THE ACADEMIC COPYRIGHTS TRADE: CANADIAN SCHOLARS BUYING THE PRIVILEGE OF CITATION

MICHELLE DAVELUY

Université Laval, Ville de Québec, Canada

ABSTRACT

In Canada, anthropological knowledge has long been made available through scholarly journals financially supported by state agencies. Some of these journals are produced by anthropology departments in specific universities (e.g., *Anthropologie et sociétés*, *Ethnologies*) while others are published by scholarly associations (*Anthropologica*, *Culture*). For a long time, the quantitative measure for allocating funds to these journals was readership, demonstrated by the number of paid subscriptions or members in good standing. In that context, relinquishing copyrights was a sound strategy for the diffusion of knowledge. Then, the readership of Canadian journals was enhanced by electronic publishing, because some have benefited from a coordinated policy embracing electronic diffusion through a portal specifically designed for the promotion of academic research (www.erudit.org). However, readership is not the sole indicator now used to determine diffusion. As some Canadian universities start endorsing open and free access in order to achieve the equitable and expeditious availability of research results, ownership must be addressed. Indeed, scholars must own the rights to reproduce their work in order to grant access to it. To ensure proper diffusion, some have stopped giving up their copyrights and are sometimes contemplating buying them back for past publications. Open access can be viewed as an opportunity for scholars to counter citation indexes they have little or no control of, but it is also a way to liberate oneself from the

collective. Access is even used as a bargaining tool between scholars and administrators. The challenges we face in fostering access to knowledge must take these circumstances into account.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays we all face challenges in fostering access to knowledge. I will describe the Canadian situation, in which universities recently started endorsing open and free access. I will specifically focus on two programs, put forward, respectively, by the University of Ottawa in 2009 and the University of Alberta shortly thereafter. I will pay particular attention to issues pertaining to the ownership of our scholarly production. A preliminary version of this text was presented in 2010 at an Executive Session of the American Anthropoogy Association entitled "The circulation of ideas across world anthropologies," which I co-organized with Gustavo Lins Ribeiro.

In the context in which we currently produce knowledge, ownership must be addressed, because in Canada scholars must own the rights to reproduce their work in order to grant access to it. This will lead me to discuss our relationship with the academic institutions to which many of us are affiliated. The work of Christopher Kelty (2008) on the cultural significance of free software has proven very useful in figuring out what is currently happening in terms of the commercialization of scholarly production. Kelty argues that the emergence of free software and open source represents a creative reaction in countering the copyright laws and established distribution networks. In the process, intellectual property and knowledge accessibility were redefined. Ownership became less time and space determined as individuals relinquished their claims for contributing to the improvement of what is viewed as collective work. From their perspective, (1) innovations are conceptualized as a continuum of solutions to practical (technological) challenges and (2) the value of knowledge is related to its use. From this perspective, novelties and inventions may not be as valuable as the enhancement of an already existing system. The detailed historical background Kelty provides applies to the Canadian context, and specifically to anthropological knowledge, the area of knowledge production I am most familiar with.

I also draw from my personal experience as a Canadian scholar publishing mostly in English and French, and as an academic involved in the distribution of funds through adjudication committees for scholarly journals in Canada and in Québec specifically; I participated in several competitions over a decade or so. Matters pertaining to the production and distribution of knowledge were also on the agenda when I was president of CASCA, the Canadian Anthropology Society/ La société canadienne d'anthropologie, at the beginning of the 21st century, in 2001–2004.

From these various standpoints I witnessed the transition to the electronic production and distribution of scholarly journals, and from these experiences I

argue that the infrastructure for the dissemination of knowledge has long been debated in Canada. In this sense, the production and distribution of academic knowledge are not new subject matters in the Canadian context. The means of production and distribution have changed over time, while the issues at stake remain exactly the same. My interest is in the repositioning of Canadian academic institutions associated with the transition to e-publication.

Anthropological Knowledge in Canada

In Canada, anthropological knowledge has long been made available through scholarly journals granted financial support by state agencies, namely, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Fonds québécois de la recherche of the government of Québec, the Frenchspeaking province of the country.

Some of these journals are produced by anthropology departments in academic institutions, like Université Laval, where *Anthropologie et sociétés* and *Ethnologies* are based; other journals are published by scholarly associations, as in the case of *Anthropologica*, published by the Canadian Anthropology Society. Funding is also obtained from the universities where these journals are produced and through membership fees in the case of scholarly societies. Individual and institutional subscriptions to journals also contribute to the financing of these venues. Additional sources of funding include, as will be discussed later on, royalties for the use of material published by scholars.

When electronic publication took precedence, it affected anthropology journals all over Canada. However, the impact of e-publishing varies greatly because (1) there is no national policy on it; and (2) regional initiatives develop. As a consequence, some venues have benefited from the transition to e-publishing while others have not.

The venues that endorsed a coordinated policy embracing electronic diffusion through a portal specifically designed for the promotion of academic research (Consortium Érudit, 2012) gained visibility in the process. The Université de Montréal initially led this project, which developed into an extensive consortium of institutions and publishers. Originally, the portal targeted the European market and included almost exclusively journals published in the French language. Since then it has expanded to include journals published in both French and English from all over the country. Interestingly enough, most of these journals are closely associated with university departments. To my knowledge, very few if any belong to scholarly societies, most of these having opted for other electronic platforms like Google Scholar (including *Anthroologica*).

Still, Érudit remains a regional endeavor because there is no interest in developing a similar coordinated endeavor at the national level. On the contrary, there is overt resistance to such an idea. This is at least how I interpret the reactions of my colleagues during discussions of this matter during adjudication for fund allocations to scholarly journals. Frequently, I heard colleagues advocating the importance of laissez-faire in this domain and the value of local initiatives in

fostering academic knowledge. These colleagues represented a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences in Canada, including sociology, geography, demography, literature, translation, and so forth. They seemed to be primarily concerned with the noninvolvement of state agencies during a period of fiscal restrictions. To me, this stand was paradoxical, considering that state agencies were already involved and controlling fund allocations for scholarly publication. It is important to note that education is a provincial (regional) jurisdiction in Canada. However, the federal government has increased its involvement in this area in the last decade in particular with the Canada Research Chairs (CRC) program. Through this program, the central government has funded the hiring of academics in various universities in the country for a limited period of time; universities backstop faculty positions initially allocated through the CRC program. In the process, the federal government has been directly involved with academic institutions that used to deal primarily with provincial governments in terms of funding. As a consequence, research agendas have been realigned to address national priorities. To obtain Canada Research Chairs, local concerns had to be framed within national parameters. Several universities were successful in this endeavor, even though the program was and still is criticized for its interference in postsecondary education, bypassing the well-established collegial bottom-up procedure for new hires (departmental units setting criteria and recommending candidates to their faculties). The gender bias of the program (in favor of male researchers) eventually became obvious and was in part addressed. The exclusive research focus of the positions that were created was also an issue in terms of teaching loads.

Meanwhile, pressures to downsize applied to scholarly journals all over the country. Disciplines for which more than one journal existed were expected to demonstrate the relevance of maintaining them all, and national scholarly associations were to avoid duplication. For example, there were two different Canadian sociology associations; resources were not available for both, nor for the journals they were respectively fostering.

Canadian anthropologists had faced this problem years earlier. The merging of two Canadian anthropology journals, *Culture* and *Anthropologica*, took place in the 1990s. This merger was not triggered by the transition to electronic production and distribution of anthropological knowledge. It predated it and rather resulted from pressures to justify the existence of several anthropology journals in Canada on a language basis. *Culture* was the CASCA journal. As such, it published articles in both official languages of (the country and) the association, English and French. It was housed at Concordia University in Montreal. The bilingual status of the journal and its geographical location made it eligible for funding from the Québec government as well as for federal funds. For years, the Québec government financially supported *Culture*; however, the small number of texts actually published in French in the journal came to hamper it in funding competitions. Indeed, other anthropology journals in Québec were either exclusively in French (*Anthropologie et sociétés*) or more balanced in terms of language (*Ethnologies*).

(These two journals are based at Université Laval in Québec City.) *Culture* came to be viewed as paying lip service to publishing in French in order to maintain its funding from the Québec agency. Ultimately, provincial funds remained available for journals clearly contributing to publishing in French, and *Culture* lost its dual funding. We will see later, in the section on e-circulation of academic knowledge, that other decisions will continue to favour dissemination through institutional channels rather than scholarly societies.

The change in funds allocation *for Culture* was seen as an opportunity to salvage *Anthropologica,* which was also challenged financially. *Anthropologica* was managed in Ontario at Wilfrid Laurier University and the University of Waterloo. It became the CASCA journal when it merged with *Culture*. A life-saving operation for some and a hostile buy for others, the merger did put Canadian anthropology ahead of the curve when pressures from the federal government to downsize required action. Indeed, *Anthropologica* was already the only national anthropology journal at a time when funding was almost restricted to one venue per discipline by the federal agency supporting the dissemination of scholarly production in Canada.

The historical background provided here shows how the production and dissemination of anthropological knowledge have been connected in Canada for a long time. It also illustrates how the language of publication has long been a relevant issue in Canadian anthropology. Saillant (2010) provides a succinct summary of major points regarding publishing in French in Canada, and in Québec more specifically. We will now turn to accessibility, which slowly but surely became prominent in discussions of state-sponsored academic work in the world in general and in Canada specifically.

CURRENT MEASURES OF ACCESSIBILITY

For a long time the quantitative measure for allocating funds to scholarly journals was readership, demonstrated by the number of paid subscriptions to a journal or members in good standing attending the annual conferences of their association. It was in this specific context that authors started relinquishing their copyrights. Most did so to the benefit of their professional/scholarly association. Widely distributed journals and lively anthropology meetings certainly ensured a valuable return for those who were so inclined. An additional rationale was provided to those hesitating to relinquish their copyrights: individual royalties were very small compared to the collective asset they represented when pooled. Figures over the years have proven the argument to be sound. Still, it is worth noting that some anthropologists uncomfortable with the commodification of their scholarly production viewed more favorably such a pay-off with an altruistic spin, for the greater good.

However, in Canada as elsewhere in the world, readership is not the sole indicator now used to determine diffusion. Considerable time and energy have been

devoted to taking into account the use of scholarly knowledge now available digitally. How to take into account anonymous users all over the world became an issue, and hits on web sites have come to complement citation indexes (Brenneis, 2010). The use of academic knowledge by unidentified individuals on the web was clearly distinguished from peer review involving renowned experts debating the value of research results made public by colleagues. The consideration of citation indexes stemmed from private enterprises wanting to preserve their market shares but it should be recognized that broadening the definition of what is meant by the use of academic knowledge to include a wider array of uses was certainly useful in many ways.

Librarians were mandated by academic institutions all over the world to document the use of electronic material through their infrastructures. The circulation of library holdings has indeed changed with e-publication. The criteria available to librarians, however, remain associated with traditional measures like citation indexes and various counts of the number of times a resource has been searched in catalogues. After all, libraries are places where students used to have to line up to gain access to knowledge. Counting bodies was a measure of efficiency in evaluating the services offered to clients. Even though the circulation of electronic resources through libraries was taken into account, circulation remained narrowly defined. Librarians continue to rank academic disciplines and scholars according to these old criteria (Daveluy, 2008).

As Canadian universities embrace open and free access with the expressed desire to achieve the equitable and expeditious availability of research results, issues with regard to the ownership of knowledge and its commercialization are gaining currency. In anthropology, this matter has made salient various issues pertaining to intellectual property in very specific ways. Anthropologists can be viewed as either early, unexpected, and uncounted users of knowledge originally produced by others or as the avant-garde of circulation and free access. The fact that scholars must own the rights to reproduce their work in order to grant access to it presents a complex issue. To ensure proper diffusion, some scholars have stopped giving up their copyrights and are contemplating buying them back for past publications. This is what I have chosen to call the academic copyrights trade. Cynicism resulting from the irony of the situation is understandable. We will see in the following section that a program was put in place by the University of Ottawa to address the academic copyrights trade. Still, in my opinion, too many academics seem to downplay the importance of the matter for the future of scholarly research in Canada.

Open Access in Canadian Universities

Like many others in the world, Canadian universities are allocating substantial resources to the evaluation of their visibility and its enhancement when deemed necessary. Two programs recently put in place, one at the University of Ottawa and the other at the University of Alberta, illustrate how open access contributes to these efforts. Each of these universities plays a specific role in the Canadian

academic landscape. The University of Ottawa is a bilingual institution in the capital of the country while the University of Alberta is located in the northwest region and has one of its three campuses set up as a French environment. (As a bilingual institution, the University of Ottawa is officially named the University of Ottawa/Université d'Ottawa. For the sake of simplicity, the English name is used in this text.) Both institutions seek to increase public awareness of their contributions in order to maintain their competitive edge in a period of fiscal restriction and global recruitment of researchers and students alike.

The University of Ottawa. On December 8, 2009, the University of Ottawa expressed its pride at being the first Canadian university to adopt a comprehensive open access program supporting free and unrestricted access to scholarly research (University of Ottawa, 2012). It also expressed its pride at being the first Canadian university to join the Compact for Open-Access Publishing Equity (COPE). As stated in the press release published by the institution (see Appendix 1), the program includes a commitment to making the university's scholarly publications available online at no charge and a commitment to an author fund to help researchers defray open access fees charged by publishers. The program is comprehensive in the sense that it supports the creation of digital education material, that is, course material, the publication of open access books by the university's press, and research on the topic of the open access movement. (I thank Natacha Gagné of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Ottawa for bringing this program to my attention.)

Three points are worth noticing in the implementation of this new program. First, a change has clearly taken place regarding scholarly work: it is the university's own publications that are readily made available. Specific authors or researchers disappear for the greater good of the institution as a whole. All are subtly reminded that their employer owns their work. Second, the fact that authors and researchers are asked to pay for their work to be accessible is countered, not opposed, by the University of Ottawa. Indeed some of the amounts paid by authors are paid to university presses, such as the University of Ottawa Press. Part of the announced funding made available to authors simply remains within the institution. Finally, research is funded only on a very narrow topic, the open access movement itself. Accordingly, the unrestricted access to research activities conducted at the University of Ottawa does not support new research at large but orients researchers to contribute to the university's own agenda. A few years ago, academic research had to show its potential for innovation to be considered relevant (and obtain financial support). In this program, diffusion is the research priority.

The visual associated with the program is also telling: chained newspapers appear in the background of the written promise of "Visibility and impact for your research." Details of how to apply to receive funds to buy back previously relinquished copyrights are provided to all those wanting to "exercise influence." Interestingly, individual authors remain responsible for the legality of the

proposed accessibility to be ensured. Indeed, in order to be able to self-archive material in the university's repository, a scholar must be the recognized owner of his or her work. Considering that various Canadian anthropologists previously relinquished their rights for the benefit of scholarly journals or their professional associations, this is a very important point as far as the future of the discipline in the country is concerned. Collective royalties have come to represent a sizable percentage of the overall budget of anthropology journals in Canada. More importantly, these amounts are used in the calculation of other sources of financial support that scholarly journals are required to provide to funding agencies like the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and, in Québec, the Fonds québécois de la recherche (FQR) since fund allocation by these agencies is partial and complementary. State agencies do not strictly match funds but certainly expect clearly identified other sources to contribute to any publishing venue they support themselves. By making funds available for authors to buy their rights back, the University of Ottawa is contributing to the ongoing national reallocation of publishing funds to institutions (via individuals) rather than to their professional associations or their disciplinary journals. Individuals and academic institutions may gain in the process, but associations and journals definitely lose some of their operating money, part of their legitimacy as representatives of researchers and the knowledge they produce, and the exclusive responsibility for (or privilege of) circulating that knowledge.

As time goes on, it will be interesting to document the extent to which academics have taken advantage of this part of the University of Ottawa program. According to Natacha Gagné (University of Ottawa), interest appears limited in 2012 in terms of participation as well as the quantity of material circulated through the system. The number of authors registered in the program from the Faculty of Sciences is 85, in Social Sciences 27, and in the Faculty of Arts 24. Perhaps these figures bode well, given that the University of Ottawa did not publicize the program after officially launching it. It neither solicited participation nor encouraged personnel to participate. However, in most cases, only a single piece was submitted to the repository by the individuals concerned. In many instances, it is a student thesis available in free access that appears under the name of a supervisor. Arguably, a generation gap is arising in terms of the dissemination of academic knowledge. For now, it remains collaboratively managed within the confines of institutions where legitimacy is obtained and granted. However, this relatively precarious equilibrium is bound to be further affected by e-publishing.

In any case, the issue of rights ownership complicates the matter to a great extent. Indeed, it is highly likely that it will not be clear in many instances from whom an author needs to buy his or her rights back. For anthropologists specifically, confusion arises since the matter of rights relinquished to *Culture* was not precisely clarified in the merger with *Anthropologica*. The Canadian Anthropology Society (CASCA) may be managing royalties received from its journal use, but it does not necessarily legally hold the rights to the material in

question. No matter what the case is, it would be quite a challenge to demonstrate any such arrangements since, to my knowledge, if paper trails ever existed they have probably been lost or shredded over time. The Canadian Anthropology Society took the virtual turn at the beginning of the 21st century and closed its office, which had been housed at the University of Concordia (with *Culture*) for years. Since then, very little documentation has been available with regard to the conduct of the society's affairs, even though Julia Harrison, of Trent University, has worked diligently to try to preserve as much material as possible at the Canadian Public Archives.

The University of Alberta. The University of Alberta has also recently implemented a digital repository, the Education and Research Archive (ERA) (University of Alberta, 2012). The repository is intended to better take account of the "intellectual output" of researchers at the university as a whole, while offering a number of "deliverables" to individuals. This includes enhanced visibility, since the repository will be available through Google. Such a "storage system will allow the university to digitally collate and measure its contribution to global knowledge." The objective is "to maximize the impact of knowledge generated at the institution." Clearly the University of Alberta is preoccupied by its position in international rankings.

The University of Alberta is a merit-based institution: for decades it has granted salary increments to meritorious individuals. (Ongoing negotiations will determine whether this model will also be implemented shortly at the University of Ottawa.) At the University of Alberta, the outcome of the yearly production of individuals is already collated through the submission of annual reports to one's unit. These reports are available electronically. Recommendations are made with regard to each faculty member by the chair of each individual's department and submitted to the dean of the faculty to which this unit belongs. Then faculty review committees evaluate the recommendations made across its pool of researchers. Each of these faculty review committees includes at least 30 scholars from all the units represented in a given faculty. No one questions the fact that this is a time-consuming and demanding process, which has often favored specific individuals over the years. Still, this is a process in which scholars read each other's work in order to compare themselves and their peers to those judged to be performing best. Having worked at the University of Alberta for a decade, I must admit I came to value the fact that my peers were given time to read my yearly contribution to the production of anthropological knowledge, even though filing reports on my own productivity was awkward.

In short, the submission and evaluation of reports on productivity is well established at the University of Alberta. It is clear to me that to collate the information in order to *measure* the contribution of the institution to global knowledge does not require the implementation of a digital repository, precisely because this information is already available at the faculty level. It has been for

years. What is required for the University of Alberta to measure its own performance in comparison to other universities in the world is the unhindered use of scholarly production. It is librarians who manage and control the Education and Research Archive (ERA) at the University of Alberta. They monitor the circulation of scholarly material. However, the role played by librarians in the world at large in the ranking of various disciplines based on the circulation of library holdings is not always the most efficient measure of the impact of disciplines' production (Daveluy, 2008).

During the latest round of negotiations at the University of Alberta, free access was used as a bargaining tool during the process of renewal of the faculty collective agreement. Furlough days were requested by the institution, and obtained, in exchange for the development of the access infrastructure. In fact, a referendum was held and six furlough days were offered to the administration prior to the beginning of the bargaining process. It is far from clear to me how temporary layoffs contribute to the enhancement of scholarly production at an academic institution.

During these negotiations, faculty members were explicitly told that in the digital era we live in, there is no need to attend expensive, frivolous meetings. To the best of my knowledge, the idea of keeping scholars on site rather than traveling the world in order to disseminate their research results dates back to 2008, the year of the 100th anniversary of the University of Alberta. Indeed, in that year, conference travel funds and support for applications for research funds including time spent in other institutions were explicitly reduced. Scholars were expected to be available to celebrate the university's achievements on site. Interestingly enough, since then funds and support have not been returned to their previous levels. Scholars are now expected to avoid conferences and make their scholarly production available in a timely fashion so that the administration is able to place itself in an improved position in world rankings.

CONCLUSION

I argue that Canadian scholars are paying a price in a number of ways for the privilege of being published and ultimately cited. They used to do so mainly through fees and norms imposed by publishers; nowadays, programs put in place directly by their employers/institutions also attempt to set the rules and pace of their scholarly contribution to the world. At the University of Ottawa, scholars are paying through buying back their copyrights with their own money or with funds made available by the institution on a competitive basis. At the University of Alberta, the institution sets the rules through a reorientation of the monitoring of scholarly production from a level at which scholars are directly involved to another level controlled by academic administrators. In both cases, peer review is bypassed. Even though criticism of peer-review procedures is worthwhile,

discarding the system rather than improving it reduces the role academics play in research and its dissemination.

Open access can be viewed as an opportunity for scholars to counter citation indexes over which they have little or no control. In that sense, the accessibility and visibility of research results represent a stage in the continuation of knowledge management through time:

> Free Software is a response to a problem, in much the same way that the Royal Society in the sixteenth century, the emergence of a publishing industry in the eighteenth century, and the institutions of the public sphere in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were responses. They responded to the collective challenge of creating regimes of governance that required—and encouraged—reliable empirical knowledge as a basis for their political legitimacy. Such political legitimacy is not an eternal or theoretical problem: it is a problem of constant real-world practice in creating the infrastructures by which individuals come to inhabit and understand their own governance, whether by states, corporations, or machines. (Kelty 2008: 305)

Indeed, Bauman & Briggs (2003) have eloquently shown how the Royal Society of London contributed to the emergence and legitimation of scientific discourse, and putting e-publishing into perspective is certainly worthwhile.

But free and open access is also a way to liberate oneself from the collective as previously understood. Associative activities are often currently summarized as ritualistic attendance at meetings, and they are subject to charges of supporting venues rather than individual output. Admittedly, some Canadian scholars are comfortable and proactive in implementing changes they feel are in their best interest:

> At a time when the giants of the software industry were fighting to create a different kind of openness—one that preserved and would even strengthen existing relations of intellectual property—this hack [Free Software] was a radical alternative that emphasized the sovereignty not of a national or corporate status quo, but of self-fashioning individuals who sought to opt out of that national-corporate unity. (Kelty 2008: 207)

Still, I have tried to show that the collective is now institutional rather than disciplinary. The pros and cons of such a situation await further assessment. Acknowledging the change in the definition of the collective is the initial step in documenting the contemporary uses of knowledge produced, at least in part, by academics. How the digitally native generation interprets the collective cannot be ignored. To many, solidarity is now lived electronically through the Internet and the "hactivism" inspired by the cyberculture (Bardeau & Danet, 2011). Work paid for by industries or institutions in form of a salary is not necessarily available for this generation, whose members choose to volunteer free contributions to ongoing projects that have been shared from the start. In their world, versions have replaced novelties, and a clash of generations in terms of knowledge production as much as

diffusion follows. However, their creative reaction to a system that does not make room for them can also be viewed as a continuation of a series of decisions taken or actions performed by previous generations, like giving up one's copyrights for a collective accounting that has a greater impact. From this perspective, the e-savvy generation remains very much a product of an era that dates back to the hippie culture of the 1960s.

As far as universities go, it is worth noting that, until recently, institutions like the University of Ottawa and the University of Alberta played a very limited role in terms of the production of scholarly journals in Canada. Very few journals were associated with departments in these two institutions. At the University of Alberta, the program to support faculty acting as editors in chief of scholarly journals has been revamped for those who will act in that capacity using the ERA infrastructure. Between 2001 and 2008, no matching funds were made available by the University of Alberta for course release partly granted by funding agencies for faculty members who were interested in taking on these tasks. As a result, few journals were housed at the University of Alberta, and such work was poorly rewarded by the institution. The resources now made available to scholars to enable them to participate fully in the digital dissemination of research results clearly aim at positioning the University of Alberta favorably in the international rankings that have become the norm for evaluating institutional performance but also at positioning the university favorably within rankings internal to the country.

The same holds for the University of Ottawa. Both the University of Alberta and the University of Ottawa are playing the international platform as a way to alter the long-established hierarchy among Canadian academic institutions. They are attempting to break the lead of others (mainly McGill University and the University of Toronto) to which most of the available research funds are allocated. Institutions like the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and Concordia University became involved in the circulation of academic knowledge during the paper era. Time will tell whether the digital era will deliver its promises to institutions now taking the lead in the dissemination of scholarly work. The fact is, in both its material and its dematerialized forms, the circulation of academic knowledge seems to be taken care of from the periphery rather than from places where knowledge is actually produced (Bošković, 2008; Daveluy & Dorais, 2009; Ribeiro & Escobar 2006).

In closing, I wonder why, in order to maximize its impact, the periphery does not simply hire more scholars in order to bring itself up to par with the center. The periphery already contributes to the renewal of the academic body in Canada through the hiring of junior scholars, since many begin their career in institutions they will later leave with seniority. The mobility of academic knowledge producers should certainly be thoroughly addressed if we are to properly understand the matter. Scrutinizing individual production and monitoring what is currently produced locally keeps administrations busy but certainly does not contribute to the improvement of either the quantity or the quality of the research results already

produced, since those involved in assessing production are rarely producers of original knowledge themselves. For anthropological knowledge to stand out in the ongoing assessment of academic knowledge, anthropologists are needed to produce it as well as to evaluate it. Perhaps part of the problem lies in the fact that academics do not necessarily view themselves as waged workers. Indeed, many think of themselves as intellectuals or professionals very much in control of their working conditions. It seems to me, though, that academics are very much like other workers as far as the commercialization of their scholarly production goes: the income it generates is managed by administrators who hire (and potentially fire) them, and it is reinvested in an infrastructure setting norms with which they have to comply in order to remain relevant in the system. Of course, academics are not exactly like manual workers in delocalised industries, but some Canadian academics and several anthropologists among them do fit the model more closely than they might be willing to accept.

APPENDIX I: PRESS RELEASE FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

University of Ottawa among North American Leaders as it Launches Open Access Program

OTTAWA, December 8, 2009—The University of Ottawa is the first Canadian university to adopt a comprehensive open access program that supports free and unrestricted access to scholarly research.

The University's new program includes:

- a commitment to make the University's scholarly publications available online at no charge through the University's repository, uO Research;
- an author fund to help researchers defray open access fees charged by publishers;
- a fund to support the creation of digital educational materials organized as courses and available to everyone online at no charge;
- support for the University of Ottawa Press's commitment to publishing a collection of open access books; and
- a research grant to support further research on the open access movement.

The University of Ottawa also becomes the first Canadian university to join the Compact for Open-Access Publishing Equity (COPE), adding its name to a list of prestigious institutions including Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the University of California at Berkeley. The signatories of this compact make a commitment to support open access journals that make articles available at no charge to everyone while providing the same services common to all scholarly journals, services such as management of the peer review process, production and distribution.

University of Ottawa researchers have already participated in many significant open access projects. These projects include developing the Canadian Creative Commons license, which ensures authors retain the right of attribution and that their work is accessible; under the leadership of Michael Geist and Ian Kerr, the publication of legal texts that are made available at no charge; and the founding of Open Medicine and Aporia, two open access journals in the fields of medicine and health sciences.

"I am proud that our university is the first one in the country to introduce a comprehensive open access program. Canada's university has become Canada's Open Access University," said Allan Rock, president and vice-chancellor at the University of Ottawa. "The fruit of our faculty's contributions to academic research will now be more visible, freely accessible and shared with the world."

Open access research can be easily accessed by anyone, anywhere, without the barrier of costly journal subscription or association membership fees. Broad dissemination of knowledge and research without access barriers is a great benefit to society as a whole.

For more information on the University of Ottawa's open access program, visit www.oa.uOttawa.ca. (Source: University of Ottawa, 2009).

REFERENCES

Bardeau, F., & Danet, N. 2011. *Pirates informatiques ou altermondialistes numériques? Anonymous. Peuvent-ils changer le monde?* Limoges: FYP éditions.

Bauman, R., & Briggs, C. L. 2003. *Voices of modernity: Language ideologies and the politics of inequality.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bošković, A. 2008. *Other people's anthropologies: Ethnographic practice on the margins.* New York: Berghahn Books.

Brenneis, D. 2010. Global flows, local soundings: Indexing anthropological knowledge. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association meeting, New Orleans, LA.

Consortium Érudit. 2012. Promouvoir et diffuser la recherche et la création. Retrieved from www.erudit.org, September 2012.

Daveluy, M. 2008. Pub venues: U of A contributors in scholarly journals funded by Canadian agencies. Report submitted to the Chair of the Anthropology Department, University of Alberta.

Daveluy, M., & Dorais, L.-J. 2009. *À la périphérie du centre: Les limites de l'hégémonie en anthropologie.* Montréal, QC: Liber.

Kelty, C. M. 2008. *Two bits: The cultural significance of free software.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ribeiro, G. L., & Escobar, A. 2006. *World anthropologies: Disciplinary transformations within systems of power.* New York: Berg.

Saillant, F. 2010. Looking back on paths travelled. *Anthropologie et Sociétés,* 34(1): 7–12.

University of Alberta. 2012. ERA: Education and research archive at the University of Alberta. Retrieved from http://guides.library.ualberta.ca/era, November 2012.

University of Ottawa. 2009. University of Ottawa among North American leaders as it launches open access program. Retrieved from http://www.media.uottawa.ca/mediaroom/news-details_1824.html, November 2012.

University of Ottawa. 2012. Open access: Visibility and impact for your research. Retrieved from http://www.oa.uottawa.ca/index.jsp?language=en, September 2012.

Direct reprint requests to:

Michelle Daveluy
Département d'anthropologie
Pavillon Charles-De Koninck, Bureau 3431
1030, avenue des Sciences-Humaines
Université Laval
Québec (Québec) G1V 0A6 Canada
e-mail: Michelle.Daveluy@ant.ulaval.ca