

Critical Reflections on Universities, Publishing, and the Early Career Experience

Jonathan Vickery

Centre for Cultural and Media Policy Studies, School of Creative Arts,
Performance and Visual Cultures (SCAPVC), University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

Correspondence: j.p.vickery@warwick.ac.uk

ORCID: [0000-0002-0494-6536](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0494-6536)

Editorial review: This article has been subject to an editorial review process.



Copyright notice: This article is issued under the terms of the **Creative Commons Attribution License**, which permits use and redistribution of the work provided that the original author and source are credited.

You must give appropriate credit (author attribution), provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Abstract

This paper is a critical reflection on the changing relationship between university institutions, academic publishing, and young researchers. It emerges from a current project in assessing the role and development of Warwick University's research journals (and their editors), but also takes into account two recent Warwick Institute of Advanced Study seminars discussing the practical and strategic challenge of publishing for early career scholars and PhD students. While these seminars concerned publishing in general, and the question of career trajectories, this reflection paper takes into account the current shifts in publishing and our understanding of research as knowledge production more broadly. This reflection maintains that, in part provoked by digital media, the status of research knowledge vis-à-vis its traditional presentation in the discrete products of the 'article', and the book, has become unstable, and this instability has opened up a range of economic and systemic conditions of knowledge production that have long since been concealed. Current shifts thus offer younger scholars and early career researchers significant opportunities: this short paper sets out the initial framework for a current research project focussing on university publishing, then it refers to the two above seminars in order to conclude with some critical issues for academic practice, research and for early career scholars.

Keywords: university publishing; new university presses (NUPs); research journals; interdisciplinarity; young researchers

In the last two decades there has been a rise in ‘NUP’s, or ‘new university presses’.¹ While in part stimulated by the ‘academic-led’ or the ‘Library-led publishing’ that has always taken place on any campus, a more strategic interest in publishing has emerged in response to digital media and new low-cost opportunities in reproduction, global internet-based dissemination, new collaborative-editorial arrangements, outsourcing and sub-contracting — especially of design and marketing — and the institutional partnership arrangements as part of an evolving Open Access economy (**Esposito, 2010; Stone, 2017; Adema & Stone, 2017; Taylor & Jensen, 2019**). However, university-based journals, are facing huge challenges with regard competition and sectoral over-production, along with a lack of individual academic participation in what remains a largely volunteer-populated sub-industry of the resource-limited university sector. Indeed, with large US publishing conglomerates owning most prestigious journals and established hierarchies and structuring markets and communities of readership, the general question on ‘why journals succeed or fail’ is now less important than specific strategic questions on how university-published journals can cultivate strong ‘communities of practice’ and therefore a strong rationale for self-determination in publishing the research they facilitate (and of other authors, and editors, and invested stakeholders) (**Keene et al., 2016**).

My original research project on this subject took the form of a scoping report for Warwick’s Library, which is responsible for the University of Warwick Press, within an institutional ‘central service’ arrangement called Scholarly Communications (**Vickery, 2023a**). While the Press had been incorporated since 1964 (i.e., nationally registered as an independent company, a surprise to many), it had not been developed in ways comparable to many other university presses. Indeed, after uncovering a whole series of internal, if brief, past strategy briefings on the potential expansion of the Press, the institutional rationale, professional will, and economic argument for a developing Press, was not forthcoming. Apart of the obvious successful university-based presses — Edinburgh, Manchester, Liverpool, Bristol and UCL — there is no ready-to-hand dataset or evidence-base that would immediately convince a university executive management that a press might be a worthy endeavour or significant source of value. Of course, Oxford and Cambridge are hugely successful, both financially and in scholarly terms, but their corporate development has been historical, unique and hardly offer a model to be replicated. Moreover, since the 1960s (and the wave of ‘new’ universities in the UK) there have been numerous small university presses that have appeared and disappeared, or that simply remain a ‘library-publishing’ project, or embedded in ‘academic-led’ faculty facilities (**Lockett & Speicher, 2016**).

I will not reiterate my initial report. A doctored version of it appears (minus the internal deliberation on Warwick, strategy and staffing) on the Warwick research repository, the WRAP: (Vickery, 2023b). I will, however, extend its conclusions, by way of prefacing the current dilemmas and challenges of publishing for younger generation academics and research students.

Since the 1980s at least, we can find chronic political dilemmas provoked by the relation between *the private* (business, market, corporate and financial forces) and *the public* (infrastructural, institutions, social services, citizenship, common goods). Indeed, the rise of digital communications has played a central role in the dissolution of established political binaries of ‘private/business/capital’ versus ‘public/social/welfare’: the now pervasive demand for ‘Open Access’ is a good case study in how public funds can make their way into private capital. But universities, for the past few decades — even public universities in countries with few or no student fees, like many EU countries — are implicated in this binary dilemma as they are situated in the liminal space between the ‘public-infrastructural’ (of education and publicly-funded research), and the markets (for IP, scientific intelligence and expert validation) (Cf., the AUP, 2020, and its ‘value’ statement).

Governments the world over know that universities are central to the global economic forces of industrial innovation and knowledge flows, professionalisation and corporate capacity-building, but at the same time, they are historic institutions embedded in the socio-cultural, and colonial, evolution of specific places, cities, regions and countries. A fundamental issue, therefore, pertains to the institutional agency of universities — as actors or potential actors in the increasing global economy of knowledge and communications, how they can lead, innovate and, crucially, maintain a certain strategic grip on their own value production (their finance, capital, products and services)? One such way of doing this was to establish a university press — where knowledge can be consolidated, structured, articulated and disseminated, and in ways that strengthen the universities own autonomy and capacity build its research capabilities and institutional prestige (Jisc, 2021; Taylor, 2019). Among the many questions and issues that arise from this situation, on the question of publishing, we need to generate more research interest in the following issues: first, ‘why get involved in publishing?’ Second, ‘what’s the big rationale for more collaborative university-based publishing activity?’, third, the question of skills and what skills set should we be mindful on developing; and fourth, how an institutional capacity-building of knowledge production would offer a different set of priorities than the ones we find ourselves with at present.

Firstly: why get involved in publishing? Why not leave it to publishers? Publishing remains a vibrant industry whose scale runs from small artisan and creative start-up enterprise to large corporate global business conglomerate. Yet, its ancient provenance is in the processes of script and parchment, writing and paper (or numbers, or code), and then of the rise of the scribe, scholar or academic as a professional ‘producer of knowledge’, and the skills inherent in addressing readers, of distributing the writing, of responding to readers — all of which remain the basic set of ancient capabilities that is publishing. Whatever size or scale the publishing operation, it will involve the same or similar skills-set in working with text and communicating knowledge, reviewing, entering into dialogue, facing questions, objections or alternate ways of understanding, then reviewing, and so forth. Today’s digital media explosion and its emphasis on ‘content’ has only emphasised this fact — i.e., the notion of ‘content’ implies that knowledge is not indissolubly embedded in a given format, framework, media or set of presentational aesthetics. By implication, we need to recognise that *which is not* format, framework, media or presentation. For the purpose of this paper, this ‘that’ is simply knowledge — the stuff of research; the rationale for scholarly writing; the current ground on which countless wars and politics are being fought from language, religion and identity in Ukraine, to misinformation and fact-checking in political communications.

While the Sociology of Knowledge has a lot to say on how knowledge is constituted and institutionally mediated (e.g., **Collyer, 2018**), I want to remain focussed on the more practical terms of a discussion on why university-based publishing is both relevant to young scholars and students trying to figure out a career pathway — what knowledge is reproduced, distributed and how. Increasingly, academic careers are involved in the complex relation between the institutional mediation of knowledge and its global economic distribution: that is the nexus where significant value is generated, but that value is fungible (different for the author, publisher and university, and can be transmuted and exchanged).

From smartphone applications to interactive TV, most of a given population will possess a similar range of *knowledge-based skills*, which now have permeated education, research, business and professional development. YouTube is routinely reported as being around 60% ‘training’ or professional skills development (**Oberlo, 2023**). Whatever the veracity of this statistic, by implication we need a more systematic understanding on how research-based knowledge can be shaped and extend into global digital economy. Even now, ‘publications’ no longer refer just to ‘articles’ or books, but can be a range of more creative products, from reports, video symposia, podcasts, data sets, or a range of visualisations. Why university publishing is still fixated on books and

articles is more a matter of how institutions manage their own value production, and the processes of institutional validation, than simply the way media and communications are expanding.

A second implication is the ‘political will’ of institutions to engage and inhabit this new open vista of choices and the digital explosion with a strategic management aligned with the interests of education and knowledge, not just corporate capital. One of the reasons that individual academics, writers, labs and projects, often prefer non-university commercial publishers, is that they remain once-removed from the public political economy of university institutions, and are creatures of the market and can optimise certain kinds of value — distribution and bibliometrics, and so forth — and are also much more in synchronicity with technological innovation on reproduction and communications media. And also for these reasons, university institutions have effectively sub-contracted responsibility for the formatting, presentation and distribution of the knowledge and research data they produce, to such commercial publishers (increasingly corporate and US-owned (**Cf. Hagve, 2024**)). This may have been a pragmatic choice for the reasons above, but it will have consequences.

The consequences of the now-dominant global publishing economy of corporate conglomerates is not simply a matter of IP and other forms of capital (paid for by their national tax payers and converted into profit by US private business). It is institutional evolution, capability and agency. Universities have become weak in terms of leadership in the public sphere on matters of knowledge, scientific truth, the use of knowledge as ‘evidence’ in public policy development, and the knowledge-basis of social ethics or political decision making (**Cf. Pellegrini, et al, 2020**). Universities should be a central public agency for truth, development, standards, value and the range of ‘social’ and ‘cultural’ capabilities that today are intrinsically involved in knowledge production. This can involve designing, editing, evaluating, critical analysis, convening communities of learning, advocating for public literacy, providing portals for local, public and citizen-directed research, and a platform for local and regional industrial development, IP management and investment, data governance and marketing, liaison and petition of government and international bodies. Of course, universities in the UK do many of these things, but I doubt few will disagree that they are weak as ‘agents’ or voices in the national debates and dilemmas central to institutional development and governance in knowledge production.

These raise some big questions, notably on how university-published journals are markers for a certain level of capability lost to global corporate expansion of the publishing industry. Nonetheless, it is a capability that

can be regained, though perhaps commercial publishers will always provide a unique service and inhabit the global economy in a way universities cannot or do not want to. Either way, universities need to re-learn and facilitate the development of knowledge production and dissemination and all the socio-cultural and institutional implications of that, involving their researchers and scholars in managing new digital media opportunities strategically.

And to close this first matter —the emergence of digital media has opened a space of learning, research and practice, where developing the above can be done by activating existing digital skills-sets, and establishing digital methods and new formats for knowledge beyond the article and book. Knowledge can be re-defined in the process of knowledge production, and re-situated within the socio-cultural complex of institutional life — the university as a community of knowledge practices as well as knowledge cognition and involving academic community, social engagement, communication, and discussion and deliberation. As noted above, the publishing process is grounded on our ancient cultural capabilities of thinking, writing and communicating with readers; in practice, the activities of publishing identify a valuable professional skills-set: these include commissioning and liaising with authors and creatives, editing and working with text, designing and presenting, peer review and evaluation, production and dissemination, all of which are ‘transferable’ skills (usually enthusiastically embraced by universities).

Moving on to my second major issue: what’s the big rationale for more collaborative university-based publishing activity? A confluence of policy developments on behalf of research funders has seen older concerns for public engagement, social benefit, stakeholders and value, emerge in the more recent demands for ‘Open Access’ (OA). While there are current economic contradictions with Open Access, a new ethic of the ‘public availability’ of research is evolving in some very productive directions. Of course, public availability does not mean a ‘give away’ or that copyrights, IP or contractually-enforced employee rights, will diminish. In fact, universities can reassert their rights to the products of their employees, which they currently do not (academic have hitherto been free to make private contracts with commercial publishers and receive royalties for work already paid for through salaried time). Nonetheless, it is hoped on behalf of Open Access advocates that the ‘public’ domain will expand along with university agency and institution-based knowledge production (Cf. the new OIPA, 2023).

Relatively new or early career researchers and scholars, are not simply looking at a future of work modelled on the ‘lone scholar’ sitting in deep thought and writing in their book-lined study. Academic labour might be

more modelled on a designer, theatre producer, entrepreneur or orchestral conductor. We should be looking at the following as part of our PhD student or early career scholar curriculum:

- Digital technologies and platforms, social media and digital products and the network of globally active research universities.
- Building Profile and prestige; rankings; bibliometrics.
- Knowledge Brand identity and strategy, design and communication
- Events and promotion (online and offline; institution-based and independent).
- Collaborative production models and current editorial and reviewing work.
- Student Participation, editorial training and professional industry experience.

My third big issue is the question of *skills*. The growing funding agency call for expanding the ‘impact agenda’ (and more recently, the national REF upgrading of the facility of university ‘research culture’ within research-active institutions), requires a more assertive approach. We will need to take seriously matters to do with the strategic branding and design of research projects, case study methodologies, mapping and assessing distribution networks or academic value chains, and generating digital media products themselves. A strategically-managed publication project could internally enable university postgraduate researchers and early career researchers a range of professional development and training opportunities, in research media, research networks and global profile-building.

Fourthly, is the way institutional capacity-building around knowledge production would offer a different set of priorities. University published research journals are small microcosms of a potentially new value spectrum: they are a high-value low-cost mechanism for meeting large institutional aims, such as in constructing communities of knowledge within and across universities, partnering with cultural institutions, laboratories or corporations, and gaining the attention of government policymakers (Cf. **Institute for Government 2019; Xu 2022**). And, as Journals are invested in specific regions of knowledge, commanding high concentration and interest from its constituencies, more could be made of both: we should invest some strategic thought in (a) the need for pedagogies of knowledge production and public agency-building; and (b) engage directly with audiences of reader engagement through events (e.g., author interviews; publication launches, talks). Journals could not

only contribute to making globally visible the university's research brand, but act as gateway to the university's industrial economy, for locating and connecting to its members, institutes, projects, products, services, and specialists. Following this, it may beneficially pursue international Knowledge Diplomacy — of diplomatic intervention in the global economy of knowledge production: when was the last time a university challenged the corporate domination of the global knowledge economy?

An obstacle to this, obviously, will be the internal social class system endemic to publishing, one symptom of which is the ignoring of neurodiversity (of the cognitive status of author, researcher, public and reader). In the 1970s it became more apparent (as conveyed by psychological sciences) that 'intelligence' was not singular or one standardised phenomenon — there were many forms of 'intelligence' (**Gardner, 1983**). In our own time we can talk about 'neurodiversity', while seeming jargon does indeed acknowledge a similar and evidently true complexity in human neuro-psychological life. Neurodiversity remains unacknowledged in large areas of specialist publishing, but this needs to happen if the social deficit of neurodiverse pedagogies in education and society more broadly is to be addressed. Indeed, the potential evolution of AI in publishing promises to facilitate a huge expansion of diversity in the digital production and reproduction of knowledge. Other issues that need attention (as identified by our current research project), are the workings of:

- Intelligibility, legibility and accessibility.
- The navigational pathways, gateways and interfaces of Open Access in practice.
- The Global South and global access.
- Diversity in readership, along with Intellectual Diversity in editorial teams (in production).

Finally, we need to think through publication in terms of knowledge production as a research project in itself. Diversity will demand interdisciplinarity when aiming for a restructuring of priorities around public value, and the capacity building of a university institution that must rediscover the real ontology of knowledge. Journals are an effective place to start, for reasons stated above, but are not often stand-alone enterprises. To maintain the editorial standards, rate of scheduled production, and reach of distribution, journal production is usually situated within a publishing enterprise or company staffed and endorsed by a whole range of university validation processes. Some specialist journals (largely in the hard sciences, but sometimes social sciences) are very lucrative. Yet the recent 'Serials Crisis' in journal publication and

subscription flagged up both the economics and ‘political economy’ of journal production: the Serials Crisis (which even has a Wikipedia page) revealed how lucrative journals were dependent on publicly-funded institutions whose vulnerability to routine increase in subscription costs was greater than anticipated. The supposed ‘market’ was not so much a market but a partially concealed form of public-subsidy. And this subsidy was playing a less than democratic role in determining the structure of knowledge production and distribution (within institutions, nationally and globally). There remains a lack of research on this phenomenon (**Cronk 2020**).

Nonetheless, the journal, as a knowledge-enterprise, remains dense with possibility. Its small scale allows for local, creative, engaged and multi-level participation, and emerging AI applications for editing, translation and marketing, will allow for even ‘local’ journals to find a global readership, however select.

Interdisciplinary Publishing and the Younger Researcher

While medical, life or hard science journals are very different from those in arts, humanities and social science (financially, legally, bibliometrically), the emerging scholar faces similar production and procedural matters in getting started, such as the building of a research profile, the conditions of submission, peer review, and recognition.

On the matter of publication as ‘strategy’, one basic consideration is most apparent — that publication is a psychologically intensive activity, demanding a concentrated investment of time in a skilfully managed process of production. ‘Time management’ is a fraught feature of all our lives, but now a research subject in itself. In terms of research publications, the rate and quality of the product will become eternal characteristics of our CVs and ‘track-record’, academic profile and thus candidature for promotion and institutional advancement. Fortunately, today’s universities are more expansive and sometimes accepting of both eccentricity, difference and of differing career paths, even for research active staff; but even so, the global economy of knowledge remains traditional in its expectation of frequent high-quality articles and books. The precise value placed on any one product, is relative to a whole range of discipline-specific, institutional, discourse, or professional factors, but the general rule remains.

Any quick search on Amazon will find a whole range of books dedicated to enhancing the understanding, performance and planning of our work. These range from strategic management to popular ‘psychology of work’ books, the latter nonetheless sometimes distil some useful scientific research in organisational behaviour or neuro-psychology or relevant

fields. Most of us benefit in continually learning and relearning the social and behavioural features of effective working, not least in a continually changing economy. For my PhD students, I often recommend Cal Newport's popular *Deep Work* (2016) and Greg McKeown's *Essentialism* (2021), both of which extrapolate and synthesise wisdom from recent empirical research. They both iterate a salutary rationalisation of principles for disciplining our academic production in terms of time, as our most valuable resource; they advocate for a 'design' approach to time as a way of engaging in strategic prioritisation, and they take an analytical approach to optimising the value produced by our design.

While American neoliberalism (individualism, success-oriented, performance-based value, and so on) permeates both of the above books, they nonetheless serve as a salutary reminder of how publishing can be an effective framework of an evaluation for our own individual academic self-management. It is all too easy to mistake an involvement in research or even publishing 'projects' for actual material production. We can invest huge amounts of time in 'uneven' partnerships (where a co-author contributes little), or become involved in events or committees for prestigious organisations, or even 'field-building' a new sub-discipline. Academic life can be full of huge investments of time that are all fascinating and related to research, but, generate little in the way of substantive knowledge or tangible research publications. Our need for 'measurable tangible products' is, of course, a neoliberal phenomenon — involving the commodification of research, the proletarianisation of the academic researcher, the new public management (NPM) inculcation of the university institution and administration, infusing every aspect of scholarly life with American strategic management. Yet, as Marx would say, capitalism is fraught with contradiction, and contradiction is something we need to learn how to inhabit productively. In our academic economy, one contradiction is that the exploitative cycle of research production also allows for some genuine critical thought. And this is still supported with funding, if what is presented is more than just a few discrete published products but a sustained project on a trajectory within a compelling research programme (Allmer 2017). Devising a research programme is one of the great challenges of our academic era, as it extends from the formulation of compelling question to equally compelling outcomes and impact. And this demands the setting of priorities, goals or aims, that command your own conviction (a commitment to the exclusion of lots of other potentially more interesting activities). There are, effectively, two categories of publication — interesting studies, and the more dynamic research writing that generates a sense of knowledge being produced (and culminating in a measurable impact in the economy of knowledge production).

While scholarly life should involve a range of professional competencies – I personally believe that pedagogy is a public duty – the modern research university is not a transparent, equalitarian, or often even a coherent enterprise. It is a contradiction, in which the senior academic finds themselves with three part time jobs that do not add up to a coherent professional position (researcher, teacher, administrator). This is a professional landscape that needs to be continually negotiated, but more than that, it requires a strong sense of knowledge-based aims so that all the research and thinking that is inevitably invested in courses, curriculum and bureaucracy, are defined and re-emerge in terms of knowledge production. My most highly cited article emerged from a module I had to teach in a summer term, where anxiety on spending ‘research time teaching’ saw me writing about pedagogy, and the how the epistemologies generated by student learning could challenge the theoretical assumptions of the subject.

Student-facing work can be avoided by scholars who neglect this public duty (and the intellectual virtues it generates), but it offers a significant gateway to institutionalised knowledge and can result in all kinds of tangible publication (even if these are only scholarly blogs, reflective essays, policy briefings or presentations at professional gatherings). Pedagogy, taken seriously (i.e., theoretically) can refine the knowledge that is embryonic of research writing – your lexicon, methodologies, theory innovation, concept of truth, values and your normative claim on the world outside.

And I conclude by reflecting on the second of the valuable IAS seminars, engagingly entitled ‘What the Heck IS Interdisciplinary Publishing, Anyway?’. And this takes us back to my initial insights into the potential of journal production, on the journal as pivotal media in the global knowledge economy. The concept of ‘interdisciplinarity’ is an unfinished project and indeterminate, ranging from the exploratory end of multidisciplinarity to international transdisciplinarity, to what my own PhD supervisor once called ‘a very British low-intensity cultural studies’. Essentially, ‘the interdisciplinary’ is less a stable framework than an ongoing epistemological project – the journal *Exchanges* demonstrates this, modelling knowledge as academic interchange, intellectual interaction, identifying boundaries, conventions, and conditions of meaning and value. This journal allows for both a normative (ethical, principled, position-taking) and pragmatic (production-oriented) approach for researchers facing the complex and politically compromised academic knowledge economy before us.

An interdisciplinary approach to this knowledge economy should be mission-focussed. This means forging an academic profile from your defined programme and knowledge production trajectory, being able to respond to compelling needs or issues, and with a strong theoretical justification for the validity, veracity and relevance of your work. This establishes your own autonomy intellectually and professionally, as you will not have a disciplinary foundation either providing a lot of certitudes, models or proven principles, or patronage from a discipline guru or ‘top dog’. Real intellectual autonomy can attract interest, recognition, allowing a role in an academic ecosystem, around which can coalesce like-minded collaborators — an epistemic community that can create solidarity, support and a collaborative production. Interdisciplinarity does not have the traditional bases of academic community, and so can be alienating for the young researcher.

And so, from what I have said in the first few sections, this critical reflection can only conclude by reiterating the opportunities presented by new university-published journals. Emerging researchers and early career scholars have an opportunity to seize the future ‘means of production’ and found another interdisciplinary fulcrum of academic community, all the while being institutionally grounded, interconnected with pedagogy and engage with public value, in the form of a digitally mediated globally circulating journal.

Jonathan Vickery is Reader and former Director of the Centre for Cultural and Media Policy Studies at the University of Warwick, UK. He has specialised in postgraduate pedagogy, public engagement and working with artists and local arts organisations, but has also published research on local urban culture, global cultural policy discourse and many other subjects. He was co-director of the Shanghai City Lab (2013-15), Chair of The Art of Management and Organization (2013-2016) and from 2017 has been co-Editor in Chief of [The Journal of Law, Social Justice and Global Development](#).



References

- Adema, J. and Stone, G. (2017) 'Changing publishing ecologies: A landscape study of new university presses and academic-led publishing: A report to Jisc'. Available at: <https://repository.jisc.ac.uk/6666/1/Changing-publishing-ecologies-report.pdf> [Accessed: 12 March 2024].
- Allmer, T. (2017) 'Academic Labour, Digital Media and Capitalism'. Available at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/96774816.pdf> [Accessed: 24 April 2024].
- Association of University Presses (2020) ['value' statement]. Available at: <https://aupresses.org/the-value-of-university-presses/> [Accessed: 10 March 2024].
- Collyer, F. M. (2018) 'Global patterns in the publishing of academic knowledge: Global North, global South', *Current Sociology*, 66(1), 56-73. DOI [10.1177/0011392116680020](https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392116680020) [Accessed: 12 March 2024].
- Cronk, L. (2020) 'Resourcefully: Let's End the Serials Crisis', *The Serials librarian*, Volume 79, Issue 1-2: 78.
- Esposito, J. J. (2010) 'Stage Five Book Publishing', in *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, Vol. 13, Issue 2: (Reimagining the University Press). DOI: [10.3998/3336451.0013.204](https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0013.204) [Accessed: 12 March 2024].
- Gardner, H. (1983) *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*, New York: Basic Books.
- Hagve, M (2020) 'Perspectives: The money behind academic publishing', *Tidsskriftet* (issue: October 2020). Available at: <https://tidsskriftet.no/en/2020/08/kronikk/money-behind-academic-publishing> [Accessed: 10 March 2024].
- Institute for Government (2019) 'How Academia Can Work with Government'. Available at: https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/IfG_Academic_and_gov_2019_WEB_FINAL.pdf [Accessed 24 April 2024].
- Jisc. 2021. New university press toolkit – guide: setting up the press. [online]. Available at: <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/guides/new-university-press-toolkit> [Accessed: 10 March 2024]
- Keene, C., Milloy, C., Weigert, V., & Stone, G. (2016) 'The rise of the New University Press: The current landscape and future directions', *wileyonlinelibrary.com*. Available at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/161106956.pdf> [Accessed: 10 March 2024]
- Lockett, A., Speicher, L. (2016) 'New university presses in the UK: Accessing a mission', *Learned Publishing*, Vol. 29, Issue S1 (Special Issue: The University Press Redux): pp. 320-329. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1049> [Accessed: 12 March 2024].

Oberlo (2023) '10 YouTube Statistics'. Available at:
<https://www.oberlo.com/blog/youtube-statistics> [Accessed: 10 March 2024].

OIPA (2023) Open Institutional Publishers Association. Available at:
<https://oipauk.org/> [Accessed: 10 March 2024].

Open Institutional Publishers Association (OIPA) – Supporting open scholarship through community and collaboration (oipauk.org). Available at:
<https://oipauk.org/> [Accessed: 10 March 2024].

Pellegrini, M.M., Ciampi, F., Marzi, G. and Orlando, B. (2020) 'The relationship between knowledge management and leadership: mapping the field and providing future research avenues', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 24 No. 6: pp. 1445-1492. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-01-2020-0034> [Accessed: 24 April 2024]

Stone, G. (2017) 'Developing a Sustainable Publishing Model for a University Press: A Case Study of the University of Huddersfield, 2011-2015'. Doctoral thesis, University of Huddersfield. Available at:
<https://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/33791/> [Accessed: 12 March 2024].

Taylor M., and Jensen K. S. H., (2019) 'Developing a model for university presses', *Insights* 32: 19, pp 1–5. Available at:
<https://insights.uksg.org/articles/10.1629/uksg.469> [Accessed: 12 March 2024].

Taylor, M. (2019) Mapping the publishing challenges for an open access university press. *Publications*, 7(4), 63: 12pp.

Vickery, J. (2023a) 'The future of the University of Warwick Press: a scoping study', Coventry: University of Warwick [internal document]. cf.
<https://publishing.warwick.ac.uk/index.php/uwp> [Accessed: 10 March 2024]

Vickery, J. (2023b) 'The University Press phenomenon: new conditions and questions on the institutional publishing of research'. Available at:
<https://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/181636/> [Accessed: 12 March 2024].

Xu, H. (02.2022) 'Open Access Publishing and University Researchers' Agency Towards Reshaping the Publishing Habitus', *Education as change* (1682-3206): 26.

Bibliography

Association of University Presses. Best Practices for peer review – AUPresses Handbook for Scholarly Books. [online]. Available at:
<https://peerreview.up.hcommons.org/> [Accessed: 10 March 2024]

Council of the EU. 2023. Outcome of proceedings: High-quality, transparent, open, trustworthy and equitable scholarly publishing (9616/23). Available at:
<https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-9616-2023-INIT/en/pdf> [Accessed: 10 March 2024].

Fulcrum, 2024. Infrastructure and services for mission-driven publishers. Available at: <https://www.fulcrum.org/> [Accessed: 10 March 2024].

Liverpool University Press. Opening the Future. [online]. Available at: <https://lup.openingthefuture.net/> [Accessed: 10 March 2024].

Michigan Publishing. Digital Innovation at University of Michigan Press. [online]. Available at: <https://www.publishing.umich.edu/digital-publishing-pams> [Accessed: 12 March 2024].

Morris, S, Barnas, E., LaFrenier, D., Reich, M. (2013) *The Handbook of Journal Publishing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saha, A., & Van Lente, S. 2020. Rethinking 'Diversity' in Publishing Rethinking 'Diversity' in Publishing. Project Report. Goldsmiths Press, London. Available at: <https://research.gold.ac.uk/id/eprint/28692/#:~:text=Led%20by%20Dr%20Anamik%20Saha,might%20disadvantage%20writers%20of%20colour> [Accessed: 10 March 2024].

UKRI (2022) 'UKRI Open Access Policy pack' [pdf]. Available at: <https://www.ukri.org/publications/ukri-open-access-policy-information-pack/> [Accessed: 10 March 2024].

To cite this article:

Vickery, J., 2024. Critical Reflections on Universities, Publishing, and the Early Career Experience. *Exchanges: The Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(2), 188-202. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.31273/eirj.v11i2.1583>.

Endnotes

ⁱ The current project is called 'The Future of University-published research journals: local enterprise in the global knowledge economy'; it is led by Jonathan Vickery with Younggeon Byun and Gareth J Johnson of the Warwick Journals Editors' Group project (in collaboration with the University of Warwick Library, WICID, the Media Lab – funded by the Institute of Advanced Study: IAS). The IAS seminars, led by Gareth J Johnson, were, 'Publication Strategies: Approaches, Ideas and Advice' (Feb 29th 2024), co-arranged online with Warwick's European university partnership, EUTOPIA; and 'What the Heck IS Interdisciplinary Publishing, Anyway?' (Wed 6th March 2024), IAS seminar room [University of Warwick campus]. The panellists for the first were Alena Cicholewski (Oldenburg), Jonathan Vickery (Warwick), Kwasu Tembo (Lancaster) and Marcos Estrada (King Fahd); and the second, Ben Schaper (Oxford), Filippo Cervelli (SOAS), Jonathan Vickery (Warwick), Pierre Botcherby (Warwick) and Rupert Gatti (Cambridge).