



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

****Please note: This is a rough transcription of this audio podcast. This transcript is not edited for spelling, grammar, or punctuation.****

Participants:

Shari Miles-Cohen

Karrin Vasby Anderson

[Audio Length: 0:43:18]

RECORDING BEGINS

Introduction:

This is *Communication Matters, The NCA Podcast*.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

Hello, I'm Dr. Shari Miles-Cohen, Executive Director of the National Communication Association. And I'm your host on *Communication Matters, the NCA Podcast*. Thank you for joining us for today's episode.

It's often said that the "publish or perish" model rules career progression in academia. If you're a grad student or early career faculty member looking to publish your first article in an academic journal, or even if you're a seasoned author looking for additional publishing tips, today's episode of *Communication Matters* is for you. Communication Professor Karrin Vasby Anderson joins the podcast today to answer common questions related to successfully preparing and submitting manuscripts. Our conversation will touch on how to write and edit your manuscript to meet the highest standards, how to choose an appropriate journal for your work, and how to handle feedback during the peer review process.

First, a bit about Dr. Anderson. Karrin Vasby Anderson is a Professor of Communication Studies at Colorado State University. Anderson studies the culture of politics and the politics of culture, focusing specifically on how women's political identities—as candidates, office holders, political spouses, and voters—are rhetorically constructed and contested in popular media. She is the outgoing editor of NCA's *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. Anderson spearheaded a 2020 special issue of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* that focused on the 100th anniversary of the 19th Amendment. She has served on numerous editorial boards, and has served as a reviewer for many notable communication journals, including NCA's *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*. Hi, Kari, and welcome to *Communication Matters*.

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Thanks for having me. I'm so pleased to be here.



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

Shari Miles-Cohen:

So let's start with the submission process. Now it may seem odd to start with submissions, but I think listeners will get a feel for why we started with submissions as we work through some of your tips and suggestions. Let's say I have a conference paper that I presented at the NCA Annual Convention, and I'm ready to revise it for submitting to a journal. How do I select a journal? Do you recommend that potential authors research the journal, the journal editor, or both? And why?

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

That's a great question. So first, if you're a graduate student or a very early career scholar, I think it's a good idea to run the paper by your advisor or a writing mentor in between the sort of presentation at conference to submission to a journal because the jump between those two levels is pretty high. So it's good to have somebody look at it with an eye to is this ready to be submitted to a journal. After that, when your paper you think has kind of reached the bar, then it's important to research the editor, not just the journal. So you do want to research the journal. Reading the journals that you're submitting to seems like kind of an obvious tip, but a lot of people don't do that, particularly if you're submitting to a journal that's maybe interdisciplinary or outside your main discipline. So read recent issues of the journal that you want to submit to. But then also, research the editor. And I wouldn't discount the journal as a possible submission outlet based on what previous editors of the journal have accepted or rejected. Editorial philosophies can be quite different. When I was taking over the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, there'd been a lot of research and discussion of how the QJS had not published nearly enough research related to people of color, international research, and such like that. So one of my primary objectives was to get more of that research into the journal. So if somebody was hesitant to submit it, saying well, they haven't published enough of that in the past, that doesn't mean that I wasn't super eager to publish it contemporarily. So do research kind of the editors call for papers and see what their priorities are.

Another tip that I have with respect to researching the journal is be mindful of where the editor is in their tenure and how that might impact your chances. When editors just take over editing a journal, they have a bit more leeway in sort of helping an author get through multiple revisions. So maybe they can accept something early in their tenure, knowing that hey, well, with the reviewers' help and a few revision cycles, we can probably get this to where it needs to be for this journal. If they're at the end of their editorial tenure, they might not have that flexibility. So how much time an editor has left or how full they are in their queue can impact your chances as well. The one thing I recommend not doing though as you're researching the journal and deciding if your essay fits, I don't recommend emailing the editor before you officially submit to tell them about your essay and ask them if it's a good fit. Editors don't really have the time or the resources to pre-review your essay in advance of an official submission, and honestly, you should do enough research on your own and reading of the journal to answer the basic question about fit. You shouldn't have to ask an editor to do that.



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

Shari Miles-Cohen:

Kari, thank you so much. It's so helpful to hear both the do's and the don'ts when you're getting feedback on how to move forward with publishing. And I know that some journal editors, their first sort of introductory article in the journal is important to review, but you're also saying to look at the call for proposals or the call for papers for each sort of special issue or each issue of the journal also.

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Absolutely. Yeah, yeah. So whenever a new editor takes over, they typically, as you know, produce like a call for manuscripts, and that will include—all the NCA journals have official aims and scope that do not change with individual editors. But beyond that aim and scope, individual editors really can set an agenda for their journal, and different editors have different agendas. So yeah, those are very important. And if you're responding to a call for a special issue, sometimes the special issue will be edited by the editor of the journal as when I edited the piece on the 100th anniversary of the 19th Amendment. But oftentimes, the editor will bring in a guest editor to edit a special issue. So in that case, you would want to pay close attention to the guest editor's call and research them as well.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

And my next question really gets us started with the writing and the editing of the manuscript. For graduate students or early career scholars, it can be tempting to play up an essay's unique contribution to theory and research. So how do you recommend that scholars articulate their essay's contributions? What should an author avoid when describing the impact of their research?

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Yeah. These are great questions. So you need to be able to articulate the unique contributions of your essay in one to three succinct sentences. Generally, projects can contribute to new theory, they can expand our understanding of a subject based on original archival research, and/or they can demonstrate a methodological innovation. So your first task is to decide which of those your essay makes a contribution in which ways, and then get it down to those one to three very succinct sentences. Now it's tempting for early career scholars or graduate students to say that they're doing something totally new that's never been done before in the field. I encourage people to resist making that claim, particularly in a field like communication studies that is diverse and that does make use of a lot of interdisciplinary research. It would be unusual for a scholar to stumble on something entirely new that nobody's talked about before, and you don't have to prove that to get your research published. All you really need to do is show that you've made a meaningful contribution to an ongoing conversation. So you can do that quite modestly and humbly. Oftentimes, and I've seen on more than one occasion where somebody has submitted an essay and said, nobody's ever looked at this set of texts this way or done this this experiment, and



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

oftentimes, the reviewers will respond, well, is there a reason? Maybe it doesn't need to be done. Maybe it's not of interest or interesting. So just simply saying this has never been done isn't a great way to justify your article.

Instead, you want to justify why you believe the research needs to be done, in what ways it does move a conversation forward. And so I would, as you're thinking about articulating your contribution to the literature, think about it in those terms. Another suggestion is as you're talking about your contribution, in your literature review, connect your argument to an ongoing conversation in the journal. And if you can't find one, that probably means you're submitting to the wrong journal. All right? So as you're doing that journal research that we talked about earlier in our discussion, really pinpoint particular conversations that you can weave your research into in that journal. As you are evaluating the literature and connecting yourself to a conversation, there's sometimes a tendency for scholars to adopt a slash and burn attitude when they're talking about other scholarship, sort of saying, well, this was terrible and that was awful, and I'm going to do this right. I think that's a bad idea generally for a couple of reasons. One is just that the people who you're citing are probably senior and experienced in the field, and they're actually also probably friends with the reviewer. They might be your reviewer. So really saying that they don't know anything about how to do their research is probably just diplomatically not a good call. But also, I think that's kind of an outmoded approach to research, like we have to prove everybody wrong in order to be right or in order to be important. In our field of communication studies, I think it's much more about hey, we've got these really complicated problems and we're all working together to try to solve them, and we can do that by building on one another. And certainly sometimes we diverge and come up with a new approach, but we don't have to tear down everything that's come before to make ours look more important.

Now having said that, that does not mean that you have to defer to norms that are racist, sexist, ableist, homophobic, transphobic, and the like. There are moments in our field where we absolutely stop and say, you know what? There are some practices we are not going to prop up anymore. We're going to do this differently than we've done in the past. And if you're marking a moment like that or if you're calling out a practice that is racist, sexist, ableist, homophobic, all of that, xenophobic, it is perfectly fine to make that clear. So you don't want to defer to norms when the norms themselves are abusive or problematic. All of that said, then the last thing that I'll say on this question is as you're envisioning who might be reading your essay as a reviewer, know that editors often look at your endnotes in order to find reviewers. Right? So the first place we go is our own editorial board. So you can look at our published editorial board and get a sense for who might be assigned your essay. But the people on our editorial board often have manuscripts that they're looking at, and a new one will come in and will have to go off board, particularly if it's an area in which the editor themselves is not an expert. So their own professional network, they might not have a lot of people who are very expert in what your essay is. The first place that editor



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

is likely to look for reviewers is your endnotes. So that's another reason why you want to be diplomatic with the treatment of the work that you cite.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

So your last comment was on endnotes. I want to go to the thesis statement which is sort of at the beginning. So what tips and suggestions do you have for authors looking to refine their thesis statements?

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

So I do critical or humanistic work in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. And so the suggestion that I have really for anybody is avoid what I call the process thesis. This is super common. A process thesis tells the reader here's the process I went about in doing my essay. So an example of a process thesis would be, "In this essay, I assess how Hillary Clinton was framed during her presidential bid using framing analysis." Okay. That tells me what process you went through in your research, but it doesn't tell me what your argument is. All right? In critical humanistic scholarship, we are really interested in tell us what your argument is. What is the new contribution you make to this conversation? So an example then if I was rewriting that process thesis, I would say, "In this essay, I argue that Hillary Clinton was constrained by the female presidentiality paradox." Okay. That's what I'm contributing to this conversation. That's my theoretical innovation. Make that front and center. So we then in rhetoric, communication studies, we use a lot of first-person active voice when we're putting together our thesis. There might be occasionally social science journals that want you to do third person or that don't use the sort of "I" language. And so that's, again, where you'll have to read the journal and see what the norms are. But in general, you want it to be clear, concise, active voice, and really foreground what your argument or contribution is.

One other thing that I will say with respect to active voice is that when I say have a simple declarative sentence, a lot of times academics introduce a verbal hedge into their thesis statements or scholarly claims in an article. So for example, they might say, "This essay seeks to argue," right? Adding that little "seeks to." And I think it's because earlier I said you want to be modest with your contributions. I think that we're sort of taught to try to make claims that we can easily defend. But what I would say is by the time your research is getting published in an NCA journal, you need to be sure about your contribution. So rather than saying, "This essay seeks to argue," I would say, "In this essay, I contend." All right? And just that. It's a very small—

Shari Miles-Cohen:

It's a big difference.



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Yeah. It's a small verbal change, but it makes a big difference in your essay for sure.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

Absolutely. Can you also discuss how an author can use an a journal style manual?

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Yes. So some journals accept more than one style manual. They might say either prepared according to APA or MLA. Other journals say you must use Chicago Style, for example. So they will all have a style manual. In addition, in the instructions for authors for individual journals, there might be additional style recommendations for that particular journal. So I know that the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, for example, we use the Chicago Manual of Style, but we also have a few specific recommendations that are very particular to QJS. So go to the journal's website and see what their instructions for authors are and make sure that you really carefully prepare your essay according to their required style manual. Occasionally, you'll find something in the instructions for authors, and it looks like it doesn't match what you're seeing in the journal. I know that sometimes when there's a turnover of editors, sometimes little changes are made. So if you're ever looking at the instructions for authors, and it doesn't seem to match what you've been reading in the journal, you're always welcome to reach out to the editor for clarification. And I do think that it's worth your time because if you don't prepare your essay with that journal style manual in mind, it kind of looks like you never intended your essay to come out in that journal. It looks like that journal is sort of like an also-ran or an afterthought. And you don't want to send that message when you're submitting to a journal. You really want it to say like this is the right journal for this research. And so making sure that your style manual is up to date weirdly sends a big part of that message.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

My next question then is why is copyediting a manuscript before submission so important?

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Oh, it's just critical. It's absolutely critical for so many reasons. One is, again, sort of that message that you send to the reviewers and the editors. If your essay is replete with typos or it has citation errors or other mistakes, it really just says to the editor and the reviewers, I didn't do my due diligence with this and now I'm asking you to do due diligence with it when I didn't even really have time to do it myself. So you never want to send that message. Secondly, another reason why copy editing is such an issue is because the editor and the author and the editorial assistant really work together to make sure that the essay is copyedited thoroughly before it goes to publication. Now there is a production editor, and the publisher will send it to a copy editor. But truthfully, that copy editor is working with many different journals and many different style



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

manuals. And so I have found that really the true quality control for individual essays is the author, editor, and the editor's editorial assistant. So any work that you can do before you even send it in to just make sure your citations are correct and everything is as it should be, that just makes the process move much more quickly and move more smoothly along in the later stages of publication.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

And I know that some certainly new authors might be nervous about sharing their work with a colleague. But do you recommend that authors ask a colleague to review their work prior to submission?

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Yes, yes, yes. This is important at all stages, and let me talk about why. So graduate students certainly have their advisors, and if they're seeking to publish something in a journal that's not in their advisor's wheelhouse, I would definitely take advantage of other faculty members in their program. That's literally our job, and you're not asking inappropriately if you ask us to help you work something into submission. That's part of what we do in those big graduate programs. So ask your advisor or if you're an early career scholar, a trusted writing mentor if you think that this is both ready for submission and for publication recommendations. I said that you have to research not just the journal but the editor. More advanced people in the field will often be friends with people who are journal editors or they will have gone to graduate school with them. They will know little insights that are important and can really make or break your submission, but you would really have no way of knowing that if you're not talking to somebody who's in that professional network. So it's always a good idea to have people review your work when you're an early career scholar. It's actually just as important to do it at mid and late career as well. Mid-career scholars I think benefit from having writing groups and peer feedback. So people who are in mid-career will also be networked with editors and can also have great just sort of seasoned feedback on your paper. So if you're targeting a specific journal in that context, you can reach out to somebody who you know has published successfully in that journal. They may or may not have time to actually read your whole paper, but they can give you some feedback at least about the topic and how the editor might respond to that topic.

But something that I've seen being editor of *QJS* is that very, very senior, seasoned scholars actually benefit by having newer scholars review their work. Because the newer scholars who are closer to graduate school and comprehensive exams will be more up to date with what the theoretical discussion is right now, what the methodological trends are happening in the field, how we're talking about issues related to race and gender and sexuality, are we using the correct terms, are we being respectful with how we deal with the literature, are we citing, is our citational diversity reflective of who's published recently and reflective of people of color, women scholars,



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

just whatever is relevant for that piece. And so very seasoned scholars I think benefit from having peer feedback from newer scholars.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

That's an excellent point, Kari. So I've picked out my journal, and I've revised my paper using your excellent tips. I've researched the editor. I've read the call for manuscripts. I've had a colleague review my paper. And so now I'm ready to submit to one of NCA's 11 academic journals. So after I finally hit submit on my paper, when should I expect to hear back? How long should I wait before I reach out?

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Yeah, that's a great question. So I think at minimum you should give the editor 12 weeks, about three months to hear back the initial decision from submission. As I understand it, NCA journals are pretty good at staying on that schedule. I know that some of my colleagues who submit in to interdisciplinary journals in other fields, sometimes the response is quite a bit slower. I think NCA does a really good job of staying on schedule for authors. So not every journal will get back to you in three months, but if you haven't heard within three months, it is appropriate to reach out to the editor and just politely ask kind of what stage of the process they're in. And if they don't have the results for you at that point, they should at least be able to give you a sense for how much longer it will be. What I try to do as editor is if it's hit that three-month mark, I try to reach out to authors and say, hey, just want you to know you haven't dropped off my radar. I've talked to the reviewer. They're running a little late, but I've given them this deadline. And so I just try to keep people up to date. Now having said that, there are definitely situations where it takes longer than three months. During the height of the pandemic, when people were homeschooling and teaching online classes on the fly, the response was sometimes slower just because we all have to prioritize accordingly. So there might be situations where it takes longer. But if it's three, four, five months and you haven't heard, definitely reach out to the editor and just ask for an update.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

Thank you. So when I was finishing my graduate work, I submitted a paper, and I got my first revise and resubmit letter. And I was devastated. And so I'm wondering were you to have been in my advising circle, what would you have said to me as a graduate student having submitted my first paper and gotten a revise and resubmit letter?

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

I would have said, you just won the lottery. The vast amount of research that is submitted to a scholarly journal, we're talking like 90% or more for an NCA journal, gets a reject. And a revise and resubmit basically means that the editor thinks your essay has a chance. They're rooting for it. The reviewers gave them feedback that said, this might actually be able to be published in this



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

journal with some modest or maybe more moderate changes. Again, that puts you in the top 10% of everybody who's submitting to the journal. So do a little dance, be excited, and celebrate yourself. And then really sit down after a couple of days and try to digest the feedback and see what are they asking for. Are they asking for major changes, minor changes? Sometimes you'll get feedback that says we really need a major revision. But when you actually look through what they're asking you to do, you're like, I can do that. That's totally doable. So there's that. You're also deciding at that point what revisions you're willing to make, and maybe are there some issues where you might push back a little bit gently on the reviewer or the editors. So in that moment though when you get the revise and resubmit, know that that's great news, it bodes well for your essay, and celebrate your accomplishment.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

Oh, if only I'd known you back then.

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Yes, indeed. And I will say, along those lines, getting a rejection is also sometimes a really important part of the process, particularly when—I mean the thing that I've been so impressed with, with most of the people who review for *Quarterly Journal of Speech* in the time that I've been the editor, is because we know that 90% or more pieces will get rejected, we don't want that three-month period to be a waste of time for you. And so the feedback can be substantive and useful and helpful. So it's more discouraging to get just a flat out rejection. But put that away and then revisit it and say, all right, here are three smart people who gave me substantive responses to my essay. What can I learn from these reviews and how can it help me maybe get the revise and resubmit to the next place that I submit?

Shari Miles-Cohen:

And you've already introduced this, but receiving feedback, it can be challenging even for really experienced scholars. And so what additional advice do you have on how to approach the revision process?

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Yes. So it's human nature for us to I think be defensive, particularly if we've done our due diligence, like it's taken us a couple of years to even get this essay to the place where we submit it. So we're very invested in what we have done. But what I would say is as much as possible, approach the process of peer review openly. In my experience, the vast majority of reviewers do their work in good faith, and they're rooting for the essays eventual publication. If they identify a problem and suggest a solution, generally it's because they're trying to help. Now that doesn't mean that you will always solve the problem in the way that they suggest, and you don't always have to solve the problem in the way that they suggest. But if they've identified a problem, it



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

probably means they're not the only reader who will see that as a problem. So I do think you need to be open to all right, how can I address that concern. The second thing to know when you're evaluating feedback is that editors have different philosophies regarding whether or not you need to get a yes publish this from all reviewers. So some editors say, it's your job convince the reviewers, and then they will convince me. Some editors say, well, you have to convince me, and the reviews are advisory essentially. And some editors say, I'm the tiebreaker. So if you don't convince both reviewers, you have to convince at least one or two of them and then myself. So I definitely think that you should try to find out from—you can individually ask the editor kind of what they're looking for in a revision if they haven't given you a lot of direction in their decision letter. You can always go back and forth with an editor. You can't with the reviewers obviously, but you can with an editor. And most editors are open to that conversation.

But finally, I will say when you're practicing the skill of receiving feedback—and I tell my graduate students, you're developing that skill as much as any other in graduate school, the skill of receiving feedback constructively. Even if the feedback isn't offered in as constructive of a tone as we would like, you can choose to receive it constructively. But know that the process of peer review is idiosyncratic and sometimes fickle. A decision on your manuscript is not a referendum on you as a writer, a scholar, or a person. And it feels like it is, but just know that it's not. And as somebody who's been doing this now for several decades and who's seen it from the chair of the researcher, the chair of the reviewer, and the chair of the editor, I will say that how a reviewer responds to your essay depends sometimes on the day that they read it. Like what's happening in their life affects how they respond to your essay, and it affects how much feedback they give you and the tone of that feedback. And so while as an editor, I certainly see it as my job to intervene if the tone is inappropriate or anything like that, not every editor does that or is able to do that successfully. So just know that you might submit the very same essay to a different reviewer or even the same reviewer on a different day, and the reaction might be different. So don't put too much stock, positive or negative, into any individual review.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

That's very helpful. I sort of feel like graduate students should have that framed in their rooms or have it written on their mirrors in the morning. They see it every morning before they leave the house.

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Absolutely.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

And sometimes, as you mentioned, the reviewers can contradict each other. I'm wondering what your advice is for authors on how to handle that. And I know that my next question is really about



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

the letter that accompanies the revised article when you send it back and is that a place to discuss the contradictory review.

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Yes, absolutely. So yeah. I know that certainly as *QJS* editor, I've occasionally gotten two reviews that are like diametrically opposed. And so when I have a case that's that blatant, usually I reach out to the author individually or I make clear in my decision letter which reviewer I agree with. And it's not saying that one reviewer is wrong or right. It's just saying, okay, well, two people think this, and one person thinks the other thing. So why don't you go with what two people say? So hopefully, if it's really contradictory, the editor will weigh in independently. If they don't, it is fine to just sort of reach out and ask for guidance. Sometimes you as the author might have a strong preference for one or the other. So in that case, if you have a strong feeling, then I would maybe not reach out to the editor. I would instead just focus on making your case explaining why you agree with one reviewer, responding in a thoughtful way in the letter that accompanies your revision, thanking the other reviewer for their perspective but explaining why you went in a different direction. And that letter that you craft with your revision is an important document. The most successful ones I think are grateful for the reviewers' and the editors' time and effort. They sort of succinctly say, I agreed with X, Y, Z suggestions. I've done those things. So if all you did was take the reviewers' suggestions, you can just simply say very quickly how you did that. You don't need to belabor the point. But yeah, if there's a point where you didn't take a reviewer's suggestion or you made a change that addressed the problem but maybe in a different way than what the reviewer suggested, say that. Take some time to explain that.

And I have a practicality as well. When you're preparing that letter that goes with a revision, make sure that you prepare it without any identifying information because sometimes the editors either don't have the technological access or just don't know how to hide that letter from a reviewer if it has identifying information in it. So if you're preparing like a Word document or a PDF to upload with your revision letter, just make sure that your identifying information is not anywhere in that letter, and then that'll just maintain the integrity of the anonymous peer review.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

Can you talk about how published communication scholarship matters to the discipline of communication, to our communities, and to our world?

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

I'm so glad that you asked that. I am really passionate about the work that we do in our journals. Now I know that some people regard traditional academic research somewhat derisively because they say, oh, it's locked away where only a few people can read it or nobody's interested in it or whatever. People say this is about academic research. But there are so many ways that research



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

in a journal is both practical and meaningful. Of course, what we publish in our journals impacts what we teach in the classroom, and it provides us with additional tools in our own research. Those are important goals. But even beyond that, academic theory routinely makes its way into the public dialogue. This might be through public-facing scholarship like NCA's *Communication Currents* or it could be websites like *The Conversation* in which academics are asked to translate their scholarly expertise and comment on current events. I know that the conversation in particular is published open access so journalistic outlets can republish it. And so you routinely see things that will go from the pages of a journal into a popular source like *The Conversation* and then into a journalistic source like *USA Today* or *The Washington Post*. Communication scholars in our field have had conversation pieces get picked up by *The Washington Post*. But there was an example a few years ago, and it was a commercial for Gillette razors, which explicitly addressed the issue of toxic masculinity and used the phrase "toxic masculinity." And I was struck by that because I was like, all right, that's a great example of something that absolutely was birthed in the pages of an academic journal. And through public dialogue and take-up and additional academic work and journalistic exposure to that work, it found its way into a Gillette ad. So I think that's a practical example of how theories that develop and circulate in scholarly journals eventually do make their way into mainstream conversation. The work that we do in our journals is interesting, it's important, and it's impactful. That's why I'm so appreciative of the work that NCA does not only to help us publish our research but help us get it out into the wider world as well. And one of the greatest privileges of my career has been serving as an editor for the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

Dr. Karrin Vasby Anderson, thank you so much for this interesting, important, and impactful discussion today.

Karrin Vasby Anderson:

Thank you.

Shari Miles-Cohen:

And thank you for joining me today on *Communication Matters*. Visit natcom.org/journals to learn more about NCA's 11 academic journals and submit your manuscript. And be on the lookout for the first call for submissions from NCA's newest journal, *Communication and Race*, later this year or early next year. Thank you.

In related NCA news, I am pleased to announce that four new NCA journal editors have been approved by the NCA Legislative Assembly. The newly elected editors will begin processing manuscripts in early 2023 and will oversee the volumes published in 2024-2026. Kyle Rudick is the editor-elect for *Communication Education*. Armond Towns will serve as the inaugural editor



Communication Matters: The NCA Podcast | **TRANSCRIPT**
Tips for Getting Published in an Academic Journal

of NCA's newly established journal, *Communication and Race*. Heather Zoller is the editor-elect for the *Journal of Applied Communication Research*. And Mahuya Pal is the editor-elect for the *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*. Congratulations, all! We can't wait to see what great scholarship you steward as NCA journal editors!

And I hope you'll tune in for the May episode of *Communication Matters*, which will tackle an important issue facing many graduate students and current faculty members: how to pursue an alt-ac or non-academic career with a communication PhD. I'll be joined by guests with a variety of perspectives on the alt-ac job search process who will offer advice on navigating the job market, preparing for a non-academic career as a graduate student, and what career paths may be especially appealing for communication PhDs. Guests will include Shantel Martinez, Director of the Center for Inclusion and Social Change at the University of Colorado Boulder; Sarah J. Tracy, Professor in the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication at Arizona State University; and Marco Dehnert, Graduate Student in the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication at Arizona State University.

Be sure to engage with us on social media by liking us on Facebook, following NCA on Twitter and Instagram, and watching us on YouTube. And before you go, hit subscribe wherever you get your podcasts to listen in as we discuss emerging scholarship, established theory, and new applications, all exploring just how much communication matters in our classrooms, in our communities, and in our world.

The National Communication Association is the preeminent scholarly association devoted to the study and teaching of communication. Founded in 1914, NCA is a thriving group of thousands of scholars from across the nation and around the world who are committed to a collective mission to advance communication as an academic discipline. In keeping with NCA's mission to advance the discipline of communication, NCA has developed this podcast series to expand the reach of our member scholars' work and perspectives.

Communication Matters, organized at the association's national office in downtown Washington, DC, is produced by Assistant Director of External Affairs and Publications Chelsea Bowes with content development support from Director of External Affairs and Publications Wendy Fernando and Content Development Specialist Grace Hébert. Thank you for listening.

RECORDING ENDS