

Journal Peer Review

Comparing the perceptions and quality
judgments of experienced Australian reviewers
in Education and the Physical Sciences

Yanping Lu, BA, MLMED

Submitting for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

October 2010

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I have spent many wonderful years at The University of Newcastle. This extremely invaluable experience and the completion of this thesis have been made possible with the support I have received from the University, the School of Education, and numerous outstanding individuals.

First and foremost I feel deeply indebted to my supervisor, Professor Allyson Holbrook of The University of Newcastle, whose patience, kindness, thoroughness, and incredible passion and experience in research, have been the ultimate motivation and driving power in my journey through doctoral training. Professor Holbrook has also provided me with the perfect role model of an intelligent, diligent, and creative female academic.

I have been a student member of the Centre for the Study of Research Training and Impact (SORTI) of which my supervisor is the director. SORTI brings together a team of outstanding members who have generously offered me assistance. I owe my deepest gratitude to Dr Ray McCredie Barker (1920-2009) who generously provided a scholarship to support my project. I would also like to thank Professor Sid Bourke who provided statistical advice, Mrs Hedy Fairbairn who assisted in proofreading of the thesis, and other members who offered valuable comments to my progress presentations.

The journey has been made more comfortable and achievable with the support of the School of Education, including an encouraging culture of research, a well-equipped research office dedicated to my exclusive use, two Travel Scholarships that allowed me to experience Melbourne, Australia and Budapest, Hungary, as well as numerous working opportunities in research and teaching. I would also like to thank Associate Professor James Ladwig and Associate Professor Michael Arthur-Kelly, among others, for allowing me to trial the research instruments with them and providing suggestions for improvement.

This thesis would not have been possible without the contribution of the participants to the study, who are busy academics but have been extremely generous in sharing their time and opinions with me.

I have been undertaking a full time job at Planning, Quality and Reporting, The University of Newcastle since 2009. I am indebted to my supervisor at work, Associate Professor Anne Young, and my colleagues for their support of me in the completion of my thesis.

Finally, I would like to express special thanks to my husband Yuhua (Eric) Shi. Eric is also a doctoral candidate and full time employee at the University, and we have a four-year old daughter. He has helped me wherever he could to concentrate on completing this thesis and supported me mentally during the course of this work. Without his love, help and encouragement, this study would not have been completed.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	Research Assessment and Peer Review: An Overview	11-39
1.0	Introduction	11-12
1.1	The Changing Environment and the Expectation of Quality	12-14
1.2	Contemporary Quality Assessment Mechanisms in Higher Education	14-17
1.3	Journal Peer Review: An Introduction to the Debate and Dilemmas	17-25
1.3.1	<i>The concept and definition of peer review</i>	18
1.3.2	<i>The notion of 'peer'</i>	19
1.3.3	<i>The functions of journal peer review</i>	19-25
1.4	An Introduction to the Empirical Literature on Journal Peer Review	26-42
1.4.1	<i>Recruitment and characteristics of editors and reviewers</i>	29-31
1.4.2	<i>Behaviours of editors and reviewers</i>	32
1.4.3	<i>Authorship issues</i>	32-34
1.4.4	<i>Journal guidelines for authors and reviewers</i>	35
1.4.5	<i>Rewards of involvement in reviewing and publishing</i>	35-37
1.4.6	<i>Trends in journal publication and peer review</i>	37-39
1.4.7	<i>Other areas in relation to peer review</i>	39-41
1.4.8	<i>Citation rates and impact factors</i>	41-42
1.5	Conclusion	43-44
Chapter 2	Review of the Literature on the Practices and Outcomes of Peer Review	45-76
2.0	Introduction	45
2.1	Reviewer Comments and Recommendations	45-48
2.2	Reviewer Agreement	49-52
2.3	Bias in Journal Peer Review	52-57
2.4	Blindness and Anonymity in Reviewing	57-60
2.5	Effectiveness of Peer Review	60-62
2.6	Reasons for Acceptance or Rejection of Papers	63-65
2.7	Rejection Rates	65-67
2.8	Fate of the Rejected Papers	68-69
2.9	Efficiency of the Peer Review Process	69-71
2.10	Mechanisms to Improve Peer Review	72-73
2.11	Conclusion: A Framework for Studying Journal Peer Review	73-76

Table of Contents

Chapter 3 Research Design and Methods	77-95
3.0 Introduction	77-78
3.1 Rationale for the Use of a Mixed Methods Approach	78-82
3.2 Features of Mixed Methods Design	82-83
3.3 Research Design for This Study	84-91
3.3.1 <i>Phase I: Analysis of selected editorials</i>	85
3.3.2 <i>Phase II: Analysis of journal publishing and reviewing policies</i>	85-86
3.3.3 <i>Phases III-V: Initial survey, interview, and follow-up survey</i>	86-91
3.3.4 <i>Phase VI: Textual analysis of review reports</i>	91
3.4 Ethical Concerns of the Study	91-92
3.5 Mixed Methods Integration	92-95
Chapter 4 Editorial Perceptions and Expectations of Peer Review	96-124
4.0 Introduction	96-97
4.1 An Examination of Selected Editorials	97-113
4.1.1 <i>Practices of publishing and reviewing</i>	98-101
4.1.2 <i>Criteria used in manuscript evaluation</i>	101-102
4.1.3 <i>Roles and responsibilities of editors and reviewers</i>	102-103
4.1.4 <i>Problems in journal peer review</i>	104-107
4.1.5 <i>Editors' reactions to the problems</i>	107-109
4.1.6 <i>Opening the process</i>	110-113
4.2 An Examination of Journal Profiles and Policies	114-123
4.2.1 <i>Profiles of the top ranking journals in education, physics and chemistry</i>	115-124
4.2.2 <i>Expectations of 'quality' in top ranking journals</i>	124-120
4.2.3 <i>Peer review policies published by top ranking journals</i>	121-123
4.3 Conclusion	123-124
Chapter 5 Survey Participants' Involvement in and Perceptions of Peer Review	125-145
5.0 Introduction	125-126
5.1 Construction and Administration of the Questionnaire	126-128
5.2 Profile of Participating Reviewers	128-132
5.3 Reviewer Perceptions of Journal and ARC Grant Peer Review	133-138
5.4 Motivation to Participate as Reviewers in Peer Review	138-141
5.5 Additional Comments on Peer Review	141-142
5.6 Conclusions and Discussion	143-145

Table of Contents

Chapter 6 Interview Participants' Comments on the Practice of Peer Review	146-180
6.0 Introduction	146-147
6.1 Participants in the Interview	147
6.2 Contribution of Journal Peer Review	147-151
6.3 Expectations of Journal Peer Review	151-153
6.4 Changes Sought	153-156
6.5 Trends Noted	156-160
6.6 Learning to Review for Journals	160-163
6.7 Consideration of Formal Training for Reviewing	164-165
6.8 Confidence in Reviewing	165-168
6.9 Editors' Feedback to Reviewers	168-170
6.10 Themes Explored in the Follow-up Survey	171-175
6.10.1 <i>Can peer review be improved?</i>	172-174
6.10.2 <i>Is the role of the reviewer held in high esteem?</i>	174-175
6.10.3 <i>The value of anonymous review</i>	175
6.11 Conclusions and Discussion	176-180
Chapter 7 Where the Line is Drawn in Reviewing Decisions	181-202
7.0 Introduction	181-182
7.1 Reasons for Recommending Rejection of a Manuscript	182-185
7.2 The Line of Remedy	185-190
7.3 The Line of Excellence	191-192
7.4 The Line of Impact	193-195
7.5 The 'Quality Continuum'	195-198
7.6 Comparison between Journal Peer Review and ARC Grant Peer Review	198-201
7.7 Conclusions	202

Table of Contents

Chapter 8 Language of Reviewing: Analysis of Review Reports	203-227
8.0 Introduction	203-205
8.1 Comments on Argument	205-209
8.2 Comments on the Review of Literature	210-211
8.3 Comments on Writing	211-213
8.4 Comments on the Fit of the Manuscript for the Journal	213-214
8.5 Comments on the Contribution of the Research	214-217
8.6 Comments on Research Design and Methods	218-219
8.7 Comments on Novelty	220-221
8.8 Disciplinary Comparison for Remediable and Irremediable Problems	221-223
8.9 Conclusion: Comparison between Interview and Review Findings	223-227
8.9.1 <i>Group A: Features related to remediable problems</i>	224-225
8.9.2 <i>Group B: Features related to irremediable problems</i>	226-227
Chapter 9 Conclusions and Discussion	228-250
9.0 Introduction	228-230
9.1 Contribution of the Study	230-231
9.2 Main Findings of the Study	232-248
9.2.1 <i>Reviewer expectations of peer review</i>	232-233
9.2.2 <i>Reviewer understanding of the task of reviewing</i>	233-234
9.2.3 <i>Quality features in the consideration of manuscripts</i>	234-237
9.2.4 <i>Distinction of manuscripts by quality</i>	237-239
9.2.5 <i>Language of reviewing</i>	239-241
9.2.6 <i>Functions and contributions of journal peer review</i>	241-242
9.2.7 <i>Expectations and guidelines published by journals</i>	242-243
9.2.8 <i>Problems in journal peer review and potential solutions</i>	243-246
9.2.9 <i>Influences of the environment</i>	246-247
9.2.10 <i>The Framework for the understanding of journal peer review</i>	247-248
9.3 Weaknesses of the Study	248-249
9.4 Directions for Future Research	249-250
References	251-273
Appendices	

List of Tables

Table 1.1	Research Literature Distributed by Major Discipline	26
Table 1.2	Main Themes in the Studies about Journal Peer Review	27
Table 3.1	Target Population	87
Table 3.2	Sample of the Initial Questionnaire Survey	87
Table 4.1	Disciplinary Distribution of the Editorials	97
Table 4.2	Number of Editorials in the Six Categories	98
Table 4.3	Publishers of Top Ranking Journals in the Target Fields	115
Table 4.4	Journal Policy Statements on Peer Review	121
Table 5.1	Demographic Information of the Survey Respondents	129
Table 5.2	Respondent Experience with Research Assessment Related Activities	129
Table 5.3	Relationship between Academic Title and Research Assessment Activities	131
Table 5.4	Respondents' Research Activeness and Level of Success	131
Table 5.5	Respondents' Research Activeness: Comparison between disciplines	132
Table 5.6	Respondents' Level of Success: Comparison between Disciplines	132
Table 5.7	Respondent Perceptions on Journal Peer Review: Means	133
Table 5.8	Respondent Perceptions on Journal Peer Review: Comparison	134
Table 5.9	Respondent Perceptions on Grant Peer Review: Means	135
Table 5.10	Respondent Perceptions on Grant Peer Review: Comparison	135
Table 5.11	Respondent Expectations of Journal and Grant Peer Review: Overall	137
Table 5.12	Respondent Expectations of Journal and Grant Peer Review: Education	137
Table 5.13	Respondent Expectations of Journal and Grant Peer Review: Physics and Chemistry	137
Table 5.14	Respondents' Level of Success and Overall Satisfaction with Peer Review	138
Table 5.15	Reasons for Declining to Review Some Papers or for Some Journals	139
Table 5.16	Motivation to Participate as Reviewers in Peer Review: Frequency (%)	140
Table 5.17	Reasons for Agreeing to Review for the ARC: Frequency (%)	140
Table 5.18	Frequency of Journals Providing Guidelines to Reviewers	141
Table 5.19	Frequency of Respondents Following Journal Guidelines	141

List of Tables

Table 6.1	Interview Participants from Education, Physics and Chemistry	147
Table 6.2	Contribution of Peer Review to a Field	148-149
Table 6.3	Respondents' Yes-or-No Responses to 'Changes to Peer Review'	153
Table 6.4	Trends in Journal Peer Review	157
Table 6.5	Respondents' Perceptions of Confidence	166
Table 6.6	Indicators of Being Confident in Acting as a Reviewer	167
Table 6.7	Demographics of the Follow-up Survey Participants	172
Table 6.8	Respondents' Concerns and Suggested Solutions	173
Table 7.1	Quality Threshold between Acceptable and Unacceptable Manuscripts	188
Table 8.1	Number of Reviews Containing Comments on Argument	206
Table 8.2	Number of Reviews Containing Comments on Literature Review	210
Table 8.3	Number of Reviews Containing Comments on Writing	212
Table 8.4	Number of Reviews Containing Comments on Fit for Journal	213
Table 8.5	Reviews Containing Comments on the Four Types of Contribution	214
Table 8.6	Number of Reviews on Research Design and Methods	218
Table 8.7	Number of Reviews on Novelty	220
Table 8.8	Number and Percentage of Reviews in Each Category Divided by Discipline	221
Table 8.9	Count of Text Units in Each Category Divided by Discipline	222

List of Figures

Figure 1.1	Research Literature on Peer Review: Decades of Publication	26
Figure 1.2	Sequences between Themes in the Literature of Journal Peer Review	28
Figure 2.1	Themes in the Literature to Be Covered in Chapter 2	45
Figure 2.2	Dynamic of Peer Review Operations with Five Dimensions	75
Figure 3.1	Schematic of Data Collection Methods of the Multiple Phases	84
Figure 3.2	Data, Phases, and Methods of Analysis	84
Figure 4.1	Spectrum of Secrecy-Openness for the Publication Process	112
Figure 4.2	Commencing Decades of Top Ranking Journals in the Target Fields	116
Figure 4.3	Proportions of Journals Specifying Identified Criteria	117
Figure 6.1	A Function Schematic of Peer Review	149
Figure 6.2	The Continuous Process of Learning to Review	163
Figure 7.1	Reasons for Rejection: Count of Responses by Category	183
Figure 7.2	Reasons for Marginal Acceptance: Count of Responses by Category	186
Figure 7.3	Comparisons between Reasons for Rejection and Marginal Acceptance	186
Figure 7.4	The Line of Remedy	189
Figure 7.5	The Quality Continuum	196
Figure 8.1	Count of Text Units by Category	204
Figure 9.1	The Five Core Dimensions Contributing to the Understanding of Journal Peer Review	229

List of Appendices

- Appendix 1 Themes in the Literature of Journal Peer Review
- Appendix 2 Changes in the Number of Authors per Article
- Appendix 3 Changes in the Percentage of Co-authored Articles
- Appendix 4 Criteria for Granting Authorship: Author's View
- Appendix 5 Studies of Reviewer Agreement and Inter-rater Reliability
- Appendix 6 Studies of the Recognition of Author Identities by Reviewers
- Appendix 7 Studies of Reviewers' Comments: Evaluation Criteria
- Appendix 8 Rejection Rates for Journals in Different Disciplines
- Appendix 9 Studies of the 'Fate' of Once Rejected Manuscripts
- Appendix 10 Waiting Periods from Submission to Publication
- Appendix 11 Number of Manuscripts Reviewed per Year and Time Taken by Reviewers to Complete a Review
- Appendix 12 Initial Survey Instrument
- Appendix 13 Interview Protocol
- Appendix 14 Responses to the Three Follow-up Survey Questions
- Appendix 15 Quality Features in the Evaluation of Manuscripts
- Appendix 16 Disciplinary Differences Identified in the Study: A Summary