

2009 Annual Report, *International Studies Quarterly*

The Indiana University ISQ editorial team assumed responsibility for new submissions on October 1, 2008 and thus concluded its first year on September 30, 2009. During this period, Sumit Ganguly, Karen Rasler, and William R. Thompson served as co-editors, with David Fidler and Jeffrey Hart serving as associate editors. Thompson also served as editor-in-chief and managing editor. In January 2010, Sumit Ganguly will move to the associate editor category. In the first year, our editorial assistant crew consisted of Michael Lee and Leila Zhakhirova. Our current team includes Manjeet Pardesi, Arwen Taylor, and Michelle Doman. Past editorial reports have been fairly long – that will no longer be our practice. For reasons that will become more clear below, we simply do not have the time to write long reports. The following information summarizes the nature of our activities for the past year.

- A new editorial board was appointed consisting of 97 individuals. Twenty-five (25.8%) are located in institutions outside of the United States. Twenty-three (23.7%) are women. The proportions of scholars outside the United States and women in the editorial board of the last editorial team were 22.9% and 21.4% respectively. Thus, the proportional sizes are not vastly different although the movement has been to expand international and female participation on the board. One difference is that only 7 states were represented in the last board while 25 states are represented in the current board.
- ISQ requested and was allocated a permanent 20% increase in pages by Wiley-Blackwell beginning in the 2009 year. Roughly, that translates in to 48 articles per year, as opposed to 40.
- Our mean response time (from submission to decision) was 76.8 calendar days.
- We processed 434 manuscripts. Of those 32 were accepted and 76 were given revise and resubmit decisions. The total number of manuscripts represents a 31.5% percentage increase over 2007-2008 figures.
- We received 155 submissions of all types from institutions in 35 countries other than the United States.
- Our acceptance rate was 9.1% percent of all submissions on which a decision was made (N=352). Since 2002, annual acceptance rates have ranged from a high of 17.5% to a low of 8.4% (with fluctuations up and down from year to year).

- Of the submissions to ISQ, 123 were authored by women . Another 26 submissions were co-authored papers in which at least one (but not all) of the co-authors was a woman. Women authors had a smaller percentage of their manuscripts accepted (8.9%) than male authors (10.1%). On the other hand, women (at 22.2%) had a slightly better chance of receiving a revise and resubmit decision than men (at 21%). If we add acceptance and revise and resubmit percentages, women (31.1%) do no better nor no worse than men (31.1%). This past year, authorship teams made up of both men and women had an abysmal proportion of their manuscripts accepted (0%) but were more likely (25%) to receive revise and resubmit decisions than authors in the single gender categories.

Trends

All information on trends in ISQ activity are subject to some problems of comparison over time. The two basic problems are that each editorial regime uses a different reporting period and some information tends to be lost in regime transition periods. Nonetheless, the following figures are taken from earlier ISQ annual reports found on the web and at least approximate trend information.

Table 1 reports turn around times. Not surprisingly, our first year figures are higher than the pace the UNT team was able to move towards but slightly lower than their first year. We expect to see some improvement in our turn around time but, frankly, there are strong systemic constraints on substantial improvement. Most editorial time these days is devoted to chasing reviewer commitments and then waiting for/encouraging them to actually deliver a review. The difficulties in securing enough reviewers to make the process work cannot be exaggerated. It is not unknown to ask 10-12 people to get 2 reviewers on board (although these types of cases are not yet the norm). Unfortunately, a mis-communication among the current ISQ editors led to bad bookkeeping on the number of reviewers requested this year. We should have better information next year but a rough estimate of 1.5-2 requests for every reviewer signed on would probably approximate what we are dealing with. If you add that it can take a week or two for potential reviewers to respond to a request and that most reviewers do not return their reviews within 30 days as requested, most of the variance in turn around time is easily explained.

Table 1: Turn-around Times

2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
82.5	74.3	75.0	71.6	n.d.	76.8

Table 2 reports historical information on submission rates. Submissions increased nearly a third (31.5%) this year. The increase is impressive but not unprecedented – something similar seems to have happened between 2003-04 and 2004-05. The trend line is quite clear. In this decade

(millennium), the increase has been about 160%. There are certainly exogenous factors afoot to account for the increased activity (basically, more people around the world submitting articles for tenure and promotion) but one must conclude that ISQ is doing something right.

Table 2: Submissions

1999-2000	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
143	167	180	215	197	284	302	337	330	434

Table 3 indicates that some of the increase in submission activity emanates from submissions from non-US institutions. This type of activity is up 82% from the year before whereas US activity increased at a 48% rate. It may be worth noting that about half of the European activity originated in the United Kingdom (which helps to explain the doubling of European submissions this past year).

Table 3: Submissions by Region

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Latin America & Caribbean	5	1	0	5	1
Africa	1	2	3	0	3
Mid East	6	5	6	12	16
Pacific	3	6	2	7	12
Europe	43	44	53	42	85
Asia	8	9	11	11	21
Canada	8	9	18	8	17
USA	153	165	188	196	291

Table 4 suggests that women have doubled their submission rates in the past 3 years. Much the same thing occurred between 2002 and 2004-05. Unlike what seems to have occurred in 2002-2004 (a marked decline in acceptance rates for women submissions), however, no decline in women acceptance rates in registered in table 5 between 2007 and 2008-09.

Table 4: Submissions by Gender

Gender	2002		2003		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2008-09	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Female	31	14.4	55	20.4	60	19.9	50	15.1	58	17.6	120	27.6
Male	163	75.8	196	72.9	220	72.8	256	77.1	243	73.6	297	68.4
Joint	21	9.8	18	6.7	22	7.3	26	7.8	29	8.8	26	6.0

Table 5: Acceptance Rates by Gender

	2002	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008-09
Female	10.7%	6.1%	6.7%	8.3%	8.6%	8.9%
Male	19.0	11.8	15.0	9.5	11.1	10.1

On the distribution of accepted papers, we are unable to duplicate the coding procedures of our predecessors which seems to mix topics and methods. The coding problem is compounded by the fact that many papers could be coded in different ways. In 2008-09, the bulk of the accepted papers were either IPE/CPE or conflict (62.5%) with the two topics equally represented. A third topical area (foreign policy and security studies) accounted for another 21.9%. The remainder could be categorized as belonging to law/human rights, comparative politics, and international organization categories.