

《公共管理与政策研究方法论》

第11讲

2016年11月28日

# 研究计划书 论文写作与发表 研究伦理与学术规范

马亮博士 副教授

中国人民大学公共管理学院

# 研究设计与研究计划书

- 研究选题
  - “非做不可”；“眼前一亮”
- 研究论证
  - 研究现状、研究思路与内容
- 研究基础
  - “非你莫属”；相近相关但不是完全一致
- 计划安排
  - 可行、可实现、可靠

# 国家自然科学基金青年科学基金项目申请书填报说明

- (一) 立项依据与研究内容 (4000-8000字) :
  - 1. 项目的立项依据研究意义、国内外研究现状及发展动态分析)
    - 需结合科学研究发展趋势来论述科学意义; 或结合国民经济和社会发展中迫切需要解决的关键科技问题来论述其应用前景。附参考文献目录。
  - 2. 项目的研究内容、研究目标, 及拟解决的关键科学问题
    - 重点阐述内容
  - 3. 拟采取的研究方案及可行性分析
    - 包括研究方法、技术路线、实验手段、关键技术等说明
  - 4. 本项目的特色与创新之处
  - 5. 年度研究计划及预期研究结果
    - 包括拟组织的重要学术交流活动、国际合作与交流计划等
- (二) 研究基础与工作条件
  - 1. 研究基础; 2. 工作条件;
  - 3. 正在承担的与本项目相关的科研项目情况
  - 4. 完成国家自然科学基金项目情况

# 国家社会科学基金项目 课题设计论证

- 本表参照以下提纲撰写
  - 要求逻辑清晰，主题突出，层次分明，内容翔实，排版清晰。
- 1. [选题依据]
  - 国内外相关研究的学术史梳理及研究动态；
  - 本课题相对于已有研究的独到学术价值和应用价值等。
- 2. [研究内容]
  - 本课题的研究对象、总体框架、重点难点、主要目标等。
- 3. [思路方法]
  - 本课题研究的基本思路、具体研究方法、研究计划及其可行性等。
- 4. [创新之处]
  - 在学术思想、学术观点、研究方法等方面的特色和创新。
- 5. [预期成果]
  - 成果形式、使用去向及预期社会效益等。
- 6. [参考文献]
  - 开展本课题研究的主要中外参考文献。

# Research Conference of the Public Management Research Association (PMRA)

- Individual Paper Proposals
  - 1-Sentence Paper Summary and Abstract of Max 400 words
- The program committee welcomes proposals featuring high quality theoretical, qualitative, or quantitative research.
- Empirical proposals will be evaluated based on the significance and quality of the research question, design, methods, data, and implications.
- The program committee also welcomes theoretical proposals.
- Theoretical proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the proposal provides insight into a compelling public management subject, identifies foundational assumptions and key concepts, and results in testable hypotheses.

# Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM) Research Conference

- Help Ensure Your Submission is Accepted!
- Here are a few tips to submitting a successful proposal:
- Exemplify a Range of Perspectives and Methodologies
  - Consider the diversity of your proposal participants with regards to geography, race, ethnicity.
- Include Practitioners as Much as Possible
  - No panel should include more than one presenting author from the same organization. When possible, consider adding practitioners from both the government and private sectors.
- Ensure All Participants are Aware of the Proposal
  - Before submitting, please ensure the participation of each presenter listed in the proposal. If you need additional presenters or papers, consult the Single Paper Listing Resource regularly.
- Look Abroad
  - We encourage members and the public policy community at large to include their peers who are doing important work around the world.

# 论文写作：学术“八股文”

- 标题：长与短；问号；副标题；吸引力
- 署名：第一作者+“打酱油的”+通讯作者
- 摘要：结构化与非结构化；实践启示
- 引言：开门见山+“？”+发现与贡献
- 文献评估：结构与平衡；经典与前沿；一览众山小
- 理论框架：图表；充分论证。
- 数据与方法：详述；清晰；有理有据。
- 结果：与理论对话；前呼后应；详略得当。
- 讨论：自圆其说；贡献；启示；不足与展望
- 结论：一段话总结。
- 参考文献：引注与格式（顺序式；作者一年份）

# 论文投稿

- “定位决定地位”
  - 顶级期刊、一流期刊、二流期刊、三流期刊
  - 书章、研究报告、其他
- 中文还是英文（其他语言）？
  - “一稿多投”？
- 屡败屡战与屡战屡败？
- 研究是“流水线”，多篇论文并进。



# 论文审稿

- 为什么要成为一个审稿人？
  - 尝鲜、学习；服务学术共同体、质量把关人
- 单盲、双盲与公开
  - 匿名是否必要？
- 审稿的伦理
  - 如果你知道被审的作者；夹带私货？
  - 先入为主？仁慈与严苛？
  - 建设性建议与意见；审稿的结构与语言。

# Public Administration Review

- Below are some questions we usually ask reviewers to address in their reviews. Please do not feel restricted to address only these issues.
- **- Does the manuscript offer significant new knowledge to the understanding of public administration?**
- **- Is the manuscript's purpose clearly defined?**
- **- Is it well written?**
- **- Does the manuscript demonstrate how the work relates to the existing literature and theory?**
- **- Is the conceptualization explicit?**
- **- Is the methodology transparent and appropriate for the conceptualization and design?**
- **- Do the conclusions follow from the findings?**
- In addition, we ask that you consider the fit of the manuscript for Public Administration Review and whether it is suitable for the journal's readers.

# Public Administration

## Manuscript Advice

- The editors would be very grateful for your opinion on the suitability of this article for publication in the Journal. It would be particularly helpful if your report included answers to the following questions:
- **1. Is the problem the article tackles a significant one? If so, how successful is the author in tackling it?**
- **2. Does the manuscript present significant new interpretations or findings?**
- **3. What are the deficiencies - logical, conceptual, statistical or literary - in the author's treatment?**
- **4. If you recommend publication, can you suggest passages that need revision, deletion or expansion? (Any detailed suggestions for improvement will be welcome).**
- Please score below and type your report in the comments box(es) below.
- Recommendation
  - Accept
  - Acceptable Pending Routine Copy Editing Minor Revisions
  - Revision And Resubmission Encouraged
  - Not Publishable
  - Author Advised To Submit The Manuscript To Another Journal

# Governance

- Questionnaire (Yes; No; Not applicable)
- **Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?**
- **Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?**
- **Is the problem significant and concisely stated?**
- **Are the experimental and/or theoretical methods described comprehensively?**
- **Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?**
- **Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?**
- **Is the language acceptable?**
- Please rate the priority for publishing this article (1 is the highest priority, 10 is the lowest priority)
- Recommendation
  - Accept
  - Minor Revision
  - Major Revision
  - Reject
- Comments (Confidential Comments to the Editor; Comments to the Author)

# INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES: GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

- 1. The International Review of Administrative Sciences (IRAS) is a learned scientific journal specializing in papers that deal with comparative and international themes and topics.
- 2. IRAS follows the scientific convention of double-blind refereeing, and is listed in the annual Web of Science/Journal Citation Reports.
- 3. Reviewers are asked to assess manuscripts with reference to:
  - **How far they contribute fresh knowledge**
  - **How far they advance theory and/or offer original conceptualizations and interpretations**
  - **How adequate and thorough their methods and evidential base are**
  - **How well organized and expressed they are (bearing in mind the international audience that reads IRAS)**
- 4. Reviewers are requested to give reasoned assessments. Simply marking a box ‘major revision’ or ‘publish’ is not helpful.
- 5. Reviewers are also requested to strive for consistency when they are asked to comment on the same manuscript at different stages of revision. If a paper is ‘major revision’ in its first version, because of significant faults, it must address those faults in its second version, or become ‘major revision’ (again) or even ‘reject’. Cosmetic improvements alone do not qualify it for publication.

# 《公共管理学报》审稿表

- 1、您对该论文的处理结论（把不选的选项删掉即可）：
  - A、同意发表（直接送三审会讨论通过）
  - B、改后发表（在作者修改后，送三审会讨论通过）
  - C、改后重审（在作者修改后，送三审会再次审理）
  - D、退稿（结合另一位审稿人意见，予以退稿）
- 2、您对该论文的综合评价、或修改意见
- （细微或具体的地方也可以在该论文的正文中以批注的形式给出）：

# 《公共行政评论》

## 专家审稿单的评审意见表

- 本文是否有创新或重要应用意义：有、一般、差
- 是否有充足的实验或分析支持文章的结论：有、一般、差
- 文字叙述是否清楚简洁：是、一般、差
- 参考文献：引用准确完整、缺乏重要文献、其他
- 有无学术道德问题：有、无、其他
- 总体评价：特优、优、良、一般、差
- 综合意见：直接刊用、修改后发表、修改后再审、退稿

# 研究伦理

- 研究什么、如何研究、研究的传播
  - 钳制研究：直接或间接；资助来源
- 学术与政治（韦伯）、学术与意识形态
  - 为政府“背书”？“红线”在哪里？党派
- 学术与商业
  - 公共政策与企业利益，如医疗卫生（制药、烟草）、食品监管、数字政府等方面。
- 学术与宗教、信仰、社会规范
  - 价值无涉？宗教驱使；LGBT；社会良心？



# 学术规范

- 学术与自律
  - 抄袭、剽窃：“天下文章一大抄”？
  - 认可他人的贡献：引用、注释与参考文献。
- 研究的诚信与透明公开
  - 研究的程序报告；可复制性。
- 研究者与被研究者（参与者）的关系
  - 以不伤害为原则。
  - 知情同意、隐私保护……

# 研究合作与学术共同体

- 为什么要合作？
  - 独著VS合著；领导与执行
- 与谁合作？
  - 志同道合；优势互补（主题、技艺）
  - 资深VS同辈；远VS近（会议与“冷信”）
- 如何合作？
  - “先君子后小人”：分工与署名
  - 言诺：言出必行；Deadline！

# 谢谢！

<http://liangma.weebly.com>

Email: [liangma@ruc.edu.cn](mailto:liangma@ruc.edu.cn)