

Publish or Perish?

Don't Perish!

Tips for Publishing Your Gender Research

Members of the Penn State GRIT Team::

Ann Tickamyer

Carolyn Sachs

Elizabeth Ransom

Brian Thiede

Ruth Mendum

Ty Butler



PennState

College of Agricultural Sciences

Overview

- I. Challenges in publishing gender research
- II. Selecting a journal
- III. Steps to follow to maximize success
- IV. Submission process
- V. Review process
- VI. What next?



I. Challenges in publishing gender research

- Bridging disciplinary gaps and differences
- Communicating across disciplines, ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies
- Making the case for gender
- Finding the appropriate venue



II. Selecting a journal: Types

- Types of journals
 - Gender specific
 - Disciplinary
 - Inter-, multi-, trans disciplinary
 - Specialty
 - Special issue



II. Selecting a journal: Considerations

- Impact factors and prestige
- Acceptance and rejection rates
- Types of articles, word limits, etc.
- Readers
- Open access
- Fees
- Review process and personnel
 - Length of time for review
 - Number of reviewers
 - Interests and qualifications of reviewers



II. Selecting a journal: List of journals

- **Journals with a specific Gender and Women's Studies focus:**
- SIGNS: Journal of Women in Culture and Society
- Feminist Studies
- Gender and Development
- Gender, Agriculture and Food Security
- Feminist Economics
- Gender and Geography
- Gender and Society
- Gender, Place and Culture
- Gender, Technology and Development
- Women's Studies International Forum
- Gender, Work, and Organization
- Sex Roles
- Men and Masculinities
- European Journal of Women's Studies
- Hypatia
- **Examples of other social science journals publishing high quality scholarship on gender, agriculture and environment**
- World Development
- Rural Sociology
- Sociologia Ruralis
- Journal of Rural Studies
- Agriculture and Human Values



II. Selecting a journal: Guides to validity

- <https://guides.library.yale.edu/c.php?g=296124&p=1973764>
- <https://www.enago.com/academy/identifying-predatory-journals-using-evidence-based-characteristics/>
- <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4206639/>



III. Steps to follow: Journal scope and content

- Examine all information about the journal (start with web site)
- Look at articles it has published in the last couple of years
 - Has it published work with gender content?
 - What kind of theories and methods does it use?
 - Who are the authors?
- Compare your work with published articles
 - How closely does your work follow their model?

III. Steps to follow: Preparing the manuscript

- **Organize!**
- **Edit!**
- **Communicate!**
- Explain problem and why it is important at the very beginning
- Provide an overview of how you will approach the issue and use it as an outline
- Follow journal formatting
- Have someone(s) else read it
- Don't make the reader work too hard to figure out what you are doing, why, and how
- **Communicate!**
- **Organize!**
- **Edit!**



IV. Submission process

- Prepare a good abstract (see next session)
- Write a good (but succinct) cover letter
- Indicate any special considerations
 - Formatting (if minor deviations from journal specifications, indicate you will comply on acceptance)
 - Reviewers to avoid and why (only if necessary and with very good reason)
 - Conflicts of interest

V. Review process

- Editors give the ms. a desk read
 - Should it be sent out to review?
 - Who should be asked to review?
- Editor solicits reviewers based on expertise and track record
- Reviewers are asked to review and respond using journal criteria



V. Review process: Journal criteria

- Reviewer comments to editor (not directly shared with author)
- Comments to author
- Publication decision:
 - Accept
 - Revise and resubmit
 - Reject
- Assessment of quality of work – varies by journal but usually includes either explicitly or implicitly (sometimes via a scale):
 - Theory
 - Methods
 - significance
 - Interest/contribution
 - Writing



V. Review process: review guidelines

1. Summarize briefly the main purpose or objectives of the paper. Things to look for include:

- Failure to specify what it is at the beginning of the paper
- Lack of clarity or inconsistency in the objectives

2. Depending on the type of paper: does it do what it states it will do?

3. If it's an empirical paper:

- Is there an appropriate literature review?
- Are research questions or hypotheses clearly stated
- Are the theory and methods clearly stated and explained?
- Are the results presented clearly?
- Are tables self-explanatory?
- Are the results discussed and implications for the theory considered?
- Is there a conclusion that includes limitations and future directions or next steps?

4. If it's a literature review:

- Is the review clearly delineated as to what it will cover?
- Within its scope, is it comprehensive or are there serious omissions in literature review?
- Does it cover what is found in the literature and what may be lacking?
- Can you make recommendations for sources or topics to consider?
- Are citations properly cited and represent the most recent work on the topic?
- Can some sort of conclusion be drawn, whether it's for additional work, suggestions for empirical follow up, etc.?

5. Organization and writing

- Is it well organized and logically structured? – applied to the paper as a whole and within sections and paragraphs
- Does it make use of headings and subheadings to delineate sections?
- Is the writing lucid with proper grammar, syntax, and spelling? (Depending how serious the problems, these can be fixed fairly easily, but should be pointed out.)
- Is the prose clear and straight forward, avoiding excessive jargon or convoluted constructions?

6. What is right or good about the paper? Don't be afraid to be positive or complimentary. The entire review should be constructive. If there are problems or things that are lacking, it's fine, even necessary to point them out, but be careful of being overly critical, and where possible, suggest ways to fix or improve it.

7. Final score:

- Accept as is
- Revise and resubmit minor
- Revise and resubmit major
- Reject



V. Review process: Editor's decision

- Editor has final decision
- Editors vary in how independent their decision will be from the reviewers
- Editors communicate decision to authors with copies of reviews and their reasons
- If anything about this process is not clear, ask for clarification



VI. What next?

- If it's an accept: Congratulations! Follow editor's instructions for publication
- If it's a reject: Commiserations, but don't give up (see following discussion)
- If it's a revise and resubmit (R&R): this is typical and there are steps to follow



VI. What next? R & R

- Read all the reviews and editor's comments carefully
- Determine which are reasonable, which are not (and why) by the source (reviewer 1,2, etc.)
- Revise paper to accommodate to reasonable comments, suggestions, requests
- Keep a list of all changes and responses
- Write a detailed cover letter describing how you responded to the reviews

VI. What next? The R&R response contin.

- In listing your response, indicate whether it covers multiple reviewers or just one
- Be specific
- Indicate where you disagree and why with reviewer comments
- Be polite and professional (even if you are seething)
- Respond, revise, resubmit in a timely manner (determine if the editor has a time frame)

VI. What next? Dealing with the fallout

- Emotional labor
- If it's an r&r do not let visceral response get in the way of timely revisions
- If it's a reject, do **not** abandon the article
- If it's a reject determine why before submitting elsewhere. Does it need to be
 - Reconsidered
 - Reanalyzed
 - Rewritten
 - Sent to a different journal virtually unchanged
- **GET IT BACK OUT!**



Thanks!

Questions, Comments, Suggestions

The Penn State GRIT TEAM