Proposal for the Co-Editorship of *Social Psychology Quarterly*
Richard T. Serpe, *Kent State University* and Jan E. Stets, *University of California, Riverside*

Vision Statement

We view *Social Psychology Quarterly* as the premier outlet for scholars who approach social science inquiry using diverse social psychological theories and methods. Over the past twenty years, the editors of the journal (Lawler, Molm and Smith-Lovin, Ridgeway, Cahill, Fine, and now Hegtvedt and Johnson) have consistently published a wide-range of social psychological articles that represent this diverse field. The journal is a strong outlet for both North American and European scholars from different disciplines who approach their work from a variety of research programs/paradigms. We believe that these aspects are the hallmark of *Social Psychology Quarterly*, and we are committed to maintaining *SPQ's* very strong and well established reputation during our tenure.

Many sociologists who may not consider themselves social psychologists do employ social psychological theories and measures in their research. Thus, *Social Psychology Quarterly* is an important outlet for sociologists working in such areas of mental and physical health, emotions, race, class, gender, family, and culture. It also is the journal of choice for psychologists who wish to extend their work to include social structural influences. These facts add to the relevance of *SPQ* beyond those scholars who work within the traditional programs and research paradigms of sociological social psychology: symbolic interactionism, group processes, and social structure and personality. We see these additional features as important to the journal's location on the landscape of scholarly outlet.

In our role as co-editors of *SPQ*, we will help advance the journal in three significant ways. First, we will work to solicit a wider range of scholarship beyond current practices so that the journal is: a) inviting to an even broader range of researchers, and b) contains content that will be of interest to more people, thereby increasing the readership of *SPQ.* Second, we will focus on improving the review process by disseminating information to reviewers about best practices in reviewing. According to the current *SPQ* editors, this is becoming a problem, and we would like to resolve it in an efficient and effective way. Third, in an era of computer-mediated interaction, it is important that *SPQ* continues to increase its visibility through this medium. Thus, we will work to routinely advertise the journal's content and make it easily accessible to the user community. We discuss each of these advances in more detail below.

Beyond maintaining the current diversity of research that *SPQ* already attracts, we want to encourage social psychological theory and research which focuses on current events and social issues/problems as well as the newest trends in research. We think that this moves the journal beyond its current boundaries and will entice readers to the journal in larger numbers. Examples of research that we envision in this regard include social psychological research on: 1) the impact of the recession on changing family structures (e.g. the increase in househusbands), mental and physical health, and family interaction patterns; 2) the influence of the same-sex marriage law on interpersonal relationships; 3) the effect of immigration and the changing face of social interaction that diversity brings; and 4) the effects of genetics and neurology on individual outcomes (behavior and emotions) and interaction processes (exchange relations or group dynamics). There are clearly many more issues of the day that are in the mainstream conversation including global warming, health care, unemployment, our educational crisis, and our aging population that are being studying using a social psychological lens that we would like to capture.

There are two ways we will work to broaden the scope of *SPQ* to include this agenda item. First, we will target our outreach to researchers in different sections in the discipline who work in the substantive areas that are in the mainstream conversation and who are examining social psychological processes in these areas. Additionally, we will encourage those who are making contributions at the intersection of social psychology and new areas of research to submit their work to *SPQ*. Second, we will build a special issue around current events or new research advances. We will work with our deputy editors and the

editorial board to identify one or two topics that are timely and will have traction in appealing to a wide readership as well as activate a rich set of submitted articles for publication. Special issues provide an organic context for integration that both builds new areas of research and links different research areas.

A second strategy under our tenure will be to improve the reviewer process. Indeed, the current co-editors of *SPQ* indicated that this is an important issue that any future editor(s) of *SPQ* should address. While the review process can help authors improve their work as well as give reviewers the opportunity to read cutting edge research, if reviewers are not instructed into best practices in reviewing, the feedback that authors receive may not be helpful and the publication of research may be delayed unnecessarily. We will develop a set of guidelines that reviewers will be given prior to reviewing for the journal that will address such issues as how to evaluate a manuscript (e.g. assess the theory, method, analytic strategy, and social psychological contribution); how to communicate one's evaluation (e.g. be clear, specific, logical and organized in the strengths and weaknesses of the paper); and how to carry out the review in a professional manner (e.g. be timely in one's review, respect the author's goal(s) for the paper and don't substitute one's own goal(s)). These guidelines will remind seasoned reviewers about the dimensions that are important in the review process. More importantly, it will guide more inexperienced reviewers as to how to carry out good reviews. As co-editors, we will monitor and instruct reviewers when necessary, and we will be judicious in our feedback to authors. In general, we think the practice of improving the reviewer process will help the journal by advancing the quality of the work that gets published in *SPQ*, encourage productive and strong collegial discourse, and facilitate good research getting published in a timely manner.

A third way we will work to advance the journal is by keeping the journal technologically present. We will work to make the journal visible on such sites as Facebook and Twitter, and we will encourage more authors to do podcasts. Related to this, we will investigate posting Skype interviews on an author's research. We see the journal as a good teaching and learning device in the classroom, so we will encourage the development of more articles for Snaps. We will ask authors to find media material such as short films, YouTube clips (such as Ted Talks), websites, and/or class exercises that will supplement their ideas and enhance an understanding of their research for undergraduates and for the lay audience, more generally.

In summary, our vision is to continue the prestigious legacy of *SPQ* established by the prior editors and to strengthen the journal in multiple ways. We propose expanding the substantive content that is published as well as capture new research ideas that are emerging and that are relevant in advancing social psychological work. We think this will make the journal more social scientifically interesting and to a wider audience including the general public as well scholars outside of sociology. We also propose improving the review process through greater instruction and guidance so that we can better ensure good reviews and timely publication of research. Finally, we propose making the journal ever-present in our technologically advancing world of communication.

Co-Editors Background Information

We have known and worked together both locally and nationally for over thirty years. We were both trained broadly in social psychology. While we are both well known among social psychologists as identity theorists, we both have focused on different substantive issues and have used different methodological approaches that will make our contributions to the journal distinctive. Administratively, we bring a breadth of experience in editing, managing academic enterprises, and taking leadership roles both within our respective universities and within the discipline. Our experience makes us keenly aware of what we know very well and where we need to look for greater expertise to ensure that manuscripts receive the best possible review. Therefore, we have invited three colleagues to join the editorial team as deputy editors. They have all agreed. We specifically have sought out scholars who have expertise in areas other than our own, where we anticipate a significant number of submissions, and where we

believe their network will produce a broader range of reviewers. The deputy editors and their areas are: Linda K. George, *Duke University* (medical sociology, mental health, and the life course); Donileen R. Loseke, *University of South Florida* (qualitative research, emotions, and interpersonal aggression); and Will Kalkhoff, *Kent State University* (group processes and experimental research).

We were both trained at Indiana University, and we share a strong foundation in symbolic interactionism. However, we have worked within different research programs, and we have used slightly different methodologies throughout our respective careers. Stets' work in identity theory has focused on the internal dynamics that operate for individuals when they claim particular identities in situations. Serpe's research has focused on how people's identities are tied to their position in the social structure, and how situations can facilitate or constrain how identities are expressed. Much of Stets' research has used experimental methods, while Serpe primarily has used survey methods. Another difference between us is that Serpe spent a number of years conducting applied research within the context of university-based social science research organizations which he established and directed. During this same time, Stets focused on the development of a very theoretically driven research program.

We see these differences in our research trajectories as assets in both understanding and valuing scholarship from different research programs and from different methodological approaches. In addition to differences in how we have progressed in our own research, we have also focused our own research in other areas beyond identity theory. For Stets, interpersonal aggression in dating and in marriage was an early focus of her research. For the last decade, she has been involved in the study of the sociology of emotions, and more recently, in the sociology of morality. For Serpe, he has studied the prevalence of psychiatric symptoms, health related behaviors, and he has conducted research in community studies. A significant amount of our research has been published in *SPQ* with Stets publishing 13 articles in the journal and Serpe publishing three.

Over our career, we have both been deeply engaged in the editorial process. Serpe was the co-editor of *Sociological Perspectives* from 2004-2007 and served as the contributing editor to the journal in 2008 to help usher a number of articles through to publication. Stets was an Associate Editor of *Emotions Review* from 2007-2009, and she has edited several volumes. Both of us have served on the editorial broads of a number of journals. Stets is currently on the editorial board of *American Sociological Review* (2013-2016) and *Sociological Perspectives* (2013-2014), and she has served on the editorial boards of *Social Psychology Quarterly (1998-2001), Journal of Family Issues (1999-2010), Journal of Marriage and Family (1992-1995), Personal Relationships (2001-2003),* and *Criminology (1992-1994).* Serpe has served on the board of *Social Psychology Quarterly* twice (1986-1990 and 1998-2000), he was the Deputy Editor of *Sociological Perspectives* (2012-2013), and he is on the editorial board of *Sociological Perspectives* (2008-2012; 2013-2015). In addition, we both review regularly for a large number of journals including *American Sociological Review, American Journal of Sociology, Social Forces, Social Problems, Journal of Health and Social Behavior, Sociological Theory* and many more.

Stets' experience as a Program Officer at the National Science Foundation (2008-2010) provides additional experience and complements Serpe's experience as co-editor of *Sociological Perspectives* (2004-2007). During her two-year term at NSF, she helped usher through roughly 1,000 faculty and dissertation proposals by locating at least six reviewers for each faculty proposal, tracking the timeliness of the reviews and their substance, and then convening a 10-12 person national advisory panel to discuss proposals received during the cycle period. Revised proposals were managed by communicating to PIs helpful strategies to modify the project for increased success in the next evaluation round. Proposal rejections were carefully justified while still providing encouragement to PIs.

We have chosen three strong deputy editors to help us in the continued success of the journal. The current editors of *SPQ* recommended that we select a deputy editor in the area of health because the journal receives many submissions in this area. The current deputy editor of *SPQ* who manages manuscripts in the health area (Debby Carr) strongly endorsed Linda George. Linda is a prolific and

seasoned scholar who will bring a wealth of knowledge in a variety of areas in social psychology including health and the life course. She is also well-versed in psychology, gerontology, demography, and neuroscience. She has been on nine different editorial boards, Associate Editor of *JHSB*, and Deputy Editor of *Demography*. She has edited the *Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences* for over 10 years. She has over 100 chapters in books and over 200 articles in referred journals. Linda will bring a significant amount of experience to the *SPQ* team.

Qualitative/Interpretative research in social psychology has increased over the past two decades. We consulted with a number of qualitative researchers including past *SPQ* Editor (Gary Fine) and past *SPQ* Deputy Editor (Tim Hallett) and from those discussions and our own knowledge, we invited Donileen Loseke. (Tim had strongly endorsed Donileen.) Donileen is an active scholar who has been the Co-Editor and is now the Associate Editor of *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. She is also currently the Associate Editor of *Symbolic Interaction*, and she has served on the editorial board of *SPQ*, *Social Problems*, and *The Sociological Quarterly*. She is the author of three books, three edited collections, and over three dozen articles and book chapters, many of which has been reprinted in other volumes. Donileen will provide a very important resource and presence as a qualitative social psychologist.

Our third deputy editor, Will Kalkhoff, is a colleague that both co-editors know well; he has worked with both co-editors in different capacities. He comes recommended by a number of prominent social psychologists working in the group process/experimental paradigm. Will has served on the editorial board of *SPQ*, and as the deputy editor of the *Electronic Journal of Sociology*. He is an active researcher with four articles now published in *SPQ* in the group processes area. His work has been moving in innovative ways to explore, for example, how emotions and neurology can inform us about exchange relations. He rounds out our team of deputy editors by providing the expertise that will be needed for scholars working in such areas as expectations states, social exchange, and social networks.

Structure and Activities of the Editorial Team

Since we are committed to extending the rich history of *Social Psychology Quarterly* representing a broad spectrum of work in social psychology, we envision a very interactive approach to editing the journal. In many ways, we will model how we as co-editors operate after both former sets of co-editors, Linda Molm and Lynn Smith-Lovin, and Karen Hegtvedt and Cathy Johnson. We will share equally in the editorial process on a daily basis, and any pressing concerns or issues will be handled by phone, email, text, or via Skype or Google Hangout. We will communicate weekly via Skype or Google Hangout. Since each of us is active professionally, we routinely get together at our annual national meeting and the regional meetings that are held throughout the year. We will create blocks of time during these meetings to discuss journal activities including short-term issues and long-term goals. The above strategies for communicating have worked well for us in the past. Neither of us needs a professional reason to stay in touch since we do so for personal reasons. Our communication will just include the goal of furthering an important professional activity for the discipline – the management and advancement of our flagship social psychology journal.

Working with the managing editor, manuscripts will be assigned to each of us equally, first based on our individual expertise, and then randomly. If there is a conflict of interest, we will pass the manuscript to the other editor or to one of the deputy editors. We envision that we will consult each other on many of the manuscripts, and we will certainly involve each other in making decisions on those manuscripts where the recommendations and advice from our reviewers is conflicting.

We intend on using the deputy editors as the experts to marshal through manuscripts in their area. The co-editors will pass on seven to ten manuscripts per year to each of the deputy editors. In this process, the deputy editors would select reviewers and make an independent recommendation to the co-editor who assigned them the manuscript. In most cases, the recommendation of the deputy editors will be supported by the co-editors. Where we anticipate not supporting a recommendation from a

deputy editor is when there is a split review and our judgment is that the likelihood of publication is low. We do not wish to encourage R&R's when the probability of success is low. In general, we plan on using our deputy editors as strong partners in selecting reviewers and providing clear and compelling judgment regarding the potential contribution of manuscripts submitted to the journal.

We intend to keep the editorial review process efficient and believe that authors should hear a decision less than 10 weeks from submitting the manuscript. By making decisions in a timely fashion, we help ensure that the research community has available the cutting edge research in the discipline. We believe that it is very important that all authors be treated in a professional, fair, and courteous manner. Thus, in addition to ensuring that the content of reviews is of the highest quality, we will work to ensure that the integrity of authors is maintained at the highest level.

Institution Support

Both Kent State University and the University of California, Riverside has strong social psychology graduate programs, thus providing additional resources for the co-editors. At Kent State, in addition to Serpe and Kalkhoff, there are five others faculty members who form the department's core social psychology program, and who will be able to assist the co-editors with manuscripts that are at the intersection of social psychology and a wide range of others areas. These include scholars in social psychology and medical and mental health (Richard Adams and Kristen Marcussen), deviance and crime (Tim Berard), race and ethnicity (Carla Goar), and the life course (Tim Owens). Additionally, because Kent State is a joint PhD program with the University of Akron, two other social psychologists at Akron will help in the areas of social psychology and crime (Emily Asencio) and emotions (Rebecca Erickson).

The University of California, Riverside is one of the 10 universities within the prestigious UC system. One of the department's strengths is its national reputation in social psychology. Along with Stets, there are two leading social psychology theorists at UCR: University Professor Jonathan H. Turner and Distinguished Professor Peter J. Burke. Also, UCR has the social exchange experimentalist Scott Savage. Stets, Burke, and Savage are affiliated with the Social Psychology Research Laboratory, which was established by Stets and Burke in 2002 to advance the study of self, identity, and interaction. The facilities are one of the leading laboratories in the country in social psychology that studies single actors, dyads, triads and larger groups. Turner, Burke and Savage add to the team of Kent State social psychologists to strengthen the available scholars that Stets and Serpe can turn to for expert guidance.

We have attached letters of support from our institutions. As you will see, Co-Editor Serpe and Deputy Editor Kalkhoff will be given one graduate student to assistant them in their duties connected to the journal. Co-editor Stets will have one course release per year during the time of her tenure as co-editor. The journal's home office will be at Stets' institution. Stets has office space at her Social Psychology Research Laboratory on the UCR campus to house the journal and carry out her duties.

Summary Statement

Our proposal brings together two individuals to edit *SPQ*. We have a long history of successfully leading scholarly efforts and research, editing scholarly research, and collaborating with others. We add three strong scholars as deputy editors to our leadership team. To continue the growth and success of SPQ, we will focus on three areas: 1) broaden the range of submissions; 2) improve and shorten the review process; and 3) increase the visibility of the journal through computer-mediated interaction. Most importantly, we are committed to maintaining the quality of scholarship published in *SPQ.*

Abbreviated Anonymous Vision Statement

Social Psychology Quarterly is the premier outlet for scholars who approach social science inquiry using diverse social psychological theories and methods. Over the past 20 years, the journal consistently has published a wide-range of social psychological articles that represent this diverse field and from North

America as well as Europe. We believe that these features are the hallmark of *SPQ*, and we are committed to maintaining its very strong and well established reputation during our tenure.

Many sociologists who may not consider themselves social psychologists do employ social psychological theories and measures in their research. Thus, *SPQ* is an important outlet for sociologists working in such areas as mental and physical health, emotions, race, class, gender, family, and culture. It also is the journal of choice for psychologists who wish to extend their work to include social structural influences. These additional features increase the relevance of *SPQ* beyond those scholars who work within the traditional programs and research paradigms of sociological social psychology: symbolic interactionism, group processes, and social structure and personality. In short, the journal's location on the landscape of scholarly outlets is strong.

Our objective is to advance *SPQ* in three ways. First, we will work to solicit a wider range of scholarship beyond current practices so that the journal is: a) inviting to an even broader range of researchers, and b) contains content that will be of interest to more people, thereby increasing the readership of *SPQ.* We will do this by encouraging social psychological theory and research which focuses on a) current social issues/problems and b) the newest trends in research. Research might include: 1) the impact of the recession on changing family structures (e.g., the increase in househusbands) and mental/physical health; 2) same-sex marriage law on relationships; 3) immigration and the changing face of social interaction; and 4) the effects of genetics and social psychological processes on individual outcomes (behavior and emotions) and interaction (exchange relations and group processes). To further this, we will contact scholars in different areas in the discipline who are working at the intersection of social psychology and these areas. We also will plan a special issue around current issues or research advances. Special issues provide an opportunity to build new areas and link different areas.

Second, we seek to improve the reviewer process. The current co-editors of *SPQ* identified this as a growing concern. While the review process can help authors improve their work, it is most effective if the reviews they receive are on target. We believe reviewers, both seasoned and new, can benefit from knowing the best practices for a good review. These include such things as: a) how to evaluate a manuscript along the dimensions of theory, method, and social psychological contributions; b) how to communicate one's evaluation clearly and in a logical manner; and c) how to carry out the review in a timely manner. This practice should help the journal by improving the quality of published work, encourage productive collegial discourse, and facilitate good work getting published in a timely manner.

Finally, we will work to keep the journal technologically present. For example, we will make the journal more visible on such sites as Facebook and Twitter, and we will encourage more authors to do podcasts and short videos. We see the journal as a good teaching device in the classroom, so we will encourage the development of more articles for Snaps. We will encourage authors to find media material such as YouTube clips (such as Ted Talks) and websites, and/or class exercises that will supplement and enhance their research for undergraduates and for the lay audience, more generally.

In summary, our vision is to continue the prestigious legacy of *SPQ* established by the prior editors and to strengthen the journal in multiple ways. We propose expanding the substantive content that is published as well as capture new ideas that are relevant in advancing social psychological research. We think this will make the journal more social scientifically interesting and to a wider audience including the general public as well as scholars outside of sociology. We also propose improving the review process through greater guidance so that we can better ensure good reviews. Finally, we propose making the journal ever-present in our technologically advancing world of communication.