

among women ages 18 to 34 (ABC Press Bundle for Tuesday, February 15, 2005). These numbers reveal many parents were exposed to evidence-based treatments for childhood behavior problems by watching the program, and suggest a broad interest by adults in observing parenting and the application of behavior management techniques. Similar programs are also aired in New Zealand, and researchers there have presented promising findings on the effectiveness of such dissemination efforts (e.g., <http://www19.triplep.net/>; Sanders et al., 2000; Sanders & Turner, 2002).

So what are the implications for behavior therapists? First, clinicians should be aware that parents initiating treatment may arrive with knowledge of evidence-based procedures based on their viewing episodes of these programs, and thus may expect clinicians to recommend similar procedures. Behavior therapists will need to address the appropriateness of potential behavioral interventions given the context and function of the child's referring problems. Second, the programs imply that severe behavior problems can be effectively treated within the space of a few days. Clearly, this is not the norm, and behavior therapists can help parents not only initiate behavioral interventions, but maintain them for as long as is necessary. Researchers should also investigate whether viewing such programs results in changes in approaches to managing be-

havior problems. The programs also suggest a service delivery model for behavioral parent training that could be evaluated in research (e.g., in-home, in-vivo modeling and practice). Finally, such programs can help parents (and teachers) understand what evidence-based treatment looks like, make it more palatable and normative, and hopefully make them more educated consumers because the behavior-modification approach used on the shows closely aligns with that identified as effective in the parent training literature (Brestan & Eyberg, 1998; Pelham et al., 1998). In the long run, both families and clinicians can benefit from the rise in the public consciousness of behavior therapy approaches for children. We are interested in the effects that these broadly disseminated shows may have on parenting knowledge and skills (see Sanders, 1999, for a thoughtful, expanded discussion). While knowledge, and perhaps even skills, may be enhanced by these programs, the implications of these programs for facilitating and maintaining change among families with more serious problems remains to be documented.

References

- Brestan, E. V., & Eyberg, S. M. (1998). Effective psychosocial treatments of conduct-disordered children and adolescents: 29 years, 82 studies, and 5,272 kids. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 27, 180-189.
- Herschell, A. D., McNeil, C. B., & McNeil, D. W. (2004). Clinical child psychology's progress in disseminating empirically supported treatments. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 11, 267-288.
- Mindell, J. A. (1999). Empirically supported treatments in pediatric psychology: Bedtime refusal and night awakenings in children. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 24, 465-481.
- Pelham, W. E., Wheeler, T., & Chronis, A. M. (1998). Empirically supported psychosocial treatments for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 27, 190-205.
- Sanders, M. R. (1999). Triple P-Positive Parenting Program: Towards an empirically validated multilevel parenting and family support strategy for the prevention of behavior and emotional problems in children. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 2, 71-90.
- Sanders, M. R., Montgomery, D. T., & Brechman-Toussaint, M. L. (2000). The mass media and the prevention of child behavior problems: The evaluation of a television series to promote positive outcomes for parents and their children. *Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology*, 41, 939-948.
- Sanders, M. R. & Turner, K. M. T. (2002). The role of the media and primary care in the dissemination of evidence-based parenting and family support interventions. *the Behavior Therapist*, 25, 156-166.

Feature

Publish Without Perishing, Part 1: Suggestions for Students and New Faculty

Steven Taylor, *University of British Columbia*, Dean McKay, *Fordham University*, Jonathan S. Abramowitz, *Mayo Clinic*, Gordon J. G. Asmundson, *University of Regina*, and Sherry H. Stewart, *Dalhousie University*

One of the strengths of a scientist-practitioner organization such as the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies (née AABT) is that many of its members, including student members, are actively involved in research and in publishing their findings in scholarly journals. Publishing your scholarly work can be one of the most fulfilling experiences in academia. It can also be one of the most frustrating. Indeed, diatribes have been written by embittered academics about the difficulties in getting their work published.

These pessimistic (and generally unhelpful) perspectives are counterbalanced by optimistic and practical advice from successful academics (Darley & Zanna, 2004; Kazdin, 1998; Sternberg, 2000). In the present article and in the second article in this series, we will build on the optimistic advice of others to offer our views on how to be successful at the game of publishing. The choice of the term "game" is deliberate; we believe that publishing should be stimulating, if not fun. It should be viewed as a game or challenge, rather than a threat. Knowing the

written and unwritten rules of the game is important for successful publishing. The perspectives and suggestions we offer are based on our experiences as authors, editors, reviewers, and mentors. Collectively, we have published several hundred journal articles and book chapters, and over a dozen books. There is no single recipe for success in academic publishing. We offer some ideas for consideration. We hope this stimulates discussion from other readers of *the Behavior Therapist*.

To set the scene for the discussion to follow in this article and the next, consider the following questions. The way you approach these issues will influence your academic career in terms of hiring and promotion.

Your time, like all of your resources, is limited. You only have X hours per week for research and writing. To which activity should you devote most of your time; writing grants, writing empirical papers from an existing dataset, writing review articles, or polishing your teaching skills?

Which are more important to write—a number of small empirical articles or one big review paper?

Would your academic career be helped or hindered by collaborating with big names in the field?

Should you be a “hedgehog” or a “fox” in your research strategy? Should you methodically follow a single line of investigation, such as doing research and publishing only on, say, the topic of alexithymia (a hedgehog strategy)? Or should you pursue diverse lines of investigation, depending on what piques your interest (the way of the fox)?

What is the optimal balance of quantity versus quality? For example, should you try to publish lots of papers in second- or third-tier journals, or should you focus on publishing fewer articles in leading journals?

Is it really that important that your papers be well-written? After all, you’re a behavioral scientist, not a novelist.

How do you decide on which journal to send your work?

How important is it to your career to publish book chapters or books?

The Busy Business of Academia: How Should You Allocate Your Time?

Understanding Local Conditions

Academia involves many things, including teaching, administration, grant writing, conducting research, and publishing. The way these activities are valued varies across departments and institutions, and so you need to understand the local conditions in which you work, or the conditions in which you are planning to work. Local conditions include the relative importance of teaching at a given institution, as well as the preferences or biases of faculty committees responsible for hiring and promotion. In some institutions, such as some smaller colleges, greater emphasis is placed on teaching and administration than on publishing (Murray, 1998). In such places it is possible that a faculty member may not be successful in obtaining tenure and promotion largely because of unsatisfactory teaching performance, such as poor evaluations from students. To understand the local conditions at the institution in which you work, or the institution in which you are applying to, you should talk to colleagues at the institution,

and consult their faculty handbook or similar departmental guidelines.

Grant-Getting Versus Publishing

Grant-getting is a particularly important component that defines the local conditions of an academic environment. Research universities emphasize grant-getting and the publishing of empirical research. Grant-getting is a time-consuming process. Grants are simply a means to an end; that is, a means of securing the time and resources to conduct and publish your research. That would seem to suggest that you should only get those grants that you need to do your research. If you can still publish good empirical work with a few tiny grants, then shouldn’t you focus most of your time and energy on writing papers instead of getting grants? Although that seems to be a logical strategy, the reality is that many department chairs and deans place great importance on their faculty members obtaining numerous, large grants. Some departments, when it comes to promotion or salary bonuses, place greater weight on grant-getting than on publishing. Bringing in grant funding can increase the prestige of a department or university, which is one reason why grants are emphasized. Some departments, particularly those in medical schools, require faculty members to raise their own salaries, either by providing direct clinical service or by obtaining grant funding. Thus, although publications are more important than grants in the progress of science, it can be more important, at least in many academic settings, to secure grants than to publish research articles. Publishing is still necessary to survive in many academic settings, but it may be insufficient for academic success. The Catch-22 here is that publishing (or demonstrating your record in research success) is also a necessary component of success in grant competitions. Space limitations preclude a discussion of grant-getting in the present article. For a detailed discussion of the art and science of grant-getting, see Sternberg (2004). Similarly, detailed discussions of effective strategies for conducting research are discussed elsewhere (e.g., Kazdin, 1998).

Publish and Perish

Local conditions also define ways that one can publish and perish. Some departments emphasize empirical research and minimize the importance of “nonempirical” papers, such as review articles or commentaries. Thus, even if you devote most of your

time to writing erudite, theoretically important review papers, it is possible that you may be passed over for salary bonuses, and you may have difficulty obtaining tenure and promotion. The bias against review articles is ironic because review papers tend to have a greater impact on the field and longer citation half-life than empirical papers (Amin & Mabe, 2000; Garfield, 1994). So, your efforts at writing highly cited articles (i.e., reviews) could actually undermine your academic success if you are in a department where hiring or promotion committees place greater emphasis on empirical papers.

Another way of publishing and perishing is to publish many articles in low-ranking journals; a better strategy is to publish at least some articles in leading journals, even though many of your articles might be in lesser journals. (Statistical indices of journal ranking are discussed in the second article in this series.) A similar approach might be taken when you consider whether to publish with established leaders in your field. There are pros and cons to publishing with big names. The pros include (a) you are likely to learn important things about research and publishing when you work with leading researchers, and (b) your articles may be more likely to be read and cited by others if they are co-authored by a well-known investigator. The cons include (a) the risk that people might assume (perhaps incorrectly) that all the good ideas in your paper came from your big-name co-author rather than you, and (b) the risk that members of hiring or promotion committees might be concerned about your ability to work as an independent investigator, especially if most of your articles are co-authored with big names in the field. The solution to these problems is to ensure that you publish articles in which it is clear that you are the lead investigator and the originator of the important research ideas. This can be achieved by publishing single-author papers. That might not always be feasible, especially when conducting complex research that involves the input of many others. In such cases you might choose to do some of your work with your own research group (e.g., other colleagues) rather than with big names in the field. Or you might include a footnote in your research papers, acknowledging receipt of your grant support and, if appropriate, mentioning that you were the principal investigator. Some journals, primarily medical journals, require articles to contain a footnote describing the contribution made by each of the authors. This can help you demonstrate the contributions you

made to the paper, even if you are publishing with an established leader in the field.

Taking a "fox" rather than "hedgehog" approach to research and publishing can also sometimes harm your chances of academic success, especially in the early stages of your career. According to the ancient Greek poet Archilochus, the fox knows many things, but the hedgehog knows one big thing (Berlin, 1953). Fox and hedgehog strategies are both commonly seen in academia. One might adopt a largely foxlike approach, whereby you do research in many different areas, and publish on a diverse range of topics. In comparison, one might adopt a hedgehog approach, in which you study one topic in great depth, and publish only on that topic. To illustrate the latter, one of our colleagues has focused his research on the concept of perfectionism, and publishes almost exclusively on this topic. Other researchers adopt a blend of fox and hedgehog approaches. Neither of the fox or hedgehog approaches is inherently wrong; both can lead to important advances in science. The hedgehog approach facilitates a deep understanding of one particular research area, whereas a foxlike approach may lead one into many different novel or under-investigated areas, some of which may be of great interest to readers, reviewers, and editors.

For someone starting out in academia, we believe it is better to adopt a more hedgehoglike approach in order to demonstrate to hiring or promotion committees that you are systematically pursuing a solid line of research. In other words, it is important to demonstrate (e.g., via your publication record) that you have a program of research that is capable of attracting grant funding, instead of seemingly haphazard or fad-driven research. A highly diverse string of publications might be interpreted as evidence that you don't know where you are heading in terms of your research. As you become more established in your academic career you might choose to diversify and become more foxlike, such as by pursuing multiple lines of research and publication.

Publishing Your Work Is the Business of Communication

Good writing is dismissed as mere window dressing by some researchers. Some researchers submit their poorly written work to journals in the hope that the reviewers will tell them how to fix their papers. Expecting reviewers to clean up your work is irritating to reviews and editors, and a recipe for rejection. It is also a misuse of the

review process (Kendall, 1990). Some researchers believe that their work sounds more "scientific" or profound if it is written in dense, jargon-filled, and convoluted prose. Again, this is a recipe for rejection. Some authors have been drawn to writing gimmicks in the hope of making their papers seem scientific, such as Dillon's (1981) work showing that the presence of a colon in the title of a manuscript is positively correlated with chances that the paper will be published. Gimmicks like adding a colon is no substitute for a well-written manuscript. (Even so, we added a colon to the title of the present article, just to be on the safe side.) We also offered a charbroiled chicken and three dolmades to Πίθηκος δακτυλογράφησης, the god of acceptance letters. Perhaps the most unusual attempt to get around the problem of good writing and good methodology was made recently by a Brown University researcher. When his paper was rejected from an occupational medicine journal, he simply bought two pages of ad space and printed the entire article in the same journal (McCook, 2005).

In graduate school we're encouraged to pour over monographs like Campbell and Stanley (1970) to learn how to design reliable and valid experiments. We're encour-

aged to study volumes like Tabachnick and Fidell (2000) to learn how to best analyze our data. We're told to examine the *Publication Manual* of the American Psychological Association (2001) to learn how to organize our findings into the desired publication format. But students and new faculty typically receive very little instruction on how to actually write their articles. Clarity and good writing are highly important in getting your work published. These points were highlighted recently in editorials from the leading journals *Nature* (Gee, 2004) and *Psychological Bulletin* (Bem, 1995).

When space in journals is at a premium, and when success is measured in terms of publication, it is in the interest of researchers to write clearly and plainly ... [Well written papers emerge] like bright buttons from a larger pile of lexical sludge written in the customarily dreadful manner. ... In the last analysis, when authors need to maximize every opportunity to get their message heard, literacy will be seen, increasingly, as something that could make or break a paper, and with it, the careers of authors. (Gee, 2004)

From my own experience as an editor of an APA journal, I believe that the differ-

THE OBSESSIVE-COMPULSIVE DISORDER CENTER AT ROGERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Directed by Bradley C. Riemann, PhD,
a nationally recognized cognitive behavioral therapy provider

Our CBT programs provide effective treatment for:

- Obsessive-compulsive disorder
- OC spectrum disorders: trichotillomania, body dysmorphic disorder, hypochondriasis
- Anxiety disorders: panic disorder with agoraphobia
- Severe depression

Residential for adults and adolescents ages 12 to 17 - Intensive care for severe and difficult to treat cases

Partial hospitalization for adults and children - Intensive care for moderate to severe cases

1-800-767-4411 Call for a free phone screening.



ence between the article accepted and the top 15-20% of those rejected is frequently the difference between good and less good writing. Moral: Don't expect journal reviewers to discern your brilliance through the smog of polluted writing. (Bem, 1995, p. 176)

Thus, it is important to remember that publishing your work is, to a large degree, the business of effective communication. To be sure, good writing can't salvage a methodologically weak study, but it is still important that you learn to communicate your ideas clearly.

Clear prose is also important when you are asked to revise and resubmit a journal article. If the reviewers can't follow your arguments, or if they raise other concerns (even if their concerns appear to be wrong-headed), then you need to clarify the text of your manuscript, in a nondefensive way. Your cover letter to the editor, in which you describe how you addressed the reviewers' concerns, should also be clear, concise, and noncombative. (Some of the best examples of the sort of writing to avoid can be found in the combative, but nonetheless entertaining, squabbles found in the Letters section of the *New York Review of Books*.) No one likes criticism (well, almost no one), and it's easy to get discouraged by scathing reviews. If you've been asked to revise and resubmit a journal article, then your paper is potentially salvageable. Responding to the reviewers' comments is just another one of the games of publishing. This one is more like a video game; if you want to get to the next level, then you need to solve the puzzles or challenges set by the reviewers. Rejected articles are also often salvageable and find a home in another journal. Don't be afraid of rejection and don't let it stop your efforts to publish your work. You need not take it personally—remember, it's just a game. Lives are not at stake. Also remember the two secrets of publishing: (a) everyone gets rejected, and (b) just about everyone eventually gets published (Asmundson, Norton, & Stein, 2002). Persevere and you will succeed.

Feel free to complain to your colleagues or rail at your poodle because the stupid reviewers failed to read your manuscript correctly. But then turn to the task of revising your manuscript with a dispassionate, problem-solving approach. First, pay special attention to criticisms or suggestions made by more than one reviewer or highlighted by the editor in the cover letter. These *must* be addressed in your revision—even if not in exactly the way the editor or reviewers suggest. ... Next, look

carefully at each of the reviewers' misreadings. ... Whenever readers of a manuscript find something unclear, they are right; by definition, the writing is unclear. The problem is that readers themselves do not always recognize or identify the unclarity explicitly. Instead, they misunderstand what you have written and then make a criticism or offer a suggestion that makes no sense. In other words, you should also interpret reviewers' misreadings as signals that your writing is unclear. (Bem, 1995, pp. 176-177, emphasis in original)

You don't need to be a Pulitzer Prize-winning author to be successful in publishing in academia, as you can see from the un-Hemingwayesque prose of the present article, but you do need to learn how to express your ideas clearly. There are several useful resources that can help you learn how to write clear scholarly articles. Among the most useful includes Strunk and White's (2000) *Elements of Style*. Other useful guides include the University of Chicago Press (2003) manual of style, and the resources on the style home page of the American Psychological Association (www.apastyle.org/). Taking courses in writing and requesting feedback from mentors or colleagues can also be helpful.

Although these resources are useful, the mere mention of doing "quality writing" can cause some students and faculty to lapse into writer's catatonia. Several useful programs have been developed to help academics overcome writing procrastination (e.g., Boice, 1989). One simple but useful strategy is to aim low when you write your first draft of a paper; construct a rough outline, then write out the paper in full, as a deliberately rough draft, without worrying about grammar, style, or concision. To get to the full draft stage, try the 3-minute rule: sit down each day and write for at least 3 minutes. Once you've written for that period of time, decide whether you want to write some more. People often find that once they've written for a few minutes, then it's easy for them to continue writing. Next thing you know, you've written something massive, like *War and Peace* or the *Starr Report*.

Once the first draft is written, it's easier to start polishing the text. You should pay careful attention to the length of the manuscript. Try to keep your paper as short as possible, without sacrificing important details. If you are writing up a single-case study, for example, the manuscript should be more like 20 pages than 50 pages. (Unfortunately, we have seen several in-

stances of the latter, which are often rejected outright.) In your literature review, focus only on the articles and issues that are germane to the aims of the study. One of the best ways to improve your writing is to continue to write, even if you're only writing a few pages each day. With increased proficiency, writing can become fun, rather than a chore.

Conclusion

Academia is a land of paradoxes. Once you land a job as an assistant professor, you're expected to carry a teaching load, even though you probably had little or no experience or training in how to teach. You are expected to obtain grants and establish a research program, even though you may have had little or no experience in grant-getting and may have only a limited understanding of the issues and pitfalls in establishing a research program. On the one hand, academics are expected to have taken the required courses and attained the requisite credentials from a suitably accredited program; self-education in such things would be woefully insufficient for even being considered for an academic job. On the other hand, academics are required to autodidact or "pull ourselves up by our bootstraps" when it comes to important endeavors like teaching proficiency, grant-getting, establishing a research program, demonstrating that one is an independent investigator, and publishing scholarly works. Along the way we fill these knowledge gaps by seeking out mentors and role models, by soliciting peer feedback, by consulting the literature on the topic, and by muddling our way along with the help of common sense.

This article has raised issues and suggestions about particular aspects of the academic enterprise; the writing and publishing of scholarly works. Your approach to publishing should take into consideration the local conditions of the academic institution in which you work, or the institutions in which you wish to apply to. Although the maxim "Publish more of everything that is worth publishing" certainly can lead to academic success, some publications are more important than others. As we have seen, empirical papers are particularly important, even when they may objectively have less impact on the field than review articles. We also suggest that, at least in the early stages of your academic career, that you avoid publishing a high quantity of low-quality articles, and avoid publishing a low quantity of high-quality articles. Aim for something in

between. We also recommend that you follow the path of the hedgehog, at least in the early stage of your career. Good writing is very important, although it is no substitute for methodologically sound research.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication manual* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Amin, M., & Mabe, M. (2000). Impact factors: Use and abuse. *Perspectives in Publishing*, 1, 1-6. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from http://www.elsevier.com/framework_editors/pdfs/Perspectives1.pdf.
- Asmundson, G. J. G., Norton, G. R., & Stein, M. B. (2002). *Clinical research in mental health: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bem, D. J. (1995). Writing a review article for *Psychological Bulletin*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, 172-177.
- Berlin, I. (1953). *The hedgehog and the fox: An essay on Tolstoy's view of history*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Boice, R. (1989). Procrastination, busyness and bingeing. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 27, 605-611.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1970). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Darley, J. M., & Zanna, M. P. (2004). *Compleat academic: A career guide* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Dillon, J. T. (1981). The emergence of the colon: An empirical correlate of scholarship. *American Psychologist*, 36, 879-884.
- Garfield, E. (1994). The impact factor. *Current Contents*. Retrieved May 8, 2005, from www.isinet.com/essays/journalcitation-reports/7.html/.
- Gee, H. (December 3, 2004). The write stuff. *Nature Online*. Retrieved April 28, 2005, from http://www.nature.com/news/2004/041129/pf/041129-14_pf.html.
- Kazdin, A. E. (1998). *Methodological issues and strategies in clinical research* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kendall, P. C. (1990). Journals: Submitting, reviewing, and rejecting. *the Behavior Therapist*, 13, 167.
- McCook, A. (2005). Journal prints rejected paper—as ad. *The Scientist*. Retrieved April 29, 2005, from <http://www.biomedcentral.com/news/20050429/02>.
- Murray, B. (April, 1998). The rules for earning tenure are different at smaller institutions. *APA Monitor*, 29(4). Retrieved April 30, 2005, from <http://www.apa.org/monitor/apr98/tenure.html>.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2000). *Guide to publishing in psychology journals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2004). Obtaining a research grant: The applicant's view. In J. M. Darley & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Compleat academic: A career guide* (2nd ed., pp. 169-184). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Strunk, W., & White, E. B. (2000). *The elements of style* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2000). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- University of Chicago Press. (2003). *The Chicago manual of style* (15th ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

ADDRESS CORRESPONDENCE TO Steven Taylor, Ph.D., Department of Psychiatry, University of British Columbia, 2255 Wesbrook Mall, Vancouver, BC, V6T 2A1, Canada; e-mail: taylor@unixg.ubc.ca

International Scene

A Truce for Venezuelans: A Preliminary Program for the Prevention of Violence

Felicitas Kort Rosemberg, *Central University of Venezuela*

The World Health Organization Global Report on Violence emphasizes the importance of developing prevention programs in mental health. Following the resolutions of Assemblies 49 (1996) and 56 (2003), in January 2003, a Global Campaign for the Prevention of Violence was declared, emphasizing that violence is a public health problem as perilous as any disease. "A Truce for Venezuelans" is a pilot program aiming to stimulate initiatives that prevent the escalation of conflict. It is a community-based project using the principals of cognitive behavior therapy (CBT). The project is designed to teach individuals from various population segments how to substitute prosocial actions for violent behavior and above all, teach behaviors that are incompatible with hostility and anger. Its main goals are to inform the public about the negative consequences of violence, to disseminate alternatives to

violence as a way to prevent social turmoil resulting from high levels of political tension, and to promote mental health for a better quality of life. The project thus aims to facilitate the broad objectives of enhanced well-being for the people of Venezuela. The project has implications for the dissemination of research and practice in community applications of CBT.

A number of previous studies exemplify successful community-based strategies and provide important models for this project. The San Francisco Mood Survey Project: Preliminary Work Toward the Prevention of Depression (Muñoz, Glish, Soo-Hoo, & Robertson, 1982) reported on a population-based intervention using CBT principles disseminated via television. A mood survey measured individuals' behavior and mood before and after viewing a television series. The television presentation was introduced as a special segment on methods that have

been used to help people feel better and included pleasant activities, how to write out contracts with yourself for positive behavior change, rewarding yourself, exercise, changing negative to positive thoughts, relaxation, and positive assertion. Mood was assessed via a phone survey conducted by trained volunteers 1 week before showing the first segment and 1 week after the last segment was shown. The results showed a positive response to the segments, some changes in behavior, and depression reduction.

Similarly, "Stress and Coping in Israel During the Persian Gulf War" (Milgram, 1993) investigated pre-war vulnerability, interpersonal and intrapersonal resources, levels of acute stress reactions (cognitive, behavioral, and somatic), and the reduction in intensity and frequency of these stress reactions following intervention. The goal was to prevent posttraumatic stress disorder via a massive education campaign: 108 articles in the main newspapers, 72 radio announcements, 23 participations in the "Family Ties" program, as well as use of telephone hot lines. Mental health experts flooded the media in an unprecedented fashion, explaining to an apprehensive public how to deal with unfamiliar threats.

In previous work, Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy theory, positing that beliefs about

the Behavior Therapist

Contents

Feature

Steven Taylor, Jonathan S. Abramowitz, Dean McKay, Sherry H. Stewart, and Gordon J. G. Asmundson Publish Without Perishing, Part 2: More Suggestions for Students and New Faculty 21

Miniseries: Behavior Therapy in Health Psychology

Jennifer B. McClure Tobacco Control in the U.S.: Cognitive-Behavioral and Behavioral Principles in Action 27

Jennifer D. Lundgren Behavior Therapy and Its Contributions to Obesity Treatment 28

Institutional Settings

James C. Seltzer, Matthew Kurtz, and Warren Thime Schizophrenia Rehabilitation Program at the Institute of Living: Combining Neurocognitive, Motivational, and Vocational Rehabilitation 30

Book Review

Eifert & Forsyth's (2005) *Acceptance and Commitment Therapy for Anxiety Disorders: A Practitioner's Treatment Guide to Using Mindfulness, Acceptance and Values-Based Behavior Change Strategies*

Reviewed by Daniel J. Moran 36

Letter to the Editor

E. Thomas Dowd Who Are the Veterans of AABT/ABCT? 37

Classifieds 37

At ABCT

David Teisler Journals On-Line 38

plus . . . { photo ID—win a prize! (p. 39)

Feature

Publish Without Perishing, Part 2: More Suggestions for Students and New Faculty

Steven Taylor, *University of British Columbia*, Jonathan S. Abramowitz, *Mayo Clinic*, Dean McKay, *Fordham University*, Sherry H. Stewart, *Dalhousie University*, and Gordon J. G. Asmundson, *University of Regina*

In the previous article in this series (Taylor, McKay, Abramowitz, Asmundson, & Stewart, 2006) we examined the relative importance of scholarly publishing in relation to other academic endeavors, in terms of hiring and promotion. Promising approaches and pitfalls in the publishing process were discussed, along with suggested guidelines for maximizing one's success in publishing. In the present article we examine issues in selecting journals and issues concerning the relative importance of journal articles, book chapters, and books. Although students are often more concerned about whether their work is published, new faculty are more often concerned about whether *and* where their work is published. Accordingly, the present article is intended more for new faculty, although it should also be relevant to graduate students aspiring toward an academic career. As we mentioned in the first article in this series, there is no single recipe for success in academia. We offer here our perspectives and hope this stimulates discussion from other readers.

What Defines the Status of a Journal?

What makes a "good" journal? There are all kinds of considerations, some of which concern

the status of the journal in comparison to other journals. The major standardized indices of journal performance were developed by the Institute for Science (ISI; Garfield, 1972, 1994); these indices appear on their Web of Science Web site (<http://isi-webofknowledge.com/>) and in the Social Science Citation Index. Despite some debate, the ISI citation indices are the leading objective measures of journal importance. These indices influence the decisions of committees responsible for hiring, promotion, and assigning faculty salary increments, and also shape the decisions of committees allocating research grants.

The ISI provides data, for many journals, on three main citation indices of journal performance. For a given journal, these are computed and interpreted as follows (Amin & Mabe, 2000; Garfield, 1994):

- *Impact factor*: This is derived by computing the number of citations in the literature during a given year (e.g., 2003) for articles published in the journal in the past 2 years (e.g., 2001-2002), and then dividing this number by the total number of articles published by the journal during that 2-year period. The impact factor represents the average number of citations the average article perceives per annum in the 2 years after the publication year.

- *Immediacy index*: This is computed by the number of citations a journal receives in a given year divided by the number of articles the journal publishes that year. This index is a measure of how quickly articles in a given journal, once published, get cited in the literature.

- *Cited half-life*: This is the estimate, for a given year, of number of years required for the number of citations of articles in the journal to decline to 50% of its initial value. In other words, it is an estimate of how long articles in a journal continue to be cited after publication.

Of the three citation indices, the impact factor is the most widely used as an index of the prestige of a journal (Amin & Mabe, 2000; Garfield, 1994). The values of all three indices, for a sample of 30 psychology journals, appear in Table 1. These journals were selected because they publish articles on cognitive-behavioral topics and therefore are of relevance to readers of *the Behavior Therapist*. The journals listed in the table were selected in order to represent a range of impact factors, including low-, middle-, and high-ranking journals. For a given index (e.g., the impact factor), the journals in the table were ranked from highest to

lowest. On a given index, the 10 journals with the highest ranking have their indices in boldface, and the 10 journals of lowest ranking have their indices underscored. This was done to facilitate the comparison among indices. As suggested by the table, journals with high impact factors tended also to have high immediacy indices. Conversely, journals with low impact factors tended to have low immediacy indices. Citation half-life is only loosely related to these other two indices; although high impact journals tended to have high citation half-lives, some low-impact journals also had high half-lives. The table also shows that the journals that publish mainly review articles (e.g., *Psychological Bulletin*) tend to have higher citation indices than journals that publish mainly empirical studies. This reflects the finding that review articles tend to be more widely cited than empirical papers (Amin & Mabe, 2000; Garfield, 1994).

The table lists only psychology journals because journal citation indices vary across disciplines. Medical journals tend to have higher citation indices than psychological journals because the former have more authors per article, and therefore more self-citations per article (i.e., authors in a given article citing their own previous work). This

inflates the impact indices (Amin & Mabe, 2000).

The value of citation indices such as those cited in Table 1 is that students and new faculty can use objective indices for assessing the status of the journals to which they choose to contribute their work, rather than relying on subjective impressions about the status of a given journal. Committees responsible for hiring, promotion, and grant reviews may similarly use such indices as part of their evaluation. Of course, such indices are not universally used or valued. This underscores the importance of local conditions, as described in our previous article.

Other Considerations in Selecting a Journal

Journal citation indices are only one set of factors for selecting a journal for your work. You also need to consider the goodness-of-fit between your paper and the journal, guided in part by the information for contributors supplied by the journal. If your manuscript describes a groundbreaking piece of research, for example, it may be suitable for a high-ranking journal. On the other hand, if your manuscript describes re-

THE OBSESSIVE-COMPULSIVE DISORDER CENTER AT ROGERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Directed by Bradley C. Riemann, PhD,
a nationally recognized cognitive behavioral therapy provider

Our CBT programs provide effective treatment for:

- Obsessive-compulsive disorder
- OC spectrum disorders: trichotillomania, body dysmorphic disorder, hypochondriasis
- Anxiety disorders: panic disorder with agoraphobia
- Severe depression

Residential for adults and adolescents ages 12 to 17 - Intensive care for severe and difficult to treat cases

Partial hospitalization for adults and children - Intensive care for moderate to severe cases

1-800-767-4411 Call for a free phone screening.



Table 1. Citation Indices (2003) of a Sampling of 30 Journals Publishing Cognitive-Behavioral Articles

Journal	Impact Factor	Immediacy Index	Cited Half-Life (Years)
<i>American Psychologist</i>	5.484	1.275	>10.0
<i>Annals of Behavioral Medicine</i>	2.878	0.467	<u>5.6</u>
<i>Assessment</i>	<u>0.852</u>	0.190	<u>5.9</u>
<i>Behavior Analyst</i>	<u>0.621</u>	<u>0.000</u>	8.1
<i>Behaviour Change</i>	<u>0.268</u>	<u>0.000</u>	<u>6.4</u>
<i>Behavior Modification</i>	0.958	<u>0.079</u>	8.1
<i>Behaviour Research and Therapy</i>	2.024	0.340	8.6
<i>Behavior Therapy</i>	1.046	0.424	>10.0
<i>British J. Clinical Psychology</i>	1.296	<u>0.094</u>	9.3
<i>British J. Health Psychology</i>	<u>0.881</u>	0.161	<u>4.7</u>
<i>Clinical Psychology Review</i>	2.453	0.355	9.4
<i>Cognitive Therapy and Research</i>	0.963	<u>0.091</u>	>10.0
<i>Health Psychology</i>	2.347	0.213	8.4
<i>International J. Behavioral Medicine</i>	<u>0.766</u>	<u>0.115</u>	<u>6.6</u>
<i>International J. Eating Disorders</i>	1.540	0.266	<u>7.3</u>
<i>J. Abnormal Psychology</i>	3.351	0.470	>10.0
<i>J. Anxiety Disorders</i>	1.084	0.174	<u>7.0</u>
<i>J. Applied Behavior Analysis</i>	<u>0.875</u>	0.140	>10.0
<i>J. Behavioral Medicine</i>	1.015	<u>0.083</u>	>10.0
<i>J. Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry</i>	<u>0.939</u>	<u>0.077</u>	9.9
<i>J. Clinical Psychology</i>	<u>0.747</u>	0.330	>10.0
<i>J. Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i>	3.252	0.617	>10.0
<i>J. Experimental Analysis of Behavior</i>	1.222	0.273	>10.0
<i>J. Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment</i>	<u>0.690</u>	0.214	9.0
<i>J. Traumatic Stress</i>	1.408	<u>0.068</u>	<u>7.1</u>
<i>Psychological Assessment</i>	2.370	1.000	<u>7.6</u>
<i>Psychological Bulletin</i>	8.405	1.000	>10.0
<i>Psychological Reports</i>	<u>0.277</u>	<u>0.053</u>	>10.0
<i>Psychological Review</i>	8.357	1.357	>10.0
<i>Psychological Science</i>	3.558	0.500	<u>6.0</u>

SOURCE: Institute for Scientific Information Web of Science (<http://isi17.isiknowledge.com/portal.cgi/>), data extracted May 8, 2005.

Boldface = top 10 rankings on a given index for the journals listed in this table.

Underscored = bottom 10 rankings in this table.

search that is methodologically sound, but simply replicates other research studies, then the chances are that your study will not be accepted by a leading journal; a lower-ranking journal is more likely to be the home for such a study.

Sometimes it is difficult to determine whether to submit to a higher- or lower-ranking journal. Submission to a high-ranking journal can lead to rejection, therefore delaying your article's eventual publication in a respectable but lower-ranking journal. But then again, you've got nothing to lose (but time itself) by aiming reasonably high. If in doubt about whether to submit your work to a high or lesser ranking journal,

then we suggest two things. First, set your paper aside for a couple of weeks, and then reread your paper and a couple of comparable articles from the journal in which you are planning to submit. Ask yourself how your paper compares to the published articles. Second, ask some colleagues or mentors for their frank advice, preferably colleagues who have published in the journal that you are considering. If in doubt, do what they do in archery competitions: aim high, but don't shoot for the moon.

There are several other considerations in selecting an appropriate journal. You should take into account the sorts of articles published by a given journal, guided in part by

the information for contributors supplied by the journal. You can also take a look at recent issues of the journals that you are considering. There are considerable—and important—variations among journals with similar citation indices. Some journals (depending on the editors) prefer creative papers that contain novel ideas. Others, with similar citation indices, prefer methodologically rigorous papers containing a minimum of speculation. Some journals are known for being very efficient (i.e., being quick to review and publish articles), whereas others (with similar citation indices) are known for being slow to review and slow to publish. If you are planning to

publish an article in a mid-level journal, such as the journals in the middle of the middle ranges in Table 1, then we recommend that you talk to your colleagues to decide which journal is best for you. You may wish, for example, to submit to the efficient journals and avoid the tardy ones. After all, if you are applying for a job or for a promotion, a paper that is "in press" carries more weight than one that is simply "in submission."

When Should You Aim Low?

Some researchers refuse to read or cite articles from low-impact journals, because they assume that the papers must be inferior. Despite this, some psychologists intentionally publish their work in low-ranking journals. This seems to be for one of two main reasons: either the researcher was unable to get his or her work published in a better journal, or the researcher is at a career point where it doesn't matter where he or she publishes. To illustrate the latter, Hans Eysenck and Paul Meehl, who are among the most widely cited psychologists in the world, have published many articles in *Psychological Reports* (e.g., Eysenck, 1982, 1995; Eysenck & Barrett, 1993; Meehl, 1990, 1993, 2002), which is among the lowest journals in Table 1 in terms of impact factor and immediacy index. Leading investigators may publish in such journals because such periodicals are generally easier than other journals to get into, and because leading researchers are not so dependent on the status of the journal in which they publish. Investigators such as Eysenck and Meehl have established themselves as important scholars, and so their work will be sought out and read regardless of where it is published. The rest of us, and especially new faculty, do not have the privilege of such name recognition. So, if you're a student or new faculty, avoid publishing in a low-ranking journal if you can help it. But also remember that at the early stages of one's career, a publication in a low-ranking journal is better than no publication at all.

Journals of Uncertain Standing

What about journals for which no impact statistics are currently available? There are a number of journals that are not listed on the ISI Web of Science (e.g., *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, and the *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*). Their omission reflects the limited coverage of the ISI database rather

than being a statement about the quality of the journals. In fact, many fine articles have been published in these journals. Nevertheless, we recommend that students and new faculty not limit their publications to such journals; it is important to have at least some publications in other journals that have high scores on the indices listed in Table 1.

The same advice applies to electronic journals published only on the Internet (as contrasted with most regular psychology journals, which are published in hard copy and also available in electronic versions). The status and survival of journals only available on the Internet currently remains uncertain. Two e-journals—*Prevention and Treatment* (published by the American Psychological Association) and the *Journal of Behavior Analysis and Therapy*—enjoyed only limited success, and both are now defunct. The status of e-journals may improve in the future as libraries and academics move toward electronic rather than paper formats of journals in general.

Book Chapters and Books

How important is it to your academic career to publish book chapters? The answer depends on a range of factors, including the local conditions of your academic institution and the stage of your career. Some departments place little value on book chapters when evaluating a person's publication record for the purposes of hiring, promotion, or salary bonuses. In those departments book chapters are often regarded as the icing on the cake. They are nice to have on one's CV because they may demonstrate that other scholars have thought sufficiently highly of you and your work to invite you to submit a chapter. But book chapters are widely regarded as being less important to one's CV than journal articles. This is because chapters often do not have to meet the standards for scholarship required for journal articles (e.g., chapters may require little or no peer review prior to acceptance for publication). Also, book chapters, unlike empirical journal articles, may make less of a contribution of new knowledge to the field. So, if you had to decide between spending your time on a journal article or a book chapter, we would vote for the former.

The value placed on scholarly books also varies across departments and across the stages of one's career. Some departments place little emphasis on books—especially edited books—in comparison to journal articles. In some departments, authored

books are seen as something important for senior faculty, such as for promotion to full professor. Authored books can be an indication of the maturity of one's research program and expertise. That is, you've done enough work in the area to provide an expert discussion of the big picture. Books enable one to synthesize the research literature, including one's own research, to provide, for example, a perspective on the current status and future directions of a given field. Although we know some highly successful senior colleagues who published books when they were junior faculty, these people are exceptions. We would recommend to most junior faculty that you devote your energy to publishing articles rather than undertaking the time-consuming process of writing a book. You might decide to edit a book, although edited books carry much less weight as a scholarly product than authored books. If you are embarking on a career at a research-oriented university, edited books are no substitute for having a string of empirical journal articles.

Conclusion

As implied by the title of our two articles—publish without perishing—an important goal of publishing, at least in our view, is to have a stimulating, productive academic career without burning out in the process. Some of the most productive psychologists we have encountered in academia are the ones who get the most enjoyment out of what they do. There is a widely circulated anecdote about Hans Eysenck, who is still probably one of the most widely cited psychologists in the world. Despite his voluminous publication record, including papers in high-ranking journals, Eysenck would be delighted each time one of his articles had been accepted for publication, even if the paper had been accepted in a low-tier journal such as *Psychological Reports*. Eysenck was driven by curiosity and was an expert at the game of publishing, and evidently enjoyed celebrating his many wins.

If you want to play the game of publishing, you should ask yourself, "Why am I doing what I do?" There are many different reasons for doing research and publishing scholarly work. A sense of curiosity, meaningfulness, and enjoyment at tackling the various intellectual "little problems" that one encounters (to paraphrase Sherlock Holmes) can lead to a stimulating, fulfilling publishing career. Indeed, social psychological research shows that a sense of being optimally challenged and absorbed in one's work (also known as a state of "flow") is an

important element of occupational satisfaction (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975). Painters who experience this state of flow describe working with complete absorption on a given painting, only to stack it with their other works against the wall when it is done, and commence a new absorbing project (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). Similarly, psychologists experiencing flow are absorbed in conducting their research and writing up their work. Once a paper has been accepted for publication it goes in the drawer along with the others, and a new research project is pursued. Although academia emphasizes products (publications), it's the process that really counts—the process of doing personally meaningful work—if you want to have a fulfilling, productive career in publishing scholarly works. That probably explains why the group of us has devoted our time to writing these two articles, instead of doing other things.

References

- Amin, M., & Mabe, M. (2000). Impact factors: Use and abuse. *Perspectives in Publishing*, 1, 1-6. Available from http://www.elsevier.com/framework_editors/pdfs/Perspectives1.pdf.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). *Beyond boredom and anxiety*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Finding flow: The psychology of engagement with everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1982). The biological basis of cross-cultural differences in personality: Blood group antigens. *Psychological Reports*, 51, 531-540.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1995). Does smoking really kill anybody? *Psychological Reports*, 77, 1243-1246.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1993). The nature of schizotypy. *Psychological Reports*, 73, 59-63.
- Garfield, E. (1972). Citation analysis as a tool in journal evaluation. *Science*, 178, 471-479.
- Garfield, E. (1994). *The impact factor*. *Current contents*. Retrieved May 8, 2005, from <http://www.isinet.com/essays/journalcitation-reports/7.html/>.
- Meehl, P. E. (1990). Why summaries of research on psychological theories are often uninterpretable. *Psychological Reports*, 66, 195-244.
- Meehl, P. E. (1993). Philosophy of science: Help or hindrance? *Psychological Reports*, 72, 707-733.
- Meehl, P. E. (2002). Cliometric metatheory: II. Criteria scientists use in theory appraisal and why it is rational to do so. *Psychological Reports*, 91, 339-404.
- Taylor, S., McKay, D., Abramowitz, J. S., Asmundson, G. J., & Stewart, S. H. (2006). Publish without perishing, part 1: Suggestions for students and new faculty. *the Behavior Therapist*, 29, 4-9.

ADDRESS CORRESPONDENCE TO Steven Taylor, Ph.D., Department of Psychiatry, University of British Columbia, 2255 Wesbrook Mall, Vancouver, BC, V6T 2A1, Canada; e-mail: taylor@unixg.ubc.ca ✉

2005 DC Convention *Lottery* winners

ROBERT A. DITOMASSO, Ph.D.

sponsor (not a member)
PRIZE: journal subscription

ADAM S. RADOMSKY, Ph.D.

sponsor
PRIZE: journal subscription

CHRISTOFFER A. GRANT, B.A.

new member
PRIZE: journal subscription

TRACY J. KISNER, M.A.

new member
PRIZE: journal subscription

LESLEY M. GRAVES

new member;
PRIZE: VHS tape*

CECILIA W. LAM, B.A.

new member
PRIZE: VHS tape*

MARSHA M. LINEHAN, Ph.D.

sponsor
PRIZE: VHS tape*

CAMI R. LOKKEN, Ph.D.

sponsor
PRIZE: VHS tape*

FRANK L. GARDNER, Ph.D.

sponsor
PRIZE: free membership year

* NO, NOT A BLANK TAPE! ANY ABCT VIDEO OF THEIR CHOICE.