



## **NCA Editor's Information Report**

To: NCA Legislative Assembly

From: Stephen M Croucher

Journal Title: Review of Communication

This report reflects the following period: August 1, 2023-October 1, 2024

### **MANUSCRIPT ACCEPTANCE/REJECTION RATE:**

- (1) Number of manuscripts received during this period: 107
- (2) Number of revised manuscripts received during this period: 12
- (3) Total number of manuscripts accepted for publication: 17
- (4) Number of manuscripts returned for revision and resubmission: 37
- (5) Number of manuscripts rejected: 41
- (6) Acceptance rate: [(3) divided by (1+2)]: 14.3%
- (7) Average days from submission to final decision: 46.4 days

### **EDITOR'S GOALS AND PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING THOSE GOALS:**

1. To work to make the *Review of Communication* more interdisciplinary, while still respecting its roots in Communication. As editor I recognize the strength and place of RoC within the field of Communication, I also recognize the importance of interdisciplinary readership for downloads, citations, and subscriptions. As an editorial team, we continue to receive inquiries and submissions from non-Communication academics, and more than 20% of our submissions have come from non-Communication researchers. Thus, we have made progress toward this goal.
2. Forum issue – One of my goals was to publish a forum issue each year. In the first year of my editorship this did not happen as all four themed issues were filled. All of our issues have been filled with peer-reviewed pieces.
3. Solicitation of pieces for issues – This not happened. Each issue has been filled with peer-reviewed pieces fitting the call for papers.
4. Varied methodological approaches –RoC has published a wide array of methodological and theoretical approaches. We have published pieces ranging from method validation, statistical analyses, to rhetorical analyses, to critical-cultural analyses. Thus, we are meeting this goal of publishing top-quality and methodologically diverse pieces.
5. It is a goal of mine that as editor I take all necessary steps to be inclusive, to ensure a welcoming, safe and respectful environment for all authors, reviewers, Editorial Board members, and participants in the *Review of Communication*. I believe this has been met. I have received numerous e-mails from authors (even those rejected) thanking me and the reviewers for clear and respectful reviews. In addition, the

review team at RoC is diverse. The team is made up of an international team representing many sexes/genders, nations, methodological and theoretical approaches, and practitioners are included. I have also shared with all regular reviewers the “Ten commandments of reviewing” by Mohan Dutta.

## **STRENGTHS:**

1. The editorial team at RoC. I currently work with two Associate Editors: Stephanie Kelly at North Carolina A&T and Uttaran Dutta at Arizona State University. Both bring wonderful knowledge and appreciation for research to RoC. In addition, each has diverse methodological and theoretical background, which enhances the reviewing and reach of RoC.
2. While the themed aspect of RoC seemed to be a bit of a challenge at first, it is a major strength of the journal. Our issues in 2023 were highly successful in terms of submissions and interest. Our themes in 2024 were less well received in terms of submission numbers: immediacy, dissent, and adaptation. However, our issues on critical/cultural methods, theory, and prejudice have been well received for 2025.
3. The average review time, except for a few outliers, has been relatively fast. We are looking at roughly 6 weeks for first decision or 4 weeks (with outliers removed). This is in large part due to highly reliable reviewers.
4. RoC has received manuscripts in this period from 20 nations including: China, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, and the United States. We have published pieces from New Zealand, Turkey, and the United States.

## **AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT:**

1. Finding appropriate reviewers for manuscript has been difficult. While we have been successful in finding reviewers for most pieces, it is very difficult to find reviewers for many manuscripts. Or many reviewers choose to review and do not return reviews at all. The recommend a reviewer tool from Routledge is often not helpful as it recommends people who have no experience in the area, and I can attest to how less than 10% of the ones chosen using this tool ever accept a review.
2. It would be good if the NCA would assist NCA journals is sending calls for papers automatically to members. As an official journal of NCA, such assistance would really increase the reach of our calls for papers.

## **DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION:**

After being chosen as editor, I recruited two associate editors to prioritize the diversity of the field's diversity. One of the associate editors is well-grounded in critical/cultural and deconstructing colonial structures, while the other associate editor is well-positioned in social scientific theories and methods. Their comments on developing themed issues have helped to raise crucial questions about the diversity of communication studies. In addition, the inclusion of these two associate editors has helped raise questions about reviewer selection. Moreover, when constructing the editorial board for RoC, the associate editors and I worked together to incorporate a wide array of reviewers from different methodological and

theoretical approaches, and we worked to ensure the board was diverse in terms of internationalization, sex/gender, and ethnicity/race. Finally, themed issues have and will continue to address the diversity and inclusiveness of communication as a discipline. In 2024 and 2025, we have issues coming out on critical/cultural methods and theories in communication.