



10th International CINet Conference

Enhancing the Innovation Environment

4-8 September 2009

Brisbane, Australia

The Review Process

Criteria for Acceptance of Papers and Abstracts

Authors should ensure when submitting an abstract or paper that they address all of the criteria listed below that are appropriate for their paper. Reviewers will pay attention to these criteria when assessing abstracts and papers:

1. Theme of the conference
2. Theoretical background and relevance
3. Empirical background and relevance
4. Research objective, problem and hypotheses
5. Methodology – data collection and data analysis
6. Presentation of results
7. Discussion
8. Conclusions - contribution to innovation theory and/or practice
9. Limitation and further research

The conference each year has a **theme** and **streams**. In structuring a paper authors need to ensure that their paper fits the theme of the conference and is suitable for one of the identified streams. A high-quality abstract might be rejected if it is outside the scope and the theme for the conference.

The **theoretical background** should draw on literature that is relevant to studies of innovation management, and references to theory should be clear and explicit. As a leading research community it would be expected that conference papers will be informed by previous contributions from the CINet community.

The **empirical background** should explain why the issues addressed in the paper are worthy of consideration. This section could also explain the nature of the empirical study and how it is similar to or different from previous studies.

The **research objectives, problem and hypothesis** should be clearly stated. You should be very explicit in saying what the paper aims to achieve. Research propositions are acceptable instead of hypotheses.

Your **methodology**, if you have one, must describe the methods you have used in the research. Can you answer these questions?

- How, when and where was the data collected?
- What was the sampling technique?
- How many people/organisations were involved?
- How was the data analysed?
- How were the variables operationalised?
- Why were these analytical techniques used?

The **presentation of results** should be in sufficient detail to allow the reader to draw their own conclusions and assess if you have done sufficient analysis.

The **discussion** situates the results and links them to the empirical and theoretical background. This section should explain how you have addressed the research problem and objectives.

The **conclusion and discussion** should clearly point out the contribution of this paper to innovation theory and practice. This is where many papers fall short.

Theoretical papers that do not have an empirical methodology should describe how the author/s went about identifying relevant literature and any limitations, such as key words, they used in their research. Theoretical papers are also encouraged to propose a future research agenda based on the presented literature study, in order to contribute to the development of the CI discipline.

References should be provided in submitting an extended abstract, but these should be limited to the key references that inform the research.