ACADEMIC PUBLISHING SUPPORT CURRICULUM: CONTENT OUTLINE AND PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM ACCEPTANCE

By

Eric T. Brey

A Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree
With a Major in

Hospitality and Tourism

Approved: 6 Semester Credits

Amy L. Gillett
Thesis Advisor

Thesis Committee Members:

The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin-Stout
September, 2003

The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, WI 54751

ABSTRACT

Brey (Last Name) Eric (First Name) T. (Initial)

ACADEMIC PUBLISHING SUPPORT CURRICULUM: CONTENT OUTLINE AND PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM ACCEPTANCE
(Title)

Hospitality and Tourism (Graduate Major) | Dr. Amy Gillett (Research Advisor) | September, 2003 (Month/Year) | 160 (Pages)

American Psychological Association (APA) Publication Manual
(Name of Manual Used in Study)

The purpose of this study was to take a closer look at the current road block that graduate students have when looking to publish their completed research. By obtaining thoughts and opinions from key members of the University of Wisconsin-Stout academic community, this research looked to uncover the basis of a curriculum offering that would assist graduate students publish. The research also looked into uncovering thoughts and opinions of graduate faculty and students towards the proposed curriculum solution along with their direct input into the construction of the outline.

By distributing surveys in the spring of 2003 to the graduate faculty and students the researcher was able to uncover that both groups saw promise in an offering such as the Publishing Support Curriculum. Both groups of respondents thought an electronic/traditional instruction combination would work best for this type of offering and student interest would only decrease if they were charged additional fees that they are

required to pay. Besides graduate students being direct beneficiaries of this type of offering, respondents believed there to be other indirect benefits at the University of Wisconsin-Stout.

Due in part to the understanding brought about by the research, an outline of the proposed curriculum offering has been generated. Information pertaining to funding of the curriculum development and perpetuation is debated. The far reaching effects of this project along with curriculum development suggestions and recommendations for further research are also discussed.

Keywords: Academic publishing, student publishing, curriculum, University of Wisconsin-Stout, graduate students

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Over the past few months, there have been many people who have been extremely supportive of me through the trials and tribulations associated with the thesis process. The first and foremost were my thesis committee members, Dr. Amy Gillett, Dr. Jafar Jafari, and Dr. Julie Furst-Bowe. Without these individuals working with me and prompting me throughout this process, my research would have never been completed!

Next, I would like to thank key members of the Department of Hospitality and Tourism who have assisted in the development of my professional and personal skills. They have not only taught me much of what I know about Hospitality and Tourism, but they have opened my eyes to this vast industry and to reach for the stars as I start my career away from Stout. Thank you Dr. Joseph Holland, Mr. Robert Davies, Dr. Ted Harris, Dr. James Buergermeister, Dr. Sharon Giroux, Dr. Charles Metelka, Mr. Phil McGuirk, and Mr. Peter D'Souza for all that you have given me over the years.

Finally, thank you to my parents, Duane and Paula Brey, for having a never ending faith in me and pushing me to do the best that I can. Without your support I could never have accomplished what I have. Thank you Mom and Dad!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

In every graduate student's life there is a period of time that one becomes a "book worm" where daily life is filled with research, writing, and the continuous headaches brought on by the completion of a thesis, field problem, or extensive research project. While many student's see this time of intensive research as an obstacle to graduation and only want to "get it done and over with," there are those graduate students who want to capitalize on the research experience and build upon their marketability through learning and extracurricular experiences.

While the theory of "get it done and over with" may hold true for the majority of students at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, there is a presence within the student body who want to not only complete a quality thesis project, but display qualities of topic expertise, perseverance, intelligence, creativity, willingness to work hard, ability to think logically, and ambition; assets that are displayed by publishing (Maddux, 1996a). Even though writing is a time-consuming and an emotionally complex process (Boice, 1994), writing is learning, whether or not accepted and doing research is educational all in itself (Gebhardt, 1995). Because of these benefits that publishing offers, the researcher was driven to uncover not only the University of Wisconsin-Stout's overall perception of student publishing and research but supply a program outline that could give the university the basis to supply guidance necessary for academic publishing.

University of Wisconsin-Stout Graduate School

In 1891, The University of Wisconsin-Stout was founded by James Huff Stout to provide manual domestic science education. Since it's founding, UW-Stout has looked to provide leadership in national and international business and industry. The Graduate School is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and covers the fields of applied psychology, education, food and nutritional sciences, guidance and counseling, home economics, hospitality and tourism management, industrial and technology education, management technology, marriage and family therapy, mental health counseling, risk control, school psychology, training and development, vocational and technical education, and vocational rehabilitation. Over the past three years, graduate student numbers have fluctuated with the greatest number of students actively enrolled in the 2002 fall semester with a total enrollment of 586 students (University of Wisconsin-Stout; Budget, Planning & Analysis, 2003).

Research requirements for graduate students vary from program to program and concentrate on a Plan A thesis, Plan B thesis, and field problems or projects. For both thesis options, the purpose of the research is to apply appropriate research methodology and analysis. The research should follow proper procedures as identified by the Graduate School and be supervised by a thesis committee (Plan A) or an individual project overseer (Plan B or field project) (University of Wisconsin Stout, 2002).

Journal of Student Research

The Journal of Student Research, while being founded only two years ago, has evolved into the only academic journal in the University of Wisconsin System to be published both hard copy and electronically. The *Journal* is for both undergraduate and

graduate students and for an explanation relating the *Journal*, Eric Brey, former editor-in-chief states (as quoted under Brey, 2003):

At the University of Wisconsin Stout, a pioneering instrument for research dissemination has been devised ... the *Journal of Student Research*: where students can publicize and receive recognition for their research in both electronic and bound copy formats. The University of Wisconsin-Stout has been a proponent of research and the *Journal of Student Research* supplies students an opportunity to display this research. From discussing the Detection of Methanotropic Bacteria by DNA to reconstructing the Low Temperature Differential Sterling Engine, the *Journal of Student Research* is a promotion vehicle that encompasses all of the different disciplines that are being studied at this campus...

This section of abstract takes a closer look at what the *Journal of Student Research* has accomplished and is striving for to promote student publishing on the University of Wisconsin-Stout campus.

Publishing Directive at the University of Wisconsin-Stout

Even though Kaplan describes publishing as the accidental profession (1998, p. 6), over the past several years, student research and the publishing of student research has come to the forefront of many administrators' and faculty members' attention on the University of Wisconsin-Stout campus. This support is not only demonstrated through the overall campus support of the *Journal of Student Research* but as the cultural persona of the university has been changing to encourage more research across the entire spectrum (R. Meyer, personal communication, March 21, 2003). According to University of Wisconsin-Stout's Provost Robert Sedlak, UW-Stout can "no longer call

itself just a teaching institution ...that doesn't do research, this has been said for a long time [because] the fact that research on campus has just not been acknowledged" (personal communication, March 17, 2003). This re-concentration on research as an independent enterprise will only lead to the increased significance of student publication in academic venues. Sue Foxwell, University of Wisconsin-Stout's Research Administrator, sees necessity in student publishing because "without (publishing) the student does not experience the full scope of doing research. It is essential, even if takes longer than the enrollment period and beyond graduation" (personal communication, April 10, 2003). Charles Sorenson, Chancellor at UW-Stout, agrees that student publication is an advantage to student's as they continue with graduate studies or even out into the work force (personal communication, March 17, 2003).

With such overall support and directives on the importance of student publishing, a pertinent question to ask is, "How many graduate students, if any, are pursuing publication in academic journals?" Exact numbers on the graduate student population pursuing publication were not attainable due to the lack of consistent cataloging of student publication in each academic discipline. Using the *Journal of Student Research* as a cross referencing tool, the trend is that very few graduate students are attempting to publish their research in this particular medium. Over the previous two academic years, an average of 241 graduate students have submitted final research projects for graduation in the various programs that the University of Wisconsin-Stout offers, and an average of 7 per year or 3% of graduating graduate students attempted to publish. While these numbers could have multiple variants as to why or why not students are submitting to the

Journal of Student Research, an opportunity such as this within the university structure is not being utilized to its full potential.

Another pertinent question to ask is, "If students are interested in publishing what type of support is there for students?" Besides one-on-one mentoring of graduate students, only 1 independent study course was revealed to be offered at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. While the publishing numbers for actively participating students are absent, the question of why students are not taking advantage of the resources present at the University of Wisconsin-Stout is a significant question considering the overall interest of graduate students. In a recent survey, 63% of graduate students said that they would be interested in submitting an article for publication to the Journal of Student Research if there was a program available to them presenting the basics of academic publishing.

As Morgan, Harmon, and Gliner (2001, p. 1476) stated; "the research process is not complete until the results are disseminated to the public and to interested researchers." If research truly has not reached completion until dissemination, the University of Wisconsin-Stout up until this point has not been fulfilling its duty to the graduate students on campus by not supplying them ALL the tools needed to succeed as a UW-Stout graduate. Graduate students at this university have an interest in publishing and even with the financial difficulties of the current University System (University of Wisconsin Stout, Addressing the University of Wisconsin Budget Crisis, n.d.); Stout has the available resources through the Student Research Fund to produce this needed assistance for students who wish to "reveal their level of thinking, stage of sophistication,

ability to clearly communicate and knowledge of their topic that publishing lends itself to" (Baldwin & Chandler, 2002, p. 8).

The following quote from Jackson, Nelson, Heggins, Baatz, and Schuh discussed what may be additional reasoning behind the lack of student publication at the University of Wisconsin-Stout (1999): "While (academic) professionals may assume that graduate students understand the significance of writing for publication, teaching graduate students the nuts and bolts of the writing process remains curiously absent from typical graduate school training in many fields." While this type of training may be lacking in many of the disciplines taught at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, the research conducted looked to provide a basis that can be built upon to give graduate students the extra edge when graduating from any of the multiple of graduate programs at the University of Wisconsin-Stout.

Statement of the Problem

For those students at the University of Wisconsin Stout who want to contribute to their particular field of study by publishing in an academic journal, there is a road block that cannot be moved single handedly by the student. This research concentrated on removing the road block by revealing the basics of academic publishing through a literature review that represented the multitude of disciplines at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, utilizing information that spans four decades (as information on publishing written 40 years ago still holds true to this day).

Quantitative data has been collected over the 2002-2003 spring semester from a cross-section sampling of graduate students on their perceptions of what this type of program could offer, as well as their perceived involvement of the University of

Wisconsin-Stout's graduate student population in a program offering such as this. This research also looked to glean additional information from the graduate faculty over the same time period as to their opinions of a program such as the publishing support curriculum through a survey consisting of quantitative and qualitative questions. This information, after tabulation, has helped lay the foundation for the publishing support curriculum outline and will show the type of support that the University of Wisconsin-Stout community shows towards students publishing in academic journals.

Research Questions

During the course of this study, the research concentrated on answering the three following questions:

1. What content should be included in the publishing support curriculum program offering?

2. What are the perceptions of graduate student and faculty at the University of Wisconsin-Stout towards the proposed program offering and the perceived level of participation?

3. What are the University of Wisconsin-Stout's graduate faculty and student's opinion on the format and course outline for the proposed publishing support curriculum?

Definition of Terms

When it comes to publishing in academic journals, there are some terminologies and jargon phrases that a lay person may not have familiarity with. Most terms used in discussing academic publishing are common phrases used in everyday conversation and these terms will be exempt from this listing unless they are used with an alternative

meaning as commonly understood. The definitions for the following terms will be assumed throughout this entire document:

Academia (Academe) – Term that represents the academic environment or world; a place where instruction is given to students (Academe, 2002). For the purpose of this research, this word will be used to identify the multiple aspects of scholarly life and professional development as related to publishing. This term will be used to identify the academic structure as a whole.

Academic Journal – The purpose of such a journal is to supply quantitative and qualitative information that can be used by those in each specified discipline. Academic journals are usually peer, blind reviewed publications and rely heavily upon volunteers from the academic community for success. Those authors who supply articles to this type of journal are typically academicians and are not looking for additional profitability but are looking to make public their research findings and experiments.

Anonymous Review – This type of review is used by academic journals to ensure that the author is unaware of who is reviewing their manuscript. This is part of the blind review concept and ensures that article appearing in academic journals is unbiased judged for their content and impact on the discipline alone.

Blind Reviewed Journal – Academic journal where the identity of the author is unknown to the reviewer. In this format the author does not know the identity of the article reviewers (Mortimer, 2001). To ensure that an article is truly being blind reviewer, the author must make sure that all identifiers must be removed from the writing and from the reference lists (referrals to intimate knowledge or first person referrals) (Mortimer, 2001).

Busch League – When a person is referred to as belonging in the "busch league" they are to be considered a lesser adversary, not a professional. Term used to describe an individual who is attempting to participate at a higher level than which they are ready.

Copyeditor – Upon acceptance of an article, this is the individual who receives the manuscript and makes grammatical and format changes. Some of the changes typically made by this editor is applying active voice to replace passive voice, making consistent authors use of terms, spelling and verb tense, eliminating typographical errors, repetition of word choice, removing extra verbiage, ensuring information in citations is concise and relevant to corresponding textual material (Mortimer, 2001).

Conceptual Framework – Is derived from the theoretical analysis and assists in giving a visual summary of concepts and their relationships (Glatthorn, 2002).

Curriculum - Terminology that is understood as all the courses of study offered by an education institution, a group of related courses, often in a special field of study: i.e. hospitality and tourism curriculum (Curriculum, 2002). The term is utilized for improved explanation of the academic content in the proposed publishing support program offering.

Exclusive Consideration – Where editors can readily assume that the manuscript they are reviewing has only been submitted to their journal and is not being considered for publication in another journal (Luey, 1996).

Ghost Authorship – Denying authorship credits to those persons who were involved in the writing process. The practice of ghost authorship usually occurs to

graduate students who have played a significant role in the article's research and are denied proper credit.

Honorary Authorship – Giving authorship credits to persons not actually involved in the writing process.

Managing Editor - Paid professional and is not directly involved with the article review and accepting process. This editor usually relieves the academic editor of all clerical/administrative duties once the article has been accepted and deals strictly with the actual, physical publishing process (Day, 1998).

Refereed Journal – The refereeing aspect of the journal directly correlates to the manner in which article are chosen for publications. In this type of journal, articles undergo intense scrutiny by academicians to qualify their publishability. This type of journal has been a long standing source of publishing research findings in every academic discipline.

Syntax – The arrangement and relationship of words and phrases to make sentence meaning (Baldwin & Chandler, 2002)

Theoretical Analysis – Delineation of the theory that provided a basis for the research or study. A sound theory provides a strong background, suggests areas that need further investigation, and helps with the organization of literature review (Glatthorn, 2002).

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study, there are several assumptions taken into effect and acknowledged by the researcher. They are as follows:

1. The information obtained from the graduate students and graduate faculty through the administered survey is explicitly germane to primarily teaching universities in the University of Wisconsin System and to the University of Wisconsin-Stout in particular.

2. The graduate faculty survey participants are from varied university backgrounds and positions. Faculty members along with administration personnel were included in the survey as identified by the Graduate School as members of the UW-Stout Community who have been validated as being able to facilitate graduate student learning.

3. Data collected through the graduate student surveys represent a large cross-section of the graduate student population. This particular sampling had a wide-array of typical and non-typical students with representatives from most of the graduate programs on campus.

4. Each academic discipline has its own formats for publishing. This research concentrated on the overall views of academic publishing from many of the represented disciplines that are taught at Stout.

Limitations

There were several limitations that need to be made mention of to accurately discuss the completed research. These limitations are identified as:

1. The information pertaining to the graduate students and faculty members of Stout are specifically germane to this "teaching" orientated university and its culture. Any application to universities that are widely considered research institutions or located outside of the University of Wisconsin System has its restrictions.

2. Because this research looks into academic publishing across a broad spectrum of disciplines, publishing idiosyncrasies relevant to each major could not be discussed in full detail, limiting the overall ability of the research to accommodate one specific major.

3. Time and financial constraints played a role in the overall access to materials and facilities that could have been utilized to complement this research. These inadequacies did not affect the quality of research but influenced the depth and breadth that could be covered in each of the corresponding sections of the academic publishing program overview.

4. The validity and reliability of the instrument and interview questions utilized for gathering information from all of the participants is untested.

CHAPTER TWO

Introduction

The University of Wisconsin-Stout, which is known as a classical teaching university, could benefit immensely from students publishing in academic journals. According to the Dean of the College of Human Development John Wesolek, "I believe a gradate student that is required to publish or present their work in a professional journal...would add a significant measure of research experience and development to their thesis writing" (personal communication, April 12, 2003). With the interest in publication growing on the University of Wisconsin-Stout campus, there is a significant piece missing for students to have access to assist them with this goal; a formal curriculum program showing the introductory aspects of how to publish. This study was unprecedented at the University of Wisconsin-Stout and looked to increase the knowledge base on academic publishing for the UW-Stout community.

Information concerning topics that were relevant to pre-writing activities of an article was covered initially, followed by information that looks directly at the different aspects of actual article writing process. Finally, the literature review covered post-writing activities. While the research concentrated on these three general areas of academic publishing, the literature presented in this chapter corresponds to a multiple of disciplines, ensuring that information presented covers the broad spectrum of offerings at the University of Wisconsin-Stout.

Pre-Writing Section

Publishing History and Culture

In 1665 the first academic journal to be published was the *Journal de Scavans*, which appeared in Paris and was closely followed by the unveiling of the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society of England (Meadows, cited in McKnight & Price, 1999). Since the academic journals humble beginning over 300 years ago, it is estimated that today there to be well over 100,000 academic journals that offer authors a medium to publish their research results (Meadow, cited in McKnight & Price, 1999). This enormous expansion of publishing outlets is a phenomenon that can be explained in several different ways.

The cliché of publish or perish in academia is a driving force behind the growing numbers of academic outlets. The environment that has been created demands quantity of information and quantity of separate titles which produces a problem of overproduction and limits to actual topic applicability (Thomsen, 1994). Berardo offered some insight into this problem of mass production of published research (1993b, p. 69):

> Many faculties in today's academic environment are consciously pumping out a series of the kind of papers to which Huer refers, sometimes rehashing old ideas and old data, in order to meet the new demands. The result is growing mountains of publications that few will ever read and that contribute very little to

> the advancement of science. C. Wright Mills, of course, had a name for it-"raw empiricism."

With such large production of scientific research, the fact that science ranges so widely that one can hardly sign post its limits – from crocodile's eyelids to outer space, from genetics to ethics, the range of scientific matter can not be disputed as the amount of written knowledge continues to expand (Thompsen, 1994).

With the emphasis of article production seemingly increasing every year, those that write divergently with specific audiences in mind could potentially publish various aspects of their research in 3-4 journals (Jenkins, 2002). Keeping the "publish or perish" mandate in mind, publishing is not a relatively easy accomplishment. A scientific paper must at least accomplish one of the following goals if the custodians of a fields tradition, the editors and reviewer's, are to deem the information publishable (Natriello, 1996). A scientific paper must 1) convey the result of testing a hypothesis, 2) should record a number of original observations, 3) review the state of a particular scientific field, 4) or can prove of bolster some conclusion of theory (Thomsen, 1994, p. 509).

Following these general guidelines for writing doesn't guarantee a publishable article. Some specific disciplines are more difficult to publish in than others as better explained by their individual rejection rates. For example, physical sciences have the lowest rejection rate at only 24%, followed by the social sciences at 69% and finally the humanities where the rejection rate is 90% (McKnight & Price, 1999, p. 560). The difference in rejection rates is germane to each sub-category of science and is something to keep in mind when attempting to publish. Another aspect of future publication is to understand the type of journals that show positive bias towards replication studies and

those that prefer to publish new studies that have brand new results (Berardo, 1993a). Understanding the aspects of the history and culture of academic publishing is integral to the success of academic authors and allows for a better understanding of academic publishing.

Article Review Process Synopsis

For many, publishing is often steeped in secrecy and mystery, and is often a poorly understood part of academic life (Murphy, 1996). For others, publishing is nothing more than a process that must be followed, a simple outline allowing for ease in information distribution. This process, however viewed, has not undergone significant changes except for the added emphasis on quantification, larger data set usage, growth in data banks and retrieval systems (Berardo, 1993b).

Before establishing where manuscript information needs to be sent, the difference in editors should be explained. When an article in first submitted for review, the manuscript packet should be sent to the editor and not the managing editor. The editor, or editor-in-chief's primary responsibilities are to decide whether or not to accept or reject the manuscripts, decides upon whom the article reviewers should be and other related academic items and is usually a high standing member in academia and a volunteer in this position (Day, 1998). The managing editor is a paid professional and in contrast, is not directly involved with the article review and accepting process. This editor usually relieves the academic editor of all clerical/administrative duties once the article has been accepted and deals strictly with the actual, physical publishing process (Day, 1998).

Upon receiving the manuscript packet from the submitting author, the editor looks initially at the submission to make sure that basic submission guidelines have been met including; the proper number of copies submitted (anywhere from 2-5 copies depending upon the journal and editors preferences), proper formatting of the submission, and examination of the article for quality and substance (Ross & Morrison, 1993; Lederman & Niess, 1999). Upon completion of the initial review, the editor will communicate with the author that the office has received the submission and that it is being sent out for review or is being returned because one or more qualities for submission have not been met (Mortimer, 2001). Article rejections can be avoided at this introductory stage through initial research of what each journal looks for in submissions (Mortimer, 2001).

During this initial phase, the review process may be delayed due to circumstances out of the editor's control, including an editor's workload, which slows down the initial screening and assignment of initial reviewers (Natriello, 1996; Mortimer, 2001). Because of these extraneous reasons, journals request that if the author would like immediate notification of manuscript delivery that they include in the manuscript packet a self-addressed stamped envelope or postcard that can be sent out immediately upon manuscript arrival in the editor's office (Thyer, 1994).

Before the initial review process, the editor will assign the manuscript an identification number to make communications between the editor/author and editor/reviewer easier and to ensure anonymity during the double blind review process that most academic journals adhere to (Ross & Morrison, 1993). This identification number should and will appear on all correspondence regarding the manuscript (Mortimer, 2001).

The next step is when the editor selects which reviewers will be asked to critique the article submission (Lederman & Niess, 1999). Once the editor has identified those reviewers (anywhere from 2-4 separate reviewers) who he/she deems knowledgeable in that field, the reviewers are contacted on their availability to review the article (Lederman & Niess; Ross & Morrison, 1993). When deciding upon who should review the article, the editor may look at two specific reviewer criteria including, 1) having the needed experience in the particular area and 2) the ability to make quality recommendations concerning the submitted article (Ross & Morrison, 1993; Mortimer, 2001). This is where the second delay may occur in the review process. If the contacted reviewers are unable to complete the review they may decline so new reviewers will have to be identified and contacted as to their availability, extending the review process timeline (Natriello, 1996; Mortimer, 2001).

Upon receipt of the manuscript that they have been asked to review, each reviewer will read and critique the manuscript based on a set of individual guidelines established by the journal (Lederman & Niess, 1999). Even though the journal may have a set of review guidelines, reviewers may not always give the same priority to various criteria (Berardo, 1993a). Several studies have been done on what reviewers see as the most important part of an article and these studies have shown that referee's disagree on the manuscript review process (Hargens, 1988). This disagreement may be one of the contributing factors why some articles are accepted by one journal and rejected by another.

While each journal has their own set of specific review guidelines and each reviewer places their own emphasis on different aspects of the review process to confuse

an author, Cantor established a list of 8 general criteria could be used as a general marker for authors to review as a general clarifier for the confusion. The list includes: (Cantor, 1993):

1) The article must hold significance to the author's field or discipline.
2) There must be comprehensiveness to the literature review.
3) Adequacy of attention must be given to conceptual research methodology.
4) Care must be taken in developing the research questions or hypothesis.
5) The research must adhere to rigorous standards germane to the discipline.
6) Care must be taken in drawing and supporting conclusions.
7) There must be clear organization to the manuscript layout.
8) Contribution made to the field of inquiry.

While Cantor establishes these as "basics" for article review, it must be noted that each discipline is different in what they deem more important and to be successful these idiosyncrasies of each discipline must be noted and followed each time the author submits an article to a different journal (Cantor, 1993).

Reviewers, while usually volunteers that make their own schedule, most academic journals have a specific timeline by which the reviewers need to complete their review by (Lederman & Niess, 1999). Most journals have a timeline that gives the reviewers anywhere from one month to three months to complete the review (Lederman & Niess, 1999; Mortimer, 2001). This timeline, while not set in stone and is at times difficult to follow because of busy schedules, is an additional reason why the review process may be extended or take longer than the author would like (Mortimer, 2001; Natriello, 1996).

While the article is in the hands of the reviewer there are certain "unwritten" and written rules that the reviewers must follow while reviewing the manuscript. According to the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), duty of confidentiality must be maintained by the reviewers (Hulten & Winslet, 2000). No use should come from any data, arguments, or interpretations obtained in the article without the author's written consent. Hulten & Winslet also discusses that reviewers should in the same respect provide accurate and unbiased, justifiable reports at all times so as not to mislead an author on the importance or validity of their accomplished research (2000).

Even though COPE has established these guidelines for efficient and ethical reviews of articles, there are practices found throughout academic publishing that are "less than desirable". According to Maddux, there have been reports that reviewers have recommended incorrect statistical treatments or suggestions that were wrong in other ways to mislead the author (1996b). There have also been instances where articles have been submitted, the reviewers had given there remarks, and it could be seen that they had never read the article (Maddux, 1996b). These unfortunate instances paired with the fact young scholars must start out somewhere and review boards may be dominated by inexperienced writers at the beginning of their career may be cause for incorrect article reviews. To add to this points, well known reviewers may "farm-out" their reviews to graduate students to give them the needed experience (Maddux, 1996b), causing the overall effectiveness of reviews to be diluted at times.

Even with all these variables concerning reviewers and there role in the review process, the reviewers supply the editor with their decisions, helping to decide the fate of the article. When a reviewer returns a decision to the editor, they usually render one of

four different choices concerning the article (Mortimer, 2001, p.184). The first decision is acceptance where the article should be published in the journal basically as is. There is the conditional acceptance decision where the reviewer recommends that the article be published with additional needed revisions. The third choice is where the article is not accepted but the article author is encouraged to revise and resubmit the article. This happens when a reviewer finds merit in an article but the article needs massive revisions before it can be published in the journal. The final, and most common of decisions, is that of rejection. This decision is rendered when the reviewer feels that the article should be reworked and re-enters into the resubmission process from the beginning (Mortimer, 2001). While it may seem that reviewers are "heartless" towards authors and their prospects of getting published, the reviewer provides an important service and plays a vital role in the development of would-be authors. Reviewers save authors from mistakes of fact, poor logic, ignorance of sources, and other embarrassments. Referees are not there to only weed out the bad articles but are there to recognize the good ones (Luey, 1995).

With the majority of journals, when all of the reviewers supply a unanimous decision or acceptance/rejection of the article, the decisions rendered are usually accepted and followed by the editor (Lederman & Niess, 1999). While this happens only 40% of the time, the remaining 60% of the time when a non-unanimous decision is rendered, co-editors may assist in rendering the final decision or if the editor feels that he/she has the necessary knowledge about the articles topic, they render the final decision on the article (Lederman & Niess; Mortimer, 2001).

Upon reaching the final decision on an article the editor sends to the author of the article a copy of the editor's decision and a copy of the reviewer's comments to reinforce the overall decision (Lederman & Niess, 1999; Mortimer, 2001). If a decision of acceptance or conditional acceptance has been reached the author should then follow the reviewer's evaluations in preparing the final production version (more in-depth information will be supplied in the third section of the literature review) (Mortimer, 2001; Brouch, 1979). The author may also receive a letter in which the editor believes the subject matter has merit but where major reworking must be done to the article to make it suitable for publication (Mortimer, 2001; Brouch, 1979). Then there is the letter which states "Thanks but no thanks" to the article submission. When an author receives this kind of statement from an editor, it is better to move onto the next journal utilizing the information that has been gained from the reviewers of the previously submitted journal than to try and resubmit to that journal (Brouch, 1979).

When an author receives a letter that states "please revise and resubmit" or a letter that states "please resubmit with minor corrections" the author should resubmit as quickly as possible to the journal with corrections called for by the reviewers (more information will follow) (Smaby & Crews, 1998). When the resubmission takes place it is important to include a cover letter that discusses the changes that were made and those changes that were not made, helping the reviewers in the decision making process (Smaby & Crews, 1998).

After the revisions have been made and if they are satisfactory, the author is officially informed of the articles acceptance into publication (Lederman & Niess, 1999). When the author is informed of the articles acceptance, there is still along way to go

before actual publication. For some journals, when an article is accepted, the author may be asked to join the sponsoring association, buy or guarantee the sale of a certain number of journal copies, or may have to pay a set amount per page of the article that was accepted (Sikula, 1980). While this is not a widely practiced phenomenon, this is "perfectly professional and sometimes essential to finance the publication of a journal" (Sikula, 1980, p.99).

Now that the article has been accepted, the author is asked to prepare a final production version according to specific journal guidelines and publication procedures (Mortimer, 2001). Upon completion of the final production copy, this copy is then forwarded onto the copy editor where changes are made to the manuscript that follows the outlay of the journal. Some of the typical changes that the copyeditor makes to the manuscript includes: applying active voice to replace passive voice, making consistent authors use of terms, spelling and verb tense, eliminating typographical errors, repetition of word choice, removing extra verbiage, ensuring information in citations is concise and relevant to corresponding textual material (Mortimer, 2001).

Somewhere within this time frame, there is a contractual agreement formed between the journal and the article author (Mortimer, 2001). This agreement includes a scheduling letter along with the publishing date and volume, dates for completion (copyediting and page proofs) and a "consent to publish" form that the author must sign before the article can go into print. Once this consent to publish form has been signed the author has limited reproduction rights to their work unless they acknowledge the publication and the publisher of that particular work (Mortimer, 2001).

Upon completion of the copyediting process, the author has one last chance to look over the manuscript before it is sent to be typeset and placed into page proofs. This is the last chance that the author has to make modifications before he/she is charged a nominal fee for the changes; making this step very important to the author (Mortimer, 2001). After all members (editor, author, and copy editor) have agreed on the changes, the manuscript is sent off to become page proofs. These page proofs are exactly how the article will look in print and upon completion, the author will have one last chance to review these for typographical errors. Since these are professionally created, the journal absorbs all costs associated to errors and oversights that were caused on their part. If the author wants to make changes due of his own accord the author must then pay for the charges that are associated with those changes (Mortimer, 2001).

Once the page proofs are returned to the printing press company, they make changes to reflect the updates and then the staff confirms the corrections with the editorial staff and the author (Mortimer, 2001 & Lederman, Niess, 1999). Once the corrections have been made, the article goes into print with its corresponding journal edition. Usual author compensation is usually in the form of complimentary copies or off prints that are given to the author to use at his/her discretion (Mortimer, 2001).

While the final wrap-up for article publication may seem to go by quickly, the actual length of the publication process from article acceptance can be startling. The standard length from having an article accepted before it is seen in print can be anywhere from 1 to 1 ½ years (Mortimer, 2001). Several reasons that effect the turn around rates of article publication include page number limits, space allocations and other physical constraints of the like (Mortimer, 2001). This overview of the review and publication

process is intended to supply a general synopsis of the typical journal submission process and is not meant in any way to describe one specific journal's procedures as they vary from one journal to another.

Journal Audience Selection

Before an author can select a journal to submit research to, the "would-be" author has to first familiarize himself/herself with the different journals in their field and which would be most appropriate to publish in. While the process of familiarization is lengthy and time consuming, becoming familiar with a journal is actually a time saving practice in the long run (Sikula, 1980). Not becoming familiar with a journal and its premises is the most common mistake made by authors (Henson, 2001), and this practice helps prevent authors from making wrong decisions about selection and should be completed before the writing process begins (Natriello, 1996).

When this mistake happens, there are three things that may happen to the submitted article including; a correspondence from the editor stating "article not suitable for this journal" (Day, 1998) (according to Thompson this is a way for reviewers to avoid reading the article if they can argue that it does not fit the journals scope (1995)). The article may receive poor/ineffective reviews because the journal's staff is not familiar with the research topics or they "just don't know" about the subject matter, or finally if the article is published it may receive limited exposure due to the lack of targeted industry professionals reading that particular work (Day, 1998).

When writing for an academic journal, matching writing style with the journals particular style plays an important role in the success or failure of articles being published. The best way to find out the style of each individual journal is to retrieve

multiple back issues and review them (Thompson, 1995; Ross, 1993; Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998). Carefully reading these previous editions will allow the author to understand the style of the journal and to utilize this style as a blueprint for the proposed article (Henson, December 1999).

Details including the range and scope of topics published, uses of primary resources, style, traditional method vs. fluid method, and approaches that contributors take in advancing arguments can all be deduced through reading articles that have been previously published in selected journals of interest (Mortimer, 2001 & Smaby & Crews, 1998; Natriello, 1996). Through reading these previously printed articles, the nuances of the articles actually assist in shaping the manuscript to fit the standards of a particular journal (Smaby & Crews, 1998). Besides these tidbits of information that can be gleaned through reading previous copies of the journal, guidelines are published regularly and give an author a basis from where to start the writing process (Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998).

Besides reviewing published articles for strictly style suggestions, there are several other pieces of knowledge located within each edition to help perspective authors. By studying key issues throughout the year (particularly the first and last editions) authors can deduce the type of articles that are being sought and what the editor/editorial staff found most valuable throughout the previous year (Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998). Reading the editorials allows the author a view into a crystal ball, scrying into the editor's mind to see what excites/bores the editor (Thompson, 1995; Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998). The editorial may also give direct statements of topical interest and discuss the type of work that would have the best chance of being published (Luey,

1996). While there is no substitution for carefully examining recent journal issues before submitting an article, consulting a book/review that summarizes the journal can be an excellent start as it helps the overall previewing process (Maddux, 1996).

Looking into a journal also allows an author to resolve problems or questions by not contacting the editor (which is a positive thing) (Thompson, 1995). For example, to ask an editor if an article is appropriate for the journal is something that is frowned upon due to the fact that the author should be able to deduce this answer themselves by reading previous journal editions (Natriello, 1996). If there are questions that remain unanswered and all avenues of approach have been expended, protocol insists upon contacting the editor for clarification as a last resort (Ross & Morrison, 1993; Natriello, 1996). If communication with the editor is deemed necessary, a short and to the point letter or email can be sent. This communication should include the subject of the article, why the author believes it suitable for the journal, why it is worth publishing and it should also include a physical description (Luey, 1995).

When selecting a journal to submit to, there is a multitude of factors that must be considered before the selection process can be considered complete. Initially an author should have more than just one appropriate journal in mind for the article that they are writing (Ross & Morrison, 1993; Henson, 2001; Walton, 1979; Thompson, 1995). The author, as a last opportunity, should also include one or lesser journals for further consideration (Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998). When selecting the group of journals to submit to, the article idea should dictate the choice of audience (Brouch, 1979), the intended audience should be considered (Cantor, 1993 & Brouch, 1979), the manner in which the manuscript is reviewed (refereed vs. non-refereed) needs to be taken into

consideration (Cantor, 1993; Henson, 2001), whether or not the reference styles are similar to eliminate major format changes between submissions (Henson, 2001), how visible the journals are that have been selected (Thompson, 1995), how the journals are viewed by peers in the relative disciplines (Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998), and the turnaround times of publication should all be taken into effect (Henson, 1999; Luey, 1996). Of the multiple turnaround times associated with academic publishing the three most important are, 1) the time the editor takes to respond to letters of inquiry, 2) the time it takes to evaluate the manuscript and make a publishing decision, 3) and the time it takes to publish a manuscript after acceptance (these times can vary from one month to two years) (Henson, 1999, p.783).

For developing authors or for those who are under time constraints to be published, the most important things to look at is the articles chances for success in being published (Cantor, 1993), the turnaround time of the publication process (Henson, 1999), and how the journals that have been selected are viewed by the disciplines practioners (Henson, December 1999). The journals audience is who you are attempting to appease and knowing who subscribes to the journal, the reasons they have for reading the journal, understanding the readers expectations, and the types of topics that they prefer will all be of assistance in deciding which journals to write for (Henson, December 1999).

One of the misconceptions for inexperienced authors is that all academic journals are the same and that the article topic is so important that the editor will "bend the rules" for them and adjust their manuscripts to meet the journals requirements (Henson, December 1999). New authors also have the misconception that journals with higher acceptance rates are of lower quality and that those journals with low acceptance rates are

the only high quality journals in which to be published (Henson, 1999), which is an incorrect assumption. Jenkins and Henson have different view points on where the new author should begin when it comes to submitting articles for publication. Henson (1999) believes that new authors should only submit to those journals that have higher than 25-30% acceptance rates while Jenkins beliefs are on the opposite end of the spectrum (Jenkins, 2002). Jenkins encourages new authors to start with more prestigious journals and work their way down to less prestigious journals simply for the advice and guidance that reviewers offer, making the author's writing that much better (Jenkins, 2002). The one thing to remember is that if prestigious journals don't want an article, authors can move their concentration to less prestigious national journals and finally to regional or state journals if need be (Jenkins, 2002). According to Sikula, regional/state journals are usually of good quality and are always looking for publishable articles (Sikula, 1980).

While academic publishing has its difficulties for authors without the variable of change added in, journal styles and preferences are very fluid and require an author to keep "up-to-date" on changes brought about by new editors, reviewers, and the natural refinements that are made to grow a journal in size and stature (Mortimer, 2001). When it comes to keeping abreast of changes to a journal, the author must consider publication lag time that is associated with changes that journals undertake. Publication lag time refers to the fact that authors may not see a change immediately (Thompson, 1995): the less frequently journals are published, the more publication lag time there is (Day, 1998).

According to Thyer (1994), there are 10 general questions that an author should ask himself/herself before selecting and submitting to a particular journal. These general questions are:

1) Is the journal suitable to the type of conducted research?

2) Does the journal use a peer, blind review process?

3) Is there a fee involved when publishing?

4) Will your article's abstract be featured in an abstracting service or listing?

5) Is there a citation index that keeps track of pertinent work?

6) Is the journal cited frequently or infrequently in other works of research?

7) What is the journals rejection rate?

8) How many subscribers does the journal have?

9) Does the journal treat potential authors professionally?

10) Is the journal prestigious?

While journals are always accepting general article submissions, most journals occasionally deal with one specific topic per journal edition, which are known as themed edition or articles. One key item when dealing with themed articles is to submit articles early on. Such specific articles almost never get published in any other edition except for the themed edition (their acceptance rate is below that of general article acceptance rate) (Henson, 1999). Editors receive 3 times more manuscripts for non-themed editions than for themed editions and submitting an article for themed editions, authors increase their chances for acceptance by 300% (Henson, 1999). When submitting an article for a themed edition, the evaluation process takes its normal course and if the information is seen as not appropriate for that particular themed edition, the editor usually places it in general circulation for later edition consideration (Mortimer, 2001).

When finding out the publishing date of when themed issue will be, there are different avenues of approach to uncover this information. The author can inquire from

the professional association that is affiliated with the journal what the theme will be and when it will appear which is usually done by contacting the publications committee of the association (Henson, 1999). Alternatively, by going through the particular association's yearbook, an author could locate the announcement of themes that are to be published a year or more in advance of the due date (Henson, 1999). Finally by contacting the editor, which is the least desirable approach due to the fact that editors are extremely busy, can an author receive an answer to such a question (Henson, 1999).

For new authors (and experienced authors) to academic publishing an additional resource, the reference librarian, can be used to help with journal selection (Luey, 1996). The reference librarian can be excellent source of information since librarians deal with journals on a constant basis, they may not be as intimidating as senior academicians, and can assist in the process of selecting quality journals to submit a manuscript (Luey, 1996). Selecting the right journal and audience can be a very daunting task indeed and help from any available sources can be a very welcomed respite from the rigors of attempting to be published.

Ethics, Values & Integrity

When thinking about ethics and values concerning writing, a person's first thought usually gravitates towards plagiarism as the most common offence. While plagiarism is primarily seen as the stealing of intellectual property by using another's words, data, or ideas without proper recognition or credit (Morgan, Harmon, & Gliner, 2001; Iammarino et al, 1989), plagiarism can include rewriting of information from one language to another one (Hulten & Winslet, 2000). But plagiarism, while one of the

more obvious forms of unethical behaviors that an author can participate in, is not the only ethical concern when it comes to academic publishing.

For many researchers who are new to academic publishing, the stress of producing publications from their research in a short period of time, may lead an author to actively take part in the unethical art of "salami publishing" or as it is referred to in some disciplines as LPU or the least publishable unit (Luey, 1996, 1995 & Morgan, Harmon, & Gliner, 2001; Jones, 1999). While multiple submissions from a single in-depth study should only be considered if there is a clear benefit to the scientific community such as a large-scale interdisciplinary study (Jones, 1999), the line between this and salami publishing is a fine line indeed (Luey, 1996). Once the line is crossed, the unnecessary publications absorb valuable journal space and may mislead future researchers or skew results in a study if it is published in multiple journals (Luey, 1995).

A recent study conducted by Schneider shows that men are more apt at "chunking" their research, an act border line to LPU, to get the most "miles" from their work while women concentrate on getting one article written right (1998). This difference in gender aptitudes towards this theory may stem from the fact that women may never be forgiven if any of their research is wrong in any manner (Schneider, 1998). This type of ethical lapse, like many others that are discussed in this section, are seldomly documented as they are taken care of in a less formal manner and therefore have limited amount of information about them (Luey, 1996).

Another ethical dilemma that authors must avoid early on in their publishing career is that of multiple article submission. Multiple submissions of the same article to different journals deny editors exclusive consideration where they can readily assume

that the manuscript has only been submitted to their journal and is not being considered for publication in another journal (Luey, 1996). Morgan, Harmon, and Gliner state that only after the author has received a formal rejection or has officially withdrawn the article from consideration should the author resubmit to another journal (2001).

One determent stopping authors from submitting multiple articles is the chance that an article may actually be accepted for multiple publications, forcing the author to withdraw one submission. According to Jackson et al the author gains a bad reputation by taking part in this practice and if the competing editors find out what has been happening (1999), the chances are generally such that both editors will reject the manuscript immediately after discovery (Luey, 1996). Automatic rejection happens because editors due not want to make the practice of authors withdrawing a manuscript from publication as it reaches maturation a frequent occurrence (Luey, 1996).

Another unethical practice is that of multiple article publication, when two articles are published that share the same hypothesis, data, discussion, points or conclusions in different journals (Hulten & Winslet, 2000). If multiple article publication takes place, there are ramifications that go beyond the author who has taken part of this unethical action. Morgan, Harmon, and Gliner insist that duplicate publication not only distorts the knowledge base but also wastes important journal resources (2001). Equally unethical is writing a paper for publication and then presenting it at a conference. The action, while unethical, in not the same as when an author presents a paper at a conference and then submits the manuscript for publication in a journal, which is completely ethical (Thompson, 1995). Exceptions to this rule include submitting an article that has already been published as an abstract only. This is ethical only if the author gives full disclosure

about the abstract and where it has been previously printed (Hulten, 2000). What some authors do not understand about publishing and the legal aspect of this process is that even though the author wrote the paper, the rights and everything that goes with those rights belongs to the journal because they took the financial risk of publishing it (Jackson et al, 1999).

Another questionably ethical occurrence in journal publishing is that of honorary authorship (Morgan, Harmon, & Gliner, 2001). Jones states that honorary authorship usually occurs in the following instances (1999, p. 104):

1) Credit is given to a well known colleague to help ensure that the article will receive publication

2) May be offered as a junior authorship to work as compensation for a variety of different contributions to research projects

3) Administrative personnel or those in authority may want to receive recognition for the support, whatever the form may be, for that particular project.

While Sherrell, Hair, and Griffen discusses that because of these "honorary authorships" journal article authorships may not be true indicator of research scholarship (1989), Lundberg and Flanagan have a definitive opinion of how to deal with honorary authorships. Lundberg and Flanagan suggest five criteria that any author of a given article should meet before they can receive credit as an author (as cited in Jones, 1999, p. 105):

1) Have sufficiently participated in the work to take public responsibility for what has been written

2) Should be able to vouch for the validity of the work that has been completed

3) Have reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript

4) Be able to ensure that the information has not been previously published and will not be without the permission of the authors

5) Will be able to produce the data on which the manuscript is based for examination if requested by the editors.

These five standards, if followed, will help deter the practice of honorary authorships by making authors responsible for each article that they are given credit for.

The opposite of honorary authorship is denying proper credit to those who have worked on a project, which is known as a "ghost authorship" (Morgan, Harmon, & Gliner, 2001). The most common example of this is when graduate students complete a portion of the research project and then are neglected the proper credit (Jones, 1999; Sherrell, 1989). While this type of occurrence goes generally unreported when it happens, Costa and Gatz state that faculty members of lower rank and less teaching experience usually give students less amount of proper credit as where faculty with a greater amount of experience usually give credit where credit is due (cited in Jones, 1999).

Confidentiality also plays a very important role in publishing research findings whenever personal information is involved and should be closely guarded (Luey, 1996). Whether the information pertains to an individual or a company, information that should be kept confidential should be reserved as so. Since this particular breach of ethics in scientific research resembles other ethical breaches, the issue of confidentiality breaches largely remains undetected or resolved on a formal basis and consequently are included in few published reports (Luey, 1996).

Previously discussed were the issues of ethics, values, integrity and the different examples of breaches to these morality issues. Thomsen discusses in his research 5 simple points to ensure that integrity and quality are upheld in the publishing process of a scientific paper. The five points that Thomsen mentions that should be considered during the publishing process are (1994, p. 509):

1) Measure the intent and purpose of the author(s) research

2) Review the overall process of the journal being considered

3) Hold an overall general review of one's community of peers

4) Review the committee's charged with assessing one's work for appointments, promotions and grants

5) Look at the general readership of the journal or scientific area that the article is looking into.

While this is an outline to deter unethical and non-moral behavior in scientists, the only way to affect a positive change in the different scientific disciplines would only be successful if the scientists themselves want the change to happen (Thomsen, 1994).

Motivation, Productivity & Success

When it comes to academic writing, the hardest part of the whole process, just like jogging or dieting, is getting started (Sikula, 1990). For new authors, breaking the ice is the most difficult part and it could stem from fears of getting rejected, having a lack of confidence, or putting it off until tomorrow until tomorrow never comes (Ross & Morrison; 1993). Maslow discusses the difficulty of writing comes from an individuals inability to be free and self-conscious, to allow the mind to roam freely and be spontaneous, imaginative, flexible, and tolerant to ambiguities (cited in Kitson, 1993).

Alamshah adds that for some authors, illusions of grandeur about the final project and self-conceit coupled with a lack of self-discipline ads to an author's inability to complete an article (cited in Kitson, 1993). With all of these difficulties and troubles associated with academic publishing, why do it?

Respect is a strong motivator for many would-be authors along with professional advancement (Jackson et al, 1999), personal growth (McKnight & Price, 1999), and the chance that it become a deeply satisfying part of their job (Maddux, 1996a; Kitson, 1993). For graduate students, publication may be the extra edge that sets their credentials apart from the others or just seeing their name in print may be enough motivation (Ross & Morrison, 1993). For other professionals, the chance to advance the knowledge in their field, share information with others, and to engage in meaningful dialect that clarifies ideas in their field may be a motivating factor (Jackson et al, 1999).

According to Berardo, even though writing is sometimes a lonely occupation, authors utilize this act as an opportunity for intellectual interaction with fellow professionals (1993a). Whether it be through criticisms or applauds, this interaction introduces authors to a wide range of interesting researchers and may help to solidify long-standing and rewarding relationships (Berardo, 1993a). Maddux even talks about how writing confers a little chunk of immortality unto the author and how exhilarating it is to see one's own name referenced in another article and be considered an expert in the field (1996b). Whatever benefits an author seeks to gain, there is motivation for writing and there are many different techniques and theories to assist the writer with this intricate process.

Before beginning the process, the first thing that an author must have is a positive approach to the writing process since it is impossible and unfulfilling to do something that you think is useless or worthless (Maddux, 1996a). The best way to view it is if you dislike the rules of the game, find another game with rules that you do like. Once an author has a positive outlook at the process, the next step is to understand them and individual limits, which can help reduce the frustration of writing (Gebhardt, 1995). A writer must understand their own area of enthusiasm and expertise, other work loads imposed on by one's position, family responsibilities and how much time can be allotted for research and writing (Gebhardt, 1995). These areas or personal knowledge, coupled with the identification of the prime writing environment, whether it be morning or afternoon, quiet vs. noisy, or thought closure vs. stopping mid-thought (Sikula, 1980), should be focused on and energy should be spent creating pristine conditions conducive to writing (Jenkins, 2002).

Once these variants have been identified and taken into consideration, a routine should then be established (Jackson et al, 1999). A routine allows the writer ensured time to develop the manuscript, revise initial drafts, and fully express ideas through conveyance. Finding a suitable time and place is essential to success in writing (Jackson et al, 1999). One important concept is that of avoiding one entire block of time during the day to write. This usually does not work because of meetings, phone calls, visitors, or the sinister lack of attention span (Jenkins, 2002). The last thing that any author wants is for writing to become a chore, burden or drudgery. Consider the fact that, just like after exercise, one feels better after writing than they did before hand (Sikula, 1980). Keeping

this feeling of joy after completing the writing process is important to enjoyment and ultimately productivity.

According to Thomas and McKenzie (cited in Smaby & Crews, 1998), most writers average 13.1 hours/week writing, 66% prefer doing it in the morning, 12 of 13 would rather do it at home, a single article took anywhere from 23-300 hours and an average number of drafts before an article was accepted was 3 with a range to 2-5 submissions. Once a routine is established it is fundamental to stick to the routine and follow it through to completion, no matter the length of time required to successfully produce a published article.

After internalization and understanding of oneself, the next step is to become organized and plan for what is to be undertaken. This step is vital since it is common for unorganized authors to spend too much time preparing and revising their manuscript than it is to write (Sikula, 1980; Jenkins, 2002). The best way to save time in the end is to put the necessary time needed in the beginning of the writing process for preparation and planning (Jenkins, 2002).

Once the information has been gathered, interpersonal strengths and weakness identified, and a suitable routine has been established in which to follow, it is time to begin. Beginning, as stated above, is the hardest part of the writing process. For many, menial tasks are identified and usually completed first so as to prevent beginning of the writing process. Completing these tasks, while normal and perfectly natural, should be tolerated as long as they do not prevent the writing process from beginning for too long (Kitson, 1993). Henson states that setting specific, attainable deadlines are key to success in publishing (2001). Kitson adds that although usually varied, good writers perceive 5-

10 pages a good day. While this number may not seem an overly abundant amount, over 5 days it could possibly mean 50 pages of written material (1993). The best way to begin and one of the most important things to remember is to clear your mind of all external impending tasks and just write (Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998). Excelling in writing takes commitment, as in athletics, and just like any other skill excellence doesn't happen over night, it takes time to develop (Sikula, 1980).

While menial tasks are a minor roadblock that prevents an author from beginning the writing process, there are other more serious problems associated with the inability to write that Smaby's and Crew's research uncovered including (1998):

1) Authors inability to overcome roadblocks that stem from a perceived publishing inability and worthiness of ideas as they are judged by their professional colleagues (Dies, cited in Smaby & Crew, 1998).

2) Beginning authors also need to develop self-discipline for targeting, conceptualization, organizing and managing their writing efforts (Smaby & Crew, 1998). To accomplish this beginning authors need to:

a) Match their writing style to the correct journal (according to Thompson, cited in Smaby & Crew, 1998)

b) Maintain a coherent focus to their writing (according to Matocha & Hanks, cited in Smaby & Crew, 1998)

c) Set and meet their publication goals and objectives (according to Maddux, cited in Smaby & Crew, 1998)

3) Ross and Morrison also intercede to state that new authors must understand and accommodate the editorial process (cited in Smaby & Crew, 1998).

These considerations in cooperation with the fact that authors should develop a management plan to use feedback from editors/reviewers commit a significant effort and time to the writing process; will assist in the overall success of not only new but established academic authors (Smaby & Crew, 1998).

For long term success it is important for beginning authors to get something into print as soon as possible, helping to establish confidence. This is important since beginning authors that experience success early, future activity and productivity are much more likely (Sikula, 1980; Berardo, 1993b). Berardo discusses three additional steps in developing a productive track record to assist the new author (1993b):

1) Never get discouraged and abandon the effort to get published. In the case of a revise/resubmit, this should be given the highest priority and returned as quickly as possible. If it is rejected, consult with the reviews, repair the manuscript and then resubmit to another journal.

2) Always expose rough drafts to colleagues and invite their reactions. Choose those who will be honest about your writing and not adhere to the "yes this is nice, this is good" syndrome.

3) If a researcher can identify important gaps in scientific knowledge, especially if it is widespread and you can complete the work before someone else does, the work will broaden recognition and perhaps escalate an author's career goals.

While Berardo concentrates on the big picture and what authors can do themselves to help ensure success, Engstrom (1999) and Creamer and Engstrom (cited in Baldwin & Chandler, 2002) make reference to three background factors contributing to

successful scholarly writing that cannot be learned but should be part of a young authors nurturing including:

1) Successful authors often have had structured opportunities in research early on in their career.

2) Those authors that reach success often have mentors or someone with whom they could learn from.

3) Student peer groups early on in an author's career or having an internal support system from which to work has added to authors publishing success.

Every article that is submitted in not accepted and therefore rejection and criticism will always play a part of the writing process. It is important to remember that the criticism is of your work and not about you in specific (Kitson, 1993). Writing is a learning process and it is important not to dwell on past failures as information learned from previous failures can be used in the future (Gebhardt, 1995).

Perseverance pays off and hard work and patience glean positive results in the form of a publishable article (Jackson et al, 1999; Thompson, 1995). Distinguished academicians are distinguished because of a willingness to be systematic and persistent (Thompson, 1995). An author must understand that that he/she is not alone; all authors have gone through difficulty when writing, even such that highly noted authors have been rejected at one time or another (Jackson et al, 1999). If an author wants to write for publication and receive the praise that publishing garners, an author cannot do it with out putting themselves on the line and exposing individual ideas, methodologies and writing abilities (Gebhardt, 1995).

Collaborative Efforts

Kitson suggests that one way for authors to break into the publishing arena is by publishing collaboratively with others (1993). There are several reasons for collaboration including; receiving assistance with complicated research projects that require a division of tasks, help in dealing with the pressure to publish in academia, and to add encouragement and support from others during the overall process (Jones, 1999). Collaboration can be one of the most efficient and rewarding strategies used by scholarly writers to successfully begin and continue a writing career. While in the same token, collaboration can be a total waste of time, source of unneeded great frustration, and end in career-long hard feelings (Maddux, 1996c).

While collaboration can be a very positive achievement, several authors make mention to the fact that if guidelines or determents are not initially established, serious problems could arise in the relationship (Berardo, 1993b; Goodyear, Reisenberg, and Schwanuck, cited in Jones, 1999). Compromise is a necessity along with the understanding that through collaboration the process may be slowed and inevitability one person may contribute more than another (Maddux, 1996c).

COPE (The Committee on Publication Ethics) states that accreditation should be decided early on in a research project and authorship duties should balance throughout all aspects of the process, whether it be the actual writing or the research that leads up to the publishable article (cited in Hulten & Winslet, 2000). The first author should be the individual who contributed the most to the project and the remaining list of authors should be determined by their relative levels of contribution (Parke, Syzmanski, Reisenberg & Lundberg, cited in Jones, 1999; Morgan, Harmon, & Gliner, 2001). Contribution to items such as the formulation of the problem or hypothesis, developing

the research design, organizing/conducting data, interpreting results, and writing the most significant portion of the paper should all be part of deliberation of who receives the coveted first authorship (Jones, 1999).

When there are several collaborators (any number greater than one) Iammarino has laid out several considerations that should influence the authorship sequence (cited in Jones, 1999). These include:

1) Each person's role in the project or paper

    a) This involves project efforts such ideas generation, survey designer, data collector, data analyzer, and writer or editor

2) Each person's role in the setting

    a) Recognizing the different roles played such as administrator, department chair, mentor, project director, and principal investigator

3) The function of the publication

    a) Why has it been submitted? For example obtaining tenure or promotion

4) The type of publication it has been submitted to

    a) Whether the paper is being submitted to a prestigious journal vs. a newsletter.

All of these points must be taken into effect when the sequence of authors is being constructed for the published article.

Maddux discusses where the partnership can hit rough waters and ways in which dilemmas can be avoided (1996c). Problems such as:

1) A dispute arises concerning the first authorship of an article. This can be avoided by:

a) Having a clear outline of this situation before the project begins.

b) Good decisions to decide upon individual duties at the beginning.

c) On an individual basis, it is always good to be generous with offering the first authorship to co-authors (Maddux, 1996c). This type of action may allow an author to reap rewards down the road, allow more opportunities to publish, and may strengthen the writing ability and credentials.

2) One of the collaborative authors is not meeting mutually agreed upon deadlines. This occurrence can be resolved by:

a) Choosing a collaborator wisely; this simple action will help with many problems.

b) Have incremental due dates ahead of schedule so that duties can be covered on time if need be.

Students and those new to academic publishing should remember that co-authoring with an established author is an excellent way to begin and continue a record of publishing accomplishments (Sikula, 1980). Engstrom (1999) concludes that faculty members encourage students to work on projects that foster collaboration between students and faculty members for several reasons. The reasoning behind this idea is because an alliance of this type; can be very satisfying and it assists in the development of teamwork skills that are essential for conducting major research projects (Baldwin & Chandler, 2002). Having a mentor also leads a student to increase future job satisfaction, obtain a higher salary, faster promotion, firmer career plans, and the protégé will

someday become a much needed mentor to other students (Wright & Wright, cited in Berardo, 1993A). Students should especially look to the director of the research project for clarity about different rules and how authors are listed (or not listed) (Luey, 1996). They should also be aware of what authorship implies and how much they need to know about the research topic and discussion if they are too listed as authors (Luey, 1996).

Final considerations about teamwork projects include making sure that consent always be obtained before someone is included as an author and that all authors review the manuscript before it is submitted. This point is crucial since all involved authors need to take responsibility for what has been written (Morgan, Harmon, & Gliner, 2001). Collaboration can be at times a difficult proposition but there have been successfully published articles that have had over 100 authors (Luey, 1995).

Article Writing Information

Writing Basics & Problems

Writing for many can be a deeply mysterious practice. Concerns dealing with the content of the article usually take center stage (Brouch, 1979). Henson discusses that there are 3 checks to make that ensure meaningful substance or content in an article. These checks include; making sure that the chosen topic captures the reader's attention immediately, stating the topic in the lead paragraph, and following up with an explanation of how the topic will be treated (1999, December 1). To combat the doubts concerning the information presentation structure, Henson iterates that authors should utilize simple sentences in common words, adding the placement of active verbs in present/future tense, and utilize recent citations of research and literature (1999, December 1).

Over 75 years ago, Wallas broke down the writing process into 4 steps to help would-be authors publish academically. The steps he discussed were to; first prepare for the writing process by gathering date, secondly to begin incubation by making the mind work on an unconscious level, third through working to illuminate the idea through development, and finally verifying the idea by revising and polishing the idea (cited in Kitson, 1993). Kitson also adds that writers sometime describe the writing process as becoming detached from their surrounding and having a narrowing of the consciousness (Kitson, 1993). As with everything else, we becoming better writers by watching others and by practicing it ourselves, over and over if need be (Kitson, 1993; Fine, 1988).

While Wallas takes an almost Zen like approach to the art of writing, Fine assists new authors by breaking it down into the Ten Commandments of Writing (Fine, 1988, p. 153-157).

Commandment I

Read what has been written. The difficulty in this is that authors become embarrassed by reading what they write, almost like seeing oneself naked in a mirror. This action is best done after the manuscript has been set aside for a while, allowing time to provide a new perspective and distance to the writing. When reading what has been written, keep in mind that an author should not just write to be understood but they should write so that they cannot be misunderstood (Summers, 2001).

Commandment II

Share the writing. Allowing colleagues or friends to review a manuscript allows a different view of the project. This process allows reviewers and journal editors to do their job and not act as proofreaders.

Commandment III

Revise brutally. An important part of the writing process is to constantly review and revise what has been written. The danger lies in the understanding of when the first 37 rewrites were necessary and that the 38 rewrite is an unnecessary act. To do this successfully, an author needs to successfully remove themselves from the manuscript to get a fresh perspective.

Commandment IV

Develop a style that is the authors and no one else's. It is important for each author to develop their own style, to be knowledgeable to the rules and conventions of writing, but not to be enslaved by them. Each audience is different and that fact should dictate in some regard what style and format should be used. The most important aspect for any writer's success is that of style (Thompson, 1995). An important thing to remember is not to try and impress with your language but look to clearly express ideas through the use of words and phrases (Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998).

Academic authors should strive with their style to interject tone into their writing that is objective to the facts, show a modesty of the writer's attitudes, and fairness in all is essential to successful publishing (Glatthorn, 2002). Black, Brown, Day and Race adds that an author should verify their writing style by: always err on the side of brevity, use a short word instead of a long substitute, double check for double meanings for certain words, spell check even after the computers spell checker program, utilize punctuation to enhance reading, use metaphors carefully and in the right context, make the writing interesting, make sure that is readable, and remember that the more an author writes the better that they become (1998).

Commandment V

Use humor, tropes, and poetry. Holding the readers attention through writing is an important aspect of article publishing. Using metaphors, figures of speech, poetic language can entice the reader to further enjoy what has been written. Humor and irony can also be used, it done properly, to incite a reader's attention and even response to the written word. While these are best suited to attract reader's attention it is important to remember not to use catch phrases, overly cute language, jargon, and over repetition of certain words (Luey, 1995). Besides utilizing these former attributes, an author should look to include examples, not from the author's world, but from the where the audience is from to include the reader and make the information that more understandable (Henson, 1999, December 1).

Commandment VI

Short is not always necessarily sweet. As a general rule, authors favor writing that is not verbose. Brevity should not be followed to the point where every last unnecessary word be removed as that can be difficult to accomplish. Authors don't need to have length for the sake of length but they also don't need to have brevity for the sake of brevity either. The ultimate goal of writing is to share information and through releasing unnecessary paragraphs, sentences or words, this goal can be easily obtained (Henson, December 1, 1999).

Intelligent readers are more impressed with clear words and expressions. They will also wonder why verbose writing was utilized in place of simpler language. Luey suggests the readers will conclude two hypotheses; the first being that the author did not know how and that in plain English the author's idea didn't make sense (1995). William

Strunck and E.B. White said that, "Vigorous writing is concise. A sentence should contain no unnecessary words, a paragraph no unnecessary sentences, for the same reason that a drawing should have no unnecessary lines and a machine no unnecessary parts" (cited in Henson, 1991, December 1, p. 80).

Commandment VII

Sometimes precision may be imprecise. Imprecise poetic language has the advantage of creating a dialogue with the reader. This allows for readers to constantly learn and understand innovative nuances of an article each time they read the article. When a speaker (or writer) and an audience have identical responses to a stimulus, the communication is boring and unneeded (Stone, cited in Fine, p. 156).

A pitfall of this is to avoid over utilizing jargon germane to the author's discipline. While jargon, used properly, can be a wonderful tool to add precisiveness and conciseness to writing, it is frequently misused in attempts to make the manuscript more sophisticated while in most cases it does more to confuse the reader (Summers, 2001; Parker, Costner, Debnam, & Soljaga, 1998). Aggressive searches should be conducted for alternative interpretations that can be used to eliminate ambiguous and confusing passages (Summers, 2001). Luey states that an author should utilize technical terms more often since these words offer better understanding and word economy (1995). When compared to each other, technical terms can be used more freely in specialized journals since the average layperson will not read them. To decide which type of term to use (jargon vs. technical term), look at the word and see if it is saying precisely what it is that the author wants to say, don't try to impress, explain the information (Luey, 1995).

Commandment VIII

Write the first sentence so the reader wants to read the second. Many authors believe that it is enough to begin a manuscript by stating what will be done or how it will be done in the study. These type of openings do not capture a readers attention and such sentences are the type that readers almost loath to read. Utilizing a paradoxical opening or even humor will make the reader want to continue the reading process through completion. Jackson et a; adds that an author can grab a reader's attention with concise, accurate and informative titles. The use of good quality titles helps to establish the purpose and relevance of the article all the way through a tightly written opening paragraph (1999).

Commandment IX

Lie, Sometimes. The factual aspects of an article are to be told truthfully and honestly (as this is a breach of ethical standards if they are not) but sometimes adding creative fictionalizing in the "story" of an article adds a new dimension to an article. Personal experiences are such that they cannot be necessarily trusted as facts but they can be trusted as narrative, henceforth the "little white lie".

Commandment X

Always rewrite your introduction in light of what you say at the end. As the writing process is followed through to completion, what an author may have said at the beginning may not longer be applicable. First paragraphs and titles should always be tentative.

Writing Problems

Writing, for many, is a difficult undertaking and there have been many researchers that have looked at problems associated with writing and ways in which they

can be overcome. According to Summers, the underlying reason behind many problems is the lacks clarity in the author's thought processes on what they are writing. To resolve this type of problem the author should first question their understanding of what they are having difficulty with before trying other remedy solutions (2001). Understanding the material at a deeper level may alleviate some of the road blocks associated with writing.

When it comes to writing problems there are two separate levels of problems. They include the easy-fix writing problems and the harder-to-fix writing problems. The most common easy-fix problems include; overuse of the passive voice, wordiness, use of long polysyllabic words, proper uses of this or it, the lack of varied sentence structure, non-varied sentence length, using the improper language and the over use of jargon terminology (Baldwin & Chandler, 2002). Those that prove more difficult to fix include; problems with information organization, the inclusion of material in the literary review not related to the material, making conclusions beyond the data and use of syntax (Baldwin & Chandler, 2002). Difficulty with syntax can actually deal with a multitude of problems to include; the order of sentence components, assumptions of relationships among parts of a sentence, compressing complex relationships into a string of adjectives and having a lack of clarity in the writers thinking (Baldwin & Chandler, 2002).

These problems, according to Kitson, can be tackled using a two prong approach. The first thing is to recognize creativity and writing as a process. This process is one that takes time and requires multiple drafts, false leads, additions, deletions and corrections. The second prong is to deal with personal issues of blockage. This approach deals more with self-awareness as to why we get stuck, understanding why it is hard to start, why getting stuck can be such a difficulty at times, and the fact that there are forces out there

that are beyond the writers control (sub-consciousness things) (1993). This approach to handling problems has been expanded upon by several different authors.

Smaby, Crews, & Downing for example, offers suggestions on how to redefine problems that will ultimately assist the author with fixing the problems that vex them. They are laid out as such that (1999):

1) Writing problems should be seen in a way that positive change can happen. The best way to accomplish this is to look at these problems such that an author can take responsibility for them.

2) Assessment of writing problems should be related to the ineffective behavior that causes them. The author should realize not only the behavior but what they are feeling during the ineffective behavior and then give themselves separation from the project to reassess their emotions. Consideration should be given to the long term effect that these attitudes/behaviors will have on the author's outlook of writing.

3) Design a plan of rewards for reaching your set objectives. Authors should establish a type of reward structure for reaching even the most minuscule of goals, the concept of positive reinforcement.

This redefinition of problems of writing is designed to help the author understand the roots of the writing problem and allow the author to deal with them in a more personal and hopefully successful manner.

Another primary source for writer's difficulty is that of writers block. Kitson's research uncovered 11 primary ways in which to attack writer's block. Listed below are these different methods which include (Kitson, 1993, p.149-151):

1) Partake in a 10 minute free write. This is where an author writes about everything in their head, no matter what the topic. There is something inside the authors head and this is designed to get that blockage out in the open (Elbow, cited in Kitson, 1993).

2) "Fix Later" or "I can't think of it now" can be placed in the position where the block is occurring. This allows the author to move onto writing a new section or a completely different task and then returning later on to complete the unfinished section.

3) Pretend public presentation of the information is immediately required. This is where the author must tell themselves that they have to present their information even though they are not completely prepared. The author must force themselves to write about the topic in a timed period or manner. This method may allow thoughts on the subject to become clearer and allow the author to once again write freely (Elbow, cited in Kitson, 1993).

4) Brainstorming. The author must write down as much as possible without being critical of ideas or style. The writer must think up as many idea's as possible and try to combine and improve upon those ideas allowing a more free flowing thought process and ability (Stein, cited in Kitson, 1993)

5) Satisfy the writing process. This process is where the author must accept the adequate, but imperfect, impression or idea in order to get on with more important problems, i.e. by placing common words in the correct places just to continue on with progression (Flower, cited in Kitson, 1993).

6) Drawing. This is where the author draws diagrams of what they are trying to say or where they make lists of sayings such as metaphors, analogies, comparisons, or

contrasts (Flower & Elbows, cited in Kitson, 1993). This is just an additional way in which the author attempts to flush out the idea so that it can be placed in the written word.

7) Keep the pen moving. Transfer typed information onto paper and during the process change a few of the words. Keep attempting to make bigger variations of what has already been written and soon this type of process will produce a new, usable thought (King, cited in Kitson, 1993).

8) Expand upon a sentence. First the author should write out the first sentence and then write an additional two sentences about that original sentence. From there, write an entire paragraph about the three sentences that have just been written while at the same time adding more concrete details. This theory can be applied to multiple sentences until the writers block has been removed (Kerrigan, cited in Kitson, 1993).

9) Let the idea cook and simmer. The author should allow the ideas to "rumble about their mind," perhaps allowing the subconscious to solve it. When a solution has been found, it is imperative with this method to immediately write down the solution since it is likely to be quickly forgotten (Kubic, cited in Kitson, 1993).

10) Ask for help. Explain to a colleague or friend what the author is trying to accomplish and then work with them to brainstorm ideas. An additional person can add new dimensions to the thought process and expand upon already developed ideas.

11) Consider what the paper is trying to cover. Decide if the paper is attempting to cover too much, perhaps allowing the information to be split into separate studies. Perhaps reread what has been written to decipher more clues on where to go and to help refocus the researcher in the argument but not necessarily the structure.

These concepts by which writer's block can be cured are by no means a comprehensive listing and for each person there is a perfect way to solve each writer's block occurrence. The listing above is a starting block from where authors can go and learn how to deal with each separate case of writers block.

Planning & Outlining the Project

When planning and outlining a writing project, the average length and size of each of an article, anywhere from 10-25 pages average, double spaced, should be considered in the initial planning and outlining stage. This number is important to remember since reviewers don't enjoy reading overly long manuscripts and are looking for articles that are written tightly and concisely; not those that are the longest (Ross & Morrison, 1993). Good writers, like good artists, look to express themselves according to the message, subject, and personal style (Ross & Morrison, 1993). Glatthorn breaks down the average academic article length into percentages per section (2002) (this is only an average as each discipline has their own norms and regulations):

Abstract	5%
Introduction	10%
Review of Literature	15%
Methodology	20%
Results	25%
Concluding Matters	25%

Keeping these averages in mind, Kitson gives two options of how an article outline can be completed (1993). The first approach to outlining is the establishment of what an author is going to be doing and where they are going. This method provides a

skeleton or structure for thought organization. The outline can be on note cards and then work on rearranging them to see the best fit. They can be individual phrases, lists of things, abstracts, sentences, paragraphs, or discussions (Kitson). This type of outline is a method of describing what you would like to do and it also works well as a memory jogger if you have to stop writing and have forgotten where you were (Kitson, 1993).

Then there is the "forget the outline and just start" school of thought (Kitson, 1993). This thought processes suggests to start writing, even if you have to throw parts of the writing away later. When someone follows this type of "outlining" process, it is important to remember that things are not required to be related, be complete, or even make sense (Kitson, 1993). The important thing is to remember just to get something down. Kitson suggests that an author should start where they feel most comfortable and that it doesn't have to be in the beginning (1993).

This process of producing an outline is just a means in which to get down a rough draft from where to work from. Once a rough draft has been established, it can be discussed with a colleague and the writing process can be progressed from that point (Kitson, 1993). The main point of outlining and planning is to get something down on paper and this is one of the most efficient manners in which an author can get started (King, 1978).

Proper Article Formatting

Every discipline and journal has their own specific format or guidelines that need to be followed. But there are certain qualities in the formatting process that remain a constant no matter what discipline or journal the article is being written for. The first and most important aspect of any journal article is that of a quality, professional appearance

(Cantor, 1993; Thyer, 1994). Making sure that the submission is of quality includes having a word processed document on clean white paper.

The next, equally important aspect of article submission is following the specific or "housestyle" requirements of a journal (Luey, 1987 & Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998). An author must remember that journals receive 100's of manuscripts and following the proper style requirements of the specific journal will help expedite the process (Natriello, 1996). In judging quality of an article there is a great amount of subjectivity involved and positive first impressions from having followed style guidelines may be the difference between having an article accepted or rejected (Natriello, 1996; Ross & Morrison, 1993). Those articles that do not conform to style usually shows the reviewers; that the author is not experienced at professional writing, may not be able to listen closely to instructions, and the article was perhaps initially prepared for another journal (Ross & Morrison, 1993).

According to Cantor (1993), editors are most concerned with stylistic snafus including (written in order from most to least important): professional appearance, guidelines for the specific journal have been followed, good writing clarity and quality, title of the manuscript, and a high quality abstract. While each of these are valid concerns for authors to adhere to, Luey suggests that writing within ones own discipline is easier. An author may pick up many of the writing conventions germane to their discipline that run as underlying theme to the disciplines journals, assisting them in writing a better article within their own discipline (1995). If an author steps outside of that discipline, the author will have to work that much harder to understand the conventions germane to that discipline (Luey, 1995).

Style does not just reference the written aspects of the submission requirements, but looks at what previously established reference style to utilize, such as APA vs. MLA format (Henson, 2001). Style also looks into whether journals require the standardized research format or if they follow an independent format (Henson, 1999). Included is the larger spectrum of the submission process including length, orientation, writing mechanics, and article format for that journal (Ross & Morrison, 1993). Article formatting includes whether or not the journal prefers brief reports, technical/comprehensive reports, theoretical articles, or applies articles (Ross & Morrison, 1993).

Other article style aspects include submitting the correct number of manuscripts, knowing whether or not a computer diskette containing the original work of research is needed (Ross & Morrison, 1993; Mortimer, 2001), and whether or not the journal accepts the use of tables and figures (Henson, 1999, December 1). The manner in which spacing and indentations are used play an important role in whether or not the manuscript submission will be suitable and accepted for publication (Mortimer, 2001). Items often over looked by authors include knowing when and where to place the authors name and vital statistics within the manuscript packet (Ross & Morrison, 1993). Double checking references to make sure that citations with multiple authors are given their proper credits each time they are mentioned is also key for style and format (Henson, 1999, December 1). According to a study conducted by Smaby, Crews, and Downing (1999), 51% of article rejections have unacceptable or uncertain ratings on proper citation listings, showing that proper citations are needed to help certify a successful submission.

When attempting to better understand what each journal is looking for in regards to style, it is important to remember that all journals publish directions on how to publish in their journals (Natriello, 1996). Commentary that covers this information usually appears in the preliminary pages of the journal and can be found in the credits column or on the contents page (Brouch, 1979; Mortimer, 2001). Also included in these informational sections are the journals frequency, number of issues per year, rates, and when manuscripts are accepted. An important note is that quarterly journals, since they are published infrequently, may not place format regulations in each journal edition (Brouch). All questions not answered are either left for the intelligence of the author to decipher (Brouch, 1979), or the editors contact information has been included in case of lingering doubts or questions that an author may have regarding the journals style requirements (Mortimer, 2001).

Title, Introduction & Abstract

"When an author prepares a title for (their) paper, (the author) would do well to remember one salient fact: that the title will be read by thousands of people. Perhaps four people, if any, will read the entire paper, but many people will read the title (Day, cited in Cantor, 1993, p. 48). This statement by Day iterates the importance of the title as there are several factors to involve with creating a title. Firstly, remember to supply clear information on the implications of the research (Day, 1998; Brouch, 1979) and to describe the key elements of the study (Cantor, 1993). The title should not be treated as a sentence but it can be used as a good summary to inform the reader of what they are going to be reading (Brouch, 1979). Employing obscure or humorous statements is meant to ensnare readers and to catch their interest (Brouch, 1979) but being too clever

may lead readers to believe that the author is in the "busch league" of publishing (Glatthorn, 2002).

Factors to avoid when writing the title of the manuscript include avoiding words such as "A Study of" or "An Investigation of" (Glatthorn, 2002). Other words and word combinations to avoid include a, an, the, studies on, investigations on, observations on, abbreviations, and any types of relative jargon (Day, 1998). The biggest mistake and most damaging to title comprehension is misuse of syntax. When writing the title, it is important not to utilize an assertive title unless the conclusions of the research are as assertive as the title proposes them to be (Day, 1998).

While titles are important in getting readers to the article it is more important to keep them reading an article (Brouch, 1979). Besides using the abstract as a way for readers to determine the relativeness to their needs (Cantor, 1993), the abstract is seen as a miniature paper that allows a brief summary and a basic content of the article (Day, 1998; Cantor, 1993). Abstracts should also include necessary elements of the study including the purpose of the study, methodology, results, discussion of the results, and should never give any information that is not included in the paper (Glatthorn, 2002; Day, 1998; Cantor, 1993). According to McGier, it is important for an abstract to contain all of these individual elements of the article since it will be published by itself (cited in Day, 1998). These elements dealing with the research can only be briefly discussed as the abstract is usually only a single paragraph between 100 and 250 words (Day, 1998; Glatthorn, 2002).

Day discusses that there are actually two different kinds of abstracts. The first type of abstract is called the informational abstract. This abstract is where a short review

of the problem, method, data, and conclusions are discussed to allow the readership to have quick information pertaining to the article (Day, cited in Cantor, 1993; Day, 1998). While the second type of abstract, the indicative (or descriptive), is frequently used in reviewing of papers and various reports, and indicates the overall content of the entire paper (Day, cited in Cantor 1993; Day, 1998).

The abstract is important in the attraction of readers. But at another level the well written abstract has importance because of the role that it plays in the review process. Using word economy simultaneously with clear and concise words will help get a research article published. Reviewers see such actions as a positive indicator of scholarly ability (Day, 1998). Because of this importance in the review process, proper care and attention should be given to this part of the writing process.

While the abstract is used to give an overview of the study, the introduction to the paper plays an entirely different role. The introduction should be utilized to identify and clarify the problem but should also supply rationale for the need of the study or research that has been conducted (Day, 1998; Ross, 1993; Cantor, 1993). The introduction can provide theoretical analysis or the conceptual framework for which the study was completed (Glatthorn, 2002).

Whatever the author sees as the overall purpose of the introduction, Summers' (2001) and Day's (1998) research discusses the four goals that should be realized when writing an introduction as:

1) Establishing the importance of the general area of interest. This doesn't mean that discussion needs to be complicated or detailed results be given. Cantor adds that this

goal should also include the development of the problem that has been covered in the article (Cantor, 1993).

2) Should indicate in general terms what has been done in the broad area of research. Only a small amount of space is required for this introduction section.

3) Identify important gaps, inconsistencies, and or controversies in the relative literature. This establishes the need for additional research and can easily be conducted in a precise manner.

4) Provide a concise statement of the manuscripts purpose and the contributions the manuscript makes to the literature. The author should provide concise statements that fill in literature gaps and inconsistencies. The one thing to avoid is the over development of a long list of contributors which diverts that readers attention from the major focus of the study.

Often, the failure of not having a clear introduction is a result of not giving enough thought to the issue before the study was conducted (Summers, 2001). Importance must be given to concluding the introduction with a brief statement of the articles purposes, hypothesis, or research question to help tie everything together (Ross, 1993).

Autonomy in the introductory section is also given to definitions, which used properly, can help to better explain the conducted research. According to Glatthorn (2002) three things to remember when generating a definitions list is to; define only terms that reader's of the journal aren't likely to know or special uses of common words, use an independent definition of a given term or borrow one with proper acknowledgement, and if terminology is borrowed from a dictionary, place the credits at the end of the term and do not begin the explanation with "According to Webster". These simple rules will assist

the author in explaining only the needed terminology and will display the term in a format that is best suited for academic publishing.

While the title, abstract, and introduction appear at the beginning of an article, the theory that they should be worked upon during the research stages, to help keep the information fresh and to provide structure throughout the process is held by several researchers (Cantor, 1993; Day, 1998). Though these sections should be started on during the research stage, Glatthorn believes that they be completed last as to represent a definitive description of the research that has been concluded and written about (2002).

Literature Review

The literature review aspect of an article should "advance the field by virtue of its insightful, integrative, and critical evaluation of the state of work in a subject area" (Churchill & Perrault, as quoted in Summers, 2001, p.411). Likewise, a good review section should also provide synthesis and make clear what is known on the topic and help show gaps in the literature (Summers, 2001). As the review section develops, it should only cover the most salient of points in relation to the research and only relevant, supportive and innovative thinking should be used to help clarify the subject matter that has been researched (Brouch, 1979).

Cantor adds that when writing the review an author should keep two purposes in mind help solidify the process (1993). Firstly, the writer should look to describe for the reader the extent of literature and research in the field. Secondly, an author should identify existing knowledge about the topic/problem statement and show how the void will be filled by the research (Cantor, 1993). Keeping these two points in mind assists the author to keep the review brief, directed to the key points of the study, and generally

based acting as a summary of the information available on the topic (Ross & Morrison, 1993).

When writing the literature review, it is imperative to use articles that are only 3-5 years old (Smaby, Crews, & Downing, 1999). Articles that are older than this age window may not have as much bearing on current issues and should only be used if it has significance for the research (Glatthorn, 2002). When searching for references, it is essential that the references be necessary to the research by supplying direct implications to the study and that it either supports or refutes the research (Black, Brown, Day, & Race, 1998). Whatever the author's opinion, excessive references will not impress the editor or the reviewers, only the information that is necessary should be utilized in this section.

Literature review sections can be placed within an article in one of two ways. The review can be a separate section or it can integrated into the body of the article (the journal's in-house style will help decide this) (Glatthorn, 2002). Once the format has been established of how to incorporate the literature review into the article, organizing the review section is the next objective. Glatthorn gives several suggestions of how to organize the review if it is to appear as a separate section in an article. These suggestions include (2002):

1) An author can chronologically organize the information according to the date of publication. This style is most useful if there have been significant changes in the overall literature.

2) The review can be laid out in the "pro-con" approach where the author lays the

literature out in a "piece for piece against" format. This style is most useful for showing both sides of a theory or argument.

3) The typical pattern where an author organizes the information into clusters of ideas. This format is used to discuss the related literature together and is useful to help make the literature more understanding to readers.

Whatever the style that is being used for the literature review, the information that is presented should not just be quoted, but synthesized into the researchers study and how it impacts the results (Black, Brown, Day, Race, 1998 & Glatthorn, 2002).

Before the literature review can be laid to rest, there are several final checks to perform. Firstly, go back and condense as much information as possible since it is natural for an author to have too much (Black, Brown, Day, & Race, 1998). Secondly, make sure that all references have been correctly quoted as citied within the text and that they appear correctly in the reference section. According to Thompson's research, 40% of journals have excessive citations, missing citations, or wrong years of particular citations within the text (1995). These items if overlooked create a bad impression in the reviewers mind and may hinder articles publishability. Smaby's, Crew's, & Downing's research on the other hand found that 86% of rejected articles had unacceptable/uncertain ratings of relevant research studies and 68% of rejected articles achieved unacceptable ratings because the literature review lacked focus and organization (1999). The literature review, while only playing a small role in the written article, is important as it shows the authors ability to retrieve credible and relative information germane to the study.

Methodology and Materials

3) The typical pattern where an author organizes the information into clusters of ideas. This format is used to discuss the related literature together and is useful to help make the literature more understanding to readers.

Whatever the style that is being used for the literature review, the information that is presented should not just be quoted, but synthesized into the researchers study and how it impacts the results (Black, Brown, Day, Race, 1998 & Glatthorn, 2002).

Before the literature review can be laid to rest, there are several final checks to perform. Firstly, go back and condense as much information as possible since it is natural for an author to have too much (Black, Brown, Day, & Race, 1998). Secondly, make sure that all references have been correctly quoted as citied within the text and that they appear correctly in the reference section. According to Thompson's research, 40% of journals have excessive citations, missing citations, or wrong years of particular citations within the text (1995). These items if overlooked create a bad impression in the reviewers mind and may hinder articles publishability. Smaby's, Crew's, & Downing's research on the other hand found that 86% of rejected articles had unacceptable/uncertain ratings of relevant research studies and 68% of rejected articles achieved unacceptable ratings because the literature review lacked focus and organization (1999). The literature review, while only playing a small role in the written article, is important as it shows the authors ability to retrieve credible and relative information germane to the study.

Methodology and Materials

This sections main purpose to the academic readership is to describe the experimental design and supply organized/chronological details so that studies can be duplicated (Day, 1998). This section, while usually skipped by most readers, should be

This sections main purpose to the academic readership is to describe the experimental design and supply organized/chronological details so that studies can be duplicated (Day, 1998). This section, while usually skipped by most readers, should be detailed to the point that readers should not only be able to replicate the research but to evaluate the soundness of the research experiment (Glatthorn, 2002). As for the importance in the review process, if a reviewer or the editor believes that there is not a chance for replication; the article may be rejected out right and lack further considerations for publication (Day, 1998).

When completing the methodology/materials section there are three variables that must be covered including subjects, design, and materials. These three areas can be covered independently or can be woven together into one section and each journals house-style will dictate how to handle this aspect of the process.

Subjects Section (could be titled as the population or sample section). Focus in this section should be on who participated in the study and information relating to the subjects (Ross & Morrison, 1993). Information including how many subjects were tested, how they were selected, and the size of the population compared to the sample should all be incorporated (Cantor, 1993). Relative to this section is the author's defense to why he/she selected that size of the sample, the criteria for selection, % of returned surveys, and the type randomness employed in the selection process.

Design (could also be titled methodology or procedures). The importance of this section is to fully explain the overall design and execution of the research process that was used during the study (Ross & Morrison, 1993; Cantor, 1993). Included is information concerning the description of how testing was administered, integrations of

learning materials that were utilized, how questionnaires were proctored, handout descriptions and independent/dependant variables associated with the previous (Ross & Morrison, 1993).

Defense of the development of the data gathering instruments and the tabulation/statistical analysis procedures should also be discussed. All measurements and analysis need to be accurately portrayed in this section if they are to be repeated (Day, 1998). Readers and reviewers look to this section for appropriateness of selected methodologies and to ensure that ethical standards have been upheld (Cantor, 1993). By reading this section, the reader should be able to duplicate the process that was followed in the experiment. If a study can not be reproduced, such a study may have damaging effects on an author's reputation or career (Day, 1998).

Materials (or instrumentation). Discussion should be held in this section addressing the instrument or materials that were used in the research. Pertinent data including how many different items were used, the nature of these items, validation, and how scores were interpreted should all be covered (Ross & Morrison, 1993). When describing the material used in the research, trade names should be avoided and only generic names should be included. Exact technical specifications and quantities should be included so that replication can be achieved (Day, 1998).

Smaby, Crews, & Downing discusses that while authors should focus on the inclusion and description of sample, design, instrumentation, and procedures; many fall short of expectations (1999). His research uncovered that:

65% of rejected articles had unacceptable/uncertain ratings of the authors description of the sample used

85% of rejected articles had unacceptable/uncertain ratings of the instrumentation as reported

51% of rejected articles had unacceptable/uncertain ratings in presentation and choice of research procedures

64% of rejected articles had unacceptable/uncertain ratings in description of statistical analysis.

The information contained in the methodology and materials section is perhaps the least read information of the article but it is necessary for experiment reproduction. Each discipline and journal has their own specific styles and guidelines on how to cover this type of information. Literature reviewed in this section should be reduced to include only those concepts and theories that could be generalized to science as a whole. Guidance as to the correct structuring in these areas should be sought by the author within each independent journal and/or discipline.

Result Reporting

The results section of an academic article plays two vital roles. The first; information it supplies is an overall brief description of the experiment and extension of the introduction section (Day, 1998 & Summers, 2001). Next, the results section should state the principle findings of the study with sufficient details and citing of relevant findings especially those related to the hypothesis (Cantor, 1993). When reporting this type of data, the most variable of the outcomes are stated first followed by the analysis and what was discovered from that analysis (Ross & Morrison, 1993). The reporting of this data usually includes a brief description of the major statistical analysis that can be displayed utilizing charts, graphs, or tables. Merely summarizing the empirical results of

a study is an inappropriate strategy as conclusions must be clearly supported by data (Summers, 2001).

When reporting the different data sets that were found, contemplation must be given to the organization of this section. If the problem was a set of questions, it must be handled as so and if the research shows a sharp division, the results must be shown as such to emphasize the prior research compared to current research (Glatthorn, 2002). Subcategories are also proper if they are needed when the information in one section is too long (Ross & Morrison, 1993). To better illustrate the results of a study, Cantor suggests that the results section be broken into three sections (1993). These sections include the description of results, explanation of any seeming inconsistencies or discrepancies in the results, and a comparison of current findings with those of other studies. These aspects of information need not be in different sections as long as the information is understandable (Cantor, 1993).

Utilization of graphs and charts in the results section should also provide the readers with a tool to better understand the results of the study (Ross & Morrison, 1993). When discussing a diagram, it is important not to be redundant with explanations that have already been made apparent by the diagram but to expound on information presented (Glatthorn, 2002). In the same instance, cutting too many necessary words from the explanation interferes with the understanding of the diagram (Day, 1998).

Construction and design of figures are often time consuming but they can reduce narrative and help to present statistical data (Glatthorn, 2002). Differences between graphs and tables need to be discerned before construction since comparisons, trends, or contrasts makes sense in graphs and not tables (Cantor, 1993). When considering labels

for charts, graphs, and tables it is extremely important that these have clearly labeled units and are self-explanatory (Cantor, 1993). Graphs should also be kept psychometrically proportioned to assist with their readability (Cantor, 1993). The purpose of diagrams is not to confuse but to report results for interpretation at a later period in the article (Ross & Morrison, 1993).

Data that is uncovered during research plays an important role in the scientific community, such an important role that the fabrication or falsification or data constitutes misconduct punishable at many different levels (Hulten & Winslet, 2000). To avoid accusations of these kinds, all methods to obtain and utilize data should be fully disclosed and explained in detail. While misconduct happens in research and should be properly documented and dealt with, major institutions are usually unwilling to formally investigate misconduct charges in fear of dragging "big names" into the fray (White, 1998).

While the results section contains the most important parts of an article, the data, it is usually the shortest and most direct (Day, 1998). The information found within this section must be clearly stated since it represents new knowledge in the industry, is the basis for further discussions, and should ultimately reaffirm the importance of the study, showing how the uncovered information fits into the literature gaps (Summers, 2001).

Conclusion & Discussion

The discussion area of an academic paper allows the author to confer and interpret the findings of the research in comparison to the research questions, previous studies, and relevant theory and practice (Ross & Morrison, 1993). Here the writer can examine and interpret the findings and relate them to the theoretical framework if needed. But

throughout the process, an author must keep the primary purpose of discussing the overall results of the research in mind, no matter how significant the individual findings (Ross & Morrison, 1993; Glatthorn, 2002).

To assist authors from "straying from the path", Day discusses that there are six general points that should be followed. These include (1998):

1) Presentation of principles, relationships, and generalizations should be shown by the results but remember to discuss the points and not repeat the contents of the results section.

2) Point out exceptions or lack of correlations and define them. Don't try to cover up these salient points or fudge the results to make a proper fit with current research.

3) Show how results and interpretations agree or disagree with previously published works.

4) Don't be shy. Discuss the theoretical and practical ramifications of your work.

5) State conclusions as clearly as possible.

6) Summarize the evidence for each conclusion to allow for better understanding.

These points, when followed as a general guideline, will assist the author in utilizing clear statements of support/non-support of research; describe theories as related to original research questions, and present relationships as indicated by the results (Cantor, 1993).

Glatthorn adds discussion about what the author should look for after writing the discussion section (2002). His suggestions include the author asking these questions at the conclusion of the writing process:

1) Has the research made any contributions to the existing knowledge base?

2) How did the results build upon/extend the professional knowledge?

3) How are seemingly contradictory findings properly explained?

4) To what extent do the findings support/disagree with previous work?

5) What are the implications of the findings to industry practitioners?

An author who has asked themselves these questions after completing the conclusion section will keep the section tight and concise and will assist the author in publication.

After completion of the discussion section the author should have: informed the reader about the subject and not left the reader dangling, made recommendations for further studies, and should have included a good ending with conclusions on what was found and options or alternative applications of the information (Brouch, 1979). If these primary purposes are kept in mind when writing the conclusion, it will assist the author in completing the most difficult part of the writing process (Day, 1998).

Most articles are rejected because of the lack of focus and proper discussion section. According to Smaby's research, 81% of rejected articles had unacceptable or uncertain conclusions drawn logically from results reported on their manuscripts (1999). The discussion/conclusion section is too inform the readership about the findings of the research and should not try to shed light on an entire subject, just to spotlight one section of truth (Day, 1998). Keeping these points in mind will help the writer inscribe a successful conclusion section.

Manuscript Editing & Proofing

The review process for many authors is perhaps the most dreaded aspect of publishing (Brouch, 1979). For many it can be accustomed to waxing a car as it takes a

great deal of "mental grease" and fortitude to accomplish this time consuming process. Swallowing one's own pride to make necessary corrections can be difficult especially when revisions, include making cuts to written material, is involved (Brouch, 1979). For many authors, revising one's own work is not particularly productive and for those authors who successfully review their own work; they often admit that it could have been done better. Revisions are part of the publishing process and every author must accept the fact that articles go through major revisions and are subject to criticisms even before they are submitted for publication (Summers, 2001).

Editing and rewriting are essential to ensuring clarity. For authors to truly improve upon an article, it is imperative that the article be set aside for a few days which helps the revision work that lay ahead (Henson, 1999, December 1; Summers, 2001). Authors can usually identify what they want to communicate to the reader and do not critically look at a manuscript for revisions. Placing the manuscript to the side for a period of time helps achieve that degree of separation that is needed for clarity and for developing a new perspective on the article.

When an author is completing self-revision, it is important to self visualize if students or colleagues would understand the written material without explanation and if an answer of no is reached, the manuscript needs to be rewritten (Summers, 2001). The initial editing and reviewing stage, while it usually doesn't produce a final paper, is helpful to clarify the article before the author receives assistance from others in the review process. Utilizing a preformatted review checklist such as the one found in Appendix D, can assist in the overall process (cited in Huff, p. 155).

While review progression may be a long and drawn out process, having colleagues proofread an article can reduce the time that it takes to complete the procedure (Kitson, 1993; Brouch, 1979; Thompson, 1995). Sharing an article with colleagues during the draft process early on is most beneficial as it will help find mistakes and errors early on in the process (Natriello, 1996). Having it reviewed early and often will greatly increase the chance that an article will be accepted when submitted for publication (Summers, 2001).

When asking colleagues (or friends) to review an article, it is important to choose a group, at least two to three, of colleagues who have a proven track record of publishing and who can be critically honest with their reviews (Henson, 1999). The author should have those colleagues who are reviewing the manuscript to look at not only the content of the article but also the style and format in which it is written (Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998). If the colleagues that were selected come back with too positive of remarks or criticisms, an author should seek out additional critiques since the initial reviewers were not harsh enough on the manuscript to assist with the editing process (Summers, 2001). The mistake often made is that young authors ask young scholars or someone who does not have a proven track record of publication for advice. This practice, while perhaps easier to accomplish, actually hurts the author in the long run because the inexperienced author more than likely will give bad advice (Maddux, 1996c).

When receiving criticisms back from the proofreaders, it is imperative for authors not to become immobilized or slowed from the reviewers remarks (Sikula, 1980). What the reviewers have offered is only advice and as advice goes, some of it can be rejected

and some of it accepted. Advice comes in two forms, bad and good, and the author must discern which advice is going to be followed (Sikula, 1980).

The key to a successful experience when a colleague reviews a manuscript is outlined by Brouch (1979). His suggestions included:

1) An author should mean it when they ask for an objective critique. The author should help the reviewer feel that the article is being pulled together and that the reviewer has a say in the completed project.

2) Make the information grammatically neat and tidy. Do not send out a script for proofreading that looks sloppy. It may be in the best interest of the author to have someone pre-inspect for grammar so that it can be readjusted before another colleague proofreads the material.

3) Choose someone who will be honest with their reviews, especially someone who will be not-so-gently honest (but not crude in nature).

4) Be patient – the work that has been completed is not as important to everyone. Check in a couple of weeks to make sure that it hasn't been bottom shelved.

5) All ideas received from proofreaders are not good advice, but it is important to get as many opinions as possible. When re-working the draft, evaluate the suggestions and utilize the ones that are good or that do not affect the overall purpose of the paper.

6) Send a thank-you right away. In some manner, offer to help the proofreader, take them to lunch and/or give them a copy of the journal article when it has reached completion.

While allowing an outsider to review an authors work is embarrassing for some, it catches the mistakes that authors may have missed including poor spelling, incorrect

grammar, awkward phrasing, and explanations or discussion that may be to verbose or limited in nature (Ross & Morrison, 1993).

Most of the errors that will be found during the proofreading process will be grammatical errors. These errors, while easily caught and corrected, are very commonplace in academic writing. Many of these errors are cause for a submitted paper to be rejected or to cause an authors article to leave an everlasting negative impression on the editor of a journal and his/her staff (Henson, 1999; Ross & Morrison, 1993). The importance of a clean submitted copy and following of the house style cannot be stressed enough as Maddux adds that instructions for headers, title page, page numbers, spacing, abstracts, and direct quotes be followed meticulously if success is to be gained in academic publishing (1996b). A good research idea is such only if it is packaged that way at the point of origin and not at the destination. Importance lies in submitting an article that allows the information to be clearly understandable for all those involved in the process (Brouch, 1979).

Post Writing Section

Article Submission

According to Walton there are two basic types of articles that are submitted for print; programmatic innovations and analytical manuscripts (1979). Walton lays out two separate sets of questions that an author should ask themselves before they submit their articles for submission to verify that the proper information has been included. For programmatic innovations an author should ask (1979, p. 470):

1) Has an appropriate literature review been developed on the topic or area of interest?

2) Does the manuscript seem to contribute uniquely to the literature?

3) Is the manuscript properly and accurately titled?

4) Is an abstract of the manuscript included?

5) Is the purpose of the manuscript clearly delineated in the first few paragraphs?

6) Is the manuscript well organized and presented in a logical and orderly fashion?

7) Is the writing clear and concise? Are the ideas or concepts set forth to the reader in a comprehensible manner?

8) Are the conclusions drawn in the manuscript valid? Do they derive directly from the body of the manuscript?

9) Are appropriate citations noted in the body of the manuscript and included in the references?

For analytical manuscripts, authors should ask these questions of their paper (Walton, 1979, p. 470):

1) Has there been an appropriate literature review?

2) Does the study seem to contribute uniquely to the literature?

3) Is the study properly and accurately titled?

4) Is the problem stated succinctly at the outset? Is the rationale for the study clear? Are the purpose, importance, and limitations of the study readily communicated to the reader? Are terms defined?

5) Are the hypothesis and methodology explicit?

6) Is the data analysis appropriate?

7) Are the findings presented succinctly (accompanied by appropriate tables and/or figures where necessary)?

8) Are the results sufficiently discussed and summarized? Are appropriate and valid conclusions drawn from the data?

9) Are recommendations for further study included?

10) Are appropriate citations noted in the text and included in the reference section?

Once these final research validity checks have been completed and adjustments made, preparing the manuscript packet for submission becomes the next step. Laser printing or using the best available printing medium on standard white paper, size 8.5 x 11, should be utilized to submit the manuscript. An imperative part of the submission process is making sure that enough copies are submitted to the editor and that they are in excellent condition, mailed flat, and not folded in any manner (Luey, 1995). As a precautionary measure to ensure that the journal receives the submission, a submitting author may want to include a self-addressed post card that the editor can return to confirm delivery (Luey, 1995).

Included with the manuscript submission is a brief cover letter. On the first page of the submission, or cover letter, it is important to place the author(s) name, address, vital information, and the article title (Mortimer, 2001). The title page is the only place where the author's vital information should reside; the rest of the article only has the title of the article as a running head, helping to assure anonymous review process (Luey, 1995).

The cover letter's basic purpose is to supply correspondence information and henceforth a short, businesslike letter will do the trick (Ross & Morrison, 1993). The cover letter can also be used to discuss with the editor what has previously been covered in prior communications (if the author has had such communications). Reminding the editor of their prior expression of interest in the manuscript, reacquaint the editor with the title of the manuscript, and to reestablish the authors credibility can all be accomplished with the cover letter (Henson, 1999).

The cover letter is the last communication that an author has with an editor before they begin to review the submitted manuscript packet. All information including whether the manuscript is an adaptation of a conference paper or seminar, whether the article has been accepted to be a chapter in a book, or whether the manuscript should be considered for a special issue (Mortimer, 2001). The previous publication or public presentation information needs inclusion on the cover letter to ensure copyright and infringement integrities are reserved for the correct parties involved. The cover letter is informational, businesslike, and should be to the point so that the editor has all of the required information to begin the review process of the article submission. For a sample cover letter, please reference Appendix E (Thyer, 1994, p. 47).

Revising the Manuscript

After the journal in which the article was submitted to, completes the review process, Walton states that there are four types of responses that an editor uses to communicate their wishes to the author. These responses include; an article being accepted without revisions, an accepted article but with minor revisions, a rejected article with strong encouragement to rewrite, and an article that has been rejected outright with

no chance for publication (1979). If the editor has not laid out specific dates for resubmission, it would behoove an author to set the article aside for a short period of time to get used to the idea that it needs more work and let the subconscious work on the details (Maddux, 1996c). When a resubmit is requested of an author, which is a perfect opportunity to improve the manuscript with the editor's assistance, the author can be assured that the editor sees value in the work and that resubmission should be completed (Jackson et al, 1999).

Setting the article aside will also help deal with preliminary negative emotions associated with the reviewer's comments. Initially, an author may want to disprove the reviewer and show that they are wrong in their review of the article (Summers, 2001). This type of reaction, while normal, is counterproductive. When reading a review it is important to take a pragmatic approach to the reviews, remember that the reviews are not meant to be vindictive, and that many leading reviewers happen to be successful researchers that take a day or two to comment on an article and to construct a sound argument (Summers, 2001). For a beginning author, importance lies in understanding the premise of the reviews as constructive criticism rather than as an attack on a writer's integrity and knowledge (Smaby & Crews, 1998a).

When looking at the offered reviews, a strong effort should be made to listen to the comments that are given by the reviewers and editor (Natriello, 1996; Ross & Morrison, 1993). The author should initially uncover possible underlying themes that all of the reviews had in common (Summers, 2001). Any themes that are revealed need special consideration as correction of these errors will lead to a better, well written article (Summers, 2001). Comments that are written by the editor should also receive

considerable attention as in most cases are actually more important than the reviewers suggestive commentary (Thompson, 1995). The editor's commentary provides additional guidance on which changes suggested by the reviewers are essential for article acceptance (Natriello, 1996). Revising a manuscript can be a difficult and taxing situation, especially when an author receives conflicting opinions from not only the different reviewers but also the editor (Natriello, 1996).

A successful review and revision process lies in the ability of an author to look closely at he reviewers and editor's commentary and criticism and discern which corrections are more important to the success of the article (Maddux, 1996c). One additional note, if the editor appears to favor criticisms from one reviewer or another it is because they have more experience or are better qualified than the remaining reviewers of that particular article (Natriello, 1996; Thompson, 1995).

When perusing the article reviews that have been supplied and after significant consideration, an author may not agree with purposed changes (Summers, 2001). When an author does deem a correction unnecessary, a case must be developed as to why the change should not be enacted. Developing a sound disagreement argument for an editor shows addressing of reviewers comments in a different manner and if structurally sound will assist the article in getting published (Natriello, 1996).

To help with the process, the author, after having a chance to ingest the information supplied by the reviewers, should be to prepare revisions notes that address both the major themes and the individual reviewer's commentary for clarification during the rewriting process (Summers, 2001). Colleagues can also play an important role in deciphering the reviewer's commentary and helping the restructuring process (Black,

Brown, Day & Race, 1998). These additional insurance actions assist in solidifying the article and assuring the rewriting is thorough since an initially positive review will become less positive and have a negative impact on the article's ability to be published if the process is not completed vigilantly (Smaby & Crews, 1998a).

Because of all the conflicting information that can be received by the author after the manuscript is reviewed, an author can contact the editor for further explanation of the reviews (Ross & Morrison, 1993). Writing an editor, even for the simplest of explanations, is the preferred manner in which to communicate especially when looking for clarification on comments for the submitted article (Natriello, 1996). Communicating through writing allows for editors to check their notes and respond with the proper information.

Henson suggests that when contacting editors at this injunction of the process, 44.7% prefer to receive inquiry letters, 42.1% prefer e-mail correspondence, and 18.9% would rather receive a phone call from the author to work out the details (2001). In the academic publishing business, politeness counts and authors should show courtesy to editors by remaining civil and professional in all correspondences of any kind (Natriello, 1996; Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998).

When resubmitting the revised manuscript, a response cover letter should be included in the submission (Ross & Morrison, 1993). In this response cover letter, the author should cover two things; first how the author responded to the editor's and reviewers remarks and secondly describe in detail how the author dealt with each of the changes that were requested (Mortimer, 2001 & Maddux, 1996c). The cover letter should include both changes and non-changes as deemed by the author and allows that

author to project to the editor the correct impression about carefully making the requested changes (Thompson, 1995; Smaby, 1995; Maddux, 1996c).

Even though an author has not made all of the changes suggested by the reviewing committee, an article will not be rejected simply because of this. Informing the editor how the changes could/would have hurt is expected in the cover letter and is to be explained in full detail (Thompson, 1995). The reviewers that will be looking at the manuscript may be privy to the cover letter to assist in the consideration of the article as an important part of the review process (Smaby & Crews, 1998a).

The importance of resubmitting lies within the percentages of acceptance as correlated to the number of times that the manuscript is resubmitted (Smaby, Crews, & Downing, 1999). According to Henson's research on academic journals, 32.8% of journals accepted articles on the first attempt and 78.1% of the journals accepted those articles that had requested revisions (2001). Smaby's et al research concluded that 100% of fourth submissions were included in publication. The acceptance theory states that editors are very busy people and if they ask for a resubmission, they must see merit within the article (Henson, 2001). The American Educational Research Journal says that only 1 in 600 articles are accepted the first go around and only 50% of those asked to resubmit do (cited in Natriello, 1996). Perseverance is a very important aspect of academic publishing and once an author has been asked to resubmit, his/her chances for publication only increase.

Dealing with Rejection

Rejection for many authors is a debilitating and paralyzing outcome, especially those authors who are new to publishing (Maddux, 1996c). Remembering that a rejection

is for the manuscript not the author paired with staying positive, while difficult, is an important part of rejection process (Jenkins, 2002). A majority of articles, while containing good information from a good study, are rejected because they don't fit the scope of the journal and not are part of the current trend that the journal is embracing (Brouch, 1979; Jenkins, 2002). The sooner an author comes to the realization that the rejection was more than likely a fundamental rejection rather than a lack of merit rejection, the sooner a move can be made to submit to the next journal (Maddux, 1996c).

Lederman, Niess (1991) & Summers (2001) state that there are four different categories of why articles are rejected including; weak methodology description, incomplete description of the study, conclusions not supported by evidence and authors reinvent the wheel, due to the lack of comprehensive literature review. Henson also adds reasons towards rejection such as a lack of familiarity of the journal, wrong style, grammatical issues, failure to include substance, and pedantic writing (1999). Violations of fundamental aspects of publishing criteria and norms also lead to rejection of a manuscript (Berardo, 1993a). The largest reason though, for rejection, is the fact that the article makes no contributions to the field of study (Henson).

When submitting an article for publication there are several common writing mistakes that are committed that lead to an article being rejected for publication. According to Sikula, they include (1980):

Mistake 1: The purpose of the work should be made explicit at the beginning of the paper; it should not be implied, assumed or hidden.

Mistake 2: Academic authors often omit basic information such as who, what, where, when, and how. Reread the manuscript to make sure that these were included.

Mistake 3: Accuracy is essential. Anything that is found to be inaccurate immediately loses its credibility.

Mistake 4: Beware of faulty causal relationships. Make sure that independent and dependant variables have been clearly related.

Mistake 5: Over-cautiousness. Authors at times have a tendency to be tentative and therefore have nothing new to report. This is known as reinventing the wheel or beating a dead horse. Neither will likely get published.

Mistake 6: Recognize that absolute objectivity is impossible. Make sure objectivity remains in the summarizing points and recognize your own biases and judgments.

Mistake 7: Use words correctly. Authors shouldn't try to impress by using big words. Plain talk should be utilized to as not to try and confuse the reader.

Mistake 8: Credit the ideas of others. Remember not to take credit for things that are not original thoughts.

Mistake 9: The use of examples, analogies, anecdotes, and illustrations help to establish meaning. Effective teaching as well as writing includes showing, demonstrating, explaining and doing.

Mistake 10: Keep manuscripts as concise as possible to avoid redundancy. Reduce materials/ideas to avoid trying to have the manuscript mean everything to everyone which is impossible.

Mistake 11: Variance of the sentence structure and the choosing of verbs and adverbs should be done with care.

Mistake 12: Proofread diligently, proofread diligently, and proofread diligently. Mistakes in the manuscript will leave a bad taste in the editors/reviewers mouth.

The first step in dealing with a rejection letter is to understand if the article was rejected outright (Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998). Academic publishing has three levels of rejection including; total rejection of the manuscript (which is rare), rewrite is possible but the manuscript needs major revisions, and basically acceptable except for a defect in the experimental work (data appears to be flawed) (Day, 1998). Once an author has disconcerted whether it was a full or partial rejection, the process of understanding the rejection can be started.

Rejection, while not something that author's actively pursue, is a real part of the submission process and resubmitting to another journal the rejected manuscript is a necessity if an article is ever to be published (Thyer, 1994; Ross & Morrison, 1993). Upon receiving a rejection, an author should allow for a cool down period and then immediately submit the revised article to another journal (Jenkins, 2002). Noting the criticism's given by the reviewers and the editor that seem most appropriate can be used to submit to another journal (Walton, 1979; Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998; Natriello, 1996; Ross & Morrison, 1993). Learning from a failure is more positive than agonizing over it and following editorial suggestions rather than feeling victimized by them will assist an author in reworking their manuscript (Gebhardt, 1995). Coping strategies can be of assistance during this time as they will reduce the reluctance to resubmit and make rejections easier to handle (Gebhardt, 1995).

Unfortunately there are those instances where rejections and even rejection letters deviate from the norm. Editors and reviewers alike are very busy and are only human,

they make mistakes just like everyone else (Thompson, 1995; Natriello, 1996). Sometimes good articles are rejected and poor articles make it into print. Sometimes an article will be rejected after initially positive reviews (Lewis, cited in Borer, 1997). Another anomaly to academic publishing is when an author receives a hostile rejection letter. When a letter like this is received, it is imperative to stay calm and not contact the editor. This "knee jerk" effect will not only alienate the author from the journal but may have far reaching effects on the editor and the reviewing staff for the journal (Maddux, 1996b). All of these anomalies to publishing, while rare, do happen and an author needs to be prepared if something this rare does happen.

There are also times in author's career where they must recognize that the article they have been working on will not get published. Reviewers usually differentiate between a flawed study and a weak write up (Jenkins, 2002). When a flawed study is involved, do not hide this fact and instead try to show what can be learned from the study. If a set of reviews comes back discussing the study is too flawed, scrap the article submission attempts and learn from the experience to create a more publishable study (Walton, 1979; Jenkins, 2002). When moving onto another article, do not throw away the previous work since it may be useful down the road or it may serve as a reminder of what has been done wrong in the past (Black, Brown, Day & Race, 1998). Good writing comes from experience and learning from those experiences, especially being rejected, is the type of experience that an author must not forget but learn from.

Article Acceptance & After

Acceptance of an article, while the goal that was being pursued by the author, is not the end of the process. When the author receives the acceptance packet from the

editor it usually includes an acceptance letter that can take two separate forms; the first acceptance is that the article is too appear in a future journal edition and the second acceptance is where the editor has placed the article in an exact edition (Brouch, 1979). The second type of letter is the preferred correspondence for authors since this allows the author to know when the article will be published and that they are guaranteed publication in a journal edition. The first type of letter is used by editors to inform author's that there article will be used as a "just in case and fill out an edition" in the near future, sometimes known as "editor's roulette" (Brouch, 1979). At this point the author can accept the offer by signing the author's agreement that usually accompanies the acceptance letter. The author's agreement form is such that an author must sign it before the article will be included in the journal. An example author's agreement is located in Appendix F (cited in Thyer, 1994, p. 66).

At this juncture, the author may also be required to deal with the different aspects of copyright permissions. When an article has been accepted the author may have to request permission from other journals whose works have been substantially borrowed from so that the information can be included in the article accepted for publication (Cantor, 1993). The author may also be required to sign a copyright assignment form from the journal that the article is being published in. This form (Cantor, 1993):

1) Basically gives the publisher the right to publish the work in a specified time frame. If not published within that time frame, the author may print somewhere else.

2) Informs authors of their rights after publication. Authors may reproduce it for class, quoting themselves in other works, but no other publication may appear without written permission.

3) Allows authors to use the information as a basis for future works and allows them to retain rights to patents and innovations.

The author, after having their article published, loses much of the control of the printed information without written receiving consent from the publishers.

After receiving the article acceptance letter and completing all of the necessary forms, the author will then receive a final proof to review for corrections and/or mistakes. This final proof or galley proof is not an opportunity to make changes to the research but should be used to check for misspelled words, typesetting mistakes, or to update in-press references (Thompson, 1995; Ross & Morrison, 1993). Using professional editing procedures is imperative at this juncture and any additional changes, other than superficial changes, made by the author may result in extra charges that the author may have to pay out of pocket (Thyer, 1994).

Marketing a published research article is a very valid and important part of an academician's success. An author must remember that everyone is extremely busy and most don't have time to read every article that is printed in their field. To receive greater exposure from a printed article, sending copies or supplied reprints to those actively researching in the field may hold great value (Thyer, 1994; Thompson, 1995). Another suggestion would be to send copies to those authors who were quoted in the research or to send out a press release to the general media if the information found has a significant amount of value (Thompson, 1995). Getting as many miles out of a printed article is essential to success in academic writing.

The rewards for having an article accepted into an academic journal are great in number. For some authors, seeing their own article in print is reward enough (Brouch,

1979). For others receiving a monetary token, while rare, is also a nice token of reward (Brouch). Hearing from others that the article helped shape their thinking is a pleasant reward and hearing reactions from people at a conference, whether good or bad, is a reward all to itself (Brouch, 1979). Sikula discusses that publications are also an important part of receiving tenure and promotions, can contribute to advancement of the discipline, and can assist in developing a positive reputation amongst peers (1980). Receiving requests for reprints, invitations to address groups, and make contributions to publications are all part of the reward structure (Sikula, 1980).

One final note on article acceptance, do not throw away article information for a period of at least 5 years after acceptance. Keeping this information will allow the author to accommodate requests for hard data, deal with legal ramifications associated with the study, and possible usage in other outlets (Thyer, 1994). Keeping the information for this period of time can help answer any questions presented about the research and will allow a basis of information that an author can draw upon if needed for additional research.

The Waiting Game

Academic publishing is a time consuming and frustrating experience for most authors. While frustrations are part of the equation, the waiting aspect of publishing can be sped up by not waiting between article submissions. During the time that is associated with publishing, the author should be working on the next great idea (Brouch, 1979). Jenkins adds that even when one article is out to review, which takes anywhere from 6-12 months to complete, an author ought to be working on their next submission (2002). A good author will have one manuscript in press, one under review, and one in the process of completion. Establishing this type of procedure will allow an author to be a productive

writer and will produce a comfort level that allows for greater success in publishing (Jenkins, 2002).

CHAPTER THREE

Introduction

The most difficulty when it comes to academic publishing comes from authors not allowing their minds to be free, self-conscious, and roam freely; to look at facts in a new way, be spontaneous, imaginative, flexible, and tolerant of ambiguities (Maslow, 1967). While this short synopsis delineates the trouble academic authors have when attempting to publish, this research takes a look at what should be included in a publishing support curriculum program to help those who are new or are having difficulty publishing in academic journals. The information obtained through the administered surveys and personal interviews will uncover perceptions of research and publication. This will also reveal what graduate students and graduate faculty feel the success of a curriculum offering would be at the University of Wisconsin-Stout.

Within this chapter, how subjects were chosen, the types of instrumentation utilized, and the manner in which instrumentation was used to collect the data will be addressed. Analysis of the data, assumptions, and limitations will also be discussed.

Subject Selection

Upon receiving clearance from the University of Wisconsin-Stout Institutional Review Board concerning sample selection and survey, 33 students in the EDU-740 Research Foundations course were selected as the appropriate sample of graduate students to be surveyed. This group of students was to serve as a gauge to the overall opinions of the graduate student body on the publishing support curriculum proposed

offering. The students in this course were selected because they represented over 10 of the graduate degree programs on campus. The course was a mix of both male and female participants, had students at different levels of graduate degree completion.

Since the main focus of this study was to target graduate students and their wish to publish, the researcher's advisory committee suggested that only graduate faculty be contacted, as they would have the most intimate knowledge of perceptions of the graduate student body. The graduate faculty selection process was developed by contacting the Graduate School and receiving the latest installment of their annual report, Academic Year 2001-2002 Graduate School Report. Within this report, there is a list generated annually of all graduate faculty members on campus. Using this list, the researcher eliminated those faculty members who were no longer on campus, on sabbatical or other leave, or were previously exposed to the survey (including the members of researcher's thesis advisory committee). Of the remaining 170 graduate faculty members surveyed, there were a total of 72 respondents, or 42.4% of the population, who completed and returned the survey.

In addition, one-on-one interviews were conducted with key administrative personnel to get a feeling for where the administration and a senior research faculty member stood on student research and their perceptions of the publishing support curriculum that was being developed with this research. The interviews were selected because of their upper-level positions within the university structure. Those interviewed included: Charles Sorenson; Chancellor, Robert Sedlak, Provost; Robert Meyer, College of Technology, Engineering, and Management Dean; John Wesolek, College of Human Development Dean; Claudia Johnston, Graduate School Director; Susan Foxwell,

Research Services Research Administrator; and Janice Coker, Chair of the Institutional Review Board. John Murphy, College of Art and Science Dean was unavailable for comment. Upon ratification of the selected Stout community members by the researcher's advisory committee, each were asked the same set of "appetizer" questions to understand their positions on the research topic.

Instrumentation

For the purpose of this research, there were three target audiences that were contacted at separate periods to glean information germane to this research. The first group of participants included a cross-section of graduate students at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. The survey that was utilized for these particular participants consisted of two parts, the cover sheet and survey body. The first part, or cover sheet, was used as an introduction to the students to discuss the scope and purpose for this research. The second part, or actual survey, utilized a combination of nominal and ordinal questions to uncover information concerning graduate students and their future goals, their interest in academic publishing, and inquiry concerning their views on the content and delivery of the proposed publishing support curriculum. The cover page and survey in their entirety can be found in Appendix A.

The second target audience was that of the graduate faculty at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. Besides being distributed, on suggestion of the researcher's advisory committee, through the office of the provost and being endorsed with Provost's signature, the surveys were constructed in a manner to make a response easily returned through inter-campus mail. These two particular aspects of the survey delivery method were utilized to help ensure a return rate that validated the information collected.

The actual survey was constructed of 12 questions, utilizing both nominal and ordinal data. This research looked into the graduate faculty's perceptions of current student research, the level of impact that the publishing support curriculum would have on the graduate student body and the Stout Community, and finally at the faculty's overall opinions concerning the structure and delivery type that should be utilized for the curriculum offering. There were also open ended questions at the end of the survey where the respondents were encouraged to add any additional information that they believed pertinent. These particular questions garnered information that was instrumental during the literature review synopsis and the publishing support curriculum outline construction. The cover page and survey in their entirety appear in Appendix B.

For those administrative personnel who were interviewed, there were a set of standard questions that were asked of each person as "appetizer" questions and the remaining individualized inquiry was dictated by the pace and direction of the interview. The questions used were chosen to receive direct feedback on the perceptions of student research and what the "decision makers" on campus thought of the proposed publishing support curriculum. While there is not a particular section in Chapter 4 that will discuss the answers to the questions, many quotations and expressed thoughts on these topics have been delineated throughout this research report. The introductory list of questions, in its entirety, appears in Appendix C.

Data Collection

For both the graduate faculty and graduate student surveys, there was limited control over the response rate and survey completion from the respondents. The graduate survey was distributed to EDU-740 Research Foundations class during a

scheduled class period. During the 15 minute block that was set aside for the students to complete the survey, the researcher was able to personally present to the class the reasoning behind the study and to reinforce the stance that participation was optional. Once distributed to the students, the instructor gave the students 10 minutes to complete the survey. To maintain anonymity, as to their level of participation; the students were not required to bring the survey to the front of the room and were collected simultaneously at the end of the 10 minutes. Upon collection, the surveys were placed into an envelope and not looked at until the information was evaluated by Christine Ness.

Initial wariness of the researcher's advisory committee over the return rate of the distributed faculty surveys prompted the researcher to add additional return insurance measures (Amy Gillett, Jafar Jafari, & Julie Furst-Bowe, personal communication, February 3, 2003). The first of these measures was to construct a response tracking matrix so during secondary email communications, those who had completed the survey would not be disturbed with information that did not pertain to them. This initial measure, in hindsight, was not required because after the initial response, no additional surveys were solicited. The success of this initial mailing was in part to the primary insurance measure which was to have the surveys endorsed and sent out of the Provost's office. With the Provost's endorsement, the research attracted greater attention from the faculty members as having legitimate university scope (Robert Davies, personal communication, April 13, 2003). The final insurance measure was to distribute the surveys before the University of Wisconsin-Stout's spring break period. The distribution timing allowed for faculty to complete the survey before their week long vacation and the

corresponding "spring rush" that happens after the return from spring break. These three aspects of the distribution assisted the researcher in assuring adequate response.

While both surveys were distributed before the spring break vacation, the interviews were conducted during this student vacation period. The researcher found that many of the intended interviewee's were more receptive to the time requirement's during this period. The interviews were conducted in close proximity of each other so that previous discussions were freshly implanted with the researcher and the ability to "ad-lib" to each subsequent interview was increased. All dialogue was audio taped to ensure proper quotations for the research report except for one administrative person who declined to have the interview taped. This information cataloging was completed to ensure that the thoughts and theories of the interviewees were properly captured for dissemination purposes.

Data Analysis

With the information that was gathered and for the purposes of data analysis, both the graduate faculty surveys and graduate student surveys were forwarded to Information and Operation Systems on the University of Wisconsin-Stout campus for descriptive statistical analysis. Utilizing the SPSS system, individual results were tallied from each of the questions on each survey to better explain the participant opinions on publishing and the proposed publishing support curriculum. Utilizing the gathered information as a base, statistical analysis was also constructed as valuable correlation statistics that will be further explained in Chapter 4.

Information gleaned from the individual interviews was analyzed by the researcher to draw direct correlation between the proposed publishing support curriculum

and the level of support from university administration and senior research faculty members. The information from the surveys was also used to reinforce the relationship between the literature review and the University of Wisconsin Stout stance on student research and support for the publishing support curriculum.

Assumptions

There are several assumptions associated with the methodology of the conducted study. They were:

1. The ideology applied to this study requires that data obtained from the graduate students and faculty can only be applied to the University of Wisconsin-Stout and those universities that closely resemble its aptitudes and constructs.

2. The graduate faculty survey participants are from varied university backgrounds and positions. These participants were selected because of their status as graduate faculty and because of their standing within the UW-Stout community.

3. Data collected through the graduate student surveys represented a large cross-section of the graduate student population and was able to achieve this without distributing a large quantity of surveys.

4. Since each discipline has its own format for publishing, the distributed surveys were kept as generalized as possible while collecting quality information germane to the researcher's goals.

Limitations

Accordingly, there were several limitations to the methodology that were taken into consideration. They were:

1. The information collected from the graduate students and faculty members of the University of Wisconsin-Stout are specifically germane to this "teaching" orientated university. Any application of the collected data to universities that are widely considered research institutions or located outside of the University of Wisconsin System has its restrictions.

2. Because the research looked into academic publishing across the broad spectrum of disciplines at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, information collected could only be generalized and no specific data concerning specific majors was solicited.

3. Time and financial constraints played a role in access to materials and facilities that could have been utilized to complement this research. These inadequacies affected the research in such a manner that only key administrators were interviewed and a limited number of graduate surveys were administered.

4. The validity and reliability of the survey instrument and interview questions utilized for gathering information from all of the participants was untested.

CHAPTER FOUR

Introduction

This chapter will present the results that have been collected from the graduate faculty survey, the graduate student survey, personal interviews and investigations conducted to uncover the level of support that a Publishing Support Curriculum offering might receive from the University of Wisconsin-Stout community. The primary purpose of this research was to uncover the content that should be offered, the perceptions of graduate faculty and students towards this proposed offering, and opinions on the format and outline of the proposed curriculum. Throughout the discussion of the results of surveys, there will be several instances where the number of answers will not correspond to the number of the responses. For these particular surveys, many of the respondents took the opportunity to "give suggestions" in place of marking one of the pre-set corresponding answers. Many of the suggestions that were given can be found in the last section of this chapter, Proposed Curriculum Commentary.

Graduate Students Reaction to Proposed Curriculum

The subjects utilized in this section of the study were from a sampling of multiple degree offerings at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. On the day that the surveys were distributed to the class, there were 33 students present who actively participated in distributed surveys.

Of those participating in the survey, 25 (75.8%) were fulltime graduate students; 6 (18.2%) were part-time students; and 2 (6.1%) were dually enrolled students. Dually enrolled students are those who do not have their undergraduate degree but are already taking graduate level courses.

Publication & Interest

When asked if students would have interest in publishing in an academic journal, there were a total of 21, (63.6%) who stated that they would have interest; 11 (33.3%) of respondents had no interest in publishing; and only 1 (3%) was unsure on whether or not they wanted to publish.

When asked whether they thought that the proposed Publishing Support Curriculum (PSC) would be beneficial to graduate students, all of the participants found benefits in a publishing support course offering. Of the respondents, 13 (39.4%) of students thought the course could be very beneficial; 18 (54.5%) believed it could be somewhat beneficial; and only 2 (6.1%) thought it would be minimally beneficial to them.

Opinions on Course Construction

Part of the purpose behind surveying the graduate student population was to ask for suggestions and input concerning the outline, content, and structure of the PSC offering. When asked to consider the length of time that the PSC course should be offered when grades for credits would be part of the curriculum, 12 of the respondents (36.4%) believed that the course should be semester long; 8 (24.2%) thought that the course should be offered throughout the academic school year, and 13 (39.4%) contemplated that students should be given as much time is needed or allowed by university regulations.

When asked about what type of support a student should be given when working with the PSC curriculum, students were wary to work with all electronic media only. A majority of students, 17 (51.5%) would like to have weekly meetings in a classroom

setting or a one-on-one based meeting with an instructor; 14 (42.4%) considered an online assisted course with occasional meetings would be preferred and only 2 (6.1%) students thought that an all electronic (Online, CD-Rom) would be most beneficial.

Course Participation Interest

Student participation in a course offering plays a significant factor in the decision to develop and offer curriculum such as the PSC at the University of Wisconsin-Stout (Robert Sedlak, personal communication, March 17, 2003). To help understand the overall level of proposed participation in this course, students were asked if they would participate in this type of curriculum if it was offered at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. Of the 33 respondents, 19 (57.6%) would be interested in taking this course; the remaining 14 (42.4%) students had no interest in participating in an offering such as this.

When those who showed interest in the course offering were asked about being required to pay a nominal fee for the course offering, 7 (36.8%) would still have a strong interest; 7 (36.8%) had a somewhat strong interest in taking the course; 4 (21.1%) were limited in their interest of the PSC offering; and 1 (5.3%) showed minimal or no interest if they were required to pay a fee for the offering.

To gauge the effects that cost would have on the Publishing Support Curriculum (PSC) offering, those students who stated they would be interested in this type of offering were also asked how interested they would be if there was no fee involved or the cost was part of the student fees that they are required to pay. Interest in the PSC offering showed a dramatic rise as there was 11 students (57.6%) who had a strong interest; an increase of 21.1%. The remaining 8 respondents (42.4%) of those surveyed, had either a somewhat or limited interest in the PSC offering when there was no additional cost associated. All

of those surveyed were interested in the course offering when there was no cost associated with taking the course.

While interest in the proposed course was indeed high, a matrix to help delineate information germane to the mean and standard deviations of this interest was constructed. Included in the matrix, is the proposed support that this type of offering would have on the *Journal of Student Research* and graduate students additional propensity to submit publishable articles to it. The questions were answered on a four point scale with 4 showing the most amount of interest and 1 showing little to no interest in the offering. Note: The 14 missing surveys are in part because if the participant answered no to question number 7 of the instrument, they were asked to skip these questions (Please reference Appendix A for Graduate Student Questionnaire).

Table 4.1 Comparison of Graduate Survey; Question 8, Question 9, & Question 10

	Question 8: Would students be interested if they were charged a nominal fee?	Question 9: Would students be interested if the cost was part of their attendance fees?	Question 10: Would publishing in the *Journal* be of greater interest if the PSC was offered?
Valid Questionnaires	19	19	19
Missing	14	14	14
Mean	3.05	3.53	3.37
Std. Deviation	.91	.61	.83

Graduate Faculties Reaction to Proposed Curriculum

Those graduate faculty members who were surveyed for this aspect of the research represents a broad spectrum of not only academic disciplines but also positions within the University of Wisconsin-Stout structure. Graduate faculty fill teaching positions that range anywhere from Assistant Professor to Professor to administrative personnel. Of the 72 returned surveys, 28 (38.9%) of respondents held the position of full Professor; 22 (30.6%) held the position of Associate Professor; 9 (12.5%) were

considered Assistant Professors. The remaining 12 (16.9%) respondents that answered this particular question of the sample indicated they were other on the survey which as previously mentioned, could have filled positions varying from administrator to special appointment employee. Only 1 respondent, representing 1.4% of the sample, did not indicate a specific option as indicated on the survey.

Support of Curriculum

When asked whether or not they would encourage their graduate students to enroll in the PSC offering if it was available, 56 (77.8%) respondents indicated that they would encourage their students to take part in this offering. Only 11 (15.3%) of the survey participants indicated that they would not and 5 (6.9%) chose not to answer this question.

When graduate faculty were asked their opinions on how interested they believed graduate students to be in this type of offering, the majority of respondents believed that students would react positively to the PSC. Among them, 47 (65.3%) of graduate faculty members believed the students would be interested, 15 (20.8%) thought they would not be interested; 3 (4.2%) were under the impression that students would maybe interested; and 7 (9.7%) of the sample did not answer this question.

The graduate faculty was also asked to identify how their perceived level of student participation if the cost of the PSC program was covered in student fees associated with attendance. Of the 70, (97.2%) that responded; 5 (7.1%) insisted that students would have a strong interest; 23 (32.9%) thought students would have a somewhat strong interest in the program; 31 (44.3%) would have a limited interest in this type of offering; and 11 (15.7%) believed graduate students to have little or no interest in this type of offering.

The participants were also asked if their fellow faculty members would have interest in this type of program if offered at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. Of the 95.8% of those who responded to this question, 18.8% believed there to be a strong interest in this type of offering; 37.7% believed that there would be a somewhat strong interest in this offering; 34.8% would only have a limited interest in this type of offering; and 8.7% thought that fellow faculty members would have little or no interest in the PSC offering.

To better represent the information requested from the graduate faculty on the perceived level of interest from graduate students and fellow faculty members, Table 4.1 shows both the mean and Standard Deviation to questions 9A and 10, perceived student interest and perceive faculty interest, on the survey (graduate survey can be located in Appendix B). The questions were answered on a four point scale with 4 showing the most amount of interest and 1 showing little to no interest.

Table 4.2 Comparison of Graduate Faculty; Question 9A & Question 10

	Question 9A: Faculty Perceptions of Student Interest in PSC offering	Question 10: Graduate Faculty Perceptions of Fellow Faculty Interest in PSC
# of Valid Questionnaires	70	69
Invalid Questionnaire	2	3
Mean	2.31	2.67
Std. Deviation	.83	.89

Cross tabulations were also conducted to determine which type of graduate faculty would be so inclined to encourage their students to participate in the PSC. This was done to see if there existed significant differences in academic standing compared to the level of encouragement for students to take part in the offering.

Table 4.3 Academic Standing vs. Participation Encouragement

			If the PSC was offered, would you encourage your students to enroll?			
			Yes	No	Maybe	Total
Academic Standing of Respondent	Professor	Count	20	6	1	27
		%	74.1%	22.2%	3.7%	100.0%
	Associate Professor	Count	18	3		21
		%	85.7%	14.3%		100.0%
	Assistant Professor	Count	8	1		9
		%	88.9%	11.1%		100.0%
	Other	Count	8	1		9
		%	88.9%	11.1%		100.0%
	Total	Count	54	11	1	66
		%	81.8%	16.7%	1.5%	100.0%

Opinions on Course Construction

Perceptions about the length of such an offering were also inquired about from the graduate faculty. The majority 55 (76.4%) thought a semester long course would be perfect; 22 (30.6%) believed that a year long course would be most beneficial; and 17 (23.6%) deemed a student should have as much time as needed or allowed by university standards. The remaining respondents, 4 (5.6%), had no opinion or marked more than one answer on the survey.

When asked which format the PSC should be delivered to students in, graduate faculty believed that an online/occasional meeting would be the most beneficial for students to learn as 48.6% of all respondents suggested a quasi electronic/traditional delivery method. Because of the combination answers that were given with a lack of proper tabulation and reporting, Table 4.3 displays the results.

Table 4.4 Format Delivery Most Beneficial to Graduate Students

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Weekly Class Meetings (1)	21	29.2%	31.8%
Online/Occasional Meetings (2)	35	48.6%	53.0%
All Electronic (3)	6	8.3%	9.1%
1 & 2 Combination	2	2.8%	3.0%
1 & 3 Combination	1	1.4%	1.5%
1 & 2 & 3 Combination	1	1.4%	1.5%
Total	66	91.7%	100.0%
Missing	6	8.3%	
Overall Total	72	100.0%	

Benefits, Involvement & Significance

For PSC, the graduate faculty does not have as positive perception about student involvement as what the graduate students themselves did. According to responses, only 6 (8.3%) of the sample foresees a large amount of participation; 20 (27.8%) see medium participation; 32 (44.4%) see a minimal participation; and 11 (15.3%) see little or no participation. Only 3 participants, (4.2%) of the sample, did not qualify an answer for this question.

An important aspect to obtaining support for the Publishing Support Curriculum is to look at far-reaching impacts. To better illustrate the perceived level of impact that graduate faculty members see in the PSC offering, Table 4.4 was constructed to show both the mean and Standard Deviation to questions 3 and 5; the significance of this offering to the Stout Community and how beneficial it would be for graduate students. The questions were answered on a four point scale with 4 showing a large significance and 1 showing little to no significance.

Table 4.5 Comparison of Graduate Faculty; Question 3 & Question 5

	Question 3: Would PSC hold any significance for the Stout Community	Question 5: How beneficial would PSC be for those students who participated
# of Valid Questionnaires	70	69
Invalid Questionnaire	2	3
Mean	2.80	2.94
Std. Deviation	.88	.92

Survey Comments: Proposed Curriculum Commentary

Both the graduate student surveys and the graduate faculty surveys had allocated space allowed for written suggestions and comments concerning the proposed offering. Because there were significantly less graduate students who took the survey, their list of suggestions were shorter than that given by the faculty. Nonetheless, all of the commentary was taken into account and played an integral role in the development of the Publishing Support Curriculum outline and creation of the recommendations located in Chapter 5. These comments given by the respondents of the distributed graduate student and faculty surveys can be found in Appendix I.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary

This research has looked at answering questions concerning opinions of the graduate faculty and graduate student populations towards the proposed Publishing Support Curriculum. A critical review has also been done on literature concerning publishing in academic journals. This chapter will focus on discussion centered on the survey responses and analyze that information to show support concerning the Publishing Support Curriculum (PSC) offering.

An outline of the proposed PSC will also appear in this chapter as a basis for future construction. Conclusions on resource availability, administrative view points, and the overall feel of those contacted towards this offering will also be discussed. Recommendations will also be supplied as the initiation of this program, implementation ideas, and further research and development.

Objective One & Two: Graduate Students & Graduate Faculty Perception of the Publishing Support Curriculum offering

According to the research, a majority of the sampled students, 57.6% would be interested in the PSC offering. This majority of students, while only part of the graduate student population at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, actually display a lower percentage of interest than what graduate faculty believed the student interest to be. When graduate faculty were asked how interested they believed graduate students to be in this type of curriculum, 72.3% of respondents believed students would be interested in the offering. This level of interest is considerable higher than first speculation by the researcher. The surprise about the high percentage is because there were a multitude of

negative comments on the survey about research and its support at the University of Wisconsin-Stout.

While faculty see a large amount of students having interest in this the PSC offering, closer analysis of the information supplied by the graduate student survey shows the pattern of which particular graduate students would be most interested in the offering. Those with interests in publishing are students who have higher aspirations beyond straightforward graduation and beginning their career and see the most benefit in the PSC offering. Of the 21 students or 63.6% of the sample who have an interest in getting published, 76.2% plan for additional education after their current graduate degree, 79.3% thought that the PSC offering would be very beneficial or somewhat beneficial to students who enrolled, and 71.4% would have an interest in taking part in the PSC. This information, while expected, was calculated to show that only those students whose interests were focused on the academic region of education were the individuals who showed the most interest. This information was expected as the researcher focused on attracting these types of students to have interest in the PSC offering.

Those interested students, while concerned in more than just graduating would not be generous in spending their money to receive this additional piece of knowledge. Adding additional fees, 48.5% of those students who were interested in the PSC were no longer interested in this particular offering due to the threat of an additional fee. Because of the unwillingness of students to pay additional fees for their education, the PSC should be offered to all graduate students at a rigorously reduced price or included in the additional fees that graduate students pay to attend the University of Wisconsin-Stout. Because of this unwillingness, research was conducted to locate those funding sources

already allocated for students conducting research and their availability as part of the development of the PSC program. This information will be covered later in the conclusions section.

Graduate faculty, as a group, see a great amount of promise in this program. The support of program is overwhelming as 76.4% of respondents would encourage their students to enroll in the program if it were offered as a standard course offering credits towards graduate. A slightly lower percentage, 65.3%, would suggest the PSC offering if offered in an electronic format and was used for professional development purposes. Such support for a program that is nothing more than an outline reaffirms the researcher's beliefs that this type of curriculum has a place at the University of Wisconsin-Stout and if quality construction would have a hefty support crowd.

Further research into the faculty support showed that assistant professors and administrative personnel would be most likely to encourage their students to utilize this offering as 88.9% of those responded said that they would encourage their students to enroll. Associate professors were third most likely to encourage their students to enroll as 85.7% would encourage enrollment and full professors were least likely as 74.1% of professors noted they would encourage enrollment. With full professors making up 40% of all graduate faculty respondents, the research shows that for this type of curriculum to have success, professors must have an active role in development and delivery of the course so that they see a benefit to the PSC and encourage their students to enroll. While assistant professors and associate professors propensity is currently to insist that their students enroll in the PSC, this predisposition would increase if they witness senior academicians insisting their students to enroll in courses such as this. Receiving and

maintaining support from the senior academicians is important to the success of such a course offering as they make up the greatest amount of graduate faculty percentages.

While the faculty's propensity to perceive graduate student involvement and overall interest in the program was high, there was an underlying doubtfulness to the reception and success of such curriculum. Whether this perception is because of the faculties' knowledge of the publication process, the failed experimentation with similar curriculum offerings, past experiences with student's who wished to publish academically, the researcher believes there to be a separate rationale for this negativity. The overall research atmosphere at the University of Wisconsin-Stout plays a significant role in this pessimism towards the PSC. Many of the survey respondents who added commentary suggested that the campus atmosphere is not conducive to research and its publication. When asked about the level of commitment to research by the university, the largest amount of faculty members, 27 or 37.5%, stated that they thought the campus was minimally committed to research and that there is room for improvement (these respondents marked a two out of a possible four for commitment, with one being the lowest amount of commitment). This relatively low number and perceived low level of commitment of the University towards research and publishing could possibly play a major factor in the level of success of the PSC offering.

Aspects of the research conducted focused on opinions of how the graduate faculty believed the PSC offering to be good for the whole University. Of those who responded, 67% commented that they thought this offering would be good not only for the graduate students but also for the Stout Community as a whole. The Stout Community, used as a general term includes all university resources available, including

maintenance of current resources. One of these sources, the *Journal of Student Research*, would stand to gain an increase of available selections for publishable student articles. According to the surveyed graduate students, they would have a greater propensity to publish in the Journal of Student research with a mean of 3.37 on a 4.0 scale. This increased involvement of resources by students is a positive endeavor especially when less than 3% of the graduate student population is attempting to publish in this university supplied resource (Eric T. Brey, personal communication, April 14, 2003). With this increased level of involvement, the benefits of the PSC could initially be two fold. The PSC offering could help students publish and supply the *Journal of Student Research* with quality articles. With the benefits of such a program already increasing without full curriculum development, the question must be asked; "What residual positive affects or outcomes could the Publishing Support Curriculum have on the University of Wisconsin-Stout and the Stout Community after curriculum perpetuation?"

Graduate Faculty Position vs. Graduate Student Position

Besides asking each group of survey respondents their opinions on the perceived level of graduate student involvement in the PSC, they were each asked for input on how beneficial they believed the program to be. Both survey groups agreed that this type of curriculum would be beneficial for those involved. Graduate students were more inclined to see benefits from the course offering as 93.9% of respondents saw the offering as very beneficial or somewhat beneficial and only 72.2.% of graduate faculty saw it as very beneficial or somewhat beneficial. This difference in opinions follows the same scenario as the proposed involvement question. Graduate faculty, with their previous experiences, were less likely to see a benefit from this offering which only reinforces the researchers

opinion that the faculty members must be actively involved with every stage of the PSC construction, development and instruction if offered in the future. This involvement will help ensure a quality product and more receptive faculty if the PSC were offered to the students at the University of Wisconsin-Stout.

Both groups were asked for their input on the construction of the course. Quantitative and qualitative data was collected and analyzed concerning the length of the course if offered for credit and the type of format that would be preferred if offered for non-credit or as professional development. Because both groups saw benefits in an offering longer than one semester, 54.3% of faculty members and 63.6% of students, a standard curriculum would have limitations for success in the survey participants opinion. These opinions partnered with the fact that 59.7 % of faculty members and 48.5% of students believed that an electronic offering would be most beneficial; only one feasible suggestion could be constructed. This offering should be available in a CD-ROM format with proper support from faculty members in the form of an independent study or professional development opportunity. While there were less than 50% of students who were interested in strictly electronic resources, the remainder of students would be inclined to participate if there was some form of personal interaction. The independent study format allows student's additional time for completion, which many students and faculty made reference too, and it allows faculty members to have that one on one interaction that many stated was important to the success of a program such as this. The only pessimistic aspect of this option is finding faculty willing to take on an independent study of this magnitude as comments were made about graduate faculty already be stressed for time, but with a quality PSC, this obstacle is one that can be overcome.

Conclusions

Objective Three: Publishing Support Curriculum Development

Both graduate faculty and graduate students at the University of Wisconsin-Stout have an interest in this program and believe that PSC has the prospect of being beneficial to everyone involved. The information that was uncovered through the survey's shows that students are interested in article publication if they would be given the proper tools to succeed. Likewise, the graduate faculty sees merit in a program offering such as this and would be inclined to promote this offering to their graduate students. Because of this support by those at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, the researcher has laid out a curriculum outline that can be completed at a later date by another researcher. Because of limitations, the researcher was unable to a full curriculum program but has supplied the necessary background research, availability, and support numbers for the offering to be completed at a later date.

One additional note on the PSC offering, the outline has been constructed to assist those students that have already completed the majority of their research project. The purpose behind PSC is to assist students from taking their research, whether it is a thesis or research project, and turning it into a publishable article. This curriculum is not meant to assist the student to start a project from conception to completion. The PSC is meant as an additional option for students to advance their education received at the University of Wisconsin-Stout through academic publication.

Proposed outline of the Publishing Support Curriculum

Progression of research pertaining to the PSC outline has lead the researcher to develop the following course modules from which to build upon. The outline should be developed so that upon full maturity, the curriculum will achieve the overall objectives in each module.

Introduction to Journal Publishing - Module 1

Learners will receive information on common terminologies and concepts that are directly associated with publishing a completed research report in an academic journal. The history and culture of publishing will be discussed along with the importance of academic publishing as an independent aspect of academia. The review process will also be covered along with discussion on the process of obtaining and receiving mentoring from a faculty member.

Considerations for Academic Publication – Module 2

Learners will receive instruction on how to select the correct audience for their research and how to choose which journal publication would be the best outlet for their work. The concept of publishing collaboration will be discussed in great lengths to expose young authors to the pros and cons of this type of enterprise. Motivation will be discussed along the ethics and values that must be taken into consideration during the publication process.

Prewriting Components to Ensure Success – Module 3

Learners in this section will discover many new and different aspects of how to ensure success in academic publishing. Factors including writing basics, writing problems, and writing styles will all be discussed in great deal to establish the difference

between the thesis writing style and that needed for successful article publication. This section will also discuss ways in which proper formatting of articles can be accomplished and show learners how planning and an outline can expedite the writing process.

Academic Writing: An Intricate Process – Unit 4

Learners will be exposed to advice for developing each individual part of an academic journal article. Importance on the creation of the title and abstract, along with the introduction, will be conferred. Reducing the literature review to cover only those resources that are absolutely necessary to the journal article will be tackled. Developing the methodology and result reporting section will also be discussed. Learners will then be exposed to the importance and difficulties involved with completing the conclusion section of an article.

Article Submission & Beyond – Unit 5

Learners, in this section, will be given different options and opinions on effective editing and proofing of the article before submission. This section will then discuss the actual submission process and the revision process that is required for journal articles to be published. This segment of the PSC will also discuss how to deal with article acceptance and ways in which a positive publishing track record can be developed and adhered to.

Publishing Support Curriculum Development Funding

Because of the current interest and the negative state of affairs that have transpired because of the current State of Wisconsin budget crisis presents some difficulty in acquisition of the funds for program development. Through communication with Bonnie Falkner, a possible funding source, the Student Research Fund, was

discovered and researched. Information was obtained concerning its beginnings and the amounts that are available each year for student research.

In 2001, Chancellor Sorenson developed the Student Research Fund which students could utilize to complete and present their research findings. (Bonnie Falkner, personal communication, February, 5, 2003). In the opinions of Robert Sedlak, University Provost, and Janice Coker, Institutional Review Board President, the research fund has been both beneficial and successful to the students at the University of Wisconsin-Stout (personal communication, March 16, 2003). This fund, while it has met with success for those students that have used its available funds, has been a limited success model because it is not completely taken advantage of by the student body.

Over the first two years of the research fund, over $10,000 has not been utilized by students for direct research activities. This money, while unused by students, has not gone unused by the university. In 2000-2001, money was used by Psychology Students to conduct an Access Evaluation and in 2001-2002; the *Journal of Student Research* received over $8,000 to finance its production. Because of the remaining finances, these funds would be an excellent resource to help offset the initial costs of construction and distribution of the Publishing Support Curriculum. To better illustrate the overall availability of funds and their distribution, please reference Appendix G, Student Research Fund Availability Matrix, for precise information.

Utilizing the student research fund would be an excellent use of resources as it was founded to support student research activities. If key University of Wisconsin-Stout administrators and personnel want students to be actively involved in research, UW-Stout

should supply students with the ability to complete the research cycle through publication.

Recommendations

The majority of students, faculty, and administration at the University of Wisconsin-Stout are supportive of developing the publishing support curriculum in one format or another. A majority of students as well as graduate faculty favor the use of a quasi electronic/in-class process where there is personal interaction throughout the course, dependant upon what is deemed necessary by those who are involved (i.e. student & faculty member). Administration would prefer a self-directed, all inclusive CD-ROM, or integration into an already present class where interested students could obtain the needed information and support (John Wesolek, personal communications, March 17, 2003; Robert Sedlak, March 17, 2003; & Charles Sorensen, March 17, 2003). These differences in opinion, while not that dissimilar in scope, lead the researcher to believe that a CD-ROM would be the best avenue of approach. The program should be offered for a small fee ($10-$15) and would not be a credit bearing opportunity unless approved by autonomous program directors as an independent study.

The following recommendations take into effect the fact that this type of curriculum, no matter how well it is designed or laid out, will necessitate some form of faculty interaction for success. The vast differences between academic programs and journal idiosyncrasies that are taught at the University of Wisconsin-Stout require this personal interaction. These apparent differences partnered with most graduate students lack of exposure to academic publishing has lead to the following recommendations:

- Students must first be made more aware of what publishing is; from understanding the benefits of academic reporting to their future career to the actual process and background of article publishing. A Research Foundations student quote, "I feel this class [Research Foundations] covers these issues fairly well. But other people may feel the need for more information." This class, while covering the foundations needed to conduct quality research, does not cover the spectrum of publishing. For this course to be successful, graduate faculty must facilitate the student bodies understanding of the concept of publishing and its importance to society.
- The University must make a change on its view of research and publishing as a whole entity. From the university support structure for professors, either monetary or other tertiary resources, to the importance of producing excellent research instead of "get it finished" mentality of students, must be addressed. This research, not intending to uncover information that was not specifically germane to the development of the Publishing Support Curriculum, uncovered these hurdles to this curriculums success at the UW-Stout campus. For this type of curriculum offering to meet with success, changes at all levels of the university structure to be more supportive of research and publication.
- Funding for the development of the PSC offering should come from an organization or fund that is directly tied to student research. The Student Research Fund, which was created by the University of Wisconsin-Stout to assist students in developing, finishing and presenting their individual works of research, would be an excellent choice for two reasons. The first reason is that this account has had funds remaining the first two years of existence. The second reason is because the costs of developing

the proposed (PSC) and administering this curriculum would be well served to be taken from this student fund. The purpose of the fund is to assist students to "complete and present" their research and the PSC offering is a perfect example of assisting students to complete this mission.

- While this research concentrated on assisting students to publish in academic journals, the individual who completes the PSC offering should look to include a section for those interested in business writing. Most of those students, who were interested in the PSC offering, were going on for higher education or planned on publishing anyways. Result reporting is a good skill to have when entering the working world, but adding a business writing aspect would give students a calculated edge in the development of their business writing skills and would attract a larger basis of interested graduate students. The PSC is currently laid out to give greater assistance to those students's who are interested in research and academia. Adding a business writing section would appeal to those graduate students who are entering the private sector of industry and perhaps even attract an audience of upper-level undergraduate students.
- As stated before, this research concentrated on uncovering the amount of interest and backing that a PSC offering would have if offered at the University of Wisconsin-Stout and the development of the PSC outline. This outline is only a starting point for another researcher, or the current researcher, to develop at a later date into a complete curriculum. Developing work plans, activities, assignments, and assessments all need to be accomplished before the PSC can be offered.

- Through the completed research, it was concluded that a CD-ROM electronic offering format would be the most conducive format. The research also uncovered that there is support for this program in this particular format if it is developed in this manner. Development of a CD-ROM would require additional research on proper formatting, successful integration of materials, and an overall understanding of concepts behind electronic media. Creating the physical CD-ROM would also require the developer to have an understanding of different computer programs and their limitations. Building the CD-ROM is an integral aspect of the PSC offering but would require additional research and the collection of electronic media information.
- Upon developing the outline into curriculum and placing this curriculum on a CD-ROM, the PSC should be tested by a select group of graduate students at the University of Wisconsin-Stout before the PSC is offered to the general student population. This test sampling would be the perfect opportunity to adjust the curriculum for any missing information or discrepancies and to gauge the general success that the PSC may have at UW-Stout.
- This outline, while an overview of general suggestions and ideas, would be a great complement to any books germane to publishing and particularly to the student's discipline. Because of this, a resource listing of available resources, whether it is books, articles, or other programs, should be researched and created as a supplement to the PSC. Appendix H, Publishing Support Resources, would serve as a starting point for this research and the construction of such a listing for students to utilize.
- To better illustrate the process involved with producing an academic article from a thesis, a step-by-step example should be included to the PSC to assist with

visualization of the process. A future researcher could take a student's published example, catalogue the information and include all aspects of that process. Then create a case study which can be used to encourage and show that the PSC works.

- Finally, the information that has been collected during the research process needs to be distributed to the Stout Community. This should be completed to increase awareness about the level of interest in student publication, the support that is available for this offering, and the numerous possibilities that a course offering such as this has at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. To complete this, funds from the Student Research Fund should be acquired to distribute the complete study to those key administrative and faculty members that have shown direct interest in receiving the completed study. To make the information available to the remaining faculty and students, an article should be submitted to the Journal of Student Research for publication in the spring of 2004.

REFERENCES

Academe. (2002). *American heritage dictionary of the English language,* (4 ed.). Retrieved May 13, 2003, from: http://www.yourdictionary.com/ahd/a/a0033600.html

Apppelbaum, J. (1988). *How to get happily published: A complete and candid guide.* (5th ed.) New York: Harper Collins.

Ashton-Jones, E. (1997). Coauthoring for scholarly publication: Should you collaborate? In J.M. Moxley & T. Taylor (Eds.), *Writing and publishing for academic authors* (2nd ed.), (pp. 175-192). Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Baldwin, C., Chandler, G.E. (2002). Improving faculty publication output: The role of a writing coach. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 18,* 8-15.

Benjamison, P. (1992). *Publish without perishing: A practical handbook for academic authors.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Berardo, F.M. (1993a). Scientific norms and research publication: Issues and professional ethics. *Marriage & Family Review, 18*(1/2), 119-141.

Berardo, F.M. (1993b). Scholarly publication: A career retrospective. *Marriage & Family Review, 18*(1/2), 59-73.

Billard, L. (1993). A different path into print. *Academe,* 79(3), 28-29.

Black, D., Brown, S., Day, A., & Race, P. (1998). *500 tips for getting published: A guide for educators, researchers, and professionals.* Sterling, VA: Kogan Page.

Boice, R. (1990). *Professors as writers: A self-help guide to productive writing.* Oklahoma City, OK: New Forums Press.

Boice, R. (1994). *How writers journey to comfort and fluency: A psychological adventure.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Borer, D.A. (1997). The ugly process of journal submissions: A call for reform. *Political Science & Politics, 30*(3), 558-560.

Brey, E. T. (2003). Journal of student research. [Abstract]. *National Conference On Undergraduate Research Abstracts: 17,* 108.

Brouch, V.M. (1979). How to publish: The hazardous journey. *Art Education, 32*(2), 18-23.

Cantor, J.A. (1993). *A guide to academic writing.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Cappazzoli, E.A., Gunderson, D.E., & Scifres, E. (1996). Student and faculty perceptions of the ethicality of selected behavior related to publishing in an academic environment. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, 38,* 14-25.

Cassuto, L. (2002, January 18). Breaking the unfair rules of scholarly publishing. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* p. B24.

Clarida, R.W. (2001). Publish or perish: Clock is ticking for unpublished works. *Publishing Research Quarterly, 17*(2), 24-30.

Cummings, L. L., & Frost, P.J., (1995). *Publishing in the organizational sciences* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Curriculum. (2002). *American heritage dictionary of the English language,* (4 ed.). Retrieved May13, 2003, from: http://www.yourdictionary.com/ahd/c/c0816000.html

Daft, R.L. (1995). Why I recommend that your manuscript be rejected and what you can do about it. In L.L. Cummings & P.J. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the organizational science,* (pp. 164-182). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Day, R.A. (1998). *How to write and publish a scientific paper* (5th ed.). Phoenix, AZ; Oryx Press.

Day, A. (1996). *How to get research published in journals.* Brookfield, VA: Gower Publishing Limited.

Deats, S.M. (1997). From podium to print: Editing conference papers and publishing the dissertation. In J.M. Moxley & T. Taylor (Eds.), *Writing and publishing for academic authors* (2nd ed.); (pp. 127-140). Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Derricourt, R. (1996). *An author's guide to scholarly publication.* Princeton, NJ: University of New Jersey Press.

Elbow, R. (1997). Freewriting and the problem of wheat and tares. In J.M. Moxley & T. Taylor (Eds.), *Writing and publishing for academic authors* (2nd ed.); (pp. 35-50). Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Engstrom, C.M. (1999). Promoting the scholarly writing of female doctoral students in higher education and student affairs graduate programs. *NASPA Journal, 36*(4), 264-277.

Fine, G.A. (1988). The ten commandments of writing. *American Sociologist, 19*(2), 152-158.

Frost, P.J., & Taylor, P.J. (1995). Partisan perspective: A multiple-level interpretation of the manuscript review process in social science journals. In L.L. Cummings & P.J. Frost (eds.), *Publishing in the organizational sciences,* (pp. 13-43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gebhardt, R.C. (1995). Learn, look forward, try again: Productive responses to publishing rejections. *Teaching English in the Two Year College, 22,* 61-64.

Germano, W. (2001). *Getting it published: A guide for scholars and anyone else serious about serious books.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Glatthorn, A.A. (2002). *Publish or perish: The educator's imperative*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Graham, J.W., & Stablein, R.E. (1995). A funny thing happened on the way to publication: Newcomers' perspectives on publishing in the organizational sciences. In L.L. Cummings & P.J. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the organizational sciences,* (pp. 113-131). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hargens, L.L. (1988). Scholarly consensus and journal rejection rates. *American Sociological Review, 53,* 139-151.

Harman, E., & Montagnes, I. (1976). *The thesis and the book.* Toronto, Canada: University Of Toronto Press.

Hartley, J., & Knapper, C.K. (1984). Academics and their writing. *Studies in higher Education, 9*(2), 151-167.

Henson, K.T. (1990). Writing for education journals. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(10), 800-803.

Henson, K.T. (1999). Writing for professional journals. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(10), 780-784.

Henson, K.T. (1999). *Writing for professional education: Keys to academic success and business success.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Henson, K.T. (1999, December 1). So you want to be published? *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 35*(2), 79-81.

Henson, K.T. (2001). Writing for professional journals. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(10), 765-769.

Huff, A.S., (1999). *Writing for scholarly publication.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hulten, N., & Winslet, K. (2000). The committee on publication ethics (COPE) guidelines. *Colorectal Disease, 2*(4), 247-249.

Hummels, H., Roosendahl, H.E. (2001). Trust in scientific publishing. *Journal of Business Ethics, 34*(2), 87-100.

Iammarino, N.K., O'Rourke, T.W., Pigg, R.M., & Weinberg, A.D. (1989). Ethical issues in research and publication. *Journal of School Health, 59,* 101-105.

Jackson, J.F., Nelson, J.R., Heggins, W.J. III, Baatz, C.M., & Schuh, J.H. (1999). Guidelines for writing for publication: Demystifying the process. *College and University: The Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, 75,* 11-14.

Jenkins, D.B. (2002, December 1). Writing for publication: Overcoming the barriers that block us. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 15,* 31-32.

Jones, K.D. (1999). Ethics in publication. *Counseling and Values, 43*(2), 99-106.

Kaplan, J. (1998, March/April). The urgent need to publish. *Society, 25*(2), 6-7.

King, L.S. (1978). *Why not say it clearly: A guide to scientific writing.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Co.

Kitson, G.C. (1993). On writing: Getting started, getting stuck, and getting finished. *Marriage & Family Review, 18*(1/2), 143-159.

Kutz, M. (2002). The scholars' rebellion against scholarly publishing practices: Varmus, Vitek, and Venting. *Searcher, 10,* 28-44.

Lederman, N.G., & Niess, M.L. (1999). Publishing: A game or process with integrity? *School Science and Mathematics, 99*(5), 225-229.

Luey, B. (1995). *Handbook for academic authors* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Luey, B. (1996). The librarian's role in teaching academic authors about publishing procedures and ethics. *Serials Review, 22,* 39-47.

Maddux, C.D. (1996a). Publishing in scholarly journals: A guide for beginners. *Computers in the Schools, 11*(4), 5-14.

Maddux, C.D. (1996b). Publishing in scholarly journals: A guide to beginners--part II. *Computers in the Schools, 12*(3), 5-10.

Maddux, C.D. (1996c). Publishing in scholarly journals: A guide to beginners--part III. *Computers in the Schools, 12*(4), 7-15.

Maslow, A.A. (1967). The creative attitude. In R.L. Mooney & T. Razik (Eds.), *Explorations in creativity* (pp. 43-54). New York, NY: Harper and Row.

McKnight, C., & Price, S. (1999). A survey of author attitudes and skills in relation to article publishing in paper and electronic journals. *Journal of Documentation, 55*(5), 556-576.

Miller, L.J., Bloom, F.E. (1998, November 6). Publishing controversial research. *Science, 282*(5391), 104.

Mooney, S. (2002). Challenges to scholarly publishing. *Publishing Research Quarterly, 17*(3), 26-29.

Morgan, G.A., Harmon, R.J., & Gliner, J.A. (2001). Ethical issues related to publishing and reviewing. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 40*(12), 1476-1479.

Mortimer, T. (2001). Demystifying publishing: The manuscript submission, external review, and journal production process. *Journal of Woman's History, 13,* 181-188.

Moxley, J.M. (1997). If not now, when? In J.M. Moxley & T. Taylor (Eds.), *Writing and publishing for academic authors* (2nd ed.); (pp. 3-18). Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Moxley, J.M., & Taylor, T. (Eds.). (1997). *Writing and publishing for academic authors* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Murphy, K.R. (1996). Getting published. In P.J. Frost & M.S. Taylor (eds.), *Rhythms of academic life: personal accounts of careers in academia.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Natriello, G. (1996). Lessons for young scholars seeking to publish. *Teachers College Record, 97*(4), 509-518.

Nash, T. (1987). By the way, is there any money in this?: Encouraging young teachers to Publish. *English Education, 19(4),* 237-243.

Nord, W. R. (1995). Looking at ourselves as we look at others: An exploration of the publications system for organization research. In L.L. Cummings & P.J. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the organizational sciences,* (pp. 64-78). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Olson, G.A.(1997). Publishing scholarship in humanistic disciplines; Joining the conversation. In J.M. Moxley & T. Taylor (Eds.), *Writing and publishing for academic authors* (2nd ed.), (pp. 51-70). Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Page, G., Campbell, R., & Meadows, J. (1997). *Journal publishing.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Parker, C., Costner, K., Debnam, L., Soljaga, D. (1998). [Graduate students and publication in scholarly journals] Editorial. *Comparative Education Review, 42*(3), 247-252.

Publishing, perishing, and peer review. (1998, January 24). *Economist, 346*(8052), 77-79.

Rakoff, V.M. (1995). On being published: A contemporary preoccupation. In L.L. Cummings & P.J. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the organizational sciences,* (pp. 237-245). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rankin, E. (2001). *The work of writing: Insights and strategies for academics and professionals.* San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Ross, S.M.,& Morrison, G.R. (1993, March 1). How to get research articles published in professional journals. *TechTrends, 38*(2), 29-33.

Rousseau, D. M. (1995). Publishing from a reviewer's perspective. In L.L. Cummings & P.J. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the organizational sciences* (pp. 151-163). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Schauder, D. (1994). Electronic publishing of professional articles: Attitudes of academics and implications for the scholarly communication industry. *Journal of The American Society for Informational Science, 45*(2), 73-100.

Schneider, A. (1998, September 11). Why don't women publish as much as men? *Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(3), A14-A16.

Schneider, B. (1995). Some propositions about getting research published. In L.L. Cummings & P.J. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the organizational sciences,* (pp. 227-236). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Schoorman, F. D. (1995). Publishing in the organizational sciences: The dilemma of values. In L.L. Cummings & P.J. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the organizational sciences* (pp. 132-148). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sherrell, D.L., Hair, J.F. Jr., & Griffin, M. (1989). Marketing academicians' perceptions of ethical research and publishing behavior. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 17*(4), 315-324.

Sikula, J.P. (1980). Writing for publication. *Educational Horizons, 58*(2), 97-104.

Silverman, F.H. (1993). *Publishing for tenure and beyond.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Smaby, M.H., & Crews, J. (1998). Publishing in scholarly journals: Part 1—is it an attitude oOr technique? It's an attitude. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 37*(4), 218-224.

Smaby, M.H., Crews, J., & Downing, T. (1999). Publishing in scholarly journals: Part II is it an attitude or technique? It's a technique. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*(4), 227-237.

Staw, B.M. (1995). Repairs on the road to relevance and rigor: Some unexplored issues in publishing organizational research. In L.L. Cummings & P.J. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the organizational sciences* (pp. 85-97). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Summers, J.O. (2001). Guidelines for conducting research and publishing in marketing: From conceptualization through the review process. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 29*(4), 405-415.

Thompson, B. (1995). Publishing your research results: Some suggestions and counsel. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73,* 342-345.

Thomsen, K. (1994). Scientific publishing: An embarrassment of riches. *American Scientist, 82,* 508-511.

Thyer, B.A. (1994*). Successful publishing in scholarly journals.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

University of Wisconsin Stout, Addressing the Budget Crisis (n.d.). *UW System budget fact sheet.* Retrieved May 15, 2003, from: http://www.uwstout.edu/ur/budget/

University of Wisconsin-Stout; Budget, Planning & Analysis (2003, February 12). *Student data: fall semester gradate enrollment by program.* Retrieved July 20, 2003, from: http://www.uwstout.edu/bpa/ir/factbook02/studdata/enrgradprog.htm

University of Wisconsin-Stout (n.d.). *General bulletin.* Retrieved July 20, 2003, from http://www.uwstout.edu/grbulletin/gb_geninfo.pdf

University of Wisconsin-Stout (2002, October). *Administrative procedures for preparation of a thesis (Plan A).* Retrieved July 20, 2003, from: http://www.uwstout.edu/grad/plan_a.html

Walton, J.M. (1979). Publishable or not: Some guidelines for the emerging scholar. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 57*(9), 469-470.

White, C. (1998). Call for research misconduct agency. *British Medical Journal, 316*(7146), 1695.

Appendix A:
Graduate Student Survey

Research Project Title: Publishing Support Curriculum

Eric T. Brey, a graduate student in the Department of Hospitality and Tourism here at the University of Wisconsin Stout is conducting research titled, Publishing Support Curriculum, and he would appreciate your participation in this study.

It is not anticipated that this study will present any medical or social risk to you. The information that is gathered from this survey will be kept strictly confidential and any reports on the findings of this research will not contain your name or any other identifying information. Your participation in this project is completely voluntary and will not affect your grade in any way.

Once you have completed the enclosed survey, please remain seated as the instructor will inform you when to bring the completed survey to the front of the room to place in the manila envelope located on the front table.

Once the study is completed, the analyzed findings will be available for your information.

Questions or concerns about the research study should be addressed to Eric T. Brey, the researcher at breye@uwstout.edu or Dr. Amy Gillett, the research advisor at gilletta@uwstout.edu. Questions about the rights of human subjects can be addressed to Sue Foxwell, Human Protections Administrator, UW-Stout Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11 Harvey Hall, Menomonie, WI, 54751, phone (715) 232-1126.

Eric T. Brey, Graduate Student
Department of Hospitality and Tourism

Dr. Amy Gillett
Research Advisor

Graduate Student Survey

1. Please indicate your academic standing:
   _____ Dual Enrolled Student (taking both Undergrad and Grad level courses)
   _____ Part-time graduate student
   _____ Full time graduate student

2. Do you have any interest in getting published in an academic journal as part of your future career endeavors?
   _____Yes _____No

3. Do you plan on attaining additional education once you have completed your current graduate program?
   _____Yes _____No

Publishing Support Curriculum = Curriculum course offering that could proposedly be accessible at the University of Wisconsin-Stout and would supply training to assist graduate students publish their research findings in professional academic journals.

4. How beneficial do you believe that the Publishing Support Curriculum would be to graduate students who participated in this type of course?
   4=Very beneficial 1=Not beneficial
   4 3 2 1

5. If the Publishing Support Curriculum were offered as a standard course, and it covered many of the basics of academic publishing and required students to hand in a manuscript for publication at the conclusion of the course, which of the following would be the best option in your opinion (check only one):
   _____ This course should be a semester long course
   _____ This course should be completed over an academic year
   _____ Students should be given as much time as needed or allowed by university regulations

6. If the Publishing Support Curriculum is designed and offered at Stout, which of the following formats would be the most beneficial for graduate students (check only one):
   _____ Course room instruction with weekly course meetings
   _____ Online assisted course work where class would meet only occasionally
   _____ Purely electronic media (CD-Rom, Internet) where only electronic contact would be required

7. If Publishing Support Curriculum were offered in any of the formats mentioned in question #6, would you be interested in this curriculum?
   _____Yes _____No

(If you answered no to this question, please skip to # 12)

8. If Publishing Support Curriculum were offered in a software/program format and was offered to graduate students for a small fee as professional development material, would you be interested in this type of offering?

   4=Strong interest 1=Minimal interest

   4 3 2 1

9. If Publishing Support Curriculum were offered in a software/program format and was accessible to all students as part of graduate school fees, would you be interested in utilizing this type of curriculum?

   4=Strong interest 1=Minimal interest

   4 3 2 1

10. If Publishing Support Curriculum was offered at UW-Stout and you participated in this curriculum, do you feel that you would be interested in supplying the *Journal of Student Research* with a publishable article?

    4=Strong interest 1=Minimal interest

    4 3 2 1

11. If curriculum like this were to be offered on campus, what would you like to see included that would make the information/curriculum more user friendly for graduate students?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. If you have any additional comments, please use this space for those remarks.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your assistance is greatly appreciated!

Appendix B:
Graduate Faculty Survey

Research Project Title: Publishing Support Curriculum

Eric T. Brey, a graduate student in the Department of Hospitality and Tourism here at the University of Wisconsin Stout through collaboration with Dr. Robert Sedlak, Provost, is conducting research concerning the proposed academic offering, Publishing Support Curriculum. We would appreciate your participation in this study.

It is not anticipated that this study will present any medical or social risk to you. The information that is gathered from this survey will be kept strictly confidential and any reports on the findings of this research will not contain your name or any other identifying information. Your participation in this project is completely voluntary.

We would like to encourage you to respond to this survey at your closest opportune time to ensure the completion of this research by the end of the current semester. Upon completion of this study, the researcher asks that you fold the survey in half, staple closed, and return utilizing intercampus mail. The return address has already been affixed so that the completed survey will be sent directly to Dr. Robert Sedlak/Eric T. Brey, 303 Administration Building.

Once the study has been completed, the analyzed findings will be available for your information.

Questions or concerns about the research study should be addressed to Eric T. Brey, the researcher at breye@uwstout.edu or Dr. Amy Gillett, the research advisor at gilletta@uwstout.edu. Questions about the rights of human subjects can be addressed to Sue Foxwell, Human Protections Administrator, UW-Stout Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11 Harvey Hall, Menomonie, WI, 54751, phone (715) 232-1126.

Eric T. Brey, Graduate Student
Department of Hospitality and Tourism

Dr. Robert Sedlak
Provost

Dr. Amy Gillett, Research Advisor
Department of Education, School Counseling, and School Psychology

Graduate Faculty Survey

1. What is your current academic standing:
   _____ Professor
   _____ Associate Professor
   _____ Assistant Professor
   _____ Other, Please Specify

   _____

2. What is your perceived level of the current university commitment to student research?
   4=High level of commitment 1=Low level of commitment
   4 3 2 1

Publishing Support Curriculum = Proposed curriculum course offering that could be accessible at the University of Wisconsin-Stout and would supply training to assist graduate students in publishing their research findings in professional academic journals

3. Would the **Publishing Support Curriculum** be of significance for the Stout community?
   4=High significance 1=Low significance
   4 3 2 1

4. If a **Publishing Support Curriculum** course were offered at the University of Wisconsin Stout, would you encourage your graduate students to enroll?
   _____Yes _____No

5. How beneficial would the **Publishing Support Curriculum** be to graduate students who participated in a course offering like this?
   4=Very beneficial 1=Not beneficial
   4 3 2 1

6. What level of participation would you anticipate from the graduate student body in regards to enrolling in such a course?
   4=Large participation 1=Low Participation
   4 3 2 1

7. If the **Publishing Support Curriculum** were presented as a course offering and it covered many of the basics of academic publishing and required students to hand in a manuscript for publication at the conclusion of the course, please select one of the corresponding choices below:
   _____ This course should be completed in one semester of work
   _____ This course should be completed over an entire academic year
   _____ Students should be given as much time as needed or allowed by university regulations

8. If a **Publishing Support Curriculum** course was offered at Stout, which of the following formats would be most beneficial for graduate students:
   _____ Classroom instruction with the course meeting regularly
   _____ Online assisted course work where class would meet only occasionally
   _____ Purely electronic media (CD-Rom, Internet) where only electronic contact would be required

9. If the **Publishing Support Curriculum** were offered in a supportive software/program format and was accessible to graduate students as part of their graduate student fees:

   a) How interested do you think that graduate students would be in this type of program?
   4=Strong interest 1=Limited interest
   4 3 2 1

   b) Would you suggest this type of supportive software or program to your students?
   _____ Yes _____ No

10. Do you believe that this **Publishing Support Curriculum** program would be of interest to faculty members here on campus that have not published or have had only limited publishing experience?
   4=Strong interest 1=Limited interest
   4 3 2 1

11. If the **Publishing Support Curriculum** were to be utilized or offered here on campus what would you like to see as part of the course/software?

12. If you have any additional comments, please use this space for those remarks.

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your assistance is greatly appreciated!

Appendix C:
Administration/Faculty Questionnaire

1. How big of role do you feel that student research should play here at the University of Wisconsin-Stout?

2. With budget cuts in the near future, will student research be taken away from?

3. How important or beneficial do you believe that a graduate student publish/present their research in a professional academic journal or present at a national conference?

4. Do you feel that faculty members on campus set a good example for student researchers?

5. Do you feel that the average faculty member at the University of Wisconsin-Stout stresses research enough, not enough, too much?

6. Where and how would you envision the publishing support curriculum being offered through (classroom vs. internet, independent study vs. traditional classroom)?

7. In your opinion, what do feel would be the best way to cover the cost of constructing and administering the publishing support curriculum?

Appendix D:
Article Review Checklist

Designed by Kurt Heppard (cited in Huff, 1999, p.155)

1= Not at all 2= To a limited extent 3=At an acceptable level 4=To a significant extent 5=Completely

Introductory Elements	1	2	3	4	5
Summarizing the Paper:					
Can you identify the one or two main point of the paper?					
Is the target journal an appropriate outlet for the paper?					
Title:					
Does the title grab attention and say something important about the paper?					
Doe it include important words that will index the paper appropriately?					
Abstract:					
Is the abstract compelling? Does it attract attention?					
Does it provide an accurate overview of the paper?					
Does the abstract summarize major accomplishments?					
Does it identify the central theory or literature stream or "conversation"?					
Does the abstract inform the reader about critical features of the articles (methodology, data sources, and so on)?					
Does it use relatively simple words and sentences?					
Can the abstract be understood without reading the paper?					
Does the order of the abstract reflect the order of the paper?					
Introduction:					
Does the introduction entice the reader to read on?					
Does it establish a need for the paper by highlighting gaps or disagreements in the literature?					
Does it organize ideas and material in a logical and meaningful sequence, which is then reflected in the body of the paper?					
Does it introduce key concepts from the paper?					
Does it highlight the key contribution or "value added" by the paper?					
Connection with previous conversation:					
Are antecedents of the paper clearly identified?					
Is the discussion of previous work an appropriate length?					
Is the author's intended contribution to previous conversation clearly identified? Are key terms identified?					
Would a significant number of scholars in the field find the paper's subject and approach interesting?					
Additional Questions Added by Author:					

Questions for Quantitative Papers	1	2	3	4	5
Theoretical framework and development of hypothesis (if appropriate):					
Are the study's propositions and hypotheses clearly articulated?					
Are the basic arguments of the paper important and interesting?					
Are important premises and assumptions identified?					
Is there a graphic depiction of the relationship between key variables in the paper?					
Are key terms defined?					
Would a significant number of scholars in the field find the paper's subject and approach interesting?					
Description and evaluation of methods (if appropriate):					
Is the methodology of the paper clearly identified?					
Are data collection methods described adequately?					
Are the sampling strategy and sample explained?					
Is the operationalization of variables and constructs plausible (content validity)?					
Are dependant variables identified and described?					
Are independent variables identified and described?					
Are control variables identified and described?					
Do measures theoretically relate independent and dependent variables (construct validity)?					
Are control variables used effectively?					
Are questionnaire or other measurement items identified and described?					
Was the discussion of interview or questionnaire construction and response rates clear and comprehensive?					
Have steps been taken to avoid data collection errors?					
Is there evidence of reliability or internal consistency in the study?					
Results:					
Are the findings adequately and accurately described?					
Are results clearly related back to original propositions, hypotheses, research questions, and data analysis?					
Do tables provide sufficient and accurate data to allow the rader to reach independent conclusions?					
Are figures and appendixes used effectively?					
Is implied causality justified?					
Has the author adequately considered alternative explanations for the results found?					
Additional Questions Added by Author:					

Questions for Qualitative Papers	1	2	3	4	5
Is the purpose of the research adequately established?					
Are the duration and intensity of observation clear?					
Are the nature of the site, and key players, adequately discussed?					
Are methods of collecting and analyzing data adequately described?					
Does the writer convince the reader that he or she was able to gather information about key events from appropriate sources?					
Is there evidence that informants trusted the researcher and were likely to honestly share information with the researcher?					
Has the author adequately considered alternative interpretations of the data presented?					
Is there evidence of systematically considering evidence that contradicts the author's interpretations?					
Questions for Theory Development	1	2	3	4	5
Is the purpose of the research adequately established?					
Is the need for (or purpose of) theory development well established?					
Is previous theory adequately summarized?					
Is the author's contribution to theory significant?					
Is it well organized and clear?					
Is it adequately liked back to the literature?					
Questions for Case Studies	1	2	3	4	5
Is the "story" intrinsically interesting?					
Is sufficient background information provided?					
Are key issues clearly stated?					
Is there enough information to develop alternative scenarios about future development?					
Is there enough information to allow reader to recommend an action and discuss possible consequences of that action?					
Additional Questions Added by Author					

Introductory Elements	1	2	3	4	5
Is there enough information to develop relatively detailed implementation plans for the recommended action or decision?					
Is there enough information to allow the recommended action and its implementation plan to be discussed and analyzed?					
Discussion	1	2	3	4	5
Does the discussion section introduce new and relevant topics? (It should not simply restate findings)					
Does the discussion section use consistent terminology that is understandable in the context of the entire paper?					
Are limitations of the study clearly stated?					
Are logical extensions of this study and avenues of additional research provided?					
Conclusions	1	2	3	4	5
Does the conclusion retain the reader's interest in the subject and the paper itself?					
Are the most important components and contributions of the study highlighted?					
Is there something new in the conclusion that has not appeared elsewhere in this paper?					
Would the busy reader looking only at the instruction and conclusion understand the contribution of the paper?					
Additional Questions Added by Author					

Appendix E:
Sample Cover Letter
(Cited in Thyer, 1994, p. 47)

[Use institutional letterhead, if possible]

Date

Bruce A. Thayer
Research on Social Work Practice
School of Social Work
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30605

Re: "Does Food Stamp Program Participation Improve the Nutritional Status of Welfare Recipients?"

Dear Dr. Thayer,

Enclosed please find five copies of the above manuscript that we are submitting for editorial review and possible publication in Research on Social Work Practice. This article represents original and previously unpublished scholarship that is not under concurrent editorial review. I enclose a letter from the publisher of the Journal of Nutrition granting permission for us to use the material found in our Table 1.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Lois A. Wodarski, Ph.D
Professor of Nutrition
University of Hamburgh

Cc: Ronald McDonald

Appendix F:
Sample Agreement Form
(Cited in Thyer, 1994, p. 66)

Agreement made (Date) , between Sage Publications, Inc., 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, California 91320 USA (hereinafter called the Publisher), and (author's name),
residing at (Author Address)
(hereinafter called the Author) with respect to a work provisionally entitled (title of research work)
(hereinafter called the Work), and consisting of (misc. information).

RIGHTS: So that the Publisher may cause the Work to be published in **RESEARCH ON SOCIAL WORK** [journal title] the author grants and assigns to the Publisher during the term of copyright and all renewals and extensions there of the exclusive right to publish and market the Work throughout the world; to cause or license the Work to be translate into any and all languages for publication and sale throughout the world; to publish or license publication of the Work in reprint form, in anthologies, in periodicals, in digests, abridgments, condensations, abstracts, microfilms, recordings, Braille, photographing, or in any other present and future media, and in all forms of merchandising and commercial use; to copyright the Work in the name of the publisher.

AUTHOR'S COPIES: The Publisher agrees to present a singular Author with 25 copies of the Work and one or two copies of the issue of the original publication in which it appears (if more than one Author, 25 copies of the Work shall be divided between them, and each Author shall receive one copy of the issue). The author shall be able to purchase reprints of the Work at the Publisher's regularly scheduled prices. The Publisher shall be under no obligation to further compensate the Author for the rights granted herein, but shall be obligated to give full credit of authorship regardless of means and form of reproduction and publication.

PUBLICATION: The Publisher may make the manuscript conform to a style of presentation, spelling, capitalization, and usage deemed appropriate. The author shall read and correct the edited manuscript and proofs when and if submitted, and return promptly corrected manuscript or proofs to the Publisher. The Publisher may charge the Author for expenses incurred as a result of excessive changes in proofs.

WARRANTIES: (a) The Author warrants and represents that he/she is the sole owner of the Work and all the rights herein granted and has full right and power to make this agreement; that the Work is not a violation of any copyright, proprietary or personal right; that he/she has not in any manner granted, assigned, encumbered, r disposed of any of the rights herein granted to the Publisher or any rights adverse to or inconsistent therewith; an d that there are no rights outstanding which would diminish, encumber, or impair the full enjoyment or exercise of the rights herein granted the Publisher; that no part of the Work libelous, obscene, or unlawful or violates any right of privacy.

(b) The Author agrees to hold harmless and indemnify the Publisher against any claim, demand, suit, action, proceeding, recovery, or expense of any nature whatsoever arising from any claim of infringement of copyright or proprietary right, or fro claims of libel, obscenity, unlawfulness, or invasion of privacy based upon or arising out of nay matter or thing contained in the Work, or from any breach of warranties or representation herein contained. In addition o other remedies, the Publisher may withhold as offset royalties due the Author. The publisher at its sole discretion and expense retain counsel and may at its sole discretion compromise any such claim or suit brought against it.

(c) The warranties, representations, and indemnities shall survive the termination of this Agreement.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS: The Author reserves the right to use all or part of the Work in any book or article he/she may subsequently write or edit.

COPYRIGHT: The Publisher shall copyright the Work as part of **RESEARCH ON SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE** in the name of the Publisher.

This agreement shall bind and inure to the benefit of the heirs, executors, administrators, and legal representatives of the Author, and upon the successors and assigns of the Publisher. However, all obligations of the Author are personal and non-assignable. His Agreement constitutes the complete understanding of the parties and shall be interpreted according to the laws of the State of California, regardless of the place of its execution. No modification or waiver of any provision hereof shall be valid unless in writing and signed by both parties.

_____ RESEARCH ON SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE

_____ BY _____
Editor

Appendix G:
Student Research Fund Availability Matrix

*Information concerning 2002-2003 school year was not available for publication at the time of research completion

General Funding Numbers

	Total Available	Research Funded	Misc. Spending	Remaining Funds
2000-2001	$14,800	$11,210	$1,582 (1)	$2,008
2001-2002	$20,000	$11,934	$8,750 (2)	($504)

(1) This included an Access Evaluation conducted by Psychology Students

(2) This included the cost of producing the Journal of Student Research
$5,595 spent on graduate assistant position salary & benefits
$2,975 spent on Journal printing cost

Appendix H:
Publishing Support Resources

Apppelbaum, J. (1988). *How to get happily published: A complete and candid guide* (5th ed.) New York: Harper Collins.

Ashton-Jones, E. (1997). Coauthoring for scholarly publication: Should you collaborate? In J.M. Moxley & T. Taylor (Eds.), *Writing and publishing for academic authors* (2nd ed.); (pp. 175-192). Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Benjamison, P. (1992). *Publish without perishing: A practical handbook for academic authors.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Black, D., Brown, S., Day, A., Race, P. (1998). *500 tips for getting published: A guide for educators, researchers, and professionals*. Sterling, VA: Kogan Page.

Boice, R. (1990). *Professors as writers: A self-help guide to productive writing.* Oklahoma City, OK: New Forums Press.

Cantor, J.A. (1993). *A guide to academic writing.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Cummings, L. L., & Frost, P.J., (1995). *Publishing in the organizational sciences* (2nd (Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Day, R.A. (1998). *How to write and publish a scientific paper* (5th ed.). Phoenix, AZ; Oryx Press.

Day, A. (1996). *How to get research published in journals*. Brookfield, VA: Gower Publishing Limited.

Derricourt, R. (1996). *An author's guide to scholarly publication.* Princeton, NJ: University of New Jersey Press.

Glatthorn, A.A. (2002). *Publish or perish: The educator's imperative*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Henson, K.T. (1990). Writing for education journals. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(10), 800-803.

Henson, K.T. (1999). Writing for professional journals. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(10), 780-784.

Huff, A.S. (1999). *Writing for scholarly publication.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jackson, J.F., Nelson, J.R., Heggins, W.J. III, Baatz, C.M., & Schuh, J.H. (1999). Guidelines for writing for publication: Demystifying the process. *College and University: The Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, 75,* 11-14.

King, L.S. (1978). *Why not say it clearly: A guide to scientific writing.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Co.

Kitson, G.C. (1993). On writing: Getting started, getting stuck, and getting finished. *Marriage & Family Review, 18*(1/2), 143-159.

Maddux, C.D. (1996a). Publishing in scholarly journals: A guide for beginners. *Computers in the Schools, 11*(4), 5-14.

Maddux, C.D. (1996b). Publishing in scholarly journals: A guide to beginners--part II. *Computers in the Schools, 12*(3), 5-10.

Moxley, J.M., & Taylor, T. (Eds.). (1997). *Writing and publishing for academic authors* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Murphy, K.R. (1996). Getting published. In P.J. Frost & M.S. Taylor (Eds.), Rhythms of academic life: personal accounts of careers in academia. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Page, G., Campbell, R., & Meadows, J. (1997). *Journal publishing.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Parker, C., Costner, K., Debnam, L., & Soljaga, D. (1998). [Graduate students and Publication in scholarly journals] Editorial. *Comparative Education Review, 42*(3), 247-252.

Schoorman, F. D. (1995). Publishing in the organizational sciences: The dilemma of values. In L.L. Cummings & P.J. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the organizational sciences* (pp. 132-148). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Smaby, M.H., & Crews, J. (1998). Publishing in scholarly journals: Part 1—is it an attitude 0r technique? It's an attitude. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 37*(4), 218-224.

Smaby, M.H., Crews, J., & Downing, T. (1999). Publishing in scholarly journals: Part II is it an attitude or technique? It's a technique. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*(4), 227-237.

Thyer, B.A. (1994). *Successful publishing in scholarly journals.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendix I:

Proposed Curriculum Commentary

Graduate Student Suggestions

[Student Question]What does it take to get published? How do you contact professional journals regarding potential topics?

A seminar or weekend seminar might also be an idea.

Good idea!

[Items to make PSC better] "Support from an advisor or mentor. This support can be materials, advice, proofreading, or direction to find information in another department…A resource of student materials would be valuable!"

With the software I feel this would be a great angle, along with meeting occasionally to critique and face to face.

Great idea – (I) would love to do it, just need to sharpen the skills…

Course should be conducted over one semester and then allow one year to complete writing for publication.

I feel this class covers these issues fairly well. But other people may feel the need for more information.

Publishing Support Curriculum is good course but how many employers/companies would really take a look at it—otherwise it wouldn't much benefit us, for further career.

This sounds like it would be a really informative & beneficial deal for those who are interested!!

Graduate Faculty Suggestions

Provide an online directory of suggested journals, both academic and professional organizations; based on Stout's majors. Providing names, addresses and email for said journals.

Some of our grad programs are de-emphasizing original research projects and focusing on result utilization as well as how to conduct program level research. This may decrease interest in this type of course.

This would be a useful course, feel if not required, I expect few grad students would take it.

If graduate students are not exposed to faculty who publish they will not see/understand the value or importance of publishing. There are many faculty – even those who teach graduate school curriculum – who have no publishing record.

- Hire more faculty that publish in their field

- Develop more graduate programs that support research and that leads to publication and then university attitudes will change

[Content] Guidance regarding mainstream and not so mainstream publishing opportunities. How to deal with re-write comments.

Model of how a thesis can be prepared for publication, i.e. the steps, submission process, do's & don'ts, editing, etc. etc.

[Content] Benefits of publishing for career advancement. The nut's and bolt's of publishing and difference between refereed and non-refereed journals.

This university should have very few graduate programs. Faculty have inadequate support to guide thesis. Current research math classes are appallingly low quality.

Graduate students need to become involved in professional organizations to gain these skills and learn the politics behind getting published – and the needs of a profession in the publishing world.

[Content] Methods for formulating literature reviews. Methods in critical analysis of literature. Identification and summarizing parallel studies or studies to be replicated. Tables and figures help (extensive section). Templates for various formats (APA, MLA, etc.)

This course/software would be more accepted if the overall campus climate truly supported research endeavors (e.g. if grad faculty had smaller loads, they could focus on research strands)

[Content] Information of journals accepting manuscripts, grant funding, sources for design of surveys, and statistical analysis of results of simulation, survey.

I think this would be a great course for our graduate students, however, most are concerned about "just getting it done" and would not want to over-burden themselves with more commitments lie getting their research published. I'd be very curious about the student feedback to this survey.

[Content] Different publishing journals requirements and styles of writing. A select graduate faculty who have been successful publishing and who would be in direct contact with students. Strict timelines on completion of this option.

You know we have a tough enough time getting our students to complete their own rigor of graduate classes, much less having another course for them to complete. My recommendation – put it on CD and sell it for $10.

Could be a good additional resource for helping supervise graduate research papers. It is difficult finding enough graduate faculty to experience all the individual projects.

Students have to do research first – before they have anything to publish. I can only see the value of this at the very end of their work at Stout.

The addition of another course within the program would be difficult for the students to fit into their course of study. If this topic could be incorporated into an existing course it would be most appropriate.

[Content] Discussion of how publication of research is different from their thesis work presentations. Discussion of the kinds of formats expected by different kinds of journals. Assistance in verification of statistical methods, writing jargon, and general writing skills.

Writing courses tend to be given lip service only. Many program directors will agree to the need but no encourage taking the course because it will cause students to go beyond the hours needed to complete the degree.