Views of Instructors about Academic Productivity

Nazife Karadağ [i]
Adıyaman University

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to determine the views of the instructors about the experiences they have during the international publishing in terms of academic productivity. The study aims to reveal the problems the instructors experience during the publication process in international journal indexes and in the journals like SSCI, SCI and AHCI and to determine the needs of the instructors in order them to succeed in this process. In the study, one of the qualitative methods, phenomenological research design was used. The study group consists of 15 instructors determined by criterion sampling within the purposive sampling methods. The basic criterion in determining the study group is that the instructors should complete the doctoral degree in Turkey in the last 10 years or abroad and they should have international publications. The data of the study were collected with semi-structured interview forms. based on the sub-problems of the study and the interviews with the instructors, the following issues were discussed about: the purposes of the instructors in overseas publishing, their experiences in international publishing, the factors motivating themselves for international publishing, if there is, the reason why they didn't want to publish in foreign countries and somehow the reason why they didn't want to publish in the journals in the country, the difficulties they encountered with during the process of international publishing, the strategies they followed during the publication and their recommendations for the researches who wish to make publishing abroad.

Keywords: Productivity, academic productivity, higher education

----

i **Nazife Karadağ**, Assist. Prof. Dr., Department of Educational Sciences, Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey.
Correspondence: nazifekaradag@adiyaman.edu.tr

Introduction

Universities are educational institutions which combine economic, social and cultural changes together which are shaped under the concept of globalisation, a worldwide phenomenon and which affect the process of globalisation (OECD, 2009). In the 21st century when innovation and competence are regarded as main driving forces, universities which are on the focus of search and development activities and instructors which are the basic elements of universities couldn't resist long against global tendency.

It can be underlined that it is a must that universities should enhance their missions to make scientific studies, which is one of their purposes of existence, in terms of obtaining competition superiority in today's world where mobility of students and instructors, innovation, technology and economic policies based on information are predominant. This necessity also results from the development of the third-generation universities which are entrepreneur and can easily integrate with public.

Many new properties have appeared with the term of third-generation universities. Wissema (2009) stated that the basic core of third world universities consists of interdisciplinary agreement and perception that the driving force is the creativity, industry, research and development institutions, as well as financers and professional service-providers, collaboration with other universities, working in an international competitive market, hiring the best academicians and students, being active in making research protocols with industry, multiculturalism, transferring the asset of produced data into society, promoting the design and innovation and cosmopolitan organisation. The so-called elements are under the responsibility of not only the management of universities but also of instructors.

During the transformational process of the universities into third generation universities, one of the most important factors to support them is the instructors and their productive activities. The universities whose priority concerns are branding, internationalization, being a renowned university in international area. Likewise, the instructors who wish their scientific studies to reach larger audience are involved in the activities such as increasing their academic productivity and publishing international papers and articles accordingly. This has contributed the universities to promote the instructors to publish academic papers and forced the instructors to develop some strategies for the process of international publishing.

Conceptual Framework: Academic Productivity

The academic progress of the instructors are basically structured under some certain principles. The most renown of these principles is academic productivity also known as productivity or productivity of the instructors. Scientific researches and academic publishing are regarded as an indispensable context of academic progress (Atasoylu, Wright, Beasley, Cofrancesco, Macpherson, Partridge, 2003). It is thought that it is difficult to describe academic productivity in higher education (Gates and Stone, 1997). The term of productivity is generally considered together with effectiveness and prolificacy (Salaran, 2010). Bibliometric analysis is among the most common elements in measuring the performance of the instructors. The number of publications produced by a group, an institution or a nation is considered as an indication of the productivity (Katz and Hicks, 1997; Yinian and Zainab, 2001). The number of scientific research papers is shown as an evidence of academic productivity (Huang, Hsu, 2005). In academic circles, the most critical indicator of research productivity is regarded as publishing (Wood, 1990). Besides, academic productivity or research productivity is defined as one of the most significant promotion tools for post-graduation process (as cited in Mishra and Smyth, 2013). Academic productivity is also thought as a strategy which was developed to tackle with the decrease of government grants (Gates and Stone, 1997).

In academic circles, publishing brings promotion and recognition both for the academicians and their institutions (Salaran, 2010). The process of academic productivity is not only about the

instructors but also an issue which the universities are closely concerned with. With the improvement of economic strategies based on information, the classification of universities has gained importance and this classification is linked with academic productivity. In recent times, in determining the rank of the countries in scientific world, in comparison of universities or institutions in terms of their scientific qualifications and in evaluation of the academic performances of the scientists, three criterion which bring "international publishing activities" into the forefront have generally been accepted: 1) the number of the papers published in international journals, 2) publishing the papers in scientific journals which are reviewed by scientific indexing services 3) the number of citations for the papers (Ak and Gülmez, 2006). Rushton and Meltzer (1981) stated that when the common features of the top universities which take first places in university rankings are studied, the activity of academic productivity come to the front.

The term of academic productivity that gained importance in 1970s is about producing and promoting knowledge. Since it is predominantly based on various aspects of research, teaching, social activities and scientific researches, it is generally considered as a multi-dimensional process (Dundar and Lewis, 1998). Academic productivity is accepted as a strenuous topic due to multi-dimensional structure of producing scientific knowledge and there have been some people who approach the topic by using different perspectives.

One of the issues of those focusing on academic productivity is to define the determinants of academic productivity and to determine the effects of academic productivity on institutions and individuals (Abramo, D'Angelo and Costa, 2009). In the researches, the factors affecting academic/scientific productivity are divided into three groups; personal features (age of the researcher, gender and educational status), institutional and departmental features (the features of the institution, size of the faculty, technological and hardware/IT infrastructure) and environmental features (business policies, funds etc.) (Abramo, D'Angelo and Costa, 2009). Similarly, Rushton and Meltzer (1981) who regard academic productivity as multidimensional divided it into three groups; individual features (natural abilities such as intelligence, age and gender and personal/environmental factors such as the quality of post-graduation education and organizational culture), institutional and departmental factors (organizational structure and leadership, extent of the program, role of private sector, financial potential of the university, technological possibilities of the university, the capacity of the library, etc.) departmental culture and working conditions (labour force policies, travel funds to make researches, institutional funds, etc.).

Abramo, D'Angelo and Costa (2009) and Lee and Bozeman (2005) stated that scientific cooperation was considered as a part of the process of academic productivity, however, Creswell (1986) underlined that departmental culture should be added in the process. Crewe (1998) said that research productivity was about department policies such as permissions, travel expenses, teaching load and research funds (as cited in Dundar and Lewis, 1998). There are studies which claim academic productivity relies on academic seniority and state the academicians whose seniority is higher are more productive than those of lower ones (Carayol and Matt, 2004; Green, 1998). Besides, self-sufficiency, (Vasil, 1993), research support (Wood, 1990), internal motivation, mentorship process, a research-based culture, a network of international colleagues (and a network of external colleagues) (Bland et al., 2005) are regarded as the elements affecting academic productivity. Bland et al. (2005) stated that academic productivity is influenced with individual, institutional and leadership elements. Academic productivity at an individual level is about socialization, motivation, content information, research abilities at basic and advanced level, simultaneous projects, tendency, autonomy and commitment (to time and purpose) and working habits. Academic productivity at an institutional level is about employment, open targets, importance given for the research, culture, organisational atmosphere, mentorship, networks for professional communication, sources, working time, experience and proficiency, communication, reward mechanisms, distribution of the roles and sharing the managerial responsibility with the shareholders. Academic productivity at leadership level is often linked with implementing some critical roles such as being research-based, participative leadership, management of human and resources, providing resources, creating the group mission and making this mission appreciated. Similarly, Santo et al. (2005) divided the elements affecting academic

productivity into internal and external factors. Accordingly, academic productivity is linked with internal factors such as enjoying doing researches, being motivated, being knowledgeable and skilled and point of view for academic career; and it is linked with external factors such as having sufficient time, having no lack of resources, involving in institutional academic culture, having good relationship with colleagues, mentorship and making collaboration with international colleagues.

Another issue that was analysed in the studies is the obstacles during the process of academic productivity. These obstacles differ in terms of departments. However, in general terms these can be described as financial problems, incentive mechanisms (Smeltzer et al., 2014), time (Bland et al., 2005; Ma and Runyon, 2004; Zhang, 2014), social networks (Santo et al., 2009), age (Levin and Stephan, 1991), gender (Alonso-Arroyo, Gómez-Guardeño, González-Sanjuán, Aleixandre-Benavent, 2013; Levin and Stephan, 1991), departmental culture (Smeby and Try, 2005).

Academic Productivity in Turkey

In Turkey, some certain strategies towards determining policies that will contribute the number of the universities to increase, growing scientists and thus improving the quality of post-graduate programs have recently been adopted in order to follow the global trends in higher-education such as competitiveness, branding and internationalization. In this context, some various studies were implemented to promote academic productivity (especially publishing papers in indexed journals). Turkish Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) and universities started to promote the studies published in international journals by rewarding with different levels. With the Incentive Program for International Scientific Publications which is within the part of TÜBİTAK, international publishing for the researchers working in the research centres of the universities, of public or private institutions was incited (Eti, 2016). However, with the regulation which was published in 2000 and issued in 2017, the obligation that those who want to be academician should have a published paper in the journals of SSCI, SCI, SCI- Expanded ve AHCI except for the letter to the editor, abstract or a book review; or they should have a published paper in an internationally indexed journal except for the letter to the editor, abstract or book review enhanced the academic productivity of the academicians. In other words, academic productivity can be described as a prior condition for academic progress. Therefore, it is thought that the evaluation about the experiences in the process of academic productivity may lead the way of the instructors.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to determine the views of the instructors about the experiences they have during the international publishing in terms of academic productivity. The study aims to reveal the problems the instructors experience during the publication process in international journal indexes and in the journals like SSCI, SCI and AHCI and to determine the needs of the instructors in order them to succeed in this process.

Method

In the study, one of the qualitative methods, phenomenological research design was used. Phenomenological researches which predominantly focus on the experiences are based on exploring the underlying meaning of these experiences (Merriam, 1998).

Study Group

The study group consists of 15 instructors determined by criterion sampling within the purposive sampling methods. The basic criterion in determining the study group is that the instructors should complete the doctoral degree in Turkey in the last 10 years or abroad and they should have international publications. The demographic features of the study group are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The demographic features of the study group

Code of the Instructors	Gender	Age	Professional Seniority	Number of International Publications
I1	M	32	4	10
I2	F	32	9	4
I3	F	33	11	2
I4	F	31	9	2
I5	F	31	9	2
I6	M	33	9	4
I7	M	31	3	9
I8	M	45	10	12
I9	M	45	17	6
I10	F	46	8	10
I11	M	33	9	4
I12	M	31	8	3
I13	F	32	9	5
I14	F	32	9	4
I15	F	33	10	4

When Table 1 is studied, it is observed that 7 of the instructors are male and 8 of them are female.

Their ages range from 31 to 46 and their professional seniority changes from 3 to 7 years. When the number of international publications is studied, it is noticed that the number is changing from 2 till 12.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data of the study were collected with semi-structured interview forms. The interview form was developed by the researcher. While the interview form was formed, the literature on the academic productivity process was first reviewed. Then the opinions of the two instructors were taken for the interview questions. The questions in the interview form were designed to take the views of instructors,

- Purpose of academic productivity,

- Experiences about the process of academic productivity

- Motivation sources during the process of academic productivity

- The reasons for not publishing in international journals

- The Reasons for not publishing in national journals

- The strategies the instructors followed during the publication process in international journals.

If possible, the instructors were interviewed face to face, if not, they had to be interviewed by phone. The duration of the interview ranged from 30 to 45 minutes. The content analysis was used in data analysis.

Validity and Reliability

In the context of validity and reliability of the conclusions, credibility (internal validity), transmissibility (external validity), consistency (internal reliability), approvability (external reliability) were overwhelmingly attached importance. In order to provide credibility, experts' opinions were taken during data analysis. Besides, confirmation of the participants was received. While providing external validity (transmissibility), the priority was to determine the participants through purposive sampling method. Additionally, determining the participants, the process of data collection and analysis was described in detail. To provide internal reliability (consistency) of the study, raw data from the interviews and sub-themes from the analysis were shown to the experts and the consistency was reviewed accordingly.

Finding and Conclusions

In this chapter, based on the sub-problems of the study and the interviews with the instructors, the following issues were discussed about: the purposes of the instructors in overseas publishing, their experiences in international publishing, the factors motivating themselves for international publishing, if there is, the reason why they didn't want to publish in foreign countries and somehow the reason why they didn't want to publish in the journals in the country, the difficulties they encountered with during the process of international publishing, the strategies they followed during the publication and their recommendations for the researches who wish to make publishing abroad.

Purpose of Academic Productivity

According to the data of the study, there are differences in purpose between the instructors who completed their doctoral degree in abroad and in Turkey. Findings about the purpose of the instructors in publishing international journals are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Purposes of Academic Productivity

Theme: Purposes of Academic Productivity	
Codes	- to provide academic progress
	- to contribute to the science world
	- to develop collaborative activities with scientists in international fields
	-sharing the results of the study with international community
	- desire to publish in indexed journals
	-to fulfil the criteria for associate professorship
	- benefitting from academic incentive system

While the instructors were expressing the purpose why they would prefer to make activities of academic productivity, they underlined the importance of sharing the results with international community and of developing collaborative activities with scientists in international fields. However only the instructors completing their doctoral degree in Turkey emphasized the purposes of academic progress such as publishing in indexed journals and fulfilling the criteria for associate professorship, assignment process and academic progress. I-7 underlined that the purpose in the process of Academic Productivity is to contribute to the field and added:

"My intention in having international publishing is to contribute to the field. As far as I see, national publishing is caught in a vicious circle; it doesn't progress and mostly takes after another. The publishing you present to an international journal is not like this; your paper should fill in an important gap and take the field a step further. Thus, I try to make international publishing to contribute to the field globally. Another aim is of course to progress academically. Each academician has an intention

to achieve and progress academically and they should. It is impossible to progress academically without making international publication..."

Experiences about the Process of Academic Productivity

Experiences of the instructors about making international publications are classified as the factors which facilitate the process and the obstacles for academic productivity. Experiences of the instructors about the process of making international publications are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Experiences about the Process of Academic Productivity

Theme: Experiences about the Process of Academic Productivity		
	Sub-theme 1: Facilitating Factors	Sub-theme 2: Encountered Obstacles
Codes	- Process of uploading publication - Objective Assessment process -Advisory guidance -Quick feedback - Past experiences	- Prejudices against Turkish writers - System of the journal - Slow feedback -Journal format - Colleagues -Paid journals -language problems

While the instructors were talking about the process of their academic productivity, they emphasized the facilitating factors and the obstacles they encountered in the process. During the process of publishing, they stated that uploading stages were too complicated but after uploading, the ongoing process was clear and understandable; the experiences about the process were affected positively since the assessment process was based on objective criteria. Apart from these, the insturctors who completed their doctoral degree in foreign countries underlined the issue of advisory guidance. About this, I-8 stated: "since I experienced that process with my advisor, I published the first few of my publications with my advisor. My advisor is in US, but I cannot tell that I have experienced too many difficulties because he/she is the person to know the process pretty well and I could make my publications comfortably during the first years.

I-2 said that "the studies conducted by sampling only Turkey might be perceieved as too specific or some prejudices against such studies might exist, these are my negative experiences… I can take a quite quick feedback, (negative/positive), for the paper I sent to an international journal, even if the paper is rejected, favourable feedback is always given, the paper is assessed objectively, you can understand what mistakes you have done, I can see that the referees just focus on the study itself, hereby you can feel that the region you are in, your belief or your ethinic identity has no significance. I can see that the referees completely focus on my study during the assessment process, the negative things I said at the beginning are about the process of editorship, if the sampling is about Turkey or if the researcher is someone from Turkey, you can feel the prejudice at this point, I can say that they can provide a quick feedback even in this process. As you know, in Turkey we can wait for long times just for the paper to be sent to the editor, I myself waited for 8 months once, it nearly takes about one and a half year to be sent to the referees. Therefore, it is a positive experience for me when I don't see these kinds of problems in international journals.

Motivation Sources during the Process of Academic Productivity

The factors motivating the instructors during the process of academic productivity to publish in international journals are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Motivation Sources of the Instructors about Publishing in International Journals

	Theme: Motivation Sources
Codes	- Contributing to science - Contributing to the field - Reaching the large masses - Creating a prestigious/professional CV -Improving personal development - To be cited - Benefitting from academic incentive - An open and clear process - Generally quick feedback

As seen in Table 4, in the process of their academic productivity, the instructors classified the motivation sources as contributing to science and to the field, reaching the larger masses, creating a prestigious/professional CV, improving personal development, being cited, benefitting from academic incentive, an open and clear process, generally quick feedback. From these statements, only those who completed their PHD in Turkey emphasized the element of benefitting from academic incentive.

Defining the motivation sources in publishing in international journals, I-11 stated that "well, there is one important thing, they are working quite systematically, I also emphasized about this while talking about the experiences, this is good thing. The fact that they work systematically encourages me to send my other papers to international journals". I9 also stated that "Here, this is important, you say to yourself you are doing a good study as an academician, because when you publish a study there, which is possible to say depending on the journal you send your paper, you make a more prestigious study, but if this study only stays with you, it doesn't mean anything. This publishing motivates you of course, another thing is the career development, you have to do that so that you can progress in your career and being renowned and celebrated is also important".

The reasons for not publishing in International Journals

The factors about the instructors' reasons for not publishing in international journals are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. The reasons for not publishing in International Journals

	Theme: The reasons for not Publishing in International Journals
Codes	- Finding a suitable national journal -Researches about national problems - Increasing the accessibility among the shareholders in the country - Paid journals -Feeling of insufficiency -Concerns about rejection

When the instructors' reasons for not publishing in international journals were studied, it was observed that when they found a suitable national journal, made a research about national problems or wanted to increase the accessibility among the shareholders in the country, they preferred national journals instead of sending publication to international journals. Besides, since some international journals are paid-ones, it can be counted as an important factor in choosing a journal. Feeling of insufficiency and concerns about rejection were considered as important factors mostly by the instructors who completed their doctoral degree in the country. About this, I-10 stated that "No, I have nothing, I am not in this situation. But maybe I can say something like that; some cases are only meaningful in these territories not in abroad. For instance, we have a publishing like that, about

Science High Schools. this may not be a valid research topic, because there are no counterparts of Science high schools in some other countries, when there is specific situation like this, I prefer publishing in national journals.

I4 stated that "… Sometimes I am worried, I say myself, now, what if I cannot get accepted, Well, I mean I am afraid of feedback too, have I done so many mistakes in the paper? I am always concerned about such a criticism to come."

I5 "The reson of this can be; If my study is about the system in Turkey or if it will contribute to the field in Turkey, I would like to send the paper to the national journals so that shareholders could benefit from the study and I also would like to do so for those who have language concerns.

The Reasons for not Publishing in National Journals

The factors about the instructors' reasons for not publishing in national journals are shown in Table 6.

Tablo 6. The Reasons for not publishing in National Journals

Theme: The Reasons for not Publishing in National Journals	
Codes	- Less reading - Concerns about being cited - Referee process - the length of time in publishing process - Vision of journal

When the the instructors' reasons for not publishing in national journals were studied, it could be said that those who completed their doctoral degree either in a foreign country or in Turkey had similar worries. The instructors in both groups stated that their publications in national journals would read less and because of this the citation will be less. Apart from these, the ambiguitites in referee process were among their concerns.

I-5, "In a foreign country, when a question is asked, they respond it as soon as possible, but I had such a problem in Turkey, I waited for a year and sent many e-mails to the editorship to have an answer. Yet, in abroad, they immediately try to turn back to you with sufficient data…"

I-10 stated that "I plan more comprehensive paper of mine to publish in international journals when I want it to reach larger audiences and if I don't want to restrict only for those who know Turkish. If I make a significant research or if I think my research would pay more attention or if I want it to reach large masses and thus if I want to be cited many times, my preference about publishing paper in a national journal would be limited.

The strategies the instructors followed during the publication process in international journals

The strategies the instructors followed during the publication process in international journals are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. The strategies the instructors followed during the publication process in international journals

Theme: The strategies the instructors followed during the publication process in international journals		
	Sub-theme 1: Strategies about the Journal	Sub-theme 2: Strategies about the Research
Codes	Reviewing Journals	Citing papers published in journals
	Considering about the topic choice	Valuing language using
	Reviewing publishing policies of the journals	Developing a powerful method
	Reviewing the editorial / referee board	Creating a strong theoretical basis
	Refereeing in national/international journals	Having support from the experts/consultant
	Reviewing the focus and content of the journal	

During the process of publishing in international journals, based on the strategies about journal the instructors focused on the strategies such as reviewing journals, considering about the topic choice, reviewing publishing policies of the journals, reviewing the editorial / referee board. The instructors determined some strategies about researches in sub-theme2 such as citing papers published in journals, valuing language using, developing a powerful method, having support from the experts/consultants.

I-8 stated that "when a research topic comes to my mind, I just start to think about which journal I should send it, at the very beginning, I determine the journal so that I can arrange the quality and content of the study, data analysis and all the other things accordingly. It is too important to determine the target at first, towards the publishing stage, I present the paper in a congress, but I don't publish it as a paper there, after I get feedback, I send it to a language editor by finalizing the last details. Although I completed my doctoral thesis abroad, our native language is not English, so I send it to a native speaker to review and then I start the publishing process.

I-13 stated as "first, we should study the content of the journal, I mean if it has a specific, minor but quality journal, we should prepare and send the paper based on their publishing policy. They are especially interested in actual events. I pay special attention to cite papers published in their journal".

Results and Discussions

According to the results of the study, the instructors described the purposes of academic productivity as academic progress, process of academic incentive and contribution to the scientific world. The issues of academic progress and academic incentive were predominantly emphasized by the instructors who completed their doctoral degree in domestic universities. The insturctors often approached academic productivity in the context of individual purposes. When the relevant literature was studied, it is possible to see similar results with the purposes of our study about the process of academic productivity. Huang and Hsu (2005) in their studies in which they analysed the process of institutional and individual academic productivity stated that the increasing competition of publishing in eligible journals among researchers could be about some purposes such as gaining a reputation, having a competitive advantage, taking up a position or taking promotion. Similarly, about the purposes of academic productivity, Long (1993) underlined the importance of prestige, Long and McGinnis (1985) and Nordhaug (1993) emphasized educational outcomes; and Mullins (1968) stated about creating social business networks (as cited: Dietz and Bozeman, 2005). Dundar and Lewis (1998) defined that academic productivity is important due to its contributions to corporate reputation; on the other hand, according to Youn and Price (2009) academic productivity seems important for academic progress and employing academicians.

In accordance with the results of the study, the instructors emphasized the facilitating factors and the obstacles they encountered during the process of publishing in international journals. The

instructors described the facilitating factors as the process of uploading publication, objective assessment process, advisory guidance, quick feedback and past experiences. When the favourable experiences were studied, it is possible to say that all experiences were about the factors facilitating the process. The difficulties encountered were described as prejudices against Turkish writers, language problems (emphasized by the instructors who completed their doctorate in domestic country), system of the journal, slow feedback, journal format, colleagues (emphasized by the instructors who completed their doctorate in a foreign country) and paid journals. It is possible to say that the instructors generally based the facilitating factors on the institutional process. They didn't dwell on individual process while talking about their experiences. However, when the literature was reviewed, the experiences based on academic productivity were mostly related with individual factors such as gender and mentorship (Diamond et al., 2016), individual conditions and age of career (Rauber and Ursprung 2008), completed academic program (Brusa, Carter and Heilman, 2010), self-sufficiency, research support, course load, business networks and organiational culture (Zhang, 2014), motivation (Horodnic and Zait, 2015), collaboration and business networks (Defazio, Lockett and Wright, 2009), having education of scientific and academic writing (Keys, 1997). Brew et al. (2015) summarized the factors contributing to academic productivity as institutional properties (organizational culture and atmosphere, finance, laboratory facilities), demographic variables (gender, family size, age of children), academic qualifications, trust and perception of self-sufficiency, work load, spending time, types of communication and guidance. Likewise, in the literature the obstacles the instructors encountered during the academic producvity were addressed as lack of time for making researches, lack of financing, lack of mentor, departmental culture (Nieuwoudt and Wilcocks, 2005) and obstacles about language (Gantman, 2012).

According to the results of the study, basic motivation sources of the instructors during the process of academic productivity, which can also be assessed as external motivation sources, are to contribute to science, to reach of the study to larger publics, to create prestigious/powerful CV, to contribute to personal development, to be cited, to benefit from academic incentive, a clear and open process and quick feedback. When the literature about the issue was reviewed, it was encountered with some studies which made emphasizes on both internal and external factors. As similar to the results of our study, Stephan and Levin (1992) stated that the basic motivation sources of the instructors during the process of academic productivity are internal pleasure, recognition and rewards (as cited: Dietz and Bozeman, 2005). While expressing the motivational factors of the instructors during the academic productivity, Bland et al. (2005) underlined the importance of internal motivation which results from contributing to society through creative studies, findings and innovations.

In the study, it was conluded that the instructors did not wish to publish papers in international journals owing to the reasons such as not being able to find a journal fitting their purpose, studies towards national problems, wishing to increase the accessibility of the study among national shareholders, costs of international journals, feeling of insufficiency and worry about rejection. Besides, it was concluded that the instructors did not wish to publish papers in national journals owing to the reasons such as less reading, concerns about being cited, referee process, the length of time in publishing process and vision of journal. In other words, the instructors encounter with several boundaries about the preference of either national or international journals in the process of publishing papers. In literature, although there has been no direct study about the reasons why the instructors do not wish to publish in national or international journals, some studies are encountered about the points the instructors should consider in finding the perfect journal. Assessment of acceptance possibility of the paper, journal prestige, reading percentage of the journal (journal visibility), publishing in time and ethical issues to consider were described as the points to take into consideration in the process of the instructors' preference of journals (Knight and Steinbach, 2008). Rowlands and Nicholas (2005) stated that journal prestige, journal visibility and impact of the journal are three important elements that should be considered. According to Björk and Holmström (2006), journal infrastructure (submission fee, journal resources, service level of journal, marketing strategies, reviewed indexes, technical facilities and payments for the writers), readership, (individual subscribers, institutional subscribers, electronic alert subscribers, impact on practitioners, web downloads, regional and topical fit of readership, impact on scientists and citations), journal prestige (publisher's prestige, impact

factor, journal ranking, prestige of editorial board, CV value of publication and institutional reward schemes) and performance of the journal (scientific level of journal, publication delay, journal rejection rate, quality of the review process and Submission rejection risk) are the points to consider in shoosing the journal (as cited: Dalton, 2013).

It was concluded in the study that the instructors determined a follow-up strategy about international journals and divided these staretiges into two: strategies about the journal and strategies about the publication. The instructors expressed to appreciate the strategies about the journals as reviewing journals, considering about the topic choice, reviewing publishing policies of the journals, reviewing the editorial / referee board and the strategies about the publication as citing papers published in journals, valuing language using, developing a powerful method, having support from the experts/consultants. When the literature was reviewed, it was revealed that many strategies about publication process were developed, which supported the results of the study. The strategies that should be followed in the publication process in international journals were defined with three steps: preparations before publishing, publishing process and technical process. The points that should be considered before publishing are choosing the research topic, determining the type of the article and audiences, finding the perfect journal in terms of aim and content, type of article, reading percentage and the actuality of the research topic and reading the writers' guidance carefully. A well-organized paper editing (title, writers, abstract, keywords, introduction, method, results and discussions chapters should be given systematically) the design of graphics and tables and a well-built reference chapter should be taken into consideration in the process of publishing; text layout, length of the article, abreviations and cover letter should be considered important in the process of technical design (Lee, 2008). According to Brunn (1998), to increase the acceptance possibilities of the paper, the writers should read the content of the journal and letters from the editors carefully and discuss about it with the colleagues. On the other hand, Harper (2006) stated that the writers should determine the journal before they start to write the paper. Additionally, choosing the topic and revising the paper (about spelling rules, language, method and content) before sending it to the journal are within the strategies that should be followed.

References

Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Di Costa, F. (2009). Research collaboration and productivity: is there correlation?. *Higher Education*, *57*(2), 155-171.

Ak, M. Z., & Gülmez, A. (2006). Türkiye'nin uluslararası yayın performansının analizi. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi*, *1*(1). 22-49.

Alonso-Arroyo, A., Gómez-Guardeño, E., González-Sanjuán, M. E., & Aleixandre-Benavent, R. (2013). Barrıers to the scıentıfıc productıon of the female unıversıty teachers of the health scıences areas. *Brazilian Journal of Information Science*, *7*(1).

Atasoylu A. A, Wright S. M, Beasley B. W, Cofrancesco J. Jr, Macpherson DS, Partridge T, et al (2003). Promotion criteria for clinician-educators. *J Gen Intern Med* 18, 711–716.

Bland, C. J., Center, B. A., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. G. (2005). A theoretical, practical, predictive model of faculty and department research productivity. *Academic Medicine*, *80*(3), 225-237.

Brusa, J., Carter, M., & Heilman, G. E. (2010). Academic content, research productivity, and tenure. *Journal of Economics and Finance*, *34*(1), 46-60.

Carayol, N. and Matt M. (2004). Individual and collective determinants of academic scientists' productivity. *Information Economics and Policy*, 18, 55-72.

Defazio, D., Lockett, A., & Wright, M. (2009). Funding incentives, collaborative dynamics and scientific productivity: Evidence from the EU framework program. *Research policy*, *38*(2), 293-305.

Diamond, S. J., Thomas Jr, C. R., Desai, S., Holliday, E. B., Jagsi, R., Schmitt, C., & Enestvedt, B. K. (2016). Gender differences in publication productivity, academic rank, and career duration among US academic gastroenterology faculty. *Academic Medicine*, *91*(8), 1158-1163.

Dietz, J. S., & Bozeman, B. (2005). Academic careers, patents, and productivity: industry experience as scientific and technical human capital. *Research policy*, *34*(3), 349-367.

Dundar, H., & Lewis, D. R. (1998). Determinants of research productivity in higher education. *Research in higher education*, *39*(6), 607-631.

Eti, S. (2003). Üniversitelerdeki akademik üretkenliğe etki eden faktörlerin incelenmesi. *Journal of Behavior at Work.* 1 (1), 87-93.

Gantman, E. R. (2012). Economic, linguistic, and political factors in the scientific productivity of countries. *Scientometrics*, *93*(3), 967-985.

G, Yinian., ve Zainab, A. N. (2001). Publication productivity of Malaysian researchers in the field of Computer Science and Information Technology. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, *6*(1), 1-23.

Green, R. G. (1998) "Faculty rank, effort and success", *Journal of Social Work Education*, 34(3), 415-426.

Horodnic, I. A., & Zaiţ, A. (2015). Motivation and research productivity in a university system undergoing transition. *Research Evaluation*, *24*(3), 282-292.

Huang, H. H., & Hsu, J. S. C. (2005). An evaluation of publication productivity in information systems: 1999 to 2003. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *15*(1), 31.

Keys, C. W. (1999). Revitalizing instruction in scientific genres: Connecting knowledge production with writing to learn in science. *Science education*, *83*(2), 115-130.

Lee, S., & Bozeman, B. (2005). The impact of research collaboration on scientific productivity. Social Studies of Science, 35(5), 673–702.

Lee, J. H.W., (2008). How to write a good paper for a top international journal. Elsevier Author Workshop Hohai University. https://www.elsevier.com/__data/promis_misc/international%20publishing%20china.pdf Erişim Tarihi: 28.02.2018

Levin, S. G., & Stephan, P. E. (1991). Research productivity over the life cycle: Evidence for academic scientists. *The American Economic Review*, 114-132.

Ma, Y., & Runyon, L. R. (2004). Academic synergy in the age of technology—A new instructional paradigm. *Journal of Education for Business*, *79*(6), 367-371.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education. revised and expanded from" case study research in education*. *Jossey-Bass Publishers*, 350 Sansome St, San Francisco, CA 94104.

Mishra, V., & Smyth, R. (2013). Are more senior academics really more research productive than junior academics? Evidence from Australian law schools. *Scientometrics*, *96*(2), 411-425.

Nieuwoudt, M. J., & Wilcocks, J. S. (2005). The attitudes and perceptions of South African accounting academics about research. *Meditari: Research Journal of the School of Accounting Sciences*, 13(2), 49-66.

OECD (2009). *Globalısatıon and hıgher educatıon: What mıght the future brıng?* Erişim Adresi: https://www.oecd.org/edu/imhe/44302672.pdf

Rauber, M. and Ursprung, H. W. (2008). Evaluation of researchers: A life cycle analysis of german academic economists', In: Scientific Competition, Conferences on New Political Economy, pp. 100–123. Tubingen: Mohr Siebek

Rushton, J. P., and Meltzer, S. (1981). Research productivity, university revenue, and scholarly impact (citations) of 169 British, Canadian, and United States universities. *Scientometrics* 3: 275-303.

Santo, S. A., Engstrom, M. E., Reetz, L., Schweinle, W. E., & Reed, K. (2009). Faculty productivity barriers and supports at a school of education. *Innovative Higher Education*, *34*(2), 117-129.

Smeby, J. C., & Try, S. (2005). Departmental contexts and faculty research activity in Norway. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(6), 593-619.

Smeltzer, S. C., Sharts-Hopko, N. C., Cantrell, M. A., Heverly, M. A., Wise, N. J., Jenkinson, A., & Nthenge, S. (2014). Challenges to research productivity of doctoral program nursing faculty. *Nursing Outlook*, *62*(4), 268-274.

Vasil, L. (1993). Gender difference in the academic career in New Zealand universities. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies,* 28(2)143-153.

Wissema, J. G. (2009). *Üçüncü kuşak üniversitelere doğru*, (Özyeğin Üniversitesi, Çev.) İstanbul: Özyeğin Üniversitesi Yayınları

Wood, F. (1990). Factors influencing research performance of university academic staff. *Higher Education*, *19*(1), 81-100.

Youn, T. I., & Price, T. M. (2009). Learning from the experience of others: The evolution of faculty tenure and promotion rules in comprehensive institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *80*(2), 204-237.

Zhang, X. (2014). *Factors that motivate academic staff to conduct research and influence research productivity in Chinese Project 211 universities*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Canberra.