

Factors and Considerations Influencing Faculty Members' Decision to Publish with Journals: A Nigerian University Experience

Ismail Olatunji Adeyemi

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9822-5950>
Pinheiro LP, Lagos, Nigeria
adeyemiismailolatunji@gmail.com

Kabir Sulaiman

Tunde Idiagbon Library, Ilorin, Nigeria
kabirsulaiman1983@gmail.com

Fatima Temim

Kwara State University, Malete, Nigeria
fatima.temim@kwasu.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

It has been observed that faculty members of Kwara State University (Kwasu) in Malete, Nigeria, publish in journals based on some factors and considerations. These factors and considerations guide their choice of publishing in journals. The aim of this study was to show the factors and considerations influencing Kwasu faculty members' decision to publish with journals. The study adopts a descriptive survey method, with a web-survey questionnaire as data collection instrument. The population for the study was 482, of whom 192 respondents participated in the survey, representing 39.8% of the total population. A quantitative analysis was carried out using data collected from the automatically-generated analysis of Google Forms. The hypothesis was tested using Microsoft Excel. It was found that some of the factors that influence the choice of Kwasu faculty members to publish with journals, include: peer review; publication cost; open access; impact factor; and frequency of publication. It was found that more than half of the faculty members give consideration to editorial board lists of journals before sending out their manuscripts to journals. It was also found that there is a statistically significant relationship between factors and considerations for the choice of publishing in a journal. Challenges encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals include poor communication between author and editor, faculty members' poor awareness of journals, difficulty in getting collaborators, and pressure to get an academic promotion.

Keywords: journal publishing factors; faculty members; Kwara State University (KWASU); journal publishing considerations; choice of journal

Introduction

The popular cliché in academia is: “either you publish or perish.” This is because publishing by faculty members is inevitable, as it propels their academic career and it is one of the core requirements for their promotion. It is observed that faculty members’ task to support teaching, learning and research through the communication of their research reports is challenged by the increasing cost of scholarly and scientific journals, publication time (from submission to publication), journal impact, country of publication and the changing of environmental factors. Anunobi and Ape (2018, 32) observe that faculty members produce knowledge and are determined in the dissemination of produced knowledge. This shows that faculty members carefully select journals to provide the best impact for their research reports and findings. Academia’s expectations for high-yielding research, as well as the multitude of new researchers entering the landscape, are factors contributing to the rise of “predatory publishers” or ill-reputed organisations that charge authors high publishing fees to publish their research (Dudley 2013, 58).

Arguably, publishing in highly regarded journals needs the development of requisite research and editorial skills, understanding of publishing ethics and professionalism (Ifijeh 2017, 152). Hence, for a faculty member to be published in a high-impact journal, there is the need to adhere to some set standards. Generally, it is perceived that faculty members consider some salient factors before they submit their manuscripts for possible publication. Some of the factors considered include whether the journal is indexed in major and popular databases, quality of publication, frequency of publishing, peer review, and high impact factor. The impact factor is the outcome of a statistical operation that shows the expected citation of a publication based on a two-year appraisal. This is the actual value of the journal, not the particular publication or author.

Masic and Begic (2015, 5) observe that index factors of journals include the quality of the journals, the language in which they are published, areas covered and journals’ distribution. Index factor denotes a simple quantification of the data for scientific research (Masic 2016). Hence, the quality of a journal is largely dependent on the index factor, because it is the quantitative criteria applied in the ranking, categorisation, evaluation and comparison of scientific journals. Also, academics who intend to publish would prefer to publish articles in high-index journals. With the index factor, the quality of journals can be determined through citation. However, citation by other authors is germane in the dissemination of study findings to the public (Nieminen et al. 2006). Practically, the general belief is that the higher the citation, the higher the quality of the journal. However, citation can be biased among some scholars. Sometimes, a citation is influenced by the quality of the article, understanding of the article, the language in which the article is written, loyalty to a certain group of researchers, types of the articles,

and benefits in terms of “I am quoting you and you quote me” (Masic and Sabzghabae 2014).

It is observed that with a high number of citations, the quality of a journal increases. The quality of a journal is another factor that faculty members take into consideration for journal publishing. Faculty members of a higher institution are interested in assessing the quality of a journal in order to publish in the most relevant scientific journals in their field of study. Masic and Kujundzic (2013) note that high standards for manuscript acceptance, a representative editorial board with appropriate representation of individual disciplines, the critical process of peer review, regular publishing, being indexed in major databases, a high degree of confidence in the content by readers, and a high frequency of citation in other journals are factors that academics consider for publishing in journals. Above all, a very important factor that determines the quality of a journal is the peer review process. A journal with a rigorous and careful review process would produce quality works with potential high citations.

Peer review is used by publishers to ensure that journal articles are robust; moreover, it helps to improve the coherence of scientific writing. This enhances the possibility of the research works to have a long-term impact on literature. The peer review system is the most conventional technique for the quality and validity of individual articles (Elsevier 2016). Kelly, Sadeghieh, and Adeli (2014) note that peer review supports and maintains integrity and authenticity in the advancement of science for better publication. Peer review can be described as experts’ observations and opinions of a research work. Usually, in high-impact journals, peer review is done in the form of blind review. Blind review is such that reviewers remain anonymous to authors, and double-blind peer review keeps authors and reviewers anonymous. Reviewers are given guidelines to follow by the editor to ensure that the standard and style of the journal are adhered to. Peer review is considered to be a reliable criterion because competent review experts’ opinion would improve scholarly communication. Meanwhile, timely peer review of authors’ work could be an indicator of timely publishing in academia.

Normally, journals are published in series, regarded as their frequency of publication. Consequently, the frequency of publishing a journal can be described as the number of times a journal publishes articles within a calendar year. Different journals have different frequency of publication, which is usually announced by journals or obvious through their pattern of publication that can be understood viewing journals’ websites or reading print copies. Some journals publish annually, some bi-annually, some three times in a year, some quarterly, monthly and some as frequently as possible. It has been observed that low quality journals usually have a high number of frequencies of publication within a year (Shen and Björk 2015). Considering all of these factors, not much study has been done on the perception and considerations of faculty members or of the factors that determine their choice of publishing in a journal.

Statement of the Problem

Over time, it has been observed that faculty members consider different factors before publishing in a journal. This is to ensure that they publish quality journal articles that will improve the frontier of knowledge. It has been observed that one of the requirements of Nigerian universities' faculty members is to be published in recognised journals that will improve their chances of academic promotion and prestige. Considering these factors, there has been heightened pressure on faculty members to get published. This may sometimes lead these faculty members to ignore the qualities of journals and to choose any journal at their disposal or reach in which to publish. With the lack of proper considerations of the necessary criteria, there is a high chance of published articles not getting the deserved and desired outreach and recognition. This has defeated the main motive of publishing research findings, which is to communicate results to educators, policy makers and society.

Kennan and Olsson (2011) note that potential factors to consider when publishing in academic journals, include the need to clarify the prospective audience and how they might ultimately use your research through quality and peer review. It is also perceived that the timing of publishing a journal article becomes an issue to faculty members. If an article under process takes a long time before feedback is received, it may possibly not meet the target of the faculty whose aim may be to use the article in consideration for promotion. Ultimately, a lack of understanding of the factors and considerations of faculty members may also lead to getting published in predatory journals. However, there has been no study that has established the factors and considerations which influence Kwara State University's (KWASU) faculty members' choices for publishing in journals. Against this backdrop, this study examined the factors and considerations of KWASU faculty members in their choice of publishing with journals.

Research Questions

The findings of this study answer the following questions:

1. What are the factors that influence KWASU faculty members' choice of publishing in journals?
2. What is the level of consideration of these factors by KWASU's faculty members in their choice of publishing in journals?
3. What are the challenges encountered by KWASU's faculty members in the effort to publish in journals?
4. What are the likely solutions associated with challenges encountered by KWASU's faculty members in the effort to publish in journals?

Hypothesis

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between factors and consideration of faculty members in their choices of publishing in journals.

Review of Related Literature

There are different studies on the factors that influence faculty members' choice of publishing. However, limited research has been carried out on the consideration of faculty members regarding their choice of publishing in journals. Masic (2013) identifies high standards for the manuscript process of reviews, regular publishing, being indexed in major databases, a high degree of confidence, and high frequency of citations in other journals as factors that influence faculty members to publish in journals. It was also established by Masic and Begic (2015) that journal quality, the language in which it is published, area covered and journal distributions are predictors adopted by faculty members in making decisions on which journals to publish in. This indicates that faculty members take into consideration language, which is most often English for the majority of journals. However, there are journals that accept manuscripts written in other languages, like Arabic, Spanish, Indonesian, and so on.

Dalton (2013) examined factors that influence Library and Information Science (LIS) authors when selecting a journal for submission, and in particular the significance of open access (OA) options and bibliometric indicators in this decision-making process. The study analysed two separate sub-groups of inferential statistical tests to explore if the research-practice dissemination divide, usually cited in the LIS literature, is also replicated in journal selection. The study result shows that choosing a journal for LIS research is a complex decision for both faculty members and staff. This indicates that academic publishing comes with intricacies for a faculty member. Therefore, it makes the decision of publishing in a journal difficult. The study also shows that index impact and peer review are majorly considered by LIS authors when selecting journals for submission. This implies that the performance of the journal and observation of peer review processes are painstakingly considered before submitting manuscripts to journals.

Sandesh and Wahrekar (2017) examined the perceptions of medical and dental researchers in India about the important criteria to consider while selecting scientific journals for publishing their research. Two hundred and six faculty staff members from three medical and five dental institutions were selected, using convenience sampling. A questionnaire with 24 items of close-ended questions on various factors related to journal selection for publication, was designed. Factors such as publication frequency, journal citation, indexing, peer review, impact factor, publication fees, acceptance or rejection rate were considered. The findings of the study revealed that indexing of the journal, impact factor, peer review process, and publication were the most important criteria to consider in journal selection. However, compared to dental researchers, medical researchers perceived open access and the peer review process as significantly more important criteria.

Pennington et al. (2017) carried out a study on faculty perception of publishing research. The study examined the perception of academic staff in publishing journals in Ethiopia. The study used a qualitative survey method called Qualtrix. Researchers gathered data

through full-time faculty members that were found through social media, such as Facebook and LinkedIn. The findings of the study revealed that the majority of the faculty members were highly aware that peer review, the indexing factor, and publication fees are factors that influence publishing in journals. This shows that a faculty of a university perceived publication fee, peer review and frequency of publication as important factors which influenced their choice of journals for publication. Understanding that Ethiopia is a developing country, like Nigeria, where the university under study is domiciled, there may be ample implication that the publication fee, the peer review process and frequency of publication influence the decision of faculty members in the university to publish with journals. However, there is no evidence to support this in the literature. This leaves obvious gaps to fill in literature.

Ritzhaupt, Sessums, and Johnson (2012) examined the factors influencing an individual's choice to publish within a specific journal. The study adopted a descriptive survey method. A total of 79 educational technology professionals responded to an online survey designed to ascertain the necessary data to answer the research questions. The instrument was made accessible in a Web-based format using LimeSurvey. The researchers made arrangements to send the survey to three educational technology listservs, viz: the AECT members' listserv, the ITFORUM listserv, and the AERA Special Interest Group on Instructional Technology member listserv. Results show that educational technology professionals generally agree that some publication attributes stand out among others. The study found that when one chooses to publish within a particular journal, the fit of the manuscript within the journal, the aims and intent of the journal, and the target audience, are among the most important factors.

Selitto (2009) examined the publication attributes of highly rated information systems journals. In the study, publishing attributes investigated included journal age and size, circulation, number of articles published, annual subscription cost, frequency of publication, and article length—attributes that have all been alluded to as being associated with journal standing and quality. The study also argues that a journal's impact factor (JIF) encapsulates citation practices that are a reflection of the knowledge diffusion value of the journal—a characteristic that allows the correlation between a journal's average 5-year impact factor and associated publishing attributes to be investigated. The study found that only two publishing attributes—circulation (0.417) and article length (0.432)—were found to positively correlate with the averaged JIF and hence, assist with knowledge diffusion. Indeed, academics in their manuscript preparation may do well to consider circulation (journal reach) and journal article length (richness) as important publishing attributes that can be regarded as having the potential to contribute to the dissemination of scholar knowledge.

Methodology

This study adopted descriptive survey research to examine the factors and considerations of Kwasu faculty members on their choice of publishing in journals.

The population of this study included academic staff of Kwara State University, Malete, Nigeria. The study adopted a quantitative method of data collection with the use of a questionnaire. The Web-based questionnaire was adapted for the administration of the questionnaire on academic staff members via e-mail and WhatsApp (majorly WhatsApp groups of KWASU academic staff). According to the Report of Kwara State University's registry (2018), there were 482 academic staff in KWASU. The study adopted a random sampling technique. Total population sampling technique was considered, owing to the small population of the faculty members. Moreover, all the academic staff in the different colleges of KWASU serve the purpose of this study. The small population of this study appears to be a limitation to the research design of this study. A total of 192 responses were collected over a period of two months between October and November 2019. The eight-weeks period was to ensure that the response rate was high. The response rate was 39.8% of the total population of the study. Fan and Yan (2010) estimate that a Web survey yields 11% lower results than other survey methods. This implies that the response rate was valid for this study.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

This section presents the result of data collected from the study. The results are presented with the use of tables, and analysed data will be interpreted.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of respondents

Items	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	142	74.0%
Female	50	26.0%
Total	192	100%
Age		
Less than 25 years	2	1.0%
26–35	54	28.1%
36–45	121	63.0%
46–55	12	6.3%
56 years and above	3	1.6%
Total	192	100%
Years of experience		
Less than 5 years	49	25.5%
6–15 years	129	67.2%
16–25 years	12	6.3%
26 years and above	2	1.0%
Total	192	100%
Academic qualification		
Graduate assistant	12	6.25%
Assistant lecturer	16	8.3%
Lecturer II	76	39.9%
Lecturer I	32	16.7
Senior lecturer	46	24.0%
Reader/Associate professor	8	4.2%
Professor	2	1.0%
Total	192	100%

Source: Field survey (2019)

Table 1 shows that most of the respondents were male, which indicates that most of the faculty members in KWASU, who responded to the study, were male. Also, it is shown in the table that most of the respondents were between the ages of 36–45 (63.0%); a significant portion of the respondents were younger than 55 years (98.4%). This reflects that most of the faculty members of KWASU were relatively young. Moreover, it can be observed in table 1 that more than half of the respondents (67.2%) have between 6–15 years of experience. Also, it can be seen from table 1 that most of the faculty members who participated in this study were in the academic cadre of Lecturer II. Table 1 shows that there were only 2(1.0%) professors among the respondents.

RQ 1: What are the factors that influence Kwara State University faculty members' choice of publishing in journals?

Table 2: Factors that influence faculty members' choice of publishing in journals

Items	Strongly agreed	Agreed	Disagreed	Strongly disagreed
Publication fee	117(61.0%)	32(16.7%)	28(14.6%)	15(7.7%)
Frequency of journal publication	152(79.2%)	21(11.0%)	13(6.8%)	6(3.1%)
Impact factor	37(19.3%)	101(52.6%)	50(26.0%)	4(2.1%)
Peer review	53(27.6%)	121(63.0%)	12(6.3%)	6(3.1%)
Editorial board	21(11.0%)	89(46.4%)	21(11.0%)	61(31.8%)
Journal host/domiciliary	61(31.8%)	76(39.6%)	15(7.8%)	40(20.8%)
Open access	180(93.8%)	2(1.0%)	3(1.6%)	7(3.6%)

Source: Field survey (2019) (N.B.: SA + A=Agreed; SD + D=Disagreed)

Table 2 shows that 149(77.7%) of the respondents agreed that publication fee is a factor that influences faculty members' choice of publishing in a journal, while 43(22.3%) disagreed. This shows that the publication fee is one of the factors that influence faculty members' choice of publishing in a journal. It was observed that 173(91.1%) of the respondents agreed that the frequency of journal publication is a factor that influences the choice of publishing in a journal, while 19(8.9%) disagreed. This reflects that the frequency of journal publication influences faculty members' choice of publishing in journals. Table 2 also shows that 138(71.9%) of the respondents agreed that the impact factor influences the choice of publishing in a journal, while 54(28.1%) disagreed. This implies that the majority of the respondents agreed that the impact factor influences the choice of faculty members' choice for publishing in journals.

Moreover, 174(90.6%) of the respondents agreed that peer review is a factor that influences faculty members' choice of publishing in a journal, while 18(9.4%) disagreed. This shows that a significant part of the respondents agreed that peer review influences faculty members' choice of publishing in journals. Table 2 shows that 110(57.4%) of the respondents agreed that the editorial board is a factor that influences faculty members' choice of publishing in a journal, while 82(42.6%) disagreed. This indicates that more than half of the respondents agreed that the list of editorial board influences faculty members' choice of publishing in journals. Table 2 shows that 137(71.4%) of the respondents agreed that journal host/domiciliary is a factor that influences faculty members' choice of publishing in a journal, while 55(28.6%) disagreed. This reflects that journals' host/domiciliary influences faculty members' choice of publishing in a journal. Lastly, table 2 indicates that 182(94.8%) of

respondents agreed that open access is a factor that influences faculty members' choice of publishing in journals, while 10(5.2%) disagreed. This means that open access (OA) influences faculty members' choice of publishing in journals. Other factors identified by the respondents include journals' ranking and Web presence, visibility of journals to wider readers, and interests and peculiarities.

RQ 2: What is the level of consideration of these factors by Kwara State University faculty members in the choice of publishing in journals?

Table 3: Level of considerations

Items	Very high level	High level	Moderate level	Low level
Publication fee	165(85.9%)	20(10.4%)	4(2.1%)	3(1.6%)
Frequency of journal publication	143(74.5%)	12(6.3%)	21(11.0%)	16(8.2%)
Impact factor	71(37.0%)	32(16.7%)	79(41.1%)	10(5.2%)
Peer review	56(29.2%)	111(57.8%)	4(2.0%)	21(11.0)
Editorial review	101(52.6%)	76(39.6%)	12(6.3%)	3(1.6%)
Journal host/domiciliary	111(57.7%)	21(11.0%)	52(27.1%)	8(4.2%)
Open access	87(45.3%)	65(33.9%)	3(1.6%)	37(19.3%)

Source: Field survey (2019) (N.B.: VHL + HL =High Level)

Table 3 highlights that 185(96.4%) of the respondents indicated a high level of consideration for publication fee, 4(2.1%) considered publication fee to a moderate level, while 3(1.6%) considered publication fee at a low level. This implies that the majority of respondents have a high level of consideration for publication fee in publishing with a journal. Table 3 indicates that 155(80.8%) of the respondents have a high level of consideration for the frequency of journal publication, 21(11.0%) have moderate consideration, and 16(8.2%) have a low level of consideration. This shows that the majority of the respondents have a high level of consideration for the frequency of journal publication. It can be seen in table 3 that 103(53.7%) of the respondents perceived that a high level of consideration is given to the impact factor of a journal, 79(41.1%) were of moderate level, and 10(5.2%) considered the impact factor at a low level. This indicates that more than half of the respondents pay a high level of consideration to the impact factor in their choice of publishing in a journal. Moreover, table 3 illustrates that 167(87.0%) of the respondents have a high level of consideration for peer review, 4(2.0%) have a moderate level and 21(11.0%) have a low level of consideration. This reflects that the majority of the respondents have a high level of consideration for peer review.

Table 3 illustrates that 177(92.2%) of the respondents have a high level of consideration for the editorial review of a journal, 12(6.3%) have a moderate level, and 3(1.6%) have a low level of consideration. This indicates that the majority of the respondents have a high level of consideration for editorial review of journals. It can be seen in table 3 that

132(68.7%) of the respondents have a high level of consideration for journal host/domiciliary, 52(27.1%) have a moderate level, and 8(4.2%) have a low level of consideration. This depicts that the majority of the respondents have a high level of consideration for journal host/domiciliary. Lastly, table 3 shows that 152(79.2%) of the respondents have a high level of consideration for open access, 3(1.6%) have a moderate level, and 37(19.3%) have a low level of consideration. This means that the majority of respondents have a high level of consideration for open access as a factor considered by KWASU faculty members in the choice of publishing in journals. It was also revealed that other factors that are considered by faculty members of KWASU, include Web presence and journal scope.

RQ 3: What are the challenges faculty members encountered in the publishing of journal articles?

Table 4: Challenges faculty members encountered in publishing with journals

Items	Strongly agreed	Agreed	Disagreed	Strongly disagreed
High cost of article processing charge (APC)	145(75.5)	19(9.9%)	7(3.6%)	21(10.9%)
Poor communication from journal's editor	161(83.9%)	10(5.2%)	13(6.8%)	8(4.2%)
Pressure to publish for promotion	78(40.6%)	100(52.1%)	4(2.1%)	10(5.2%)
Falling into the trap of predatory journals	116(60.4%)	53(27.6%)	3(1.6%)	20(10.4%)
Difficulty in getting collaborators	170(88.5%)	15(7.8%)	3(1.6%)	4(2.1%)

Source: Field survey (2019) (N.B.: SA + A=Agreed; SD + D=Disagreed)

Table 4 shows that 164(85.5%) of the respondents agreed that the high cost of article processing charge (APC) is a challenge encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals, while 28(14.5%) disagreed. This indicates that an overwhelming number of respondents agreed that the high cost of article processing charge (APC) is a challenge encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals. Table 4 illustrates that 171(89.1%) of the respondents agreed that poor communication from a journal's editor is a challenge encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals, while 21(10.9%) disagreed. This shows that the majority of the respondents agreed that poor communication from a journal's editor is a challenge encountered by KWASU faculty members in publishing with journals. Results show that other challenges faced by faculty members of KWASU include the late response of reviewers, finance, timing, and poor editorial work.

Table 4 shows that 178(92.7%) of the respondents agreed that pressure to publish for promotion is a challenge faced by KWASU faculty members in publishing with journals, while 14(7.3%) disagreed. This implies that the majority of the respondents agreed that pressure to publish for promotion is a challenge encountered by faculty

members in publishing with journals. Moreover, table 4 indicates that 169(88.0%) of the respondents agreed that falling into the trap of predatory journal is a challenge encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals, while 23(12.0%) disagreed. This depicts that an overwhelming number of respondents agreed that falling into the trap of predatory journals is a challenge encountered by KWASU faculty members in publishing with a journal. Lastly, 185(96.3%) of the respondents agreed that difficulty in getting collaborators is a challenge encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals, while 7(3.6%) disagreed. This indicates that the majority of respondents agreed that difficulty in getting collaborators is a challenge encountered by KWASU faculty members in publishing with a journal.

RQ 4: What are the likely solutions associated with challenges faculty members encountered in journal publishing?

Table 5: Likely solutions associated with challenges faculty members encountered in the publishing of journals

Items	Strongly agreed	Agreed	Disagreed	Strongly disagreed
Waiver of APC and reduction in the cost of publishing	101(52.6%)	37(19.3%)	4(2.1%)	50(26.0%)
Proper communication between editor and author	111(57.8%)	56(29.2%)	4(2.0%)	21(11.0)
Reduced pressure to publish for sake of promotion	99(51.6%)	75(39.1%)	06(3.1%)	12(6.3%)
More awareness and campaign against predatory journal	143(74.5%)	12(6.3%)	16(8.2%)	21(11.0%)
Scholars should be open to collaborators	161(83.9%)	10(5.2%)	13(6.8%)	8(4.2%)

Source: Field survey (2019) (N.B.: SA + A=Agreed; SD + D=Disagreed)

Table 5 shows that 138(71.9%) of the respondents agreed that the waiver of article processing charge (APC) and a reduction in the cost of publishing are likely solutions to the challenges encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals, while 54(28.1%) disagreed. This implies that the majority of the respondents agreed that the waiver of APC and a reduction in the cost of publishing are likely solutions to the challenges encountered by faculty members in publishing with a journal. Table 5 illustrates that 167(87.0%) of the respondents agreed that proper communication between editors and authors is a likely solution to the challenge encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals, while 25(13.0%) disagreed. This indicates that an overwhelming number of respondents agreed that proper communication between editors and authors is a likely solution to the challenges encountered by faculty members in publishing with a journal. Table 5 shows that 174(90.7%) of the respondents agreed that reduced pressure to publish for the sake of promotion is a possible solution to the challenges encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals, while 18(9.3%)

disagreed. This reflects that the majority of the respondents agreed that reduced pressure to publish for the sake of promotion could be regarded as a possible solution to the challenges encountered by faculty members in publishing with a journal.

Furthermore, 155(80.8%) of the respondents agreed that more awareness and campaigns against predatory journals may be a possible solution to the challenges encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals, while 37(19.2%) disagreed. This reflects that the majority of respondents agreed that awareness and campaigns against predatory journals could be regarded as possible solutions to the challenges encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals. Lastly, 171(89.1%) of the respondents agreed that scholars should be open to act as a collaborator, which was regarded as a likely solution to the challenge encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals, while 21(10.9%) disagreed. This depicts that an overwhelming number of respondents agreed that scholars being open to act as collaborators, is a likely solution to the challenge encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals. Results revealed that other solutions suggested by some of the respondents include motivation of academic staff to carry out research, free publication fee, a reduction in the article processing charge, and research grants.

Test of hypothesis

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between factors and considerations of faculty members in their choices of publishing in journals.

Table 6: Relationship between factors and consideration of faculty members in their choices of publishing in journals

Variables	Mean	SD	N	df	R	P-value	Remark
Factors for the choice of publishing	3.1623	0.84302	192	190	.831**	.000	Sig....
Consideration for the choice of publishing	2.6509	0.87332					

Source: Field survey (2019) **Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 6 indicates that the Pearson's R is 0.831, while the p=0.000 is lower than the common level of significance of 0.05. The null hypothesis is hereby rejected. Hence, this shows that there is a relationship between factors for the choice of publishing in journals and consideration for the choice of publishing in a journal by faculty members of Kwara State University, Malete, Nigeria.

Discussion of the Findings

On the factors that influence KWARA faculty members' choice of publishing in journals, the findings of the study show that publication fee, frequency of journal publication, impact factor, peer review, editorial board, journal host/domiciliary and

open access are the factors that influence faculty members in journal publishing. The findings of this study support Dalton (2013), who identified index impact, peer review and open access as factors that influence authors' choice of publishing in journals. Similarly, Pennington et al. (2017) reveal that the majority of faculty members in Ethiopia were highly aware that peer review and publication fees are factors that determine their choice of publishing with journals. Other factors identified by the respondents include journals' ranking and Web presence, visibility of journals to wider readers, and interests and peculiarities. In a similar finding, Ritzhaupt et al. (2012) showed that the fit of a manuscript within a journal's aim, audience and target audience are the most important factors. This basically suggests that faculty members in KWARA are concerned with the communication of their findings to a wide coverage of reader, with utmost interest in the visibility of journals.

On considerations of faculty members in the choice of publishing in journals, the findings of the study indicate that the majority of faculty members have a high level of consideration for publication fee, frequency of journals publication, impact factor, peer review, editorial review, journal host/domiciliary and open access. This buttresses the opinion of Sandesh and Wahrekar (2017) that indexing of journals, impact factor, the peer review process and publication were the most important criteria to consider in journal selection. Moreover, study findings show that, compared to dental researchers, medical researchers perceived open access and the peer review process as significantly more important criteria for consideration in selecting a journal. It was also revealed that other factors that are considered by faculty members of KWARA include web presence and journal scope. The results show that there is a statistically significant relationship between factors for the choice of publishing in journals and consideration for the choice of publishing in a journal by faculty members of KWARA.

On the challenges encountered by faculty members in the publishing of journals, the study revealed that the high cost of APC, poor communication from a journal's editor, the pressure to publish for promotion, falling into the trap of predatory journals and difficulty in getting collaborators, are the challenges that KWARA's faculty members encountered in publishing with journals. Other challenges faced by KWARA's faculty members include the late response of reviewers, finance, timing, and poor editorial work. Regarding likely solutions to the challenges encountered by faculty members in publishing with a journal, the findings show the waiver of APC and a reduction in the cost of publishing, proper communication, reduced pressure to publish for the sake of promotion, awareness and a campaign against predatory journals, and being open to more collaborators as the likely solutions relevant to the challenges encountered by faculty members in publishing with journals. Other solutions suggested the motivation of faculty members to carry out research, free publication fee, a reduction in the article processing charge, and research grants.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. University management should improve on providing research grants for their faculty members to boost their morale to carry out research and report its findings.
2. Senior faculty members should be open to collaborations with junior faculty members to ease the challenges associated with academic collaborations.
3. Journal reviewers are advised to facilitate review time, as it was established that extended timing of manuscript review could be a challenge to faculty members.
4. Faculty members should be patient enough to go through journals' information before submission of a manuscript.
5. Faculty members of the university should be sensitised on the factors that influence the choice of publishing in journals.
6. Interdisciplinary collaborations should also be encouraged among the faculty members.
7. Future studies should consider expanding the study population by considering a study on faculty members in universities in the north-central or other geo-political areas in Nigeria.
8. Future studies could consider carrying out a study to ascertain the most important factor considered by Nigerian faculty members in publishing with journals.
9. Moreover, future studies can consider carrying out a comparative analysis of the factors considered by faculty members in polytechnics and universities in Nigeria.

Conclusion

It was established in the study that factors such as peer review, editorial board, cost of publication, open access, frequency of publication, and impact factors are seriously taken into consideration by faculty members of KWASU in their choice of publishing with a journal. It is also affirmed in the study that challenges faced by faculty members in publishing with journals include poor communication between author and editor, a faculty's poor awareness of predatory journals, lack of collaborators and a hastening of getting a promotion. This espouses that the communication pattern between authors (especially those in a developing country like Nigeria) and editors poses a challenge in the publication process. The study supports that there is low awareness of predatory journals among faculty members in developing countries like Nigeria. The study affirms that research grants and scholarship will boost the morale of faculty members of KWASU and other universities in developing countries to carry out research and report their findings.

References

- Anunobi, V. Chinwe, and Rebecca Ape. 2018. "Promotional Strategies for Open Access Resources Discovery and Access." *Webology* 15 (1): 31–45.
- Dalton, Michelle. 2013. "A Dissemination Divide? The Factors that Influence the Journal Selection Decision of Library and Information Studies (LIS) Researchers and Practitioners." *Library and Information Research* 37 (115): 33–57.
<https://doi.org/10.29173/lirg553>.
- Dudley, M. Quinn. 2013. "The Curious Case of Academic Publishing." *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research* 8 (1): 56–65.
<https://doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v8i1.2601>.
- Elsevier. 2016. "What is Peer Review?" Accessed December 26, 2019.
<https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers/what-is-peerreview>.
- Fan, Weimiao, and Zheng Yan. 2010. "Factors Affecting Response Rates of the Web Survey: A Systematic Review." *Computers in Human Behaviors* 26: 132–39.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2009.10.015>.
- Ifijeh, Goodluck. 2017. "Emergence of Predatory Publishing in Library and Information Science: Issues and Implications for Scholarship among Academic Staff in Nigeria." *Bilgi Dünyası* 18 (1): 149–61. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/85162291.pdf>.
<https://doi.org/10.15612/BD.2017.572>.
- Kelly, Jacalyn, Tara Sadeghieh, and Khosrow Adeli. 2014. "Peer Review in Scientific Publications: Benefits, Critiques, and a Survival Guide." *The Journal of the International Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine* 25 (3): 227–43.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4975196/>.
- Kennan, Mary Ann, and Michael R. Olsson. 2011. "Writing It Up: Getting Your LIS Research Out There." *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* 42 (1): 14–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2011.10722201>.
- Kwara State University's Registry 2018. "Annual Academic Report. Kwara State University."
- Masic, Izet. 2013. "Medical Publication and Scientometrics." *Journal of Research Medical Science* 8: 516–21. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3818625/>.
- Masic, Izet. 2016. "Index Factors for Assessing the Scientific Journal Validity, its Articles and their Authors." *Journal of Forensic Anthropology* 1 (1): 1–11.
<https://www.longdom.org/open-access/index-factors-for-assessing-the-scientific-journal-validity-its-articles-and-their-authors-jfa-1000103.pdf>.
- Masic, Izet, and Edin Begic. 2015. "Meta-analysis as Statistical and Analytical Content Scientific Evaluation." *Acta Inform Med* 23 (1): 4–11.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25870484/>. <https://doi.org/10.5455/aim.2015.23.4-11>.

- Masic, Izet, and Enes Kujundzic. 2013. "Science Editing in Biomedicine and Humanities." *Avicena Sarajevo*, 11–144.
- Masic, Izet, and Ali Muhammed Sabzghabae. 2014. "How Clinicians Can Validate Scientific Contents?" *Journal of Research Medical Science* 19: 583–85.
<http://jrms.mui.ac.ir/index.php/jrms/article/view/9986>.
- Nieminen, Pentti, Carpeter R. James, Rucker Gerta, and Schumacher Martin. 2006. "The Relationship between Quality of Research and Citation Frequency." *BMC Medication Research Methodology* 6 (1): 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-6-42>.
- Pennington D. R., A. Swanson, E. Akwaowo, and P. Zobisch. 2017. "Faculty Perceptions of Publishing Research." In *Interactive Collaborative Learning*, edited by Auer M., Guralnick D., Uhomoibhi J., 75–87. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, vol 544. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50337-0_7.
- Ritzhaupt, D. Albert, D. Christopher Sessums, and C. Margeaux Johnson. 2012. "Where Should Educational Technologists Publish their Research? An Examination of Peer-reviewed Journals within the Field of Educational Technology and Factors Influencing Publication Choice." *Educational Technology* 52 (6): 47–56.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/44430204>.
- Sandesh, Narajappa, and Shilpa Wahrekar. 2017. "Choosing the Scientific Journal for Publishing Research Work: Perceptions of Medical and Dental Researchers." *Clujul Medical* 90 (2): 196–202. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5433573/>.
<https://doi.org/10.15386/cjmed-704>.
- Sellitto, Carmine. 2009. "A Study of Journal Publication Attributes: Some Considerations for Academics in the Information Systems Discipline." *Webology* 6 (1): Article 66.
<http://www.webology.org/2009/v6n1/a66.html>.
- Shen, Cenyu, and Bo-Christer Björk. 2015. "'Predatory' Open Access: A Longitudinal Study of Article Volumes and Market Characteristics." *BMC Medicine* 13 (1): 1–15.
<https://bmcmmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12916-015-0469-2>