COUC810 Pre-Intensive Quiz—Due February 2, 2025

1. **What helpful tips do you want to keep in mind from chapter 1 of the Rocco and Hatcher text?**

Writing can be for multiple reasons such as to get attention, to use a talent that I have, to work with other scholars to gain comradery with them and to learn from their valuable knowledge (Pg. 3-4). The author goes on to encourage writers to not be discouraged by rejections because it is just part of being a writer. The authors suggested I use these as opportunities to grow in my writing skills. They suggest that writers should go through great efforts to ensure they have submitted their best work. A paper that does not need a lot of corrections is more likely to be accepted (pg. 9). Further they go on to say that a paper that has been rejected should not be discarded but should be refined to be submitted to another journal or maybe includ as a chapter in a book I help write (pg. 5).

2. **What is important to remember about publishing in peer-reviewed and non-refereed journals from chapter 2 of the Rocco & Hatcher text?**

A peer reviewed journal uses a blind review process where a non-refereed journal may have one or two people who typically look over submissions ((pg. 13-14). It is often a temptation for newer writers to desire to be published in the latest greatest journals. However, if you are beginning your writing career and are wanting to increase your odds of publication you may need to consider applying to journals that are newer and are actively seeking articles to publish. On the other hand, the authors indicate that newer writers may have an interesting or unique interpretation of a phenomenon that a well-established journal may be intrigued by and desire to publish the ideas (pg. 20). A key factor in deciding whether a peer reviewed or non-refereed are the best place to submit an article or which is better to use as a source, you need to decide who is the intended audience. Are you seeking to affect the research and scholarly portion of the field or are you seeking to get your information out to the practitioners in the field (pg. 21)? A scholarly article will need peer reviewed material to support its finding. A good use on non-scholarly work is to help spur thought to help get a good topic to pursue and develop (pg. 16). Three keys to writing are to consider the “relevance”, do you have the “capability”, and the marketability of the topic being considered (pg. 17). When submitting articles to journals, you need to have an idea of the typical word count and the readability level the journal aspires to so you will write the article in a manner that aligns with the journal’s expectations to lower the probability of getting a rejection (pg. 19).

3. **What wisdom from emerging scholars stood out to you in chapter 3 of the Rocco & Hatcher text? Be sure to include something from the "Express your scholarly voice" section as well as several other pearls from the chapter.**

This chapter helps the emerging scholar to recognize that the way to become an active member of this group of scholars is to start writing and submitting (pg. 39). The authors also help emerging scholars to be aware that criticism is a good thing. It helps to refine a product into the very best it can be when we allow ourselves to be open to hearing and learning from those who have already dove into the world of writing and have had opportunity for their skills to be more refined (pg. 36). This chapter helps me to better understand that the research I have already done for papers and assignments has given me basic foundations for topics that could be expanded upon to speak at a conference or submit to a journal to share my insights and gained knowledge (pg. 28). It is also a good practice to collect information in a format that can be retrieved for later use. The author recommends a couple of ideas with one being to put the data into a spreadsheet format (pg. 28-30).

4. **Drawing on content from the rest of the chapter, describe Exhibit 4.1 in chapter 4 of the Rocco & Hatcher text (p. 59 and 60). What do you need to remember as a budding scholar?**

The main answer to this is to learn to be critical. This does not mean to be rude or petty, but to look intently at a work to test the validity of what is being put forward (pg. 44). This means that I attempt to understand the argument and the belief system that underlies the outcomes being espoused in the writing. Not only should I be critical of other people's work, but I should be self-critical and ask myself all the questions that are in the Exhibit 4.1 chart (pg. 45 & 59-60). I need to be self-critical to be as certain as I possibly can be that I have presented the best possible case for my claims in a manner that can be clearly understood by the intended audience (pg. 45). A key to being a great writer is to also be a great and diligent reader. To be scholarly requires one to read and to be filled with the knowledge base put out by scholars (pg. 45). It also means that I will learn to differentiate between just talking and knowing when and why something is significant and worthy of a discussion with other scholars (pg. 47). Further, I need to be aware that there is a claim by a writer and then the warrant that is displayed through the evidence that is presented to either support or to weaken the validity of the claims made (pg. 44). In the social science field of research, it is best practice to use phraseology such as the findings “suggest” or are “consistent with the claim” rather than making the leap into certainty or absolutes (pg. 53).

5. **Based on chapter 6 of the Rocco & Hatcher text, how will you transform your dissertation into a publication?**

The authors make several suggestions regarding converting a dissertation into a scholarly article. One suggestion is that you work from the beginning of the dissertation process with the idea of using it to produce future journal articles (pg. 83). This is a process said to need the engagement of the critical thinking skills (pg. 87). I need to be aware that the process is more than removing a few sentences or sending in a section of my dissertation (pg. 85). The process will likely require a refinement to meet the standards of the publication I submit to (pg. 86). It is imperative that I seek out the journal I wish to submit too and learn their submission requirement and guidelines to eliminate incorrect formatting as a reason for automatic rejection (pg. 81). It is a good practice to have a few clearly delineated points from a dissertation and not try to cram to entire work into one article. It may be valuable to produce multiple articles from one dissertation to get the most value from the work produced (pg. 86).

6. **According to chapter 7 of the Rocco & Hatcher text, what do scholars need to know about "writing with authority"?**

The authors say there are three main pitfalls to writing with authority: verbosity, ambiguity, and unsubstantiality (pg. 92). I will also need to learn how to write in a self-critical manner that recognizes repetitious language that is “superfluous” (pg. 93). I will strive to write in such a way that is not cluttered and creates confusion (pg. 95). I will also have to be very cautious that my words put forward the intended meaning I am desiring to be communicating to my audience (pg. 96). I will need to develop a way of interacting with sources to understand them well and to then communicate the value of my sources to help my readers understand why I have cited them and their importance to the article (pg. 97). I must remember that well written articles have likely gone through multiple revisions, and I should expect to do likewise if I expect to produce an article that is not a turn-off due to the lack of refinement (pg. 99). My writing will need to utilize contextualization to make clear to all, regardless of where the person reading the article lives, the desired and concise meaning (pg. 100). Scholarly writing can be a one-sided picture, but my goal will be to present a balanced approach to give my audience the information to arrive at a well-reasoned understanding of the facts (pg. 100). Part of being a scholar whose words hold authoritative stature is being well read from the published scholarly works to gain a better understanding of what that looks like as a final product (pg. 101).

7. **What will you keep in mind about "Finding Voice" (chapter 8 of the Rocco & Hatcher text) when you engage in scholarly activities?**

This chapter is one that I am very interested in the concepts and how to implement them effectively as a aspiring writer. I want to be able to balance the world of scholarly language with more common language that can be better understood by the masses. The authors speak of find your voice and spoke of the “power in the personal”, and “writing from experience” helps to draw people in and engages the reader (pg. 103). To much scholarism and it is dead. To much “personality and feeling”, it becomes a “monologue”. A balance is needed, a contrast between the “authorial I” and “academic voice” to help it be palatable (pg. 103) and to lend to the authoritative guise of the work (pg. 106). I agree with the author’s perspective of appreciating text that take me through the argument well so I am allowed to draw my on inferences rather than feeling as though I have been“…misled into accepting the author’s point of view…” (pg.105). The chapter goes on to talk about the use of first person writing and says that omitting it from scholarly work allows the reader to engage the work without the writer getting in the way (pg. 106). Part of voice and authority is reading other scholarly works to gain better writing skills that includes both style and form (pg. 107). I need to be aware of my audience and the expectations regarding the use of the authorial I (pg. 110).

8. **Explain the qualities of good writing offered in Chapter 9 of the Rocco & Hatcher text?**

A key component to a well written research document is to have clearly delineated the problem being considered (pg. 116). One clear method to assist a researcher in being equipped to write a distinctive problem description is to be well read and to identify the gaps in the existing literature that the manuscript is attempting to fill or at least narrow the gap (pg. 117). The authors go on to say that a well-studied and presented literature review will lay a solid foundation to then demonstrate how the current work can advance, refine, and revise the current information pool on the topic at hand (pg. 118). It is also stated that the presentation of existing information should include the manuscript writer’s critical interactions with the data (pg. 118). It is made clear that having a clearly defined theoretical framework is an essential component to good writing (pg. 118-120). Another component of good writing is to have a clearly laid out method so others can perform the research in a different setting to see if the findings are repeated or if the same procedures produce a different outcome in a different population (pg. 120-121). A discussion section is where I will lay out the "logical sequencing" and will be "articulating the findings without interpretation" (pg. 121). An additional need is to list any limitations that were present to assist my readers in their critical analysis of the data being presented and to help with any future research that comes out of the presentation (pg. 122). Finally, good writing considers the audience being spoken to and doing so in a manner that is in alignment with the expectations of that population (pg. 122-123).

9. **What new things did you learn about writing a literature review from chapter 11 of the Rocco & Hatcher text? Include information about Table 11.3 - Completed Literature Analysis Hybrid Chart.**

This process needs to have a clearly defined problem that is seeking to be better understood. The literature review (LR) process should have thought included from the reviewer and not simply a compiling of data. Something new should be gained by the consumer of a LR (pg. 147) and any gaps identified in the data should be highlighted (pg. 149). In the LR process major concepts and themes are likely to begin to be seen and should be communicated (pg. 149). The use of several tools should be used to find data for the review process and not simply using one tool to improve the likelihood of finding resources taken from varying perspectives (pg. 150). The process used to gather the data should be communicated to the readers (pg. 151). A warning is to be intentional about critically engagement with the data to avoid having what amounts to an annotated bibliography (pg. 151). A key process is sorting the articles for the review and then to have a system in place where you can analyze the works and list the information in a logical manner to be best able to refer to the works as needed (pg. 152). The authors share a chart and talk about using a series of questions to help the process to be consistent as I interact with each work. The chart demonstrates various categories to help sort the information being critically analyzed (pg. 152-156). The concluding thoughts speak to any conclusions or reviews made in the writing up of the reviewed materials, I must focus on the literature and not the purpose of my writing (the "topic") (pg. 158).

10. According to chapter 12 of the Rocco & Hatcher text, how might you increase the odds of publishing a qualitative manuscript?

Following some recommendations of the authors should increase the likelihood of publication. The authors have some very helpful charts to clarify what their understanding of an ideal layout should look like (pg. 161-162). I will need to have an introduction that; (1) introduces the research question and makes clear the background ("hook the reader"), the purpose statement, and the research question and (2) includes the framework or literature review (pg. 162). I will need to indicate why I chose the methods used by referencing other works who did likewise and those who chose differently to justify my chosen methods (pg. 166). An interconnecting of the framework being weaved throughout the manuscript will help it to be a unified and "seamless" document (pg. 166). The methods section is to follow and typically has: "(1) conceptual framework, (2) sample, (3) data collection, (4) data analysis, (5) integrity measures, and (6) data management", but can vary depending on the author's "presentation logic" (pg. 167). Conceptual Framework—The authors cite multiple ideas about specific types of qualitative research and cites Creswell (1998) who "presented five traditions within qualitative research (biography, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, and case study)”. The authors make clear that qualitative is not a “method or technique” but is more of a generalized philosophical approach of seeing the world through a diverse lens (pg. 168). Sample—I will need to decide on a sampling method and then make this choice clear in both the type and reasoning for the type chosen (pg. 168). Data Collection—The authors suggest making this process clear so the factors can help the reader to see the full effects of the methodology utilized (pg. 170). Data Analysis—This process needs to be laid out to help the readers to understand how I interacted with the data to arrive at a conclusion (pg. 171). Integrity Measure—Readers need to see the steps taken to understand how trustworthiness has been achieved through a process like triangulation (pg. 171-172). Data Management—Include some basic information regarding techniques used (e.g., did I paraphrase-=[during transcription) (pg. 172). The discussion section can be presented in various fashions with one method being to use the “research questions, themes, categories, and inferences as subheadings” to help the reader in their analysis of the research to understand the inference made by the writer (pg. 172-174). The implication section gets at the: “so what” of the manuscript and how to take what has been shared and put it into action (pg. 174-175).

11. According to chapter 13 of the Rocco & Hatcher text, how might you increase the likelihood of publishing a quantitative manuscript?

The chapter begins with a concise summarization. “Good quantitative research has three basic characteristics regardless of the topic: consistency among the components, a logical trail of evidence, and transparency, which is a clear presentation of how the data were selected, collected, coded, analyzed, and interpreted" (pg. 179). The title should be decided before beginning, while remaining fluid throughout the process, and is a tool to help potential readers to have an expectation of what they are embarking upon in their reviewing of the manuscript (pg. 180). The purpose is the "so what" and should be connected to the relevant literature to help ground the importance of the work at hand (pg. 180-181). The problem reveals the "objectives of the study" and should align with the other sections' intent (pg. 182). The research methods section should state the research hypothesis (which is the statement of the problem), the research design considers the unit of analyses, why and to whom you want to generalize, who were your subjects, context, location, etc. and what type (i.e., true experimental, quasi-experimental, preexperimental (they suggest avoiding this type), and the ex post facto (without hypothesis (weakest), with hypothesis, and with alternative hypothesis (preferred)) (pg. 182-184). The sources of the data collection need to be clearly delineated so the readers will have the full understanding of the process (pg. 184). Operational definitions help to clarify terms which allows the readers to be on the same page and to be better able to see how the writer has arrived at their understanding of the data (pg. 184-185). Sampling procedures need to be stated to help readers to see the "generalizations" and the "casual interpretations" made and generally fall in the probabilistic (simple random or stratified random sampling) and non-probabilistic (purposive, convenience, quota, and sometimes cluster sampling) categories (pg. 185). The validity estimates of the measures and instruments used should be included. The following types of reliability to consider are "test-retest, equivalent forms, and internal consistency" and the types of validity to be considered are face, expert judge, content or logical validity, concurrent validity, and construct validity (pg. 186). The analysis must be a process that aligns with the overarching purpose of the study, be done in a manner that can withstand scrutiny, and is clearly evidence based (pg. 186-188). The authors share a very clear idea of preparing the results section by creating a chart and then I should write to explain the chart. They also go on to recommend reviewing the journals you plan to publish in to ensure appropriate formatting of the charts (pg. 188). The final section of the discussion, conclusion, and implications wrap the bulk of the work up in a neat package to help show the overall indications of significant or the lack of being significant, and the delimitations, limitations, and generalizations that can be drawn. The implications imagine where the research could lead and be put into practice where the conclusion states the results of the study that has taken place (pg. 188-189). It is essential that the ethical guidelines have been adhered to and documented appropriately (pg. 189).

12. List and describe several of the qualitative and quantitative legitimation considerations described in chapter 14 of the Rocco & Hatcher text.

First, this make the process much more complicated because in essence you are doing two studies that are being married together. There becomes the need for each process to be clearly defined as mentioned in the previous chapters on each method individually (pg. 191). When two processes are being used it leads to a meta-inference which is coming to judgements based on more than one study (pg. 192). There still must be practices in place to lend the article's design and outcomes to trustworthiness or validity (pg. 193).

Qualitative

Reflexivity—The researcher making known their awareness of biases and efforts to mitigate it by multiple observers or training coders in the consistent use of techniques (pg. 199).

Triangulation—Using multiple sources to help avoid biases and to get a more well-rounded view of the thing being studied (pg. 199).

Negative Case Analysis—Using deviant case to help see the thing from all perspectives including those believed to be unusual or outliers (pg. 199).

Referential Adequacy—Is their enough evidence to support the claims or are general implications being made (pg. 199).

Member checking—Taking the implications drawn back to the people who were the participants to check if what I have agrees with their understanding of what occurred (pg. 199).

Quantitative

Maturation effect—Caused by certain variables weakening over the period it took to complete the study (pg. 204).

Testing Effects—A possible concern is that at retest a person recalls the pretest and answers accordingly rather than the current actual effect of a treatment (pg. 204).

Statistical Regression Effect—When a pretest has excessively high or low scores and then the post tests are lower, or drastically different, it may lead to a misinterpretation of the findings (pg. 204).

Experimental Mortality Effect—Occurs when participants fall off and are unable to complete the study for external factor to the study, can cause negative outcome effects (pg. 204).

Selection Bias Effect—Simply put, it is not dividing the types of participants up consistently (all men or all women in what should be balanced groups) (pg. 204).

13. What is important to keep in mind about writing theory, conceptual, and position articles for publication (chapter 15 of the Rocco & Hatcher text)?

The theory article is designed to help make clear “concepts under investigation” (pg. 209). A theory is a best summation of a reality based on the facts known at the time of the development of the theory (pg. 210). Theories help to move the knowledge base forward by taken the existing knowledge and seeking to add additional content not previously developed or understood (pg. 210). The act of writing about theory requires that an individual be thoroughly well read to have a distinctive handle of what information exist and where the gaps are that are needing to be filled (pg. 211). A great point is to see theory as looking beyond what is already accepted to be so while staying within the constraints of reasoning through the current knowledge of the phenomenon being theorized (pg. 212). Putting forward a new theory may bring about attention that has not been anticipated (both good and bad) (pg. 213).

The conceptual article typically has less evidence to back its inception and is what often helps to develop a theory (pg. 215). There is not a distinctive and formal method of writing a conceptual article, but the authors suggest writing in line with those who have previously undertaken this endeavor (pg. 215-216).

The position article is the least formal of these three and should be used with great decorum to avoid an unintended controversy or even being humiliated by an opinion being espoused that can be easily refuted. Though it is often used to sway people’s views, authors should not attack another directly, make overgeneralizations, be too vague, go on an on (be concise), and possibly utilize a bit of humor to soften the potential sting (pg. 217-218).

14. What did you learn about creating and publishing non-refereed manuscripts from chapter 16 of Rocco & Hatcher?

Nonrefereed means that it has not gone through the peer review or formal editorial review process (pg. 222). The process is much quicker because it does not go through the process (that can be time consuming of a year or more before publication). Being quicker is a very important aspect of nonrefereed to get current and needed information published as quickly as possible (pg. 222). Book reviews, editorials, and perspective pieces are three typical types of nonrefereed publications (pg. 223). The book review is a critique of a current work, with the writer having some expertise in the field discussed and uses few references if any at all (pg. 223). Editorials are meant to share an opinion and to persuade the field to consider an idea, the writer is typically an active member of the field being discussed or a scholar, and is brief in length with few if any references (pg. 223). Editorials are long enough to give a good grasp of the conversation but also short enough that people will take the effort to read it (pg. 226). The perspective article gives a glimpse into current research that is being conducted, shares a perspective on a topic generally, or introduces new topics to stir thought on the ideas, the writers range from students to well established scholars, and often has some references (pg. 223). Nonrefereed articles should meet the intended goal of the publication where they are submitted (pg. 223). Some of the ethical concerns of non-refereed article is plagiarism, privacy, conflicts of interest, codes of conduct, (pg. 225) and having actually read a book you are reviewing (pg. 230). The nonrefereed platforms grants a writer an ere of freedom that is not the norm in most of the scholarly world of research and publication (pg.

225). I was amazed the authors felt the need to state that to copy and pasting various works into a new document for submission is not appropriate (pg. 225).

15. According to chapter 18 in Rocco & Hatcher, how should we receive and address feedback from reviewers and editors?

I find the authors transparency regarding his publication submissions to be a breath of fresh air. The author indicates having over seventy submissions, over thirty years and has only had one accepted without revisions requested (pg. 251). I really appreciate the authors commitment to making their reviews as specific as possible to help the authors of the works being reviewed task to make corrections as straight forward as possible (referring to specific page and paragraph) (pg. 251). Both negative and positive book reviews can be helpful to others to help them decide to or not to read a work in (pg. 252). I appreciate that the author shares the emotional blow of receiving the rejection with revision letter and the suggestion that I ruminate on the information for a couple of days before responding (pg. 252 & 253). I so appreciate the author stating the feeling of being an imposter and the reality of having twenty-nine positive and one negative and the human norm to focus on the one (in essence catastrophizing) (pg. 252). What a blessing that the author has the attitude that well published authors need to make the emotional reality of the 'request for revisions' they receive to be known. The more assurance newer authors can have that they are not the epidemy of stupidity or think the system is jaded against them, the more likely new writer are to continue rather than ceasing to submit article for publication (pg. 252). Accepting a request for revisions as a compliment based on the large number of submissions a journal receives is a great way to think through this process (pg. 253). Being sure to follow the journal's guidelines for submission is crucial (pg. 252 & 254-255). Having at least a couple of projects going to hopefully see progress on one of them seems like a reasonable idea (pg. 253). Conversing with my colleagues about revision request can hopefully shut down my feelings of being singled out or may verify an unreasonable request by a reviewer (pg. 254 & 257). The author points out that their own grading of student's work has been affected by their own experience with how they receive revision request and try to implement these principles in their own grading processes (pg. 254). The author shares that it should not be my intention to try to get a journal to accept an article that is the antithesis of their perspective because it will likely be a waste of time and would be better served to find another journal where I can submit the work (pg. 259). As a writer, it is wise to understand when your work with a journal has come to an end due to a change in your views or that of the journal and may be recognized if the reviews change and take on a personal attacking stance (pg. 259).

16. What are some of the important pointers Rocco & Hatcher provide in chapter 20 about working with coauthors?

Choosing Coauthors Strategically—Some choices are out of necessity because of another person's area of expertise where other potential partnerships may be due to a more experienced author seeing the potential value of a colleague leading to the question: "who must or should" participate (pg. 278).

Clarifying Coauthoring Goals—Have the conversation at the coming together stage to establish some specific goals of the group so there are not conflicting paradigms at play and you end up fighting one another rather than working towards the common target. Also, think through meeting times and ask will these be formal or more casual and laid back to help the group cohesion to be well set up for success (pg. 279-280).

Getting Along is as Important as Producing—The ideas of group are laid out as forming, functioning, formulating, and fermenting and were shared with an excellent chart to give specifics of each phase. There is also another chart that refers to some roles within the group that are helpful to consider with one chart being task achievement roles (i.e., timekeeper, recorder, summarizer, checker) and the other being positive interpersonal relationship roles (i.e., encourager, praiser, jargon buster) (pgs. 280-283).

Agree to Reflective Analysis of the Coauthoring Process and Celebrate—Take the time to ask how the process is going and be open to the need to change strategies and when the process is flowing well be able to celebrate it together (pgs. 283-284).

Expect to be Responsible and to be Held Accountable—Coworkers need to meet the commitments they have agreed to and be very transparent if this becomes an undoable task, discuss what steps need to occur to correct this or other issues (e.g., extend due dates), and keep in frequent communication to discuss progress and needs. The author shares a couple of helpful agenda charts that would help to make clear to all the intentions of meetings (pgs. 285-288).

Be Willing to Let Go of Personal Paradigms to Create a New Paradigms—This one I understand their intention and how this can be a very creative stance, but am concerned about setting my paradigms (values or worldview) aside. I am concerned that a lot of the craziness we have in our world today is as result of this very concept being used, then writing from this perspective, intending for it be a thought exercise, and people reading it and implementing it as their reality. Regardless of my apprehensions, the authors share a chart to help delineate their point: Think of unusual ways to approach the problem and define the goals in different ways to assist with paradigm busting while asking what if questions to develop new mental connections (pgs. 288-290).

17. What was interesting and important to you in chapter 1 of the Jalongo & Saracho text about the journey from aspiring author to published scholar?

Several great thoughts were within the chapter. One metaphor used was when driving in the fog you can only see as far as your light shine, but you can make the whole trip this way. (pg. 37). Another thought the author quoted from Donald Murray is, "Authors do not need to know, in advance, what they want to say before they begin to write; rather, they should begin writing right away to discover what they have to say" (pg. 44). These ideas can help writer to know that at times they may not see the entire path but to keep plugging along and as the journey progresses the destination will become clearer. Along with the statement already mentioned from pg. 44, the authors also share that an outline can also be produced along the way or at the end of writing, getting the ideas and thought reduced to writing is more important than "correctness" in the initial stages, revision is more than changing some words, but is a reshaping of portions of the work, do not get caught up in the wordiness of other writer, but to make the word choices to be aligned with the intended audience, be creative with how you write and do not get in the rut of one size fits all (pg. 44). A valuable suggestion is to learn coping tools to help myself as a writer not buy into the self-deprecating idea of being an imposter but rather know that I do indeed have value to add to the profession. Also, the authors shared how they used encouragement to help one another when writing this book (pg. 47). The authors give a chart with "strategies to getting started" that have lots of valuable thought (e.g., interview (act like you are being interviewed to come up with good questions to ask), cubing (generate six questions for each side of a cube to spur thought), the five W's (Who, What, Where, When, Why) (pg. 48-49). The chapter reminded me that each person has the same 24 hours a day and to know that what we deem to be important and worthwhile will likely get accomplished (pg. 51). It is noted that 70% of manuscript sent back in after corrections are accepted where 0% that are not corrected are printed. This is used to teach that a returned manuscript with corrections needed should be seen as an invitation to be published (pg. 55). A piece of good advice is to let a manuscript sit that you believe is ready to submit and then come back to it later to see if you still feel the same. The second thought is to have a group you are familiar with to read through it to see if they concur with your intent to submit (pg. 59). The conclusion shared the idea that much like Olympians train diligently, we do not see all the pregame work that has gone into their performance. This is very similar to well-known published scholars and all the work they have done behind the scenes we also cannot see (pg. 69).

18. What will be important for you to keep in mind from chapter 2 of the Jalongo & Saracho text if you want to turn an unpublishable manuscript into one that is publishable?

A pertinent point made is that being accepted is not based on luck. It is through diligent preparation on the front side and follow through regarding the suggested revisions shared by a journal's reviewers (pg. 80). Another reality is many scholars who are well published have put many hours of study and implementing revisions that often occur at hour such as 4:00 am -8:00 am to be able to get uninterrupted time (pg. 81). The process is certainly a ‘slow and steady win the race’ approach rather than ‘fast and furious’, as well as one that needs “a well-stocked mind” that can only be produced through time and study (pg. 83). Remembering to write clearly, warmly, and well and to ask oneself if I am writing to illuminate my vocabulary sophistication or am I seeking to share valuable information in a manner that is readily digestible and understood by the intended audience (pg. 84). A suggestion was to think about the author who I respect and enjoy reading and would even read a work of this person that may not be on a distinct topic of typical interest to me but is written by this author. The prompt is to ask myself what about this writer would cause me to stop and even read a topic I am not overly interested in, what would cause me to skip it, what would be so appealing that I would ask to use the writing or even write to the editor about a letter whether good or bad (pg. 87). Be very certain that there is a clear and concise well-reasoned argument that will move the reader in the direction of also reaching a reasonably asserted claim (pg. 89). There is a nice list of common phrases used in scholarly writing in the chapter that will be very useful as I grow into the role as a scholarly writer (pg. 93-94). Just as a singing voice can improve with work and teaching, the scholarly voice improves with work and teaching as well (pg. 95). In scholarly writing I will need to have well supported arguments rather than “sweeping generalizations” (pg. 98). I should persuade and not ramble, respect the audience and not attack, present evidence and not pluck at heart strings, be balanced in my presentations, make the problem clear while providing ideas to resolve it, inform my readers as allies and not as the enemy, and give reasonable solutions rather than pushing an agenda (pg. 101). There is a helpful chart that shows the intent of a student paper verses a published work and spells out the differences (e.g., voice—student's voice is muffled by the voices of professionals; published writing—logical authoritative argument to promote thought and a progression in thought) (pgs. 102-103).

19. What are the main points that Jalongo & Saracho (chapter 3) share about moving from trepidation to first draft?

Scholarly writing is not something that just happens as a feat of luck or happenstance but is a long process of intentionality that leads to a wealth of knowledge through reading and digesting other works and learning the norms of the scholarly field while I am also showing great thought and creativity (pg. 121). Three keys presented in graph form are developing and idea (creative), analytically determining the need to move forward with the idea (analytic) and demonstrating to others the need for their interest (Practical) (pg. 122). I will need to consider ways that will help me to develop ideas for writing a manuscript that will likely begin with the broad topical area and then become refined down to a manageable idea (pgs. 126-127). Publishing in a lesser-known journal can be the catalyst that allows you to later be published in more widely read journals (pg. 128). It is a real need to research to find the best journal for the topic that you are writing on to get your work in front of those who have an interest in the topic (pg. 129). One of the graphics helps to make clear the idea of getting started by setting the goal, start collection of data, identify task needed to be accomplished, and cluster ideas in an organized manner (pg. 133). Some reasons offered for rejection of a manuscript include lack of knowledge regarding the audience being spoken to or who is reading a certain journal, showing no concern for the guidelines of the journal, bucking against implementing the suggested revisions, lack of originality, senseless errors in grammar, and lacking the understanding that the journal editor and reviewers are determining what is appropriate for their publication and are not there to serve at the whelms of the hopeful contributors (pgs. 136-138). Another great chart with common reasons for denial is presented and very helpful (pgs. 138-139). See a rejection as a critique of my writing rather than a personal attack on my character (pg. 140). A key is coming up with a process to start that is not overwhelming and allows you to attack it one bite at the time, with a key suggestion being to write one page and then to write the next (pgs. 147-149). A great chart on how to be "irresistible to editors" states the need to define terms, having a clear thesis, be concise, be well studied on the subject, ask others to review, real world examples to bring the topic to life, synthesize the literature, detailed editing one line at the time, and headings that bring clarity (pgs. 150-151).

20. Share what you learned about presenting at professional conferences from chapter 4 of the Jalongo & Saracho text.

The authors put forward a chart that presents general question I will need to ask regarding speaking at a conference; is my proposal aligned with the guidelines, is proposed session aligned with the venue, is it scholarly, focused, promoting thought, is respectful yet expertly informative (pg. 160). It is important to be aware of the organization's intention for a conference and what groups or individual will be in attendance and their levels of expertise (pg. 162). Attending conferences is a valuable endeavor because of the professional face to face professional relationships that can be developed (pg. 165). When writing the title, abstract, and description of the presentation I will want to ensure that what I present is indeed in alignment with what I have advertised it to be as to not waste the time of those in attendance (pg. 167- 168). Writing the proposal should be in alignment with the type of presentation I will be doing and have planned what the session will include ahead of the proposal writing (pg. 169). A great chart with proposal guidelines is presented (i.e., include new findings, get co-presenters approvals, utilize guidelines of the conference and rubric if available, meet deadlines and other specification, clearly delineate the purpose of the session, do not oversale the sessions ability to perform, ask colleagues to review the proposal, plan for technology needs, write the proposal and then submit to conference portal, and proof read (pgs. 173-174). Some writers choose to write a paper as a guide for their conference presentation. The authors share that it may be a condensed paper or full length and mentioned that some conferences may publish these submissions as a conference proceeding (pg. 176). When preparing a speech or keynote presentation, the authors suggest I refine my thoughts much like I would refine a dissertation into a manuscript and do research into what presenting should look like through reading thoughts and by watching information and previous presentations regarding speaking well and concisely to an audience (pgs. 178-179). Presenting can be a great opportunity to share some research that I am producing and should be presented in hope of enlightening other while also hoping to be further enlightened by those in attendance. I appreciate the thought by the authors that I should "[a]ccept that it is possible to respectfully disagree without defensiveness or rancor." (pgs. 180-181). [This is certainly something I personally have had to learn as I have matured as a human and especially one who seeks to live through a Christian worldview.] A section of the chapter that I hope all scholars would review is the ethical concerns of being a presenter and being aware of the responsibility that is undertaken when agreeing to present. I firmly contend that all people doing any type of public speaking needs to consider the cost and commitment involved with the people who are in attendance and indeed seek as the presenter to meet the expectations, as well as the presenter's abilities will allow (pgs. 186-187). They conclude the chapter by encouraging conference presenters to utilize the excitement generated to propel them into seeking publication of their work and to do this regularly to prevent becoming a stagnant relic (pg. 188).

21. Chapter 11 of the Jalongo & Saracho text includes instructions about grant writing and creating an assessment plan. Outline the steps of writing a grant and outline the steps of creating an assessment plan found in that chapter.

The author shares a story that mentions the concept of buy one and get one free and suggests in our writing we make a habit of giving our audience more than they bargained for and to deliver extra nuggets that will entice and pique their interest (pg. 433). A helpful key is to have a true zeal and desire to do the research work I am involved with and to be seeking the best possible methods to get the information to the field so they too can be thrilled about the work. Another suggestion was to be aware of cognitive distortions that can lead to thoughts of inadequacies (The authors present a nice Table to counter act negative thinking) (pgs. 438-441). Multiple scholarly endeavors can be produced from one set of research because a different focus, audience, or purpose may require a totally different approach to the presentation that does not change the essence of the content but does change the approach to the delivery. Developing additional presentations from the original data can help the scholar to: dig deeper, refine, further reach, and to be better enlightened to the subject matter (pgs.

443-444). Multiple uses will require the scholar to innovate, use outside of the box thinking, not use segmented thinking of one discipline in hopes that this leads to “more original and interesting outcomes” (pg. 445). The grant writing process is said to be a regular occurrence in the scholarly field and is the process of seeking funding to do a project or research (pg. 450). It is important to know my audience when writing to a group for grant funding and to be aware if they too are scholars or are overseers of a fund and desiring to know the money is being used as stated in the proposal (pgs. 451-452). When preparing to seek a grant there are a series of questions that I will need to answer. (1) What is the problem? (2) Why is this important? (3) What difference do I anticipate? (4) Measures and documentation. (5) Why me and my organization? (6) Importance to organization? (7) Total funding plan? (8) What part do grants play? (9) What happens when grant funding ends? (10) Why would a grant committee care about this work? 1(1) Are the values of the research aligned with the grant committee? (pg. 453). Three key influences of a grant are (1) knowing the funding agency and their focus areas, (2) awareness that the discipline will dictate the aspirations and layout, (3) what the institution attaches to the success of university personal acquiring grant funding for their work (e.g., tenure) (pg. 453). The authors offer advice for securing grants. (1) Identify Resources—Universities typically offer help. (2) Study Exemplary Proposals—no need to reinvent the wheel. (3) Look Before You Write—Grant committee may require a pre-submittal of a summary to narrow the actual submissions that will be accepted. (4) Volunteer to Evaluate Proposals—Being in the process will help you identify strengths and weaknesses. (5) Investigate Modest Funding Streams—Smaller funds are often overlooked. (6) Seek Additional Training—Universities often have people to train in grant proposing. (7) Be

Client Centered—Many grants are seeking to benefit the end users (public). (8) Demonstrate Collaboration—Knowing others are onboard lends credibility. (9) Observe Deadlines and Prepare for Time Sinks—Be sure the institutions authorization person is available. (10) Understand the Institution's Policies Regarding Grants—It would be an embarrassment and waste of everyone's time to submit a proposal that is granted and cannot be accepted due to policy issues. (11) Work with the Funding Group—Make the proposal "clear, concise, and complete", while also knowing who the committee is, individually and as a group, to ensure your proposal is focused with the appropriate dynamics. (12) Write as You Go—Do not wait until a deadline is looming. (13) Keep Searching for Support—Having received support increases the likelihood of gaining additional funds (pgs. 454-457). A key concept not to be overlooked is the evaluation plan to help demonstrate to the grant committee that the funds granted indeed went where they were intended to go and what was accomplished with it (pg. 459). Collect the needed data along the way and do not wait until the last minute (pg. 460). Again, the authors are providing a very useful series of thoughts to guide me in writing an evaluation report. (1) Stakeholder Identification—Effects on the studied population that include participants insights. (2) Report Clarity—Does it cover all the needed areas: context, stakeholders, purpose, curriculum and is clear, concise, and supported? (3) Values Identification—justifying how conclusions were made. (4) Evaluation Impact—Is evidence clear and what was propelled from the efforts discussed. (5) Feasibility—Is the assessment realistic and reasonable. (6) Resource Analysis—Is there adequate justification for funds sought and can account for all resources? (7) Management Plan—A clear schedule that also considers potential setbacks. (8) Ethical Issues—Clearly demonstrates care and concern for all involved. (9) Description of Methods and Sources of Information—Make distinct the process and data utilized. (10) Valid and Reliable Information—Is the process implementing assurance techniques to achieve validity and reliability? (11) Justified Conclusion and Recommendation—Are the outcomes evidence driven? (12) Other, e.g., Timely Delivered—Did the project adhere to the agreed upon dates for submission of findings? (pgs. 460-462).