

“... is an open access, peer-reviewed, scholarly journal”: How open access journals describe themselves in their “Aims and Scope” statements

An Cheng

Oklahoma State University (USA)

an.cheng@okstate.edu

Abstract

Open access journals (OAJs) have been celebrated for freeing research from paywalls and increasing the visibility of research results beyond disciplinary, academic, or financial boundaries. They have been recognized as an important part of the Open Science (OS) ecology. However, they are still viewed by some with skepticism. Given these conflicting perceptions, it would be important for LSP researchers and practitioners to understand OAJs better as they may need to work with students who are or will be part of the OS movement. Examining how open access journals describe themselves in their “Aims and Scope” (A&S) statement is a worthwhile step in this direction. I analyzed the A&S statements of 104 OAJs and 104 subscription-based journals. I conducted thematic analysis aided by NVivo. Although both groups of journals include some broad themes in their A&S statements, there are some observable differences in the way they describe their scope and promote themselves. Using the concept of the prestige economy, I offer two theoretical insights: the OAJs journals may be self-consciously and purposefully responding to the expectations of the prestige economy. Meanwhile, they may be redefining what is relevant in such an economy.

Keywords: LSP practitioners’ specialized knowledge, meta-genres, open access journals, open science, scholarly publishing

Resumen

“... es una revista académica, con revisión por pares y de acceso en abierto”: Cómo las revistas de acceso abierto se describen en su declaración de “Objetivos y Alcance”

Las revistas de acceso abierto han sido aclamadas por liberar la investigación de los muros de pago y aumentar la visibilidad de los resultados de investigación más allá de los límites disciplinarios, académicos o financieros. Por esto, han sido reconocidas como una parte importante de la ecología de la Ciencia Abierta. Sin embargo, algunos investigadores todavía las perciben con escepticismo. Dadas estas percepciones contradictorias, sería importante que los investigadores y profesionales del campo de las Lenguas para Fines Específicos comprendieran mejor las revistas de acceso abierto, ya que es posible que necesiten trabajar con estudiantes que son o serán parte del movimiento de la Ciencia Abierta. Examinar cómo las revistas de acceso abierto se describen a sí mismas en su declaración de “Objetivos y Alcance” (A&S, por sus siglas en inglés) es un paso en esta dirección que merece la pena. En este estudio analicé las declaraciones “A&S” de 104 OAJ y 104 revistas de suscripción. Realicé análisis temáticos con la ayuda de NVivo. Aunque ambos grupos de revistas incluyen algunos temas amplios en sus declaraciones “A&S”, se observan algunas diferencias en la forma en que describen su alcance y se promocionan. Utilizando el concepto de economía de prestigio, ofrezco dos conclusiones: las revistas de acceso abierto pueden estar respondiendo consciente e intencionadamente a las expectativas de la economía de prestigio. Al mismo tiempo, es posible que estén redefiniendo lo que es relevante en dicha economía.

Palabras clave: conocimiento especializado de los profesionales de lenguas para fines específicos, revistas de acceso abierto, ciencia abierta

1. The rationales for this study

Open Science (OS) has been championed as “a pivotal global movement to advance science and scholarship” (Jeschke et al., 2019, p. 1). Open access journals (OAJs) have been recognized as a crucial part of the OS ecology. OAJs have been celebrated as freeing research from paywalls and increasing the visibility of research results beyond disciplinary, academic, or financial boundaries (Asai, 2022). The market share of OAJs has increased substantially in recent years (Björk & Korkeamäki, 2020). OAJs journals have also elaborated on the benefits of OA, believing that their OA status has enabled them to embark on “an exciting new future as an open access scholarly publication” (the “Aims and Scope” statement of *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*). Publications’ internationality and academic influence have been noted as improved through OAJs collaboratively published by research institutes and small publishers (Asai, 2021). Even though the proportion of articles published in OAJs varies across disciplines

(Björk & Korkeamäki, 2020), the advantages of OAJs have led to the call for publishers to make all their flagship journals open access (Jeschke et al., 2019). Some have predicted that, with the progress of OS, research will be published mostly in OAJs within the next 20 years (Christopher, 2020). An increasing number of research funding organizations, such as Plan S, Research Councils UK 2, and the National Institute of Health, have mandated that authors publish grant-funded research in OAJs or provide open access to their research findings (Christopher, 2020).

Meanwhile, publishing research articles (RA) in reputable journals is career impacting for most academics, who not only have to “publish or perish”, but also to “publish in the right journal or perish” (Faulkner, 2021, p. 3). Consequently, many LSP-related guidebooks have discussed how to select suitable journals for one’s manuscripts (e.g., Paltridge & Starfield, 2016; Yan, 2021). Belcher’s (2019) popular guidebook, for example, includes a 39-page chapter on this topic.

Notably, in some of these discussions by writing researchers and instructors, OAJs are viewed as “debatable publishing outlets” (Belcher, 2019, p. 116) on a par with local journals, graduate student journals, and non-peer-review journals, citing “questions about rigor” (p. 121). Such a perception may be that of one researcher and may not represent the views of other scholars in other disciplines. However, such a perception has been noted and recorded by other scholars from inside and outside of LSP and writing instruction (e.g., Ray, 2016; Faulkner, 2021; Nejadghanbar & Hu, 2022).

The skepticism has also been reflected in the scholarly publishing realities of some disciplines. For example, ecology has been noted as “currently [having] no top-tiered open access journals” (Jeschke et al., 2019, p. 2). In trauma and orthopedics, “open access journals have significantly lower quality measures in comparison to subscription journals” (Cooke & Jain, 2021, p. 1). In educational leadership, a survey of 100 faculty at 98 universities found that only a third believed that articles in the OAJs in their discipline undergo the same review process as articles in traditional subscription-based journals (SBJs). Similarly, only a small percentage of these faculty indicated that institutional perceptions of OAJs’ quality, rigor, and peer-review process were equivalent to that of SBJs (Richardson et al., 2019, p. 15). In psychology, a study found that the faculty at one university cited OAJs more than they publish in them (Faulkner, 2021). With these observations, it is unsurprising that some have characterized OAJs as

among the “debatable publishing outlets” for aspiring authors (Belcher, 2019, p. 116).

It seems that, on the one hand, OAJs, as a crucial part of the progressive OS ecology, have been celebrated as representing the future of scholarly publishing. On the other hand, they have been viewed by LSP-related researchers and practitioners and by researchers of scholarly publishing as still not measuring up to SBJs in quality measures or in recognition. It seems that OAJs are caught in such conflicting perceptions and complex rhetorical pulls. Such a conflict makes it important for LSP researchers and practitioners to develop their understanding of OAJs from various possible angles. Some of the students in our graduate-level LSP classes are likely already a part of, or will be involved in, the OS movement through accessing articles from OAJs to learn research writing, through submitting journal articles to OAJs, or through their future editorial or gate-keeping work. In fact, we have seen the concerted efforts by scholars outside of LSP to educate students in their disciplines about OAJs (Christopher, 2020) or to advise junior researchers to use OAJs as opportunities for expanding publishing opportunities (Duarte, 2020).

Therefore, developing our knowledge of the OS movement and OAJs should become a part of LSP researchers and practitioners’ specialized knowledge (Ferguson, 1997, p. 84). “Specialized knowledge” is distinct from “specialist knowledge” (p. 84), which refers to knowledge of the content of the students’ disciplines or subjects. LSP practitioners’ specialized knowledge includes their understanding of their students’ disciplinary cultures and the epistemological basis of students’ different disciplines. Such an understanding should entail the culture and context of publications of our students with OAJs and OS being an inherent part of the future.

Given the importance of the OS movement and OAJ publishing, researchers of scholarly publishing have devoted their attention to OAJs. Some have focused on faculty’s perceptions of OAJs (e.g., Richardson et al., 2019; Faulkner, 2021). They have also analyzed the economics and infrastructures of OA journal publishing (e.g., Asai, 2022), such as the strategies to convert SBJs to OAJs. Some have analyzed the challenges faced in the peer-reviewed system in OAJs (Kumar & Ahmed, 2022). These are all very important aspects that can enhance our understanding of OAJs and OS. One angle that has yet to receive research attention is how OAJs describe themselves. How do OAJs define and present themselves in public-facing documents on their

websites? For example, do they make any status or legitimacy claims? If yes, how? This study aims to address this question. Specifically, I will examine the "Aims and Scope" (A&S) statements of 104 OAJs. I will also study the A&S statements of 104 SBJs for reference purposes to examine the observable differences, if any, in how the two groups of journals analyzed in this study describe themselves. The goal of such a comparison is not to endorse the normative superiority of SBJs, but to enrich our understanding of OAJs, which remains the focus of the study. The study will, thus, be guided by these two research questions:

- (1) What is often included in the A&S statements in these two groups of journals?
- (2) Are there any observable differences in the way the SBJs and the OAJs describe themselves? If yes, what might these be?

2. Focusing on journals' A&S statements

Any journal nowadays likely provides various public-facing documents on their websites as noted by researchers of scholarly publishing (e.g., Nejadghanbar & Hu, 2022). These documents include the journal's A&S statement, editorial policies, author guides, a list of editors and editorial board members, and statistics about the journal's citation impact, among others. These public-facing documents serve as the journal's meta-genres, defined as "genres about genres" (Giltrow, 2002, p. 195) that "provide shared background knowledge and guidance in how to produce and negotiate [one's target] genres" (Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010, p. 94). The A&S statement is a common, important public-facing meta-genre for any journal. It describes what a journal aims to achieve (its aims) and what it publishes (its scope). This meta-genre, together with other meta-genres, can potentially guide the submission decision of a less experienced author or an author submitting to a previously unfamiliar journal.

The importance of A&S statements has been recognized by journal publishers, editorial teams, seasoned researchers, and other academic publishing stakeholders. The journal publisher Taylor and Francis' "Author Services" portal includes a page on "how to use a journal's aims and scope to find the right fit for your research" (<https://authorservices.taylorandfrancis.com/choosing-a-journal/how-to-use-a-journals-aims-and-scope/>). The page explains what an A&S statement is and what it does. It

describes the components in a typical A&S statement. It emphasizes the function of A&S statements as “a powerful resource” for aspiring authors to “choose the best journal” for their research. With visuals and hyperlinks, the page teaches new or aspiring authors how to use a journal’s A&S statement to guide their writing of their manuscripts. In the author portals of most major journal publishers, similar information about A&S statements can be found.

Many journals have also underscored the role of the A&S statement meta-genre in guiding new authors. The *Textile Research Journal*, a SBJ included in this study, for example, reminds its potential authors that, “before submitting your manuscript ..., please ensure you have read the Aims & Scope ... as only manuscripts of sufficient quality that meet the aims and scope of *Textile Research Journal* will be reviewed”. *Veterinary Evidence*, an OAJ included in this study, tells its potential authors flatly that “any submissions not adhering to the journal’s aims and scope will be rejected outright”. The importance also lies in how “the aims and scope of journals”, often crafted by editors and their editorial teams, sometimes meticulously, result in “monitoring and shaping intellectual developments in the field” to “drive the advancement of scientific knowledge” (Petersen et al., 2017, p. 1594).¹

Seasoned researchers across the disciplines have also stressed the importance of this meta-genre. A group of biomedical researchers remind novice writers that “one of the editors’ roles is to check the content match of submissions regarding aims and scope of journal”, so “authors should ... study the scope of journal and check the frequency of their own manuscript topic with scope” (Shokraneh et al., 2012, p. 62). Similar advice has also been given by Sheldon et al. (2012) to novice writers in forensic sciences, among other examples.

The usefulness of this meta-genre, of course, should not be overly estimated. A journal may be so well established and well reputed that even new authors have read enough articles in it to know its aims and scope. A journal’s meta-genres, this one or others, may also not correlate with its quality. This study does not make any of these assumptions. Instead, it views the A&S statement as a rhetorical opportunity for the journal to discursively construct itself and studies it merely from that perspective.

3. Research Design

3.1. The data

To answer the research questions in this study, I analyzed the A&S statements of 104 OAJs and 104 SBJs. The OAJs were chosen from the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). DOAJ is a “a vital part of the global open access infrastructure”. It aims to “increase the visibility, accessibility, reputation, usage and impact of quality, peer-reviewed, open access scholarly research journals globally, regardless of discipline, geography or language”, according to www.doaj.org. It indexes 1,9436 in 80 languages in June 2023. Among the indexed journals, about 13,204 have no article processing charges (APCs). I limited my search to OAJs with a DOAJ Seal, which is “awarded to journals that demonstrate best practice in open access publishing” (www.doaj.org/apply/seal). The DOAJ seal of approval means that these OAJs have more than likely met the threshold level of quality in journal publishing. They have set themselves apart from predatory OAJs and are likely to represent the future of OAJ publishing. Therefore, these journals constitute a worthwhile source of data. I focus on the OAJs published in English from the US, UK, Australia, and Canada with no APCs. These search categories resulted in 127 OAJs. Among them, seven led to dead links and were eliminated. I randomly selected 104 from the remaining 120 journals by removing one at every 6th journal until 16 journals were eliminated from the data. The step ensures an equal number between the OAJs and the existing data of SBJs (see more below) for ease of comparison. The journals end up representing these broad disciplines (in alphabetical order): anthropology, archaeology, architecture, animal science, biology, chemistry, civil engineering, criminology, dentistry, digital humanities, economics and statistics, education, electrical engineering, engineering, environmental sciences, finance, fine arts, history, language and literature, law, mathematics, library science, medicine, nursing, pediatrics, philosophy, political science, public health, psychology, and science and technology. Annex 1 provides a list of the OAJs analyzed in this study.

The SBJs in this study consist of journals selected by my previous students from across the disciplines. As a task to learn discipline-specific writing, I asked graduate students in two previous research writing classes to select research articles (RAs) from well-respected journals within their disciplines to analyze, seeking the advice of their disciplinary faculty if needed (Cheng, 2018, provides additional details about the selection criteria and process

instructed to the students). The graduate students (about 40) were from a range of disciplines as noted in their selected journals listed below. EAP researchers have noticed that many advanced graduate students are “highly acculturated into the genres of their discourse communities” (Lee & Swales, 2006, p. 72), and, indeed, the journals they selected turned out to be very well-respected, highly cited, key journals, as noted in their memos citing their advisors’ evaluation and in the information on the websites of the students’ professional organizations. The broad disciplinary areas represented are agriculture education, architecture, animal science, biochemistry, computer science, education, economics and statistics, environmental science, finance, information systems, leisure studies, materials science, physics, plant pathology, political science, science and technology, urban studies, among others. See Annex 1 for a list of these SBJs.

The gigantic number of SBJs and the inherent differences between OAJs and SBJs in general, such as most OAJs’ lack of impact factors and their shorter histories, imply inherent difficulties in a comparable set of journal criteria and data between the two groups. The two groups of journals analyzed in this study, however, are comparable in these four criteria intended for this study: presumably meeting such threshold levels of quality control as being peer reviewed and having editorial teams consisting of university faculty members; no APCs; published in major English-speaking countries; and representing a range of disciplines. Note that some OAJs, though sponsored and published by “local” professional organizations in non-English-speaking countries, are published through publishers such as Springer Online, University of Pittsburgh Library, and located in English-speaking countries within the criteria. This phenomenon will be analyzed in Sub-section 4.3.4 and in Annex 3. I heeded these possible differences between the two groups: the OAJs represent a wider range of disciplines and greater number of interdisciplinary journals, while the SBJs have a stronger presence of science and engineering related disciplines. The SBJs are more established journals within their respective disciplines with a longer history than the OAJs. I integrated any detectable impact these differences may have into the analysis in the findings. I tried to present examples from as many disciplines as possible in the Findings section.

3.2. Data analysis

I read all the meta-genres, such as the landing page, any “about” section, submission guidelines, editorial policies, and others, on each journal’s website

carefully. I identified the section serving the rhetorical purpose of an A&S statement regardless of the section title (“Scope of the Journal”, “Focus and Coverage”, or “Mission and Scope”, among other variants). I conducted a thematic analysis of these A&S statements aided by NVivo 13 (www.qsrinternational.com). I followed the standard procedures of thematic analysis (e.g., Rubin, 2021) to code the data to develop a set of themes that can capture the information in the A&S statements. The procedures include:

- *Familiarization*: I read through these 208 A&S statements numerous times for an overall impression of the data. Memo keeping helped me record any initial thoughts on the data.
- *Open coding*: I conducted initial coding of each statement. I identified any unit of meaningful data, which could be a word, a phrase, a clause, a sentence, or a group of sentences, in each A&S statement. I applied an initial label, i.e., an open code, to each unit of data. I then moved to the next unit until I finished the open coding of a statement. I then moved to the next statement. Each coded statement was compared with the preceding coded ones. Memo keeping helped record subtle connections among similar open codes as well as relative frequency of the codes. Such reflections and constant comparison helped prepare for the next step.
- *Closed coding*: I pared down the open codes. I did so mainly through combining open codes when the distinction between them was not observed as especially relevant to the research questions. I then conducted two more rounds of closed coding of each statement data based on these pared-down codes. Memo keeping at this stage helped me note down my initial thoughts on the thematic connection among various codes to prepare for the next stage.
- *Thematic categorizing*: I developed several main themes based on the closed coding processes and reflections in my memos, each theme with as clear a definition as possible. I recorded all the representative examples under each of the contributing codes contributing to the themes through NVivo. I also counted the numbers of these examples.

A list of the open codes, the pared-down codes, and the thematic categories are provided in Annex 2. A list of the broad themes with examples is provided in Table 1 in the Findings.

4. Findings

4.1 An overview of the themes

In this section, I first present in Table 1 the broad themes developed from the data. The broad themes help answer Question 1: What is often included in this meta-genre? In Subsections 4.2 and 4.3, I zoom in to two themes and their sub-themes (as bolded in Table 1) because of their direct relevance to Question 2: Are there any observable differences in the way the SBJs and the OAJs describe themselves in this meta-genre? This focus also takes into consideration space constraints. I discuss these two themes extensively with as many examples as possible to illuminate the themes' various dimensions. Each example will be marked as SBJs or OAJs to indicate the group it belongs to.

The A&S statements examined in this study include these themes with some of them expanded into sub-themes as shown in Table 1. These broad themes help answer Question 1: What is often included in the A&S statements.

Theme	Supporting example
To describe the journal's aims.	<i>AAPS Open</i> , the flagship open access journal of ... provides a global forum for the rapid publication of original research and discussion that demonstrates applications of scientific concepts and techniques across the breadth of the pharmaceutical sciences (OAJs).
To specify the journal's scope. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To specify what one includes or encourages. - To specify what one discourages or excludes (the bolded themes and subthemes will be discussed in the subsequent subsections). 	[<i>Architecture's</i>] focus lies in critical and original engagement with the built environment and explicitly welcomes interdisciplinary perspectives on this focus (OAJs). Please note that while [<i>The History Education Research</i>] accepts historical research on history education, it does not accept papers that are solely focused on the history of education in general or on history itself (OAJs).
To provide the rationales for the journal.	Film is a distinct medium with a distinct history and, as such, it requires a distinct pedagogy. In consequence, pedagogical approaches inherited from other subjects, such as the textual study of literature, are not always appropriate for analyzing film. In many parts of the world, the study of film is not yet recognized as a discrete subject and has not become a fully integrated part of the curriculum. <i>Film Education Journal</i> aims to lead and shape the developing conversation about the place of film education in diverse educational contexts (OAJs).
To describe one's manuscript types	In addition to primary research articles in four formats, <i>Cell</i> features review and opinion articles on ..." (SBJ).
To promote the journal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To make explicit status claims - To describe one's diverse readership - To highlight one's open access status - To emphasize one's peer-reviewed status and the prestige of its editors and editorial board members - To describe one's affiliated or sponsoring professional organization - To present one's long history 	<i>Development</i> is a leading primary research journal in the field of developmental biology (SBJ). The contents of <i>Accounting Horizons</i> , therefore, should interest researchers, educators, practitioners, regulators, and students of accounting (SBJs). <i>Journal of Anthropology and Ethnology</i> is an open access, peer-reviewed, scholarly journal (OAJs). [<i>The Journal of Service Theory and Practice</i>] publishes double-blind peer reviewed papers (OAJs) [<i>Financial Analysts Journal</i> is] the flagship publication of CFA Institute and ... serves as the outward-facing presence of CFA Institute (SBJ). From <u>its launch in 1923</u> ... to the present day, [<i>The Journal of Experimental Biology</i>] publishes papers on...(SBJs).
To provide house-keeping details such as publication frequency, the submission platform, word limit, inquiries, and others	<i>Archaeology International</i> , produced annually, combines news about Institute activities with reports on research, both on new and on-going projects (OAJs).

Table 1. Themes and subthemes with examples developed from the data.

4.2. To specify what the journal in question discourages or excludes

Each A&S statement discusses the journal's scope, or the covered topics, study types, approaches, and others. This theme is supported by two sub-themes as noted in Table 1: (1) to specify what a journal includes or welcomes and (2) to specify what a journal discourages or excludes. This subsection focuses on Sub-theme 2 due to the observable differences in the two groups that can enlighten Question 2. Specifically, 30 of the 104 SBJs (28.8%) explicitly reference the topics, approaches, study types, and others they discourage, conditionally consider, or simply exclude. The total references are 95 for the 30 SBJs, since the same journal may make multiple such explicit references in the same A&S statement. By comparison, only 12 (10.5%) OAJs make such references. The total number of references is 12 for the 12 OAJs.

The references by the SBJs are also more detailed. For example, a subsection in the A&S statement of the *Journal of Marketing* (JM) is "What Types of Research Does JM Not Publish?" (SBJs) with a six-item list consisting of 267 words to specify what it considers out of scope and the reasons. The SBJ *Atmospheric Environment* similarly includes a 5-item list consisting of 100 words to elaborate on perceived out-of-scope studies. *The Journal of Experimental Biology* provides detailed fine-tuning conditional statements to delimit its scope:

"Articles focusing on ... will be considered but must The journal does not have room for ... that do not make clear Studies where... are measured under ... (i.e., ...) and that only ... are rarely considered for publication because... . . . Approaches (e.g, xxx, xxx, xxx, or xxx) are welcome but only where they ... Please note that we do NOT publish ... with ..., ... or ...; however, ... may occasionally be considered. Papers in ... should contain ... that fulfill at least one of the following criteria: (1) ..., ..., or ... and (2) ..., ... Purely ... papers that do not ... will not be considered (SBJ).

The sample categories that the SBJs consider out of scope include:

Study types: "We do not publish small-scale evaluations of specific software/systems in specialist domains or particular courses in individual institutions (unless the findings have broader relevance that is explicitly drawn out in the paper)" (*Computers and Education*/SBJs).

Methods: "Original research manuscripts submitted to *Tree Physiology* must have a focus on laboratory and/or field experimentation" (SBJs).

Content: “The following manuscripts will NOT be considered for publication: Studies that examine atmospheric transport but do not directly show how the investigated transport process impacts the composition of the atmosphere ...” (*Atmospheric Environment*/SBJs, original emphasis).

The OAJs’ references to what they consider as out of scope are, by comparison, briefer than those in the SBJs. No reference by the OAJ surpasses two sentences in length with examples such as “*Digital Studies* rarely publishes criticism of digital objects (e.g., game criticism, literary criticism of electronic art or literature); it does so primarily in the context of special issues” (OAJ) or “Please note that we do not publish poetry or creative writing in any form” (*Hungarian Cultural Studies*/SBJ). The Discussion will explore the reasons for, and significance of, such differences.

4.3. To promote one’s journal

The A&S statements in both groups include explicit promotional words, phrases, or sentences to present a positive image of the journals to the academic communities it serves or aspires to serve. This theme can be expanded into six sub-themes: (1) to make explicit status claims, (2) to describe its diverse readership, (3) to highlight one’s OA status, (4) to underscore one’s peer-reviewed status, (5) describe the affiliated professional association, and (6) to present one’s history. This subsection elaborates on these sub-themes except for “(2) to describe its diverse readership” as no noticeable differences between the two groups were found in my analysis, rendering that subtheme not as relevant to Question 2 as other subthemes are. I will zoom into each of the remaining five sub-themes, presenting illustrating examples as well as necessary frequency numbers.

4.3.1. To make explicit status claims

Certain journals make explicit claims about its leading, flagship, premier, highly acclaimed, highly cited status. Among the SBJs, the *Financial Analysts Journal*, for example, claims to be “the leading practitioner journal in the investment management community” (SBJs). *The Journal of the American Chemical Society* brands itself as “the flagship journal of the American Chemical Society and the world’s preeminent journal in all of chemistry and interfacing areas of science” (SBJs). *The Journal of Political Economy* sees itself as “one of the oldest and most prestigious journals in economics”. The *Journal of Superconductivity* is a “highly acclaimed journal” (SBJs) while *The*

American Journal of Distance Education is “internationally recognized as the journal of record of research and scholarship” (SBJs) in its field.

38 SBJs (36.5%) make a total of 42 such explicit status-claims. By contrast, only 16 OAJs (15.3) make a total of 17 such explicit claims in their A&S Statements. Unlike the SBJs, no OAJs call themselves “highly acclaimed”, “widely cited”, or “prestigious”. Instead of boldly declaring themselves to be the recognized “leading”, “flagship”, “premier”, “widely cited” journals as many of the SBJs do, their status claims seem to be more moderated and circumscribed. For example, *Jewish Cultural Studies* only states that it “**aims to** serve as a leading forum for Anglo-Jewish historiography” (OAJs; my emphasis), seemingly conveying its self-conscious aspirational, rather than already established, status. Similarly, *The Journal of Interactive Media* only claims that its aim is to “publish international leading research” (OAJs). *The Egyptian Liver Journal*, though calling itself “highly respected”, seems to self-consciously limit such a status to being a “highly respected journal in the Middle East” (OAJ).

The differences may be due to the categorical differences between SBJs and OAJs as well as to some journals within each group. As a group, OAJs are newer. They, thus, haven’t established long and strong publication records in their respective fields. Many, if not most, of the SBJs in this study have long publication records, with some even dating back to 1879 or 1911. A longer publication record has probably earned one recognized status that one can boldly claim. If another group of recently established SBJs were compared with the OAJs, the findings may be different. Additionally, SBJs, as a whole, have statistical indexes that could support such claims, something that most, if not all, OAJs lack.

Other methods by some OAJs to claim their status are noteworthy. For example, they name themselves as the first or the only journal in the area. No SBJs make such a claim. *The Journal of Art Historiography* states that “It will be the first contemporary journal dedicated specifically to the study of art historiography and [its] ambition is to make it the point of first call for scholars and students interested in that area” (OAJs). *The Journal of Embodied Research* calls itself “the first peer reviewed, open access, academic journal to focus on the dissemination of embodied knowledge through video” (OAJ). *The Film Education Journal* is “the world’s only publication committed to” its topic areas while *Literacy and Numeracy Studies* describes it as “one of perhaps only two international journals currently focusing on adult literacy and numeracy” (OAJs).

Another noteworthy method used by the OAJs in this study to claim their status is to highlight their internationality. Of the 104 SBJs, 39 (37.5%) mention global reach or status and make 51 total references. For example, *Applied Ergonomics* claims that its “Readership is truly international with subscribers in over 50 countries” (SBJs). *Higher Education Research & Development* simply states that it “is an international peer-reviewed journal” (SBJs). All the SBJs in this study are “international”, at least if judged by the composition of their editors and editorial boards and the statistics of authorship and readership coverage. Many of the science journals in the SBJs have basic science topics in well-established disciplines often considered universally appealing to researchers across many countries. It is, therefore, surprising that only 39 (37.5%) of these SBJs claim their internationality explicitly with only 51 of such references. It seems that most of these SBJs may have assumed their recognized global reach and may not see the need to highlight this aspect as a status-claiming strategy.

By contrast, 71 OAJs (68.2%) claim their internationality. These 71 OAJs make a total of 108 such references. They also provide comparatively elaborate descriptions of their international reach and topics instead of nearly naming themselves as international as many of the SBJs seem to do. They provide some details about how they serve international academic communities. For example, *Dialogic Pedagogy* promises that, since it views its audience as “international scholars and educators”, “scholars will have an invaluable opportunity to engage in an international debate” through disseminating their scholarship in this journal. Similarly, *Performance Philosophy* emphasizes that it serves “an emerging interdisciplinary field of thought, creative practices and scholarship, supported by an international network of over 2000 scholars and artists” (OAJs).

The OAJs also elaborate on the internationality of their topic coverage or contexts of studies. For example, *Gateways* claims that it is “avowedly international in scope, actively seeking to make the journal a space for diverse voices and perspectives, in multiple forms and modes and from across different geographies” (OAJs). *Contemporaneity* claims that “it examines how cultures around the world conceive of and construct their present and the concept of presentness”. *The History Education Research Journal* “focuses on the global significance and impact of history education” (OAJs). Such claims were also made by some OAJs with titles that imply geographically limited topic coverage. The *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*

specifically claims that it has broadened “the content of the journal to include international perspectives” (OAJs).

4.3.2. To highlight one’s open access status

Of the 104 OAJs, 75 (72%), explicitly self-identify as “open access” in their A&S statements. They make 116 such references. For example, *Gateways* begins its A&S statement by emphasizing that it is “an open access, refereed journal” (OAJs). Near the end of the A&S statement, it expands on the benefits of its open access status: “As an open access journal, Gateways’ mission is to increase the timely, accessible and inclusive sharing of new knowledge and valuable insights ... around the world” (OAJs). Through doing so, it “strives to ... build ... active, evolving and critical global dialogue for change” (OAJs).

The numbers become more interesting when we consider the details the OAJs delve into, as noted in the *Gateways* example above. The benefits the OAJ highlight include:

Open access provides additional publishing affordances. For example, *The London Review of Education* believes that “as an entirely web-based open-access journal”, it provides “opportunities for including illustrative video clips, color photos and illustrations” (OAJs). The *British Arts Journal* claims that being one of the “completely open access journals”, it has become “also a forum for the growing debates about digital humanities, publication, and copyright” (OAJs). By remaining “committed to being an open access publication”, *Body, Space, and Technology* believes that it can “support innovation and experimentation in the Arts, in whatever form it takes or processes from which it arises” (OAJs). Overall, to some of these OAJs, being open access means that they have embarked on “an exciting new future as an open access scholarly publication” (*The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education/OAJs*).

Open access helps fulfill the mission to democratize knowledge. For example, *Science of Nursing and Health Practices* believes its OA status promotes “the democratization of access to research results for increased use of the results of research so that the benefits and outcomes of research concerning health practices may be applied to greater effect” (OAJs). *Emerging Markets Journal* affirms its commitment to “ensure that the journal is made available to the widest range of readers in all nations and international institutions free of charge” (OAJs). *The Comics Grid: The Journal of Comics Scholarship* states that its

OA format enables “frictionless sharing and public engagement” (OAJs). To some of these OAJs, such a mission is a matter of principle: research should be made “freely available to the public” (*Continuity in Education*; see also *Cateral Tomada, The Journal of Modern Philosophy*, and numerous other OAJs with a similar insistence on such a principle in their A&S statements). By adhering to this principle, they see themselves as becoming part of the progressive “worldwide initiatives towards open access to scientific literature” (*The International Journal of Technologies in Higher Education*). In fact, some of these journals call out the injustice in the unequal access to knowledge. Such injustice lies in the fact that “cost barriers or use restrictions imposed by other publishers”, a not-so-subtle stab at the SBJ industry, result in “research results ... not available to the full community of potential users” even though “researchers engage in discovery for the public good” (*Impacting Education*). *Arxivoc* highlights the negative impact of such restrictions on economically disadvantaged institutions when it claims that its OA format “is designed to promote the dissemination of organic chemical research worldwide to benefit students and researchers, particularly those at less well-endowed institutions” (OAJs). *The International Journal for Crime, Justice, and Social Democracy* brings our attention to the global divide in the access to knowledge when it emphasizes that it “aspires to democratize knowledge, bridge global divides and encourage the voices of those on the periphery to publish with the Journal” through its OA status (OAJs). It continues to highlight the fact that the journal founder’s “dedication to the inclusion of ... research from the Global South is sustained by the Journal’s commitment to cognitive justice and open access” (OAJs).

Notably, even though the other 29 OAJs do not explicitly state their OA status and benefits in their A&S statements, they all include a separate section where they discuss their OA policies and benefits. Since these sections are not part of their A&S statements, they are not analyzed in this article.

The emphasis on one’s OA status and benefits is something the SBJs are incapable of given their paywalls. Unsurprisingly, among the 104 SBJs, only 6 make very brief references to OA in their A&S statements (4%). Their references are in three categories:

Recommending these SBJs’ fee-based companion OA titles. For example, *Computers and Education* points out that “Authors are also welcome to submit to the journal’s open access companion title” (SBJs).

Introducing OA as one of the publication options. For example, *Developing Biology* introduces OA as one of its “flexible publication (open access or subscription)” options. The OA option, in this case as in all cases in SBJs, is based on an often-hefty fee.

Pointing out that one of the article types is OA by default. *Plant Disease* points out that “feature articles are solicited or contributed narratives summarizing a significant topic in plant pathology [and] are open access as soon as they are published” (SBJs).

In meta-genres other than the A&S statements, such as the author guides, most, if not all, SBJs introduce their fee-based OA options.

As noted in the literature review, researchers’ views on OAJs are complex, even negative. Why can, then, the highlighting of one’s OA status be considered as a promotional rhetorical strategy? This and other questions will be explored in the Discussion.

4.3.3. To emphasize one’s peer-reviewed status

Another noticeable difference is in how these two groups specify their peer-reviewed and refereed status. 78 OAJs (75%) bring up their “peer-reviewed” or “refereed” status in their A&S statements. The number of such references is 108. They also zoom in to more details than just simply naming themselves peer-review as if in passing. For example, they specify that they are “double” or “double-blind” peer-reviewed or refereed (nine references), “fully” peer-reviewed (six references), “rigorous peer review” (three references), “strict peer review” (one reference), “internationally refereed” (two references), and other references such as “independent, anonymized peer review” or “high-quality peer review”.

Other than these various ways of designating their peer-reviewed status, they also offer details about their peer review procedures and quality assurance measures. One journal highlights its peer reviewed status and adds that its “editorial team blends students, trainees, librarians, and faculty with a wide range of authorship and editorial expertise in order that we provide mentored peer review learning opportunities” (*Journal of Scientific Innovations in Medicine/OAJs*). Another claims that its “Editorial Board contains reviewers from a wide range of countries with a variety of qualifications, including many who have international accreditation recognized by major ... associations [in its field]” and that it “has an extensive set of ethical

guidelines to ensure that editors, reviewers ... are taking all reasonable steps to ensure that articles are in line with current publication, research and professional practice guidelines There are also procedural documents to provide guidance to ... reviewers” (*The International Journal of Transactional Analysis Research and Practice/OAJs*).

By contrast, only 31 SBJs (33%), as opposed to 78 OAJs (75%), mentioned their peer-reviewed status in their A&S statements. The total number of these SBJs’ references to their peer-reviewed status is only 32, compared with the 108 references by the OAJs. When analyzing how the SBJs mention their peer-reviewed status, I also detected some subtle differences. For example, only one SBJ refers to it as “fully peer-reviewed”, as opposed to six such references by the OAJs. Five references to the “double-blind” or “blind” peer-review processes can be found in the SBJs in contrast to nine such references in the OAJs. No SBJs highlight the fact that they are internationally refereed (two in the OAJs). Compared with 13 OAJs which reference the composition and prestige of their editorial boards or teams, their role, and other details in the gatekeeping and review process, only one SBJ called *Econometrica* does so. Even there, compared with what we noted earlier, the statement by this journal seems less elaborate: “An international board of editors, together with the generous help of many referees, works hard to maintain the deep and timely reviews” (SBJs). Interestingly, as is common among journals in this field, *Econometrica* charges a submission fee of \$100, part of which likely supports the “deep and timely review”.

By virtue of being a SBJ, and since all these journals have at least a five-year long publication record as noted in their volume number, the peer-reviewed status of all the SBJs in this study may have been assumed by their readers. All the SBJs have a section about their peer-reviewed policies separate from their A&S statements (the same is true for the OAJs). The difference is only in the observation that the OAJs highlight their peer-reviewed status significantly more frequently and elaborately in the A&S statements than the SBJs do. The meanings of such differences will be explored in the Discussion.

4.3.4. To describe one’s affiliated or sponsoring professional organization

A list of the journals’ affiliated or sponsoring professional organizations is provided in Annex 3. As noted in the annex, the OAJs refer to 43 affiliated

or sponsoring professional organizations in their A&S statements. SBJs refer to 20. Other than the different numbers, the organizations referred to by the two groups also show some differences as noted in the names of the organizations and their online information. Many OAJs’ organizations tend to be on a narrower focus (e.g., *The Sylvia Townsend Warner Society*), affiliated with universities or departments (e.g., Department of History of Art and Architecture, University of Pittsburgh), or are outside of what many may perceive as the center of academic research (The Korean Society of Hypertension, The Quebec Network on Nursing Intervention Research, or The Egyptian Society of Internal Medicine). By comparison, a great majority of SBJs’ affiliated organizations are often seen as, admittedly eurocentrically, substantially more prestigious national or international associations with a strong presence by US scholars and often with offices in the US. The differences may be due to the SBJ samples in this study, especially since these are often well-respected and well-established journals selected by graduate students who read them. Other SBJs beyond this study may have affiliated organizations like those of the OAJs.

Interestingly, even though some OAJs are affiliated with organizations in countries outside of the perceived center of academic research, they claim their international reach boldly. For example, *The International Journal of Anthropology and Ethnology*, published by Springer Open, is sponsored by and affiliated with the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. It explicitly states that it “aims to introduce achievements representing the highest level of anthropological and ethnological studies around the world (not only in China or Asia); promote academic exchanges between western and non-western circles; facilitate dialogues and interactions about the global or regional hot topics; build a platform for communications within the international research communities of anthropology and ethnology” (OAJs). The journal *Progress in Orthodontics*, also by Springer Open, is “owned by the Italian Society of Orthodontics” as it states in its A&S statement, and it brands itself as “a premier journal of international scope that fosters orthodontic research” (OAJs). Other OAJs making similar claims include *Financial Innovations* (from China), *Westminster Papers in Culture and Communication*, the UKSG (United Kingdom Series Group) *Journal*, *Egyptian Pediatric Association Gazette* (Springer Open), and *the Egyptian Journal of Forensic Science* (Springer Open), among others.

4.3.5. To present one's history

The two groups of journals present publication history differently. The SBJs mention history 14 times in their A&S statement. They refer to their launching years with short phrases or sentences such as “established in 1911, the *American Education Review* is among the nation's oldest...” (SBJs), “Since 1929, *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* (JASA) has been the leading source of...” (SBJs), or “The [*Journal of American Chemical Society*], founded in 1879, is the flagship journal of ... and the world's preeminent journal in all of chemistry and interfacing areas of science” (SBJs). As noted in these examples, these SBJs seem to believe that just mentioning their long history is enough to invoke prestige.

By comparison, the OAJs mention history 37 times in their A&S statements. The OAJs have comparatively shorter histories as noted in the volume numbers and in the fact that OAJs, as part of the OS ecology, are a newer phenomenon of scholarly publishing. Therefore, presenting one's history may not necessarily boost status as is the case of the examples of the SBJs above. Why do the OAJs mention history more than the SBJs do?

It seems that they provide more details about the various dimensions of their history. For example, they may refer to the year their affiliated organization was established, as in the case of *The British and Irish Orthoptic Journal*, which states that it “is the official journal of the British and Irish Orthoptic Society. The BIOS was founded in 1937 ...” (OAJs). They may name when they were indexed by DOAJ: “In 2020, *The Journal of Hate Studies* received the Seal of Approval from the DOAJ, an online directory of high quality, peer-reviewed, open access journals” (OAJs). They also refer to their evolution: “*Education in the North* was first published in 1965 as the in-house journal of Northern College of Education in Aberdeen. It is now published by the School of Education at the University of Aberdeen. The journal has been published wholly online since 2008” (OAJs). Other examples of such comparatively more detailed descriptions include *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, *The Comics Grids*, *Texas Water Journal*, and *the Welsh Economic Review*, among many other OAJs. In comparison, none of the SBJs delve into their history in detail except for one journal. Even for that journal, the detailed discussion of history is not included in the A&S statement but in a dedicated separate meta-genre.

5. Discussion

5.1. The concept of the prestige economy

What do the findings mean? This section discusses this question through the concept of the prestige economy, a concept scholars studying academic life in general and journal publishing in particular have adopted from anthropology. Anthropologists noticed that human actions could not be explained only by the operation of a money or subsistence economy. The prestige economy denotes a kind of market in which what is recognized and traded does not necessarily have a direct financial value (Blackmore & Kandiko, 2011; Blackmore, 2018; Kwiek, 2021).

This concept can be applied to the study of scholarly journal publishing. Academics engage in activities where social and cultural capital is generated and exchanged and where academic appraisal can lead to tangible, but also intangible, rewards. Academic appraisal is often based on the number of published papers and citations these papers generate (Rosinger et al. 2016), which leads to researchers' engagement in prestige-maximizing activities, primarily through publishing frequently and in high-ranking journals (Mouritzen & Opstrup, 2020; Kwiek, 2021). Consequently, academic success across many disciplines depends largely on publishing in prestigious journals (Heckman & Moktan, 2018; Kwiek, 2021) except for some areas of the humanities (Hammarfelt, 2017).

Academic journals themselves also participate actively in the prestige economy because "prestige requires scarcity" (Blackmore, 2018, p. 234): the "leading" journals in any field are limited in number; space is limited in these journals and is far outnumbered by the academics wishing to publish in them. The phenomenon results in first-, second-, and third-tier journals forming an informal pecking order with top journals flooded with submissions and journals lower in tier fighting to attract authors.

5.2. OAJs' active rhetorical efforts to participate in the prestige economy of scholarly publishing

Seen through this concept, the OAJs studied in this project can be understood as making rhetorical efforts in their A&S statements to participate actively in the prestige economy of scholarly journal publishing. This observation itself is not striking because any academic journal, OAJs or not, by virtue of being established, has already thrown itself, or been thrown,

into the prestige economy to swim or sink. However, my findings reveal the seemingly self-conscious, purposeful, and even eager rhetorical efforts by these OAJs. Understanding how the OAJs make such conscious rhetorical efforts can help us understand not only journals' A&S statements as a meta-genre, but also, more importantly, open science (OS) in general and OAJ publishing in particular more deeply.

To understand any rhetorical message in any genre, including those in the A&S statement meta-genre, one must unpack the intended or unintended rhetorical recipients the message targets or implicitly respond to (Bitzer, 1968). Seen in this light, the OAJs can be understood as self-consciously and purposefully enacting certain rhetorical messages in their A&S statements to respond to the rhetorical recipients. Some of these rhetorical recipients have the potential power to marginalize these OAJs and even to edge them out of the prestige economy. Specifically, as noted in the Introduction of this article, OAJs are still perceived by some, if not many, as lacking prestige even though the perceptions of OAJs have, admittedly, become more complex and are evolving (Richardson et al., 2019; Björk & Korkeamäki, 2020), especially with the progress of the OS movement.

From the data, we can see how some OAJs may be aware of and may be rhetorically responding to such perceptions. For example, part of the reason for the less-than-positive perceptions is OAJs' perceived questionable, difficult-to-assess, and inconsistent peer review practices and standards, especially when compared with the perceived or even assumed higher editorial quality of commercial, long-standing SBJs (Ray, 2016). Among the 180 faculty members in educational leadership at 98 universities surveyed in a study, for instance, only a third believed that articles in the OAJs in their discipline undergo the same review process as articles in traditional SBJs. They cited "less likely to receive quality peer reviews" and "peer reviews as less rigorous" as the deterrents to submitting to OAJs. Similarly, only a small percentage of these faculty indicated that institutional perceptions of OAJs' quality, rigor, and peer-review process were equivalent to that of SBJs (Richardson et al., 2019, p. 15). Such perceptions, admittedly, may not be universal to all disciplines (Cooke & Jain, 2021) but have been reported by researchers of scholarly publishing (Jeschke et al., 2019; Faulkner, 2021).

Peer review has long been considered the ubiquitous and institutionalized process in scholarly communication and the gold standard of scholarly publishing (Gonzalez et al., 2022). Any negative perceptions of OAJs' peer-

reviewed standards and practices, thus, risk marginalizing OAJs in the prestige economy.

With these insights in mind, the prevalence of “peer-reviewed” in the OAJ A&S statements as noted in the findings section could very likely be a self-conscious and very purposeful rhetorical strategy that these OAJs perform to bring themselves back in line with the institutionalized gold standards in journal publishing. Through doing so, they may be aiming to highlight their relevance in the prestige economy in the eyes of the authors, promotion committee members, and other stakeholders and consumers of these OAJs. As noted in the Findings section, 78 OAJs (75%) make explicit references to their “peer-reviewed” or “refereed” status in their A&S statements. The number of such references is 108. By comparison, only 31 SBJs (33%) make 32 references to their peer-reviewed status. The OAJs’ references also show a greater variety of language features and more details. Admittedly, all the SBJs include a separate section on their editorial and peer-review policies or incorporate peer-review information in their guides for authors. The same, however, can be said of all the OAJs in this study. All things considered, although the SBJs studied here can rely on the academic community’s assumption about their relatively high editorial standards, OAJs seem to be self-conscious of the fact that they cannot do so, and the lack of such an assumption could endanger their role in the prestige economy of scholarly publishing. Consequently, they may be making more rhetorically purposeful efforts to highlight their peer-review status in the A&S statements which are a prominent meta-genre of any journal.

What is the practical implication of such an understanding? When looking at meta-genres other than A&S statements, such as the editorial policies and guide for authors, I noticed that most OAJs (and most SBJs) only provide cookie-cutter and generally vague statements about how manuscripts, once received, will be handled by editors, and how many reviewers will be involved. To further strengthen the adopted rhetorical strategy for highlighting their peer review status, they would be well-served to provide ample details about their editorial policies, including the criteria, standards, procedures, and other transparency documents in a separate section with link or a reference to such information in the A&S statements. OAJs could even go a step further by providing detailed procedures, criteria, and even examples of peer review feedback that demonstrate transparency and quality of their review process. Doing so would further boost these OAJs’ status and help them participate more effectively in the prestige economy of

scholarly publishing. In fact, such a suggestion has been made for all journals, SBJs or OAJs, (e.g., Ray, 2016). OAJs may have a heavier rhetorical burden in this respect, as noted above, that makes the adoption of such a suggestion worth considering.

As noted earlier, a substantially higher number of SBJs discuss what is out of their scope. Detailed information about what one excludes may be out of necessity as is the case of some of the journals in this study because of their well-established status, the resulting large number of submissions, and, thus, the need to exclude. Many OAJs may not have that privilege. Regardless, careful continual reviewing of one's scope and delineating of not only the in-scope, but also the out-of-scope dimensions of one's journal is a strategy OAJs should consider adopting to add value in the prestige economy.

The OAJs' presentation of history can also be understood through the lens of the prestige economy. To some, OS and OAJs are still a relatively new or newer phenomenon and may be viewed with skepticism (Richardson et al., 2019). Most, if not all, of the OAJs in this study have much shorter histories than those of the SBJs regardless of whether they specify their histories or not because each journal's number of published volumes can also index its history. Newer journals are often seen as less prestigious. In fact, some research writing instructors have advised authors to steer clear of new or newer journals, be they SBJs or OAJs (e.g., Belcher, 2019). Similar to the way they highlight their peer-review status, many OAJs may be aware of this perception. Although they have shorter histories, they provide more details about their "storied" histories to describe their evolution and development. Doing so may be their self-conscious and purposeful responses to this perception as such a perception could potentially marginalize OAJs in the prestige economy of scholarly publishing.

5.3. OAJs' rhetorical efforts to redefine what is relevant in the prestige economy

The previous subsection shows some OAJs' rhetorical strategies to comply with the expectations in the prestige economy of journal publishing. The findings also show OAJs' rhetorical strategies to redefine such expectations.

For example, the OAJs as a group in this study may not be able to claim prestige by boldly branding themselves "leading", "flagship", "highly acclaimed", or "highly cited" as some SBJs in this study can. They, instead, adopt other rhetorical strategies for status-claiming. They emphasize the

aspirations to build or unite an international community surrounding the topics they publish. They highlight how they enable the immediate global dissemination of knowledge. They highlight their internationality.

Their emphasis on their OA status is another noteworthy rhetorical strategy. As noted in the Findings section, 75 of the 104 OAJs (72%) make 106 explicit references to their "open access" in their A&S statements. They delve into the benefits of OA and champion the OA mission. Indeed, OA and OS have become a lively topic of discussion in many disciplines and by many academics (Jeschke et al., 2019; Richardson et al., 2019). As more and more disciplines and scholars continue to strengthen their social justice orientation, many have believed in the imperative to openly confront the perceived unjust reality of limited access created by SBJ paywalls. Many OAJs' proud display of their mission-driven OA status, thus, can be seen as a rhetorical strategy to appeal to the progressive new normal of scholarly publishing enabled by the forward-looking OS movement. Since such a new normal will continue to profoundly alter the landscape of scholarly publishing, this rhetorical strategy could be understood as boldly redefining what is relevant in the prestige economy of scholarly publishing.

That said, only 75 of the 104 OAJs explicitly name their OA status, tout the OA benefits, or champion the mission of OA in their A&S statements though all the OAJs include a section outside the A&S statement to discuss their OA policies and benefits with varying details. A separate section may not have the same attention-getting power as the A&S statement. It would be helpful for more OAJs to champion the benefits of OA and its connection to the open science movement in their A&S statements. Such a rhetorical strategy could serve as part of the collective efforts to disrupt the current discourse about the prestige of scholarly publishing and to define the new normal.

The findings section shows some OAJs with sponsoring or affiliated organizations outside the center of academic research, thus eurocentrically considered as less prestigious, claim their aspirations to be an international channel of disseminating the research in the topic areas. Observers of scholarly publishing have pointed out that respectable OAJs located in emerging economies and "peripheral" countries should not automatically be discounted as non-prestigious or as peripheral. They may be addressing important local issues or connecting the local and the global in academic research (Butler, 2013). In fact, some OAJs in this study may be aware of such

a role. For example, *The Central Asian Journal of Global Health* states that it focuses on “the fields of public health and medicine with specific focus on Central Asian countries, a geographic region often underrepresented in the scientific literature” (OAJs). *The Egyptian Pediatric Association Gazette* states that it aims to “continuously import clinical best-practice and recent scientific advances in order to facilitate local and regional improvement in medical and surgical healthcare of children, across Egypt, Africa and the Middle East” (OAJs). If these OAJs, with their affiliated organizations, address important science and other issues in their economies, they deserve as legitimate a place in the prestige economy as those located in the US and other Western countries. In fact, if affiliated with local professional organizations that solve important local problems or bridge the local and the global, these OAJs are well-served to highlight or continue to highlight such a role in the A&S statements. Doing so would be more than a legitimate claim. It would enable OAJs in the same situation to collectively confront the undercurrent eurocentricity in what is considered prestigious or relevant and help redefine what is relevant in the prestige economy of scholarly publishing.

6. Conclusion

This study was guided by these two questions: (1) What is often included in the A&S statements of the SBJs and OAJs examined in this study? (2) Are there any observable differences in how these two groups of journals describe themselves? The six themes in Table 1 in Findings answers Question 1. The journals analyzed in this study describe their aims, specify their goals, offer rationales for the journal, describe manuscript types, promote themselves, and offer house-keeping details in their A&S statements. The 2 bold-faced themes or sub-themes in Table 1 answer Question 2. Specifically, these two groups of journals specify what they discourage and self promote noticeably differently in their A&S statements. I provide details, numbers, and examples to show such observable differences.

The findings in this study reveal the rhetorically resourceful strategies adopted by some OAJs in their A&S statements. Through the lens of the prestige economy, the rhetorical strategies show the efforts by the OAJs analyzed in this study to comply with what is expected in the prestige economy of scholarly publishing and to attempt to redefine what is relevant in such an economy.

Although the findings should, understandably, be viewed with the OAJ and SBJ samples in this study in mind, rather than as applicable to all OAJs and SBJs, I hope this study has taken a measurable step in advancing our understanding of OAJs and OS. I hope the study has also offered useful insights into how LSP practitioners can develop their specialized knowledge through analyzing meta-genres.

Article history:
 Received 1 March 2023
 Received in revised form 11 July 2023
 Accepted 13 July 2023

Reference List

- Asai, S. (2021). Collaboration between research institutes and large and small publishers for publishing open access journals. *Scientometrics*, 126(6), 5245–5262. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03949-4>
- Asai, S. (2022). Strategies to increase the number of open access journals: The cases of Elsevier and Springer Nature. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 53, 75–84. <https://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/847390>
- Bawarshi, A. S., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy*. Parlor Press.
- Belcher, W. L. (2019). *Writing your journal article in twelve weeks: A guide to academic publishing success*. University of Chicago Press.
- Björk, B. C., & Korkeamäki, T. (2020). Adoption of the open access business model in scientific journal publishing: A cross-disciplinary study. *arXiv preprint arXiv, 2005, 01008*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2005.01008>
- Blackmore, P. (2018). What can policy-makers do with the idea of prestige to make better policy? *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 2, 227–254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2018.1498300>
- Blackmore, P., & Kandiko, C. B. (2011). Motivation in academic life: A prestige economy. *Research in post-compulsory education*, 16, 399–411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2011.626971>
- Bitzer, L. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 1, 1–14.
- Butler, D. (2013). The dark side of publishing. *Nature*, 495, 433–435. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40236733>
- Cheng, A. (2018). *Genre and graduate level research writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Christopher, E. (2020). Open access journals: what you should know. *BMJ*, 369. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1057>
- Cooke, R., & Jain, N. (2021). Open access journals are as likely to be referenced by the Orthopaedic literature, despite having a lower impact factor than subscription-based journals. *SICOT-J*, 7, 64, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1051/sicotj/2021062>
- Duarte, A. (2020). Using the Directory of Open Access Journals to expand publishing opportunities and stay competitive. *OnCue*, 14(1), 72–79.
- Faulkner, K. (2021). Faculty Use of Open-Access Journals: A Case Study of Faculty Publications and Cited References at a California University. *Publications*, 9, 39, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications9030039>
- Ferguson, G. (1997). Teacher education and LSP: The role of specialized knowledge. In R. Howard & G. Brown (eds.), *Teacher education for LSP* (pp. 80-89). Multilingual Matters.
- Giltrow, J. (2002). Meta-genres. In R. Coe, L. Lingard, & T. Teslenko (Eds.), *The rhetoric and ideology of genre: Strategies for stability and change* (pp. 187-205). Hampton.
- Gonzalez, P., Wilson, G. S., & Purvis, A. J. (2022). Peer review in academic publishing: Challenges in achieving the gold standard. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 19(5), 1–12. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol19/iss5/01>
- Hammarfelt, B. (2017). Recognition and reward in the academy: Valuing publication oeuvres in biomedicine, economics and history. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, 69, 607–623. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-01-2017-0006>

- Heckman J. J., & Moktan S. (2018). Publishing and promotion in economics. The tyranny of the Top Five. *NBER Working Paper Series*, 25093. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w25093>
- Jeschke, J. M., Börner, K., Stodden, V., & Tockner, K. (2019). Open Access journals need to become first choice, in invasion ecology and beyond. *NeoBiota*, 52, 18. <https://doi.org/10.3897/neobiota.52.39542>
- Kumar, A., & Ahmed, S. N. (2022). Challenges faced in the peer review system in open access journals. *Asian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 13, 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ajms.v13i12.49361>
- Kwiek, M. (2021). The prestige economy of higher education journals: A quantitative approach. *Higher Education*, 81, 493–519. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00553-y>
- Lee, D., & Swales, J. (2006). A corpus-based EAP course for NNS doctoral students: Moving from available specialized corpora to self-compiled corpora. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 56–75.
- Mouritzen, P. E., & Opstrup, N. (2020). *Performance management at universities. The Danish Bibliometric Research Indicator at work*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nejadghanbar, H., & Hu, G. (2022). Predatory and legitimate open access journals in language and linguistics: Where do they part ways? *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 53, 224–248. <http://doi.org/10.3138/jsp-2022-0021>
- Paltridge, B., & Starfield, S. (2016). *Getting published in academic journals: Navigating the publication process*. University of Michigan press.
- Petersen, J., Hattke, F. & Vogel, R. (2017). Editorial governance and journal impact: a study of management and business journals. *Scientometrics*, 112, 1593–1614. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2434-7>
- Ray, M. (2016). An expanded approach to evaluating open access journals. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 47, 307–327. <http://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.47.4.307>
- Richardson, J. W., McLeod, S., & Hurst, T. (2019). Perceptions of educational leadership faculty regarding open access publishing. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, 15(5), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.22230/ijep.2019v15n5a817>
- Rosinger, K. O., Taylor, B. J., Coco, L., & Slaughter, S. (2016). Organizational segmentation and the prestige economy: Deprofessionalization in high- and low-resource departments. *Journal of Higher Education*, 87(1), 27–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.11777393>
- Rubin, A. T. (2021). *Rocking qualitative social science: An irrelevant guide to rigorous research*. Stanford University Press.
- Sheldon, K., Davies, J., & Howells, K. (2012). Conducting research in forensic settings. In K. Sheldon, J. Davies, & K. Howells (Eds.). *Research in practice for forensic professionals* (pp. 8–15). Routledge.
- Shokraneh, F., Ilghami, R., Masoomi, R., Amanollahi, A. (2012). How to select a journal to submit and publish your biomedical paper? *BiolImpacts*, 2, 61–68. <https://doi.org/10.5681/%2Fbi.2012.008>
- Yan, Z. (2021). *Publishing journal articles: A scientific guide for new authors worldwide*. Cambridge University Press.

An Cheng is Professor of English at Oklahoma State University. He is interested in genre-based pedagogies and English for Research and Publication Purposes. His publications have appeared in *Applied Linguistics*, *English for Specific Purposes*, and many journals and edited books. He is the author of *Genre and Graduate-level Research Writing* (Michigan).

NOTES

¹ As someone serving as a member on five journals' editorial boards, I have witnessed the laborious and sometimes contentious process in which editorial boards and editors work on this meta-genre.

Annex 1: A list of the journals analyzed in this study

OAJs

1. AAPS (American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists) Open
2. Archaeology International
3. Architecture MPS
4. ARENA_Journal of Architectural Research
5. Arkivoc A Platinum Open Access Journal for organic chemistry
6. Asian Association of Open Universities Journal
7. Body, Space, and Technology
8. British Arts Studies
9. Bulletin of the Faculty of Physical Therapy at Cairo University
10. Catedral Tomada
11. Central Asian Journal of Global Health
12. Chinese Neurosurgical Journal
13. Clinical Hypertension
14. Construction Economics and Building
15. Contemporaneity
16. Continuity in Education
17. Dialogic Pedagogy
18. Digital Medievalist
19. Digital Studie
20. Drone Systems and Applications
21. Ecological Processes
22. Education in the North
23. Egyptian Journal of Forensic Sciences
24. Emerging Markets Journal
25. Empirical Research in Vocational Education and Training
26. Ethnologia Europaea
27. Europe and the World: A law review
28. Evidence Based Library and Information and Practice
29. The Film Education Journal
30. Financial Innovation
31. Gateway: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement
32. Hungarian Cultural Studies
33. Impacting Education
34. Insights: The UKSG (United Kingdom Series Group) Journal
35. International Journal of Anthropology and Ethnology (IJAЕ)
36. Jewish Historical Studies
37. Journal of Biomedical Sciences
38. Journal of Embodied Research
39. Journal of Interactive Media in Education
40. Journal of Modern Philosophy
41. Journal of the Egyptian Mathematical Society
42. KULA: Knowledge Creation, Dissemination, and Preservation Studies
43. Large-scale Assessments in Education
44. Law, Technology and Humans
45. Literacy and Numeracy Studies
46. MaHKUscript. Journal of Fine Art Research
47. Marvell Studies
48. Metaphysics
49. Macro and Nano Systems
50. Numeracy
51. Orbit

52. The Open Library of Humanities
53. Performance Philosophy
54. Photonics
55. Progress in Orthodontics
56. Protection and Control of Modern Power Systems
57. Portal Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies
58. Radical Americas
59. Radical Teachers
60. Science of Nursing and Health Practices
61. Studies in the Maternal
62. Sustainable Environment Research
63. The ASIANetwork Exchange
64. The Australian Journal of Indigenous Research
65. The Bolivian Studies Journal
66. The British and Irish Orthoptic Journal
67. The Comics Grid: Journal of Comics Scholarship
68. The Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance
69. The Egyptian Journal of Bronchology
70. The Egyptian Journal of Internal Medicine
71. The Egyptian Liver Journal
72. The Egyptian Pediatric Association Gazette
73. The History Education Research Journal
74. The International Journal for Court Administration
75. The International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy
76. The International Journal of Development Education and Global learning
77. The International Journal of Social Pedagogy
78. The International Journal of Technologies in Higher Education
79. The International Journal of Transactional Analysis Research
80. The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning
81. The International Review of Social Psychology
82. The Journal of Labor Market Research
83. The Journal of Analytical Science and Technology
84. The Journal of Art Historiography
85. The Journal of Basic and Applied Zoology
86. The Journal of British and Irish Innovative Poetry
87. The Journal of Hate Studies
88. The Journal of Illicit Economies and Development
89. The Journal of Population and Sustainability
90. The Journal of Scientific Innovation in Medicine
91. The Journal of the Egyptian National Cancer Institute
92. The Journal of the Sylvia Townsend Warner Society
93. The Journal of Youth Development
94. The London Review of Canadian Studies
95. The London Review of Education
96. The Student Success Journal
97. The Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics
98. The Texas Water Journal
99. The Theoretical Roman Archaeology Journal
100. The Tilburg Law Review Journal
101. The Welsh Economic Review
102. Veterinary Evidence
103. Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture
104. Worldwide Waste

SBJs

1. Accounting Horizons
2. Acta Materialia
3. AIAA Journal
4. American Economic Review
5. American Journal of Respiratory Cell and Molecular Biology
6. American Political Science Review
7. Annual Review of Physiology
8. Annual Review of Phytopathology
9. Applied and Environmental Microbiology
10. Applied Ergonomics
11. Applied Physics Letters
12. Atmospheric Environment
13. Catalysis Today
14. Cell and Tissue Research
15. Cell
16. China Economic Review
17. Clothing and Textiles Research Journal
18. Computer Systems Science and Engineering
19. Development
20. Developmental Biology
21. Econometrica
22. Energy and Fuels
23. Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science
24. European Journal of Operational Research
25. European Journal of Plant Pathology
26. FEMS Microbiology Ecology
27. FEMS Microbiology Letters
28. Financial Analysts Journal
29. Frontier in Ecology and Environment
30. Fuel Processing Technology
31. Fuel
32. Fungal Biology
33. Fungal Genetics
34. Higher Education Research and Development
35. Higher Education
36. IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology
37. IEEE Transactions on Communications
38. Information and Management
39. Information Systems
40. Information Systems Research
41. Intermetallics
42. International Journal of Clothing Science and Technology
43. International Journal of Computer Vision
44. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research
45. Journal of Anthropological Archaeology
46. Journal of The American Chemical Society
47. Journal of Banking and Finance
48. Journal of Biological Chemistry
49. Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media
50. Journal of Civil Society
51. Journal of Experimental Biology
52. Journal of Financial Economics

53. Journal of Food protection
54. Journal of Marketing Research
55. Journal of Marketing
56. Journal of Microbiological Methods
57. Journal of Political Economics
58. Journal of Service Theory and Practice
59. Journal of Sound and Vibration
60. Journal of Structural Engineering
61. Journal of Superconductivity and Novel Magnetism
62. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Research
63. Journal of the Acoustic Society of America
64. Journal of the Electrochemical Society
65. Journal of the Philosophy of Sport
66. Leisure Studies
67. Managing Sports and Leisure
68. Meat Science
69. Metallurgical and Material Transaction B
70. Modeling and Simulation in Material Sciences and Engineering
71. Nano Letters
72. Nature
73. Nucleic Acids Research
74. Organic Letters
75. Perspectives on Politics
76. Physical Review B
77. Physical Review Letters
78. Plant and Soil
79. Plant Disease
80. Plant Physiology
81. Plan, Cell, and Environment
82. Research in Higher Education
83. Research Policy
84. Review of Scientific Instruments
85. Ribonucleic Acid
86. Science
87. Sensors and Actuators, B, Chemical
88. Studies in Higher Education
89. The International Journal of Production Economics
90. The Journal of Economic Perspectives
91. The Journal of Finance
92. The Journal of Higher Education
93. The Journal of Product Innovation and Management
94. The Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics
95. The Quarterly Journal of Economics
96. The Review of Economic Studie
97. The Review of Economics and Statistics
98. The Review of Financial Studies
99. The Review of Higher Education
100. The Textile Research Journal
101. Theoretical and Applied Genetics
102. Tree Physiology
103. Urban Studies
104. Water Research

Annex 2: a list of the open codes, closed codes, and themes

Open codes

Access (global)
Access (financially disadvantaged countries and institutions)
Access (to the public to foster open science and collaboration)
Access (to fight unequal access to information)
A distinct area of research (needing a dedicated journal)
Adherence to ethical principles of research and editing
Aims (serve discipline/topics)
Aims (serve researchers)
Approaches can be but must ...
Annually
Archived in
Authors (researchers/academics)
Authors (practitioners/teachers)
Authors (international)
Biannually
Discouraged topics
Discouraged methods
Discouraged study types
DOAJ standards
Do not publish (manuscript types)
Editors
Editorial boards (international)
Editorial boards (high quality)
Editorial boards (mentoring)
Editorial boards (industry/academic)
Editorial boards (qualification)
Encouraged approaches
Encouraged topics
Especially welcome new areas
Especially welcome connections between
Global subscription countries
Global subscription numbers
Include but must meet conditions (content)
Include but must meet conditions (methods)
Include but not limited to
Indexed in [archive] in
Indexed by DOAJ in
International research communities
International research communities China and West
International research communities East and West
International research communities the Global South and the Global North
International research communities the Middle East
International in scope though from a specific country
International in scope though title implying geographical limitation
Flagship/Leading journal in (research area)
Flagship/leading journal of (organization)
Highly/widely cited
Launched/established in

Launched/established in with reputation
Listing approaches
Listing topics
Listing encouraged
Listing discouraged
Manuscript quality (original)
Manuscript quality (highly cited)
Manuscript quality (rigorous and high-quality)
Manuscript language style
Manuscript types (original)
Manuscript types (others)
Manuscript types (how different types will be handled by whom)
Methods can be
Multidisciplinary connections
Multidisciplinary necessity
Multidisciplinary research communities
Multidisciplinary subjects
Naming adjacent disciplines
Organization affiliated
Organization countries
Organization details
Organization research institute
Organization university departments
Organization prestige
Organizations with financial support
Organization years
Permanent identification code
Previous edition of journal
Quarterly
Peer review (double-blind)
Peer review (high quality)
Peer review (fully)
Peer review (internationally)
Peer review (strictly)
Readership (global)
Readership (academic)
Readership (practitioners)
Readership (industry)
Research (highly cited)
Research (original)
Research (rigorous and high-quality)
Reviewers (number)
Reviewers (quality)
Publishers
Will not publish approaches
Will not publish methods
Will not published study types
Submission platform
The first journal in (areas)
The only journal in (areas)
To create debates on topics
To serve as an international forum on
To offer a forum for discussion related to
Word limit

Pared-down, closed codes:

Aims
Authorship (international/diverse)
Covered and encouraged topics/methods/study types
Gaps or needs for the journal
Discouraged or exclude topics/methods/study types
History: what and how
International topics or contexts of study
Leading/flagship/premier/other explicit status claims
Manuscript types and handling procedures
Multidisciplinary topics and research communities
Open access status and benefits
Peer review quality, infrastructure, and support
Professional associations and publishers
Publication frequency, submission platform, word limit
Description and assurance of quality of manuscript
Readership (international/diverse)

Themes (examples provided in the findings)

To describe the journal's aims
To specify the journal's scope
To provide the rationales for the journal
To describe manuscript types
To promote the journal
To provide house-keeping details

Annex 3: A list of the affiliated or sponsoring organizations

The OAJs' affiliated or sponsoring organizations

1. Asian Association of Open Universities
2. Architectural Research European Network Association
3. ASIANetwork (a consortium of Asian Studies in US universities)
4. Canadian Society for Digital Humanities
5. Department of History of Art and Architecture, University of Pittsburgh
6. Educational Testing Service (ETS)
7. Southwestern University of Finance and Economics in China
8. Studies within the network of liberal arts studies)
9. Metaphysics Collaborative
10. National Numeracy Network
11. Northern College of Education in Aberdeen
12. Taiwan's National Science and Technology Council
13. The American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists
14. The American Hungarian Educators Association
15. The Andrew Marvell Society
16. The British and Irish Orthoptic Society
17. The Egyptian Mathematical Society
18. The Egyptian Scientific Society of Bronchology
19. The Egyptian Society for Biosciences Advancement
20. The Egyptian Society of Internal Medicine

21. The Egyptian National Cancer Society
22. The Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, The Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
23. The International Society for Ethnology and Folklore
24. The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement
25. The International Association of Law and Forensic Sciences (based in Egypt)
26. The International Society for Ethnology and Folklore
27. The Italian Society of Orthodontics
28. The Korean Basic Science Institute
29. The Korean Society of Hypertension
30. The Korean Society of Pulmonary Hypertension
31. The Faculty of Physical Therapy at Cairo University
32. The National Numeracy Network
33. The Metaphysics Collaborative
34. The Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, London
35. The Quebec Network on Nursing Intervention Research
36. The Social Pedagogy Professional Association (a UK association)
37. The Society of Friends of Liver Patients in the Arab World
38. The Sylvia Townsend Warner Society
39. The Swiss Society of Economics and Statistics
40. The Tilburg Law School
41. The Yale Center for British Art, New Haven
42. UCL: Institute of Archaeology
43. Westminster School of Media, Arts and Design, University of Westminster

SBJs' affiliated or sponsoring organizations

1. The Acoustical Society of America
2. The American Accounting Association
3. The American Chemical Society
4. The American Physical Society
5. The American Society of Plant Biologists
6. The British Mycological Society
7. The Broadcast Education Association
8. The Chinese Economists Society
9. The Econometric Society
10. The Electrochemical Society
11. The Harvard Kennedy School
12. the International Association for Food Protection
13. The International Association for the Philosophy of Sport
14. The International Association for Wind Engineering
15. The International Ergonomics Association
16. The International Textile & Apparel Association, Inc.
17. The Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia
18. The National Recreation and Park Association
19. The RNA Society
20. The Society for Financial Studies