ('scholarly publishing', 'academic publishing', 'electronic publishing', and 'university press'). Further search terms were used for more specific background e.g., on open access, print on demand etc. Bibliographic databases, the Internet, print and e-journals were all identified and searched using the key search terms. All searches were conducted in the time frame 1995 to 2004, except where older material was thought to be of relevance, e.g., the history of the university press. Key journals and databases were searched monthly throughout the period of research to keep updated on developments in the field. All relevant documents, papers and studies were stored in hard copy, with bibliographic information stored on Endnote bibliographic software [21].

6.4.4. Pilot study

The term pilot study refers to the testing out or trial run of research methods and instruments on a smaller scale, in preparation for a full-scale study [22]. Pilot studies are conducted in order to ensure success, to eliminate possible ambiguities and problems in the methods selected, and to refine the data collection instruments.

The advantages of pilot studies are: they give advance warning about where the project could fail, they show if proposed methods or instruments are inappropriate, they help identify potential practical problems in the procedure, and identify poor recording and response rates [23]. A possible limitation of
conducting pilot studies would be in making inaccurate assumptions or predictions based on pilot study results. Teijlingen and Hundley stated:

"Completing a pilot study successfully is not a guarantee of the success of a full-scale survey." [24]

However, the authors concluded:

"Well-designed and well-conducted pilot studies can inform us about the best research process and occasionally about likely outcomes." [25]

The main objectives of the pilot study were as follows:

- Test the interview survey in a real setting.
- Test one site in the natural setting and discover if the population and questions are appropriate.
- Check for ambiguity in the questions.
- Test the amount of time taken and the appropriate environment required.

The pilot respondents were selected through contacts of the researcher and her supervisor. Initially, it was decided that face-to-face interviews would be conducted with each stakeholder, i.e., an academic author, a library professional in Higher Education, and a director of a UK university press. Respondents were approached via email and the pilot interviews were held during May 2002. The interview setting and questions, the environment and time taken, resources needed, and the collection of preliminary data were all tested during the pilot interviews.

The interviews (see Appendix D for Pilot Study Report, including interview surveys, emails and transcripts) were designed to address issues relevant to the three stakeholders. Issues discussed with the academic author were: pressures to publish; reasons for where they published books and journal articles; preferences in choice of publishing house; access to scholarly material; views and use of electronic publishing; reasons for and experience in publishing with a university press; and differences between university presses and other publishers.
Issues addressed with the university library director were: the relationship between the library and university press; ways in which the library works with the university press; and the role the university press could play in the scholarly communication network.

The issues discussed with the university press director were: the role of the press in the scholarly communication environment; governance of the press; relationship with the university, commercial publishers and other university presses; initiatives in electronic publishing; the impact of electronic publishing on the press; and the future of the press.

Interviews were recorded for transcription with permission from the interviewees. The respondents were informed that the interviews were pilot studies and briefed as to what this implied. Along with answering the interview questions, the respondents provided feedback regarding the interview process and identified ambiguities in the questions. Table 6.3 shows the feedback from the pilot study and the action taken to improve the methods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure no external noise and interview for transcription purposes</td>
<td>Interviews were conducted in setting free from external interruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with librarian irrelevant as no specific university press experience</td>
<td>Interviews were conducted only with librarian staff as part of the case studies, or for the UK case studies sent as email questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian interview too long and questions not always appropriate</td>
<td>Length of librarian interview curtailed, more specific to university press relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic author interview very long</td>
<td>Interview questions shortened and sent as email questionnaire due to time constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author experience of book and journal publishing very different</td>
<td>Concentrate on book authors only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University press director interview not focused on electronic publishing</td>
<td>Director interview/case studies focused on electronic publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author questions a little ambiguous</td>
<td>Questions more specific to university press publishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: Feedback from, and Action Taken, as a Result of the Pilot Study

It was decided that two questionnaires, one qualitative and one quantitative, would be sent to UK directors, rather than interviews conducted, in order to save time and travel costs. The academic authors were sent a shorter questionnaire via email for ease of distribution. Five university presses in the USA and five in the UK were contacted and used as case studies for a more in-depth exploration, and librarian interviews were conducted only as part of the case studies, as these belonged to a HEI with a university press. The pilot study therefore proved vital, ensuring that the methods were more appropriate to the specific objectives.
6.5. **Questionnaire Design**

This section focuses on the way the questionnaires were designed in order to produce valid results. Distribution and sampling procedures are also outlined.

Questionnaires were selected as the main data collection method to receive responses from academic authors and from the directors of UK university presses, as they could be easily distributed, inexpensive, and save costs (as the researcher did not need to be present). The following list covers the advantages of using questionnaires [26]:

- Encourages frank answers
- Researcher does not need to be present
- No interviewer bias
- Can be completed at the leisure of the participants
- Data is easily collected and analysed
- Relatively inexpensive to administer

Busha and Harter provide a few more advantages [27]:

- Can target a larger sample
- Fixed format helps eliminate variation in the questioning process

There are however, a number of disadvantages [28]:

- Elimination of personal contact
- Respondent cannot ask questions about possible ambiguous questions
- Not all may be motivated to complete and return the questionnaire

Again Busha and Harter add to the list with the following [29]:

- Difficult to obtain responses from a representative cross-section of the target population
- May lead to non-response bias as some respondents may be more interested in the research topic than others
- Does not allow in-depth exploration

Three questionnaires were developed, two for the directors of UK university presses, one qualitative and one quantitative (see Appendix E) and one qualitative questionnaire for academic authors (see Appendix F).
6.5.1. Academic Author Questionnaire

A structured email questionnaire was formulated after consideration of web-based questionnaires and telephone interviews. A structured email questionnaire would allow for a direct and easy response and save the time and cost of the researcher, and more easily accommodates pre-coding for analysis. However, an email questionnaire also decreases the response rate as it is impersonal and adds to the receiver’s email inbox. To increase response rate, the email questionnaire consisted of only 11 questions (see Appendix F). The objectives in conducting questionnaires with academic authors were as follows:

- Consider the reasons why academics publish with university presses.
- Look into the value university presses add today.
- Provide an original approach.

The literature demonstrated that author surveys are common in subjects such as factors motivating academic authors to publish (e.g., [30], [31]), journal publishing (e.g., [32]) and faculty use of electronic publishing (e.g., [33], [34], [35]). However, while there are surveys that cover university press publishing, there have been none that specifically study authors publishing with a university press, or consider the differences of publishing with a commercial publishing house. Therefore, this strand of the research was original.

As this part of the study was original, the questionnaire could not draw on previous related studies. Issues discussed with the academic authors were: job details; the university press published with; reasons for and experiences in publishing with a university press; preferences in choice of publishing house; differences between university presses and other publishers; improvements presses can make for the author’s benefit; and views regarding university presses becoming more active electronically.

The questions were listed following a cover note to the academics explaining who the researcher was and the nature and purpose of the research. The cover note also confirmed that the responses would not be attributed to the respondent or the institution with which they were affiliated. The respondents were asked to reply
direct to the email sender, responding to the questions in the email reply. The author email questionnaire was sent during February 2003.

6.5.2. **UK University Press Director Questionnaires**

Two questionnaires were formulated and sent as postal questionnaires direct to all operating UK university press directors. Postal questionnaires were chosen because both email and web-based questionnaires would be too long, and personal interviews would involve a lot of time and travel. A covering letter (see Appendix G) accompanied the questionnaires explaining the purpose and importance of the research, the objectives and hypotheses of the research, information about the researcher, and the anonymity of responses.

The objectives to be achieved using questionnaires for UK university presses were as follows:

- Obtain an overall view of the UK university press situation.
- Compare the UK situation to the USA.
- Find out about initiatives in electronic publishing.
- Discover what presses are doing, struggling with, and need to do to improve.

A qualitative questionnaire was developed to generate in depth responses regarding the current situation and views of UK presses (see Appendix E). The qualitative questionnaire consisted of 21 questions and was separated into three sections. Section one covered general press information, goals and mission; section two dealt with electronic publishing and more specifically asked about initiatives in electronic publishing, experiences of electronic publishing, future plans for electronic publishing and lessons learned; and section three covered existing and future collaboration with other university presses. An option was provided for respondents to add any other comments or concerns. At the end of the questionnaire, a question asked the directors if they were willing to be used as a case study. If so, they were to tick a box and provide contact details.
The respondents were also sent a quantitative questionnaire (see Appendix E) to put into perspective the economics of university presses and electronic publishing at UK university presses, and to support the qualitative questionnaire. The questionnaire was based on a questionnaire used by Greenhalgh et al [36] in 2000 and completed at that time by 187 UK-based scholarly journal publishers undertaken in conjunction with a broader-based research project on the future of the UK electronic publishing industry. Some questions were omitted, others added, and the format was changed to fit the needs of the respondents and in order to make the questions more appropriate for a university press.

The quantitative questionnaire consisted of seven lengthy questions split into three sections. Section one asked about financial turnover. Section two covered a list of reasons for an Internet presence and asked respondents to rate the reasons on a four-point Likert [37] scale as follows:

| Not Important | | Very Important |
|---------------|----------------|

Section two also covered percentage of products published in electronic format, percentage of revenue derived from electronic publishing, and a list of statements under the headings of: market considerations, technology, security and legal concerns, training and management issues, and economic factors, to be rated on a four-point Likert scale as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section two also included a list to be completed in a similar manner, consisting of 34 statements under the heading of ‘Obstacles and Opportunities’ to be rated on a four-point Likert scale from minor to serious impediment to the faster growth of the press’ electronic publishing business:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Impediment</th>
<th></th>
<th>Serious Impediment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Section three asked the director to list up to three factors that would help the press’ electronic publishing business grow. The university press director questionnaires were distributed during February 2003.

6.5.3. Questionnaire Distribution, Sample and Response Rate

A sample is a portion or subset of a larger group or population [38].

“Sampling should be conducted in such a way that all types represented in a population are included.” [39]

The population for the academic author email questionnaire consisted of academic authors who had published both with a university press and a commercial publisher.

Stratified or cluster sampling was used and UK academic authors were identified using UK university press catalogues to locate university press author names. These were subsequently searched on the British National Bibliography website [40] to identify whether these authors had also been published by other publishing houses.

Once this lengthy process was complete (between July 2002 and September 2002), the identified author names were then searched using Google [41] to locate the author’s email address. This introduced convenience sampling as only those addresses located were used. Common names were omitted to ensure the authors’ contact details were not identified incorrectly. A total of over 200 names were identified as having published with both a university press and a commercial publisher, from which a list of 100 was compiled that had usable email addresses.

The response rate to the email questionnaire was 38 percent. One author replied saying he was too busy to respond, and 12 of the email addresses were incorrect. 12 additional author names were subsequently identified, using the process described previously. Two weeks after distributing the email questionnaire (mid-February), 31 responses were received. A reminder email was then sent and seven
more responses were received. Some questions were omitted by some respondents, and other responses did not provide much depth. As the questionnaires were self-completed, questions could have been misinterpreted.

The population for the UK director questionnaires consisted of all UK university press directors. 20 university presses in the UK were identified at the beginning of the research (January 2003), with director contact details discovered by locating information through the press catalogues and press Web pages. Every university press operating in the UK was targeted to achieve a comprehensive overview of the UK situation.

The mere fact of distributing the questionnaires also provided further information regarding the current situation for UK university presses. One press had been taken over by a commercial publishing house, namely Open University Press, and two presses had been closed down by the Higher Education Institution, namely Greenwich and Sheffield Hallam. Another press did not have a director and informed the researcher that the press had not been actively publishing for a number of years. This lowered the number of operating UK university presses to 16. Discovering this information allowed further contact with the appropriate press staff or Higher Education Institution in order to discuss the reasons for such action. The press operating under a commercial publishing house was included in order to compare the differences and similarities with those 16 presses operating under the Higher Education Institution, making the number of presses studied 17.

12 UK university press directors responded to the questionnaires. This gave a response rate of 71 percent. Although follow-up letters and emails were sent to those directors who did not reply, five press directors did not complete the questionnaires. Two press directors informed the researcher they would complete and send the questionnaires, but they did not; two directors gave no response; and one contacted the researcher directly stating that they did not like to complete questionnaires but would like to be used as a case study (this press was indeed used as a case study). Those directors that did respond made known their view of the importance of the research, an enthusiasm to be involved in the research, and asked to be informed of the results.
To encourage a high response rate, a covering letter (see Appendix G) was sent with the postal questionnaires. These were addressed to each director by name and signed individually. An introductory note with the author email questionnaire was sent (as mentioned previously) promising anonymity. The email questionnaires were sent directly to individual email addresses. The postal questionnaires were printed on different coloured paper to aid analysis and to look more attractive. A freepost envelope was included for the directors to return the questionnaires. Contact details of the researcher and supervisor were also provided if respondents needed further clarification or more information.

6.6. Case Study Design

Case studies are in-depth investigations of a discrete entity and are undertaken with the assumption that it is possible to:

"... derive knowledge of the wider phenomenon from intensive investigation of a specific instant or case." [42]

"... (complete) an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence." [43]

Case studies can employ a range of methods including interviews, historical and documentary analysis and observations. Case studies aim to reflect the main characteristics of the population, in this case the university press, and were selected for their qualities of allowing in-depth exploration, permitting further investigation and understanding of the organisation and more particularly into any existing electronic publishing views, initiatives, and successes.

The use of case studies was chosen to supplement the questionnaires and to provide further detail regarding UK university presses, and new information from USA university presses, providing a basis for comparison.

The objectives of the case studies were:

- To look in-depth at a few university presses.
To consider the situations of USA and UK university presses.

To compare the USA university press initiatives with UK university press initiatives.

To study existing university press business models and strategies for electronic publishing.

The case studies were designed to look in-depth at university presses to discover publishing activities, use and opinions of electronic publishing, lessons learnt and problems faced. Field research and desk research tools were adopted. For the field research, semi-structured interviews were used, and for the desk research, a literature search was conducted using each press name along with: historical data provided by others, the press' own publications, annual reports, press releases, press accounts, and business plans and models. Five presses in the USA (November 2002) and five in the UK (June, July and August 2003) were studied in depth.

"One aim of studying multiple cases is to increase generalisability....that the events and processes in one well-described setting are not wholly idiosyncratic." [44]

Semi-structured interviews with the director of the press and the corresponding library director, along with a review of the documented history concerning the press and the press publications, were the methods selected for the case studies. Semi-structured interviews fix and control circumstances in order to collect appropriate data while remaining flexible and responsive. This enables the researcher to go into greater depth on certain issues [45]. Semi-structured interviews can include both open and closed questions. Structured questions have the advantage of providing a systematic approach, helping analysis. A number of issues can be discussed to elicit respondents' views, and elaboration and explanation is encouraged. Interviews allow the interviewer to clarify questions and provide further explanation, allow for a large amount of data to be collected at one time, and allow for the interviewer to ask further questions or explore other issues that arise [46]. Disadvantages include time and cost to the researcher, therefore limiting the number of case studies.
Normal practice in semi-structured interviews is for the respondent to create a list of issues and sub-issues to discuss, and include prompts and questions to use when necessary, enabling respondents to talk:

“...in their own words at their own level of understanding.” [47]

Flexibility should be paramount, and important and concrete issues are explored before abstract ones. Questions should be straightforward and direct, with more sensitive issues approached indirectly if respondents seem reluctant to answer or go into detail. Anonymity should always be offered [48].

6.6.1. USA Case Studies

The USA Case Studies had the following objectives:

- To examine the US university press and its delivery of electronic scholarly information to the Higher Education community.
- To study the initiatives they have taken in relation to electronic publishing.
- To study the advantages and disadvantages of university presses publishing electronically, including the best practices and lessons learned in electronic publishing, the common problems, and possible solutions.

The literature was dominated by the USA university press situation and many US presses are more active in electronic publishing than the majority of UK presses. The UK can learn from experiences, projects and choices made by these bigger presses.

The researcher was awarded funding for the USA trip from the John Campbell Trust\(^1\) [49]. The researcher met with the director of each press and in some cases, other staff members. Information regarding funding, electronic publishing, and

\(^1\) The John Campbell Trust is an independent charitable trust for the field of Information Science. It has the purpose of furthering the education and development of information professionals through grants, scholarships, research or travel awards, and thereby aims to enhance the knowledge and experience of the information community.
competition and collaboration were discussed in detail. The corresponding Higher Education Institution librarian was also interviewed where possible.

The interview survey (see Appendix H for John Campbell Trust Report) consisted of three sections with a total of 34 questions. Section one, entitled 'Press information, goals and mission', covered funding, mission of the press, long-term goals, subjects published, present and future revenue, revenue generated internationally, and future opportunities.

Section two, entitled 'Electronic publishing', covered electronic publishing initiatives, charging for electronic products, profit from electronic products, success of electronic publishing, benefits and disadvantages, lessons learned, the effect of electronic publishing on the press, strategies and business plans for electronic publishing, and long-term and future plans.

Section three, entitled 'AAUP and collaboration', looked into the benefits of membership with the AAUP, along with competition and collaboration with other university presses.

Library directors were also interviewed using an interview survey consisting of 12 questions (See Appendix H: John Campbell Trust Report). The questions covered: size of book and electronic journal stock, effects of electronic publishing on the library, any initiatives in electronic publishing taken by the library, the relationship between the library and the university press, ways in which university presses publishing electronically would benefit the library, and the role the university press could play in the scholarly communication network.

6.6.2. UK Case Studies

Case studies were conducted in the UK with the following objectives:

- To study a number of UK university presses in depth.
- To compare these presses to the case studies conducted in the USA.
- To add further insight to the UK director questionnaire responses.
• To develop business plans and make recommendations appropriate to individual press needs.

Five university presses in the UK were selected for case study. The interview survey was similar to that used for the USA case study interviews, but with some distinct differences. The interview survey was split into three sections with the same sub-headings. Section one included questions that addressed the press relationship with the HEI and whether the press gave priority to university authors, and section three, entitled 'Collaboration', included questions regarding existing collaboration and possibilities for future collaboration, particularly the role of a UK association of university presses. The interview survey conducted with the USA librarians was sent in advance as an email questionnaire to the UK libraries associated with the university presses, in order to save time.

Table 6.4 lists the research conducted and where it can be located in the appendices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Date of Research</th>
<th>Population and Sample</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Appendix Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Study Questionnaires</td>
<td>May 2002</td>
<td>1 Academic Author, 1 Press Director, 1 Librarian</td>
<td>100 percent</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Study Report</td>
<td>June 2002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Author Questionnaire</td>
<td>February 2003</td>
<td>100 academic authors</td>
<td>38 percent</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires for UK Press Directors</td>
<td>February 2003</td>
<td>17 UK University Press Directors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Interview Surveys USA</td>
<td>November 2002</td>
<td>5 USA University Presses and 5 Libraries</td>
<td>5 Presses and 4 Libraries</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Interview Surveys UK</td>
<td>Summer 2003</td>
<td>5 UK University Presses and 5 Libraries</td>
<td>5 Presses and 3 Libraries</td>
<td>See H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4: Table Showing Research Conducted and where it can be Located in the Appendices

6.6.3. *Case Study Sample and Response: USA and UK*

For the USA case studies, the target population was all university presses in the USA. It was however difficult to identify all presses, and it was decided to focus on the 86 university presses that were members of the AAUP [50].

Stratified sampling was used to identify the presses to be studied using the university press statistic charts (see Appendices A and B). All university presses were listed under categories selected by the researcher as small, medium and large. These categories were dependent on the annual book title output of the press: 0-20 title output being classed as small, 21-70 title output as medium, with
presses that produce a title output of over 71 as large. The figures used were based on the information found in the AAUP directory 1999 to 2000.

Once categorised, the presses that were located on the East Coast of the USA (for ease of access) were selected, and from that, sample presses were selected for their electronic publishing programmes or lack thereof, and the size of the press (by number of staff) using convenience sampling and quota sampling. Elite interviewing was also adopted as only the directors of the university presses, and when appropriate, electronic publishing directors, were interviewed for the case studies.

There is a high concentration of university presses in the East Coast of the USA (over 30), allowing a large sample to be obtained. For this study, four presses were selected, all being large, well-established presses with a variety of electronic publishing initiatives, and one small university press was selected in order to be more comparable to the small UK presses.

Visits with the Association of American University Presses (AAUP) director, SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition) and ARL (Association of Research Libraries) (see Appendix H) were also arranged for further insight and discussion of the issues facing university presses.

USA press directors’ contact details were located through the university press Web page, or the press catalogue. An email was then sent requesting their assistance. The emails included information about the researcher and the project, reasons for the study, how the sites were selected, benefits and risks to participants, the promise of confidentiality and anonymity, what the study entailed, length and number of sessions, request to record the information obtained, and an explanation of what will happen to the final results.

All directors responded favourably and agreed to take part in the study. Extra presses were initially approached, and accepted, but were then sent a polite decline stating they were not needed as travel plans had changed. At each university press, the corresponding institution library director was also contacted.
via email and asked to participate in a short interview. All but one responded affirmatively and interviews were conducted with four university librarians.

As noted earlier, the trip to the USA to conduct these case studies was funded by the John Campbell Trust and taken during November 2002. For a copy of the trip report see Appendix H. Copies of the interview survey were sent to the directors in advance, allowing for preparation. The interviews began with introductions and seeking permission to record the interview. The questions were addressed and explored, and other important comments or issues were then addressed. The directors and corresponding librarians were very helpful in all aspects of the research.

The interviews varied in length between one half and one hour at the libraries and between two and three hours at the presses. All directors and staff were willing to divulge much information and stressed the importance of the research, and all requested the results.

For the UK case studies, the target population was all 17 operating university press directors. UK case studies not only provided a comparison to the USA case studies but the data collected supplemented the information from the questionnaires. Each UK university press director was asked at the end of the postal questionnaire if they would be willing to be interviewed and used as a case study, therefore using the probability sampling method. Of the 12 that responded to the questionnaires, seven responded affirmatively with the majority of others offering reasons why they could not, such as the director being on long-term sick leave and the deputy director therefore very busy. This was a small sample; however, all the press directors had a wealth of experience in the organisation and in university press publishing.

The five university presses selected from the seven willing to participate were chosen by the researcher due to size and electronic publishing initiatives. These were two large presses, one press that had been bought by a commercial scholarly publisher, and two very small presses. The university librarians were contacted via email with the questionnaire being sent over email to save time. The response
rate was favourable. However, this may have skewed the results, as the participants themselves chose to be involved (introducing response rate bias) in the study and may have had strong feelings regarding the research topics. Each case study followed the same format and a similar interview survey as the USA case studies, having a structured layout, therefore allowing for easier analysis and comparison.

6.7. Data Analysis

Qualitative and quantitative data were generated from the research, the majority of data being qualitative. Each stage of the research was analysed separately and then comparisons were made. The quantitative data from the UK university press director questionnaires were coded and analysed using Microsoft Excel. The qualitative data from the academic authors were compiled in a MS Word file for manual analysis (as there were only 11 questions to be analysed), with graphs created in Excel. The qualitative data from the USA and UK case studies were coded and analysed using Atlas/ti, a qualitative data analysis software (see Chapter 6.7.5), as were data from the qualitative questionnaires completed by the UK university press directors.

6.7.1. UK University Press Quantitative Data

Data analysis began as soon as data collection had begun in order to analyse the development of important themes and issues, and from this, create codes. The quantitative data were input into an Excel spreadsheet with all responses being analysed and compared respectively. Tables were created for each question or statement, and percentages were calculated for the corresponding responses.
The results were presented in graph form, created in Excel, e.g.,

![Percentage of Products Published in Electronic Format](image)

**Figure 6.1: Example of a Graph Created from Responses to a Question in the Quantitative UK Director Questionnaire**

### 6.7.2. UK University Press Qualitative Data

The results from these questionnaires were considered, initially as individual presses, and then compared to provide an overall view of the UK university press situation.

The questionnaire text was transcribed into Microsoft Word and formatted appropriately for analysis in Atlas/ti. Codes and general patterns were noted during transcription. For further detail on the use of Atlas, see Chapter 6.7.5.

### 6.7.3. Academic Author Data

The responses from each of the questions in the email questionnaires were collated into a Word document for comparison.
Tables and graphs were created for each question or statement in an Excel spreadsheet and the percentage calculated for the corresponding responses, e.g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added Value from University Presses</th>
<th>Number of Author Votes</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Author Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with me more/personal approach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More likely to be taken seriously by academics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More care and attention to book</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion/beneficial to career</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS more efficient and had more time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well marketed to target audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable prices of books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5: Example of a Table Created in Excel showing Author Responses to one Question

### 6.7.4. USA and UK Case Study Data

Analysis of interviews can be done simultaneously with data collection and transcription. The continuous searching for evidence to both confirm and refute early interpretations should be paramount [51]. Interviews were recorded for transcription, and codes and general patterns were noted during transcription. Once codes had been created, the transcripts were input into Atlas/ti analysis software (see Chapter 6.7.5).

Miles and Huberman offer different methods for cross-case analysis; a variable oriented approach focusing on one variable and applying this across all cases (generalisation of ideas and opinions), and the case oriented approach studying one case in depth, then examining successive cases to see if the pattern continues to emerge [52]. The case oriented approach was adopted for analysis of the case studies, with each case being analysed individually, and subsequently compared to the others. Each case was analysed by code, and then expanded to compare findings to the other cases.
6.7.5. **Atlas/ti Analysis**

Two main qualitative data software packages are available, Atlas/ti and Nudist [53], both with advantages and disadvantages. Atlas, however, offers a greater range of advantages [54]. From the author’s own use of Atlas, these include: open questions (such as those addressed in the case study interviews) are easily coded, there is no limit on the codes applied, theories can be built from the output, it provides hypertext links between the data and the created codes, and is creative and visual yet unstructured. Barry [55] suggests others; Atlas is visually attractive and creative, and conceptual network displays can be created and manipulated.

While Nudist is more structured and provides sophisticated search tools [56], it was not selected for use because the researcher had no previous experience of the software, and when tested it was found not as user-friendly as Atlas. Additionally, the researcher had previous knowledge and skills with the package, having used it on a previous JISC-funded project [57]. Atlas was therefore selected as the analysis tool.

**Atlas/ti** stands for: archive for technology, and the life-world and everyday language. ‘ti’ stands for text interpretation. Atlas is a software package for the analysis of qualitative or ‘soft’ data. While Atlas can be used for graphical, audio and video data [58], in this instance it was only applied to the text of the case study interviews and questionnaire surveys.

Atlas helps identify themes and patterns using developed codes. Atlas is used by entering the transcripts of interviews into the hermeneutic unit in a certain format, and assigning the developed codes to the text. This gathers together blocks of information from all respondents on the same issue or code for analysis and comparison. Atlas was assessed as:

> “Having been designed specifically for coding, memoing, data linking and theory building.” [59]
Pre-determined codes were developed for analysis of the data and assigned to the interviews and questionnaires according to the subject investigated by each question.

"Codes are tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study...used to retrieve or organise." [60]

Sub-codes were then developed in relation to the responses to these questions. As new issues and responses were identified, further sub-codes were added and incorporated into the existing data from the transcripts.

For an example of a developed code with sub codes, see Figure 6.2:

![Diagram](image)

Figure 6.2: Example of a Code and Sub-Codes

Once data analysis using Atlas was complete, the case studies and questionnaires were analysed for patterns and themes individually, and then compared using matrices and tables. Conclusions were drawn from this data.

6.8. Business Models

Two business models were developed based on the results of the research. The models were built using a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. *Ithink Analyst* was also considered for use, (a modelling software package that aids a user in graphically representing processes in a model and in building numerical relationships between different elements of the model [61] and which has been used previously for business models of scholarly publishing [62], [63], [64], [65], [66]). However, in
the first stage of the model building, Microsoft Excel was used to input the model. Excel spreadsheets had all the functionality and components necessary and applicable for the models to operate fully, as well as having the advantage of being accessible to the majority of computer users, (and therefore the university press directors), Microsoft Excel was therefore selected as the software in which to build and represent the models.

Excel spreadsheets allow the creation of graphical models showing the process or patterns involved, along with the use of tools to fine-tune the model, adding equations and real-cost examples to show the model in implementation. Following the creation of the model, the output can be viewed and analysed in graphs and tables created from the data in the model.

The models were sent to the press directors for feedback, following which a few changes were made. Chapter Eleven discusses the business models in more detail.

### 6.9. Business Plans

An initial business plan was developed for a UK association of university presses. This was sent to the press directors and, following feedback, a second plan was written incorporating the feedback received. A third plan was developed by ALPSP based on the second plan, but incorporating such an organisation into the structure of the ALPSP.

Sample business plans [67], [68] were used as a basis and adapted according to need. The business plans contained some or all of the following sub-headings:

- Executive Summary
- Mission Statement
- Situational Assessment and Strategic Response
- Organisation
- Fees and Funding
- Market, Marketing and Sales
- Organisational Structure and Staffing
- Competition
Business Risks and Contingency Planning
- Financial Management Plan

More details of the business plans can be found in Chapter Ten.

6.10. Summary

Research questions were formulated from the literature concerning USA and UK university presses and academic authors, and were concerned with electronic publishing. From these, the research was designed using the methods of case study, including interview and data collection; and questionnaires, mainly qualitative, with some quantitative data. An analysis of the data collected is presented in the following three chapters.
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Chapter 7
Results - UK University Press Director Questionnaires
7.1. Introduction

Twelve of the seventeen UK university press directors completed both the qualitative and quantitative questionnaires (see Appendix E). The qualitative questionnaire was separated into three sections. Section one covered general press information, goals and mission, section two dealt with electronic publishing, and section three covered collaboration with other university presses.

7.2. Funding

Results of the questionnaires showed that five presses (42 percent) were subsidised by their Higher Education Institution (HEI), and four presses (33 percent) were nominally self-funded (though these presses also received funding from other sources such as bank financing, lottery grants and project funding). A commercial publisher had bought one press, one had entered into a venture with a commercial publisher, and one was operated as a side business of the Higher Education Institution.

Figure 7.1 shows the funding situation of UK university presses involved in this study, in graphical form.

Figure 7.1: Funding of UK University Presses
7.3. The Mission of University Presses

The missions of the presses were all similar. Five presses aimed to publish high quality material, four focused on the dissemination of knowledge and research, and three aimed to raise the profile of the university press. The presses generally mentioned more than one specific mission, including reaching customers, and having increased involvement in digital printing and electronic publishing initiatives. UK university press missions remain traditional, but have adapted to include new technology and marketing strategies.

7.4. University Press Goals

The most common long-term goals of the presses were to: develop new technology (three presses), increase output (three presses) and be the best in their specialist field (two presses). Other goals mentioned by individual presses included; continue with the mission, achieve limited company status, collaborate with the HEI library and computing services, publish in more areas central to the HEI, and balance academic obligations with financial imperatives.

7.5. Relationships with the Higher Education Institution

Eleven (92 percent) university press directors reported a relationship with their Higher Education Institution. However, five presses (42 percent) still maintained that they were independent from their HEI. Directors clearly viewed independence very differently. Two presses (17 percent) stated they were a department of the university, two reported being wholly owned by the university, two were part of the HEI Information services, two existed to promote the HEI, and two to serve the needs of the HEI. Only one press reported receiving accommodation with rent paid for by the HEI, and one director reported being employed by the university. UK university presses therefore continued to have a strong link with their parent Higher Education Institution, although these relationships were not strongly related to funding or subsidy.
Ten presses (83 percent) did not give priority to publishing material from their HEI staff, one press did and one stated ‘not necessarily’. UK university presses clearly do not operate as vanity presses and instead seek wide authorship.

7.6. International Sales

University presses also aimed for wide dissemination and sales. Eleven of the twelve presses (92 percent) were selling internationally. The majority of these eleven presses used international agents, representatives and aggregators, with the aim to disseminate to the widest possible market. Greenhalgh et al, in a similar study, reported that 91 percent of scholarly journal publishers exported their products [1].

![Publishers Selling Internationally](image)

**Figure 7.2: University Press International Sales**

7.7. Opportunities for the Future

Five presses believed publishing opportunities lay in the growth of certain subject areas, while two presses saw opportunities using print on demand technology, and two in electronic learning (e-learning). Other presses saw opportunities in reference material, the trade market, electronic publishing, textbooks, strategic alliances, and facsimile publishing.
7.8. *Electronic Publishing*

Eight of the twelve presses (67 percent) reported that they had taken initiatives in electronic publishing, and three (25 percent) stated that they had not. One press stated that it had participated in projects, but not taken a lead. Of the three presses that had not taken initiatives in electronic publishing, two stated that they had plans to introduce electronic publishing, and the remaining press reported that they had no plans to introduce it.

![Electronic Publishing at UK University Presses](image)

*Figure 7.3: Electronic Publishing at University Presses in the UK*

Four of the eight presses that had taken initiatives in electronic publishing stated that they had been successful, three said it was too early to respond and one reported no success. The presses reporting success all gave different reasons for success. These included; having established print journals, limiting products to areas in which there is demonstrated consumer demand, not investing too heavily, outside assistance, clear positioning, customised websites, and having products that are valued by students. All the university presses had at least a basic presence on the Internet. In 2000, Greenhalgh [2] reported that 95 percent had a presence on the Internet.
7.9. **Effect of Electronic Publishing**

Only two directors stated that electronic publishing had had no appreciable effect, or no effect to date, on the university press. Two presses talked of a large effect on staff (both positively and negatively), and one reported the new recruitment of staff, business partners and authors. One press mentioned that turnover had stabilised, and another talked of planning for an electronic future.

7.10. **Strategy or Business Plan for Electronic Publishing**

When asked about the current strategy or business plan for electronic publishing, four presses planned to develop their electronic journals and two aimed to build relations with international partners or the HEI library and computing services. Other strategies included working on further partnerships, providing electronic services, keeping watch as to what technology was appropriate to adopt, increasing output, developing an electronic archive, introducing electronic publishing, and shifting from print to online format. Greenhalgh found that scholarly publishing companies with more than 250 employees considered themselves as having clearly defined electronic publishing strategies while the small companies did not. However:

"... a smaller company could introduce change with greater speed and agility."

[3]

Only two of the presses that responded to the questionnaires had a staff of over 250, and both did have a business plan for electronic publishing. However, all but one of the UK university press directors reported some form of business strategy or plan in terms of electronic publishing, demonstrating that electronic publishing is more embedded in the business than it was a few years ago.
7.11. Benefits and Disadvantages of Publishing Electronically

All but two respondents listed benefits from electronic publishing; one stated there were no benefits and one argued they were not yet quantifiable. Two presses mentioned status, two mentioned that authors like the press to be involved, and other comments included: business retention, being at the leading edge, improved production, good student response, and beneficial for publishing learning materials, all of which were long-term benefits.

When asked about the disadvantages of undertaking electronic publishing projects, one press surprisingly stated there were none, one stated progress was too slow, while two stressed the large amount of time taken versus the lack of income. Four presses stated that high investment was required, with low returns.

7.12. Lessons Learned

Lessons learned from electronic publishing included:
- The need to strike a balance between cost and benefit
- Electronic publishing is very costly if there is no demand
- There is no immediate payback
- It is difficult to extract payment for electronic only products
- The need for staff training
- Electronic publishing takes patience and hard work
- Asset management is very difficult
- There may be legal and copyright problems.
- It is better not to lead, but wait and see what the market wants
- There is no data or market research to analyse

7.13. Collaboration and Competition

When asked about collaboration with other university presses, six presses (50 percent) reported no collaboration (one press had collaborated in the past but no longer did, and one press was looking for new partners). Six presses (50 percent) did report collaboration with other university presses (one had informal
relationships, one collaborated when they felt it was appropriate, mainly in co-publication, and two presses reported formal relationships of collaboration). Two presses stated the reasons for collaboration were mutual economies of scale. No presses gave reasons for not collaborating.

The majority of these presses named both commercial and university presses as their primary competitors. Two university presses stated they had no major competitor because they published in niche subject areas. One press listed a competitor that was a local printer, rather than a publishing house.

Eight presses stated that they would benefit from UK collaboration; some stated, 'absolutely', and one, 'in part'. No press said they would not benefit, and three stated possibly or maybe.

In response to the idea of joining a UK association of university presses, one press stated they would not as they were too large and would not benefit from collaboration with other UK presses. Three presses stated possibly, but the majority, seven (58 percent), stated that they would. One press did not respond. One director was interested in any publishing community similar to his own, but another believed there were not enough players in the UK for such an organisation. One director reported being in the process of attempting to orchestrate such an organisation, and a few others referred to an organisation that
once existed called ‘UniPress’ set up by a commercial company and run by the University of Birmingham Press. This organisation folded because it wasn’t profitable. The results demonstrate that the majority of UK university presses in this study would support a UK organisation for university presses.

![Graph showing the Number of Presses that would join a UK Organisation of Presses](image)

**Figure 7.5:** Graph showing the Number of Presses that would join a UK Organisation of Presses

7.14. *Quantitative Questionnaire*

The respondents were also asked to complete a quantitative questionnaire (see Appendix E) based on the questionnaire used by Greenhalgh et al [4] in 1999, and reported in 2000. Greenhalgh et al used a questionnaire that was completed by 187 UK-based scholarly journal publishers regarding their opinions on the future of the industry, undertaken in conjunction with a broader-based research project, carried out on behalf of the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI). Of the 187 scholarly journal publishers, 11 were university presses, 71 were learned and professional societies and the majority, 105, were commercial publishers. The results from Greenhalgh et al. are compared to the questionnaire results of this study.
7.15. **Turnover**

Of the eleven UK University presses that responded to this question detailing total turnover for the last financial year (2002), five presses reported a turnover of up to £250,000, two presses with turnover of between £250,000 - £500,000, one press between £500,000 and £1 million, two presses between £1 million and £5 million, and one presses with an annual turnover of over £50 million. Table 7.6 shows these results in graphical form.

![Press Turnover](image)

Figure 7.6: Annual Turnover

Greenhalgh reported 7 percent claiming turnover of over £50 million per annum, but only 16 percent with a turnover of up to £250,000. Turnover is also reflected by the number of staff at the university presses. The majority of presses (ten) reported having staff numbers of between 1 and 20 staff, one press had 27 staff members, and one very large press recorded 1200 staff. Greenhalgh reported 36.7 percent of respondents having fewer than ten employees [5].

7.16. **Percentage of Products Published Electronically**

One question asked was: what percentage (if any) of your products is published in electronic format? The directors were asked for percentage estimates two years ago, currently, and in two years time. Two years ago, all that responded (one did not respond) claimed the percentage of products published in electronic format was between 0-25 percent. Ten directors stated it was currently the same as it was
two years ago (0-25 percent), but one press stated that currently over 75 percent of its products were published in electronic format. Predictions for the future showed four presses publishing between 0-25 percent in electronic format, six between 26-50 percent, and one over 75 percent. The majority of smaller university presses have not undertaken electronic publishing initiatives with as much vigour as bigger learned societies and commercial houses, nor do they envision this effort increasing much, if at all, in the future.

![Percentage of Products Published in Electronic Format](image)

**Figure 7.7: Percentage of Products Presses Publish in Electronic Format**

7.17. *Percentage of Revenue from Electronic Publishing*

The same question as detailed in 7.16 was asked but referred to the amount of revenue derived from electronic publishing. Greenhalgh reported only 58 percent generated revenue from electronic publishing, with 82 percent of respondents predicting that by the end of 2000 they would be generating revenues from electronic products [6]. This study revealed that two years ago all presses that responded to this question (ten) received between 0-25 percent of their revenue from electronic publishing; that these same presses all reported receiving between 0-25 percent in 2002, and in two years time all but one director believed it would remain the same (between 0-25 percent) with one stating it would be between 26-50 percent.
Attitudes toward the generation of revenue derived from electronic publishing have changed; with less expectation of revenue today than was reported in Greenhalgh's study (although the majority of respondents in Greenhalgh's study were commercial publishers). As Greenhalgh noted:

"Clearly, some respondents were making losses, or only just breaking even, on their electronic publishing activities." [7]

The university press sector in the UK does not generate, or expect to generate, much revenue from electronic publishing.

7.18. Reasons for Internet Presence

One question asked the reasons why presses had a presence on the Internet and offered the choice of a range of reasons. Responses were marked on a Likert type scale of one to four from not important to very important. Publicity (eleven presses, 92 percent), reach new customers (ten presses, 83 percent), and deliver an improved service (nine presses, 75 percent) were considered very important or important. The generation of increased profit was seen as slightly important or not important (seven presses, 58 percent). Greenhalgh reported over 67 percent of her respondents considered the Internet to be an important publicity tool, with 53 percent reporting the ability to reach new customers being very important [8]. These results support the idea of the ability of the Internet to reach new markets and audiences, rather than to generate revenue.
7.19. Market Considerations

Eight or 67 percent of respondents disagreed that publishing electronically would improve products, with only 3 (25 percent) agreeing or strongly agreeing. Only four presses (33 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that reaching the market is easier with electronic products than paper, while seven (58 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed. In contrast, Greenhalgh reported that 64 percent agreed with this latter statement [9].

Four presses (33 percent) also believed that there were sufficient potential customers for electronic products (again with seven, or 58 percent disagreeing). Only six (50 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that customers were willing to access material electronically (with five, or 42 percent disagreeing), corresponding with Greenhalgh’s 50 percent [10]. Only five (42 percent) of respondents in this survey agreed or strongly agreed that there are sufficient
market statistics available on which to base product development decisions, with 50 percent disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. Figures 10 to 15 below demonstrate these data.

**Figure 7.10: Publishing Electronically will Improve Products**
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Figure 7.14: No Intense Competition in the Electronic Market
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Figure 7.15: Customers will pay a Realistic Price for Electronic Products
Eight (67 percent) respondents believed that there was intense competition in the electronic market (three presses believed there was no intense competition). Nine (75 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that customers had appropriate hardware and software (only two, or 17 percent disagreed), but only five presses (42 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that customers would pay a realistic price for electronic products with six, or 50 percent, disagreeing. Greenhalgh reported just-under 60 percent of her respondents agreed that customers would pay a realistic price [11]. Clearly, directors believe customers remain unwilling to pay a realistic price for electronic products.

7.20. Technology

Five respondents (42 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that there was uncertainty over future technical development and this has discouraged investment in electronic products, six disagreed or strongly disagreed. Seven respondents (58 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed that they had a clearly defined electronic publishing strategy (with 33 percent, or four, agreeing). Five presses (42 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that converting print material to electronic format has posed considerable problems (six disagreed or strongly disagreed). Five respondents agreed that the Internet is too slow (again six disagreed or strongly disagreed), and six agreed that common technical standards are adequate (five disagreed or strongly disagreed). However, Greenhalgh reported that only 17 percent agreed that standards were adequate [12], showing that in recent years, technical standards have improved.
Common technical standards are adequate
The Internet is too slow
Converting print material to electronic format has posed considerable problems
We have a clearly defined electronic publishing strategy
Uncertainty over future technical development has discouraged investment in electronic products

Figure 7.16: University Press Views Regarding Technology

7.21. Security and Legal Concerns

Seven presses (58 percent) agreed that copyright infringement is a key concern (compared to the 70 percent reported by Greenhalgh [13]) and 50 percent agreed that electronic distribution creates unknown legal liabilities (60 percent reported by Greenhalgh [14]). However, only 25 percent (three presses) agreed with the statement that data protection laws are restricting publishing opportunities, and indeed, it is difficult to see why data protection should inhibit publishing.
Copyright Infringement is a Key Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Study agreed</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhalgh agreed</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Study disagreed</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhalgh disagreed</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.17: Copyright Infringement Concerns

Electronic Distribution Creates Unknown Legal Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Study agreed</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhalgh agreed</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Study disagreed</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhalgh disagreed</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.18: Electronic Distribution and Legal Liabilities

Data Protection Laws are Restricting Publishing Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Study</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreed</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.19: Data Protection Laws Restricting Publishing Opportunities
7.22. *Training and Management Issues*

Eight (67 percent) of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that there were sufficient trained personnel to undertake electronic publishing projects, (in comparison to only 47 percent in Greenhalgh’s study [15]), 25 percent agreed there were sufficient personnel, although no respondents strongly agreed with the statement.

42 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that there is a lack of understanding of electronic publishing at senior management level in their organisation compared to the 53 percent stated by Greenhalgh [16]. In this study 50 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed.

![Figure 7.20: Personnel Available to Undertake Electronic Publishing Projects](image)

![Figure 7.21: Senior Management Understanding of Electronic Publishing](image)
7.23. **Economic Factors**

67 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the immaturity of online charging mechanisms is a constraint to business development, while 25 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed. 58 percent believed that the costs of maintaining parallel print and electronic products were not prohibitively high and 33 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they were, with Greenhalgh's study conducted in 1999, reporting 31 percent disagreeing and 34 percent agreeing [17]. 67 percent of respondents in this study also believed that electronic products do not damage the sales of paper-based products, while 16 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they did. This result is similar to Greenhalgh's findings, contradicting fears that electronic products damage printed products and their revenue streams [18].

---

**The Immaturity of Online Charging Mechanisms is a Constraint to Business Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.22: Views Regarding Online Charging Mechanisms and Business Development

**The Costs of Maintaining Parallel Print and Electronic Products are Prohibitively High**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.23: Views of High Costs Maintaining Print and Electronic Products
Electronic Products Damage Sales of Paper-based Products
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Respondents were also asked to rank impediments to the faster growth of their electronic publishing business, if appropriate, from minor to major impediment. Of those that replied, major impediments were reported as:

- Competition from low-cost or give-away products (50 percent versus 16 percent reporting it as a minor impediment)
- Concern over protection of copyright in an electronic arena (50 percent versus 25 percent)
- Shortage of trained staff at a salary that can be afforded (50 percent versus 25 percent)
- Costs of marketing (42 percent versus 25 percent)
- Shortage of capital (50 percent versus 34 percent)
- Lack of sales/retail outlets (42 percent versus 33 percent)
- Lack of viable market opportunities for electronic material (41 percent versus 34 percent).

Minor impediments were reported as:

- An overcrowded marketplace discouraging new product introduction (75 percent as a minor impediment)
- Taxation issues (69 percent)
- Problems with encryption technology (67 percent)
- Internet being too slow (66 percent)
• Confusion caused by constant updates of hardware (67 percent) and software (50 percent)
• The complexity of the technology required (58 percent)
• Uncertainty over future regulations (50 percent v 25 percent)
• Fear that electronic publishing will damage sales of paper-based products (50 percent v 25 percent)
• Security of payment mechanisms (50 percent v 25 percent)
• Insufficient government support for electronic publishing (50 percent v 25 percent)
• Cost of promoting/marketing electronic products (50 percent v 25 percent)
• Market for further electronic publishing products does not currently exist (50 percent v 25 percent)
• Fear of the high costs associated with electronic publishing (50 percent v 25 percent)
• Competition from other companies/presses (41 percent v 25 percent)
• Lack of Higher Education Institution support (50 percent v 33 percent)
• Presses’ own unfamiliarity with electronic publishing (50 percent v 41 percent)
• Cost of maintaining parallel print and electronic products (42 percent v 33 percent)
• Licensing material is too difficult/expensive (41 percent v 34 percent)
• Lack of training of staff (41 percent v 33 percent)

Those that were rated equally as a major and minor impediment were: the cost of acquiring electronic rights to third-party data, lack of common technical standards, and customer resistance to paying a realistic price for electronic information products.

Interestingly, one of the biggest perceived impediments was competition of low cost or give away products, including open access journals. This ties in with the view that customers are not willing to pay a realistic price for electronic products. However, customer resistance to pay was viewed by 42 percent as a major and 42 percent as a minor impediment by press directors.
50 percent of respondents argued that the shortage of capital was a serious impediment, agreeing with Greenhalgh's result of companies viewing this as a major disadvantage [19], indicating the need for sponsorship and grants. Only 33 percent in this study viewed lack of Higher Education Institution support as a major impediment and 50 percent as a minor impediment.

All respondents agreed that an overcrowded marketplace and taxation were minor impediments, whereas Greenhalgh reported tax issues as a big concern [20]. This difference may be because Greenhalgh studied a large number of commercial publishers, while university presses are not-for-profit organisations.

Greenhalgh revealed the belief that the speed of the Internet was an obstacle (over 50 percent) [21], whereas the majority (66 percent) of directors of the university presses, did not view this as an obstacle. Technology is constantly being updated and improved, and this may account for the difference. The majority of sales for university press products are to academia, where technology is fast and generally up to date in the UK.

Greenhalgh discovered that 60 percent of respondents were either neutral or disagreed that there was intense competition from other companies [22]; this study revealed only 41 percent. Greenhalgh reported a quarter of respondents being in agreement that there was intense competition [23] with this survey agreeing and revealing 25 percent of respondents in agreement that there is intense competition in the electronic market.

7.25. Factors of Improvement

When asked to list three key factors that would help the electronic publishing business grow, the most common factors given in Greenhalgh et al in descending order, were as follows:

1. More trained and experienced staff
2. Greater uptake and acceptance of information in electronic format
3. Secure payment mechanisms
4. Improved market information
5. Greater copyright protection
6. Improved technical infrastructure
7. Greater funding for libraries and universities
8. Easier access to capital
9. Faster Internet response times
10. Customer willingness to pay a realistic price for electronic products
11. An end to VAT on electronic products [24].

Results in this study revealed 43 percent of comments referring to economics. The most commonly stated were an easy payment system, and a culture shift in paying for electronic goods and also amongst the Higher Education community. Other factors listed were; economic upturn, increase in project funding, more national government support, acceptance by the market of realistic pricing, market confidence in payment mechanisms, cheaper conversion costs, and a reduction in the cost of third party rights clearance.

Other comments included: more evidence of a market for electronic products, better recognition by corporate clients, emerging consumers more adept in an electronic environment, greater confidence by librarians in one form of digital technology, better understanding of technology, clarity in academic assessment standards on both sides of the Atlantic, specifying what academics should be publishing and how, cheaper and faster home access to the Internet, clearance of electronic rights, especially illustrations, co-operation of authors, staff time, quality content, less competition from free and low-cost providers, common technical standards, implementation of XML workflow, and retailer investment in e-book sales.

Unfortunately Greenhalgh did not provide exact percentage results making correlation with her results impossible. While Greenhalgh reported business, marketing and staffing issues as the publishers main concerns, this study reveals that for university presses payment systems and a culture change with Higher Education would most help their electronic publishing business to expand.
7.26. Conclusions

UK university presses struggle with funding and have adopted a variety of ways to remain in business. Many university presses are now expected to make a profit and are not financially supported by their Higher Education Institution. University presses in the UK are under constant pressure to fulfil a mission difficult to achieve without subsidy. While some university presses do have links with the parent HEI, there is decreasing financial support, if any, and university presses face an increasing search for outside funding, while maintaining their original mission. Lack of funding and often support from the parent HEI makes it harder to accomplish the press mission, yet some presses have adapted well under a constantly changing environment and many do not view lack of HEI support as a major impediment.

These small publishers need to adapt or risk failing to make the impact they could. With press closures and cuts in print runs and subject areas, the future of the UK university press is uncertain, despite the critical role they could fulfil.

Predictions for the level of future electronic publishing were generally low, as was future revenue. It seems paper publishing will continue to be important in the foreseeable future. Electronic publishing business plans and strategies adopted were conservative; university press directors believed that although there is a market for electronic products, they were unsure how to reach it, and felt customers would not pay a realistic price. There is, therefore, arguably, a need for a change in attitude towards electronic publishing amongst the Higher Education community.

Press directors viewed the lack of trained staff and immaturity of charging mechanisms as a constraint to developing electronic publishing strategies and products. However, the results demonstrate there is a culture shift occurring amongst publishers; press directors no longer believed the costs of parallel printing to be prohibitively high, and agreed that electronic publishing does not damage the sales of print-based products.
Whilst electronic publishing initiatives may solve some short-term problems e.g., retaining customers and attracting authors, they are generally not integrated or large enough to make the required impact. Electronic publishing has not been sufficiently utilised by university presses and they require guidelines and standards for electronic publishing in order to adopt it appropriately. The presses also feel that low-cost and give-away products, including open access journals, may be a threat to business development. Presses need to get involved and experiment with new technologies and products in order to remain players in the market.

While the not-for-profit system run by the learned societies and university presses is well placed to capitalise on the so-called crisis in scholarly publishing, in order to be successful, university presses need to appropriately experiment with new publishing technologies and ensure these support and help further the mission and goals of the press.
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8.1. Introduction

The cases included five USA university presses and five UK university presses. They compared the current situations and initiatives of the presses and studied existing practices and strategies for electronic publishing.

The case studies were designed to look at the presses to discover publishing activities, use and opinions of electronic publishing, lessons learnt and problems faced. For the methods adopted for the case studies see Chapter Six.

The questions the case studies were designed to answer were:

- Where did press funding come from?
- What electronic publishing initiatives were taken?
- What were the lessons learned from electronic publishing?
- What strategies and business plans existed for electronic publishing?
- What were the long-term and future plans of the presses?
- What collaboration exists between presses?

The questions addressed by the library interviews were as follows:

- What effect did electronic publishing have on the library?
- What was the current relationship between the library and the university press?
- What role could the university press play for the library?

Each case was analysed individually using the analysis software Atlas/ti (see Chapter Six), and subsequently all cases were compared.

This chapter covers a brief summary of each case and then a more detailed comparison of cases. Further details of each case could not be included due to the size of each case. The USA cases are described and compared, followed by the UK cases. These are followed by a comparison of the USA and UK cases.
8.2. USA University Press Case Studies

8.2.1. Description of the Presses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Annual Book and journal output</th>
<th>Titles in print</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>200+ books</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>45 books</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>200 books</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>190 books</td>
<td>2,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40 books</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1: Description of the Presses

All five presses were well established and published a wide-ranging number of books and journals. Three of the presses studied were large, and two of medium size (see Chapter 6.6.3).

8.2.2. Case One

This large press remained true to its original scholarly mission while remaining leading edge and being willing to experiment. While the press was working with partners and moving toward print on demand, further experimentation was difficult due to financial constraints, as well as the uncertain sustainability of such projects. The press did see a future for electronic publishing, but was unsure of the role the press will play in such an environment. In order for the press to become more active in electronic publishing, the financial situation would need to improve. While collaboration with the library was minimal, further collaboration was encouraged to improve relationships and mutual understanding.
8.2.3. Case Two

This was the only US press interviewed that was not a member of the AAUP. The press was reluctant to invest in electronic publishing, but had partnerships with a number of e-book aggregators, as without partners it could not experiment. The press was, however, developing templates for producing standards for electronic manuscripts. The press did not plan to invest in experimenting with print on demand but will keep abreast of developments. This was the only press studied that was concerned about copyright infringement of electronic products. While the press had a lot of informal collaboration, it did not collaborate formally.

8.2.4. Case Three

This press was one of two presses studied that had chapters available online and also offered some whole electronic books. The press was one of the first publishers to be involved with electronic publishing. At this press, all manuscripts were dealt with in electronic format and electronic communities (sites offering a variety of information on a particular discipline) were viewed as the way to success for the press. All out of print books were being converted to electronic format, and this is the only USA press studied that had begun a print on demand programme, believing it would solve the problems of inventory and the economics of university press publishing. The long-term plan of the press was to deploy print on demand, believing publishing electronically was more successful as a distribution mode. This press had a detailed business plan and strategic direction for its electronic publishing programme.

8.2.5. Case Four

This press offered chapters and many reference works online. This press worked on many collaborative projects, working very closely with the library and university information services on three electronic projects, making it unique in this respect. This was the only press that hired staff specifically for electronic publishing. While all projects were initially funded by outside sources, all had the
aim of being self-supportive after three years. This press received 10 percent revenue from its electronic publishing initiatives and boasted a doubling of electronic revenues since 1999, with continual annual increases. The press planned to develop templates for e-books but viewed print on demand as the future and was working to that end. This was the only press studied that held regular meetings specifically to discuss electronic publishing. The library was also very active in electronic publishing, having established a separate hybrid organisation in which to work with the press and information services of the Higher Education Institution, making provision of three major electronic communities possible.

8.2.6. Case Five

This was the smallest press studied, employing only seven staff. However, the press had a title output of 39 in 2000. Though small, the press did offer online ordering and aimed to increase title output by 5 percent each year. The press had no plans to offer everything in electronic format as some commercial presses do, for fear of damaging print sales. The press was, however, somewhat active in experimenting with electronic publishing and had a small number of books which provided 20-25 percent of the press’ revenue due to the electronic components available with the books. The press did not have a financial picture of the future impact of electronic publishing or a strategy for such work and believed print publishing would always exist. There was no collaboration with the library but both parties saw great potential, with regular discussions scheduled.
8.3. **Comparison of USA University Press Cases**

8.3.1. **Funding**

| Press 1 | Large endowment |
| Press 2 | Wholly owned, not-for-profit subsidiary of its parent university. |
| Press 3 | HEI provides certain subsidies, paying about half of the costs for space, and a certain level of interest free capital to keep the press running. Self-Sustaining. |
| Press 4 | Press office space is subsidised by the HEI, no other direct financial subsidy. All projects funded by outside sources and the press often attempts to get subsidies for individual titles. |
| Press 5 | Annual grant from HEI, representing about 10 percent of sales. Rent is paid for. |

**Table 8.2: Funding of USA Case Study Presses**

The majority of the presses receive subsidies from their parent Higher Education Institution. The majority of presses receive subsidised or paid-for rent.
### Press Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press 1</th>
<th>Publish the highest quality of scholarship; reflect the excellence of the university, all in a fiscally responsible manner.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>Sustain its reputation as a leading edge publisher in its subject discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>Stay at the leading edge of scholarly publishing and dissemination in specialist areas, and publish vertically (publish a variety of material e.g. books, journals, monographs) in those areas. Add value to information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>Publish scholarly materials not only for the academic community, but a larger intellectual community to find the widest possible readership. Assist other presses in their scholarly mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
<td>To be considered the premiere publisher in its specialist areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.3: Press Missions**

The general mission for the university presses was to publish the highest quality of scholarship, to add value, and be at the leading edge in their discipline(s).
### 8.3.3 Press Goals

| Press 1 | Maintain a strong and active presence in specific areas, keep up with developments in those fields, and adapt to the changing marketplace in terms of the products it provides and the avenues through which it provides them. |
| Press 2 | No long-term goals for electronic publishing, but is experimenting while keeping abreast of new developments. |
| Press 3 | To grow and thrive. Long-term financial stability and self-sufficiency. It is not looking for ongoing outside funding sources to keep it alive. |
| Press 4 | No comment |
| Press 5 | Contribute to reserves and stay financially solvent. To progress in terms of reputation and author pool. Increase title by five percent each year. |

Table 8.4: Press Goals

Many presses were looking to remain or become self-sustaining. One press sought no outside funding and the only mention of goals regarding electronic publishing was to keep abreast of new developments.
### 8.3.4. Electronic Publishing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press 1</th>
<th>Online sales and marketing, partnerships with a number of e-book aggregators, though on a modest scale. The press was moving toward print on demand, though electronic publishing was not big on the agenda as funding is always a problem. Initiatives have always been funded by outside organisations such as the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, though was unsure whether if support were removed it would survive.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>Very experimental, and generally with partners who can do the jobs the press cannot at this time; without such partners, the press could not experiment as much. All back-end publishing work and preparation of manuscripts was done electronically and the press was developing templates for producing standardised electronic manuscripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>Many projects with partners, mainly with e-book aggregators, and all manuscripts are dealt with in electronic format. Electronic communities have had big success however further development will take a few years due to the large investment required. The press offered journals in electronic only format and was converting all out of print books to electronic format. This press had a digital print on demand programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>Many electronic projects underway and many online reference publications. The press worked on three database projects with the HEI library and other associations. The press spent the last two years revamping internal production capabilities aiming for 75 percent of the books published by the end of 2002 to be converted to XML, thereby being prepared to deliver materials in any format required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
<td>Online sales and online tables of contents offered with a plan to offer excerpts and chapters of books online. There are no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
plans to offer everything in electronic format for fear of damaging print sales. The press does have a number of partnerships with e-book aggregators and online sales distributors.

Table 8.5: Press Initiatives in Electronic Publishing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electronic Publishing Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = no
* = experimenting
√ = yes
* = yes with partners

All of the presses were actively experimenting with electronic publishing in some form, depending on where they saw the need, market and potential growth. Initiatives included marketing online, selling online (mainly through retailer sites), e-book projects, e-journals, reference works online, e-communities, and collaborative projects with organisations and societies such as Netlibrary, ebrary, Questia, etc.

"Here was a way to increase one's visibility and presence internationally, in a very easy way, so it began that way, and then the notion of actually selling books online began to be taken pretty seriously, and I don't have figures on how many books we're selling through 'Amazon.com', but there's no question that that's increasing."
One press wanted to use electronic publishing:

"...as an opportunity, not only to go where our customers are or that our authors want us to be, but where the business is and where business is going to be growing in the 21st century. We do believe it's going to be growing in this direction in the 21st century."

Many of the initiatives and projects were undertaken with partners, and presses saw them as impossible to operate without outside funding or collaboration with partners. The majority of ventures had been very experimental. Many presses were building up electronic repositories and archives and were working in XML. Many communicated with authors through electronic means and worked with manuscripts in electronic format.

All believed electronic publishing should lead to profits, but only some viewed it as being profitable now or in the future. The majority of presses studied received very little electronic publishing revenue, some none at all. However, one press reported ten percent revenue from subscriptions, licences, subsidiary right licences, and e-book aggregators.

Some saw electronic publishing playing a large role in the future but did not see it happening yet, while others saw print on demand as making a difference. Electronic communities provided a revenue stream for one press in the form of subscriptions. First copy costs remain the same.

Only one press hired staff specifically for an electronic environment. For the other presses, electronic publishing had resulted in staff learning new tasks.

"...but it has resulted in the way we think about who we hire, and anyone we hire in certain key areas of our business we're going to expect them to have some familiarity with or some wisdom about electronic publishing".
The majority had existing staff take on different roles. Advantages for the staff in working with electronic publishing were: learning new things, being more aware, and more staff remaining at the press. Only one press held regular meetings to discuss electronic publishing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electronic Publishing</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>Opportunity to learn more about the customer, being at the leading edge, and providing for authors.</td>
<td>Copyright infringement. Investment of time, money and energy into something not ready.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>New and interesting, and generates some revenue. Helps fulfil the mission of the press cost-effectively, improves the sale of print books, helps to successfully serve authors and solves many inventory problems.</td>
<td>Expensive. The press is unsure if authors want to publish electronically. Print on paper is the core business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>Providing what the customers want, being at the leading edge, continuing to contribute, greater benefits for their authors, and providing new learning experiences for press staff.</td>
<td>Financial. The press has to do everything two ways (print and electronic) and some projects have not yet paid for their development costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
<td>Increased visibility, an international presence and an increase in print sales.</td>
<td>Loss of time and money.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.7: Advantages and Disadvantages of Electronic Publishing

Presses saw many benefits from electronic publishing. The main agreed benefits were: to give customers what they want and be where the customers are, to serve
the authors, new ways to reach the readership, and a publicity tool. Other benefits included new learning experiences:

"I'm delighted to be involved in this area; it has been a really great experience for me."

Increasing communication between staff, and working more efficiently were other benefits. The presses saw electronic publishing as eventually saving costs, time and energy. Some, then current, projects did generate revenue and were self-supporting. The two main concerns were that it required a big investment in terms of money, staff, time and resources:

"Leading edge is often the bleeding edge; it costs a lot to be first".

The majority of initiatives were funded by outside organisations or undertaken with partners (one press was an exception).

### 8.3.5. E-Books

| Press 1 | There is future for e-books, but unsure when and how much of the market they will take. The press was waiting until electronic products are more accepted by the market before it invests considerably in electronic books. |
| Press 2 | Involvement with many e-book partners. Viewed the market as unstable, but with partners doing the jobs the press cannot they can be very successful. |
| Press 3 | Published some whole books with free access with the aim to encourage purchase of the print copy. The press sells electronic books through partners such as Netlibrary. |
| Press 4 | Would like to develop templates for e-books and has the architecture of an e-book already developed. |
| Press 5 | Sells e-books through aggregators. There may be a market for |
certain types of e-books, e.g., reference works and travel
guides, but these are not a part of the financial picture or
strategic planning.

Table 8.8: Adoption and Views of E-books

Some presses were working with e-books, some were not, some saw potential,
and some did not. One director stated that an inexpensive reader was required
first, but there was no market for them; others agreed. Some believed they would
serve as supplements to printed books, while others saw potential for certain
formats, e.g., reference works, but not rigorous scholarly works. While e-book
distributors have come and gone, many presses continued to work with e-book
distributors such as Netlibrary, Questia, Ebrary and Books 24x7. While many
presses offered online chapters on their Websites, the overall aim was to
courage customers to buy the print copy and therefore use electronic publishing
to increase sales.

8.3.6. Print on Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print on Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Press 4 | Print on demand is the future and the press is working to that end. Materials are being converted to XML so that texts are ready to be distributed in any required format.

Press 5 | No comment

Table 8.9: Press Views of Print on Demand

Those that did comment viewed print on demand as being the way forward, with some very enthusiastic and some a little more reserved. Only one publisher viewed it as a 'pipe dream', stating that it was an ideal and a possibility for the future but not the present. The press did, however, state that while it would not experiment in print on demand technologies, if these became widely available, it would adopt it.

Some mentioned great prospects for certain categories of books, and some for all books. One director saw it as the future only if there was no clear difference between offset books and digital print on demand. No disadvantages were raised except the possibility it would be more expensive short-term. Directors believed it would solve the economics of current print runs, save time, money and energy and provide flexibility to increase publishing programmes. Print on demand was quoted by one as the ultimate benefit of electronic publishing.

8.3.7. Business Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Models and Strategies for Electronic Publishing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.10: Press Business Models and Strategies

| Press 4 | Current strategy and business plan is to get projects up and running and in use. Continue with translations and continue to adapt to the needs of authors and customers. |
| Press 5 | The press does not have a specific strategy for electronic publishing. |

One press had no specific business models or strategies for electronic publishing, they aimed to watch and see. One press made no comment. The majority of press strategies depended on the individuality of the press, its subject list, and projects to date. Many presses continued to plan to watch and learn from others, and continued to experiment in areas of strength, including the aim of constantly renewing and updating while keeping costs low. One press stated they would continue to offer e-books but as a complement to the print copy, not as a substitute, and were working towards the goal of print on demand being a reality.

8.3.8. Lessons Learned from Electronic Publishing

| Lessons Learned from Electronic Publishing |
| Press 1 | No comment |
| Press 2 | Electronic publishing is taking a lot longer to catch on than many thought. The electronic world is where the customers are. Electronic publishing is a powerful tool when used appropriately and could revolutionise publishing. Timing is crucial. |
| Press 3 | Electronic technology is a distribution mode, not a publishing mode. Things take longer than they seem, and it is easy to get carried away with technology. |
| Press 4 | Expensive but worthwhile because this is the future. |
| Press 5 | Expensive and time consuming. Have to get it right. |

Table 8.11: Lessons Learned from Electronic Publishing
Quotes:

"I guess we've learned we haven't found the formula and that the need is not yet pronounced enough."

"I don't think at this point you can afford to sit on the sidelines.... some presses are doing that and whenever I have nightmare with this I don't blame them."

"There's a disadvantage of expending resources and staff hours and certainly money on something that may not have a significant financial impact. We all have to go through these growing pains of figuring it out, but it can't take your eyes off what you're supposed to be doing."

The publishers were agreed that electronic publishing activities are expensive and time consuming, but worthwhile and necessary.

8.3.9. Competition

The US press directors all stated that their main competition came from long established, commercial U.S. publishers or big university presses. Many stated that it varied according to subject area. The larger university presses had a monopoly on certain subject areas and formats. However, they still viewed themselves as small in comparison to some of the large commercial publishers.

One press, talking about a commercial publishing house, stated:

"I have no illusion if they want to publish a book and we do who will get it, but there are areas where I think we can do better than they can ... patience... to wait for books to be finished, they will remain in print much longer, we're not going to be bought, sold or changed, there's that continuity which is important for certain projects."
### 8.3.10. Collaboration Amongst Presses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
<td>The press collaborates with other university presses, sharing sales representatives along with warehouse operations. There are considerable benefits from collaboration, such as learning from the best practices of the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>The press does not have formal collaboration although the press does have informal collaboration with many. The press views collaboration as invaluable, as enormously constructive and useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>The press works on a small scale with the library. It has contributed all its print books to the library's electronic project. The press has collaborative activities with other university presses that it seeks out, and has established international offices with other university presses. Presses share information, but they're very independent in terms of doing things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>The press does collaborate with other university presses and distributes other university press books with economic benefits. The press also works with associations, the library, other publishers and foreign presses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
<td>Co-publishing with certain university presses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.12: Collaboration Amongst Presses
The majority of presses studied collaborated with other university presses in a number of activities, see Figure 8.1 below:

Figure 8.1: Activities with Other University Presses

The presses also worked with foreign presses, other publishers, associations and learned societies and the library.

The benefits of collaboration were: learning best practices, economies of scale and new valuable learning experiences. However, some presses were very individual and independent, having few collaborative ventures. One press had no formal collaboration, but plenty of informal communication.

8.3.11. AAUP Benefits

All but one of the case presses belonged to the AAUP. They identified the benefits as:

- Strength in numbers
- Training programmes
- Meeting opportunities
- Advertising, promotion and book exhibiting opportunities that a small press wouldn't be able to afford on its own
- Conferences and programmes available
• In touch with their colleagues
• Sharing of information
• AAUP lobbying on behalf of the presses
• AAUP online site sells press books
• Statistical surveys

All directors viewed the Association of American University Presses as beneficial and worthwhile.

"I think there's absolutely no question that if you're doing what we do, scholarly publishing, you really can gain a lot from this organisation...AAUP now is beginning to take political stands on certain issues, regarding funding for scholarly activities, regarding freedom to publish and so on; we're now sort of being pulled into this orbit of advocacy on a national stage about certain political, economic issues."

"An incredible amount of information and knowledge and wisdom you can pick up by being a part of this peer group, and that ranges from the annual meeting, the departmental meetings, AAUP has business manager meetings and production meetings and so you get these sets of meetings and those are just incredible in terms of picking up information and making contacts and that's wonderful".
### 8.3.12. The Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press 1</th>
<th>No comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>The future is an electronic world. This is where the customers are migrating to and where the growth will be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>Looking to create a book publishing operation that will be modelled more closely on a journals publishing operation. The press sees print on demand and electronic communities as the way forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>Electronic publishing is the future. Revenue will double again by 2005 with electronic material contributing 15-30 percent of revenue with paper publishing being about 70-85 percent. Electronic distribution is the future but the real challenge is going to be managing on different platforms, including print on demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
<td>Excerpts and chapters online for all books. Unsure about the future of electronic publishing, mainly about the time scale for it to take hold and become acceptable. Print publishing will always exist and any electronic publishing initiatives would have to be in addition to those, not just replications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.13: The Future of Publishing

Three press directors argued a strong case for the future of electronic publishing, stating that it will play an enormous role with rises in revenue growth. Electronic communities, print on demand and electronic distribution of material were all argued as the future. One press however, was unsure about the viability of electronic publishing.

"Successful scholarly publishing today is also a test of sound management and financial acumen."
8.4. Comparison of Libraries

8.4.1. Effects of Electronic Publishing

All of the libraries interviewed subscribed to both print and electronic journals and databases. Some had extensive electronic offerings, while others were working toward building them up. Electronic technologies had made changes to library operations in real terms.

Because of the uncertainties and opportunities presented by electronic publishing, increased collaboration and discussion with faculty, administration, and the university presses had occurred. There had also been, at many presses, a reorganisation of staff and acquisitions.

The majority of libraries reported some cost savings due to an increase of available shelf space. However, the library staff reported the extra workload and new skills required because of access to electronic material. A few librarians reported that electronic databases are often more expensive than print counterparts, and while existing electronic resources are valuable, they do not always fit the library’s subject areas.

8.4.2. Library Collaboration

The majority of the HEI libraries studied were involved in electronic publishing projects, either individually, with university presses, or with other libraries. While some libraries reported little or no direct discussion or collaboration with the university press, and viewed them as different entities with different goals, one library collaborated with the press as a partner in many electronic publishing projects. The one library that did not collaborate with their press saw great potential to do so, and discussed future plans to work with them.
8.4.3. **Improvements Presses can make for the Libraries**

The main improvements discussed by the library staff were: improvements in press licensing regarding electronic products, further collaboration with the libraries and adhering to the university press mandate by remaining not-for-profit and continuing to support scholarly works. A majority of library staff stressed the need for press staff to have a better understanding of the issues of distribution.

Library staff believed presses should not be required to be self-supporting or expected to be contributing to the bottom line. Some believed presses should become more active electronically, resulting in benefits for both parties and in increased access. Library staff believed electronic projects should be hybrid, using the various organisational strengths. One respondent requested more websites or improved access to university press resources that better fit the academic environment.

Other points raised were for presses to work on their charging models, and to understand the nature of aggregation.

8.5. **UK University Press Case Studies**

8.5.1. **Description of the Presses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Annual Book and journal output</th>
<th>Backlist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>1,000+</td>
<td>2,500 books 170+ journals</td>
<td>14,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>1,000+</td>
<td>4,500 books 300+ journals</td>
<td>30,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 books</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90 books</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 books 2 journals</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.14: Description of the UK Case Study Presses
The presses varied considerably in staff size, backlist and title output. Two presses were very large and well established. A commercial publisher bought one of the presses studied, and two presses were very small, representing the majority of UK university presses.

8.5.2. Case One

This large press concentrated on its electronic journal programme, providing nearly all journals in both print and electronic format, and became involved with electronic publishing because of consumer demand. The press aimed to keep investing in order to stay at the leading edge of new technologies. Electronic publishing has grown much less quickly than the press imagined and press staff believed the future of university presses would depend on funding. The press had been attempting to initiate discussion with other presses and also with learned societies. The press viewed collaboration as beneficial but would not join a UK association of presses, as they did not see the benefits for a large press. The press worked on a number of activities with the library.

8.5.3. Case Two

This large press was very active in electronic publishing with nearly 100 percent of journals offered both print and online, and a number of online services. The electronic publishing programmes provided little revenue with 90 percent of sales still from print products. The press hoped they would become profitable in the next three to five years. The press collaborated with the library on a number of projects, but not with other presses, they did however, welcome appropriate collaboration. The press believed collaboration amongst smaller university presses would be beneficial, particularly in terms of advertising, but saw a difficult future for smaller presses unless they made some changes.

8.5.4. Case Three

This press only had only two staff members along with secretarial support; the second full time post was created summer 2003. The press published an average
of ten books per annum. The press had a long established distributor in North America, which sent out spring and autumn catalogues with print runs of 6,000 to academic and trade audiences. The majority of revenue was generated in the UK and the press targeted North America for growth opportunities. The press was not active in electronic publishing, mainly because authors refused permissions (even though they had titles suited to electronic publication), along with a lack of financial and staff resources. The press had the goal to be self-sustainable within the next five years. In order to become active in electronic publishing, the press would require funding. The press published occasional co-editions with other university presses and stressed the importance of collaboration amongst presses. It would strongly support any UK university press organisation. The press and library were an integral part of the same department.

8.5.5. Case Four

This press was bought by a commercial academic publisher, which maintained the imprint and list of the university press. The publishing house bought the imprint in order to complement publishing activities and incorporate into existing operations new subject lists. The publishing house benefited from the university press imprint by learning from it, strengthening the existing subject list and from economies of scale.

While the books did not have a connection with the university courses, the publishing house maintained relationships with academic advisors. The press was very active in electronic publishing with a number of online communities and companion websites for books. While it proved hard for the press to measure whether electronic publishing was profitable they believed they would not have market share if they had not provided electronic products. The publishing house did not collaborate with other presses, but the university press imprint had co-published with other presses.
8.5.6. Case Five

This press had only one staff member and published on average twelve books a year (including the typesetting), and was active, to some degree, in electronic publishing, providing a number of electronic journals and an e-book. The press got involved with electronic publishing because of another project based at the HEI. Electronic publishing activities were not profitable but the press envisioned a profit in the next three years. The press did not collaborate with others, but believed there were strong reasons to do so. The press was very interested in a UK organisation for university presses. The press did not work with the HEI library and viewed the future as very bleak for the smaller presses. The director had worked for four university presses, and with the exception of two, reported the others as not viable:

"... They’re too small and there’s no expectation or reason for them to ever become viable, there’s no mechanism for them to become viable."

8.6. Comparison of UK University Press Cases

8.6.1. Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
<td>Accumulated earnings and bank financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>Accumulated earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>Currently subsidised by parent university. To be self-funding in 5 years. Work with a local association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>Bought by commercial publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
<td>One-off fund from parent university. Plus sales income. HEI pays salaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.15: Funding of UK Case Study Presses

The large presses were funded mainly from accumulated earnings, one press was operated by a commercial publisher, and the two small presses were subsidized by the HEI.
8.6.2. Press Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.16: Press Missions

8.6.3. Press Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.17: Goals of the Presses

The goals of the five presses were different. All presses aimed to improve business and focused on different areas. Three of the five presses generated the majority of their revenue in the UK and two presses, both significantly larger, generated the largest part of their revenue from the U.S. market. Growth
opportunities were reported to be in the USA and the Far East. One press mentioned Australia, two Asia and one Japan. One press stated that Western Europe remained important. The presses' chief target market for 2004-2005 followed the same pattern. All the presses also focused on North America.

### 8.6.4. Electronic Publishing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press 1</th>
<th>Very active in electronic publishing, and concentrated on electronic journals (as demand was here), however, all journals were still to be published for the foreseeable future in print format. This press had been involved in a collaborative electronic publishing project with other presses; however, it was not successful.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>Very active in electronic publishing ventures, nearly all journals being available in print and online, a number of online reference works, companion websites for major textbooks, involvement in an Andrew W. Mellon project and the History e-book project, with a new online reference service planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>Not active in electronic publishing, but had considered it. There were possible projects the press could undertake. However, either the author, or staff numbers would not permit it. There were generally not enough funds, resources or expertise for such initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>Electronic publishing initiatives included a number of online learning centres, and companion websites for all major textbooks that were provided free with the textbook. “...The idea of having all these services is to drive print sales.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.18: Electronic Publishing Initiatives at the Presses
Three presses were very active in electronic publishing initiatives, having undertaken a number of projects. Of the two smaller presses, one was not active, facing obstacles when attempting to. However, the other was active and involved in a number of initiatives with more planned.

"If someone would come up with a nice pot of money to allow us to take some projects forward then I'd be delighted."

Only one press was involved in e-books, however, provided free access to only one book. All but one press were experimenting in print on demand technology with the two larger presses reporting established and successful print on demand programmes. Other services delivered consisted of: online chapters, online reference works, companion websites for textbooks and online communities. The majority of the ventures were reported as successful (particularly electronic journals), because the demand was there and the products had an existing market. Only one project was reported as unsuccessful, because too many players were involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electronic Publishing Initiatives</th>
<th>E-journals</th>
<th>E-books</th>
<th>Chapters online</th>
<th>Online selling</th>
<th>Conversion of print to electronic</th>
<th>Print on demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>✓*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.19: Table Showing the Variety and Level of Electronic Publishing Initiatives

X = no
* = experimenting
✓ = yes
✓ = yes with partners
Two presses reported charging for some, but not all, online services, while three did not. These services generally came as free additions to print services. As far as charging mechanisms were concerned, four presses used the tested subscription model, while one press provided electronic products free of charge. One press was investigating the use of a payment system similar to that of airline miles, i.e., purchase miles/time to be used for electronic access. None of the presses had other revenue generation mechanisms such as advertising, though one press stated it would be necessary in the future.

"... without any clear indication at all that you’re going to make a return, you really are taking a gamble, sheer uncertainty relating to investment; in online you’ve no way of judging.... What’s really frustrating about this whole area is how slow the educational world is in general in taking it up.”

All the university press directors reported the intention for electronic publishing to make a profit. However, when asked if currently profitable, four presses stated it was not and the fifth did not comment (though it was difficult to measure because of the way the products are packaged and made available, e.g., companion websites or free electronic access when subscribed to the print journal). The presses did envisage a future time when electronic publishing would provide profit; one predicted five years, one three years.

"It’s a long investment period, and if you say how much loss will we rack up during that period the answer is going to be on that kind of publishing between £10 and £15m of losses that we’ll accrue in order to get to a position that is in line with the market requirements in the long-term, you simply have to look at it as an investment in the future.”

Growth of electronic publishing over the past two years (2001-2002) was slower than expected for the majority of presses. However, one press reported doubling their electronic publishing activity (from one to two projects). Forecasts for 2005 were enthusiastic but not specific.

"The trick is identifying what products people are willing to pay for.”
Benefits of electronic publishing were listed as follows:

- Retention of market share
  
  "The other way of looking at it is that if we hadn’t gone electronic, we would have lost a lot of market share, so as much as anything it’s about retaining share, retaining subscriptions, it’s such a fundamental demand, if you don’t do it, people will walk away from you."

- Positive response of customers
- Preparing for an electronic future
- Image of the Higher Education Institution and the university press
- New skills learned by staff
- Learning new technology
- Keeping in touch with the market
- Production of what the market wanted and was ready for

Disadvantages were listed as follows:

- Lost costs
- Lack of sustainability and durability of platforms and technology
- Time consuming
- No obvious financial reward
- The gamble to get it right
- Constant updating required
- Constant changes of technology
- Uncertainty relating to investment
- Grown much less quickly than the press imagined five years ago

"Because of our lack of conviction about consumers being ready for these things we’ve been standing back watching what’s happening. The biggest problem at the moment is the concern about high costs of introducing new products when there’s a horrible suspicion that the public isn’t quite ready for it yet, or the public that is ready for it, the consumers that are, aren’t a big enough body, with enough money to spend to fund it.... we’ve got this...digital/electronic warehouse, which is just waiting for us to see what the applications are and then just extract the data, so I suppose we’re preparing for it".
Reasons given by both UK and USA university presses for becoming active or not becoming active in electronic publishing are shown in Figure 8.2 below:

**Figure 8.2: Reasons Presses did or did not Become Active Electronically**

- **Active in electronic Publishing**
  - Consumer demand/ Market share
  - It is the future
  - Staff and Infrastructure Present
  - Retain subscriptions
  - Understand available technologies
  - Funding Available
  - Collaboration with Library/Outside Organisations

- **Not active in electronic publishing**
  - Not Enough Resources or Staff
  - Large Investment Required
  - No Expertise
  - Not Enough Funds
  - HEI Not Supportive
  - Projects Won't Survive if Funding is Removed
  - Authors won't give permission
8.6.5. Business Models and Strategies for Electronic Publishing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models and Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The press strategy for electronic publishing was threefold: the further development of the journals business, to archive all material electronically, and to wait and see what models worked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put the press resources into proven areas of success and demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No model for electronic publishing but rather stressed increasing the number of titles and improving marketing and distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The business plan for electronic publishing was an integral part of the general publishing business plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No business plan or strategy for electronic publishing, apart from an individual plan for the new journal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.20: Press Models and Strategies for Electronic Publishing

The majority of the presses had some kind of strategy or business plan for electronic publishing. Some were more detailed and others very vague. One press aimed to develop their electronic journals business, and two presses aimed to put resources where there is a demand.
8.6.6. Lessons Learned from Electronic Publishing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Lessons Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
<td>Must invest carefully and seek correct market opinion through market research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>It is best to sit back and keep watch:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It’s far better to be a settler than a pioneer, you really do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not want to be right out in front especially if you’re a university press....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First year sales are always very low, it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>takes the market a long time to adopt.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>Do not underestimate the foundational skills of customers, or the hidden costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on what you’re good at and do not get sidetracked. Constant updating is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
<td>Systems won’t run themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.21: Lessons Learned by Each Press when Undertaking Electronic Publishing

8.6.7. Competition

Chief competition came from both university presses and international commercial publishers. Three of the presses were members of the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP). Two were not, and stated that the reasons were because of high costs and because the association was viewed as irrelevant to its needs.
8.6.8. Collaboration Amongst Presses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 1</td>
<td>Did not collaborate with other university presses, but was trying to initiate discussions. The press viewed working with learned societies as worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>Only collaborated on the History e-book project (not with university presses), but stated they were happy to collaborate in the future if they take a lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>Occasionally produced co-editions with other presses and were interested in doing more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>Co-published with other presses, but only on a small scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
<td>Did not collaborate with other presses, but believed a joint marketing set up was necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.22: Collaboration Undertaken by University Presses

Two presses did not collaborate with other university presses. Three did, but on a small scale. One press reported trying to initiate collaboration because of the cost that can be saved and the benefit of additional selling power.

“I usually find other publishers very helpful, whether they be commercial or university press, we’re in it together.”

8.6.9. UK Association of University Presses

Four of the presses (one did not comment) agreed that there was a need for a UK association of presses for the smaller UK university presses. Two presses stated they would join such an organisation, one being very enthusiastic at such a suggestion. Two did not because they were comparatively much bigger than the general UK university press. Of the eleven UK university press directors that responded to the questionnaires reported in Chapter Seven, seven said they would benefit from such an organisation, one would not, and three stated possibly or maybe.
When asked if a UK organisation should be a subset of the ALPSP, two presses stated it should not, stressing it should be independent. One press was undecided, one did not comment and the other believed it should.

Suggestions of what should be accomplished by a UK organisation were as follows: joint catalogues, exhibition space, joint mailing lists, advertising, joint marketing and meetings.

8.6.10. The Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press 1</th>
<th>The future of small UK university presses is dependent on funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press 2</td>
<td>The future of smaller university presses is grim; the ones that would survive are the big, established presses, with their own source of funding or a very strong regional list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 3</td>
<td>Unsure, need funding if to continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 4</td>
<td>Need more HEI support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 5</td>
<td>The future for smaller UK university presses is very bleak. The director argued there was no need for these smaller presses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.23: The Views of the Presses Regarding the Future of University Presses

The directors saw the future as bleak for the smaller university presses in the UK. All respondents commented that the presses needed funding and more HEI support.

"I don’t know of a single university up to and including the size of Manchester which regards its university press fondly.”

Many believed that smaller university presses could not be profitable.
“There has to be a willingness and actually a determination on the part of their parent universities to fund them and to believe that university presses are more than just a ‘ball-ball’, that they are actually part of the core mission of the university which is about the dissemination of knowledge and about teaching, and if universities for financial reasons forget that, then you’re going to have real difficulty.”

8.7. Comparison of Libraries

8.7.1. Effects of Electronic Publishing

Only three of the corresponding libraries responded, making generalisation difficult. Library directors reported both positive and negative effects of electronic publishing: an increase in the number of journals available, decline of inter-library loan, expectation of readers for all material to be available electronically creating extra demand for resources, an increase in purchase and maintenance, less shelf space required, and faster delivery of content direct to desktops. However, there was no budget relief, no great decline in the print material required, and continued pressure on budgets, while many vice chancellors viewed the free Internet as a panacea for library budget problems.

8.7.2. Library Collaboration

Only two of the libraries collaborated with the HEI university press. One press was an integral part of a department to which the library also belonged, and one worked together at exhibitions, on publishing the library history and other non-commercial ventures. The libraries reported a number of benefits of being affiliated with a university press: a closer involvement with research and publishing, contribution of its staff to the Research Assessment Exercise and the demonstration to academics of the university’s commitment to research.
8.7.3. *Improvements Press can make for the Libraries*

One director suggested that the press should develop further in the disciplines important to the HEI to enhance and maintain the reputation of the HEI. Another director suggested that university presses should offer publishing templates to stimulate the creation of pre-prints in the HEI so that research could be made available through institutional repositories. Another suggested that a press should do more to assist academics in becoming active in publishing and to initiate discussion regarding research and publication. All libraries viewed themselves as benefiting from university presses becoming more active electronically.

"A strong and active university press would make academics more aware of the need to publish and would offer a conduit through which discussion about interdisciplinary research and publication could take place."

8.8. *Discussion and Conclusions*

While these results prove insightful, only ten cases were conducted. Of the five U.S. cases, four presses were large and well established. Only one press was comparable to the smaller UK presses. Of the UK cases studies, two were very large and not comparable to the other UK presses, which are much smaller.

Previous studies regarding university presses argued that the majority were struggling financially, mainly due to decreased HEI support and lower sales. Many presses had made changes, including the introduction of trade titles. Lipscombe [1] argued that university presses needed to be creative in order to survive; and Fisher [2] stressed that new business models were required for an electronic age.

The AAUP reported that presses were taking advantage of electronic technologies [3], though Ekman [4] stated that the larger presses were taking the lead and it was proving difficult for the smaller organisations. Meyers [5] suggested that while presses were experimenting, they were holding on to
traditional methods of publishing, and Watkinson [6] noted that most university presses had not been in a position to take advantage of electronic opportunities.

Generalisation is difficult because a small number of presses was studied, but mainly because the university press sector is so varied. Each press is individual in size, subject list, funding and electronic publishing, tied together by similar missions and a link to a Higher Education Institution.

In general, while larger presses are financially stable, the funding situation is different in the USA compared to the UK, with more UK presses having HEI subsidies withdrawn and receiving no endowment. Lack of funding is a major problem for many UK presses. Adopting electronic publishing is seen as necessary but difficult and financially draining by all presses, both in the UK as well as the USA (particularly for the smaller presses), as experimentation and adoption of electronic technologies requires large investment and has reaped low returns to date.

There was no real evidence that the presses had introduced trade titles in any real way, though the presses agreed that new business models were required. All of the presses, except one in the UK, were involved in electronic publishing, however, while collaboration was widely adopted in the USA, no real press collaboration was taking place in the UK, and each press had different aims and reasons for projects and experiments.

Electronic publishing activities are generally undertaken with partners, outside organisations and funding bodies, with print on demand seen as the benefit of electronic publishing. This is what the majority of presses are working towards. For small publishers such as university presses, print on demand is the way forward in terms of electronic publishing.

It is clear that the larger presses (both UK and USA) that are financially stable are taking the lead in experimenting and adopting electronic technologies, however,
the smaller presses are doing what is possible. A UK association was viewed as beneficial and necessary for overall improvement of the industry.

Innovation in electronic technologies at both UK and USA presses seems to depend on the size of press, the financial situation, staff numbers available, and the resources that can be created or adapted for an electronic environment. Electronic publishing needs to be viewed as a long-term investment and must continue to be done in conjunction with print.

Presses and libraries need to collaborate and communicate more frequently, establishing links and common ground, while maintaining individuality. There is great potential for more collaboration to improve the situation of stakeholders.

Senior faculty and university administration in both the USA and UK must be educated to understand the difficulties presses face while they attempt to maintain their unique role in the publishing world, and do more to support the press (as well as the libraries). University presses face a tough business environment and must maintain a leading edge and business mind in order to remain active in the industry.

8.9. Postscript: Changes to University Presses

An email was sent in July 2004 to the directors of the UK university presses that were used as case studies in 2002/3, i.e., one year after the research was conducted. The email asked for an update of press initiatives and changes to management since the case studies were conducted.

Four of the five UK university press directors responded. Two directors had left their positions. One of these had stayed within the publishing house, but had moved position; the other had left the press for another appointment. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this director was unhappy with the workload and the relationships between the press and HEI administrators. Another university press director had retired. Other changes included a new journal that was being
considered for parallel publishing on the Internet, and a twelve-volume work being considered for CD. These were the first electronic offerings of the press, but they did report the need for many issues to be overcome. The fourth university press that responded reported movement toward collaboration in platform sharing and the possibility of hosting a symposium for university press collaboration based on the results of this research (see Chapter Ten).

Two of the five USA presses reported changes in management. One of these was through retirement and the other director moved to a trade publishing company.

This demonstrates the constant changes experienced by the university press business.
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Chapter 9

Results - Academic Authors Published with a University Press and a Commercial Publisher
9.1. **Introduction**

38 academic authors responded to the email questionnaire, which was sent to 100 academic authors, giving a response rate of 38 percent. The author respondents had published with both big and small university presses in the UK and the USA. As the questionnaire was sent to academic authors located in UK university press catalogues, the majority were published with UK presses.

The job titles of the author respondents varied greatly and included the following: lecturer, reader, professor, graduate research professor, senior lecturer, vice-provost, research director, head of department, and senior research fellow. Similarly, the authors worked in a variety of subject disciplines ranging from the arts and humanities and the social sciences to the sciences. Subjects included: American studies, biology, chemistry, coastal engineering, early modern women's writing, economics, English, ethics, French Studies, German studies, Hispanic Studies, history, law, linguistics, mathematics, media, media theory, philosophy, philosophy of religion, physics, politics, political communication, religious studies, renaissance drama, social anthropology, socio-legal studies, theatre studies, and theology.

In the UK, the following presses were represented: Bristol (Policy Press), University of Birmingham Press, Cambridge University Press, Edinburgh University Press, University of Hertfordshire Press, Imperial College Press, Keele (when operating), Leicester (when operating), Luton University Press, Manchester University Press, Open University Press, Oxford University Press, University of Wales Press, and in the USA: Iowa University Press, MIT Press, Penn State University Press, and Princeton University Press.

9.2. **Reasons for Publishing with A University Press**

The authors offered a variety of reasons for publishing with a university press. The responses are given in Table 9.1 below with the corresponding number of comments made by the 38 authors, and the corresponding percentage showing
which reasons were given the most. The majority of authors gave more than one reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Publishing with a University Press</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise in the subject/list of the press</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited/contacted by the university press</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation/prestige</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic at HEI affiliated with the press</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage/good networking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable price of books</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books in print longer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful reviewing obtained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of scholarly issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable advance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher sales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not like commercial publishers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in book/support from the press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less focused on sales, room for innovation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationship with editor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference in production of books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present publisher sold to university press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No particular reason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1: Author Reasons for Publishing with a University Press

The three dominant reasons given by the authors for publishing with a university press were: the press' expertise and/or list in a particular subject discipline, the author being contacted directly by the university press or invited to offer a manuscript, and the reputation and prestige of the university press.
9.3. **Added Value of a University Press**

The question was asked: Comparing to a commercial publisher, what added value (if any) did you feel you got from the university press for your work? The authors gave their own responses and these were grouped under headings. The results are shown in Table 9.2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added Value from a University press</th>
<th>Number of Author Votes</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Author Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More personal approach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More likely to be taken seriously by academics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More care and attention to book</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion/book beneficial to career</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficient, had more time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well marketed to target audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable price of books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9.2: Added Value Gained from Publishing with a University Press*

Only 34 authors felt they could answer this question appropriately. Twelve of the 34 (35 percent) stated there was no added value gained from publishing with a university press rather than a commercial publisher. Five authors (15 percent) commented that prestige was higher at a university press (this would of course be dependent on which press was published with or being referred to), four (12 percent) talked about the personal approach of the press, and three (9 percent) discussed the view that university press books were taken seriously by academics.
Two authors (6 percent) stated that the university presses they published with were more efficient and gave the authors more of their time, and two (6 percent) talked of the benefits to their career with added value seen only in academic circles.

9.4. Reasons for Publishing with a Small University Press

The question: Why would you choose to/do you publish with a small university press? (i.e. not Oxford or Cambridge), led to a wide variety of responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Publishing with a Small University Press</th>
<th>Comments given by Authors</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Author Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List/expertise in a particular subject area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular and close contact with editor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation/Prestige</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support own HEI/Convenience of own HEI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press was interested/available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press distributes widely/high quality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish wherever can due to pressure of RAE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.3: Reasons Author would/did Publish with a Small University Press

Overall, just under one third of authors stated that they would not publish with a small university press (one author gave the reason as lack of sufficient dissemination for a new book). No other reasons were given. Other authors liked the personal working relationship:

"I particularly liked the fact that I can pick up the phone and speak when I like with the senior editors."
Others were concerned with the subject area of publishing and prestige of the press:

"The fact that they are University based is irrelevant as far as I am concerned: what matters is their reputation and whether they have expertise in the area."

9.5. Prestige at University Presses

The authors were asked if they thought there was a difference in prestige between commercial publishers and university presses.

16 authors (42 percent) stated there was a difference in prestige, while 22 (58 percent) argued no difference. Some authors mentioned the difference between big university presses and small university presses, taking the view that larger university presses were more prestigious. Others argued that the differences were only applicable to academics and that it depended on the individual university press.

A number of authors commented that university presses are more skilled at reaching the correct audience, are respected by their peers and have established reputations and traditions. Some authors stated that many commercial publishers are as prestigious as university presses, with some university presses not as successful at marketing, and the only difference being due to public perception.

Author Quotes:

"Yes, between 'some' university presses and 'most' commercial publishers."

"I think the prestige issue lies more in terms of the nature of the book published. Commercial publishers gain in terms of numbers of copies sold, overseas reach and so on. But a 'text' book published commercially is unlikely to outweigh a substantial academic/research book published by a university press."

"Yes - university press less good at marketing to a general (non-academic) audience."
"There is a prestige in RAE terms but the simple fact is that commercial publishers usually get books out more quickly, have a more thorough editing process and produce high quality books that are able to sustain reasonable prices."

"As they move increasingly towards text books and away from true academic monographs, there is less and less reason to publish with a university press."

9.6. **Author Experience of Publishing with a University Press**

The authors were asked about their personal experience of publishing with a university press. Eighteen authors stated there was no difference compared with a commercial publisher, that their experiences were on a similar level. The results are shown in Table 9.4 and Figure 9.1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Positive Comments (e.g., excellent/good)</th>
<th>Negative Comments (e.g., poor/bad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness of staff</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts offered</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty rates offered</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.4: Results of Author Experiences of Publishing with a University Press
Some respondents commented on their experiences with different presses having published with more than one. Generally all five factors of efficiency, professionalism, helpfulness of staff, contracts offered and royalty rates were rated a lot more positively than negatively.

Author Quotes:

“I have experienced both efficient and inefficient editors at university presses.”

“Helpfulness of members of press staff: this is one of the areas of weakness in all the university presses with which I have experience. As a rule, they are less proactive than press staff for commercial publishers”.

Figure 9.1: Histogram showing the Results in Table 5
9.7. **Comparison of Publishing**

The authors were asked to comment on how publishing with a university press compared to publishing with a commercial publisher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of publishing</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.5: Results of University Press Publishing Compared with Commercial Publishing

The majority of the authors did not respond to this question. Fifteen (or 39.5 percent) stated that their experiences of publishing with a university press and a commercial publisher were similar. An equal amount of authors had the opinion that publishing with a university press was either better or worse (8 percent each). Those that stated publishing with a commercial publisher was better gave the following reasons: no advance from the university press, shorter reviewing processes, shorter delays, faster publishing process, more competent, and better marketing of books.

The authors gave many reasons why they preferred publishing with a university press:

- "Very favourably. In some areas they were more efficient. Unlike commercial publishers, they keep their editing in-house, rather than farming it out to freelancers. They impose reasonable deadlines for editing queries, proofing and indexing."

- "Greater interaction with the publishing process at a university press."

- "Much more involvement in advertising/marketing than one would with a commercial publisher."
There was less turnover of staff, and therefore the same person was there throughout the process.

9.8. University Presses Becoming More Active Electronically

The authors were asked if they would like university presses to become more active electronically and why.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Electronically Active?</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not bothered</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.6: Results of Author Opinions Regarding University Presses Becoming More Active Electronically

Ten (26 percent) authors stated they would like university presses to become more active electronically. 21 percent of authors stated they were 'not bothered' about the electronic status of university presses, while 18 percent would not like the presses to become more active electronically. 21 percent of authors were unsure.

Authors gave the following reasons for stating university presses should become more electronically active: to increase access, improve dissemination, incredibly successful for journals, improve publicity, the future of publishing is moving in this direction, presses should keep up with the times, to help the publication of small print run books.

"Yes - although I would like all presses to become more active electronically, ...there is a major culture shift to be effected and paper publication is going to be at least as important as electronic for some considerable time".

Other authors disagreed and believed presses should not become more active electronically, and offered the following reasons: the research assessment...
exercise, prestige comes from hard copies, royalties are lower, there still exists prejudice in the evaluation of electronic publications, electronic works are seen as less rigorously peer-reviewed and thus of lesser quality, real books are more valuable, cannot see how publishers can re-cap costs, makes plagiarism amongst students easier, cannot replace the hard copy and discomfort reading on screen.

9.9. **Improvements for Authors' Benefit**

The authors were finally asked how, in their opinion, university presses could improve for their benefit. The responses are listed below under headings:

**Authors**

Presses should encourage young, first time authors, advise authors and editors on how to think about their projects in wider contexts than they are doing at present, provide good advances, and reward authors for their work. Respondents also requested they be kept better informed of progress.

**Audience**

Presses should assist in communicating the findings of research to as wide a field as possible, aim for a wider market, and attempt to reach a non-academic audience.

**Promotion/Dissemination/Marketing**

Respondents requested better publicity to promote sales, good promotion, improved distribution and the development of more creative and vigorous marketing strategies.

**Cost/Funding**

Respondents asked that presses produce books more cheaply and consider larger print runs at lower unit prices thereby reducing costs. The lack of funds and staff was also mentioned as a problem.
Electronic Publishing
Presses should keep books permanently on the web for free, and keep up to date electronically.

Subject Lists
Presses should consider the dissemination of academic research beyond the narrow confines of the various subject disciplines and be more proactive in commissioning academic scholarly books of general interest.

"In my field, the main worry is that fewer and fewer publishers of any description are publishing monographs (as distinct from text-books), regarding them as uneconomic. I don't know how you change that, but it's the single change which would benefit us most."

Personal Contact
Respondents requested contact with an individual editor and to be kept informed of progress.

Other
Authors stated that presses should not be solely driven by the market but by scholarship, that presses should become much more professional, tighten up on procedures, become more efficient and stop the artificial distinction between hardback monographs and soft cover student texts. Respondents commented that necessary changes such as fast publication times and keeping books in print were necessary for all publishers, not just the university press. One author stated that presses were fine and did not require change.

"The small ones, by their informality, allow small editions to be published that otherwise would not be. Trying to improve them from outside would simply kill them off."
9.10. Discussion and Conclusions

38 authors completed the email questionnaire giving a 38 percent response rate. The respondents filled a variety of job positions in Higher Education and had published with a commercial publishing house as well as a university press.

Studies discussed in Chapter Five stressed that authors are publishing more due to HEI assessment mechanisms, and because of this need to publish more, getting an article or book published is independent of the publishing house. Authors were reported as publishing more in electronic form, though figures remained low and depended on a number of different factors [1], [2], and the real concern for authors was the impact of their work.

Numerous projects and studies (see Chapter Five) revealed that technology is available and being utilised for authors to be their own publishers. Authors are posting their work on personal web pages, on institutional and subject repositories, and are submitting to open access journals, all systems that bypass the traditional publishing system. However, the questionnaire did not cover such initiatives and author involvement, as at the time, open access was not at the forefront of discussion.

The authors chose to publish specifically with a university press primarily for the expertise in subject area or due to personal contact and invitation from the press to publish. A further factor was the reputation and prestige of the press.

Compared to publishing with a commercial house the experiences are similar and no added value is gained from choosing to publish with a university press. A small number stated prestige was higher than commercial publishers with personal contact better at a university press. When comparing publishing with a small university press rather than Oxford University Press or Cambridge University Press, 26 percent of the authors stated they would not publish with a small university press. Others would because of the press subject list and expertise in a discipline.
The majority of authors believed there was no difference in prestige between university presses and commercial publishers, however a large number of respondents argued that the larger university presses had higher prestige than commercial publishers with the professionalism and helpfulness of staff were rated highest. As each university press is individual in subject list and size, generalisations are difficult.

The experiences the authors had when publishing with a university press were very positive, however those respondents choosing to respond to the questionnaire may have done so because of a positive experience.

There was no dominant opinion regarding electronic publishing at university presses. 26 percent of authors were in favour, 18 percent were against it, and 43 percent were 'not bothered' or unsure. The suggested improvements for university presses were numerous and varied, mainly focusing on author relations and subject areas.
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Chapter 10

Business Plans for UK University Press Collaboration
10.1. Introduction

Results of the data collection demonstrated that the majority of UK university press directors saw a need for assistance to support their presses in the publication of scholarly works, and in remaining self-sustaining in a changing and diverse industry. The majority of UK directors believed some form of association was necessary. Three business plans were therefore developed outlining possible organisations.

10.2. Business Plans

"A business plan is a formal statement that describes in great detail an enterprise that is about to be launched, substantially reorganised, or expanded, and is most commonly prepared and presented in order to obtain financing and secure necessary permits and approvals for legalising the venture." [1]

A business plan provides a structure and a framework for any new enterprise, outlines and highlights weaknesses, considers future strategy, gives clear goals and looks at the prospects of any company [2]. It is:

"A systematic way of approaching future problems and overcoming them...it is an instrument of the present developed through trial and error...to plot the way forward realistically." [3]

A business plan also has the purpose of; focusing the venture, describing the problems to be addressed by the service/product, explaining why the new venture is important, and acting as a recruiting tool to gain support and collaboration [4].

Any plan must be simple, accurate, useful, realistic and achievable, must allow for change and adapt accordingly [5], and should be supported with hard facts and figures. The market a new venture is targeting must also be clearly and honestly understood, and is essential to business success [6].
The SPARC ‘Gaining Independence’ manual offered suggestions and help with writing a business plan in an academic environment [7]. An introductory section detailed why a business plan is essential and stated that in any new venture a solid case must be made for its impact and strategies. Any business plan must be convincing [8].

Barrow, Barrow and Brown focused on the importance of true and sound financial statistics in any business plan [9], and Eglash stressed the importance of providing evidence for all information provided [10].

Business plan literature provides differing views and guidelines on what sections and headings should be included in a business plan. Eglash offered one comprehensive outline:

- Executive Summary
- Mission Statement and Company Description
- Management
- The Competition
- Market/Customer
- Products and Services
- Marketing and Sales
- Operations

SPARC stated that a business plan contains four parts, each with numerous chapters depending on the specifics of the venture. The first part discusses the background and introduces the product, in the second part the service/product is described in detail, the third part presents the marketing strategy, and the final section covers financial, organisational and staff details [12].

Gaining Independence offered a detailed list of section headings for any business plan. However it was stressed that all ventures are different and therefore each plan will include different sections [13].

- Executive Summary
- Situational Assessment and Strategic Response
There are however, no rules. A list of subheadings for both plans was compiled that best fit the need in each case.

### 10.3. The Need for a UK Organisation

As noted in Chapter Four, there are currently seventeen university presses in the UK (and Plymouth University is also considering establishing a press). Two presses have been classified as large (title output of over 500), four as medium (title output of between 41 and 499), and eleven as small presses (with a title output of 0 – 40). In recent years, many presses have closed for financial reasons, with three of the 20 UK presses having closed between 2002-2003.

Results of the research conducted in 2003 showed that UK university presses received less funding than hitherto from their parent HEI, with some having received no support at all. The smaller presses tended to publish in niche areas, although overall, the presses publish in a wide variety of subject disciplines.

The presses do not collaborate with one another and at present there is no forum for discussion or any organisation that provides them with assistance. A number of press directors stated that they had collaboration in mind and would benefit from any such association. Porter stated:
“Positive action can be initiated...through providing direct assistance and help in forming trade associations or in stating their case to the government.” [14]

The medium and small UK presses do not generally utilise electronic publishing or new technologies due to high cost and the time required. While many presses have goals and aims to grow and increase title output, many find it difficult for similar reasons, those of financial and time constraints.

The research showed that UK university presses desired and required an organisation to provide the necessary support and assistance. Competition for such an organisation for this market is indirect, consisting of other organisations that provide some similar resources. Examples of such organisations are ALPSP and the PA. If presses are to increase output and remain or become self-sustaining, assistance is required. Although the market is small, there appears to be a need for an organisation.

10.4. Developed Business Plans

Three business plans were developed, offering different approaches. One was initially developed for a trade association, requiring substantial funding and support. The second was for a voluntary organisation requiring the time and resources of member presses, and the third was a plan developed with the ALPSP.

10.4.1. Trade Association

A business plan for a not-for-profit Association of Small UK University Presses (ASUKUP) was developed. Such an association would provide a unified voice and service for the small UK university press sector. This would be an independent association, based at one of the university presses. The association would have a separate identity and governance structure to support the smaller university presses in the UK.
The purpose of ASUKUP would be to provide the smaller university presses with direct help and support. Services provided would include assistance to get funding, discussion fora, a joint mailing catalogue, online selling on a joint website, joint stands at exhibitions, liaison with the PA, ALPSP and JISC, lobbying government and other relevant bodies, and assistance with electronic publishing projects and licensing. All of this would be provided in return for a small annual fee based on press annual turnover.

ASUKUP would provide marketing and research, and would facilitate the exchange of ideas. A small staff would be required to run ASUKUP, which would be managed by a board of Directors. Its business plan can be found in Chapter 10.6.1.

10.4.2 Voluntary Organisation

A business plan for a voluntary self-help organisation for smaller UK university presses (SHUP) was also developed. This body would create collaboration amongst UK university presses and therefore provide the presses with much-needed support in scholarly publishing.

SHUP would operate using the time and resources offered from member presses (based on the staff size of each press). A small fee would be charged for non-university press members, and projects would be contracted out to other groups (using advertising revenue and grant funding).

Services such as lobbying for funding, discussion fora, joint stands at exhibitions, a joint mailing catalogue and joint electronic publishing projects are services the organisation could initiate, along with the negotiation of favourable terms with distributors, overseas representatives, printers, and trade stands etc. Online selling on a joint website, and industry statistical analyses are services that could be contracted out for members. Its business plan can be found in Chapter 10.6.2.
10.4.3. *ALPSP Proposal*

The Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers reviewed the results of university press questionnaires and the two business plans discussed previously. It believed a sub-group within ALPSP specifically for university presses would be appropriate and therefore ALPSP developed such a proposal with my assistance. For this business plan see section 10.6.3.

10.5. *Creating the Business Plans*

Cross and Richey provided a basic outline of a not-for-profit business plan. They state such a plan should include a description of the venture, statement of objectives, personnel and a plan of action [15]. An outline of headings was first created that seemed most appropriate for ASUKUP and then for SHUP. Table 10.1 below contains a list of headings, with descriptions of what would be included; the headings vary according to plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subheading</th>
<th>Contents of Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive summary</td>
<td>Overview of the business plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement</td>
<td>The business and its purpose, what will it achieve and how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business description</td>
<td>The background of the situation and how the problems will be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Assessment and Strategic Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project History and Outlook</td>
<td>What has been achieved to date and future plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Organisation and Business Model</td>
<td>What the business model is for the venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>What is being offered and for what reasons, with what benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees/Funding</td>
<td>Funding and fees required, figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market/Marketing/Sales</td>
<td>Scope of the market, what they need, their situation, size and resources available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Structure and Staffing</td>
<td>Staff required and job descriptions, organisational chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Other organisations that compete for resources. In light of competition what are the critical factors for success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management Plan</td>
<td>Sources of support, balance sheet, and investment required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Risks and Contingencies</td>
<td>What problems might be encountered? How will they be dealt with or avoided/plans to reduce failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Overall statement of why the venture is important and necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.1: Contents of a Business Plan
Using these headings, an initial business plan (see Chapter 10.6.1), was developed for ASUKUP as a trade association. However, it was decided such a venture required high financial assistance and would initially serve a very small market. Therefore, a second business plan was developed for a self-help voluntary organisation (see Chapter 10.6.2).

10.6 Business Plans

10.6.1 Trade Association Business Plan

Business Plan for Association of Small UK University Presses (ASUKUP)

No representations or guarantees are made or implied. Plans and projections are subject to change. All stated amounts are approximate and estimated.

Executive Summary

- The Association of small UK University Presses (ASUKUP) is a proposed not-for-profit organisation established to support and aid small UK university presses in scholarly publishing. Through the provision of services such as marketing and dissemination, fora and training, and assistance with electronic publishing, ASUKUP aims to assist the presses to achieve or retain self-sufficiency or profitability, take a greater role in scholarly publishing, and fulfil their individual missions and commitment to the improvement of scholarly publishing.

- There are currently seventeen university presses in the UK. In recent years, many presses have closed for financial reasons. Higher Education Institutions are removing or decreasing financial support for their presses, causing the presses to struggle to provide reasonably priced scholarly works for the academic community.

- The majority of UK university presses are small. Many operate with only one or two staff members and publish only one journal and a small number of books per annum. UK university presses do not collaborate with one
another and at present there is no forum for discussion or an organisation that provides assistance.

- UK university presses have a vital role to play in the current scholarly communication process. They do, however, need assistance to fulfil that role and require help to alleviate existing problems.
- The new association will be formed to provide a unified voice and service for the small UK university press sector. This will be an independent association that will have a separate identity and governance structure.
- ASUKUP will offer two levels of membership: full and affiliate. Services would be provided in return for a small annual fee based on the annual turnover of the press.
- ASUKUP will support university presses to disseminate widely scholarly knowledge and research and facilitate the exchange of ideas. The aim of the association is to assist these presses to become more self-sustainable therefore benefiting the libraries and HEIs by keeping prices low, and helping them to fight the price rises of commercial academic publishers.
- Research conducted throughout 2003 showed that UK university presses desire and require an association such as ASUKUP. If presses are to increase output and remain or become self-sustaining, assistance is required. Therefore, although the market is small, the association is justified because of the need for the services it would provide.
- ASUKUP will consist of an executive director and a small professional staff consisting of a marketing manager, and secretary/treasurer. Member press staff will create a board of directors to ensure the operation of the association is in line with member needs.
- There are no similar organisations or associations that are specific to UK university press needs.
- Along with emails on discussion lists, press releases, and adverts in journals/publisher magazines, direct mailing was selected as the most appropriate marketing method, including a personal letter, information regarding ASUKUP and membership details.
- ASUKUP is a not-for-profit organisation. Sources of financing will be based on cost recovery and limited to membership fees, sponsorship, and revenue derived from seminars and the publishing of university press statistics and
publishing-related books. It is hoped grants will be procured from funding agencies and government bodies to assist ASUKUP in specific projects.

- An initial start-up investment is required for the association to become active. (This would need to be obtained as a grant or through sponsorship). This will include a year’s salary for the staff members, equipment, and an initial purchase of material for the first joint catalogue and marketing needs.

Mission Statement
The Association of Small UK University Presses (ASUKUP) is a proposed not-for-profit organisation that will be established to support and aid small UK university presses in scholarly publishing. Through the provision of services such as marketing and dissemination, fora and training and assistance with electronic publishing, ASUKUP aims to assist the presses to achieve or retain self-sufficiency, take a greater role in scholarly publishing, and fulfil their individual missions and commitment to the improvement of scholarly publishing.

ASUKUP will assist the presses in offering improved services for the academic community and the HEI library community by providing scholarly knowledge and research at affordable prices.

Business Description
A university press is a publishing house associated with a Higher Education Institution, bearing its imprint and primarily devoted to publishing scholarly, low-profit works.

Academic and scholarly publishing is in a state of flux (1). Tensions caused by the conflict between the price rises imposed by some commercial publishers and the limited budgets of Higher Education Institution (HEI) libraries have caused real friction and much talk of ways to by-pass commercial publishers. Many new players are entering the market and new services have been developed to challenge the current pre-eminent role of commercial publishers in scholarly publishing. Kohl (2) has argued that academia has lost control of scholarly publishing. He explained academic publishing as a big business whose market is
dominated by commercial publishers and as a result the focus has shifted from scholarly communication to the generation of profit.

Despite the many changes that have occurred in the scholarly publishing industry in recent years (1), smaller university presses in the UK have remained minor players in both scholarly communication and electronic publishing.

There are currently seventeen university presses in the UK. In recent years, a number of presses have closed for financial reasons, with three UK presses having closed in the last two years (2002-2003). Higher Education Institutions increasingly have been removing or decreasing their financial support for their presses, causing the presses to struggle to provide reasonably priced scholarly works for the academic community. Many presses have turned to regional publishing and in some cases, trade publishing.

The majority of UK university presses are small; many operate with only one or two staff members and publish only one journal and a small number of books per annum. Presses do not collaborate with one another and at present there is no forum for discussion or any organisation that provides assistance. A number of press directors stated they had collaboration in mind and would benefit from any such association. University presses in the UK have a vital role to play in scholarly publishing that is not widely recognised. As not-for-profit publishers of scholarly works they could do much to alleviate current problems, however, they do require assistance in order to achieve this.

The proposed new association will provide a unified voice and service for the UK university press sector. ASUKUP will be an independent association, based at one of the existing university presses, with assistance from JISC or a similar funding body. The association will have a separate identity and governance structure to support the university presses in the UK. The AAUP provides a good example of what such an association could do.
Eight of the eleven UK university press directors who responded to a questionnaire (conducted in 2003) said they would benefit from such an organisation with three stating possibly or maybe.
The Association of Small UK University Presses (ASUKUP) should be a not-for-profit association. This is required to support the not-for-profit missions of the university press.

The purpose of ASUKUP will be to provide the smaller UK university presses with direct help and support. Services such as assistance to get funding, discussion fora, a joint mailing catalogue, online selling on one website, joint stands at exhibitions, liaison with the PA, and JISC, lobbying government and other relevant bodies, and assistance with electronic publishing projects and licensing could be offered. All of this would be provided in return for a small annual fee.

ASUKUP will support university presses to disseminate widely scholarly knowledge and research and facilitate the exchange of ideas. The aim of the association is to assist these presses to become more self-sustainable in UK scholarly publishing, therefore benefiting the libraries and HEIs by keeping prices low and helping them to fight the price rises of commercial academic publishers.

**Service**

ASUKUP will provide UK university presses with the following services:
- Encouraging collaborative work with HEIs and libraries and other foreign presses and ensure understanding of the university press situation
- The collection and distribution of statistics and industry analyses regarding UK university press publishing and not-for-profit publishing
- Lobbying for funding
- Political lobbying with the PA, JISC, ALSPS, and the government
- Practical and financial assistance with electronic publishing projects/initiatives
- External collaboration including co-ordination with AAUP, the Publishers Association, SPARC and ALPSP when appropriate
- Informing presses of legal issues e.g., copyright, and the drawing up of model licences and contracts
- Representing members to appropriate organisations and government bodies
- Technical advice and assistance and the circulation of information regarding new developments, technology etc.
- Professional development seminars and training covering appropriate electronic publishing methods and technology
- Advice and guidance on institutional repositories and open access publishing
- Co-operative publishing and joint catalogue and mailings
- Development of print on demand facility, or a deal with a print on demand provider
- Co-operative marketing services and activities
- Joint stands at book, library and trade shows
- A UK university press website providing online purchasing
- A Discussion forum/mailing list

These services have the overarching aim of helping presses to fulfil their scholarly mission more economically and effectively, thereby improving the UK university press situation.

Each press will benefit in differing ways from these services depending on its size, aims and subject areas.

Membership
All members must be not-for-profit publishing organisations. ASUKUP will offer two levels of membership, full and affiliate.

*Full membership:* not-for-profit university presses based in the UK that publish academic scholarly works and are directly affiliated with a Higher Education Institution. Full membership includes access to all services provided by ASUKUP, a member of the press staff on the board of directors, and full voting rights. Full membership fee would be on a scale as shown in the table below.
### Table 10.2: Membership Fees for ASUKUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Turnover of the Press (£)</th>
<th>Membership Fee (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 500</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 – 1,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 – 2,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001 – 5,000</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 10,000</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 +</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affiliate membership: not-for-profit publishing organisations that are not directly affiliated with a Higher Education Institution that publish scholarly/academic works/subjects. Affiliate members also include foreign presses, academic departments and individuals. Affiliate membership will pay a lower subscription but will not have voting rights or a member of staff on the board of directors. Full services are provided except for financial assistance with new ventures, and use of joint exhibition stands at book and trade fairs. Affiliate membership fee would be £100 per annum.

**Customer service**

Customer service will be dealt with through a feedback section on the website. Telephone numbers and email addresses for staff members of ASUKUP will be provided for the members. Each full member will be entitled to appoint a staff member to the board of directors of ASUKUP, thereby ensuring press needs are met.

**Development of Service**

Developments to ASUKUP can begin as soon as a board of directors is in place. Future possibilities include the introduction of a print on demand service provided for member presses and a joint warehouse and distribution centre for print books and journals.

**Market**

ASUKUP will provide a service for the small/medium UK university presses. There are currently 17 operating presses in the UK. Two presses have been
classified as large (title output of over 500), four as medium (title output of between 41 and 499), and eleven as small presses (with a title output of 0 – 40).

Research conducted throughout 2003 showed that UK university presses received decreasing funding from their parent HEI. Some received no support at all. The smaller presses tend to publish in niche areas, becoming specialists in that area.

The medium and small UK presses do not generally utilise electronic publishing or new technologies due to cost and time required. While many presses have goals and aims to grow and increase title output, many find it difficult due to cost and time. The competition in the market consists indirectly of other organisations that provide some similar resources. Example of such organisations are: ALPSP, AAUP and the PA.

Research showed that UK university presses desire and require an association such as ASUKUP. If presses are to increase output and remain or become self-sustaining, assistance is required. Therefore, although the market is small, the association is justified because of the need for the services it would provide.

In order to ensure the association is kept relevant to the presses’ needs, the board of directors will work closely with the director of ASUKUP and an opportunity to provide feedback on the website and direct to ASUKUP staff will be provided.

Organisational Structure

ASUKUP will employ an executive director and a small professional staff consisting of a marketing manager, director, and administrator/secretary/treasurer. Member press staff will create a board of directors to ensure the operation of the association is in line with member needs.

The director will be responsible for: encouraging and establishing collaborative work with HEIs, libraries, and other presses; lobbying for funding; the coordination of projects with AAUP, ALPSP and other bodies when appropriate; the development of model licenses and contracts; and the circulation of information regarding new developments and technology. The director must have experience
in university press publishing and in working with other related bodies such as the ALPSP.

The marketing manager will be responsible for the sales and marketing of the association, creating and distributing a joint catalogue and regular mailing lists for the member presses, along with organising stands at fairs and exhibitions. The marketing manager will also be responsible for the creation and operation of the ASUKUP website, operating an electronic discussion list and creating the newsletter. The marketing manager must have experience in sales and marketing in the publishing industry.

The administrator/secretary/treasurer will be responsible for the funds and monies of the association and the day-to-day communication of ASUKUP, and the collection and distribution of statistics regarding UK university press publishing.

The board of directors will be responsible for the policy and strategic direction of the association and will ensure ASUKUP is providing a service in line with member needs and concerns. The board will elect a chair, who will hold regular meetings with the staff. An annual report will be provided for the board of directors and all member presses, as well as a financial report.

There is much potential for expansion within ASUKUP. Staff members could be increased as other roles are required and as the workload increases.

ASUKUP organisational chart:

```
Board of Directors (Staff of member presses)
   ↓
   Chair
   ↓
   Director
   ↓
Marketing Manager  Secretary/treasurer
```

Figure 10.1: ASUKUP Organisational Chart
Competition

Research conducted with the directors of the UK university presses demonstrated that no other organisations exist to assist UK university presses. There was an organisation named ‘UniPress’ that was for-profit and many gave this as the reason for its failure. There was however no information regarding this organisation.

The Association of American University Presses (AAUP) does have many international members. However, only the two major UK university presses are members of the AAUP. The smaller presses do not qualify for membership in the AAUP or cannot afford the fees and do not feel they would gain from such a large and predominantly American association.

The Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP) is a UK based association, of which seven UK university presses are members (3). ALPSP provides practical help in the form of seminars and training days that are useful to university presses. ALPSP is however, not directly aimed at the university press, though it is the nearest competitor in the UK and provides some services that ASUKUP aims to provide.

There are therefore no organisations or associations that are specific to UK university press needs. There is, however, much competition for the resources and time of these presses. The demands of time and money on the smaller UK university presses may make them reluctant to join a new association requiring an annual fee. However, ASUKUP offers many potential benefits that will be of practical and direct assistance. The specificity of the association and the statements from the university press directors stressing the need for such an organisation demonstrates that the association is required. Because of the competition for time and money, the critical success factors will be tailoring the association to the specific needs of the presses and charging an appropriate fee for membership.
Marketing Strategy

ASUKUP will be marketed using a number of methods.

- Emails will be sent to relevant publishing and academic discussion lists informing the academic and publishing communities of the association and its key objectives and aims.
- Direct mail will be sent to all the directors of the UK university presses and their HEI administrators/Vice chancellors informing them of the association, membership terms, fees and benefits.
- An advertisement sent to major publishing magazines/journals informing their readerships of ASUKUP.
- A press release will also be sent to major publishing magazines/journals informing their readerships of ASUKUP.
- The ASUKUP website will be operational from the start with the URL appearing on all of the above methods of advertising for further information.

In order to reach the specific target audience of small UK university press directors, direct mailing is likely to be the most successful, including a personal letter, information regarding ASUKUP and membership details. This personal approach provides more in-depth information for the potential members.

Customer service will be dealt with through a feedback section on the website, telephone numbers and email addresses of ASUKUP staff will be provided and the board of directors will work closely with staff (each member press having a staff member on the board).

ASUKUP will produce an annual report and an online monthly newsletter for all member presses, keeping the presses up to date with advances, changes and news in the publishing world and in the university press sector in particular.
Financial Management Plan

ASUKUP is a not-for-profit organisation. Sources of financing will be limited to membership fees, sponsorship and possible revenue derived from seminars and the publishing of university press statistics and publishing related books. It is hoped grants will be procured from foundations and government bodies to assist ASUKUP in specific projects such as electronic publishing.

A start-up investment is required in order to provide membership at a reduced rate. See Table 10.3.

Balance sheet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incomings</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>Outgoings</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start-up investment</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>Salaries (with super-annuation and National Insurance):</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing Manager</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary/bursar</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding: grants</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Equipment: PCs etc.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship/advertising</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web space</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from seminars and publishing</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Packaging, payment, ordering methods, shipping</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member fees: Full (500)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Delivery/postage of leaflets</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: Affiliate (300)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Costs of materials</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seminars/exhibitions</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising/promotion</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.3: Balance Sheet for ASUKUP

An initial start-up investment of £90,000 is required for the association to become active and work towards being self-sustaining. This will include a year’s salary for staff members, equipment and initial purchase of material for marketing and
the first joint catalogue. Income and outgoings will increase in years two and three. However, fees will rise as the association becomes established and the benefits become clear, therefore attracting more members through further advertising campaigns.

**SWOT Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unique association</td>
<td>Possible lack of revenue/income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves the needs of UK university presses</td>
<td>Serves a small community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits the HEI community</td>
<td>Requires membership of the majority of UK university presses to be a success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extend to help new university presses start up</td>
<td>Presses have limited resources and funds to join</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop services unique to the press needs</td>
<td>Presses are closed by HEI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.4: SWOT Analysis for ASUKUP

**Business Risks and Contingencies**

Potential problems or changes for ASUKUP:

- Presses do not want to join ASUKUP
- Presses cannot afford to join ASUKUP
- More presses close due to HEI administrative decisions
- Presses receive less/no funding/support from HEI

Plans to reduce failure:

- Direct mailings and personal contact with small UK university press directors informing of the benefits and long-term cost savings of the association
- ASUKUP lobbying for funding on behalf of the presses therefore providing further funds to assist the presses to becoming self-sustaining and assist the HEI in distributing funds elsewhere
- Advertising sent to HEI administrators and Vice chancellors informing them of the benefits of ASUKUP, with the aim of encouraging their press to become a member and educate them of the benefits ASUKUP can have for the HEI

This business plan and the ASUKUP mission will be evaluated and modified once the association has been running for a year, noting successes and failures.

A future role for ASUKUP may be the promotion of, and support for new university presses.

A website with the following features will be created:
- Links to: AAUP, ALPSP, PA, SPARC, sponsor sites
- Links to UK university press web pages
- Member section requiring username and password
- UK university press book catalogue and ordering online
- Personalisation for members once signed in

The web-site design and management will be done in house, and will be monitored and updated regularly with technical support and site security provided.

Business Plan References:


10.6.2 Voluntary Self-help Organisation Business Plan

Business Plan for Voluntary Self-Help Organisation for UK University Presses (SHUP). No representations or guarantees are made or implied. Plans and projections are subject to change. All stated amounts are approximate and estimated.

Executive Summary

- While many changes have occurred in the scholarly publishing industry in recent years, smaller university presses in the UK have remained minor players in scholarly communication.
- There are currently seventeen university presses in the UK. In recent years, many presses have closed for financial reasons (three UK presses closed in the years 2002-2003). Higher Education Institutions have been removing or decreasing their financial support for their presses, causing them to struggle to provide reasonably priced scholarly works for the academic community. Many presses have turned to regional publishing and in some cases, trade publishing, to alleviate the problems.
- Research was conducted throughout 2003 with the Directors of UK university presses. Twelve of the seventeen press directors were involved in the research. Findings showed that the majority of UK university presses are small; many operate with only one or two staff members and publish only one journal and a small number of books per annum. UK university presses do not collaborate with one another and at present there is no forum for discussion or any organisation that provides assistance.
- University presses in the UK have a potentially vital role to play in scholarly communication that is not widely recognised. Presses can help libraries in their acquisitions by continuing to provide scholarly works on a not-for-profit basis. If presses were to collaborate further, and therefore increase economies of scale, the host institutions would be able to channel funds elsewhere while still retaining the press. UK university presses need to collaborate in changing areas (such as the open access movement) in order to know how best to act, and to take advantage of such changes.
Nine of the twelve UK university press directors who responded to the questionnaire said they would benefit from an organisation for UK university presses, and three stated possibly or maybe.

The proposed service is a voluntary self-help group comprised of UK university presses. It will include all UK university presses and also have scope for other not-for-profit publishing ventures to take part. The service is not yet established, but the majority of UK university press directors have demonstrated the need for such an organisation and have shown an interest in the proposed organisation.

The proposed mission statement for the organisation is: "SHUP is a proposed self-help voluntary organisation that will support and aid UK university presses in scholarly publishing. Through collaborative services such as marketing, dissemination, and joint electronic publishing projects, SHUP aims to assist the presses to achieve or retain self-sufficiency, take a greater role in scholarly publishing and fulfil their individual missions and commitment to the improvement of scholarly publishing. Through SHUP, the presses will be better able to offer improved services for the academic community and the HEI library community by providing scholarly knowledge and research at affordable prices and disseminating widely".

The purpose of SHUP is to create collaboration. Services such as assistance to acquire funding, discussion fora, a joint catalogue, online selling on a joint website, joint stands at exhibitions, liaison with the ALPSP, PA/CAPP, SPARC and JISC, lobbying government and other relevant bodies, and joint electronic publishing projects and licensing, could be accomplished by SHUP or contracted out. Favourable terms with distributors, overseas representatives, printers, and trade stands for member presses would also be negotiated.

As the organisation will be run on a voluntary basis, the majority of fund-requiring services will be contracted out. The benefit of the group being self-help is that services selected to be accomplished by the members will be directly relevant to their needs, giving the member presses control, and ensuring quality.

No subscriptions will be required from member university presses because of their limited financial assets. Instead, member presses will be required to
give time to the group's activities, and when necessary, their resources, to assist the group in achieving its goals (e.g., creating and publishing a joint catalogue). Other non-university press members will be required to pay a small annual fee. However, this cannot be viewed as guaranteed income as the number of such members is unknown.

- Revenue will be based on achieving cost recovery, and will be procured from possible advertising costs on the website (though this may be limited due to the small market it will serve). It is hoped grants and funding will be received. The funding will determine what activities can be outsourced to others.

- Competition in the market consists indirectly of other organisations that provide some similar resources. Example of such organisations are: ALPSP, PA/CAPP and the AAUP. However, there is no similar organisation directly competing for press time and resources, other than the daily demands operating such a press brings.

- In order to reach the specific target audience of small UK university press directors, direct mailing is likely to be the most successful approach, including a personal letter, information regarding SHUP and membership details. This personal approach provides more in-depth information for the potential members.

- Quarterly meetings will be held with all member presses to create an agenda of priority for SHUP and to arrange voluntary time and tasks to be undertaken by each member.

- One press director will act as the chair of the group, and will have overall responsibility to: ensure SHUP operates smoothly, organise and chair the meetings, and create an online monthly newsletter to keep members updated. Another press will provide a treasurer to handle financial operations and accounting; these roles will be appointed through votes of the member presses and will be for fixed terms.

- Meetings will include setting the agenda and action to be completed, and reporting progress. If conflicts of interest arise, the chair will organise either a public or private system for all members to vote.

- SHUP, as a not-for-profit voluntary self-help group, is the most appropriate way for UK university presses to create collaboration and maintain or
achieve sustainability in the current market place. SHUP does not put financial strain on the member presses and requires only limited time and resources. As the group becomes established and builds a reputation, it will be able to accomplish much good for Higher Education and the scholarly market, providing rigorous academic works at affordable prices.

- If such an organisation is not supported, more university presses in the UK may be closed by their parent Higher Education Institution because they may become or remain unsustainable.

**Mission Statement**

SHUP is a proposed self-help voluntary organisation that will support and aid UK university presses in scholarly publishing. Through collaborative services such as marketing, dissemination, and joint electronic publishing projects, SHUP aims to assist the presses to achieve or retain self-sufficiency, take a greater role in scholarly publishing, and fulfil their individual missions and commitment to the improvement of scholarly publishing.

Through SHUP, the presses will be better able to offer improved services for the academic community and the HEI library community, by providing knowledge and research results at affordable prices, and disseminating them widely.

**Situational Assessment and Strategic Response**

A university press is a publishing house associated with a Higher Education Institution, bearing its imprint and primarily devoted to publishing scholarly, low-profit works.

Academic and scholarly publishing is in a state of flux (1). Tensions caused by the conflict between the price rises imposed by some commercial journal publishers and the limited budgets of Higher Education Institution (HEI) libraries have caused real friction and much talk of ways to by-pass certain commercial publishers. Many new players are entering the market and new services, in particular the open access movement, have been developed to challenge the current pre-eminent role of commercial publishers in scholarly publishing.
Kohl (2) has argued that academia has lost control of scholarly publishing. He explained that academic publishing is a big business whose market is dominated by commercial publishers and as a result the focus has shifted from scholarly communication to the generation of profit.

Despite, or because of, the many changes that have occurred in the scholarly publishing industry in recent years (1), smaller university presses in the UK have remained minor players in scholarly communication.

There are currently seventeen university presses in the UK. In recent years, many presses have closed for financial reasons (three UK presses closed in the years 2002-2003). Higher Education Institutions have been removing or decreasing their financial support for their presses, causing them to struggle to provide reasonably priced scholarly works for the academic community. Many presses have turned to regional publishing and in some cases, trade publishing, to alleviate the problems.

Research was conducted throughout 2003 with the Directors of UK university presses. Twelve of the seventeen press directors were involved in the research. Findings showed that the majority of UK university presses are small; many operate with only one or two staff members and publish only one journal and a small number of books per annum. UK university presses do not collaborate with one another and at present there is no forum for discussion or any organisation that provides assistance. The research revealed that the majority of press directors had collaboration in mind and would benefit from any such association.

University presses in the UK have a potentially vital role to play in scholarly communication that is not widely recognised. Presses can help libraries in their acquisitions by continuing to provide scholarly works on a not-for-profit basis. If presses were to collaborate further and therefore increase economies of scale, the host institutions would be able to channel funds elsewhere while still retaining the press. Presses also need to collaborate in changing areas (such as the open access movement) in order to know how best to act, and to take advantage of such changes.
As not-for-profit publishers of scholarly works, they could do much to alleviate current problems. However, collaboration is necessary in order to be able to achieve this.

A voluntary self-help group will create collaboration, thus helping the presses to continue to compete in the scholarly market and continue to provide a service for academia. The voluntary aspect of the venture means that all presses can take part and no membership fee would be required. The services the presses can create will assist them in projects, aid in becoming more widely recognised, assist them in fulfilling their missions more thoroughly, and support them in becoming sustainable.

Any profit-based group or association requiring fees would deter the presses from becoming members and may not address their unique needs. Funding required would also be substantial and there is no evidence such an organisation would be sustainable. A voluntary self-help organisation would be more acceptable amongst university press staff and their parent HEIs. With limited funds, and a lack of membership in other not-for-profit associations requiring fees, a voluntary group is deemed more appropriate.

The research demonstrates that there is an existing market for such a group. The market is, however, small, and the group requires commitment from member presses in order for it to be successful. The Association of American University Presses is an organisation assisting member presses in many ways. However, the association requires fees and has certain membership requirements. At present, only two of the UK university presses are members of the AAUP. The ALPSP is an association for learned and professional society publishers of which seven UK university presses are members. The ALPSP provides many useful services from which university presses could benefit, however, some university press directors stated subscription fees as the reason for not joining.

It should be noted, however, that an organisation named 'UniPress' was a commercial organisation set up for UK university press collaboration. UniPress
encouraged discussion and collaboration, but was discontinued because there was no revenue stream to support it.

*Project History and Outlook*

Research into UK university presses revealed the need for a not-for-profit self-help group in order to create collaboration and assist the smaller presses to become more sustainable.

Such a group would need to be established. Table 10.5 lists the hypothetical key events and actions that need to take place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale (month/year)</th>
<th>Achieved/Scheduled Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestones Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Research with UK university press directors to discover needs, requirements and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2004</td>
<td>Business Plan created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2004</td>
<td>Plan sent to UK university press directors and other concerned parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheduled Milestones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2004</td>
<td>Feedback received as to the venture’s viability and acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2004</td>
<td>Plan finalised and approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2004</td>
<td>Advertising sent out to HEI administrators, UK university presses and the press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2004</td>
<td>Meeting of interested presses to establish roles and initial goals: develop terms of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2004</td>
<td>Establish chair and treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2004</td>
<td>Group established, assignments made, action underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2004</td>
<td>Establish financial and accounting policy and practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.5: Table of Key Actions and Events
The Organisation and Business Model

The proposed new organisation will serve the UK university press sector and will be operated on a voluntary basis with member presses giving time and resources.

Nine of the twelve UK university press directors who responded to the questionnaire (conducted in 2003) said they would benefit from such an organisation. Three stated possibly or maybe. The current market consists of seventeen active university presses.

The purpose of SHUP is to create collaboration. Services such as assistance to get funding, discussion fora, a joint catalogue, online selling on a joint website, joint stands at exhibitions, liaison with the ALPSP, PA/CAPP, SPARC and JISC, lobbying government and other relevant bodies, joint electronic publishing projects, and licensing, are services that could be accomplished by SHUP or be contracted out. Favourable terms with distributors, overseas representatives, printers and trade stands for members would be negotiated.

A voluntary self-help group would be operated by member presses, contributing resources and time. Funding for services to be outsourced would be procured from funding bodies and grants, with the possibility of advertising revenue from the web site.

The aim of the organisation is to assist these presses to become more self-sustainable in UK scholarly publishing, therefore assisting libraries and HEIs by keeping prices low and helping them to fight the price rises of commercial academic publishers.

The member presses will jointly operate the group. However one director will take responsibility for over seeing the group and its activities.

This model has been formulated on the basis that a not-for-profit organisation is required to fit the needs and mission of the university presses. A previous organisation called 'UniPress' demonstrated that any commercial venture is inappropriate and will not procure revenue. Initially it was thought a trade
association would be successful, requiring fees from the member presses in order to cover operating costs. A business plan was developed for such an association. However, feedback from potential members showed that such an association was too large a venture for such a small market and with the lack of funds potential members would be reluctant to pay the fees. The university press directors themselves recommended a voluntary self-help organisation as the most appropriate route; this model therefore offers the greatest chance for success.

Relationships with other initiatives and programmes will be developed. Collaboration with the ALPSP, AAUP, SPARC, the PA and JISC will be established. Collaboration with these groups will help visibility and reinforce the group’s mission. Such a group will also complement such organisations as SPARC and PLoS, as university presses aim to play their part in the changing role of scholarly communication.

Service
A voluntary self-help group, comprised of UK university presses, will provide the proposed services. It will include all UK university presses and also have scope for other not-for-profit publishing ventures to take part. The service is not yet established, but the majority of UK university press directors has demonstrated the need for such an organisation and shown an interest in the proposed organisation.

As the organisation will be run on a voluntary basis, the majority of fund-requiring services will be contracted out. The benefit of the group being self-help means that tasks accomplished will be relevant to specific needs. Control will lie with member presses, thus ensuring quality.

The services to be offered on a voluntary basis by the group’s members include the following:

- Encouraging collaborative work with HEIs and libraries, and other foreign presses
- Lobbying for funding
- Political lobbying with the PA, JISC, ALPSP, and the government
- External collaboration including co-ordination with AAUP, the Publishers Association, SPARC, JISC, and the ALPSP when appropriate
- Representing members to appropriate organisations and government bodies
- Joint stands at book, library and trade shows
- Joint electronic publishing projects/contracts
- A Discussion forum/mailing list
- Co-operative publishing and joint catalogue and mailings
- Joint discussion and initiatives in open access
- Future print on demand service

The following services will be contracted out as deemed necessary:
- The collection and distribution of statistics and industry analyses regarding UK university press publishing and not-for-profit publishing
- Technical advice and assistance and the circulation of information regarding new developments, technology etc.
- Favourable contracts with print on demand services
- Professional development seminars and training on appropriate electronic publishing methods and technology (possibility of attaining group discounts to participate in training courses)
- Co-operative marketing services and activities
- A UK university press website providing online purchasing

These services have the overarching aim of helping presses to fulfil their scholarly mission more economically and effectively, thereby improving the UK university press situation and helping the wider scholarly communication crisis.

Each press will benefit in differing ways from these services depending on their size, aims and subject areas. The main advantage however, is that the presses can target specific activities according to their needs.
Fees and Funding
No subscriptions will be required from member university presses because of their limited financial assets. Instead, member presses will be required to give their time to the group and when necessary their resources, to assist the group in achieving its goals (e.g., creating and publishing a joint catalogue). Other not-for-profit publishers who wish to join will be required to pay a small annual fee. However this cannot be viewed as guaranteed income, as the number of such members is unknown. Revenue will be based on achieving cost recovery, and will be procured from possible advertising costs on the website (though this may be limited due to the small market it will serve), and it is hoped grants and funding will be received. The funding will determine what activities can be outsourced to others. The model will be evaluated after one year and adapted according to need, by majority vote of the members (on the basis of one vote for each press).

Membership
All members must be not-for-profit publishing organisations. SHUP will offer two levels of membership; full and affiliate.

*Full membership:* not-for-profit university presses based in the UK that publish academic scholarly works and are directly affiliated with a Higher Education Institution. Full membership is free to the above described group and includes access to all services provided by SHUP; however, each member press would be required to give time and resources as necessary, based on the staff numbers (see below). Annual turnover has not been used as the measurement because the presses are asked to give a number of days each year to the group rather than fees. It is therefore more relevant to base the time given using the number of staff each press employs:
### Table 10.6: Time Required by Member Presses Related to the Size of the Press Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE Staff of press</th>
<th>Time required (FTE person in days per annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>6 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>8 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 40</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 100</td>
<td>12 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - 300</td>
<td>14 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 +</td>
<td>16 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affiliate membership: not-for-profit publishing organisations that are not directly affiliated with a Higher Education Institution that publish scholarly/academic works. Affiliate members also include foreign university presses, academic departments, and individuals. Affiliate members will pay a small annual fee and will have access to full services, except voting rights. Membership fees would be based on the scale below using annual turnover of the organisation:

### Table 10.7: Membership Fees of Other Organisations Related to the Annual Turnover of the Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Turnover of the Press/organisation (£)</th>
<th>Membership Fee (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 500</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 1,000</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 - 2,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001 - 5,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 +</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Markets, Marketing and Sales

SHUP will provide a service for the small/medium UK university presses. There are currently seventeen operating presses in the UK (December 2003). Two presses have been classified as large (title output of over 500), four as medium (title output of between 41 and 499), and eleven as small presses (with a title output of 0 – 40).

Research conducted in 2003 showed that UK university presses received decreasing funding from their parent HEI. Some received no support at all. The smaller presses tend to publish in niche areas, becoming specialist in that area. The presses are located throughout the UK and have a wide variety of staff numbers. The medium and small UK presses do not generally utilise electronic publishing or new technologies due to the cost and time required. While many presses have goals and aims to grow and increase title output, many find it difficult due to cost and time. The market is generally mature, but with constant changes in funding and decisions made by HEI administration, their position is not static.

The group will also serve other potential members, including other not-for-profit scholarly presses.

Competition in the market consists indirectly of other organisations that provide some similar resources. Example of such organisations are: ALPSP, PA/CAPP, and the AAUP. However, there is no similar organisation competing for time and resources, other than the daily demands operating such a press brings.

The research showed that UK university presses desire and require an organisation such as SHUP. If presses are to increase output and remain or become self-sustaining, collaboration is required.

Each member press will have input to the organisation, ensuring the organisation is kept relevant to the press needs. The experience of university presses as publishing businesses provides the necessary tools for them to operate such an organisation (such as accounting, creating catalogues, operating online selling).
Objectives for market capture include the appropriate marketing of the group using a number of methods.

- Emails will be sent to relevant publishing and academic discussion lists informing the academic and publishing communities of the association and its key objectives and aims.
- Direct mail will be sent to all the directors of the UK university presses informing them of the association, membership terms, fees and benefits.
- A press release will also be sent to major publishing magazines/journals informing their readerships of SHUP.
- Direct mail will be sent to HEI administrators and Vice chancellors informing them of the benefits of SHUP, with the aim of encouraging their press to become a member, and educating them concerning the benefits of the organisation for the HEI.

In order to reach the specific target audience of small/medium UK university press directors, direct mailing is likely to be the most successful, including a personal letter, information regarding SHUP and membership details. This personal approach provides more in-depth information for the potential members.

Customer service will be dealt with within the group. As all member presses take an active part in the group’s activities this will ensure input into the collaborative activities.

A future role for SHUP may be the promotion of, and support for, new university presses.

**Organisational Structure and Staffing**

The not-for-profit voluntary self-help organisation has been developed in response to research conducted with UK university press directors, which stressed the need for collaboration. It has not yet been established. The group will operate on a voluntary basis with each member press offering time and resources as required.
Other members will pay a small annual fee, may participate in meetings, but will not be required to give their time or have voting rights.

Quarterly meetings will be held with all member presses to create a priority agenda for SHUP and to arrange voluntary time and the tasks to be undertaken by each member.

One press director will act as the chair of the group, and will have overall responsibility to ensure SHUP operates smoothly, organise and chair the meetings, and create an online monthly newsletter to keep members updated. The chair must be committed to the role. Another press will provide a treasurer to handle financial operations and accounting. These members will be appointed through votes of the member presses and will be for fixed terms.

The meetings will include setting the agenda and action to be completed. If conflicts of interest arise, the chair of the group will organise either a public or private system for all members to vote.
Financial Plan

SHUP is a voluntary organisation. Sources of financing will be limited to grants, sponsorship and possible revenue from advertising. There may also be the possibility of a small amount of fees from non-university press members. It is hoped grants will be procured from foundations and government bodies to assist SHUP in specific projects such as electronic publishing.
Table 10.8: Activities to be Conducted by Member Presses Using Own Time and Resources

Income and expenditure for possible incomings and outgoings after first year of operation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Income</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>Potential Outgoings</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-university press fees</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Initial marketing costs</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship/advertising</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Industry analysis</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding: grants</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Web designer and host</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.9: Income and Expenditure for First Year of SHUP

Financial reviews will be given at the end of each quarterly meeting.

**Business Risks and Contingencies**

The most formidable barrier to market entry for the self-help group would be lack of interest and participation and therefore achieving the necessary critical mass of members. However, this barrier has been overcome by conducting market
research. Research showed that over half of the operating UK university presses would support such a group.

Potential risks to the venture include the following:

- Lack of interest or support by UK presses
- Extensive funding required to make necessary and desired impact
- Member presses neglecting responsibilities, therefore the group dwindles
- UK presses face further closure
- Impact of evolving economic and technological situations causing presses to become redundant

**SWOT Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-help group, tasks will be</td>
<td>Relies on enthusiasm of members to operate group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directly related to press needs</td>
<td>and ensure success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require subscription</td>
<td>Must have a dynamic chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of print on demand</td>
<td>Presses closed by parent HEIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service for the member presses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint warehouse and distribution</td>
<td>Neglect of responsibilities from members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centre for press books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for set-up of new</td>
<td>Finances required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university presses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research funding to bid for</td>
<td>Lack of press support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evolving technological and economic situations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.10: SWOT Analysis
Table 10.11 shows the contingency plans to reduce or cope with failure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Potential Response or Action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finances required</td>
<td>Adjust financial model and include further lobbying for funding and grant money to achieve balance between expenses and income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of press support</td>
<td>Direct mailing to university press directors, discussions with press directors regarding the benefits of SHUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect of responsibilities</td>
<td>Chair of group to prompt and remind members of responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press facing closure</td>
<td>Lobbying on behalf of the press in question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolving economic and technological situations</td>
<td>Adapting to change accordingly and using collaboration to remain strong in the market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.11: Contingency Plans to Reduce/Cope with Failure

Conclusions

SHUP, as a not-for-profit voluntary self-help group, is the most appropriate way for UK university presses to create collaboration and maintain or achieve sustainability in the current market place. SHUP does not put financial strain on the member presses and requires only limited time and resources. As the group becomes established and builds a reputation, it will be able to accomplish much good for Higher Education and the scholarly market, providing rigorous academic works at affordable prices. If such an organisation is not supported more university presses in the UK might be closed by their parent Higher Education Institution as they become or remain unsustainable.
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10.6.3. ALPSP Proposal Business Plan

Thank you for showing us your ‘Business Plan for a Voluntary Self-Help Organisation for UK University Presses’. You have done some impressive work in identifying the presses and analysing their needs – congratulations!

However, we think there may be a more practical alternative to your proposed ‘Self-Help Organisation’. It is our experience that publishers of all kinds – but particularly overstretched small not-for-profit publishers – have less time than ever before for voluntary activities; the ‘day job’ absorbs all the time they have and more. This is why, in recent years, we have considerably increased the staffing level at ALPSP – and the increased services we have been able to deliver to members have justified the investment.

What we would like to suggest is that we use the existing ALPSP infrastructure to deliver the services that your University Presses are asking for. We already provide the following from your list, on behalf of all not-for-profit publishers:

- Collaborative initiatives with HEIs and libraries – we are one of the partner organisations in PALS, with the Publishers Association and JISC; we also have a strong working relationship with the British Library and with SCONUL.
- Active lobbying and representation, both separately when appropriate and in collaboration with other publishing bodies, at national and international level to governments, policy-makers and opinion-formers.
- Two online discussion lists, one on general publishing topics and the other on copyright issues.
- Numerous meetings, and a major research project, on open access.
- Discounts with a whole range of suppliers.
- A range of research projects collecting data on scholarly publishing in general, and on not-for-profit publishing in particular, members can purchase these and other publications at an attractive discount.
- A series of bimonthly ‘technical updates’ on new developments.
The industry's largest programme of seminars, workshops, round tables and briefings; members attend at substantially discounted rates. While in the past these have focused primarily on journals topics, we have recently set up a task force to develop a strong programme on non-journal events.

A rapidly growing programme of high-quality training courses at all levels.

Cooperative marketing of journals through the very successful ALPSP Learned Journals Collection, a collection of over 350 journals from smaller publishers, which are sold as a single collection (or in discipline-specific subsets) to consortia and other large library customers. This makes it possible for smaller publishers to compete effectively with the 'big deals' offered by larger publishers; Swets, who act as the publishers' agent, have already sold more than 30 licences in the Collection's first year.

We are also already exploring the possibility of joint stands at book fairs and the like, and would be happy to investigate joint catalogues and mailings, and an online portal for ordering publications. A larger number of University Press members (we already have 10, including 7 in the UK) would also help us to shape future activities which particularly addressed their needs – if it was felt appropriate, we would be happy to create a 'University Presses' sub-group; enquiries suggest that the UK offices of some American university presses would also benefit from activities focused on their particular needs, in particular relating to book publishing.

In addition, we offer members:

- A free print copy of our highly esteemed quarterly journal Learned Publishing, as well as organisation-wide online access.
- As many copies as required of our free monthly online newsletter ALPSP Alert, which is often mentioned as one of the key benefits of membership
- Access to the members-only area of the website www.alpsp.org, which contains a series of specially-written practical 'Advice Notes' on all aspects of publishing, free access to a number of ALPSP and others' publications, and discounts on a wide range of services.
You say that the University Presses would be unable to pay for membership of an organisation, and would prefer to give up between 2 and 35 man-days of staff time instead. In our experience, as mentioned above, ‘spare’ time is even scarcer than money; our own membership subscription, for presses with publishing expenditure (not turnover) of under £40,000, is only £160 for a full year (prorated quarterly for those joining in the course of the year). We believe that this would represent excellent value for money and suggest that the best course of action for the UK university presses who are not already ALPSP members would be to join us. We would be happy to work with you to make a suitable approach to them.

Yours sincerely
Sally Morris, Chief Executive,
Andrea Powell, CABI, ALPSP Chair,
Martin Richardson, OUP, ALPSP Vice-Chair,

ALPSP
South House, The Street, Clapham, Worthing, West Sussex BN13 3UU
Tel: 01903 871686 Fax: 01903 871457 Email: chief-exec@alpsp.org
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Chapter 11

Business Models for Small UK University Presses
Whilst the developed business plans encourage collaboration amongst UK university presses, individual presses still require assistance. A couple of business models were therefore developed to assist smaller university presses to become sustainable and adapt to industry change.

11.1. Business Models

“A business model is the method of doing business by which a company can sustain itself – that is, generate revenue.” [1]

A business model is the engine of a business. It is often a one-page description of how the business works. Afuah and Tucci described a business model as:

“...the method by which a firm builds and uses its resources to offer its customers better value than its competitors and to make money doing so.” [2]

Koty explained a business model as: the core strategy of a firm that defines its place in a market. A business model describes new opportunity and how the company will generate profit thereby, answers the ‘why’ of a company’s existence and provides overall direction. He stressed that a model does not generally address implementation issues and strategy, but does indicate how and why transactions will occur [3].

Linder and Cantrell specified that a business model is the value proposition an organization offers to its stakeholders; it also outlines operating processes, arranged as a coherent system that relies on and builds assets, capabilities and relationships, with the aim of creating value [4].
Effective business models must include a description of the various business actors and their roles, a description of the potential benefits, and a description of the sources of revenue [5].

“A good business model always tries to take advantage of any opportunities in its environment while trying to dampen the effects of threats from it.” [6]

Industry change can make models obsolete and therefore any model must be receptive and adaptable to change. Models must also be realistic, simple, relevant and valid to the market and industry they serve. If possible, experimentation in a business setting should take place, with amendments made to any model as appropriate.

Business models should include the value that is offered, to whom the service or product will be provided, how it will be priced and provided and how advantage will be sustained. The business environment and competition must be considered, and a business model should never jeopardise the company’s reputation, mission or customer trust [7].

Linder and Cantrell reviewed the business models of seventy companies and stated that the more successful models shared three characteristics: unique value offered, difficult to imitate and based on accurate assumptions [8].

An e-business model details the approach of conducting business electronically through which a company can sustain itself. Electronic commerce refers to doing business electronically; electronic commerce can be either complementary to existing business or represent a whole new line of business [9]. An Internet business model includes details regarding how a firm plans to make money using the Internet. Internet business models include brokerage, advertising, merchant, infomediary, manufacturer, affiliate, community, subscription and utility [10].
11.2. **Existing Business Models**

In the publishing industry, the prevailing business model has been to provide a physical object for a set cost (e.g., books) or through subscription (e.g., journals). With the introduction and widespread availability of electronic distribution and creation of information, business models and pricing strategies have been altered in an attempt to reflect these changes. Joseph noted that in the last decade a remarkable number of experiments in alternative business models for scholarly e-publishing (as well as new pricing models) had been conducted and tested [11] (e.g., [12], [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20]).

The print only book and journal models provided a successful service for the academic publishing community for many years. However, with the introduction of electronic technologies and demand for electronic information and products, new models were introduced alongside traditional models. New pricing models such as: free at point of use, joint subscription with the print edition, and the author fee model associated with open access journals, have been tested to cater for these changes.

As new services and products become available and as user/customer demand for electronic products increase, business models adopted by publishers must adapt accordingly. No industry is static and change is inevitable in order to retain market share and remain a player in the industry. While traditional models proved successful in a print environment, new models are probably essential to cater for the new electronic environment.
11.3. New Business Models

New models have the potential to change the business practices of university presses, help them to become sustainable or maintain sustainability currently under threat, to adapt in a changing environment, and improve current business practice. Porter [21] discussed the need to highlight areas where there are potential savings in business practice.

Changes in business practice could include the mounting of reference works and print only journals online, selling online, educating HEI administration to better understand the university press, the development of a strong regional list, concentrating on publishing vertically in a niche subject area, and considering complementors [22] (e.g., provide chapters online with the aim to boost print sales). Print on demand is another significant new business practice in the sector (see 11.4).

Developing new business models implies changing the way a university press does business. A list of potential new business models dealing with the two entities produced by the university press (i.e., books and journals), and based on the results of the research (see Chapter Ten) is provided below:

Journals
- Put existing print journals online
- Work with SPARC in developing new journals at low prices, offering cheaper alternatives to commercial journals.
- Create electronic journals/electronic communities in niche subject areas
- Adopt the author fee model to cover publishing costs, thereby reducing/eliminating subscription costs to HEI libraries, and perhaps aid in the move to an open access journal model.

- Develop and operate an institutional repository. This would be based at the press and managed by the press for the university, providing a service for
the HEI and assisting the press to retain its position in a changing environment.

Books
- Adopt print on demand and short run digital printing
- Enhance/adopt online selling through existing vendors, or as part of a UK press organisation.
- Focus on niche subject areas, expand in regional lists
- Aggregation of text (for an example see [23]), or consortium of presses providing aggregations of material.

Any new model must be internally as well as externally effective and must consider all stakeholders involved in the chain, taking into account their needs, and ensuring that the model benefits all parties. The two models developed were those highlighted above and are detailed in Chapters 11.5 and 11.7.

11.4. Print on Demand and Short Run Digital Printing

Offset printing has dominated the printing of both books and journals. However, digital printing is affordable and is becoming regularly used in the publishing industry.

Print on demand utilises digital publishing and refers to:

“...the printing of a document in response to the requirement of a specific end user.”

[24]

True print on demand deals with printing one copy for a specific customer on request, printed as the need arises. Short run digital printing uses the same technology, but for a small print-run, rather than one off texts. Digital printing is done from a pdf file but can be taken by scanning a book.
Huggins [25] and Alexander [26], as well as others, have outlined the advantages of print on demand:

- Provides economically effective quantities versus economic order quantity
- Faster delivery to the end-user
- Allows for product flexibility - digital proofs, test market, feedback, custom products
- Reduces warehouse space requirements - more titles in less space
- Eliminates shelf investment tied up in cash that could be used on new product development
- Produces only what is sold
- Reduces production time
- Extends the life of the title - titles never go out of print again
- Improves cash flow
- Generates new revenue streams
- If outsourced, saves delivery costs
- Can have short runs replenishing stock, or have single copies printed as required.
- Recovery of lost sales
- Elimination of excess stock
- Reduction of returns
- Saves the time of staff e.g., stock/inventory managers

The speed of digital printing does not yet match that of an offset press. However, the technology is improving rapidly and compared to offset digital printing compensates in:

"...flexibility, cost-effectiveness in short runs, and simplifies binding processes."

[27]
While print on demand was once confined to less than 500 print runs, with the advance in technology, page costs have substantially decreased, and:

"...will be competitive at 2,000 copies." [28]

While print on demand currently raises the unit cost of a book slightly and fixed costs are distributed over a smaller number of copies, there are considerable savings elsewhere [29], and publishers can print out of print titles and generate new revenue from these sales.

The future may see customers choosing their books on a print on demand machine and printing them in a bookshop. However, for now, print on demand is fulfilled at a commercial printing division e.g., Lightning Source, or at a university printing division. Companies such as Lightning Source (who have printed over ten million books and have a database of over 90,000 titles) [30], and Anthony Rowe (specialists in short run books), offer both print on demand and short run services. For a press to perform print on demand in-house the costs are currently prohibitive and therefore outsourcing makes sense. An alternative would be for one press or an association of presses to set up and offer a print on demand service.

Wilson Higgins of Lightning Source in the UK has stressed the benefit of this new technology. Cash is no longer tied up in inventory and customers can be satisfied promptly. It minimises unit cost of production, shows cost reduction by carrying no inventory and reports extra sales revenue from better availability, reduced transport costs, and delivery times, [31], [32].

While true print on demand (printing one copy at a time) can have many benefits (e.g., solving inventory problems), it does require changes in selling and distributing practice. However, while short run printing allows a publishing business structure to remain the same, it may not solve inventory problems, still retaining stock and creating extra work, with a need to monitor both the warehouse of stock printed
traditionally (if this were to continue), in addition to the monitoring of short run stock to see when another short print run is required.

A number of UK university presses have adopted print on demand, and seven are working with Lightning Source. These are: University of Birmingham Press, Cambridge University Press, Edinburgh University Press, Exeter University Press, Manchester University Press, Nottingham University Press and Oxford University Press. The University of Hertfordshire Press uses Anthony Rowe for some short print runs.

Cambridge University Press has utilised print on demand by keeping titles available that would have gone out of print, thereby generating new revenue streams. The press has used Lightning Source for both short runs and for single print on demand copies [33].

Oxford University Press operated a pure print on demand programme selecting certain titles where the traditionally printed version is exhausted and relying entirely on print on demand. The press used this technology for over 4,000 books, mainly backlist titles, out of print or out of stock titles, or where demand was dropping. The press has kept these titles in print and has therefore retained the copyright (as copyright reverts back to authors under some contracts when a title goes out of print) rather than have the rights revert to the author (a prospect not favoured by some authors [34]). The press worked with Lightning Source who created the digital files, stored and printed the books and shipped them direct to the customer, saving both time and money for the press. Much of the print on demand stock consists of specialised academic monographs [35] where sales had dropped considerably. The press now hardly ever declares a book out of print.

The University of Hertfordshire Press, with an average print run of 1,000 (ranging from 500 to 3,000), used print on demand for reprints where sales had fallen to a few
dozen a year. The press had not yet adopted this technology for first editions, as unit costs were high and book prices low [36].

In the USA, the University of Chicago installed a digital printing centre in their production centre. The University of Chicago Press utilised this centre and does all printing in house, as well as fulfilling the printing for other smaller university and not-for-profit presses [37]. The centre produced between 25 and 300 copies of a book at a time to fill small orders, leaving some to fill future orders. Collins et al [38] stated the costs of print on demand had now proved considerably lower than traditional offset printing.

MIT Press also created a digital archive and moved to producing more short run quantities for both new titles and reprints (all reprints under 500 and one particular series were produced using print on demand technology). The press had a partnership with Edwards Brothers Inc. for supplies of both short run and print on demand [39]. MIT stated that once the technology, model and processes were in place, the programme was implemented for new and reprint titles as was deemed necessary [40].

Alexander [41] discussed in detail the available technology and costs. An example of the minimal, though not insignificant, cost savings is given by Huggins:

"We will first look at titles that are out of stock (OS), or out of stock indefinitely (OSI)... let’s assume there are five titles that are OSI, and there are back orders ranging from 52 to 340 units per title. These books are already sold, and consumers would love to have them in their hands. Traditional methods would dictate offset production for reprints of 1,000–1,500 units for our hypothetical backlist, and if all five were printed, a very significant number of books would go to inventory. These books average 230 pages, have four-color covers, and are perfect-bound. To reprint 1,000 units of a title offset, our cost for production is approximately $3.27 USD per unit. The sunk cost is $3,270.00. Books are shipped against back orders, and the
balance goes to inventory. To reprint 340 units of the same title POD, the cost is approximately $4.20 USD per unit. Your sunk cost in production in this case is $1,428.00. This is $1,842.00 less than the cost of printing by the traditional methods. If excess production goes to inventory as a result of offset printing, you have the associated warehousing costs and the cost of money associated with your sunk cost. You now have $1,842.00 that can be used to print the other four back ordered books, invested in new titles, or applied it to longer print runs for your faster-selling titles.”

The use of digital printing for short runs and print on demand copies saves costs in the production of traditional print based products and will benefit university presses in a number of ways. Print on demand is particularly appropriate for:

- Sample and advance reading copies
- Small quantities for niche markets
- Reprints
- Out of stock, out of print titles — stop them going out of print, and bring out of print titles back [43].

A change in business practice to adopt digital printing is appropriate for the university press. Lewis stated:

“Print on demand will help save publishers money in the long-run, so any use of the technology by an academic or trade press is positive use.” [44]

11.5. Digital Printing Business Model

A new business model utilising digital printing is needed to save costs and keep inventory to a minimum, thus improving sustainability for the university press.

This new business model has the following objectives:

- Save lost costs by minimising or getting rid of inventory and remaindering
- Provide a service to customers ensuring out of print books are available
- Generate new revenue streams from printing out of print copies on demand

The majority of UK university presses are small with low print runs. The books published by university presses often serve niche markets, are facing a declining market [45] and if book returns are high, the presses lose money.

To achieve sustainability, the presses must invest in digital printing, utilising both short run and print on demand publishing as appropriate.

University presses should consider print on demand and short run printing for:
- Books that sell under 500 copies each year
- Books being considered for reprint
- Books that are out of print
- Journals titles with subscriptions under 1000
- Missing journal back issues

As short run and print on demand technologies are utilised for printing, presses can expect to save costs bound up in inventory and from returns and generate a small new revenue stream by offering out of print books.

Figure 11.1 shows the model I have developed for a press to use to utilise digital technology for short run and print on demand publishing. The number of copies a press prints of a book or a journal is based on a variety of factors (e.g., potential demand, size of market, number of subscribers, past sales of similar titles, feedback from reviews). However, it is often impossible to predict the number of titles which will be sold, returned, kept in inventory or remaindered, as sales fluctuate. If a title is printed either print on demand, or short run, the number held in inventory and returned is minimal, if any, with some publishers having a 'no returns' policy on print on demand titles.
While short run digital print could be utilised in every case, print on demand should be considered initially for backlist and out of print books and possibly for research monographs with a very small market. Backlists and out of print titles not already converted to digital files should be converted into digital format for ease of future printing. Although this can incur high costs, it would prepare material for any future format required.

While a digital printing service could be provided in-house, or by press collaboration, for the short term it is more appropriate to outsource short run and print on demand to an established company.
This model utilises electronic technologies without damaging current revenue streams and aims to provide new revenue streams by saving costs long-term. Changes required to traditional and existing publishing models are minimal, however, extra duties such as the administration of print on demand orders, and
liaison with the outsourced company are necessary. For short print runs, no internal changes are required and for print on demand, changes depend on whether the service is outsourced. If outsourced, the company printing the product can distribute the book directly to the customer or return it to the press (or, for example, to online booksellers such as Amazon) for distribution. The press is left to arrange payment with the customer (if the purchase service is provided online, further savings are recognised). Figure 11.2 shows an example of a business cycle using short run and print on demand digital printing.

Business Cycle Using Short Run and Print on Demand Publishing

University press

Book in digital format – decision regarding number for initial print by short run

Short run printing – Sent for distribution

Revenue received from sales

Extra copies required – numbers established

Files sent for print on demand

Print on demand copies distributed

Revenue received from sales

Figure 11.2: One Business Cycle using Short Run and Print on Demand Publishing
Table 11.1: SWOT Table for Digital Printing Business Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Saves costs tied up in inventory</td>
<td>- Difficult to judge the size of any print run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does not damage current revenue</td>
<td>- Cost savings minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Serves customer needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Creates new revenue streams</td>
<td>- Dependence on outside company to print and distribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better able to serve customers</td>
<td>- Potential closure of presses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although at present cost savings are minimal and presses would initially be dependent on an outside company to print and possibly distribute press output, there are potential long-term savings as the price of digital printing technologies is decreasing.

As presses adopt short run and print on demand digital technology, warehousing may not be required long-term, or may be required on a much smaller scale. This model is appropriate for the smaller university press as print runs are regularly small and press publications tend to serve a niche market.

This business model seeks to create a new revenue stream by providing out of print books, and to save costs through the minimisation of inventory and returns.

11.6. Institutional Repositories

The Open Archives Initiative and the open access movement have been documented in Chapter Three. The term institutional repository refers to a collection that contains and preserves the electronic intellectual output of a Higher Education Institution. The
repositories are built to common technical standards, and all content is made available over the Internet at no cost to users.

The benefits of institutional repositories for the academic community are as follows [46], [47], [48]:

**Academic author:**
- Provides a central archive of an author's work
- Increases an author's visibility and impact
- Long-term preservation of works
- Generates view of personal research, on an institutional, departmental and personal level

**HEI:**
- Increases visibility and prestige
- Marketing tool
- Can be organized to accommodate the varying policy and workflow issues inherent in a multi-disciplinary environment

**User:**
- Provides easy access to research
- Ensures preservation and access to output

At first glance, the role of the institutional repository seems to conflict with that of scholarly publishing, especially the business of commercial publishing. This is because many publishers require authors to confirm the material submitted has not been published elsewhere and/or require assignment of copyright before they will accept a manuscript for publication. However, a PALS study reported that institutional repositories have a valuable role and function in scholarly communication and that this role will be complementary rather than conflict with scholarly publishing, with publishers sharing this view [49].
At the beginning of 2004, almost 60 institutional repositories had been established, mainly operated by an institution’s library, with institutional funding; and three open source software packages had been developed for setting up and implementing institutional repositories [50]. In order to ensure an appropriate national infrastructure is in place for institutional repositories in the UK, project SHERPA was established to investigate the issues [51]. However, PALS reported in 2004 that while many universities have implemented or are considering implementing institutional repositories, with funding bodies supporting their development, all existing repositories were small with an average of only 290 records held on each repository [52]. There is clearly room for growth and development.

MIT Dspace is an example of a full-scale institutional repository, operated by the MIT Libraries as a joint venture with Hewlett Packard. Two reports detailed the process and idea behind the repository [53], [54]. The repository is not affiliated to MIT Press. Nonetheless, the repository holds and provides limited access to out of print books from the press [55].

Dspace is reliant on outside funding, though it has the long-term aim to cover costs. It currently has financial support from the institution, support from corporate and federation partners, and earns money by offering services beyond the core services including e-conversion services, metadata services, custom repository services, and user reporting services [56]. It is also the intention of Dspace to seek added support from the libraries’ annual operating budget.

“The total annual cost of operating Dspace, with plans to scale content to 3TB in three years, currently represents less than 2 percent of the Libraries’ annual budget.” [57]

While the system development costs were high, the costs for other institutions to use the Dspace software could be little or none.
Other such repositories include the Ohio State University 'Knowledge Bank' [58], and the University of California's eScholarship Repository [59]; both rely on institutional funding.

One example of collaboration with a university press is Oxford University. The library established an institutional repository as part of the SHERPA project and the press provided the library with access to articles authored by Oxford academics [60].

Development and operating costs vary greatly, depending on the size of the repository and the budget of the institution [61]:

"...both development and operating costs can range from virtually no incremental costs (for institutions that reallocate resources) to hundreds of thousands of dollars (for institutions recognizing incremental systems and staff resources)." [62]

Crow argued that a number of tasks are necessary when implementing an institutional repository, regardless of size and scope and all institutions must be aware of the work that is required [63]. Such work includes:

- Technical implementation
- Development of content accession policies
- Metadata storing and presentation
- Creation of digital object identifiers (DOIs)
- Author permissions and licensing agreements
- Development of document creation and input guidelines suitable to long term archiving and proper presentation
- Training staff and authors in using the software for submission of content
- Creation of document submission instructions
- Marketing the repository concept to prospective depositors
To date, no university press has been linked to institutional repositories and indeed, some have stated that repositories may replace the traditional university press [30], as HEI subsidies (if provided at all) for presses become smaller or disappear entirely, and as university faculty store output on such repositories. Crow and others argued that if repositories come to be considered more efficient for the dissemination of material and in saving costs, then other means for scholarly communication, namely university presses, will not survive [64], [65].

University presses need to be aware of the changes they could face if these repositories become established providers of scholarly communication. To date, most institutional repositories have been an extension of the library service, with the PALS report and others arguing the suitability of libraries to aid in such a venture [66], [67], [68], [69]. However, the university press could use its role and expertise in scholarly publishing to become involved in hosting and operating an institutional repository, thus adapting to a changing environment and allowing the university press to continue its role in scholarly publishing, while also maintaining its position and place at the HEI, and supporting new methods of scholarly communication.

The university press operates in the publishing industry and therefore press staff have experience of all aspects of publishing law including intellectual property rights, contracts, licensing, defamation, etc. [70]. It would be natural for a university press to take on the role of implementation and operation of such a repository, saving library budget and time and using its expertise and resources to make such a venture successful. It is therefore surprising that to date, university presses have shown so little interest in institutional repositories.

11.7. Institutional Repository Business Model

The second proposed business model consists of an institutional repository being hosted and managed by the university press alongside the traditional publishing
activities of the press. While institutional repositories are viewed as secondary vehicles for publishing, hosting these at the smaller university press alongside the primary publishing activities, will help HEIs to see the benefits the university press can continue to provide in a changing environment, and that although threatened, they are adaptable. Such a move will also demonstrate to authors that both primary and secondary publishing activities can coexist.

A new business model is needed to assist the academic community to archive all intellectual output in a safe, trusted repository. This model helps the university and its press to support the philosophy of open access, while continuing to offer traditional publishing services.

This new business model has the following objectives:

- Provide a service to the academic community
- Establish and operate a safe, trusted repository
- Educate faculty on the benefits of archiving
- Aid the press in establishing a dual role of supporting open access while continuing the valuable role it plays in scholarly publishing

It is beneficial for the press to develop a dual role in continuing its mission in scholarly publishing (i.e., continuing to publish scholarly works, books and journals), but to also operate the institutional repository, providing core services at no cost and offering further services to cover operating costs. The burden of operating the repository would be taken from the library and would require little financial support or subsidy from the institution once in operation.
The university presses could adopt the following strategy in the operation of an institutional repository (some of these ideas are taken from [71]):

- Maintain current subscriptions for print journals
- Establish, using available software, an institutional repository for all faculty to place their material
- Collaborate with the library to educate and encourage all faculty to place final versions of their papers on the institutional repository, so that archiving becomes a part of the publishing process, and encourage faculty to boycott publishers and journals that do not allow this practice.
- Once core material is built up, there is a possibility of providing other services, possibly charging a small cost, with possible new journals being created from the material submitted.

The development of an institutional repository to operate alongside the daily business practices of the university press will allow change in the scholarly communication system and improve relations with the institution, and should not damage the current revenue stream of the press (however, changes to revenue may occur). Such a development may lead to new business opportunities for the press, and greater visibility.
Figure 11.3 shows the process of the hybrid role the university press could play.

The university press would continue to operate the traditional publishing business but also operate the institutional repository for the governing HEI. More importantly, the press could also operate the repository for nearby institutions, creating an extensive collaborative service and providing cost-effective solutions for the collections of smaller institutions, whilst at the same time generating
profits for the press. This could be done on a regional or subject basis and would allow centralisation of some of the costs, offering economies of scale.

This model requires collaboration amongst the library, press, university administrators and faculty. The library would be involved in educating and encouraging faculty to deposit their output in the repository; faculty would deposit their output with the press and have access to all output and university administration would need to support the hybrid nature of the press.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allows university press to take on hybrid role</td>
<td>Infrastructure for repository to be developed if not in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not damage current revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves user needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New business opportunities</td>
<td>Repository may take over traditional roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better able to serve faculty and users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.2: SWOT Table for Institutional Repository Business Model

While such a model allows the university press to take on a hybrid role, it should not damage current revenue or alter traditional publishing methods. It is therefore better able to serve faculty and users. Such an infrastructure must be developed by the press or transferred from the library (if in place) to the press, and may require set-up costs. There is a threat that such a repository, if it becomes the focus of the press, may dominate its traditional publishing role. However, once a press takes on this hybrid nature and becomes established in its dual role, new opportunities may arise for the press and all other key players involved (see Table 11.2).
Such opportunities may include the generation of profit for the press by contracting out and providing services to other bodies, including other HEIs, learned societies and professional bodies. Any potential profits from an institutional repository could be used to subsidise losses in traditional publishing areas.

An institutional repository service provided by one university press on behalf of other HEIs was considered. An attempt was made to list potential services provided for a charge, to show potential revenue. However, this task involved much conjecture, and was therefore not included.
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Chapter Twelve
Discussion
12.1. Introduction

This chapter includes a synopsis of the findings from the research; will detail how these relate to and answer the original research questions, including what the real issues are; and will discuss feedback and implementation of the developed business plans and models as detailed in Chapters Ten and Eleven.

12.2. Research questions

Chapter One lists three statements that were addressed by the research:

1. University presses are in a prime position to increase their power in the scholarly publishing system and could use electronic publishing to do so.

2. University presses need to experiment with and become involved in electronic publishing ventures and ensure that these support and help further the mission and goals of the presses.

3. University presses need to collaborate with each other and with the parent Higher Education Institutions.

In order to test the validity of these statements, a number of questions were addressed:

a. What is the current environment of the university press?

b. What action are the presses taking to adapt to a changing environment?

c. How active are presses in utilising electronic publishing technologies?

d. How do presses view electronic publishing as beneficial?

e. How do presses collaborate with each other and with the parent HEI?

f. What can university presses do further to survive and improve their role in the current environment?

g. What is the future of the small university press?
12.3. **Synopsis and Discussion of Findings**

The results of the three strands of research (academic authors, UK and USA case studies and UK director questionnaires) are summarised below in answer to the above questions.

**What is the current environment of the university press?**

The majority of presses are struggling financially because of decreasing sales and loss of subsidies, yet many are now expected to make a profit. Three UK presses have closed in the last two years, owing mainly to financial problems. University presses are under constant pressure to fulfil a mission difficult to achieve without subsidy.

The smaller university presses require financial and HEI support or risk closure, and may therefore fail to make a positive contribution to scholarly communication. University presses have adopted a variety of ways to remain in business. Many university presses search increasingly for outside funding while attempting to maintain their original mission.

As library budgets suffer from regular price rises from some large commercial publishers, press sales are affected and university faculty and librarians have looked for other ways to provide academic output for the HEI community. Open access and the Open Archives Initiative have created ways for the traditional publisher to be bypassed and thereby add another threat to university press business. With press closures and cuts in print runs and subject areas, the future of the university press is uncertain, despite the valued role they continue to fulfil.

Because of the mandate, mission, and financial situation of both UK and USA university presses, all research and development projects need to be funded by outside sources, even though many presses have goals that include being at the leading edge. In general, presses do not have the financial resources or capacity
to experiment with, let alone adopt, wide-ranging electronic publishing programmes.

The lack of financial assistance is holding presses back from utilising effective electronic technologies or making a bigger impact in scholarly publishing. UK university presses need to make some fundamental changes or they will not survive.

A generalised business structure for a university press was developed (see Figure 12.1). Many of the factors vary from press to press, and income is dependent on a number of factors such as: HEI subsidy, grants and project funding, revenue from sales, and electronic publishing projects. Output also varies according to press (e.g., volume and type).
Figure 12.1: Business Structure of a University Press
What action are the presses taking to adapt to a changing environment?

While the majority of presses cannot afford to experiment with electronic publishing technologies, some are attempting to use existing resources to do so in some way, not only because of the potential to improve business, but because they believe there is a need in order to keep market share. Initiatives include electronic journals, electronic communities, print on demand and digital printing and online reference works.

Some presses have published trade books, others regional titles and many of the smaller presses focus on one particular subject list, creating a niche in that area. Some presses are experimenting with print on demand and thereby experiencing small cost savings. While U.S. presses collaborate in some joint projects and some UK university presses are taking action with outside organisations, no collaboration amongst UK university presses is taking place.

How active are presses in utilising electronic publishing technologies?

Electronic publishing activities are generally undertaken with partners, outside organisations and funding bodies, as the majority of the presses do not have the capital necessary to invest. University presses are experimenting in electronic publishing, depending on where they see the need, market and potential growth.

Some presses see electronic publishing and electronic distribution as the future and are therefore developing their backlists and converting all files to electronic format using the limited resources available.

E-books have varying degrees of acceptance. Some U.S. and UK presses are working with e-book distributors and report a small revenue stream. The future of e-books is uncertain and this is reflected in the cautious nature of adoption by the presses.
Many presses have an electronic journal programme, and some offer electronic communities (subject-based electronic sites). Print on demand is seen as the benefit of electronic publishing technology and this is what the majority of presses are planning to implement in the future, waiting until a viable print on demand model and appropriate technology are available. For small publishers such as university presses, print on demand is the way forward in terms of electronic publishing.

Whilst electronic publishing initiatives at university presses may solve some short-term problems, e.g., retaining customers and attracting authors, they are generally not integrated or large enough to make the required impact. Electronic publishing has not been utilised to any large degree by the majority of university presses and presses require guidelines and standards in order to integrate electronic publishing practices into business practice.

Currently, there is no big return or revenue from electronic publishing initiatives, mainly because little investment has been made and much of the area is still under development. The level of return depends on the level and type of activity. While the potential for increased revenue is available and increasing, investment of time and money is required that presses cannot, or are not willing to give, when initially returns are low.

**How do presses view electronic publishing as beneficial?**

Although electronic publishing is financially draining for the majority of university presses, it is still regarded as necessary and important, with many presses viewing electronic publishing as the future.

The results demonstrate a culture shift occurring amongst publishers e.g., press directors no longer believe the costs of parallel printing to be prohibitively high, and agree that electronic publishing does not damage the sales of print-based products.
Perceived disadvantages for electronic publishing were similar across the board. Respondents stated that electronic publishing was time consuming, with the financial reward small or non-existent. Despite these perceived disadvantages, the majority of university presses are active in electronic publishing in some way in order to remain in the market and retain market share.

**How do presses collaborate with each other and with the parent HEI?**

Many university presses in the USA are involved in collaboration, due mainly to the AAUP and its collaborative efforts with conferences, meetings and discussion lists. The AAUP is an invaluable organisation for presses in an industry of constant economic and technological change. Many U.S. presses share warehouses and sales representatives, however the majority of collaboration is informal rather than formal. The AAUP is an organisation that helps members remain in the industry and provides necessary information for presses to keep a leading edge in a commercial world.

UK university presses, while some are involved with SPARC Europe and other associations, do not have any direct organisations of support. A UK organisation was viewed as beneficial and necessary for overall improvement of the UK industry.

In general, many UK presses and libraries do not collaborate or communicate, and should work on fostering relations and establishing links and common ground. Press staff feel that senior faculty and university administrators do not understand the role of the press and should be educated to understand the difficulties presses face while they attempt to maintain their role in the publishing world. Presses would like more support from the HEI and it would be beneficial if presses were reinvented in their original light, being valued for their role and not as contributors to the bottom line, thus allowing them to focus on their original mission, that of contributing to scholarship.
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The majority of competition facing presses comes from the commercial world. University presses face a tough business environment and must maintain a leading edge and business mind in order to remain active in the industry.

University presses are part of the bigger scholarly communication network. The relationship with other key players is demonstrated in Figure 12.2. This network shows suppliers, customers, competitors and complementors, in relation to the university press. Nalebuff and Brandenburger defined a 'complementor' as another player that reinforces a company's role (e.g., "To date, computers have complemented far more than competed with paper." [1]). Stakeholders, such as other university presses and electronic publishing services, can help a press to be self-sufficient if relations are built appropriately. The roles of many players overlap, and Nalebuff and Brandenburger argued that the roles of others can be changed for the benefit of the business [2].
An organisation for UK university presses could help create collaboration, help offer improved services to customers and lead to increased economies of scale, improving chances for sustainability (see also Porter’s work in Chapter 12.4).
What can university presses do further to survive, and improve their role, in the current environment?

1. Press directors felt that there was a need for a culture change within Higher Education. HEIs need to understand the difficulties presses face and the functions they provide. An overriding factor and focus was that presses need funding and more HEI support.

2. Presses require further education and information about electronic publishing technologies regardless of their activity in the field. Many see electronic publishing in some form as the way forward even though they do not have the resources to become involved as much as they would like at present. The presses require standards, and an overall view of the market and demand, so that correct decisions can be made and appropriate business models adapted according to need.

3. There is also a need for a culture change within the university press, i.e., not to expect revenue from electronic publishing activities for a number of years. Although returns are low, these will increase, and therefore electronic publishing needs to be viewed as a long-term investment.

4. Presses should prepare for the future by continuing to convert backlists, out of print titles and files, as appropriate, to electronic format using the limited resources available. This would ensure that all material, e.g., journals, books and monographs, could be made available when needed, in the format required (e.g., print or electronic, or both).

5. Print on demand could be the main benefit of electronic publishing technologies for small university presses publishing in print format, and the majority of presses should work toward adopting this technology, or plan to outsource to other companies providing this service.

6. With what seems to be constant changes occurring, presses must keep abreast of technology, adapt accordingly and concentrate on their pricing models for electronic publishing. Because the market has not been defined in any real way, experiments and initiatives must be
appropriate because of the limited resources that will be used and presses must keep in touch without over-investing.

7. With the shift toward open access of information, university presses must keep informed of changes in the scholarly communication environment and take advantage of these changes when appropriate. University presses can take a role in encouraging open access, allowing authors to post their material on institutional repositories. Presses also have the skills and knowledge to assist Higher Education Institutions in establishing and operating an institutional repository for the benefit of the press and the HEI (see Chapter 12.4).

What is the future of the university press?
The overall view was that there was not much need for the smaller university press and there was only a future for those presses that had a strong source of funding, or a strong regional presence. The directors gave measures for improving the situation of the smaller university presses in the USA and UK:

- Do something that's different
- Create a strong regional list
- Publish in niche areas/provide a unique service

The future of the smaller university press looks bleak if changes are not implemented. The recent closure of three smaller UK university presses, mainly due to lack of funding, may be an emerging pattern. However, there are changes presses can make to business practice without relying too heavily on HEI or outside funding to improve the chances of survival. This is further discussed in Chapter 12.6.1 to 12.8.

12.4. Discussion of University Press Business

The original proposal for the research discussed the need for wide and varied adoption of electronic publishing. However, the findings demonstrated that a more conservative approach and in particular, changes within the presses themselves, and the adoption of electronic technologies to improve business practice, were required to increase chances for sustainability.
Before implementation of the business models is discussed, the factors affecting university press business and the reasons behind the development of the business models are examined.

The research revealed many variables affecting university press business and ultimately survival. These included revenue, sales, HEI funding and support, project and grant funding and projects undertaken. Input and output varies according to press.

Figure 12.3. is taken from Porter [4]. It has been adapted to show the industry competitors for the university press business and includes potential entrants, suppliers for the university press market, buyers and potential substitutes for the university press in a new electronic environment with a focus on open access (through institutional and discipline repositories, and open access journals).
Porter argued that there are three generic strategies to cope with the competitive forces facing an industry: overall cost leadership, product differentiation, and focus (targeting one specific group) [6]. While university presses do not have cost leadership in the industry (though prices are competitive), they are, however, involved in the other suggested strategies.

University presses provide product differentiation by their brand name, the name of the Higher Education Institution with which it is associated. This often brings with it a certain reputation and prestige, and is seen by many as an advantage. University presses also produce differentiated products by publishing monographs, journals and scholarly books, and focus by providing these products for a specialised market. However, many commercial publishers also provide scholarly books and journals of a similar standard.

Of the suggestions made by the directors to help smaller university presses survive, a number of smaller presses are already publishing in niche subject areas, or are active in regional publishing, e.g., University of Hertfordshire Press, University of Wales Press and a number of smaller USA university presses (see Chapter Four). There may, however, be further room for differentiation and focus to improve the university press situation.

The results from the academic authors revealed that authors choose to publish with a university press because they viewed them as a specialist in a particular subject discipline, or because of the prestige of the press. Presses therefore, need to continue to focus on their subject lists and create an appropriate reputation in order to continue to attract authors.

The book world has remained largely unchanged. The slow adoption of e-books, and the posting of some chapters online, has, in some areas, increased print sales. However, the university presses continue to focus on print because the market still demands it. The university press must therefore continue to provide the traditional print services.
The journal world has experienced, and continues to experience, great change. The introduction of electronic journals has grown from simple digitised versions of print journals to electronic articles offering links and multi-media functionality. A number of open access journals have proved successful, and the product continues to change and improve, with an ever-growing number of journals becoming available electronically. The journal article has proved successful in an electronic environment, and presses should therefore continue to offer, or introduce, electronic journals.

For many years, presses have struggled financially and sales have dropped as funding has decreased or ceased. The number of print runs has dropped, as has the size of the print run, the monograph has all but disappeared at many presses and the differences in press practice and revenue between university presses across the world is vast. Causes of decline in university press business and sales include: technological substitution, a shift in needs, lack of funds for presses to produce scholarly works, and a lack of library funds to purchase university press works.

The role of the university presses has changed significantly. The original aim of some university presses was to publish works of the HEI faculty. Now presses publish works in specific subject areas by a wide variety of authors, both national and international, publish many other works, and undertake other activities in order to remain sustainable. Many presses have remained throughout the scholarly communication crisis; others have closed their doors. While the commercial academic publisher could successfully take on the role of the university press, this is undesirable, as the role of the university press in publishing longer works and in publishing works in niche subject areas may not be fulfilled by commercial publishers. The university press does offer the academic community a valued service and continues to provide value in the scholarly communication chain.
The larger university presses, both in the USA and the UK, will continue to use their resources to adapt to change in order to survive. However, the smaller university press may not always have the resources to change in necessary ways. As presses adapt, the role of the university press may completely change and become unrecognisable from what it once was. While smaller presses can survive, they need to be willing and able to reform.

The future is unknown and further change will be required, but in order to remain in business during current technological and financial transitions and declines, presses must adapt. Like any business, they cannot remain static in a changing industry.

"Industry evolution should not be greeted as a fait accompli, to be reacted to, but as an opportunity." [7]

What must be decided is how useful electronic publishing is for the university press and for the market the university press serves, and if useful, what form it will take. The usefulness of electronic publishing will vary according to press size and subject list. Individual presses have had varying degrees of success on a variety of projects and initiatives. Some presses have initiated successful electronic journals and have more planned; two presses reported success with electronic communities, and a few reported small revenue streams from partnerships with e-book aggregators. While some electronic publishing projects have reported success, they must be tailored to the individual needs of the press and its subject list and provide what the market is ready for. Therefore, no one solution will be appropriate for all university presses.

Print on demand was viewed by the university press directors as the main advantage of electronic technologies, and with increasing adoption of open access and repositories throughout the academic world, the press must take advantage of these changes and introduce them as deemed appropriate.
The first business model was developed for the adoption of print on demand and short run digital printing because the press directors stressed the importance of their role and the continued market demand for print products. It also utilises electronic technologies to improve the traditional print business of the press.

In the current scholarly communication environment, much focus and effort is directed toward the open access movement, the Open Archives Initiative and institutional repositories allowed by the widespread use of the Internet and communication technologies. While not aimed to attack university presses, open access initiatives bypass traditional publishing roles. However, as the traditional role of the publisher is still valued, there may be a dual role for the university press to fill. Pioneers of open access argue that it can and should run alongside traditional publishing methods. With not-for-profit status, presses could continue to provide the traditional role of the publisher, while also operating new publishing systems such as open access journals or an institutional repository (see Chapter Eleven), thus taking control of possible substitution and taking advantage of a technology that is increasingly becoming adopted throughout academia.

Therefore, the second model details the university press in a potential dual role as traditional publisher and operator of the institutional repository, both for HEI faculty output and also for press material. This model was developed because of the focus on and push toward open access in an academic environment. The model details an institutional repository and does not include or consider open access journals. More research and experimentation is needed regarding open access journals, and in particular their role for the not-for-profit press. However, university presses should not dismiss shifting to an open access journal model in the future and should investigate the area further.

As discussed in Chapter Eleven, university presses are experienced in the publishing industry, are aware of the legal risks involved in publishing [8] and have expertise in areas of management, sales and legal issues. HEIs and their libraries are establishing institutional repositories naively [9], not realising or understanding the legal risks (i.e., copyright, defamation, intellectual property...
rights, liability, contravention of local laws, data protection etc. [10], [11]). Institutional repositories need to develop terms and conditions for copyright abuse, moral rights issues, acceptable use(s), licences for liability issues and disclaimers, privacy policies, metadata, policies for article withdrawal/removal and notice and take down procedures [12]. Any form of publishing activity therefore needs to be managed, including the operation of institutional repositories, and because of university press experience in these areas they are therefore well suited to fill this role.

It is important for presses to take advantage of new technologies for the improvement of business practice. However, presses with limited resources must not get carried away with these technologies, and ensure the use of resources and adoption is appropriate and modest, while also adopting when and where they will be beneficial.

While the not-for-profit system run by the learned societies and university presses is well placed to capitalise on the so-called crisis in scholarly publishing, this role is often ignored or undervalued. In order to be viewed as having potential, they must adapt and proactively fill the gap in the scholarly market that is being left by the shift from big commercial publishers to open access. For my proposed strategies for university presses to be successful, those in HEI administration and in press governance must have a positive attitude toward change. However, many press directors are cautious about change. Presses have become separated from the HEI in many ways (not only financially), and this lack of support creates attitudes of helplessness. Many press directors continue to stress the valuable service university press publishing provides, but focus on the problems as out of their control, and dwell on the view that solutions to problems must come from HEI administration rather than taking advantage of recent changes in scholarly communication by taking action. While there may be room for more support from HEI administration for the university press, the financial situation of Higher Education may not improve, and may in fact, worsen. Therefore, the presses need to stop expecting others to change and should instead initiate change themselves.
Any proposed organisation of UK university presses could have a key role to play here.

12.5. Business Plan Feedback and Implementation

All press directors discussed the need for press collaboration and encouraged development of the business plans. Initially the majority of press directors favoured the voluntary organisation of UK university presses. However, once the third plan was developed and proposed by ALPSP, this also became a preferred plan. As feedback was not received from all presses studied, an informed decision could not be made as to which plan should be implemented. The benefits of the creation of an ALPSP sub-group were that the infrastructure already exists for such an organisation and ALPSP already fulfils many of the press requirements. Presses stated they would investigate both plans further and adopt one as deemed appropriate following discussion with other presses. Press directors claimed the key advantages of the plans were in becoming more visible, along with improving business practices, and the creation of economies of scale.

In order for such an organisation to be successful, the majority of UK university presses must work together in selecting a plan and either in the organisation of plan 2, or in discussion with the ALPSP for the creation of the sub-group.

12.6. Business Model Feedback

The majority of press directors did not respond with feedback to the business models, again making recommendations difficult. Some responded stating they had nothing major to add and that the models seemed viable. Those that did offer comments were generally enthusiastic, commenting that such models would help to lower costs and assist presses in becoming, or remaining, sustainable and operable in a changing environment. Both business models allow the smaller university press to adapt to change. The feedback that was received is summarised below according to each model.
12.6.1. Print on Demand and Short Run Digital Printing

The print on demand and short run digital printing model was popular, as presses still viewed their main business as print based and this model included the adoption of electronic technologies to improve the practices of print publishing. It also included the conversion of all files to digital format (making the material ready for digital printing, in addition to preparing all files for a possible electronic future when the market is ready and initiatives had proven successful, e.g., files will be ready to be provided in e-book format or online). A future possibility is that the customer is given a choice of a print book (printed on demand), or the electronic file to download on an e-book reader or a desktop. This model allows electronic technologies to be internally as well as externally effective for the university press, saving costs by printing on demand and selling copies when the market requires them.

One director stated that if such a model were widely adopted university press book format would become standardised, leaving no differentiation between presses (or commercial publishers if adopting such technology) in size and layout of book. However, this claim is unsubstantiated, as differences regarding book length, cover and type will continue in a print on demand environment. Another disadvantage to the print on demand model was the continuation of paper waste and not making the most of electronic possibilities, e.g., the book is created in, or converted to, electronic format (pdf) but not made available for public use. However, this model was developed in response to the need for print-based products to continue.

12.6.2. Institutional Repository

Feedback regarding the second model was very positive and created much further discussion. Presses commented that institutional repositories have been based at HEI libraries but are not necessarily an appropriate role for the library. They stressed a role for presses and libraries to work together on such a repository. One director suggested the possibility of merging the library and press. Another commented that such a model would be successful, helping the HEI to value the
press role further and continue to support it. One commented that such a model would be highly successful for journals but not for monographs and in the long term, the traditional publishing role may disappear. Some commented on the possibility of one press operating a repository for a region of Higher Education Institutions (particularly those without a press), receiving funds from those institutions for the provision of such a service, helping to subsidise operating costs. Others liked the possibility of creating fee-based services to cover costs such as the creation of journals compiled from repository material, conversion services and usage statistics. There is no evidence to suggest that press directors were concerned that institutional repositories would take over the role of the university press, indeed the majority showed enthusiasm for this new hybrid role.

The JISC funded project "Delivery, Management and Access Model for E-prints and Open Access Journals within Further and Higher Education" [13] identified three main generic models for the delivery and access of e-prints:

"...the centralised model, where the service gathers open access material (including articles in open access journals) directly into a national archive and then makes the content available for service providers; the distributed model, where the service points users at original metadata (in institutional or subject-based repositories, or open access journals) at the time of enquiry; and the model we have termed the 'harvesting' model, which is a development of the distributed model and which allows for improvement, standardisation or enhancement of the metadata to provide a superior level of service." [14]

The final report [15] recommended a harvesting model, discussed it in further detail and covered cost examples. University presses could play a role in any such system and JISC and other governmental bodies should consider university presses in the decision making process. Other authors also discussed a number of options for the operation of digital repositories [16], [17].
12.7. Implementation of the Business Models

Each model must be adapted according to press needs and circumstances and altered according to changes in the publishing and academic environments. Each model requires changes in business practice in a number of ways and will require new skills for press staff. HEI administrators, as well as faculty and library staff must be educated to understand the changes and advantages of the business models. In order for either or both models to be implemented in press practice, presses must seek support from their affiliated HEI and must develop individual strategies for each model. Cox argued that in the testing of new business models collaboration with all stakeholders is required [18].

12.7.1. Print on Demand and Short Run Digital Printing

In order for university presses to adopt print on demand and short run digital printing, presses must have a knowledge and understanding of the costs and changes that will be required to business practice.

Exact outsourcing costs depend on the company providing the service. Table 12.1 shows example costs received from Lightning Source UK Ltd. and are based on UK List prices [19]. However, the table as it stands does not show discounted pricing which the majority of Lightning Source clients enjoy. The list pricing is as of August 2004 and is typical of prices paid by a UK based Micropublisher, publishing 50 or fewer books per annum. The example shown in Table 12.1 makes the following commercial assumption:

- A paperback trade book priced 7.99 (which means 50% discount)¹

¹ With thanks to Paul Williams and Suzanne Wilson-Higgins of Lightning Source UK Ltd. for providing the table and information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lightning Source POD Short Run Cost Ready Reckoner</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enter SR QTY here</strong></td>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enter number of pages here</strong></td>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TVDP page price</strong></td>
<td><strong>£44.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set-up</strong></td>
<td><strong>£35.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cover set-up costs from digital file</strong></td>
<td><strong>£18.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page set-up costs from scan</strong></td>
<td><strong>£50.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unit price</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printing costs paperback Crown and below</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4.70</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printing costs paperback A4 or 200 x 210</strong></td>
<td><strong>£7.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printing costs hardback stamped cloth or PPC</strong></td>
<td><strong>£8.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printing costs hardback stamped cloth and jacketed</strong></td>
<td><strong>£9.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: Prices are shown for reference only and may be subject to change.
It seems appropriate that the presses initially outsource their digital printing, but aim to eventually offer the service in-house or as a consortium of presses. This could be a role for the organisation of university presses.

A number of UK university presses have implemented and are using digital printing for short run and print on demand copies, either outsourcing, or in-house, and have reported cost savings. The scale to which digital printing is adopted will affect the changes to business and costs required. It must also be remembered that converting existing files to digital format creates substantial costs.

12.7.2. Institutional Repository at the University Press

In order to establish an institutional repository, the university press and HEI must understand the costs and set up processes involved. Seven existing institutional repositories (Dspace at MIT, the Glasgow ePrints service as part of the Daedalus project, the institutional repository based at the National University of Ireland at Maynooth, the National University of Singapore institutional repository project, QSpace project at Queens as part of the Canadian Association of Research Libraries, the SHERPA project based at Nottingham University, and the ePrint repository based at St. Andrews University), were contacted by email requesting costs for establishing and operating repositories that included HEI faculty output. Four institutions provided costs and two replied with general information but had no exact cost figures. All repositories to date have been established independently and on different levels, sizes and scales to fit institutional needs and therefore, their costs and processes varied considerably.

Table 12.2 shows the four cost examples of setting up and operating an institutional repository. It does not include advocacy costs, preservation costs, or the costs of digital preservation and the figures from the SHERPA project assume that the HEI can absorb many ongoing maintenance costs [20].
For the purposes of UK university presses establishing an institutional repository, the costs from the SHERPA project were deemed most appropriate, as it is a UK based project. However, many long-term costs are still being assessed, in particular preservation, which will need further consideration in any such venture [21].

DSpace reported high costs because the project was large scale. DSpace received a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the institution and other outside funding, worked in collaboration with a number of other institutions and also developed value-added fee-based services [22]. Many other repositories are still in experimental stages.

Table 12.3 shows example set up and operating costs of an institutional repository based at a university press. These costs are based on the figures of the SHERPA project, and take into account the role the press would play in customising and monitoring the repository, along with the cost to put each article in the repository. These costs change according to the size of the repository, and skill of staff.

On average, each faculty member is likely to produce between one and five papers per annum. For an institution with a faculty of 1,000, that amounts to only 5,000 items per annum as a maximum.

Table 12.4 shows the cost per article as employee salary and article deposit rate vary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Repository</th>
<th>Set up Costs</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dspace: MIT</strong></td>
<td>$1.8m grant</td>
<td>Staff $225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 FTE staff</td>
<td>Operating Costs $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000 system equipment</td>
<td>Systems equipment $35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total $2.4-2.5m</td>
<td><strong>Annual running costs $285,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maynooth: Ireland HEIs</strong></td>
<td>Grant for €5,000 for server</td>
<td>1 part-time staff member for upkeep and maintenance (2 days per week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee salary for 6 months for set-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Software free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total €20,000</td>
<td><strong>Total 15,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Queens QSpace: Canadian Association of Research Libraries</strong></td>
<td>Software free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Server space at Institution</td>
<td>Library staff: $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programmer for 12 months: $50,000</td>
<td>ITS Staff: $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff costs for advocacy work with faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardware: $2,065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total $52,065</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total $50,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHERPA: Nottingham</strong></td>
<td>Software: Free</td>
<td>Maintenance absorbed within HEI costs: 5 FTE days per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Server: £1,500</td>
<td>Coordination and collection of material £30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Installation 2-5 FTE days £600</td>
<td>3 year update of hardware and software: 2-5 FTE days and £3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial customisation 15 FTE days £1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total £3,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total £33,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.2: Real Cost Examples of Setting up and Operating an Institutional Repository
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Support/Maintenance</th>
<th>Annual Operating Costs</th>
<th>Article Output Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Set-up Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customisation</td>
<td>£1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI Standard Web service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salary for customising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and monitoring the repository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as well as inputting material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours per week</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article input per hour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Three Years: £3,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.3: Example Costs of an Institutional Repository at a University Press
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The university press must also be aware of the processes involved when implementing an institutional repository. If an institutional repository has already been established at the HEI of the press (possibly based at the library) then arrangements and plans would need to be made for the transferring to, or sharing of responsibilities with, the press. This would save set-up costs, as the repository would already be established.

Crow [23], a SPARC Guide [24], and experiences of Dspace implementation [25], all provided information regarding what must be done when implementing an institutional repository. Using these resources, I have created a brief guide detailing issues that would need considering by university presses setting up a repository. While there are implementation issues and guides for each software available e.g., Dspace, Eprints etc., these are generally software specific.
An overview of the major issues that university presses need to address in implementing an institutional repository include:

- Organizational, administrative and cultural issues
- Content policies and accession and retention policies
- HEI and faculty education and participation
- Technical, operational and infrastructure issues

These issues are covered briefly below, and are intended only as an introduction to what presses must consider when establishing an institutional repository.

**Definition of the Service:**
Each university press must define for itself and also for faculty and administration what an institutional repository is and what their own repository will be, do and include.

- Decide what software your repository will adopt.
- Decide what your repository will include (e.g., journal articles, before and after publication, conference proceedings, working papers, theses and dissertations, research and technical reports, departmental and research newsletters, committee reports, technical documents, statistical reports, learning and support material etc.)
- Decide if core services and premium services will be provided and what these will include.
- Decide who can post/submit material e.g., staff, faculty, students
- Explain the process of how the repository will operate (e.g., author or faculty member submits an item to the repository. The author accepts (or rejects) an agreement that grants the host institution rights to make the item available and convert it as necessary for digital access and preservation purposes. Material is logged by subject area/department, and other selection criteria. Metadata checked, allowing access and searchability.
Material is reviewed and approved for use or returned (e.g., for resubmission if changes are required). Once accepted, the material is assigned a URL ensuring perpetual availability along with a unique document identifier allowing the content to outlive the repository infrastructure. Material can be withdrawn, updated, or corrected as the author chooses.

Marketing of Repository and Training for Repository Use
In order for a repository to be successful, it must be clearly understood by, and marketed to, potential depositors and users of the service.

- Identify those to be approached (e.g., faculty, staff, administrators, students, funders, departmental heads, etc.)
- Understand and address concerns appropriately and regularly and by department (e.g., potential impact of repository, copyright issues, long-term effects, tool for managing RAE submissions, scholar’s independence, perceived low status, intellectual property rights, added faculty workload).
- Conduct attitude and perception faculty surveys to discover concerns and potential problems.
- Articulate the benefits of participating and identify existing problems the repository can solve (subject or group specific).
- Establish a discussion list and/or point of contact for questions and support, and allow for user feedback.
- Run training sessions and demonstration programmes for all faculties on the use of and access to the repository.
- Produce a briefing paper including support and contact details and distribute appropriate literature.

Guidelines on Submissions, Development of Document Creation and Input Guidelines:
Create accessible and understood guidelines for required formats, type of material accepted, access steps and rules and develop content accession policies (these may have to be subject specific).
System Development and Operations

- Allocate space requirements for each department/community.
- Organise system support.
- Organise Metadata storing and presentation.
- Consider preservation issues [26].

Draw up licensing agreements for users to grant the institution an irrevocable, non-exclusive, royalty-free licence to the content (these may vary by department and/or type of content).

Management/Staff Structure

Staff structure must be decided:

- Advisory board of HEI administrators and faculty
- Systems manager
- Reviewers to review submitted content
- Editors of material
- Technological support
- Library Staff

Cost and funding

The financial structure must also be in place and receive approval. Consider:

- Institutional support
- Library support (financial, time)
- Possible income from offering premium services
- Government/Foundation grants
- Endowments for collections
- Transactional charges
- Possible income for hosting output of other HEIs

Free, open source software such as Eprints and Dspace can be used; development can be shared with the library and other university presses and HEIs and a repository can be run from existing server hardware. An institutional repository
can be operated using existing press, library and technical systems staff, can utilise existing resources and will save future costs as the marketplace responds to institutional initiatives. Other issues such as preservation [27] will need consideration as the repository builds and develops.

12.8. **Summary**

When implementing these or other models, university presses must start small, building over time. University presses will need to keep an open mind and be adaptable to change. Nalebuff and Brandenburger stated:

"No matter how successfully you've seized your current opportunities, new ones will appear that can best be utilized by changing the game again. No matter how secure your current position, challenges will arise that can be best met by changing the game further." [28]

All university presses, though they share not-for-profit status and an affiliation with a Higher Education Institution, are individual and different in many ways, e.g., size of staff, title output, electronic publishing initiatives, subject list, etc. It is therefore difficult to develop models and recommendations that will fit all presses. Each press must adapt the plans and models accordingly and develop their own strategies.

Chapter Thirteen offers recommendations for the key stakeholders: university presses, libraries that are affiliated to an institution with a university press, HEI administrators and authors. It also provides an overview of the conclusions of the research.
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Chapter 13
Conclusions and Recommendations
13.1. Introduction

This chapter documents the overall conclusions of the research, offers personal views on possible future scenarios for the UK university press, discusses a strategic plan for an future electronic university press, discusses the limitations of the study, makes recommendations to each of the stakeholder groups, and identifies areas of potential further research.

13.2. Academic Authors

Academics publish their work in part to satisfy Higher Education assessment criteria and to have their work widely disseminated, thus improving impact. In general, an author chooses a publisher because of the prestige or subject list of the publisher.

Authors choose to publish specifically with a university press for its expertise in a particular subject area, due to personal contact, or because of an invitation from the press to publish. A further factor is the reputation and prestige of the press.

The experience of publishing with a university press compared with a commercial house is similar and no added value is gained from choosing to publish with a university press. A few authors believed prestige was higher, with more personal contact when working with a university press. When comparing publishing with a small university press rather than Oxford University Press or Cambridge University Press, a significant majority of the authors in the study stated that they would not publish with a small university press. Others would because of the press’ subject list and expertise in a discipline. Smaller presses need, therefore, to concentrate on improving their reputation and individual expertise.

Technology is available for authors to be their own publishers. Authors are increasingly posting their work on personal web pages, on institutional and subject repositories and are submitting papers to open access journals. Traditional
publishing outlets are also still well utilised with authors valuing the editorial and peer-review input a traditional publisher provides (however, many open access journals also offer such services). Authors still regard publishers as having a vital role to play in scholarly communication.

13.3. University Presses

Both UK and USA university presses struggle with funding and have adopted a variety of ways to remain in business. Many university presses are now expected to make a profit and are not financially supported by their Higher Education Institution as they once were. University presses are under constant pressure to fulfil a mission difficult to achieve without subsidy, yet some presses have adapted well in this environment. There was no real evidence from the presses studied, contrary to suggestions in the literature, that UK university presses had introduced trade titles in any significant way. The smaller university presses require financial support or alterations to improve business practice, or risk failing to make the impact they could. With press closures and cuts in print runs and subject areas, the future of the UK university press is uncertain, despite the critical role they could fill.

Predictions for future electronic publishing activities were generally low, as were predictions for future revenue. University presses believe that paper publishing will continue to be important in the foreseeable future. Existing electronic publishing business strategies were conservative; university press directors believed that although there is a market for electronic products, they were unsure how to reach it and felt customers would not pay a realistic price. There is, therefore, arguably, a need for a change in attitude toward electronic publishing amongst the Higher Education community and within the university press. University presses need to be more pro-active and risk-taking.

Electronic publishing activities are generally undertaken with partners, outside organisations and funding bodies, with print on demand seen as the benefit of electronic publishing. This is what the majority of presses were working towards.
For small publishers such as university presses, print on demand is a promising way forward in terms of electronic publishing.

Obstacles to further adoption of electronic publishing were the lack of trained staff and immaturity of charging mechanisms. However, the results demonstrated that there is a culture shift occurring amongst publishers; press directors no longer believed the costs of parallel printing to be prohibitively high, and agreed that electronic publishing does not damage the sales of print-based products.

It is clear that the larger presses (both UK and USA) that are financially stable are taking the lead in experimenting with and adopting electronic technologies. Innovation in electronic technologies at both UK and USA presses depend on the size of press, the financial situation, staff numbers available and the resources that can be created or adapted for an electronic environment. Electronic publishing needs to be viewed as a long-term investment with print likely to continue.

Whilst electronic publishing initiatives at university presses may solve some short-term problems, e.g., retaining customers and attracting authors, the press projects are generally not integrated or large enough to make a major impact in scholarly communication. Electronic publishing has not yet been utilised by the majority of university presses and in order to do so, they require guidelines and standards for appropriate adoption.

In general, while larger presses in both the UK and USA are financially stable, the funding situation differs, with more UK presses having HEI subsidies withdrawn and receiving no endowment. Electronic publishing is seen as necessary but difficult and financially draining for all presses but particularly for the smaller presses, as experimentation and adoption of electronic technologies requires large investment and has reaped low returns to date. While collaboration was widely adopted in the USA, no real press collaboration was taking place in the UK, possibly because each press had different aims and reasons for projects and experiments.
While the not-for-profit systems run by the learned societies and university presses are well placed (with the role of publishers continuing to add value) to capitalise on the so-called crisis in scholarly publishing and assist in the transition to a more successful scholarly communication/publishing process, presses feel that this role is often ignored or undervalued. In order to be valued, university presses must adapt and proactively fill the gap in the scholarly market that has been left by the shift from big commercial publishers to open access, and experiment appropriately with new publishing technologies, ensuring that these support and help further the mission and goals of the press.

13.4. Libraries

In general, university libraries were supportive of the university press and had some understanding of the difficulties they face. Presses and libraries need to collaborate and communicate more frequently and establish links and common ground, while maintaining individuality. There is potential for greater collaboration to improve the situation of both stakeholders.

Both libraries and presses believe there is a need for senior faculty and university administration to be educated to understand the difficulties presses face while they attempt to maintain their unique role in the publishing world, and do more to support the press and library.

13.5. Business Plans for Proposed Organisations

The presses were interested in both plans two and three, and stated they would investigate both plans further and adopt one as deemed appropriate, following discussion with other presses. Press directors claimed the key advantages of plans two and three were in becoming more visible, improving business practice and the creation of economies of scale.
In order for such an organisation to be successful, the majority of UK university presses must work together in selecting one of the plans and establishing the organisation.

13.6. Business Models

Business models were developed for print on demand and short run digital printing and an institutional repository hosted at the university press.

As print publishing was still deemed the main business of the university press, the print on demand and short run digital printing model was developed in order to improve print publishing. The institutional repository model was developed in response to changes in the scholarly communication world and open access, allowing the university press to adapt to and take an active role in the changing environment.

Feedback from the press directors was positive in relation to both models, but particularly to the institutional repository being hosted by the university press for the HEI.

While changes will be required to university press practice, change can create potential cost savings and improve the standing of the press at the HEI by providing extra services in support of scholarly communication. However, a significant barrier is that many press directors feel controlled by their HEI administration and therefore unable to make key changes in the press business and operations. While a board of directors at the HEI governs many university presses, press directors and staff have the power to propose and initiate change in collaboration with the board.

For my proposed strategies for university presses to be successful, both those in HEI administration and in press governance must have a positive attitude toward change, and not, as at present, be cautious about change. Presses have become separated from the HEI in many ways, and this lack of support has created
attitudes of helplessness. Many press directors continue to stress the valuable service university press publishing provides, but focus on the problems being out of their control and dwell on the view that solutions to problems must come from others rather than taking advantage of recent changes in scholarly communication by taking action themselves. While there may be room for more support from HEI administration for the university press, the financial situation of Higher Education may not improve, and may, in fact, worsen. Therefore, the presses need to initiate change themselves.

Presses have a golden opportunity to become involved in institutional repositories, using their experience in publishing and in particular the legal and managerial issues of publishing to successfully take on the running of the institutional repository on behalf of the HEI, or establish a new institutional repository, and operate it on behalf of the university. With funds being a primary concern for university presses, there is also scope here for the press to offer repository services to other HEIs, thus covering some costs and potentially creating some revenue. In the future university presses may need to add extra services to the institutional repository with the aim of making a profit in order to fund the traditional publishing model to ensure it does not become yet another drain on funds.

13.7 Possible Future Scenarios

Scholarly communication and publishing is in a period of change. All players, including the university press, to a greater or lesser extent are adapting their roles in the electronic environment. Because of the changes caused by drop in HEI support, falls in traditional subscriptions and purchases as well as the introduction of electronic technologies, university presses are and must continue to initiate change to their business models.

There are a number of possible future scenarios for the university press:
The current situation continues: university presses continue to struggle to fulfill their original role, while also continuing to experiment with open access and electronic technologies. The majority of university presses will work independently, with some collaboration with others and with the HEI library and offer a mix of open and subscription access. University presses may suffer long-term as more open access developments and initiatives take place.

The push towards open access and the institutional repository model continues, with the potential effect that smaller university presses are squeezed out of the market. Academics are mandated to publish open access and insist journals support this. Some journals are therefore dropped.

Further collaboration between the university press, the university library and the institutional repository with the sharing of a number of roles but they remain separate bodies.

University presses become e-presses, take on the management and operation of the institutional repository, offer online journals, digital archives and other electronic services.

The university press, the library and the institutional repository (depending where it is managed and held) merge and alter roles accordingly. This would create an overlapping and evolution of roles with adjustments made to the responsibilities of stakeholders (e.g., presses adding value to digital objects) and may eventually lead to an electronic press and electronic university library working together, i.e., a university electronic information publishing and distribution centre.
There are many models and examples of university press and library collaboration involving electronic initiatives (see Chapter 4.4.). For example, in 2004, Cornell University Library partnered with Pennsylvania State university libraries and university press with a grant from the Mellon Foundation to generalise and enhance its previously developed DpubS system [1]. The goals of this partnership are to create a general purpose publishing system, provide online editorial management services to support peer review activities, provide interoperability with institutional repository systems, foster communication to support the development of an open source publishing system and the sustainability of business models, to focus on technological developments and to establish a framework for intra-institutional partnerships between libraries and university presses [2].

HEIs have also initiated projects to create and allow for change in scholarly communication and publishing, utilising electronic technologies and hosting institutional repositories. For example, the e-scholarship repository hosting peer-review publications, Berkeley e-press licences IR technologies, Boston College, which is using an institutional repository as a journal platform and has initiated a programme of open access publishing, and the California digital library.

The FIGARO project established by two Dutch and two German higher education institutions has developed a new model for collaboration. FIGARO aimed to establish an infrastructure for academic electronic publishing in Europe and set out to provide effective and efficient e-publishing services for both individuals and organisations, aimed to utilise open source and standard base software tools allowing authors to retain ownership of work, planned to support journals, institutional repositories, and publication sites with and without peer-review, and to initiate co-publishing with traditional publishers [3]. While funding from the European Commission was withdrawn in 2004, the project offers a potential model for scholarly publishing and communication involving collaboration across a number of HEIs.
The current mix of both traditional and electronic models will no doubt continue as changes occur. Short-term, a strategic plan for the UK university press should therefore include both traditional and electronic models and formats, with a view to becoming an electronic press as the new technologies become established.

A number of international university presses have adopted electronic technologies, becoming e-presses, while a number of new university presses have been established as digital presses, e.g., Melbourne University Monash e-press [4] and Australia National University e-press [5]. In Europe, the Firenze University e-press project was initiated in 2000 and developed a computer-aided publishing service to assist university authors in publishing electronically [6]. The press offers an editorial service, facilitates the access and diffusion of university electronic publications by using the most advanced technologies, and enhances editorial production by assuring certification of authenticity and intellectual property rights [7]. These e-presses provide examples that UK university presses can use to develop their own electronic strategies.

13.8. Strategic Plan for a Future Electronic University Press

A strategic plan for an electronic university press [8], with the university library involved if deemed necessary, is outlined below.

13.8.1 Aims

To remain active in the electronic environment by introducing appropriate electronic technologies in an appropriate and cost-effective way and achieve cooperation and the sharing of goals between the press and library, each adding its own experience, skills and value.

The long-term aim may be to create a merged organisation that can implement the benefits and successes of open access experimentation and new and emerging technologies for the benefit of the academic community.
13.8.2. Objectives

- To continue the appropriate acquisition and selection of new material with the view it will be hosted and offered in electronic format and/or print using print on demand, on a cost-recovery or profit-making basis.
- To maintain high editorial standards.
- To appropriately store, allow access and preserve an increasing collection of resources in a variety of formats.
- To promote and disseminate other intellectual output of the HEI.
- To collaborate with the library in hosting and managing the HEI institutional repository.

The UK university press should alter its business model to incorporate appropriate electronic publishing technologies, that will not add significant extra cost to the press, and offer electronic services on behalf of the HEI. These services would maintain the peer-review process. It should also work on the development of technology for an electronic peer-review system.

In order to assist university presses in the transition to fulfil these objectives, a number of key strategies should be employed:

13.8.3. Key Strategies:

Strategy 1: Offer press lists through print on demand or electronic download on a fee-based system through online ordering, eliminating the print side of the business.

While the current press lists will continue, these should be offered through online ordering for download electronically or ordering a print on demand copy. Print on demand facilities and demand should be monitored. The traditional print side of the business should cease, thereby saving costs, with new costs being managed through appropriate fees for the electronic download and print on demand copies.
While current lists continue, in order to generate sufficient funds to support this new model, new works that are aimed at a wider audience should be sought.

Strategy 2: Host and manage the institutional repository/e-print archive with the HEI library, for the HEI, based on the open access model. In order to play a more prominent role in the HEI community, the university press should (with the library) host and manage the institutional repository/e-print archive, with the library, and use it's publishing expertise therein. Work with appropriate bodies regarding standards, interoperability and preservation issues will be a key feature of this part of the strategy.

Strategy 3: Support and dissemination of e-learning materials for the HEI. To encourage interaction and collaboration with the HEI academic community, the press should assist the academic community in hosting e-learning materials.

Strategy 4: Work with other publishers, HEIs and university presses to develop an open access publishing system. The press will actively seek opportunities to collaborate with other presses, publishers and HEIs in the development of an successful open access model for scholarly publishing. This strategy will ensure the university press is part of a possible future scholarly publishing model. The press, however, must experiment cautiously as the open access business model is yet unproven.

Strategy 5: Keep up to date and experiment with new and emerging technologies. The press should keep up to date with developments in electronic technologies and introduce these into press operations as deemed necessary and if the technologies can assist in keeping costs low. Print on demand technologies should be developed and used appropriately.

13.8.4. Long-term Key Strategy:
Strategy 1: The merging of roles with the university library and/or computing centre to fulfil the roles of online journal publishing, and managing and maintaining the HEI institutional repository.

This key strategy would involve each organisation using its strengths together to accomplish a number of tasks. In the long-term, new technologies may emerge that will enhance or replace traditional activities and products that were once central to scholarly communication and publishing, and to the university press role, e.g., peer-review through new technology-based alternatives [9], open access journal publishing, individual papers being published electronically rather than associated with a brand of journal, etc. There is a clear potential for UK university presses to become electronic presses and in this role, merge with the electronic library and institutional repository to become an electronic information publishing and distribution centre for its university.

13.9. Limitations of the Research

The research focused on the situation of UK university presses, and compared this briefly to the USA situation. While there are some fundamental differences between UK and USA university press publishing, such as financing and collaboration, many of the issues they face are similar. It would have been useful to conduct more USA case studies, and to compare these results not only to the UK but also to some European university presses, giving an international overview. However, because of time and financial limitations and language barriers, (although one European press provided information regarding their electronic publishing programme), European presses, or a greater number of USA presses, were not studied. The economics and costs issues faced by university presses were not covered in detail nor was governance of university presses. It is possible such insights would have given further clues on how university presses can prosper.

It would have been useful and interesting to conduct a longitudinal study focusing on the changes that have occurred at the university presses since they were first studied. However, due to time limitations and the many changes in
press staff and directors, detailed follow-up studies proved difficult, and instead, follow-up emails asking for updates in initiatives and changes to the press were sent. The results were included as a postscript following the university press case study results (see Chapter 8.9).

Originally, I had planned to test the business models with university presses. However, this was not done because of changes to press governance and staff. Two university presses had originally agreed to pilot the models in a real setting. However, during the course of the research, the director of one of the presses retired, and the other took on another role at another publishing house. While contact was made with the new press directors, their lack of knowledge of the research, and their workloads as new press directors, made their participation impossible.

While the results of the research prove insightful, only ten cases were conducted in detail. Of the five U.S. cases, four presses were large and well established. Only one press was comparable to the smaller UK presses. Generalisation is difficult because although only a small number of presses were studied, the university press sector is varied, with each press individual in size, subject list, funding and electronic publishing initiatives. While these differences make the models difficult to apply to all presses, they can be adapted according to need.

It would have also proved interesting to talk to commercial publishers and learned societies about their relationships with university presses and the role they play in the scholarly communication environment. However, again, time and financial constraints did not allow investigation.

13.10. Recommendations

A number of recommendations can be made to the key stakeholders involved with, or affected by, the research. These are listed under stakeholder headings:
13.10.1. Recommendations for HEI Administrators

- Where possible, HEIs administrators should consider financial subsidies for their university press projects, and in general offer more support and assistance.
- HEI administrators must recognise, understand, support, and place higher value on the role the university could play in the scholarly communication system.
- HEI administrators should support and encourage the university press to adopt model two, and play a full role in aiding the successful creation of the institutional repository or in transferring it to the university press.
- Play the role of facilitator in achieving the key strategies outlined in the strategic plan.

13.10.2. Recommendations for University Presses

- University presses need to view electronic publishing as a long-term investment, experimenting, continuing to adopt carefully, keeping abreast of new technology and developing pricing models for electronic publishing.
- University presses should convert backlists and files to electronic format in preparation for electronic delivery, or for print on demand.
- Presses need to continue to focus on their subject lists and to create an appropriate reputation in order to attract authors.
- University presses should collaborate further with their corresponding HEI library, particularly in electronic publishing projects, in the adoption of the institutional repository and in offering umbrella services to other HEIs.
- In order for a UK university press organisation to be successful, the majority of UK university presses must work together in the organisation of plan two, or in discussion with the ALPSP for the creation of the sub-group.
- Smaller UK university presses should consider in detail the two business models, and adopt them by working towards digital printing and by establishing/transferring and operating an institutional repository for the HEI.
- University presses should research further into the possibility of shifting some of their journals to open access models.
- University presses need to take control, and take advantage of opportunities in the changing scholarly communication and publishing environment.
- University presses with experience in successful and different business models and collaboration should develop case studies and make these available for the wider community.
- Consider becoming an electronic university press and accordingly, take on the key strategies outlined earlier in this chapter.

13.10.3. Recommendations for Government and Funding Bodies/JISC

- JISC and other governmental bodies should consider university presses in any decisions regarding institutional repositories, open access or scholarly communication in general.
- Funding agencies have worked toward greater acceptance and recognition of electronic format. They should now work on educating the academic community further to ensure that electronic formats are accepted as equivalent in status to print.
- Governmental bodies and JISC should assist in the removal of barriers to electronic delivery, e.g., provide funding for archiving and preservation and work with partners in the development of standard copyright licences etc.
- Research into the electronic publishing industry and market monitoring is needed to ensure that informed choices are made by the academic and publishing communities.

13.10.4. Recommendations for Libraries

- Libraries should continue to work with and support the university press in its traditional publishing role and new electronic roles, as appropriate.
- Libraries should consider merging the roles of the press and library, and consider the role of the librarian and the director of the press becoming one role.
- Libraries with experience in successful electronic publishing ventures and collaboration with others should develop case studies and make these available for the wider community.
- Discuss with the wider HEI community and the university press the key strategies outlined in Chapter 13.8.2. and 13.8.3. and plan collaborative initiatives as deemed appropriate.

13.10.5. Recommendations for Academic Authors

- Academic authors should, wherever possible, support the role of the university press as a not-for-profit scholarly publisher and where appropriate, continue to, or begin to, submit material to the smaller university presses in the UK.

13.11. Further Research

Further research is required to:

- Test the models in a real environment and then adapt and adopt them as appropriate.
- Discover what HEI administration and faculty need to understand about the university press and its role, by working with university presses.
- Conduct a longitudinal study into UK university presses and continue to monitor the changing situation and assist presses in adapting, as appropriate, to the changing electronic environment.
- Study the potential of open access journal publishing at university presses.
- Study the costs of establishing and operating institutional repositories at the university press, in particular, sources of income to subsidise traditional scholarly publishing.
- Examine the implications of merging the university press and the library.

University presses, both in the USA as well as the UK have faced and continue to face change. Lack of funding and HEI support continues to make the traditional
publishing role of the university presses difficult and, in many cases, has caused the closure and sale of university presses in the UK. University presses will continue to play an important role in the near future if they adapt appropriately in the changing environment. In order for smaller university presses in the UK to remain sustainable they must continue to adapt to, and take advantage of, change, recognise the value they add to the scholarly communication system and not rely on others to improve their situation.

The university press role has changed and must continue to change. They cannot remain static in a changing environment. The biggest hurdle that university presses have to overcome is themselves to allow for a future of further change.
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Appendix A: Brief Outline of UK House of Commons Inquiry Report

Brief outline of the Final Report from the House of Commons Science and Technology Committee: Scientific Publications: Free for all?¹

In December 2003, the House of Commons Science and Technology Committee in the UK launched an inquiry into the prices and accessibility of scientific publications addressing whether the government should support open access (OA).

The report concluded that the current model of scientific publication is unsatisfactory, and took a general position in favour of the principle of open access.

Recommendations included, amongst others, that:

- The government should provide funds for all HEIs to launch open access institutional repositories;
- All HEIs should establish institutional repositories (IRs) as an important first step toward more radical change;
- Authors of articles based on government funded research should deposit their articles in their IRs, within a month of publication;
- The government should appoint a central body to oversee the launch of Institutional repositories and work on preservation and to co-ordinate the implementation of a network of institutional repositories;

- The government should create funds to help authors pay the fees of OA journals for the experimentation of the model;
- Research Councils and other Government funders mandate their funded researchers to deposit a copy of all of their articles in this way.

While applauding commercial publishers for providing digital journals and added functionality, the report stresses the need for change, and focuses on the institutional repository operating alongside the traditional publishing model:

"Set-up and running costs are relatively low, making institutional repositories a cost-effective way of improving access to scientific publications. Institutional repositories will help to improve access to journals but a more radical solution may be required in the long term. Early indications suggest that the author-pays publishing model could be viable... Nonetheless, this Report concludes that further experimentation is necessary".
## Appendix B: UK University Press Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Date Est.</th>
<th>Staff no.s</th>
<th>Title output 2002</th>
<th>Title output 2000</th>
<th>No. of journals 2004</th>
<th>Backlist in print 2004</th>
<th>Cat. in print 2004</th>
<th>Cat. Online 2004</th>
<th>Order Online 2004</th>
<th>Online chapters 2004</th>
<th>Int. presence</th>
<th>Funding of the Press</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Birmingham Press</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>One off fund, sales income, HEI pays salary and overheads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Policy Press: Bristol University</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Stand alone business unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge University Press</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>170+</td>
<td>14000+</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Accumulated earnings and bank financing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranfield University Press</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Management buyout May 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh University Press</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>800+</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Company of University of Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Exeter Press</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>To be self-funding in 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hertfordshire Press</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Flyers</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Joint venture with commercial press, profit oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial College Press</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Self-sustainable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool University Press</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Self-funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Luton Press</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Self-sustainable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester University Press</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>800+</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Self-funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex University Press</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Self financing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria University Press</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham University Press</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>HEI funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>30,000+</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Accumulated earnings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wales Press</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>500+</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Small subsidy from HEI, project funding, sales income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of York Music Press</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Lottery grant and assistance from music department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: USA University Press Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Date est.</th>
<th>Staff no.s</th>
<th>Title output 1999</th>
<th>Title output 2000</th>
<th>No. of journals</th>
<th>Backlist</th>
<th>Catalogue in print</th>
<th>Catalogue online</th>
<th>Order online</th>
<th>Online chapters</th>
<th>International presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron Press</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama Press</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alaska Press</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona Press</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas Press</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Press</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University Press</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of US</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago Press</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5050</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Press of Colorado</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University Press</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University Press</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University Press</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duquesne University Press</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Press of Florida</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University Press</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallaudet University Press</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>Date est.</td>
<td>Staff numbers</td>
<td>Title output 1999</td>
<td>Title output 2000</td>
<td>No. of journals</td>
<td>Backlist</td>
<td>Cat. in print</td>
<td>Cat. online</td>
<td>Order online</td>
<td>Online chapters</td>
<td>Int. presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Press of Hawaii</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University Press</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho Press</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois Press</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University Press</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa Press</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hopkins University Press</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2169</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Press of Kansas</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University Press</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Press of Kentucky</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University Press</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University Press</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Press</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT Press</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer University Press</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan Press</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University Press</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota Press</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi Press</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Missouri Press</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska Press</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada Press</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No. of</th>
<th>Backlist</th>
<th>Cat. in print</th>
<th>Cat. online</th>
<th>Order online</th>
<th>Online chapters</th>
<th>Int. presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina Press</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University Press</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois University Press</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University Press</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame Press</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Press</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University Press</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma Press</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University Press</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania Press</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University Press</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh Press</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University Press</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3138</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University Press</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller University Press</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University Press</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Scranton Press</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina Press</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois University Press</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Methodist University Press</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University Press</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State University Press</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>No. of</td>
<td>Backlist</td>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee Press</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas Press</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University Press</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Christian University Press</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University Press</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Western University Press</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah Press</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University Press</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University Press</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia Press</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington Press</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University Press</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University Press</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan University Press</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin Press</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University Press</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3331</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D: Pilot Study Report

1. Introduction

The term pilot study refers to the testing out or trial run of research methods and instruments, in smaller scale and in preparation for a full-scale study. Pilot studies are conducted in order to ensure success and eliminate possible ambiguities and problems in the research and methods selected. The advantages of pilot studies are: to give advance warning about where the project could fail, to discover if proposed methods or instruments are inappropriate, to identify potential practical problems in the procedure, and to identify poor recording and response rates [1]. A possible limitation of conducting pilot studies could be in making inaccurate assumptions or predictions based on pilot study results. Teijlingen and Hundley state, “Completing a pilot study successfully is not a guarantee of the success of a full-scale survey” [1]. The authors conclude, “Well-designed and well-conducted pilot studies can inform us about the best research process and occasionally about likely outcomes” [1].

The key stakeholders in the research project are academic authors, particularly those that have published with a university press and another publishing house, university library professionals, and university press directors and staff.
Three pilot interviews were held with one person from each of the three major stakeholders, i.e., an academic author, a library professional in higher education, and a director and business manager of a UK university press. The interview setting and questions, the environment and length of time taken, resources needed, and the collection of preliminary data were all tested during the pilot interviews.

2. Methods

Qualitative methods were adopted for the research. Qualitative data has been described as "developing a detailed understanding of individuals’ views, attitudes and behaviour" [2]. Qualitative studies require flexibility and openness. The research questions should be general enough to permit exploration, but focused enough to delimit the study [3].

To study in depth the practices, views and developments of university presses and university libraries in electronic publishing, qualitative methods were judged to be most appropriate. The data collection method that was adopted for the research was semi-structured, in-depth interviews.

The pilot respondents were selected through contacts of the researcher and supervisor. They were approached via email informing them of the nature of the pilot study.

3. Design of Interviews and Case Studies

The interviews were designed to address issues relevant to the three stakeholders.

Issues discussed with the academic authors were: pressures to publish; reasons for where to publish books and journal articles; preferences in choice of publishing house; access to scholarly material; views and use of electronic publishing; reasons for and experience in publishing with a university press; and differences between university presses and other publishers. Issues addressed with university library professionals were: the relationship between the library
and university presses; ways in which the library works with the university press; and the role the university press could play in the scholarly communication network. The issues discussed with university press staff were: the role of the press in the scholarly communication environment; governance of the press; relationships with the university, commercial publishers and other university presses; effect of author publishing initiatives on the press; initiatives in electronic publishing; the impact of electronic publishing on the press; and the future of the press.

4. Interview Data Collection

Interviews were recorded for transcription with permission from the interviewees. The respondents were informed that the interviews were pilot studies and briefed as to what this implied. Along with answering the interview questions, the respondents provided feedback identifying ambiguities and unclear questions. The time taken to conduct the interviews was also recorded.

5. Results and Discussion

The time taken for each of the interviews was as follows:
Academic author = 30 minutes
University Press director = 1 hour
Library professional = 10 minutes

5.1. Academic Author Interview

The interview with an academic author was successful and all questions were answered. The interview was a comfortable length of time and the respondent, being well experienced in the field, identified possible ambiguities and made suggestions for improvement. One lesson learned was that in recording interviews, it is important to conduct the interview in a setting that is free from external interruption.

Question 5: Do you have any preferences as to which type of publisher/journal you publish with? Why? This question depends on author motivation and why the material is being written. If an author’s primary motivation for writing is for
promotion and tenure or assessments of output, the preferences for whom to publish with may be very different than if the material is for the primary dissemination of knowledge or for a student textbook.

Question 8: How satisfied are you with current access to scholarly material? Library service? This question is not specific enough. The question needs to refer to either personal or general views in the scholarly world.

Question 9: What is your view of scholarly material published electronically? This question needs to be more specific. Does it mean the respondent’s views of electronic material as equivalent to print or how respondents regard electronic material personally?

In Question 10 the term ‘websites’ needs to be defined. Does the question refer to personal academic web pages, institutional sites or archives?

Question 16: Do you think there is a difference in prestige between commercial publishers and university presses? This response depends on the university press. In the UK, Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press are in a different league in comparison to the smaller presses.

Question 18: How would you compare the process/experience of publishing with a university press and other publishers? This is ambiguous and needs rewording to be more specific.

5.2. University Press Interview

This interview was conducted with a university press director who was also the university librarian and the press business manager. The interview took an hour and proved very successful and enlightening for both the researcher and the interviewees. The interviewees showed a lot of interest in the topic and felt a great need for the research. They expressed great interest in the results and findings of the research and a desire to be involved further.
As far as individual questions were concerned, room for improvement was identified in a number of areas. The researcher felt that an extra question to acquire the number of staff members would be appropriate and would give better insight into the size and scope of the press.

Questions 20 and 23 were answered when answering previous questions and should therefore be merged with the relevant questions.

Question 18: 'What effect would you say learned societies and other not-for-profit publishers have on the press.' This question needs to also refer to any relationship the university press has with these learned societies and publishers. Question 24: What is the impact of electronic publishing on the university press, seemed to be ambiguous. This question needs to be more specific in order to make it easier to answer.

5.3. University Library Professional

This interview was unsuccessful and took only ten minutes for a number of reasons. The interview was not successful as the respondent felt he could not answer the questions. No specific ambiguities or problems were found with the interview structure or questions themselves, except that they were geared towards university libraries whose host university has a press. The librarian interviewed is not affiliated with a university press and the respondent therefore did not know enough about how these presses worked. It was discovered that libraries do not work directly with university presses but through an intermediary. The respondent felt that university presses were on a par with commercial publishers.

6. Recommendations for Change

The interviews with academic authors and university press directors will be administered in exactly the same way as the pilot interviews, subject to a few changes in the questions to ensure clearer understanding.

Changes in questions: Academic Author

Question 5 will be split into two questions, one referring to the publishing of journal articles and one relating to books.
Question 8 will be altered to read 'how satisfied are you personally with your own access to scholarly material and library services?'

Question 9 will be changed to read 'what is your personal view of scholarly material published electronically? Do you feel it is equivalent to print?'

Question 10 will define web sites as personal web pages, whether mounted individually or as part of an institutional site.

Question 16 will refer to the smaller university presses, and specifically not include Oxford and Cambridge university presses.

Question 18 will ask 'can you tell me a little about your experience in publishing with a university press? How did this compare to publishing with commercial publishers?'

Changes in questions: University Press

Additional Question: Number of staff members at the university press.

Question 18 will be changed to read, 'what relationship do you have with learned societies and other not-for-profit publishers? And would you say these learned societies and publishers have a negative or positive effect on the press?'

Question 20 and 23 will be incorporated into the previous questions.

Question 24 will be changed to read 'How has electronic publishing affected your press? How are things done differently?'

Changes: University Librarians

If librarians are interviewed in the study at all, only those with university presses should be interviewed. These may have a more direct relationship with the press and may work with them on a number of projects. It was decided that university professionals throughout the UK not be interviewed.

References:


7. Emails Contacting Interview Respondents for Pilot Studies

**Email to University Librarian - Pilot study**

I am writing to request your help with my research. My name is Rachel Hardy and I am a research student in the Department of Information Science, under the supervision of Professor Charles Oppenheim.

My PhD is concerned with Higher Education Institutions as publishers, in particular the role of University Presses in the UK and the USA, focusing on electronic publishing initiatives.

I will be interviewing University library professionals throughout UK Universities later this year. To this end I have developed an interview schedule. I would like to interview you for my pilot study.

The interview will take about half an hour, and with your permission will be recorded for transcription purposes. The questions I will be asking are related to the library's relationship with university presses. The objective is not just to get your views, but also to identify any ambiguities or other problems with any interview questions.

I would be very grateful if you would be willing to take part in my research. Please let me know if you would be willing to do so. I look forward to hearing from you.

**Email to University press - Pilot Study**

I am writing to request your help with my research. You may remember me from the PELICAN project; I am now a research student in the Department of Information Science, under the supervision of Professor Charles Oppenheim.
My research is concerned with Higher Education Institutions as publishers, in particular the role of University Presses in the UK and the USA, focusing on electronic publishing initiatives.

I will be interviewing University Press staff throughout UK Universities along with a number of USA and UK case studies later this year. To this end I have developed an interview schedule. I would like to interview you for my pilot study.

The interview will take a maximum of an hour of your time, and with your permission will be recorded for transcription purposes. The questions I will be asking are related to the university press operations with a broad focus on electronic publishing initiatives. The objective is not just to get your views, but also to identify any ambiguities or other problems with any interview questions.

I would be very grateful if you would be willing to take part in my research. Please let me know if you would be willing to do so. I look forward to hearing from you.

Email to academic authors - Pilot study

I am writing to request your help with my research. My name is Rachel Hardy and I am a research student in the Department of Information Science, under the supervision of Professor Charles Oppenheim.

My research is concerned with Higher Education Institutions as publishers, in particular the role of University Presses in the UK and the USA, focusing on electronic publishing initiatives.

I will be interviewing academic authors throughout the UK who have published with both a university press and a commercial publisher later this year. To this end I have developed an interview schedule. I would be grateful if you would be willing to be interviewed for my pilot study.
The interview will take about 45 minutes of your time, and with your permission will be recorded for transcription purposes. The questions I will be asking are related to your publishing patterns and opinions of both journal articles and books, with a particular focus on your views of electronic publishing and your experiences of publishing books with both commercial and university presses. The objective is not just to get your views, but also to identify any ambiguities or other problems with any interview questions.

I would be very grateful if you would be willing to take part in my research. Please let me know if you would be willing to do so. I look forward to hearing from you.

8. Questions for Interviews

Questions for academic authors of material in University press publications and commercial presses:

1. Age
2. Job title
3. Subject area
4. Do you feel a pressure to publish? Why?
5. Do you have any preferences as to which type of publisher/journal you publish with? Why?
   - Commercial publisher
   - University press
   - Learned society
   - Refereed journal
   - Popular/general journal
6. How do you decide where to publish books? Rank in order of importance:
   - Likelihood of acceptance
   - Speed of publishing
   - Publishers/journal reputation
Quality of design and editing
Numbers of readers
Royalties paid
Promotional effort made by publisher

7. How do you decide which journals to publish in? Rank in order of importance
Likelihood of acceptance
Speed of publishing
Publishers/journal reputation
Quality of design and editing
Numbers of readers
Available in electronic format

8. How satisfied are you with current access to scholarly material? Library service?

9. What is your view of scholarly material published electronically?

10. Do you read material posted on the web?
E-journals
Web sites
Open archives

11. Have you heard of the Harnad Open Archive initiative?

12. If yes, do you use it?

13. Do you publish materials on the web? e.g. your own website, e-journals

14. If not, would you be willing to consider publishing on your own web-page or in an open archive?

15. Why would you choose to/do you publish with a university press?

16. Do you think there is a difference in prestige between commercial publishers and university presses?

17. What is your experience of publishing with a University press?
Efficiency
Staff members
Professionalism

18. How would you compare the process/experience of publishing with a university press and other publishers?
19. What are the implications for academic authors of university presses becoming more active electronically?

Questions for university librarians:

1. Name
2. Job title
3. Type of University
4. Number of FTE Students
5. Size of book stock
6. Number of journals currently subscribed to
   - Print
   - Electronic
7. Annual budget
8. Does your university have a university press?
9. If yes, what relationship, if any, is there between you and the university press?
10. How could university presses improve the way they work for the benefit of the library?
11. What are the implications for the library of university presses becoming more active electronically?
12. What roles could/should the university press play?

Questions for University presses:

1. Name:
2. Job title:
3. Subject specialities:
4. Number of new titles published per annum:
5. Number of journals published:
6. Annual turnover:
7. Annual profit made:
8. What is your role as a university press in the scholarly communication environment?
9. What is your relationship with the university?
10. To whom are you answerable? If board of directors is the university represented on the board of directors?
11. How is the press funded/controlled? Does the press receive any subsidies? Does the press make a profit?
12. Are profits passed to the university?
13. Do you give priority to publishing material authored by university staff?
14. Who are your major competitors?
15. Do you have any relationship with commercial publishers? Other university presses?
16. Are you selling internationally? Who do you use to sell abroad?
17. What effect would you say commercial publishers have on the press?
18. What effect would you say learned societies and other not-for-profit publishers have on the press?
19. What would you say is the effect of author’s initiatives (e.g. Open Archive Initiative, academic staff publishing on websites etc) on the press?
20. What are the implications for university presses of libraries and academic authors becoming more active electronically?
21. What are the short and long-term goals of the press?
22. Has the press taken any initiatives for electronic publishing?
23. If not, are there plans for the use of or introduction of electronic publishing?
24. What is the impact of electronic publishing on the university press?
25. What does the future hold for your press? University presses in general?
Appendix E: UK University Press Qualitative and Quantitative Questionnaires

Qualitative Questionnaire:
Please complete the following questions. All responses will remain confidential.

Staff numbers
Subject specialities
Number of new titles published per annum
Number of journals published

Section One: Press information, goals and mission

1. How is the press funded?
2. What is the primary mission of the press?
3. What are your general long-term goals?
4. What is your relationship with the university?
5. Do you give priority to publishing material authored by university staff?
   If yes, are they your own institution staff or other university staff?
6. Are you selling internationally? Who do you use to sell abroad?
7. In what areas do you think the major opportunities for your company's publishing activities will lie over the next two years?
Section Two: Electronic Publishing

8. Has the press taken any initiatives for electronic publishing? If no, answer question 9 only in this section. If yes, answer questions 10 – 17.

9. Any plans to introduce electronic publishing?

10. Have such projects been successful?

11. To what would you attribute their success?

12. What effect has electronic publishing had on the press? Staff? Turnover?

13. What is, if any, the current strategy/business plan for electronic publishing?

14. What have been the benefits of electronic publishing to date?

15. What have been the disadvantages of electronic publishing to date?

16. What are the most important lessons the press has learnt from undertaking electronic publishing?

Section Three: Collaboration

17. Do you collaborate/have a relationship with other university presses? If yes, why did you choose to collaborate?

18. Who are your major competitors?

20. Would your press benefit from meeting with and exchanging ideas and information with other university presses?

21. If an organisation existed to encourage and ensure this happened would you join?

The researcher will be conducting 5 case studies at UK university presses over the next few months. If you would be willing to be interviewed please state here:

Yes, I am willing to be interviewed

Thank you for your time.
Quantitative Questionnaire:

Section One A:

1. Total turnover for the last financial year?

- Up to £250,000
- £250,000 - £500,000
- £500,000 - under £1 million
- £1 million - under £5 million
- £5 million - under £20 million
- £20 million - under £50 million
- £50 million and over

Section Two A: Electronic Publishing

2. For what purposes does your company have a presence on the Internet?

Please mark on the scale below 1 = not important 4 = very important

1 2 3 4
- Publicity
- Generate increased revenue
- Experiment with new technologies
- Make products available online
- Generate increased profit
- Keep up with competitors
- Enhance product range
- Reach new customers
- Deliver an improved service

If you do not have an Internet presence please tick here
3. What percentage (if any) of your products is published in electronic format?

2 years ago?
0% up to 25% □ 26-50% □ 51-75% □ over 75% □

Currently?
0% up to 25% □ 26-50% □ 51-75% □ over 75% □

In two years time?
0% up to 25% □ 26-50% □ 51-75% □ over 75% □

4. What percentage (if any) of the revenue is derived from electronic publishing?

2 years ago?
0% up to 25% □ 26-50% □ 51-75% □ over 75% □

Currently?
0% up to 25% □ 26-50% □ 51-75% □ over 75% □

In two years time?
0% up to 25% □ 26-50% □ 51-75% □ over 75% □

5. Indicate on the scale below whether you agree or disagree with the statements below:

1 = strongly disagree  4 = strongly agree

*Market considerations:*
- Publishing electronically will improve products
- Reaching market is easier with electronic products than paper
- There are sufficient potential customers for electronic products
- Customers are willing to access material electronically
- There are sufficient market statistics available on which to base product development decisions
- There is *no* intense competition in the electronic market
Customers have appropriate hardware and software
Customers will pay a realistic price for electronic products

Technology:
- Uncertainty over future technical development has discouraged investment in electronic products
- We have a clearly defined electronic publishing strategy
- Converting print material to electronic format has posed considerable problems
- The Internet is too slow
- Common technical standards are adequate

Security and legal concerns:
- Copyright infringement is a key concern
- Electronic distribution creates unknown legal liabilities
- Data protection laws are restricting publishing opportunities

Training and management issues:
- There are sufficient trained personnel to undertake electronic publishing projects
- There is lack of understanding of electronic publishing at senior management level in this organisation

Economic Factors:
- The immaturity of online charging mechanisms is a constraint to business development
- The costs of maintaining parallel print and electronic products are prohibitively high
- Electronic products damage sales of paper-based products
Section Two B: Obstacles and Opportunities

What are the chief impediments to the faster growth of your electronic publishing business? If relevant, please rank on the scale below

1 = minor impediment  4 = serious impediment

- Shortage of capital
- Your own unfamiliarity with electronic publishing
- Fear of the high costs associated with electronic publishing
- Confusion caused by constant updates of:
  (i) Hardware
  (ii) Software
- The complexity of the technology required
- Cost of maintaining parallel print/electronic products
- Lack of sales/retail outlets
- Costs of marketing
- Shortage of trained staff at a salary you can afford
- Fear that electronic publishing will damage sales of paper-based products
- Concern over protection of copyright in electronic arena
- Cost of acquiring electronic rights to third-party data
- Fear that electronic distribution will lead to higher and/or unknown legal liabilities
- Lack of viable market opportunities for electronic material
- Unwillingness among customers to access products electronically
- Customer resistance to paying a realistic price for electronic information products
- An overcrowded marketplace discouraging new product introduction
- The market for further electronic publishing products does not currently exist
The Internet is too slow
The cost of promoting/marketing electronic products
Licensing material is too difficult/expensive
Insufficient government support for electronic publishing
Lack of training of staff
Lack of higher education institution support
Competition from low-cost or give-away products
Competition from other companies/presses
Problems with encryption technology
Security of payment mechanisms
Uncertainty over future regulations
Burden of existing regulations
Lack of common technical standards
Lack of information/data about new technologies
Taxation issues

Section Three:
Please identify (in order of importance) up to 3 key factors, which would help your electronic business grow:
Appendix F: Questions for Academic Authors

1. Job title
2. Subject area
3. Which university press have you published with?
4. Why did you choose to publish with a university press?
5. What added value did you feel you got from the university press for your work?
6. Why would you choose to/do you publish with a small university press? (Excluding Oxford or Cambridge)
7. Do you think there is a difference in prestige between commercial publishers and university presses? If yes, in what ways?
8. What is your experience of publishing with a University press?
   - Efficiency
   - Staff members
   - Professionalism
9. How did publishing with a university press compare to publishing with a commercial publisher?
10. Would you like university presses to become more active electronically? Why?
11. How, in your opinion, could university presses improve for your benefit?
Appendix G: Covering Letter to UK University Press Directors

My name is Rachel Hardy and I am conducting research for my PhD into UK university presses, and more particularly in how the electronic environment will affect them. I am working under the supervision of Professor Charles Oppenheim in the Department of Information Science at Loughborough University.

My research hypotheses are as follows:

1. University presses are in a prime position to increase their power in the scholarly publishing system and could use electronic publishing to do so.
2. University presses need to experiment with and get involved in electronic publishing ventures and ensure these support and help to further the mission and goals of the presses.
3. University presses need to collaborate and cooperate with each other and with their parent higher education institutions in the use of electronic publishing.

I began my studies in December 2001 and am due to complete my thesis around November 2004. So far I have conducted five case studies at university presses in the USA, concentrating on their business models and electronic publishing initiatives and projects. I am also currently receiving responses from a questionnaire completed by 100 academic authors who are published with both a university press and a commercial publisher to compare their experiences of both. The next stage of my research involves looking in detail at the UK university press situation and I will then go on to conduct a number of case studies here. The results are proving to be very interesting and useful and I hope to be able to share these with you.
I would be very grateful if you would be willing to help me in this research and enclose two questionnaires for you to complete. They should take no longer than 30 minutes of your time in total. I would be very grateful if you would complete the questions as you see fit and return them to me at the address below.

All responses will be kept confidential and not be attributed to yourself or your organisation. In return, a summary of the results of my research will be sent to you and I will keep you up to date with continuing progress and articles. Please do not hesitate to contact me, or my supervisor, if you have any questions or comments regarding my research, or would like further information about it.

Thanking you in advance for your time,
Yours sincerely
Rachel Hardy
Department of Information Science
Loughborough University
LE11 3TU
Email: r.l.hardy@lboro.ac.uk
Appendix H: USA Research Trip Report – John Campbell Trust

As part of my PhD study into electronic publishing at university presses, I needed to conduct a number of case studies with USA university presses in order to compare the US situation with the UK situation.

Aims and objectives of research trip:

- Based upon the sample, to examine the US university press and its delivery of electronic scholarly information to the higher education community.
- To conduct case studies at 5 US university presses to study the initiatives they have taken in relation to electronic publishing.
- To study the advantages and disadvantages of university presses publishing electronically, including the best practices and lessons learned in electronic publishing, the common problems, and possible solutions.

My overall research aims and objectives are:

Libraries:
What are the implications for HEI libraries of university presses becoming more active electronically? What roles do they/could they/should they play? What initiatives are the libraries taking in electronic publishing? How is electronic publishing affecting the HEI library? How does the library work with the university press?
University presses:
What is the impact of electronic publishing on university presses, both large and small? What initiatives have been taken? How do they see their role today and in the future? How are they funded, controlled? What are the lessons learnt and best practices of electronic publishing? Are business plans, policy and strategy in place for electronic publishing?

The PhD research is based on the following hypotheses:

1. University presses are in a prime position to increase their power in the scholarly publishing system and could use electronic publishing to do so.

2. University presses need to experiment with and get involved in electronic publishing ventures and ensure these support and help further the mission and goals of the presses.

3. University presses need to collaborate and co-operate with each other and with their parent higher education institutions in the use of electronic publishing.

Basic background:
Despite the many changes that have occurred in the scholarly publishing industry in recent years, university presses in the UK (with the exception of the two major presses, namely Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press) have remained minor players. This is in contrast to the USA, where university presses have adopted a pro-active stance regarding electronic publishing. One example of such an initiative is Project Muse, launched in 1995 by the Johns Hopkins University Press. University presses are not-for-profit organisations that are linked to higher education institutions. Producing scholarly books and journals they are unique for investing in long term or bigger scholarly projects.

With the introduction and increased use of electronic resources in UK higher education, the role of the university press is shifting. The position of university presses in the UK and elsewhere needs consideration. What initiatives are they taking, what effect is this evolution of scholarly communication having, and how
they are acting or reacting to it? As Law argued: "revivifying the concept of the university press in an electronic world is attractive". Kohl has reasoned: "Publishers continue to fulfil a much needed role in the process of assessing and preparing work for dissemination". To what extent are university presses in the UK taking advantage of the evolution of scholarly communication and in the shift from traditional print material of scholarly works to the electronic environment?

The scholarly publishing market is fertile ground for electronic innovation. In the current rather heated atmosphere, there has been a marked lack of objective research regarding the roles and needs of the key stakeholders, including librarians (facing slow-growing budgets while coping with growing numbers in students and their demands), and the university presses. The current situation of electronic publishing at university presses in the USA requires in-depth research.

*Case study methodology:*
Case studies were selected to allow in-depth exploration, permitting further investigation and understanding into each selected university press. The case studies included the compilation of historical data and statistics, interviews and organisational data (development of the press over time). Interviews were held with the press director, the electronic publishing director (if different) and relevant electronic publishing staff. Topics covered in the interviews were: business plans, views on electronic publishing, reasons for electronic publishing, future plans, current strategy and best practice, lessons learned, membership of the AAUP and collaboration with other university presses.

It was decided that five university presses in the USA would be used for case studies. The presses selected for study were all based in the Eastern States of the USA for ease of access. Those presses studied were Harvard, MIT, Harvard Business School (all in Boston, Massachusetts), Columbia University Press (New York), and Georgetown University Press (Washington DC) along with their corresponding Higher Education Institution libraries. These were selected for their location, and also for their electronic publishing programmes or lack thereof, and their size. Visits to the Association of American University Presses
(AAUP) director in New York, SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic and Resources Coalition) and ARL (Association of Research Libraries) were also arranged both in Washington, DC (See end of report).

The case study information was organised on an individual university press basis. Once the information was gathered and compiled, the individual presses were then compared. However, individual characteristics of each press remained paramount in comparison. Each of the five university press directors was interviewed and also asked to complete a questionnaire (See end of report). Each of the four university librarians was also interviewed (See end of report). The interviews varied in length between one half and one hour at the libraries and between one and three hours at the presses.

**Itinerary:**
The trip was carried out during the first two weeks of November 2002. For the itinerary see end of report.

**General findings from each meeting:**
In order to retain confidentiality and anonymity, each case study has been numbered and not listed in date order.

**University Presses**

1. At present there is very little revenue from electronic publishing and this will probably remain the same in the future. Electronic publishing means the distribution of material in electronic form. The ultimate goal is to have all press material in electronic copy and to print on demand. The solution to many problems is print on demand. Many electronic publishing programmes are conducted with partners and are intended only to earn enough to support the electronic publishing activities of the press.

Electronic publishing is a guessing game and there has been no growth in revenue.
The press aims to concentrate on growing areas. The future will see an increase in subject discipline communities.

The press became involved with electronic publishing, because it was viewed as what customers want, and in order to stay in touch with the market.

Electronic publishing is more relevant for journals than books.

There is currently no library collaboration – the two institutions missions. The long-term goal is to use technology to communities.

Benefits of electronic publishing are being up to date and tuned in, and to access and keep in touch with customers. The main disadvantage is the expense, as it costs a lot to be first!

Important lessons learned: things take longer than planned, easy to get carried away with technology.

Long-term business plan is to deploy technology of digital print on demand.

2. The press is working on the current development of academic trends, with the aim to be at forefront of scholarly publishing. The press is not heavily involved in electronic publishing apart from web presence and selling online, but aims to keep abreast of initiatives and movement in this area.

Initiatives taken by the press include the use of partners such as Netlibrary and Questia, although on a modest scale, with involvement in a collaborative project. The way forward is print on demand. Possible potential for e-books; however, this will remain a small market; it requires a good reader to be successful.

3. Print on demand will be very successful for smaller presses, for small print runs; however, the technology is not yet available.

Electronic publishing is beneficial for finding new revenue streams; it is where the business is, gives customers what they want, and serves author needs.

Electronic publishing offers currently less than 1% of total revenue. This will increase in the future; so far, activity in this area is very experimental, but it will play a big role in the future.

The press got involved with electronic publishing as it's viewed as the future, to reach customers, and to serve authors.
The press’s electronic publishing programme is intended to make a profit. Initiatives have been taken with many partners and aggregators – though the return, tools, readers or functionality are not yet available.

The press has had some success in electronic publishing projects, though has experienced technological problems, and generally does not view current capabilities as user-friendly. The press has no electronic publishing strategy or business plan, as electronic publishing is not a main focus. No big returns, can’t invest necessary funds yet, as it’s too expensive, however there is a lot of potential for the future. At present, the focus is on the print business.

Benefits include: authors content, forward looking and thinking, being leading edge, knowing customer’s needs. Disadvantages include risk of copyright and other intellectual property infringement, and time and money invested in a programme that’s not ready.

Lessons learned: learning about customer’s behaviour, needs and wants, new relations with customers. Haven’t yet found a successful formula; the need is not pronounced enough.

4. The press is experimenting in electronic publishing. It is viewed as the future, although standards are needed for new aspects. Presses must keep learning and stay involved.

The press is actively involved in the electronic market, and since 1999 has doubled its electronic publishing revenue.

Currently, the press receives 10% of its revenue from electronic publishing. In two years time, this is estimated at 15-20%. Initiatives include many projects and work with partners. The opportunities lie in electronic distribution. E-publishing initiatives are intended to make a profit. Currently some are profitable, others are not and are taking time to become profitable.

Benefits include staff awareness and skill development, development of own database. Disadvantages are financial, need to do everything two ways, print and electronic.

Business plans includes getting projects up and running, renew sites and material constantly, have a content management system in place, allow remote work. The
forecast is that revenue from electronic publishing will have doubled by 2005. The challenge for the future is staying in the market.

5. Revenue in electronic publishing will increase in the future. The press has plans for future electronic publishing sales, and chapters online. Online sales are increasing and the press gains small revenue from work with aggregators and partners. The press is involved with electronic publishing because it's a great publicity tool, increasing visibility and international presence. There is a need to develop relationships with aggregators, and let them do the work. Currently it's difficult to make money, and the press doesn't plan for large future revenue. Benefits include increased visibility, to strengthen the pool of authors, expanding acquisition as well as marketing and sales. Disadvantages include the fact that it is hard to know impact on sales - no hard data, time wasted on schemes, financial costs are high, can get sidetracked from original mission on something not financially successful. No specific strategy. No financial picture of electronic publishing. Business plan is to get more material on the website, and to increase revenue from aggregators.

*University Libraries:*

1. Electronic publishing projects: collections of library material digitised, no big projects, various material online. How does library work with the press: very little. Debates the cost of books and which parts of books should be used for electronic reserves. Benefits of the university press: free access to its databases. How could university presses improve? Keep communication open, be more willing to give library rights, make material as accessible as possible for different needs.
Benefits of university presses publishing electronically: increased availability and access, easy dissemination.

2. Very active in electronic publishing projects. Many projects running very successfully. All projects are working with university press. Did not work with the press until electronic publishing projects were initiated at the library; now work very closely. The press had no funding for such projects and therefore worked with the library. Benefits of the university press: knowledge and expertise they bring to the system, success of working together, collaboration and cooperation. How could university presses improve: More collaboration with the libraries.

3. Electronic publishing projects: electronic publishing consortia never got started, no specific projects. How does library work with the press: don't - discussions are taking place, both parties are willing, though generally each stakeholder has conflicting and competing priorities. There is, however, lots of potential. How could university presses improve: work more closely with libraries - would provide both with benefits.

4. Due to electronic publishing there has been a significant increase in databases, big push for electronic access, tend to be more expensive than print, but have cancelled large numbers of print titles (saved money), digital acquisitions office created, ceased binding print journals, saved space and binding costs. Electronic publishing projects: e.g., author work online, digests published electronically. How does library work with the press: features books published by the press, utilises material from the press on the website, press included as member of university community. Benefits of the university press: marketing - email of press publications sent via library service. How could university presses improve: understand the nature of libraries as customers, e.g., no exclusive licensing, provide more access, more open licensing
to fit a more academic environment, not be afraid of aggregators, and understand issues of distribution.

Role university press could/should play: current relationship is indirect; would like a closer relationship.

Common issues that arose:

University Presses:

There is currently little or no revenue from electronic publishing. Electronic publishing at present mainly consists of electronic distribution. Many projects are with partners and aggregators, such as Netlibrary etc.

Presses are experimenting with, and utilising electronic publishing. It is viewed as being where the customers are and what the customer wants, and is helpful in order to stay in touch with the market, and keep up to date.

Electronic publishing is expensive and not all the needed technology is available yet.

Benefits of electronic publishing include knowing customer needs, being in touch with the customer, publicity and marketing, increased visibility and being on the leading edge.

Disadvantages are primarily the investment of time and money, and the heavy financial cost.

Libraries:

The benefits of the associated university press publishing electronically are increased availability of material and easier dissemination. All libraries would like more collaboration and a closer relationship with the press. All libraries stressed the need to keep and encourage communication with the press.

Discussion - differences:

University Presses:

Some presses are very active in the electronic publishing arena, while others are not, experimenting only on a small scale. Some believe electronic publishing will play a large role in the future of scholarly publishing and estimate huge revenue
increases, while others do not. For some, electronic publishing is intended to make a profit.
Some argue that revenue from electronic publishing will remain the same while others believe it will increase dramatically over time. Some presses want to make considerable profit, while others aim to make enough to cover the costs. Some believe print on demand is the way forward and the answer to current scholarly publishing problems. Only a few presses have strategic business plans for electronic publishing. Some presses work closely with the institution library while others do not collaborate at all.

Libraries:
There is a large variety of ways libraries work with the press. Some work very closely, others not at all. Some libraries are very active in electronic publishing projects, while others are not. Some argued that presses don't understand the nature of libraries and their role.

Discussion with the Association of American University Presses (AAUP):
The aims of the AAUP are to; help presses operate more economically and efficiently, provide services, help in understanding the market, aid presses to be better publishers, and to work with other associations in scholarly publishing on federal legislation.
The AAUP is a not-for-profit organisation with 120 members. It has a mandate to break even and is funded by two sources. Member dues contribute one third of operating costs, two thirds comes from the marketing and programmes initiatives. An example of the programmes conducted is an annual statistical survey of all member presses. For new projects and initiatives the AAUP works with grants from organisations such as the Mellon Foundation.
Collaboration between university presses is encouraged, and a role of the AAUP is to provide facilities and encourage the sharing of information and experiences. The AAUP collaborates with other scholarly publishing organisations such as the AAP (Association of American Publishers), ARL, and AAU (Association of American Universities). One example of collaboration with these organisations is the creation of a statement on copyright law for universities. The AAUP does
work with SPARC but not as directly as it could; the AAUP has, however endorsed SPARC initiatives and encourages its members to work closely with SPARC. The AAUP also encourages member presses to work with libraries and their parent higher education institutions and has, in recent years, seen a large increase in the number of hybrid projects.

Regarding foreign presses joining the AAUP, it currently has a small number of such presses as members. UK presses would be welcomed to join the AAUP but as the majority are small, it could prove difficult due to their lack of resources.

Electronic publishing is not viewed as a financial solution to economic problems. It is presently an additional expense with little payoff in the short-term.

University press respondent comments regarding AAUP:
Benefits – keeps you in touch with colleagues, the exchange of information and experience. Learning from others, achieves a critical mass, strength in numbers. Valuable, collegial - share expertise. There is a huge amount of information and wisdom available.
The AAUP lobbies on behalf of presses, sells press books online. Participation in annual meeting, statistical information and surveys, takes a political stand, participates in public policy, useful training programmes, useful email discussion list.

Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) and Association of Research Libraries (ARL):
SPARC is an organisation established under the ARL to market affordable journals, lower the risk of starting new journals, and help the non-profit organisations to create change and improve the situation in scholarly publishing and communication.
SPARC offers grants to many university presses to help with projects and aims to stimulate the presses to take a forward view of digital publishing. However, even though a natural partner, university presses run small journals programmes, often
focusing on books and mainly in the humanities discipline, SPARC is more concerned with the STM crisis and often university presses don't have the capital to invest, resulting in a lack of initial support for SPARC. SPARC aims to take the first step in solving the scholarly publishing problems, working with all stakeholders, and try to build communication and relationships between them.

A survey conducted summer 2001 showed that libraries were not cancelling subscriptions on a large scale, but SPARC have, to date, raised awareness and offered alternatives within the publishing and higher education communities and all SPARC alternative journals have been a success.

The role of ARL is to aid libraries and inform faculty and administrators of initiatives to assist them in keeping costs down, to keep communication moving between stakeholders, in particular to libraries, to support SPARC and endorse SPARC alternative journals to assist in the STM and scholarly publishing crisis. ARL libraries are making resources available digitally, however they can and need to do more work electronically to help the system. ARL collaborates with the AAUP and ACLS (American Council of Learned Societies), and encourages libraries to work with presses on all projects, including electronic publishing. What is required is improved communication between the stakeholders and more experimentation. All stakeholders must put themselves at risk to help the system.

Conclusions:
Initial conclusions show that university presses are becoming increasingly active in electronic publishing, though some are utilising such capabilities more than others. The potential for an increase of revenue due to electronic publishing is there, though the extent of this depends on the type and scope of electronic publishing activities undertaken. All presses believe electronic publishing benefits the customer and fills the need of the market. The needed technology is not yet available to utilise electronic publishing in the required ways and currently the costs of successfully implementing electronic publishing are very high for little return.
Libraries varied in their attitudes and responses depending on the relationship with the university press and the collaboration that existed on electronic publishing projects. All libraries encouraged further collaboration with the university press in all aspects, particularly electronic publishing.

All university presses valued the contribution of the AAUP to their business. The activities undertaken, and provided, for the member presses are invaluable for such unique organisations.

Future Activities:
Future research will consist of five UK university press and library case studies, as well as questionnaires sent to each of the 20 UK university press directors. The findings from the USA research trip will be used in comparison to the UK data, from which business models will be developed to assist UK university presses and libraries. An article will be written based on the findings of the USA and UK case studies. Due acknowledgements to the John Campbell Trust will be made in the article.

The trip was vital for the research. USA case studies would not have been possible without funding from the John Campbell Trust. My thanks go to the John Campbell Trust and all involved, for the funding of this research.

References:

**Itinerary for the trip:**

**Monday 4th** – Fly to Logan International, Boston

**Tuesday 5th** – Harvard Business School Library. Tom Michalak – Executive Director. Baker Library, Cambridge, MA. (617) 495-6042. tmichalak@hbs.edu

**Wednesday 6th** – MIT Press. Frank Urbanowski – Director. 5 Cambridge Center, Cambridge, MA. (617) 253-5242. furb@mit.edu

Harvard UP, William Sisler – Director. 79 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA. (617) 495-2600. William_Sisler@harvard.edu

**Thursday 7th** – Harvard University Library. Professor Verba – Director. Ivy Anderson – Digital Acquisitions Program Librarian. Wadsworth House. 1341 Mass. Ave. Cambridge, MA. (617) 495-3650. sverba@hulmail.harvard.edu

Harvard Business School Publishing. Constance Devanthery-Lewis – Managing Editor, Print and Electronic Publishing. 300 North Beacon Street, Watertown, MA. (617) 783-7470. cdevanthery-lewis@hbsp.harvard.edu

**Tuesday 12th** – Columbia University Library. Kate Wittenberg – Director, Electronic Publishing Initiative at Columbia (EPIC). 507 Butler Library, 535 West 114th Street, NY. (212) 854-0167. kw49@columbia.edu

Columbia University Press. Bill Strachan – Director. 61 West, 62nd Street, New York, NY. (800) 459-0600 ext. 7118. wbs16@columbia.edu

**Wednesday 13th** – AAUP, Peter Givler – Executive Director. 71 West, 23rd Street, Room 901. New York. (212) 989-1010. pgivler@aaupnet.org

**Thursday 14th** – Rick Johnson - SPARC Executive Director. 21 Dupont Circle NW, Suite 800. Washington DC. (202) 296-2296 ext. 157 rick@arl.org and Mary Case, ARL – as above. marycase@arl.org

**Friday 15th** – Georgetown University Press, Richard Brown – Director. 3240 Prospect St NW. Washington, DC. (202) 687-5912. rebl@georgetown.edu
Interview surveys for USA case studies

Name of University Press:
Date of Interview:
Job Title:
Number of Staff:

Section One: Press information, goals and mission

1. How is the press funded?
2. What is the primary mission of the press?
3. What are your general long-term goals?
4. Subject areas? Print and/or Electronic
   - Reference
   - Scientific, technical, medical
   - Academic/educational
   - Commercial or business information
   - Financial/statistical
   - Legal, tax or patent information
   - Consumer or leisure
5. What proportion of your revenue currently comes from:
   Electronic Publishing?
   Paper Publishing?
   Other
6. What do you envisage the proportion being in two years time?
   Electronic Publishing?
   Paper Publishing?
   Other?
7. If your press is international, what proportion of your revenue is currently generated in:
   - The USA?
   - Continental Europe?
   - The UK?
   - Rest of the World?

1. In which areas do you see growth opportunities?
2. Which will be your chief target market over the next two years?
3. Where do you think the major opportunities for your company’s publishing activities will lie over the next two years?

Section Two: Electronic Publishing

1. Do you deliver services via the Internet (either directly or via third-party hosts)?
2. Why did/didn’t the press want to get involved with electronic publishing?
3. Do you (or your Internet Service Provider) charge customers for these services?
4. What is your charging mechanism? (E.g. subscription, pay-as-you-go)
5. Do you have any other revenue generating mechanisms? (E.g. advertising, sponsorship)
6. Are your Internet publishing activities intended to make a profit? If yes:
7. Are your Internet publishing activities currently profitable?
8. If not yet, when would you envisage them moving into profit?
9. What percentage of your electronic publishing activities comes from the Internet?
10. What electronic publishing ventures/initiatives have you taken? Projects?
11. Have such projects been successful? If yes, what would you attribute their success to?
12. What effect has electronic publishing had on the press? Staff? Turnover?
13. What is the current strategy/business plan for electronic publishing?
14. What have been the benefits of electronic publishing to date?
15. What have been the disadvantages of electronic publishing to date?
16. What are the most important lessons the press has learnt from undertaking electronic publishing?

17. What are your long-term goals/business plans in relation to electronic publishing?

18. How fast has your electronic publishing business grown over the past two years? What is your forecast for 2005?

Section Three: AAUP and collaboration

1. Why did the press become a member of the AAUP?

2. What are the primary benefits from membership in the AAUP?

3. Do you collaborate with other university presses? If yes, why did you choose to collaborate?

4. What are benefits of collaboration?

5. Does your chief competition come from:
   Other university presses?
   Commercial publishers?
   Continental Europe? (State which Countries)
   The UK?
   Japan?
   Other Asian Countries?
   Rest of World?

6. Are your chief competitors:
   Long established in your field?
   Recent market entrants?
   Broadly comparable, in terms of product line, to your own company?
   Active in a substantially different field?

Some questions and ideas taken from 'The Advance of Electronic Publishing'
Department of Trade and Industry. Williams, Peter (1999) 'Department of Trade and Industry Survey into Opportunities for Electronic Publishing in the UK'

Questions for library Staff, of case study university presses:
1. Job title:
2. Number of FTE Students:
3. Size of book stock:
4. Number of journals currently subscribed to
   - Electronic:
   - Print:
5. Annual budget
6. How has electronic publishing affected the library? Stock? Budget?
7. Is the library running any electronic publishing projects/programmes?
8. In what ways do you work with your university press?
9. What are the benefits for you as a library of having, being affiliated with, a university press?
10. How could university presses improve the way they work for the benefit of the library?
11. In what ways would it benefit the library for the press to become more active in electronic publishing?
12. What roles could/should the university press play?

Questions SPARC and ARL:
1. What are the main advantages for university presses in working with SPARC/ARL?
2. Is SPARC Europe working with or planning to work with UK university presses?
3. Have university presses been responsive to SPARC/ARL?
4. How successful do you think SPARC/ARL has been in the USA? Could be in Europe?
5. How well are SPARC journals doing - how many are in profit or breaking even?
6. What proportion of SPARC journals are university press titles, and is this proportion growing?
7. Has the decrease in library journal subscription (commercial) accelerated since SPARC was established?
8. What potential do you think university presses have and what role do you think university presses can play in improving the current scholarly publishing system?

9. Have the initiatives of SPARC/ARL had the required impact?

10. If no, in your view what is needed to make the required impact?

11. What is the relationship between SPARC/ARL and AAUP?

Questions for Director of AAUP:

1. What is the mission and purpose of the AAUP?

2. What programmes does AAUP run for its members?

3. How is the AAUP funded?

4. What are the benefits for AAUP members?

5. What is the AAUP view on electronic publishing at university presses?

6. Does AAUP support its members in electronic publishing initiatives?

7. How does the AAUP work with other organisations such as AAP, ARL, AAP and AAU (Association of American Universities)?

8. Do you work with SPARC?

9. Are there any initiatives for presses to work more with libraries and their Higher Education Institutions?

10. Are there opportunities for a UK association of university presses?
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Background
The scholarly publishing debate has been well documented and is undergoing continuous discussion in many arenas. It is clear that academic and scholarly publishing is in a state of flux (Tenopir and King, 2000). The tensions caused by the conflict between the price rises imposed by some commercial publishers for journals and the limited budgets of Higher Education Institution (HEI) libraries have caused real friction and there has been much talk of ways to by-pass commercial publishers. Many new players are entering the market. New services, such as SPARC, and initiatives such as the Public Library of Science and the Budapest Open Access Initiative have been developed to challenge the current pre-eminent role of commercial publishers in scholarly publishing. Other suggested initiatives include exploitation of the Web as a publishing medium, for example Harnad’s approach to the Open Archive Initiative, whereby authors place their scholarly materials on a Web site prior to submitting the materials for publication by more conventional means. Kohl (Kohl, 2001) has argued that academia has lost control of scholarly publishing. He explained academic publishing as a big business whose market is dominated by commercial publishers.

Despite the many changes that have occurred in the scholarly publishing industry in recent years (Tenopir and King, 2000), smaller university presses in the UK have remained minor players in scholarly communication. University presses in the UK vary greatly in size, subject, and staff, from very large to very small. Our research analyses the extent that university presses in the UK are involved in the evolution of scholarly communication and in the shift from traditional print material of scholarly works to the electronic environment. The research focuses on two hypotheses:
university presses are in a prime position to increase their power in the scholarly publishing system and could use electronic publishing to do so; and university presses need to experiment with and get involved in electronic publishing ventures and ensure these support and help further the mission and goals of the presses. Although UK university presses vary greatly, all have been included in the study to give a fair representation of the current situation.

We have defined the university press as a publishing house associated with a higher education institution, bearing its imprint, and primarily devoted to publishing scholarly, low-profit works. In general, writings about university presses have focused on the US situation; for one article discussing the UK university press situation, see (Davies, 1996).

History and Current UK Situation
The two best-known university presses in the UK are Cambridge University Press (with the first press book being printed in 1584) (Cambridge University Press, 2003) and Oxford University Press receiving a decree confirming its privilege to print books in 1586) printing its first book soon after. Printing was introduced to England in 1476 making these presses possibly the oldest general presses in the world.

Oxford University Press is the world’s largest university press with a large number of international offices. The press is a department of the university and policy of the press is controlled through a board of delegates comprised of academic staff. The press provides the university with financial return, transferring 30% of annual post-tax surplus to the university. As the university has charitable status, so, too does the press (Oxford University Press, 2002). University presses in the UK claim not-for-profit status. However, in general university presses are operated as businesses with the aim to maintain existence and grow.

Liverpool University Press was the third UK university press to be established (1899). Manchester University Press was the next press to be established (1903)
and publishes an average of 120 titles per annum along with seven journals. It has a presence in sixty countries and is self-supporting. The University of Wales Press was established in 1922 and has an average output of sixty titles per annum. It operates on a grant from the university. Edinburgh University Press is another well-established press in the UK, dating back to 1950. It publishes eighty titles per annum and twenty-three journals.

Exeter University Press was set up in 1990. Other UK presses are relatively small and were established only recently. The University of Hertfordshire Press was established in 1992 and operated with one staff member until recently. Between the years 1993 and 1996, Birmingham (with only one staff member), Bristol (Policy Press), Luton, Middlesex, Nottingham and York university presses were established (Davies, 1996). More recently Cranfield University Press has become active.

In April 2002, there were 21 operating UK university presses. At the time of writing this article, (January 2004) there were 17 university presses operating in the UK. Sheffield Hallam University Press closed in July 2003 after 23 years. Reasons for closure were that the director was retiring, and the cost of replacing skills required the university to invest in the press, which it had never done. The university was also cutting back due to financial constraints and a press was not considered part of core business. Bath University Press has not been actively publishing since 2002 and does not have a press director, and Greenwich has also ceased activity for financial reasons. Keele, which published an average of thirteen books a year, operated for a few years only and was acquired by Edinburgh University Press in 1997. Hull, which published around twelve books per annum was closed down in 2000 because it was not financially viable, and the University of North London (UNL) Press also proved unsustainable (James, 2002). Leicester University Press was bought from the university by Pinter Publishers and was subsequently sold to Cassell Academic. Today it functions as an imprint of Continuum. Aberdeen and Glasgow University Presses are other such closed presses.
Of these 17, one has also been bought by a commercial publisher: Open University Press (an independent publisher not affiliated to the Open University after it was sold to management in 1988) was sold to McGraw-Hill Education (Rickett, 2002) with the plan to keep the imprint of the university press.

Imperial College Press, now in a joint venture with a commercial publisher, World Scientific, and University College London, now owned by Cavendish publishers, (previously by Taylor and Francis) never had any direct relationship with the HEI nor were governed by an editorial board, but given the licence to use the name.

The USA has a huge number of university presses. The larger US presses have become more commercial, publishing trade books, whereas the smaller presses tend to publish regional works and works in niche areas. Unlike the USA which has the Association of American University Presses (AAUP) (Association of American University Presses, 2002) founded in 1937 by 17 university presses and managed by a board of directors, the UK does not have such an association. The Association of Learned, Professional and Society Publishers (ALPSP) (Association of Learned Professional Society Publishers) however, was established in 1972, and represents UK not-for-profit academic and professional publishers (Association of Learned Professional Society Publishers, 2001). Only four UK university presses are currently members of the ALPSP (University of Birmingham Press, Cambridge University Press, Edinburgh University Press and Oxford University Press).

Problems facing UK University Presses

Due to shrinking library budgets and escalating prices, many US and UK university presses have altered their vision, increasingly competing with the trade-publishing world, though not always with success (Sisler, 1996). Pochoda (Pochoda, 1997) explained that both large and small presses in the USA have reacted imaginatively to the dilemma by reducing the number of fields in which they publish, becoming more specialised, raising standards and turning a significant slice of their publishing programme over to books that are designed
for non-academic audiences, i.e., trade titles. In both the USA and UK a number of university presses has been forced to become more like general trade and textbook publishers while still trying to fulfil some semblance of their traditional roles as academic publishers (Brogdon, 1996). While some university presses seem to have always been more business oriented, in general, many trade titles are being accepted as a means to provide the funds to publish the more costly scholarly works (Ekman, 1996), (Barnes, 1998). Kasdorf puts it more elegantly: "...they suddenly had to pay their way. They rolled up their sleeves and rose to the occasion, developing excellent lines of regional titles, trade books, midlist books...and still struggled to bring out those important monographs" (Kasdorf, 2003).

In the UK shifts in publishing programmes have been seen in both the cut in print runs of the scholarly monograph, the shift to other types of works and the rise in journal publishing. Manchester and Edinburgh University Presses report a reverse in the figures with the ratio of monographs to textbooks shifting from 80:20 to 20:80 (Baker, 1998). Other UK presses have followed similar patterns. The University of Hertfordshire Press publishes books on the social, cultural and political aspects of the Romani, Liverpool concentrates on the public sculpture of Britain and local and regional publishing, The University of Birmingham Press specialises in European studies and religion and theology, and The University of Wales Press publishes Welsh language titles and has a focus on books about Europe (Baker, 1998).

University presses have suffered financially over the past decade. Traditionally, smaller university presses have either attained 'break-even' point or have relied on subsidy from their parent institutions and funding from outside sources. The shift to trade publishing and a focus on works with a wider audience means the possibilities and opportunities for self-sufficiency, or even profit, are more favourable. However, presses no longer see the possibility of being entirely self-sustaining, constantly seeking new sources of funding, proving that the primary mission of scholarly publishing is impossible without support (Baker, 1998). In the UK, many university presses are expected to break-even, and 'ideally ensure
some surplus for future development' (Baker, 1998). With their singular emphasis on editorial quality, however, at present, smaller university press profits are frequently nonexistent, and financial crises common.

Indeed, with lack of funds, the dual publishing role of scholarly and trade works has helped to maintain the publishing of traditional scholarly works that are too expensive to print without subsidies. However, Rosenthal argues that if presses are to remain true to their mission, subsidies or other sources of funding are essential (Rosenthal, 1985).

**Electronic Publishing at University Presses**

Electronic publishing is defined as the production and distribution of material in and through electronic formats, primarily via the Web. This definition was used throughout this study and with the directors of the university presses.

In the last few years, many new communication technologies have been introduced to higher education and publishing. Watkinson noted (Watkinson, 2001) that although the information revolution has opened the door to new opportunities, most university presses have not been in a position to take advantage of them. While as early as 1993, university presses in the USA were experimenting with the new communication technologies (Baker, 2001), these were generally basic and initiated with partners.

A limited but realistic picture can be drawn for the USA by a small survey conducted by *CHOICE Magazine*. Each year, a questionnaire is sent to members of the AAUP. The questionnaire sent to respondents in 2000 focused on electronic technologies and received a 70% response rate. Results showed that 56% of presses had experimented in some way with electronic formats and many presses were taking initiatives in electronic publishing (Bartlett, 2000). There did appear to be broad agreement that new technologies have the potential to help presses disseminate information more effectively. However, the majority of presses also predicted that efforts in electronic publishing would either remain constant or increase.
In the UK, Cambridge and Oxford University Presses are leading the electronic publishing initiatives. However, many of the smaller presses are also involved in the publishing of electronic journals or an electronic project in some way. In 1998, Cambridge University Press launched *Cambridge Journals Online* (Cambridge University Press), offering full access to around 50 leading journals. Boyle, the Journal Marketing Manager, recognising the benefits of electronic publishing stated, “The Web has become a key resource for many of our customers, and we are...delighted to launch this new...service. We are amongst the first publishers to provide Web access to journals...confident it will be welcomed...it demonstrates our ongoing commitment to adapting in order to meet market needs” (Fell, 1998).

Oxford University Press has also been working with new technologies. As well as offering more than 190 full text online journals, Oxford University Press is well known for its dictionary databases. The Oxford English Dictionary is available online, and the Concise English Dictionary, Oxford Thesaurus and Oxford Spellchecker have been licensed for three hand-held devices (Oxford University Press, 2002), Oxford Reference Online was launched in March 2002 (*OUP Sets Out Its Giant Online Reference Stall*, 2002), and Oxford Scholarship online was launched in October 2003 (Oxford University Press, 2002). Oxford has other online publishing projects underway.

Smaller presses such as Birmingham offer electronic journals, though others do not publish journals and face barriers, such as author permissions, and infrastructure, when it comes to publishing reference and other works electronically.

Freeman discussed the vital role that university presses can play in the new environment for the HEI: “Such endurance also suggests that university presses...are uniquely well suited to performing this crucial task...a successful transition to electronic publishing in academia will depend in part on the degree to which university presses are incorporated into the process.... university presses
offer a great deal of expertise that can help to ensure that such a transition is successful" (Freeman, 1994). Rosenthal argues that collaboration can only help university presses to more successfully fulfil their mission (Rosenthal, 1985).

The argument that each stakeholder in the system of scholarly communication, (namely, the university press (or publisher in general), the author, the library, end user, and the intermediary), has been too self-focused is raised in many discussions. Collaboration amongst these groups has been argued as a way to overcome current obstacles and move forward to become more active in electronic publishing and lower prices.

Recently however, collaboration has become more common. The University of North Carolina Press and its library have held annual meetings since 1993 to learn about each other's work (Flowers, 1998). It is not uncommon to find librarians and university presses working together on many projects today (Baker, 2001) e.g., CIAO at Columbia University Press and library and in the UK, Cranfield University Press library director is also the director of the university press. While it is clear a substantial effort is required if university presses are to maintain their place in the changing market, social aspects, as well as business, technical, economical and management issues need to be considered (Hovav and Gray, 1997).

Methods adopted
Quantitative and qualitative questionnaires were sent to all 17 UK university press directors in February 2003. Subsequently, five UK university press case studies were conducted. Research was also conducted at five USA university presses, and an email questionnaire was distributed to 100 authors who had published with both a university press and a commercial publisher. In this paper, we report the results of the questionnaire of UK presses. Results from the other studies will appear in a future article.

12 of the 17 (70%) UK university press directors completed the questionnaires. Two did not, giving valid reasons, leaving three who did not reply. The
qualitative questionnaire was separated into three sections. Section one covered general press information, goals and mission, section two dealt with electronic publishing and section three covered collaboration with other university presses. The quantitative questionnaire (used to gain a general overview into the UK situation) was based on a questionnaire used by Oppenheim, Greenhalgh and Rowland (Oppenheim, Greenhalgh, and Rowland, 2000) which was completed by 187 UK-based scholarly journal publishers (undertaken in conjunction with a broader-based research project, carried out on behalf of the Department of Trade and Industry) regarding the future of the UK electronic publishing industry. Of the 187 publishers 11 were university presses, 71 were learned and professional societies and the majority, 105, were commercial publishers. The sample used in this study is small but valid, as it includes the whole population, i.e., all operating UK university presses.

UK Director Questionnaires

Results of the questionnaires showed that five presses were subsidised by their HEI, and four presses were nominally self-funded, though these presses received funding from other sources: bank financing, a lottery grant, project funding, one had entered into a venture with a commercial publisher, and one was operated as a side business of the Higher Education Institution.

Press Goals

The most common long-term goals of the presses were to: develop new technology (stated by three university presses), increase output (again mentioned by three) and be the best in their specialist field (stated by two presses). Other goals mentioned by individual presses included; continue with the mission, achieve limited company status, collaborate with the HEI library and computing services, publish in more areas central to the HEI, and balance academic obligations with financial imperatives.

Relationship with the HEI

11 university press directors reported a relationship with their Higher Education Institution. However, five presses stated they were independent from their HEI.
Directors clearly viewed independence very differently. Two presses stated they were a department of the university, two reported being wholly owned by the university, two were part of the HEI Information services, two existed to promote the HEI, and two to serve the needs of the HEI. Only one press reported receiving accommodation and paid for rent by the HEI and one director reported being employed by the university. UK university presses therefore continue to have a strong link with their parent Higher Education Institution, although these relationships are not strongly related to funding or subsidy.

Ten presses do not give priority to their own HEI staff, one press does and one stated ‘not necessarily’. UK university presses clearly do not operate as vanity presses and instead seek wide authorship. University presses also have wide dissemination and sales. 11 of the 12 presses were selling internationally. The majority of these 11 presses used international agents, representatives and aggregators, aiming to disseminate to the widest market.

Publishing Opportunities
Five presses believed publishing opportunities lay in the growth of certain subject areas, while two presses saw opportunities using print on demand technology, and two in e learning. Other presses saw opportunities in reference material, the trade market, electronic publishing, textbooks, strategic alliances, and facsimile publishing.

Electronic Publishing
Nine presses reported they had taken initiatives in electronic publishing, and three stated they had not. Of those that had not taken initiatives in electronic publishing, two presses stated they had plans to introduce electronic publishing and one press reported they did not. Five of the nine presses that had taken initiatives in electronic publishing stated they had been successful, three said it was too early to respond and one reported no success. Reasons for success included; having established print journals, limiting products to areas in which there is demonstrated consumer demand, not investing too heavily, outside
assistance, clear positioning, customised websites, and having products that are valued by students.

Two presses stated electronic publishing had had no appreciable effect, or no effect to date. One stated it had no effect on staff. However, two presses talked of a large effect on staff both positive and negative, and one reported the new recruitment of staff, business partners and authors. One press mentioned that turnover had stabilised, and another talked of planning for an electronic future. Electronic publishing has been undertaken to some degree by UK university presses with plans for an electronic future.

When asked about the current strategy/business plan for electronic publishing, four presses plan to develop their electronic journals and two aim to build relations with international partners or the HEI library and computing services. Other strategies included working on further partnerships, the provision of electronic services, keeping watch as to what technology was appropriate, increasing output, developing an electronic archive, introducing electronic publishing, and a shift from print to online.

All but two respondents listed benefits from electronic publishing; one stating there were no benefits and one arguing they were not yet quantifiable. As far as benefits were concerned, two presses mentioned status, two mentioned authors like to know the press can do it, and other comments included business retention, being leading edge, improved production, good student response, beneficial for publishing learning materials, and ongoing benefits.

When asked about disadvantages of undertaking electronic publishing projects, one press stated there were none, one stated progress was too slow, while two stressed the large amount of time taken versus the lack of income. Four stated the high investment required with initial low returns.

Lessons learned from electronic publishing included the balance between cost and benefit, electronic publishing is very costly if there is no demand and no immediate payback, the difficulty of extracting payment for electronic only
products, the need for staff training, electronic publishing takes patience and hard work, asset management is very difficult and there are legal and copyright problems. One stated 'don't lead – wait and see what the market wants', another reported having no data to analyse, and another press stated that the press learned its lessons from others.

Collaboration
When asked about collaboration with other university presses, six presses reported no collaboration, one press collaborated in the past but no longer does and one press was looking for new partners. One had an informal relationship with another press, one collaborated when they felt it was appropriate and two presses reported formal relationships of collaboration with reasons for collaboration being mutual economies of scale.

The majority of these presses named both commercial and university presses as their primary competitors. Two university presses stated they have no major competitor and this was because they publish in niche subject areas. One press surprisingly listed a competitor that was a local printer, rather than a publishing house.

Eight presses stated they would benefit from UK collaboration. No press said they wouldn’t benefit, and three stated possibly or maybe. In response to the idea of joining a UK association of university presses, one press stated it would not, three stated possibly, but the majority, seven, stated they would. One director was interested in any publishing community similar to his own, but another believed there were not enough players in the UK for such an organisation. One director reported being in the process of attempting to orchestrate such an organisation. The majority of presses saw a need for collaboration.

Quantitative Questionnaire
The respondents were also asked to complete a quantitative questionnaire. This was based on the questionnaire used by Greenhalgh et al (Oppenheim, Greenhalgh, and Rowland, 2000) for the comparison of results. One question
asked was: what percentage (if any) of your products is published in electronic format? The directors were asked for percentage estimates two years ago, currently and in two years time. Two years ago, all respondents claimed the percentage of products published in electronic format was between 0 – 25%. 11 directors stated it was currently the same as it was two years ago (0-25%), with, however, one director stating over 75% of its products were published in electronic format. The prediction for the future showed five presses continuing to publish between 0-25% in electronic format, six between 26-50%, and one over 75%.

Greenhalgh reported 42% of scholarly publishers producing products in an electronic format by the end of 1996, with a further 74% by the end of 1998. However, 93% of respondents expected to be publishing in electronic format by the end of 2000. (Oppenheim, Greenhalgh, and Rowland, 2000; Baker, 2003). These smaller university presses have not undertaken electronic publishing initiatives with as much vigour as bigger learned societies and commercial houses, nor do they envision this as increasing much, if at all, in the future.

The same question was asked but referred to the amount of revenue derived from electronic publishing. Greenhalgh reported that 58% of respondents reported the generation of revenue from electronic publishing. This study revealed that two years ago all presses received between 0–25% of their revenue from electronic publishing; that the presses all reported receiving between 0-25% in 2002, and in two years time all but one director believed it would remain the same (between 0-25%) with one stating it would be between 26-50%. This shows that the university press sector does not generate, or expect to generate, much revenue from electronic publishing.

Other results proved interesting. Nine directors believed that publishing electronically would not improve products. Greenhalgh reported a similar result; 64% agreed that reaching the market is more difficult with electronic products than paper, but that there are sufficient potential customers for these products, however, 45% believed that customers are not willing to access material
electronically. In our survey, nine believed there was intense competition in the electronic market, although only five agreed with the statement that customers would pay a realistic price for electronic products. Greenhalgh reported over 40% agreeing that customers would not pay a realistic price.

Seven directors agreed that common technical standards are adequate. The majority of press directors (nine) believed there were not sufficient trained personnel to undertake electronic publishing. In contrast, Greenhalgh reported only 47% feeling this way and 53% arguing that there exists a lack of understanding of electronic publishing among senior management. Greenhalgh argued that there was a lack of technological skills alongside marketing skills and that publishers need to be more commercially aware for electronic publishing to succeed.

The majority of presses (nine in this study and 60% reported by Greenhalgh) also felt strongly that the immaturity of online charging mechanisms is a constraint to business development. However, in our survey, eight directors agreed that costs of maintaining parallel print and electronic products are not prohibitively high. In our survey, ten directors believed that electronic products do not damage sale of paper-based products; this result is similar to Greenhalgh’s findings (Oppenheim, Greenhalgh, and Rowland, 2000).

When discussing obstacles to a faster growth of electronic publishing, seven directors believed that shortage of capital was a serious impediment, with the complexity of the technology required seen as a minor impediment. When discussing support from their Higher Education Institution, surprisingly seven saw a lack of help as a minor impediment, with only five viewing it as a major problem.

When asked to list three key factors that would help the electronic publishing business grow, the most common factors given in Greenhalgh et al in descending order, were as follows:
1. More trained and experienced staff;
2. Greater uptake and acceptance of information in electronic format;
3. Secure payment mechanisms;
4. Improved market information;
5. Greater copyright protection;
6. Improved technical infrastructure;
7. Greater funding for libraries and universities;
8. Easier access to capital;

Results in our study revealed:

1. Easy payment system
2. Cultural change in paying for electronic goods and amongst Higher Education
3. Increase in project funding
4. More national government support
5. More evidence of a market
6. Better understanding of technology

While Greenhalgh reported business, marketing and staffing issues as the publishers’ main concerns, this study revealed that payment systems and a culture change within Higher Education would most help UK university presses electronic publishing business to expand.

What Does the Future Hold?
The majority of smaller UK university presses struggle with funding and have adopted a variety of ways to remain in business. Many university presses are now expected to make a profit and are not financially supported by their Higher Education Institution. While some university presses do have links with the parent HEI, financial support is decreasing, and university presses face an increasing search for outside funding. These small publishers require funding and financial support or risk failing to make any impact in the current environment. With press closures and cuts in print runs, the future of the small UK university press is unknown and uncertain, despite the critical role they could fulfil.
The majority of presses have undertaken electronic publishing in some form, though only the larger presses have done so to a significant degree. While directors believed electronic publishing was important, predictions for the level of future electronic publishing were generally low, as was future revenue. It seems paper publishing will continue to be important due to perceived low amounts of revenue from electronic publishing initiatives. The electronic publishing business plans and strategies adopted were conservative; university press directors believed that although there is a market for electronic products, they are unsure how to reach it and believe many issues need to be addressed. There is, therefore, a need for a change in attitude towards electronic publishing amongst the higher education community. The results demonstrate however, that there is a culture shift occurring amongst publishers; press directors no longer believe the costs of parallel printing to be prohibitively high and agree that electronic publishing does not damage the sales of print based products.

Nonetheless, whilst e-publishing initiatives solve some short-term problems, they are generally not integrated or large enough to make the required impact. Electronic publishing has not been sufficiently utilised by university presses and they require guidelines and standards for electronic publishing, and a need to learn from those with more experience.

If university presses are to take advantage of the current climate in scholarly publishing, they will need enthusiasm, influence and concerted action in order to establish the level of organisation required to compete with established commercial channels. Many university press directors stressed the need and desire for further collaboration. There may, therefore, be a future role for a UK association. Joint ventures bring a range of benefits and create competitive advantage, driving the industry forward. However, each press must retain its individuality and remain flexible and attentive to the market.

Greenhalgh stated in her conclusion “Academia should look to the current not-for-profit system run by the learned societies and university presses. These publishers are well placed to capitalise on any ‘anti-commercial’ feelings, as their
objectives are closer to those of academia. These bodies could become the key in the future dissemination of scholarly communication" (Oppenheim, Greenhalgh, and Rowland, 2000).

It is our opinion that University presses could have a crucial role to play in the future scholarly publishing arena. University presses need to experiment with, and get involved in appropriate electronic publishing ventures and ensure these support and help further the mission and goals of the press. In order to successfully accomplish this, university presses need to collaborate and cooperate with each other and with the Higher Education Institution faculty and administrators with whom they are affiliated as well as appropriate funding bodies and organisations such as SPARC.

The results of the research will be used to develop business models for small UK university presses to undertake electronic publishing. A business plan for a possible association/group of UK university presses will also be written. These will be described in a forthcoming article.
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