



Copyright Rules

Abstract: In "Copyright Rules" I lay down the law about *JOE's* copyright policy and explain why it's wrong to "double dip." In "Request for *JOE* Reader Response" I relay a request from the authors of a popular and highly regarded article that gives you the opportunity to join a collaborative group and contribute to the scholarly dialog. In "April *JOE*" I highlight too few of the many fine articles in the issue.

Copyright Rules

The *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA) calls it "duplicate publication." It's also known as "double dipping." It's submission of substantially the same article to two different refereed journals. No matter what you call it, it's wrong.

Here's what the APA manual (the style guide *JOE* uses) says about duplicate publication.

Duplicate publication distorts the knowledge base by making it appear there is more information available than really exists. It also wastes scarce resources (journal pages and the time and efforts of editors and reviewers). Duplicate publication can also lead to copyright violations (*Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 6th ed., p. 13).

Copyright violations?

JOE has a firm copyright policy. When an article has been provisionally accepted for publication, the corresponding or submitting author must affirm, on behalf of all article authors, compliance with the following policy in order for the article to be officially accepted for publication.

The submitted manuscript is the sole, original work of the author(s) listed, has not been previously published, does not violate any copyrights, and has been submitted only to the *Journal of Extension*. The manuscript's copyright is fully transferred to the *Journal of Extension*, which will hold full and exclusive rights to the manuscript. The manuscript does not represent a violation of the Civil Rights of others, and this manuscript does not violate the Code of Federal Regulation for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46). In making my submission to the *Journal of Extension*, I am affirming the above conditions <<http://www.joe.org/about-joe-copyright-policy.php>>.

Note the "has not been previously published" and "has been submitted only to the *Journal of Extension*." Authors who affirm the above conditions although their articles have been submitted to other journals or been previously published are being dishonest. They're guilty, whether they realize it or not, of a serious violation of scholarly ethics and of contract law.

Next issue, I'll cover this issue further, acknowledge (but not accept) some extenuating circumstances, and discuss some legitimate ways of getting more than one article from the same research. For now, I'll rest the

case with this: Do notâ do notâ submit the same article to two different refereed journals. It's wrong.

Request for *JOE* Reader Response

For more than a decade, the Tools of the Trade article by Lynne Borden and Daniel Perkins, "Assessing Your Collaboration: A Self Evaluation Tool," has garnered a lot of attention. I receive requests for permission to distribute or use the assessment tool presented in the article often. (I get such requests because, as explained above, *JOE* holds the copyright to the article.) It has been one of the top-read articles in *JOE* for several years (e.g., #5 in 2007, #8 in 2008, #12 in 2009). As a matter of fact, it's cited in "Community Mobilization Model Applied to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren" in this issue.

Given the long-term, continued interest in the article, the authors invite individuals who are using the assessment tool to contact co-author Perkins <dfp102@psu.edu>. The authors are interested in establishing a collaborative group to examine the tool's utility and lessons learned in its usage.

Please contact Perkins if you use or have used the assessment tool and are interested in joining such a collaborative group. It's an opportunity to advance scholarship, to contribute to the scholarly dialog and, perhaps, to a *JOE* article or so.

April *JOE*

It's happened again. Too much to discuss. Too many great articles. And too little space to do those articles justice. So I'll mention just a few of the 29 articles that all repay reading.

The Commentary and first Feature describe the increasingly important topic of culinary nutrition. The next Feature, "A Conceptual Model for Retaining County Extension Program Professionals," presents precisely what the title promises. And the third, "Explore Your World: Professional Development in an International Context," points out how "Extension agents can take advantage of opportunities at home and abroad to increase their cross-cultural competencies."

Water quality is an issue in several articles, including "Information Sources, Learning Opportunities, and Priority Water Issues in the Pacific Northwest."

The author of "Practical Application of Aspiration as an Outcome Indicator in Extension Evaluation" explains how to use aspiration as an outcome indicator in Extension evaluation. And the next four Tools of the Trade articles discuss Wiki, a virtual advisory committee, Polycom programming, and Adobe® Presenterâ all ways to use technology to extend our reach and effectiveness.

I could easily say more about more articles if I had not already exceeded my word limit.

I repeat: "Too many great articles. And too little space to do those articles justice."

Copyright © by *Extension Journal, Inc.* ISSN 1077-5315. Articles appearing in the Journal become the property of the Journal. Single copies of articles may be reproduced in electronic or print form for use in educational or training activities. Inclusion of articles in other publications, electronic sources, or systematic large-scale distribution may be done only with prior electronic or written permission of the *Journal Editorial Office*, joe-ed@joe.org.

If you have difficulties viewing or printing this page, please contact *JOE* Technical Support.