

# Research paper on well-conceived scrupulously researched

[Sociology](#), [Slavery](#)



The organizational research report and peer-reviewed journal article are concerned with well-conceived and scrupulously followed research methodologies. However, they differ as to purpose. The research report is generally a tool compiled with the intention of securing agreement with, and support for, some specific course of action aimed at aiding the institution. The peer-reviewed article, on the other hand, must be prepared as an authoritatively academic resource aimed at generating ongoing interest as a means of enlightenment and information, and as a useful resource for other academic work.

The most fundamental difference between the peer-reviewed article and organizational/institutional reporting may be summed up with the term “shelf life.” The institutional report is a finite endeavor undertaken for the express purpose of closely reviewing data before determining some organizational course of action to be taken. In this, it may be said to have a comparatively brief shelf life – once completed, presented and enacted, its purpose has largely been served. By contrast, the peer-reviewed journal article, which undergoes its own kind of rigorous scrutiny, may live long past its point of publication and in many different iterations; for instance, as a source of expertise quoted in subsequent articles on identical or related subjects. In serving different purposes, they bear significant differences in the ways they are presented and reported.

In his 2006 article entitled “The Institutional Research Report Revisited,” Larry G. Jones explained that details concerning a research report’s reporting and presentation is of secondary importance to whether it has good or bad

news to impart, whether what it has to say “ will bode good or ill” for the organization. “ Contributing to this concern is the fact that an institutional research report is both an outcome of institutional research and therefore an end in itself and a process, a means to some institutional end” (Jones, 2006). Its presentation to a board of directors, or chancellors or some other governing sub-group within an organization is a face-to-face process, one that may well include give and take between presenter and audience, or perhaps a “ question-and-answer” format at its conclusion. The validity of the report’s research is of concern, insofar as it leads to some actionable conclusion.

Because the research report is, fundamentally, a results-oriented instrument, it is often intensely concerned with the compilation and extrapolation of information. Reporting is just one aspect of the institutional researcher’s charge. There is also quite extensive analysis to be undertaken, usually in order to determine whether variance in the information compiled requires some modification in the prediction of outcomes. The data models that emerge may be used to line up support for a specific course of action. Often, the analysis that goes into the research report can have significant consequences for the institution and on external audiences, clients or constituencies to which the organization is responsible. These sometimes take quite interesting forms.

In 2006, the Royal Bank of Scotland Group (RBSG), in partnership with Citizens Financial Group, Inc., released a research report aimed at determining if any links existed (and the extent to which they existed)

between the predecessor organizations of the Royal Bank of Scotland and the slave trade. The report was part of a trend among commercial institutions in the European community to determine what, if any, culpability could be traced from the existing entities to their antecedent companies. The ostensible intention of the report was to determine whether, and to what extent, restitution should be made to surviving descendants of those who suffered from the company's complicity in the slave trade. After more than 2,500 hours of exhaustive research and interviews, it was revealed that RBSG predecessors were indeed involved in providing loans to Caribbean plantation owners whose livelihoods depended on slave labor (RBSG & CFG, Inc., 2006). . Thus, it was determined that RBSG's commercial predecessors had business ties to individuals or institutions that owned slaves. (The exact nature of the bank's response to these findings is pending.)

The gravity of such information requires that researchers/compilers report their findings, usually in person. The presentation of the peer-reviewed journal article is quite different. The peer-review process is conducted by a "blind" panel, which reviews the article for relevance to a particular subject. Reviewers also determine whether any research conducted is sound and credible; whether the article is accurate in its presentation; and makes a clear and compelling argument based on research (Bowler, 2012). The panel of experts may make suggestions for improving the information presented, even down to the quality and coherence of the writing itself. Thus, detail is more important to the peer-review process.

The presentation of a peer-reviewed article may reflect on one of a broad range of research and analytical approaches, including qualitative/quantitative; broad analysis; literature review; or issues-based discussion; just to name a few, based on the subject matter in question. The audience, and the particular journal for which it is intended, determines the format of the peer-reviewed article, and the audience for which the article is intended plays an important role in informing the review board's focus (Bowler, 2012). The panel acts as a gate keeper of sorts, serving as the arbiters of what will, and will not, meet a litany of standards that include everything from research to grammar and syntax. In this, the peer-reviewed article may be considered more complex in its reporting and presentation when compared to the organizational research report, which tends to feature more in-depth research, the more exhaustive the better. The peer-reviewed article must be presented according to painstaking conditions established by the journal in question. The institutional research report may be required to uphold certain organizational style and formatting standards in the interest of clarity and readability, but the peer-reviewed article will certainly face rejection if it is not presented according to specific standards.

One standard that must be upheld in the preparation of any peer-reviewed article is the quality of its writing. It is, by definition, an article prepared by writers and reviewed by writers. As such, content and style alike come under careful scrutiny from the review panel. By comparison, the organizational research report may consider top-quality writing to be a matter of secondary importance, as long as the data required for the report's completion is

thoroughly and clearly presented. Whereas the research report is concerned with arresting the reader's attention and achieving actionable ends with data, the peer-reviewed article must capture the reader with both facts and language. In fact, an article indifferently written would not only lose credibility with its well-educated, highly critical audience, it almost certainly would not pass muster with the panel assigned to determine its fate.

In either case, well-conceived research methodologies are crucial. It is simply that the results derived through careful research serve different purposes in the institutional report than in the peer-reviewed article. The success of the journal article depends greatly on an authoritative and academic presentation. Peer-reviewed articles typically “live on” as resource material, as building blocks for other academically oriented works, and must impress and inform in order to be considered. The research report undertaken within an organization is, essentially, a tool intended to help improve the organization in some way, to provide a baseline in which recommendations may be grounded. In both cases, presentation is essential if the information being put forth is to be commended and accepted.

## References

Bowler, S. “Preparing Articles for Publication in Peer-Reviewed Journals.”  
Web.

<http://www.deakin.edu.au>.

“Historical Research Report: Predecessor Institutions Research Regarding  
Slavery and the Slave

Trade.” The Royal Bank of Scotland Group and Citizens Financial Group, Inc.,

<https://assignbuster.com/research-paper-on-well-conceived-scrupulously-researched/>

25 May 2006.

Jones, L. G. “ The Institutional Research Report Revisited.” *New Directions for Institutional*

*Research*, vol. 1989(64), Winter 1989, pp. 61-71.