

Secrets of Publishing in Peer-Reviewed Journals



DR. JENNIFER L. BEVAN
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
DEPT. OF COMMUNICATION STUDIES
M.S. PROGRAM IN HEALTH & STRATEGIC
COMMUNICATION

A CRASSH WORKSHOP FOR THE
WILKINSON COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL
SCIENCES
MARCH 21, 2013

My Roles in Publishing in Peer Review Journals:

- Author and Collaborator
- Ad Hoc Manuscript Reviewer
- Conference Paper Reader
- Editorial Board Member
- Journal Co-editor



Topics for Today:



- **Generally Approaching Research**
- **Writing Your Manuscript**
- **Revising Your Research**
- **Describing Your Research in University Reviews**

Research and the “Get To” Philosophy



- Not viewing research as an obligation
 - You don't “have to” do research – you “get to” do research
- From Interest to Motivation to Publication
- If your interest wanes, think about how to jump-start it
(New method? New context?)
 - *or* consider shifting to a new research topic that holds your attention

Combining Teaching and Research



- **Recruiting interested, motivated undergraduates to assist with your research via independent study credits**
 - Sample independent study application
- **Overseeing student work on your research projects in research methods, senior capstone, or 329/429 courses**
 - Email me if you would like to see a sample syllabus using this method in a senior capstone course

Writing Your Manuscript



(Guidelines adapted from Hagger, 2012):

1. Present your research purpose and hypotheses/research questions clearly
2. State how your research presents an original contribution (beyond “No one has ever studied this before”!)

Writing Your Manuscript



- 3. Organize your manuscript consistently and clearly (look to published studies as a guide):**
 - Use a consistent style (APA, MLA, etc.)
 - Use sections, headings, and subheadings
 - Use transitions and concise writing
- 4. Use clear, logical evidence that combines to build a rationale for your hypotheses/RQs**

Writing Your Manuscript



5. Devote time, space, and attention to your study's design/method and analyses/findings
 - The Recipe metaphor
4. In your Discussion section, do the following:
 - Summarize your findings in the opening paragraph
 - Describe the “bigger picture” and how your findings fit into it
 - Your study is not perfect: include limitations!

Determining Where to Send Your Manuscript



- 1. Don't automatically send it to a top-tier journal**
 - Seeking advice from a mentor or senior scholar
- 2. Look in the study's reference section for ideas**
- 3. Consider interdisciplinary journals**

Determining Where to Send Your Manuscript



4. Research possible journals online

- Thomson Impact Factor or other quality indicators (SJR)
- Editorial board
- Recent articles
- Springer's Journal Selector Tool

5. Once you decide on a journal, read and follow the journal's submission guidelines!

Springer's Journal Selector Example



- http://www.springer.com/authors/journal+authors/journal+authors+academy?SGWID=0-1726414-12-837833-0&cm_mmc=AD--CFP--SPR18984_V1--CENTER_837833
- This study explores the potential cognitive and communicative differences between single and serial romantic argument episodes. An online survey asked participants to report either on a serial or a single romantic argument. Findings indicated that serial argument participants found positive and negative argument goals to be more important, ruminated more, and used more negative and avoidant, and fewer positive, conflict strategies than single argument participants. Serial arguments that are abbreviated (i.e., between two and five episodes) may also differ from those that are extended (i.e., more than five episodes) in nature. These findings and their implications are discussed.

Revising Your Research



- **Read the editor's letter carefully**
- **Stay within their requested deadline (or alert the editor ASAP if you cannot)**
- **Don't be afraid to ask the editor questions**

Revising Your Research



- **Be clear, specific, and detailed in your revision and your response letter, including:**
 - Page numbers where edits have been made
 - Numbering each suggested revision
 - Using a neutral or conciliatory tone
 - If you disagree with a suggestion, politely justifying why you chose to not make it
 - Thanking the editors and reviewers for their reviews, especially if they are particularly detailed and helpful

“Making Your Case” In University Reviews



- Provide as much information as possible about your scholarly publications in your annual, 2nd and 4th year, and tenure reviews
 - Is the journal national, international, regional, etc.?
 - Is it interdisciplinary?
 - What are its quality indicators, including impact factors, acceptance rate, and tier?

“Making Your Case” In University Reviews



- How many times has it been cited?
 - ✦ Google Scholar and the EBSCO research database provide this information
 - ✦ Sign up for a Google Scholar user profile and email alerts for your citations: <http://scholar.google.com/>
- Provide any other context that you think will assist reviewers in understanding the impact of your research

Thank You!



- Please feel free to email me with questions or comments at bevan@chapman.edu!