

Publishing Global South Cases Transcript

00:01

Okay,

00:04

I believe Okay, now we are we are exporting your session. So, right.

00:11

Okay. Let us begin with the first question, which is about theoretical framing. So, probably this might be one of the most important question among all about questions we had. So, our question is a follow, how do you find bro this theoretical discussion that aligns well with your research and then portray to your audiences to value your finding? Maybe you've simplified this. In other words, how can you write a good introduction and the research review? So, Aaron, will be answered the question first. And then you know, I will introduce her very briefly, Erin Asia and Associated Press professor of sociology at the University of Notre Dame. She is currently chair of the sociology of development, she published the unit petricola, bias and polecat who bureaucratic effectiveness in developing state with Princeton University Press. This book focused on the case of Oregon bureaucrats, but also covered the UniProtKB faith in diversity in a global sales country. So Erin, it's your turn.

01:23

Thanks so much, John.

01:25

I think the way that I think about this question first is that it's kind of a a common challenge that everyone faces, which is many authors have to explain why they chose their particular case or their particular data. But often for people like us who do most of our research outside of the US or European context, we have this additional challenge of having to try to somehow situate the country, sometimes in readers minds. And even if we can abstractly understand why this happens, sometimes it can feel really annoying or hurtful in the review process to have to grapple with some of those. So I've been in different publishing panels where editors were asked how to deal with cases that were less common or less familiar to readers. And often editors didn't have a good answer for that, or they would say something kind of general, like, they get theoretically irrelevant. But I think without examples, or breaking down what that looks like, that can be kind of a hard thing to parse. So a big level, I want to say I think one of the things that often can be a struggle to work out as making sure that when you're trying to feel to an audience who may not care about your particular case, you want to make sure that the way that you're talking about your case is how do the qualities of your case illuminate something that's a bigger problem for knowledge or something we don't know about knowledge, sometimes people start and it's easier to think in the other direction, which is to say, like, I have a case I really care about. And oh, I can use the theory of new institutionalism, or the theory of raving social movements to explain my case. And that helps people who care about your case. But that doesn't convey what you're giving

back to people who may not share that same intrinsic interest in the case. So one of the things I put together for this panel out of my own curiosity that I'll share with you the links that Jiwon has prepared to share with everyone is I just went through and did a search of articles that have been published in the last 15 to 20 years that included a country name in the title or the abstract. That wasn't in North America. I Mexico, I put in the list, but not us, not Canada, not Western Europe, and just kind of looked through some of the things they do. And I think you see a handful of strategies come up again, and again, that is people arguing that they're the case is puzzling that there are qualities of this case that are not well explained by existing theory, that something about the case will help us sort out something we don't know, theoretically, for example, we maybe haven't been able to identify boundary conditions or confounding conditions in the existing theory, that the case is reflective of some broader trend that people might not have realized is as common as it is, I think Maggie makes a case for this when she talks in her recent work about students buying papers in Uganda that this idea of buying papers is surprisingly common around the world. And it's also an instance of a broader theoretical concern that we might all be concerned about. And then uses the case of Uganda to unfold that. You also see some of the cases outside of the West come into scholarship, because it's a site that is has something going on that is a pop an evidence of a popular scholarly interest. So right now Rwanda has the most female legislatures as a percentage of anywhere in the world. And so it's attracting some attention for people who want to understand what might happen to politics when you had greater female representation. It's a really important case for that. And then sometimes you also see people in collaboration with some of these other strategies, but making the case that we can get unusually good data, their data that maybe

05:00

Isn't obtainable elsewhere. So for example, in Brazil, there's incredible rich data that they have on their bureaucracy that in the US, we just do not have that level of access into an understanding at a granular level about what public servants are doing similar things with the research on conditional cash transfer programs in Mexico and Brazil, some people who run field experiments, sometimes there are data sources, either that the person themselves has collected, or that by virtue of the way the country itself collects data are available there that just absolutely are unrivaled in terms of what they can help us do. And when those are hooked into a question that people can recognize as relevant to an area of scholarly discussion, that can be a really powerful reason to

05:43

explain to people who might not have heard or thought about that country, why, nevertheless, data and information on that country is important and theoretically relevant to them. So I have a little set of those tricks and tips and then some excerpts from a bunch of articles that have done that, that are kind of annotated to help give people a little roadmap that I thought might be helpful that I can share afterwards.

06:05

Um, well, I was thinking about, I think

06:09

I was one thing that might be helpful to add is sort of like, what you like what process I think at least I go through and thinking about the theoretical framework, so.

06:22

And, you know, as I was preparing for this seminar, I was thinking about how I draw on colleagues who are more or less familiar with my cases for different parts of the research process. And for me, at least, the process of coming up with a theoretical framing is often a case in which I really draw on conversations with people who are interested in similar topics, but who don't have as much local expertise, because I think that that process of talking across across cases can really help to illuminate some of the broader relevance of my findings. So it's often a time where I will have lunch or coffee with somebody who sort of works in a similar topic area, but not in Uganda, or in Malawi, or wherever I happen to be focused. So that's one sort of practical tip. And then the other point that I would like to make is, at least personally, I find that often the theoretical framing, you know, I start with sort of this is this, this finding is really interesting. And then the specific theoretical framing kind of emerges over time as I present it, and share it with other people. So I think like having that iterative feedback loop with people can be really helpful for this stage.

07:36

Okay, so I'm trying to, you know, the intuitive, you know, panelists do not get in the middle of a conversation. So, it can be, you know, feel a little weird about, you know, please, you know, understand that Margaret, is also worked as a good author shape to be the progenitor of sociology at University of Michigan, and she served as a council member of our section between 2018 and 2021. Going to her work, as you know, the Aaron mentioned, you know, the about imbalance student and that you can't that student population, the American Journal of Sociology and American, sociological liberal. So thank you for sharing your note your your SR, Erin, and background. Alright, and then, Holly and Louise, you and your daughter, any one of you want to add something to that question about theoretical framing? Okay, Holly, your floor is yours.

08:32

Yeah, I just, I think what, what, both what Aaron and Maggie said, were very useful. But I think what Maggie said about being in conversation with others who are working on similar topics, and different caught local contexts, I think is quite useful. And that's the main thing I get out of conferences actually is, you know, being on a panel with people who are coming from,

08:55

you know, different contexts presenting work about a similar topic, which is usually what your, you know, conference session is, and I find that that's extremely useful for sort of developing the theoretical linkages across those different cases, and why why my particular case might, might fit in? Well, and I think you should always take advantage of those sorts of networks that you build at conferences, I feel like that's very helpful for as you're working towards getting things published. And you have then this network of colleagues that you've found at conferences who can really serve as a sounding board on some of these things. And, and, you know, you'll, you'll probably run into them again and again, right, and it's sort of a nice network to have throughout your career. And, you know, now I find as a journal editor that I call on them to do be reviewers, right. So, you know, you sort of your relationship may change over time, but I think that's all for the good so yeah,

10:00

I would, I would, I would second what Maggie said.

10:04

Great. So Holly is Holly to work as a professor of sociology at Queens College, can you say the University of New York, and then the Lord, she's, you know, the she she is also you're currently you know, the editor in chief of the international migration of your repute, so she can share, you know, the insight as an editor. And then also I want to highlight that she's also council member of our section and the reader, the graduate students Career Development Initiative. With with me, so EPR graduate, you know, Section member, and they want to talk about anything about the section, please reach out to us. So, really, do you want to add the you know, the your thoughts for the university itself? You don't need to but do you have a you know, something to share?

10:56

I mean, I guess I can just quickly share that I think I agree a lot with what Maggie and Holly said about, you know, sharing your

11:05

your research with non-country experts. I feel like as

11:10

when I was in grad school, I feel like my early thoughts, my immediate thoughts, when I started studying corruption cases in Brazil was I need to talk to experts in Brazil to make sure that I understand this case correctly, like, am I? Am I an alien is Am I understanding

11:24

it? Well, and I think that that has certain benefits. And I'm going to talk a little bit about that later on as well. But I quickly realized that I was getting more important feedback from people who had no idea about Brazil or about

11:39

anything that was going on in my specific case. So yeah, I just wanted to highlight I guess that sharing

11:45

your work even early on before or doing field work with people who do not know the country at all, can be super helpful in terms of figuring out what exactly is the theoretical contribution that you can make, these are the people who have studied similar concepts, but in very different contexts.

12:03

Thank you very recently, currently you and a postdoc fellow at the Center for Inter American politics and research at a Tulane University. And then she will be joining Bowdoin College as an assistant professor soon. And then he is also currently the council member of our section and the Chief Research on project the bureaucrats. And they've been published the institutional problems and the mobilization to Louisa, thank you for you know, you're mentioning about that, you know, discussing

earlier about because, you know, second, the question I want to address is what is about, you know, research design? So, second question, what we prepared? If this, though, what specific challenge do you expect when designing, you know, the global south cater study? And then what do you do? manage them? So, in other words, how can you write a, you know, good research plan that can be used as the introduction of your article? So, Maggie, do you want to, you know, start

13:09

answering this question.

13:11

Sure. Yeah. Thank you, everyone. So, I was trying to think I mean, this could launch us into an entire separate panel about research, design issues, and fieldwork challenges. So, in order to try to avoid that, I thought that I would focus my commentary on issues related to research design that I think show up later when thinking about publishing your results. So specifically, things that can create issues around publishing and writing up results. So the first kind of bundle of challenges that I think are unique to research in the Global South, is around collaboration. So

13:51

I think probably many of us will agree that it's, it's really important to think about involving people from the local communities and contexts in which you are doing research and contributing to professional development and, and opportunities, especially in places that have limited employment opportunities.

14:08

One thing that I've sort of come to realize over time having, you know, done fieldwork in, in data collection for I don't know, 10, between 10 and 15 years,

14:18

is that

14:20

it the way the sort of the extent to which something is professionally useful, varies a lot across contexts. And the kind of marketability of different opportunities is really context specific. So for instance, in my experience with, you know, publishing my research on Uganda, at first, I had offered the opportunity to be a co author thinking that that would be a really good opportunity for my local collaborators who were research assistants.

14:52

And it became sort of it became clear that that was actually for their career stage and in their professional context, that was less

15:00

Have a useful credentialing

15:03

outcome than being able to say that they had managed a project that they had collected these data and also reporting back to the local community about findings that are relevant to them. And so over time, and through conversations, I sort of pivoted from thinking about collaboration in terms of the metrics that I'm used to and try to, to move towards their metrics. So that's one thing to think about.

15:27

And also, the demands on time are often hard to understand from the outside. So the university system, in Uganda, there's a lot of ways in which people are busy in ways that don't translate very well to my experience as a university professor in the United States. So, you know, consulting projects,

15:47

other kinds of demands that take up a lot of time, and can be hard to know from the outside. So in terms of thinking about local collaboration, it's also really important to just sort of try to get a sense of what the rhythm of time commitments is, in different contexts and what kind of availability people have.

16:07

So that's the first set of challenges. The second is around

16:11

ethics. So one of the things that I find the most challenging is that there are different ethical issues that feel more or less salient in different international contexts, but that our system for managing ethics is all very US based.

16:25

And so it can that produces two types of problems. One is that it can sometimes be hard to translate the kind of legalistic system of US ethics to people who are, you know, doing interviews or filling out your questionnaires or things like that. And the other is that things that are important in that context can be hard to make sure that you're paying attention to because of the way that our IRB is structured. So for instance,

16:50

somebody that I think is really important to the local community in Malawi that I worked with in was

16:57

dissemination of results and kind of reporting back to the community that really doesn't show up in the IRB process very much, and can sometimes be challenging to do during the data collection project, because you have to think about, you know, confidentiality, and things like that. So, dissemination to the community and sort of fitting that into the fieldwork process can be challenging. And then also, there's less of an emphasis culturally, in some places that I've worked on anonymity. And so thinking about like, Oh, I'm only going to use a pseudonym, I'm never going to mention you. It's like, Well, why not? Why can't you you know, why, and then, you know, sort of realizing that they would actually prefer that I list them by name, because they want their commentary to be recognized by people.

17:41

And so just sort of thinking about how to work within this structure in which even IRB systems that are located in different countries often use the system that has emerged from the US and have a very western centric way of thinking about protecting research subjects.

17:59

And then the third set of issues that I was going to talk about is translation issues.

18:05

So

18:07

I think we've probably all had experiences where ideas that we have for questions or topics to study just don't really have the same meaning in the context that we're studying them as we expect. So a good example is that when I was working in Uganda, with the population that I'm working with there for my study, as university graduates, and I was really interested in asking them questions about like work life balance, and how they were thinking about their careers and having children.

18:33

And it's just not, the salience of that topic isn't the same as in the US, because childcare is really easily available, it's very cheap, you can bring your babies into the workplace. It's just much more fluid way of having children and kind of integrating them into your professional life. And so one, it's sort of like, not only was the words are different, but also just the salience of the issue socially was really different.

18:59

And so I would say that, you know, the best two ways to manage that would be to pilot often do a lot of preliminary data collection projects that don't always show up in your final data collection.

19:11

Avoid using skills or questionnaires that are designed for Western studies.

19:15

Although I know that's hard for certain quantitative projects, if you want to have like the same question asked in different countries

19:22

and then the importance of really treating field notes as data themselves. So I think Jenny tryna toppling is really a great example of that a lot of her work that comes out of her Malawi data collection is actually from the field notes that she collected as part of the collection of a longitudinal survey. So kind of treating those moments of translation slippage, as as opportunities to collect additional data. So those are my thoughts on that question. Thank you for your great any any panelist want to react to the idea add to what Megan said.

19:57

Yeah, kind of. Okay. I see.

20:01

I think first, I mean, before we go into the challenges, I also just wanted to briefly state that, you know, I would encourage you all to think a lot about the unique opportunities that studying the designer case that in the global south would bring you to. So for example, Aaron mentioned in the beginning of how Brazil has this, like amazing, fine grained data in the bureaucratic apparatus that can allow researchers transferred some kind of new questions compared to the US or even other Western countries. And in my case, for example, Brazil was able to meet to interview law, a lot of high level prosecutors, the attorney general that I think that most people wouldn't have access to in the US or in other countries. So I would also be very like, yeah, I definitely encourage you to think about what are the unique opportunities that doing research on Country X, Y, or Z would bring to you and which kind of data it might allow you to collect that might otherwise be unavailable if you're studying this in the US context or in other Western countries. But to go back to the original question of challenges, I think, first and foremost, it's important to stress that, you know, it's okay for this to be a difficult thing. I think we all go through this process of trying to figure out like whether this is the case or not, and how is this helpful or not for me?

21:15

And I think going back to the earlier question, the most important thing really is to be thoughtful about why you chose that case. And in particular like how that case enables you to make if you had a contribution, so why that case is periodically relevant. And as Erin mentioned before, there's a lot of different reasons that can make a case theoretically relevant. For example, sometimes the case is interesting, because it simply cannot be explained by dominant theories, which are sometimes typically built from Western cases. So for example, in one of my papers, my case was task forces of prosecutors investigating high level corruption. So just comparing different task forces. And I frame this as a case of state effectiveness, because this case cannot be explained by previous explanations that focus either on political will or on bureaucratic capacity. So you know, while most of the previous literature focused on explaining variation between different state organizations, going to Brazil, allow me to compare task forces embedded in the same organization, and then therefore, look at variation within variation of performance within the same state organization.

22:19

But it could also be, for example, that your case just happens to give you really good data about something or that allows you to look at a new outcome that prior studies had neglected, because they were focused on other locations, or to study allow for just testing the mechanism, I think whatever it is, it is really helpful to think about it first, and then goes going back to that point as well about running your ideas, with people who might not know a lot about your country to figure out whether you're framing this in a way that could be theoretically fruitful.

22:48

Going forward.

22:51

I think relatedly one thing that can help as well is to write some sort of a pre analysis plan. I think that has become really common for people who do quantitative analysis, and specifically experiments. But I personally think it's also pretty valuable for people who are involved in work, too. And I ended up doing qualitative work as well. And essentially, a pre analysis plan is the front end of a paper. So basically, like an introduction, a background and a hypothesis section or hypothesis in your data and methods.

23:19

And I like doing that, because I think it really forces you to think deeply about, like, what is just a case off? And how does it enable me to make a theoretical contribution to a given body of literature. And I know that like with qualitative studies, you know, we typically don't go to the field to test hypothesis and things can change, you might find unexpected things when you actually are collecting data in the field. But I still think that having a pre analysis plan can be really helpful because at least it forces you to familiarize yourself with literature, you can engage with it to understand what prior studies are saying, so that we can reflect even if things change when you go to the field, how can you reposition yourself to still make a meaningful theoretical contribution?

24:01

And I think finally, another thing that I think can work well, is, especially for, you know, when early on in grad school, and for people who are struggling to figure out like, I don't really quite know what to make sense of this case, or like what which to basically contribute to, I think that it also helps to pick cases that are empirically interesting. So I will admit that when I first starting, you know, studying the carwash prosecutions in Brazil is a series of high level corruption scandals. I will send my first year of grad school did not quite know how but the theoretical contributions that that kids would allow me to make. But it was the biggest thing going on in Brazil at the moment and all the questions

24:41

that were popping up in the political arena, you know, we prosecute something convictions with his convictions be overturned by higher courts where prosecutors politically motivated those were the biggest issues that were going on in the country at the time. And I figured like, even if I don't quite know how I'm going to position this case, theoretically, I feel like has generated a lot of empirical animus

25:00

that could play in my favor as well. So I think that picking cases that are empirically interesting, could also help going forward through the in the publication process.

25:12

Entirely. I think it's really good. Oh, yeah. Aaron, I go ahead.

25:18

I just want to add the to me, this is a moment to loop back around and what Maggie brought up to that those conversations with people who don't know your case, can be really important before you go into the field as well, because it can be important to get exposed to the idea that the average American or the average person who doesn't know this case might think a, b, and c are important and might need me reviewers might in the future asked me to provide evidence that addresses those elements. And if

you don't have that in your head, before you go into the field, because a lot of this involves going, you know, a \$2,000 plane ride 18 hours away, it's not easy to collect that data later, if in the review process, someone brings it up. So flushing some of that out before you get into the field can also be really helpful at a super early stage.

26:08

Let's see, yeah, I think that's great. If it is unlike, you know, gathering your data.

26:14

Like, you know, as much as possible before that, you know, the conducting research, I think that's another thing. I wish I had known, you know, before, though, in terms of, you know, read picking your notes yet. And I also, you know, what I recommended, you know, they're all the participants here, you pick up a crap ton, it's totally fine. You know, bring your pet with the, you know, the specific research agenda you are working on. So I think we do have a time to do that. And then I think it's a good timing to move on to our third question about selecting empirical evidences, more data is always very helpful. But you needed to make, you know, decision. So how do you choose the most relevant, you're going to get empirical details to present your case, the background, you know, section, and then also, you know, the finding section, I always found the, it's very hard to like, you know, there, I felt like, part of me feel like, I needed to explain everything, but I know, people will not be, you know, super patient about them. So, Holly DENTSPLY, you know, here OCIO, you know, the introduces some example, as a, you know, from the perspective as the editor, to Holly, are you ready to share anything? You have? Yes, yeah. Thank you, John. I

27:44

think, you know, in my position as an editor now, there's some typical pitfalls that I see when people are submitting their manuscripts. And one of the major reasons that, I mean, you know, if you're, if you're an editor at a very top tier journal, you get hundreds of manuscripts every year. And obviously, most of them cannot be even sent to external review, just because of volume. So you want to get past that hurdle, I think is the main thing as an author as at least get into review. Right, then you have the opportunity to respond to reviewers. And in general, so the things that, you know, one of the major reasons that I wind up desk rejecting papers, and I don't think it's only a global south issue, frankly, I think it's it happens a lot in global North papers as well, is because they're too narrowly focused on their own specific case, and they're not connecting with the broader literature. They're not making that theoretical connection, or even an empirical connection with other cases. Right. So they, they're not saying what they're adding, what's new, and the sections that they have on local context? Well, you know, we all love our cases, right? We're all very wedded to them. We're interested in what we're studying. But you got to think who you're talking to the broader readership of the journal. And I find that a lot of times these local context sections are very long. They're not clearly linked to the literature to the analysis. Why are you telling me about these things? Right, what is the point of this wonderful history and context of, you know, whatever this country is, right? I want to know why, why I as a reader should care about it. And so you have to really make a clear argument that links every section of the paper,

29:34

to the argument to the story that you're trying to tell.

29:39

I think local context doesn't have to be a separate section all the time. You can really successfully integrate it into either your lit review or your theory section, or in some cases, even into the data and methods, right? If it's, if it's a unique case in terms of the data, right, maybe that's where you want to focus in

30:00

Um, wherever you think readers are going to have that question of why should I care? Right? That's where you want to link your context. If your content and sometimes, you know, if you're contributing to a literature that

30:15

is only present in one country or region, for some reason, right? It might seem very repetitive, right? So you might not want to have a local context section that's separate. So an example of this.

30:27

You know, I wouldn't say this is entirely only in the US, right. But I see a lot of papers about sanctuary cities and policies toward undocumented immigrants in the US, right. And that's not necessarily a literature that has globalized as much as some other literature's, for example. So in that case, you know, you might not need a section that's separate. But I thought I might show just one or two examples of from our Journal recently, where people were really good at motivating using this local context section. So let me see if I can share my screen here and show you the recent article that was published in our general international migration review. And it was called Why do citizens criminalized migrants, experimental evidence from a multi-role country Mexico, and what they mean by that is that Mexico is, in addition to being sending country of migrants, as we all know, it is also now a receiving country of migrants from mostly from Central America and South America. And it's also a transit country, right for those migrants who are trying to make their way north to US and Canada. And so, and also for migrants from around the world, right, who are also trying to cross the US border, and, and other roles as well, in terms of Mexico becoming a country of deportation, just like the US so. So this, let me just scroll down and show you here. There's this nice little section right before the fear theory section, which talks about Mexico as a multi multi-role country. And it explains the brief history of migration and Mexico, it talks about some of the recent trends in terms of how Mexico has evolved into this multi role country, which is an important theoretical framing of migration countries in the migration system across the world, right. And then talks about why this is important, right? Mexico's distinctive role in global migration, the transformative impact of immigrants within its borders, and the mounting pressure that reception countries enforce on multi-role countries to retain immigrants render it a critical case study. For those interested in comprehending global migration. Bam, there's your sentence, right? This tells me exactly as a reader, why I should care about this and why I should continue reading this. And then they go on to talk about how the importance of skin tone, national origin and criminalization and we have this whole literature in the US about crema Gration and criminalization of immigrants. And this, this is really contributing to that literature in a new way, and bringing a new case to that. So that's, I think, I think this is the type of thing that you want to try to do is to situate your case, and make it really relevant for the reader. Even if they're not familiar with that particular case. Um, maybe I'll stop there,

because I don't want to take over too much time. And I'll see if anyone else has some things they want to say.

33:40

Great, thank you for providing very, you know, your concrete example. But you know,

33:46

what, what's a good example look like? And then leave your well thought rescue to do something. Similar question on that issue. So a little hope of I hope, you know, the holy address did some of your, you know, your credits, and but if you're still wondering about how to do so, maybe we can revisit your question after you know, dia, for more, you know, your q&a. So does anyone want to react? Okay, Eric, to jump in on that, too. So,

34:17

I'm on the same page as Holly Fisher. And I have a couple examples. I'll show too, but I think I'll just admit that I'm someone who overwrites everything. Like when I when I started cutting words for what became my ASR. It was above 25,000 words, and I got it down below 15,000. I think by like, I mean, just a sweated blood in the process. And I think some of that is good. I mean, it's qualitative work, and it's hard to put your work forward when it's qualitative. So to Libya's question about how you give context without exhausting word limits, and you give the example of Dilma Rousseff, I think pretty much anytime you use a name, you should expect to have to explain what that thing is whether

35:00

Read is the name of an organization or the proper name of a person. And so one question that sometimes you have to engage in is like, is this a critical player, then you're gonna have to explain who they are. And if it's not, sometimes you just want to say,

35:14

you know, Chief Economist and former president, beloved, blah, blah, blah. And that may be the way to convey to people what's going on?

35:23

I think for me, my process is something like, I always think I want to thread the needle between what would be insightful for an expert in this area, or that might be a role that you can mentally cast your advisor in. If you're a grad student, I always used to think, What could I say that Jim Mahoney would find insightful, but I also want it to be sensible to my mother, and I'm a first generation college student. My mother did not go to college. She does not know who Dilma Rousseff is, she will never go to Brazil. And trying to think about how can I write with those two tensions in mind, is often a productive space for me to think in. And sometimes it flushes out some things that are I'm going to say, genuinely challenging to thread that needle on. So in writing my work, sometimes I realized early on that to me, as someone who is used to going around public sectors in Ghana, I totally understood and I took for granted that everyone would understand why it is completely remarkable that 100% of staff came to work early and stayed late. Like that is an astonishing thing in an African public sector. But when I told white Americans that they were like so and so to have to thread that needle of I want to be authentic

and respectful to the people who I'm dealing with in the field. But I also want to make sure that the people who have not gone to Ghana understand what's noteworthy about what's going on. And so that is another moment where those mental discussions or actual discussions are important. The way that I grapple with jawans question about the need to explain everything is I just keep a cuttings and future ideas file, it's a lot harder for me to take something out if it just disappears. So if I put it into a little file, and I say, if I want to do that later, I can come back to that I give myself permission to come back to that if I later want, it often will help take things out. I also, I forced myself through an exercise kind of, it's how I achieve what Holly just told you to do, which is like let everything have a purpose. And I label in the margin next to every paragraph. At the end of this paragraph. I want my reader to be persuaded that or to think to feel and I write whatever the answer is. And if I don't have an answer, I can write in the margin to the paragraph that connects in a clear and compelling way to the central purpose of my project. It has to go. If I can't make that strong case for why that content has to be there. I think it has to go and then I've got a couple examples that I'll share that kind of maybe briefly add to

37:48

what Holly was showing that are fun that document I mentioned that I'm happy to share with you guys later. So this is from

37:58

D'souza Laos recent piece doing a comparative analysis of conditional cash transfers in Mexico and Brazil. So she sets us her central goal, this idea about why and how projects of legibility differ, or what the effects of the different projects on the capacity of states intervene. So to me that sets the stage for we need some information, you cannot assume that everyone knows about Bolsa Familia or progressive even though there are very famous programs now that a lot of people have increasingly written about. So she curates in the introduction, some context that helps people understand how these two cases are appropriate as a comparative analysis of that kind of project. That's a little bit different. This is this is the second paragraph of my intro for a piece that I wrote about conciliatory states. And here, the idea is making the case for why Ghana is an exception to what we think we know in existing theory. So I'm going to provide the kind of background information that runs contrary to the theory, it's not going to be everything, I'm not going to name every single ethnic group, I won't be talking about all of their cultural practices. But I'm going to try to compile a set of evidence that suggests that although existing theory thinks ethno linguistic diversity should have a host of negative outcomes, not all African states were doomed by the diversity that they inherited in the post European conquest. And that Ghana is in fact, by most measurements, the 12th most diverse country in the globe, but lots of things are going well there. And so that boils down tons of history in a very small space, but it's something that people need to know to understand why this case is puzzling and why it's therefore worth reading about, because it will help reflect something you will know something not only about Ghana, but it will help you think differently about the effect of ethno linguistic diversity broadly.

39:49

It looks like we have a question. Do you want to do we want to ask just to put his question out now if it's relevant to the topic we're having now

40:00

Yeah, yeah, I think when you know, our you know, their main goal is having a, you know, the open conversation. So Chad, do you want to, you know, address your question first and then I also see Maggie raise your hand. So, Jada first then Matthew, okay. Okay, very, very quick. It's, I, when I had to say is basically a coda to what Aaron was just saying that is

40:27

what is the answer? You establish cadex by answering the question, Why did you do this study?

40:36

And, and I mean, that's the sort of like the short, the short version? That's what I came up with, sort of thinking about this whole panel during during the presentation Anyway, that's all I have to add at this point. Not much. But I mean, obviously, you're talking about

40:55

try tried to shorten the, the comment, so. And I had to leave it in about five, five minutes. I'm sorry. But

41:04

thanks. I'm sorry, I have to leave. But thanks for joining us. That's what you.

41:14

Okay, Maggie? Yeah, I just had one quick additional thing on the context section, which is that I often save it for the last thing I write. And the reason for that is because I often have the best idea of like, what pieces of the context needs to be put in place for people to understand my results, if I have the rest of the paper really well laid out. And also, I try to jot down all of the questions about the case that people asked me when I talk about the project as I'm writing it, because those questions are often what you have to answer. So it's not like everything about universities or everything about relationship contexts. But it's the specific things that people need to have a sense of in order to follow your argument. And those often come out. As you can see, I think this is similar to the thing I said before about talking to colleagues, but often those conversations can help you figure out what questions need to be answered. So I recommend procrastinating on the content section.

42:15

I think I just want to underscore one, how often that idea of talking to other people is coming up because I think it is a a brave and scary thing to expose your ideas before they are perfectly fully baked and fully formed to other people's feedback. But part of what's coming out again and again and again, is how generative that is if you can be brave enough to share your your ideas at early stages in various stages, you will benefit enormously from those conversations. So I just want to tie that together as a strategy that just keeps on giving. But I recognize that it's scary.

42:51

Highly, you're

42:54

probably Yeah, I would like to make a you know, your frequent news. Yeah, I'll be very brief. But I just like to third that, I guess our second thought because I think, especially as younger scholars, we're kind of afraid to put our stuff out there. And you have to write at conferences, but you can also do it in informal ways. And, you know, that might be with your graduate student colleagues and a working group. But we continued that actually, when I was a junior assistant professor right in my in my department, and we had a working group just like that, and it was the most helpful even though we all come from different

43:28

parts of sociology, we were really supportive of each other and helping each other to narrow down these types of questions about, you know, how can this person who works on organizational sociology understand this other person's work on, you know, state formation or whatever it is? Right. Like, I think those things are important, right? So work across those little boundaries within sociology as well. I think that's really helpful.

43:58

Thank you. I think, you know, the, I'd love to, you know, come back to this issue, because that's something you know, I have all the way to wonder to you that personally, but I'm really glad to see that you guys have so many thoughts and then beriberi practical tips on the issue. So last question, while we prepare the today is about you know, the negotiating with you. So you did your best you came up with the you know, the greater research design and the great teachers case, a justification that some reviewer and editor they want, you know, still don't agree with you with your NHL framing. So in that case, how do you respond to reviewer or editor to skill question, you're focused on the Unicode rather, how can you write a good discussion section or response to a letter? So any panelists want to react to it earlier?

45:00

Question of first?

45:04

Yeah, I'm happy to, I'm happy to share your thoughts here. Thank you. Thank you.

45:11

I'll first say that like, and that goes back to leave us question as well. I mean, sometimes what happens is the review is not necessarily that, you know, the reviewers don't agree, or they, you know, don't like your case, but that they need sometimes more information or information that you hadn't provided in the in the first submission. And I share with you just constantly, like, there's only, there's only a finite amount of words that you can put in the paper, right. So one thing that I think can be helpful as well, I think, specifically for manuscripts that might need, you know,

45:45

that might require more words, is to also use user online attendance, if you have to a lot of journals will allow you to do that. And for example, I had a paper recently under review on social forces, and it was a mixed methods paper that use quantitative and qualitative data. And reviewers were asking all these

questions about my case in Brazil, about the paper was about like how social movements on corruption were affected the way judges were making decisions. And they wanted to know a lot about the movements, why I selected these cases, they wanted to know about, you know, the criminal trials, how the justice system works in Brazil. And I was like, Well, how can I fit all this information in 10,000? Words, like, how can I make this fit? And the answer was like, I could not I could only move, I could address part of it in the actual manuscript, but part of it just had to be moved to an online appendix with a lot of, you know, information about why did I choose these two cases? Or like, how does the how does the criminal trial work in Brazil, or all these kinds of details that the reader might need to fully understand the paper, but you might not necessarily need to explain in full detail in the actual manuscript. So I would definitely encourage using that space, if, if that's a possibility.

46:53

And I think in terms of the review process, the most important thing is trying to understand sometimes what exactly is annoying reviewers, because there can be a couple of different things going on.

47:04

Sometimes, you know, reviewers may understand and kind of like your case, but they don't agree with your interpretation of what is the case off. So sometimes it's a matter of understanding like, what exactly is the only reviewers? And how can I change that in a way that isn't compromising what I wanted to say, but at the same time can appease the concerns that were being raised in the review process.

47:24

I think another possibility that at least I have encountered before as well, is that is not the reviewer, you know, disagrees with how you're positioning the case in the body of literature, but they think you're not characterizing the case properly. For example, I happen to study a kid who was highly controversial, the series of corruption prosecutions. And I noticed early on when I first started sending things out, that I was getting some really snappy comments from viewers because it was inadvertently using certain words that had a connotation beyond what I was trying to say, for example, when I was calling prosecutors effective, and I use the word effectiveness, in part because it was framing this as a case of state effectiveness. So when do state organizations manage to perform effectively, especially when they're embedded in weak states, but some of yours that was, for some of the viewers, that was really jarring, because they thought that, you know, the work of prosecutors, criminalizing corruption in Brazil was the worst thing that happened in the country. And he contributed to like, you know,

48:22

the Democratic instability, and he brought a lot of negative consequences. So in this case, was about of clarifying, you know, by effectiveness, I did not mean that I agreed with prosecutors or that I thought that work was positive, but simply that they managed to achieve the goals we had, irrespective of what the normative implications of that is. And I think by bringing this clarification, as well as giving more voice to scholars and practitioners who are critical of my case, I think really helped persuading reviewers and getting across

48:51

the finish line.

48:54

And finally, I think a third possibility

48:58

is not necessarily that the reviewer disagrees with her case.

49:03

But that just didn't provide, you know, enough information for why the case is valuable. I think.

49:09

Some people have the tendency, and I used to do that, too, in the beginning of grad school, which was to bury the case as much as possible. I think when I first started studying Brazil, when I, you know, and I was insecure about like, How can I publish articles in Brazil, in generalist journals or in journals that would publish mostly us in non western cases, my first instinct was, well, let me try to bury this as, almost as if I was trying to, like, hide a dead body, like your case is not that by you should like approach it positively. So you know, I was trying to like write interviews, introduction sections in a way that was really theoretical and really broad. And you introduce all these concepts, and then like, you drop a tiny little second at the end, by the way, I use the case of Brazil to test all these theories. And that was really jarring for our viewers because they were like, well, we don't know nothing about the scale. It didn't explain to us why, why it's good or why it is directly relevant or why it is important. So I think in a way, it's all

50:00

So a question of approaching the case positively and really highlighting why this is a great case. And instead of kind of like hiding behind the case, and not not giving enough information, to have reviewers make sense of why this is a meaningful case.

50:21

But yeah, I mean, but basically, overall, I guess my broader point being that there's a lot of different things that reviewers can dislike or disagree with, with the case selection process, but I think it's really important to pay attention to what exactly is the problem? And how can you best address that in the review process in a way that can appease these concerns without necessarily

50:43

altering what you wanted to argue in that paper?

50:48

Holly coy. Yeah.

50:51

Yeah, I wanted to just pick up on a few of the things Louise said, I think those are all like extremely excellent advice. And, in particular, I find that the thing that people find it very hard to write the

discussion section, right, sort of the last part of the paper, which is not the findings, it's really the so what and why do we care and what's next, right. And I actually found this in my own research. One of one of my most cited papers, was published in demography, which is typically not a paper that, at least in the past, had not published much outside of us cases. And my paper was about South Africa and internal migration and how it increased in South Africa, even before the end of apartheid. And the editor at the time was a migration guy, luckily. But he, he was a US person, he had studied the great migration in the US. And so in my discussion section, I was relating the findings that I had in South Africa, to things like the floating migrant population in China and the

52:07

migration across the Mexico US border. And he, he wanted me to also include a paragraph talking about how it related to the great migration of America, African Americans from the South to the North, the United States. And I was a little bit hesitant because I didn't see the exact connection, I felt like it was stretching it a bit. And at the time, I was, you know, not sure if I should do this. But then I thought about it some more. And I thought, well, you know, it's a it's a concession, right? It's sort of what Luis was saying, like, in some ways, sometimes you have to make a little bit of a concession to the reviewers, and order or the editor in order to get something published, right. Not to not to compromise your values, or your beliefs or integrity about the case, but to make a little bit of a concession to reach out a little more and make a connection. And now that I actually look back at that paper, I realized that it's actually it was a very small sacrifice. But it was also a smart part of that editor to suggest this because more people read this paper because of that, right? Because they saw this linkage to their own work, and things that they might be interested in, in the unit in the US case. And, you know, I'm not saying this is always the right way to go. But I think sometimes if you can make that paper very relevant for a broader audience in some small way, then you may find that it becomes a really important and cited paper. And I think that's something to keep in mind.

53:49

Every day, I just want to

53:53

I double down on everything he said. But I also want to invite you all to join my my quiet little social moment, which is now when I review Western papers, I ask questions like, but how would this work in Pakistan? And would this also be true in Nigeria? Because I just think Americans need to know what that's like and get used to the idea that sometimes their case is the weird case. And so I invite you all to join me in delighting in that exercise, and it, it often is really good. And the other thing that I'll admit, I have no idea what Hollywood think of this as an editor. But when I did my response, I've got absolutely zero questions about Africa or African states have lots of questions about Europe. One of the things I looked at and pointed out in my response letter was it in the last 30 years, there have been more articles published in ASR on one policy, the new deal than anything, anywhere in any country in Africa. And to me, that's a problem and so drawing attention to the fact that like that there could be some unevenness in the application, I think is worth doing.

54:57

I love that

55:00

Okay, Maggie, I see I saw you, you know, raise your hand approach to and we have a question for you. Those are three But Maggie up. Yeah, just real quick. i Yeah, in some ways it's sort of echoing what Aaron was just saying. I think that making small concessions is really important during the publication process. But I also think that sometimes you can politely stand your ground. So for instance, like sometimes I've had reviewers pushback on like, Well, why, why Malawi? Why not, you know, Zambia, or Zimbabwe. And to me, that's like, too far, like, I shouldn't need to justify that it's the perfect place in the world to study something. That's, and so I just sort of politely I just kind of ignore those kinds of questions. And then say something like, I added more context about why this is a particularly interesting question. And not anything about like, why it's the perfect spot in the world. So there are certain ways in which I refuse to justify my cases. And I think that it's okay to push back sometimes when reviewers go too far in questioning why they should read something outside of the US so similar to Aaron's campaign to ask American writers to think about their cases, I think sometimes, you can sort of reframe the question to one that doesn't necessarily hold you to a standard of only talking about a country in the Global South, if it's the best country in the world to ask that question.

56:34

Yeah, I think, yeah, Holly, yeah, actually, I was, you know, give before you know, get something into, you know, separate tickets, and I was a little curious about, will it be okay to react? Or your Python? Will, it'll be okay to react? Like, you know, what meditate? Like, you know, you know, as a, you know, from the perspective as an editor, will it sound okay, or acceptable? Or recommendable?

57:01

I would say, if you're a good editor, you are. And you know, I aim to be a good editor is that I don't expect that authors respond to every single comment from a reviewer. And they don't have to change something in response to every single comment from a reviewer, I want to see that authors have made a good faith effort to engage with the comments that are most relevant, which I point out in my letter to them, obviously, and the critiques that are constructive, right. So if it's not a constructive critique, I'm totally fine with you ignoring it. And I, you know, I try not to even pass those on, or I try to comment on them, if I see them

57:44

from coming from reviewers, because I don't think those types of things are useful. And, you know, I think we all should be aiming to publish more diverse cases. And that's my goal as an editor, to say, um, you know, I don't just need to keep publishing the same stuff over and over again, right, that's like making some tiny incremental change in a variable or something, right. I want to see stuff. That's, that's really telling me a new story that I haven't read before. And I think that's what my readership wants as well. So, you know, I totally agree with Maggie and I think she's, she's absolutely right to do that. So, yeah. Thank you. I wish I had a editor like you know, when I look at all you know, yeah, my paper about you know, orientated. Let us go back to your notes, apricots and peaches look very important. So let me lead the discussion. Now. The related to prepare the latest point, I struggle balancing the degree at which I feel comfortable with collaborating, the finding, from my case to broader theoretical question in the discipline and to other case, but that being said, I usually enjoy reading papers that are polite,

you're pretty far because it helps me see how different cases it's analyzable Do you have any suggestion for maintaining that balance?

59:09

Anyone who wants to react to this question first?

59:21

I mean, I'm happy to talk. I feel like I'm talking too much. But I, I think,

59:27

I think it's a it is a balance, of course. Right. And I think what I think you have to be careful about and I was really had to struggle with this when I was younger scholar as well is the language that you use specifically. I found that I would get a lot of pushback when I was using words that were like a little too strong in terms of my findings, right. And so, you know, if, and I'm, you know, I do I do mixed methods. I do qualitative but I'm talking in particular about quantitative research where people

1:00:00

it'll sort of use the words, prove or show or demonstrate right? You're not always doing that. Right? You're, you know, if you've if you have a correlation, right, that's not causal inference. Right. So I think you have to, like, think about

1:00:15

the argument you're making and whether it's justified by your data. Right. And then I think,

1:00:22

I think also

1:00:25

expanding that and extrapolating that to cases, I think that's exactly what the discussion section is for, is this sort of speculation and forward thinking, right, which doesn't have to be justified, right. So be careful in your findings and conclusions, to make sure that everything is backed up with the data and your analysis. But in the discussion section, you have more freedom, right to sort of say, what's next? And what what's, what does this make me think of? And what are the connections I can make? Right. And I don't think that I think that makes for a more interesting paper and something more interesting for the reader and something that then may cause a dialogue within the within the literature. Right. So I think that's, I think that's the place where you have the option to sort of blue sky think right. So yeah.

1:01:19

Yeah, I, I agree to build on that. And I think also to loop in that question that the follow up question, the similar follow up question about how do you do theorizing.

1:01:31

At one level I, I'm, like, I draw I think about this in response to how we Becker and the old trick of like, explain your case, to me, without using any of the proper nouns in your case, that kind of step it up one

level of abstraction. So it's not about, you know, the Ministry of Finance, budgeting in Ghana, you've got to take all those words off the table, all those proper nouns are gone. Now, what is it about?

1:01:55

The other thing that I think about in terms of that balance, is for me, and I, I have no idea if this is just my world and how I work. But very often at some level, I'm thinking early on, I want to get out there, like how is this case like other cases, I want to light up your imagination of things that this is like. And so I have my very first article is about budgetary units. It's not set in the Global South, but like the opening lines to that article are like five different ways I want you to imagine things you have experienced in your world. And then I'm going to tie them all together and say they're of a type and let's talk about that type. And so sometimes it's it's the example of saying, This is how Ghana is really, really like and all of these ways, many, many other countries in the world, kind of that similarity index around the case, whether the case is the country, or whether the case is what you're actually talking about. So if you're talking about selling grades, Maggie's out there telling us that 15% of students worldwide are buying their grades in some way or another like that's, that's a generalizability claim that she didn't have to prove she could get it out there on research to someone else's. But it's already got you thinking that this is like other cases of this more abstract phenomenon. And then for me, I think this space between like, what have I done that I can competently state I've done and what are the more speculative things that I'm going to put in the conclusion like Holly was mentioning, I think, is just developing some comfort around

1:03:19

the space between what you have done and can claim in cash. So like, in my research, and I'm getting at bureaucracies. I can't say I have the one true new way to do it. The World Bank should force every state around the world to do it this way that horrifies me, I am actually afraid that that would happen. I don't know that to be true. So I'm going to say, I don't know that to be true. Here are some reasons why we might think, because of the things that might inhibit or allow generalizability, that this would be a better model than a model based on like Germany. So that's going to go in the speculative section. But I can also say that what this article is saying is we have treated a certain model of organizing as globally true. And I'm putting forward an existence proof that it is not globally true. And that itself is important. And then if I add in that we have reasons to believe Ghana is not the one and only exception on Earth, because the qualities that it shares are widely shared by many other cases, then I don't have to say, confidently. This is true everywhere, you know, take that vapor, but it adds up to a sense that this is a significant thing to have shown. And then in the speculative section, we can talk about what other work might need to be done to actually take those steps to look at generalizability or if you're working in area where you could execute a kind of causal field experiment or something like that. What might that look like?

1:04:47

Yeah.

1:04:51

Mug Mark red shirt. Maker. Do you want to, you know, yeah, I can say it out loud. Yeah, so I'm the chair of the theory section and

1:05:00

And we as one of our section panels, this year, we're having a panel basically on the question of kind of how to think about the relationship between data and theory within sociological writing. So how to kind of create more generalizable arguments using a specific set of data, and then also how to make sense of your data by using theory. So this is a really important question that, you know, extends beyond research in the global south. But it would be nice to I think, we will have at least one participant who's doing research from the Global South, but it'd be nice to have people in the audience from this section. So

1:05:36

please share that information with us. I think that sounds great.

1:05:43

Glad, glad to hear it was helpful. You know, what, we still have a, you know, the 14 minutes. So if you guys have a, you know, any question, please address them? Right, you know, the right away.

1:05:58

And then it's one that we get a participant, also, you know, have an answer to, you know, address the question, or feel free to join, I see some of our council members are here, and then I'm pretty sure that they have a berry unit. Yeah. You know, the, you know, the experiences are related to this issue. So don't, you know, don't be shy to, you know, jump in. Anyone happened, you know, question, any other question?

1:06:30

If no one has let me address, you know, one of the pets and what I have, you know, had, you know, so far, so how you guys, you know, dealing with you that year researcher are written in local language. So some of you know, rape, you are want to see, you know, the more extent to you want to return to review written in, you know, Dr. Will call rangriti. In my case, you know, they're written in South Korean, and then others, you know, generally, probably, it might be more general case that they don't want to see that much. Because they can read them, you know, my themselves are less, you know, the reviewers are, you know, the Orient. So I, I'm having a little bit of trouble, how to balance, you know, between two, so.

1:07:21

Yeah, so, yeah. Does anyone have a question about that, Holly? Thank you.

1:07:27

Yeah, I mean, that's the thing this reminds me of is some of the work I that my advisor and colleagues and I did in Ghana. And we actually were speaking to this literature on internal migration and urbanization in Africa. And a lot of that literature is actually Francophone literature written in French. And, you know, the French demographers especially work in western Central Africa, and, and then a lot of local demographers work in French, right? So and there was kind of this need for us and bring someone else onto our team who was a francophone speaking person. And we wound up bringing on

another colleague just primarily for that purpose to start with, and then he wound up becoming a full fledged member and publisher of the team, right. But he was brought on originally just because of his French knowledge, and being able to review that literature for us was invaluable, because there were things that we would have not been

1:08:29

speaking to, and that then French reviewers or French speaking reviewers would have been frustrated by because we had missed those things in the literature. We were not familiar with so yeah, I think this is I mean, I think it depends right on the context, and it depends on the case. But in many cases, I think you can miss a key contribution if you're not speaking language, right. So it's an important thing to keep in mind.

1:09:02

Do you also have a you know, insight to share with the attention, okay.

1:09:09

Yes, I do.

1:09:11

I actually got a comment recently, in one of my articles, the one I mentioned before that uses mixed methods that was under review. And one of my comments from the reviewers was precisely like, Oh, you're citing all these people who study, you know, anti corruption, protests and judiciary that are in the US, but you're not finding any resilience. And I was like, I was having a few Brazilians, my defense, but I was like, okay, yeah, that's, that's a fair point. And it struck me that it can be really easy sometimes when, especially when we're shrinking down on paper, try to like condense it as much as we can to keep the citations that you feel like are from the most relevant journals and it can be really easy to sometimes

1:09:52

not cite people who are really at local experts and who know a lot about your case, just because they may not have

1:10:00

between the most prestigious journals in the US or in other places.

1:10:04

So I definitely think it's good to find that balance. And I think one thing I did during fieldwork that kind of helped me map, like, who are the people in Brazil that are studying my case? And that I should definitely cite when I'm writing about it. It's just talk to other scholars want to be interviewed work? I mean, I wasn't exactly doing interviews with them. But it was kind of like, you know, just reaching out explaining my case and figuring out who are who studies in Brazil? And who should I be reading? Who should I be citing. And I feel like mapping these these studies, while you do fieldwork can be really helpful, not only because it helps you uncover new, new data and new new sort of articles that you might not have seen before, but also because it helps you like map work, who's the landscape of

people that you might cite? And who might even be potential reviewers in the future? So I think it's, it's definitely helpful to get a good sense of who are the local experts who are writing about it?

1:10:59

I think to just to loop this back around with the conversation at the beginning about how do you how do you position yourself as making a contribution to a larger field. Sometimes, Louise, and I have a project right now on this. So we've been reading hundreds and hundreds of papers in lots of different fields. And so what this connects up with is sometimes you have to be really thoughtful about discreetly articulating to the broader area of people working in a larger, like, one level up from what I'm working on one level up from my case, this is my contribution to those people. And then you kind of funnel down and to the most proximate scholars who are also working on public administration in Africa, this is my contribution to these people, and you just have to articulate it in two separate ways. Because often, it is two slightly different contributions to those two sets.

1:11:49

Thank you, I think, I think we have covered the, you know, the really diverse, you know, the type of Utopia case justification strategy, you know, today, and then we didn't intend them. And that I think, we have a really, kinda, you know, best possible, you know, panel, a set of a panel panelist over here. And then another rigid, you know, what, you know, one of us, you know, made me think about it, that we have a panelist who wrote about Kolobok, who wrote both blue and you know, the article. So what I want to do addressed here, is that, what you are said, what you shared so far, the strategy, are we going to do a case justification will vary depending on, you know, our format, like whether it worked better for boo, the other type of strategy work better for article, if there's something you can we can consider.

1:12:53

And you won't want to address that issue.

1:12:56

Probably, am I the book writer? Or is there anyone else who's written a book? Okay, that's me, then. I mean, the one thing that strikes me in response to that question is just that you have more space to stretch your legs in a book. And so there are in an article, I don't have the word count to make one of my goals, like, I just want people to understand how Ghana works better, I want people to understand, like the kind of minut ways that people operating in the system face trade offs and perceive it. I don't have space for that often in an article, but in a book, you can breathe a little bit more. And so there can be moments where in the midst of an analysis whose primary analytic purpose might be a, you are nevertheless able to explain or set the stage more fully, or help people understand and imagine in in more realistic detail what that bureaucratic life is like. And I think that was something I enjoyed about writing the book form of it in a way that I didn't have the space to do

1:14:00

in the article form of it. But I think a lot of the

1:14:05

basic functions of you still in writing a book are usually having to explain because now you have to convince a press that they will be able to sell this object to other people. And I don't know if this will surprise anyone. But the long list of people clamoring for books on bureaucracy, and Africa is not really like beating down the doors of most American presses. And so you, you are going to be asked when you're meeting with those editors, helped me imagine who buys this book, and why do they buy this book? And so you're, you're doing that same kind of work of who are the audiences and why would they care about this work?

1:14:41

And you know, some topics sell themselves in America because they can already imagine how big the audience is for certain things, and other topics or cases you have to do a little bit more, more work to curate that attention span because I think the important thing to remember is we are operating in a system where there is just so much knowledge

1:15:00

out there, there are so many different topics. There's so much research, no one is on top of all of it. And so everyone has to curate the attention of the people they're encountering, so that they can understand why what you're doing matters.

1:15:14

At the end of the day

1:15:19

Holly,

1:15:21

yeah, this is slightly different, but I just wanted to build on what Aaron was saying, which is that there are lots of different outlets, right? I mean, and I think we tend to, you know,

1:15:33

you know, often think about, you know, the top tier journals, and we all want to publish in them, right. And they're all good, but not every paper is a top tier journal paper, right? We all publish in a variety of places. And I think the approaches and strategies can be different and for different types of journals. And so, you know, sometimes I published an African journals, and then I don't have to justify my case very well, right, because that people are interested, right, that readership wants to read about a case in Ghana or a case in South Africa, right, or Nigeria, or whatever. And so I think, I think sometimes, it's important to also think, well, maybe, maybe this paper right on this particular topic, and this big theoretical contribution, I should try to send to ASR AJs, or whatever the big top thing is that I'm trying to get into and then maybe this other paper is, is really interesting. And I love it, right. But maybe it's a better fit with a different kind of audience. And, and sometimes it's a lot easier process, I mean, to get through review at a smaller journal, just because they don't have the volume that they're dealing with. And I speak from experience. So I think I think editors can take a slightly maybe a little bit more time, and reviewers are like, maybe a little more friendly sometimes. Right? Not always, but I think sometimes we should consider that different. There are a lot of multiple outlets out there.

1:17:04

Thanks so much. I think you haven't been really very productive. And I will say unique, you know, Section session, you know, I haven't ever, you know, never had it, you know, so far. Does anyone want to have a, you know, final word before we, you know, to wrapping up the session. It's so much dependent. I'd love to profit. Are we? Okay, the process of choosing journal of the best, you know, feed? So let us you know, take this as a last question, how to choose the journal?

1:17:40

That's it. Okay. macking? Yeah, I'm happy to take a stab at that. It's a it's a hard question, I would say.

1:17:47

Something that I often do when I'm trying to decide about journals is to think about what has been published in those journals recently, and, you know, look at the citation lists and see if there are journals that I'm citing often. And sometimes, actually,

1:18:04

you know, I think a lot of journals want to be publishing more in the Global South. And so

1:18:11

sometimes, like, if you don't see articles written on your country, that doesn't always mean that the journal isn't open to it, it may be that they haven't gotten as many submissions. So and sometimes I will actually ask editors, like whether they have, like social ad is a very us focused journal. I was like, Is this are these us focused by definition? Or is it just sort of who and so I asked the editor before I submitted it. So sometimes you can do that they don't always get back to you in time, because, as I'm sure how they can tell you editors are busy people. But you can also kind of check in and see whether the fit is correct in terms of like, if there's like a specific orientation that the journal has, that you might not know about. But generally, I think, looking at citation lists, and

1:18:57

also talking to other people who are senior would be my two pieces of advice.

1:19:03

I can just follow up on that briefly, which is, editors are busy, but I do answer every email that I get. And I think I welcome that. Because sometimes it is not a good fit for whatever reason, and I like to tell people before they submit and waste their time, and you know, I don't want that to happen. But you know, often they're just trying to clarify, and I want to help them with that process. But secondly, I think

1:19:29

it's, it's great to do exactly what Matthew is saying. And I also think you need to think, you know, who am I speaking to, right? Who do I want to be in dialogue with and where are they publishing? And what do I, you know, who do I want to have a conversation with basically write in a journal format, and I think that's a good way to sort of narrow down a focus for your article.

1:19:54

I think I just want to build on what Holly ended with, which is that one of the things I think that is often

1:20:00

An unintended challenge for people is, if you take from one area, like let's say you borrow from organizational theory to explain and outcome in the sociology of education, sometimes people then try to publish that in an organizational theory journal. And the organizational theory journal is like, yeah, you're using our stuff, but you're not contributing to us, you're not telling us what we need to do or think differently, you're actually telling the sociology of education people what they need to do and think differently. So that's just a distinction that's worth kind of having in your head. And then the other thing that I'll say, as a concrete piece of practice that I often do with graduate students or myself sometimes is

1:20:40

I tell them to set a timer for exactly 60 minutes, and just plow through as many of the abstraction of that journal as you possibly can start at their page and go backwards. And you get through a lot of abstracts in 60 minutes. And at the end of 60 minutes, you have kind of consumed the taste of that journal in a way that is really, really valuable in terms of the language through using about problems and projects, the sorts of problems and projects, they're dealing with the expectations they have for kind of evidentiary standards, you will know a lot at the end of that, that is really valuable. And it does not really take as much time as you think you don't have to be like a lifelong reader since infancy. So I recommend that as a strategy. Once you've kind of done the thing Maggie pointed out and identified a couple of candidate journals, you can really power through that knowledge base pretty fast.

1:21:29

Why don't we like you know, give a round of applause for our wonderful panel. And thank you, thank you so much for sharing, you know, all of the organizer know, who's

1:21:43

airing

1:21:46

the panel, so you guys need to know that. So thank you, we need to lap up this session. And then as I said, the recording will be shared in that, you know, your Google document. So, you know, keep in touch. And then I hope we can, you know, keep this conversation in other venues as well. So thank you. Thank you for joining us today.

1:22:09

Bye bye. Thank you, everyone. Bye. Bye, everybody. Thanks so much.

1:22:16

Let me try to