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Dear Graduate Student,

In this issue of Graduate Quarterly we continue our practice of using this newsletter to address issues related to quality of graduate education and student welfare. Both time-to-degree and the challenges of graduate student publishing are key issues that affect—as well as measure—the outcome of graduate education.

While the featured topic of this issue is publishing as a part of graduate education, I also want to elaborate briefly on a comment directly related to time-to-degree, which I made to you at the Entering Graduate Students’ Welcome Reception in September: “Please feel at home but don’t stay too long” is my advice, which—if taken seriously—can serve to increase your value on the job market once you’ve completed your program. Al Aubin, associate director of the UCLA Career Center, told me recently that some employers, such as the consulting firm of McKinsey & Company, use a graduate’s time-to-degree as an indicator in selection criteria for employment. The particular quality evaluated when questioning time-to-degree is “what is the applicant’s drive or aspiration?” Whether your future career is in academia or industry, you need to assume that those responsible for hiring decisions will interpret timely progress in doctoral education as a sign of intellectual vigor, competence, and commitment. Please learn what the normative time-to-degree is for your academic program and use it as a yardstick for your progress. You will find this information in the Program Requirements sections, which are posted on the Graduate Division website at gdnet.ucla.edu under “Publications and Forms.”

Our feature article, “An Inside Look at Pre-doctoral Publishing” was created using a somewhat unique approach. We studied the accomplishments section of six GQ newsletters in the past two years and identified those students who reported their papers and presentations most consistently. Those students were then sent an email survey asking a variety of questions related to the process of publishing in graduate school. The article is based on the overwhelming response generated by this email survey, as well as from interviews with many of the respondents. It is my sincere hope that this article, so rich with student voices, along with Wendy Belcher’s article on page 20, will provide helpful information, ideas, and support. We would enjoy any feedback from you on the effectiveness of these writings and their applicability to your everyday situations.

Where possible the Graduate Division will continue using institutional research data, including student surveys and interviews, to provide relevant background and updates on these issues. If there are particular issues you would like to see addressed in the Quarterly, please let me know by sending email to cmkernan@gdnet.ucla.edu or call 825-4383.

Sincerely,

Claudia Mitchell-Kernan
Vice Chancellor Graduate Studies
Dean, Graduate Division

quote for thought

“The dissertation is the ultimate homework—a complex, ritualized caricature of every academic exercise one has done, or should have done, and now, finally, must do. Consequently, most dissertations are marked by pedantry, redundancy, defensiveness, and timidity. These characteristics all fall within the time-honored tradition of students’ homage to the discipline and humility toward self. But the dissertation style is at variance with the requirements of postdoctoral writing and publication…. A successful transition from dissertation student to publishing scholar requires a crucial shift from one type of writing to another.”

Mary Frank Fox (1985)

The Transition from Dissertation Student to Publishing Scholar and Professional
In M. F. Fox (Ed.), Scholarly Writing and Publishing Issues, Problems, and Solutions
Time Taken to Earn Doctorate: An Indicator of Outcome in Higher Education

In her opening statements at the Fall 2000 reception to welcome incoming graduate students, Vice Chancellor Claudia Mitchell-Kerman explained that while we welcome new students and encourage them to enjoy their time at UCLA, we also expect that they will move through their programs in a timely fashion. “Please feel at home, but don’t stay here too long,” she said. With this, she introduced new students to the concept of time-to-degree.

The time it takes doctoral students to complete their degrees has been a concern at university campuses across the United States for some years. Much research has been done into describing times to degree by various fields and determining differences. National organizations such as the National Science Foundation and most universities are involved in ongoing discussions about this topic.

Why the concern with time to degree?

While enrollment in UCLA’s Graduate Division has remained relatively steady over the past several decades—about 8,000 students each Fall term—the UC system is expecting an increased influx of students in what is termed “Tidal Wave II.” The question of how to make room for the additional 1,000 graduate students UCLA is expecting is answered in part by increasing the number of students who graduate each year. This can be accomplished by shortening the length of each student’s stay at the university.

Another issue related to time to degree is whether the institution is using its limited financial resources effectively if students are not making appropriate progress toward degrees. Financial resources used for student funding are expected to be used to encourage students to complete degrees.

While a doctoral degree is a goal in itself, it can also be seen as a step in a person’s professional career development. It has been reported that some prospective employers are using time-to-degree as part of the evaluative process of recruitment and hiring. In short, those who are productive as graduate students and who move through their degree programs more quickly are viewed as those most likely to be productive faculty members or employees in other fields. Those who take extended times to get their degrees have many reasons for doing so, but students should realize that long times to degree may have unintended negative consequences.

Extended times to degree also bring into question whether the graduates are still at the “cutting edge” in their fields. This is obviously true in the sciences, but also impacts other fields where research directions and research techniques are changing.

A few numbers

Time-to-degree varies by field of study. Science doctorates take less time than social sciences and humanities. Doctorates in some of the professional programs take much longer than other fields.

For doctorates at UCLA during the 1989-90 through 1998-99 period, the overall mean time from admission to graduate programs to the award of the degree is 7.42 years and the median time is 6.33 years. This differs by field as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Mean Years</th>
<th>Median Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Architecture</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy and Social Research</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater, Film and TV</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Academic</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Reported here are the “elapsed” time-to-degree numbers. The mean and median for “registered” time-to-degree figures would be somewhat less.

continued on page 14
Does ‘publish or perish’ pertain to you?

An Inside Look at Pre-doctoral Publishing

Once upon a time the old saw, “publish or perish,” applied only to faculty seeking tenure at a college or university. Today, with more and more competition for jobs in academia and industry, it’s an adage graduate students might want to work in needlepoint or chip in marble and hang over their desks for inspiration. How, we wondered, do graduate students go about meeting this challenge?

In each issue, the Graduate Quarterly publishes a listing by department and author’s name of works recently presented or published. Drawing from those lists, we sent email surveys to nearly 100 graduate students who presented or published their work regularly in 1999 and 2000. Nearly half of them replied, providing us with an inside look at the art of getting published while still in graduate school.

Many graduate students are blessed with advisers who are prolific publishers and who recognize the importance of this work to their students’ professional success. Other students enjoy the adventure of publishing more or less on their own, drawing experience from reading journals and attending professional conferences. Many rely on other students as practice audiences for presentations and copy-editors for journal submissions, as sources of inspiration and moral support.

In the following pages, we’d like to share some of our findings, and we extend our warmest thanks to the many students who so generously and forthrightly shared their experiences.

Lone Scholar Versus Co-authorship

Tom Shih in Environmental Science and Engineering has co-authored 18 publications or presentations in the last two years. He attributes much of this publishing record to his mentor and co-author, Professor Mel Suffet. Because Professor Suffet “is renowned in his field, he captures large amounts of research grants to fund many different projects simultaneously,” Tom says, including Tom’s work on the treatment of drinking water to remove gasoline additives. And Professor Suffet “is very proactive in terms of getting things published—he pushes you.”

In the sciences and some of the professional schools, co-authorship is the rule. Working on a team with a professor who publishes frequently, as Tom does, gives graduate students an advantage in getting their names attached to articles. For students in the humanities and social sciences, where co-authorship is rare because student research projects are usually quite distinct from the faculty adviser’s work, the hurdles may be a bit higher:

Having a faculty co-author also helps students meet submission or publication fees at some journals, fees that can run into the hundreds of dollars—“not a price that a graduate student can usually afford,” Wen-wen Tung of Atmospheric Science notes. Reprints of articles cost still more, she says. Such costs can have an impact on decisions about where to submit work, but there are other factors as well.

Picking a Target Journal

Valentina Pagliai of Anthropology urges her graduate student colleagues “to trust in yourself—go for the important journal,” but she adds, “don’t be discouraged if you don’t make it the first time.”

Steve Baur in Musicology follows this strategy: “I send it first to the place where I would like it to be published. If it isn’t accepted by that journal, then I can always send it later to a journal more likely to accept it.”

A crucial issue is how the topic of the paper meshes with a journal’s typical content. “I usually ask faculty and professionals which journals would fit the best my article, since they have more experience publishing than myself,” says Lawrence Chu in Epidemiology. “I would ideally like to be published in the top-tier journals, but if my chances of being accepted are slim, then I would opt for a journal that would be more likely to accept the article.”

Graduate students at UCLA and other universities sponsor conferences and journals. About 30 graduate student journals are published at UCLA alone. These may be easier first targets for graduate students’ work.

Conferences First, Journals Later

A rough count of the Graduate Quarterly’s listings for 1999 and 2000 showed nearly twice as many conference papers as printed publications, which are an aggregate of journal articles, book chapters, and books.

As Misha Becker of Linguistics points out, in most fields, regional, national, and international conferences are held every year, with 40 or more presenters at each of them. That means lots of opportunities for enterpriseing graduate students. By comparison, most journals publish four times a year with five or six articles per journal, a much smaller window.

The time investment for prospective presenters and authors also varies, Misha says. With their more rigorous review process, journals require a great deal more work. Wendy Setiawan in Epidemiology talks about a typical submission: “Editing of the paper usually takes awhile (three months and eight to ten drafts)” and that’s just passing it back and forth to her adviser. When they’re satisfied, they send the
manuscript to co-authors for review and comments and more editing. Once the article is submitted, reviewers at the journal may request changes before it will be accepted for publication. Production takes a few more months before the article is in print.

By comparison, for conferences, “you only submit a one- or two-page abstract,” Misha says, with the full paper due after the presentation. “There’s not a lot you can say in [an abstract’s] amount of space. Because of that reviewers can’t expect the kind of thoroughness and solid results you can expect in a journal article.”

Chris Rudolph of Political Science suggests looking at the conference abstract or proposal “as a sales pitch rather than a highly reduced summation of the paper’s points. Brevity, clarity, and a distinct response to the ‘so what?’ question (why is this paper important?) matter much more than trying to express one’s methodological genius or to condense all the findings.” Chris also notes that the use of four letters—UCLA—gives proposals an extra boost: “Grad students at UCLA have a tremendous advantage in conference participation by virtue of UCLA’s academic status.”

Conference presentations provide valuable feedback. Peter Snow in Applied Linguistics says, “I try to present distinct revised versions of my papers at two conferences prior to submitting them for publication in order to get useful feedback from a large audience.” And Javier Gomez, a business economics doctoral student at the Anderson School of Management says conferences “test your ability to defend what you have written. . . . Usually you get questions you had never thought of. . . . because people have different backgrounds or like to stress different aspects.”

Sometimes, a presentation provides more than feedback. “Discussants and respondents at conferences might like your paper enough to recommend publishing opportunities,” says Mirana Moy Szeto of Comparative Literature. “Some senior scholars also will introduce the work of junior scholars to journals or editors if your work interests them.”

After Valentina Paglia presented a paper at a conference of the American Anthropological Association, she was approached by a professor who was editing a special issue of an Italian journal on video data gathering. Valentina’s linguistic anthropology studies of verbal art in Tuscany fit perfectly into her plans.

People she met at conferences have asked Lynn Waldorf of Education to do program evaluation work for them, and she is paid as a professional consultant. And attending conferences means that “my name is at least vaguely familiar when I submit an article to a journal,” says Folklore’s Antone Minard.

Turning Course Papers Into Published Articles

Like some other students, Howard Eissenstat in History has successfully turned course papers into conference presentations, choosing “topics that are doable during the course period and that have the necessary primary source material in the UCLA library.”

Misha Becker in Linguistics thinks that “all or almost all of the papers I’ve presented came out of something I worked on for a course. . . . I did sort of look at courses as potential sources of inspiration for conference papers.”

Andrew Lear’s professors in Classics “have given me extensive feedback” on two articles he’s developing for publication based on course papers.

Help From Faculty and Departments

Lorena Garcia’s adviser in Epidemiology sits his graduate students down and makes them write article sections that report the ongoing research at the Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center, including Lorena’s studies of domestic violence among Latino couples in the United States and Mexico. Since graduate students participate in all aspects of the study, this prepares them for the next eventual step—publication. “I’ve received help from my mentors in learning what is or is not acceptable for publication,” she says. “That’s why I believe having a mentor is key.”

In Atmospheric Science, Wen-
Strategies of Self-Direction

Although the journal he had selected rarely published work by graduate students, James A. Benn of East Asian Languages submitted his article about self-immolation in Chinese Buddhism, which had been developed from a seminar paper. “I didn’t tell anyone in my department until after the article had been accepted and published,” Benn says. With an education at Cambridge and University of London, James “felt confident that it was good enough for publication” and decided not to wait for faculty comment. Explaining his work strategy, James says, “I always pay attention to articles by other scholars. I try to work out what it is that is good or bad about their style.”

James is among the many self-directed scholars at UCLA. Although they may have good relationships with departments and advisers, they do most of their writing and publishing work on their own. Like James, many of them look for exemplars in the journals where they want to publish.

Chris Rudolph in Political Science says he has also learned a great deal by watching presentations and reading conference papers. “Emulation is a good learning tool, at least initially,” he says.

In Folklore and Mythology, Antone Minard says, “publication is something I’ve learned by osmosis.” His publication success is fed by close attention to the field. “Many of the journals submit calls for papers over email lists,” he says. “Besides that, I just try to stay aware of what the journals in my fields are publishing.” Most of Antone’s papers have been inspired by a seminar or conference and were completed without much feedback. “I’m sure faculty would be happy to edit or give feedback,” he says, “but I haven’t asked.”

Encouragement From Student Colleagues

Kim Miller of Folklore and Mythology was inspired to publish and present papers by other students in her program. “I can still remember one moment from my first quarter at UCLA. I was standing in the hallway of the folklore program listening to graduate students a few years ahead of me talking about their presentations for the American Folklore Society Conference, which was happening the following week,” she says. “I knew then, that if I was going to be successful in my program, and in my future career, I would need to present papers and publish as soon as possible,” she says. “This example of my grad student colleagues pushed me more than any prodding by a professor could have.”

Javier Gomez, a PhD student in the Anderson School of Management, organized a seminar for a group of doctoral students, a place where everyone presents work and “we get tons of critical feedback from one another, which is good.”

Several departments have formal seminars or loosely organized groups where graduate students can present their papers to faculty and/or peers to get useful feedback and build their confidence.

Faculty respond best to those students who are very intentional about seeking assistance and using that assistance.
What Motivates Graduate Students to Publish?

Those who find the prospect of writing for publication a bit daunting may be heartened to learn that some find this work enjoyable. Replies to a survey question about motivation were about equally divided between the practical demands of building a vitae that’s attractive to prospective employers, on the one hand, and the intrinsic rewards of getting feedback on research, making professional contacts, finding friends with similar interests, and simply enjoying the process.

For graduate students in the physical sciences, the motivation to publish may begin at home, with departmental requirements for publication attached to acquiring a PhD. Epidemiology’s encouragement is more subtle but nevertheless quite clear: “All you have to do is walk down the hallway and see how professors post their students’ work,” says Lorena Garcia. Their emphasis is useful, she says, because “publishing is key to finding a job opportunity.”

Watching the careers of other graduate students, says Peter Snow of Applied Linguistics, he was motivated to publish by “seeing how other people move through the system and what it takes to make the transition from graduate studies to academic employment.”

Some students believe the process enhances their work: “I feel like it is only through research and writing that I really work out my thoughts,” says Howard Eissenstat of History. “The process of honing material and presenting it to a wider public is exciting and uncovers previously unnoticed flaws in my work.”

They also know that publication reaches a wider audience: “After all the hard work in the lab,” says Wendy Pauwels of Epidemiology, “it is nice to have the results written up and shared with other people in scientific communities.” And Wen-wen Tung of Atmospheric Science looks to her publications to “eventually get me some friends with similar interests that I cannot otherwise find around me.”

Chris Rudolph of Political Science sees the publishing process as “a crucial part of learning the trade of academia. The ability to find new and interesting research topics, design effective research programs, and write in a lucid, cogent manner to disseminate findings is at the core of the profession of academic research.”

Not everyone who does it well enjoys the all aspects of the effort. Koen Pauwels in the Anderson School, who loves research and writing, dislikes the review process when it has “too many random components such as the reviewer’s ego.” Even though it may not be optimal, I do believe the review process is necessary to ensure the quality of top journal articles.” And although Steve Baur of Musicology finds “research to be enjoyable, . . . writing is a difficult, painful process for me. I don’t enjoy writing papers, [but] it is gratifying to see my work in print.”

But others clearly take pleasure in their work. James A. Benn of East Asian Languages and Cultures writes for publication “mostly because I enjoy the process.” If he publishes more than some colleagues, he believes it’s because he is “not particularly interested in being a graduate student, but in being a productive young scholar.”

Andrew Lear in Classics says, “I do not regard the things I am writing as part of my academic career as a burden. Instead, these are projects that respond to interests of mine that I would not have been able to follow this far if I had not started an academic career.”

And Mirana May Szeto of Comparative Literature likens her research and writing to a more homespun craft: “Once you get a hobby horse carved and painted, it is just natural that you want to show somebody else the thing,” she says. “I think my drive [to publish] comes from being in love with what I do as if my life depended on it.”

equipped to teach others, she says. (An article written by Ms. Belcher appears in this issue on page 20)

One of Ms. Belcher’s grateful alumni is Alvin Mares, who recently completed his PhD in Social Welfare and is now working at a Veterans Administration research center affiliated with Yale University’s School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry. Alvin acknowledges her contributions to his publishing success, as well as the input of three faculty members and writing mentors who “revealed that academic writing is both a scientific and artistic endeavor. There’s much more to learn, but at least I’m off to a good start.”

But he’s concerned that not all graduate students have the benefit of such informal teaching. “We’re expected to know how to write,” Alvin says, “but never explicitly taught how to do so certainly not at the level required to publish in peer-reviewed journals.” The lack of writing classes in the regular curriculum is a serious weakness of the graduate program, he believes. “So long as the teaching of writing is limited to informal mean, many students [will complete programs] without really understanding the academic publishing process and without an appreciation of good scholarly writing.”

Feature article, sidebar, and student profiles were written by Jacqueline Tasch
In an effort to document, understand, and improve the experiences of doctoral students at UCLA, the Graduate Division developed an exit survey and has been administering it to all doctoral degree recipients since Winter 1994. As part of the survey, doctoral students are asked to self-report the numbers of publications they’ve authored and/or co-authored, whether they’ve presented papers at conferences, and how many scholarly meetings they’ve attended. Following are some data that have been compiled and analyzed from the answers received on surveys collected between Winter 1994 and Spring 1999. The overall response rate for the exit survey is high at 93.1%, and the response rates for the individual fields ranged from 90.3% to 97.2%. The Ns for Graduate Division analyses ranged from 2961 to 3164, and the Ns for analyses within fields ranged from 32 to 503.

What do the exit survey data* tell us about the publishing climates in various doctoral fields at UCLA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Co-authored Publications</th>
<th>Published Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Health Sciences</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Applied Science</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division Total</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>co-authored with faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It is important to underscore that these were self-reported data.

** Due to the language on the survey, when aggregating the dataset the responses had to be approximated as follows [recoded value indicated in parantheses]: none(0); 1-2 articles(1.5); 3-4 articles(3.5); 5-6 articles(5.5); more than 6 articles(?)
### Percent of UCLA doctoral recipients who have both published and presented*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Applied Science</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Health Sciences</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division Total</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater, Film &amp; Television</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy &amp; Social Research</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Information Studies</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It is important to underscore that these were self-reported data.

### Percent of UCLA doctoral recipients who have neither published nor presented*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Health Sciences</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Applied Science</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division Total</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater, Film &amp; Television</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy &amp; Social Research</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Information Studies</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It is important to underscore that these were self-reported data.

### How much do UCLA doctoral recipients participate in scholarly activities**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Mean number** of articles published alone</th>
<th>Mean number** of articles co-authored with faculty</th>
<th>Mean number** of times attended scholarly meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy &amp; Social Research</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Information Studies</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Applied Science</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater, Film &amp; Television</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Health Sciences</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division Total</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It is important to underscore that these were self-reported data.

** Due to the language on the survey, when aggregating the dataset the responses had to be approximated as follows [recoded value indicated in parentheses]: none(0); 1-2 articles(1.5); 3-4 articles(3.5); 5-6 articles(5.5); more than 6 articles(7)
Pearlie Rose S. Baluyut
Art History

For a dissertation on national support for the arts and reconstruction of the national culture during the authoritarian regime of Ferdinand Marcos in the Philippines, it seemed only natural to interview her husband and collaborator, Imelda. But it might also have seemed an unrealistic goal, given Imelda’s political notoriety. Nevertheless, Pearlie Rose S. Baluyut, a Filipino émigré and UCLA PhD Candidate in art history, prepared a letter and a list of questions, giving it to an aunt in the Philippines who “handed the file to Imelda over dinner. The next thing I know, her secretary is calling me to make an appointment.”

Pearlie thinks Imelda’s enthusiastic response had to do with her asking “questions people don’t want to ask about the arts,” Pearlie says. “Most scholars ignore the Marcoses’ artistic projects because they disagree with them politically.” While Pearlie’s intention was not “to attack or redeem either side,” she felt that their contributions—which formed part of a long genealogy of art patronage and cultural production in the service of politics, the nation, and the self—deserve a critical reexamination. One such contribution is the Cultural Center of Philippines built on land reclaimed from Manila Bay.

During their six-hour interview, Imelda was “the ultimate performer,” Pearlie says, surprised at “how animated, how charismatic she is.” Imelda “made me feel that I was the only person she wanted to be with at that moment,” Pearlie adds. “She fed me. She took me for a ride in her Mercedes limo with bodyguards.” In what Pearlie calls “a uniquely Filipino strategy,” Imelda did her best to make Pearlie “feel comfortable, but making me aware of my debt of gratitude and cultural duty to reciprocate.”

Before she nurtures expectations of anything but impartiality from Pearlie, Imelda might want to talk to the folks who run the Ayala Museum in the Philippines, the subject of a paper Pearlie wrote for a course in museum theory and methodology early in her graduate career at UCLA. A Spanish family that came to the islands as galleon traders hundreds of years ago, the Ayallas control a great deal of the Philippine economy, from beer to life insurance to real estate. Their museum, established in the 1960s, blends fine art with natural history and features dozens of dioramas that are “an imagining” of Philippine history, says Pearlie. “You can see the whole museum as a big commercial advertisement and a powerful reminder of Spanish colonial legacy.”

The Ayallas are one of the most influential and affluent families in the Philippines, surviving because they “know how to tiptoe around regimes,” that “no one will say anything negative about them,” says Pearlie. “Irrreverent as I am,” she did. Her professor, Donald Preziosi, loved the paper and encouraged her to submit it to the Australian Journal of Art. It was accepted. Although it took some time to appear—the article was part of a special issue—“it was a very painless process,” recalls Pearlie, “uncharacteristic of first-time publishing.”

Another early publication helped support her visit to the Philippines and her meeting with Imelda Marcos. For the Philippine centennial in 1998, UCLA’s Asian American Studies Center sponsored a photo exhibit on the Philippines at the Fowler Museum of Cultural History. Assistant Director Enrique de la Cruz invited Pearlie to collaborate on the exhibit and an accompanying book, both titled Confrontations, Crossings, and Convergences: Photographs of the Philippines and the United States 1880-1998. Pearlie did much of the research and writing, rewarded for her efforts by a Fulbright grant to conduct research in the Philippines during the 1999-2000 academic year.

Home again, Pearlie is focused now on her dissertation, “Art Patronage and National Culture in the Philippines During the Marcos Regime, 1965-1986,” hoping for a postdoctoral appointment that will let her turn the dissertation into a book and perhaps a documentary film.

Her dissertation project is an idea that developed gradually. Professors at Los Angeles Valley Community College politicized her; she says: “I think I still carry that fire, which informs my work right now.” They also encouraged her to apply to UCLA.
Jennifer Daigle
Biomedical Physics

When the Graduate Student Association representative in Biomedical Physics asked Jennifer Daigle if she had any suggestions for the department, it seemed like a golden opportunity. Jennifer had noticed that the program wasn’t providing graduate students with much information about the process of writing for publication.

“As a scientist, you’re always going to have to write,” she says. “It’s part of your career, and you need to know what to do.”

Graduate students from other universities told her about seminars they had attended on publishing. So Jennifer asked her GSA representative to suggest developing a class for the department’s first-year graduate students.

She also told her adviser, William McBride, who thought the idea was so good he supported the GSA proposal at a faculty meeting.

The plan was approved, and Professor McBride enlisted Jennifer’s cooperation in designing the class. The seminar was presented for the first time in Fall 2000. “It was very well-received,” Jennifer says. “Students were very appreciative.”

Perhaps the most interesting part of this story is that Jennifer had nothing to gain from her suggestion. She was already presenting conference papers and publishing journal articles. There were a couple of reasons for her early success in publishing.

First, as an undergraduate at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, she had been co-author of a paper about neutron activation analysis. “I didn’t go through all the rigorous publishing stages,” Jennifer says, “but I did have a hand in it, and I did write some of it.”

Her second break came when Professor McBride became her adviser. After taking his Introduction to Radiation Biology class her first year at UCLA, Jennifer requested a rotation in his lab, “and I just never left.” Professor McBride was a big help when she got interested in making conference presentations. “The first time I found myself writing an abstract and a paper, he gave me examples from the conference proceedings of the previous year,” she says.

“I looked at how they were set up, and then I wrote mine and I showed it to him for his comments.”

Based on that first abstract, she was accepted to present a paper before the American Association for Cancer Research. Jennifer’s subject was research on tumor necrosis factor, or TNF alpha, a molecular messenger produced by the immune system to help cells communicate with one another.

A graduate student who preceded Jennifer in Professor McBride’s lab had discovered that TNF-α levels increased in the brain after exposure to radiation. Picking up that research, Jennifer looked to see if TNF-α, which causes inflammation in other places—for example, your nose when you have a cold—was involved in the dangerous side effects radiation therapy can have on normal brain cells. She found that when it binds specifically to one of its two receptors on brain cells, TNF-α can make the cell less sensitive to radiation.

“If you could exploit that finding, you might be able to create a drug or antibody that would make normal brain tissue less sensitive to radiation. Then you could give a higher radiation dose during therapy to kill the tumor, without worrying so much about damaging normal tissue,” Jennifer explains.

Her findings have been disseminated in several conference presentations and co-authored journal articles, including papers to be published in Radiation Research and Cancer Research. She also worked with Professors McBride and Rodney Withers on a chapter for a textbook on radiation therapy and the central nervous system, Biomedical Principles of Radiation Therapy in the Central Nervous System.

The process of preparing papers for publication has had many benefits. Writing about her findings helps Jennifer clarify her ideas and get them in order, she says. “I know what I’m trying to do, but having to explain it to other people makes me realize where my research is weak. If I can’t explain it, I have to work on it more.”

Working with others, Jennifer has learned how useful having an editor can be for “situations when you’ve read your own work too often to realize a sentence may not even have a verb.”

And there will be more tangible rewards. “Jen has gained considerable recognition for herself, for the lab, and for UCLA,” says Professor McBride. “She has used these avenues to put herself in a strong competitive position for a good postdoctoral experience.”

With her dissertation complete, Jennifer is already accepted for a postdoc at UCLA to finish up some ongoing research. She is looking at East Coast universities such as Harvard for another postdoc appointment and already has an offer from the M. D. Anderson Cancer Center in Texas, “one of the best places you can go” to study radiation oncology.

Her ultimate destination is still undecided, although she likes the road she’s taken so far. At MIT, Jennifer was a nuclear engineering major, drawn to the subject by a science project she did on nuclear power in the sixth grade. Then, thanks to another childhood influence—“I fell down a lot as a kid because I was a tomboy, so I was always getting X-rays and I wanted to know what they were all about”—she specialized in radiation medicine, which brought her to UCLA.

Jennifer feels “well-prepared to become a professor or to work for a biotech firm,” an option she’s considering. “That’s where the money is,” she notes, but the tangibles won’t determine her choice. “I always wanted to do something for a career that I would be willing to do for free,” she says. “This is something I would do for free.”
Daniel Baldwin Hess
Urban Planning

In recent years, more than 10 percent of the students, faculty, and staff who arrive at UCLA each day have traveled on the Santa Monica Blue Bus. Since last fall, chances are that number has gone up.

Thanks to research by urban planning student Daniel Baldwin Hess and his adviser, Professor Donald C. Shoup, passengers can board that bus free by simply swiping a UCLA ID card through the fare box. The bus company tallies the fares, and UCLA pays later. “We certainly didn’t make the administrative decisions,” Daniel says, “but we provided a lot of information on the cost and benefits of similar projects.”

A survey of U.S. colleges and universities turned up 35 programs that allowed students to ride free on existing public transportation. As Daniel points out, “only 27 percent of bus seats are occupied on the average. University students are a group that’s willing to ride.”

In providing free transit for students, universities were motivated by overflowing parking lots, the need to turn parking lots into building sites for expanding campuses, and the lobbying of environmentally conscious students. Such programs are “usually wildly successful,” says Daniel, with increases in student ridership ranging from 70-200 percent in the first year. There’s no reason to expect that the same won’t be true at UCLA.

Before Professor Shoup and Daniel presented their data to UCLA’s Parking Services department, the research had passed muster as a conference paper for a national meeting of the prestigious Transportation Research Board. “I realized the importance of presenting papers there early on,” Daniel says, “and I always submitted something and pushed to see that I could go.”

One reason for Daniel’s early recognition of the importance of publishing was Professor Brian Taylor, who took him aside “my first day here” and advised him to publish early and often during his PhD career. Everyone has a dissertation; having publications as well is “the way to make yourself different,” Professor Taylor told Daniel. Some employers, he said, are “more interested in articles you’ve published than in your dissertation.” This was advice Daniel “really took to heart.”

Today, his CV lists about a dozen conference presentations and a few journal articles. Still more articles are in the pipeline, Daniel says. “It takes a little while to build up your research background so you have the right things to say for journal articles.” As for the effort involved, “some things just write themselves,” he says. “Sometimes, I spend a little longer staring at a blank screen trying to come up with the right thing to say.”

Professor Shoup has been a big help, telling research over with Daniel and providing feedback on drafts. Sometimes, they reverse roles. Professor Shoup is writing a book titled The High Cost of Free Parking and when Daniel travels, his mentor often provides “a couple of chapters to read on the plane.” Professor Shoup “only wants to hear critical comments,” says Daniel. “I’ve learned a lot about how people can look at your drafts and make your writing stronger.”

All this practice should be helpful as Daniel launches into his dissertation writing. For that project, he’s building on research he did during an Eisenhower Fellowship in Washington, D.C. He’s hoping to provide useful strategies for planners who use spatial data sets from more than one source, for example, U.S. Census data and local school district information.

Daniel’s interest in transportation began during his undergraduate years as a civil engineering student at Clarkson University in Potsdam, N.Y. But when he graduated, “I got on the next bus to New York City to fulfill my dream of being a dancer.” He was successful, performing in Broadway musicals and national touring shows for about 10 years.

As Daniel got older—in dancing, that happens early—he got a master’s degree in urban design at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Since he “did pretty well there,” he came to UCLA seeking his PhD. He still dances in occasional shows, and he stays fit with a daily 16-mile bicycle ride to and from UCLA to his West Hollywood home. “Most of my route is through Beverly Hills,” he says. “I take a different street every day and drool over the houses.”

Pursuing his interest in transportation as a field of study was made easier by Federal legislation in 1998 that created a large pool of funds. These reach Daniel through the University of California Transportation Center, which has given him fellowships for graduate study and travel grants. It also provides some funds for the research projects of his mentors. And Daniel won a research mentorship award from the Graduate Division for a summer of work with Professor Paul Ong, who found his protégé “smart and hard working, quick to master new skills.”

Their work resulted in two articles, including one on ways in which older neighborhoods, with their higher density, available transit, and corner stores, mean less need for polluting automobiles. “Unfortunately, we’re not building those places any more,” Professor Ong said.

Daniel has yet to decide whether his future will take him to other universities or perhaps to government planning agencies. But his history suggests success in any endeavor. “One of the great pleasures of teaching at UCLA is to work with graduate students like Daniel Hess,” says Professor Shoup. “He is a fine scholar whose honesty, integrity and good humor make him the ideal partner in research.”

“I’ve learned a lot about how people can look at your drafts and make your writing stronger.”

Professor Brian Taylor said that some employers are more interested in articles you’ve published than in your dissertation.
Daniel Pondella
Organismic Biology, Ecology, and Evolution

When Dan Pondella was 8 years old, he was enrolled in the gifted students program of the Los Angeles Unified School District. As part of that program, “one year, we did marine biology, and we cruised around every Friday on a boat somewhere doing different things,” he says. “I liked being on the water. That’s how I got started.”

What he got started on was a career in fish research and marine ecology that’s about to enter a new phase as he nears completion of his dissertation for a PhD in Organismic Biology. His research involves eight species of eastern Pacific basses, three of them found off the Southern California coast, two from Mexico, one from Ecuador, one from Chile, one in the Galapagos, and one in the western Atlantic. “I’m reconstructing their evolutionary tree,” he explains. In addition he is “working on life history, trying to understand why fishes do what they do,” his research will also be of interest to ecologists and to those involved in commercial fisheries.

Unlike some doctoral candidates, Dan already has a place to work when he acquires his PhD—the place he’s worked since 1988, when he became a research associate in the Vantuna Research Group at Occidental College. Today, he’s director of that group. Thus, for more than a decade, he’s studied marine ecology on the Southern California coast, including fish life off Redondo Beach’s King Harbor, the Palos Verdes peninsula, and Santa Catalina island. A major program involves white sea bass, the variety that ends up in supermarkets. “It’s my job to cruise around Southern California in a large research boat to assess the hatchery [at Carlsbad] and see how the natural stocks are doing” he says.

Dan has also worked with the U.S. Navy on a project at the North Island Naval Station in San Diego and with the Chevron Products Company water-monitoring project at the El Segundo refinery.

He came to UCLA in 1995 in part because he wanted to switch his focus from ecology to evolutionary biology. Professor Don Buth, who became his adviser, “always impressed on me how important it was to publish papers, because in our field that’s big.” Having digested that message, Dan has a CV that lists nine published articles, along with another dozen in press or under review. His list of professional presentations runs three pages.

Professor Buth boasts that “Dan would be too modest to say that he received our department’s highest award—the Otto H. Scherbaum Award for Outstanding Research in Biology.” And, he is currently the president of the Southern California Academy of Sciences—making him the first person to hold this office while still in graduate school.”

Asked to explain this starting record, Dan says, “I just work hard, nothing special.” But clearly, more than hard work is involved when someone writes a dissertation at the same time he “makes sure that I continue to write papers.” Dan says, “The key for me is just staying organized, doing one project, finishing it, doing the next one. There’s nothing really special about it,” he repeats.

The writing itself is “lot of hard work, but it’s not incredibly difficult. It just takes a lot of practice.” Getting things published can be more complicated. Daniel recalls a co-authored article for the Bulletin of Marine Science that proved a challenge. Titled “Method for Estimating Marine Habitat Values Based on Fish Guilds,” its successful publication was the result of a two-year review process. The article looked at environmental data to compare different fish habitats, Dan explains, using “a brand new technique” that caused the long delay because reviewers were unfamiliar with it.

Unlike most graduate students in the sciences, Dan has published much work on his own or with collaborators in institutions other than UCLA. “Dan [Professor Buth] told me when he accepted me into his lab that he did not expect me to tag his name onto all my publications,” Dan says. However, they will soon publish some collaborative research.

While Dan was “cruising around collecting these fishes,” he says, he was also collecting the parasites that live on them, usually in a way that “doesn’t really cause the fish any problems.” Professor Buth had become interested in those parasites, and together, the two are developing a new classification system for the organisms.

In another collaboration, Dan and two marine scientists in the California State University system recently signed a contract with the University of California Press to write, The Ecology of Marine Fishes of California, which will be both textbook and scholarly publication.

“Publishing papers can be a pain in the ass,” Dan acknowledges, but “I don’t see any reason why you want to be subsidized as a scientist. It enhances every aspect of my work, stimulating critical thinking and improving current and future work.”
Time to Degree
— continued from page 3

What steps have been taken?
In 1993 UCLA’s Graduate Council published Policies and Recommendations to Improve Time to Degree in UCLA’s Graduate Degree Programs. The two policies and twenty-two recommendations in this document are based on findings from the Association of American Universities and the Association of Graduate Schools (AAU/AGS).

UCLA has created several initiatives designed to impact time-to-degree.

Formula for allocating funding: In an attempt to bring this issue to the forefront in academic departments, the Graduate Division has used time-to-degree data in the allocation of fellowship funds. Departmental financial allocations are based, in part, on enrollments: students who have exceeded recognized standards for times-to-degree are not included in these calculations, which can negatively impact the support a department receives.

Expanded the use of multiple-year funding for the recruitment of doctoral students: This multiple-year funding consists of different types of support—fellowships, TAships, GSships—which helps to give students financial support in completing their programs. With the question of livability answered, the student will be able to concentrate on studies.

Initiated and expanded the use of Dissertation Year Fellowships: Most research on time-to-degree concludes that students in the humanities and social sciences are delayed in completing their degrees because of inadequate financial support at the dissertation stage of their degree programs. At the same time, students in the sciences are often supported on research grants that provide funding for dissertation research and writing. The Dissertation Year Fellowship is designed to provide a year of funding for students completing their dissertations to enable them to concentrate on their dissertations and not on seeking employment to support themselves.

Developed the Summer Research Mentorship program to encourage students in humanities and social sciences to obtain practical experience in research prior to beginning a dissertation. Students are funded to work with their faculty advisors to produce a publishable paper or prepare for a presentation at a national conference.

Improved data collection and reporting on the time-to-degree in each academic program. These data appear in the Graduate Division’s Annual Report and are used in programmatic reviews. Use of comparable data within each field of study should encourage departments to make systematic efforts to reduce their times-to-degree.

Future Graduate Division publications will cover the topic of time-to-degree in greater detail. Topics to be covered are: Steps graduate students can take to shorten time-to-degree; analysis of data spanning 10 years time showing overall mean and median timeframes by field of study from admission to receipt of the degree; results from the Doctoral Exit Survey time-to-degree questions comparing expected time and actual time by field on study; and a comparison of UCLA’s time-to-degree to other UC institutions.

— by Ellen Bekin, PhD

Additional 2000-2001 Graduate Fellowship Recipients

Congratulations to the following fellowship recipients. Graduate Quarterly devoted a full section in the Fall 2000 issue to the announcement of fellowship recipients. The following names, however, were either unavailable at press time, inadvertently omitted, or listed incorrectly.

Chancellor’s Fellowships
Cui, Yan Epidemiology
Emerling, John Anthony Art History
Erwin, Jacey Collyer Theater

Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS), Title VI
UCLA Center for East Asian Studies Academic Year 2000-2001
Wang, Michelle Art History

Fulbright Grant-Institute of International Education (IIE)
Moore, Leslie Applied Linguistics

Mildred E. Mathias Graduate Research Grant
Brennan, Teresa Geography
Liebert, Aviva OBEES
Louie, Kristina OBEES

E-books Added to Library Collections

As a trial of the academic application of this growing publishing trend, the UCLA Library has acquired access to 572 e-books. The titles cover subjects in the humanities and social sciences, life and physical sciences, and management. Reference sources as well as monographs have been selected. Access has been licensed through netLibrary, the world’s leading provider of electronic books.

Records for these e-books have been added to ORION2, so users will be able to find them by searching the catalog as they would for other UCLA Library materials. As with online journal subscriptions, users will find a URL field on applicable records just above the holdings table. The link reading “Online Access” will take users to a netLibrary information screen, where users can preview the book or check it out.

To check out e-books, users will be asked to create a free netLibrary account. All personal information in that account will be kept confidential and will not be disclosed to a third party without the user’s consent. Depending on the subject and expected use, e-books can be checked out for loan periods of two hours or three days.

The initial collection of 572 books has been leased for one year. At the end of the year, subject specialists in the various disciplines will decide whether to continue to fund access to individual titles.

Campbell Book Collection Competition

Graduate and undergraduate students are invited to enter the 2001 Robert B. and Blanche Campbell Student Book Collection Competition, with a total of $1850 in prizes available. First and second prizes are awarded in the categories of graduate and undergraduate collections; prizes are also awarded for children’s book collection and honorable mention. In addition, a special award will be given this year in memory of Newton Werner for an outstanding arts, music, or culture collection.

The deadline for entries is Wednesday, April 4, 2001. Entry forms will be available at the reference desks in the Arts, Biomedical, College, SEL, Engineering and Mathematical Science, and Young Research libraries and can also be printed from the Internet at the URL listed below. The awards ceremony will take place on Wednesday, April 18, 2001.

Interested students are encouraged to attend a workshop on book collecting on Wednesday, February 27, from 3 to 4:30 p.m. Sidney Berger, director of the California Center for the Book, which is based at UCLA, will suggest ways to focus collections and write an effective annotated bibliography. It will take place in the YRL Department of Special Collections (room A1713).

Further information is available on the Campbell Web site at www.library.ucla.edu/committees/campbell/index.htm.

[Link to the Campbell Web site]
Graduate Student Accomplishments 1999-2001

This feature appears in each edition of the Graduate Quarterly. For inclusion in future issues, UCLA graduate students who have recently presented their work at conferences, written books, published articles in professional journals, performed or recorded their work, or received extramural awards should send complete references to: Patricia Jordan, Graduate Division, at pjordan@gdnet.ucla.edu.

SUBMISSION DEADLINES:
Fall Quarter .......... September 20
Winter Quarter .......... December 20
Spring Quarter .......... March 20

Recipients of intramural fellowships and selected extramural fellowships are listed in the “Award Recipients” section of the “Fall issue.”

ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN DESIGN


ART HISTORY


BIOMEDICAL PHYSICS


CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY

Vinay Shaskar: Upjohn Corporation Research Award.


Sean Curran: Excellence in Teaching Award.

Hieru Duong: First Year Academic and Research Award.

Veronica Egan: Advances in Research Forum Award of Excellence.

Nora Green: Bernstein Research Award.

Adam Gross: Gregory Research Award.

Robin Hayes: First Year Academic and Research Award.

Kenneth Yue: First Year Academic and Research Award.

Raquel Hernandez: Excellence in Teaching Award.

Emily Jarvis: Bauer Research Award.

Mazen Karaman: Received a departmental TA Consult- ant Service Award.

Steven Kim: Excellence in Teaching Award.

Michael Lansdown: Received a departmental TA Con- sultant Service Award.

Amelia Lapena: Excellence in Teaching Award.

Mark Lee: Excellence in Teaching Award.

Huying Li: Excellence in Teaching Award.

Jeffrey Moseley: John M. Jordan Memorial Award.

Rebecca Nelson: First Year Academic and Research Award.

Craig Newlands: Received a departmental TA Con- sultant Service Award.

Noh Jin Park: Excellence in Teaching Award.

Grazia Pilzzi: Excellence in Teaching Award.

Jason Tarver: Excellence in Teaching Award.

Omar Torres: Excellence in Teaching Award.

David Tsao: Excellence in Teaching Award.

Alexandra van den Heuvel: First Year Academic and Research Award.

Lisa Villicis: Excellence in Teaching Award.

Ilyas Washington: Jacobs Research Award.

Andrea Zachman: Received a departmental TA Con- sultant Service Award.

Jerome Zoidakis: Excellence in Teaching Award.

CLASSES


COMMUNITY HEALTH SCIENCES


Alex Sripatana: Received the W. K. Kellogg Foundation Fellowship in Health Policy Research for academic years 2000 to 2004.


COMPARATIVE LITERATURE


EDUCATION


Michelle Plecha: Received a Kellner Award for Fall 2000.

Kristen Robertson: Awarded a Predoctoral Fellowship, UCLA University Program in the Neurosciences, and the California Department of Developmental Services at Lanterman Developmental Center, September 2000-September 2001.

ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING


ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES


ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING


EPIDEMIOLOGY


ETHNOMUSICOLOGY AND SYSTEMATIC MUSIC


FILM AND TELEVISION

Erica Abbott: Won a Debut Panel of the Association for Asian Performance award for the paper “Androgyny and Otherness: Exploring the West Through the Japanese Performance Body” at the 150th Annual Meeting of the Association for Theater in Higher Education national conference, Washington, DC.


Ryan Bradley: Won third prize in the 45th Annual Sam Gould Writing Award for the screenplay “Storm Front.”
J. L. Chang: Won second prize in the 45th Annual Samuel Goldwyn Writing Award for the film noir/martial arts screenplay “A Killing in Chinatown.”

Shana Feibel: Received honorable mention in the 45th Annual Samuel Goldwyn Writing Award for the screenplay “Hades, Louis.”

Felicia D. Henderson: Appointed as co-executive producer of Showtime’s “Soul Food,” a new drama series based on the 1997 hit film of the same name. [2] Screenplay “Life In Sansomite Blue” was one of the Specs Appeal winners at UCLA Festival 2000.

Tyler Kelly: Received honorable mention in the 45th Annual Samuel Goldwyn Writing Award for the screenplay “Betty and Betty.”

Kelly Kennewick: Won first prize in the 45th Annual Samuel Goldwyn Writing Award for the dramatic screen

Lichelli Lazar-Lea: Received honorable mention in the 45th Annual Samuel Goldwyn Writing Award for the screenplay “Killing Aunt Irma.”

Debbie Lollie: Received honorable mention in the 45th Annual Samuel Goldwyn Writing Award for the screenplay “Re-Entry.”

Josefin Lépez: Awarded the Generation Next Award at the 2000 Prism Awards, which recognizes outstanding contributions of women from Latinx, Oath of Junctu


HEALTHSERVICES
Myriam Bernal: Awarded a departmental fellowship for Fall 2000.


InDO-eUROPEAN StUDIES


INFORMATIONSTUDIES
Angela Citizen: Selected to receive a student scholar- ship to attend the Simopoulos Conference on the “Write to Tolerance 2000” program on Oct. 29, 2000.


ISLAMic STUDIES

ITALIAN

MOLEcULAR BIOLOGY


MOLecULAR PHARMACOLOGY
Shahriar Yaghoubi: [1] (First author) “Imaging Adenovirus Infected Cell Genomic Delivery by Co-administration of a Second Adenovirus Carrying a PET Reporter Gene.” Presented at Society of Nuclear Medi-

MOLECULAR CELL AND DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY

Hongwei Guo: (First author) “SUL1, an Arabidopsis calcium-binding protein involved in the cryptochrome and phytochrome co-action.” Science, in press.


MUSIC


MUSIKOLOGY


NEAR EASTERN LANGUAGES AND CULTURES


MOLECULAR, CELL AND DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY

Hongwei Guo: (First author) “SUL1, an Arabidopsis calcium-binding protein involved in the cryptochrome and phytochrome co-action.” Science, in press.


MUSIC


MUSIKOLOGY


NEAR EASTERN LANGUAGES AND CULTURES


Two Writing Myths: Demystifying the Academic Publishing Experience
— continued from page 20

uncoer that, wow, it really did work. One student told me she had solved an important revision problem while writing for fifteen minutes in line at the Department of Motor Vehicles. Another student set herself the goal of writing a 2,000-word article for a trade magazine in her field without ever writing more than fifteen minutes a day. In two weeks, she had submitted the article. Almost all of the students who actually do the exercise admit that they get a significant amount of work done in fifteen minutes a day and that they have no problem remembering where they are or what they are doing when they start up the next day. Furthermore, if they wrote in the morning they felt so productive that the rest of their day seemed much more manageable.

The moral? Writing daily works. Writing in binges doesn’t.

The problem with binge writing—where you don’t write all quarter and then spend four days doing nothing but writing—is that the less often you write, the harder it becomes to write. Part of the reason students feel they need big blocks of time is because it takes them so long to get restarted after a long break. In the absence of the small but satisfying daily successes of writing, your inner critic becomes harsher and louder. If you’ve been writing every day, you don’t have this problem.

As UCLA film professor Chon Noriega tells his graduate students when they embark on their dissertations, “One usually gets better at whatever one does on a regular basis. If one does not write on a regular basis, one will get better at not writing.” In fact, one will develop an astonishing array of skills designed to improve and extend one’s not writing.” The more of a habit that writing becomes, the more likely you are to complete writing projects and to enjoy writing.

Myth 2: Writing is a private and lonely activity.

The myth that writing should be a solo activity is just that, a myth. Yet the popular image persists of the writer as someone who works alone for months in a cold garret, subsisting on bread and cigarettes while coughing consumptively and chumming out page after page of sui generis prose. It’s a lonely, hard life, but that’s what writing takes, so goes the popular myth.

Academics in the humanities especially persist in believing that texts spring fully formed from the mind of the writer. In the sciences this is not such a problem since most articles are the result of a team of researchers who publish as co-authors. Students work as secondary authors, contributing sections or data to faculty members’ essays, long before they ever become primary authors. That’s why the rate of writing dysfunction in the sciences is so much lower. Scholarly writing is consistently seen as a form of conversation, a place where many voices speak. When this idea is lost, one gets many of the writing problems so common in the academic community—writer’s block, anxiety over having one’s ideas stolen, the obsession with originality, the fear of belatedness, even plagiarism. All rise from the myth that writing should be private and lonely.

The second solution to writing paralysis, then, is to work to make your writing more public and less private, more social and less solitary. Start a writing group. Take a writing class. Convince another student to cowrite an article with you. Meet a classmate at the library or a café to write for an hour. Attend conferences, participate in electronic listservs, join journal clubs, and introduce yourself to scholars whose work you admire. Don’t get distracted by reading yet another article when conversations with those in your field can better help you to shape your ideas and direction. You should be spending as much time on establishing social supports as you do on writing. For the best writing happens in active interaction with your potential audience.

Most of all, show your writing to others. Unfortunately, many students are hesitant about showing their writing at any stage to anyone. The university environment can encourage students to see their colleagues as adversaries rather than assistants. Classmates and professors can appear too busy to read and comment on your work. Students can be afraid that sharing their work will reveal them as imposters and demonstrate their deep unsuitability for the academy. (This particular fear, by the way, is nearly universal.) Fortunately, if you manage to share your work, you usually find that others are happy to help and that you are not as much of an idiot as you thought you were. Moreover, others can quickly identify absences and logical breaks that would take you weeks to figure out. Of course, some readers will be too critical and others will give you bad advice. But an essential part of becoming a writer is learning to sift useful criticisms from useless ones and learning that critiques are always subjective.

The more often you deal with others’ reactions to your work, the more readily you will be able to deal with peer reviewers’ comments down the road.

Finally, avoid waiting until your manuscript is “done” before sharing it. Once you have completed a manuscript, you will be disappointed when you share it with others expecting compliments. Instead you will get recommendations for revision that you are little interested in addressing. The point of sharing is to improve your writing, not to convince others of your (undoubtedly) genius. Share outlines with classmates, faculty members in your discipline, or even journal editors. Exchange abstracts. Share drafts and ask for specific comments about aspects of your writing that you suspect are weak. Learn to share your writing at all stages.

These activities help bury the myth of the lonely writer. For few things are as collaborative as good writing. All texts depend on other texts, all writers stand on the shoulders of other writers, all prose demands an editor, and all writing needs an audience. Without community, writing is inconceivable.

Wendy Belcher teaches “Writing and Publishing the Academic Article” at UCLA and around the world. She has been an editor for more than a decade for academic presses and journals, including Oxford University Press, the University of California Press, and Routledge. She currently manages a small UCLA press producing books and a peer-reviewed journal. Ms. Belcher is also an award-winning short story writer who has published numerous articles and a book on West Africa. She can be reached at wb@ucla.edu.

“Start a writing group.
Take a writing class.
Convince another student to cowrite an article with you.”
Two Writing Myths: Demystifying the Academic Publishing Experience

by Wendy Belcher

A student said to me recently, “When I think about the fact that my entire career depends on publication, I feel completely paralyzed.” Sound familiar? In my experience, this is the reaction of many graduate students (and faculty members) to the pressure to publish. In fact, writing paralysis seems to be the norm rather than the exception.

A UCLA survey of over 30,000 U.S. faculty revealed that 25 percent of professors spent 0 hours a week writing and 26 percent had never published a peer-reviewed article. The majority had never published a book: 57 percent. Put another way, only 27 percent of faculty spent more than 8 hours every week writing and only 32 percent of faculty had produced more than two publications in the past two years. Furthermore, these statistics are self-reported and reflect the activities of only those organized enough to respond to the survey. Since publication is seen as the major marker of productivity in the academy, these statistics demonstrating that at least a quarter of faculty are production-less are surprising. Or are they?

I believe that the reason why so many academics are not publishing is because of persistent writing myths. If you can disabuse yourself of the following notions, I can guarantee that you will have more success with writing.

**Myth 1: I can only write if I have big blocks of time.**

Many students believe that in order to write they must have long uninterrupted stretches of time. Only then will they be able to sit down and concentrate. Such stretches are elusive, however, so they wait for the weekend, and then for the break between classes, and then for the summer, and then for the quarter after their qualifying exams, and then for the year after teaching, and so on. Others forcefully create blocks of time. As one of my students put it, “If I wait until the night before to write my paper, I will only be miserable for eight hours!” Such students believe that containing the process will reduce the painfulness of the experience.

Yet study after study shows that you do not need big blocks of time to write. In fact, writers who write a little bit every day produce more manuscripts than those who alternate weeks/months without writing with extended writing sessions. Writing just thirty minutes a day can make you one of those unusual writers who publishes several academic essays a year.

When I make this assertion about how little time it can take to be productive, the students in my “Writing and Publishing the Academic Article” class look at me skeptically. Some actually voice their disbelief. “No way,” I hear. “That’s impossible.” When I ask why, this is what students tell me: I need whole days to write otherwise I forget what I’m working on. I lose track. If I don’t stay in one mental space for an entire week my ideas don’t cohere. I need to get up a head of steam and just keep on going because if I stop, I’ll never get started again. One student said, point-blank, “Look, if it was that easy, everyone would do it.”

I listen to the students’ objections, but then ask them to indulge me. “Just as an experiment,” I say, “try writing fifteen minutes a day for the next week.” I remind them that we all manage to get to work, program a microwave, and answer our email without having to do it for ten hours at a stretch. “But writing is different,” they argue. “It’s intellectual; it’s about ideas.” Just indulge me, I reply.

The next week, the student who protested the most is usually the first to vol-
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