

Who's Publishing What? Publication Patterns in Seven Community Engagement Journals

Diane M. Doberneck, Ph.D.

National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement

John H. Schweitzer, Ph.D.

Center for Community and Economic Development

University Outreach and Engagement

Michigan State University

13th Annual National Outreach Scholarship Conference

Tuscaloosa, Alabama

October 2, 2012

Introduction

In their 2010 chapter “Defining the ‘Engagement’ in the Scholarship of Engagement,” Kelly Ward and Tami Moore outlined four areas for continued attention if the engaged scholarship movement were to mature:

- Critique
- Theory
- Cross/interdisciplinary scholarship
- Community perspectives

Conferences, like this one, are places where such critical conversations about the evolution of the movement take place. Journals are another one of those places.



Purpose

What has the critical conversation been in the community engagement journals—especially since Ernest Boyer’s 1996 seminal article about the scholarship of engagement appeared in the inaugural edition of the *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* ?

What has been published? By whom?

- What do the publication patterns mean for authors, peer reviewers, and journal editors?
- What are implications for community engaged scholarship as a field?



Research Questions

In this three phase study, we explored the following research questions.

1. What **types of articles** are published in the community engagement journals? (Phase 1)
2. **Who** is publishing in the community engagement journals? (Phase 2)
 - First author's personal information
 - Collaborative publishing
 - First author's institutional information
3. How **rigorous** is the research published in the community engagement journals? (Phase 3)



Journals

Included

- *Metropolitan Universities*
- *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*
- *Journal of Community Practice*
- *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*
- *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*
- *Gateways: International Journal of Community Engagement and Research*
- *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education*

Excluded

- Journals that focus on one aspect of community engagement
 - Extension, continuing education
- Journals that focus on a particular social issue
 - Health, community development
- Journals that had been established very recently



Approach to Research

Phase	Journals	Number
Phase 1	All journal articles 1990-2010 <i>Inductive coding—codes emerge from data</i> <i>Calculate frequencies</i>	1917
Phase 2	10% purposive, stratified sample <i>Deductive coding—codes already defined</i> <i>Calculate frequencies, compare to national figures</i>	175
Phase 3	All research articles from 10% sample <i>Deductive coding—codes already defined</i> <i>Based on rigor framework—codes already defined</i> <i>Calculate frequencies</i>	39



Phase 1: What Types Articles Were Published?

Nine mutually exclusive categories

1. Publicly engaged research and creative activities
2. Publicly engaged teaching and learning*
3. Partnerships, programs, or project descriptions
4. Conceptual frameworks, theories, definitions, models (big picture)
5. Policies, procedures, best practices (more specific)
6. Literature reviews, synthesis articles
7. Practice articles, notes from field (not peer reviewed)
8. Reflections
9. Book Reviews

*NOTE: Research on teaching/learning was coded in category #1.



Types of Articles Overall

TYPES	MU	JCP	MJCSL	JHEOE	JCES	G	JCEHE	Overall
Research	13%	29%	32%	16%	22%	39%	15%	21%
Teaching	20%	6%	19%	11%	10%	0%	15%	13%
Partnerships	16%	11%	11%	28%	28%	3%	8%	17%
Frameworks	<1%	13%	5%	6%	14%	14%	0%	6%
Policy	12%	2%	<1%	3%	2%	8%	0%	5%
Lit Reviews	23%	24%	24%	22%	10%	17%	31%	23%
Reflections	16%	14%	3%	14%	14%	19%	31%	14%
Book Review	0%	1%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Total Number	662	482	270	384	56	13	50	100%



Research Articles Overall

RESEARCH	MU	JCP	MJCSL	JHEOE	JCES	G	JCEHE	Overall
Quantitative	31%	24%	17%	25%	18%	7%	100%	24%
Qualitative	44%	61%	64%	54%	45%	79%	0%	57%
Mixed	25%	15%	18%	21%	36%	14%	0%	19%
Total number	87	141	87	61	11	14	2	100%

In summary

Over 50% of engaged research articles were qualitative studies.

JCEHE published quantitative research studies exclusively.

Gateways published qualitative research predominantly.

6 of 7 journals published studies with qualitative and quantitative data combined.



Teaching Articles Overall

TEACHING	MU	JCP	MJCSL	JHEOE	JCES	G	JCEHE	Overall
K-12	14%	26%	10%	10%	20%	0%	50%	14%
Undergraduate	77%	60%	90%	76%	80%	0%	50%	77%
Graduate	3%	11%	0%	12%	0%	0%	0%	5%
Multi-level	6%	4%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Total Number	130	27	52	41	5	0	2	100%

In summary

Over 75% of engaged teaching articles focused on undergraduates.

MJCSL published the most engaged teaching articles.

Gateways published no engaged teaching articles—at any level.



Phase 2: Who published articles?

10% Sample

- Stratified by Journal Title, then Type of Article
- Number = 175

Who Is Publishing Analysis	
<u>Variable</u>	<u>Source of Data</u>
First Author Personal Characteristics	
Position/Rank	Article
Field of Study	IPEDS
Collaborative Publishing	Article
First Author Institutional Characteristics	
Carnegie Institutional Classification	Carnegie
Carnegie Engagement Classification	Carnegie
Institutional Enrollment	Carnegie
Control	Carnegie



1st AUTHOR POSITION/RANK	Total	Percentage
K-12	0	0%
Undergraduate	1	<1%
Graduate student	8	4%
Academic Staff	32	16%
Tenure track faculty		47%
Assistant professor	28	14%
Associate professor	27	13%
Full professor	41	20%
Emeritus professor	3	1%
Extension	3	1%
Administrator	36	18%
Community Partner	24	12%
Total Number	203	100%

In Summary

Tenure track faculty as a group were first author for the largest percentage of articles, followed by academic staff. Full professors published the highest percentage of CES articles.

1st AUTHOR FIELD OF STUDY	Number	Percentage
Public Administration	35	32%
Education	24	22%
Social Sciences	18	16%
Top Three Combined	77	69%
Agriculture, architecture, bio-science, business, communications, construction, cultural studies, English, engineering, history, human science, liberal arts, performing arts, philosophy, physical science, psychology		
Remainder	34	31%
Total number	111	100%

NOTE: There are 60 IPEDS categories and only 20 categories were represented in our study sample.



COLLABORATION

Of authors, they were

Authorship	Single Author	101	58%
(mutually exclusive)	Multiple Authors	73	42%

Of multiple authors, collaborations were

Collaborations	Across Disciplines	43	59%
(not mutually exclusive)	Across Institutions	39	53%
	Community Partner	23	32%

In summary

Most of the community engagement articles were published by single authors. Over half of the collaborations were across disciplines or across institutions. One third of the collaborative publishing included a community partner.



CLASSIFICATION	Total Publishing	Percentage Publishing	National Percentage
RU/Very High	53	47%	2%
RU/High	22	19%	2%
DRU (Doctoral/research)	6	5%	2%
Master's L (larger)	22	19%	9%
Master's M (medium)	1	1%	4%
Bac/A&S (arts & sciences)	5	4%	6%
Assoc/Pub-U-MC	2	2%	3%
Assoc/Pub-S-MC	1	1%	2%
Spec/Med	1	1%	1%
Other institutions	0	0%	69%
Total	113	100%	100%

ENGAGEMENT CLASSIFICATION*	Total Publishing	Percentage Publishing	National Percentage
No—Engagement Classification	65	52%	94%
Yes—Engagement Classification	61	48%	6%
Total	126	100%	100%

In summary

First authors from research universities (71%) and master's institutions (20%) published the most journal articles (prev. slide).

First authors from Carnegie Engaged institutions published disproportionately more than those from non-Carnegie Engaged institutions.

*First authors from institutions outside of the U.S. were not included in this n, because they do not participate in the Carnegie Engagement Classification. National Carnegie classification information is from John Saltmarsh at NERCHE (personal communication).

ENROLLMENT	Total Publishing	Publishing Percentage	National Percentage
≤ 4,999	12	11%	76%
5,000-9,999	13	12%	12%
10,000-14,900	14	12%	5%
15,000-19,999	12	11%	3%
20,000-24,999	11	10%	2%
25,000-29,999	15	13%	1%
30,000-34,999	14	12%	<1%
35,000-39,999	4	4%	<1%
40,000-44,999	7	6%	<1%
45,000-49,999	6	5%	<1%
50,000 +	5	4%	<1%
Total	113	100%	100%

In summary

First authors from institutions over 10,000 students enrolled published more than would be expected given their numbers nationally.



CONTROL	Total Publishing	Percentage Publishing	National Percentage
Public	79	62%	37%
Private/Not-for-profit	35	28%	37%
Not at college, university	13	10%	0%
Private/For-profit	0	0%	26%
Total	127	100%	100%

In summary

First authors from public institutions published more than those from private/not-for-profit and private/for-profit institutions.

When compared nationally, first authors from public institutions published more than expected.



Phase 3: How Rigorous Was the Research?

1. Foundational Elements

- a) Significance of research problem
- b) Thorough review of literature, connection to research
- c) Research paradigm, methodological choices
- d) Clearly defined research questions

2. Design-Related Elements

- a) Rigorous research design
- b) Population or sample selection

3. Measurement-Related Elements

- a) Data collection strategy
- b) Instrument development
- c) Data analysis techniques
- d) Ensuring quality in research process



Rigor Coding, con't.

4. Inference-Related Elements

- a) Conclusions
- b) Interpretive rigor

5. Consequence-Related Element

- a) Consequences and context
- b) Future directions

Overall Rigor Score

Low	0-14
Medium	15-27
High	28-42



RIGOR	MU	JCP	MJCSL	JHEOE	G	Overall
Low	25%	21%	13%	57%	0%	26%
Medium	13%	29%	13%	14%	50%	21%
High	63%	50%	75%	29%	50%	54%
Total Number	8	14	8	7	2	39

In summary

MJCSL published the most rigorous research, followed by

Metropolitan Universities, Gateways, and Journal of Community Practice. JHEOE published the least rigorous research.

JCES and *JCEHE* were not included in the rigor sample due to small numbers.



Findings

Authors who are publishing in the CES journals (in this study) are from

- public administration, education, and social sciences
- research universities
- Carnegie-engaged institutions
- institutions with enrollments over 10,000
- Public institutions



Study Limitations & Future Research

Investigation of what's published in other CES journals

- *Journal of Extension* (more Agriculture & Natural Resources)
- *Progress in Comm Health Partnerships* (more health related)
- *Reflections* (more student authors)

Study of how authors decide to publish their CES in disciplinary journals vs. CES journals

- Are there disciplinary differences ?

Analysis of how publishing in CES journals has changed over time

- Are there more conceptual pieces earlier & more research later?
- Are there more qualitative studies earlier & more quantitative ones later? Are there more sophisticated research designs later?

CLOSING THOUGHTS ABOUT CES PUBLISHING



Implications for Authors

If you want to publish your community engaged scholarship, you have many choices:

- Disciplinary journals
- Journals about teaching/learning in your discipline
- Community engagement journals

Since 1990, the number of journals dedicated to publishing community engaged scholarship has been growing steadily with 15 different journals occupying different niches.

As would be expected, different journals are publishing different kinds of community engaged scholarship, conducted and written up by different scholars.

You need to strategize about where to publish your scholarship.

Implications for CES Journals

Some disciplines are not well (or not at all) represented in the community engaged scholarship journals.

- Why is this? What more might be done to encourage publishing from a wider range of disciplines?
- If publishing were to expand beyond the “usual suspects” of social science and education, are there peer reviewers familiar with scholarly expressions of outreach and engagement in these disciplines available to review these submissions?
- Are CES journals prepared to publish community engaged scholarship that may have been developed through alternative inquiry paradigms?



Implications for the Field

For some authors, the **journal impact factor** is an important consideration. None of the community engagement journals participate in this system.

For authors who want to have their journals cited frequently, the **availability and ease of access** may be an issue. A number of CES journals are available on-line; Some are not—limiting access to the publications.

Some CES journals are **indexed in popular social science and education databases**, making it easier for readers to find the published articles; Some are not—limiting visibility of the publications.



Acknowledgements

I would like to gratefully acknowledge those who contributed to the completion of this study, which was supported by the National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement, University Outreach and Engagement, Michigan State University. MSU Library Inter-Library Loan department was invaluable in providing access to journal articles not available on-line. Berlinda Tolsma worked tirelessly on data entry and data coding. John Schweitzer assisted with statistical analysis.



References

- Anfara Jr., V. A., Brown, K. M., & Mangione, T. L. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. *Educational Researcher* 31(7), 28-38.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Chouinard, J. A., & Cousins, J. B. (2009). A review and synthesis of current research on cross-cultural evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation* 30(4), 457-494.
- Coryn, C. L. S., Noakes, L. A., Westline, C. D., & Schroer, D. C. (2010). A systemic review of theory-driven evaluation practice from 1990-2009. *American Journal of Evaluation* 32(2), 199-226.
- Cox, D. (2010). History of the scholarship of engagement movement. In H.E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions, volume 1: institutional change* (pp. 25-38). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research designs: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory to Practice*, 39(3), 124-130.

- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dellinger, A. B., & Leech, N. L. (2007). Toward a unified validation framework in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1(4), 309-332.
- Giles, Jr., D. E. (2008). Understanding an emerging field of scholarship: Towards a research agenda for engaged, public scholarship. *Journal of University Outreach and Engagement* 12(2), 97-106.
- Glass, C. R., & Fitzgerald, H. E. (2010). Engaged scholarship: Historical roots, contemporary challenges. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions, volume 1: institutional change* (pp. 9-24). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press. [check citation format].
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology 2nd edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange* 17, 63-84.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- MacQueen, K. M., McLellan, E., Milstein, K. K., & Milstein, B. (1998). Codebook development for team-based qualitative analysis. *Cultural Anthropology Methods* 10(2), 31-36.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1992). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. *Harvard Educational Review* 62(3), 279-300.

- Mertens, D. M. (2001). Publishing mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 5(1).
- Morris, M. (2010). The good, the bad, and the evaluator: 25 Years of AJE Ethics. *American Journal of Evaluation* 32(1), 134-151.
- Ryan, G. W. (n.d.). What are standards of rigor for qualitative research? Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. Available from:
<http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/nsfqual/Ryan%20Paper.pdf>.
- Sandmann, L. R. (2008). Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement: A strategic review, 1996-2006. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 12(1), 91-102.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Tashakkori, A., & Creswell, J. W. (2007). Editorial: The new era of mixed methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1(1), 3-7.
- Ward, K., & Moore, T. L. (2010). Defining the “Engagement” in the scholarship of engagement. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions, volume 1: institutional change* (p. 39-53). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Zaruba, K. E., Toma, J. D., & Stark, J. S. (1996). Criteria used for qualitative research in the refereeing process. *The Review of Higher Education* 19(4), 435-460.

Contact Information

Diane M. Doberneck, Ph.D.

John H. Schweitzer, Ph.D.

University Outreach and Engagement

Michigan State University

Kellogg Hotel and Conference Center

219 S. Harrison Road, Rm. 93

East Lansing, MI 48824

Phone: 517-353-8977

Fax: 517-432-9541

E-mail: connordm@msu.edu or schweit1@msu.edu

Web: www.outreach.msu.edu