

HOW QUALITATIVE RESEARCHERS COMPETE (OR SURVIVE) GLOBALLY

—OVERGENERALIZING FROM MY EXPERIENCES—

YASUHIRO IZUMIKAWA (AOYAMA GAKUIN UNIVERSITY)

FOR THE MMRA, MAY 23, 2022

TOP IR (AND A BIT OF CP) JOURNALS THAT FREQUENTLY PUBLISH QUALITATIVE STUDIES

Top Tier:

International Security, International Organization, Security Studies, World Politics, International Studies Quarterly, European Journal of International Relations, Journal of Strategic Studies

Semi-Top:

ISA journals, APSA journals, International Theory, International Affairs

Good Journals with Asian Regional Focus:

The Pacific Review, Journal of Northeast Asian Studies, Asian Security, International Relations of the Asia-Pacific



PRESENTER'S TOP TIER JOURNAL ARTICLES

- *“Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism: Normative and Realist Constraints on Japan’s Security Policy,” International Security 2010 (3.5 years since 1st submission to IS)*

- *“To Coerce or Reward? Theorizing Wedge Strategies in Alliance Politics,” Security Studies 2013 (One year since 1st submission to SS)*
- *“Binding Strategies in Alliance Politics,” International Studies Quarterly 2018 (R&R then rejected by World Politics, 2.5 years since 1st submission to ISQ)*
- *“Network Connections and the Emergence of the Hub-and-Spokes Alliance System in East Asia,” International Security 2020. (??? years since 1st submission to IS)*

PRESENTER'S **NON-TOP TIER** PUBLICATIONS

- *Unpublished Manuscript based on my dissertation*

Submitted to IO, rejected by reviewers → never submitted elsewhere

- *“The Efficacy of Asymmetric Positive Sanctions: South Korea’s Nordpolitik,” Korea Observer 2006*

*Submitted to SS, rejected by reviewers → Invited for a good regional journal, submitted → **Rejected!** →*

Submitted to KO, accepted without revisions

- *“Security Dependence and Asymmetric Coercive Bargaining,” Asian Security 2007*


Submitted to IS, rejected by reviewers → Submitted to XXXX → R&R, resubmitted

*→ **Rejected (probably by a different reviewer)** → Submitted to AS → R&R, resubmitted → Accepted*


- *Unpublished Manuscript (Title Anonymous), around 2007*

*Submitted to SS → R&R offered → **Not resubmitted (yet)***

CHRONOLOGY OF THE 2020 IS ARTICLE

- *Once upon a time...: The inception of the paper idea (around 2000)*
-
- *Sometime in 2010: Visit to Taiwanese Diplomatic Archive → Some key findings*
 - *Sometime in 2012: Start writing a first draft*
 - *April 2013: Submitted to IS, received R&R in July 2013, with a special request by the editor*
 - *XXXXXX*
 - *XXXXXX*
 - *September 2018: Meeting the IS editor at APSA in Boston, my manuscript turned out to be alive.*
 - *March 2019: The editor finally returned his 15-page, single-spaced comments on my 2nd draft*
- 

CHRONOLOGY OF THE 2020 IS ARTICLE—CONTINUED

- *September 2019: 3rd draft submitted*
-
- *December 2019: The editor's comment returned, asking for further revision*
 - *March 2020: 4th draft submitted*
 - *June 2020: Conditional acceptance, with some more revisions required*
 - *July 2020: 5th draft submitted → Accepted soon afterwards*
 - *Late July to September 2020: Tortuous, several rounds of final editing*
 - *October 2020: Published*
- 


TECHNICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Think of *a group of top-tier journals*, not just one (i.e., not just IS or IO)
 - Consider yourself lucky if your work gets published from **ANY** of them.

- Go for a 2nd-tier journal if it is rejected by top-tier journals. **Cross the finish line!**
- Keep your 1st draft somewhat shorter than the word limit.
- *Real challenges begin only when you get a R&R.*
- At the R&R stage, make sure *to address ALL the points raised by the reviewers.*
 - Even if you decide **NOT** to comply with their suggestions, explain why!
 - Write a note elaborating how you address their concerns and why you didn't do so.
- Show your respects for the previous literature.

HOW TO DEVELOP A-CLASS ARTICLES

- *Ask an important question!*
 - *DON'T focus too much on “what nobody has ever done before.”*

 - *Take literature review seriously.*
 - *Develop the good command of qualitative research design.*
 - *Not just hypothesis testing, but also **concept formation**, **hypothesis generating**, etc.*
 - *The quality of case studies matters! Choose good sources & use process tracing effectively.*
 - *Think about which level of generalizability your research may be the most fruitful.*
 - *Whether or not going up or down the ladder of generalization? Typologize?*
 - *NEVER treat historical materials merely as “data.”*
 - *Think of your strength and take advantage of it. Ex. Language skills, interview opportunities*
- 

ONE LAST COMMENT.

The most important may not be to come up with a great idea. Rather, it may be more important **to develop the great idea into a research design** with sufficiently clear visions of how to execute theoretical and empirical parts.

(事後のコメント) ここ**10**年の私の査読論文は、**2010**の**IS**論文の査読プロセスで鍛えられた経験がなければ、存在してなかったと思う。そして、**2010**年の**IS**の査読プロセスを乗り切れたのは、**non-top tier**ジャーナルで査読を生き残った経験があったためである。その意味では、トップジャーナル以外にでも論文を発表していくことが重要。

THANK YOU!

COMMENTS & QUESTIONS?

