

EDITORIAL 2(1): OPENING SCHOLARSHIP AND RETHINKING PEER REVIEW

ALISON CRUMP (Senior Managing Editor), McGill University

LAUREN HALCOMB-SMITH (Managing Editor), Royal Roads University

In his book, *The Access Principle*, Willinsky (2006) identified the year 2003 as the breakthrough for the open access (OA) movement. Fifteen years after the OA breakthrough, we can see the impact of this movement on high-level policies governing academic publishing and throughout the publishing landscape. For instance, the Canadian Tri-Agency now requires that publicly-funded research be published in open access journals (Government of Canada, 2016). We have also seen the emergence of software to help manage online and open source journals (e.g., [OSJ](#) - Open Source Journal) and seen journals transition from print-only to online-only journals. As Eve (2014) argued, however, “there is nothing in the concept of open access that means anything must be done differently except to lower price and permission barriers to research” (p. 137). This is seen, for instance, in Willinsky’s definition of the access principle, that “[a] commitment to the value and quality of research carries with it a responsibility to extend the circulation of such work as far as possible and ideally to all who are interested in it and all who might profit by it” (p. xii). In this editorial, we focus on how we can leverage technology in academic publishing to extend the principle of open access toward a principle of open scholarship. Beyond open access, our view of open scholarship is collaborative and transparent, rather than anonymous and potentially adversarial. Open scholarship, we argue, is changing how we produce and share knowledge. We focus on two aspects of J-BILD—the online platform and the collaborative peer mentoring model—that align with our vision of open scholarship.

When planning to launch the Journal of Belonging, Identity, Language, and Diversity (J-BILD), we explored several options for publishing platforms, the most obvious one being [OJS](#) (Open Journal Software). This federally-funded software provides editors, reviewers, and authors with a secure backend for managing submissions and an anonymous peer review process. We did not need this functionality for J-BILD because we do not do anonymous peer review of manuscripts. Instead, we use Google docs to allow authors and members of the editorial team to work collaboratively on developing manuscripts for publication (more on this shortly). Because we didn’t need a system to manage anonymous submissions, J-BILD is self-hosted with WordPress, a platform that gives us aesthetic flexibility as well as something most journals within our field do not offer: the ability to comment on published articles. While we have not seen comments on J-BILD articles yet, we are excited about giving readers the option to connect with authors and provide feedback on what they are reading because doing so allows conversations about research to happen more freely and openly than traditional publishing often allows. These ideas of free and open scholarly conversations tie back to our beginnings as a [blog](#) with the Belonging, Identity, Language, and Diversity (BILD) community. It is our view that open scholarship is more than open access. It involves opening lines of communication and inviting public dialogue about published research. It also means making the process of producing published research (that is, through peer review) a personal and collaborative one, rather than one masked in “blind” objectivity.



In founding a journal on the principles of open scholarship, we have taken inspiration from Eve (2014), who reminded us that “shifts in publication practice allow us the space to rethink peer review and other practices and to ask whether there are analogous changes, facilitated either socially or technologically, that could be worth exploring at this time of transition” (p. 137). Like Eve, we challenge the traditional model of peer review as the gold standard in academic publishing and have joined a small, but growing community of scholars who are breaking down the practice of double-blind review (e.g., [CJNSE](#); [eLife](#); [Hybrid Pedagogy](#)) and taking away what is sometimes an unconstructive atmosphere. We are also avoiding using the ableist language in the term *blind* review. We recognize that *anonymized* peer review “works on a series of unspoken ideological assumptions that are never wholly objective and apolitical” (Eve, 2014, p. 139). By challenging the condition of anonymity in peer review, we have developed a model for J-BILD much like the one Jesse Stommel uses for *Hybrid Pedagogy*, which focuses on building community through collaborative peer mentoring (Linder, 2018).

We have not, however, shirked the idea that a manuscript should be reviewed by more than one person. Each J-BILD manuscript benefits from the feedback of at least three people: peer mentors do several rounds of feedback with authors, focusing primarily on argument structure and content; copy editors do a second review and a closer edit of grammar, references, and formatting; senior copy editors do a final review and formatting check. Authors are closely involved with the editorial team during each of these feedback and cycles, and everyone’s identities are known to one another. This collaborative peer mentoring is done entirely on Google docs, which allows multiple people to access and edit the same document. As managing editors, we are also involved throughout the process. For example, peer mentors or copy editors can flag us in a comment, which sends us an email notification that our attention is needed on a manuscript to resolve a question or issue. Because peer mentors and copy editors have the opportunity to work back and forth with authors, this can improve the quality of their feedback. We have heard from peer mentors that this is a more satisfying experience than doing anonymous reviews, one that encourages a greater sense of investment in the research and the final publication.

Another aspect of the collaborative peer mentoring model that contributes to open scholarship is the quick turnaround time our model allows; we are often able to publish manuscripts within six months to a year of their submission. This is entirely due to the extremely engaged and dedicated members of our editorial team, who we feel are so committed because of the interpersonal connections they make and the investment they feel in helping move an author’s work towards publication. In our view, it is extremely important to recognize the people who contribute to a single issue, which we do as an ongoing practice through our interactions with our editorial team, and through collaborative decision making and input on editorial processes and procedures. We also list their names on the same webpage as the issue they have contributed to. This, we hope, will help address the peer reviewer fatigue—that is, the difficulty in finding reviewers for submissions—that some journals experience. Because of the relatively short timeline for publishing a manuscript, authors are able to bring current research and scholarship to the community, which can allow for dialogue that is fresh enough for authors to use the ideas generated to further their research. This has the potential to enrich the quality of research, expand the reach of knowledge, and of course, build community.



We see open scholarship as grounded in the open access movement, thus it is important to acknowledge some issues with OA. First, open access does not mean universal access; there remain barriers, such as language and connectivity barriers (Suber, 2012). Open access also does not mean free. There are many costs associated with producing scholarship; however, in the world of academic publishing, many of these costs are subsumed under the umbrella of “service.” J-BILD, for example, has no fees for authors and operates on an annual budget of about \$100 (fees for hosting the WordPress site and for our domain name) and a tremendous number of volunteer hours, not just ours but from the entire editorial team, including the peer mentors, copy editors, senior copy editors, and web developer.

Publishing an online journal that is also open access is changing how knowledge is produced and shared. It is also changing how people read, for instance, by encouraging more critical engagement with reading because readers can click hyperlinks and check sources and have access to more complete data sets (Willinsky, 2006). An area that has not been fully explored in the field of Applied Linguistics is the integration of digital tools, methods, and media in publications. As a field, we could draw some inspiration from work being done in the field of Digital Humanities, where this practice is far more advanced (see, for example, [Vectors Journal](#), which explores the intersections of technology and social relations). We expect that the J-BILD model will continue to evolve over time as authors begin to embrace the affordances of new media and produce texts that are more multimodal. We hope to continue to push the boundaries of open scholarship and to encourage new kinds of authors and new kinds of conversations in open spaces.

ARTICLE OVERVIEWS

We received 15 submissions for our second issue. We are pleased to be publishing eight manuscripts--five recent research projects and three critical literature reviews.

Research studies

Marie-Eve Bouchard presents the results of her study of the ideologies that surround the use of rhotics in the Santomean variety of Portuguese in her article, titled “A distinctive use of R as a marker of Santomean identity.” Bouchard presents and discusses data generated through sociolinguistic interviews to show how the distinctive use of rhotics is becoming a marker of Santomean national identity, particularly among younger Santomeans who grew up after the independence of the country and among those who expresses pride in the Santomean variety of Portuguese.

Timothy Loh, author of “‘Maybe Jesus knows Sign’: Resistance through identity formation,” presents the results of anthropological research exploring how Deaf Christians negotiate their identities as members of two distinct identity groups: Deaf and Christian. Contextualizing his research within historical events over the last 50 years, Loh presents his analysis and interpretation of data generated through ethnographic field work to argue that Deaf Christian identity formation does not necessarily include a conflict between deafness and Christianity, but rather a resistance against historically-rooted narratives in Christianity that relate to deafness as a deficit. Loh further



argues and demonstrates that Deaf Christians use language and communication to index and reinforce their identity as Deaf Christians.

“Spanish Language Ecosystems in New Mexico and their Impact on Spanish Language Learners,” by Sarah O’Brien, explores how U.S. students’ receptiveness to Spanish language learning is impacted by the social perceptions of the language that exist within their surrounding community. O’Brien shares the results recent research within three school districts in New Mexico, where she generated data through mixed-methods over a period of seven months. Through her interpretation and discussion of these data, O’Brien explores the stratified views held by members of the school communities, specifically related to ideologies of language related to learning and speaking Spanish, concluding with a number of language planning suggestions for improving outcomes for Spanish language learners.

“Navigating Competing Identities through Stance-Taking: Migration, Class, and Nation,” by Elizabeth Peacock, presents the results of ethnographic research on Ukrainian teenagers’ use of stance-taking on issues of migration as a means of aligning or disaligning themselves in interactions with others. Grounded in stance theory, Peacock’s paper seeks to address limitations in the existing body of research related to the ways in which individuals take up stances in everyday interactions. Through her analysis and interpretation of qualitative data generated through group discussion, Peacock makes links between stance-taking and social identities as they relate to socioeconomic class and migration in Ukraine, revealing the broader views held by Ukrainian teenagers on migration.

Gregory Tweedie and Robert Johnson, authors of “Listening instruction and patient safety: Exploring Medical English as a lingua franca (MELF) for nursing education,” present the results of a recent student exploring Medical English as a lingua franca (MELF). Specifically, the authors look at the intelligibility of interactions using MELF and its implications on patient safety. Through their analysis and discussion of mixed-methods data, the authors argue that intelligibility can have implications on patient safety, concluding their paper with recommendations related to language education of nursing professionals in sociolinguistic contexts where MELF is used.

Critical literature reviews

“L’enseignement du français chez les Premières Nations d’hier à aujourd’hui: Enjeux didactiques, pratiques pédagogiques et perspective interculturelle,” by Nancy Crepeau and Carole Fleuret, takes a critical stance to explore the pedagogical foundations at the origins of current French-language teaching practices in Quebec. In particular, the authors focus on the implications of current teaching practices on students from First Nations backgrounds and identify issues related to learners’ language repertoire, academic achievement, and plurilingual competence. The authors conclude their review with recommendations for the future.

In his paper, titled, “A case for policy analysis in minority language discourse: A critical literature review,” Taylor Ellis explores Indigenous language revitalization in educational contexts. Beginning with a critical review of linguistic diversity metaphors, such as language-as-resource (Ruiz, 1984)



and language ecology (Hornberger, 2002), as well as specific case examples from around the world, Ellis problematizes and highlights the issues inherent to the language-as-resource model as a whole.

Hailey Iacono presents “Designing opportunities to support pre-service teachers in noticing and understanding how to position students competently: An overview of supporting literature.” Iacono frames her critical literature review within the context of recent educational reforms, specifically as they relate to the mathematics classroom, and limitations in the scope of teacher educational programs. Through her exploration of the literature, Iacono successfully highlights several guiding principles to address such limitations, ultimately making the argument that more research on teacher noticing of interactions relating to positioning students competently is needed.

REFERENCES

- Eve, M. P. (2014). *Open access and the humanities: Contexts, controversies and the future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Government of Canada (2016). Tri-agency open access policy on publications. Retrieved from, http://www.science.gc.ca/eic/site/063.nsf/eng/h_F6765465.html?OpenDocument
- Hornberger, N. H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, 1(1), 27–51.
- Linder, K. (2018, Feb. 19). Dr. Jesse Stommel on founding a journal. [audio podcast]. Retrieved from, <https://ecampus.oregonstate.edu/research/podcast/e99/>
- Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE: The Journal for the National Association for Bilingual Education*, 8(2), 15-34.
- Suber, P. (2012). *Open access*. Cambridge, MA, and London, UK: The MIT Press.
- Willinsky, J. (2006). *The access principle: The case for open access to research and scholarship*. Cambridge, MA, and London, UK: The MIT Press.

