

Publishing and Dissemination workshop

BALTA Symposium

14 November 2008

Peter Hall with Sara-Jane Brocklehurst and Stuart Wulff

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