

DO'S AND DON'TS OF GETTING PUBLISHED

Professor Gary S Monroe
University of New South Wales

Do's

You have subjected your work to external scrutiny before submitting the paper

- paper has been presented at conference(s)
- paper has been presented at seminar/workshop(s)
- paper has been professionally edited (particularly if English is not your first language)

Critically check your paper before submitting it to a journal. The following checklist can be used as a guide:

Paper is compatible with the journal and complies with all journal requirements

- topic of the paper (e.g., must address some aspect of ethics for JBE)
- style of research and research method (e.g., qualitative vs quantitative)
- complies with journal style requirements (e.g., headings, referencing, etc)
- includes references from that journal
- structure of paper is consistent with other papers published in that journal

Quality of Overall Presentation

- spelling (including authors' names), grammar and punctuation checked
- clear and concise writing
- title clearly indicates what the paper is about
- terminology used to describe phenomena, events, variables or tests is consistent throughout the paper
- citations in the text are consistent (e.g., with regard to '&' and 'and' and et al.)
- no missing references and do not include references not cited in the paper
- references updated for working papers now published
- references are in alphabetical order
- use appropriate and consistent decimal places
- when reporting results from statistical analysis double check all statistics in the paper against the tables and against your own statistical output files.

Introduction - Motivation and Significance

- introduction sets the scene and introduces a research problem
- introduction describes how the problem is approached and explored
- introduction briefly describes what was done and what was found
- introduction describes the importance of this research
- introduction describes the potential benefits of this research
- introduction describes what the study does and its contribution(s) (both theoretical and practical to the literature is stated early in the introduction)

Prior Research

- all relevant prior research covered
- only relevant prior research covered
- clear and critical assessment of prior research
- clear articulation of deficiencies / holes in prior research

- prior research is synthesised, classified and insightfully engaged with, rather than presented as a series of “abstracts”

Research Questions and Hypotheses

- research questions are developed from the critical assessment of prior research and identification of weaknesses
- there should be a logical link between the critique of prior research and research questions
- in qualitative research, you articulate research questions which the paper aim to answer
- in quantitative research you propose hypotheses based on theory discussion
- hypotheses are developed from the preceding literature
- discussion preceding a hypothesis leads to (develops) the hypothesis
- hypotheses are stated in a testable format
- where appropriate, the hypotheses are directional (as are the tests)

Research Method and Design

- argue for the selection of specific method(s) that allow for your research questions to be answered or hypotheses to be tested
- explain why the proposed research method(s) (e.g. a survey, an experiment, a case study) are suitable to answer research questions or test hypothesis
- describe research design and specific data collection techniques used (e.g. questionnaire, interviews)
- describe recruitment of participants in surveys or experiments
- when using qualitative methods describe research setting, your role as a researcher and interactions in the research setting, as well as time spent collecting the data
- when using quantitative methods make sure model is clearly set out, all variables are clearly described/defined and other (confounding) factors are controlled in the design
- make sure experiment is clearly described (e.g., manipulations, procedures, tasks)
- make sure survey instrument is properly designed and described including sources of questions and procedures to validate the instrument
- check validity using Libby’s boxes (see handout on managing your thesis)

Data in Quantitative Studies

- convincing reason why data and sample selection criteria are suitable
- sampling techniques are defined
- data and sample selection criteria are well described including how you arrived at your final sample size
- any sample biases are stated/treated
- treatment of outliers described
- convincing reason why data and sample selection criteria are suitable
- appropriate justification of partitioning data into subsamples (where relevant)
- if the sample size changes from table to table an explanation is provided

Data Analysis Technique(s) in Qualitative Studies

- describe your approach to data analysis and specific techniques employed; be explicit about how you developed your knowledge claims
- if appropriate, provide a good description of coding process and some evidence of actual codes and coded texts (often given in an appendix)

Analysis of Results in Quantitative Studies

- table of descriptive statistics is presented
- correlation matrix presented in a table
- analysis techniques are defined and appropriate
- analysis relates to the hypotheses to be tested
- appropriate use of one- vs two-tail tests
- appropriate conclusions are drawn from the results
- appropriate use of additional or sensitivity tests to rule out other explanations
- tables are stand-alone, i.e., every table should have a key, every variable should have a definition such that the reader could replicate the study (e.g., compustat codes)

Presentation and Analysis of Results in Qualitative Studies

- make sure that a presentation of results, that is, your story from participants' perspective (first level analysis) is authentic and comprehensive
- make sure your discussion section provides a theoretical analysis (second level analysis) of the results, and thus answers your research question(s)

Study Limitations Acknowledged

- limitations of the study are appropriately acknowledged

Future Research

- future research opportunities and extensions are identified

Reading Decision Letters and Review Reports

- read the decision letter very carefully
- assess whether the decision is reject, revise and resubmit or accept
- read the review reports carefully and consider how you can/will address each point
- do not discount what the reviewer says (e.g., if they say something is unclear, assume that it is unclear rather than assume the reviewer is an idiot)
- wait a couple of weeks and then go through the review reports again
- discuss how to address the issues with your co-authors and colleagues

Resubmissions When You Have a Revise and Resubmit Decision

- revised paper addresses all of the reviewers' comments (or explains why some issue(s) cannot be addressed/remedied in the response to the reviewer)
- resubmission includes a "Response to the Reviewers", which reproduces the review points raised by the reviewers and a description of how you have addressed each point
- do not make unnecessary changes outside of the issues raised by the reviewers – you can make things worse

Submitting Papers that Have Been Rejected at another Journal

- do not just send the paper to another journal with no changes (you might get the same reviewer)
- revised paper should address most, if not all, of the reviewers' comments from the journal that rejected your paper

Don'ts

- don't ignore the points in the Do's section
- don't motivate a paper with "no prior research has done this before" or "no one has investigated this in country X" – you need a better motivation
- don't motivate a paper with "there are conflicting results in the literature" unless you plan to resolve those conflicting results. Otherwise you are just adding to the conflicting results.
- do not make sweeping statements (especially criticisms) without references e.g., don't say things like "prior literature has failed to do so and so", or "prior studies always assume blah blah" etc. unless you are 100% confident or have references to back up your claims
- do not overclaim your results or the implications of your results
- don't present a literature review section that reads like a chronological series of abstracts
- don't develop your hypothesis by just citing the results of prior research, e.g., "several studies have reported a positive relation between X and Y (Jones 1991; Smith 2009; Wang 2011; Zhou 2013), therefore I expect a positive relation between X and Y". Use theory and/or logical arguments. Consider whether you need a hypothesis for X - should it just be a control variable?
- don't send an early draft of a paper to a journal just to get some comments
- don't ignore valid comments received when presenting your paper at a conference or seminar
- don't revise a paper for every comment that you get – you have to consider whether the comments are valid
- don't ignore review points when revising a paper
- don't assume the reviewer just got it wrong or didn't understand your paper – the problem could be with your paper rather than the reviewer
- don't send a rejected paper to another journal without revising it and addressing the points raised in the review from the journal that rejected the paper
- don't underestimate the amount of work required to get a good publication
- don't ignore reviewers' advice to collect additional data even if it is a lot of work

Some excellent references include:

- Bradbury, M.E. 2012. "Why you don't get published: an editor's view", *Accounting and Finance*, Vol. 52, pp. 343-358.
- Clarkson, P.M. 2012. "Publishing: art or science? Reflections from an editorial perspective", *Accounting and Finance*, Vol. 52, pp. 359-376.
- Evans, J.H., Feng, M., Hoffman, V.B. and Moser, D. V. 2012. "Self Assessing Your Empirical Accounting Research", Working Paper, University of Pittsburgh.

Publishing in the Academy of Management Journal (AMJ) – Parts 1 – 7. This is a series of commissioned papers about how to write a journal article. Although it refers to the Academy of Management Journal, the points raised and issues addressed are relevant to accounting and finance journals.

- Colquitt, J.A. and George, G. 2011. "Publishing in AMJ – Part 1: Topic Choice", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 54(3), pp. 432-435.
- Bono, J.E. and McNamara, G. 2011. "Publishing in AMJ – Part 2: Research Design", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 54(4), pp. 657-660.

- Grant, A.M. and Pollock, T.G. 2011. "Publishing in AMJ – Part 3: Setting the Hook", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 54(5), pp. 873-879.
- Sparrowe, R.T. and Mayer, K.J. 2011. "Publishing in AMJ – Part 4: Grounding Hypotheses", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 54(6), pp. 1098-1102.
- Zhang, Y. and Shaw, J.D. 2012. "Publishing in AMJ – Part 5: Crafting the Methods and Results", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 55(1), pp. 8-12.
- Geletkanycz, M. and Tepper, B.J. 2012. "Publishing in AMJ – Part 6: Discussing the Implications", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 55(2), pp. 256-260.
- Bansal, P. and Corley, K. 2012. "Publishing in AMJ – Part 7: What's Different about Qualitative Research", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol 55(3), pp. 509-513.