The Inaugural Research, Write & Publish e-Club Meeting

Wednesday September 23, 2009, 12:00-2:30 PM

Facilitators:
John Capitman, PhD
Mathilda Ruwe, MD, MPH, PhD
Thomas Ngo
Diana Traje, MPH

Publish or perish?
If a tiny, little butterfly can fly, Why can’t I?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Presenter/Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12:00-12:05| Background and welcome remarks  
Get Lunch                             | Dr. John Capitman  
Director Central Valley Health Policy Institute                                      |
| 12:05-12:15| Self-introduction                                                       | All                                                                                   |
| 12:15-12:30| Speed network: teaching interest; writing interests, research interests, hobbies (spend five minutes in each and switch pairs every five minutes) | All  
(Dr Mathilda Ruwe, facilitator)                                                      |
| 12:30-12:45| Key note speech  
*Road Map to Tenure and Promotion: Role of Publication and Research* | Dr. Andrew Hoff  
Dean College of Health And Human Services                                             |
| 12:45-1:15 | Introduction to RW&P e-club collaboration tools, including introduction of club positions | Dr Ruwe and Thomas Ngo                                                                |
| 1:15-1:30  | Needs assessment feedback plus Q&A session                              | Dr. Ruwe                                                                              |
| 1:30-1:45  | Overview of writing for publication                                     | Dr Capitman                                                                            |
| 1:45-2:15  | Breakout session: working in groups of two or three to discuss writing goal, generate individualized or group writing goals | Drs. Ruwe/Capitman                                                                    |
| 2:15-2:30  | Plenary and closing remarks(appreciations, regrets, suggestions for next meeting) | All                                                                                   |
SPEED NETWORKING

★ Break in pairs
★ Discuss with your colleague the writing project you wished you could get done or you can’t seem to get started
★ Each person gets about two minutes to share, then switch partners
KEY NOTE SPEECH

Road Map to Tenure and Promotion: Role of Publication and Research

Dr Andrew Hoff
Dean of the College of Health and Human Services
California State University, Fresno
INTRODUCTION TO RW&P e-CLUB COLLABORATION TOOLS
The RW&P e-Club

- **Mission**
  - Provide a forum for faculty to collaborate on research and publishing

- **Approach**
  - Mainly through electronic collaboration with occasional in-person meetings

- **Participation**
  - Free participation
  - Open to in Faculty and research staff in CSU Fresno Colleges and Foundation, Institutes
RW&P e-Club

Objectives

• Increase faculty and staff whose research work becomes published
• Increase faculty and staff participation in funded research
• Generate faculty interest in discourse around policy issues relevant the Central Valley
• Increase opportunities for tenure relevant faculty development activities
RW&P e-Club Tour

- Purpose of the electronic collaboration suite
  - Facilitate ongoing networking between members
  - Serve as a problem solving forum
  - Serve as a resource base
  - Serve as continuing education forum
RW&P e-Club Tour

- Main features of the e-club
  - Announcements
  - Club information
  - Contact us
  - Discussion Board

http://blackboard.csufresno.edu/
RW&P e-Club Tour

- E-club Tour highlights
- Club information
- Discussion Board
Club Information

- This is the e-club home page
  - Contains information about the club and links to resources

- Resource links highlights
  - Funding sources
    - Federal grants
    - Proposal central (federal and foundation grants)
  - Cabell’s directories—advice on journal publishing
  - Text Academic Authoring association (TAA)
Club Information - Additional functions

Open for discussion

What other functions or resources would you like to see in the club information forum?
Discussion Board

- This is the main e-club collaboration tool
- Discussion board highlights
  - Asking questions
  - Suggesting discussion topics
- Also exploring other capabilities e.g. co-editing, web seminars
Discussion board challenges

Open for discussion

- What would be your motivation for visiting discussion board regularly?
- What other mechanisms can we use to prompt members to a new discussion topic that minimize e-mail flooding?
FACULTY AND STAFF CLUB POSITIONS

Co-chair 1 position
Club secretary : 1 position
Planning team member -4 positions
All positions are voluntary

Please indicate your interest in any of the listed positions by entering your name under the provided space
Names will be entered in a random draw at the end of this meeting
NEEDS ASSESSMENT
FEEDBACK PLUS
Q&A SESSION
OVERVIEW OF WRITING
A JOURNAL ARTICLE
A Bird’s Eye View

Dr John Capitman
**Overview on Writing for Publication**

- Questions explored
  - Who can be a journal article author?
  - What are the common journal articles?
  - What type of article should you write? Where does the information come from?
  - Where do you start as a novel author?
  - Now that you have collected and analyzed the data, what story should you tell?
  - How do you maximize your chances for your manuscript to be accepted for publication?
  - What are the advantages of having more than one author on a paper?
  - What are the main issues in collaborative authorships?
  - What are the main issues in multi-disciplinary authorships?
  - What are the benefits of being an academic author?
  - How do you respond to a Journal editor’s feedback?
Who can be a journal article author?

* Any one with data, knowledge of the field they are writing in and a story to tell can write a journal article.
What are the common journal articles?

- Secondary research articles
- Review articles
- Systematic review and meta-analysis
- Primary research studies
- Theory and concept papers
What type of article should you write?

- Choice of article type is driven by:
- The type of study that produced the data
- The publication goals and audience you are trying to reach
- Your skill in interpreting and presenting the data in the format demanded by the publication type and discipline you are writing in
Where do you start as a novel author?

- A novel author has a number of choices
  - Join an establish team and contribute to any process of the study and be a co-author
  - Publish part(s) of your dissertation
  - Publish a term paper that you think has new information to contribute
  - Conduct a literature review or systematic review on a subject that has not been resolved
Now that you have collected and analyzed your data, what story should you tell?

- Two basic approaches
  - Write the story you originally intended when you designed the study
  - Write the story that has emerged after analyzing the data

- In both cases
  - Be sure you have evidence in your data to back up your conclusions
  - Identify the major contribution you are making
What are the main issues in collaborative authorships?

- Determine team leader
- Determine authorship order
  - Three approaches
    - Alphabetical order
    - By level of contribution to substantive knowledge
    - By career advancement objectives?
What are the main issues in multi-disciplinary authorships?

- Differences in research language across disciplines
- Determining publication audience
- Finding the right reviewer?
What are the advantages of having more than one author on a paper?

- Collective credibility
- Sharing of writing responsibilities
How do you maximize your chances for your manuscript to be accepted for publication?

- Give the Journal what it wants
- **CSSS**—Clarity, Style, Science and Story
  - Understand the type of studies published by the journal—see examples from previous studies
  - Understand the style format required by the Journal—follow guidelines provided by the journal
  - Be clear on what your article is contributing to the advancement of existing knowledge
  - Communicate potential applications of your research findings
  - Address study limitations
How do you react to editor’s feedback?

- You will get three types of feedback
  - Provisionally accepted pending revisions in accord to reviewers comments
  - Rejected but invited to resubmit a revised version
  - Rejected

Darley et al., 2004
# How do you address editor’s feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor’s Feedback</th>
<th>Author’s Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provisionally accepted pending revisions in accord to reviewers comment</td>
<td>Be happy and address reviewers comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected but invited to resubmit a revised version</td>
<td>Be happy, address reviewer’s comments and resubmit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rejected due to substantial flaws or poor fit for the Journal                    | Do not stress over it
|                                                                                 | Ask for reviewers comments, address comments and submit to a different journal   |

Darley et al., 2004
Responding to reviewer’s comments

- Pay attention to criticism or suggestions made by more than one reviewer
- Look carefully at each reviewer’s misreading if any
- Analyze reasons for misreading and re-write problematic sections
- Include a cover letter in your revised manuscript
- Include explanation of how you addressed each reviewer’s comment

Source: Darley et al 2004
How do you respond to reviewer’s comments?

- There are right and wrong ways to respond to reviewer’s comments
- See examples from Darley et al, 2004 Page 218-219

Source: Darley et al 2004
Responding to reviewer’s comments - Exhibit 1

1. *Wrong:* “I have left the section on the animal studies unchanged. If Reviewers A and C can’t even agree on whether the animal studies are relevant, I must be doing something right.”

*Right:* “You will recall that Reviewer A thought that the animal studies should be described more fully, whereas Reviewer C thought they should be omitted. A biopsychologist in my department agreed with Reviewer C that the animal studies are not really valid analogs of the human studies. So I have dropped them from the text but cited Snarkle’s review of them in an explanatory footnote on page 26.”
2. **Wrong:** “Reviewer A is obviously Deborah Hardin, who has never liked me or my work. If she really thinks that behavioral principles solve all the problems of obsessive–compulsive disorders, then let her write her own article. Mine is about the cognitive processes involved.”

**Right:** “As the critical remarks by Reviewer A indicate, this is a contentious area, with different theorists staking out strong positions. Apparently I did not make it clear that my article was intended only to cover the cognitive processes involved in obsessive–compulsive disorders and not to engage the debate between cognitive and behavioral approaches. To clarify this, I have now included the word ‘cognitive’ in both the title and abstract, taken note of the debate in my introduction, and stated explicitly that the article will not undertake a comparative review of the two approaches. I hope this is satisfactory.”
3. Right: “You will recall that two of the reviewers questioned the validity of the analysis of variance, with Reviewer B suggesting that I use multiple regression instead. I agree with their reservations regarding the ANOVA but believe that a multiple regression analysis is equally problematic because it makes the same assumptions about the underlying distributions. So, I have retained the ANOVA but summarized the results of a nonparametric analysis, which yields the same conclusions. If you think it preferable, I could simply substitute this nonparametric analysis for the original ANOVA, although it will be less familiar to the journal’s readers.”
What are the responsibilities and benefits of academic authoring?

**Responsibilities**
- Accuracy
- Objectivity
- Ethical conduct of research
- Contribution to solving real life problems

**Benefits**
- Establishing your leadership in advancing knowledge in your field of study
- Being an authoritative voice in your area of expertise
- Tenure and promotion credits
WRITING GOALS AND, INDIVIDUALIZED OR GROUP WRITING WORK PLANS

• Break up in groups of three
• Share with your colleagues a writing or research idea you would like to do as a club project
• Use the provided worksheet to write down your goals and draft work plan
Recommend Further Reading


PLENARY AND CLOSING REMARKS

• Appreciations, regrets
• Suggestions for next meeting
• Closing remarks—Dr capitman