

0:00:14.660,0:00:20.170

My part of... in this presentation today is to deal with, what I refer to as our sub task

0:00:20.170,0:00:21.170

force on citations.

0:00:21.170,0:00:27.210

And so I'll be discussing in a very, uh, not too proficient but in a very quick manner

0:00:27.210,0:00:31.439

because I think we've covered a lot of ground in our... our particular task force activities

0:00:31.439,0:00:33.770

in terms of literature and research, etc.

0:00:33.770,0:00:39.720

So we're talking about the citation, its' impact on individual's careers, the role of

0:00:39.720,0:00:44.969

journals and in fact, journals have become in some way the gateway for citations, it's

0:00:44.969,0:00:49.250

obviously an important part of the process, and editors who make significant decisions

0:00:49.250,0:00:54.890

about what manuscripts can review, who they're sent to, and what happens to... as a result

0:00:54.890,0:00:55.890

of that process.

0:00:55.890,0:01:01.390

Uh, so that's basically a quick intro, uh, to this and okay.

0:01:01.390,0:01:05.880

So this is repetitive, so I won't go very much time on this slide.

0:01:05.880,0:01:11.119

Basically, I list the four main areas: the point I would make in this this slide is a

0:01:11.119,0:01:15.750

commonly used term in our in our field, in other fields, is intersectionality.

0:01:15.750,0:01:21.540

You look at the four main areas, there's a lot of intersectionality between tenure promotion

0:01:21.540,0:01:27.049

and citation and also the generation of work has to do with the climate in which we operate

0:01:27.049,0:01:28.049

in.

0:01:28.049,0:01:32.920

And obviously, uh, training we have a section in our report that talks about syllabi and

0:01:32.920,0:01:39.470

citations and so how the field is presented to perspective academic admissions is influenced

0:01:39.470,0:01:43.990

about who... what... who is read, what is valued, what is the percent, what is missing

0:01:43.990,0:01:44.990

and so forth.

0:01:44.990,0:01:52.149

So, uh, that... our... our role is to look at systematic inequalities relative to what

0:01:52.149,0:01:58.630

was referred to in this document among ourselves and other segments on marginalized, uh, communities

0:01:58.630,0:02:01.049

and [inaudible] recommendations and best practices.

0:02:01.049,0:02:08.890

So to point out some of the obvious, citations are very critical in terms of academic's reputation.

0:02:08.890,0:02:14.940

People have standing in the field based on their notoriety as scholars and contributors

0:02:14.940,0:02:20.310

to the knowledge base, etc. and an impact in terms of opportunities when what's the

0:02:20.310,0:02:23.540

[inaudible] for external funding, what's your track record, where have you published, what...

0:02:23.540,0:02:25.030

what research have you generated.

0:02:25.030,0:02:28.870

Also, in terms of professional advancement:
reputation, standing.

0:02:28.870,0:02:33.489

If a person leaves an institution to go to
another, maybe a function is that they're,

0:02:33.489,0:02:38.730

uh, have both assets that other institutions
also want to take advantage of.

0:02:38.730,0:02:40.930

Uh, and basically citations are in a sense
of really an assessment...

0:02:40.930,0:02:44.180

assessment of the quality the contribution
of an individual.

0:02:44.180,0:02:50.190

So I had an important impact not only for
the institutions because institutions essentially,

0:02:50.190,0:02:55.709

um, place their reputation on the reputation
of their faculty and so faculty who have a

0:02:55.709,0:02:59.040

good reputation in that institution benefit
by that.

0:02:59.040,0:03:04.760

It also impacts in terms of your competitiveness
for... for, uh, funding, uh, your prestige.

0:03:04.760,0:03:05.760

The thing...

0:03:05.760,0:03:11.459

third point I would make point is that there's
this greater reliance on what I call citation

0:03:11.459,0:03:17.299

services to evaluate who's being cited, where
they're being cited, and essentially the impact

0:03:17.299,0:03:18.299

of those citations.

0:03:18.299,0:03:23.890

And what's happened is that not only is there
more services provided, but also they're more

0:03:23.890,0:03:29.190

users: departments in evaluating faculty or
faculty departments rely on these citation

0:03:29.190,0:03:31.280

services for that information.

0:03:31.280,0:03:36.250

And so one of the things we point out is depending
on what citation service you use, they use

0:03:36.250,0:03:40.689

different algorithms, they have biases in
and of themselves, if you're not aware of

0:03:40.689,0:03:44.230

that, that that impacts the assessments you're
trying to make.

0:03:44.230,0:03:46.060

Uh, the other thing...

0:03:46.060,0:03:50.930

the other takeaway is that there are biases
and biases that we know particularly is in

0:03:50.930,0:03:56.709

gender, race, ethnicity field of study is
an important area of bias in terms of some

0:03:56.709,0:04:01.600

fields of study are sort of less visible,
in some cases invisible, and not all sexual

0:04:01.600,0:04:07.970

orientation, your epistemological orientation
is reflected in terms of how you how you manif...

0:04:07.970,0:04:11.939

manipulate or navigate through that whole
process, and institutional standing.

0:04:11.939,0:04:14.650

Uh, Cathy made reference to R1 institutions.

0:04:14.650,0:04:20.380

Being an R1 institution versus not has an
impact in terms of your whole citation success

0:04:20.380,0:04:21.660

or lack thereof.

0:04:21.660,0:04:26.389

And... and journals which I'll spend more time... is in terms of talking about how that

0:04:26.389,0:04:32.560

process works, the submission review process, whom are the reviewers, other biases in terms

0:04:32.560,0:04:37.300

of acceptance and... and last part I think there's been more work I've been reading more

0:04:37.300,0:04:41.610

recently is guidance and training for peer reviews.

0:04:41.610,0:04:42.810

In a sense, one of the...

0:04:42.810,0:04:47.220

I would argue one of the voids in graduate training is how do you review?

0:04:47.220,0:04:51.139

In fact, there's... that's one of the recommendations we make is that there's maybe more need for

0:04:51.139,0:04:53.430

formal training in peer reviewing.

0:04:53.430,0:04:59.340

Um, and then the last is just, uh, making use of this kind of a caveat saying if you're

0:04:59.340,0:05:04.259

using whatever source, know what the source is, what their bias is, what their algorithms

0:05:04.259,0:05:05.680

are in assessing what that...

0:05:05.680,0:05:10.289

most people look at the final counts how many citations does that individual have.

0:05:10.289,0:05:12.910

There's much that goes into how that comes about.

0:05:12.910,0:05:18.670

Uh, I'll focus more, uh, on the area of our journals.

0:05:18.670,0:05:25.350

I'm reminded of, uh, the first scene I encountered

as an academic a long time ago had a little

0:05:25.350,0:05:29.140

plaque in his office says the... "the written word remains."

0:05:29.140,0:05:33.979

Obviously the written word remains if you're... you're published and you're cited and so forth.

0:05:33.979,0:05:39.820

So obviously, journals are are major gateway and so in some sense, is the significance

0:05:39.820,0:05:45.930

of citation counts... again, it affects your advancement, your promotion, your competitiveness

0:05:45.930,0:05:48.919

of grants, uh, and that basically, uh, it has significant impact.

0:05:48.919,0:05:55.380

Uh, one of the personal impacts of being part of this task force that Paula put together

0:05:55.380,0:06:00.821

was, um, enlightened me a much greater extent about the whole citation process and the research

0:06:00.821,0:06:01.821

area.

0:06:01.821,0:06:05.630

Uh, it's an expansive research area and a very expansive... not only in terms across

0:06:05.630,0:06:09.770

disciplines, but also in terms of questions raised, methodological...

0:06:09.770,0:06:13.160

very sophisticated methodologies in looking at citations.

0:06:13.160,0:06:20.120

Uh, we had a the fortune of looking at works in computer sciences, and the biological sciences,

0:06:20.120,0:06:23.039

psychology, economics, and so forth.

0:06:23.039,0:06:28.569

So we took a broad view in terms of looking

at this whole process is, uh, if we rely I

0:06:28.569,0:06:33.200

think exclusively on political science, it would be a much shorter report, in other words.

0:06:33.200,0:06:35.319

This is just a short...

0:06:35.319,0:06:39.330

quick that [inaudible] proliferation of citation services, this is the few that exist, some

0:06:39.330,0:06:41.630

of which are more known to use, some or lesser known.

0:06:41.630,0:06:45.490

Probably Google Scholar, Web of Science, uh... uh, probably Scopus, which is part of Web

0:06:45.490,0:06:49.900

of Science is probably more well known, but there's a lot of them out there.

0:06:49.900,0:06:55.700

And to be aware of them and use them it requires you knowing not only their existence, but

0:06:55.700,0:07:00.800

how they generate the citation counts and some... each has their own biases.

0:07:00.800,0:07:05.330

Google Scholar is largely is driven to a good part by individuals initiatives.

0:07:05.330,0:07:11.419

Set up a Google Scholar page and there's a study we show later on showing that... that

0:07:11.419,0:07:15.360

this differentiates among whom that scholar is in terms of... uh.

0:07:15.360,0:07:19.830

So there's strategies that individuals can make to enhance their citation use, being

0:07:19.830,0:07:23.419

more proactive in terms of putting yourself out there.

0:07:23.419,0:07:29.770

A lot of times uh self-promotion is... is ingrained or part of people's, uh, DNA, for

0:07:29.770,0:07:30.900
many others it's not.

0:07:30.900,0:07:34.449
And so that has advantages and disadvantages.

0:07:34.449,0:07:39.361
So I'm going to focus for the rest of this presentation on the journals and one of the

0:07:39.361,0:07:43.930
sub-subgroups of our task force was in fact looking at journals.

0:07:43.930,0:07:45.460
And we had a smaller group, we had a...

0:07:45.460,0:07:50.830
I think a group of about 10 people in our task force, that looked specifically in journals.

0:07:50.830,0:07:58.220
And they did it... um, a formal informal survey of existing journal editors, either current

0:07:58.220,0:08:03.330
or most recent editors and asking them questions about how they dealt with citations.

0:08:03.330,0:08:06.229
And just the main finding is that most...

0:08:06.229,0:08:10.199
most journal editors were unaware of a citation gap that was neither not part of their awareness,

0:08:10.199,0:08:15.010
nor part of their quote, "charge to look at," in terms of their journal editorship.

0:08:15.010,0:08:20.860
Uh, none spoke of any guidance of training on citation issues, that when they took over

0:08:20.860,0:08:24.030
the journals that they had took on their responsibilities.

0:08:24.030,0:08:28.740
Uh, and in fact if they did, it was mostly coming from the journal editors themselves,

0:08:28.740,0:08:31.330

their own kind of vantage point, their own experiences...

0:08:31.330,0:08:33.820

that they raised the issue about a citation gap.

0:08:33.820,0:08:38.149

Rather than their successors or the association saying this is an important area you need

0:08:38.149,0:08:42.600

to look at, they initiated that and started discussions in the... that structurally took

0:08:42.600,0:08:47.830

the form of adding more field editors to kind of deal with the coverage issues.

0:08:47.830,0:08:54.260

Uh, others having more in... informal or internal discussions about, uh, if there is a citation

0:08:54.260,0:08:58.930

gap, what is it, how do we deal with it, what are the biases inherent in those gaps.

0:08:58.930,0:09:04.210

So that conversation took place amongst a very small portion of journal editors, again,

0:09:04.210,0:09:05.210

we didn't...

0:09:05.210,0:09:10.310

I think there's... give me no... how many political science journals are there in the

0:09:10.310,0:09:11.310

discipline?

0:09:11.310,0:09:12.900

It's got to be what, 50, 70 or so?

0:09:12.900,0:09:15.149

Uh, we only deal with a small subset, mostly the major...

0:09:15.149,0:09:16.610

quote, "major visible journals."

0:09:16.610,0:09:20.920

But, uh, this is a sort of a snippet about

those conversations.

0:09:20.920,0:09:25.890

[inaudible] did you have a sense of what that number may be?

0:09:25.890,0:09:30.519

Well within the orbit of APSA related journals, there's about [inaudible].

0:09:30.519,0:09:31.519

Okay, okay.

0:09:31.519,0:09:36.280

But then, of course, there are many political science journals outside of that orbit.

0:09:36.280,0:09:37.280

Yeah.

0:09:37.280,0:09:39.370

We had an estimate about 75 in that cat... in that category.

0:09:39.370,0:09:40.370

[inaudible]

0:09:40.370,0:09:47.570

There's a lot of them.

0:09:47.570,0:09:52.370

Again, when the academy reference about a methodological issue about representation

0:09:52.370,0:09:58.030

and so forth, this is more of an informal kind of... uh, conversations of journal editors

0:09:58.030,0:10:02.410

where we were able to both reach out to and they were cooperative to respond to.

0:10:02.410,0:10:10.279

Uh, other thing was that, um, new teams of editors, uh, that included the citation issues,

0:10:10.279,0:10:17.149

uh, really requested more materials and orientations about understanding what the issue is, how

0:10:17.149,0:10:21.541

do you deal with it, how do you remedy if there are gaps, uh, what are the nature of

0:10:21.541,0:10:26.050
the gaps, how do you deal with it, how do
you uh mediate those gaps.

0:10:26.050,0:10:28.209
Uh, another way to justify...

0:10:28.209,0:10:33.850
why bother about citation gaps you know eventually,
if we rely on peer reviewers they're knowledgeable

0:10:33.850,0:10:37.620
in their field so, uh, they should know the
field.

0:10:37.620,0:10:42.460
Well what we found is that one... one uh,
response of editors has to do with the quality

0:10:42.460,0:10:44.890
of research, regenerating knowledge.

0:10:44.890,0:10:49.410
If there's segments of knowledge that has
not been widely known then you're not really

0:10:49.410,0:10:55.260
advancing the knowledge area in that regard
and so that was uh... uh, issues that you're

0:10:55.260,0:11:00.100
really not representing what that knowledge
community is generating if you just sort of

0:11:00.100,0:11:09.410
limit to sort of standard areas of uh... [inaudible]
a cadre of scholars a [inaudible] reference

0:11:09.410,0:11:14.440
that part of the scholarship is that the subsets
that get more recognition than others.

0:11:14.440,0:11:19.630
And so that was the... uh, and then what many
people do is you assign, uh, an editor as

0:11:19.630,0:11:25.490
you're saying this is a manuscript that's
not really in my kind of knowledge area so

0:11:25.490,0:11:31.610
who can I, uh, talk to about whom with an
appropriate reviewer or reviewers, but that

0:11:31.610,0:11:37.460
essentially, uh, reaching out, trying to get
coverage of the fields that are offered or

0:11:37.460,0:11:42.230
active, and appropriate peer reviews who can
assess those research is a challenge.

0:11:42.230,0:11:45.690
Um, and also how do you assess what's missing
work?

0:11:45.690,0:11:49.820
Uh, you know you look at the universe, yeah
you say I know what it is, but there's uh...

0:11:49.820,0:11:56.440
well this is a short caveat, when I've done
journal... uh, article reviews, but the trigger

0:11:56.440,0:11:59.269
for me is no one has done work in this area.

0:11:59.269,0:12:02.800
And to me that's it, that's the flag, that
person.

0:12:02.800,0:12:07.300
And sometimes I invest time in generating
a page full bibliography about here's work

0:12:07.300,0:12:11.760
in this area that's done prior to the time
you discovered that no one has done an important

0:12:11.760,0:12:12.959
research in this area.

0:12:12.959,0:12:16.870
So essentially it's, you know, missing is...
we're dealing with missing data, well there's

0:12:16.870,0:12:19.269
missing data in this context as well.

0:12:19.269,0:12:25.190
Um, and so, uh, while we find is there's a
overlap between admission data and missing

0:12:25.190,0:12:28.110
works that overlap with certain communities
of scholars.

0:12:28.110,0:12:34.209

Again, we go back to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, sub fields, institutional

0:12:34.209,0:12:40.990

basis, all those are quote, "cadres," where that's... this missing work is is can be found.

0:12:40.990,0:12:44.220

Um, also, um...

0:12:44.220,0:12:48.990

[inaudible]... trying to be comprehensive but also not take a lot of time.

0:12:48.990,0:12:50.899

When... are any of you editors...

0:12:50.899,0:12:55.380

only 17 percent of that editors, we're taking about talking small ends, made reference that

0:12:55.380,0:12:58.470

a citation gap was an issue, a concern of theirs.

0:12:58.470,0:13:00.260

Uh, they did mostly...

0:13:00.260,0:13:04.880

they did mention it was mostly in the context of gender gap, but even though there are quote,

0:13:04.880,0:13:08.779

"missed communities," some communities are totally missed, while others are sort of not

0:13:08.779,0:13:11.180

as missed, to put it in those terms.

0:13:11.180,0:13:15.500

Uh, and if you look at the research and I would encourage you if you look at the reports,

0:13:15.500,0:13:21.690

we included a 52-page bibliography of citation related research, uh, and there's a... if

0:13:21.690,0:13:28.640

you look at in terms of groups that are, uh, most biased, gender's quite clearly the overwhelming

0:13:28.640,0:13:34.949

body of research in that category, much less,

uh, systematic work on other communities of

0:13:34.949,0:13:37.699

color, uh, sexual orientation, etc.

0:13:37.699,0:13:44.089

Uh, so there was a lot in terms of either gender, secondarily race/ethnicity, and then...

0:13:44.089,0:13:48.200

or a generic underrepresented disadvantaged, uh, communities of scholar.

0:13:48.200,0:13:53.180

Um, again that's why many editors have talked about setting up field editors.

0:13:53.180,0:13:56.889

You look at APSA I think has a field editor kind of format in terms of trying to cover

0:13:56.889,0:13:58.260

the discipline.

0:13:58.260,0:14:04.200

Uh, other people talk about in order to quote, "capture those missing elements of both scholarship

0:14:04.200,0:14:09.850

and scholars," is may perhaps use thematic issues as to a way to bring those communities

0:14:09.850,0:14:14.940

in a more visible sense and... and then others pull out networks.

0:14:14.940,0:14:21.080

One of the major areas of research is networks are integral part of generating research.

0:14:21.080,0:14:26.480

Uh, co-authorships, most of our authorships... in the sciences you have articles that are

0:14:26.480,0:14:29.300

written by 105 people, 110 people.

0:14:29.300,0:14:34.790

And so there are researchers that talk about scales of multi-authorship relative to citations

0:14:34.790,0:14:40.279

and what is it... how do you interpret a person 95th in terms of their contribution to that

0:14:40.279,0:14:41.279
work.

0:14:41.279,0:14:45.310
So there's dynamics going on in this... in
our knowledge industry in terms of multiple

0:14:45.310,0:14:52.149
authorships, in terms of co-authorship, there's
gender issues where women co-author less than

0:14:52.149,0:14:56.180
males do, males tend to co-author more with
other males.

0:14:56.180,0:15:01.310
And so all these things that dynamics occur
in our... in our social respective disciplines

0:15:01.310,0:15:02.920
that impact citations.

0:15:02.920,0:15:06.000
Um, the other thing is that, um, networks...

0:15:06.000,0:15:12.310
there's a term they use third-party cita...
citators, I guess this is the word, where

0:15:12.310,0:15:17.570
in terms of who gets cited, males tend to
be cited more by the collaborative networks

0:15:17.570,0:15:19.930
or self-citation.

0:15:19.930,0:15:24.550
Women are much more cited and again, this
is gendered research, much by third-party

0:15:24.550,0:15:26.970
collaboration or third-party cite.... citers.

0:15:26.970,0:15:32.310
So how you generate citations has a lot to
do with the network your part in and the biases

0:15:32.310,0:15:34.130
those networks you're comprised of.

0:15:34.130,0:15:41.970
Um, overwhelmingly, uh, more editors are aware
this is an issue that needs to be addressed,

0:15:41.970,0:15:44.990

but also seeking out how to how do we address it?

0:15:44.990,0:15:50.170

Uh, the... within the discipline it seems to me IR has been probably the subfield that

0:15:50.170,0:15:53.259

has been more conscious in terms of trying to deal with this issue.

0:15:53.259,0:15:59.560

Uh, some have been more proactive and set up like... that Andrew says okay, I'm gonna

0:15:59.560,0:16:05.820

send this... this demographic on... on... on IR theory for instance, a colleague of

0:16:05.820,0:16:13.540

mine Spike Peterson dealt a lot to generate that area, and so I'm gonna look at this and

0:16:13.540,0:16:19.680

say does this... just, is this person's references representative of that field?

0:16:19.680,0:16:23.839

And so there are some methods to try to get... in a sense looking at just a bibliography

0:16:23.839,0:16:28.350

of that manuscript in terms of whether we need to tell that submitter saying before

0:16:28.350,0:16:33.490

we review your manuscript you need to take into account other works that are not inclusive

0:16:33.490,0:16:34.620

in your current bibliography.

0:16:34.620,0:16:36.009

So that's more proactive.

0:16:36.009,0:16:41.839

Uh, so there are some some editors and again, IR and each of my surveys of the literature

0:16:41.839,0:16:47.019

suggests that IR is taking a more proactive role in trying to deal with this than others...

0:16:47.019,0:16:48.019
other fields.

0:16:48.019,0:16:53.240
Um, the other thing is is that, um, one of
the problems that journals are fearing you're

0:16:53.240,0:16:57.920
saying well we're pushing from broader breadth
of knowledge, broader sense of fields, many

0:16:57.920,0:17:01.350
journals are complaining I don't have enough
reviewers to review any manuscript.

0:17:01.350,0:17:04.780
And so the reviewer pool has become a major
issue.

0:17:04.780,0:17:08.819
And so you're saying on the one hand, we need
a... you need more people to cooperate and

0:17:08.819,0:17:12.940
provide, uh, reviews, on the other hand saying
the breadth of the scope of knowledge is to

0:17:12.940,0:17:20.610
such a degree that a specialization is...
is going to even magnify or amplify that particular

0:17:20.610,0:17:21.610
issue.

0:17:21.610,0:17:22.839
Uh, there is a resource...

0:17:22.839,0:17:28.350
I think there's some reason that number five
is being blocked, uh, two sources that people,

0:17:28.350,0:17:32.040
sometimes some editors also use is called
"Women Also Know Stuff" and "People of Color

0:17:32.040,0:17:36.450
Also Know Stuff" is a way to look at what
is missing, what is being produced that may

0:17:36.450,0:17:38.650
not be in the purview of reviewers.

0:17:38.650,0:17:40.470

Um, so that...

0:17:40.470,0:17:43.690
there are resources available to you kind
of assess that.

0:17:43.690,0:17:48.760
The thing with training of reviewers is reviewers
should be shedding new light on how do you

0:17:48.760,0:17:49.760
improve your work.

0:17:49.760,0:17:52.990
Uh, sometimes not all reviewers do that, uh,
and I still...

0:17:52.990,0:17:58.120
I know journal editors have a way to evaluate
whether that reviewer you want to use again

0:17:58.120,0:18:02.130
or not if they're... they're not really providing
constructive criticism, they're pretty goading

0:18:02.130,0:18:04.400
over their own work, and not... etc.

0:18:04.400,0:18:09.860
So that the need for training may be really
very quite relevant in terms of what's a good

0:18:09.860,0:18:15.980
review and what... this slide sort of suggests
good reviewers shed new light on on submitted

0:18:15.980,0:18:21.630
work, the review, which review is missing
a "W," uh, to deal with content, the language,

0:18:21.630,0:18:26.820
the tone, the structure, and it should be
beneficial in terms of informing the reader,

0:18:26.820,0:18:30.020
as well as the person who's generating that
work.

0:18:30.020,0:18:35.400
Uh, so the reviewer should bring skills, expertise,
motivation, uh, one article talks about mega

0:18:35.400,0:18:41.370
reviewers: individuals who seem to review

lots of articles on the... in the time period.

0:18:41.370,0:18:47.461

And they seem to be... when Cathy refers about knowing the "why," why are people doing that

0:18:47.461,0:18:53.010

and... and you know, what is their motivation to be... not to say no, not to that, not at

0:18:53.010,0:18:54.010

this time.

0:18:54.010,0:18:57.559

Uh, so it's... the common kind of phrase is, I don't have time, I don't...

0:18:57.559,0:18:59.890

I don't want to do this or this is out of my purview.

0:18:59.890,0:19:01.309

So... so and yeah.

0:19:01.309,0:19:07.080

In those cases, most journal editors, can you suggest to us other individuals who might

0:19:07.080,0:19:09.440

either have the expertise or the willingness to do so.

0:19:09.440,0:19:15.179

We also find that in terms of race, ethnicity, and junior faculty, they're more inclined

0:19:15.179,0:19:21.580

not to refuse to review an article and in... the trade off they may also take away some

0:19:21.580,0:19:27.100

of their own time to generate, uh, research that they need for their promotion and tenure

0:19:27.100,0:19:28.100

and advancement.

0:19:28.100,0:19:32.070

Uh, so sometimes the people who are asked the most are also the people who are probably

0:19:32.070,0:19:37.840

most in jeopardy of getting success in this process, but also to avoid the biases of reviewers.

0:19:37.840,0:19:44.780

Uh, heightened negativity, self-centered feedback, there's ideological biases, combative languages,

0:19:44.780,0:19:49.909

the epistemological biases, all those come to play in how reviewers respond so that obviously

0:19:49.909,0:19:55.400

the editors who receive these reviews, uh, need to... to take that into consideration

0:19:55.400,0:20:00.600

in terms of saying, is this a fair and comprehensive review of the submitted piece?

0:20:00.600,0:20:04.830

The last piece is... again, I'm repeating myself, is to recognize the need for peer

0:20:04.830,0:20:06.360

review training.

0:20:06.360,0:20:10.289

And the question is by whom and what are the mechanisms to have that happen?

0:20:10.289,0:20:15.490

Um, we were looking at open peer review, but process of doing a citation that we call the

0:20:15.490,0:20:22.370

literature, it talks about open peer review has a direct correlation to quality and transparency

0:20:22.370,0:20:23.370

in the review process.

0:20:23.370,0:20:28.020

Open peer review in a very simplistic way is that it's known whom the reviewer is and

0:20:28.020,0:20:33.350

who the submitter is and there is an open record that shows what that... those review comments

0:20:33.350,0:20:38.549

is, the submitters response to those comments, it's a whole history of that whole process.

0:20:38.549,0:20:43.240

And there are some studies that says yes, that open peer review in fact increases citations,

0:20:43.240,0:20:48.280

it also improves its transparency, and also improves the quality of not only the piece,

0:20:48.280,0:20:52.070

but also the quality of the review.

0:20:52.070,0:20:57.770

Because if my name is on there and it's public, I may be more conscious about how I present

0:20:57.770,0:21:04.190

stuff and so forth and so there is some and, again, this... all pros generally have cons,

0:21:04.190,0:21:07.070

and so obviously you're saying well if it's an open process, I'm not sure if I want to

0:21:07.070,0:21:09.040

be that open in terms of being a reviewer.

0:21:09.040,0:21:13.370

But, including there's... there's a growing body of literature saying that it does generate

0:21:13.370,0:21:18.279

higher quality reviews, you give credit to reviewers, which is another issue about getting

0:21:18.279,0:21:22.140

more reviewers, being more open in terms of credit, uh, is good.

0:21:22.140,0:21:25.789

I know economic journals... actually its a nominal amount but, they do pay their reviewers,

0:21:25.789,0:21:27.500

uh, for reviewing their articles.

0:21:27.500,0:21:32.080

Uh, you know classic economic model stuff.

0:21:32.080,0:21:37.580

But anyway, uh, there's significant, uh, things to consider.

0:21:37.580,0:21:43.779

We're not... our taskforce shouldn't promote open review versus looking at citations.

0:21:43.779,0:21:49.960

That became part of that discussion and so it needs to be a discussion among journals,

0:21:49.960,0:21:53.779

among the discipline, and among... among the research community about using the open review

0:21:53.779,0:21:57.720

process as a... as opposed to the double buying process.

0:21:57.720,0:22:02.529

Uh, the one, uh, major published... publisher that I'm aware of that does that is SAGE.

0:22:02.529,0:22:06.169

A lot of the SAGE journals are open... open, uh, peer review.

0:22:06.169,0:22:11.700

Um, just goes back to the pros and cons... uh again, it's a more democratic process,

0:22:11.700,0:22:17.570

ensures that reviewers are more honest and more thoughtful, uh, less likely to exhibit

0:22:17.570,0:22:19.549

ad hominem ideological biases.

0:22:19.549,0:22:26.010

Uh, and again, there may be hesitancy of people to do so, uh, they may in fact, uh, soften

0:22:26.010,0:22:30.400

their review if they're going to be open, which is actually credited to both the reviewer

0:22:30.400,0:22:31.400

and the submitter.

0:22:31.400,0:22:36.740

Um, one of the things we did, uh, in terms of... oh.

0:22:36.740,0:22:43.159

Well I think Cathy made the... [inaudible] of qualitative versus quantitative.

0:22:43.159,0:22:51.740

Uh, one of our task force members Natalie Maduka, who... whose now at UCLA, um, was

0:22:51.740,0:22:56.480

part of a study that Bernie Groffman did at Irvine in 2014 that did actually look at it

0:22:56.480,0:23:04.080

who are the top fighters in... by fields and by subfields and they had a sample of 4000

0:23:04.080,0:23:06.320

and 200 cases.

0:23:06.320,0:23:08.760

So Natalie says we can...

0:23:08.760,0:23:10.490

I can make that available to you.

0:23:10.490,0:23:11.490

So we...

0:23:11.490,0:23:12.490

what we...

0:23:12.490,0:23:17.280

I took it on which, uh, it was [inaudible] it's a data issue, because its a data cleaning

0:23:17.280,0:23:18.280

issue.

0:23:18.280,0:23:25.330

Because I contacted APSA, I worked largely with Betty Super about merging that data set,

0:23:25.330,0:23:31.000

which was done in '14, with a more contemporary time set of the membership data of APSA in

0:23:31.000,0:23:33.920

this time 2019, I think or '20.

0:23:33.920,0:23:36.700

Um, but what happened is you had a lot of multiple entries.

0:23:36.700,0:23:42.480

I found one person that was listed 17 times because they were in different institutions,

0:23:42.480,0:23:46.980

they responded racial/ethnically differently in different ways, and so there's a lot of

0:23:46.980,0:23:47.980

data.

0:23:47.980,0:23:54.590

We had 7200 cases combined, but there are a lot of duplicates and so it made some issues

0:23:54.590,0:23:58.860

about how one structures the data to avoid a lot of data cleaning process.

0:23:58.860,0:24:03.710

To make sure that we didn't... not only not duplicate, but also the person that we assumed

0:24:03.710,0:24:07.020

was the same person was actually the same person.

0:24:07.020,0:24:08.020

People move and so we...

0:24:08.020,0:24:09.990

we have from the mobility data.

0:24:09.990,0:24:15.419

Uh, race and ethnically, uh, another person would put one race, and then the next would

0:24:15.419,0:24:19.960

respond and put another race, third response would put a combination of races.

0:24:19.960,0:24:23.970

So for categorization, if race was a... an initial part of our analysis that we had to

0:24:23.970,0:24:29.100

make sure that we're operationalizing that way to create quote, "non-discreet," uh, "discrete"

0:24:29.100,0:24:30.100

categories.

0:24:30.100,0:24:31.690

So there's a lot of data cleaning involved.

0:24:31.690,0:24:37.100

This represents just two tables from that study where we look at based on, uh, the race

0:24:37.100,0:24:41.500

and ethnic, um, non-white persons who said, I'm not...

0:24:41.500,0:24:43.200

I'm some other race.

0:24:43.200,0:24:45.810

So they indicate they were White or whatever.

0:24:45.810,0:24:54.690

So basically, what you see is, uh, just numerically, uh, White, uh, APSA members, uh, are cited

0:24:54.690,0:25:03.100

most, uh, Asian second, uh, non-white third, Latinos fourth, and... and African-American/

0:25:03.100,0:25:05.860

Black last, uh, fifth.

0:25:05.860,0:25:10.970

Um, we had... going back to American Indian/ Alaskan Native conversation, very few if any,

0:25:10.970,0:25:16.390

and there may be a reference of including that category as well for the zeros that you

0:25:16.390,0:25:17.460

made reference to.

0:25:17.460,0:25:22.789

Uh, but clearly in terms of the citation, uh, quote, "counts," uh, there's clearly a

0:25:22.789,0:25:29.169

pattern of of lesser citations and that may not represent lesser productivity of those

0:25:29.169,0:25:31.920

of those categories of persons.

0:25:31.920,0:25:36.491

We did our most varied analysis to look at what contributes for high numbers of... of

0:25:36.491,0:25:40.409

and oh, citations [inaudible] what citation source do we use?

0:25:40.409,0:25:43.830

We use Scopus and Google for comparative purposes.

0:25:43.830,0:25:51.390

The most negative aspects are an inverse relationship of higher rates of citations, or in this case,

0:25:51.390,0:25:58.680

lower rates is being female, is being African-American, it's being "other," other is... is more of

0:25:58.680,0:26:00.140
a multiracial residual...

0:26:00.140,0:26:02.669
Latino, uh.

0:26:02.669,0:26:09.159
And uh, and the plus was, uh, being an R1 institution.

0:26:09.159,0:26:15.240
The other negative was... we also had the year of the person's PhD so we created a cohort,

0:26:15.240,0:26:20.049
I think we started with people who got their degrees before 1950 I think from that point

0:26:20.049,0:26:21.231
forward every 10-year increment.

0:26:21.231,0:26:26.490
And so again, uh, you assume that the longer you've been around, the more you get... the

0:26:26.490,0:26:28.020
more you produce and the more you're going to be cited.

0:26:28.020,0:26:32.799
So this is just a quick snapshot, uh, again I would encourage you to look at the report.

0:26:32.799,0:26:37.179
It gives you much more detail in terms of that... that part of our report.

0:26:37.179,0:26:43.429
Uh, I found some additional work that was after this report was completed, I thought

0:26:43.429,0:26:45.130
I'd add it in this context.

0:26:45.130,0:26:52.520
Uh, a study by I think its Tangled economics found that women submitters wait 4.4 days

0:26:52.520,0:26:58.100
longer before they get results of their... of their submission, it takes 12.3 days longer

0:26:58.100,0:27:04.640
to revise their their work, which means that
the net... their time if they're in particularly

0:27:04.640,0:27:11.970
in a time rush, they're... institutionally,
uh, affected in terms of that time period.

0:27:11.970,0:27:18.700
Also, the same, uh, person in another piece
indicates that women were, uh, write more

0:27:18.700,0:27:23.080
clearly than their male counterparts, but
at the same time they're held to higher standards

0:27:23.080,0:27:24.080
of clarity.

0:27:24.080,0:27:28.780
Uh, so that you do better in one area, but
you also have a higher standard, so that gender

0:27:28.780,0:27:30.789
effect is, uh, is clear.

0:27:30.789,0:27:38.130
And also, if women submitters, uh, are reviewed
by what they call novice reviewers that has

0:27:38.130,0:27:40.029
a negative effect on their outcomes.

0:27:40.029,0:27:43.550
Uh again, maybe a function of just the longer
you've been around, your grasp of the knowledge

0:27:43.550,0:27:45.720
base is open or you're more open, who knows?

0:27:45.720,0:27:47.909
But again, back to the why part of it.

0:27:47.909,0:27:48.909
Um, clearly...

0:27:48.909,0:27:55.409
this is a point I made earlier, women citations
are largely the result of third-party citations,

0:27:55.409,0:27:59.160
whereas males are largely collaborative networks
and self-citation.

0:27:59.160,0:28:06.330

So again, reinforce the networks is a critical process to the whole citation process in terms

0:28:06.330,0:28:08.510

of productivity and recognition.

0:28:08.510,0:28:11.549

And there's a lot of literature about the infamous COVID.

0:28:11.549,0:28:16.750

COVID has impacted our lives in so many ways that affected in terms of citation.

0:28:16.750,0:28:22.549

Women's submitted their manuscripts less, uh, they in... the largest...

0:28:22.549,0:28:27.570

there's a category we have as terms of parenthood, what parenthood has to do with citations.

0:28:27.570,0:28:32.299

So again, this categories which I'm not dealing with in this presentation that I think represents

0:28:32.299,0:28:36.519

the breadth I think we took in terms of what are the factors that affect your ability to

0:28:36.519,0:28:42.070

cite, uh, to generate citations: gender, besides gender is also parenthood, uh, beside, um,

0:28:42.070,0:28:47.870

race/ ethnicity it could be national origin, or foreign born status, it could be language.

0:28:47.870,0:28:52.510

So that, uh, there's a whole litany at the tail end of that report that talks about these

0:28:52.510,0:28:58.179

are other factors in which... and all these are quote, "evidence-based, uh, findings"

0:28:58.179,0:29:01.740

on a fairly extensive review of the literature.

0:29:01.740,0:29:05.289

Um, what can journals do?

0:29:05.289,0:29:06.289

Uh, you know one...

0:29:06.289,0:29:09.960

I may references in terms of doing a preemptory, uh, review of bibliography.

0:29:09.960,0:29:10.970

Are they representative?

0:29:10.970,0:29:14.590

Do they include the distribution of markers of race and gender?

0:29:14.590,0:29:19.679

And I know, uh, APSA has done some... some, uh, involvement in this area.

0:29:19.679,0:29:25.970

Um, sponsor journals that need to evaluate the publications in terms of the representation

0:29:25.970,0:29:28.389

of... of the section members.

0:29:28.389,0:29:34.890

You know, many journals are... are generated by organized sections and so where those sections

0:29:34.890,0:29:40.890

in fact represent their constituency in a sense of... of their, uh, activities in terms

0:29:40.890,0:29:46.590

of publication, including the journal editorial teams not only pay attention to diversity,

0:29:46.590,0:29:50.320

but their potential for addressing other citation biases.

0:29:50.320,0:29:56.520

Subfields, uh, is... is a major one, sexual orientation is becoming much more a growing

0:29:56.520,0:29:57.520

concern.

0:29:57.520,0:30:04.390

Um again, uh, it's... it's both recognizing who is... who is being marginalized and how...

0:30:04.390,0:30:08.919

how they're being marginalized and what can

be done to remedy those situations.

0:30:08.919,0:30:15.360

Um, and again, um, that... the slide I showed you earlier was our attempt to try to fill

0:30:15.360,0:30:22.970

some gaps on scholars of color relative to citation bias, which is a much smaller literature...

0:30:22.970,0:30:24.360

research literature area.

0:30:24.360,0:30:29.490

Some journals have developed statements of and guidance about citation gaps.

0:30:29.490,0:30:34.149

Um, I mentioned the, uh, IR journals have probably been more at the forefront of that.

0:30:34.149,0:30:37.860

New tools to help editors broaden their reviewer pools.

0:30:37.860,0:30:43.380

Again, whether that's a function of just the journal editors themselves there's... they

0:30:43.380,0:30:49.560

represent organized groups where those sections can play a role in trying to, uh, to actively

0:30:49.560,0:30:51.919

encourage more reviewer pools just the association.

0:30:51.919,0:30:58.799

Are their quote, "reward systems," or notoriety kind of incentives that can be done, uh, to

0:30:58.799,0:31:04.470

get more people, uh, to... to be more open to be a reviewer of submitted articles.

0:31:04.470,0:31:11.990

Field review... editors, review editor teams, um, also we go back to data and documentation,

0:31:11.990,0:31:17.330

the citation gap for historically excluded scholars and lesser billable... visible and

0:31:17.330,0:31:22.830

recognized subfields is something that is

in a sense is known and there's significant

0:31:22.830,0:31:29.419
evidence to prove that, but it essentially
is not as well... that, uh, promoted or are

0:31:29.419,0:31:33.279
out there in terms of people that affect it.

0:31:33.279,0:31:36.840
And that's just journals, journals is sort
of what the focus is in this presentation,

0:31:36.840,0:31:42.570
but also in terms of institutions, make use
of citation partners, make use of citations.

0:31:42.570,0:31:44.039
Individuals, make use of citation.

0:31:44.039,0:31:49.190
Now I guess that's one of the recommendations,
that there are strategies to enhance an individuals

0:31:49.190,0:31:53.610
citations and yet, for the most part individuals
may not be aware of those strategies.

0:31:53.610,0:31:57.080
So it essentially goes back to the graduate
training part of it.

0:31:57.080,0:32:02.810
Besides learning your field and the discipline
and major, um, areas of knowledge, it's also

0:32:02.810,0:32:05.470
how do you deal with your professional life.

0:32:05.470,0:32:10.760
Um, Cathy made reference to mentors in terms
of how you navigate, uh, promotion and tenure

0:32:10.760,0:32:17.160
but also maybe how you navigate promoting
your own research and and enhancing your citation,

0:32:17.160,0:32:18.260
uh, visibility.

0:32:18.260,0:32:25.779
Um, this again, and I think I've dealt with
this in previous slides, um, is in terms of

0:32:25.779,0:32:30.081

basically you bro... broaden the network,
if networks are important for citation, networks

0:32:30.081,0:32:34.970

should be important to deal with those citation
gaps, make use of the networks that are available

0:32:34.970,0:32:37.260

in our research communities, uh.

0:32:37.260,0:32:45.090

And, um, we can always po... point to APSA,
but the last recommendation is empirical studies

0:32:45.090,0:32:49.220

citation gap or historically excluded scholars
and fields of study.

0:32:49.220,0:32:54.179

Again, our review of the literature says a
lot of disciplines and journals have been

0:32:54.179,0:32:58.899

doing that, not that APSA has not, but we
always try to kind of phrase we can always

0:32:58.899,0:33:03.020

do more and that's... that's what this falls
under.

0:33:03.020,0:33:04.649

Um, we don't get enough recognition...

0:33:04.649,0:33:08.360

these are, just these last two slides are
just more informational.

0:33:08.360,0:33:14.270

Um, these are the members of the citation
task force, uh, we had three undergraduate,

0:33:14.270,0:33:21.560

um, research assistants help us with both
the editor survey, the... the [inaudible]

0:33:21.560,0:33:26.050

description, the Groffman survey, and, uh,
some other work.

0:33:26.050,0:33:31.539

And then big help from... from Kim, Betty
Super, and Aaron McGrath in terms of the data,

0:33:31.539,0:33:32.539

so.

0:33:32.539,0:33:35.679

And then why it's added... because my sense is this these slides are being shared but

0:33:35.679,0:33:40.150

only by people in attendance here, but other people who access the site.

0:33:40.150,0:33:46.799

These are references that I added since the report was was completed and submitted, so

0:33:46.799,0:33:52.190

it has 52 pages of bibliography additional ones in fact, I have another probably 10 more

0:33:52.190,0:33:53.190

pages.

0:33:53.190,0:33:58.450

One of the... one of the legacies that Paula had on me is I've become much more engaged

0:33:58.450,0:34:02.409

in this area than I ever had anticipated and still am, so.

0:34:02.409,0:34:05.059

Whether it was a plus or minus...

0:34:05.059,0:34:08.520

Uh, anyway I'll end here and open up the questions.

0:34:08.520,0:34:11.100

I just want to make a comment, John.

0:34:11.100,0:34:12.100

That was, um, that was great.

0:34:12.100,0:34:15.429

One of the things John talked about is networks.

0:34:15.429,0:34:24.141

Um, in the STEM disciplines in 1999 they picked up... and then there was an article in the

0:34:24.141,0:34:31.909

frontiers of physics in 2016, the development of what they call citation cartels where a

0:34:31.909,0:34:40.379

group of scholars will disproportionately cite each other excluding others who work

0:34:40.379,0:34:41.579
in that area.

0:34:41.579,0:34:48.339
And the whole purpose of citation cartels is to continue to bump up their age indices

0:34:48.339,0:34:51.450
and so in... in the STEM disciplines they're trying to figure out...

0:34:51.450,0:34:56.609
they've done a lot of network analysis as to who these people are and what they're doing.

0:34:56.609,0:35:02.100
And it's also extended to acceptance into some of their dis... their journals, that

0:35:02.100,0:35:12.760
an editor will say unless you cite A, B, C, D, and E, we won't accept the manuscript.

0:35:12.760,0:35:19.790
So there's a lot going on in this area that... that just continues to work against scholars

0:35:19.790,0:35:20.790
of color.

0:35:20.790,0:35:24.540
I don't know if we have citation cartels in political science, I know we've got groups

0:35:24.540,0:35:30.020
that only cite... but you know, but... but that is...

0:35:30.020,0:35:32.570
Yeah.

0:35:32.570,0:35:36.530
I guess we don't call them that, but... but they're you know.

0:35:36.530,0:35:38.030
But that's an issue.

0:35:38.030,0:35:43.910
That is really an issue and unless you don't understand what's going on especially at the

0:35:43.910,0:35:50.410

APT level, it can work against scholars of color and others who work in areas that some

0:35:50.410,0:35:51.690

disciplines consider to be marginalized.

0:35:51.690,0:35:52.690

One year...

0:35:52.690,0:35:56.839

I won't get into detail, but we make also a difference about what's your cited in a

0:35:56.839,0:36:00.270

book versus article because that's something junior faculties always have to deal with.

0:36:00.270,0:36:04.810

I'm better off producing short articles and I'll do the books after I get tenure.

0:36:04.810,0:36:05.810

And what...

0:36:05.810,0:36:11.050

what the value is in citation payback if you publish a book versus you publish a journal

0:36:11.050,0:36:12.050

article.

0:36:12.050,0:36:15.540

So that... we covered... we covered a lot of ground so I would encourage you to... you

0:36:15.540,0:36:20.890

to have a look at the... that particular piece or review, uh, that... we covered a lot more

0:36:20.890,0:36:26.380

than what I did in 15 plus minutes.

0:36:26.380,0:36:32.650

Any questions for John?

0:36:32.650,0:36:37.020

Thanks for terrific, uh, work, um.

0:36:37.020,0:36:38.020

[inaudible]

0:36:38.020,0:36:42.710

I have two questions about the APSA journals,
in particular.

0:36:42.710,0:36:49.849

Uh, one of them is whether you require your
authors to agree to serve as reviewers?

0:36:49.849,0:36:58.140

Um, and the second is, uh, whether, uh, you've
got explicit guidance, um, or rules for co-authorship?

0:36:58.140,0:37:06.421

Well... my understanding is that there's no
requirement that if you submit to a journal

0:37:06.421,0:37:08.440

and you have to agree to be a reviewer.

0:37:08.440,0:37:09.440

No requirement?

0:37:09.440,0:37:11.390

Not that I'm aware of.

0:37:11.390,0:37:14.620

And also in co-authorship, that's more the...
at least in my...

0:37:14.620,0:37:19.119

my experience more the institutional factor,
whereas if I submit...

0:37:19.119,0:37:23.750

I'm going for promotion and I've got a co-author
a multi-author piece that is supposed to indicate

0:37:23.750,0:37:28.010

what portion of my contribution went into
that particular order but I'm not sure at

0:37:28.010,0:37:29.380

the journal level that is...

0:37:29.380,0:37:33.700

The articles don't have a list of what the
role was of each co-author.

0:37:33.700,0:37:36.530

At least it's not formally required.

0:37:36.530,0:37:40.460

Some authors may choose to add that information,
but I don't think it's required.

0:37:40.460,0:37:46.450

Or if they say we're listed alphabetically because we all contributed equally too.

0:37:46.450,0:37:47.730

Yeah.

0:37:47.730,0:37:54.970

Can you pass the mic to her?

0:37:54.970,0:38:05.470

This is a comment or a question, but I'm the book reviewer for Publius and one of the issues

0:38:05.470,0:38:09.950

is you know what type of books and also who submits.

0:38:09.950,0:38:14.530

How is it that a book gets to my desk right?

0:38:14.530,0:38:21.100

And of course, most of us do this on a voluntary basis so we don't have unlimited resources

0:38:21.100,0:38:24.800

to identify you know all the books that are out there, who... who are writing them.

0:38:24.800,0:38:28.740

And also on the other hand, who's reviewing those books, right?

0:38:28.740,0:38:35.079

So that might be another suggestion for... recommendation for... for journals in terms

0:38:35.079,0:38:41.500

of being more systematic of what type of books make it to that stage and who... who gets

0:38:41.500,0:38:42.940

to review them, right?

0:38:42.940,0:38:45.619

How is that we can be more intentional in that way.

0:38:45.619,0:38:46.619

I know somebody...

0:38:46.619,0:38:49.030

somebody has to do with this is a publisher.

0:38:49.030,0:38:54.460

Yeah they want to... they want to promote their book, so they'll contact whom they feel

0:38:54.460,0:39:01.260

is the appropriate topical journal to say, we'll send you "X" books and then primarily

0:39:01.260,0:39:05.240

rely on the journal itself to determine whom the reviewers will be.

0:39:05.240,0:39:12.740

At least that's my knowledge of it, but other people may have other...

0:39:12.740,0:39:16.079

other perspectives.

0:39:16.079,0:39:17.749

Andrew.

0:39:17.749,0:39:21.130

... the mic near Andrew.

0:39:21.130,0:39:22.260

Okay.

0:39:22.260,0:39:25.640

Pass the mic.

0:39:25.640,0:39:26.770

[inaudible]

0:39:26.770,0:39:30.160

Okay, thank you.

0:39:30.160,0:39:38.560

Uh, and me, I've not received any kind of any issues around citation and I did wonder,

0:39:38.560,0:39:42.220

um, as you said most of the research is around gender.

0:39:42.220,0:39:46.010

And I do wonder if this is an issue because gender is something that people can infer

0:39:46.010,0:39:48.530

from names, whereas other things are just much more difficult.

0:39:48.530,0:39:53.450

Like how do you know whether a scholar is
LGBTQ unless you actually personally know

0:39:53.450,0:39:56.690
them or they have a public profile that is
that way?

0:39:56.690,0:40:02.569
And so, I guess I have a question about like
how in terms of guidelines, how am I to assess

0:40:02.569,0:40:08.839
a paper for its inclusion when I may not necessarily
know the identities of the individuals that

0:40:08.839,0:40:10.190
they're citing?

0:40:10.190,0:40:15.670
Um, and in order to kind of say this is insufficient,
right, as opposed to you're not citing specific

0:40:15.670,0:40:17.430
pieces of literature.

0:40:17.430,0:40:18.430
I...

0:40:18.430,0:40:24.589
I'll just say my quick response would be it's
largely determined on your own, your kind

0:40:24.589,0:40:31.339
of... access to people with potentially that
kind of knowledge base to... to pass on that.

0:40:31.339,0:40:35.859
But it's... it's more informal as opposed
to there's no categorization saying well,

0:40:35.859,0:40:40.650
the sex... sexual orientation of scholars
in political science you go to this site,

0:40:40.650,0:40:41.930
this will differentiate them.

0:40:41.930,0:40:48.089
I think it's... at least that's my impression
at this point.

0:40:48.089,0:40:50.380
Oh you know.

0:40:50.380,0:40:56.810

Um, this relates to the last presentation,
to Cathy's presentation too, and also the

0:40:56.810,0:41:01.730

[inaudible] article, for the politics groups
and identity article that was very enlightening.

0:41:01.730,0:41:07.520

Um, do we have data... so we've talked...
we've talked a lot about acceptance rates

0:41:07.520,0:41:15.690

of you know, in Paula's article, um, in the
REP subfield, uh, sort of historically marginalized

0:41:15.690,0:41:18.560

subfields, you could argue.

0:41:18.560,0:41:23.670

Um, about 4.5 percent of the top three journals,
so I want to focus on the top three journals,

0:41:23.670,0:41:30.220

APSR, AJPS, JOP, um, and so you have that
substantive area but I also want to...

0:41:30.220,0:41:35.430

I also want to be curious about scholars of
color, you know, if they're in that area or

0:41:35.430,0:41:36.430

not?

0:41:36.430,0:41:40.300

So do we have data on on, um, submission rates
at all?

0:41:40.300,0:41:46.170

About, uh, how likely scholars of color or
REP scho... and/ or REP scholars, some of

0:41:46.170,0:41:53.079

that's overlaps, uh, do they submit at lower
rates than other scholars, either White scholars

0:41:53.079,0:41:55.560

or scholars outside that field?

0:41:55.560,0:42:00.660

Um, and that would highlight a potentially
even more troubling pattern if scholars of

0:42:00.660,0:42:06.510

color or scholars in the REP subfield perceive that those journals don't even appreciate

0:42:06.510,0:42:07.510
that work.

0:42:07.510,0:42:12.640
So I wonder if we have data on that because I think we focus a lot on outcomes, um, you

0:42:12.640,0:42:13.640
know what percentage are...

0:42:13.640,0:42:14.640
do actually appear.

0:42:14.640,0:42:17.890
But do we know how many are submitting?

0:42:17.890,0:42:22.900
Maybe only 4.5 maybe the... maybe the rates are representative of submission, maybe they're

0:42:22.900,0:42:23.930
not.

0:42:23.930,0:42:29.200
But of course that opens up a new question about, um, if people have perceptions that

0:42:29.200,0:42:34.119
their work is not welcome at JOP, AJPS, and of course that has huge implications for tenure

0:42:34.119,0:42:35.660
promotion and citations.

0:42:35.660,0:42:40.020
So we got to get people submitting, is my big thing, and that's... you know you've got

0:42:40.020,0:42:42.400
to submit to the top three journals no matter what.

0:42:42.400,0:42:44.470
Well I'll give a quick historical response.

0:42:44.470,0:42:49.569
I've been in this profession for over 50 years, so there is clearly, particularly in the earlier

0:42:49.569,0:42:53.750
part of my career, there's clear perceptions

of which journals are likely to be more open.

0:42:53.750,0:42:57.350

Not to say that you can't accept a bit of
a open [inaudible] reviewer.

0:42:57.350,0:43:00.590

But I've had cross pressure saying well, hold
it.

0:43:00.590,0:43:07.020

I'm not tenured, I need to get an AJPS article
again and so forth, and I... so there was

0:43:07.020,0:43:11.690

this personal strategy saying, if I think
this article has any chance at a mainstream,

0:43:11.690,0:43:12.690

I'll submit it.

0:43:12.690,0:43:14.440

If I don't, I'll send it to more specialized.

0:43:14.440,0:43:20.780

And in fact, from my earlier mainstream submission
saying, well this piece might be publishable,

0:43:20.780,0:43:23.210

but it's not a major interest to our readership.

0:43:23.210,0:43:24.820

So again, that has changed.

0:43:24.820,0:43:31.829

I mean that... clearly that is not as much
the case now as it was two generations ago,

0:43:31.829,0:43:33.200

but I think it's part of it.

0:43:33.200,0:43:37.690

And again, we don't have any systematic, uh,
you know documentation of that.

0:43:37.690,0:43:38.690

Uh, Paula had...

0:43:38.690,0:43:41.900

I'm sure has much more to add than what I
just said.

0:43:41.900,0:43:42.900

Well, yeah.

0:43:42.900,0:43:47.359

Um, I'm a little behind you in terms of my time in the discipline, but not much.

0:43:47.359,0:43:52.920

Um, Matthew Holden was... [inaudible]

0:43:52.920,0:43:56.569

... And I think that was in early 80's or something... [inaudible]

0:43:56.569,0:44:04.640

And then there was this long, long period, then Pat Patterson became [inaudible] for

0:44:04.640,0:44:07.710

ACSR and he was trying to open it up.

0:44:07.710,0:44:12.369

And so then you saw Catherine Tate had a piece accepted and I had a piece accepted.

0:44:12.369,0:44:21.380

And then we had this long period again, right, where the work, you know it was... it was

0:44:21.380,0:44:25.880

just the editors were just not interested in publishing those things.

0:44:25.880,0:44:32.930

And so, those you know things are still kind of percolating around of... of the journals

0:44:32.930,0:44:33.930

at that time.

0:44:33.930,0:44:38.580

I think JOP was the one that was probably most likely because they came out of the Southern,

0:44:38.580,0:44:39.580

right?

0:44:39.580,0:44:47.000

And issues of race in the South were important or you know that that JOP, um, would take

0:44:47.000,0:44:48.000

it.

0:44:48.000,0:44:51.680

So I'm sure that in graduate school, people...

0:44:51.680,0:44:53.770
REP it's not going to make any of these journals.

0:44:53.770,0:44:57.070
You know, it's just this kind of continuing...

0:44:57.070,0:44:58.070
continuing process.

0:44:58.070,0:45:03.410
And if you go back to citation in the syllabi,
you're being trained in terms of certain fields

0:45:03.410,0:45:08.520
of study, you're not only looking at who's
contributing to that knowledge base, but also

0:45:08.520,0:45:10.579
where is it being found.

0:45:10.579,0:45:14.690
And you find that it's... you know where in
the journal location made for it guides you

0:45:14.690,0:45:19.420
in saying, well I'm probably better off submitting
here and not... not there in the major.

0:45:19.420,0:45:26.040
So I mean, again, it cuts across in a lot
of different contexts.

0:45:26.040,0:45:32.180
Um, we do collect that data for APSR, I can't
speak to JOP or HAPS.

0:45:32.180,0:45:35.442
But for the last five or six years now, we
have... we do collect that data, demographic

0:45:35.442,0:45:41.020
data on people who submit to the journal.

0:45:41.020,0:45:45.170
It... it publishes aggregate data.

0:45:45.170,0:45:49.230
Yes, every year there's a... there's... it's
published and is aggregate data.

0:45:49.230,0:45:50.310
Yeah, so.

0:45:50.310,0:45:55.450

Um, but what... the comment that I wanted to make and... and maybe Ed can comment on

0:45:55.450,0:45:56.850

this too, but the...

0:45:56.850,0:46:02.250

I'm in as executive director of APSA, we're in the midst of this movement towards open

0:46:02.250,0:46:03.250

access.

0:46:03.250,0:46:08.960

And one of the assumptions around open access is that it leads to more citations and...

0:46:08.960,0:46:14.770

and you know, Cambridge is talking about flipping APSR in a couple years to open access.

0:46:14.770,0:46:21.460

Over 50 percent of the articles now are open access, but of course this raises lots of

0:46:21.460,0:46:22.460

issues around equity.

0:46:22.460,0:46:23.570

Who pays?

0:46:23.570,0:46:30.050

And who pays and differential institutional access and you know, it's very complicated

0:46:30.050,0:46:31.290

issues around equity.

0:46:31.290,0:46:38.300

And so, um uh, I would be interested in your thoughts on it, but I think it's going forward

0:46:38.300,0:46:39.380

the issue of an open access.

0:46:39.380,0:46:44.200

And as we move towards more open access journals, journals experimental political sciences flipping

0:46:44.200,0:46:51.089

open access next year, um uh, that it's an important issue for the discipline and it's

0:46:51.089,0:46:55.540
also directly affects I think potentially
directly affects citations, so.

0:46:55.540,0:46:59.040
I'm just looking for a microphone if I needed
to.

0:46:59.040,0:47:05.369
Um, I just wanted to note, we haven't even,
um, commented about methodological plurality

0:47:05.369,0:47:07.130
and the biases of journals.

0:47:07.130,0:47:12.089
I've never submitted to the top three journals
because they don't do ethnographic studies.

0:47:12.089,0:47:16.990
I do ethnography, I talk to people, I don't
do survey data, right?

0:47:16.990,0:47:22.739
Um, I... and even though I'm a classically
trained political scientist out of Georgia,

0:47:22.739,0:47:26.579
I should actually be a sociologist because
I do prisoner re-entry.

0:47:26.579,0:47:31.690
And so it's this whole idea of being accepted,
it's not just the race, it's the politics

0:47:31.690,0:47:36.180
of the criminal justice system which is now
just emerging.

0:47:36.180,0:47:44.010
But when I first went up for tenure, I was
in Cathy's salmon colored bar graph about

0:47:44.010,0:47:51.829
being denied tenure and then moving around
um so this whole idea of what is acceptable...

0:47:51.829,0:47:57.160
I don't read certain journals now because
my work is not even marginally represented.

0:47:57.160,0:48:02.010
I'm not even talking about race, I'm just
talking about methods and questions related

0:48:02.010,0:48:05.150
to politics that sometimes we don't even consider.

0:48:05.150,0:48:17.960
[inaudible] You may not need a mic but we
will prop it near you anyway.

0:48:17.960,0:48:19.849
The screen is off.

0:48:19.849,0:48:25.750
So Brandon, I have kind of a question for
you.

0:48:25.750,0:48:28.850
Um, we always...

0:48:28.850,0:48:29.850
we...

0:48:29.850,0:48:35.660
we always knew that the journals were some...
wasn't for us.

0:48:35.660,0:48:40.329
Now there's been development, um, but we always
knew.

0:48:40.329,0:48:47.540
So what you're articulating is that... is
that you're just finding out.

0:48:47.540,0:48:54.800
So this is... so usually in a setting like
this, the... the folk on the underside you

0:48:54.800,0:48:58.630
know talk about their experiences, but there's
actually that other side.

0:48:58.630,0:49:01.170
Like what do the folk on the top, like how...

0:49:01.170,0:49:05.500
what are their conceptions and when do they
actually come to the moment where they're

0:49:05.500,0:49:12.070
like, oh okay, this... this thing that I thought
was meritocratic you know wasn't?

0:49:12.070,0:49:18.220
You know, so... so I... so, I got my PhD in

Michigan in the early 2000's, that was when

0:49:18.220,0:49:23.030

Michigan was producing most of the Black folk
or a significant chunk of Black folks.

0:49:23.030,0:49:27.510

[inaudible] ...were still in there...

0:49:27.510,0:49:28.510

[laughter]

0:49:28.510,0:49:31.780

Well I mean, Hayes was my advisor.

0:49:31.780,0:49:37.070

Hey... that's the first PAC at Howard, Hayes
was my advisor, so I consider myself related.

0:49:37.070,0:49:41.700

So... so, but we always knew, and we knew
that from stories, and we knew that through

0:49:41.700,0:49:43.299

also individual activity.

0:49:43.299,0:49:49.880

In fact, I... a really dear friend of mine
actually submitted to a major journal.

0:49:49.880,0:49:58.549

He was in the department of the person who
edited that journal, overheard that editor

0:49:58.549,0:50:06.440

of that journal giving personal information
to somebody who had submitted to that journal,

0:50:06.440,0:50:08.099

and that person ended up getting in.

0:50:08.099,0:50:15.950

So it was a combination of those... of that
type of really deep, um, unethical interactions.

0:50:15.950,0:50:22.310

And then there was a... a separate set of
dynamics that were more about kind of epistemological

0:50:22.310,0:50:25.970

frameworks that didn't... that just said that
this wasn't politics.

0:50:25.970,0:50:32.200

So when did you... you know what was the process by which you were like, wow, this this layer

0:50:32.200,0:50:34.569
exists that I wasn't aware of?

0:50:34.569,0:50:39.280
[inaudible] And then, when did you realize?

0:50:39.280,0:50:40.630
Yeah, yeah.

0:50:40.630,0:50:58.740
I interact and engage with scholars of color and REP scholars, some White, some Black,

0:50:58.740,0:51:03.099
um, that certainly do submit to the journal.

0:51:03.099,0:51:08.130
So I... you know and obviously that's just my anecdotal information.

0:51:08.130,0:51:12.710
And I mean when I talk to junior faculty in my department, some scholars of color, some

0:51:12.710,0:51:18.089
White, um, I always encourage them to submit their best work to the top journals.

0:51:18.089,0:51:19.990
And I don't pressure them, but I always...

0:51:19.990,0:51:24.820
I'm like your work is awesome, submit it to the top journals, you know?

0:51:24.820,0:51:27.420
Give it a shot, your best work's got to go in the top journals.

0:51:27.420,0:51:32.099
So I guess I do know of plenty of cases, but again, I...

0:51:32.099,0:51:34.750
I you know that's just my neck of the woods.

0:51:34.750,0:51:38.870
Um, and mostly people doing quantitative work for instance.

0:51:38.870,0:51:42.369

Um, so does that answer your question?

0:51:42.369,0:51:44.671

Maybe I asked it the wrong way.

0:51:44.671,0:51:50.580

I mean, to piggyback a little bit on what [name] is saying is like, how do we live in

0:51:50.580,0:51:51.580

such different information networks?

0:51:51.580,0:51:52.580

Yes, yes.

0:51:52.580,0:51:53.580

... And when you think about the the coming on the scene of like Women In Politics and

0:51:53.580,0:51:57.030

Policy, JRAP, all these journals which were sort of standing in the breach because the

0:51:57.030,0:52:01.450

big journals, especially with [inaudible], you submitted, you wait, you get the reviews,

0:52:01.450,0:52:11.030

you get a tepid R&R, then you do it, and then a year is gone, and then you get the rejection.

0:52:11.030,0:52:14.569

And you got to start all over again.

0:52:14.569,0:52:18.109

And now look, and those are good, right?

0:52:18.109,0:52:22.910

I mean you can make them work better, but it's still wasting time.

0:52:22.910,0:52:26.750

Um, and you spin a lot of wheels.

0:52:26.750,0:52:34.119

And so, you know at some point, there's clearly something that is not translating or the strings

0:52:34.119,0:52:38.119

are not crossing because I remember when JRAP came online.

0:52:38.119,0:52:39.119

Right?

0:52:39.119,0:52:47.099

And that was partly because there was a very real sense and I think a very real set of

0:52:47.099,0:52:53.210

evidence that said HAPS, APSR are not that interested, unless you have like some crazy

0:52:53.210,0:52:56.760

model that people think is really pretty.

0:52:56.760,0:53:03.059

Um, and then... but that's a very particular kind of political science, not to demean it,

0:53:03.059,0:53:08.190

but it is a very particular way of approaching questions that from what we've even talked

0:53:08.190,0:53:10.359

about today are really complicated.

0:53:10.359,0:53:15.809

And that need more than just, you know, the big N survey and when you think about communities

0:53:15.809,0:53:17.130

that you care about.

0:53:17.130,0:53:18.130

Right?

0:53:18.130,0:53:21.810

[inaudible] was talking about, uh, indigenous communities, they don't really show up in

0:53:21.810,0:53:22.810

those places.

0:53:22.810,0:53:25.940

[inaudible] ...David said he's going to collect all 30 people, right?

0:53:25.940,0:53:31.550

That you have to pull across I don't know how many years of the... the NES or [inaudible]

0:53:31.550,0:53:32.550

or whatever.

0:53:32.550,0:53:38.090

Um, you know, and so there are just going to be places that are just not hospitable.

0:53:38.090,0:53:44.100

And how do those places, I mean we know the acceptance rates are... they're pretty low

0:53:44.100,0:53:50.079

in general for everybody, but the low acceptance rates and then there's just the sense that

0:53:50.079,0:53:53.619

these places are not hospitable, not interested in engaging.

0:53:53.619,0:53:57.980

And how that information doesn't seep over is, I think maybe...

0:53:57.980,0:53:58.980

Uh, yeah.

0:53:58.980,0:54:00.420

The stuff I'm given, yeah.

0:54:00.420,0:54:04.359

And that requires right... and that requires, um, us talking about our experiences.

0:54:04.359,0:54:10.530

On the... the flip side it requires talking about you know to extend this discussion,

0:54:10.530,0:54:16.190

like what is... what's going on where people just tend to think this stuff is meritocratic?

0:54:16.190,0:54:17.190

Right?

0:54:17.190,0:54:19.960

Where... where the reason that people aren't getting in is because they're not doing the

0:54:19.960,0:54:23.329

work, or the work wasn't good, or because they're not talking about political subjects

0:54:23.329,0:54:24.480

when we know they are.

0:54:24.480,0:54:25.540

I have two...

0:54:25.540,0:54:30.850

I see this is a good discussion, I have two

other points for the discussion.

0:54:30.850,0:54:37.270

One is on the data for Native American population and ICPSR you say well, there's no quote,

0:54:37.270,0:54:38.859

"surveys on Native American population."

0:54:38.859,0:54:43.780

Well, I started doing literature searches and just getting journal abstracts and I find

0:54:43.780,0:54:49.210

studies that were specific tri... tribe specific studies, but that's relevant within the context

0:54:49.210,0:54:50.819

of that community.

0:54:50.819,0:54:53.140

And so I would reach out to those researchers...

0:54:53.140,0:54:55.680

so there is data out there, except we...

0:54:55.680,0:54:59.790

when we put the standards where it has to be a national representational study, that

0:54:59.790,0:55:01.109

excludes that possibility.

0:55:01.109,0:55:08.340

The second thing in terms of ethnographic, uh, there are quote, uh, "contextual data,"

0:55:08.340,0:55:13.849

and also ethnographic data that I started trying to recruit because that's another...

0:55:13.849,0:55:14.849

that's data.

0:55:14.849,0:55:15.849

Right?

0:55:15.849,0:55:19.369

We think about data in the broadest contexts, those are data sources which people use and

0:55:19.369,0:55:21.980

other people who are not aware of them can make use of.

0:55:21.980,0:55:26.200

The second point I want to make in terms of how we set citations is the nature of knowledge

0:55:26.200,0:55:28.430

production has become much more trans-interdisciplinary.

0:55:28.430,0:55:38.440

So if I'm a political scientist in a department and much of my work is in non-political science

0:55:38.440,0:55:43.700

journals, industry journals, how does that affect my advancement within political science?

0:55:43.700,0:55:49.570

And so the nature of knowledge production is much more expansive, but sometimes political

0:55:49.570,0:55:53.410

scientists deal too much with it and scientists will say well that's not in a political science

0:55:53.410,0:55:55.000

journal, so I'll [inaudible].

0:55:55.000,0:55:56.589

And that's over simplistic...

0:55:56.589,0:55:57.720

may not have much value.

0:55:57.720,0:56:01.739

So how do you work through that dynamic and that development.

0:56:01.739,0:56:05.510

... Just make a quick... quick point, or two quick points.

0:56:05.510,0:56:07.480

Um, I've enjoyed this discussion.

0:56:07.480,0:56:12.230

Um, I do think, you know, I mean I think the extent to which, you know, this resistance

0:56:12.230,0:56:17.280

to submit to the top journals, I don't... you know, it's an empirical question how big

0:56:17.280,0:56:19.130

the racial gap is, I think, the race gap.

0:56:19.130,0:56:22.549

Because I know plenty of White scholars who just know that works in that...

0:56:22.549,0:56:24.530

it's not... those journals aren't for me.

0:56:24.530,0:56:25.530

So I...

0:56:25.530,0:56:31.039

I think we see it from all sorts of people and across different, um, factors but I would

0:56:31.039,0:56:38.140

say, you know I mean, I think, you know, uh, I'd like to, you know, going forward I think

0:56:38.140,0:56:44.150

we need to develop more proactive and... and solutions, um, to getting, you know, more

0:56:44.150,0:56:45.150

REP peop...

0:56:45.150,0:56:48.950

If there is this resistance to submit to the top journals you know... you do there's...

0:56:48.950,0:56:53.450

there's capacity for... clearly capacity for getting the work in, because I see...

0:56:53.450,0:56:57.579

I read a ton of great REP work in the top journals.

0:56:57.579,0:57:00.760

Um, and um, and that's not my core area, but I keep track I...

0:57:00.760,0:57:02.960

I pay attention to it.

0:57:02.960,0:57:08.809

Um, and then, um, and then this the strategy aspect, which is you know we all are strategizing

0:57:08.809,0:57:14.500

to get in the top journal, it's really hard, it's a time suck, it sucks, it's not the sexiest

0:57:14.500,0:57:16.780

situation, but being strategic about recommending reviewers.

0:57:16.780,0:57:17.780
Right?

0:57:17.780,0:57:22.940
If you're an REP scholar and or a judicial politics scholar or whatever, um, you're gonna

0:57:22.940,0:57:24.109
get...

0:57:24.109,0:57:30.610
you're likely gonna get, uh, a reviewer pool, now again that that's depending...

0:57:30.610,0:57:37.180
maybe the editors are playing on some of these, um, aspects that Paula points out in her excellent

0:57:37.180,0:57:39.490
article in Politics, Groups, and Identities.

0:57:39.490,0:57:45.480
Are they sending... if you get an REP paper let's say, um, and the, uh, the editor thinks

0:57:45.480,0:57:50.480
this is a... this is not a real subfield, are they going to send it to a broad Americanist

0:57:50.480,0:57:52.119
for hopes of getting it rejected?

0:57:52.119,0:57:56.140
Or... or like oh, does this play to the... does this have broader interest?

0:57:56.140,0:57:57.140
Right?

0:57:57.140,0:58:02.810
That's a serious problem that, you know, maybe that happened in this era coming up that Paula

0:58:02.810,0:58:04.569
documents in that... in the McClain et al. article.

0:58:04.569,0:58:09.210
So, um, but I would just say, you know, I think we can develop str... you know, there's

0:58:09.210,0:58:14.490

a lot of strategy for getting review... you know, recommend two reviewers who... who would

0:58:14.490,0:58:15.490
be fair reviewers.

0:58:15.490,0:58:16.490
Right?

0:58:16.490,0:58:19.430
I always recommend two reviewers because then I can...

0:58:19.430,0:58:25.309
I know they're going to pick at least one of them and you know, it's the strategy there.

0:58:25.309,0:58:30.240
And... and you know, send it to a wide group of you know, people you know, try... you know.

0:58:30.240,0:58:32.349
So I think there are strategies for getting...

0:58:32.349,0:58:38.970
I think there's capacity especially now, maybe to get... to get a fair reviewer pool because

0:58:38.970,0:58:41.440
these are people... you're going to get reviewers in your area.

0:58:41.440,0:58:45.799
Um, and I do think that's the best.

0:58:45.799,0:58:55.609
[inaudible] I must be on some website because the top political science journals send me

0:58:55.609,0:59:01.460
Black things, things related to Black politics to review and they've never published my work

0:59:01.460,0:59:05.319
and I automatically say no. [inaudible]

0:59:05.319,0:59:10.900
I thought picking my own reviewers was cheating because a White man had told me to do that.

0:59:10.900,0:59:15.309
Honestly, a senior practitioner, he's like 'yeah, you can do that.'

0:59:15.309,0:59:17.167

I thought that was cheating. I didn't know.

0:59:17.167,0:59:19.599

And that's part of that hidden curriculum that I was talking about when you talk about graduate school.

0:59:19.599,0:59:25.690

[inaudible] That you don't know, until somebody kind of pulled your coat and were like 'no, pick your reviewers'.

0:59:25.690,0:59:28.210

Like is that crazy talk? Or suggest reviewers.

0:59:28.210,0:59:33.630

But many times, they'll probably be friendly and we all know how this work, you get an

0:59:33.630,0:59:38.520

article you kind of know who this is when you get it and people who are halfway decent

0:59:38.520,0:59:39.640

make that sure.

0:59:39.640,0:59:41.890

I'll give this a good look.

0:59:41.890,0:59:42.890

Right?

0:59:42.890,0:59:44.520

Not yet, but a good look.

0:59:44.520,0:59:49.960

I did not know that you could do that because I've been living in the blind and the meritocracy

0:59:49.960,0:59:51.109

of it all.

0:59:51.109,0:59:56.400

Right, and... and being foolish and wasting my own time but, um, instead of being strategic.

0:59:56.400,0:59:59.099

I think that's perfectly acceptable and when I tell people that now, they're like what?

0:59:59.099,1:00:00.520

Oh you can do that?

1:00:00.520,1:00:04.053

A lot of people don't know that you can do that.

1:00:04.053,1:00:06.841

And there are a lot of kinds of people who don't

1:00:06.841,1:00:08.516

know you can do that.

1:00:08.516,1:00:11.880

That mimic some of this marginalization they talk about.

1:00:11.880,1:00:15.351

So let's take one more comment from Andrew and then move on to the next presentation.

1:00:15.351,1:00:20.990

I just wanted to say that this is true, that from the editorial side it helps when people actually

1:00:20.990,1:00:24.930

submit cover letters or recommend reviewers at all.

1:00:24.930,1:00:29.059

And then it makes my... it actually makes my job a little bit harder, as you know,

1:00:29.059,1:00:32.045

the number of individuals in which to draw from...

1:00:32.045,1:00:46.909

[inaudible] ...so please, mentor your students...

1:00:46.909,1:00:50.410

Um, the second point that I, um.

1:00:52.195,1:00:57.182

Uh, the second point was that yes, there's a prioritization of the top journals but...

1:00:57.182,1:01:00.280

but my university has recently done an acknowledgment that scholars who study marginalized communities

1:01:00.280,1:01:06.690

may not be at a challenge to the mainstream journals is to readjust their opinion requirements

1:01:06.690,1:01:12.381

having value journals like Politics, Groups and Identities, and in order to change that

1:01:12.381,1:01:14.560

conversation with the criteria for us.

1:01:14.560,1:01:20.170

And I'm going to tell you the person going up after all those conversations that happened

1:01:20.170,1:01:31.390

so I'm going to see how much sense the institutional policy change that into the departmental of

1:01:31.390,1:01:43.609

culture about how NYC say my FPV versus someone who has an.

1:01:43.609,1:01:47.690

They wrote it down.

1:01:47.690,1:01:48.710

[laughter]

1:01:48.710,1:01:49.730

[inaudible]

1:01:49.730,1:01:51.990

And I believe Cathy is trying to add in something.

1:01:51.990,1:01:52.990

Okay, thank you.

1:01:52.990,1:02:00.660

And it's the same as the comment we just heard, which is I think one thing is to try to get

1:02:00.660,1:02:05.790

in the what's called the top journals, but it's still a strategy of scarcity.

1:02:05.790,1:02:11.180

But I think the other thing to instruct the idea of the top journals, like what makes

1:02:11.180,1:02:13.290

those three the top journals?

1:02:13.290,1:02:20.359

Other than they publish a certain type of political science that's largely inaccessible

1:02:20.359,1:02:25.040

to the wider population, if in fact we're really thinking about and worried about kind

1:02:25.040,1:02:27.420

of questions of impact in terms of knowledge production.

1:02:27.420,1:02:33.720

So I appreciate this idea of really pushing back on institutions to say that there are

1:02:33.720,1:02:39.330

a wide group of journals through which people will publish and their work will be recognized

1:02:39.330,1:02:42.490

and all of those have to be considered to some degree equally.

1:02:42.490,1:02:46.200

That, you know, to hell with the top three journals.

1:02:46.200,1:02:53.009

Okay, thank you and thank you everyone for that robust discussion.