

## **Publishing & Career Advancement - Julia Oestreich**

All right everyone we're supposed to have we're supposed to have more people here so I wouldn't be surprised to see people trickle in over the next couple of minutes but I want to get started because we have a pretty full plate to get through. I don't recognize any of you from my workshop a couple of weeks ago but if any of you did come there's gonna be some repetitive information here but there's going to be some new material as well.

So today's workshop is on Publishing and Career Advancement and I wanted to start off with this quote that the University of Delaware Press, for which I'm the director, we received this as part of back-and-forth I was having with one of our peer reviewers who was reviewing a manuscript under consideration by the press. And this reviewer who was a long tenured scholar said, "Well it means something to publish with you so if it (the manuscript) does go to a lesser press you should not feel bad. Every university considers the quality of the press at tenure time and for all raises thereafter." I like to start off with that because it's a really good demonstration of sort of the casual nature of the importance that scholars tend to place on publishing. Especially when it comes to career advancement issues. So the idea of not only actually getting work published but who you're publishing with makes this issue very important.

One of the things that I wanted to start off with was not just the question of where you should publish but where you shouldn't publish, who you should publish with. And so we advise you to look out for publishers or journals that are predatory in nature. What that basically means is that they are not they are not respected, established, journals in their field or in any field for that matter. They're not reputable publishers and so these are outlets with whom you would not want to publish your work. Yet it still happens it so happens a ton. In fact, the New York Times recently published an article on predatory publishing and just how rampant it is. But it's important for you as young scholarly authors to not get caught up when approached by a predatory publisher or journal and end up publishing somewhere that at the very least is not going to help your career if not hurt your career. So a great place to start is to check "Beall's List of Predatory Open Access Publishers and Journals", which is at: [beallslist.weebly.com](http://beallslist.weebly.com) and Beall's List has always been a really great resource to find out what journals and publishers are out there that are predatory in nature and not reputable to publish with.

Another big red flag is cold calls. If you get a call out of nowhere from a journal or a publisher looking to publish your work that's actually something to be suspicious of. In all likelihood they haven't honed in on your work as being, you know the next great work of American scholarship what they're doing is they're basically they're basically shopping around to try to find people who are willing to submit to them so that they can continue to publish their journal. But if they have no reputation then that's why they need to reach out and solicit scholars as opposed to most reputable journals which are pretty flush with submissions. So if it's a reputable journal they're not going to be generally reaching out and cold calling scholars to try to get their work.

Another huge red flag is simply if you or your colleagues have never heard of this journal or never heard of this publisher that's probably also an indicator that they are at the very least not a high profile publisher or Journal and potentially a predatory one. Another sign is if you can't find any indication of what the journal's peer review process is that's also a bad sign. There's a lot of information that journals and publishers should be able to give you up front. You should be able to at least find it on their website or if contacting somebody who works there you should be able to get a lot of detailed information about their peer review process, their editorial board, their article processing fees, and a bunch of other information like that. So if you can't find that information that's a bad sign. Same thing with the editorial board - do you recognize any of the scholars on the editorial board? If you don't where are the scholars on that editorial board coming from? You can also generally check on the webpages belonging to the scholars listed on the editorial board to double-check that they actually say that they're members of the editorial board of this particular journal. So there are ways to investigate that.

Another indication of a potential predatory journal or publisher is that they give no indications of their indexing policies or how they keep track of their impact factor. Again most of the prestigious journals - particularly in the sciences - are going to tell you where they indexed their articles and also how you can keep track of impact factor. Same thing with article processing charges. Article processing charges still exist; they still are something that you as an author need to be prepared to encounter, but a standard established journal is going to be able to tell you upfront how much the article processing charge is and if you either can't find that information or the charge is exorbitant, that's probably a journal to avoid. Same thing with the copyright policies and the preservation plans. You should be able to know upfront whether or not the journal the publisher is going to claim copyright on your material, whether they'll grant you copyright and the same thing with preservation what their plans are for how they actually store and preserve your work over time.

So this is all information that's basically standard operating procedure for any legitimate journal or publisher so again if you can't find that information that's a bad sign. And finally just head to the website because the website will give you a really good indication of just how legit the operation is. If the website looks like it was designed at the dawn of the Internet it's got very little information on it and the information that is there is really generic in general again that's usually a sign that it's not really that professional of an operation and it's probably an outlet to avoid. There are also a couple of organizations that are generally signs that their members are legitimate. So for instance there's COPE - The Committee on Publication Ethics, and generally the publisher of a journal that you want to publish in should be a member of COPE. Same thing with the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association. If you want to publish in an open access journal where it's a little bit more murky oftentimes whether or not a journal is legitimate especially because many open access journals are newer usually it's a really good sign if they're a member of APSA. Same thing with the Directory of Open Access Journals. If an open access journal is legitimate it's going to be listed in that directory. So these are all places that you can check.

And then finally: [thinkchecksubmit.org](http://thinkchecksubmit.org) is a wonderful website that will kind of guide you through the process of deciding where to place your scholarly material and how to suss out basically which of these journals and which of these publishers may be predatory in nature. So a lot of really good guidelines on that site. So despite all the dangers out there with predatory publishers and journals, you've got to publish! You've basically got to be a little bit fearless toward the beginning of your career to get your material out there your scholarship needs to be heard; it needs to be published. So what do you do? The first thing that you can do is to know your rights as an author. And one of the things that many people oftentimes don't realize is that copyright means that the second that you create something, you own the copyright over that material. So the second that you put pen to paper and write something, that written material is yours. And that means that you have a whole slew of rights associated with your intellectual property. So you can distribute your work however you see fit, you can publish it, you can sell it, you can give it away. You can copy your work, you can reformat your work, and distribute it in another format. You can translate the work or have it translated. You can have the work performed or broadcast over various media. You can create all sorts of derivatives of that work, you can display it, and most importantly you can authorize others to exercise those rights that are granted to you via copyright.

The problem with that is that most author agreements with publishers entail transferring all of these rights to the publisher on an exclusive basis. And one of the reasons that the exclusivity is such a major problem is because it means that not only do you transfer these rights, but you don't share those rights anymore. You've literally given them away. You've given them to the publisher and now they step in for you and exercise all of these rights instead of you. So, many of the author agreements that are made with publishers basically entail giving your basic rights of copyright away.

There are a number of ways that you can approach that problem. Oftentimes people will simply try to negotiate with a publisher, and so there's one potential way you could go, which is you could attempt to place an agenda to your contract. Now, an addendum to your contract is something that will allow you to basically modify the clauses of the contract so that you can negotiate to retain certain rights or perhaps grant the publisher rights on a non-exclusive basis so that they can exercise the rights, but you still also maintain control over those rights over your work. So, there's this wiki site which basically has a whole bunch of different examples of different types of author addenda. Now what I usually say with that is that you can probably imagine that if you attempt to negotiate with publisher and just say, "Oh, what is simply gonna stick this addendum onto the back of the contract and then that'll just, you know, modify all the rights and everything will be taken care of;" obviously, it's not that straightforward of a process. Usually if you're going to negotiate with a publisher for the retainment of certain rights that's generally going to mean somewhat more protracted period of negotiation.

So what's the most important thing to do before you make a contract with a publisher to publish your work, is to think about what you want to do with that work. So when you think about what you want to do with your work then that helps you figure out which rights you want to negotiate to retain. For instance do you want to be able to reuse parts of your work in a future work? Do you want to have the ability to post the work on a website or deposit it in a repository? And will those sites or repositories be open access? In that case you're going to have to retain certain rights to be able to post that material in an open access setting. Would you like to include that material in a course pack? Which means that you basically would adapt the work for another purpose, or you'd be able to excerpt from it. Would you want control over future editions? And that's actually a very very important purpose to think about your work in. Especially in certain fields where you know if you're writing for a textbook for instance - that textbook may get published in many different editions in the future but if you've signed your rights over that means that you have no control over how that work appears in future editions. If you want control over how your work maybe republished in the future and whether it's going to be reformatted, supplemented with any new material, all of that that's something that you need to be in control of.

Also as many of you know there are requirements that funders have for what you can do with your work in the future. Many funders now are requiring that when you publish your work, you publish it in an open-access setting. And they want that work published pretty much immediately; one of the things that many publishers will often do is they'll implement an embargo period in which they'll agree to allow you to publish your work in an open-access setting, but only after the paid version has been available for a certain length of time. So it basically gives the publisher a certain period of time in which they can sell the book with no competing free version. But although that is a common approach of publishers, you need to be sure that your funder would allow you to agree to an embargo period. Your funder may not allow you to agree to an embargo period, in which case you need to be able to say to your publisher, "No I can't delay the availability of my material in an open-access setting because I'm required to do so by my funder." It's the same thing with open archiving as well. A lot of funders also require you to deposit your work on an open access repository a lot of times in a discipline-based repository and again that's something that you have to be able to do under certain funding mandates and the publisher has to allow you to do that.

So that's a tricky business to figure out all of these things and what is a publisher going to allow you to do? Luckily there are some resources that can help you figure that out before you even go through the trouble of contacting various publishers. The Sherpa site is particularly helpful to figuring out what funders are going to mandate you to do, what various publishers will allow what different journals will require you to do as well. There's the Sherpa/RoMEO database and that's a searchable database of publishers and journals archiving and copyright policies. So if you know that your funder is mandating certain things in terms of how you archive your work, and who owns the rights to that work, and whether they're owned exclusively or not exclusively, you

can look up what different publishers and different journals policies are so that you can submit to a journal or a publisher that is in line with your funding requirements.

In the opposite direction you have Sherpa/JULIET which is a searchable database of funders' open access and archiving policies. So as you're looking at your grant options you can look and see how stringent the requirements are under certain funders. And then you have OpenDOAR, D-O-A-R, which is a worldwide directory of open access repositories. Again, this is another resource that will let you know what repositories are out there for depositing your work and what their policies are as well. Then there's Sherpa/FACT which is really great because it combines info from RoMEO and JULIET to determine if particular journals comply with particular funders. So if you already have your eye on specific agencies to apply for funding from and specific journals in your field where you would like to submit your work you can basically plug them both in and see if their policies match up to each other. So it's a really quick shorthand way to get that information and find out basically whether all of the policies match up and allow you to submit where you want to submit and get the funding that you need for your research.

So along those lines it's important to know the costs associated with publishing. And many of you know that journals oftentimes require article processing charges to be able to publish with them. So that's one pretty straightforward cost. And as I said it should be very easy to find out information about article processing charges. So as you're looking for what journals to publish with you should be looking to see what the journals article processing charges are. But there are also often fees associated with making your work open access. And so that's another fee to investigate when you're looking up certain journals. The thing about open access fees is that oftentimes support for going open access will be coming from either funding agencies or from your own scholarly institution. So you may not be responsible for paying to make your work open access but likely somebody is. For books, there are some costs associated with open access publishing; there are some pilot projects going on around academia associated with attempting to promote open access monograph publishing, but on a larger scale, book publishing is still more traditional in nature and the cost that you're going to see associated with publishing a book tend to be more focused around things like the reproduction of images. So anyone who has potentially a book say in art history who needs to be able to present a lot of images alongside their work, or the same thing often times with charts, graphs, different data sources, and even multimedia can oftentimes be very costly to produce. So if your publication involves more than just purely text you should know that that's likely to mean that you're going to incur some level of cost to get that work produced and published.

Oftentimes what publishers will do especially with the reproduction of images is they'll basically cost out how much it's going to cost to produce and publish that book with the kinds of reproductions of images that you as the author want and then you will have to pay that subvention to actually get the book produced. So many people will actually look for funding once they've gotten that estimate of how much it's going to cost to produce a book with images. In the book world it's definitely a bit different than it is in the journal world. However, for both journals and books there are going to be fees associated with the permission to reprint either large pieces of text, song lyrics are oftentimes very, very costly. Images, multimedia basically any material that is not yours that you use to either quote or excerpt in your own work, you're going to need to get permission to republish that material in your in your work.

The thing about permissions fees is that they vary widely, depending upon whom you're appealing to for that permission. So oftentimes for instance like I mentioned song lyrics. Oftentimes you could use you know two lines in a song and be asked to pay thousands of dollars for quoting that in a work. Whereas you might be quoting a fairly significant chunk of text from another scholarly book and you could be granted permission to reprint that for free! Especially if you appeal on fair use grounds and say that you are using that material for scholarly purposes. But many people oftentimes go into the publishing process not realizing that: A) they need

to get permission to use material that is not theirs in their publication but they also don't realize the fees that can oftentimes be associated with getting those permissions. And so you need to go into the process knowing that you need to get those permissions and you need to pay whatever fees are charged or you need to be prepared to potentially let some material go if the permissions fees are exorbitant. And that can be another reason that you may pursue various funding options as well they can be for production costs but oftentimes people also get funding support for permissions fees.

So another important thing is to know your options and a big decision these days is whether or not to go open access with your material? So you may want to make your material or some of your scholarly material available on a website you may want to place it on an open access journal or you may want to place it in a repository and it could be your institutional repository - like here, we have UD space. Or it can be a discipline-based repository like PubMed Central or something of the like. So you want to know where you want the scholarship to appear - so if you want, if you want basically the public to have access to it there are still many different ways that that can happen.

And then you can decide to make your content available under an open content license. The prime example of which being a Creative Commons license. So that's another way that you can basically decide how your material is disseminated and made available to the public but a Creative Commons license is a good way to then determine sort of the boundaries around that and how the work can then be reused or not reused by people who have access to it. So why choose open access as a route? The University of Delaware press for instance publishes in areas like literary studies in art history and you know many of our authors are not particularly interested in going open access, at least not yet, because they are part of a scholarly community that really values the printed book.

But even amongst that group of scholars you're seeing an increasing number who are interested in certain advantages that open access publishing provides. They are advantages that many people in the sciences and social sciences are already a bit more familiar with. That is increasing the reach of your scholarly work increasing the discoverability of their scholarly work and as a result increasing the impact that your scholarly work has. So by making your work available to the public you are obviously making it available to more people than you would as on a per pay basis. But by doing that you're also making it a lot easier for scholars and laypeople to find your work, and then in doing so you're increasing the impact of that work. Certainly in the journal world that's often called "impact factor," but it's the same principle for monographs and the humanities let's say. The idea that you're giving yourself a much broader reach. But open access is also good because you don't necessarily have to publish just the standard traditional types of materials like a journal article or a scholarly monograph.

Open access is also really well-suited to non-traditional types of publications like, you know, blog postings and things of that nature and also works-in-progress, which is oftentimes really important as in a number of fields there are repositories developing for works in progress so that people can share their work and get feedback on it before they complete it and publish a final version. And it's a really good way to sort of bounce works-in-progress off of colleagues get high-quality feedback on it without actually going through a standard peer review process that you might put the final draft of an article through. So there are a lot of different purposes that open-access can serve and a lot of different kinds of scholarship that you can publish in an open-access setting that is different from what you might decide to publish through more traditional venues. So basically you can massively expand your record of scholarly publication without sacrificing the overall quality of what you publish because you have one venue that you can use for completely different purposes than what you might use more traditional publishing means for.

So what is publishing anyway? I mean if you can publish a work-in-progress on a website on a blog, how is that different from publishing your 400-page scholarly monograph? Or your lab report? What is the difference? So when you think about how your work is assessed - such as for tenure promotion or research funding - how much recognition should you receive for your research products compared to traditional research publications such as journal articles and scholarly books?

So this was from a report in 2016 from a survey that was conducted in 2015 amongst faculty members around the country by a company called Ithaca. And they basically asked scholarly faculty around the country how they viewed different non-traditional types of publications relative to traditional research publications. So in other words should they get the same amount of recognition, more recognition, less recognition than other traditional publications like monographs and journal articles? And you can see here that while blog posts - there wasn't widespread the same type of recognition as the more traditional types of publications. As you went down the list towards the data and images, primary source materials, an increasing number of scholars were willing to accept that and recognize that similarly to how they recognized more traditional publications. And then when you got down to pre-print versions of people scholarship about half of the scholars were willing to give those kinds of publications the same type of recognition.

I think that if you took the survey again this year you'd probably get even more acceptance for some of these types of publications but it does demonstrate that while the scholarly publishing climate is evolving to accommodate more non-traditional types of publications that generally there is still a lot of pushback and there is still a fairly widespread preference for the more traditional types of publications. So that's where it takes you drilling down into your field and into your own institution's departments and figuring out what they prefer and what their standards are. For instance if you look at traditional versus non-traditional types of publications, you have more traditional types of publications like scholarly monographs and edited collections that humanists do very frequently, and then humanists will oftentimes do blog posts. But if you were to look at this in its original formatting, you would see that all of the publication's listed under scientists are a sort of newer more non-traditional form of publishing: pre-print archives, digital archives and repositories, and data. Traditional modes of scholarly publishing wouldn't accommodate those kinds of publications and so scientists and social scientists who are also publishing working papers and draft manuscripts as well as blog posts and data are all coming up with mechanisms to accommodate those non-traditional types of publications.

But you can see that the scientists and social scientists are somewhat ahead of the curve on that. Again, are not only more willing to accept non-traditional types of publications but have the repositories the archives the blogs and the forums for those kinds of publications whereas that's somewhat less common amongst humanists. Although with the digital humanities movement that is changing as well. But in that same survey 6-percent of faculty surveyed we agreed that enabling the broadest possible readership of my research maximize the impact of my findings. So again you've got this strong focus on the reach of your work and increasing the impact of your work. Non-traditional forms of publishing are preferable if they maximize dissemination and therefore maximize impact. So ultimately it's about balancing these two interests right? It's about balancing increasing your impact with what's going to be accepted in your field and in your department.

So as you think about where to publish what venues to publish in what formats to publish in and whether or not to go open access you have those two sort of competing values. However in the scholarly world it's increasingly becoming less up to you. At many institutions there is an open access mandate and this now includes the University of Delaware. Where it now says in the handbook policy: "Each faculty member grants to the University of Delaware permission to make available his or her scholarly articles and to exercise the copyright in those articles. More specifically each faculty member grants to the University a non-exclusive irrevocable worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of their scholarly

articles and any medium, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit... Each faculty member will upon request provide an electronic copy of the author's final version of each article to the University of Delaware library in an appropriate format. The library will make the articles available to the public in an open access repository UDSpace or its successor." So faculty are now expected to make their work available via our open access repository. And I highlighted that non-exclusivity because what that means is that the University of Delaware wants to exercise those same rights that copyright bestows upon authors. But they're asking for that to be transferred to the University not non-exclusively. So you ultimately still retain those rights over your work. Because you're only granting them on a non-exclusive basis.

So get publishing! In order to advance your career, publishing is obviously very important. But the biggest piece of advice that I can give to anyone is to plan ahead. There are a lot of aspects of the entire publishing process from conceptualizing a project to actually seeing it published and get sold or placed on say an open access repository or a website. There are a lot of points of the process that can take a long period of time. First of all you need to give yourself ample time to find the right publisher or journal for your work. And then you need to consider that it's going to take time for your work to go through the peer review process and for you to then revise it and potentially send it through the peer review process all over again after it's been revised. So take into account that there is a long process that requires you doing a lot of legwork and research to figure out the right venues for your publication and then once you've chosen where to submit there's a whole process that takes place after that to get your work into publishable shape.

Peer review timelines vary as do production schedules. So when you pick a publisher you may end up sending your work out for peer review and peer review can take anywhere from a few months to a year and I've even heard in some cases of it taking multiple years. So again it can depend upon the length of a publisher or journal's peer review process. How long it takes to actually get a published work out of your scholarly material. And the same thing with production schedules. Depending on whether you're publishing a journal article or a book it can again take anywhere from months to years for something to publish. Then you also have to make time to secure permissions as I was saying before and to secure the funding that you'll need to submit the payment of permissions and production costs. And as you know that if you're waiting upon word from the granting a grant funding agency that can oftentimes also take many months. Then consider aspects of your work that may add cost in time to production. So if your work contains a lot of images a lot of data a lot of extra textual elements or a lot of funky design elements in the work itself chances are you may end up having to pay for that or at the very least you'll have to pay in time because it will make the production process a bit more complicated. And again you'll have to know that if you have a book with these kinds of materials or an article with these kinds of materials in it it could take a bit longer to actually get the final published product.

Also of course you'll be needing to consider non-traditional forms of publishing as supplements or alternatives to traditional scholarship so you'll have to make the decision along the way as to whether or not you want to publish in any of these non-traditional venues either alongside a more traditional publication or in lieu of a more traditional publication. Again that's a choice that you'll have to make dependent upon the specific project you're doing who you're trying to reach with that scholarship and what your field is willing to accept. Also of course if you're seeking tenure or promotion you need to familiarize yourself with the requirements of your department and your institution. And that in and of itself can be a pretty onerous process. To not only find out what is required of you to actually fulfill what is required of you. So for instance oftentimes you'll be needing to think about building a portfolio for yourself from pretty much the moment you start publishing. So thinking about getting yourself set up for eventual tenure and promotion processes is another thing that you'll have to be thinking about at the same time that you're figuring out where to get your work published.

And finally you should strongly consider getting an Orcid ID. The great thing about an Orcid ID is that it's basically a digital identifier for you as a scholar. So it basically helps to aggregate all of your scholarly work into a digital record that you or anyone else can find. And one of the nice things about Orcid IDs is that it kind of gets around some of the problems of scholarly attribution that often occur when for instance sometimes somebody's name appears with their middle initial and sometimes it doesn't. Well you might have difficulty then having people who are looking for your work find all of your work because they'll find it under one version of your name but they won't find the work that's listed under another version of your name. If it's all under the same scholarly identifier then all of that work will appear together and people will be able to find everything in your scholarly record. So Orcids are a really great way to basically create your own active online scholarly portfolio.

And then finally what about my dissertation? And I think a lot of what's here applies not only to dissertations but to scholarly articles to lab reports and basically to all sorts of scholarly products. As many of you know there is a step by step process to submit a graduate portfolio here, but when you think about moving from dissertation to book or when you think about moving from any type of scholarly product to a book or to a journal article you should really not hesitate to do it. There can be a lot of trepidation about whether or not a dissertation or part of a dissertation is really worthy of turning into a larger scholarly publication. You really need to think about it as again a career advancement tool. And it's important that you begin building up a record of scholarly publishing. But one of the concerns that I've heard is that especially in the open access age and the age of digital publishing a lot of people are concerned that publishers will say well you've basically published this already you published your dissertation you uploaded it to ProQuest and therefore this isn't new. So we're not going to publish it. There are a whole list of reasons why that's not really something that you need to be concerned about but what I can say bottom line is that uploading a dissertation is not the same as publishing the scholarly book. Probably the main difference is that any press that's going to be publishing a work of yours is not going to be publishing an unrevised dissertation. Any legitimate scholarly press is expecting that your dissertation will be heavily revised and made into a scholarly book and a fantastic resource is William Germanos' "From Dissertation to Book" and gives really really great advice on basically how you revise to turn a dissertation into a book. And again this applies to not just dissertations but to scholarly articles, reports, what-have-you.

But in order to move beyond a dissertation the main thing that any publisher is looking for is confidence. We want to see that you have confidence in your argument, confidence in your research, and that you're basically ready to become a participant in the scholarly conversation in your field. So we don't want to see timid language. We don't want to see sort of muddy argumentation. We want to see a clear thesis and we want to see the writing of somebody who is confident in what they're arguing. And that also means that you're making less reference to other scholars work and other scholars arguments. So if you're trying to get your work published in a journal or a scholarly monograph you want it to be yours you don't want to constantly be making reference to the scholarship of others in your field and certainly it's completely normal to make reference to other scholars in your field because you want to situate yourself in that field but you're doing so much less than you would in a dissertation.

Another big thing is taming footnotes a lot of times dissertations footnotes can be places for everything but the kitchen sink and if you're going to be publishing a book a publisher does not want to see that. A publisher wants to see a little bit more restraint a little bit more laser focus and also wants you to have the editing ability to be able to look at your own work and really understand what is essential about it versus what is tangential. A book published by a major publisher or an article published in a major early scholarly journal these are opportunities to open up your work to a broader audience. And that's not just about avoiding jargon, which is important, but it's also about how your work is organized. You may take an earlier version of an article or your dissertation and decide that ultimately it's not organized in such a way that a lot of people beyond maybe a



couple of people in a small subfield of a subfield of a subfield are going to understand. So you may want to reorganize your work.

A lot of times a lot of the work that people will do coming off of a dissertation is really sort of figuring that out what other material do they want to add and how do they want to reorganize everything to come up with a more compelling book. But even more importantly than that is the implications of the work. And again this is true in any sort of scholarly publication that the most important thing you can do is really hone in on what you're arguing and how you're arguing it. How clear is the argument, how sharp is the argument and how important is the argument? Are you really making a contribution to your field? Are you really making a contribution to scholarship? In other words is this a publication that's going to help you advance your career? Because if you put something out there but it doesn't add to the scholarly conversation you're not making a strong argument for yourself on the job market. Also if you can't make a dissertation into a book or you're in a journal oriented field aim to get journal articles published. You may find that your studies are going in a different direction you may find that your topic has ended up being too unwieldy to move forward into publishing a book or you may be in the sciences or social sciences where publishing an article is just much more standard. Any way you can do it you still want to build up a publishing record for yourself.

So whatever you can do to build up that record of scholarly publication even if it means turning out a bunch of articles that's what you should do. Again you should be trying to avoid predators and if somebody cold calls you and tells you they want to publish your dissertation basically unrevised that's a no-no. But you should be looking for what publishers want. So when you find the publishers that you're interested in whether they be journal publishers or monograph publishers you should be looking at their websites looking at what else they're publishing. If you're looking at a journal look at other issues of that journal that have already been published. Maybe look at some of the books that that publisher has already published and find what they want. Especially for monograph proposals let's say oftentimes presses will very directly tell you what they want to see So again it's about doing that legwork and figuring out what the venues that you want to publish in want to see from you as an author.

And finally and this is perhaps the most important message that I can give about the publishing process as a whole - use the publishing process as a networking opportunity. Publishing is not just important for career advancement in the sense of you publish a book and you give yourself a record of scholarly publication and making a scholarly contribution. It's because the publishing process gives you an incredible opportunity to reach out to other scholars in your own department and across the country and even the world in your field. Get to know people get to understand what's going on in your field. Get to understand what are the needs of your particular institution and your field. Get to know people, form relationships with people and ultimately those relationships will be just as important in advancing your career as the record of publication itself will be. And also that will help you to maintain currency in your field as well. So it's much easier to be on the cutting edge and make a scholarly contribution when you create a sort of network of scholars. And the publishing process is a wonderful opportunity to begin developing those relationships. So the importance of publishing in career advancement is more straight is more complex than just the straightforward publishing process itself. It's about becoming an engaged scholar in more ways than just being an author. It's about being a scholar in every sense of the word.

[Applause]