Open Science Talk No. 41 (2022): Dr. h.c. Johan Rooryck – an in-depth interview : a computer-generated transcript [1]

00:00:06 Per Pippin Aspaas

You are listening to Open Science Talk, the podcast about open science. My name is Per Pippin Aspaas and I'm joined today by a man with a big smile on his face. He has just been nominated and created an honorary doctor at UiT the Arctic University of Norway. This happened less than 24 hours ago and I'll read aloud something in Latin for the first time in this podcast's history, just to put you in the right mood. *Quod felix fortunatum faustumque sit: anno bis millesimo vicesimo secundo Kalendis Septembribus ab hora secunda pomeridiana usque, ni fallor, in mediam fere noctem virum illustrissimum doctissimumque, professorem nempe Francogallicae linguae in studiorum universitate quae Lugduni Batavorum floret et principem editorum diarii academici quod olim Lingua nunc autem Glossa est et ducem fortissimum proiecti vel, ut ita dicam, belli Europaei Plan S dicti, praesertim singularibus in litteraturam academicam liberi accessus adamantalis via divulgandam meritis notum: dominum scilicet Johannem Rooryck coryphaei huiusce universitatis doctorem honoris causa, idque merito, creaverunt atque celebraverunt.* Congratulations, Johan!

00:02:29 Johan Rooryck

Thank you.

00:02:30 PPA

And welcome to the podcast.

00:02:32 JR

Very happy to be here!

00:02:32 PPA

How was your last day?

00:02:36 JR

It was wonderful, really. I mean, we had a full day of events and ceremony and very nice dinners and very pleasant company. The crown prince was here to for the celebration. So it's very interesting to see the royal family taking such a great interest in academic life and research. So yeah, it was quite wonderful, really.

00:03:06 PPA

Yes. And you're an honorary doctor now, at UiT. And I heard the vice rector yesterday say that it was because of two things. One was your eminent work as a linguist and and the other was for your eminent work in terms of Open Access. And you could start first with your – actually, you have a linguist back background. So if we go back to the Latin again, *professor Francogallicae linguae*: you're actually a professor of French linguistics and just – could you just mention: how did you come from that background onto a Open Access field?

00:03:59 JR

Yes, actually it's true that I do French linguistics – well, that's my focus. But in fact it's a little bit broader. I work also on Romance linguistics and Germanic linguistics – and the small differences, the smaller and greater differences between the two types of languages. So that is one thing, and I do that from a perspective of theoretical linguistics. So I work mainly in syntax and in the relationship between syntax and semantics from a generative linguistics perspective, a Chomskyan perspective. And so it's very much this generative linguistics perspective that informs my work on Romance and Germanic. And in 1999, I became the executive editor of the journal *Lingua*. This is actually a very – a bit of a sad context. Until 1998, a good friend of mine and a colleague at Leiden University where I worked since 1993, unexpectedly died of renal cancer and he asked me before he died – because that was still the way of doing things at the time, sort of dynastic succession at journals – he asked me before he died to take over the journal, which of course was something that I felt honour bound to do. So I took over, but of course, and in the beginning – in the beginning, of course, I was just an editor. But one of the things that struck me at the time is that the relationship between the publisher and the editors at the time was was very much one of a kind of gentlemen's agreement. I had a contract of one page with them and, you know, they would say we have this many subscriptions and here is your fee for that and it was all very, you know, very gentlemanly, so to speak, they took me out once a year for dinner. And all of that changed very quickly, actually. The next ten years it became a very transactional relationship with them – with the publisher, in this case Elsevier – becoming more and more demanding on how I spent my time and what the targets were and meddling into how associate editors were selected. And then of course, there was the serials crisis which came to the fore in the late 2000s.

00:06:32 PPA

Yeah, the serials crisis. Could you just explain that for people who don't know?

00:06:35 JR

Yeah, so the serious crisis is the crisis that – that people started to realise, in the course of that period, that subscription prices had risen much more than inflation or than library budgets could afford. So basically, you know, publishing houses were at hand to take advantage of universities and university budgets. And that became really an issue around – that crystallised around 2010 with the the Elsevier boycott organised by Tim Gowers and others, a boycott that said: look, don't don't review, don't publish in Elsevier anymore – in Elsevier journals anymore – because they're exploitative of the academic community. And that got me thinking because, you know, I mean a number of people started telling me: we don't want to review for you anymore because you are, you know, you are working for the enemy, basically. And that really got me thinking because, I mean, if you start losing your good reviewers because they tell you: look, I don't want to review for Elsevier anymore out of principle. You do wonder whether you are not collaborating with the enemy, so to speak. So I started exploring other options, so that was about the time that I also got into contact with a number of Open Access activists, so to speak.

00:07:53 PPA

Yeah, you came in contact with with activists, but also people who were able to do things, make things happen themselves. So how how did you make this famous transition from Lingua, where you left Elsevier collectively together with all your co-editors?

00:08:13 JR

Yes. So my the first stage was getting acquainted with Open Access and I was fortunate enough to meet some people who were really able to tell me about that and I decided, of course, to keep this

quiet and to prepare a transition, especially when at the time when Elsevier started telling me things like: you should have an editor from Asia. And then I said: OK, an editor from Asia? And what they actually meant was China, because they were selling at the time a lot of subscriptions there. So they wanted an editor on the board of *Lingua* that was from China, but at the time, there were very few people in my field – or in the field that *Lingua* was dedicated to – that were actually, that I could have even put on the board. So I was very proud at one point to have found someone that was what I would consider the perfect Pacific Rim candidate. You know, I mean, somebody who was from China – no, somebody with a Chinese background who was from Korea – and who was actually working at Simon Fraser in Canada, so more Pacific Rim than that and more more all round Asian than that, you know, you couldn't imagine it. And they weren't satisfied, they said: next time you will have to do better. And so there was this tug of war, you know, I mean, where before I was my own person and, you know, the team could decide themselves with who they took on board. Suddenly they started meddling in affairs that we thought were proper to the running of the intellectual content of the journal, and I wasn't pleased at all. And I – since I had been with them for, like, ten years, I could see where this was going because this was this constant narrowing of the conditions under which you had to work. Like I said, I started with a contract of one page. I ended up at the end of my tenure with the with a 27-page contract in which they stipulated that all the correspondents that I had with authors and reviewers was their property, that all the authors that I had painstakingly put into the system – so, about 3000 authors and reviewers names – those names, that list belonged to them. So there was clearly this conflict in who has responsibility for what. And so that got me thinking about – and together also with my Open Access friends – about what the proper structure of a journal should be. So our idea about the proper structure of a journal should be that every intellectual decision – and that includes governance of the journal and ownership of the journal as a title and – so, the way the journal is run – that that should be in the hands of the academic community, and that the publisher really is just a printer – you know, I mean, they can they deliver services, certainly: they make sure that the articles look good, they make sure that the journal is marketed, and they can ask the price for those services. That's not a problem, but we are in control, not the publisher. That was my idea of what a journal should look like. And so, slowly, I convinced – I started convincing the members of my editorial team and board of that. And I said: look, if I find the money to do the transition, will you follow me? And everybody said: yeah, sure. I mean, you know: we know that this is for a good cause and we trust you. And it is true that the fact that I had done this for a long time – I had built, you know, I had built up some credit in the community by doing this. If you do this for ten years and, you know, people are not too angry at you and they think you are doing a good job, you get some credit. And I think that credit accounted for a lot. And so that they knew that this was not some brain scheme Johan devised on a Sunday morning because, you know, he was angry at something that happened with Elsevier – no, they knew that this was well thought out. And then this was there this string of serendipitous moments. In fact, I mean, around 2014 Elsevier and the Association of Dutch Universities were negotiating a new contract and I was there with my project and we got into contact with the boss – the then boss of the association – who was a very dynamic and forward-looking person. And they said: OK, we'll give you some money for the transition and, you know, just do it. And I said: OK, that's nice to have money for the transition, but I also need a long term solution. And that's when I met Martin Eve of the Open Library of Humanities, who have a consortial library model, which basically means that every library that is a member of the Open Library of Humanities gives a relatively small amount of money, something between 700 and 2000 Euros a year. And they have, like, 300 libraries doing that and with that money they keep alive, they pay for the costs of about 30 academic journals in the humanities. And Martin offered me that *Lingua*, that *Glossa* – the new journal that we founded after leaving *Lingua* – would then be a part of the Open Library of Humanities once the money for the transition ran out. So I had both things at

that time. I had money for the transition, which was needed because you need to prepare things and you need to convince people, and we also wanted to get along some other journals because there were some other journals that I wanted to flip alongside with us. So that on the one hand we had a long term solution in the sense that of course, if you're an editor of a journal with a long history, then you want that journal to go on for the next, the next foreseeable future. So *Lingua* was a journal that had been founded in 1949 by two professors – one at Leiden, one at Amsterdam. So it had a venerable history in the field and, you know, when you make that decision, you don't take it lightly. You want that journey to continue. So we then consulted – with that transition money we consulted some lawyers because of course, you know, you don't want to do this without proper legal advice. And they advised us to first – to not, you know, go head first into a transition but to propose Elsevier first to renegotiate the terms of the contract, which is what we did. We offered Elsevier to work on the different conditions, to make the journal Open Access, to give us the title and to hand over the title to work with reasonable Article Processing Fees of about four or five hundred Euros. And of course, the people at Elsevier could not believe what they were hearing.

00:15:05 PPA

Yeah, because that, that was some years ago, right? It was around 2014?

00:15:09 JR

'15.

00:15:10 PPA

Yeah. So back then, Article Processing Charges were coming – the term now known as Gold Open Access. But I believe – Open Library of Humanities, they are more into the Diamond Open Access, right?

00:15:24 JR

Yes, yes. That's why they have a very different model. At that time, *Lingua* was already a hybrid journal, so you could publish articles – hybrid journal means that, you know, the journal has basically two sides: there is an open access side where articles are published for Open Access, if you can pay for the fee, and you publish them behin a the paywall, if you cannot pay for the fee. So that's how hybrid journals work. The model of the Open Library of Humanities was completely different, they said, they said to the libraries: look, you pay a fee – a flat fee annually – and in exchange for that we we make sure that there are 30 journals that produce content and that is at the disposal of everyone. So that's the model known as Diamond Open Access, because basically what happens is that the articles are free for the reader and they're also free to the author. The author doesn't have to pay a fee – because the fee, the costs for the article – are carried by the participating libraries in this case. So that is how that model is called Diamond Open Access. Diamond Open Access is a model whereby neither authors nor readers pay for accessing content and of course, it's a very equitable model. I think one of the main advantages of Diamond Open Access is that it is, first of all, scholar controlled and scholar-owned most of the time. Secondly, that it is equitable by design, as I call it. Namely, everybody can publish there if the quality, the scientific and scholarly quality of the article is good enough – is deemed good enough by the peers. That means that you don't need to have money to publish as an author – you do need to have money as an editor or as a publisher to publish of course – but it means, for instance, that authors from lower and middle income countries who do not have access to funds for publication fees, can freely publish in the journal if their paper is deemed good enough, whereas that is not the case in hybrid journals or in Gold Open Access journals. Very often, Gold Open Access journals and hybrid journals charge fees between two and three thousand Euros – I think the lowest fees these days is something like fourteen hundred, the highest fee is about ten

thousand – and these are prices that are expensive already for Northern authors, I would say, or Western authors, but certainly they're completely inaccessible for people of lower and middle income countries. And basically I think what Gold Open Access does is create a two tier system between researchers, namely researchers who can afford to pay and researchers who cannot afford to pay. What is even worse, I think about the gold Open Access system is that it is a one-size-fits-all approach, namely there is one fee that is set for the entire the world, which is very strange if you think about it, because there's almost no service that works that way, or product that works that way. If you look at Coca-Cola or flight tickets or even aspirin, you know, those prices are differentiated the world over as a function of local purchasing power. It's – really, the prices are what the market can bear and here it's not what the market can bear. And here it's not what the market can bear, it's what the publishing houses impose.

00:19:00 PPA

Could I just ask, market: diamond open access, Open Library of Humanities, it seems out of this market thinking. Am I right there?

00:19:12 JR

Yes, it's definitely out of the market thinking, it's a way of publishing that functions within the academic community. That is also something that I like about it. It is basically funded by the funding that universities receive. And so that operates outside of a market, so to speak. Of course there is a market aspect to it, in the sense that even the Open Library of Humanities hire specific services – for instance, services of copy editing and services of type setting: making the XML and the PDF of the article is something that is farmed out in the case of the Open Library of Humanities to a company in India called Silicon Chips, who ask for a decent price for their services. I mean, they're certainly not the cheapest, but they deliver a very good quality service, I must say. For instance, linguistics articles are really difficult because, I mean, you know, we have all these different typefaces for phonetic symbols – we have phonetic symbols, semantic symbols, tables, graphs – so, you know, if you can type set a linguistics article, you can type set pretty much everything. And they do a remarkably good job. And the Open Library of Humanities pays them – pays them a fee per article for these services, but it is a contract. I mean, we are in control of them, they are not in control of us. You see what I mean?

00:20:39 PPA

Yes.

00:20:40 JR

So in that sense, there is a participation in the market, because there are certain services that you don't want to do yourself. But the entire control is within the academic community, which is something that I very much think is a way forward for academic publishing, which as as you know is right now, for the most part, controlled by the Big 5 academic publishers who make tremendous profits on these Article Processing Charges and on these subscriptions – profits which they make on on taxpayer money, which I don't think is right. As I've said before, I think scholarly production and articles are a common good, common good of mankind. In the same way as as you have the right to clean water, the population has a right to the knowledge that we as scientists produced. It's just a basic human right.

00:21:36 PPA

So we started out now – we're talking a lot about – general linguistics is a very international research field. Of course, there are practitioners of this, researchers spread all over the world, so it's big in one

way, but in another sense it's not as big as certain other disciplines where you have, like, literally thousands of articles submitted to journals per week, right? So, do you have examples of this non-commercial Diamond Open Access thinking – scholarly-led, scholarly-owned – in other fields that are more like the big natural sciences?

00:22:17 JR

Yes, there is one example, actually. Well, there's a few. I think there is a journal in Oceanography – but again, I mean, it's perhaps also a smaller thing, but I think in oceanography there is one journal – I'm sure I saw one – but there is one great example I think, which is the example of *SciPost*. *SciPost* is a Diamond Open Access journal run by Jean-Sébastien Caux who is a professor of physics at the University of Amsterdam. I think they publish about 600 articles a year, something like that. They have, you know, great volume and they really intend to be the competitor of the big journals in the sciences. Yes, I think we should have more of those, definitely. Because indeed, Diamond Open Access is mostly in relatively small fields, from very very small to moderately small – moderate, medium – I think *Glossa* as a journal is a, sort of, mid-level journal, I think. A journal that publishes about 130 articles a year is, sort of, a mid level journal. But then, of course, indeed you have these journals that publish hundreds or thousands of articles a year. Also in mathematics there are a couple of examples – *Journal of Combinatorics*, for instance, also publishes quite a number of articles a year. So these things are slowly starting and I hope to see them flourish in the next few years.

00:23:48 PPA

Yeah, because what I was thinking is: you actually were lucky, you found a place to land, so to speak, to go from Elsevier to land to a platform that was exactly what you needed. But I guess other editors in other fields – well, they're not in the humanities. So where to land? Do you have examples of platforms like this, or are these something only for certain fields?

00:24:11 JR

No, I think *SciPost* is a platform that allows other fields to flip as well, or to set up a journal. Of course they will need money, but this is something that we will look at. I mean, we are, as you know, we are also developing a project – or we are starting a project – to reinforce Diamond journals. So what we want to do is to create an international Capacity Centre that would make sure that these journals become sustainable and that it becomes easier for journals to start, also in terms of finances.

00:24:44 PPA

Yeah, just for the audience who don't know you: we're now moving on to your very recent task as being the Executive Director of cOAlition S – the coalition that is known for promoting Plan S – so you've been there for the last two years, I think?

00:25:06 JR

Yeah, since 2019 in September – it will be 3 years, yeah.

00:25:09 PPA

Yeah. So, you're now you're sitting in that chair for quite some time, so I guess you've had – you have lots of experience already, on how to try and and change the system because Plan S is trying to flip everything onto an Open Access reality.

00:25:28 JR

Yes, so the single goal of Plan S is, actually, that all articles that come out of research financed by the organisations that are members of Plan S – and most of the time, these funders work with public money – that all publications coming out of that have to be published in Open Access in one way or

another. So that means Gold Open Access, when you pay for it; via transformative agreements, when the libraries pay for it; Diamond Open Access; or even via repositories. So if you publish behind a paywall, then you will have to deposit a copy of the article in a repository. So this has simply become, since 2021, a condition of the contracts that researchers conclude with the funders. So this is simply because of the sense of frustration by these founders, back in 2018. They didn't see a return on investment for them, because of course, you know, these founders that we have now collectively put about 35 billion Euros into research, with an output of about 150 thousand articles a year. And the frustration there is that, even today, only 55% of those articles are in Open Access. That has to be 100%. It has to be 100% because, of course, you know, societal challenges – Ebola, COVID, lately also monkeypox virus – they don't want to go back to the publishers and sit on their knees and ask: will you please make that research Open Access? and then see it closed down again, six months later when the threat has passed. No, all of that research has to be openly accessible. So that was a bold move – certainly a move that was not welcomed, shall we say, by the big publishers, or only welcomed by the big publishers, to the extent that they were guaranteed money, big, large amounts of money for it. So that was the one goal of Plan S, and that is also why I signed on. I thought: OK, this is a great initiative. What I liked about the initiative is that it didn't think that there was a single silver bullet to get to Open Access – because Open Access is a field, I think, where there's a lot of utopian thinking. I mean, lots of people think that they have the one solution. For instance, there are people who think we have to just stop concluding contracts with these big publishers and move to a completely different system. The problem is – you cannot do that overnight, because researchers are human beings. They function with certain expectations, and they have all been led to believe that they have to publish in the large, prestigous journals. And this is a mentality change that you need to work on, that it takes time to change, and especially in these big fields that you're talking about, with thousands of articles, the notion of prestige of a journal is extremely important, and the notion of impact factors is completely – is also very important – and this is something that needs change. We need to slowly change the mentality and slowly convince the researchers that this is no longer what we're looking at, that we don't want researchers to publish in such high-prestige journals, and this was actually also a principle of Plan S. Principle 10 says: we don't care about prestige, we care about the content – and also when we select people for grants, that is what we look at. We don't look at impact factors. We are not interested in the impact factor of the journal that you publish in, we're interested in what you think is important about your research – so please explain that to us. And I think, what I liked about it was the integrated approach. Or, well, should I say: we reject commercial publishing. The honest attempt to try to convince commercial publishing to change tack by saying, for instance: well, we will no longer pay for hybrid journals, because hybrid journals have not led to Open Access, so we reject – we will no longer allow our researchers to pay for articles in hybrid journals. So we will pay for articles in full Open Access journals because that contributes to a future of Open Access, even if those fees are expensive, and we acknowledge those fees are expensive, but we want them to be transparent. So we want to understand what goes into the cost. We understand that publishing costs money, but publisher: please explain to us why it has to cost 3000 Euros. Where does your costs go? I think that's fair – that's a fair way of approaching a commercial actor, right? I mean, if if you go to the hairdresser – I mean, in my case, of course, it's difficult, I never go to the hairdresser – but if you go to the hairdresser, you get an itemised list of things that they do for you, right? I mean, there's shampoo – there's this, there's that – and you know what you pay for. The same when you go to service your car, you know that you pay for the windshield wipers and the change of oil. And if you think that is too expensive, you can go elsewhere in the same way. We want the prices of high of of, of Open Access fees and costs and prices to transparent. So this is one of the things that I really liked about Plan S – the very pragmatic approach of complementary policies. So on the one hand, commercial, yes, but please be transparent: you can publish in a subscription journal as well, that's

not a problem. We do not prevent our authors to publish anywhere they want, but there are conditions: if you publish in a subscription journal and you choose to publish behind a paywall, well, then it's incumbent on you, dear author, to make sure that the last version, the pre-final version of your article – the so-called author's accepted manuscript – that you keep rights on that, so-called CC BY – this is the Rights Retention Strategy – and that then you put that Author Accepted ;anuscript copy in a repository that is openly accessible. And in the same way, of course, we were looking at Diamond. We saw that Diamond is an opportunity for us to take back control of academic publishing. And we decided to – or, at least some some funders decided to launch a plan – a Diamond Action Plan to federate Diamond Open Access journals in Europe – and with the help of the European Community, who launched a call for such a plan for what they called, euphemistically, institutional publishing – they launched a call and we wrote a project, we meaning a number of actors in this, 23 organisations, among which UiT the Arctic University of Norway, who were a member of this coalition that wrote a plan to look into Diamond Open Access, to see how it could be strengthened further.

00:32:46 PPA

So this project is now starting.

00:32:50 JR

Yes, so now we have come full circle. This is the project that now has started with members of UiT onboard – Jan Erik, as you know, Jan Erik Frantsvåg, who is on board. And so I very much look forward to seeing that project. Concurrently, there is another project that will look at infrastructure for Diamond Open Access, that is led by Margo Bargheer at the University of Göttingen, and cOAlition S is also a member of that project. So yes, I think we for the first time are seeing a regional movement – here, I mean in Europe – starting to make Diamond Open Access a federated unit, very much in the same way that this has already happened in South America, where you have Redalyc, Amelica and Scielo that are federated infrastructures for Diamond Open Access journals. And we hope in the long run to make this into a global movement, of course, so joining up with them and other actors in this space.

00:33:56 PPA

And what then? What if Diamond Open Access becomes so big and such a success that everybody moves on to such platforms, as you did with with the *Lingua–Glossa* story – they don't have to break new land, they just follow a certain protocol and then they're free, so to speak. What if everybody does that? Is there any room for commercial publishing anymore, or will they have to shut down, all of them?

00:34:24 JR

I don't think they will have to shut down, I think they will simply have to change their business model. I mean, I think this will take a long time, I mean I hope it will happen. And then I would say: mission accomplished – you know, I can die a peaceful man! But I think they will survive in one way or another because, after all, I mean, there will still be publishing services that are necessary. I mean, let's not forget, I certainly do not underestimate the commercial publishers. They have a great amount of knowledge that we lack – things like marketing, for instance. I mean, this is not something that we do well in the academic community. There's also typesetting and copy editing, but that is something that even the big publishers farm out to ancillary companies in India or in other countries. But there's certainly a great deal of knowledge that we could use, and might be willing to pay a fair price for if they can – if they can make that point. What I don't think we will pay a price for is the kind of control and privacy-breaking searching services that they practise now on their readers. This is something that will definitely go into the Charter for Diamond Open Access – that we do not pry, that

we do not check what our authors are reading, so to speak. So we definitely want to also not only make Diamond publishing into a force to be reckoned with, but we also want to put it on a different ethos. I mean, we are not there to exploit our readers, or to predict their behaviour. We are there to serve the readers and to understand what they want and to make this into a communal enterprise.

00:36:23 PPA

There is a saying: books and diamonds are forever. Could we move a little bit beyond the journal article and and look into what they call monographs, anthologies – and textbooks, even? I mean, these are important scholarly works. How can they become more open?

00:36:45 JR

Yes, it's definitely the case that books – Open Access for books – is lagging behind articles. This is also, of course, because a project like Plan S has to have a focus. So, the first focus was on peer reviewed articles. It is also the case that we have a principle - Principle 6, I believe – that said: look, we acknowledge that the trajectory for books will take a little bit longer, but last year we did come out with a statement – because we had promised that we would come out with a statement – that we had a sort of road map for books. And the road map for books is – again, it's a little bit longer, but the idea is there as well – is that books should ultimately be Open Access. And there were a number of recommendations and principles there as well, namely, that funders would be willing to pay for Open Access for books, and that of course, devices had to be put into place for that. It was also acknowledged that the licence that would apply to books would not be purely CC BY as we do for articles, but that various types of CC licences would be possible. The reason for that has to do, also, with the very different landscape for books. Books are mainly a mode of communication of the social sciences and humanities – books are not profitable at all, they are also published very often by smaller companies, smaller publishing houses that have sometimes very, very focused – I mean, for instance, you have publishing houses that are only concerned with African linguistics, for instance – you do see that – or only with linguistics generally, like Benjamins. And that is true for many, many publishers in the humanities. And these publishers, for whatever reason, have not always understood the consequences of the digital revolution and still think in terms of paper books. So that has to change, we know that. There are organisations that are working on that, but it's going more slowly. So this is something that we need to accelerate. At the same time, you also see that some publishers have seen the light and have understood – for instance, if they make a book, even a book in a niche subject in humanities, if they make that book Open Access, they reach a much wider audience worldwide, and the people who then see that Open Access version of the book want the paper copy, because in humanities very often, you know, the books contain pictures of high quality, pictures and graphs and all sorts of other material that people want to have on paper because – yeah, a book is more convenient. So what these publishers have seen is that in fact the Open, the free Open Access copy, drives the sale of paper books. And of course, that's an opportunity because that that is something that we don't care about. I mean, that they charge a certain price for the paper book, that they can do. The only thing that we as funders are interested in is that the book is available Open Access, so that you don't have to buy it. If you want, you can still have full access to the content because you have a digital copy. So that is my ideal model for Open Access books. In fact that, you know, publishers would see the light and say: look, we publish everything Open Access, we don't care. I mean, there will always be people who want books on paper and let's make that our new publishing model. So I do think there's opportunities there, I do think there's a long road to go. There, again, we have been very fortunate to have organisations like OAPEN and DOAB – the Directory of Open Access Books – where there's a number of people who are very much concerned about this and have a lot of expertice. And together with them, we have applied for a project – again with the EC – a

project that will also start in the beginning of 2023, a project called Palomera – it's led by Niels Stern. So we are – that's a two year project that will formulate recommendations for all stakeholders to get books in Open Access – so, recommendations for funders, for universities, for libraries – how can we get more books Open Access? And I think that's going to be an important project, bringing forward the idea that Open Access for books is also an absolute necessity. But again, it's going to be slower, but then it also concerns a much smaller amount of digital content.

00:41:29 PPA

We returned to where we started – general linguistics, the study of grammatical structures or phonetics, and things like that. You need to assemble data. I guess you, you linguists, you make excel sheets and things like that all the time?

00:41:44 JR

Yes.

00:41:46 PPA

And that's also part – an important part – in the broader Open Science thinking. So now we're moving away from Plan S to the broader picture of open science. Some people are concerned that these commercial publishers, they ask also for different kinds of supplementary material like data sets to be submitted to them. So perhaps they are behind paywall whereas the article as such is in Open Access? So there are some institutions – like, here in Tromsø, for instance, eight years ago we launched something called the TROLLing repository, the Tromsø repository.

00:42:27 JR

Yes, excellent initiative!

00:42:28 PPA

So, that's a repository for linguistic data sets, and it's curated by people at the library and these data sets they get DOIs and they can then be – you know, you can cross reference between the data set as such and any articles – or books, even – that are related to it, and vice versa, so that you get a transparent and fully open system. But as I said, the big publishers, they know what's happening and they try to lock things away.

00:43:03 JR

Yes, I think, indeed we should be very careful. I mean, I think this is something that universities should be more aware of and are not yet. I hope that the current wave of Rights Retention Strategies, or Policies, that is now starting – so, in Norway, University of Tromsø was the first to launch a Rights Retention Policy. I hope that the rights retention policy for articles will also extend to data, actually. Because I think universities should be much more aware of what they are giving away – or what their authors, their employees are giving away – so there should be much more awareness, that: don't give away the copyright on your articles, make them CC BY – don't give away the copyright on your data. So I think that that's a realisation that has to take place. That's, again, one of those mentality changes that we need to work on. I think organisations like the European University Association – EUA – could, and is, helping a lot in that. They represent 800 universities in Europe, so I hope they will be able to convince their constituency that this is a move that is absolutely necessary in view of the publishers, indeed, taking ownership of data that, again, have been compiled with public money. I do think that awareness of data is growing a lot. For instance, even if I look at my own journal – I mean, we also publish articles in experimental linguistics – five years ago we did not have a data policy. Right now, you know, because I also hired some younger associate editors, they told me: look, we have to have a

data policy, and that data policy should not be optional, it should be mandatory. And so we did that. We said: look, I mean, if you submit an article on experimental linguistics with us, we want to see your data. They have to be in an appendix – we can upload them for you and give them a independent DOI, or you can host them yourself on osf.io and have them there, but there has to be a link – we want to see them, and we want to make sure that you have – in terms of ethics, also, we want to have an ethics declaration from your university that if human subjects are involved, you know, that these these protocols have been respected. So all of a sudden, you know, even in a few years at a relatively small journal like ours, you see that change has happened. And there's much more – this idea of: OK, we have to make sure that the data are available – not only available on request, which was the mode of functioning until a few years ago, where people would say: data are available upon reasonable request – no, no more on reasonable request, they have to be downloadable alongside the article! And that's where we are now and I think that's a good thing. So things are changing and there is much more of an awareness of authors that yes, they have to keep their copyright to their article or but also the copyright and the ownership of the data, while at the same time making them available to the rest of the world, so that people can see if the work is reproducible and can also reuse it if they want – or duplicate the research as they want. Yeah, absolutely important.

00:46:43 PPA

Final question then, Johan: are you an optimist?

00:46:49 JR

I'm not by nature an optimist, but I am an optimist when it comes to Open Access! I really think it is possible to move to a better world. I mean, maybe it's my – maybe it's the fact that I was lucky with the journal, but I think, you know – very often it's, like, with everything you do, you know – there's a part of luck in what you do, and there's a part of planning. And sometimes the two come together and then you are extremely lucky. So, I think, my experience with *Glossa* made me an optimist. I think also my work with with cOAlition S makes me an optimist, because I see that things are changing. I do think there are things that can can change for the better, but we of course all have to do our part. But yes, I do think that things are changing for the better, but they will only change for the better if as academics, we take our responsibility and we reflect on these things and are not just preoccupied with the number of publications that we produce and the impact factors and just blindly go down that alley of numbers. But reflect on our role in society and reflect on the fact that – if we publish an article, that article has to be available to every person on the planet, because you never know which person on that planet will have an idea building on your article. You don't know that, and that's why it has to be Open Access. It's in your own interest as a scientist, because you will be cited more – and it's in the interest of all the problems that we are having in front of us, that need solving. And so we need the collective intelligence, the hive mind of the planet to do that. I very much believe in that.

00:48:54 PPA

With that, I thank you so much for coming to the programme, Johan.

00:48:58 JR

Thank you. Thank you for inviting me. Pleasure!

00:49:04 PPA

Open Science Talk is produced by the University Library of UiT the Arctic University of Norway. Thanks for listening.