Publishing Your Research

Laurie Dillon, Michigan State University
Vina Ermagan, UC San Diego
Topics for this session

- Importance of publishing your research
- Avenues for publication
- What is required for different types of publications
- Ethical issues about publishing
  - and other
Credits

Bits of wisdom gleaned/borrowed/stolen from:

- *Building a Research Career*, Francine Berman, UCSD
- *How to Have a Good Career in Computer Science*, Stefan Savage, UCSD
- *How to Have a Bad Career in Research/Academia*, David Patterson, UCB
- *Mapping out a Research Agenda*, Barbara Ryder, Rutgers
- CRAW mentoring workshops

Plus some personal observations
Research is Its Own Reward

“Research is both an art and a science: It requires you to know your subject and to know yourself, to have knowledge of the mechanics of solving a problem, as well as a feel for what is promising and what is not.

For many people, the experience of conducting research provides an opportunity to grow not only as a researcher, but as a person, in a deep and substantive way, and is well worth the commitment and effort.”

-- Building a Research Career, Francine Berman
www.cra.org/Activities/craw/projects/mentoring/
Publishing: A Critical (!) Phase of Research

- Discovery is unbridled fun
- Writing (and speaking!)
  - Are eating your vegetables:
    - reviewing, rehashing, reworking, reconstructing,…
  - Are essential for your growth as a researcher
    - for dissemination & vetting of your ideas
    - for others to corroborate, refine, extend, build on your findings (to have impact!)
  - Can bring tremendous (bridled) satisfaction:
    - others appreciate what you have done
    - to explain is to understand
Publication Types

Different foci:
- Research
- Pedagogy
- Retrospective, survey
- Expert opinion piece

Different venues:
- Technical reports
- Workshops
- Conferences
- Journals
- News bulletins
- Public press
- Trade magazines
- WWW
Technical Reports

Venue characteristics:
- self-publishing on web page
- no page limit, no deadlines
- not archival, not refereed, limited visibility

What to publish:
- preliminary results for focused audience
- details of theorems, experiments, data analysis, algorithms, etc.
- pre-prints for early citation
Workshops

Venue characteristics:
- by invitation or lightly reviewed submission
- may or may not include oral presentation
- may or may not produce proceedings/report, etc.
- relatively narrow topic and audience
- often collocated with bigger/broader venues

What to publish:
- preliminary ideas/results
- research summary/short paper (2–6 pages)
- position paper
Networking

- *It’s not who you know, it’s who knows you*

- **Myth:** your work speaks for itself (and you)
  - Little Reality #1: most people haven’t read your publications (feel lucky if they skimmed it)
  - Little Reality #2: many people attending your talk were gossiping in the hall or didn’t listen

- **Reality:** it is *your* responsibility to be “known” to your community, not their responsibility to know you
  - Your advisor, friends and colleagues can help
Conferences

Venue characteristics:
- non-iterative, peer reviewed,
- strict page limit (6 –15 pages) and deadline
- oral or poster presentation
- high variability in selectivity and visibility
- publish proceedings and may invite best papers (after expansion) for journal submission

What to publish:
- semi-developed to mature research or pedagogical results (depends on conference)
Not All Conferences are Equal

Examples in just one area (Softw. Eng.)

- *International Conf. on Software Engineering (ICSE)*
- *Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE)*
- *Prog. Lang. Design & Implementation (PLDI)*
- *European Softw. Engr. Conf. (ESEC)*
- *OO Prog. Systems, Lang. & Applications (OOPSLA)*
- *Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*
- *Tools & Algos. for Constr. & Anal. of Systems (TACAS)*
- …
Considerations for Workshop and Conference Venues

- Workshops and less selective conferences are good for:
  - preliminary ideas in need of feedback
  - learning about a research area and networking

- But look for well regarded venues
  - ask advice from a more senior researcher
  - see who is on the program committee
  - look over past proceedings
  - see where your peers publish
Journals

Venue characteristics:
- iterative, peer reviewed
- no (strict) page limits
- no deadlines (except for special issues)
- highly variable in selectivity and visibility
- may or may not be archival

What to publish:
- depending on journal: semi-developed to mature research or pedagogical results
- comprehensive description of a body of work
Not All Journals are Equal

Example for one area (Sftw. Eng.)

Preferred journals
- ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology
- IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering

Many other reputable journals
- Software: Practice & Experience
- Empirical Software Engineering
- Journal of Software Maintenance
- Journal of Automated Software Engineering
- ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conferences v.s. Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timely publication &amp; feedback</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expose leading researchers to your work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Widely available in digital libraries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prestigious, visible</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Issues for Publishing

Myth: Great research speaks for itself

Reality:
- you need a compelling story (terribly underrated in importance)
- clear presentation is necessary (not sufficient)

quality >> quantity
Kinds of Papers/Stories

- Opens up new area
- Provides unifying framework
- Resolves long-standing question
- Thoroughly explores an area
- Contradicts existing knowledge
- Experimentally validates theory
- Produces an ambitious system
- Provides empirical data
- Derives superior algorithms
- Develops a new methodology
- Develops a new tool
- Produces a negative result

(Allen Newell’s kinds of PhD theses)
A Good Story Starts with a Great Introduction

Grab a reader’s interest in the first page/minute
- set the context
- motivate and explain how to look at the problem
- foreshadow most impressive result

Specifically:
- why should everyone care about the problem?
- what is done currently?
- what is your key insight?
- how much better are you making it?
Presentation is Critical

Organization:
- beginning: necessary background, roadmap
- middle: unfold logical progression of ideas
- ending: summary, conclusions, future work

Make your ideas understandable
- use standard, clearly defined terminology/notation
- provide intuition to explain formulas (code, algos)
- use clarifying examples
- illustrate ideas in figures
- use acronyms sparingly (judiciously)
Writing Affects Presentation

Use understandable, interesting prose
- *The Elements of Style*,
  Wm. Strunk jr. and E. B. White
- *Bugs in Writing*, Lynn Dupre

Create multiple drafts
- write, critique, rewrite, critique, rewrite, critique, …
- solicit comments from other students, mentors, …

Use tools:
- dictionary, thesaurus, wikipedia, grammar and spell checkers
Signs of Good Scholarship

Clearly identify
- work you build on (provide citations!)
- contribution of the paper
- what can v.s. has been done
- limitations of your work

Compare/contrast with related work
- search: portal.acm.org, www.melvyl.cdlib.org, citeseer.ist.psu.edu
- not a related work summary!
Other Issues: Authorship

Authors involved in
- framing research questions, formulating ideas, carrying out the research
- writing, proof reading, commenting on the paper
- implementing prototypes, carrying out experiments

Issues to be resolved openly (and early)
- do contributions warrant authorship?
- how will authors be ordered?
Other Issues: Rejection

Learn from it!
- do not take criticism personally
- all reviewers’ comments have some merit
- revise and resubmit
  (Journal: explain how you addressed comments in cover letter)

NEVER
- simultaneously submit the same work to multiple venues!
- resubmit the same work to a different venue without first revising!
Other Issues: Expanding Conference Publication(s)

New paper must add sufficient value
- ACM pubs policy: at least 25% new content material

Differences must be explained in
- the new submission
- letter to the editor-in-chief/conference chair

The prior publication(s) must be cited
Other Issues: Plagiarism

Contexts and types:

- copying or paraphrasing portions of another author’s papers with out citation
- copying *elements* (equations, illustrations) of another author’s papers with out citation
- copying portions of another author’s paper with citation but with out quotations
- self-plagiarism: copying portions of *your own* copyrighted paper with out citation (but quotations are not necessary)

http://www.acm.org/pubs/plagiarism%20policy.html
Other Issues: Plagiarism

Consequences may include:

- formal letter of apology admitting to plagiarism
- if under review, automatic rejection of submission
- if in ACM DL, replace paper with a Notice of Plagiarism
- notification sent to Department Chair, Dean, employer (may result in expulsion, loss of position, etc.)

http://www.acm.org/pubs/plagiarism%20policy.html
Guard your good name!