

JOURNAL OF NAVAL ENGINEERING - READER SURVEY

The UK Ministry of Defence tasked BMT Defence Services to undertake much of the production and editorial functions for the Journal of Naval Engineering.

BMT Defence Services Ltd is delighted to be able to assist in the production of the JNE which has a strong tradition and a long successful history. Most notably it has always been produced specifically for naval engineers with many of the articles being written by serving officers and it has an enviable brand in its field. However the MoD has asked that BMT develop a strategy for its future development and, naturally, this change in editorial responsibility is a perfect opportunity to review the style, content and delivery of the JNE.

There are many options that needed to be considered for the future of the JNE including: retention or change of the current format, consideration for on-line publication (with or without the hard copy) and changes to the content and style of the publication.

The feasibility of reducing the classification to UNCLASSIFIED was also investigated as was provision of a searchable database of past editions and papers.

However the overriding necessity is that any change should only be made in response to the needs and wishes of the Journal's readers.

As part of BMT Defence Services' process of understanding how best to develop the JNE, a short questionnaire was forwarded to serving engineering officers to gain their views.

A total of 156 questionnaires were sent out and even though only 26 were returned it allowed a consensus to be formed. The readership in general called to maintain the status quo responding to the questions as follows:

QUESTION	YES/NO	COMMENTS
1. Do you want production of the JNE to continue?	YES = 25	Provides valuable insight into progress of applied research. It is well received by all WE/ME staff. Is there scope to merge with RNE?
	NO = 1	Insufficient activity in Engineering Dev by RN Staff to support 2 separate publications.

QUESTION	YES/NO	COMMENTS
2. Are you content with the range of articles within the JNE?	YES = 26	<p>Encouragement of broader range of contributors welcome.</p> <p>Some worthwhile Articles in the past.</p> <p>I feel there is a need for a more 'academic' style of articles than is covered in other publications e.g. RNE.</p>
3. Is there a subject area, currently missing, you would like covered?	YES = 8	<p>Repair projects, near misses etc. should be included.</p> <p>Commercial technology breakthroughs particularly IT and IS.</p> <p>Project Management.</p> <p>More Modern and future NBCD equipment.</p> <p>RFA issues (difficult to be more specific here, except to say that there should be more reference to RFA platforms in some respects).</p> <p>As a regular feature, reprint all or part of an interesting article from a past edition.</p> <p>Wider exposure to commercial and other navies' practice would be beneficial. Link with BMT may help this.</p> <p>Greater coverage of topics such as emerging technology in the civil sector that has application in the military environment.</p>
	NO = 17	No comments.
		1 = Gave no answer.
4. Would you like the classification to be reduced to UNCLASSIFIED?	YES = 15	<p>Widen the opportunity for new articles.</p> <p>I suspect there would be very little difference in the content of the articles.</p> <p>Would enable a broader distribution and would enhance the reputation of RN Engineering in the wider world.</p>

QUESTION	YES/NO	COMMENTS
		Being classified does cause a few issues although if the quantity is reduced to enable UNCLASSIFIED publication. I would NOT support it.
	NO = 8	Only if this did not significantly restrict the range and depth of articles published.
	3 = Gave no answer.	
5. Do you want the book reviews to continue?	YES = 17	No comments.
	NO = 7	Not required, can reduce size of publication.
	2 = Gave no answer.	
6. Are you content with the style of the JNE?	YES = 19	It is easy to stow on board and follows the format of other professional journals.
	NO = 6	Expensive to produce and difficult to reproduce for training purposes. Too many technical Papers from Conference Proceedings reprinted. A more 'handy' approach, smaller size. It could be brought a little more up to date. Needs to modernise to become appealing. The style is fairly dated and would benefit from review, although not at the expense of quality.
	1 = Gave no answer.	
7. Would you support change to a more standard format such as A4 of A5? If so which?	YES = 18	A4 with four holes drilled for storage in binders. A4. x 8. A5 x 4. A5 more in keeping with an 'academic' style. Whatever is most cost effective.

QUESTION	YES/NO	COMMENTS
		<p>Yes if this reduced production costs without detriment to presentation.</p> <p>A4 is probably more universal and sometimes easier to read. The diagrams could then be bigger and therefore easier to view.</p>
	NO = 6	It is easy to stow on board and follows the format of other professional journals.
	2 = Gave no answer.	
8. How would you like delivery?	Hard Copy = 4	There is so much on the web (not always available on board ship). It is not easy to read such papers on a laptop in the confines of a shipboard environment.
	Soft Copy = 6	<p>Not all vessels/users have the connectivity to use web.</p> <p>Web not easily accessible on a small ship.</p> <p>I rarely see JNE as distribution is very hit and miss. Availability in soft-copy would ensure distribution to all.</p>
	Both = 16	<p>To enable all dept members to have access.</p> <p>Hard copies useful for reading away from the office and in depth study.</p> <p>But if soft copy delivery only would aid its 'survival' then that would be acceptable.</p> <p>My view is that hard copy is preferable for initial reading but the ability to access a soft archive version would be useful.</p>
OTHER COMMENTS		
Keep up the good work – it is an excellent publication in my opinion, although I think a few tweaks would make it feel a bit more up to date. Hope the editing is going well.		