

Getting Published in Value World

Value World seeks papers that fall into four broad categories:

1. Discussion or exploratory papers
2. Analytical papers
3. Review papers
4. Case studies

Authors are requested to indicate which category of paper they are submitting and are expected to submit papers that fulfil the “excellent” characteristics of their chosen type. This will increase the likelihood of the paper being accepted for publication on first submission, as the referees will be able to review the submission using the relevant criteria below

If you would like to make a submission that does not fall into any of the categories described, please contact the editor (at derek.thomson@gcal.ac.uk) to discuss your proposal prior to submission.

Discussion or Exploratory Papers

Discussion or exploratory papers seek to develop the theory of value by promoting ongoing debate. It is not necessary for a paper of this type to support its position with experimental or empirical data, provided that its arguments are sufficiently well supported by its references. These papers must establish their context within the existing debate and must clearly communicate how they are moving that debate onwards.

Review Criteria	Paper Quality		
	Poor	Good	Excellent
Argument	Jumbled (illogical), poorly formed.	Argument present, but disjointed – hard to see how leaps made. Reader expected to form argument as they read.	Very clear flow from original premise through a series of arguments that naturally flow into conclusions.
Clarity of point of view	Reader left with a sense of uncertainty about what was discussed	Reader senses that they have understood, but is not completely sure.	Clearly addressed through argument and conclusions.
Conclusion / recommendation	No conclusions. No lessons from the review.	Conclusions not supported by review.	Conclusions naturally and clearly flow from the preceding discussion.

Context and comparison to other work	No reference to a wider consideration of other leading publications.	Some reference to other published works, but key texts missing.	Sits clearly alongside major publications and makes its position very clear with reference to them.
Contribution to general debate	Conforms to generally accepted views.	Attempts to present different view, but does so badly.	Presents well prepared case for a different view.
Readability	Many grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. Difficult to understand the message communicated in words or diagrams.	Requires minor modification to presentation, rather than content.	Contains no grammatical errors and would be easily read and understood by an intelligent 25 year old.
References	Few/irrelevant/ references. Unclear if originality of points made belong to another author.	References used without relevance to the points being made.	References used to build greater fit with work of other authors that leads to strengthened arguments.

Analytical Papers

Analytical papers seek to advance understanding of value by analysing and drawing conclusions from experimental or empirical data. Contributions to the theory of value are made by drawing conclusions from the analysis of data presented. These papers must demonstrate a thorough investigative methodology and must establish a clear link between information gathering, analysis and the drawing of conclusions. Each must logically flow from the other so that conclusions can be justified.

Review Criteria	Paper Quality		
	Poor	Good	Excellent
Argument	Jumbled (illogical), poorly formed.	Argument present, but disjointed – hard to see how leaps made. Reader expected to form argument as they read.	Very clear flow from original premise through a series of arguments that naturally flow into conclusions.
Conclusion / recommendation	No conclusions. No lessons from the review.	Conclusions not supported by review.	Conclusions naturally and clearly flow from the preceding discussion.

Contribution to general debate	Conforms to generally accepted views.	Attempts to present different view, but does so badly.	Presents well prepared case for a different view.
Demonstration of results	Not shown in any form.	Summary of results is shown, but reader is forced to trust author.	Results are made available, as is the research method, in full (possibly outside the paper (e.g. website)).
Discussion / interpretation of results	Interpretation of the results is not supported by the content of the results themselves.	Interpretation appears to be supported by the analysis of results, but links with supporting evidence are not clear.	Interpretation has high levels of validity and is synthesised with the construction of the overarching argument.
Readability	Many grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. Difficult to understand the message communicated in words or diagrams.	Requires minor modification to presentation, rather than content.	Contains no grammatical errors and would be easily read and understood by an intelligent 25 year old.
Research method	No explanation of a method selection process, units of analysis, or measures of significance.	Explains, but has some elements missing.	Justifies chosen method, units of method deals with interpretation. Validity, reliability and confidence have been demonstrated.
References	Few/irrelevant/ references. Unclear if originality of points made belong to another author.	References used without relevance to the points being made.	References used to build greater fit with work of other authors that leads to strengthened arguments.
Value to community	Can benefit little from reading with regard to improving their practice.	After reading, the reader would reflect on their practice.	After reading the case study, the reader would change their practice.

Review Papers

Review papers present an author's overview and summary of another published work. Reviews will typically present a response to the reviewed work developed by comparing its contribution with established knowledge.

Review Criteria	Paper Quality		
	Poor	Good	Excellent
Effectiveness of overview	Would need to read reviewed piece to understand the review. Possibly long-winded.	Would leave the reader with a good picture of reviewed piece.	Well structured, with few unnecessary diversions. Leaves the reader in no doubt about the contents of the reviewed piece.
Argument	Jumbled (illogical), poorly formed.	Argument present, but disjointed – hard to see how leaps made. Reader expected to form argument as they read.	Very clear flow from original premise through a series of arguments that naturally flow into conclusions.
Conclusion / recommendation	No conclusions. No lessons from the review.	Conclusions not supported by review.	Conclusions naturally and clearly flow from the preceding discussion.
Context and comparison to other work	No reference to a wider consideration of other leading publications.	Some reference to other published works, but key texts missing.	Sits clearly alongside major publications and makes its position very clear with reference to them.
Readability	Many grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. Difficult to understand the message communicated in words or diagrams.	Requires minor modification to presentation, rather than content.	Contains no grammatical errors and would be easily read and understood by an intelligent 25 year old.
References	Few/irrelevant/ references. Unclear if originality of points made belong to another author.	References used without relevance to the points being made.	References used to build greater fit with work of other authors that leads to strengthened arguments.
Reviewer's opinion	Just facts, no author's opinions.	Ungrounded opinions.	Well-grounded opinions, with direct links to evidence.

Case Studies

Case studies are sought to share lessons and insights drawn from everyday practice with the Journal audience. Case studies can be compiled in two different ways:

- Submissions may use case studies to describe and summarise practice; or
- Submissions may use case studies to structure the analysis of observed practice.

Submissions of the latter type are expected to draw conclusions from their analysis.

Review Criteria	Paper Quality		
	Poor	Good	Excellent
Argument and conclusions (where provided)	Unnecessary argument detracts from the case study content.	Argument and conclusion is presented, but is mixed in with factual observations.	Builds argument based on analysis of factual case study. Conclusions flow from argument and are presented apart from observations. Academic references to case study methodology.
Context	Does not explain background to case study and the fundamental problem to be addressed.	May give problem to be addressed or background, but usually not both.	Background to the study and the problem to be addressed are presented. Research aims are clearly stated.
Factual basis	Laden with personal opinions. Author's bias not recognised. "Done and remembered later."	Author bias recognised. Approaches to have structured data collection, but methods not explained.	Author's own bias handled so that interpretation of facts is not biased. Facts observed using documented methods, such as feedback questionnaires.
Readability	Many grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. Difficult to understand the message communicated in words or diagrams.	Requires minor modification to presentation, rather than content.	Contains no grammatical errors and would be easily read and understood by an intelligent 25 year old.
References	Few and irrelevant references. Unclear if the points made are those of another author.	References cited do not support the argument presented.	References used to build greater fit with work of other authors that leads to strengthened arguments.

Research methodology	Reporting observations and distinguishing factual basis - just observations.	Doesn't make explicit the methods by which stated results can be clearly believed.	Clearly explained the processes by which argument clarity was supported and verified using an established research methodology.
Value to community	After reading the case study, the reader would benefit little with regard to improving their practice.	After reading, the reader would reflect on their practice.	After reading the case study, the reader would change their practice.

Enquiries

Please forward general enquiries to info@value-eng.org.