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Research contributions: the world according to SSHRC

- Research Contributions Over the Last Six Years
  - Refereed contributions: books (where applicable, subdivide according to those that are single authored, co-authored, and edited works), monographs, book chapters, articles in scholarly refereed journals.
  - Other refereed contributions, such as: conference proceedings, papers presented at scholarly meetings or conferences, articles in professional or trade journals, etc.
  - Non-refereed contributions, such as: book reviews, published reviews of your work, research reports, policy papers, public lectures, creative works etc.
  - Forthcoming contributions: indicate one of the following statuses: "submitted", "revised and submitted", "accepted" or "in press". Contributions not yet submitted should not be listed. Provide the name of the journal or book publisher and the number of pages.

- Other Research Contributions
  - Describe any other contributions to research and the advancement of knowledge within the last six years, including your research contributions to non-academic audiences (e.g., general public, policy makers, private sector, non-profit organizations, etc.).

- Most Significant Career Research Contributions (for Regular Scholars)
- Career Interruptions and Special Circumstances
- Contributions to Training.
The dissemination continuum...

- Working papers
- Research reports
- Database, Dataset, Archive
- Case studies
- Policy or Program Materials
- Curriculum content / Educational Aids
- Websites and internet content
- Magazines / Op-eds / Media
- Newsletters, Press Releases and Pamphlets
- Seminars, Workshops, Public Lectures or Addresses
- BALTA Knowledge Dissemination Events (symposium)
- Networking and Outreach
- Book (General Public)
- Academic Journal Articles
- Books, monographs and book chapters (Academic)
- Conference Papers, Presentations and Proceedings
- Masters/PhD Theses
Re-thinking dissemination and publishing…

• As part of the research process
  • Proposal
  • Process
  • Reflection
  • Results
    – There is a need for intermediate outputs

• As participating in a conversation
  • Audience
  • Style / Genre
  • Moderators
  • Forums
    – The challenge of crossing boundaries
Dissemination and publishing as part of the research process

• Proposal
  • Being explicit about which conversation(s), why?

• Process
  • Keep a diary, log-book, field notes, research record

• Reflection
  • Engaging in a written conversation with yourself and your friends (intermediate outputs)

• Results
  • Specific outputs for targeted audiences
The CED Conversation

• Audience:
  • CED Practitioners and Professionals

• Genre:
  • The case study vignette
  • The personal hook
  • Arguing from practice

• Moderators:
  • CCEDNet, BCCA, and other co-ordinating organizations
  • CCE

• Forums:
  • CCEDNet conference workshops and tele-learning events
  • Making Waves
  • Black Rose Books
  • CED Professional Certificate training
The Policy Conversation

• Audience:
  • Elected officials
  • Public servants (senior)

• Genre:
  • The weight of ‘evidence’
  • Heavily statistical
  • The digestible executive summary

• Moderators:
  • Government policy departments
    – Statistics Canada
    – Policy Research Initiative
  • Policy institutes: CD Howe, Conference Board, Fraser Institute, Canada West, CCPA, CPRN, Caledon Institute, etc

• Forums:
  • Policy conferences
  • Official reports
The academic (peer-reviewed) conversation

- **Audience:**
  - Other academics, always
  - Students, sometimes
  - The wider world?

- **Genre:**
  - Formal style
  - Citations (positioning in literature)
  - ‘Contribution’ (theoretical connections)

- **Moderators:**
  - Editors
  - Reviewers

- **Forums:**
  - Academic journals
  - Books, monographs and book chapters
  - Conference Papers, Presentations and Proceedings
  - Working papers
Trends in the academic journal industry

• The online age…
  • Journal rankings
  • Online publishing (and pre-publishing)
  • Database packaging
  • Copyright concerns

• Publishers:
  • Decline? Academic societies and disciplines
  • Rise? Academic publishing houses

• New kids on the block?
  • Open source / e-journals

• Special / theme issues
The Peer-review Process

• Choosing a journal and submission

• Pre-review and peer review

• Editor’s decision
  • Most likely ‘revise and re-submit’ or ‘reject’

• Revisions
  • Responding to reviewers

• Re-submission, re-review…

• Acceptance and publication
Choosing a journal

- The audience
- The debate
- Tone and content:
  - Empirical, Theoretical, Applied
  - Quantitative, Qualitative, Case studies
  - Region (Canada, Global)
- Ranking: how high to aim?
- Turn-around time
What are reviewers asked to do?

REFEREE REPORT GUIDELINES: Your review is a confidential document. Overall, your review should assess the suitability of the paper for *The Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe canadien*. I would especially appreciate your comments regarding:

- Originality: does the manuscript make a significant contribution to the geographical literature?
- Literature: does the manuscript draw upon and properly interpret appropriate literature? Are there ‘sins’ of omission or commission? Is the link to geographical questions properly made?
- Objectives: Are the objectives of the paper clearly stated?
- Coherence and structure: is the manuscript sound in terms of its intellectual / theoretical argument, methodology, and/or use of sources? Are the objectives met? Is the methodology and research design of the manuscript well connected, consistent and properly explained?
- Style: is the manuscript well written? I do not expect you to edit the manuscript but commentary in this regard is helpful.
- Errors: does the manuscript contain important errors of analysis or interpretation?
- Figures and tables: Are the figures etc well constructed or necessary or insufficient.
- With respect to your recommendation regarding publication, should the paper be:
  - accepted in its current form
  - accepted subject to minor changes as outlined in the report
  - accepted subject to major revisions as outlined in the report
  - rejected with encouragement to resubmit after substantial revisions as outlined in the report
  - rejected with advice to submit the manuscript elsewhere or rejected without qualification
Reviews: what to expect…

• Review A: …this is a rigorous and methodologically sound paper. The paper moves the reader through a logical progression of the research problem – broad statements and statistical overview, and toward more detailed and nuanced views…

• Review B: I’m afraid I cannot recommend this paper for publication. Following a competent literature review and a tedious analysis of all possible combinations of data, I found that I had learned very little from the paper.

• Review C …: the author needs to do a better job or articulating what that contribution is. While the contribution is hinted at in the conclusion it needs to be more explicitly stated.
All’s well that ends well…

• Editor: I now have reports from three referees who have assessed the article … On the basis of these reports my decision is to reject your paper in its present form. However, I strongly encourage you to resubmit a substantially revised version, as advised by the referees.

• Timeline for this publication:
  • Submission: February Year 1
  • Reviews: March Year 1 (unheard of speed)
  • Resubmission: September Year 1
  • Acceptance: October Year 1 (again, unheard of speed)
  • Publication: Fall year 2 (again, this is fairly quick)
Other academic forms

• Books, monographs and book chapters
  • Books follow articles (review, summarize and extend)
  • Peer-reviewed academic presses
  • Practicalities: cost pressures and time delays
  • Shoppable proposals

• Conference Papers, Presentations and Proceedings
  • Sometimes abstracts are reviewed
  • Large, disciplinary vs small, specialized conferences
  • Papers may be published in Proceedings

• Working papers
  • Not reviewed; does not preclude later publication
  • An effective intermediate step?
Conclusion

• Academic publishing is a subset of publishing is a subset of dissemination

• SSHRC and BALTA both want more of all forms of dissemination

• Re-thinking dissemination and publishing:
  • Part of the research process
    – Intermediate outputs (Working Papers?)
  • Engaging in a conversation
    – The challenge of crossing boundaries
    – Understanding the nature of the conversation (Academic journal articles)
How can BALTA enable / support more dissemination and publication activity?

- Open, collective discussion – 15 mins, Sara
- Project leads complete matrix with input from team members – 15 mins
- Break – 15 min
- SERC-level planning – 40 mins
- Report-back and next steps – 20 mins, Stuart