



# Author engagement


Sebastian Nordhoff

2018-11-7/8

KE Workshop on Open Access Monographs

- › Language Science Press
- › since 2014
- › 82 books
- › monographs and edited volumes
- › somewhere around 3-400 authors
- › 987 public supporters
- › 340 community proofreaders
- › up to 20.000+ downloads per book

- › publisher in need of an author
- › author in need of a publisher
  - › linguists were unhappy with the publishing landscape, so they set up the Glossa journal and Language Science Press for books
- › other fields might have a different culture and a different level of organization





**R@ss Mounce**  
 @rmounce


Follow


Prof Nigel Vincent “Everyone in linguistics is very happy to be published by @LangSciPress “ Perhaps we just need more, high-quality, low cost, discipline specific publishers? #OAMonographs





11:52 AM · 11 Sep 2018 from London, England


9 Retweets
 8 Likes


 2
  9
  8
 





**Sebastian N+rdh+ff** @twig2noise · Sep 11  
 Replying to @rmounce @LangSciPress  
 The technology and the workflows are all there. The question is: which fields are ready to move? There seem to be vast cultural differences between fields in the humanities regarding the readiness for #OAMonographs.



 1
 


**Stefan Müller** @StefanMueller · Sep 13  
 Replying to @rmounce @LangSciPress  
 It was our hope that others would copy this. :-)) It is easier now. We tested a lot of things and new presses just have to take what works.


 1
  2
 



- › autonomous series
- › initial 7 submissions
- › supporter list
- › community proofreading
- › community typesetting
- › conference ambassadors

1. **community-based**
2. **open** (Open Access, Open Source, Open Data, ...)
3. **lean** (no paywalls, no warehousing, no rights management, no royalties, no marketing ...)

- › by big names
- › by crowd attracted by the crowd
- › by quality
- › by innovation

- › Collaborative approach
- › “continuous integration” instead of first proofs/final proofs
- › GitHub/Overleaf/PaperHive/docloop



- › Is there a printed copy?
- › does it have an ISBN?
- ›  $\text{\LaTeX}$  Aaaaaarghhhh!!!!?!
- › do you accept MS Word?
- › is it indexed in SCOPUS? (Eastern Europe)
- › why can't I submit a sloppy bibliography?
- › Open Access does not have to be advocated for in linguistics, it is the authors who demand it.
- › Difference between discipline-specific publishers and “general purpose” publishers?
- › Funding (BPCs) not an issue for LangSci, but might be an issue elsewhere