Editorial Comment: The State of the Journal

by Steve Marson and Jerry Finn

During my first year in academia, I submitted my first manuscript to a scholarly/practice refereed journal. The manuscript came out of my MSW thesis from The Ohio State University. My thesis committee was delighted to see my first publication. For me, it was a self-actualizing experience.

Later, I acquired a copy of a document published by the National Association of Social Workers that included the acceptance/rejection rates for the major journals. I looked up the journal in which my manuscript appeared and was shocked to learn that the editorial board rejected 90% of the manuscripts. I was reading this statistic when a colleague walked into my office. I distinctly remember saying, “If I knew the rejected rate was 90%, I would have never submitted the manuscript.” If you are like me, do not read further. In this State of the Journal report, we are going to include a discussion of rejection rates. We are also going to address the process of manuscript review and the work of the board.

First, we will address the acceptance/rejection rate. Since the announcement of The Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics, 36 manuscripts have been submitted. Of these, six (6) have been published. This gives the journal an acceptance rate of 16%. According to the latest edition of NASW’s An Author’s Guide to Social Work Journals, the acceptance rate among most journals is between 5% and 15%.

Most of the manuscripts we receive are neither immediately accepted or rejected, but require further polishing by the author(s). The process of explaining to the author is straightforward, and all of our authors have accepted such criticism with an immediate revision.

A major internal conflict within us occurs when one reviewer immediately accepts the manuscript and the other reviewer immediately rejects it. We see a pattern. Practitioners and academic social workers have different world views of what should be published. This is NOT a new phenomenon! In an historical review of literature, we find the beginnings of a conflict in the 1929 Social Work Yearbook (to eventually become The Encyclopedia of Social Work). The difference in opinion between practitioners and academic social workers is not little, but great – even in 1929. Thus, we have been thinking about splitting the journal into halves; one section devoted to social work practice, while the other section would be devoted to areas of educational and academic interest. What do you think?

Since the journal’s inception, 6 practitioners and 20 academic social workers have agreed to serve on the editorial board. Two have resigned and two new members have joined. Currently, we are seeking more members to join. The work load is getting out of hand for the current members. As a result, we are seeking 5 to 10 more professionals to join the board. If you are interested, e-mail one of us at smarson@nc.rr.com (Steve) or jfinn2@comcast.net (Jerry) and we will send you a profile form.
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