



Social Problems

The official journal of the Society for the Study of Social Problems

Becky Pettit, Editor
University of Washington

To: SSSP Board of Directors
Editorial and Publications Committee
Social Problems Advisory and Associate Editors
From: Becky Pettit, Editor, *Social Problems*
Re: 2012-13 Annual Report
Date: July 12, 2013

This report documents the activities of the editorial offices and staff at the University of Washington from June 1, 2012-May 31, 2013. I want to begin by thanking you for giving me the opportunity to serve as Editor of *Social Problems*. I am honored and privileged to serve in this position. I find my duties as Editor both rewarding and challenging. I thoroughly enjoy thinking about how to engage and advance the range of scholarship submitted to *Social Problems*. I look forward to the opportunities that the next year will bring.

Editorial Office

All new and revised manuscripts submitted to *Social Problems* during the past year have been managed by the editorial office at the University of Washington. I am fortunate to have the excellent assistance of three part-time staff: Erin Powers, the managing editor; Sarah Diefendorf, the editorial assistant; and Amy Jo Woodruff, the production editor. I feel privileged to have such an extraordinary team and I deeply appreciate the support of the SSSP and the University of Washington, which has enabled me to recruit and retain such talented staff.

The editorial office benefits from the expertise of our five associate editors: Kenneth (Andy) Andrews, Jennifer Jordan, Christopher Lyons, Ziad Munson, and Abigail Saguy. More than 50 sociologists have agreed to serve as advisory editors (listed in Appendix A). Advisory editors review 2-3 papers per year, provide reviews quickly when necessary, and help to resolve discrepancies in reviews. I have also selected 20 student editors (also listed in Appendix A) from the University of Washington, Washington State University, and the University of British Columbia to assist in the editorial process. I meet with student editors approximately every two weeks to discuss incoming manuscripts and reviews. Student editors have been instrumental in summarizing comments of external reviewers and helping to select reviewers. They are a vital part of the editorial team.

Innovations

I am very happy to report a few key innovations for *Social Problems* in 2012-13. During 2012-13 we fully implemented on-line, ahead-of-print publishing. After a paper is accepted for publication it is copyedited, typeset, and made available on-line ahead-of-print through JSTOR. Papers are now available as much as 3 months before being available in print. With the support of the SSSP, we would like to make papers available on-line as much as 6 months ahead-of-print.

Second, we now provide targeted advertisement and outreach for all published articles. When a paper is published, we solicit names and e-mail addresses of friends and colleagues that the corresponding author would like notified of the publication of the paper. We send those identified a link to the JSTOR on-line link of the paper and offer to send a copy of the paper, free of charge, for her/his personal use. We are also tracking publicity and awards for recently published papers. We have already identified 4 award-winning papers published in the past 18 months and another 3 that have received significant media attention. Appendix B

includes a list of all papers published since February 2012, with information about citations, downloads, awards, and publicity when available.

Third, we have a policy of not inviting what are commonly termed “second R&Rs”. It is our hope that this streamlines the review process by reducing the total number of reviewers involved, and shortens the ultimate time to publication. However, it also means that authors have only one opportunity to revise a paper before a final decision is made. It is my understanding that this policy is somewhat inconsistent with other leading journals that allow more than one (and sometimes multiple) revision(s). This policy has been met with mixed reactions and several authors and reviewers have expressed their dissatisfaction; more information can be found in Appendices C and D. To resolve any lingering ambiguities about our policy, we have revised all of our materials to make this policy clear to authors, reviewers, and members of the editorial team.

Budget

The journal is operating within budget at this time.

Manuscript Submissions and Processing

The editorial office at the University of Washington has been responsible for all issues of *Social Problems* during the past year. We anticipate continuing to publish issues on time and within budget. We are very proud of the issues that we have produced (see Appendix B for a list of all publications since February 2012). We believe papers we publish represent the finest scholarship on a broad range of social issues. And, it is our hope that they are of interest, and accessible, to the broad and diverse readership of *Social Problems*.

We are an extremely selective journal, publishing approximately 8 percent of original submissions. All submissions to the journal are initially reviewed by two members of the editorial board (an editorial board member and me). If a paper is determined to be appropriate for peer review, we solicit the advice of three external reviewers. Table 1 compares submission information between 2011-12 and 2012-13. Between June 1, 2012, and May 31, 2013, we received 328 new submissions to *Social Problems*. This represents a 12.3% increase in submissions over the corresponding period in 2011-2012.

Table 1. New Submissions to Social Problems and Editorial Decisions between June 1, 2011 and May 31, 2013

| | June 1, 2011- May 31, 2012 | | | June 1, 2012- May 31, 2013 | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| | N | Percent | Mean Days to Decision | N | Percent | Mean Days to Decision |
| Deflect | 78 | 26.7% (78/292) | 39 | 98 | 29.8% (98/328) | 33 |
| Reject | 102 | 34.9% (102/292) | 144 | 135 | 49.2% (135/274) | 135 |
| Revise and Resubmit | 112 | 38.3% (112/292) | 157 | 41 | 14.9% (41/274) | 163 |
| Currently Undecided | 0 | 0 | NA | 54 | 16.4% (54/328) | NA |
| Total | 292 | 100% | 121 | 328 | 100% | 103 |

Of the 328 new manuscripts submitted between June 1, 2012 and May 31, 2013, we have made 274 initial decisions. Our average time to decision is 103 days. All manuscripts sent out for review have received at least

three peer reviews and most manuscripts have been reviewed by at least one advisory or associate editor. I review all of the materials associated with each manuscript and write all of the decision letters. In the rare cases where I have had a conflict of interest, manuscripts and associated materials have been assigned to an associate editor.

We send approximately 70% of all new manuscripts out for peer review. Of the 328 manuscripts submitted between June 1, 2012, and May 31, 2013, we decided to not send 98 manuscripts out for peer review. In other words, 29.8% of all new submissions were “deflected” or “desk rejected”. Our average time to decision on manuscripts not sent out for peer review is 33 days. We extended “revise and resubmit” (R&R) decisions to 41 manuscripts sent out for peer review, or 14.9% of manuscripts on which decisions have been made. Our average time to decision for R&Rs is 163 days. We rejected 135 manuscripts sent out for peer review, or 49.2% of manuscripts on which decisions have been made. Our average time to decision for manuscripts that are rejected with peer review is 135 days.

Internal Process Assessment

In response to feedback we have received from some authors and reviewers, we have spent some time this year assessing our review process. I enlisted the help of an undergraduate student at the University of Washington, Caitlin Dickens, to code submissions, solicitations for reviews and completed reviews and analyze them for differences by gender and rank. Appendix C provides a summary of her findings from an analysis of 100 articles submitted during a 3-month period in 2012. Appendix C also includes a summary assessment of letters to the editor from authors and reviewers appealing editorial decisions. Appendix D includes the de-identified full text of the correspondence from a complainant who specifically asked that I pass her/his feedback along to the *Social Problems* Editorial Board.

I am uncertain how to assess this information. I am committed to maintaining a transparent process that ensures that every manuscript gets full consideration for publication in *Social Problems*. I also respect and value the voluntary assessments of peer reviewers and I am committed to maintaining the confidence of those reviewers. On the recommendation of one complainant I am seeking advice from the Social Problems Editorial Board about deleting the “confidential comments to the editor” field in Manuscript Central, our on-line submission system. On occasion, reviewers raise significant concerns about a paper in the confidential comments to the editor. Although I do my best to pass along the sentiment of reviewers, inconsistencies in comments to the editor and the authors leave room for confusion and frustration for authors. In addition, and as mentioned above, we are also working to make sure that all of our materials clearly state our policy not to offer second R&Rs. I welcome any advice or insight you may be able to provide to me on these issues.

In summary, we are working very hard to continue to publish high-quality accessible scholarship in *Social Problems* and we are excited about our continuing work on *Social Problems*. We look forward to any comments, suggestions, or feedback that you may have on our editorial process.

Appendix A
Recommended Advisory and Student Editors 2013-2014

Advisory Editors

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Alon, Sigal (2012) | Tel Aviv University | salon1@post.tau.ac.il |
| Bair, Jennifer (2011) | University of Colorado | jennifer.bair@colorado.edu |
| Beckett, Katherine (2013) | University of Washington | beckett@uw.edu |
| Beckfield, Jason (2012) | Harvard University | jbeckfie@wjh.harvard.edu |
| Bernstein, Mary (2013) | University of Connecticut | Mary.Bernstein@Uconn.edu |
| Beyerlein, Kraig (2013) | Notre Dame | kbeyer1@nd.edu |
| Cadge, Wendy (2012) | Brandeis University | wcadge@brandeis.edu |
| Chiricos, Ted (2013) | Florida State University | tchiricos@fsu.edu |
| Cranford, Cynthia (2013) | University of Toronto-Mississauga | c.cranford@utoronto.edu |
| Craig, Lyn (2013) | University of New South Wales | lcraig@unsw.edu.au |
| Emeka, Amon (2012) | University of Southern California | emeka@usc.edu |
| Feliciano, Cynthia (2013) | University of California Irvine | felician@uci.edu |
| Foster, Holly (2013) | Texas A&M University | hfoster@tamu.edu |
| Gallagher, Charles (2013) | Lasalle University | gallagher@lasalle.edu |
| Gonzales, Roberto (2012) | Harvard University | robertog4@gmail.com |
| Gullickson, Aaron (2013) | University of Oregon | aarong@uoregon.edu |
| Hipp, John (2013) | UC-Irvine | hippj@uci.edu |
| Hironaka, Ann (2012) | UC-Irvine | hironaka@uci.edu |
| Hirsh, Elizabeth (Beth) (2012) | University of British Columbia | ehirsh@interchange.ubc.ca |
| Holstein, James (2013) | Marquette University | James.Holstein@marquette.edu |
| Hook, Jennifer (2013) | University of Southern California | jenhook@uw.edu |
| Huffman, Matt (2013) | University of California Irvine | mhuffman@uci.edu |
| Hughey, Matthew (2013) | Mississippi State University | MHughey@soc.msstate.edu |
| Kmec, Julie (2013) | Washington State University | jkmec@wsu.edu |
| Krysan, Maria (2013) | University of Illinois-Chicago | krysan@uic.edu |
| Lee, Hedy (2012) | University of Washington | hedylee@uw.edu |
| Maroto, Michelle (2013) | University of Alberta | maroto@uw.edu |
| Martinez, Lisa (2013) | University of Denver | Lisa.Martinez@du.edu |
| Muschert, Glenn (2013) | Miami University | muschegw@muohio.edu |
| Muller, Chandra (2013) | University of Texas | cmuller@prc.utexas.edu |
| Okamoto, Dina (2013) | UC-Davis | dgokamoto@ucdavis.edu |
| Pettinicchio, David (2012) | Oxford University | david.pettinicchio@sociology.ox.ac.uk |
| Quillian, Lincoln (2012) | Northwestern University | l-quillian@northwestern.edu |
| Roggeband, Conny (2012) | Vrije University | c.m.roggeband@vu.nl |
| Rohlinger, Deana (2013) | Florida State University | drohling@fsu.edu |
| Rosenfeld, Jake (2012) | University of Washington | jakerose@uw.edu |
| Roth, Louise (2013) | University of Arizona | lroth@email.arizona.edu |
| Rydgren, Jens (2012) | Stockholm University | jens.rydgren@sociology.su.se |
| Saperstein, Aliya (2013) | Stanford University | asaper@stanford.edu |
| Schnittker, Jason (2013) | University of Pennsylvania | jschnitt@ssc.upenn.edu |
| Steensland, Brian (2013) | Indiana University | bsteens@indiana.edu |
| Stewart, Quincy (2013) | Northwestern University | q-stewart@northwestern.edu |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Sykes, Bryan (2013) | DePaul University | blsykes@uw.edu |
| Teasdale, Brent (2013) | Georgia State University | bteasdale@gsu.edu |
| Tranby, Eric (2013) | University of Delaware | etranby@udel.edu |
| Watkins-Hayes, Celeste (2013) | Northwestern University | c-watkins@northwestern.edu |
| Wharton, Amy (2013) | Washington State University | wharton@vancouver.wsu.edu |
| Wildeman, Christopher (2013) | Yale University | christopher.wildeman@yale.edu |
| Young, Jacob (2013) | Arizona State University | Jacob.Young.1@asu.edu |

Student Editors

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Abdulcadir, Issa (2012) | University of Washington | issa9@uw.edu |
| Adrian, Valerie (2013) | Washington State University | valerie.adrian@email.wsu.edu |
| Anderson, Annika (2013) | Washington State University | annika.anderson@email.wsu.edu |
| Beach, Lindsey (2013) | University of Washington | beachl@uw.edu |
| Bruns, Angela (2013) | University of Washington | abruns@uw.edu |
| Crookston, Andrew James (2013) | Washington State University | andrew.crookston@email.wsu.edu |
| Denice, Patrick (2013) | University of Washington | pdenice@uw.edu |
| Edwards, Frank (2013) | University of Washington | fedwards@u.washington.edu |
| Fernandes, April (2012) | University of Washington | afern@uw.edu |
| Knaphus, Emily (2013) | University of Washington | eknaphus@uw.edu |
| Koski-Karell, Daniel (2013) | University of Washington | koski@uw.edu |
| Kravitz-Wirtz, Nicole (2013) | University of Washington | nicolekw@uw.edu |
| McGlynn-Wright, Annie (*NM) | University of Washington | amcglynn@uw.edu |
| Polonijo, Andrea (2013) | University of British Columbia | polonijo@alumni.ubc.ca |
| Reisman, Ande (2013) | University of Washington | areisman@uw.edu |
| Reosti, Anna (2013) | University of Washington | areosti@gmail.com |
| Serafini, Brian (2013) | University of Washington | valgaav@uw.edu |
| Shannon, Michelle (*NM) | University of Washington | shannml@uw.edu |
| Shin, Solee (2012) | University of Washington | soleeis@u.washington.edu |
| Torcasso, Bekah (2013) | Washington State University | rebekah.torcasso@email.wsu.edu |

***NM=NOT A MEMBER**

Appendix B

Papers Published in Social Problems Since February 2012

Number of citations identified by GoogleScholar is listed in parentheses; number of downloads in 2012 is included after the parentheses for those that were in top 25 most downloaded articles published between 2008-2012.

Presidential Address: The Challenge of Service Sociology (1)

A. Javier Treviño

Vol. 59, No. 1 (February 2012), pp. 2-20

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.1.2>

Laboring Underground: The Employment Patterns of Hispanic Immigrant Men in Durham, NC (2)

Chenoa A. Flippen

Vol. 59, No. 1 (February 2012), pp. 21-42

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.1.21>

Explaining Frame Variation: More Moderate and Radical Demands for Women's Citizenship in the U.S. Women's Jury Movements (3)

Holly J. McCammon

Vol. 59, No. 1 (February 2012), pp. 43-69

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.1.43>

***The Paradox of Protection: National Identity, Global Commodity Chains, and the Tequila Industry (4)**

Sarah Bowen, Marie Sarita Gaytán

Vol. 59, No. 1 (February 2012), pp. 70-93

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.1.70>

*Best Paper in the Social Sciences, Mexico Section of the Latin American Studies Association.

***Weak Coffee: Certification and Co-Optation in the Fair Trade Movement (7;1105)**

Daniel Jaffee

Vol. 59, No. 1 (February 2012), pp. 94-116

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.1.94>

*Coverage in The Nation (8/22/2012).

Neighborhood Ethnic Composition and Resident Perceptions of Safety in European Countries (4)

Moshe Semyonov, Anastasia Gorodzeisky, Anya Glikman

Vol. 59, No. 1 (February 2012), pp. 117-135

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.1.117>

Big Books and Social Movements: A Myth of Ideas and Social Change (3)

David S. Meyer, Deana A. Rohlinger

Vol. 59, No. 1 (February 2012), pp. 136-153

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.1.136>

This School's Gone Downhill: Racial Change and Perceived School Quality among Whites (2)

Kimberly A. Goyette, Danielle Farrie and Joshua Freely
Vol. 59, No. 2 (May 2012), pp. 155-176
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.2.155>

***An Opening in the Congregational Closet? Boundary-Bridging Culture and Membership Privileges for Gays and Lesbians in Christian Religious Congregations (0)**

Gary Adler
Vol. 59, No. 2 (May 2012), pp. 177-206
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.2.177>

*Coverage in The ARDA Press Room (7/7/2013), The Huffington Post (7/7/2013)

Unequal Motherhood: Racial-Ethnic and Socioeconomic Disparities in Cesarean Sections in the United States (2)

Louise Marie Roth and Megan M. Henley
Vol. 59, No. 2 (May 2012), pp. 207-227
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.2.207>

Imprisonment and Infant Mortality (8)

Christopher Wildeman
Vol. 59, No. 2 (May 2012), pp. 228-257
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.2.228>

Metropolitan Heterogeneity and Minority Neighborhood Attainment: Spatial Assimilation or Place Stratification? (0)

Jeremy Pais, Scott J. South and Kyle Crowder
Vol. 59, No. 2 (May 2012), pp. 258-281
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.2.258>

Choking on Modernity: A Human Ecology of Air Pollution (2)

Richard York and Eugene A. Rosa
Vol. 59, No. 2 (May 2012), pp. 282-300
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.2.282>

Street Gang Recruitment: Signaling, Screening, and Selection (1;1092)

James A. Densley
Vol. 59, No. 3 (August 2012), pp. 301-321
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.3.301>

Organizational Frames for Professional Claims: Private Military Corporations and the Rise of the Military Paraprofessional (0)

Katherine E. McCoy
Vol. 59, No. 3 (August 2012), pp. 322-340
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.3.322>

Acculturation and Self-Rated Health among Latino and Asian Immigrants to the United States (0)

Rachel Tolbert Kimbro, Bridget K. Gorman and Ariela Schachter

Vol. 59, No. 3 (August 2012), pp. 341-363
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.3.341>

The Geography of Exclusion: Race, Segregation, and Concentrated Poverty (12;1011)

Daniel T. Lichter, Domenico Parisi and Michael C. Taquino
Vol. 59, No. 3 (August 2012), pp. 364-388
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.3.364>

Tokenism, Organizational Segregation, and Coworker Relations in Law Firms (1)

Jean E. Wallace and Fiona M. Kay
Vol. 59, No. 3 (August 2012), pp. 389-410
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.3.389>

The Unequal Weight of Discrimination: Gender, Body Size, and Income Inequality (0;1181)

Katherine Mason
Vol. 59, No. 3 (August 2012), pp. 411-435
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.3.411>

"Another Second Chance": Rethinking Rehabilitation through the Lens of California's Prison Fire Camps (2)

Philip Goodman
Vol. 59, No. 4 (November 2012), pp. 437-458
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.4.437>

Buying Time: Gendered Patterns in Union Contracts (0)

Jillian Crocker and Dan Clawson
Vol. 59, No. 4 (November 2012), pp. 459-480
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.4.459>

***Does This Make Me Look Fat? Aesthetic Labor and Fat Talk as Emotional Labor in a Women's Plus-Size Clothing Store (0)**

Kjerstin Gruys
Vol. 59, No. 4 (November 2012), pp. 481-500
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.4.481>

*Best Graduate Student Paper from the Section on Consumers and Consumption of the American Sociological Association.

*Honorable Mention for the Thompson Award for Best Graduate Student Paper from the Section on Organizations, Occupations and Work of the American Sociological Association.

*Honorable Mention for the Graduate Student Best Paper Award from the Section on Labor and Labor Movements/Critical Sociology of the American Sociological Association.

Defying (Dis)Empowerment in a Battered Women's Shelter: Moral Rhetorics, Intersectionality, and Processes of Control and Resistance (0)

Amanda M. Gengler
Vol. 59, No. 4 (November 2012), pp. 501-521
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.4.501>

From Varieties of Capitalism to Varieties of Activism: The Antisweatshop Movement in Comparative Perspective (0)

Jennifer Bair and Florence Palpacuer
Vol. 59, No. 4 (November 2012), pp. 522-543
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.4.522>

Modularity and Transferability of Repertoires of Contention (0)

Takeshi Wada
Vol. 59, No. 4 (November 2012), pp. 544-571
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2012.59.4.544>

Presidential Address: The Art of Activism (0)

Wendy Simonds
Vol. 60, No. 1 (February 2013), pp. 1-26
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2013.60.1.1>

***Controlling Sex in the Name of "Public Health": Social Control and Michigan HIV Law (0)**

Trevor Hoppe
Vol. 60, No. 1 (February 2013), pp. 27-49
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2013.60.1.27>

*Graduate Student Paper Award from the Sociology of Law Section of the American Sociological Association.

*Mark Chesler Paper Prize from the University of Michigan Department of Sociology.

*Coverage in Out Smart Magazine (1/30/2013), Pride Source (4/4/2013), Washington Blade (2/7/2013), The Body (2/1/2013).

***Inside the Pyramid of Disputes: Naming Problems and Filing Grievances in California Prisons (0)**

Kitty Calavita and Valerie Jenness
Vol. 60, No. 1 (February 2013), pp. 50-80
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2013.60.1.50>

*Distinguished Article Prize from the Sociology of Law Section of the American Sociological Association.

*Honorable Mention for the Article Prize from the Law and Society Association.

Class in Name Only: Subjective Class Identity, Objective Class Position, and Vote Choice in American Presidential Elections (0)

Benjamin Sosnaud, David Brady and Steven M. Frenk
Vol. 60, No. 1 (February 2013), pp. 81-99
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2013.60.1.81>

Slicing the Pie: State Policy, Class Organization, Class Integration, and Labor's Share of Israeli National Income (1)

Tali Kristal
Vol. 60, No. 1 (February 2013), pp. 100-127
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2013.60.1.100>

[The Determinants of the Number of White Supremacist Groups: A Pooled Time-Series Analysis \(0\)](#)

Rachel M. Durso and David Jacobs

Vol. 60, No. 1 (February 2013), pp. 128-144

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2013.60.1.128>

[Counting Care Work: The Empirical and Policy Applications of Care Theory \(0\)](#)

Mignon Duffy, Randy Albelda and Clare Hammonds

Vol. 60, No. 2 (May 2013), pp. 145-167

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2013.60.2.145>

[Glass Cliffs and Organizational Saviors: Barriers to Minority Leadership in Work Organizations? \(0\)](#)

Alison Cook and Christy Glass

Vol. 60, No. 2 (May 2013), pp. 168-187

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2013.60.2.168>

[A Test of the Temperance Hypothesis: Class, Religiosity, and Tolerance of Prostitution \(0\)](#)

Liqun Cao and Edward R. Maguire

Vol. 60, No. 2 (May 2013), pp. 188-205

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2013.60.2.188>

[*Limited Engagements? Women's and Men's Work/Volunteer Time in the Encore Life Course Stage \(0\)](#)

Phyllis Moen and Sarah Flood

Vol. 60, No. 2 (May 2013), pp. 206-233

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2013.60.2.206>

*Coverage in the Huffington Post (5/7/2013).

[A Mark of Disgrace or a Badge of Honor?: Subjective Status among Former Inmates \(0\)](#)

Jason Schnittker and Valerio Bacak

Vol. 60, No. 2 (May 2013), pp. 234-254

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2013.60.2.234>

[Broad Reciprocity, Elderly Poverty, and the Retiree/Nonretiree Cleavage in the Demand for Public Retirement Income Support \(0\)](#)

Juan J. Fernández

Vol. 60, No. 2 (May 2013), pp. 255-280

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2013.60.2.255>

[Electronically published on Jun 6, 2013: \[Delinquency as a Consequence of Misperception: Overestimation of Friends' Delinquent Behavior and Mechanisms of Social Influence\]\(#\)](#)

Dr. Jacob Thomas Neal Young, Ph.D. and Dr. Frank Weerman

[Electronically published on Jun 3, 2013: \[Constructing the Model Immigrant: Movement Strategy and Immigrant Deservingness in the New Sanctuary Movement\]\(#\)](#)

Dr. Grace Yukich

Electronically published on Jun 2, 2013: [Economy and Disability: Labor Market Conditions and the Disability of Working-Age Individuals](#)

Mr. Rourke Liam O'Brien

Electronically published on May 29, 2013: [Does Violence Toward Others Affect Violence Toward Oneself? Examining the Direct and Moderating Effects of Violence on Suicidal Behavior](#)

Dr. Gregory M. Zimmerman, Ph.D.

Electronically published on May 5, 2013: [New Jobs, New Workers, and New Inequalities: Explaining Employers' Roles in Occupational Segregation by Nativity and Race](#)

Prof. Jill Lindsey Harrison and Ms. Sarah E. Lloyd

Electronically published on Apr 25, 2013: [The Role of Perceptions of the Police in Informal Social Control: Implications for the Racial Stratification of Crime and Control](#)

Prof. Kevin M. Drakulich, PhD and Prof. Robert D. Crutchfield

Appendix C
Summary Findings of Internal Assessment of Social Problems Review Process
Becky Pettit & Caitlin Dickens

In response to questions about the review process at *Social Problems*, we conducted a review of submissions, solicitations of reviewers, completed reviews, and appeals by gender and rank. Our project was primarily exploratory and it should be considered solely as an evaluation of our internal review process, although full details about the analyses of submissions and reviews can be found in “Mom at Home, Mom at Work”, a senior thesis paper by Caitlin Dickens. Our investigation was shaped by our understanding of sociological ideas about how gender and status shape the division of labor and symbolic contests over the exercise of power and authority.

We began by downloading the names and available contact information of authors and solicited reviewers for 100 manuscripts submitted during one quarter of 2012. This generated a sample of 100 authors and 572 reviewers. We used publicly available information to code the names for gender and rank. Gender was coded dichotomously as female and male as perceived by the coder. The coder used pronouns on professional websites, name, and other on-line information as the basis for coding gender. Rank was coded based on website information and individuals were coded as: Full Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, graduate student, lecturer, untenured faculty or non-academic researcher. We were able to find and code information for 91 submitting authors and 566 of the 572 individuals solicited for review.

There are no discernible gender differences in submissions to *Social Problems* either within or across ranks during this period of observation. Appendix C Table 1 shows that 40 percent of submissions come from graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, lecturers or researchers. We received 2 more submissions from women than from men in this category. Submissions are nearly equal between assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors (21, 20, and 20 percent of all submissions, respectively). While the numbers are small, gender parity in submissions is striking. Across tenure-stream faculty ranks, women submitted 27 articles and men submitted 29.

Appendix C Table 1. Submitting Author by Gender and Rank

| | Female | | Male | | Total | |
|---|--------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|
| | N | Percent (in rank) | N | Percent (in rank) | N | Percent (of total) |
| Graduate Student /Post-Doc /Lecturer /Other | 19 | 53% | 17 | 47% | 36 | 40% |
| Assistant Professor | 9 | 47% | 10 | 53% | 19 | 21% |
| Associate Professor | 8 | 44% | 10 | 56% | 18 | 20% |
| Full Professor | 9 | 50% | 9 | 50% | 18 | 20% |
| Total | 45 | 49% | 46 | 51% | 91 | 100% |

Appendix C Table 2 shows gender and rank differences in completing a review, given having been asked. Assistant professors are more likely to agree to review than members of any other rank group. They were invited to review 85 times and completed 45 reviews for a completed review rate of 53%. Full professors were invited to review 261 times and completed 80 reviews for a completed review rate of 31%. Women complete

more reviews than men and women are more likely to review than men, given they are asked. Male full professors complete the most reviews but female assistant professors are twice as likely to review as male full professors, given they are asked.

Appendix C Table 2. Completed Review Rate by Gender and Rank

| | Female | | Male | | Total | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Graduate Student /Post-Doc /Lecturer /Other | 16/33 | 48% | 8/19 | 42% | 24/52 | 46% |
| Assistant Professor | 27/46 | 59% | 18/39 | 46% | 45/85 | 53% |
| Associate Professor | 45/100 | 45% | 36/68 | 53% | 81/168 | 48% |
| Full Professor | 32/97 | 33% | 48/164 | 29% | 80/261 | 31% |
| Total | 120/276 | 43% | 110/290 | 38% | 230/566 | 41% |

Gender differences in reviewing contrast sharply with gender differences in appeals. Since November 28, 2011, I have received 33 appeals to reconsider editorial decisions. Thirty of the letters are from authors and three are from reviewers. Of the 30 unique cases, 5 appeals were for deflect decisions, 12 were for papers rejected after review and 13 were for papers rejected after a paper was reviewed, revised and re-reviewed. Appendix C Table 3 shows the distribution of appeals by gender and rank. The largest number of appeals come from assistant professors (45%) and men represent 70% of complainants. Men are more likely to appeal than women at every rank, but among full professors, men outnumber women by 8:1. These patterns are particularly surprising given the gender and rank distribution of submitting authors and reviewers.

Appendix C Table 3. Appeals to Editorial Decisions by Gender and Rank

| | Female | | Male | | Total | |
|---|--------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|
| | N | Percent (in rank) | N | Percent (in rank) | N | Percent (of total) |
| Graduate Student /Post-Doc /Lecturer /Other | 1 | 25% | 3 | 75% | 4 | 12% |
| Assistant Professor | 6 | 40% | 9 | 60% | 15 | 45% |
| Associate Professor | 2 | 40% | 3 | 60% | 5 | 15% |
| Full Professor | 1 | 11% | 8 | 89% | 9 | 28% |
| Total | 10 | 30% | 23 | 70% | 33 | 100% |

Appendix D

Full text of appeal to decision 2012-XXX.R1

This is the de-identified full text of the correspondence from a complainant who specifically asked that I pass her/his feedback along to the *Social Problems* Editorial Board.

Date: Tue, 28 May 2013 14:19:43 -0700
From: XXXX
To: Professor Becky Pettit <socprobs@uw.edu>
Subject: "Title" (#2012-XXX.R1)

Dear Professor Pettit:

I am writing to you about a paper you recently rejected: "Title" (#2012-XXX.R1). The paper is by AUTHOR a graduate student with whom I work in the department of sociology at UNIVERSITY. In brief, AUTHOR submitted his paper and it received an R&R on the basis of three sets of reviewer comments, one very critical. He worked very hard revising the paper according to their and your specifications. He submitted the revised paper and it was rejected even though all your chosen reviewers (including a new one) had only minor criticisms – as you yourself acknowledge in your cover letter. Instead of following the recommendations of the reviewers, you rejected the paper on the basis of the comments of an Associate Editor whose acidic style might suggest he or she had an axe to grind. Moreover, the new objections, far from being insurmountable, could have been addressed in a second round of revisions. Yet you refused to countenance that on the grounds that your policy is not to send papers back for a second R&R. This all seems both arbitrary and unfair. It is an abuse not only of the author but of the reviewers who spend much time reading and commenting on papers. Their views are ignored and they become superfluous to the process. I know being an editor can be a thankless task, but this is an unprofessional mode of operation, unbecoming of a journal of the status of *Social Problems*. I hope you will reconsider your decision.

Yours Sincerely, ADVISOR.

On 5/28/2013 3:41 PM, Becky Pettit wrote:

Dear ADVISOR,

Erin forwarded your note to me. Thank you for sending it. I hope that you are enjoying the beginning of Summer in the CITY. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.

I'm not exactly sure how to reply to your note. We take reviewer comments very seriously and we would like to believe that they are not only helpful for us in making decisions on manuscripts but also helpful for authors in revising their work for publication. In addition to the reviews provided to the author, reviewers also provide confidential comments to me, I solicit the advice of advisory editors, and I read every revised paper myself.

The decision not to invite 2nd R&Rs is one that was thoroughly discussed and unanimously recommended to me

by my associate editors. It is clearly articulated in all letters to reviewers of revised manuscripts.

I have seen no evidence that anyone involved in the review of any paper at Social Problems under my tenure has had an "axe to grind." We review over 400 manuscripts a year and I am constantly amazed at how generous and thoughtful reviewers are in providing valuable comments on the scholarship of others. We don't have the time or interest in engaging in personal attacks on authors, reviewers, or anyone in the discipline. In my view, that would be completely orthogonal to the task of editing. We view our role as helping to advance scholarship and publishing a very small amount of it in the pages of Social Problems.

I am very sorry that you have this impression of Social Problems and/or its editorial team which is currently being led by me. I will reflect on your assessments and discuss their implications with my editorial board when we meet at the SSSP meetings in August. The advice of reviewers is essential for our process as it not only informs our editorial decision-making but also provides authors valuable feedback. But ultimately, I have to make final decisions on papers and I take full responsibility for each and every one of those. I'd like to think that the process that we follow to come to those decisions is transparent and helps advance scholarship but I recognize that not everyone may feel the same about that. Nonetheless, I would be happy to discuss any aspect of our review process with you if you think that would be helpful. But as you must understand, I can not discuss the details of any specific paper with anyone other than the corresponding author of the paper.

All my best,
Becky

On Wed, May 29, 2013 at 6:18 AM, ADVISOR wrote:

Dear Becky,

Yes, these days are very beautiful here. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.

But to your letter. First, thank you for responding so quickly. I decided to write to you because I'm watching so many graduate students having a frustrating experience grappling with refereed journals in an ever more competitive market.

Take AUTHOR's case. He submits his article in March 2012, receives comments 6 months later in September, comments that encourage him to revise. He works on it for another 3 months and resubmits in November, and then receives a final rejection letter 6 months later. But the 3 reviewers (including a new one) say everything is now fine -- even if they say something else to you privately -- only now an associate editor, is summoned to condemn the MS for doing what the reviewers had told him to do. No response allowed. I'm sorry this is not a transparent process.

A young sociologist, struggling to forge a career, is being led up the garden path, first spending three months revising according to the recommendations of the reviewers, then waiting 6 months to hear that it is being rejected for doing what the reviewers wanted him to do -- reviewers who ostensibly agree that he did what they wanted him to do. And then to cap it off a hostile review is invoked to conclude the process with no more revisions possible.

It appears then that this paper was condemned from the beginning and should have been rejected rather than given an R&R. Either you cut the author off at the beginning or you encourage him to complete a solid paper. In this case -- and I've seen others -- you do neither. So the process appears unfair and arbitrary and the student is left clueless as to what he is supposed to do, except hope that the next journal will be less unfair and less arbitrary. This is not advancing scholarship but demoralization and despair. If you wish I can send these thoughts to your editorial board since I think there is a structural problem here.

Thank you very much for being willing to listen to me.

Best wishes, ADVISOR.

Dear ADVISOR,

Thanks for your thoughtful reply. I will share your message -- and the others I have received in the past two years -- with my editorial board this summer at the SSSP meetings. I will remove identifying information. I hope that doesn't dampen the impact of your message.

We've been thinking about how to manage the review process in a way that gives authors timely and hopefully useful feedback on their work. I'm not sure that we get it right every time but we follow the same procedures every time. I'd like to think that means that we don't preference (or disadvantage) particular areas of work, methodological approaches, or groups of scholars.

But, even the best intentions can sometimes have unanticipated consequences so we've been collecting data to evaluate exactly these issues. Hopefully we'll have something interesting to report at the SSSP meetings in August. If the Editorial Board believes that there are lessons from those data (including the information you provide in your letter) that might improve the review process at Social Problems, I will do my best to make it happen.

All my best,
Becky