



## Moving forward, looking back

---

**Emma Weitkamp and Paola Rodari**

### **Abstract**

This issue sees the implementation of new designs for the JCOM website and articles and there are plans for further updates over the next year. In a recent survey, we have explored readers opinions of the journal with a view to introducing improvements. Your interests are diverse, which is not surprising for a field which ranges from books and print media, to museums and interactive technologies. We are also reviewing our peer review process to ensure that it meets the needs of our authors.

---

Over the coming year we have some exciting developments planned for JCOM. This issue sees the first of these, with a new design for JCOM website and articles and a space to publish news of interest for the international community - practitioners and researchers. Later in the year we have plans to update the platform for article submission. These planned changes are being informed by you, the readers and writers of JCOM, with input from our Editorial Advisory Board.

Over the past few months we have implemented a readership survey as well as a survey aimed at those who have submitted articles to JCOM over the past few years. These surveys were designed to help us understand how JCOM serves its community and what improvements we could implement to better meet readers' and authors' needs.

The readership survey attracted 103 responses, from science communication practitioners (40%), science communication researchers (51%), active scientists (24%) and other fields (11%). (Note that respondents could select multiple roles if appropriate.) Your interests span the range of topics covered by JCOM, though over 30% chose "public engagement with science and technology", "science communication: theory and models" and "science and the media" as one of their 5 preferred topics. Science education (28%), citizen science (27%), history of public communication of science (25%), informal learning (25%) and science centres and museums (25%) were also popular.

We are also considering how JCOM can support the science communication research and practice community beyond the papers we publish. We, therefore, asked readers what additional services would be of interest and it is clear that readers would value alerts about the publication of new surveys of public understanding of science and technology (e.g. Eurobarometer surveys), news regarding participatory projects at local, regional or national level and training courses, seminars and workshops. The news published in this issue is a first taste of

what we will offer. You can help ensure that the service is rich by notifying the journal of relevant publications, projects or other events that can help the international dimension of our community to become stronger.

Comments from readers also suggest interesting new avenues to explore. For example, we will consider how we can invite comment from other voices than those within our community as suggested by one respondent:

“Science is too serious a matter to be handled only by scientists. So, I think you should invite opinion makers (inside society, culture, sports, politics, economy, organisations, arts, schools) and citizens (why not?) to share their opinions about science and current issues, interests and concerns...”

Another respondent offers a similar view:

“Be more open to the dialogue with society and lay people. Give voice to the citizens (we have so much to learn...)”

Other readers asked for special attention to be given to developing countries, hosting reflections on the role of science communication in the development of societies and presenting case studies of participatory projects in those contexts.

Our survey of authors (44 responses from 289 requests to participate) also highlighted a number of issues for us to consider. Overwhelmingly responses were received from researchers in science communication and related fields (n=36: 82%). Respondents consider our review processes quick or very quick (n=19) with only 2 respondents reporting slow or very slow processing. Likewise, authors (of both accepted and rejected papers) generally believe that the quality of the peer review process is good or very good (n=26), with only 1 respondent rating it as poor. Likewise, respondents generally found the comments received from referees useful or very useful (n=25), with only 2 respondents finding the feedback of poor quality. Qualitative comments, though, suggest that our communication with authors is not always as clear as we hope; for example one respondent reported a paper apparently being accepted and then once revised the paper was in fact rejected. Clarity around the wording of responses to authors needs careful attention.

The feedback from authors highlights the important role that our reviewers play, both in ensuring the quality of the research papers published in JCOM and also in providing feedback to our authors. We would like to thank these committed individuals for their efforts on behalf of the journal, providing here the names of those who have reviewed papers for the journal in the past 3 years. I hope that we have not missed anyone from the list.

Ana Cristina Abad Restrepo  
Marta Agostinho  
Joachim Allgaier  
Nick Allum  
Carla Almeida

Ashley Anderson  
Maria Ataide  
José Manuel Azevedo  
Annalee C. Babb  
Ayelet Baram Tsabari  
Miguel Barceló García  
James Bell  
Davide Bennato  
Anne Bergmans  
Bernd Blöbaum  
Heinz Bonfadelli  
Frederic Boudier  
Laura Bowater  
Michael A. Cacciatore  
Rebecca Bruu Carver  
Paige Brown Jarreau  
Karen Bultitude  
Lorenzo Cassi  
Oron Catts  
Chiara Ceci  
Tim Clark  
Cynthia-Lou Coleman  
Fabienne Crettaz von Roten  
Christine Critchley  
Débora d'Ávila Reis  
Robert Dalitz  
Sergio de Regules  
James W. Dearing  
Karel Deneckere  
David Domingo  
Doug Downs  
Nick Dragojlovic  
Maret Du Toit  
Carlos Elias  
Declan Fahy  
Jean S. Fleming  
Steven M. Flipse  
José Franco Lorine E. Giangola  
Ana Godinho  
Patronella Grootens-Wiegers  
Aphiya Hathayatham  
Alexandra Hofmänner  
Peter Hocke  
Rowan Howard-Williams  
Baudouin Jurdant  
Shishin Kawamoto  
Watcharee Ketpichainarong  
Heather King  
David A. Kirby  
Inna Kouper

Françoise Lafaye  
Markus Lehmkuhl  
Jacqueline Leta  
Bienvenido León  
Simon F. Locke  
David E. Long  
Luisa Massarani  
Marzia Mazzonetto  
Elaine McKewon  
Fabien Medvecky  
Niels Mejlgaard  
Andrew Moss  
Ana Rosa Moreno  
Marcos C.D. Neves  
Ana Noronha  
Fiachra O’Brolcháin  
Sebastian Olenyi  
Wayne Orchiston  
Lindy Orthia  
Kumar Patnam  
Hans Peter Peters  
Nico Pitrelli  
Carmelo Polino  
Donato Ramani  
Jessica Ratcliff  
Gema Revuelta  
Paola Rodari  
Luis Azevedo Rodrigues  
Katherine E. Rowan  
Margarida Sardo  
Ryuma Shineha  
Jousha Schimel  
Elad Segev  
Lloyd Spencer Davis  
Erik Stengler  
Robert Sternberg  
Susan M. Stockmayer  
Barbara Streicher  
Giancarlo Sturloni  
Keith S. Taber  
Bruno Takahashi  
Elisabetta Tola  
Brian Trench  
Ana María Vara  
Victor Venema  
Giuseppe A. Veltri  
Dirk Vom Lehn  
Emma Weitkamp  
C.F. Rick Williams  
Ronald A. Yaros

## Author

Dr. Emma Weitkamp is an Associate Professor in Science Communication at the University of the West of England, Bristol where she teaches on an MSc in Science Communication and provides training in science communication for practitioners and Ph.D. students. Emma is also Editor in Chief of JCOM.

E-mail: [Emma.Weitkamp@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:Emma.Weitkamp@uwe.ac.uk).

Paola Rodari is the project manager of *JCOM* on behalf of Sissa Medialab. For Sissa Medialab she also works as project manager and content developer for the development of new science centres, and she is involved in many European action-research projects aiming at developing innovative programmes and tools for the communication of science. She teaches Museum Studies in the SISSA Master's in Science Communication and has been organizer, speaker and tutor on many international courses. E-mail: [paola@medialab.sissa.it](mailto:paola@medialab.sissa.it).

## How to cite

Weitkamp, E. and Rodari, P. (2015). 'Moving forward, looking back'. *JCOM* 14 (01), E.



This article is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivativeWorks 4.0 License.  
ISSN 1824 – 2049. Published by SISSA Medialab. <http://jcom.sissa.it/>.