International Journal of Social Science Research and Review

http://ijssrr.com
editor@ijssrr.com
Volume 9, Issue 2
February, 2026
Pages: 337-354

The Use of Peer-Reviewed Published Lecture Model in Promoting Academic Paper Writing: A Cost Effective Strategy

Professor Augustine Nwoye

Discipline of Psychology, School of Social Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg Campus, South Africa

Email: nnakwe.morah@gmail.com

https://orcid.org/0000.0003-2880-832x

http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v9i2.3229

Abstract

Sometime in 2016, the South African Journal of Higher Education, on pages 73–93 published a very incisive and noteworthy article by Jane Castle and Moyra Keane, both of the University of Witwatersrand, South Africa. The article was intended “to inspire academic staff developers and research managers to initiate and support strategies to help academics write more and better, and to take pleasure in writing” (p. 1). In implementing this aim the two authors turned a critical eye to writing development strategies extant in the literature for supporting and promoting academic writing. In carefully reading through their analysis and criticisms of the benefits and drawbacks of each of those strategies, it became clear that despite the importance attached to them, the need for proposing more viable strategies still exits since none of the current approaches was deemed a masterful solution to the challenge of promoting academic paper writing. What was missing in that list is the failure to recognize and adopt the published lecture model as a cost effective didactic strategy for promoting the art and science of academic paper writing among emerging academics and research managers in universities in Africa and the wider world. This article is an attempt to contribute to this need.

Keywords: *Academic Staff Development; Emerging Academics; Academic Publishing; Academic Research Writing; Promoting Academic Writing; Writing Development Strategies*

Introduction

The point of departure for this article is the incisive article published in 2016, by the South African Journal of Higher Education (pages 73–93) submitted by Jane Castle and Moyra Keane, both of the University of Witwatersrand, South Africa. Castle and Keane’s (2016) article was intended “to inspire academic staff developers and research managers to initiate and support strategies to help academics write more and better, and to take pleasure in writing" (p. 1). The two authors however regretted that for several years now the tendency of academic institutions in Africa and the wider world has been to presume that the best way to help academics to learn to write and publish more is to expose them to a number of workshop related approaches that aim to invite emerging academics and research managers to attend a writing workshop or writing retreat on academic writing and publishing.

Unfortunately, when the authors (Castle & Keane, 2016) turned their critical eyes to the major five writing development strategies extant in the literature for supporting and promoting academic writing what they discovered was less than encouraging and satisfactory (Boice and Jones 1984; Kapp, Albertyn and Frick, 2011; Moore, Murphy and Murray 2010; Grant and Knowles 2000; Badenhorst, Penny, Peckett, Joy, Hesson, Young, McLeod, Vaandering and Li 2013; Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen, Talbot, Verrinder and Ward 2009, 229–230; Singh 2012; Dwyer, Lewis, McDonald and Burns observe, 2012, p. 132; Thomson and Kamler 2013, pp.7–8; YetMurray, 2012;, Dickson-Swift et al,.2009; McGrail, Rickart and Jones 2006; Thomson and Kamler 2013; Boice and Jones 1984; Thomson and Kamler 2013; Aitchison and Lee 2006; Elbow 1981; Murray and Moore (2006, 28–29; Badenhorst, 2007; 2008; Murray and Moore (2006, 24–27; and Murray, 2013; Badenhorst, 2007; 2008; 2010; Kapp et al.,2011; Merriam 2009). This is because in carefully reading through their analysis and criticisms of the benefits and *drawbacks* of each of those strategies, it became quite clear that despite the importance attached to them over the years, there appears to be a need to shift to a more practical and cost benefit approach to achieving the specific aim of helping beginning academics and research managers to learn to write and publish their research.

Purpose of the Study

What was missing in the list of the five strategies they identified and analysed [including: "writing courses and workshops; writing groups; writing mentoring and coaching; PhD bootcamps; and writing retreats" [Castle & Keane (2016), pp. 79-88)], is the use of the published lecture model as a didactic and less expensive strategy for supporting and promoting the art and science of academic paper writing among emerging academics and research managers in universities in Africa and the wider world. The present article is an attempt to respond to this need.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework that grounds this proposed turn to the use of the published lecture presentation method in promoting academic paper writing is R. S. Peters' (1963) concept of *education as initiation*. Following R. S. Peters' perspective, what is argued in this article is that successful academic writing is a skill that can be transmitted and mastered through the academic process of initiation such as often takes place through the application of the lecture method. The feasibility of the lecture method in this regard follows from the fact that when carefully considered, it can be discovered that it is possible to understand the *art* and *science* of scholarly writing as entailing a describable and teachable process (as will be shown shortly) amenable to the principles of teaching and learning.

Research Questions

In recognition of the above, the following research questions have been formulated to guide the task involved in working out this article.

1. How would the lecture presentation strategy for promoting academic paper writing look like in practice in terms of structuration, theme presentation, and message?
2. What comparative advantages does the lecture presentation model have over the other strategies for promoting academic paper writing?

Method

In response to the first of the above two questions, the section that follows presents a paradigmatic structure, content, and message of a typical lecture presentation strategy aimed at promoting and supporting academic paper writing. Answers to the second of the two questions will be provided at the end of the template of the lecture presentation model that now follows.

Paradigmatic Illustration of the Use of the Lecture Presentation Strategy in Promoting Academic Paper Writing

The model lecture presentation strategy given below is drawn from a modified version of an earlier attempt by the present author to put his present formulation into action, under the platform of an invited Lecture for promoting academic paper writing organized for the members of the Hospital Staff at an Academic Teaching Hospital, in Pretoria, South Africa. The model is expected to lead to an improved understanding and advancement of the art and science of academic paper writing among emerging academics and research administrators within and outside Africa.

The model focuses on and highlights the meaning and scope of the different elements of academic writing and publication process, including the following themes: *the task of putting together a manuscript for publication, manuscript submission, the intricate demands of the peer-review process, editorial decision and responding to such a decision, copy editing and the open-access publication*.

These themes will be explored in a lecture presentation pattern one after the other in the section that follows.

Theme 1: Putting Together a Manuscript for Publication

Under this heading the first point to make is that the best way to start a discussion aimed at promoting academic paper writing, is to begin with the question about what happens when a well-written academic manuscript, empirical or theoretical, is dissected or looked at closely. When such a process or dissection takes place such a manuscript would be seen to consist of **SIX** major parts, namely:

(1) The title of the manuscript;

(2) The abstract or a rich and enticing summary of the paper;

(3) A solid, but brief well-argued introductory or contextual background to the article;

(4) A method's section to account for how the data or sources, whether empirical or literary, presented were collected; or in a theoretical article to indicate the procedure to be followed in working out the article.

(5), A section on findings, discussion and conclusion/Implications, and

(6) The References section.

Without or with only marginal information on any of these parts in one's manuscript, the paper will face severe criticism from either the Journal Editor or from the peer-reviewers of the manuscript (Pickett

& McDonnell, 2017). Of course, it is important to mention that in some academic papers, methods and findings sections may not appear in these very terms which largely obtains when writing a paper based on an empirical research. In theoretically based manuscripts rather, the six parts can be named as follows:

1. The Title,
2. The Abstract,
3. The Introduction,
4. The Middle section,
5. Implications/ Conclusion, and
6. The References

Similarly, it is crucial to highlight that in theoretically based academic manuscripts, the introduction section is the key section where the argument highlighting the gap to be filled, the objectives to be achieved, and what to be covered in the Middle section of the paper is made clear to the reader.

However, this variation notwithstanding, the bulk of this presentation is intended to take the reader through the six parts of a standard academic manuscript, and indicate what is expected of the author in working out each of these parts. In doing this, we start with the very first of them, namely title formulation.

1. Formulating an adequate Article Title

As pointed out by Roberts (2012) the first words committed to paper in writing an academic article is the *Title*. And it is to be noted that the first attempt at formulating this title is liable to be carefully re-examined and often reworded following each revision of the draft of the manuscript. In this way, the initial formulation is possible to be changed several times before the manuscript is completed. However, the key point to remember is that a manuscript's title is expected to describe the content of the said manuscript in the most specific and precise terms. This requires that the title of one's paper be devoid of excessive words but enough to adequately reflect the manuscript's contents; providing a clear signal of the manuscript's message.

Another crucial principle to remember in formulating one's paper title is that the shorter the title the better its effect as long as it is sufficiently appropriate to describe the content of the work. For this reason, Journal Editors usually ask manuscripts peer-reviewers to comment on the appropriateness of the title.

Additionally, some journals often ask authors to provide a shortened 'running title', with a specified maximum number of characters that is printed at the top of each published page of the article. An academic paper writer must therefore be ready and prepared to respond to this requirement.

2. Composing a good Abstract for the Article

Under this theme, one fundamental principle to note is that after the title, the next most frequently read portion of the manuscript is the Abstract, or the 'front-loaded' summary of the manuscript. Because such a summary is so important to the heart of a manuscript, it is suggested that authors should write this portion immediately after the title.

However, no matter at which stage it is written, what is important to remember is that when submitting a paper to a journal, it is crucially necessary that you have an Abstract for it. For, without an Abstract, your paper will in all likelihood be returned to you. This means that essentially speaking the Abstract is like an external window to your paper, the 'front desk officer' to the manuscript. This is because it presents the summary of the content and message of the paper, and the first opportunity the author has to promote him/herself and the research, and a way to underline one's skills as a scholar and create a favourable first impression in the mind of the Editor to which the manuscript is to be submitted.

The Abstract of a manuscript is indeed so crucial because the abstract of the article will be the most widely read part of your study when published. It is the basis for which many people will decide whether or not to do a full-text reading of the article. Unfortunately, it is often discovered that many beginning scholars write the abstract of their paper almost in haste and much like an afterthought; thereby putting insufficient effort into crafting this important summary of the work.

Yet Journal Editors understand the importance of an article's Abstract and so specifically request the reviewers' opinion on the quality of the manuscript's Abstract. In this regard it is important to bear in mind that a good Abstract is expected to *outline the scope of the study*, *summarize salient methods*, *report findings*, and *highlight the major contributions* of the article. In other words, an impressive article's Abstract provides information on the purpose of the paper, the problem it addresses, the methodology used to garner the data reported, and the result and the contributions it makes to the world of scholarship in one's study area.

Given that the Abstract is that much important, it is generally believed that the writing of an Abstract is often one of the most difficult and delicate parts of writing a research paper. This difficulty lies in the fact that the Abstract decides the first steps of evaluating the paper. As noted earlier, the Abstract is what everybody, including the Journal Editor and the Peer-Reviewers, reads first. For this reason, if your Abstract is haphazardly done you will face criticism and the reviewers might not bother to look at your paper with despatch, thus delaying the processing of it.

To avoid this problem, it is important that you do not write an Abstract as an afterthought. It is one of the fundamental elements of your manuscript. You should therefore spend enough time to bring the key points of your research or paper into it. But in doing this, you must aim to be precise and informative. This is because a provocative and informative Abstract helps to attract attention of the Editors and peer-reviewers to the manuscript. Hence, unless your Abstract is well written, your manuscript starts on a negative footing.

Now, along with the title and the abstract, comes the need for provision of appropriate **Keywords** to accompany the Abstract of your manuscript. Indeed, Keywords are an important component of the materials forming the first impression that potential readers will have of your article. The Keywords to be provided are designed to accurately reflect the content of the paper, and they need not be single words. You can use short, three to four-word phrases that are likely to be relevant in searching for your article in academic databases. However, what to avoid in choosing your Keywords, is picking of words that are already in the article's title, since these titular phrases will *ipso facto* be visible in database searches. Hence featuring them among the Keywords makes their inclusion redundant.

3. Crafting a solid Introduction or Contextual Background to the Article

Keeping in mind that one's primary reading audience (namely the Journal Editor and the Peer-Reviewers) will go immediately to reading the Introduction section of the article after perusing through its title and the abstract, underlines the need to craft an effective Introduction to one's manuscript. And it needs to be remembered that in reading your Introduction the Editors and the peer-reviewers do have a target, namely to find in it, some evidence to answer the following questions: (a) Does the article have a new knowledge or new idea to share? (b) Is this new knowledge of sufficient significance? (3) Is the new knowledge suitable for publication in this journal?

To ensure one's success in this regard, Weissberg & Buker (1990), and Cargill & O'Connor (2009), point out that a solid article background should contain general statements about the field of research to provide the reader with a setting or context for understanding the problem investigated and to claim its centrality or importance. In other words, the first stage of great article introductions is designed to locate one's project within an existing field of scientific research. For this reason, in working out their introductions, great academic paper writers usually begin with broad statements that would generally be accepted as fact by the members of their reading audience. And often the present tense is used for making such statements because one function of the present tense in English is expressing information perceived as always true. Sentences written in the present perfect tense are also common in the background introduction writing, expressing what has been found over an extended period in the past and up to the present. For Pickett & McDonnell (2017), these statements may or may not include references, depending on the field and the topic of the paper.

Those initial general statements are to be followed by more specific statements about the aspects of the problem already studied by other researchers, thereby laying a foundation of information already known and a sign of one's knowledge of the literature in which the problem under attention belongs. This means that this second stage in crafting one's article introduction is where authors seek to move their readers smoothly from the earlier broad, general statements towards one sub-area of the field, before zooming in to the author's own particular topic area. This is meant to prepare the way for the author(s) to provide statements that indicate the need for more investigation, through recognition of what is left undone by earlier researchers in responding to the problem of the study, thereby creating a gap or research niche for one's study to fill.

At this stage and the next in crafting one's article Introduction, authors use selected literature from their field to justify their study and construct a gap or niche for their own work. They write sentences supported by references to the literature they have selected. But here it must be remembered that the term literature refers to all the published research articles, review articles, and books in one's field. The term also includes information published on websites that have been peer-reviewed or belong to organizations with appropriate scientific reputations. References to other published studies, also known as citations or in-text citations, can be used in all stages of the Introduction writing. Such citations are particularly vital in demonstrating that one knows clearly the work that has been conducted by others in one's study area and therefore what has not been done and needs to be done: the gap that one's study or paper was designed to fill.

This function of establishing the existence of a knowledge gap in one's area of study is carried out in Stages 2 and 3 of the Introduction. And essentially, what the author is required to do in these advance stages of the Introduction is to construct an argument, an *argument of omission*, which justifies the need for one's own study and contribution and shows why and how it is important. This is then followed by statements giving the purpose/ objectives of the writer's study. This is another way of saying that before the end of the Introduction authors usually set up the readers' expectations of the rest of the paper: they tell them (the readers) what they (the readers) can expect to learn about the research or the article presented.

Here statement of the research question will be expedient as it might serve as the anchor around which the entire paper circles. It influences the methodology to be used, and the direction of the specific findings expected. In short, the research question(s) influences the structure of one's paper. Without a research question/hypothesis, many scholars would agree, one does not have a paper.

These indications mean that the introduction of one's paper must contain an argument based in logic. Lindsay (2018) asserts that this is often what is referred to as the 'Story' of the manuscript, or the 'Big Picture'. A random study of good academic manuscripts shows that the logical progression of the Introduction of one's empirical manuscript may sound something like this: (1) A better understanding of N is necessary for reasons O, P, and Q. (2) Recent research into N has shown some R progress in the field. (3) Yet, there is still an obvious deficiency in S, which shows that our understanding of N is currently still limited, as evidenced by T. (4). This argument is usually concluded by an indication that one's study or paper will attempt to resolve these issues (Lindsay, 2018). Most scholars suggest that if one cannot express one's empirical research or paper background in something similar to the above sort of four-to-five sentence argument fashion, one doesn't have a good hold on the logic of the paper or the study.

Where the manuscript is based not on an empirical research but on a theoretically inspired scholarship (See Nwoye, 2015), the nature of the argument will of course be adapted to specify the omission the author has detected in the literature that s/he wants to address. For always, the aim of the introduction is to strive to initiate the reader into the study's point of departure; the gap to be filled and what to expect in the rest of the paper.

4. Writing the Methods' Section

For an empirically based manuscript in particular, an important way to think about the goal of the Method's section is to see it as aimed at establishing credibility for the data garnered in the study. And this section is for many journals essential even when the article is not a product of an empirical research but rather a theoretically based scholarly manuscript. For this reason such a section is expected to provide enough information about how the work was done to enable the readers to evaluate the results; i.e., to decide for themselves, whether the findings presented was real or 'cooked'.

In this regard, peer-reviewers are likely to look into the methods section for evidence to answer the following questions: Do the methods and the treatment of findings conform to acceptable scientific standards? Are the findings related to the research questions investigated? Is there any coherence between them? Other ways of naming this section of the manuscript include 'Methods', 'Materials and Methods', and 'Experimental Procedures' depending on one's field of study and the nature of the study. But for the sake of simplicity it is referred to as Methods in this presentation.

Now, since the goal of the Methods section is to help readers to evaluate the findings presented in the Results section, and to provide enough information for those who would like to replicate the study, the author needs to make it clear how the two sections (methods and findings) relate to each other. Facilitating the opportunity for assessing this alignment is the basis why the Methods section is usually placed before the Results/Findings section of the manuscript.

5. Writing the Findings/ Results Section

As highlighted by Naylor & Munos-Viveros (2005) this section in an empirically based paper is designed to enable the author to response to such questions as the following: What do one's research outcomes indicate? Did one's research support existing and previously published findings? Were the results contrary to present thinking or did they shed new light on an old subject? In responding to such questions the aim is to ask oneself the conclusions that can be drawn from the findings emanating from one's research. To do this effectively one must present all necessary data in ways which make the most important points most prominent. Indeed, for an empirically based manuscript, data analysis and presentation process is also an exercise in deciding which datasets or details to leave out of the article. Whatever happens, if one decides to include figures or tables, they should be numbered and presented sequentially and referred to in that order in the text. Similarly, in writing sentences about their results, effective authors highlight the main points only. Also, published advice from editors and established researchers indicates that it is important that authors do not repeat in words all the results contained in the tables or figures. This means that authors should only write sentences or bottom table summaries, about the most important findings, especially the ones that will form part of the focus of the Discussion section.

In some journals, the results/findings are sometimes presented separately from the Discussion; while in others they are combined (due to space limitation) in a single Results and Discussion section. To determine what model to use, you need to check with the Instructions to Authors' section in the home page of the journal you are targeting to submit your manuscript to, to see which format they prefer. Or else you can examine a selection of articles from your target journal if the Instructions to Contributors section are not sufficiently explicit on that.

If the separate style is used, as in an academic thesis, it is generally important to confine any comments in the Results section to saying just what the numbers show, without comparing them with other research, or suggesting explanations. However, authors sometimes include comparisons with previous work in the Results section where the point being made relates to a component of the Results that will not be discussed in detail in the Discussion section.

Past tense (either active or passive voice) is used when the sentence focuses on the completed study; that is, on what was done and found. It is also important to mention that in a theoretically based scholarly article, even though display of empirical data is not expected yet it is the section where the author brings his/her own contributions to the field by expounding his/her own concepts and theories.

6. Crafting the Discussion and Conclusion

In both theoretically and empirically based manuscripts, the key point to note under this sub-theme is that your Discussion must be made to connect clearly with the issues you raised in your Introduction, especially your statement of purpose or objectives of the study as well as the research questions. To promote this connection, when the first draft of the Discussion is ready, you must go back to the Introduction to check for a close fit. If necessary, you can redraft the Introduction to make sure the issues of importance in the Discussion appear there too. However, it is not necessary to include in the Introduction all the literature that will be referred to in the Discussion. This is because it is important not to repeat information unnecessarily in the two sections.

For empirically based papers specifically, types of information commonly included in Discussion sections are given below:

- A restatement of the main purpose or hypothesis of the study.
- A restatement of the most important findings, in the order of their significance, including (i) whether they support the original hypothesis, or how they contribute to closing the main gap addressed in your study; or to answering the research questions, or to meeting the research objectives; and (ii) whether they agree with the findings of other researchers.
- Explanations for the findings, supported by references to relevant literature, and/or speculations about the findings, also supported by literature citation.
- Limitations of the study that restrict the extent to which the findings can be generalized beyond the study conditions.
- Implications of the study (generalizations from the results: what the reader can take home from the study) or what the results mean in the context of the broader field in which one is working.
- Recommendations for future research and/or practical applications (See Weissberg & Buker, 1990).

In theoretically based manuscripts the information to include in the discussion or middle part of the paper are usually already cut out in the introductory section of the study as earlier noted, and exploration of those themes highlighted to be addressed will form the content of the discussion section of the paper (See Nwoye, 2015a, b). Additionally, in working out these middle sections of the manuscript (empirical or otherwise), the prime directive for writers according to Picket & McDonnell (2017) is to remember that the most important idea in academic or scientific writing is to respect the audience, which fundamentally includes the Editor and the peer-reviewers of the journal where the paper is targeted for submission.

In this regard, as pointed out by Picket & McDonnell (2017) to respect your audience you are expected to write in such a way that you:

Do not make them (your audience) work to figure out what you are trying to say, or what the structure of your story is. You should do as much work for them as you can, to be sure that your message comes across clearly. After all, readers of scientific papers … are busy people. This is especially true of journal reviewers and editors. They have many things competing for their attention. There are other papers to read and write, there are lectures to prepare, there are colleagues to meet, and there are proposals to evaluate. If your article ... is hard to follow, or just makes them work harder than they should to sort out possible meanings, connections or flow, they may turn their attention to other tasks, rate your work poorly or quickly reject it if it is being considered for publication.

The above injunction is important in that regardless of the originality and significance of your article's message, if after just a quick read it seems poorly written, hard to follow and contains obvious errors in grammar, syntax and spelling, which reduces the impact of your message, it will be desk rejected. On the other hand, if you follow Pickett & McDonnell's (2017) advice above and write cogently and powerfully with no errors, your article will make a good first impression and will, ultimately, be sent out for peer review.

7. The List of References

Although it is rarely emphasized but it is obvious that a manuscript cannot be submitted without a list of References in which the author recognizes the presence of previous investigators or researchers in his or her area of research. Failure to do so will make the manuscript incomplete and needs to be added to before the manuscript could be deemed ready for submission to the target journal for review about wither it is s publishable.

Many Journal editors are interested in making sure that the works published in their journals are not products of plagiarism. And many journal editors now have devices for ensuring that the manuscripts sent to them are not products of plagiarisms. And the list of References section is the part of the journal where authors declare the sources of some of the ideas presented in the manuscript. Psychology and Education journals often adopt the APA referencing style as their guide to authors of how to enter the full references of their sources.

Now, one important requirement in relation to citation and references in academic paper writing is to make sure that all the works cited in the body of the text (the in-text references), are entered into the list of the References at the end of the article and that all sources entered into the Reference list are first of all cited in the body of the text. A limitation on this requirement is part of what the reviewers will be keen to detect and point out for correction.

Theme 2: Manuscript Submission

Producing a well-crafted manuscript is no doubt a key step but yet not the only thing that is required for getting a paper fully out in print. After the manuscript has been prepared in a proper manner as suggested above, then comes the important transition stage in which the paper needs to leave the writer's desk to the Editor's desk of the journal targeted for its publication. In this regard, an important milestone in the whole process is getting the manuscript successfully electronically submitted to the journal for review and decision regarding its publishability.

Of course, it is to be presumed that at this stage in the whole process, one has already shopped around and found a preferred journal destination for the manuscript. Getting to decide on a preferred journal destination for the manuscript means that the author has already acquainted himself or herself with the Journal's Guide to Authors to determine what the journal requires (e.g., in terms of article length; some journals allow between 5000 to 8000 words, while other may a maximum of about 10000 words in this regard) for a manuscript to be deemed in conformity with the scope and requirements for submission in the said journal. In other words, to facilitate the positive reception and assessment of the submitted manuscript, it is imperative that the author has crosschecked, understood and completely followed the guidelines the Journal has mapped out to guide authors who target to publish their manuscript in the said Journal. Failing to do so will usually result in a desk rejection. Desk rejection here means that the editors quickly reject the paper, usually within a week of receiving it, without requiring further peer review.

Preparing the Cover Letter

Where, however, the Journal's Guidelines to Authors have been fully adhered to in the manuscript prepared, the next thing that the author needs to do, in preparing to send the manuscript electronically to the Journal Editor, is to prepare the *cover letter* designed to introduce the manuscript to the Editor. This letter is addressed to the Editor of the targeted Journal, and the email address of the Editor concerned is usually specified in the Authors' Guidelines or Information to Authors' section in the Journal's Home page. This cover letter is not generally seen by the reviewers, but just by the Journal Editor (Lindsay, 2018).

Essentially, it is important that this letter be brief and clearly identifies the goals of the research reported in the manuscript, as well as the major findings and their significance to the academic field. Corroborating the above observation, Pickett & McDonnell (2017) propose that a cover letter should be carefully written to quickly convey one's story so that editors can rapidly evaluate how well it fits into the scope of the journal. They (Pickett & McDonnell, 2017) also recommend that it is advisable to explicitly state one's target audience especially if it is a multi-disciplinary or international journal.

In offering a justification for the manuscript's publication in the cover letter, it is considered a good practice to list up to three of the important expected contributions of the article in question. The editor also needs to be made clear (in the same cover letter) why you, the author, have submitted your paper to their journal and why they should publish it. This means that a cover letter in manuscript submission is not just a letter sent to the Editor aimed at simply introducing the manuscript; it must contain an argument made to convince the editor of the relevance and significance of the manuscript in question.

Rules on authorship/co-authorship

Now, where there is more than one author of the manuscript, you must determine author order ahead of time and make sure that all co-authors are in agreement. This can be a surprisingly contentious issue and so it is important that it is discussed with your advisor/supervisor and any other potential co-authors early in the publishing process. Each discipline has its own standards for co-authorship; however, generally co-authors need to contribute to the work in a meaningful way. This may include contributions to the project's conceptualization, initial design and set-up of the study, acquisition of research funding, data collection, data analysis, and the writing and/or editing of major sections of the draft manuscript (Dusick, 2011; Weissberg & Buker, 1990; Lindsay, 2018).

Author order is considered important in that it is usually indicative of the degree to which each author has contributed to the final article. Generally, in academic article publishing, the corresponding author is the person responsible for submitting the paper to the targeted Journal Editor, and for drafting the response to the reviewers' comments when the reviews are completed. The corresponding author should also communicate with all the co-authors when revising the manuscript and preparing the response to reviewers' suggestions for corrections. This corresponding author is usually the first author in the list of authors of the manuscript, but is not always, particularly when the first author is a graduate student, as usually happens when the manuscript is a product of a thesis. It is also important that the corresponding author have an institutional email address; as a Gmail or Yahoo email account is often looked at as very unprofessional if provided as the corresponding author's contact; but in some cases, some journal editors do not mind whether the email account is an institutional or a Gmail or Yahoo email account (Dusick, 2011; Weissberg & Buker, 1990; Lindsay, 2018).

Currently, the process of submitting a manuscript to a journal usually involves an online author's portal for most major academic publishers. To facilitate this, the corresponding author will be required to set-up an account with the Journal Editor. In this regard, the one in question must be sure to remember or save one's account information because one will need that information some time later when working on the revisions after the manuscript has come back from peer review (Cargill & O'Connor, 2009; Dusick, 2011; Weissberg & Buker, 1990; Lindsay, 2018)..

In some cases, the corresponding author may be required to suggest up to at least three people that may serve as potential reviewers of the manuscript. This is often a challenging task to fulfil. In confronting such a task, however, one may start by identifying active authors within the reference list of the prepared manuscript; but in doing this one must be sure to discuss this short-list with all co-authors beforehand. Ultimately, the Editor may or may not solicit peer reviews from that list. For most academic journals, peer review is not only anonymous but often *double-blind*; which means that the author will not know who the selected reviewers are nor would the reviewers know who the authors are (Cargill & O'Connor, 2009; Dusick, 2011; Weissberg & Buker, 1990; Lindsay, 2018).

Rule against multiple submission of manuscript

Now it is important to emphasize that one cannot submit a manuscript for review to more than one journal at a time. However, where one's manuscript has been rejected for publication by the editor of a journal, one is free to submit the manuscript for review to another journal. Also, if one decides after submitting a manuscript for peer review that one would rather prefer to publish it elsewhere; then one must formally withdraw that manuscript from the initial journal before submitting it to the second journal (Cargill & O'Connor, 2009; Dusick, 2011; Weissberg & Buker, 1990; Lindsay, 2018).

Sometimes an author, for various reasons, may decide to seek publication elsewhere after receiving the reviews that requires major revision and resubmission of the manuscript. In such cases, the author must inform the editor of his or her intent to withdraw the paper rather than revising the paper for resubmission. Usually the editor will provide the author with a deadline for resubmission of a revised manuscript along with the reviews. After this deadline and the editor hear nothing from the author, the paper would automatically be deemed to have been withdrawn from consideration (Cargill & O'Connor, 2009; Dusick, 2011; Weissberg & Buker, 1990; Lindsay, 2018).

Theme 3: The Peer-Review Process

Manuscript submission is only the beginning of the process of getting one's article published. After the paper has been submitted, the Editor will attempt to identify about 2 or 3 reviewers for the work. In this regard, beginning authors need to know that this stage may take several weeks to complete depending on the size of one's research field, the willingness of reviewers, and the time of year.

Where the Editor is unable to identify a satisfactory number of willing reviewers, one's manuscript will likely be rejected at this stage. However, assuming that the Editor is able to find willing reviewers, the reviewers will each be given a specific deadline (often 4-6 weeks) to provide their detailed review. Reviewers will commonly ask for, and be granted, extensions beyond this initially proposed review period. And the review process can be quite slow which means that a beginning author needs to exercise some considerable patience in the waiting process that this entails.

Like mentioned earlier it is necessary to remember that journal Editors and reviewers are very busy people. In particular, Editors of Journals have the undesirable task of ensuring that reviews are completed within a reasonable period. Here while beginning authors may be anxious and want this process to be speeded up, the speed with which one's submission could progress through the publishing process is largely less of a priority for editors and reviewers, particularly if they are managing a large number of submissions simultaneously.

Receiving an editorial decision and a request for manuscript revision

However, after all of the reviews or an acceptable number of reviews have been received, the Editor, within a period of one or two weeks, will compile the information and submit a decision letter to the corresponding author. In all instances, the corresponding author will be given a deadline to submit a revised manuscript after s/he has received the reviewers' feedback. The editor will also communicate a deadline for the return of a revised manuscript within the decision letter. Once the revised manuscript is resubmitted, the editor may send the revised work back to the initial reviewers, depending on the severity of modifications requested in the initial review. This means that often articles go through two or more rounds of reviews before the final acceptance letter for publication can be issued. These days, many publishers allow authors to view or monitor the progress of the submission as it moves through each stage of the reviews and revisions through an online process (Cargill & O'Connor, 2009; Dusick, 2011; Weissberg & Buker, 1990; Lindsay, 2018).

In addition to being asked to revise the manuscript, the author is also often asked to prepare a response to each of the reviewers' comments. The author must respond to each reviewer's comments directly. In doing this s/he is expected to state whether one agrees or disagrees with the reviewer's comment. If one agreed with a comment and it resulted in a modification to the revised manuscript, one must highlight where in the manuscript a changed was effected. Consequently, most Journals often require a 'track-changes' version of the revised manuscript so that the Editor can easily identify where modifications have been made.

Given below is an example of a typical response of a corresponding author to a reviewer's comment:

The authors agree with Reviewer 2 that the description of the ….. in the original manuscript was unclear. As a result, a paragraph was added to the revised manuscript (see lines 230 - 236) to further clarify the….method and the deployment strategy used in the study. (Lindsay 2018).

Here, it is crucial to mention that an author does not need to agree with all of the reviewers' comments. Such disagreement is healthy as long as one is able to provide a detailed justification in the author's response for why one disagrees with the reviewer on the matter and why no modification of the revised manuscript was warranted.

Of course one must bear in mind that should one disagree with a reviewer's comment and fail to provide the reviewer/editor with a sufficient and justifiable rationale for one's position, the reviewer may insist that the author(s) readdress the issue in a subsequent round of reviews. Where the matter is viewed by the editor as a critical aspect of the study, this may lead to eventual rejection of the manuscript. Thus one cannot disagree with a reviewer's comment simply because one does not feel like making a particularly challenging revision to the work that was called for.

Yet, preparing the author's response to the reviewers' comments is often one of the most frustrating hurdles in the publication process. In that case, it may not be anyone's favourite aspect of publishing but at the same time it is one of the most important. Some open-access journals, which might decide to accept such a controversial manuscript is in the habit of publishing the reviewer's comments and the author's responses alongside the article itself.

Furthermore, in many instances, the result of a round of reviews, and the Editor's decision on the publication of the manuscript, will be summarized as one of several possible categories:

1. *Accept without change*. Usually the end point after one or more round of revisions and is very rarely the outcome after the initial submission.

2. *Minor revisions*. This decision category is indicative that the revisions required are minor such as the need for some clarification in the paper. In some cases, with this kind of decision category, the editor is able to make the decision on the eventual acceptance of the revised manuscript for publication without the need for an additional round of reviews.

3. *Moderate revisions*. This is a mid-way category between major and minor revisions. It usually implies the need to send the revised manuscript back to the reviewers for an additional round of reviews.

4. *Major revisions*. This kind of decision category suggests that some sections of the manuscript need rewriting and possibly even the need for re-analysis or inclusion of additional literature. With this kind of editorial decision category, the editor may invite additional reviewers for the subsequent round of reviews.

5. *Reject*. With rejection decision category, the paper is considered inadequate for publication in the said Journal and no further opportunity for revisions are solicited from the author (Cargill & O'Connor, 2009; Dusick, 2011; Weissberg & Buker, 1990; Lindsay, 2018).

It must be mentioned that, at times, the rejection of a manuscript does not mean that the article has no merit in itself. It is frequently a sign that the journal one submitted the manuscript to was not a good fit for the research or the article. In that case, one should use the reviewers' comments to improve on the quality of the manuscript and then either re-submit the improved work to the same Journal as a new submission or submit it to a more appropriate Journal.

On the whole, after one's article has been accepted for publication by the Editor, one will thereafter be contacted by the Journal's Copy Editor regarding the submission of the final documents, including figures. The requirements for the final submission of one's manuscript and figures may be different from those outlined in the author's guide for the initial submission. Apart from this, at this stage what is crucial is that the manuscript is clean of all typographical errors or omission or misplacement of references and that the resolution of figures is appropriate at this stage because it will be difficult to make any further changes in the manuscript thereafter.

Receiving proofs pages and responding to Editor's queries

At some point after this final submission, the corresponding author will likely be forwarded a preprint version (referred to as 'proofs'), formatted to the Journal's style, in readiness for publication, along with a list of queries that the copy editor made during preparation of the article. These usually include minor points of clarification, often with the reference list (e.g., what the volume number or page range of an article is). This is the last opportunity for the author(s) to make changes to the article before publication. However, substantial modifications are usually not entertained at this stage and would result in long delays in publication. The corresponding author is normally also given a relatively short deadline (usually 48 hours) to provide the final responses to the editor's queries.

Of course, it is important to note that critiques of one's article will not necessarily end when the peer-review process is over. Often, even after the article has been published, readers may raise with the work by submitting a critical review of the article to the Journal for publication. When this happens, the Journal's Editor will generally contact the original author to provide an opportunity for rebuttal. Your rebuttal will then be published alongside the critique. In some disciplines this is a very common practice.

Theme 4: The Open-Access Journal Publication

Finally, it is to be presumed that many potential readers of this lecture must have been hearing of the Open-Access Journal. For this reason it appears necessary to say something briefly about it here. In this regard, the point to make is that the Open-access Journal can be a good option for publishing one's research. Indeed, today's academic publishing landscape includes numerous open-access journals that are distinguished by the fact that anyone is able to read the published articles without incurring an access fee. This is in contrast to most of the Journals that are run by the major commercial academic publishers that have expensive subscription fees which naturally restrict readership to members of universities and colleges with the financial resources needed to maintain access. Consequently, publishing one's research in an open-access journal can increase the size of the audience, and therefore the potential impact of one's work (Cargill & O'Connor, 2009; Dusick, 2011; Weissberg & Buker, 1990; Lindsay, 2018).

Again, on the positive side, many research grant agencies often insist that funded researchers publish the outputs of their research such as their theses, in open-access venues.

Yet, a sense of caution is still needed in this respect. This is because there are currently many *predatory open-access journals* that have been set-up to extract large administrative/publication fees from authors (majority of their victims coming from developing countries), offer shortened but often doubtful peer-review of articles, and can have surprisingly small readerships despite their claimed open-access status. Fortunately, updated lists of such predatory journals and conference meetings are maintained on the Internet and should be consulted by wary intending authors before submitting their manuscripts so that they do not fall into the hands of such dubious open access journals that promise so much but deliver so little including embarrassment to unsuspecting young authors (Cargill & O'Connor, 2009; Dusick, 2011; Weissberg & Buker, 1990; Lindsay, 2018).

But it needs to be emphasized that not all open-access journals are considered predatory. Many scholarly organizations these days operate excellent and respected open-access journals. These need to be identified and resorted to instead. However, generally, most open-access journals charge an administrative fee, and so the matter of charging an administrative fee cannot be used as a sole indicator of whether or not a journal is predatory, although the size of this fee is usually an important sign. In fact, most traditional journals managed by commercial academic publishers currently offer open-access publishing options that are also associated with a one-time publication charge incurred by the author (Cargill & O'Connor, 2009; Dusick, 2011; Weissberg & Buker, 1990; Lindsay, 2018).

Theme 5: Implications and Significance

With the above sample of the lecture presentation strategy for promoting academic paper writing now in place, a critical question will then arise. How does such a model correlate with the conceptual framework of the study, namely, the theory of education as initiation propounded by R. S. Peters (1963). In response, it can be mentioned that the connection is reflected in the fact that following that perspective, it has become quite easy to see how the lecture presentation approach could serve as an important orientation strategy in support of the emerging academic as through its themes and contents, such a lecture method has the power of illuminating, and therefore, initiating the said young academic into the waters of academic paper writing and publishing, investing them with the practical principles and methods of thriving well in that process. After going through such a lecture presentation strategy, particularly after it has attained the status of a published text within the pages of an academic journal, it is expected that the beneficiary academic or research manager would be able to discover the pathways to follow in assisting him or her to learn and master the principal ingredients of the art and science of successful academic writing and publishing.

The relevance of such a new model for promoting successful academic writing and publishing is also in line with the vision of Castle and Keane (2016) in their article encouraging "academic staff developers and research managers to initiate and support strategies to help academics write more and better, and to take pleasure in writing" (p. 1).

Discussion

The Comparative Advantage of the Lecture Presentation Model

Of course it could be argued that each of the other available strategies for promoting academic paper writing also draw from the framework of education as initiation by R. S. Peters' (1963) in their own respective ways. White that cannot be disputed, when studied closely one discovers that a number of significant advantages which the published lecture presentation strategy has over other strategies for promoting academic paper writing easily stand out. The first is that it is much more cost effective a strategy when compared to the other models such as the *writing workshop*, *writing groups*, or *writing retreat approach* Castle and Keane (2016). For instance, with the published lecture model, there is no hotel fee to worry about in terms of venue for the workshop or the writing group or retreat. And unlike other strategies that impose limitation on population of their beneficiaries, the published lecture method is not boundary or member restricting in terms of location or number of beneficiaries to benefit from it. It is globalectical in its reach and coverage. Once written, presented and published in a well-established academic journal, like the International Journal of Social Sciences, Research and Review, the text of the lecture becomes global in its reach. In that way, both emerging and established academics and research managers can have access to it, as long as they have access to the journal in which the lecture text, like the present one, is published.

Similarly, unlike the writing workshop or writing retreat strategy the published lecture approach is not time constraining or time-bound in terms of when people could have access to it. People can have access to it at any time of the day and any day of the week and even after the author of the said published lecture has died. The potential reach of the published lecture presentation model thus becomes immortal once it is published in a good journal that never dies but remains in publication for years and years.

Finally, although it is possible that some critiques may tend to equate reading of the published lecture with that of reading a magazine article or blog post but this is if such critiques have failed to realise and give credit to the background statement and problem formulation on which it is grounded, the research questions posed, and the critical reflections that come after the lecture presentation; all of which are principal markers of procedures of a scholarly discourse publishable in a journal. Furthermore, magazine articles or blog posts are often author published unenriched by the critical judgments of a journal peer-review process which a lecture presentation model published in a journal, enjoys.

Indeed, what is argued in this article and the basis for its being is that given the critical importance that is attached to successful academic paper writing and publishing in the career lives of academics and research managers and their respective institutions, leaving the task of helping such emerging academics and research managers to learn to write better and publish more at the hands of people who use the blog posts to guide them is an error that is no longer acceptable. And the present article is an important step aimed at showing how the persistence of that error could be combatted.

Conclusion

In sum then, one of the distinguishing contributions of the proposed lecture presentation approach for promoting successful academic paper writing among emerging scholars and research administrators is that when published. the text of the lecture becomes ageless and easily accessible, and can travel from place to place to the young (and even the old) academics and research managers all over the world who would then be in a position at their own convenient time and pleasure to read and ponder through it and be able to draw inspiration and guidance from it in putting into practice the principles and methods of the art and science of academic paper writing it presents.

References

Badenhorst, C. M., S. Penny, S. Pickett, R. Joy, J. Hesson, G. Young, H. McLeod, D. Vaandering and X. Li. (2013). Writing relationships: Collaboration in a faculty writing group. *All Ireland Society for Higher Education – Journal 5*(1), 1001–1026.

Benvenuti, S., J. Castle and M. Keane. (2013). 'Writing retreats in response to the "incessant demands" of the university.' 4th World Conference on Learning, Teaching and Educational Leadership. October 27–29, 2013. Barcelona, Spain. www.sciencedirect.com

Boice, R. and F. Jones. (1984). Why academicians don't write. *The Journal of Higher Education 55*(5), 567–582.

Cargill, M. & O' Connnor, P. (2009). *Writing scientific research articles: strategy and steps*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Castle, J. & Keane, M. (2016). Five writing development strategies to help academics flourish as writers. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. *30*(6), 73-93.

Dickson-Swift, V., E. L. James, S. Kippen, L. Talbot, G. Verrinder and B. Ward. (2009). A non-residential alternative to off-campus writers' retreats for academics. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *33*(3), 229–239.

Dusick, D. M. (2011). The art & science of scientific writing. Presented at the Institute of Behavioural & Applied Management Conference, Orlando, Florida.

Elbow, P. 1981. Writing with power: Techniques for mastering the writing process. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haberer, A. (2007). Intertextuality in theory and practice. *Literatura*, *49*(5), 54-67.

Lindsay, J. B. (2018). A practical guide to academic writing & publishing. *Technical Report*. February (Revision 9).

MacLeod, I., L. Steckley and R. Murray. (2012). Time is not enough: Promoting strategic engagement with writing for publication. *Studies in Higher Education, 37*(6): 641– 654.

McGrail, M. R., C. M. Rickard and R. Jones. (2006). Publish or perish: A systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates. *Higher Education Research and Development, 25(1*), 19–35.

Merriam, S. B. ((2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: John Wiley and sons.

Moore, S., M. Murphy and R. Murray. (2010). Increasing academic output and supporting equality of career opportunity in universities: Can writers' retreats play a role? *The Journal of Faculty Development, 24*(3): 21–30.

Murray, R. (2012). 'It's not a hobby': Reconceptualising the place of writing in academic work. *Higher Education*, *66*, 79–91.

Murray, R. (2013). *Writing for academic journals*. 2nd Edition. Maidenhead and New York: Open University Press.

Murray, R. and S. Moore. (2006). *The handbook of research writing: A fresh approach*. New York: McGraw Hill and Open University Press.

Naylor, W. P. & Munoz-Viveros, C. A. (2005). The art of scientific writing: How to get your research published. *Journal of Contemporary Dental Practice*, *6*(2), 164-180.

Peters, R. S. (1963). Education as initiation. *Inaugural lecture delivered at the Institute of Education*, University of London, 9 December.

Pickett, S. T. & McDonnell, M. J. (2017). The art and science of writing a publishable article. *Journal of urban sociology, 1-6*. D0I: 10.1093/jue/jux018

Roberts, W. C. (2012). How I prepare a manuscript for publication in a medical journal. *MDCVJ, VIII, 4*, 53-54.

Singh, R. J. 2012. Promoting writing for research: The 'writing retreat' model. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *26*, (1), 66–76.

Thomson, P. and B. Kamler. (2013). *Writing for peer reviewed journals: Strategies for getting published.* London and New York: Routledge.

Wadee, A. A., M. Keane, T. Dietz and D. Hay. (2010). *Effective PhD supervision mentoring and Coaching*. 2nd Edition. South Africa-Netherlands research Programme on Alternatives in Development SANPAD. Amsterdam: Rosenberg Publishers.

Weaver, D., D. Robbi and A. Radloff. (2013). Demystifying the publication process – a structured writing program to facilitate dissemination of teaching and learning scholarship. *International Journal for Academic Development*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/ 1360144X.2013.805692 (accessed 25 June 2013).

Weissberg, R. & Buker, S. (1990). *Writing up research*. Prentice-Hall Regents.

Copyrights