

Getting published

Personal style and attitude

Eliciting and planning lessons - respecting, anticipating and managing audiences

Knowing my niche - who I support and oppose

Finding networks in conferences and reading

First 3* article from thesis

Developing ideas and methods from everyday and professional experience

Always being ready to speak - learnt from athletes

Being professional with evidence and ideas

Never waiting for outcomes before going onto the next project

Publishing politics

The culture of the journal and its discussion

Looking around the journal to see what they publish, and citing recent articles

They are an audience that you need to communicate with

Make it easy for them to publish you

Not joining a long queue - very popular journals

Ideas that catch attention

Reading the wider community and the opposition

Not being intimidated by positivism

Using what you bring and know

3* publications

'... internationally excellent ... originality, significance and rigour ... falls short of the highest standards of excellence ... important contributions ... knowledge, ideas and techniques ... lasting influence ... not necessarily leading to fundamental new concepts ... significant changes to policies or practices ... influence on processes, production and management ... on user engagement.'

7,000 words

At least two blind referees (though could include editors)

Depth - empirical, theoretical or discussion

High-rated journal or publisher - because they're more likely to publish research pieces

Interrogating relevant issues - to get noticed

But, there are also reasons for writing to other audiences - professional, political, popular

Reviewing process for journals

Two or three reviewers

Blind

‘This author needs to read Holliday’

Takes time - editor finding reviewers, often getting refusals and having to find others, waiting for their reviews

Many submissions not considered if they don't fit the journal

The editor can mediate conflicting reviews

Books

Making contact with publishers - conferences, network, direct

Be wary of unsolicited invitations

Check who and what else they publish

May not want your thesis as it is - different audience - book chapters not like thesis chapters

Invited to write a proposal

Overall message

Synopsis - summary of each chapter

Competition - how different to existing books

Readership - who will buy it - students, researchers, subject areas etc.

My first book was a mixture of my thesis and new ideas developed through teaching - four years later

Reviewed

Contract - 1-2 years

£400 per year royalties?

Common weaknesses - superficiality

Boring literature review and listing of data and findings

No proper, defensible, personal voice

Cutting and pasting parts of your thesis without explanation

No evidence that you're struggling with difficult questions

Not coming out and explaining explicitly how you solved research problems

Lack of reflexivity

Not dealing with inevitable subjectivity

From journal reviews - by me and about me

Communication and being convincing

Evidence and clarity

Doing what is claimed

[1] The authors' main criticism is the use of mixed method in intercultural studies. It seems that they find the quantitative component of this method problematic.

Yet, the characteristics of mixed method are described only briefly. Readers, including proponents of mixed method, would be more convinced about the criticism if they were given detailed information about different types and principles of mixed method, which would provide the rationale for why it is problematic. Perhaps it is not mixed method per se that is problematic for studying about interculturality, but rather any type of research method that lacks the researcher's critical reflexivity of their positionality, relations of power between them and the participants, and engagement with difference.

[2] The comparisons between postpositivism and postmodernism needs to be enriched with examples of research/references that exemplifies the points you are making. What if someone disagrees that this is the case? You need to back your claims with references.

[3] Also although the authors argue against reified categories, they present post-positivism as a solid and rigid paradigm. For example they mention 'a post-positivist argument is ...' Who says that? Do you consider post-positivism a clearly defined paradigm that people strictly and consciously follow? Or is this your evaluation of their choices? It is not clear.

[4] I find this submission unfortunately very confusing. The author uses many concepts and ideas that are featured in current academic discussions but unfortunately there is very little clarification of what they mean and how they apply to the specific context in which this study took place (there is, as a matter of fact, no detailed account of the context). There are also quite a lot of claims that are either contradictory (is identity emergent/ liminal/ hybrid or 'hidden'?) or somewhat unsubstantiated (Who is oppressed here and how does this oppression work?) There is no justification of the intervention and the procedures in the 'action research project'. The criteria for selecting parts of the data is unclear and the interpretation of these voices seems somewhat disconnected from what the participants (or 'Authors'?) actually express.

[5] While the topic is timely and relevant, I was not convinced by the text. The abstract is not clear enough in my view. You have to read until the end to find out what the aim of the research is. The first sentence is, in my opinion, a given. It is impossible to know anyone in depth, even a family member, let alone our students.

[6] Many central concepts are not well developed (e.g. critical cosmopolitan view, hegemony, Western imperialism and so on). Amadasi and Holliday are referenced recurrently but their argument is not presented in a straightforward way. The presentation of findings is a bit odd. It focuses on the actions taken in the research (Action 1, action 2 and so on) instead of presenting findings. What did the authors discover that is worth communicating and why are these findings arranged around those actions? The section, which is very long, is not engaging to read. The authors could have discussed their findings in relation to the literature review more clearly rather than incidentally. There are multiple examples from varied data sources, but they are not described or interpreted. In general, the reader is left alone to make something of each data extract. Finally, there are no discussion or conclusion sections and the paper finishes abruptly again.

[7] This paper therefore needs recasting, as already suggested above, to allow the student voices to come through and drive the discussion. If this does not happen, the author may well appear to be hypocritical. There is an apparent total lack of reflexivity throughout, leaving the paper to read like a series of polemic asser-

tions which are not supported by the evidence that has very clearly been collected. This is therefore a hugely wasted opportunity.

[8] Here, therefore, the use of 'international' and 'heritage' need to be explained and justified. It is not clear what exactly is attributed to de Wit and Preese. The references come at the end of very long sentences. I doubt if they talk about all the concepts mentioned there. The positioning of other references need to be checked in this respect.

[9] This presents good definitions and descriptions of neoliberalism but doesn't explain why it is relevant to the paper. Perhaps the beginning of the third paragraph needs to be woven into the first paragraph to provide this explanation.

[10] I think it's too long to wait to page 5 to find out about the empirical base of the paper. It's mentioned briefly in the abstract; but something also needs to be said in the introduction to contextualise the theory presented there. The first part of the second paragraph of this section might therefore be better placed right at the beginning of the paper. Then, at the beginning of this section, something more needs to be said about the participants to contextualise what is said about Pond University. Also, what exactly its meant by 'multicultural' - another contested term.

[11] Why three students, and why these three students with these particular biographies? for example, did they self-select in response to an invitation? On what basis can the author say that Carlos had 'a considerably more expansive experiential repertoire'? As a student, in life experience, or what? And why is this important? Also, given the political sensitivity of the research, how were they approached, how was their relationship with the researcher(s) managed? Were there issues with researcher power dynamics - especially given the highly subjective nature of what the participants were asked? How were these issues managed?

[12] Data collection and analysis

There is nothing in this section about approach. The questions asked could lead to a multiplicity of of responses and constructions. A bit more needs to be said than 'explorative-qualitative'. What was done to acknowledge the possibility that the participants may choose to say completely different things when interviewed at different times and under different conditions?

[13] In each sub-section, the data extracts are presented as though evidence of claims and supporting literature made at the beginning of the sub-section. There is a danger that this leads to a forcing upon the data of interpretations that the author wishes to find.

[14] On pages 6 and 7, the data extracts are used to confirm what has already been claimed. We don't see any detailed discussion of what Carla and Carlos actually say, which is open to more interpretation that what is claimed. This pattern of appearing to use the data extracts to exemplify rather than taking time to analyse them continues throughout.

[15] Again, I wonder what is behind teachers apparently so easily reiterating the apparent 'truths' presented in the literature review. Could this be a result of them being 'socialised'? This goes against my personal experience where some university teachers think that WTC in the classroom takes time away from other forms of content given that there students are well able to practice the language

in their own time outside the classroom. What we do not have any information about in this article is the size of the classroom groups and how this lends itself to, e.g., observing group work.

[16] Odd to have a sub-heading straight after a main heading - again indicating a lack of explanation. A little more 'talking to the reader' is required. Everything that is said in the section seems to me true; but please stand back a bit and tell me why it is relevant. Throughout we are told THAT all the people cited say what they say. But so what? We need to know the author's argument, not the arguments of people we can read for ourselves elsewhere.

Again, in the first paragraphs of this section we are lectured about a methodology before being told about that it will be used and why it will be used. Again, please talk to the reader instead of giving a distanced lecture. This reminds me of when my university lecturers only spoke to their blackboard notes and never turned round and spoke to us students.

This begins to become more informative in the Data Set section, where the use of the first person brings some sense of purpose lacking in the section so far. However, while we now get WHAT the researcher did, we are still not being told WHY.

More politics

