

Dr. John Garcia: My part of... in this presentation today is to deal with, what I refer to as our sub task force on citations. And so I'll be discussing in a very, uh, not too proficient but in a very quick manner because I think we've covered a lot of ground in our... our particular task force activities in terms of literature and research, etc. So we're talking about the citation, its' impact on individual's careers, the role of journals and in fact, journals have become in some way the gateway for citations, it's obviously an important part of the process, and editors who make significant decisions about what manuscripts can review, who they're sent to, and what happens to... as a result of that process.

Dr. John Garcia: Uh, so that's basically a quick intro, uh, to this and okay. So this is repetitive, so I won't go very much time on this slide. Basically, I list the four main areas: the point I would make in this this slide is a commonly used term in our in our field, in other fields, is intersectionality. You look at the four main areas, there's a lot of intersectionality between tenure promotion and citation and also the generation of work has to do with the climate in which we operate in. And obviously, uh, training we have a section in our report that talks about syllabi and citations and so how the field is is presented to perspective academic admissions is influenced about who... what... who is read, what is valued, what is the percent, what is missing and so forth.

Dr. John Garcia: So, uh, that... our... our role is to look at systematic inequalities relative to what was referred to in this document among ourselves and other segments on marginalized, uh, communities and [inaudible] recommendations and best practices. So to point out some of the obvious, citations are very critical in terms of academic's reputation. People have standing in the field based on their notoriety as scholars and contributors to the knowledge base, etc. and an impact in terms of opportunities when what's the [inaudible] for external funding, what's your track record, where have you published, what... what research have you generated.

Dr. John Garcia: Also, in terms of professional advancement: reputation, standing. If a person leaves an institution to go to another, maybe a function is that they're, uh, have both assets that other institutions also want to take advantage of. Uh, and basically citations are in a sense of really an assessment... assessment of the quality the contribution of an individual. So I had an important impact not only for the institutions because institutions essentially, um, place their reputation on the reputation of their faculty and so faculty who have a good reputation in that institution benefit by that. It also impacts in terms of your competitiveness for... for, uh, funding, uh, your prestige.

Dr. John Garcia: The thing... third point I would make point is that there's this greater reliance on what I call citation services to evaluate who's being cited, where they're being cited, and essentially the impact of those citations. And what's happened is that not only is there more services provided, but also they're more users: departments in evaluating faculty or faculty departments rely on these citation services for that information. And so one of the things we point out is depending on what citation service you use, they use different algorithms, they have biases in and of themselves, if you're not aware of that, that that impacts the assessments you're trying to make. Uh, the other thing... the other takeaway is that there are biases and biases that we know particularly is in gender, race, ethnicity field of study is an important area of bias in terms of some fields of study are sort of less visible, in some cases invisible, and not all sexual orientation, your epistemological orientation is reflected in terms of how you how you manif... manipulate or navigate through that whole process, and institutional standing.

Dr. John Garcia: Uh, Cathy made reference to R1 institutions. Being an R1 institution versus not has an impact in terms of your whole citation success or lack thereof. And... and journals which I'll spend more time... is in terms of talking about how that process works, the submission review process, whom are

the reviewers, other biases in terms of acceptance and... and last part I think there's been more work I've been reading more recently is guidance and training for peer reviews. In a sense, one of the... I would argue one of the voids in graduate training is how do you review? In fact, there's... that's one of the recommendations we make is that there's maybe more need for formal training in peer reviewing. Um, and then the last is just, uh, making use of this kind of a caveat saying if you're using whatever source, know what the source is, what their bias is, what their algorithms are in assessing what that... most people look at the final counts how many citations does that individual have.

Dr. John Garcia: There's much that goes into how that comes about. Uh, I'll focus more, uh, on the area of our journals. I'm reminded of, uh, the first scene I encountered as an academic a long time ago had a little plaque in his office says the... "the written word remains." Obviously the written word remains if you're... you're published and you're cited and so forth. So obviously, journals are a major gateway and so in some sense, is the significance of citation counts... again, it affects your advancement, your promotion, your competitiveness of grants, uh, and that basically, uh, it has significant impact.

Dr. John Garcia: Uh, one of the personal impacts of being part of this task force that Paula put together was, um, enlightened me a much greater extent about the whole citation process and the research area. Uh, it's an expansive research area and a very expansive... not only in terms across disciplines, but also in terms of questions raised, methodological... very sophisticated methodologies in looking at citations. Uh, we had the fortune of looking at works in computer sciences, and the biological sciences, psychology, economics, and so forth. So we took a broad view in terms of looking at this whole process is, uh, if we rely I think exclusively on political science, it would be a much shorter report, in other words. This is just a short... quick that [inaudible] proliferation of citation services, this is the few that exist, some of which are more known to use, some or lesser known.

Dr. John Garcia: Probably Google Scholar, Web of Science, uh... uh, probably Scopus, which is part of Web of Science is probably more well known, but there's a lot of them out there. And to be aware of them and use them it requires you knowing not only their existence, but how they generate the citation counts and some... each has their own biases. Google Scholar is largely driven to a good part by individuals initiatives. Set up a Google Scholar page and there's a study we show later on showing that... that this differentiates among whom that scholar is in terms of... uh. So there's strategies that individuals can make to enhance their citation use, being more proactive in terms of putting yourself out there. A lot of times uh self-promotion is... is ingrained or part of people's, uh, DNA, for many others it's not. And so that has advantages and disadvantages.

Dr. John Garcia: So I'm going to focus for the rest of this presentation on the journals and one of the sub-subgroups of our task force was in fact looking at journals. And we had a smaller group, we had a... I think a group of about 10 people in our task force, that looked specifically in journals. And they did it... um, a formal informal survey of existing journal editors, either current or most recent editors and asking them questions about how they dealt with citations. And just the main finding is that most... most journal editors were unaware of a citation gap that was neither not part of their awareness, nor part of their quote, "charge to look at," in terms of their journal editorship. Uh, none spoke of any guidance of training on citation issues, that when they took over the journals that they had taken on their responsibilities.

Dr. John Garcia: Uh, and in fact if they did, it was mostly coming from the journal editors themselves, their own kind of vantage point, their own experiences... that they raised the issue about a citation gap. Rather than their successors or the association saying this is an important area you need to look at, they

initiated that and started discussions in the... that structurally took the form of adding more field editors to kind of deal with the coverage issues. Uh, others having more in... informal or internal discussions about, uh, if there is a citation gap, what is it, how do we deal with it, what are the biases inherent in those gaps. So that conversation took place amongst a very small portion of journal editors, again, we didn't... I think there's... give me no... how many political science journals are there in the discipline? It's got to be what, 50, 70 or so?

Dr. John Garcia: Uh, we only deal with a small subset, mostly the major... quote, "major visible journals." But, uh, this is a sort of a snippet about those conversations. [inaudible] did you have a sense of what that number may be? Well within the orbit of APSA related journals, there's about [inaudible]. Okay, okay. But then, of course, there are many political science journals outside of that orbit.

Yeah.

Dr. John Garcia: We had an estimate about 75 in that cat... in that category. [inaudible] There's a lot of them. Again, when the academy reference about a methodological issue about representation and so forth, this is more of an informal kind of... uh, conversations of journal editors where we were able to both reach out to and they were cooperative to respond to. Uh, other thing was that, um, new teams of editors, uh, that included the citation issues, uh, really requested more materials and orientations about understanding what the issue is, how do you deal with it, how do you remedy if there are gaps, uh, what are the nature of the gaps, how do you deal with it, how do you uh mediate those gaps.

Dr. John Garcia: Uh, another way to justify... why bother about citation gaps you know eventually, if we rely on peer reviewers they're knowledgeable in their field so, uh, they should know the field. Well what we found is that one... one uh, response of editors has to do with the quality of research, regenerating knowledge. If there's segments of knowledge that has not been widely known then you're not really advancing the knowledge area in that regard and so that was uh... uh, issues that you're really not representing what that knowledge community is generating if you just sort of limit to sort of standard areas of uh... [inaudible] a cadre of scholars a [inaudible] reference that part of the scholarship is that the subsets that get more recognition than others. And so that was the... uh, and then what many people do is you assign, uh, an editor as you're saying this is a manuscript that's not really in my kind of knowledge area so who can I, uh, talk to about whom with an appropriate reviewer or reviewers, but that essentially, uh, reaching out, trying to get coverage of the fields that are offered or active, and appropriate peer reviews who can assess those research is a challenge.

Dr. John Garcia: Um, and also how do you assess what's missing work? Uh, you know you look at the universe, yeah you say I know what it is, but there's uh... well this is a short caveat, when I've done journal... uh, article reviews, but the trigger for me is no one has done work in this area. And to me that's it, that's the flag, that person. And sometimes I invest time in generating a page full bibliography about here's work in this area that's done prior to the time you discovered that no one has done an important research in this area. So essentially it's, you know, missing is... we're dealing with missing data, well there's missing data in this context as well. Um, and so, uh, while we find is there's a overlap between admission data and missing works that overlap with certain communities of scholars.

Dr. John Garcia: Again, we go back to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, sub fields, institutional basis, all those are quote, "cadres," where that's... this missing work is is can be found. Um, also, um... [inaudible]... trying to be comprehensive but also not take a lot of time. When... are any of you editors...

only 17 percent of that editors, we're talking about talking small ends, made reference that a citation gap was an issue, a concern of theirs. Uh, they did mostly... they did mention it was mostly in the context of gender gap, but even though there are quote, "missed communities," some communities are totally missed, while others are sort of not as missed, to put it in those terms. Uh, and if you look at the research and I

would encourage you if you look at the reports, we included a 52-page bibliography of citation related research, uh, and there's a... if you look at in terms of groups that are, uh, most biased, gender's quite clearly the overwhelming body of research in that category, much less, uh, systematic work on other communities of color, uh, sexual orientation, etc.

Dr. John Garcia: Uh, so there was a lot in terms of either gender, secondarily race/ethnicity, and then... or a generic underrepresented disadvantaged, uh, communities of scholar. Um, again that's why many editors have talked about setting up field editors. You look at APSA I think has a field editor kind of format in terms of trying to cover the discipline. Uh, other people talk about in order to quote, "capture those missing elements of both scholarship and scholars," is may perhaps use thematic issues as to a way to bring those communities in a more visible sense and... and then others pull out networks. One of the major areas of research is networks are integral part of generating research. Uh, co-authorships, most of our authorships... in the sciences you have articles that are written by 105 people, 110 people. And so there are researchers that talk about scales of multi-authorship relative to citations and what is it... how do you interpret a person 95th in terms of their contribution to that work.

Dr. John Garcia: So there's dynamics going on in this... in our knowledge industry in terms of multiple authorships, in terms of co-authorship, there's gender issues where women co-author less than males do, males tend to co-author more with other males. And so all these things that dynamics occur in our... in our social respective disciplines that impact citations. Um, the other thing is that, um, networks... there's a term they use third-party cita... citators, I guess this is the word, where in terms of who gets cited, males tend to be cited more by the collaborative networks or self-citation. Women are much more cited and again, this is gendered research, much by third-party collaboration or third-party cite.... citers. So how you generate citations has a lot to do with the network your part in and the biases those networks you're comprised of.

Dr. John Garcia: Um, overwhelmingly, uh, more editors are aware this is an issue that needs to be addressed, but also seeking out how to how do we address it? Uh, the... within the discipline it seems to me IR has been probably the subfield that has been more conscious in terms of trying to deal with this issue. Uh, some have been more proactive and setup like... that Andrew says okay, I'm gonna send this... this demographic on... on... on IR theory for instance, a colleague of mine Spike Peterson dealt a lot to generate that area, and so I'm gonna look at this and say does this... just, is this person's references representative of that field? And so there are some methods to try to get... in a sense looking at just a bibliography of that manuscript in terms of whether we need to tell that submitter saying before we review your manuscript you need to take into account other works that are not inclusive in your current bibliography.

Dr. John Garcia: So that's more proactive. Uh, so there are some some editors and again, IR and each of my surveys of the literature suggests that IR is taking a more proactive role in trying to deal with this than others... other fields. Um, the other thing is is that, um, one of the problems that journals are fearing you're saying well we're pushing from broader breadth of knowledge, broader sense of fields, many journals are complaining I don't have enough reviewers to review any manuscript. And so the reviewer pool has become a major issue. And so you're saying on the one hand, we need a... you need

more people to cooperate and provide, uh, reviews, on the other hand saying the breadth of the scope of knowledge is to such a degree that a specialization is... is going to even magnify or amplify that particular issue.

Dr. John Garcia: Uh, there is a resource... I think there's some reason that number five is being blocked, uh, two sources that people, sometimes some editors also use is called "Women Also Know Stuff" and "People of Color Also Know Stuff" is a way to look at what is missing, what is being produced that may not be in the purview of reviewers. Um, so that... there are resources available to you kind of assess that. The thing with training of reviewers is reviewers should be shedding new light on how do you improve your work. Uh, sometimes not all reviewers do that, uh, and I still... I know journal editors have a way to evaluate whether that reviewer you want to use again or not if they're... they're not really providing constructive criticism, they're pretty goading over their own work, and not... etc. So that the need for training may be really very quite relevant in terms of what's a good review and what... this slide sort of suggests good reviewers shed new light on on submitted work, the review, which review is missing a "W," uh, to deal with content, the language, the tone, the structure, and it should be beneficial in terms of informing the reader, as well as the person who's generating that work.

Dr. John Garcia: Uh, so the reviewer should bring skills, expertise, motivation, uh, one article talks about mega reviewers: individuals who seem to review lots of articles on the... in the time period. And they seem to be... when Cathy refers about knowing the "why," why are people doing that and... and you know, what is their motivation to be... not to say no, not to that, not at this time. Uh, so it's... the common kind of phrase is, I don't have time, I don't... I don't want to do this or this is out of my purview. So... so and yeah. In those cases, most journal editors, can you suggest to us other individuals who might either have the expertise or the willingness to do so. We also find that in terms of race, ethnicity, and junior faculty, they're more inclined not to refuse to review an article and in... the trade off they may also take away some of their own time to generate, uh, research that they need for their promotion and tenure and advancement. Uh, so sometimes the people who are asked the most are also the people who are probably most in jeopardy of getting success in this process, but also to avoid the biases of reviewers.

Dr. John Garcia: Uh, heightened negativity, self-centered feedback, there's ideological biases, combative languages, the epistemological biases, all those come to play in how reviewers respond so that obviously the editors who receive these reviews, uh, need to... to take that into consideration in terms of saying, is this a fair and comprehensive review of the submitted piece? The last piece is... again, I'm repeating myself, is to recognize the need for peer review training. And the question is by whom and what are the mechanisms to have that happen? Um, we were looking at open peer review, but process of doing a citation that we call the literature, it talks about open peer review has a direct correlation to quality and transparency in the review process. Open peer review in a very simplistic way is that it's known whom the reviewer is and who the submitter is and there is an open record that shows what that... those review comments is, the submitters response to those comments, it's a whole history of that whole process.

Dr. John Garcia: And there are some studies that says yes, that open peer review in fact increases citations, it also improves its transparency, and also improves the quality of not only the piece, but also the quality of the review. Because if my name is on there and it's public, I may be more conscious about how I present stuff and so forth and so there is some and, again, this... all pros generally have cons, and so obviously you're saying well if it's an open process, I'm not sure if I want to be that open in terms of being a reviewer. But, including there's... there's a growing body of literature saying that it does generate higher quality reviews, you give credit to reviewers, which is another issue about getting more reviewers, being more open in terms of credit, uh, is good.

Dr. John Garcia: I know economic journals... actually its a nominal amount but, they do pay their reviewers, uh, for reviewing their articles. Uh, you know classic economic model stuff. But anyway, uh, there's significant, uh, things to consider. We're not... our taskforce shouldn't promote open review versus looking at citations. That became part of that discussion and so it needs to be a discussion among journals, among the discipline, and among... among the research community about using the open review process as a... as opposed to the double buying process. Uh, the one, uh, major published... publisher that I'm aware of that does that is SAGE. A lot of the SAGE journals are open... open, uh, peer review. Um, just goes back to the pros and cons... uh again, it's a more democratic process, ensures that reviewers are more honest and more thoughtful, uh, less likely to exhibit ad hominem ideological biases. Uh, and again, there may be hesitancy of people to do so, uh, they may in fact, uh, soften their review if they're going to be open, which is actually credited to both the reviewer and the submitter. Um, one of the things we did, uh, in terms of... oh. Well, I think Cathy made the... [inaudible] of qualitative versus quantitative. Uh, one of our task force members Natalie Maduka, who... whose now at UCLA, um, was part of a study that Bernie Groffman did at Irvine in 2014 that did actually look at it who are the top fighters in... by fields and by subfields and they had a sample of 4000 and 200 cases. So Natalie says we can... I can make that available to you.

Dr. John Garcia: So we... what we... I took it on which, uh, it was [inaudible] it's a data issue, because its a data cleaning issue. Because I contacted APSA, I worked largely with Betty Super about merging that data set, which was done in '14, with a more contemporary time set of the membership data of APSA in this time 2019, I think or '20. Um, but what happened is you had a lot of multiple entries. I found one person that was listed 17 times because they were in different institutions, they responded racial/ethnically differently in different ways, and so there's a lot of data. We had 7200 cases combined, but there are a lot of duplicates and so it made some issues about how one structures the data to avoid a lot of data cleaning process. To make sure that we didn't... not only not duplicate, but also the person that we assumed was the same person was actually the same person. People move and so we... we have from the mobility data. Uh, race and ethnically, uh, another person would put one race, and then the next would respond and put another race, third response would put a combination of races. So for categorization, if race was a... an initial part of our analysis that we had to make sure that we're operationalizing that way to create quote, "non-discreet," uh, "discrete" categories.

Dr. John Garcia: So there's a lot of data cleaning involved. This represents just two tables from that study where we look at based on, uh, the race and ethnic, um, non-white persons who said, I'm not... I'm some other race. So they indicate they were White or whatever. So basically, what you see is, uh, just numerically, uh, White, uh, APSA members, uh, are cited most, uh, Asian second, uh, non-white third, Latinos fourth, and... and African American/ Black last, uh, fifth. Um, we had... going back to American Indian/ Alaskan Native conversation, very few if any, and there may be a reference of including that category as well for the zeros that you made reference to. Uh, but clearly in terms of the citation, uh, quote, "counts," uh, there's clearly a pattern of of lesser citations and that may not represent lesser productivity of those of those categories of persons.

Dr. John Garcia: We did our most varied analysis to look at what contributes for high numbers of... of and oh, citations [inaudible] what citation source do we use? We use Scopus and Google for comparative purposes. The most negative aspects are an inverse relationship of higher rates of citations, or in this case, lower rates is being female, is being African American, it's being "other," other is... is more of a multiracial residual... Latino, uh. And uh, and the plus was, uh, being an R1 institution. The other negative was... we also had the year of the person's PhD so we created a cohort, I think we started

with people who got their degrees before 1950 I think from that point forward every 10-year increment. And so again, uh, you assume that the longer you've been around, the more you get... the more you produce and the more you're going to be cited. So this is just a quick snapshot, uh, again I would encourage you to look at the report. It gives you much more detail in terms of that... that part of our report.

Dr. John Garcia: Uh, I found some additional work that was after this report was completed, I thought I'd add it in this context. Uh, a study by I think its Tangled economics found that women submitters wait 4.4 days longer before they get results of their... of their submission, it takes 12.3 days longer to revise their their work, which means that the net... their time if they're in particularly in a time rush, they're... institutionally, uh, affected in terms of that time period. Also, the same, uh, person in another piece indicates that women were, uh, write more clearly than their male counterparts, but at the same time they're held to higher standards of clarity. Uh, so that you do better in one area, but you also have a higher standard, so that gender effect is, uh, is clear. And also, if women submitters, uh, are reviewed by what they call novice reviewers that has a negative effect on their outcomes. Uh again, maybe a function of just the longer you've been around, your grasp of the knowledge base is open or you're more open, who knows? But again, back to the why part of it. Um, clearly... this is a point I made earlier, women citations are largely the result of third-party citations, whereas males are largely collaborative networks and self-citation. So again, reinforce the networks is a critical process to the whole citation process in terms of productivity and recognition. And there's a lot of literature about the infamous COVID. COVID has impacted our lives in so many ways that affected in terms of citation.

Dr. John Garcia: Women's submitted their manuscripts less, uh, they in... the largest... there's a category we have as terms of parenthood, what parenthood has to do with citations. So again, this categories which I'm not dealing with in this presentation that I think represents the breadth I think we took in terms of what are the factors that affect your ability to cite, uh, to generate citations: gender, besides gender is also parenthood, uh, beside, um, race/ ethnicity it could be national origin, or foreign born status, it could be language. So that, uh, there's a whole litany at the tail end of that report that talks about these are other factors in which... and all these are quote, "evidence-based, uh, findings" on a fairly extensive review of the literature. Um, what can journals do? Uh, you know one... I may references in terms of doing a preemptory, uh, review of bibliography. Are they representative? Do they include the distribution of markers of race and gender? And I know, uh, APSA has done some... some, uh, involvement in this area. Um, sponsor journals that need to evaluate the publications in terms of the representation of... of the section members.

Dr. John Garcia: You know, many journals are... are generated by organized sections and so where those sections in fact represent their constituency in a sense of... of their, uh, activities in terms of publication, including the journal editorial teams not only pay attention to diversity, but their potential for addressing other citation biases. Subfields, uh, is... is a major one, sexual orientation is becoming much more a growing concern. Um again, uh, it's... it's both recognizing who is... who is being marginalized and how... how they're being marginalized and what can be done to remedy those situations. Um, and again, um, that... the slide I showed you earlier was our attempt to try to fill some gaps on scholars of color relative to citation bias, which is a much smaller literature... research literature area. Some journals have developed statements of and guidance about citation gaps. Um, I mentioned the, uh, IR journals have probably been more at the forefront of that. New tools to help editors broaden their reviewer pools.

Dr. John Garcia: Again, whether that's a function of just the journal editors themselves there's... they represent organized groups where those sections can play a role in trying to, uh, to actively encourage more reviewer pools just the association. Are their quote, "reward systems," or notoriety kind of incentives that can be done, uh, to get more people, uh, to... to be more open to be a reviewer of submitted articles. Field review... editors, review editor teams, um, also we go back to data and documentation, the citation gap for historically excluded scholars and lesser billable... visible and recognized subfields is something that is in a sense is known and there's significant evidence to prove that, but it essentially is not as well... that, uh, promoted or are out there in terms of people that affect it. And that's just journals, journals is sort of what the focus is in this presentation, but also in terms of institutions, make use of citation partners, make use of citations. Individuals, make use of citation. Now I guess that's one of the recommendations, that there are strategies to enhance an individuals citations and yet, for the most part individuals may not be aware of those strategies. So it essentially goes back to the graduate training part of it. Besides learning your field and the discipline and major, um, areas of knowledge, it's also how do you deal with your professional life. Um, Cathy made reference to mentors in terms of how you navigate, uh, promotion and tenure but also maybe how you navigate promoting your own research and and enhancing your citation, uh, visibility.

Dr. John Garcia: Um, this again, and I think I've dealt with this in previous slides, um, is in terms of basically you bro... broaden the network, if networks are important for citation, networks should be important to deal with those citation gaps, make use of the networks that are available in our research communities, uh. And, um, we can always po... point to APSA, but the last recommendation is empirical studies citation gap or historically excluded scholars and fields of study. Again, our review of the literature says a lot of disciplines and journals have been doing that, not that APSA has not, but we always try to kind of phrase we can always do more and that's... that's what this falls under. Um, we don't get enough recognition... these are, just these last two slides are just more informational. Um, these are the members of the citation task force, uh, we had three undergraduate, um, research assistants help us with both the editor survey, the... the [inaudible] description, the Groffman survey, and, uh, some other work. And then big help from... from Kim, Betty Super, and Aaron McGrath in terms of the data, so. And then why it's added... because my sense is this these slides are being shared but only by people in attendance here, but other people who access the site.

Dr. John Garcia: These are references that I added since the report was was completed and submitted, so it has 52 pages of bibliography additional ones in fact, I have another probably 10 more pages. One of the... one of the legacies that Paula had on me is I've become much more engaged in this area than I ever had anticipated and still am, so. Whether it was a plus or minus... Uh, anyway I'll end here and open up the questions.

Audience Member: I just want to make a comment, John. That was, um, that was great. One of the things John talked about is networks. Um, in the STEM disciplines in 1999 they picked up... and then there was an article in the frontiers of physics in 2016, the development of what they call citation cartels where a group of scholars will disproportionately cite each other excluding others who work in that area. And the whole purpose of citation cartels is to continue to bump up their age indices and so in... in the STEM disciplines they're trying to figure out... they've done a lot of network analysis as to who these people are and what they're doing. And it's also extended to acceptance into some of their dis... their journals, that an editor will say unless you cite A, B, C, D, and E, we won't accept the manuscript.

Audience Member: So there's a lot going on in this area that... that just continues to work against scholars of color. I don't know if we have citation cartels in political science, I know we've got groups

that only cite... but you know, but... but that is... Yeah. I guess we don't call them that, but... but they're you know. But that's an issue. That is really an issue and unless you don't understand what's going on especially at the APT level, it can work against scholars of color and others who work in areas that some disciplines consider to be marginalized.

Dr. John Garcia: One year... I won't get into detail, but we make also a difference about what's your cited in a book versus article because that's something junior faculties always have to deal with. I'm better off producing short articles and I'll do the books after I get tenure. And what... what the value is in citation payback if you publish a book versus you publish a journal article. So that... we covered... we covered a lot of ground so I would encourage you to... you to have a look at the... that particular piece or review, uh, that... we covered a lot more than what I did in 15 plus minutes.

Audience Member: Any questions for John?

Audience Member: Thanks for terrific, uh, work, um. [inaudible]

Audience Member: I have two questions about the APSA journals, in particular. Uh, one of them is whether you require your authors to agree to serve as reviewers? Um, and the second is, uh, whether, uh, you've got explicit guidance, um, or rules for co-authorship?

Dr. John Garcia: Well... my understanding is that there's no requirement that if you submit to a journal and you have to agree to be a reviewer.

Audience Member: No requirement?

Dr. John Garcia: Not that I'm aware of. And also in co-authorship, that's more the... at least in my... my experience more the institutional factor, whereas if I submit... I'm going for promotion and I've got a co-author a multi-author piece that is supposed to indicate what portion of my contribution went into that particular order but I'm not sure at the journal level that is...

Audience Member: The articles don't have a list of what the role was of each co-author?

Dr. John Garcia: At least it's not formally required. Some authors may choose to add that information, but I don't think it's required.

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

Dr. John Garcia: Yeah.

Audience Member: Can you pass the mic to her?

Audience Member: This is a comment or a question, but I'm the book reviewer for Publius and one of the issues is you know what type of books and also who submits. How is it that a book gets to my desk right? And of course, most of us do this on a voluntary basis so we don't have unlimited resources to identify you know all the books that are out there, who... who are writing them. And also on the other hand, who's reviewing those books, right? So that might be another suggestion for... recommendation for... for journals in terms of being more systematic of what type of books make it to that stage and who... who gets to review them, right? How is that we can be more intentional in that way.

Dr. John Garcia: I know somebody... somebody has to do with this is a publisher. Yeah they want to... they want to promote their book, so they'll contact whom they feel is the appropriate topical journal to say, we'll send you "X" books and then primarily rely on the journal itself to determine whom the reviewers will be. At least that's my knowledge of it, but other people may have other... other perspectives.

Audience Member: Andrew... the mic near Andrew. Okay.

Audience Member: Pass the mic. [inaudible]

Audience Member: Okay, thank you. Uh, and me, I've not received any kind of any issues around citation and I did wonder, um, as you said most of the research is around gender. And I do wonder if this is an issue because gender is something that people can infer from names, whereas other things are just much more difficult. Like how do you know whether a scholar is LGBTQ unless you actually personally know them or they have a public profile that is that way? And so, I guess I have a question about like how in terms of guidelines, how am I to assess a paper for its inclusion when I may not necessarily know the identities of the individuals that they're citing? Um, and in order to kind of say this is insufficient, right, as opposed to you're not citing specific pieces of literature.

Dr. John Garcia: I... I'll just say my quick response would be it's largely determined on your own, your kind of... access to people with potentially that kind of knowledge base to... to pass on that. But it's... it's more informal as opposed to there's no categorization saying well, the sex... sexual orientation of scholars in political science you go to this site, this will differentiate them. I think it's... at least that's my impression at this point. Oh you know.

Audience Member: Um, this relates to the last presentation, to Cathy's presentation too, and also the [inaudible] article, for the politics groups and identity article that was very enlightening. Um, do we have data... so we've talked... we've talked a lot about acceptance rates of you know, in Paula's article, um, in the REP subfield, uh, sort of historically marginalized subfields, you could argue. Um, about 4.5 percent of the top three journals, so I want to focus on the top three journals, APSR, AJPS, JOP, um, and so you have that substantive area but I also want to... I also want to be curious about scholars of color, you know, if they're in that area or not? So do we have data on on, um, submission rates at all? About, uh, how likely scholars of color or REP scho... and/ or REP scholars, some of that's overlaps, uh, do they submit at lower rates than other scholars, either White scholars or scholars outside that field? Um, and that would highlight a potentially even more troubling pattern if scholars of color or scholars in the REP subfield perceive that those journals don't even appreciate that work. So I wonder if we have data on that because I think we focus a lot on outcomes, um, you know what percentage are... do actually appear. But do we know how many are submitting? Maybe only 4.5 maybe the... maybe the rates are representative of submission, maybe they're not. But of course that opens up a new question about, um, if people have perceptions that their work is not welcome at JOP, AJPS, and of course that has huge implications for tenure promotion and citations. So we got to get people submitting, is my big thing, and that's... you know you've got to submit to the top three journals no matter what.

Dr. John Garcia: Well I'll give a quick historical response. I've been in this profession for over 50 years, so there is clearly, particularly in the earlier part of my career, there's clear perceptions of which journals are likely to be more open. Not to say that you can't accept a bit of an open [inaudible] reviewer. But I've had cross pressure saying well, hold it. I'm not tenured, I need to get an AJPS article again and so forth, and I... so there was this personal strategy saying, if I think this article has any chance at a mainstream,

I'll submit it. If I don't, I'll send it to more specialized. And in fact, from my earlier mainstream submission saying, well this piece might be publishable, but it's not a major interest to our readership. So again, that has changed. I mean that... clearly that is not as much the case now as it was two generations ago, but I think it's part of it. And again, we don't have any systematic, uh, you know documentation of that. Uh, Paula had... I'm sure has much more to add than what I just said.

Dr. Paula McClain: Well, yeah. Um, I'm a little behind you in terms of my time in the discipline, but not much. Um, Matthew Holden was... [inaudible] ... And I think that was in early 80's or something... [inaudible] And then there was this long, long period, then Pat Patterson became [inaudible] for ACSR and he was trying to open it up. And so then you saw Catherine Tate had a piece accepted and I had a piece accepted. And then we had this long period again, right, where the work, you know it was... it was just the editors were just not interested in publishing those things. And so, those you know things are still kind of percolating around of... of the journals at that time. I think JOP was the one that was probably most likely because they came out of the Southern, right? And issues of race in the South were important or you know that that JOP, um, would take it. So I'm sure that in graduate school, people... REP it's not going to make any of these journals. You know, it's just this kind of continuing... continuing process.

Dr. John Garcia: And if you go back to citation in the syllabi, you're being trained in terms of certain fields of study, you're not only looking at who's contributing to that knowledge base, but also where is it being found. And you find that it's... you know where in the journal location made for it guides you in saying, well I'm probably better off submitting here and not... not there in the major. So I mean, again, it cuts across in a lot of different contexts.

Steve Smith: Um, we do collect that data for APSR, I can't speak to JOP or HAPS. But for the last five or six years now, we have... we do collect that data, demographic data on people who submit to the journal. It... it publishes aggregate data. Yes, every year there's a... there's... it's published and is aggregate data. Yeah, so. Um, but what... the comment that I wanted to make and... and maybe Ed can comment on this too, but the... I'm in as executive director of APSA, we're in the midst of this movement towards open access. And one of the assumptions around open access is that it leads to more citations and... and you know, Cambridge is talking about flipping APSR in a couple years to open access. Over 50 percent of the articles now are open access, but of course this raises lots of issues around equity. Who pays? And who pays and differential institutional access and you know, it's very complicated issues around equity. And so, um uh, I would be interested in your thoughts on it, but I think it's going forward the issue of an open access. And as we move towards more open access journals, journals experimental political sciences flipping open access next year, um uh, that it's an important issue for the discipline and it's also directly affects I think potentially directly affects citations, so.

Audience Member: I'm just looking for a microphone if I needed to. Um, I just wanted to note, we haven't even, um, commented about methodological plurality and the biases of journals. I've never submitted to the top three journals because they don't do ethnographic studies. I do ethnography, I talk to people, I don't do survey data, right? Um, I... and even though I'm a classically trained political scientist out of Georgia, I should actually be a sociologist because I do prisoner re-entry. And so it's this whole idea of being accepted, it's not just the race, it's the politics of the criminal justice system which is now just emerging. But when I first went up for tenure, I was in Cathy's salmon colored bar graph about being denied tenure and then moving around um so this whole idea of what is acceptable... I don't read certain journals now because my work is not even marginally represented. I'm not even talking about

race, I'm just talking about methods and questions related to politics that sometimes we don't even consider.

Audience Member: [inaudible] You may not need a mic but we will prop it near you anyway. The screen is off.

Audience Member: So Brandon, I have kind of a question for you. Um, we always... we... we always knew that the journals were some... wasn't for us. Now there's been development, um, but we always knew. So what you're articulating is that... is that you're just finding out. So this is... so usually in a setting like this, the... the folk on the underside you know talk about their experiences, but there's actually that other side. Like what do the folk on the top, like how... what are their conceptions and when do they actually come to the moment where they're like, oh okay, this... this thing that I thought was meritocratic you know wasn't? You know, so... so I... so, I got my PhD in Michigan in the early 2000's, that was when Michigan was producing most of the Black folk or a significant chunk of Black folks. [inaudible] ...were still in there... [laughter] Well I mean, Hayes was my advisor. Hey... that's the first PAC at Howard, Hayes was my advisor, so I consider myself related. So... so, but we always knew, and we knew that from stories, and we knew that through also individual activity. In fact, I... a really dear friend of mine actually submitted to a major journal.

Audience Member: He was in the department of the person who edited that journal, overheard that editor of that journal giving personal information to somebody who had submitted to that journal, and that person ended up getting in. So it was a combination of those... of that type of really deep, um, unethical interactions. And then there was a... a separate set of dynamics that were more about kind of epistemological frameworks that didn't... that just said that this wasn't politics. So when did you... you know what was the process by which you were like, wow, this this layer exists that I wasn't aware of?

Audience Member: [inaudible]

Audience Member: And then, when did you realize? Yeah, yeah.

Audience Member: I interact and engage with scholars of color and REP scholars, some White, some Black, um, that certainly do submit to the journal. So I... you know and obviously that's just my anecdotal information. And I mean when I talk to junior faculty in my department, some scholars of color, some White, um, I always encourage them to submit their best work to the top journals. And I don't pressure them, but I always... I'm like your work is awesome, submit it to the top journals, you know? Give it a shot, your best work's got to go in the top journals. So I guess I do know of plenty of cases, but again, I... I you know that's just my neck of the woods. Um, and mostly people doing quantitative work for instance. Um, so does that answer your question?

Audience Member: Maybe I asked it the wrong way.

Audience Member: I mean, to piggyback a little bit on what [name] is saying is like, how do we live in such different information networks?

Audience Member: Yes, yes.

Audience Member: ...And when you think about the the coming on the scene of like Women In Politics and Policy, JRAP, all these journals which were sort of standing in the breach because the big journals,

especially with [inaudible], you submitted, you wait, you get the reviews, you get a tepid R&R, then you do it, and then a year is gone, and then you get the rejection. And you got to start all over again. And now look, and those are good, right? I mean you can make them work better, but it's still wasting time. Um, and you spin a lot of wheels. And so, you know at some point, there's clearly something that is not translating or the strings are not crossing because I remember when JRAP came online. Right? And that was partly because there was a very real sense and I think a very real set of evidence that said HAPS, APSR are not that interested, unless you have like some crazy model that people think is really pretty. Um, and then... but that's a very particular kind of political science, not to demean it, but it is a very particular way of approaching questions that from what we've even talked about today are really complicated. And that need more than just, you know, the big N survey and when you think about communities that you care about. Right?

Audience Member: [inaudible] was talking about, uh, indigenous communities, they don't really show up in those places. [inaudible] ...David said he's going to collect all 30 people, right? That you have to pull across I don't know how many years of the... the NES or [inaudible] or whatever. Um, you know, and so there are just going to be places that are just not hospitable. And how do those places, I mean we know the acceptance rates are... they're pretty low in general for everybody, but the low acceptance rates and then there's just the sense that these places are not hospitable, not interested in engaging. And how that information doesn't seep over is, I think maybe...

Audience Member: Uh, yeah. The stuff I'm given, yeah. And that requires right... and that requires, um, us talking about our experiences. On the... the flip side it requires talking about you know to extend this discussion, like what is... what's going on where people just tend to think this stuff is meritocratic? Right? Where... where the reason that people aren't getting in is because they're not doing the work, or the work wasn't good, or because they're not talking about political subjects when we know they are.

Dr. John Garcia: I have two... I see this is a good discussion, I have two other points for the discussion. One is on the data for Native American population and ICPSR you say well, there's no quote, "surveys on Native American population." Well, I started doing literature searches and just getting journal abstracts and I find studies that were specific tri... tribe specific studies, but that's relevant within the context of that community. And so I would reach out to those researchers... so there is data out there, except we... when we put the standards where it has to be a national representational study, that excludes that possibility. The second thing in terms of ethnographic, uh, there are quote, uh, "contextual data," and also ethnographic data that I started trying to recruit because that's another... that's data. Right? We think about data in the broadest contexts, those are data sources which people use and other people who are not aware of them can make use of.

Dr. John Garcia: The second point I want to make in terms of how we set citations is the nature of knowledge production has become much more trans-interdisciplinary. So if I'm a political scientist in a department and much of my work is in non-political science journals, industry journals, how does that affect my advancement within political science? And so the nature of knowledge production is much more expansive, but sometimes political scientists deal too much with it and scientists will say well that's not in a political science journal, so I'll [inaudible]. And that's over simplistic... may not have much value. So how do you work through that dynamic and that development.

Audience Member: ... Just make a quick... quick point, or two quick points. Um, I've enjoyed this discussion. Um, I do think, you know, I mean I think the extent to which, you know, this resistance to submit to the top journals, I don't... you know, it's an empirical question how big the racial gap is, I think,

the race gap. Because I know plenty of White scholars who just know that works in that... it's not... those journals aren't for me. So I... I think we see it from all sorts of people and across different, um, factors but I would say, you know I mean, I think, you know, uh, I'd like to, you know, going forward I think we need to develop more proactive and... and solutions, um, to getting, you know, more REP peop... If there is this resistance to submit to the top journals you know... you do there's... there's capacity for... clearly capacity for getting the work in, because I see... I read a ton of great REP work in the top journals. Um, and um, and that's not my core area, but I keep track I... I pay attention to it.

Audience Member: Um, and then, um, and then this the strategy aspect, which is you know we all are strategizing to get in the top journal, it's really hard, it's a time suck, it sucks, it's not the sexiest situation, but being strategic about recommending reviewers. Right? If you're an REP scholar and or a judicial politics scholar or whatever, um, you're gonna get... you're likely gonna get, uh, a reviewer pool, now again that that's depending... maybe the editors are playing on some of these, um, aspects that Paula points out in her excellent article in Politics, Groups, and Identities. Are they sending... if you get an REP paper let's say, um, and the, uh, the editor thinks this is a... this is not a real subfield, are they going to send it to a broad Americanist for hopes of getting it rejected? Or... or like oh, does this play to the... does this have broader interest? Right? That's a serious problem that, you know, maybe that happened in this era coming up that Paula documents in that... in the McClain et al. article. So, um, but I would just say, you know, I think we can develop str... you know, there's a lot of strategy for getting review... you know, recommend two reviewers who... who would be fair reviewers. Right? I always recommend two reviewers because then I can... I know they're going to pick at least one of them and you know, it's the strategy there. And... and you know, send it to a wide group of you know, people you know, try... you know. So I think there are strategies for getting... I think there's capacity especially now, maybe to get... to get a fair reviewer pool because these are people... you're going to get reviewers in your area. Um, and I do think that's the best.

Audience Member: [inaudible] I must be on some website because the top political science journals send me Black things, things related to Black politics to review and they've never published my work and I automatically say no.

Audience Member: [inaudible] I thought picking my own reviewers was cheating because a White man had told me to do that. Honestly, a senior practitioner, he's like 'yeah, you can do that.' I thought that was cheating. I didn't know. And that's part of that hidden curriculum that I was talking about when you talk about graduate school. [inaudible] That you don't know, until somebody kind of pulled your coat and were like 'no, pick your reviewers'. Like is that crazy talk? Or suggest reviewers. But many times, they'll probably be friendly and we all know how this work, you get an article you kind of know who this is when you get it and people who are halfway decent make that sure. I'll give this a good look. Right? Not yet, but a good look. I did not know that you could do that because I've been living in the blind and the meritocracy of it all. Right, and... and being foolish and wasting my own time but, um, instead of being strategic. I think that's perfectly acceptable and when I tell people that now, they're like what? Oh you can do that? A lot of people don't know that you can do that. And there are a lot of kinds of people who don't know you can do that. That mimic some of this marginalization they talk about.

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

Audience Member: I just wanted to say that this is true, that from the editorial side it helps when people actually submit cover letters or recommend reviewers at all. And then it makes my... it actually makes

my job a little bit harder, as you know, the number of individuals in which to draw from... [inaudible] ...so please, mentor your students... Um, the second point that I, um. Uh, the second point was that yes, there's a prioritization of the top journals but... but my university has recently done an acknowledgment that scholars who study marginalized communities may not be at a challenge to the mainstream journals is to readjust their opinion requirements having value journals like Politics, Groups and Identities, and in order to change that conversation with the criteria for us. And I'm going to tell you the person going up after all those conversations that happened so I'm going to see how much sense the institutional policy change that into the departmental of culture about how NYC say my FPV versus someone who has an.

Audience Member: They wrote it down. [laughter] [inaudible]

Audience Member: And I believe Cathy is trying to add in something.

Dr. Cathy Cohen: Okay, thank you. And it's the same as the comment we just heard, which is I think one thing is to try to get in the what's called the top journals, but it's still a strategy of scarcity. But I think the other thing to instruct the idea of the top journals, like what makes those three the top journals? Other than they publish a certain type of political science that's largely inaccessible to the wider population, if in fact we're really thinking about and worried about kind of questions of impact in terms of knowledge production. So I appreciate this idea of really pushing back on institutions to say that there are a wide group of journals through which people will publish and their work will be recognized and all of those have to be considered to some degree equally. That, you know, to hell with the top three journals.

Audience Member: Okay, thank you and thank you everyone for that robust discussion.