

Chapter 2

Journal Articles

in: Beth Luey, *Handbook for Academic Authors*
(Cambridge UP, 3rd ed. 1995), 8-25

He put his hand into the well-known nook under the pillow: only, it did not get so far. What he touched was, according to his account, a mouth, with teeth, and with hair about it, and, he declares, not the mouth of a human being. . . . "Gayton, I believe that alchemist man knows it was I who got his paper rejected."

M. R. James, "Casting the Runes"

Journals are the vehicle most frequently used by academic authors for disseminating the results of their research. In some fields, particularly in the natural and physical sciences, book writing is rare. A biochemist may publish hundreds of journal articles and never think of writing a book. Journals are also the least professionalized of the publishing media. In the humanities and social sciences, journals are often edited on the side by academics with regular teaching and research assignments and without professional staff.¹ (This is less common in the physical and natural sciences.) The advent of personal computers, relatively inexpensive phototypesetting,

¹ Should you ever become a journal editor, you will want to consult an excellent handbook: Lois DeBakey, *The Scientific Journal: Editorial Policies and Practices: Guidelines for Editors, Reviewers, and Authors* (St. Louis: Mosby, 1976). Although written primarily for those in the medical sciences, it contains thoughtful discussions of issues facing all journal editors, as well as excellent practical advice on organizing an editorial office. On the nuts and bolts, including financial questions, you will find help in *Journal Publishing: Principles and Practice*, by Gillian Page, Robert Campbell, and Jack Meadows (Boston: Butterworth, 1987).

and desktop publishing has led to the creation of numerous small, specialized journals run out of faculty offices. Electronic journals that are "printed" only on one's computer screen are also beginning to appear; these are even easier to start and cheaper to distribute.

The growth of specialized journals since the 1960s has expanded opportunities for publication. At the same time, the end of the academic hiring boom of that decade and the stabilization of the size of the academic community have decreased the number of submissions received by many journals. This adds up to improved possibilities for getting good articles published, even if they are on very specialized topics. To take full advantage of these opportunities, authors need to write well, select carefully the journals to which they submit their work, prepare their manuscripts properly, and communicate well with journal editors.

Writing Well

Good academic writing is clear and succinct. (To use myself as an example, I first wrote that sentence: "For the purposes of academic writing, writing well is writing clearly and succinctly." I read it, saw that it was neither clear nor succinct, and rewrote it. One key to being a good academic writer is having the patience to reread and revise.) If you can move beyond clarity to grace and elegance, you are to be congratulated. Editors will happily settle for clarity, however.

Many fields have formal conventions about article writing: All articles are organized in the same way, with subsections covering specified topics (e.g., title, abstract, introduction, method, results, discussion, references). Because disciplines vary, you should familiarize yourself with the conventions of the field in which you are publishing. If this is the field in which you have done most of your research, you probably have absorbed such conventions subliminally. You will have to make a special effort, though, if you are writing in an area

outside your usual territory (e.g., a historian venturing into a medical journal or a lawyer writing for a psychology journal). The bibliography of this book includes the official style manuals for a variety of disciplines. If your discipline has a generally accepted style manual, you should own and use the current edition. The bibliography also includes several general guides to writing, guides to writing for specific fields, and dictionaries.

Intelligent readers are impressed by ideas and clear expression, not by elaborate constructions and excess words. If your writing is obscure, vague, and verbose, readers will translate what you have written into plain English and wonder why you did not write it that way in the first place. There are two possible answers, neither of which is flattering. First, perhaps you did not know how. More damning, perhaps you realized that reduced to plain English your idea did not make sense or was so obvious that it wasn't worth saying. Good writing saves the reader's time and your reputation.

Beyond the basic advice on writing offered by Strunk and White in *The Elements of Style*, I can offer a few suggestions that may help you avoid errors common in academic writing.² A frequent error is the use of jargon. It is easy to forget that the lingua franca of your discipline frequently departs from standard English. However, it is rarely necessary to use a word that is not in the dictionary. This does not mean that you should avoid technical language, for a technical term often expresses an idea most economically and will be understood by your readers. In writing for specialized journals you need not worry about whether a layperson will understand a given term, because no layperson will read it. To determine whether you are using technical expressions appropriately or whether you are simply resorting to jargon, ask yourself if you are using the plainest word that will say precisely what you mean. Do not use technical words merely to impress. It sometimes can be helpful to define technical terms precisely, within your

² If English is not your native language, you will find assistance in Gregory A. Barnes, *Communication Skills for the Foreign-Born Professional* (Philadelphia: ISI Press, 1982).

article, to ensure that you are using them properly and that your readers will understand exactly what you mean. Technical terms can take on a life of their own if not used carefully.

Bureaucratic language is a form of jargon that provokes the special ire of editors and careful readers. Do not use *finalize*, *monies*, or *debrief* when you mean *finish*, *money*, or *question*. (Reading Edwin Newman's books, listed in the bibliography, should cure you of this tendency.) Equally to be avoided is trendy language, which rapidly becomes overused and then dated. "Excellence," "the best and the brightest," and "the right stuff" all fell victim to this phenomenon, but even words that have not been used in book titles are vulnerable. (I once deleted "the agony and the ecstasy" from a technical report for the Department of Defense.) Some of these – though not all – were perfectly good words at one time, but overuse has worn them out. If you feel you must choose between being stuffy and being trendy (a false dilemma), choose stuffy.

Also avoid cuteness, especially in titles. Your title, of course, should be brief and should tell the reader what your article is about. Occasionally a title can be used to attract attention but usually not in a scholarly journal. If a title is not clear, your article may be indexed incorrectly, so that it goes unread and uncited.

Another frequent fault in academic writing is the repetition of certain words, notably qualifying adverbs and abstract nouns. *Rather*, *quite*, and *somewhat* can usually be omitted without sacrificing meaning. Similarly, you should rewrite sentences to avoid the use of such phrases as "friendly by nature," "in terms of," "on a weekly basis," "generous in character," and "for the purpose of."

Even if you are deaf to the beauty of language, you can be accurate. Check and recheck all quotations. A literary scholar once quoted Macbeth's hags on the heath as chanting, "Double bubble toil and trouble." The failure of referees to catch such mistakes should not be taken as license to butcher the Bard – or anyone else. Also, be accurate and complete in the citations you provide in notes and bibliographies. Any of the

style manuals in the bibliography – including, of course, *The Chicago Manual of Style* – will assist you in this task. Some journals and a few book publishers routinely check citations, but you should not rely on this. The reader who cannot find an article using your citation has good reason to doubt your reliability.

In sum, you can write well by being clear, direct, precise, and accurate. If you can accomplish this apparently modest goal – and if you have something new and important to say – you will be on your way to publication.

Selecting a Journal

Few journals tolerate multiple submissions. In fact, some regard this as a sin so serious that they report it to the author's department chair. Because you can send your work to only one journal at a time, you should choose carefully. The best way to decide where to submit an article is to look through the journals you read regularly. As long as you are writing in the mainstream of your own discipline, one of these journals will probably be the place to start. If, however, you have ventured into new territory, you will have to do some exploring. Investigate journals cited in your manuscript first. Many field-specific guides to journals are published (see bibliography), and you should consult them. This rooting around will produce a list of journals that cover your subject area. The guides will often provide further information, such as maximum length of articles, usual time for review, preferred style, percentage of submissions accepted, and time between acceptance and publication. Because journals frequently change editors and addresses, however, and because policies change, you should always consult the latest issue of the journal to verify its current location, staff, and editorial policy.

Most journal editors do not welcome query letters, so it is up to you to decide whether a journal is appropriate or not. If a journal regularly publishes articles in your field and of the

same length and scope as yours, then it is appropriate. Do not, for example, submit a bibliographical review to a journal that never includes such reviews, even if it does include other sorts of articles in the same field. When you have a list of journals, look at the current issue of each. Many journals include a description of editorial requirements; all provide an address to write to if such information is not published. You may have to eliminate some journals from your list because your article is too long or too short or because your article is illustrated and they do not accept artwork. Perusing a few issues may also disclose an ideological or theoretical bias that renders the journal unsuitable. You may decide to eliminate others because they seem sloppily produced or edited. Take a look at the date of the current issue to see whether the journal is hopelessly behind schedule.

If, contrary to the norm, the journal's note to contributors or directory listing indicates that the editor does expect a query letter, compose a brief one that includes the subject of your article, why you believe it is suitable for the journal, and why it is worth publishing. Also include a physical description (length, illustrated or not, how many notes, and so forth). If your manuscript is on a computer disk, say so. You may send such query letters simultaneously to as many journals as you like; the single-submission rule applies only to the full manuscript.

In deciding where to submit, you first may want to figure out whether to choose a less prestigious journal that you think will probably accept your article and publish it quickly or to begin by trying for one of the big names. This decision will depend on your own impression of how administrators evaluate publications, on how much of a hurry you are in, and of course on how much you yourself value publication in a major journal. Do not automatically assume that a lesser journal represents your best bet. Journals are quirky, and you may find your work rejected in the minor leagues and accepted in the majors. However, remember that more prestigious journals may take longer to get your work into print because of backlogs of accepted articles. They may also de-

mand more extensive revisions than lesser journals. Whenever possible, choose a refereed journal – that is, a journal whose submissions are reviewed by outside readers in addition to the editor. Most universities distinguish between articles in refereed and nonrefereed journals when awarding tenure and raises, but many do not distinguish among refereed journals. You can find this out from your colleagues and chair.

Your colleagues are also a good source of information on how prompt a journal is about refereeing, how quickly articles are put into print, and how well promises are kept. You should take much of this information with a grain or two of salt, since horror stories abound. (For truly terrifying and entertaining accounts of how bad things can get, see the articles by Robert C. Maddox and Jack B. Ridley listed in the bibliography.) If you get consistent accounts of mistreatment by a journal, put it low on your list.

You also may want to ask one or two colleagues to read your article before you send it off. You probably know who is likely to be helpful in providing suggestions on content, organization, and writing. If you do this, however, be prepared for criticism and accept it graciously. If you just want a pat on the back or uncritical encouragement, read the article to your dog.

After reading the manuscript, your colleagues may suggest a journal that you had not thought of. Do not take the suggestion without checking the journal yourself for appropriateness and editorial requirements.

Another way to get criticism of your work is to present the paper at a national or regional meeting or at a less formal colloquium. Some writers regard such public presentation as insurance against plagiarism by referees. Such dishonesty is too rare, however, to make this a genuine concern. The real value lies in the opportunity to receive criticism and suggestions.

Some authors achieve lengthy publication lists by recycling their research. They change the emphasis slightly, alter the length, rephrase, add a section or two, and submit two or

three articles instead of one. Although journal editors and subscribers may initially be unaware that they are being victimized in this way, eventually word gets out. Both editors and colleagues read more than one journal. Although this practice is legal, it is ethically questionable and wastes the time of editors, referees, and readers. In the medical sciences, it can have serious consequences for patients. A researcher doing a meta-analysis (a synthesis of several studies on, for example, nonsurgical treatment of a specific cancer) may unknowingly be counting the results of a single study more than once, if its authors have published it more than once. This duplication will alter the statistical results and may mislead practitioners into thinking that a treatment is more (or less) effective than it really is.

On the rare occasion when republication of material is appropriate – for example, if the first appearance was a brief note in a journal with very limited circulation, or in another language – you should nevertheless tell the editor the circumstances of the first publication. Enclosing a copy of the original article or manuscript will enable the editor to verify the differences and make an informed decision.

A variant on duplicate publication is “salami publishing,” in which each bit of research is divided into the thinnest possible slices (sometimes referred to as “LPUs,” for “least publishable units”), with each slice submitted as a separate article. This is marginally more ethical than duplicate submission, but it is equally wasteful. Nor is it clear that it does the slicer much good. In any serious review of a scholar’s work (for tenure, promotion, or major grants), reviewers look at all of the applicant’s work as a body. If there is only one ounce of salami there, slicing it thin doesn’t make it any weightier. One significant article in a major journal almost always benefits a researcher’s career more than four or five trivial pieces scattered in lesser publications.

Another way that lengthy bibliographies are built is by overstating the number of authors. In the humanities, where single authorship is the rule, this rarely happens. But when scientists work in research teams, each team (or sometimes each

department or institution) sets rules for who may be considered an author. (In a few cases, more than a hundred authors have been listed for a single article.) Some professional societies are trying to establish standard definitions of authorship, but so far none has been widely adopted. Most standards revolve around two issues: knowledge and responsibility. To be listed as an author, one should have direct knowledge of the conduct and results of the entire study and should be willing to take responsibility for its conduct, data, and conclusions. In the absence of accepted standards, each author must follow the guidelines of institution and conscience.

Preparing the Manuscript

The general rules for preparing an article manuscript for publication are very simple: type neatly on 20-lb, white 8½-by 11-inch bond (not erasable bond) paper, double-space (text, notes, and bibliography), and leave ample margins on all four sides (at least 1 inch). If you use a computer, print the article on a laser or letter-quality printer if possible, but at least make sure that the print is dark enough to photocopy well. It is usually all right to send a photocopy if it is of good quality and on ordinary paper. Carbon copies are not acceptable. Some people argue that sending the original assures the editor that you are not submitting the article elsewhere. The fallacy of this argument is obvious, particularly in the era of computer-generated "multiple originals."

Beyond these commonsense requirements, be sure to follow the instructions provided by the journal to which you are submitting the paper. Specifically, if the journal's format includes notes in a particular place and in a particular style, comply with these conventions. Conforming to a given footnote style can be a nuisance if journals in your field do not agree on which style to use. Using a computer, however, it is not that difficult to change from one footnote style to another; some word-processing programs have the basic styles

built in. If the editor wants two copies of your manuscript, send two copies. If the journal publishes abstracts, prepare one. If quotations must be in English, provide translations. If the journal follows the style book of the Modern Language Association, American Psychological Association, Council of Biology Editors, or some other professional organization, or if it has its own style sheet, get the style guide and follow it. (See the bibliography for a list of style guides.)

Proofread the manuscript carefully (see Chapter 10) and correct it neatly. Make sure you have a printed copy of your own, even if the manuscript is also on a computer disk. If you send your manuscript on a disk, keep a backup disk as well as hard copy.

Unless you are told otherwise, be sure to provide a title page with your name, address, and article title. Repeat only the title on the first page of the text. Do not put your name on each page, because this makes it difficult to implement blind reviewing, in which referees are not told the author's identity. Mail the manuscript flat, not folded, and enclose a self-addressed envelope of appropriate size with return postage. Send it first class. If you want reassurance that the manuscript arrived safely, send it by certified mail with a return receipt or enclose a self-addressed, stamped postcard. Journals should automatically acknowledge receipt of submissions, but not all of them do. When submitting articles to journals outside the United States, enclose International Reply Coupons for return postage. They can be purchased at the post office.

A brief cover letter is adequate unless you have something specific to tell the editor. For example, if you have sent photocopies of artwork, you might want to let the editor know that you have the originals and will obtain permission to use them. (On illustrations and permissions, see Chapter 10.) Let the editor know if your manuscript is on disk. Some journals are able to use authors' disks, and a few even give precedence to such manuscripts in scheduling. Some require that you provide disks and even specify acceptable word-processing programs.

Refereeing

On refereed journals, experts review submissions; for nonrefereed journals, the judgment of the editor or the editorial staff suffices. Thus, editors of nonrefereed journals can make decisions faster, but publication in these journals does not offer the prestige or the assistance provided by the refereeing process. The notion that refereeing provides a service to a would-be contributor may be alien to the author busily collecting rejections or requests for revision. Nevertheless, it is a service. Referees can save an author from mistakes of fact, poor logic, ignorance of sources, and other embarrassments. Their purpose is not merely to screen out bad articles but also to recognize good ones and help move articles from the unacceptable category into the acceptable. Although you should not expect referees to correct minor details or rewrite bad prose, they will often give general advice on further sources or weaknesses in your argument whose correction would make your work publishable. Certainly not all criticism is constructive, but much of it is. As an academic writer, you are likely to wear the hats of both referee and author during your career. To perform both jobs well, you should try to keep in mind what it is like to be under the other hat.

Most articles are read first by an editor who determines whether they are appropriate for the journal and good enough to be sent to a referee. "Good enough" may mean sufficiently original and interesting, adequately researched and documented, clearly written, or all of these. Articles that survive this initial scrutiny are then sent to at least one referee, who is either a member of the editorial board or a specialist unaffiliated with the journal except as an occasional reviewer. Journal editors may ask referees specific questions about the article or ask them to fill out a form; some ask for a "grade" in addition to comments and recommendations. More often, however, the referee is asked merely whether the article should be published in the journal and why or why not. The major scientific and medical journals have an

even more elaborate refereeing process that may include review by a statistician or other technical experts in addition to review by outside referees.

Referees have a great responsibility, and no one who is not willing to take the job seriously should agree to review an article. A referee must be competent in the field (and that includes being familiar with current research), able to judge other people's work objectively, willing to spend the time it takes to evaluate the article and make useful suggestions, and committed to doing all of this under a deadline. As a contributor, you expect this of referees. When you yourself are asked to be a referee, make sure you meet your own standards.

Because most people who write articles also judge other authors' work, you may need some more advice about what to do when wearing the referee's hat. As you read an article, you will be asking yourself a number of questions: Is the topic worth investigating? Is the author's research sound? Have the relevant sources been tapped? Is the thesis clearly and convincingly argued? Does the evidence support the thesis? Is the article adequately documented? Is the writing clear and succinct? Did I learn anything from reading this? One question you should not ask yourself is, Is this the way I would have written the article? The least fair, least useful reviews result from asking this question. One reason research is fun and exciting is that no two people approach a question in the same way. Perhaps you would have done it differently, and perhaps your way would have been better, but that is not the issue. You have been asked to evaluate an article as written, on its own terms. Do so.

Remember, too, that the manuscript you have been sent is a privileged communication. You must not cite it or use it in any way. You should not show it to others or discuss its contents. If you feel that a colleague or graduate student might be a better referee, ask the editor's permission before passing it on. Communicate with the author only through the editor.

It is possible – and in some fields even probable – that a second journal will send the same article to the same referee that the first journal used. If you are asked to referee an article that you have previously advised be rejected, you should behave in a civilized, ethical manner. It is not acceptable to blight anonymously and eternally another person's career. The solution least prejudicial to the author, yet helpful to the editor, is to decline without reason and suggest another referee. There is an exception to this rule: an article that you felt was inappropriate for journal A but all right for journal B. It is of course reasonable to referee an article for journal B that you recommended for publication to journal A but that its editor nevertheless declined. (Do not be outraged if this happens. The journal editor or another referee may have disagreed, or perhaps the author declined to make changes required by the editor.)

Now, back to the author's hat. While one or more referees are reading your manuscript, what are you doing? Not sitting at home chewing your nails, I hope. You already have a second journal in mind for your article in case the first one rejects it. (In an article offering suggestions on journal writing, Richard Penaskovic recommends using the term *returned* rather than *rejected*. You, too, may find this comforting.) You are launched on a new project. But you have not forgotten about your article. On your calendar, about three months after the date you submitted your article, you have written a note reminding yourself to send the editor a polite note: "On 5 September I sent you my article on the lost continent of Atlantis. When may I expect a response?" Mark a date three or four weeks ahead for another inquiry if you have not received an answer by then. If you still have no answer five months after your initial submission, telephone. Then, if the response is inadequate, write to the editor, withdrawing your article from consideration, and send it elsewhere. (You need not wait for the physical return of your manuscript.) For articles in the sciences, or in any case where timely publication is vital because of the article's subject, this timetable should be speeded up considerably.

Good News, Bad News

When a journal accepts your article, the editor may publish it as is or ask for revisions. If revisions are required, make sure you understand exactly what is wanted. For example, if the article is to be shortened, by how much? If you are to shorten the article, yet include additional material, how is this miracle to be accomplished? Find out when the revised manuscript is due. Make sure, too, that the article will definitely be published if you make the revisions. Sometimes an editor hedges, and you may not want to revise extensively to someone's specifications if the article may still be rejected despite your additional efforts. At a minimum, seek the editor's assurance that if the article is to be re-reviewed, the same referees will be consulted.

If you have quoted extensively from other people's work or if you are reprinting tables or illustrations from other sources, you must get written permission from the copyright holder. Do this the minute the article is accepted. Chapter 10 provides information on acquiring such permission.

You may be asked to review a copy editor's work on your article, or you may merely receive proof to be read (see Chapter 10 for instructions). In either case, read carefully. If you have an edited manuscript, you may still make changes and ask for clarification of editorial changes you do not like or understand. In proof, you must restrict yourself to changes that are absolutely necessary unless the editor permits more extensive alterations. Return manuscript and proofs on time.

Although it is certainly better to have an article accepted, you should not be disheartened by two or three rejections. The rejections in fact may have nothing to do with the quality of your work. That particular journal may have a backlog of articles in the same field, or the editor may feel that your article is – in the publisher's vague jargon – "not quite right for us." It may easily be "quite right" for another journal. If your article is returned, try to answer the referees' objections (if they are valid) and then send the article on to another journal. When articles are returned without comment, write

It is possible – and in some fields even probable – that a second journal will send the same article to the same referee that the first journal used. If you are asked to referee an article that you have previously advised be rejected, you should behave in a civilized, ethical manner. It is not acceptable to blight anonymously and eternally another person's career. The solution least prejudicial to the author, yet helpful to the editor, is to decline without reason and suggest another referee. There is an exception to this rule: an article that you felt was inappropriate for journal A but all right for journal B. It is of course reasonable to referee an article for journal B that you recommended for publication to journal A but that its editor nevertheless declined. (Do not be outraged if this happens. The journal editor or another referee may have disagreed, or perhaps the author declined to make changes required by the editor.)

Now, back to the author's hat. While one or more referees are reading your manuscript, what are you doing? Not sitting at home chewing your nails, I hope. You already have a second journal in mind for your article in case the first one rejects it. (In an article offering suggestions on journal writing, Richard Penaskovic recommends using the term *returned* rather than *rejected*. You, too, may find this comforting.) You are launched on a new project. But you have not forgotten about your article. On your calendar, about three months after the date you submitted your article, you have written a note reminding yourself to send the editor a polite note: "On 5 September I sent you my article on the lost continent of Atlantis. When may I expect a response?" Mark a date three or four weeks ahead for another inquiry if you have not received an answer by then. If you still have no answer five months after your initial submission, telephone. Then, if the response is inadequate, write to the editor, withdrawing your article from consideration, and send it elsewhere. (You need not wait for the physical return of your manuscript.) For articles in the sciences, or in any case where timely publication is vital because of the article's subject, this timetable should be speeded up considerably.

Good News, Bad News

When a journal accepts your article, the editor may publish it as is or ask for revisions. If revisions are required, make sure you understand exactly what is wanted. For example, if the article is to be shortened, by how much? If you are to shorten the article, yet include additional material, how is this miracle to be accomplished? Find out when the revised manuscript is due. Make sure, too, that the article will definitely be published if you make the revisions. Sometimes an editor hedges, and you may not want to revise extensively to someone's specifications if the article may still be rejected despite your additional efforts. At a minimum, seek the editor's assurance that if the article is to be re-reviewed, the same referees will be consulted.

If you have quoted extensively from other people's work or if you are reprinting tables or illustrations from other sources, you must get written permission from the copyright holder. Do this the minute the article is accepted. Chapter 10 provides information on acquiring such permission.

You may be asked to review a copy editor's work on your article, or you may merely receive proof to be read (see Chapter 10 for instructions). In either case, read carefully. If you have an edited manuscript, you may still make changes and ask for clarification of editorial changes you do not like or understand. In proof, you must restrict yourself to changes that are absolutely necessary unless the editor permits more extensive alterations. Return manuscript and proofs on time.

Although it is certainly better to have an article accepted, you should not be disheartened by two or three rejections. The rejections in fact may have nothing to do with the quality of your work. That particular journal may have a backlog of articles in the same field, or the editor may feel that your article is – in the publisher's vague jargon – "not quite right for us." It may easily be "quite right" for another journal. If your article is returned, try to answer the referees' objections (if they are valid) and then send the article on to another journal. When articles are returned without comment, write

a polite letter to the editor asking whether you might see some of the referees' criticism. You may not get a response, but it can't hurt to ask. Also, be sure to incorporate any new information or citations that have appeared while your work was under consideration. Even if you do not change a word of the article, make a fresh photocopy if the copy you sent to the first journal comes back dogeared and shopworn. There is no reason to make your second-choice journal aware of its status.

Some journal editors make a special effort to be helpful to authors who submit their work. They will send referees' comments and their own suggestions and sometimes even recommend other journals that might be more appropriate. Unfortunately, most editors do not have the time to do this. When you are given such generous help, write a note to thank the editor. Perhaps your next encounter with the journal will have a happier ending.

Revising Oral Presentations

Many journal articles begin as talks presented at professional meetings. Not every oral presentation can become an article. For example, a report on work in progress is not ready for publication, and a paper that is part of a panel may not survive out of context. Many conference papers, however, can be revised for publication.

Before undertaking revision, check with the conference sponsors. Some groups publish proceedings of their meetings, and they may want to include your paper. Others ask that you give their own journal the right of first refusal. You should, of course, honor those expectations.

There are many differences between oral and written presentations. If you have ever sat through someone's reading of an article (after a banquet, in the worst case), you have some clues to the differences viewed from that angle. The talk was probably too long, too dense to follow easily, and

devoid of enlivening spontaneous remarks. Reading an article instead of presenting a paper is a mistake. But submitting an unrevised talk to a journal is also a mistake. Shifting from the oral form to the written requires some work.

The most important consideration when revising a talk for publication is the audience for the article. The audience for your oral presentation may have been only a handful of specialists; perhaps it was a roomful of amateur enthusiasts. In any case, it is not the same group as the one your article will reach. Revise with your readers in mind, and alter the level of detail, the background information, the tone, the tables and illustrations, and the documentation accordingly.

In some cases, revision will require substantive changes. It is always wise to incorporate changes based on your audience's reaction. Any doubts, misunderstandings, or questions your hearers expressed will occur to readers as well, and you should deal with those problems when you revise. If your talk was a brief summary of your work, you will probably want to flesh it out with examples and details when you prepare it for publication. The article may also offer opportunities to review background and earlier work, to discuss possible limitations or qualifications of your conclusions, and to expand on opportunities for further research. If, by contrast, your talk was discursive and chatty, you will have to tighten it up.

A speech generally contains references to the occasion of its presentation. In an article, an initial note can tell the reader where and when the material was first presented; references within the text should be eliminated. The obvious ones are easy to omit ("It is a pleasure to be here in Punxsutawney on Groundhog Day"), but be on the lookout for subtler references, such as those that refer to the nature of the audience, the interests of the group, or an earlier paper or other event at the conference. These, too, must be omitted or altered. Similarly, references to time should be adjusted.

If you have used visual aids, these must be adapted for publication. This is not simply a matter of preparing your

slides in a different medium. Readers of journal articles have more time to look at tables or graphs and to relate them to the text. Speakers who have selected or compiled their tables somewhat hastily must make up for those lapses as they revise. Make sure that the table actually says what you have claimed, that it is accurate and succinct, and that you have documented the sources. If you have simply copied a table, graph, or drawing from someone else's work, you will have to get permission for publication.

Also make sure that the illustrations are really needed. Speakers often use slides and overhead transparencies to liven things up and to keep the audience's attention. In the written incarnation, however, illustrations should be kept only if they are vital to the argument.

An article requires more rigorous documentation than a speech, which does not come with footnotes. In a speech you may get away with something like "As Lomonosov has pointed out. . . ." In an article you must add first name, article title, journal name, date, volume, and page number. You must also check to see that you have quoted accurately. Speakers occasionally indulge in such statements as "Someone once claimed that" or "At a conference I attended a few years ago, a speaker argued that. . . ." Some of these quotations, I suspect, are fictional. In any case, they must be omitted or documented when revising for publication.

The tone of an article is generally more formal than that of a talk. You may wish to shift from the first or second person to the third, in addition to removing or formalizing jokes, anecdotes, and other casual features. You may have to find an appropriate punctuation mark or phrase to substitute for the raised eyebrow, hard stare, or eloquent gesture that you relied on when speaking.

When you are writing, you may want to provide more structure for your argument, and the medium of print allows you to use headings and subheadings. Some speakers display or circulate outlines of their talks, and these can be transformed into headings.

Although some speakers expend as much effort on an oral presentation as on a written one, they are the exceptions. Most academics regard such presentations as trial runs. Journal editors have learned this, and they do not look favorably upon unrevised speeches. On the other hand, a speech that has been presented to a critical audience and then properly revised has received a sort of preliminary referee's report and can be a valuable contribution.

Money

Scholarly journals rarely pay contributors or referees. At most, authors receive a few extra copies of the journal or some offprints. Some journals – generally those in disciplines such as literature where amateurs frequently venture – even charge submission fees that you must pay before they will consider your article. These fees are meant to defray the cost of mailing articles to referees and to discourage frivolous submissions. In the physical and life sciences it is accepted practice to bill authors a "page charge" for publishing their work. This does not mean that enclosing a check with your manuscript guarantees publication. Rather, once the article is accepted on its merits, through the usual review procedure, you are informed that you must pay x dollars (anywhere from \$10 to \$100) per page. (In fact, some journals that impose page charges may waive them, but they generally limit the number of free articles per issue. This means that your article will probably be published, but not for quite a while.) Journals in the physical sciences have charged these fees since about 1930, and they are common in the natural and medical sciences. Some journals in other fields are considering their adoption as well. Because there is a good deal of misunderstanding about them, they merit some discussion.

It costs money to publish a journal. Staff must be paid, as must typesetters and printers. Paper and ink cost money. The postal service charges for delivering mail. Journals are