

## McDaniel, Anita

---

**From:** McDaniel, Anita  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 20, 2009 6:16 PM  
**To:** tugba@tugbakalafatoglu.com  
**Subject:** FW: ACJ Call for Managing Editor 2010-2013  
**Attachments:** CCAreview.doc

This letter serves as my formal response to the call for 2010-2013 Managing Editor of the American Communication Journal. I learned of this opportunity from a posting on the ACJ listserv by Dr. Kalafatoglu.

Recently, I received tenure and a promotion and chose to seek a major service project that I could devote myself. Being editor of an online journal seemed like the best way to combine my passion for learning about and researching our discipline. I have two years experience as a reviewer for regional and international journals and have attached a sample of that work. I have 20 years of teaching experience in areas such as media studies, interpersonal communication and performance studies and am in the process of developing a graduate level interpersonal communication course. Below is a link to a website that contains my vitae and course materials. I am not tech savvy, but I welcome the opportunity to promote the use of new media in an academic journal among my peers and rising scholars.

I hope that you will consider me for this position. I can begin work as soon as you need me.

Anita McDaniel  
Department of Communication Studies  
UNC Wilmington  
<http://sites.google.com/site/anitasvitae/Home>

CCA Review of  
“The Communication Classroom: A Case Study Analysis of Student Attendance of a  
First-Day Attendance Policy”

This is an interesting piece of pedagogical research. Definitely, a publishable effort. However, although the logic of the study is sound, the presentation of the material is “messy.” In some areas, the presentation of the material needs to conform to the conventions of scientific research; and in other areas, the presentation of the material lacks detail. Therefore, I would recommend the following substantial revisions before resubmitting the manuscript for minor editorial comments.

Areas needing to conform to conventions

1. This study needs to identify a theoretical foundation.
  - This study seems to focus on a heuristic about an attendance phenomenon as opposed to a general theory about attendance.
  - Therefore, clarify that focus by using the anecdote on the bottom of p. 12 earlier in the study as a guiding principle.
  - Also, operationally differentiate between/among the students referenced in that anecdote—i.e., “beggars” (students who need the course to graduate, but can’t get in), “shoppers” (students who don’t need the course to graduate, but got in), and “motivated” (students who need the course to graduate and got in)—who is the focus of the study?
  - Rephrase your hypotheses as research questions because you have no theory to test.
2. This study needs to address the issue of institutional identification.
  - Most journals do not use the names of the institutions being studied.
  - Use some other descriptor for ALL of the universities/colleges identified (i.e., public/private institution, geographical location of institution, number of students, etc.).
3. This study needs to include a section on limitations.
  - Need a disclaimer about spurious results produced by student culture and first day behavior referenced on bottom of p. 11.
  - Need to address competing explanations (i.e., departmental apathy and institutional trends).

Areas lacking detail

1. This study needs a more detailed description of the questionnaire.
  - Need to offer examples of the items on the questionnaire especially the fill-in-the-blank question.
  - Need to report your coding scheme (i.e., 1-7 likert scale).
  - Need to report the reliability of measure and coders.
  - Need to justify using a self report measure for an attendance study (is it a norm in prior research?).