

# **Perspectives on good practice: Publishing in academic journals**

Tracy Creagh, Queensland University of Technology

## ***Abstract***

*Publishing is an integral part of scholarly research and a strong publication record underpins a successful research career. For people and institutions alike, publications form the most important measure of research output and they are a critical means of achieving impact from the research. The aim of this workshop is to provide an informal session to hear from those involved in publishing practices who can assist in clarifying the publishing process and provide various perspectives on scholarly publishing, including insights into editorial decision-making and the peer-review process. The session is aimed primarily at early-career academics and those practitioners taking steps to disseminate their research and practice in a public sphere*

## **Academic publishing**

Getting research published in a high quality academic journal can profoundly affect your academic employment status and prospects in terms of future research funding and career trajectory (Nyaard, 2015). Despite the global challenges to traditional publishing models and the dissemination power of the internet, publishing in an academic journal remains a pivotal marker of impact (Anderson, 2013; Antell, Foote & Foote, 2016). Successful publication of research not only brings attention to the scholar and their institution but is a crucial measurement in international institutional rankings.

Aspects of scholarly practice have been transformed by the opportunities of new technologies. Open Access platforms and journals have emerged as new avenues for disseminating scholarly work. Open Access (OA) refers to the free access and reuse of scholarly material and OA publishing is possibly the most recognisable aspect of how academic activity is adjusting to the opportunities afforded by digital and networked technology (Weller, 2014). A propagation of new platforms for publishing and disseminating scholarly research also presents scholars with a range of considerations regarding identification of quality publications and how best to share their work while still protecting their intellectual property. Despite the changing landscape of academic publishing, expectations around quality, adherence to specific publishing models and best practice protocols to ensure the integrity of the peer review process remain consistent.

## **Aims and objectives of workshop**

The workshop is intended to provide an informal session to hear from those involved in publishing practices (editors, authors and peer reviewers) who can assist in clarifying the publishing process and provide various perspectives on scholarly publishing. Topics will include:

- how to select a quality publication;
- ethical considerations and protocols;

- common submission workflow activities;
- addressing editorial expectations;
- the peer review process;
- what to expect if your work is accepted for publication, and;
- how to make your work more discoverable once published.

Additionally, participants will be encouraged to ask questions throughout the session and share insights with workshop colleagues in a series of short break-out activities with key facilitators

The workshop is aimed primarily at early-career academics and those practitioners taking steps to disseminate their research and practice in a public sphere. Practitioners who have participated in scholarly publishing as both authors and peer reviewers are also encouraged to attend to contribute to a collegial discussion on expectations. Research students who want to improve their knowledge and expectations of scholarly publishing may also find this workshop of interest.

### **Workshop structure**

The workshop will be organised around three focus areas:

1. Editorial Expectations - Selecting the right journal; quality expectations; adherence to focus and scope; ethical considerations and protocols; workflow activities

(30 minutes) This session will allow a small number of editors to briefly introduce themselves and address a number of themes separately. For example, one editor might focus on how to identify quality higher education publications to submit research, while another might focus on the quality expectations of a submission and how it is selected for peer review. Participation from delegates in the form of questions will be encouraged.

2. Perceptions of Peer Review – Good practice; reviewer expectations; mechanics of peer review; workflow

(30 minutes) This session will be a Q&A between the facilitator and four to five peer reviewers. The questions could include the following:

- a. What are the key considerations you employ when approaching a review of a paper?
- b. As a reviewer, what are the main issues you come across in terms of content and quality?

3. Dissemination Makerspace - Building your research profile; drawing attention to your research; social media tools for dissemination; writing for online media

(20) Small group session to share strategies for disseminating research and publications once published. Each table will have a template to complete with columns: Strategies; Tools; Notes. This session is intended to help participants reflect on the ways in which they share their research and notify their peers of recent publications. The templates will be compiled post-session and distributed electronically to participating delegates.

### ***Resources***

The key resources will be a set of PowerPoint slides to separate each session accordingly. Delegates will receive the compiled set of session slides and the completed template from the final makerspace session post-workshop. All participants will also receive a compilation document of

**Perspectives on good practice: Publishing in academic journals** – Collaborative Workshop

information and resources shared by the QUT eJournal Community of Practice (A group of academic and professional staff involved with academic publishing at QUT): *Good Practice Resources in Scholarly Publishing*.

### ***Suggested workshop schedule***

The interactive session provides an opportunity to hear from the experiences of editors, authors and peer reviewers actively involved in scholarly publishing and allow participants to discuss their own publishing experiences and share good practice tips and strategies.

| <b>Allocated time</b> | <b>Topic</b>  | <b>Facilitators/Resources</b>  | <b>Outcomes</b>  |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| <i>5 minutes</i>      | <b>Welcome and introductions</b>  | <b>Professor Karen Nelson/Professor Rachael Field</b>  | <i>Introduction to Workshop contributors; outline of sessions</i>  |
| <i>30 minutes</i>     | <p><b>Session 1: Editorial Expectations</b></p> <p><i>Activity:</i></p> <p>Panel session – Brief summary from each outlining key guidelines, expectations and strategies for a successful submission</p> <p>Participants are encouraged to ask questions of editors.</p> <p>These may include: Selecting the right journal; ethical considerations and protocols; workflow activities</p> | <p><b>Editors/Editorial Board members</b></p> <p>Professor Karen Nelson, Editor-in-Chief, Student Success.</p> <p>Dr Edward Palmer, University of Adelaide, HERGA</p> <p>Professor Rachael Field, Editor, Student Success; former editor QUT Law Review</p>  | <p><i>Perspectives and expectations of Editors and Conference organisers</i></p> <p><i>Information and strategies for participants</i></p> |
| <i>30 minutes</i>     | <p><b>Session 2: Perceptions of Peer Review</b></p> <p><i>Activity:</i></p> <p>Question and Answer</p> <p>Perspectives from peer reviewers with an initial series of set questions</p> <p>Participants are also encouraged to share experiences and outcomes.</p>   | <p><b>Peer Reviewers</b></p> <p>Dr Ann Luzeckyj, Flinders University (Reviewer and author perspective)</p> <p>Dr Sarah O’Shea, UoW (Reviewer and author perspective)</p> <p>Dr Helen Benzie, UniSA (Reviewer and author perspective)</p> <p>Dr Sharron King, UniSA (Reviewer perspective)</p> <p>Kathy Egea, UTS (Reviewer and author perspective)</p> | <p><i>Perspectives and expectations of peer reviewers.</i></p> <p><i>Information and good practice examples</i></p>                        |

|            |  |  |  |
|------------|--|--|--|
|            |  |  |  |
| 20 minutes | <b>Dissemination Makerspace</b><br><br><i>Activity:</i><br><br>An interactive makerspace session were groups can share information on the platforms and social tools they are using to draw attention to their research and academic profile | <b>Group activity</b><br><br><i>Table groups</i> | <i>Post-workshop – participants will receive a compilation of sharing strategies, tools and platforms to assist in their dissemination of their research</i> |
| 5 minutes  | <b>Conclusion</b>  | <b>Facilitators</b>                              |  |

## References

- Anderson, W. (2013). Quality not quantity: measuring the impact of published research. Retrieved from <http://theconversation.com/quality-not-quantity-measuring-the-impact-of-published-research-18270>
- Antell, K., Foote, J., & Foote, J. (2016). Scholarly Publishing's Evolving Landscape: Impact Metrics, Electronic-Only Journals, and Open Access in Journalism and Communication Research. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 71(3). doi: 10.1177/1077695816668864
- McLaughlin, H. (2015). *How to write a peer review to improve scholarship: Do unto others as you would wish them do unto you*. Retrieved from <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2015/08/18/how-to-write-a-peer-review-to-improve-scholarship/>
- Nygaard, L. (2015). Publishing and perishing: an academic literacies framework for investigating research productivity. *Studies in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2015.1058351
- Weller, M. (2014). *Battle for Open: How openness won and why it doesn't feel like victory*. London: Ubiquity Press. doi: 10.5334/bam