PSA Guide to Publishing

Political Studies Association

Disclaimer:

Information provided in this guide is correct at the time of publication but we cannot make guarantees as to its future accuracy. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the Political Studies Association, its Executive Committee, or sub-committees. None of the Political Studies Association, members of its Executive Committee, or individual contributors to the guide assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information disclosed herein. Chapters in this guide may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other public and private organisations. Please be aware that none of the Political Studies Association, its Executive Committee, or individual contributors control or guarantee the accuracy, relevance, timeliness, or completeness of this outside information. Furthermore, the inclusion of links to particular items in hypertext is not intended to endorse any views expressed or products of services offered by the author of the reference or the organisation operating the service on which the reference is maintained. Readers should thus be aware that information available through hypertext in this guide may not reflect the views and positions taken by the Political Studies Association, its Executive Committee, or sub-committees.

Contents

PSA Guide to Publishing

Kyle Grayson, Co-Editor-in-Chief, Politics,
Newcastle University and Alasdair R. Young,
former Co-editor, Politics, Georgia Institute of Technology

Introduction[1]

Publishing is important in the disciplines of politics and international studies. Professional pressures are such that one must publish both early and well. This short guide is intended to provide both general advice and some specific recommendations about how to do so. It is important to bear in mind that publishing is a very personal activity. It is undertaken for different reasons and to realise different objectives. This guide, therefore, does not seek to be prescriptive. Rather, it aims to provide useful information on why and how to publish, so that you can make informed decisions that best reflect your professional goals and ambitions. It is intended primarily for PhD students and 'early career researchers' (ECRs), although its advice should be relevant to all academics in the disciplines of politics and international studies. Given that the Political Studies Association and its journals are based in the United Kingdom, much of the discussion will reflect this national academic context. However, most of the information here can be subject to wider application. Therefore, it is important to discuss your publication strategy with your supervisors and/or mentors as a general guide cannot offer appropriate strategic advice to deal with all individual circumstances.

This opening chapter discusses the benefits of publishing and considers the main forms of publication. The second chapter focuses on publishing research articles in journals, while the third by Martin Smith and Mark Wenman considers review articles. The fourth chapter by Nicola Parkin explores publishing monographs, with a focus on converting a PhD thesis into a book. The fifth chapter by Peter Geoghegan discusses how to write research based material for non-academic audiences while the sixth by Patrick Dunleavy and Jane Tinkler explores research impact. The seventh chapter by Meera Sabaratnam outlines using social media and the final chapter by Lee Jones provides an overview of open access publishing.

Why Publish?

Regular scholarly publication in peer-reviewed outlets throughout the course of a career has become the expectation for researchers in higher education. Successive rounds of government mandated research assessment in the UK – the most recent being the Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014 – use publications as a key measure of research excellence to form the basis for allocating discretionary funding to universities[2]. Departments are therefore keen to recruit people who are research active – i.e., publishing in high quality peer-review outlets and engaging with broader audiences – because the performance of these individuals potentially contributes to an important source of institutional prestige and a discretionary income stream. Although research assessment processes have made allowances for 'new entrants' to the profession, departments generally prefer to hire colleagues with clear track records of publication. The logic is that there is no better indicator of the ability to publish in the future than already having successfully published work previously. Thus, publishing is very much a pre-requisite for PhD students and young academics wishing to enter the UK job market. Even in other national

[1] This is an up-dated version of the introductory chapters from the first two editions of the guide. Thus, the authors are grateful to the current editorial team for Politics (Martin Coward, Michael Barr, Emily Clough, and Valentina Feklyunina) as well as the former editorial team (Jane Duckett and Paul Graham). Earlier versions of this chapter also benefitted from comments provided by Anke Schmidt-Felzmann, Craig Smith, Stephen White and Kerri-Anne Woods at the University of Glasgow. The current version was strengthened by comments from Peter Eckersley, Craig Johnson, Sobia Kaker, Cahir O'Doherty, Sarina Theys, and Andrew Walton at Newcastle University.

[2] For more on the Research Excellence Framework and how it relates to the evaluation of Politics and International Studies in the UK, please see HECFE (2012) **'Part 2c: Main Panel C Criteria'**

jurisdictions where government-led managerial interventions into the research process may be less pronounced, publication records are displacing more fuzzy measures as the shrinking market for tenure-track positions becomes increasingly competitive. The bottom line is that, whatever the academic culture, it is better to publish well than not.

Beyond employment considerations, there are significant intellectual benefits to publishing. First, publication remains the best way to share your research findings and engage in academic debates within your field of study. It is only by publishing that people beyond your peers, students and supervisors will learn of your research, ideas and insights. Publishing is one of the most important ways you can contribute to the discipline.

Moreover, the very process of publishing is also a valuable learning experience. It forces you to explain your ideas to others who, unlike your supervisors, are not intimately aware of what you are trying to achieve. In addition, you can get valuable feedback from referees' reports. These reports will not always be positive, supportive, or even well-mannered. Most though are constructive and will help you to strengthen your paper. Even less constructive reviews can at least flag potential issues with, or misinterpretations of, your work that you can seek to pre-empt in a future draft.

The implication should be clear. Doctoral students who wish to pursue an academic career need to be seeking to publish even while working on their theses. But given that the typical British doctoral programme is only three to four years in length, a difficult balancing act is required. On the one hand, a thesis must be completed in good time as it is also a pre-requisite for the academic job market. On the other hand, publications are an important element of being a competitive academic job candidate. As the preceding discussion suggests, by submitting work that has been adapted from your doctoral research, completing the thesis and publishing can be complementary. In fact, so long as there are findings that make an original contribution to your topic area, students can try to spin out thesis chapters into journal articles or book chapters as they go along. This will provide additional feedback as the thesis project develops, indicate that aspects of the thesis are indeed publishable – often a criterion for passing a doctoral viva in the UK – and allow you to enter the job market with one or two publications in hand – or at least in the pipeline. Plus, timelines in academic publishing are very often measured in months – if not years – from initial submission until final publication. In order to maximize the benefits of publishing and to minimize the distraction from the pursuit of the doctorate, however, you should seek to only publish pieces that can be relatively easily adapted from your thesis.

In what form to publish?

Academic publishing comes in many forms of outputs such as books, journal articles – including research articles, research notes, and review articles – and book chapters in edited volumes. All have their benefits and drawbacks. Rightly or wrongly, some forms of publication are more highly valued than others. While the quality of the material published should be what matters, the reality is that colleagues – including university hiring committees – often take the form in which something is published as a proxy measure of its quality. The proxy value is based largely on how rigorous the peer review process is assumed to be. Moreover, there is a significant degree of variation in the assumed quality of specific outlets within these different forms of publication. For example, with journals, assessments of quality can be based on quantitative measures (e.g., impact factors, h-scores, or rejection rates), the type (e.g., disciplinary association, generalist, specialist, American-based, European-based, or the language of publication) and/or perceptions of prestige that could generously be described as 'impressionistic'.

With the emergence of open access publishing, the last few years has also witnessed the beginning of distinctions being made in terms of an outlet's wider accessibility. Accessibility is shaping both the terms under which funders provide research grants as well as eligibility for future research evaluation exercises in the UK. Open Access (OA) has thus become yet another consideration in the publishing process and is discussed in further detail in chapter 8.

For the purposes of delineation, the discussion below will be divided into two forms of publishing academic research: traditional and contemporary. Traditional forms are those most commonly identified as academic publishing. Contemporary forms of publishing reflect both the recent importance attached to 'engagement' and 'impact 'in the UK higher education research context as well as the emergence of digital technologies that are transforming how information is shared and platforms researchers use for communication.

Traditional forms of academic publishing

In politics and international studies, the monograph (an authored rather than edited, research-based book) remains the gold-standard publication, though this may vary for some sub-fields.[3] This status reflects the effort involved, the demands of sustaining a substantiated argument, the scope of the research undertaken, and the fact that monographs are subject to peer review – or 'refereeing'. The perceived rigour of the publishers' refereeing policy is the key to how highly-regarded the publisher will be. Generally, university presses – particularly those based out of Oxbridge and the Ivy League – are considered to be top tier outlets followed by commercial presses. However, there are marked differences within sub-fields and national jurisdictions regarding the perception of publishers. Moreover, some presses may offer advantages in terms of their audiences, global distribution networks, marketing, indexing, pricing, and even production – e.g., simultaneous paperback publication is now uncommon – that can shape the best choice for you depending on your goals. Given the importance of the monograph, it is important to try to publish your PhD thesis. Chapter 4 by Nicola Parkin provides guidance on how to do this.

Second in the perceived hierarchy is the refereed journal article. Again, their higher status is based on the perception that rigorous peer review ensures higher quality content than other forms of publishing. Journal quality may also be judged in terms of the frequency with which articles published in an outlet are cited by other academic publications. Indices like the Thomson-Reuters SSCI index, Google Scholar, and Scopus provide various forms of citation data that are used as proxies for quality in some quarters. As an ECR, it is important to be familiar with them for the purposes of being able to present 'objective' evidence of the quality of the outlets in which you have published and the academic impact of your research for the job market, potential research funders and tenure and promotion committees.

A unique advantage of journal articles is that they are more likely to be widely-read[4]. This has much to do with the time constraints of academic life. Journals, especially those of learned associations, may land on academics' desks, though this is becoming less frequent as many journals switch to publishing online only. However, their tables of contents appear in email in-boxes and articles are readily turned up by search engines, making titles and keywords increasingly important (see chapter 6). This greater visibility is a huge advantage over book chapters (see below), which might be buried in a volume that is not directly of interest to your target audience or that proves quite expensive to acquire.

Journal articles – from the writer's and the reader's point of view – also have the advantage of being much shorter than books. Many authors publish the condensed argument of their book in a journal article. Journal articles also generally experience faster turnaround times from submission to publication than books. Both the quality signalling effects and the profile effects are greater the more prestigious the journal. Chapter 2 provides guidance on publishing journal articles while chapter 3 discusses review articles.

[3] See, for example, the BISA/PSA response to the DfES consultation on Reform of Higher Education Research Assessment and Funding, 2006; and Richard Rhodes, 'Writing a Book is Good for You,' PSA News, September 2009, p. 18.

[4] For example, PSA journals are available at 8,900 institutions around the world.

Book chapters are similar to journal articles in terms of length. They differ, however, in that they tend to be solicited and tend not to be subject to as stringent peer review. As a consequence, it is common for colleagues and hiring committees not to rate book chapters as highly as journal articles. Again, this reflects the shortcut of using the type of outlet as an indicator of quality, rather than an actual assessment of the specific piece of work. Some book chapters are excellent and, particularly with diligent and engaged editors, may be put through a more rigorous screening process than many journal articles. Regardless of individual cases, the general perception of inferiority still remains, with data from REF 2014 showing that book chapters in politics and international studies were far less likely to be awarded 4* than books or journal articles. Therefore, you need to be aware of these perceptions and the REF context.

In addition, as noted above, book chapters may not connect as effectively with your target audience as a journal article. To be fair though, there are edited volumes that are 'must-reads' in a field or subfield. Such volumes are usually edited by, or bring together, the leading scholars in the area and/or are published as part of an established and respected series that is highly visible in the field. Chapters in such volumes may receive much more attention than articles in journals. Moreover, some edited volumes grow out of workshops in which there are intense, substantive discussions among the contributors. Such exchanges and connections are extremely valuable in their own right and contribute to the quality of the overall volume. Because book chapters tend to be solicited and are similar in form to journal articles, we have not included a separate chapter on how to publish them.

One way to begin to publish is through book reviews[5]. Writing book reviews (or the shorter book notes) does not carry great cachet in politics and international studies, but it is a way to gain experience of the mechanics of the publication process. Moreover, you get a free copy of the book that you review. While providing an important service to the discipline, book reviews are not understood to be research articles. Only do reviews for books (especially the expensive ones) that you want to read for your own work.

Review articles are different from book reviews. They are discussed by Mark Wenman and Martin Smith in Chapter 3. Review articles examine literature related to a concept, theoretical framework, method, or empirical area in order to present an argument about the state of the art for the field, current limitations, and future directions for research[6]. They may be substantial articles of up to 12,000 words in length or shorter focussed pieces that concentrate on a set of books/articles or a particular article/book. Such reviews are widely read and are often extensively cited. Because of their more reflective nature, they also provide scope for the author to make a substantive contribution. However, in the guidance provided in the run-up to the last REF, HEFCE made it clear that:

> *sub-panels will accept the submission of review articles only where they contain a significant component of unpublished research or new insight. Such outputs will be judged only on original research or new insights reported (emphasis in original).*[7]

This explicit singling out, uncertainty over how these criteria might be determined in practice, and the general risk adverse approach to REF submissions means that review articles have tended not to carry as much status as conventional journal articles. Still, the very best ones can be extremely insightful and make a significant intellectual contribution.

[5] For a recent example, see the following from **Political Studies Review**.

[6] For an example, see Jonathan Grix (2013) 'Sport Politics and the Olympics' **Political Studies Review** 11(1), pp. 15-25.

[7] HEFCE (2012) **'Panel Criteria and Working Methods'** p. 44.

Contemporary Forms of Publishing

In addition to the traditional means through which researchers have shared their work with other members of the academic community, forms of publication aimed a wider audience are now seen as important aspects of a well-rounded publishing portfolio. This, in part, reflects recent changes to how the social role of the university is being understood. Successive governments in the UK have sought to channel research towards solving immediate challenges identified by the state, pressure groups, and commercial interests. These functional and utilitarian preferences – with research being envisioned as a technocratic problem-solving tool – have greatly shaped the research landscape in the UK. This has led to the inclusion of measures like impact in the REF and the sector wide push towards engagement – envisioned primarily as a pathway for impact.[8] However, the growing importance attached to publications intended for a general audience is also in part a reflection of feelings held by many academics themselves that advanced research ought to be made accessible to as wide an audience as possible. While this sentiment has motivated many working within the open access movement, it has also begun to change the ways that researchers seek to distribute their work, including practices of 'triple writing'.[9] Newspaper opinion editorials and magazine articles remain venues for academics to share findings and views supported by evidence-based research. Disciplinary associations such as the PSA have developed their own in-house magazines like **Political Insight** aimed at the general public – including school students – in order to raise the profile of the discipline and individual researchers within broader constituencies. Blogging and tweeting about research-whether for globally recognised sites like the Huffington Post, disciplinary association blogs, groups blogs like The Disorder of Things, or individual research blogs – are other ways that academics are attempting to reach a wider audience and share their research findings. These forms of dissemination reach academics too. As a recent World Bank study concluded, research articles that are blogged tend to result in higher levels of readership than those articles not circulated through social media.[10]

While forms of publication aimed at the general public and practitioners have an important role to play, there is an essential caveat that should not be forgotten: no matter how high-profile the venue and no matter how much public/media attention an op-ed, magazine article, or blog post might receive, it will not substitute for – nor be treated by colleagues with same level of respect as – a traditional form of scholarly publication. While there is a skilful art to correctly pitching research to a non-specialist audience, within academia, there remains a deeply engrained notion that the lack of academic peer-review equals an overall loss in rigour. Therefore, publications in non-academic outlets should serve to complement work appearing in traditional peer reviewed publications by sharing research results in a form that will make them more digestible to a potentially larger audience. They may also help to build up your own reputational profile and open doors towards consultancy and policy-influence, strong signals of impact according to criteria outlined in REF guidance. Thus, an ECR should be under no illusions that a blog post, op-ed, or magazine article will be perceived on par with a book chapter, journal article, or book. However, such publications are an important aspect of raising your profile both inside and outside of the profession. Chapters 5 on writing for a generalist audience, chapter 6 on writing for impact, and chapter 7 on blogging will provide more information and guidance on these forms of publishing.

[8] In the REF, impact is defined as an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia. See HEFCE (2011/12) **'Assessment Framework and Guidance on Submissions'** p.68

[9] Matthew Flinders (2013) 'The Politics of Engaged Scholarship: Impact, Relevance, and Imagination' Policy & Politics 41(4), p. 632.

[10] David McKenzie and Berk Özler (2011) **'The Impact of Economics Blogs: Policy Research Working Paper 5783'**, World Bank.

10

Co-authoring

In addition to the issue of in which form to publish, another key consideration, particularly for ECRs, is whether or not to co-author. Co-authoring can be extremely beneficial. It can provide valuable training in how to write and get published – including how to respond emotionally and literally to referees. It can be extremely intellectually rewarding as you and your co-author(s) debate points and develop the argument. It can be very efficient, with each author contributing complementary elements to produce a whole that is more than the sum of its parts. And it can be a relatively easier way for a junior scholar to get published.

Caution, however, is required. As a junior scholar, you may be approached by a senior colleague or your supervisor with a co-authoring opportunity. It may be that this person, who gets asked to write many things, does not have the time to write it him or herself and is looking for somebody to do the heavy lifting. This may be worth it in order to get published, but **think carefully about what is in it for you**. The further the project takes you from your core research, the more wary you should be.

You also need to be aware of the need to establish your own intellectual identity and not have the intellectual credit for your own research blurred.[11] Co-authoring as an ECR can produce mixed reactions amongst colleagues. For some, particularly those for whom co-authoring is common within their sub-field, a paper co-written with senior colleagues may be perceived as a strong indication of your intellectual bona fides: clearly you must be good if well-respected researcher(s) are willing to have their name on a piece to which you made a contribution. For others, a co-authored piece can be seen as a signal that you have not yet fully matured as an independent researcher. Such a view may become more entrenched if all of your initial publications are co-authored. Thus, like many things in academia, those predisposed to you and your work will likely perceive co-authoring positively while those less predisposed to you may view it negatively.

When co-authoring you need to be willing to stand up to your co-author(s) if you are unhappy about the direction the piece is taking or the quality of what is written. Problems with the direction of the piece are best avoided by agreeing to a line of argument in advance. It is also important to establish a clear division of labour and timetable for delivery. To put it bluntly, you need to be able to rely on your co-author(s). Consequently, it tends to be easier to co-author with people that you know well and respect. Remember, particularly when writing with somebody more senior than yourself that the piece in question may matter much more to you than to him or her.

It is also vitally important that you have a frank discussion about the order in which your names will appear on the article and the percentage contribution of each co-author.[12] This agreement should be confirmed in writing and it is in your best interests to keep several copies. Percentage contribution towards co-authored work is often required for national research assessment preparation processes and funding applications as well as for tenure and promotion. Without corroborating documentation, others – including hiring committees – will not be sure of the extent of your contribution which could lead to publications being significantly discounted and/or declared ineligible.

[11] This can be managed within the text by, for example, inserting a reference to your thesis (even if still in progress) or other work.

[12] If names are listed in alphabetical order via surname, the general assumption will be that all co-authors made an equal contribution to the published product. This may not necessarily be the case. Similarly, any deviation from alphabetical order may be interpreted as an indication of the significance of the contributions made by individual authors. Generally, when not presented alphabetically, the first name provided is considered to be the lead author with others listed in diminishing importance. It is also worth bearing in mind how the work will be cited. Will your name feature in a standard citation or will you be a part of the 'et al'?

Conclusion

Unfortunately, there are not always clear answers when it comes to publishing. Much of what will be most beneficial to you and your career will be context dependent on the national system, the particularities of your institution and/or the type of institutions in which you are seeking employment. Much is also dependent on what you are trying to achieve with the publication itself and your personal circumstances. Are you looking to establish a widely recognised proxy for the high quality of your research? Are you looking to engage with a specific audience within or outside of academia? Are you trying to build up a research network? Are you looking to maximise the potential exposure of your research to peers working in the same sub-discipline by contributing to an ongoing debate? Are you operating under specific time constraints? Are you attempting to demonstrate your ability to engage in a sustained research project with substantial findings? While ideally a publication will be able do all of those things that you need, the reality is that no one outlet – or publication – is likely to achieve everything that you desire. Thus, you will have to make choices about what is most important and the trade-offs you are willing to make for each potential output. As a part of this process, do your research. Talk with your supervisors. Consult with your mentors. And most importantly, design and implement a clear publication strategy that aligns with your career objectives. The rest of this guide is devoted to providing concrete advice about how to publish in politics and international studies.

Developing a Publication Strategy

The type and volume of publications required to be competitive for academic positions – or to be perceived as a successful researcher – is context dependent. It is not always a matter of having X peer-reviewed publications or an article in a very prestigious journal. Increasingly though, academic hiring processes in the UK are being influenced by the Thomson-Reuters' Social Sciences Citation Index list. Shortlists for entry-level lectureships at research intensive institutions are generally filled with candidates with at least 1-2 articles in SSCI listed journals, many with journals in the top quartile. Your strategy – if seeking permanent academic employment – must be to publish in the best possible outlets given your area of research and the audiences to which you are trying to connect. You will need to create a bespoke plan about the elements of your thesis that could be turned into stand-alone articles, a list of journals you will target for each article (assuming that you may be rejected at points along the way), anticipated timelines, and compile a dossier of metrics that you could use to provide evidence of the quality of the outlet to a prospective hiring committee, funding agency, and/or manager. Remember that hiring committees are looking to employ future colleagues who will be able to meet the output demands of national research assessments every 5-7 years with high quality submissions. Jobs.ac.uk has prepared an ebook called **'The Research Publications Planner'** which can help with developing your publication strategy in the short, medium, and long terms.

Publishing Journal Articles

Kyle Grayson, Co-Editor-in-Chief, Politics,
Newcastle University and Alasdair R. Young,
former Co-editor, Politics, Georgia Institute of Technology

Introduction[13]

Politics and international studies are broad fields defined as much by their theoretical, methodological, and empirical diversity as any specific topic area or approach to research. But do not let the relative pluralism of these fields contribute to a sense that research articles themselves are an open frontier where 'anything goes'.

From the very start of your publishing career, it is important to remember that academic research articles are a genre of writing. Like any other genre, there are conventions that must be adhered to for your work to be formally recognised as a research article by your peers. Failure to gain this recognition will inevitably result in rejections, whether by editors or peer reviewers who all expect a research article to embody the conventions of the genre. Thus, from the outset, you must remember that a research article is **not** a thesis chapter. A research article is **not** a research proposal. A research article is **not** a term paper. A research article is **not** an essay. A research article is **not** a literature review. And a research article is **not** a blog post.

The core conventions that define the genre of the research article can be reduced to the following core elements:

- It must have original research content as established by the norms of your field or sub-discipline;
- It must be a stand-alone output that is not dependent on someone reading your thesis or other research articles you have written for exposure to core aspects of the argument;
- There must be a clear research problem that is situated within the relevant academic literature;
- A single line of argument should be articulated and defended OR a single set of hypotheses should be presented and tested;
- An account of how the research was undertaken in accordance with the norms of your (sub) field or methodological approach must be provided;
- A clear sense of the original contribution that the article makes to the literature in the sub-field and/or field must be expressed;
- A clear sense of the significance of the findings in relation to the existing literature must be articulated;
- Presentation must be according to the **house style** of the journal including rigid compliance with word count limitations.

Why is adherence to these conventions important? In many cases, submissions that fall outside the recognised genre of a research article are immediately desk rejected by journal editors. A desk rejection indicates that after initially being read by the editorial team, a decision was made that the submission should not be sent out for review. In other words, in the judgement of the editors, the submission falls short of minimum standards. It is important to understand that editors are not necessarily experts in your particular subject area. In the absence of any other signals of quality, if you cannot clearly express to them the rigour, originality, and significance of your research, they are likely to assume that your work is unimportant, uninteresting, derivative, and therefore not worth burdening colleagues with the time-consuming task of reviewing it. Similarly, the inability

[13] This is an up-dated an expanded version of the chapter that appeared in the first two editions of the guide, so it draws on Charles Lees's presentation on publishing in journals to the 2006 PSA Graduate Conference in Reading and on discussions with PhD students at the Universities of Edinburgh (June 2006) and Glasgow (January 2007) as well as discussions with members of the BISA Postgraduate Network (2012 and 2013), doctoral students at Newcastle University (2012, 2013, and 2014), and early career researchers at Cardiff University (2014). Thus, the authors are grateful to the current editorial team at Politics (Martin Coward, Michael Barr, Emily Clough, and Valentina Feklyunina) as well as the former editorial team (Jane Duckett and Paul Graham). This chapter previously benefitted from comments provided by Anke Schmidt-Felzmann, Craig Smith, Stephen White and Kerri-Anne Woods at the University of Glasgow. The latest version received helpful feedback from Peter Eckersley, Craig Johnson, Sobia Kaker, Cahir O'Doherty, Sarina Theys, and Andrew Walton at Newcastle University.

to follow formatting instructions at the initial stages of submission does not send a strong signal that you are serious about publishing in the journal.

Beyond the initial round of vetting by the editorial team, submissions that fail to adhere to more than one of these conventions tend to be rejected during the peer review process. Reviewers, even if leading experts in the field, are still sensitive to the genre conventions of how a research article should be structured, what information it needs to convey, and how it should do so. These are baseline expectations that help to establish the minimum standards for publishable material. No matter how brilliant the theoretical framework, research methods, or findings, work that breaks with these conventions is going to have a hard time surviving the peer review process. While your research may produce results that challenge orthodox understandings or conventional wisdom, it should not present the reader with challenges in terms of determining the research problem being addressed, the central argument or hypotheses, how the research was undertaken, or the contribution and significance of the findings.

Choosing a Journal Outlet

This is probably one of the most difficult decisions to make with respect to academic publishing. The easy answer is that you should aim for the most prestigious journal you can find in your field. However, there are very different perceptions of prestige and many different indicators used by hiring committees, university managers, and colleagues for ranking journals. Generally, prestige is attributed to perceptions of:

- The acceptance rate;
- The name recognition and reputation of the journal;
- Levels of citation for articles published by the journal.

The acceptance rate is used as a proxy for how selective a journal is, that is the ratio between the number of papers submitted and the number that the journal accepts for final publication. In theory, the lower the rate of acceptance, the higher the overall quality of the papers published. Acceptance rates tend to vary from about 5-30% depending on the outlet, with particularly prestigious journals claiming to have acceptance rates of less than 10%. The name recognition of the journal refers to impressions of how well-known the journal is in the discipline more generally and perceptions about the extent of the journal's audience. The rationale is that well-known journals have built up their reputations by only publishing the very best research and wish to maintain this status by continuing to publish only the very best research. Levels of citation refer to how often articles published by a journal are cited in other academic publications. The rationale is that citations are a proxy measure for influence – i.e., other experts are identifying work published in the journal as being important enough to warrant mention or sustained engagement – and that influential pieces are necessarily higher-quality by definition.

There are obviously potential problems with all three as indicators of prestige and quality. First, apart from levels of citation – which can be determined through the Thomson-Reuters SSCI index, Scopus, Google Scholar, and freeware like Harzing's Publish or Perish – data on acceptance rates and reputation can be absent, anecdotal, and even conflicting. Citation measures for journals vary widely from database to database – depending on the collection criteria – year to year, and article to article. The reality is that most journals have a long-tail of uncited work. Errors in calculation are also not uncommon. Second, these proxies may not always indicate what some assume that they indicate. For example, a low acceptance rate could be masking the overall low quality of the submission population and/or any particular piece published by a journal. Name recognition benefits long-established journals and those linked to disciplinary associations, potentially missing world-leading research published in outlets that are more recent in origin and/or focused in specialisation. And an article may be highly cited because it explores a fashionable topic in the field, is deliberately provocative, or has been identified as being fundamentally flawed.

While these indicators may be problematic, you do need to take them into consideration as general principles when deciding the journals to target with your work. To help make your decision, you should also seek advice from your supervisors and mentors on which journals are well-regarded in your field. If possible, speak to senior colleagues who have recently served on hiring committees, had research director positions, or have prepared research assessment documentation for the REF or its predecessor – the Research Assessment Exercise. Look at the publication records of early career colleagues in your sub-field who have recently secured employment. Examine the REF and RAE submissions of institutions that performed well to see where colleagues were publishing. Also, consider the journals you yourself read regularly: you must believe what they publish to be of reasonable quality, so you can be fairly sure that what you are writing is substantively appropriate and is likely to be read by others working in your area.

The decision to submit to a general politics journal or to a more specialist journal should be influenced by the audience with which you wish to engage and the type of argument that you are trying to make. An article in a general politics journal will need to engage with broader debates in the discipline and may need to provide more background information. The contribution of the findings or conclusions will also need to be cast in relation to their significance to the discipline. An article in a more specialist journal will focus on a narrower set of debates and can take more background information for granted. The original contribution of the article and its significance should be pitched towards specialists, focusing primarily on how the findings advance the frontiers of the sub-field. Publishing in more general politics and international studies journals may be beneficial when applying for academic jobs. Members of the hiring committee are more likely to be familiar with the journal – and perhaps even the article. It also helps to demonstrate your ability to relate your work to more general debates as well as signalling the broader significance of your research. At the same time, publishing in more specialist journals helps to establish your reputation as an expert in a particular area who is shaping the sub-field. Therefore, a good strategy is to seek to publish in a variety of journals, perhaps submitting an article based on the central argument of the thesis to a general politics or international studies journal and a more focused empirical chapter or conceptual discussion – as appropriate – to a specialist journal.

When considering where to submit, you should pay careful attention to the range of topics the journal publishes. It is important to make sure that your subject matter fits within the remit of the journal – they usually have a description of the remit on their website or on the inside cover of the journal itself. With generalist journals, it is important to ensure that your paper is sufficiently broad to be of interest to colleagues outside of your sub-field. For specialist journals, it is vital that your submission matches the specific aims of the journal. Beyond subject matter, some journals favour a particular approach or methodology, such as formal modelling, feminisms, or quantitative studies. If your piece does not fit the subject matter or approach as outlined in the journal's remit, submit it somewhere else. If you are unsure, you should check with your thesis supervisor and/or a research mentor. If still unsure, you may wish to send an abstract to the editor(s) for advice. In this communication, politely provide the case as to why you think your paper is a good fit to the specific remit of the journal. If you are struggling to articulate this case, it may be better to consider another outlet.

Inter-disciplinary research continues to be a mot d'ordre amongst university managers and research councils. Thus, it may make sense not to restrict yourself to journals in politics and international studies. A number of important international studies articles, for example, have been published in political geography journals, while many political theory articles appear in philosophy and cultural studies journals. Keeping the job market in mind, particularly the requirement to present yourself as being a researcher within the discipline of a prospective politics department, it may be advantageous to hold off on pursuing publication opportunities outside of your discipline. If you do decide that it is wise to pursue such opportunities, is probably better, at least initially, to submit to only to the best known journals outside of politics and international studies.

Another consideration when deciding where to submit is timing. If you are not in a hurry to have an article accepted, you might try submitting it to a more prestigious, and therefore more selective, journal. If the article is rejected, you can always submit it somewhere else. If time is of the essence however, you may want to target a journal that you think would be more likely to accept it. Similarly, it is important to do your research on turnaround times. Some journals have well-earned reputations for making decisions relatively quickly – within three months – others are known to take longer, and some journals are unfortunately notorious within the discipline for operating on geological time scales. Data on times to a decision are not always publicly available. Some disciplinary association journals – like those operated by the International Studies Association – provide annual reports online. Other websites such as poliscirumors.com, scirev.sc, andrewcullison.com, and reviewmyreview.eu provide data of varying reliability from both journals and those who have submitted articles. Supervisors, mentors, and peers may have anecdotal information that can be useful. All of this being said, the length of time to a decision should not be made into a fetish; it needs to be weighed in relation to the reputation of the journal for providing constructive feedback.

A further consideration is the length of the period between acceptance and publication. Some journals have quite long 'queues' – two years or more between acceptance and print publication. A lengthy queue can be extremely frustrating when you are trying to build your reputation and engage in wider debates. The size of the queue may also be an issue if you are trying to ensure that you have publications in hand for the job market and could be important for ensuring your eligibility for future forms of research assessment or tenure requirements. The introduction of online article publication prior to print with Digital Object Identifier (DOI) numbers has made this less of an issue than in the past.[14] However, there are still lead times between acceptance and online publication, though these are now often measured in weeks rather than months.

Some journals publish the date on which the final version of the article was accepted, which gives you some idea of the length of the queue. If you are very concerned about how promptly your article will get into print, you should contact the journal, probably the editorial assistant if there is one, to ask how long it is currently taking accepted articles to appear in print.

The overall point is that many factors may come into play when choosing a journal outlet. Therefore, you need to be able to provide a coherent narrative and justification to yourself – and potentially to hiring committees, research funders, tenure committees, and university managers – about why you selected a particular outlet, its indicators of quality, and how it contributes to your overall publication strategy.

Writing the Journal Article

As noted above in the introduction to this chapter, journal articles are a genre of writing and thus it is vital to abide by the genre's conventions. In addition, one should keep the following in mind during the writing process:

- Have as many colleagues – particularly supervisors and/or senior mentors – as possible read a draft of the paper prior to submitting it to a journal. They are likely going to spot areas that can be improved. Improving these areas will increase the prospects of a good result with peer review.
- Be organised and meticulous with your referencing and citation practices. Many journals now require authors to sign a declaration of academic integrity. Many of the declarations define plagiarism such that intent to deceive is not a necessary criterion. In other words, sloppy practice or an accidental oversight could be enough to instigate an investigation during the review process based on the Committee for Publication Ethics (COPE) guidelines to which many journals subscribe. It could even lead to a retraction once an article has been published.

[14] Most higher education institutions and research funders consider an online article with a DOI number to be formally published.

- Do not treat the abstract as an after-thought. The abstract is crucial in terms of signalling to editors, reviewers, and – when published – other researchers why your work is important and why it should be read. Thus, your abstract highlights how your paper satisfies the conventions of the genre by identifying the research problem, your central argument, how the research was undertaken, the contribution of the paper, and its significance.

Like all forms of academic writing, the preparation of papers for journals requires a great deal of time, energy, and motivation. This holds whether expanding a conference paper into a journal submission, converting a thesis chapter into a journal article, or beginning a journal article from scratch. Simply cutting out text to go under a word limit, and/or adding a couple of paragraphs of explanation, and/or engaging in stream of consciousness writing because the idea underpinning the paper is 'ground-breaking', are not sufficient. Well-crafted, precisely argued, and rigorous pieces of scholarship are not created in an afternoon or over a weekend. Thus, it is important to be realistic about the amount of time – and number of drafts – it will take to do this well.

Submitting the Article

You should pay attention to the journal's submission guidelines that are available online – often under Author's Guidelines – and also usually on the inside front or back cover of print copies of a journal. The submission guidelines for the Political Studies Association publications – *The British Journal of Politics* and *International Relations; Political Insight; Political Studies; Political Studies Review* and *Politics* – are reproduced at the back of this guide. These guidelines will tell you how and to whom to submit your article. Most journals now use online submission systems like Manuscript Central. Full instructions and support on how to use these systems are usually available on the site. Others journals still require that you send electronic – or in some cases hard-copies – to the editors. Make sure to follow the instructions carefully.

In order to facilitate the refereeing process (see below), you should provide an anonymised version of your article. This means not inserting your name into the text, removing phrases like 'as I have argued elsewhere' with a reference and may also, depending on the journal, involve removing all citations of your own work. You may also be asked for a title page, an abstract, or a list of 3-4 major contributions made by the article. Not submitting in the correct form or with key materials missing will just slow down consideration of your article. The guidelines will also inform you of word limits (if any) and the journal's house style – i.e., use of headings and sub-headings, referencing style, and whether they use American or British spelling conventions. Word limits should be respected and are rarely negotiable. They reflect financial decisions made by publishers and/or disciplinary associations about how many pages to allocate each year for the journal and a sense of how to best maximise the number of articles published within this allocation. Strategically, it may even be wise to ensure your submission is below word count so that you have spare space to address reviewers' comments as required. Submissions are less likely to be rejected outright for not conforming to the house-style, but an incorrectly formatted paper can be viewed by editorial teams as evidence that the paper was rejected by another outlet and/or that the author is not particularly serious about being published in the journal. The point is, while it may be a pain, you will have to conform to house style before the piece is finally accepted for publication.

The Review Process

There are three main stages in the review process: desk-review; refereeing; and decision-making. Desk-reviewing is conducted in-house by the editorial team and involves assessing whether the article's substance, approach and length are appropriate for the journal. It is also likely to involve a preliminary evaluation of the article's quality, or what is sometimes referred to as the 'smell test'. As mentioned above, articles that do not conform to the genre conventions, are poorly presented, or, in the judgement of the editors, fall well-short of scholarly standards are rejected without being sent out to referees. Known as desk-rejections, these papers are removed from the peer-review process so as not to over-burden and/or try the patience of referees with hopeless cases or work that would never be published by the journal because it does not fall within its remit. With the increased pressures to publish across career stages, many journals now find desk rejections comprise a significant percentage of the overall number of papers that are rejected.

A desk rejection should be taken as a clear signal that your work requires extensive refinement before being submitted to another journal and/or that you made an initial error in the selection of an outlet. While a desk rejection can be a disappointing outcome, it does provide valuable feedback, even if the comments received are less comprehensive than if the paper had been sent out for review.

The heart of the review process is refereeing. Referees advise the editor(s) about whether a submission should be published and are encouraged to provide feedback to the author(s). Most journals require reviews from two or three referees. The norm is for refereeing to be 'double-blind' – that is the referee does not know who the author is (hence the need to anonymise the text) and the author does not know who the referees are. This is intended to enhance the impartiality of the refereeing process.

Refereeing is by far the most time consuming stage of the process. It takes a long time because referees offer their services out of a sense of professional responsibility; refereeing work is undertaken on top of teaching, research, administration, and personal commitments. It can, therefore, take the editorial team a significant amount of time to find appropriate scholars who are willing and available to referee a submitted article. Having found suitable referees, it is standard for a journal to provide them with one or two months in which to write a report. Sometimes there are unavoidable reasons why referees miss deadlines or have to pull out of the process altogether and these are communicated to editorial teams who can make alternative arrangements. The most significant delays though come from referees suddenly going incommunicado and failing to provide a review after agreeing to do so. Such events may force the editors to start the process again with a new referee. It is therefore not unusual for the screening to take six months, even a year, although many journals now aim for under four months and *Politics* aims for under 10 weeks. Because of the potential for delays in the refereeing process, some journals send articles out to four referees, but will make a decision based on only two referees' reports (never fewer) if all referees do not deliver in a reasonable period of time.

Referees, due to the requirements of their task, tend to be critical. This can come as a rude awakening to ECRs who have spent most of their time in academia regularly receiving positive affirmation in the form of first-class marks, awards, funding, and the support of supervisors. Unfortunately, a few referees, encouraged by their anonymity, can be brutal with their comments. Occasionally referees seek to impose their own views of important questions or appropriate methods, objecting that the article does not answer the question that interests them or use the methodology they favour. Some referees, thankfully relatively few, invest so little time and energy in the reviewing process that their comments are of little help to the editors and even less to the author. Most though, are extremely conscientious and constructive. Their comments will help you to strengthen and improve your argument, and thus the article. But even good referees are individuals and it is not uncommon to receive very different comments, and even different recommendations for acceptance or rejection, from them. It is therefore necessary as an author to develop a thick skin.

The three principal recommendation options that referees may select are:

1) accept the article with no or only minor corrections to be reviewed by the editors;

2) request major revisions that require the paper be resubmitted and undergo a second round of peer review, sometimes also called a revise and resubmit (R&R); and

3) reject the paper so that it will no longer be considered for publication in the journal.

There used to be a tendency for referees to choose the middle option, so as to avoid rejecting an article. But there seems to have been a move away from this norm, with some editors giving explicit instructions to referees to reject articles unless they really think they are realistically publishable to the standard held by the journal. In addition, there are other incentives for referees to be decisive: if a referee recommends revise and resubmit, s/he is both expected to provide extensive comments about how this should be done and will probably be asked to referee the resubmitted piece.

Informed by the referees' reports, the editorial team will decide what to do with the article. As noted above, referees frequently disagree, both in their specific comments and in their final recommendations. For the most prestigious and therefore competitive journals, one luke-warm – let alone negative – referee's report may be all it takes for the editorial team to reject the article. Editors of less prestigious journals with lower submission rates may be more likely to exercise discretion in favour of the author(s). Even editors of prestigious journals may discount a referee's recommendation if they doubt the quality of the review or believe that a paper is particularly innovative. Thus, the editors will evaluate both the quality and substance of the referees' reports – including confidential comments made directly to the editorial team that are not shared with the author(s) – and weigh them against the other reports. The more disparate the opinions and the sketchier the reports, the harder it is for the editorial team to make a decision. There is no universal formula used and the process is more art than science. At the end of the day, decisions are based on the academic judgement of the editorial team. While journals strive towards consistency and fairness, there is variation across journals and sometimes even within them.

Given the disincentives for reviewers to recommend revise and resubmit, such a decision by the editorial team should be viewed as an excellent initial result and a clear indication that peers believe your paper has considerable potential to make an original contribution to the discipline. The editorial team should provide specific guidance on the revisions to be done, especially if the referees diverged substantially in their comments. As a consequence of the tightening up on the 'revise and resubmit' option, more articles are rejected, but articles that are given a 'revise and resubmit' have a stronger chance of being accepted by the journal, assuming that the referees' comments are addressed seriously.

What to do after Submitting

You (and all authors) need to bear in mind that yours is only one of many submissions under consideration and it is much more important to you than to anybody else. That does not mean, however, that you should be passive. If you do not receive an acknowledgement of your submission within four weeks, you should contact the journal via its email address. If you have not heard anything for three months after receiving acknowledgement of your submission, contact the journal again to ask what is happening with your article. It will almost certainly be with the referees, but this contact will probably spur the editors to chase them. You can continue to follow up every couple of months if necessary.

It is usually better to address procedural questions to the editorial assistant, if there is one, who is more likely to know where an article is in the review or production process. In all of your interactions with the editorial team be polite. You want them on your side and exercising any available discretion to your advantage. In particular, be courteous to editorial assistants and follow the guidance that they give you at each stage of the process. Editorial assistants play a vital role in the sound functioning of any journal. As such, journal editors are very protective of them and will not take kindly to reports of disrespect towards the editorial assistant from prospective authors.

After the Decision

If your article has been accepted, congratulations! You can up-date your CV and look forward seeing your work published. In the meantime, there will be licensing agreements, proofs, and other administrative matters to be navigated. Be particularly vigilant when it comes to your proofs – which are the type-set but pre-publication drafts of articles prepared by publishers. This is your final opportunity to ensure that everything is in order with your article. While most journals have all accepted articles professionally copy-edited, errors do get missed – and made. Moreover, the type-setting process can be murder on tables, charts, and graphs. Thus, given all the hard-work that has gone into your now nearly published article, you owe it to yourself to ensure that it is error free in its final form.

A revise and resubmit decision is also something to be celebrated. While the journal has not yet committed to publishing your paper, in their judgement, it has the potential to be accepted with some further refinement. One way to improve one's chances of acceptance after a revise and resubmit decision is to provide a detailed cover letter upon resubmission. This should outline all of the revisions that have been made based on the referees' comments – including where they appear in the text – and provide a rationale for any comments that were not addressed. Revisions can even be indicated in the document itself by highlighting the changes that have been undertaken. It is important to remember that a revise and resubmit decision is made with the expectation that the text and/or research underpinning it will be significantly transformed. Any requested revisions not made need to be directly indicated and robustly – but politely – defended on intellectual grounds. Paradoxically, the revisions process can be even more difficult – and stressful – than writing the original submission. Adding a few references or footnotes will not be sufficient. Remember that is highly likely that the same referees will be evaluating the resubmission.

If your article has been rejected, commiserations. While you are entitled to an explanation, whether your paper has been rejected at the initial stages by the editorial team or after the peer-review process, it is worth noting that no matter how outraged the decision may make you feel, no matter how unfair you believe it to be, do not contact the editors with a vitriolic email. All rejection decisions are a matter of academic judgement and are deliberated by an editorial team. And they are final. Most editors are well-aware that they are potentially acting as gate-keepers and therefore put procedures in place to ensure that the review process is as fair and consistent as possible, particularly across 'like' cases. But, the review process is not a democracy where editors, referees, and authors share decision-making power. Editorial teams are sovereign though they may be subject to the oversight of an editorial board, publisher, or disciplinary association. Editors are given editorships in most cases because a publisher or disciplinary association believes that they will exercise good judgement and act in the best interests of the journal as well as the scholarly community by maintaining standards. Editors will not change their mind just because you disagree and are likely, at best, to be bemused by such conduct. And unfortunately, the reality is that as an ECR, you have more to lose if serious offence is taken.

While the initial sting is very unpleasant, even a rejected article is only rejected from one journal. There are many others out there to which you can submit. So console yourself with the fact that you might have been unlucky in having had tough referees this time round, engage with the more useful referee comments, seek advice from your supervisor(s)/mentor(s), and try again. Also remember that many well-regarded articles were initially rejected by other outlets before eventually being published. Finally, editors consider and make a decision on each article, not its author, so just because you have been turned down on this occasion does not mean you should not submit articles to the same journal in the future.

Ethics

The one professional ethic that is unique to journal publishing is that although the process can be slow and unpredictable, it is not acceptable to submit the same article to more than one journal at the same time. If you are caught, and through the process of refereeing there is a good chance of this happening, all of the journals in question are likely to reject the article. Moreover, it is highly unethical to publish the same article in more than one place (at least not without permission).

It is acceptable to submit more than one article based on the same research, but each should have a distinctive take on the material and they should not present the same data – journals are usually unwilling to publish research that has previously been published elsewhere, including translations of articles published in a different language. Be careful of publishing too many articles that are too similar as you will get a reputation as a 'cut and paste artist' and people may stop reading your work because it is so repetitive. This is bad enough after you have established a reputation for significant scholarship, but is lethal if you are trying to build a professional profile.

It is also important not to abuse the reviewing process. Journal submissions should not be used as a replacement for feedback from supervisors and/or mentors. Editing, peer reviewing, and managing a journal are all significant time commitments which contrary to popular perceptions, do not necessarily come with any direct compensation attached to them. Thus, there is an expectation that when a paper is submitted, the author(s) are putting forward – to the best of their judgement – a fully polished piece of scholarship rather than draft work in search of a steer. Editorial teams and peer reviewers are extending their professional expertise and energy to evaluate these papers in the expectation that those who submit them are committed to seeking publication in the journal outlet. Works in progress that one knows require further refinement are better suited to conference presentations, seminar papers, or writing groups. If one is in the unfortunate situation where a supervisor or supervisory team is not providing feedback on draft work, it is better to address the problem using internal mechanisms within your university than downloading this work onto other colleagues. In the end, submitting simply for feedback slows down the system for those who are actually seeking publication.

Finally, as alluded to above, journal publications and the peer review process are reliant on voluntary labour that is not compensated. Every time one submits a paper, it is likely be read by the editor(s), other members of the editorial team, and 2-4 referees – often multiple times. Currently, within the predominant form of peer review, if colleagues are unwilling to referee, the process would grind to a halt.[15] Thus, if you are submitting work to journals, do think about contributing back. As a rule of thumb, for each submission you make, you should be willing to serve as a referee for a minimum of three papers.

Conclusion

Publishing is a professional necessity. Although you may be looking to publish your thesis as a book once you have submitted (see chapter 4), while pursuing your PhD you should be looking to implement a publication strategy and establish your own professional research identity. Journal articles are an excellent way to do this as they are prestigious and provide an in-built audience that should be interested in your work. They are more prestigious than book chapters because the screening process is perceived to be (and usually is) more rigorous. This means that publishing a journal article is more difficult, but also potentially more rewarding, particularly if you get valuable comments from your referees.

Publishing in journals is not easy. Original research is necessary but not sufficient for success. It requires an initial investment of time and energy. It also requires discipline to work within the conventions of the genre, resolve during the peer review process, and determination while undertaking revisions. But publishing provides the opportunity to be recognised as someone in the field who is making a contribution to the collective body of knowledge on a topic area. Moreover, it provides a chance to be recognised by peers an expert and to potentially begin the process of shaping the field for years to come.

[15] Criticism from some quarters has been levelled at predominant business models in scholarly publishing, particularly the reliance on unpaid academic labour by for-profit publishers. For an overview of the debate, see Armin Buverungen et al (2012) 'The Poverty of Journal Publishing' Organization, 19(6), 929-938. Perceptions that the status quo in scholarly publishing is unsustainable have been a motivating factor behind the **'Academic Spring'** and open access movements. It has also raised ongoing debates about the value of current methods of refereeing and whether new models might provide more rigorous and collaborative forms of peer review. See for example, Pandelis Perakakis (2013) **'New forms of open peer review will allow academics to separate scholarly evaluation from academic journals'** LSE Impact Blog.

Publication Ranking Lists and Bibliometric Tools

Thomson-Reuters SSCI List (you should be able to access this through your library's **Web of Knowledge Database**). This is considered by many institutions to be the gold standard journal ranking list, with the two year impact factor being the most widely quoted measure. Roughly speaking, the two year impact factor is calculated on the basis of the rate at which articles published in a SSCI listed journal from the previous two years are cited by other SSCI listed journals during the index year (i.e., a journal's 2013 ranking would be based on the number of citations in 2013 from articles published in 2011 and 2012). Given that the list is highly exclusive – there are many concerns about the transparency of the process for inclusion and, as a private firm, the lack of public accountability – very respectable journals are absent. It also misses citations from other sources such as unlisted journals and books.

Google Scholar: This provides an accessible ranking of journals based on the h5 index (i.e., the number of articles in past five years (n) that have been cited at least (n) times). Citation calculations include any materials that can be captured online by Google's crawler bots. Rankings only include the top 20 journals in a given subject category and concerns have been raised about the system's capability to compile more complicated bibliographic information. One can create an account on Google Scholar and have their citations tracked privately or publicly.

The Australian Political Studies Association's Preferred Journal List: An offshoot of the now abandoned ERA ranking list commissioned by the Australian Research Council, this list is intended as an aid for internal monitoring within the Australian higher education sector. The list itself is more comprehensive and less US-centric than the SSCI List.

The TRIPS List: From the **Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations, at William & Mary**, this list is based on a twenty country survey of scholars working in the discipline of IR. It includes ranking lists of journals and book publishers. Currently, you can create bespoke reports. The journal list is not particularly comprehensive (respondents had to choose from a pre-selected list of primarily American IR journals) but it does reveal marked national differences in perceptions of influence and quality for those journals listed.

The SCImago Journal and Country Rank: This is a ranking system developed by a research consortium from the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), University of Granada, Extremadura, Carlos III (Madrid) and Alcalá de Henares. SCImago draws its information from Scopus in order to capture citations of journals within this database. Although the coverage is extremely comprehensive, subject area listings are somewhat idiosyncratic. Thus, it may be wise to search for individual journals first to see where they are listed before undertaking a subject area search.

Harzing's Publish or Perish: This is a free software package available for download that uses Google Scholar data to compile raw citation rates by author, journal, or keyword and provides various statistical measures (e.g., h index; g index, mean rate). This is a valuable tool when drafting one's own research dossier. It is also very useful for revealing more general citation patterns in the field.

Research Assessment and Early Career Researchers

Every 5-7 years, UK-based universities go through a national auditing exercise in which departments – or units of assessment – have their research outputs, environments, and impacts evaluated by an independent panel. Requirements, scoring systems, and the weightings given to individual elements have changed from assessment to assessment. However, for the past two assessments, individual outputs have been graded on a five point scale

Four star	Quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour.
Three Star	Quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence.
Two Star	Quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.
One Star	Quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.
Unclassified	Quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work. Or work which does not meet the published definition of research for the purposes of this assessment.

Generally, in order to be eligible for submission into the assessment, researchers are required to have four outputs (i.e., peer-reviewed publications) produced during the assessment cycle to submit for evaluation. There are exceptions to this rule and the requirements for ECRs have always been one of these exceptions. The number of outputs required of an ECR depends on when during the assessment cycle one begins employment – either as a researcher or lecturer. In previous assessments, this has been between 1-2 outputs per ECR. It is also worth noting that currently only outputs evaluated to be at least 3* in quality count towards the institutional allocation of research funding tied to the audit.

While keeping abreast of the minutiae of these assessment exercises is important if you wish to pursue an academic career in the UK, most crucially from the perspective of an ECR is to determine how many outputs (i.e., publications) will be necessary for you to be eligible for submission to the upcoming assessment exercise and to ensure that each journal publication meets the minimum Green Open Access requirements demanded by HEFCE for inclusion (see chapter 8). Therefore, your initial publication strategy should be built around maximising the strength of your potential submission given these requirements.

REF 2014

RAE 2008

Publishing Review Articles

Mark Wenman, Editor, Political Studies Review, University of Nottingham in collaboration with Martin J. Smith, former Co-editor Political Studies, University of York

Introduction

In the mind of some people review articles are of lesser importance or quality than articles based on primary research. This is an attitude that has been reinforced by the REF process, which has led to the perception that papers not based on primary research are of less value. However, we believe that this is a false view, and review articles make a valuable contribution to knowledge. Review articles, like other articles and books, are neither good nor bad in themselves, but depend on the quality of the article. Indeed, it is the case that the review articles are frequently the most cited publications. Some review articles can be magisterial in their sweep, and in the way that they analyse a field of research, and the best can define a new research agenda. Indeed, in the so-called hard sciences, a review article is often seen as a major contribution to the development of a particular scientific question by pulling together all the data on a research theme and thus providing an overview of where research in a particular area has reached. A good review article in politics and international studies can have a similar impact. The line between review articles and research articles can be blurred. A leading review article can build on the review to provide an original understanding of an issue, theme or approach in politics and international studies.

Types of Review Articles

The first thing to bear in mind is that there are different types of reviews. The most simple and straightforward reviews are those of a single book. These can range from a few hundred words to over a thousand. Simple book reviews are a good way into publishing. They are not usually refereed, they are relatively short and they provide good practice for getting published. Moreover, there are more books than reviewers and so editors are often looking for people to review books. Essentially, with a book review of this type it is important to summarise the book and make a few critical comments – in a friendly way – about the nature of the book. It is unproductive to 'slate' a book because judgments are always subjective and somebody's heart and soul has gone into producing it. However, there is no need to avoid constructive criticism either. Nonetheless, it is important for a reviewer not to do too many simple book reviews because, while they are useful, they are also time-consuming, and nobody has ever been appointed to a post for the number of book reviews that they have written.

More substantial, extended book reviews can be a couple of thousand words long and often deal with books that cover a common theme. Whilst these are in some ways the easiest forms of book review, it is important to think about how to tackle a long review. The extra space means that it is important that the review is more than a summary of the books and so it should place the books in a wider context. More importantly, it provides the opportunity to deal with some of the issues raised in the books under review, developing your own perspective and arguments on a particular issue. It is important when doing this type of review to think what themes you will develop from the books being reviewed, and to use the review as a way of developing an essay with a clear approach.

Also remember that many journals need reviewers and you can register your interest in being a reviewer with them. This does sometimes lead to the commissioning of longer review articles. It is also the case with Political Studies Review that the editors are open to suggestions for review articles covering a number of books, as well as symposia, where the contribution of a single book is discussed by several authors. So if you have a good idea, approach an editor.

The more usual review article can be much longer, up to 5,000 or 6,000 words, and as we suggest, can have equal worth compared to a research article. The aim of this type of review is not to focus on a limited number of articles or books, but essentially to write a paper that can:

- review the state of the art in a discipline or sub-discipline;
- examine a new body of theoretical or empirical work;

- introduce a politics audience to complementary work from another discipline such as philosophy or geography;
- take a particular empirical problem and review cross-disciplinary work on that area;
- review a field or subfield and suggest a way of developing it or a new agenda.

A good review article can thus open up a debate on a particular area; outline new areas of research; introduce new approaches; and shape the way that a field is perceived and developed.

Writing a Good Review Article

Writing a good review article takes considerable thought and some skill. The best reviews condense what may be an extensive body of work into just 6,000 words. This has to be done in a way that demonstrates a mastery of the literature. Also, the best reviews are able to add something new to that literature, either in way of interpretation or in terms of suggesting a new way forward for research. It is important that review articles are not simply descriptions of what a number of authors have written, but that they develop the themes and omissions in the literature. In other words, a review should be a critique that attempts to sum up a body of literature and place it into a wider context. It needs to pull out the key contributions of the literature, as well as its failings and areas where it can develop.

There is no single way of structuring a review article. However, it is important to ensure that a review article is organised around themes, and not books. The themes could be historical in the sense of examining how a concept has developed over time; or it could be analytical in the sense of grouping together particular approaches to a concept or literature. What is crucial for a good review article is to have some sense of development. A good paper will build on the existing literature to present a new argument, to think about evidence in a particular way and to make a theoretical or conceptual advance. If a review article simply summarises the positions and goes no further, then the reader is left hanging and the piece is nothing more than a book review, not a contribution to knowledge. Although a review article is not essentially distinct in some sui generis way from an ordinary article, review articles do often take a broader sweep at the topic, and they do not make claims to be generating new evidence, unlike a research article, which usually deals with a specific focus on a particular problem (see chapter 2).

Why Write Review Articles?

A review article is a good way of getting into publishing for the first time and can be a good disciplining experience for learning how to structure a large amount of material into a readable and relatively short paper. There are a number of reasons why a new entrant to the profession should consider writing a review article. First, it can be done without primary research; hence with limited resources it is possible to gather the material for a review article. Second, most doctoral theses start with a literature review and it should be relatively straightforward to develop your literature review into a review article. In your thesis you may have brought together a body of literature for the first time, and a review article is a good way to disseminate your knowledge or approach. Third, it is a good way of getting a name as an expert in a particular area. Review articles do get noticed, and so your name will be associated with a particular subfield. Finally, to get a review article published on a particular area can be useful in terms of establishing credibility for a research grant application.

In making grant application, you need to demonstrate a grasp of the existing literature, an expertise in an area and the ability to make a significant advance in understanding. A review article allows you to do all of these things and so prepare the ground for a research grant. If you are thinking of writing a review article, it is important, as with any other publication, to do your research. Not all journals publish review articles, or at least they do not all have a distinctive review article section, so look at the journals and examine which ones do reviews and how they organise their review articles. Are the reviews examining the state of the discipline, or are they reviewing new bodies of work? Often with a review article it is a good idea to contact the editor and ask if they are interested in a review article in a particular area prior to writing.

Some review articles may not present themselves as such. A review article that takes a new line or develops a particular argument or theoretical approach can be presented as an original paper and be like any other journal article, and so you need to consider how you are presenting your review, and what claims are you making for it. Are you essentially building on an existing body of literature to develop an original article or are you offering a state-of-the-literature debate? Next it is important to do the background research and make sure that your review is comprehensive. You need to think about your themes and to highlight what is distinctive about your approach. Then it is a good idea to get a number of people to read your review and to take account of their points. Review articles are usually reviewed in the same way as research articles. Therefore, you need to consider the reviewing process and the need to satisfy reviewers (see chapter 2). In the review process it is important to distinguish between presenting a review article either as a specific review piece or as a standard article. If it is the latter, then it will be important to convince the referees that the paper is making an original contribution to the debate.

Conclusion

Good review articles are difficult to do, but when done well and with a distinctive approach to a subject they can be amongst the most highly regarded and cited pieces of work. As such, it is important to give serious attention to review articles and to think about how you can use your work to develop an overview of your area. Moreover, reviews and review articles are a good way into the world of publishing. Talk to you colleagues and supervisors, and think about how to develop your work into a review piece that may shape the future research agenda of a particular field.

Publishing Your Doctoral Thesis

Nicola Parkin, Commissioning Editor
(International Relations), Routledge

As a commissioning editor of a politics and international relations research list at a commercial press, the aim of this article is to provide a brief guide to the process of converting and publishing a PhD thesis from the publisher's perspective.

There can be a lot of pressure on successful doctoral candidates and junior researchers to convert and publish their PhD thesis. The publication of a first monograph can strongly contribute to the success of a junior academic's career: it enables the author's work to become more widely read and cited; it can strengthen the author's reputation and it can help a candidate when seeking a job and/or applying for grants and funding. This article is structured around the most common questions that a commissioning editor is asked and seeks to demystify the process and provide signposts to help junior academics, or those new to the publishing process, to make the right choices.

Is my PhD thesis suitable to be converted into a book?

While many PhD theses are suitable for conversion and publication as academic books, some are not. The potential for a PhD thesis to be published as a book is not decided by academic quality alone, but also by its potential commercial value. Some PhDs can lend themselves better to being reworked as journal articles, while some can be suitable for both selected journal publication and a viable book manuscript. Publishers depend on the peer review process provided by academic referees and series editors to assess the scholarly quality and standard of a book project. When a commissioning editor considers new proposals for publication, their approach is not as an academic, but as a publisher. Publishing is a highly competitive and financially-driven business and assessing a book's commercial potential is an important consideration.

What makes a successful monograph?

The monographs that tend to be most successful, commercially and academically, are books that:

- make a significant and original contribution to the field, empirically and/or theoretically;
- appeal to a sufficiently large proportion of the discipline or one of the larger sub-disciplines;
- have international appeal, either discussing subjects of international relevance or including international case studies;
- have a comparative approach;
- present findings and conclusions that can be applied more broadly across the discipline.

A book might be of high scholarly merit but if it is considered unlikely to be a commercial success, it might be rejected.

At what point in my research should I approach a publisher?

While it is prudent to start thinking about how you might publish your thesis earlier, most publishers prefer you to wait until your PhD has been awarded before you formally submit your project to them.

Are multiple submissions acceptable?

Although multiple submissions are not acceptable for journal articles, many book publishers do accept that you might submit your proposal and manuscript to another publisher simultaneously. It is courteous to discuss this with the publisher when you first submit your project and it is useful to bear in mind some publishers are not willing to consider a project under these terms. When a publisher does accept a project submitted to multiple publishers, it is the responsibility of the author to inform the publisher and should the author choose to accept a contract from an alternative publisher, it also expected that the author will inform the other publishers as soon as possible and withdraw their project from consideration. One final recommendation I would make is to ensure that you change any references to other publishers and editors in your cover letter and proposal. It does not create a good impression when an editor receives a letter that explains how keen the author is to publish their book with a competing press or book series – in fact some presses have been known to reject proposals on this basis.

How do I decide which publisher to approach?

It is important to carefully consider your options. Many academic publishers and presses today focus on textbook publishing only and it is important to find one that publishes monographs, research titles and PhD conversions. The most obvious choices would be university presses and commercial academic publishers. There are also non-profit publishers and professional associations, but there are few other outlets for publishing academic monographs that also offer effective marketing and distribution. There are also niche publishers who specialise in areas which bigger publishers may not. Large academic conferences including those organised by the PSA, UACES and BISA in the UK, ISA and APSA in the US, EPSA and ECPR in Europe and WISC and IPSA globally feature book exhibitions where publishers display their latest publications. The exhibitions are useful places where you can seek advice from publishers and also gain an overview of the scope of their lists. It can also be useful to talk to your former supervisor, examiners or colleagues for any recommendations. It is important to be realistic when considering presses to approach, as some university presses – especially the larger more prestigious ones not willing to publish PhD conversions and only a handful of reputable commercial academic presses will consider PhDs.

It is important to identify a publisher who publishes in your area. In reality the quickest way to do this is to browse the latest titles on their website. You can also look at the references and bibliography in your own thesis, browse your own bookshelf, the library catalogue or sites such as Amazon to see who is publishing the volumes that most complement the research focus of your project. When seeking a publisher it is important to identify one that has a good reputation for publishing extensively in the same area as your potential book. The reputation of the publisher with whom your book is published can affect how the book is perceived and the academic reputation of a publisher is normally grounded in the process of peer reviewing projects and manuscripts. From a practical point of view, if you are aware of a publisher's publications in your field then it would also suggest that the publisher has effective marketing and distribution.

The marketing and distribution offered by a publishing company should be a key consideration. Publishing a first book should enhance an academic's reputation with the potential to further their career and bring about new opportunities. If an excellent book is written and published but not supported by sufficient marketing and distribution, it is likely to sink without making an impact. When considering a publisher, it might be prudent to find out about the following:

- Does the publisher have an established reputation for quality publications and reliability in your area?
- Does the publisher offer global distribution and marketing? Important non-UK markets include North America, Europe, Asia, the Middle East and Australasia.
- Do they have sales and marketing teams/offices in and outside the UK who will promote and sell books to the local market?
- Does the publisher send out review copies to key academic journals?
- Does the publisher effectively market their books in catalogues and through targeted email campaigns and will they offer author flyers or other marketing material?
- Does the publisher have the capacity to keep your book indefinitely 'in print' through print on demand technology?

- Does the publisher have an online presence, promoting books and events through their website and social media. Are they offering books/chapters through interactive content platforms?
- Does the publisher publish ebooks as well as print formats?
- Will the publisher bring out a paperback edition of the book some time after the initial hardback publication?
- Does the publisher attend large academic conferences and take part in book exhibitions?

All of the above make an important contribution to raise the profile of an academic book and can significantly increase the potential sales. The author too can play an important part in the promotion of their book: distributing and displaying flyers when giving presentations, flagging up appropriate conferences and workshops, using social media to generate interest in the book and announcing publication through their own networks.

It is also a good idea to identify whether the press requires subsidies for the production of the book, as this can be a substantial cost. Many of the larger publishers do not require their authors to contribute to the normal production costs of the book. However, there are some costs that are often the author's responsibility which include permissions costs for reproducing any previously published material and the indexing of the book. At Routledge we always require an index and if the author does not wish to provide their own, we will offer to charge the cost to the author's royalties, rather than requesting payment upfront.

Should I consider submitting to a specific book series?

You may be aware of a potential series that you would like to submit your book to. At Routledge almost all our research titles are published in series that are thematic, reflecting the key sub-disciplines. Book series are an effective tool that help market our books. Librarians often follow the progression of a book series and keep up to date with the latest titles. Series also bring related titles to the attention of readers of individual titles as they often form the basis for email campaigns or small, targeted online catalogues. It is by no means obligatory to submit a proposal to a specific series and the publisher may offer to place a book in an appropriate series on your behalf. You can usually find information about book series from publishers' catalogues, their websites and at conferences, or from academics in your own networks.

If the series has academic series editors then you may wish to approach them for some preliminary feedback as they can provide valuable advice on the content of your book and whether they feel it would be a strong fit with the series they edit. Depending on how active the individual series editors are, it can be beneficial to publish your book in a series that has external academic series editors. These series can offer a more detailed and involved review process as the series editors will provide feedback on the content of your book, in addition to the academic reports solicited during the review process. Publishing in these series can be more challenging and more competitive as most series editors only want to include books they feel strongly embody the aims of the series and can cherry pick a small number of projects. The upside of this is that being published in a competitive series with a recognised reputation in the field can be advantageous and a good selling point when applying for funding or a new position.

I have chosen a publisher, what material should I submit?

Before you begin writing your proposal I would strongly recommend that you have a look at the publisher's website to see if they provide instructions about submitting a proposal for publication, as it is likely most publishers will reply and ask you to reformat your proposal to reflect their guidelines. Most publishers request very similar material, including but not limited to the following:

- A statement of aims including 3-4 paragraphs outlining the rationale behind the book;
- A detailed synopsis and chapter headings & length and schedule;
- Definition of the market;
- A list and assessment of the main competing titles;
- CV/author biography;
- Sample chapters/full manuscript

The word length of the final manuscript is expected to be between 80,000 – 100,000 words. It is very rare for a PhD to be published in the format of the thesis and a proposal for a PhD should also include the changes you intend to make. Questions and issues to consider include:

- Which parts will you cut or modify?
- How you will be adapting the language and style? Some aspects of the 'scholarly infrastructure' of a PhD such as the literature review or detailed notes on methodology are important to impress your examiners but not vital in a book. You should also reduce any unnecessary jargon and notes.
- Most people find it necessary to streamline the argument and the writing to reduce repetitions and overlaps, and to lighten the empirical material.
- You may wish to restructure the content, changing the order of the chapters.
- You will need to explain how you will draw out and expand the main findings and conclusions.

If some time has passed since the PhD was written you will also need to ensure the book is up-to-date and considers recent publications in the field.

It is likely that most publishers will request electronic submission of material so the best practice for submission is to go onto their website and look for the details of the appropriate commissioning editor to approach. If you are unsure then select the person you think looks most suitable, editors are used to passing on proposals to colleagues whereas emailing multiple commissioning editors at the same press separately often leads to confusion and a delay in response.

How does the review process work?

If your book is accepted for consideration by the press, the proposal, sample chapters or manuscript will usually be reviewed by at least two academics in the field and the anonymous reviews will then be forwarded to you. The reviewers are required to comment on a number of issues, including: the subject area/topic of the proposal; the strengths and weaknesses of proposed book; how the project might be improved; the size of the market and potential competing titles; the author's qualifications; and finally whether they recommend publication. You will then be invited to respond to the comments and while you are not obliged to take all of the reviewer's suggestions on board, you should explain why if you do not do so. At this stage a publisher may request that you revise the proposal and the table of contents. If the changes are significant the publisher may send the revised proposal to be reviewed again.

If at this stage, both yourself and your Editor are satisfied with your response to the reviews/revised proposal and proposed changes, it will then be presented by your Editor to their Editorial Board for contract approval. If your proposal is accepted, you will be offered a contract. It is possible that your proposal might be rejected, but that you are invited to revise your proposal in line with specific comments and resubmit. In this case it is likely that your revised proposal will need go through the review process again and would be treated as a new project. If your proposal is not approved you will also be informed with a brief explanation why.

The most common reasons for a book proposal to be rejected are:

- negative academic reviews received during the review process;
- the book does not make a substantial or original contribution to the discipline;
- the market may be considered to be too small for the book to be commercially viable;
- the proposal may not fit the company's strategy for the specific list;
- there are too many competing titles and the market may be saturated;
- the publisher may have a very similar title under contract already.

An Editorial Board's decision is usually final. If the proposal is rejected on commercial grounds, you could ask the Editor if there is another publisher they could recommend. If the reviews provide constructive suggestions about how the book can be improved you may wish to rethink your proposal and resubmit it. For example, if the book is considered not to be commercially viable based on the narrow focus of the case studies, further case studies could be researched and included to give the book a broader and more comparative context, which would also increase the book's market appeal.

The review process can take some time and varies from project to project, and can depend on the publisher and the time of year. I would expect this process to take two to four months.

What information is included in the contract?

If you are offered a contract, this document will explain your responsibilities and the responsibilities and obligations of the publisher. It will also indicate the word length, the expected delivery date (this will be set in consultation with the author to ensure it is realistic), the royalties, and the number of presentation copies you can expect. The royalties for research publishing are generally low, they can be non-existent and in some cases a subsidy is requested. If this occurs you might wish to approach another publisher.

At this stage you can expect guidance about how the final manuscript should be formatted in the form of an electronic document with "instructions for authors" or similar (these are also often available on the publisher website to download and consult). Occasionally publishers require camera ready copy which means the author has to submit the final manuscript fully typeset. If this is the case, the publisher should provide guidelines about how to prepare this and it is worth finding out at contract stage what you are responsible for providing.

What happens on delivery of the manuscript?

When you deliver your final manuscript, it is likely to be reviewed again by academic referees and/or approved by the press before it is accepted for publication. You may at this stage be required to make further changes to your manuscript and then resubmit. When your final manuscript is accepted, the production of your book will begin and your manuscript will go through most of the following stages:

- Copyediting: this involves a detailed reading of your manuscript to ensure the text is consistent, grammatically correct and correctly referenced. The copy-editor will send the author a list of queries that need to be answered before the manuscript is typeset.
- Typesetting: the manuscript is typeset according to the house style as it will appear in the published book.
- Proofreading: at this stage the author is sent the proofs to check for any errors in the typesetting. A professional proof-reader may also be employed at the same time to do the same task. It is also at this stage that the index needs to be created; either by the author or the publisher may commission a professional indexer on the author's behalf.

Printing: the manuscript and files are finalised and the book is printed and bound and/or made available as an ebook.

- Publication: the advance copies are sent approximately five days before publication and the remaining author copies are sent when the books are received and logged in the warehouse. The book is now available for purchase.

The production schedules vary from publisher to publisher and it is hard to specify how long this will take. At Routledge our production schedules are considered to be reasonably quick and it takes approximately six to seven months from when our production department begin work on the book, after the final manuscript has been accepted.

Can I include previously published material?

Including previously published material in the book, for example chapters that have been published in academic journals or in an edited collection, is not normally an issue for publishers as long as it does not exceed more than 25% of the final book. It can be considered beneficial to have published one or two chapters in journals, particularly well-respected journals, as this demonstrates that the author has successfully published as an academic and their work in part has met the rigorous review standards set by many journals. Publishing an article can also increase interest in a potential book and act as advance marketing for the author's future publications.

Who will read my book?

When writing a proposal you need to bear your potential audience in mind at all times. A PhD is written for a specific audience: the supervisors and the examiners. A book is published for a broader audience and it is very likely that the potential reader of your book will have different expectations, for example the literature review is an important part of a thesis but those reading your book will be more interested in your specific findings and research rather than the books you have read. While one or two chapters may appear on secondary reading lists or in course readers, most research titles are unlikely to be adopted and used as a textbook for undergraduate students; the expected audience would be advanced students, researchers and academics in the field. For a book to succeed in this competitive market, it will need to have international appeal.

Who will buy my book?

The main purchaser of research monographs is the international library market. The market for academic books has become increasingly challenging. Many libraries continue to face budget cuts and there is growing competition for the budget from journals. Increasingly library purchasing decisions are triggered by a request being completed by academics/students at the institution (patron-driven acquisition). For this reason it is vital that the title is clear and descriptive, using key words indicating the content and subject appeal of the book. This will ensure that your book is easily discovered by those browsing online or in catalogues for new work in their research area. Books with narrowly focussed case studies on areas of limited interest do not tend to sell as well because they appeal to a very small amount of scholars.

How many books will I sell?

It is good to be aware that most PhD conversions and research titles are published in hardback format and sold at a high price with a small first print run of a few hundred copies. For a published book to be considered a commercial success, it needs to sell approximately 75% of the initial print run and this should ensure that the book sales have covered production costs, share of company overheads and broken even.

What about Online Publication or Open Access?

In the digital age, there are now more opportunities than ever before for scholars to disseminate their work. Some of these can involve bypassing the traditional publishing model by making your work freely available online in a variety of formats from a series of blog posts or browsable documents to downloadable PDFs and ebooks. The advantage of this self-publication is that you are entirely in control of the publishing process and distribution and can charge as little or as much as you want. The downside is that self-publishing free online does not offer the same academic and scholarly credibility as publishing with a reputable publisher who have undertaken peer review of your manuscript. Therefore, with these kinds of publishing models, it will likely be difficult to get the appropriate recognition for your work from the market or the academy.

Another recent innovation is to co-operate with a publisher to publish your book Open Access (OA). The peer review process and contract stages will probably be the same but the fundamental innovation is that you (or your funder or institution) will pay an upfront fee to the publisher in return for the electronic version being made available freely for reading, copying and distribution. Some publishers will also continue to sell a print version of the book. Check the publisher's website to see if they have an OA book programme.

A few final thoughts

If you are unsure or have any questions about publishing your thesis, do ask your supervisor and more senior colleagues' advice and if you are at an academic conference, speak to a commissioning editor and ask them about the process. Most editors are approachable and happy to answer your questions and can provide you with some initial feedback before you submit a proposal. There are a growing number of chances to attend workshops on publishing at conferences and it is worth taking advantage of this as it can provide a great opportunity to hear from publishers, experienced academics and series/journal editors. If you have submitted your proposal unsuccessfully, do some more research and approach another publisher and/or consider publishing one or two chapters from your thesis in the form of a journal article. Publishers do look at the CVs and publication background of potential authors and it is considered favourably if an author has published journal articles. Depending on how time sensitive the thesis is, it is also acceptable to take a break and come back to your thesis at a later date. It is not unusual for an author to publish one or two journal articles from the thesis and then prepare a proposal for a monograph based on a fully revised, restructured and updated PhD thesis two or three years after it has been awarded. Publishing your first book can be hard work, but very gratifying and rewarding. I wish you the best of luck!

Writing for General Audiences

Peter Geoghegan, Editor Political Insight

Increasingly academics find themselves called upon to write for general audiences. For those used primarily to addressing a specialist readership in scholarly journals this can be a challenge. But clear, effective writing is crucial for engagement and impact – both within the discipline and the wider world.

That academics 'cannot write' has become a truism. This, in my experience as editor of Political Insight, is simply not the case. But where scholars are most likely to struggle is with the very different styles and conventions required of non-academic writing.

Journalism – like scholarly writing – is a genre. When writing for popular audiences, academics need to recognise this and shift registers accordingly. As an editor, the last thing I want to see is verbose, multi-clause sentences peppered with neologisms. Such writing is confusing to follow, lacks clarity and, perhaps most crucially, is too abstract and lacking in precision.

I often suggest that the best way to begin a Political Insight piece is with a vignette or brief anecdote that will offer the reader a window into the world that they are discussing. This approach is far more likely to produce vivid, direct writing than the jargon-heavy prose that, unfortunately, can be a feature of some academic publications.

When writing for a general audience there are a number of questions that must be asked: why use a longer word, if a shorter word will do? Is this sentence grammatically and structurally sound? Is this piece of writing repetitive or overly wordy? The key to effective writing is as simple as it is difficult: revise, revise, and then revise some more. A sentence should contain no unnecessary words, a paragraph no unnecessary sentences.

Arguably the most important part of the process of crafting a piece of writing is figuring out the overall structure of the argument – what points need to be developed first, and then what follows naturally from them and so on. An ideal piece of writing should have a built in sense of logical inevitability so that the reader moves along the argument and supporting evidence as effortlessly as possible.

When addressing a general audience it is important, too, to consider the 'why' of a piece of writing. While 'a gap in the literature' is a perfectly reasonable hook for a journal article, it is not a good reason to write a piece for a general audience article. Editors are looking for originality, timeliness and distinctiveness.

Academics have a huge amount to offer editors. They are experts in their field, with a deep understanding of their subject that most journalists lack. Timing, however, is key. Editors will be far more interested in an academic's expertise if it pertains to the current news agenda. This does not mean a war has to have broken out or a government fallen before you can consider proposing an article, but it is important to think about why the proposed piece should appear now.

Pitching to Political Insight is very similar to pitching to any media outlet. We welcome submissions and discuss articles in detail with authors during the commissioning process. The best way to pitch is via an email of around 100 words setting out the proposed piece and specific expertise. Never send an already-written piece. Don't assume prior knowledge of the subject area.

Good writing is the key to successful communication. It helps people to understand complex ideas, informs accurately without unintentional ambiguity and can shift opinion. Good writing is also far more likely to get commissioned than mediocre writing. So there are plenty of reasons for academics to think about writing for general audiences!

Writing for Impact

Patrick Dunleavy and Jane Tinkler,
London School of Economics

Start by not being an academic hermit

In our research project, **The Impact of the Social Sciences**, we tried to establish what made some academics well-cited and well-regarded academically, and what also made them influential in spheres of life outside academia. To do this we created a dataset of 360 researchers at UK universities, assembled everything we could find on them and their career, their academic citations as well as references to their work in external to university sources.

Our biggest single problem in doing all this was that a high proportion of our sample were clearly academic hermits, sitting alone on top of a pillar somewhere in academia and doing their level best not to communicate in any way with the outside world, or let any information about their work leak out. Try as we might, we could not assemble even the most basic demographic information on fully 35 per cent of our target British academics. Their university or department websites contained no details of their PhD or career track. And these researchers had no personal website, no online CV, and were absent from every known digital listing of scholarly activity.

There is clearly a significant fraction of academics and researchers that need to reassess their stance and to try systematically to reverse years of quiet solitude by going out into the digital world and making their name and works as well-known as they can possibly be. There is no point at all in undertaking research, and authoring papers and books about it at great pains and over many months or years, but then not doing your level best to communicate your corpus of work to professional and wider audiences.

Five essential digital showcases

Therefore these are some key locations where everyone in academia or research should be listing their work. Some of these need you to do it once only, others need more regular checking. But this effort is worthwhile and is something that is now just part of academic life.

Google Scholar Citations (GSC) is a really useful way to collect all of your outputs together, both traditional academic outputs like your books and articles, but also less traditional ones such as blog posts and briefing papers. Setting your GSC page up takes just 5-10 minutes and once it is done you never really need to do anything more – Google Scholar will automatically update your page with new publications as it find them.

Research Gate (RG) is a useful newer addition. It works in a similar way to GSC (and it is equally easy to set up) but it also allows you to upload versions of your work along with supporting materials and link them to your profile straight away. A nice feature is that people can request copies of your work or suggest that you upload a free version. This can help to create links with other academics working in your field.

Academia.edu (AE) is well used in the US but less so in the UK. It does not update automatically so you will probably need to revisit your page every six months or so and manually input new items. However, a nice feature of AE is that you can easily put up links to your social networks, which is a sharing capability that other systems don't offer.

Mendeley is a free referencing system and PDF organizer but it also allows academics to create a public profile and share papers with other users.

Lastly **LinkedIn** is a place for your CV details and a way to create links to all your academic and practitioner contacts that they themselves will update from their end. Because business and government already use LinkedIn a lot, getting yourself an account is a great way for researchers to reach external audiences beyond the university world. It is a key first step in beginning to build your external visibility and research impacts with these audiences.

Writing for impact means writing differently

Once you have decided to try and step out of your academic comfort zone and write something that those both inside and outside universities might want to read, you need to re-think some of the comfortable conventions you may have slipped into in terms of how you set up and write academic pieces. Writing with an eye to impact means looking again at all the things you routinely do in your writing to see if they need to be altered, updated or done away with all together.

Don't choose a useless title for your work

Titles play a key role in helping people find your work in the first place and then convincing them it is worth reading or downloading. Most people find articles, chapters and papers now via Google Scholar or other online sources. So for potential research users (such as business, public policy or media people), incorporating some widely used but subject-specific vocabulary in your titles will tend to improve the visibility of your work.

Yet too often academics choose ineffective titles that utterly fail to communicate what the research is about. Some particularly bad habits are to choose titles that are similar to a thousand others, use phrases that mean much to those within that discipline but little to those outside, or provide essentially an 'empty box' that gives a topic and sometimes a date range but without actually telling readers anything about what findings have been made, or what line of argument is being followed.

It's not hard to improve. The first step is to look seriously, critically and comparatively at a range of possible alternatives. Try and think things through from a reader's point of view: How will this wording be interpreted by someone scanning on Google Scholar? What will attract them to click through to the research? We recommend generating a minimum of 10 possible titles and consider them carefully. Compare these alternatives with each other and see if recombining words from different titles might work better. Type your possible titles as search terms into Google Scholar or subject-specific databases and see what existing work comes up. The second step is to look at whether your title words are picked up in the abstract of the piece, and in the internal sub-headings. It's a good sign if the title, abstract and sub-headings all use consistent, linking, meshing or nesting concepts and vocabulary.[17] A third step is to consider using a full narrative title, one that makes completely clear what your argument, conclusions or findings are. It seeks to summarize the substance or core value-added of your argument, that is, the one key point that you want to stay in readers' minds a week after they have read your paper and forgotten most of its details.

Keep readers interested via 'attention points'

Writing for external audiences will usually mean shorter pieces than traditional academic articles. In order to keep words to a minimum you will need to make excellent use of 'attention points' which are any exhibits that stand out or attract readers' focus in the text, especially tables, graphs, charts, flow charts, graphics, diagrams, example boxes, case study boxes, and so on.

- **Make attention points stand on their own.** Attention points focus readers' attention – that is what they are there for. Exhibits are especially salient for experienced and skilled professional readers, the potential users and citers of your work, because they provide direct windows into your thinking or results. If the exhibits suggest that something novel or worthwhile is going on, these readers are much more likely to continue with the piece. This means that every chart, table and diagram should be labelled as fully and as informatively as possible, using accessible language, or commonly understood abbreviations in this specific research field. Never use a symbol or formula alone where space allows for a fuller descriptive label.

[17] For more on nesting and connections amongst titles, keywords, and abstracts, see Anne-Marie Green (2013) **'Search Engine Optimization and Your Journal Article: Do you want the bad news first?'**

- **Show readers what they need to know – no more, no less.** Exhibits must be designed for their audience, not for the text author. That means thinking through in advance who your audiences are, and what their needs or interests are likely to be. For example, by presenting the data in a chart or a graph instead of using a table, you will normally radically simplify the numbers involved.
- **Make the messages in attention points as simple as possible.** As academics are used to dealing with jumbled data or complex understandings of processes, it can be difficult for us to 'see' tangles and difficulties present in data because they are so familiar to us. So look again and see whether it is possible to make messages clearer by altering how you show them. A good example is the relatively common use of alphabetical orderings within data displays that create completely jumbled tables and charts. The maximum simplicity principle dictates that alphabetic or customary-sequence listings in tables or charts should always be reorganized so as to create a descending numerical progression in the data displayed. Here the region or locality with the largest number on a key variable comes at the top of the table or chart, the second largest comes next, and so on, with the others arranged in descending order below.
- **Use a single sequence to order attention points.** Scholarly convention was that figures and tables were numbered separately in any text. This is often an artificial distinction and is completely unnecessary. Pick a label, 'figures' works well across most exhibits, and number all the things you are displaying for readers in a single, easy-to-follow sequence.

Only report data in ways that readers need to know

There seems to be an academic syndrome of overly precise reporting of results, often paradoxically allied with an under-description of charts and tables. Often this reflects an effort to cram into one table or chart all the information that might be needed by multiple different readers. Instead here are three suggestions for improving the accessibility of your data reporting, without sacrificing academic respectability.

- **Separate out main text tables and charts** from large-scale results and data presentation in Annexes. Exhibits within the main text should fulfil a single purpose, being carefully chosen to support that part of the core argument. Annex tables, by contrast, can be far more detailed, encompass multiple purposes, play a 'version of record' role, and be the main place where you demonstrate the accuracy and replicablity of your work. Quote numbers that are only as detailed as most readers need.
- **Only quote numbers at a level of accuracy that is credible.** If a government reports 2,816,013 unemployed people, what credence can we attach to each digit here? Putting the complete number implies that you believe the total is correct to + or – one person, which is highly unlikely. Quote only as many numbers as readers need. The great vehicle for poor academic communication has been the giant table, spread across whole pages with dozens of numbers. This is especially true of regression and other multi-variate analysis outputs.
- **Avoid using unnecessarily complex numbers,** ones that that most people (usually including the author) find hard to understand.

Writing for impact also means writing different outputs

For engaging with academic colleagues, for promotion and professional advancement traditional academic outputs of articles and books are still the norm. But for research users outside the academy, it is unlikely that these output types will be as useful. They are long and often jargon-heavy, and they are likely to be expensive to buy or access. But more than that, the research set out in them is unlikely to have been mediated or translated by the academic in a way that makes the findings or conclusions relevant for what a policymaker, journalist or business official is able to quickly use.

So when you are considering your publication pipeline, you need to think about other outputs that are more suitable to audiences that you are trying to engage with. Unfortunately producing these outputs will tend to be in addition to traditional publications, so they are more work. But for those working in applied fields, or those seeking to create some impact from their work, these outputs are a crucial stepping off point in interacting with practitioners, funders and the public on the outcomes of research.

What different types of outputs can you publish?

The range of output types that you could produce is wide and depends on both your subject area and the sector that you work on or with.

- **Briefing documents** are a very common output type for those trying to impact on policymakers or corporate officials. These are often very short (2 pages) with lots of data, figures and key facts in order to synthesise complex analysis into as accessible a form as possible.
- **Research reports** are often commissioned or co-produced with external organisations. They cover more applied research and often include recommendations that can be used by, for example NGOs or charities, to lobby policymakers about a particular way forward on an issue.

Another key way to reach a number of external audiences is now via social media with academic blogging being an essential part of the landscape of scholarly communication (see the next chapter). These short (between 800-1,200 word) blog posts should be punchy and accessible. They are written more like newspaper articles in that the concluding messages should be at the start of the blog post rather than at the end. Although conference papers are fairly traditional academic outputs, they still can be a useful way of updating practitioner audiences with new or interim research findings, or discussion points. They can also be written in a more informal style or make fairly controversial judgements to stimulate discussion. Their key advantage when thinking about impact is that they are quicker to be published than waiting for journal versions two years down the line when the research or ideas may have been supplanted by newer work.

For more on writing for impact see the **LSE Impact blog** (@LSEimpactblog on twitter) or **Writing For Research** (@Write4Research).

Having an Online Presence: Websites, Blogging and Social Media

Meera Sabaratnam, SOAS, University of London;
Contributor, The Disorder of Things; Web Advisory Board
for the ISQ Blog

Introduction

Having a good online presence is clearly desirable for many reasons in our field – making our research accessible, developing new connections with the work of others, testing out new ideas and even creating new platforms for publication and discussion. Some platforms are also excellent for responding to unfolding events in real time. But the practice of being an online academic can also be extremely time-consuming, neurosis-inducing and – if done badly – may have a negative effect on your professional standing. The last of these pitfalls is rare – the previous two are much, much more common. Moreover, for those in the job market or starting a career, the online presence won't get you a job without the traditionally-published research there to back it up – but it will certainly help get you and your work known in your field. As such, there's a trade-off between the time spent building up the research and the time spent developing the online presence.

This brief guide will work through the three main different kinds of online presence for academics in politics and international studies, in increasing order of the potential demands they can make, discussing the benefits and pitfalls of each. We begin with personal webpages, before moving onto blogging and Twitter/Facebook.

Should I have a personal webpage?

Yes, you should have a personal webpage. The real question is, what kind? The choices here are effectively three: institutional, social network (e.g. academia.edu), and personally-managed webspace.

Some institutions have detailed and well-organised webpages for their staff and research students, which allow you to link to online copies of work and profile your interests and teaching. These are 'static', meaning that content is not updated very often, but they will often be the first port of call if someone is trying to look up your work. If your institution does not provide this, you should encourage them to do so. This is a very low-maintenance option, but the downside of this is that it probably won't get updated very often. In addition, you'll have little control over any extra content that you might want to add.

Instead, or often as well as this, many academics have an 'academia.edu' personal webpage on a social network. This is a very good, and relatively low-maintenance platform that allows you to upload your research easily (you'll have to check licensing agreements with published work), and a wider range of materials (if you like), such as talks or your CV, but also allows you to be contacted by anyone in the network, and connects people based on their research interests. It will also generate interesting statistics about where your website is being viewed from and what kinds of relevant searches happen online. You might want to think about what exactly goes up there – I tend not to put anything too draft-like up, but decent conference papers and 'open' versions of published work are there. With a small investment in set-up time, this is probably the most useful of the personal webpage options in terms of curating your own presence.

Yet, for the more committed, more ambitious, or those with more material, a personally-built custom webpage might appeal. These can either be hosted on free popular blogging platforms such as wordpress.com, or you can buy your own domain name and register with another website-hosting company for around £5 a month. This will give you more aesthetic flexibility, allow you to integrate a twitter feed or user stats, and will stay with you if you move institutions. Have a look for **Saskia Sassen** or **Martin Coward** as examples of how these might look at different career stages. Depending on how you manage these, they are a slightly higher investment to set-up but may prove more appealing than the academia.edu webpage. The advantage of the latter is the social networking element, although a well-visited personally-run website can also be integrated into social media platforms and thus become more dynamic.

To summarise, you should get your work online somehow on a personal webpage. More people will read it, and, crucially, they will understand your research profile as a whole rather than within the context of a standalone journal article or book chapter. This might open up some interesting and unexpected doors in terms of collaboration and research – it certainly has done for many.

Ok, I have a webpage now. Should I blog?

It depends. You need to think about: i) why you want to blog; ii) what to blog about; iii) how to do it; iv) where to do it and v) how often to do it. If the answers are because you think you should, everything you know about, at length, everywhere and all the time, then you are probably doing it wrong, or at least having very little sleep and very few friends.

Let's start instead with the question of why.

Academics have lots of different motivations for blogging. For some it is a way to summarise research published elsewhere in a more accessible form, and to get people to know their 'formal' research. For others, it is the opportunity to comment on current events, things that they have read, workshops they have been to, thoughts they have been thinking – in short an outlet for thinking out loud to a potentially engaged audience, on matters of mutual interest. Others will use blogs to think about the boundaries between interests and activities connected with their intellectual lives – art, literature and politics being a notable one, but another key one is the activist/academic crossover. Some blog as part of regular commentary for big news outlets, which is a more formalised space, and edited by others. Others maintain very issue-specific blogs targeted at a specialist audience. Some will only blog very occasionally when feeling especially provoked by an intellectual or political development.

The key thing is that there are lots of good but entirely different reasons to blog as academics. These shape different blogging practices. Some individuals have invested heavily in issue-specific blogs over the years, which now have sizeable followings and reputations as news/comment sites (see **Justice in Conflict**). Other collective blogs host a range of posts (**Crooked Timber**; **Duck of Minerva**), and sometimes academic forums (**The Disorder of Things**). More institutionally-developed blogs are also appearing, such as that launched by **International Studies Quarterly**. A helpful hint for those thinking of blogging would be to try to write a guest post for a relevant existing blog before investing heavily in setting up your own. Blog-writing is its own skill – and not one that comes easily to all. Blog editors are often grateful for solid, relevant timely content, so don't be shy about approaching them unless the blog is exclusively personal. But, as with all other publishing, don't over-promise, keep to your deadlines and give it a good read-over before going out. Because blogging is not only about prose, but pictures, videos and other visual stimuli, you should think carefully about these. In addition, if you don't plan to blog that often, but do want to engage occasionally, think about contributing to a collective blog more regularly than setting up your own.

Blogging can be a fantastic way of developing yourself as a writer, engaging with ongoing debates or new audiences, and drawing attention to worthy and interesting things happening in the world. However, it can be a relatively serious commitment, both if you're good at it (because you'll end up doing it more) and if you're less good at it (because it'll take longer). Approach it with caution, and think about the investment you'll make carefully. Read a few different kinds of blogs regularly for some time to get a feel for what they do and think about the effect on you as a reader. Also, if you've got something really substantial to say, think about whether it might work better as a short academic article instead or as well.

So it might be worth blogging. What about Twitter and Facebook?

Again, it depends. Unlike with blogging, content is extremely short and relatively ephemeral on Twitter, and to a lesser degree on Facebook. This can be an advantage as well as disadvantage. You may have already found with one or other of these that you have developed semi-professional networks of interest already through following particular people, joining particular groups or connecting with colleagues or friends you have met at conferences. If you're not on these networks, they can be useful ways of keeping in touch with people, events or issues through groups and hashtags. Certain academics have developed strong reputations as useful news sources (see @ texasinafrica) filtering through the mainstream media; others enjoy sharing moments or humour or outrage that nonetheless resonate professionally. It is possible to engage in these relatively passively, using them as a source of news, or participate more enthusiastically. In particular, Twitter can be a way of quickly reaching a much wider audience, especially if someone with a lot of followers re-tweets something you have shared, or if you are commenting on a popular topic.

Of all of the potentially time-consuming online activities that one can engage in as an academic, however, these forms of social networking are potentially the most lethal – particularly as quick-fire controversies or short quips can develop into ongoing and involved conversations. Whilst these may be rewarding and enlightening, they may also become quite consuming, repetitive and distracting. You may also find that the things that you want to say are not necessarily fitted for the format, and you might well be better off blogging or writing something more formal instead if you want to respond in a more satisfying manner.

Conclusion

Whilst having a basic, static online presence in terms of a well-maintained and useful webpage is increasingly a 'must' for academics, the rest – in terms of blogging and other social media – should really be a matter of personal choice. Some people find it easy and useful to integrate multiple platforms into their working day; others find it creates more heat than light and is a distraction. As we better develop our public and community engagement skills, having a more interactive and dynamic online presence may increasingly become important, and this will be something we continue to think about. But like all tools, online publishing and comment platforms will only be as good as the uses to which we put them.

Open Access Publishing

Lee Jones, Queen Mary, University of London

Introduction

The Open Access (OA) agenda, longstanding in the life, health and physical sciences, has entered the mainstream of social sciences in the last few years. This chapter explains what OA is and identifies the key factors that early-career researchers (ECRs) in particular should bear in mind.

What is Open Access?

OA refers to work that is freely and publicly accessible online, without the need to pay subscriptions or other charges to read it. Journal articles are the scholarly output most commonly made OA, though OA monographs are also emerging. There are two main routes to OA:

- 'Gold' OA: where the research output is made freely available in the final published form, typically in PDF format and via a publisher's website. Most publishers charge a fee (Article Processing Charge, APC) for this service, which **vary wildly** but can be up to US$3,000. Some journals have arrangements to reduce or waive these fees depending on career stage, the body that funded the research, or the geographical location of the author(s).
- 'Green' OA: where the author can archive the peer-reviewed version of their manuscript online (usually in an 'institutional repository', a publicly-accessible database) once it is accepted by the journal. Usually this will be a Word document that includes revisions made by the author after peer review but excludes any proofing or typesetting done by the publisher. Public access to these files is usually subject to an 'embargo'. Most licensing agreements in politics and international studies require embargo periods from 12 to 36 months in duration depending on the publisher, though again **policies vary wildly**.

Why Should You Care About OA?

First and foremost, making research freely and publicly available is an obvious social good. Non-academic users – policymakers, NGOs, journalists, the general public – and those lacking access to costly journal subscriptions – like scholars and students in developing countries – can freely access scholarly output made OA.

In general, research has shown that OA work is also **read and cited more widely**, increasing authors' scholarly impact. Books published by **Open Book Publishers**, an OA press run by Cambridge academics, are downloaded about 500 times per month, more than the total lifetime sales of an average academic book. OA can also be easily combined with social media, **increasing downloads by 100-500 per article**.

Moreover, crucially, HEFCE has declared that in order 'to be eligible for submission to the post-2014 REF, authors' final peer-reviewed manuscripts must have been deposited in an institutional or subject repository on acceptance for publication. Deposited material should be discoverable, and free to read and download, for anyone with an internet connection. The requirement applies only to journal articles accepted for publication after 1 April 2016 (HEFCE, 2014a, p4). Since REF eligibility is a key part of the hiring and promotions process in UK universities, this has obvious implications for all researchers.

While HEFCE shows no preference for Green or Gold OA routes, in practice this policy will mean that all researchers need to archive their accepted, peer reviewed version of their articles in their institutional repository within three months of acceptance by the journal (not publication) to meet the OA eligibility requirements.

Your institution will have a process for uploading your accepted manuscript to the repository. You should familiarise yourself with this process as soon as possible. Generally speaking, you should only be responsible for uploading the accepted manuscript. The institutional repository should be responsible for checking the journal's policies on OA archiving and ensuring that any embargo period is respected before the article becomes freely downloadable. Current

HEFCE (2014a) guidelines state that the maximum embargo period for REF eligible articles in politics and international studies is 24 months (see point 30). However, HEFCE has recognised that some journals have longer embargo periods while others prohibit the free downloading of authors' accepted versions in perpetuity (see points 37abc). These policies do not eliminate your responsibility to upload the file to your institutional repository within three months of acceptance. In such cases, the repository will need to create a 'closed deposit' – one where the basic information shows up in online searches, but the full text cannot be read. You should not worry that this will make your work ineligible for REF submission: closed deposits will be eligible and HEFCE will also make exceptions where deposits were impossible, journal policies vitiate compliance, or technical issues have arisen (see points 35-39). Thus, while it would be sensible to read publishing licensing agreements carefully and flag potential non-compliance to your department to help plan for making any cases for exceptions, you should not worry that HEFCE's policy means you cannot publish in particular journals if they are the best outlets for your work. More on HEFCE's OA policy can be found **here**.

OA is also increasingly a requirement of research funding. The Wellcome Trust has long required its grant-holders to publish using OA, and has even started funding APCs for OA monographs. Research Councils UK (RCUK) now require all research they fund to be made OA. RCUK officially favours the gold route, despite the extremely high cost of most APCs. RCUK has issued block grants to some research-intensive universities to fund APCs, but these cannot even cover all publications arising from RCUK funded projects. Institutions receiving these block grants have their own procedures for rationing these funds internally. If you are publishing work arising from RCUK (e.g. ESRC and AHRC) grants, including PGR studentships, you should ask the research director of your unit how you might access APC funding.

What OA Publishing Opportunities Exist?

There are two basic approaches here. First, if you are RCUK funded or have access to other funds, you may be able to make your work available using the publisher's Gold OA route. This will involve paying an APC of up to US$3000. This will make the typeset PDF of the article available online for free to all readers, irrespective of subscriptions. A small but growing number of outlets offer low-cost routes to Gold OA. Typically these are online journals who either have low/zero APCs as part of their publishing model (e.g., **Stability** or **Research and Politics**) or are able to waive APCs in a significant number of cases (e.g., **Ethics & Global Politics**). These journals' APCs may change over time as low/waived APCs tend to depend on the journal's external funding and/or are offered to attract submissions for a limited period of time. Other models also exist, such as the Society for Cultural Anthropology's journal, **Cultural Anthropology**, which offers a free Gold OA route for society members (and charges non-members a low fee). OA book publishers are scarce, though more are emerging. In the Humanities and Social Sciences, **Open Book Publishers** and **Open Humanities Press** offer the full services of any scholarly press – peer review, editorial support, page-setting – and make the books freely readable online.

However, given the financial costs of Gold OA, most scholars will generally need to pursue Green OA, as described above.

It is important to emphasise that simply uploading the PDFs of your articles to a personal website or an academia.edu profile is not an alternative to the archiving of accepted work in an institutional repository. While this practice is widespread, it is noncompliant with RCUK/HEFCE guidelines, which require work to be placed in institutional repositories. It also usually violates copyright and can be considered the legal equivalent to piracy. For example, in December 2013, Elsevier issued **'take-down notices'** to 2,800 scholars who had posted their papers on academia.edu on precisely these grounds.

Particular Considerations for Early-Career Researchers

OA is generally a good thing for junior scholars. Adapting to the new agenda is easier for ECRs, who are typically more tech-savvy, work more online, know more about OA, and are more familiar with alternative forms of publishing, including blogs.

OA also offers early adopters a chance to achieve much wider exposure for their work. Combined with good practice in writing titles and abstracts, **some research suggests** that OA can help achieve a wider readership and more citations. Similarly, since anyone with an internet connection can read your articles, OA provides a useful pathway for public engagement and non-academic 'impact'. Particularly if you write in a way accessible to and meaningful to non-academics (see chapter 6 of this guide), making your work OA could help reach non-governmental organisations, think-tanks and others that you might want to influence. Of course, you will still need to do more than merely post articles online to secure 'impact', but it is a start.

Pragmatically, however, ECRs must balance OA opportunities against other considerations. Establishing, securing and progressing in an academic career often depends on the reputation of the journals or presses where one publishes. A **recent survey** confirmed that along with pricing, reputation is a major barrier to the development of Gold OA. Bluntly, a non-OA article in the American Political Science Review carries greater prestige than the same article would in a recently-started, low-APC Gold OA journal. Similarly, a non-OA book with Oxford University Press 'counts' for more than an OA book with Open Book Publishing. Moreover, prestigious journals and presses generally have larger established readerships, meaning work published there is more likely to be read, used and cited in comparison to other scholarly outlets, OA or otherwise.

Although OA journals and presses are trying hard to build reputations, they face a Catch 22 situation: they cannot attract authors until they achieve parity of esteem with traditional outlets, but they cannot achieve this without attracting more high-profile authors. ECRs, whose positions are relatively precarious, cannot reasonably be expected to take the lead in advancing OA journals and presses in this way. It would not be sensible for ECRs to prioritise publishing in low-APC, Gold OA journals just for its own sake. Thus, do discuss your publication plans with senior colleagues and/or research mentors.

ECRs must also be aware of the different licensing (copyright) arrangements attached to OA publications. One of the driving forces behind OA is the idea that publicly-funded research should be available for use and re-use without significant extra cost. For Green OA, authors licensing agreements usually assign copyright to the journal publisher as a condition of publication. However, for some Green and Gold OA, other copyright arrangements are possible. The most popular approach is the **Creative Commons** (CC) licensing system (see below). CC has designed a range of licences that, while superficially sounding very similar, actually involve very different rights for authors. The 'CC-BY' licence, for instance, 'lets others distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon your work, even commercially, as long as they credit you for the original creation'. Conversely, the similar-sounding 'CC-BY-NC-ND' license permits redistribution only in the original format and without any reuse or derivatives. Thus, CC-BY potentially allows companies to copy and paste chunks of your work into products that they later sell, with no return to you; CC-BY-NC-ND does not. If how and for what ends your work might be used matters to you, pay careful attention to the copyright forms you sign.

Finally, beware of 'predatory journals' masquerading as legitimate OA outlets. These dodgy businesses often spam academics to solicit articles and peer reviews. They charge authors APCs to publish with them, but provide few or none of the services traditionally associated with publishing. Predatory journals exist to con and exploit desperate or naive scholars. Involvement with them can only waste your time and resources. **Manchester University** has provided a useful guide to avoiding them. See below for more detail on predatory journals and how to spot them.

Conclusion

OA publishing offers real social, intellectual and personal benefits, along with risks, in an extremely complex and evolving policy landscape. Particularly given HEFCE's new rules, all academics should educate themselves about the OA agenda and its implementation. You may not be interested in OA, but OA is interested in you! Engaged with positively, OA can yield huge social benefits by opening up our research to anyone interested in it, rather than limiting it to those able to pay access charges. It can get our work more exposure, multiplying potential pathways to impact, and promote the discipline more widely. For ECRs, the bottom line is: do keep OA in mind; make your views on OA known within your institution and professional bodies; and ensure you are compliant with HEFCE rules. But do also be wary of the pitfalls, and discuss your publishing plans with your research mentors and senior colleagues.

References and additional resources

HEFCE (2014a): Policy for open access in the post-2014 Research Excellence Framework

HEFCE (2014b): Open access research

House of Commons (2013): Business, Innovation and Skills Committee, Inquiry into Open Access

House of Lords (2013): Science and Technology Committee, Inquiry into Open Access

Creative Commons Licensing

Creative Commons is a non-profit organisation dedicated to facilitating 'the sharing and use of creativity and knowledge through free legal tools'. They provide standardised text for copyright licenses that enable individuals to give the public permission to share, use, remix, and even resell creative work. There are various license types. Some of these are listed below with explanatory text from Creative Commons.

HEFCE notes that 'outputs licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Non-Derivative CC-BY-NC-ND licence would meet' their requirements (HEFCE, 2014a, p.5).

CC-BY (Attribution): Enables others to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon your work, even commercially, as long as they credit you for the original creation.

CC-BY-SA (Attribution-Share Alike): Enables others to remix, tweak, and build upon your work even for commercial purposes. They must credit you and license their new creations under the identical terms.

CC-BY-ND (Attribution-NoDerivs): Allows for redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, as long as it is passed along unchanged and in whole, with credit to you.

CC-BY-NC (Attribution-Non-Commercial): Enables others to remix, tweak, and build upon your work non-commercially. Although any new works must also acknowledge you and be non-commercial, they do not have to license their derivative works on the same terms.

CC-BY-NC-SA (Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike): Allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon your work non-commercially, as long as they credit you and license their new creations under the identical terms.

CC-BY-NC-ND (Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivs): Enables others to download your works and share them with others as long as they credit you; however, they cannot change them in any way or use them commercially.

Identifying Predatory Open Access Publishers

Predatory publishers can be defined as outlets whose academic standards lag behind their claims to promoting outstanding scholarship. They do not run rigorous peer review systems and the general scholarly quality of what they publish is low. They actively solicit authors through spam emails (often making reference to your conference papers, thesis, or previously published material), offer unrealistically swift timelines for peer review and publication (often a matter of days) and always charge an article processing fee. The names of the journals themselves are either overly broad (e.g., The Journal of Life) or combine disparate subject areas (e.g., Arts, Sciences, and Information Technology Journal). The academic quality of the work they publish is poor and the production values (e.g., proofing and presentation) are substandard. Unfortunately, with the spread of open access publishing requirements, predatory publishers have proliferated.

It can be difficult to identify predatory open access publishers. In particular, as an early career academic, it can be flattering to be approached by a publisher about your work which can lead to one letting their guard down. However, it is important to conduct due diligence. The first thing to ask yourself is if you have heard of the publisher? As a researcher, you should have a good idea of key publishers in your field. If not, check with your advisors and/or mentors. The second thing is to go through the criteria for determining predatory open access publishers compiled by **Jeffrey Beall**. These include verifying if the publisher's policies meet the standards established by key organisations in the area of open access publishing, vetting the editorial set up including the qualifications and reputation of the editor and editorial board (the absence of either is a clear red flag), checking transparency in the publishing model (e.g., is there sufficient information about APCs, for how long will articles be hosted?), and the overall integrity of the journal (e.g., does it make false claims about where it is indexed or provide bogus measures of its impact?). It is also worth looking at the quality of the work published. How high is the standard of English? Do articles meet scholarly norms for attribution? Do you recognise authors or their institutional affiliations? If still in doubt, Beall has also compiled lists of **standalone journals** and **publishers** that are suspected of engaging in predatory open access publishing.

54 Politics

Editors in Chief: Martin Coward and Kyle Grayson

Impact Factor: 0.477

ISI Journal Citation Reports © Ranking 2013: 99/156 (Political Science)

The ethos of Politics is the dissemination of timely, research-led reflections on the state of the art, the state of the world and the state of disciplinary pedagogy that make significant and original contributions to the disciplines of politics and international studies. Politics is pluralist with regards to approaches, theories, methods, and empirical foci. Politics publishes articles from 4000 to 8000 words in length. We welcome 3 types of articles from scholars at all stages of their careers:

- Accessible presentations of state of the art research;
- Research-led analyses of contemporary events in politics or international relations;
- Theoretically informed and evidence-based research on learning and teaching in politics and international studies. We are open to articles providing accounts of where teaching innovation may have produced mixed results, so long as reasons why these results may have been mixed are analysed.

All articles - regardless of length - must make an original contribution to their field. Expectations regarding the extent of this contribution will obviously depend on the length of an article.

Turnaround Time: Politics aims to reach final decisions on manuscripts within 2 months of receipt.

Manuscripts should be submitted online via Scholar One Manscripts at http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/politics

General submission guidelines are available **here.**

British Journal of Politics and International Relations

Editors in Chief: Andrew Baker and Alistair Clark; from 1 August 2015, John Peterson

Impact Factor: 0.986

ISI Journal Citation Reports © Ranking 2013: 27/82 (International Relations); 57/156 (Political Science)

BJPIR is committed to acting as a broadly-based outlet for the best of British political science and of political science on Britain. A fully refereed journal, it publishes topical, scholarly work on significant debates in British scholarship and on all major political issues affecting Britain's relationship to Europe and the world.

As well as publishing submitted articles, BJPIR addresses developments in politics and international relations in its State of the Discipline surveys and offers up-to-the-minute commentary in its Controversy section. Annual Special Issues afford an opportunity to explore areas of particular interests for the Journal's readers.

Manuscripts should be submitted online via Scholar One Manuscripts at
http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bjpir

This should be in the form of an MS Word document typed in double spacing and no more than 8,000 words in length.

Please note, authors must submit a 'Research Highlights' file in addition to their anonymised main document and separate title page. Failure to do so will hamper authors' successful submission of their manuscript to BJPIR.

BJPIR aims to provide authors with a decision on papers within four months of receipt of manuscripts.

General submission guidelines are available **here.**

56 Political Insight

Edited By: Peter Geoghegan

Political Insight provides a window to the world on all aspects of research in politics. Published three times a year by the Political Studies Association of the United Kingdom, this full-colour magazine is written for everyone with an interest in politics. International both in the scope of issues it covers and in the sources it draws from, Political Insight aims to present research into politics and international studies to a broad audience in an entertaining and engaging way.

The magazine includes articles on a wide variety of topics such as human rights, the causes of terrorism, recent innovations in policy-making across the advanced industrial world, the impact of globalisation on politics and society, the changing nature of democracy, and much more.

Manuscripts must be original contributions which are not under consideration for publication elsewhere and should be submitted to:

Editor, Political Insight

editor@politicalinsightmagazine.com

They should be written in a clear, accessible way, suitable for a wide international readership. References should be kept to a minimum and certainly no more than 5 or 6. References must be in the Harvard style. Footnotes should be avoided.

Feature articles will normally be in the range of 2000 – 2500 words and should include tables, charts, graphs and diagrams wherever possible. Columns such as 'country focus', 'in focus', 'research methods', 'research impact', 'debates', 'controversy' and 'author meets critic' and opinion pieces will normally be in the range 800-2000 words. All word counts will be agreed with the editor prior to commissioning.

General submission guidelines are available **here.**

Political Studies

Edited By: Cees van der Eijk, Vivien Lowndes, Christopher Pierson and Mark Wenman

Impact Factor: 0.869

ISI Journal Citation Reports © Ranking 2013: 64/156 (Political Science)

Political Studies is a leading international journal, which is committed to publishing high-quality research in all areas of politics and international relations. The journal publishes rigorous and original work of significance to the discipline broadly defined. The journal's editorial approach is not constrained by any particular methodological or theoretical framework and the editors wish to encourage a pluralistic approach to the discipline and debate among the different approaches. The editors particularly welcome submissions which aim to be innovative in their approach, which cross traditional disciplinary boundaries, which reconsider the relationship between the domestic and international politics, or which offer fresh comparative perspectives. The journal is committed to the very highest standards of peer reviewing, to developing the most promising new work available, and to facilitating professional communication in political science.

Articles should be no more than 9000 words in length including all notes and references. Shorter research notes and responses are also welcome.

To submit a manuscript to Political Studies, go to **http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/post.**

General submission guidelines are available **here.**

58 Political Studies Review

Edited By: Cees van der Eijk, Vivien Lowndes, Christopher Pierson and Mark Wenman

Impact Factor: 1.194

ISI Journal Citation Reports © Ranking 2013: 40/156 (Political Science)

Political Studies Review provides unrivalled review coverage of new books and literature on political science and international relations and does so in a timely and comprehensive way. In addition to providing a comprehensive range of reviews of books in politics, PSR is a forum for a range of approaches to reviews and debate in the discipline. PSR both commissions original review essays and strongly encourages submission of review articles, review symposia, longer reviews of books and debates relating to theories and methods in the study of politics. The editors are particularly keen to develop new and exciting approaches to reviewing the discipline and would be happy to consider a range of ideas and suggestions.

Review articles are no more than 5000 words in length inclusive of all notes and references.

To submit a review article to Political Studies Review, please prepare a Word document and upload it via the online editorial site for Political Studies Review at http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/psr/.

Book Reviews

The journal receives around 1500 books a year for review, not all of which can currently be reviewed, since space is limited. We aim to publish printed reviews of 300 to 400 books per year. The two foundations of our strategy are:

- to provide short, accessible and authoritative reviews
- in a timely manner.

Reviewers undertake these short reviews (no more than 400 words per book) without payment, as a professional service to colleagues. Reviewers can, of course, keep the books they have covered.

To request a book to review, email Alex Windsor, the Reviews Co-ordinator, at psr@nottingham.ac.uk and tell us your name, institutional affiliation and brief details of your research interests and publications.

General submission guidelines are **here.**

PSA Guide to Publishing

Political Studies
Association