

Writing a manuscript and submitting it to a journal

Natalya Pak

Associate Professor

Department of Languages IITU

Almaty, 2015

Outline

- 1) Types of articles
- 2) Manuscript structure and content
- 3) How to find a journal
- 4) Peer review process and timelines
- 5) Questions

Types of Articles

- Empirical Studies
- Literature Review
- Theoretical Articles
- Methodological Articles
- Case Studies

Manuscript Structure and Content

- 1) Title
- 2) Author's name and Institutional Affiliation
- 3) Author Note
- 4) Abstract
- 5) Introduction
- 6) Method
- 7) Results
- 8) Discussion
- 9) Conclusion
- 10) References
- 11) Footnotes
- 12) Appendices and Supplement Materials

Title

- Summarizes the main idea
- Should be clear, not so long, meaningful, not necessarily a sentence, no abbreviations, formulas, jargon, etc.
- Use words that are relevant to understanding the article and avoid words that serve no useful purpose
- Words such as *methods*, *results*, and terms such as *a study of*, or *an experimental investigation of*, should be avoided in the title.
- Title should be typed in upper case and lower case letters, centred between the left and right margins, and positioned in the upper half of the page.

Author's Name and Institutional Affiliation

- First name, middle initial(s), and last name
- Use the same form for publications throughout your career
- Omit all titles, e.g., PhD, EdD, Dr., Professor, etc.
- Institutional affiliation identifies where the author was when the research was conducted
- Authors are listed in order of importance to the research

Author Note

- 1st paragraph: Complete departmental affiliation
- 2nd Paragraph: Changes of affiliation if any
- 3rd Paragraph: Acknowledgments and Special Circumstances
- 4th Paragraph: Person to contact (mailing address, email).

Abstract

- A brief, comprehensive summary of the contents of the article that allows readers to survey the contents of an article quickly and, like a title, it enables persons interested in the document to retrieve it from abstracting and indexing databases
- It should:
 1. state the principal objectives and scope of investigation
 2. describe the methods employed
 3. summarize the results
 4. state the principal conclusions
- Should be accurate, non-evaluative, coherent and readable, concise
- Abstract word limits vary from journal to journal and typically range from 150 to 250 words.

Introduction

- Introduce the problem. The body of a manuscript opens with an introduction that presents the specific problem under study and describes the research strategy. A good introduction answers the following questions in just a few pages:
 - Why is the problem important?
 - How does the study relate to previous work in the area? If other aspects of this study have been reported previously, how does this report differ from, and build on, the earlier report?
 - What are the primary and secondary hypotheses and objectives of the study, and what if any, are the links to theory?
 - How do the hypothesis and research design relate to one another?
 - What are the theoretical and practical implications of the study?

Method

- Describes in detail how the study was conducted including conceptual and operational definitions of the variables used in the study
- Participant characteristics
- Sampling procedures
- Sample size, power, and precision
- Measures and covariates
- Research design

Results

- Summarizes and reports the data in sufficient detail to justify the conclusions
- Should be given in tables and graphs
- The results should be short, clearly and simply stated

Discussion

- Evaluate and interpret the implications of the presented results
- Emphasize any theoretical or practical consequences of the results
- A clear statement of the support or nonsupport for the original hypotheses

Conclusion

- Draw a brief conclusion answering the question, “so what?”

References

- Follow the style guideline of the journal, e.g.,
APA

The proper choice of a journal

- Prestige
- Access
- Impact factor

Other factors to consider

- Speed of publication
- Quality of printing
- Likelihood of acceptance
- Instructions to authors

Authors Responsibilities

- Quality of presentation
- Scientific writing in English
- Format (typeface, special characters, line spacing, margins, line length and alignment, paragraphs and indentation)
- Order of manuscript pages (title page, abstract, text, references, tables, figures, appendices)
- Page number and running heads
- Spelling check
- Supplemental materials (check the journal's website)
- Interim correspondence

Complying with Ethical, Legal and Policy Requirements

- Ethical conduct of research and conflicts of interest
- Permission to reprint or adapt the work of others (tables, figures, data, questionnaires, long quotations)
- Transfer of copyright, posting articles on Internet

How to find a good journal?

- Thomson Reuters data base (ISI WEB OF KNOWLEDGE and ISI WEB OF SCIENCE)
- Elsevier data base (Scopus www.sciencedirect.com, www.scopus.com, www.elsevier.ru)
- ERIC data base of the US Education Department
- EBSCO data base (II data bases <http://search.epnet.com>)
- Academic research premier
- Springer data base (www.springerlink.com)
- Emerald Research Register (www.emeraldinsight.com)

Electronic data bases and information systems on Economics, Management and Finance

- [ABI Inform Global](#)
- [Best of Biz](#)
- [Blackwell](#)
- [Cambridge University Press](#)
- [Ebrary](#)
- [EBSCO](#)
- [EconLit](#)
- [eLibrary](#)
- [Elsevier](#)
- [Elsevier Business, management and accounting backfiles](#)
- [Elsevier Handbooks, Book series and Encyclopedia](#)
- [InfoTrac One File](#)
- [Integrum](#)
- [JSTOR](#)
- [JSTOR Business](#)
- [Oxford University Press](#)
- [ProQuest Dissertations & Theses](#)
- [Sage](#)
- [SCOPUS](#)
- [Springer/Kluwer](#)
- [SSRN](#)
- [Taylor&Francis](#)
- [Emerald](#)
- [Factiva](#)

Decision on the manuscript?

- Acceptance
- Rejection
- Rejection with invitation to revise and resubmit

Peer Review Process


Three Decisions to Make:

- 1) Accept/accept with minor changes: manuscript meets high standards of scholarship, be written so as to engage the interests of a diverse readership, and requires only minor editorial changes
- 2) Seek major revisions: manuscript is not acceptable in its present form and requires major revisions to meet publication standards. Depending on the nature and extent of the revisions that are needed, the editor may in turn decide to: a) accept the manuscript subject to satisfactory revision or b) reject the manuscript and invite the author(s) to revise and resubmit for review
- 3) Reject: manuscript is not suitable for publication in the journal either because it is inappropriate for the *journal* readership, it is too weak to be worth revising, or because it makes little or no contribution to the field

PedMS11-012_Disposition: “Te Kotahitanga: Professional development supporting teachers to be culturally responsive”

Dear authors,

Thank you for your co-authored submission to *Pedagogies* titled, “Te Kotahitanga: Professional development supporting teachers to be culturally responsive”. We have now received two detailed and insightful reviews of your manuscript. As you will see below, both reviewers raised a number of points relating to the strength of the scholarly, organisational and methodological cases made. Given the unanimity of the ratings awarded, your submission is not acceptable as it stands at present. However, the reviewers did find some merit in the topic and so the editorial board encourages you to consider reworking and resubmitting your piece to undergo a fresh refereeing process. If you decide to do this, it would be helpful if you could supply us with a covering letter explaining the changes made in response to the comments made.



For my own part, I would like to add that I read your article with some interest and agree with the spirit and intent of the reviewers' critiques. While your material (and previous work along similar lines) seems to fit well within the broad scope of the professional development literature, it would be useful, and indeed necessary, to specify your position on issues relating to pedagogy, in particular. As it reads, I understand pedagogy as being largely synonymous with teaching methods or approaches but I suspect (given your interests in culturally sensitive and situated education) that you mean differently. In short, I think your material needs to be geared more specifically to the theoretical and practical interests of our international readership. You might also—if you have not done so already—find Professor Robin Alexander's work useful in the linkages between pedagogy and culture, and Professor Allan Luke's (2006) "Editorial Introduction: Why Pedagogies?" in *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 1(1), 1–6, a strong foundation for your exposition.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Phillip A. Towndrow
Managing Editor
Pedagogies: An International Journal



Manuscript Number.	Manuscript Title	Reviewers	Rating
PedMS11-012	Te Kotahitanga: Professional development supporting teachers to be culturally responsive	Reviewer A	3
		Reviewer B	3

Rating scale:

- 1. Accept as is or with minor changes**
No revisions or only a few minor revisions in style, etc.
- 2. Conditionally accept after revision**
Some revisions are needed, but the editors should decide whether the revisions are acceptable; there is no need for the manuscript to be returned to reviewers.
- 3. Reject but worth revision and resubmission**
The work needs major revision or reworking and if resubmitted, should undergo a fresh refereeing process.
- 4. Reject**
Not publishable in **Pedagogies**.

Reviewer A	
Rating:	3

Specific comments to author

Summary

This paper addresses an important issue: The roles of a culturally responsive curriculum in enhancing success among Maori students. It deals with a collaborative effort of a professional development that supports teachers of Maori students to become culturally responsive in their teaching. Explanation of how culture-specific pedagogies enhance learning is timely. There is no doubt that this general issue will continue to be discussed and debated among those interested in issues concerning the education of ethnic and indigenous groups and so it is entirely appropriate that articles such as this be showcased within *Pedagogies*. This article is therefore worthy of publication but not in its present form. My recommendation is that the author(s) substantially revise and resubmit the manuscript to *Pedagogies*. What follows, then, are my suggestions. I group these under several titles in random order. Further, I also note some specific suggestions/comments by page. The suggestions/comments here are intended to help strengthen the substantive analysis, organization, and format.

Abstract

The abstract in journal articles is usually set in one paragraph, providing a brief summary of the article or study including the problem, methods used and the findings. As it now stands, the author(s) set the abstract in three paragraphs in which the problem and methods are described but failed to indicate the major findings in the form of student achievement. I suggest that the author(s) rework the abstract.

Context

The author(s) failed to present the specific setting under study up front. There is no statement that provides the overall context or setting of the research site. The introductory part does not give any sense to the reader the type of setting for the research. The author(s) stated that changes are occurring for Maori students in 47 secondary schools in New Zealand (p. 2). I was very surprised indeed to stumble upon the statement at page 18 that "The breadth of these observation parameters..... will generate a range of effective and meaningful solutions for teachers and Māori students while at the same time be inclusive of all other students." It was from here that I was trying to envision the setting. From the beginning of the manuscript, the reader is wont to think about settings such as those on American Indian reservations or those on Canadian First Nations reserves where schools are provided exclusively for Aboriginal children. For an international audience, it is necessary for the author (s) to provide a general profile or the setting of the schools up front. I suggest this profile section follows the "Introduction" section.

Figures and Tables

First of all the author(s) must know the differences between tables and figures. The author(s) introduced Figure 1 at page 4, calling it "Teaching Profile". The so-called Figure 1 is not a Figure; and secondly apart from indicating where to insert the figure, nothing else was said about the figure. Although figures and tables are an effective way of communicating complex sets of analysis, they only supplement the text and cannot do the job of what they imply by themselves. The author(s) should tell the reader for what the reader should be looking in the figure or table. It is the responsibility of the author(s) to sufficiently explain the figures and tables for them to be comprehensible. After introducing the figure or table, it is also important for the author(s) to speak to the table/figure before moving on. For example, "*Table/Figure 1 shows culturally responsive and culturally appropriate material used by ...*" *The table/figure indicates that*" The author(s) should speak to all the figures and tables as they attempted to do for Table 2 and 3.

Organization

Although the manuscript is quite well written, it lacks orderly presentation of ideas. It is not clear where the literature review ends and where the results and the discussion sections begin. I was surprised to find the author(s) introducing figures as early as page 4 when the research problem and the background to the study have not yet been firmly established. As indicated above, figures and tables are usually meant for reporting results/findings and should be in the section that carries the purpose of reporting the findings. The author(s) mixed the literature review, the methods and procedures, results and discussion. This paper could have been more interesting if the author(s) first builds a thesis or background of the research around the literature review, describes the methods and procedures employed for supporting teachers to be culturally responsive, and then findings/results. After all these, the author(s) should provide a discussion of the results using the literature. The discussion section is meant for the author(s) to develop explanations for the results and adduce positive implications for the study. I suggest the author(s) cleans up and reorganizes the manuscript.

Conclusion

This is an important research and it deserves a good conclusion. It is in this final section of the manuscript that should contain the author(s)'s thoughts in seeking answers and exploring the meanings and implications of a culturally responsive teaching. More than anything else, this is the section that allows the authors to speculate, move a little beyond hard evidence and stringent logic and tell what they believe the findings mean, how they were interpreted and their implications for the education of indigenous people.

Reporting Quotes from Research Data

In reporting quotes from the data, the author(s) should indicate the source of the quotes. Some of the quotes seem to drop from nowhere as for example, the quotes at page 11 and 12 of the manuscript. At times, it is very difficult to know whether it is a lead facilitator, a teacher or someone else who is speaking. The author(s) should indicate who is saying what.

Individual Page Comments

I list below, in a numerical order, a few typos that I caught:

- a) Page 4: Paragraph 2, last sentence "Research team have should read "research team *has*".
- b) Page 13: Paragraph 2, first sentence: "Facilitators contend that this professional development is unlike any other professional development *in which* they have engaged.
- c) Page 19: The caption, "Individual Teacher Feedback". The author(s) starts this section with "This". It is not clear what the author(s) means by "This". Say exactly to what you are referring.
- d) Page 19: Last line, "feedback to feed-forward; *and*, responsive feedback."
- e) Page 20: Paragraph 2, first sentence "Teachers' feedback sessions *that* normally take 40 minutes to an hour and in the early stages of the project consist of feedback to the teacher by the facilitator."
- f) Page 22: Paragraph 2: "Pacific Islands" should read *Pacific Islanders*.

In summary, I encourage the author(s) to revise this paper. I know these are major revisions that I have recommended, some of them requiring an altering in perspective and altering in theoretical approach. I do think, however, that revisions taking in the feedback that I have provided would not only make the piece stronger, but would help guide the author(s) in other writing on the topic.

Reviewer B	
Rating:	3

Specific comments to author

- ***Does the manuscript make an original contribution to education in the international arena?***
The paper is interesting because it links professional development to increases in students' scores, particularly of Maori and Pacific Islander students. However, it does not appear to extend the analysis beyond the 2005-2005 data already discussed in a 2007 publication. Thus it is not clear how it contributes further to educational theory and practice of an indigenous approach to professional development.

An international audience unfamiliar with cultural differences and history of education in Aotearoa would need more background on these educational contexts. As a researcher from a setting with similar issues of colonization and marginalization of Indigenous populations, demographics of schools, teachers, and students could also be made clearer.

What were the demographics of the professional developers and the participating teachers? The role culture may have played in teacher receptivity or difficulty with the model is not explored, though the model is culture-based.

- ***Does it make a strong scholarly and/or practical case?***

As a qualitative research paper it could provide more thick description (Geertz, 1973). It is difficult to know what is going on in particular schools, classrooms, between teachers and students, and teachers and facilitators. There are a few quotes but not in context of specific situations. Not clear how co-construction operated or power was shared among participants. Culturally-influenced interactions are of particular interest, but not presented. No example clearly showing how the process led to more effective, culturally responsive teaching and learning is presented

- ***Does it use existing and relevant literature in the field?***

Though the focus is Aotearoa, the literature review could draw upon the growing international body of literature on critical curriculum theory, indigenous education, and culturally responsive pedagogy.

This is particularly important in an international journal.

Smith's Decolonizing Methodologies is cited, but it is not clear how this applied to the research methodology. The role of culture is brought up many times, but it is not clear how it played out in classroom interactions or in teacher reflections, relationships, and changes in pedagogy. Lave and Wenger's (1991) situated learning theory and the concept of community practice (Wenger, 1998) might be useful. The literature on culturally responsive pedagogy could be developed further.

- ***Is it clearly argued and written?***

The author might consider reorganizing the paper to reflect a research approach. Research questions were not clearly stated. The role of the writer in the program is not mentioned. There is room to expand upon sustainability of the program, mentioned several times but not elaborated upon. Do shadow-coaching, use of the Te Kotahitanga Observation Tool and the Effective Teaching Profile (EFT) persist? What sustains this culture of problem-solving and critical reflection?

- ***Are there any unique merits or qualities of the work?***

If it were to present an in-depth analysis of cultural change and sustainability since the 2007 report it would be more unique and useful. This would address the questions raised by this statement in the abstract, "This paper highlights the importance of pedagogies, in both professional development and classrooms, wherein self-determining individuals collaborate in the sharing and construction of new knowledge." It is not clear if this paper makes contributions beyond Timperly Wilson, Barrar, & Fung, 2007 who present both case study and data.

- ***What problems or omissions require the author's attention?***

What is the Te Kotahitanga Observation Tool? Need to show how this works in the cycle of shadow coaching, feedback, and use of EFT to guide instructional change and student learning. I could not find an example of this.

- ***Items for consideration.***

Suggest looking more in-depth at issue of sustainability of approach and student academic outcomes. The writer notes, "The hui culminated in an examination of components required for sustainability" (Bishop, O'Sullivan, & Berryman, 2010) but does not state the findings.

Suggest elaborating on, "The use of school-based evidence at this hui provided facilitators and principals with a supported opportunity to critically reflect on their own evidence and apply their experiences and expertise to problem solving around the common vision of what constitutes excellence in educational outcomes for Māori students in their schools." What does this mean over several years?

Assignments

- Analyze the structure (components) of a research paper.
- What methodology is applied in a research paper?
- Analyze the references of a research paper.
- What references are you using in your research?
- What are the possible journals to submit your research to in your research area?