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The “Process”

- Research Process
- Conference Paper Writing Process
- Journal Paper Writing Process
- Electronic Submission Process/Online Submission Process
- Resubmission Process
- Paper Review Process
- Paper Publishing Process/Electronic Publishing Process
- Academic Networking Process
- Scholarly Business Process
A Research Process

Identification of Problems/Issues

- Back to New Questions
- Asking the Question
  - Identifying the Important Factors
  - Formulating the Hypothesis
  - Collecting Relevant Information

- Working with the Implications
- Drawing Conclusions
  - Analyzing the results/data
  - Testing the Data
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Research Process: Two Sides

- Logical side of the process
- Objective side of the process
- Intellectual side of process
- Social side of process
- Marketing side of process
- Political side of process
A Target Journal

- What is the mission/policy statement/objective of the journal?
- What is the acceptance rate?
- What is the turn-around time?
- Does the journal have an international audience?
- Is the journal peer reviewed?
- Who is the editor?
- Who are on the editorial board?
- Is the journal in the ISI-ranked database?
- Is the journal available online?
- Is the journal published by an international association, University, or a publishing company?
"Look at past issues of the journal. See what kinds of things are published, I mean basically identify the papers that you think are the strongest papers. So everyone has certain papers that they think are amongst the key things in their field. Well what sets those papers apart? Look at how they've been constructed and then try and do the same."

Dr. David Gillborn, Editor of *Race Ethnicity and Education*
"Some people who send papers ... simply send it to the wrong journal and that's becoming increasingly the case ... And it's surprising how many people submit papers clearly never having read the journal, never opened a page of the journal or read on the website what it is the journal's interested in. And increasingly, as the Managing Editor, I'm fielding papers at the initial stage which we would never send out for review and I write back and I say sorry, this doesn't fit within the remit of our journal."

Dr. Stephen Ball, Editor of Journal of Education Policy.
Choice of a Target Journal

- "When I do the first read through of papers that come in, it's clear that I am sometimes getting things from people that haven't read the policy statement and actually haven't read papers, so one of the things that we added to the policy statement last time was to actually encourage people to situate themselves within the journal. So I'm afraid that the reason sometimes that papers get rejected before they go out to peer review is that they're simply not suitable for the journal….One of the most important things that we say back to people at that stage, is 'please go away and read the policy statement, please go away and read the journal'."

- Dr. Sue Clegg, member of the Executive Editorial Board of Teaching in Higher Education
- Cabells Company has listed at least 5,000 journals. Check [http://www.cabells.com/directories.aspx](http://www.cabells.com/directories.aspx) for details and prices.
- Your school will need to purchase these directories for printed copies or accessing the list online.
- AACSB business schools view the *Cabells Directory* as a resource in which journal quality and research productivity are measured.
Choosing a Research Paper Title

- It should be **concise**, **accurate**, and **informative**.
- Titles are often used by **Google search engines**.
- The title should be specific and it should contain words that readers might be searching for.
- **Impact** of the paper title: **strong** and **attractive**
Choosing a Research Paper Title

- The paper title will make it more likely that people will **find** and **want to read** your article.
- The paper title must **reflect the content** of your article; if it does not, readers will be confused or disappointed.
- The title must also be comprehensible to the **general reader** outside your field.
- Where possible **avoid** abbreviations, formulae, and numbers.
- The title should **not** bear any abbreviations.
Online Submission System

To submit a new manuscript to the journal, click on the blue square:

- Click here to submit a new manuscript
- Click here to submit an EndNote manuscript

This section lists the subjects of the five most recent e-mails that have been sent to you regarding your submission(s). To view an e-mail, click on the link. To delete an e-mail from this list, click the delete link.
Online Submission System

Complete all stages to submit your manuscript:

- **Type, Title, & Abstract**
  - Select your manuscript type. Enter your title and abstract into the appropriate boxes below. If you need to insert a special character, click the "Special Characters" button. When you are finished, click "Save and Continue." [Read More...]

- **Keywords**
- **Authors & Institutions**
- **Reviewers & Editors**
- **Details & Comments**
- **File Upload**
- **Review & Submit**

A purple "req" icon indicates all required fields. You will need to complete these fields in all stages to submit your manuscript.
The Paper Title

- **Length** of the paper title
- Be sure to Google the same title you created.
Search Engine Optimization

This article introduces and discusses the concept of academic search engine optimization (ASEO). Based on three recently conducted studies, guidelines are provided on how to optimize scholarly literature for academic search engines in general, and for Google Scholar in particular. In addition, we briefly discuss the risk of researchers' illegitimately ‘over-optimizing’ their articles.

How to Write up Abstract

- Your abstract is what readers/reviewers/editors will use when they are deciding whether to read through your article.
- Should spend significant time making sure that it is readable and that it contains a complete description of your research.
How to Write up Abstract

- Must be accurate as a reflection of what is in your article.
- Must be self-contained, without abbreviations.
- Check the journal’s Authors Guidelines to see what length of abstract is required.

Selling points
- Check that the abstract reads well.
- Structured abstract
The language in which the piece is written has to be clear and to an acceptable standard, so it's always advisable to get a colleague to read through your final draft, or your first draft that you submit. This is particularly important if the prospective author is not a native English speaker - get a native English speaker to read through your draft."

Dr. Douglas Allford, Editor of the Language Learning Journal

Reviewers are not expected to correct or copyedit manuscripts. Language correction is not part of the peer review process.

It is NOT reviewer’s responsibility to correct your writing mistakes.
If English is not your first language ...

Emerald provides the following service for any articles that may need copyediting. Authors would need to pay for this service.

http://www.emeraldinsight.com/authors/editing_service/index.htm

SfEP suggested minimum freelance rates:

http://www.sfep.org.uk/pub/mship/minimum_rates.asp

The copyediting editors will be editing primarily for the quality of the English and will not necessarily be able to advise on the quality of content.

Emerald will not guarantee that work that has been edited by the copyediting editors recommended will be published. All articles must also be submitted to the editor of an appropriate journal for assessment and peer review.
Copyediting Solutions allow you to:

- Prepare an error-free manuscript, ready for submission to journals
- Convey your research ideas and results clearly and effectively
- Increase the chances of acceptance your paper
Journal Styles

- A way of specifying how your article will look when it is published in print or online as a PDF.
- Each element of the journal article has a style associated with it, for example
  - the article title
  - the author's name
  - the abstract
  - the article headings
  - the date of 1st submission, the date of 2nd submission, the date of acceptance
  - and the references
Journal Styles

- Templates for journal styles
- Detailed style sheets can be downloaded
- References and EndNote output styles
- Proof stage details
- Copyright forms
- Your journal article publication can be faster because everyone involved is more familiar with the style, and more can be automated.
Online Abstract

Abstract

**Paper title:** A library circulation system for city and special libraries

**Abstract:**

The aim of this research is to model and implement a software system for library circulation, so that all requirements of city and special libraries for electronic business with the library users can be fulfilled.

Object-oriented methodology is used for modelling of information systems. Modelling is carried out in the CASE tool that supports the Unified Modelling Language (UML 2.0). The software architecture of the system is based on the software components and web services.
## Structured Abstract

### Abstract (limit 250 words)

Please type your structured abstract into the corresponding fields. Your abstract should be no longer than 250 words in all. Each section of the abstract is limited to no more than 100 words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Limit (100 words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/methodology/approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research limitations/implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Keywords

- It is essential that authors, editors, and publishers make every effort to ensure articles are found online, quickly and accurately, ideally within the top five hits.
- The key to this is the appropriate use of keywords.
- The use of appropriate keywords helps to increase the chances of the article being located, and therefore cited.
- Recent evidence suggests that a strong correlation exists between online hits and subsequent citations for journal articles. Search engines rank highly as starting points.
- The linkage between choice of keywords and impact factor
Topic + Online Accessibility

- Topic of the article was ranked by all demographic groups as the most important characteristic that helps in choosing an article to read.
- After topic, the next most important characteristics selected were online accessibility and source of article.
- Author(s), type of publisher, and author(s)’ institution were consistently ranked last.

Co-authors are defined as any person who has made a scientific contribution to the work reported, and who shares responsibility and accountability for the results.

The corresponding author is responsible for ensuring all address, email, and telephone data are correct for all named co-authors.

The affiliations of all named co-authors should be the affiliation where the research was conducted.
The research being reported should have been conducted in an ethical and responsible manner and should comply with all relevant legislation.

Authors should present their results clearly, honestly, and without fabrication, falsification or inappropriate data manipulation.

Authors should strive to describe their research methods clearly and unambiguously so that their research findings can be confirmed by others.

(Wager E & Kleinert S, 2011)
International Standards for *Authors*

- Authors should take **collective responsibility** for submitted and published work.
- The **authorship** of research publications should accurately reflect individuals’ contributions to the work and its reporting.
- **Funding sources** and relevant **conflicts of interest** should be disclosed.

(Wager E & Kleinert S, 2011)
Readership

- "I've always felt that the readership has to be **broad and general** so you will see that papers are cast for specific segments within the readership and one of the tasks that I think I have is to try to make sure that the journal is moving around and touching the broad range and different constituencies of the readership. And the other element of that is that it's **international** and that has an impact when you're looking at papers and advising folk about how their writing can **touch** an international audience and be **relevant**."

- "It's perhaps a bit of a hobby horse at the moment and that is that people are writing with the reader in mind, not **A reader** but **THE readership** in mind, so they are thinking about the clarity of the work they're doing and it's accessibility, I think that's really important."

- Dr. Roger Slee, Editor of the *International Journal of Inclusive Education*
Uploading your Files:

Designate your files according to the file designations that you will find in the drop-down menu. These may differ according to the journal.

All files for review will be combined into one single PDF proof for your submission.
The Final Checklist Stage:

The final checklist stage will flag up any information that is still required.

Click on the blue pencil icon to edit any stages with a red cross.
You will need to view your PDF proof before you can submit your manuscript:

Click on the PDF icon to view your manuscript.
The PDF proof is Editors and Reviewers will see your submission.
When you see the Submission Confirmation screen, your manuscript has been submitted to the journal for peer review:

Submission Confirmation

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Taylor & Francis QuickStart Demo 4.

Manuscript ID: TANDF-2011-0031
Title: Submitting Your Manuscript to ScholarOne Manuscripts
Authors: Amy, Author
Date Submitted: 19-Jul-2011
Figures and Tables

- In general, most editors of highly competitive journals are looking for **solid** and **original contributions** from authors of paper submission subject to a **very limited space** (such as max word count).

- **Policy Statement:** All authors should provide permission documentation to the Publisher if they include any figures or tables **not created by themselves in their articles**, i.e. which are taken from another source such as another person's article or book. Photos which are not created by the author also need this, as do logos and symbols which belong, for example to a company.”

- **To Cite Rather than to Reproduce**
Other Processes in Research

- Recent developments (Literature Review)
- Classification of information/Knowledge
- Accounts of successful ventures and failures
- Qualitative research
- Understanding the Review Process
- 100% Compliance
- Resubmission process

- How reviewing earlier work releases the imagination other than constraining it.
- How to classify and read research literature,
- how to analyze arguments, and
- how to organize and express
“You can't review the whole of the relevant literature but you have to give the reader some help. Tell them how what you're doing relates to key work that's gone before and, if possible, how are you extending that work? So sometimes we'll get a really good interesting piece of research but it's written as if no one has ever considered these questions before. Now, if the person had actually added a section which says here's the work that had been done previously, it allows them to then show how they're building on that work."

"I think the strongest papers usually have one point to make and they make that point powerfully, with evidence, and they locate it within the field."

Dr. David Gillborn, Editor of *Race Ethnicity and Education*
A **common mistake** is authors who want to publish papers in areas that we are interested in without ever referring to previous papers in the same area that we've published in the journal.
"If your paper covers any empirical research that you've done, whether it's a survey, interviews, participant observations, even if it's desk-based research that you've analysed previous work, you have to tell the reader something about your methods. It doesn't mean that the whole paper has to be devoted to that but you have to give the reader a sense of whether they can trust you. How did you decide your sample, what were the key questions you were looking at?"

"Almost everything that's rejected from the journal has fallen foul on the basis that it hasn't discussed its methods appropriately, or it hasn't recognised that there is a relevant literature out there which needs to be addressed, or it hasn't been clear about what its key argument is."

Dr. David Gillborn, Editor of Race Ethnicity and Education.
The theoretical framework and the literature review needs to **clearly influence** any empirical study that's being reported.
Empirical Study: **Sampling Plan**

“The population of the study was of Malaysian Generation Y. But only a sample size of 150 Malaysian college students was selected through a stratified random sampling method. The paper failed to:

(a) justify why using students as sample,

(b) justify why a sample size of 150 was enough to represent the population, and

(c) clarify how the stratified random sampling method was implemented.”
Empirical Study: Survey Instrument

“The author(s) stated that based on the proposed model, the author(s) developed a survey instrument by borrowing and modifying some tools from the literature, without showing the details. Therefore, readers will not know whether or not the survey instrument is valid and reliable and will not be able to replicate the study. Please provide your survey instrument as an appendix when revising your study.”
Research Method

- Empirical Study: **Hypotheses**

“The findings indicated that of the 11 hypotheses, four (H1, H3, H7, and H10) were rejected, which means 36.4% of model was rejected. Therefore, the model was not robust. But the authors jumped into the conclusion that the model was relatively robust, and trust and network externalities can profoundly affect relative weights in the determination of behavioral intention.”
Qualitative Research

- Use **words** rather than numbers to describe findings
- Assume a dynamic reality
- Emphasize seeing the world from the perspective of the participants
- Goal is **understanding** rather than prediction
- Emphasize the **subjective dimensions** of human experiences
- **Holistic** rather than reductionistic
- Associated with the interpretive approach which is discovery oriented, explanatory, descriptive, and inductive in nature
Conclusion: Four Major Components

- Research contributions and/or implications for research
- Implications for practice
- Research limitations
- Future research directions
Conclusion: Limitations (an example)

- Our study has some limitations within which our findings need to be interpreted carefully. Some limitations of this study should be mentioned. First, as in most empirical studies, the research presented here was limited by the measures used. Because environments are comprised of numerous uncorrelated facets, …..

- Second, our study was cross-sectional in nature, and assessed respondent perceptions of the obligations at a specific time. As a caveat to the significant relationships we observed in this study, causal relationships could not truly be tested with cross-sectional data. The use of a longitudinal research design is another potential avenue for research.

- Third, our study did not examine the impact of ……..

- Last but not least, results of this study may not be completely generalizable because the sample was restricted to XXXXX.
Conclusion: Future Research Directions (an example)

- The results of this study suggest that the concept of …… This study is therefore a pioneering attempt to adapt the concept of --------. Opportunities for further research are abundant. This study suggests the following future research directions. First, ……..
- Second, this study concentrated on … among three dimensions of a …… We encourage other to carry out further research in this area.
- Third, while XXXX theory is based on the assumed difficult of …., future research may wish to explicitly consider this aspect of XXXX in understanding ……
- Fourth, longitudinal studies of a smaller number of outsourcing projects can be carried out to establish causality effects in the theoretical model.
- Finally, careful development of a multidimensional metric to assess ……
Initial Screening Process

- Editors’ decision
- The aim of the initial screening of new submissions is to prevent editors wasting their time on submissions that are
  - unsuitable, erroneous or malicious.
- Important screening criteria include:
  - fit with the mission of the journal,
  - significance of the research, and
  - likelihood of moving forward acceptance in two rounds of review.
Understanding the Review Processes

- Work is received electronically by the Editor and skimmed for reasonable fit, quality, and impact.

- Work is sent to two reviewers (i.e., 35 members of Editorial Board + 1,000 ad hoc reviewers)

- Work is judged by reviewers’ report:
  - Major revisions
  - Minor revisions
  - Reject

- Evaluation of Review Reports (timeless & quality assessment)
Reviewers

- Although authors' identities are normally anonymised, content within a manuscript may reveal an author's identity, or aspects of identity. In such cases, a peer reviewer of a manuscript must give unbiased consideration to each manuscript submitted for consideration for publication, and should judge each on its merits, without regard to race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s).

- A peer reviewer should declare any conflict of interest when the manuscript under review is related to the peer reviewer's own work. A peer reviewer should not evaluate a manuscript authored or co-authored by a person with whom the peer reviewer has a personal or professional connection if the relationship would bias judgment of the manuscript.
# Timeliness and Quality Assessment

## Timeliness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review was on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review was slightly delayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review was severely delayed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Quality Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review was highly relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review was sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review was below average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100% Compliance

- Use of correct style and language
- Choice of a target journal, use of the **correct format**, and **100% adherence** to journal guidelines
- Submission of the manuscript in the **appropriate** format and with the **appropriate** cover letter and other materials
- Format for responses to reviewers' comments and resubmission of revised manuscript
Copyright

- **Policy Statement:** In conducting review process or/and publishing this article, we also understand this to be an original article that does not infringe the copyright, or violate other rights, of any third party.
Resubmission Process

- **Format** for responses to reviewers' comments
- **Point-to-point** responses
- **Deadline**
- Your **attitude**
- Online resubmission
Resubmission Process

“The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter. I urge you to make a significant effort to satisfy the reviewers’ concerns in the revision, since it is most likely that a final determination about your paper after the next review cycle will be made. Please note that a final favorable outcome is by no means certain at this stage.”
Resubmission Process

“Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the journal, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision within 4 weeks, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission. If you do not resubmit all required files by MONTH DATE, 2012 (in U.K. time), your file will be closed. Please note that the online submission system does not allow you to resubmit after the deadline.”
Resubmission Process

- **Policy Statement:** We will terminate the review process (i.e., reject your paper) if you do not resubmit a complete point-to-point responses file in the next review process. Your point-to-point responses file MUST not include any author's identity.

- **Policy Statement:** Please be advised that IMDS does NOT allow any resubmission or final submission with changed authorship from the 1st submission.
Resubmission Process

- “The paper sent to me is some sort of draft with parts of the text crossed out, parts underlined, and the formatting information on the right hand side. I need a clean version that is appropriate for review, not a hacked-up draft.
- The paper has obviously been reviewed before since there are responses included but still that is no excuse for not submitting a professional version.
- I started out trying to read it but on page 5 there is a part that makes no sense; obviously, some part is missing. Apparently, the authors did not bother to read and proofread the entire paper after revising it. It is not the reviewer’s job to catch their mistakes.”
Typical Research Process Problems

- Too Many Focus
- Database & Sampling Subjects
- Un-researchable Questions
- Ill-Defined Research Problems
- Project Management
- Weak Conclusion
- Outdated References
Good Research Does Not Publish Itself

• Logic alone is insufficient to win the approval of reviewers, editors, and program chairs.
• Becoming an expert on the logical side of research is critical too. One has to become no less an expert on the social/political side of research.
Tips for Increasing Your Impact

- Actively involve academic conferences
- Choose an attractive title
- Get known in your community
- Improve your web presence
- Make sure that relevant terms are included in the abstract
Tips for Increasing Your Impact

- Publish a straightforward paper on cutting-edge research or a "hot" topic
- Publish with an author with high h-index
- Review papers for conferences/journals
- Target journals in rapidly growing research fields
- Use blogs to leverage ongoing researcher discussion
- Write a review article
“I think a good paper is one that is both innovative and convincing, in other words it has something new to say, but is convincing in that it understands what else has already been said. It's important if we, for example, take a report of a piece of empirical research, that that research reflects a clear understanding of what has gone before and an extremely solid construction of a theoretical framework; solid and critical, in other words that the author has reviewed and thought carefully about how other people have framed the problem and that that is clearly informing the research that then is reported.”

Dr. Elspeth Broady, an Editor of the Language Learning Journal
Two Types of Innovations

**Sustaining**
- Improve performance of established products
- Meet demands of mainstream customers in major markets
- Vary in difficulty, cost, time, etc.
- Established firms

**Disruptive**
- Generally underperform established products in mainstream markets
- Have new features that fringe / new customers value
- Cheaper, simpler, smaller, more convenient to use
- Entrant firms
Other Lenses

- A benefit to the discipline: a cumulative tradition.
- A benefit to the individual researcher: easier to build new theory on old theory than to build something completely brand new.
- A benefit to the author in the review process: the old theory leads to a built-in audience.

(Lee, A.S., 2000)
- It is said that if you know your enemies and know yourself, you will not be imperiled in a hundred battles.
- Keep your friends close, and keep your enemies closer.
- What is essential in war is victory, not prolonged operations.
Porter Competitive Model

- Potential New Entrants
- Intra-Industry Rivalry
- Bargaining Power of Suppliers
- Bargaining Power of Buyers
- Substitute Products and Services
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Buyers

- Reviewers
- Editors
- Subscribers/Readers to Journals
- Program Chair
- How am I presenting my research to them so that they would “buy” it?
International Standards for *Editors*

- Editors are **accountable** and should take responsibility for everything they publish.
- Editors should make **fair** and **unbiased** decision independent from commercial consideration and ensure a fair and appropriate peer review process.
- Editors should adopt **editorial policies** that encourage maximum **transparency** and **complete, honest** reporting.
- Editors should guard the **integrity** of the published record by issuing corrections and retractions when needed and pursuing suspected or misconduct.

(Kleinert S & Wager E, 2011)
Editors should pursue reviewer and editorial misconduct
Editors should critically assess the ethical conduct of studies in humans and animals
Peer reviewers and authors should be told what is expected of them
Editors should have appropriate policies in place for handling editorial conflicts of interest

(Kleinert S & Wager E, 2011)
Suppliers

- Research capacity/capability
- Research funding and assistance
- Travel/attending conference funds
- Release-time for teaching
- Access to related data/information
New Entrants

- Hot topic? Timing topic?
- If you choose a research topic that just anyone else can do ..... 
- New Ph.D......
Substitute Products

- Is my research **unique**?
- Is my research **relevant**?
- Does my research have **significant impact**?
- Does my research have **good quality**?
Strategy Options

- **Primary Strategies**
  1. Differentiation (Unique Contributions)
  2. Least Cost (Timing/Hot Topics)

- **Supporting Strategies**
  1. Innovation
  2. Growth
  3. Alliance
A topic across business functions leads to changes in business processes.

Colleges are comprised of different departments just as companies are comprised of different functional areas.

Output of colleges is a workforce prepared to contribute in an open, cross-functional environment.

A topic across discipline-based departments should reflect similar changes in discipline-specific content.
http://performancesforum.org/index.html

---

**International Journal of Performance Measurement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>CFP</th>
<th>EDITORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDITORIAL REVIEW BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AUTHOR GUIDELINES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REVIEW PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBMISSION OF PAPERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IJPM-Table of Contents**

*Volume 1, Issue 1*

---

Complimentary Article - Full Text PDF
Multi-Resource Networks

\[ \text{Content} + \text{Community} = \text{Network} \]

- **Content**
  - Peer-Reviewed Research Content
    - Journals + Editors who have partnered together
  - Editorial or Industry-related Content
    - Conference reviews + Editorial opportunities + job postings, etc

- **Community**
  - Interactive Services
    - Attending conference + Presenting papers + Feedback
  - Member Generated Content
    - Moderated discussion forums from well-known experts

- **Network**
  - Editors Panel + Exhibiting
    - High Value Service
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## An Output of Global Networking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inaugural Issue</th>
<th>IJPM</th>
<th>IJSR</th>
<th>IJMKL</th>
<th>IJBDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Authors: Harzing’s Average H-index & Cites/Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Avg H-index</th>
<th>Avg Cites/Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IJSR</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJMKL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJPM</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Authors: Harzing’s Total H-index & Cites/Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Total H-index</th>
<th>Total Cites/Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IJSR</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJMKL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJPM</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

For a visual representation, please refer to the chart.
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IJPPM  MBE  TPM  PMM  IJPM

www.emeraldinsight.com/ijppm.htm
www.emeraldinsight.com/mb.htm
www.emeraldinsight.com/tpm.htm
www.emeraldinsight.com/pmm.htm
http://performancesforum.org/index.html

May 2012        Dr. Lin
SCImago is a freely available web resource available at http://www.scimagojr.com/. This uses Scopus data to provide metrics and statistical data for journals. The main metrics have now also been included within the subscription Scopus product if you have access to that.

**Key metric: SCImago Journal Rank Indicator (SJR)**

The SJR is much like the Journal Impact Factor in principle.

- Mimicking the Google PageRank algorithm.
- Assigns higher value to citations from more prestigious journals.
- The SJR covers a three-year citation window.
Performance Management & Measurement Journals

- **Visibility:** Emerald's Performance Management and Measurement journals receive almost **half a million** downloads annually
- **SJR:** Scientific Journal Rankings
- **SNIP:** Source-Normalized Impact per Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Int. J. of Productivity &amp; Performance Mgmt</th>
<th>Measuring Business Excellence</th>
<th>Team Performance Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scopus: SJR</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scopus: SNIP</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harzing: H-index</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harzing: Cites/Paper</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(as of April 2012)