



## Transcript for Australian Scholarly Summit Panel: Using Research Communication for Public Engagement

### Lyndal Byford (Australian Science Media Centre):

Thank you, Natalie, and thank you for having me here today. I am not sure if any of you have ever heard of the Australian Science Media Centre before. But we are essentially a midway point between scientists and the mainstream media. I think a journalist once said we were like the pimps for scientists. I prefer to think of us as a dating agency, so that we put the two together, but we are very much dedicated to improving the amount of quality peer reviewed science that is in the Australian media landscape, but also making sure that that is informed and evidence-based. When a big story hits the mainstream news headlines, whether it is a plane crash or an earthquake or a controversial research paper, that there are scientists who step up and engage with that story and work with journalists.

So, why would you bother with the media? Essentially, if you are not talking to the media in Australia, you're really not talking to the public, because about 90% of people get their information about science through the mainstream media. That is not that they are Googling your science news story and coming across it. For most people, that is a case of just in passing - I was reading The Age this morning, I was flicking through and I read a science story as part of that, or I jumped onto the ABC news website or on my Facebook feed, I got a BuzzFeed story about Barnaby Joyce today.

So, if you're not talking to the media in Australia, you're really not reaching out to the broader public and the public really need to know about science and be engaged in the process of science and research discovery. We're not doing so well on science literacy in Australia. Whether you can blame Jurassic Park for this or not, I don't know, but there are a third of Australians who still think humans and dinosaurs co-existed. So, a level of scientific literacy is quite low and by engaging people in science and science stories, hopefully we can bring that up.

There is a real interest in science news in Australia. So, when we poll people and ask them what sort of topics they're interested in reading about in the news, health and education news, science and technology news rate above lifestyle and entertainment news, and above sports news, and some of the things that get quite significant page space dedicated to them in the media. So, there is a bit of a mismatch in terms of what people say they are interested in reading and how much space we actually see dedicated to these things in the news media, and that could be just because scientists aren't pushing their stories out enough.

On the plus side, from a journal editor's perspective, if research is published in the mainstream media, it is twice as likely to be cited as research that doesn't appear in the mainstream media and there are a couple of studies over the years that have shown this. It also boosts the download



rates of articles by about 1.7, 1.8 times, so also around that doubling level. So, getting mainstream media coverage of your papers is a good way to raise the profile of that particular paper more broadly.

There are lots of reasons why you should engage with the mainstream media. You could argue that lots of research is publicly funded and therefore there is a responsibility on researchers to communicate the results of that research back to the public. There is also a really good argument around correcting bad science, so given that it is Valentine's Day, I thought I would start with a lovely story about love amongst kangaroos.

So, this was a story that went viral, I think, last year. It was on the front page of the Courier Mail in Queensland about a kangaroo who was dying and his mate who was cuddling him in this fond embrace and saying his last goodbyes. Interestingly no one actually asked a scientist if that what was happening in this story and when they did get some input from scientists, it turns out the kangaroo wasn't so much grieving as trying to mate with the dying female kangaroo. So, that's a nice little Valentine's Day story for you there. As CBC News put it, "Horny kangaroo in viral photo is not grieving, scientist says," so you can actually use the media to correct wrong science and in doing so, actually teach the public a little bit about animal behaviour.

I think another good reason is that if quality peer reviewed published science isn't out there engaging with the media, somebody else with an agenda will fill that space. So there is an appetite, as we saw amongst the public for science and health news, and science and technology news; and so if we don't fill that with quality, good, research, Paleo Pete will be all too keen to step up and fill that space.

So, our philosophy at the Science Media Centre is the media will do science better when scientists do the media better. So, the onus is on us scientists and publishers to actually improve the way that we engage with the media and step into the game on their terms and learn how to play.

So, what do we do? One our main strategy is to actually make what is in Australia a very general news audience more aware of science research that is coming up. So, we have a website called Scimex, where research organisations and institutions can upload embargoed science stories being published in journals. We work with all the journal publishers, including Taylor & Francis I am pleased to say, to actually upload that embargoed journal content and then alerts go out to about 1,500 journalists on our list that essentially gives them a list of here is some stories coming up this week. Here is a story for Tuesday. Here is a story for Wednesday. Here is a story for Thursday, so they can plan to include some science in their news reporting. There is a twice a week big summary and a daily alert.

So, to give you an example of a Taylor & Francis journal story, this was one from December about an extinct marsupial lion discovered in Queensland. So, that short summary email is what we write to go out to journalists. If they are interested in covering that story from your journal, they will click on a link in the headline. That takes them through to the page in Scimex where they get images, they can get a copy of the paper, they get a copy of the press release if there is a full



press release. They get the link to where it is going to be published, so that they can include that journal link in their story. They get a media contact, they get everything they need to write up that story and to make it as easy as possible for a journalist without a speciality in science to actually cover a science story.

On a story like this, we can look at quite a range of news outlets. This is just a selection on the left, not the full list, who looked at this page and downloaded it. You can see it was interest from around Australia, not just in New South Wales or Queensland where the fossils were found. International journalists are also looking at these pages, and this is the little snapshot of some of the coverage that results from this. So, this is one way as journal editors that you can help push your story out to the media, we're working with Taylor & Francis and they are actually alerting us to some of your journal papers and they come through, so we can start telling journalists about them under embargo. We know that that embargo and having that embargo period is crucial to actually boosting media coverage in Australia. If we're telling journalists about your study and its already online, they will consider that old news and too late report. We have to tell them about it before it is actually published and online.

We also take a host of media enquiries from journalists, anyone looking for an expert on a topic. So, as journal editors, you may also be experts in your field. We have an expert database that you can register for that is accessible to journalists on Scimex. It [Scimex.org/expert](http://Scimex.org/expert) if you are interested in signing up. Those expert profile pages you can put your contact details and your expertise and your ORCID ID and clips of previous media work that you have done, and all of those contact details are only available to journalists who are actually registered and logged in, so the public don't necessarily get to see them.

We also do what we call an expert reaction, which is essentially the way that we inform upcoming research with peer reviewed and evidenced based commentary. So, if there is a plane crash tomorrow or volcano erupts, we know the news media is going to be really interested in finding experts who can comment on that, and that is another opportunity to get your research out into the mainstream media. It might be a paper that was published three months, three years ago, but if the volcano is erupting now, that is an opportunity for you to talk about some of that work that you have already done and to bring some evidence into the debate.

So, just a little example of that, a couple of years ago the International Agency for Research on Cancer put out an embargoed report which classified processed meat as category 1A I think it is or carcinogenic to humans, unfortunately, in that same category are cigarettes, plutonium, asbestos. All the things that journalists immediately think my God, bacon is as bad as plutonium and the report that came out really didn't give journalists any kind of risk figures for how those things might compare. It was a statement of how sure we are that these things cause cancer, not about the risk of cancer associated with each one.

So, you got some pretty misleading headlines across the world. So, the sort of thing that we do when we see that is that we ask experts in that field to read the report and to provide us with an expert comment and we send a collection of those comments out to journalists under embargo



and they can essentially cut and paste those comments straight into their news stories and use them to inform what they are writing or as a talent scouting exercise for people to interview. You can see in Australia, the coverage was much more measured. We had lots of people talking about the risks of this actual compared to tobacco smoking or something like that, and not to give up necessarily your bacon sarnie overnight. Tobacco smoking kills a million, but diet and red meat, you're talking about 50,000. So, there was a bit more context in this story than would otherwise have been there.

We will also run media briefings about upcoming papers, again, we're talking about *upcoming* research. So, the earlier we can know about your journal articles coming up and let journalists know, the better. So, just to give you an example of that, this was a report out of the Kirby Institute at the University of New South Wales. Again, very Valentine's Day, STI stats and Gonorrhoea, going up by 63% in five years. So you know, get your love on Valentine's Day! Again, the way these work is essentially they are little online web conferences, we have the authors there to present their work to journalists who can actively ask questions. So, it's essentially an online press conference and it is a good way of hitting a whole bunch of journalists at once, so that is some of the work we have done.

We know the expert reactions and briefings we do on average generate about 200 news stories each, or about 3,000 news stories per month that we are informing and that all the research we push through Scimex is on top of that. So, we have a reach of about 8 to 10 million per month, based on the news coverage that we get. We also have a little media training website online that is free to access, called Science Media Savvy and it has some online videos, and hints and tips for researchers across the board in how to engage with journalists, examples of interviews that went really badly and then how many they could have gone a lot better. Lots of information there so that if you have got experts or you are about to do an interview yourself and it has been a while since you did media training, you can actually jump on this website and just kind of refresh yourself in the skills. But we do also do a lot of in-person media training at institutes, so if you want us to come out and train, you let me know.

Shannon Schedlich (Media Center for Education Research Australia – MCERA):

Good afternoon everyone. I really loved Lyndal's analogy of being a dating agency because I like to think of myself as a bit of a matchmaker, despite a woeful track record in that regard, but we do a very similar thing to what Science Media Centre do, but just with education research.

To provide some context for MCERA's work and touch a bit on my own background, as Natalie said in my introduction, I used to work as an Education Advisor and prior to being an Education Advisor to a Minister, I was just a bit of a nerd who liked reading education research. After I finished my PhD I had adjunct status at the university and my supervisor said to me, "You're not planning on being an academic, are you?" I said, "No," and she said, "Do you want to keep up your adjunct status?" I am like, "I really just like reading journals, so if you could keep it up, so I keep reading your journals," – so they took away my adjunct status when they realised I wasn't going to publish anything for them. But I used to be the person who went out and sought out



those journal articles, just for interest's sake and particularly in education research, despite the fact that I am a historian by training.

The thing that became really obvious to me when I started as an education advisor is that everybody thinks that they are an expert on education. Everybody goes, "I went to school, I know how this works. I have kids, they go to school, I know how this works." A whole heap of stuff that happens in the education policy space and in the public discussion around education isn't informed by research, it isn't informed by facts, it is just gut feel and there is a whole heap of, "this is what used to happen in my day, this is what happened when I went to school and look how well I turned out." And it doesn't seem to happen as much in other areas necessarily.

If a scientist comes out and says, "We have had this medical breakthrough, this is going to be a new way that we start administering anaesthetic," I have no idea, I am not a science person, people aren't going to go, "Well, I had an anaesthetic ten years ago and that worked really well for me, so I don't know why would like at something different." But there is that thing with education that people go, "why should we be changing this"?

So, what we are trying to do is not only inform the general public about what is happening in education research, but why it is important in a changing world. I have got a little boy who is in Year Two. The workforce that he is going to go into in 10, 15 years is going to be different to the workforce that I joined when I started my career. We are also trying to ensure that journalists are informed about the decision-making process that sits behind these policy reforms that are announced, and so one of the things that we do is we hook up journalists with experts so that when they go into interview the head of ACARA for example, they know this is the actual facts that sit behind these stats that you have just given us, we know you are going to give us some spin. I have worked in a Ministers office, I know about putting the spin together, but what is the actual stuff that sits behind that. Is this just a thought bubble that the ministers had while they have been on the beach over the summer, or is there some background to that? So, by linking the journalists up with those experts, they have got that evidenced-based knowledge to go in and ask some really serious questions about where did this come from.

When we first started, and we are a very new organisation, but when we first started, we seemed to get a bit of backlash from some marketing and comms teams from universities. We are here, we're already doing stuff, we're already putting our academics out into the public – why do we need you? My response to that is we do something a bit different to what those comms departments are doing and we actually work really closely with the comms departments in universities.

In my time at MCERA, and I have only been there for four months, I have only had one media unit who has gone "no, that is our job, please step back". Everyone else, once we explain what we do, is very much "this is fantastic, you are helping to get our academics out there, you are helping them engage with the public", but what we can do is we can draw together a whole heap of research. Not just from the one institution, but from across institutions and package it up as these are the experts in this field, or if there is an academic who has got a paper coming out from



RMIT and there is an academic who has got a paper that compliments it out of Murdoch, we can package them up as one media story. Here is an academic who was writing on PE and here is an academic who is writing on why playgrounds are important for kids' engagement, and that is one story, and that is more likely to be picked up than one niche little thing.

On Monday, we worked with Taylor & Francis's UK office, for example, there was some research that was coming out of the US, and it was actually really pertinent to the Australian landscape. So what we did was we got an academic from a quarry and one from Swinburne and we put them out as the local content and the local context around that story and we know that got picked up by journalists who were like, "this is an international story, we want to be able to engage with that, how can we do that?". These are our local experts that can talk about why this is relevant, why this giant study that has come out of the US is relevant in Australia.

Like I said, we're very new. We are a start-up. We started about a year ago, but we didn't launch until May last year and so what we're doing is we're really focusing on doing a few things and doing them really well. We are based very closely on the Science Media Centre model and I look at their work and I look at all of their portals and their alerts and stuff that go out and I go "wow, that is fantastic, that is ultimately where we want to get to", but we have only been operational for less than a year. By focusing on doing a few things and doing them really well, we have found that we have had a real uptake in public engagement and with what we're doing. In my first two months of working at MCERA, I think I had one inbound call from a journalist saying "I am writing an article on education and I need someone to speak to". We're now at the point where we are getting multiple phone calls a week and often multiple phone calls a day from journalists saying "this has come up, there is an education issue that we know is going to break, I have just been talking to a Minister and I need some content to go around it".

So, I think that focus on doing some really big things, but only a few of them, has really gone a long way to showing the media this is why it is important to have organisations like us to have organisations like AusSMC who are widening that discussion, who are providing the content and who are giving journalists more of these people who have stood up and gone "I am an expert on education, come to me".

Education is one of the few academic areas where people have managed to sell themselves as, "I am an expert on education." If I am a journalist and I am writing an article on something in chemistry, I don't go, "Well, I know a physicist, I will ring them up because they are a scientist." But within education, there doesn't necessarily seem to be in the media up until now hopefully, this idea that there are different experts on different things, and so you can see the same names coming up again, again and again. It doesn't matter what the issue is, it doesn't matter what their area of research is, but they are like "I am an education expert".

What we do is we actually find the niche expert who does know about what literacy means in south Sudanese communities in inner suburban Melbourne. We are not going to send you someone who is doing STEM research at Western Australia but goes, "I am an education expert". So, getting those voices into the media is really important and getting that variety of voices into



the media is really important. We also work with the embargoed press release system. We also do the expert comments when issues are in the media and as I said, we do the outreach service for journalists.

We are also launching a service this year called Informed Sources, which is a newsletter content subscription for schools, and what we're doing with that is we're working with academics who have written their article, or they have written their book, but it is something that relates directly to schools. That schools are really interested in, that parents are really interested in and we're breaking that research down even further into 250-word articles that can be dropped straight into school newsletters. We have got our first one going out today actually, and it is about cyber bullying and it is written as if the principal was speaking to the parents. We are basing it around the research of a couple of academics that we have worked with and we are providing real world solutions for parents, for "what should I be doing if my kid is being cyber bullied or if I think my kid is being a bit of a jerk and is being a cyber bully? What should I be doing as a parent?" based on research.

So, for your academics, for your researchers, for the people who are writing for your journals, that gives them a really direct contact with schools, that provides them with some really direct impact into schools. When we were stress testing this idea with some principals, one of the immediate questions we got back was, "Can we then contact the researchers?" And our thing is "absolutely!". If you're a researcher who is sitting there doing some work and you have got a school who says, "I have got a problem with cyber bullying, or my staff don't know how to deal with sexualised behaviour amongst children". They don't know how to recognise it, they don't know what to do. And when they do recognise it, we have got the experts sitting there and who come in and talk to you directly.

I think breaking down that wall between what is happening in universities, what is being published in academic journals and actually getting those people out, I think that is a really important aspect of the public engagement that we're looking at doing.

I am going to end it there. If anyone has any questions, I will take them after but thank you very much for your time today.

Misha Ketchell (The Conversation):

I think Shannon and Lyndal have actually said many of the things I would normally say at events like this. So, what I will try to do is really whizz through this, just giving you a bit of a sense about what we are doing at The Conversation, just so we can get to the Q&A bit and maybe have more of a discussion about ideas and how we go forward.

Just quickly, how many people in this room have read The Conversation, just to get a sense? That is pretty good. A few years ago, that would have maybe been half of that. How many people have written so far? Okay, that is not too bad. We are working on that.



So, just by way of some very basic background. The Conversation was launched in Melbourne in 2011. The idea behind it was to marry what we have been talking about today which is the need for academics to have engagement and have impact in public debate and public discourse, with what we saw as a failure in the media, basically the collapse of media business models had meant that we had lost a lot of specialist reporters.

We had lost a lot of the capacity to have the detailed policy, science, education articles that we have been talking about today. Anybody who used to read a weekend newspaper, ten or fifteen years ago like I used to do when they used to thud on your doorstep and they were this fat, and you now get the emaciated version that arrives every day, will know what I am talking about.

Part of that coverage really was often driven by academics in various guises. Some of the more sophisticated literally criticism, cultural criticism, some of more the sophisticated writing about ideas, a lot of the more detailed science reporting; all those things have certainly vanished or largely vanished from our print newspapers and overall, the media ecosystem is less resourced for the people who can in a knowledgeable way seek out and develop those types of story ideas.

So, The Conversation was partly about trying to serve these evidence-based knowledgeable ideas, research, evidence to inform public discourse. So, it is sort of partly about market need and partly about the need that academics have to communicate.

Basically, the way we work is we have a team of professional editors. We start everyday with an editorial meeting and we try to identify opportunities in the news cycle to create stories that can be informed by the work of academics. So, I think on this panel today, there has been a bit of discussion about ways of communicating your expertise and your ideas, both based on research. So, if you got a new research paper out, you can write an article for The Conversation, you can link to your research paper and it will definitely increase your citations. It will definitely increase the impact of that research. We have got research that shows that that is very effective.

But also finding opportunities, as the previous panellists have said, where you read things in the media that are misleading or that you think only present part of the picture or where you can add a quote or you can inform something or correct something, and one of the things that we're constantly doing is encouraging academics when you come across things that touch on your field of expertise, and you find yourself going, "That is bullshit," to actually contact us, or contact the Science Media Centre or MCERA and actually say, "hey, I can talk about this and I can put better information out there".

The way we do it is we have an editorial conference every day and we will talk about and try to develop ideas and one thing we are really working on is trying to communicate ideas in ways that get a little bit outside the standard formats of accurate words in a picture. So, for example, in a news conference quite recently, an academic had pitched us an idea about some research that he had done on the soundscapes of different cities and the way those cities sounded. It had a headline saying, "research shows that you can identify cities by their soundscapes." And there were some audio files, so what we did to try to ensure that that story reached the maximum



readership. The maximum audience was, we developed a quiz where basically, people could listen to these different sounds or these different cities and they had to match it up. Which one is Paris, which one is Melbourne, which one is London or whatever it is. That basically, by designing an editorial product that functioned as a quiz, we were able to get a lot more readers for that content, for that academic research, that idea, than we would if we just published 800 words, here is my research. We are constantly trying to do that.

So, our editorial meetings, there will be things like there is a search on for MH370 and we're discussing ideas and the idea might be "well, let's go and get somebody who is an expert on ocean currents to explain how you model where the debris might be", and then somebody might say "well, let's take that one step further. What if we create an infographic, where as a reader, you can actually have an interactive model and you could drop something into this map and you could see where it ended up". Going from that idea of just having somebody using some academic expertise to inform a topic, to actually developing something that will engage readers, that will be shareable is a really good way of driving traffic.

So, what we try to do is provide editorial creativity and services, working with academics to drive traffic to your stories and to your ideas. We also work a lot through editorial products, so we have ongoing series. We have got a series called Guide to the Classics which is literally a classicist providing a very useful plain language guide to a classic work. We have a section called Curious Kids, where we answer questions that are created by children, we have fact check articles which are peer-reviewed fact checks of claims made by political figures, and we try to do them in a really timely way. We fact check Q&A, so that they get injected into public debate and have an impact on public discourse.

So, we're constantly trying to invent new ways and think creatively about how to draw on the expertise that you all have and share that expertise. The best way to work with us, I am going to go through some processes about how you think about stories and how you pitch, but the best way to work with us is in a conversation or a collaboration. So, if you are thinking about writing something, there is a pitch system on our website where you can pitch a story. Even better is if you can get on the phone and talk to us, or we can talk to you and we can talk about an idea together.

So, academic authors are welcome to pitch 800-word articles. You can send your completed articles if you want, but one of the downsides of that is you don't always know if it is going to be accepted, if there are other issues in the news cycle that might get in the way. So, what I would encourage anybody to do if they are thinking about writing a piece is get on the phone to an editor, have a conversation so that we can talk through what is happening in the news cycle, where the ideas are going, and the best way to creatively tackle telling a particular story.

So, just a little bit about us. Part of what we do is published direct, so we have an audience of about 8 million unique browsers on our website every month. Just by way of a comparison to give you a sense, the ABC gets about 4.5 million but that is a slightly different measure, it is only an Australian audience and that 8 million is our global audience. So, I would say that the ABCs



audience probably overall is still in Australia is slightly larger than ours, but our audience is considerable. It would be bigger than The Age website for example. It has actually got quite a big direct audience. But additionally, what we do is we magnify that through republication. So, we get around about 35 to 40 million reads per month, through republication and that is everything from the New York Times, The Washington Post to the Sydney Morning Herald. We actually have a full-time editor whose job it is to make sure that the stories that we publish are republished by other media outlets.

A big part of what we do is seeding the media. So, if Fukushima happens and we get an academic to write on how radiation affects the human body, that person will then spend a large period of time over the next week doing interviews on TV and radio, because what they have basically done is put up their hand and said, "I know about this topic and I am prepared to be a spokesperson that can inform your reporting on it". The Conversation is very well read by other media outlets. So, it is a very good way if you have got an idea, that can engage with an ongoing issue, of launching yourself into that media ecosystem. Sometimes you have got a narrow window of time, so you might have a few hours or a few days because the media can move on very quickly, other time, you have got a longer period of time.

Actually, I was interested, Lyndal, in the example you gave about the cancer research because one of the editorial products that we worked on that had the longest lead time was an infographic which showed how different lifestyle factors like smoking or obesity impacted your risk of cancer in certain parts of your body. We worked with an oncologist on that and we basically developed this product where you could click on different organs. You could work out your lifetime risk of contracting a certain type of cancer and you could work out how doing things like eating red meat would change that risk. The reason we did that was precisely because we noticed as editors, we were reading stories everyday in the newspaper saying "eating salami doubles your risk of colon cancer", and we were thinking "well, what does that mean?". If your risk is 0.0001% doubling it doesn't mean anything much anyway and it is impossible to actually make sense of this information that the media is giving us. So, let's try to produce a product that puts it all into context.

So, sometimes we work with academics on really long big projects, that will take a lot of back and forth. Other times, it is really quick. It is just about having an idea, it is about something that was in the news and getting it out straightaway. Just the other point that really was worth noting is again, we're really focused on public interest journals and so we see our role as both working with and serving academics, but also trying to inform public discourse in a way that is useful. I am not going to spend too much time on this because I want to race through.

Again, this gives you the figures. More than 80% of our readers are non-academics, I think that is important to note. I think a lot of people within academia see us as an academic website and certainly, it is true that if you are an expert in a particular field and you publish an article in The Conversation, other people in that field, both in Australia and globally, we have got teams in the US, UK, Africa, France, Canada, Indonesia, New Zealand; all those people will see your work, so you can speak to an intentional audience of your peers by publishing in The Conversation but



predominately what we're trying to do is communicate with the broad public. You have probably talked a lot today about impact, engagement and I am not going to go too much further on those words because I know you have heard a lot about them, other than to say that we see what we do as providing a path to engagement and impact, and we do our best to measure those things and give you tools to report, particularly on your engagement. The impact is a little bit harder to report on, but we are doing what we can there.

Again, you are probably quite aware of these things, so I won't talk in too much detail about some of the things RC identifies as types of impact. What I will do is point you briefly to the author dashboard. So every time an academic author publishes a story on The Conversation, they get data about how many times it has been read, what country it has been read in, who the republishers are and who has commented and who has Tweeted. The idea is to give you a command centre, so you can engage with your audiences, so you can respond to their comments, so you can help build an audience and a following for some of the work that you have done. It's not for everybody, but it is a really useful tool.

The other thing just to mention here that makes working with The Conversation different to other media outlets is everything that you publish, you have final signoff on. So, we have an interactive publishing platform and part of the reason we exist is to try to put quality information in the public sphere that won't misquote or distort or misrepresent the work of academics. So, we have actually designed systems to basically put you in charge of your publishing and this is part of it, but the other part is that nothing can be published until you press a button saying that you are happy with the final version.

These are just some examples of engagement and impact. So, impact comes in all sorts of shapes and sizes, I guess, the quintessential example people talk about its influencing government policy, but there are also examples of international influence. We have had academics who've been asked to give evidence to international bodies, changing policies, publishing books. We have had academics that have written articles that have turned into TV series. All these things can flow on from initial publication. I will give you a moment to have a quick look at some of these. These are other examples of some of the things that we collect that flow on from publishing with us. So, we're talking about things like invitations for public speaking, collaborations in Japan, work being republished by the United Nations Office of Disaster Risk Reduction.

It is very, very hard to provide quantitative data on impact, but the qualitative data we get from academics is very, very strong. These are just more examples from academics, we have tried to cull this so there is not too many, but of what has happened after publishing with The Conversation in terms of follow up. So, this led to a full publication deal. This is another thing that we actually notice, which is that a lot of our readers have .gov.au website addresses. The Conversation is very well read by government advisors, by policy makers, by bureaucrats, so if you are in an area where your research will impact on public policy, it is a good way of talking to decision makers. We have actually found a pretty good depth of readership, of things being picked up.



So, hopefully, I don't need to convince you with the benefits of the public communication. This is just another example of what has happened to an academic's career, partly by virtue of some of the public communication work she has done. I think this is another interesting point which is that when you publish online, your article can have a long tail. It can continue to be found and referenced and there are actually times sometimes when issues that you have might have written on will come back into the news cycle, and our editors will work to make sure that they then reinject the content appropriately into the discussion, so it can form and provide valuable, useful information to inform the public discussion.

This is just an example of some of the potential career benefits. The last thing I just want to touch on before we go to a discussion is the benefits of working with editors. Our model; one of the key strengths is pairing up professional editors with professional academics who bring vast knowledge and expertise. But we hope that our editors can also bring some expertise in terms of the way that you communicate an idea and the way you hold a reader's attention, the way you creatively develop and frame a story to get the maximum audience and we think there is a real power in that relationship and that collaboration and that includes not just us helping you achieve the maximum audience for your ideas, but us also helping you develop skills in terms of ways of thinking about framing ideas to inject them into public discourse.

We have found that some academics that work with us over time get quite good at this and start to develop and think about story ideas in very journalistic ways that can also increase their reach and impact and profile. And also, hopefully, some of the editing process which is often quite a detailed back and forth process, can help people hone the clarity of their writing. We think we provide a value in that way. I am going to finish there just so we can have a panel discussion.