



AMERICAN
SPEECH-LANGUAGE-
HEARING
ASSOCIATION

2008 ASHA Researcher Survey Section Report: Research Processes

AMERICAN SPEECH-LANGUAGE-HEARING ASSOCIATION

2010

Written by the ASHA Researcher Survey Group

2008 ASHA Researcher Survey Section Report: Research Processes

Summary

In an effort to better serve the interests and needs of the communication sciences and disorders (CSD) research community, a survey was fielded on August 5, 2008, to all American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) constituents who indicated their primary or secondary employment function as researcher as well as to individuals who expressed interest in participating based on their response to an advertisement in the ASHA Research Digest e-mail list ($n = 1,233$). Two follow-up reminders were sent to nonrespondents. A total of 303 responses were received, for a usable response rate of 24.6%. Note that of the 303 responses received, 209 individuals completed the entire survey; 94 dropped out of the survey prior to completing all questions.

The survey covered nine broad areas: education and preparation, areas of research, evidence-based practice, research mentoring, domestic and international research collaborations, publications and online tools, reviewer experiences, support for research (financial and institutional), and ASHA's role in supporting researchers.

This report focuses on research processes (i.e., how researchers go about their work and what that work entails).

Domestic and International Research Collaborations

Domestic Collaborations

The majority of the respondents (80%) reported that they had been involved in domestic research collaborations (excluding students) within the discipline and/or across disciplines during the past 5 years. Of those who had, 56% served as the principal investigator in collaborating with others within the CSD discipline, 12% in psychology, 8% each in medicine and neuroscience, and 7% each in special education and statistics.

International Collaborations

Approximately one third of the respondents (31%) reported collaborating on international research projects over the past 5 years. Again, most projects focused on the CSD discipline (29%), 7% in psychology, 6% each in biology and medicine, and 4% in linguistics.

Funding Sources for International Collaborations

Respondents indicated in written comments that funding sources used for international research collaborations included internal university funds, federal funding sources such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and private funding sources such as foundations and nonprofits.

Initiating International Collaborations

The respondents indicated in written comments that international research collaborations were often initiated by the respondent, faculty or research staff at universities abroad, lab directors, or current or former advisors and/or doctoral students. Sometimes the collaborations were initiated at international meetings.

Countries Involved in International Collaborations

The respondents (the majority of whom primarily resided in the United States) reported that they had collaborated with individuals in numerous countries, including the United Kingdom (26%), Australia (24%), Canada (23%), Germany (19%), and New Zealand (12%; see Table 1).

Table 1. Considering the research that you have conducted over the past 5 years involving international collaboration, which countries were involved?

Country	Response Percentage	Country	Response Percentage
Australia	24.4%	Korea, South	1.1%
Austria	3.3%	Kuwait	1.1%
Belgium	4.4%	Lebanon	2.2%
Belize	1.1%	Mexico	3.3%
Brazil	6.7%	Netherlands	6.7%
Bulgaria	2.2%	New Zealand	12.2%
Canada	23.3%	Nigeria	1.1%
Chile	1.1%	Norway	2.2%
China	5.6%	Philippines	1.1%
Colombia	2.2%	Poland	3.3%
Croatia	2.2%	Portugal	2.2%
Czech Republic	1.1%	Rwanda	1.1%
Denmark	1.1%	Saudi Arabia	1.1%
Egypt	2.2%	Senegal	1.1%
Estonia	1.1%	Singapore	3.3%
Finland	3.3%	Slovakia	1.1%
France	5.6%	South Africa	4.4%
Germany	18.9%	Spain	3.3%
Iceland	1.1%	Sweden	8.9%
India	2.2%	Switzerland	2.2%
Iran	1.1%	Taiwan	2.2%
Israel	1.1%	Thailand	1.1%
Italy	7.8%	Turkey	3.3%
Japan	2.2%	United Kingdom	25.6%
Kenya	1.1%	United States*	10.0%

n = 90

*Of these nine individuals, two resided in Canada, one in Lebanon, and six left their country of residence blank (i.e., did not complete the survey item).

Attending and/or Presenting at International Meetings

The respondents indicated that they had attended an average (mean) of one international meeting (i.e., a meeting that attracts an international audience and/or that is held in rotating countries) in the past 5 years. They also indicated that they had attended and presented at an average (mean) of three international meetings in the past 5 years (see Table 2).

Table 2. How many international meetings have you attended and/or presented at in the past 5 years? (Enter 0 if none.)

	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Attended only	0	1.3	3.0	0–25
Attended <u>and</u> presented	2	3.0	4.0	0–30

n = 257

ASHA's Role in Fostering International Research Collaborations

The respondents were asked to express in written comments their opinions about how ASHA might help to foster more collaborative research efforts between ASHA members and individuals in other countries. They suggested numerous opinions, including that ASHA offer funding in support of such activities, provide networking opportunities, have more international panels/presentations at the ASHA Convention, and publish international research “success stories” in *The ASHA Leader*. Some respondents did not support ASHA cultivating international research collaborations.

Topics for Future ASHA Materials and Programs About International Research

The respondents were asked to indicate in written comments topics that ASHA should address in future materials and programs about international research. They suggested numerous varied topics, including basic “how to”/getting started information, funding opportunities, Institutional Review Board (IRB) requirements, aphasia, bilingual/multilingual research, and language and literacy.

Research Mentoring

Mentoring Students and Professionals

Of those employed in a college or university setting, respondents indicated that they had directly mentored two bachelor’s level, three master’s level, and two research doctoral level students in the conduct of research in the past 3 years. (For the purposes of the survey, mentoring was defined as providing guidance and/or resources in the conduct of research.)

Few respondents, regardless of their employment setting, reported directly mentoring professionals engaged in research (e.g., clinicians, junior researchers, or postdoctoral fellows). The median response was zero across all types of professionals.

Publications and Online Tools

Publishing Manuscripts

The most common journals for publishing CSD-related research in the past 5 years were the *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* (11% of 687 reported published research studies); the *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* (5%); *Aphasiology* (5%); and *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* (5%; see Table 3).

Table 3. Indicate the journals in which you have had one or more manuscripts published within the past 5 years.

Journal	Response Percentage
<i>American Journal of Audiology</i>	1.0%
<i>American Journal of Gastroenterology</i>	–
<i>American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology</i>	4.5%
<i>Annals of Dyslexia</i>	0.3%
<i>Aphasiology</i>	4.9%
<i>Applied Psycholinguistics</i>	1.0%
<i>Archives of Otolaryngology—Head & Neck Surgery</i>	0.4%
<i>Audiology and Neuro-Otology</i>	0.3%
<i>Brain</i>	–
<i>Brain and Language</i>	2.3%
<i>Brain Injury</i>	0.6%
<i>Child Development</i>	0.6%
<i>Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal</i>	0.9%
<i>Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics</i>	2.2%
<i>Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews</i>	–
<i>Cognition</i>	0.4%
<i>Cortex</i>	–
<i>Disability and Rehabilitation</i>	0.6%
<i>Dyslexia</i>	–
<i>Dysphagia</i>	0.9%
<i>Ear and Hearing</i>	3.3%
<i>Early Education and Development</i>	–
<i>ECHO</i>	–
<i>Exceptional Children</i>	0.1%
<i>Folia Phoniatica et Logopaedica</i>	1.5%
<i>Hearing Research</i>	1.5%
<i>Human Brain Mapping</i>	–
<i>International Journal of Audiology</i>	1.2%
<i>International Journal of Epidemiology</i>	–

Continued

Table 3 Continued.

Journal	Response Percentage
<i>International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders</i>	1.6%
<i>International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology</i>	0.4%
<i>International Journal of Rehabilitation Research</i>	–
<i>Journal of Allied Health</i>	0.1%
<i>Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders</i>	0.6%
<i>Journal of Child Language</i>	0.4%
<i>Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience</i>	0.1%
<i>Journal of Communication Disorders</i>	1.9%
<i>Journal of Fluency Disorders</i>	–
<i>Journal of International Neuropsychological Society</i>	0.4%
<i>Journal of Learning Disabilities</i>	0.1%
<i>Journal of Memory and Language</i>	0.1%
<i>Journal of Neurolinguistics</i>	0.1%
<i>Journal of Neuroscience</i>	0.1%
<i>Journal of Psycholinguistic Research</i>	–
<i>Journal of Rehabilitation</i>	–
<i>Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine</i>	–
<i>Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development</i>	0.9%
<i>Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research</i>	11.2%
<i>Journal of the American Academy of Audiology</i>	3.5%
<i>Journal of Voice</i>	1.0%
<i>Language Learning and Development</i>	–
<i>Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools</i>	2.5%
<i>Laryngoscope</i>	0.3%
<i>Memory and Cognition</i>	–
<i>Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities</i>	0.3%
<i>NeuroImage</i>	–
<i>Neuropsychologia</i>	0.1%
<i>Neuropsychology</i>	0.4%
<i>NeuroReport</i>	0.1%
<i>Pediatric Rehabilitation</i>	–
<i>Reading and Writing Quarterly</i>	0.3%
<i>Reading Research Quarterly</i>	–
<i>Research in Developmental Disabilities</i>	–
<i>Seminars in Speech and Language</i>	1.5%
<i>Stroke</i>	0.1%
<i>The Gerontologist</i>	–
<i>The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i>	5.4%
<i>Topics in Language Disorders</i>	2.3%
<i>Other journal(s)</i>	36.5%

n = 188

NOTE. The dashes (–) in the data table represent zero (i.e., not selected by any respondents).

Submitting to an Online-Only Journal

The respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood of their submitting a manuscript to an online-only journal. More than half (57%) reported that they did not intend to submit a manuscript to an online-only journal (see Table 4).

Table 4. Which of the following statements best describes your likelihood of submitting a manuscript to an online-only journal?

Statement	Response Percentage
I have submitted a manuscript(s) to an online-only journal.	16.6%
I intend to submit a manuscript(s) to an online-only journal.	20.9%
I do not intend to submit a manuscript to an online-only journal.	57.0%
Online-only journals are not available in my area of research.	5.5%

n = 235

Using Online Tools

The respondents were asked to indicate which online tool(s) they used in their professional life. More than three quarters (77%) reported that they used searchable journal databases. Nearly half (48%) reported that they used Manuscript Central. A slightly lower percentage (45%) indicated that they used the e-mail tables of contents feature for ASHA's scholarly journals (see Table 5). The respondents reported using other online tools in written comments, including electronic libraries, Google Scholar, and Web conferencing systems.

Table 5. Indicate which of the following online tools you use in your professional life. (Select all that apply.)

Online Tool	Response Percentage
Searchable journal databases (e.g., Medline)	76.9%
Manuscript Central (online peer review system)	48.2%
E-mail tables of contents (online journals)	44.9%
CiteTrack alerts (e.g., author, topic, or key word e-mail alerts)	27.4%
Podcasts	5.9%
Social network Web sites (LinkedIn, Web 2.0, etc.)	4.3%
RSS feeds	4.3%
Blogs	3.3%
Internet II.edu	3.0%
SciVee	0.7%

n = 252

Reviewer Experience

Reviewer Experience (Scientific Journals)

The respondents were asked to indicate whether they had served as a reviewer for a scientific journal in the past 5 years. One third (33%) of the respondents reported that they had served as a reviewer for the *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. Other journals for which the respondents had served as reviewers included the *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* (19%); *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools* (15%); and *Ear and Hearing* (13%; see Table 6).

Table 6. In the past 5 years, have you served as a reviewer for any of the following scientific journals? (Select all that apply.)

Scientific Journal	Percentage Indicating "Yes"
<i>American Journal of Audiology</i>	8.3%
<i>American Journal of Gastroenterology</i>	–
<i>American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology</i>	19.1%
<i>Annals of Dyslexia</i>	0.3%
<i>Aphasiology</i>	5.0%
<i>Applied Psycholinguistics</i>	4.6%
<i>Archives of Otolaryngology—Head & Neck Surgery</i>	1.0%
<i>Audiology and Neuro-Otology</i>	3.3%
<i>Brain</i>	1.3%
<i>Brain and Language</i>	4.0%
<i>Brain Injury</i>	0.7%
<i>Child Development</i>	2.0%
<i>Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal</i>	1.3%
<i>Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics</i>	3.3%
<i>Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews</i>	–
<i>Cognition</i>	1.3%
<i>Cortex</i>	0.3
<i>Disability and Rehabilitation</i>	1.0
<i>Dyslexia</i>	–
<i>Dysphagia</i>	1.7%
<i>Ear and Hearing</i>	13.2%
<i>Early Education and Development</i>	0.3%
<i>ECHO</i>	–
<i>Exceptional Children</i>	0.7%
<i>Folia Phoniatica et Logopaedica</i>	3.0%
<i>Hearing Research</i>	5.0%
<i>Human Brain Mapping</i>	0.7%
<i>International Journal of Audiology</i>	5.3%
<i>International Journal of Epidemiology</i>	–
<i>International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders</i>	5.6%

Continued

Table 6 Continued.

Scientific Journal	Percentage Indicating "Yes"
<i>International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology</i>	2.3%
<i>International Journal of Rehabilitation Research</i>	0.7%
<i>Journal of Allied Health</i>	0.7%
<i>Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders</i>	2.6%
<i>Journal of Child Language</i>	4.0%
<i>Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience</i>	0.7%
<i>Journal of Communication Disorders</i>	8.3%
<i>Journal of Fluency Disorders</i>	3.3%
<i>Journal of International Neuropsychological Society</i>	2.3%
<i>Journal of Learning Disabilities</i>	–
<i>Journal of Memory and Language</i>	2.0%
<i>Journal of Neurolinguistics</i>	0.7%
<i>Journal of Neuroscience</i>	1.3%
<i>Journal of Psycholinguistic Research</i>	–
<i>Journal of Rehabilitation</i>	0.7%
<i>Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine</i>	0.3%
<i>Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development</i>	2.6%
<i>Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research</i>	33.3%
<i>Journal of the American Academy of Audiology</i>	5.3%
<i>Journal of Voice</i>	1.3%
<i>Language Learning and Development</i>	1.0%
<i>Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools</i>	14.5%
<i>Laryngoscope</i>	0.7%
<i>Memory and Cognition</i>	0.3%
<i>Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities</i>	0.3%
<i>NeuroImage</i>	0.3%
<i>Neuropsychologia</i>	1.7%
<i>Neuropsychology</i>	0.7%
<i>NeuroReport</i>	1.0%
<i>Pediatric Rehabilitation</i>	–
<i>Reading and Writing Quarterly</i>	–
<i>Reading Research Quarterly</i>	0.7%
<i>Research in Developmental Disabilities</i>	–
<i>Seminars in Speech and Language</i>	3.3%
<i>Stroke</i>	0.7%
<i>The Gerontologist</i>	–
<i>The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i>	10.9%
<i>Topics in Language Disorders</i>	3.3%

n = 187

NOTE. The dashes (–) in the data table represent zero (i.e., not selected by any respondents).

The respondents indicated in written comments that they had reviewed for other scientific journals as well, including the *American Journal of Medical Genetics*, *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *Journal of Early Intervention*, *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *Journal of Medical Speech-Language Pathology*, *Journal of Phonetics*, *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, and *Otology and Neurotology*.

Reviewer Experience (Research Grants)

The respondents were asked to indicate whether they had served as a reviewer for a research grant in the past 5 years. A small percentage had: 14% for the NIH’s National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders; 13% for university, institutional, or intramural funded projects; and 12% for the American Speech-Language-Hearing Foundation (see Table 7).

Table 7. In the past 5 years, have you served as a reviewer for a research grant for any of the following entities? (Select all that apply.)

Entity	Percentage Indicating “Yes”
NIH—National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders	13.5%
University/institutional/intramural funds	12.5%
American Speech-Language-Hearing Foundation	12.2%
ASHA	7.3%
National Science Foundation	6.6%
Department of Education	5.0%
NIH—National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	3.3%
State or local agency	3.0%
Department of Veterans Affairs	2.3%
Institute of Education Sciences	1.3%
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality	0.7%
Department of Defense	0.7%
Department of Health and Human Services	0.7%
NIH—National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities	0.7%
NIH—National Institute of Mental Health	0.7%
NIH—National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke	0.7%
Deafness Research Foundation	0.3%
NIH—National Institute on Aging	0.3%
Pharmaceutical corporation	0.3%

n = 124

The respondents indicated in written comments that they had served as a reviewer for a research grant for other entities as well, including the Alzheimer’s Association, Bamford-Lahey Children’s Foundation, Canadian Department of Health, Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research, and United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation.

Additional Information

Additional Survey Reports

Companion reports are also available on the ASHA Web site:

- *Executive Summary*
- *Respondent Demographics*
- *Areas of Research*
- *Support for Research*
- *ASHA Resources*

Citation

This report may be cited as follows: American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2010). *2008 ASHA Researcher Survey section report: Research processes*. Available from www.asha.org.

Project Team

The project team comprised Gail Brook, Research Analyst and Technical Writer; Joanne Jessen, Director of Publications (retired); Lemmietta McNeilly, Chief Staff Officer for Speech-Language Pathology; Sharon Moss (project director), Director, Scientific Programs and Research Development (former); Loretta Nunez, Director, Academic Affairs; Jim Potter, Director, Government Relations and Public Policy (former); Margaret Rogers, Chief Staff Officer for Science and Research; and Sarah Slater, Director, Surveys and Information.

Questions?

Questions regarding this report may be directed to Gail Brook at gbrook@asha.org, or Sarah Slater at sslater@asha.org.

Thank You

Without the generous cooperation of the members who participate in our surveys, ASHA could not fulfill its mission to provide vital information about the professions and discipline to the Association membership and public. Thank you!