

IPA NEWS

EDITORIAL REPORT: *JIPA* 2011–2015

The period from 2011 to 2015 was a productive period for *JIPA*. Every issue appeared on time; the copy-editing, typesetting, and web-posting processes through Cambridge University Press ran efficiently. An overview of each issue beginning with vol. 42 through the end of the current volume is as follows:

- Vol. 42.1 (April 2012) – 5 articles, 3 reviews, 0 illustrations, 128 pp.
- Vol. 42.2 (August 2012) – 4 articles, 3 reviews, 3 illustrations, 140 pp.
- Vol. 42.3 (December 2012) – 2 articles, 1 review, 4 illustrations, 128 pp.
- Vol. 43.1 (April 2013) – 4 articles, 1 review, 5 illustrations, 134 pp.
- Vol. 43.2 (August 2013) – 3 articles, 0 reviews, 3 illustrations, 124 pp.
- Vol. 43.3 (December 2013) – 6 articles, 4 reviews, 2 illustrations, 160 pp.
- Vol. 44.1 (April 2014) – 4 articles, 1 review, 2 illustrations, 120 pp.
- Vol. 44.2 (August 2014) – 3 articles, 4 reviews, 4 illustrations, 126 pp.
- Vol. 44.3 (December 2014) – 3 articles, 2 reviews, 3 illustrations, 126 pp.
- Vol. 45.1 (April 2015) – 3 articles, 2 reviews, 3 illustrations, 120 pp.
- Vol. 45.2 (August 2015) – 2 articles, 3 reviews, 4 illustrations, 134 pp.
- Vol. 45.3 (December 2015) – 3 articles, 5 reviews, 3 illustrations, 140 pp.

Since 2007, *JIPA* has been published in three issues a year. Volumes 42–45 (from April 2012 to December 2015) have had an average issue length of approximately 132 pages, ranging from 120 pages to 160 pages in the special issue (43.3) on non-pulmonic sounds in European languages.

Although three issues have increased the amount of content that can be published, the page limit is generally restricted to 128 pages. Even with CUP's flexibility in accommodating slightly enlarged issues, the limit sometimes delays the timely publication of an accepted manuscript and given the present constant backlog of content, we are hoping to move *JIPA* to digital publication of papers using FirstView in the near future, taking much of the pressure off the wait for paper publication.

JIPA remains an 'A' journal, and *JIPA* is listed in the European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH) of the European Science Foundation (ESF) as well as in the Thomson Reuters Arts & Humanities Citation Index. *JIPA* has had an impact factor (IF) since 2008. Initially, the IF was calculated somewhat erratically, sometimes including, sometimes excluding illustrations as regular articles. However, it was then calculated to include only the regular articles, relegating illustrations to editorial material. Due to this, the IF in 2012 was 1.042. However, the treatment of illustrations as mere editorial material is not scientifically justified and Thomson Reuters revised their calculation for *JIPA* to include illustrations as regular papers. This step corrected the misrepresentation of illustrations, but at that same time increased the number of papers in each issue thereby decreasing *JIPA*'s IF to its most recent value of 0.515 in 2014 (rank in Linguistics: 92/171).

The audio files accompanying Illustrations are posted on the *JIPA*'s online site as supplementary materials. These have now been updated to include the same illustration audio material that is archived on the IPA site, in other words, from Nina Grønnum's 1998 illustration of Danish. IPA members can also access the illustration audio via the new IPA site (<https://www.internationalphoneticassociation.org/>). CUP will also integrate into their database Michael MacMahon's full searchable *JIPA* Index, which includes information from *Le Maître Phonétique* since 1886 and from *JIPA* since 1971. The Instructions for Contributors

to *JIPA* are posted on the CJO (Cambridge Journals Online) site for *JIPA* and a condensed version can be found in the back inside cover of each issue.

Throughout 2011–2015, the stated goals of the Journal have remained the same:

The Journal of the International Phonetic Association (*JIPA*) is a forum for work in the fields of phonetic theory and description. As well as including papers on theoretical phonetic issues, *JIPA* encourages submissions on experimental phonetics, phonetic data-based phonology, and the applications of phonetics to areas such as computer speech processing, language and phonetics teaching, and speech science. In addition, *JIPA* tries to review a good selection of books on phonetics. While seeking to advance new views of phonetics, *JIPA* also recognizes its special responsibilities with regard to the Association's alphabet, the IPA. It publishes discussions of IPA symbols, short accounts of the phonetic structures of a wide variety of languages, illustrating the use of these symbols, and charts. These accounts initially became part of the *Handbook of the IPA*, and those appearing since 2000 have become available through CJO. In this way *JIPA*, the Handbook and the CJO *JIPA* site are useful sources to which people may turn to find brief accounts of the sounds and the phonetic structure of the world's languages.

Since 2011, we have accepted and published:

- 26 articles on segmental properties (aspirated stops in Western Andalusian Spanish, epenthetic stops in Valencian Catalan, vowel spaces in Plains Cree, palatalisation in Connemara Irish, ultrasound study of /sV/ in English, non-(retroflex) affricates in Czech and Polish, RP LOT and THOUGHT vowels, EPG study of voiced and voiceless fricatives, aspiration in Scottish Gaelic, pulmonic vs. glottalic voicelessness in Scottish English, ejectives in Scottish English, clicks and percussives in English conversation, intraoral pressure in German plosives, clicks as speaker discriminant in English, speaker sex effects on temporal and spectro-temporal aspects of speech, Czech trills, transvocalic ejectives in Cochabamba Quechua, hiatus resolution and linking 'r' in Australian English, Mandarin apical vowels, place of articulation in Croatian stops, Catalan voiced prepalatals, and nasality in Lakota vowels);
- 3 articles on general phonetic issues (articulatory classification of (alveolo)palatal consonants, phonetics in advanced learner's dictionaries, and phonetic makeup of Portuguese 'North Wind and Sun' text);
- 13 articles on prosodic aspects of various languages (tonetic comparison of Osaka and Kagoshima Japanese, polar questions in Italian, contrastive breathiness in Gujarati and White Hmong, effects of tone on laryngeal distinction in Seoul and South Kyungsang Korean, phonetic organisation of talk, social meaning of intonation, Effort Code in Catalan, Italian and Spanish contrastive focus, pitch and intonational contrasts, laryngeal gestures in Mandarin, emphatically lengthened consonants in Japanese, acoustic correlates of glottal articulations, Tongan stress, and L1 effects on L2 prosody);
- 36 illustrations of the sounds of individual languages (Assamese, Czech spoken in Bohemia and Moravia, Mono Lake Northern Paiute, Bardi, Central Sama, Tausug, Sumi, Luxembourgish, Lizu, Mapudungun, Shiwili, Mennonite Plautdietsch (Canadian Old Colony), Southeastern Pashayi, Upper Saxon, Lower Xumi, Upper Xumi, Bukharan Tajik, Cocos Malay, Pitjantjatjara, Kedayan, Tashlhiyt Berber, Greek Thrace Xoraxane Romane, Béarnais (Gascon), Cicipu, Northwest Sahaptin, Bemba, Basaá, Goemai, Ersu, Ika Igbo, Russian, Murcian Spanish, Shanghai Chinese, Standard Austrian German, and Lyonnais (Francoprovençal)).

There have also been reviews of 27 publications, reports on IPA News matters and announcements, and obituaries. This diversity, range of content, and quality of material is due to the energy and commitment of the many authors who have made submissions and the numerous reviewers whose comments and recommendations have also contributed to quality. We thank them for entrusting their scholarship to the *Journal*, thereby enhancing the *Journal's* reputation and standing.

Overview of the editorial process

Submissions are received and disseminated to reviewers as e-mail attachments as Word or PDF files. In the period 2011–2015 some reviewers preferred to remit PDF documents, especially when phonetic symbols are involved, and some annotate the original PDF submissions, but in many cases, reviews can be provided quite efficiently in the body of an e-mail message. Illustrations of the IPA must be accompanied at the time of submission by audio recordings of all words and narrative material cited in the text. Authors provide .wav files in zipped attachments, or a URL for downloading, at the same time as submission of the manuscript. Only submissions of Illustrations with accompanying audio material are considered further. All audio material is processed in the editorial office and posted on a site for the reviewers of the Illustration. Audio material submitted as a single long .wav file is broken up into individual word and text files by an editorial assistant. However, if the audio material is more extensive, authors are encouraged to carry out this editing themselves and are provided with guidelines as to how the individual audio files should be created and named. Ultimately, the supplementary audio materials will receive filenames that are grouped together by section heading and numbered in linear text order as well as being glossed with the English translation given in the text so that readers can easily locate each recorded item in its appropriate folder.

Reviewers who are the most appropriate people in the field are selected by the editor. Often, one reviewer will be a specialist in the language area and at least one other reviewer will be a specialist in the experimental approach. Where appropriate, reviewers are drawn from the Editorial Board. Usually there are three reviewers; in some cases there may be two (especially for Illustrations); and in some cases there are four. Occasionally, a manuscript will be referred to a member of the Editorial Board for supplementary adjudication, especially when two reviewers may have widely differing opinions about the suitability of a submission. We do not conceal authors' names from reviewers, as we believe that a submission should be judged with reference to its background. Reviewers can make more helpful comments if they know the identity of the author they are trying to advise. We assume that reviewers will remain anonymous, but if they wish to sign their reviews we will communicate this to the authors. Papers are usually considerably improved by the collaborative interaction between reviewers and authors. The normal object of a review is to help improve a paper within its own framework with the best advice available. When a manuscript is received after extensive revisions, it is forwarded, if possible, to the original reviewers for their further evaluation, comments and suggestions.

Once a paper is deemed acceptable by the reviewers, the editor reviews the final revision of the paper and makes extensive added comment primarily on format, structure and symbolization but also on content. After that, final revised manuscripts in the various required formats are forwarded through the editor to the copy-editor as electronic files. A hard copy is no longer required by the copy-editor. From that point, the copy-editor deals directly with authors on the technical details of copy preparation, verifying fonts and figures and noting particular items for the typesetters, and then working with authors on first proofs and mediating corrections to the typesetters through second (revised) proofs.

The time it takes for papers to be reviewed and to be returned by authors varies greatly, and the number of revisions required also varies considerably. Generally, the larger volume of copy flow since 2007, including the fact that most papers are read by three reviewers, means that manuscripts are taking slightly longer than before to appear in print. Some manuscripts may take two years to appear; some more; but others only one. Statements of acceptance/rejection rates cannot be given exactly because of the variation in each paper's individual history. Some papers that are accepted subject to revision may not be resubmitted, and the number of revisions a paper goes through is an incalculable variable. Since August 2011 *JIPA* has received 90 submissions of regular papers and 64 Illustrations. Of these, 14 regular papers and 24 Illustrations have been accepted for publication and 45 submissions (43 regular papers, 2 Illustrations) have been rejected. The remaining submissions are either under review or under revision. Illustrations have a better acceptance rate but usually entail a longer turn-around

Table 1 Number of submissions by country of academic residence of first author (2011–2015).

37	USA
10	France, UK
8	Germany, Spain
7	India
6	Australia, Malaysia
4	Argentina, Canada, China, Pakistan
2	Brunei, Greece, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Russia, South Africa, Taiwan, Thailand
1	Afghanistan, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Ghana, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Sweden, Turkey

time for their revision and to appear in print, because of the time required to process and update audio archive. Although the majority of submissions are submitted from academic locations in the USA and western Europe, *JIPA* publishes content from every continent, as is evidenced by the detailed summary of the country of origin of submissions shown in [Table 1](#).

The process of soliciting reviews and making sure that reviews are submitted on time remains a time-consuming task in the reviewing process and can slow up the turn-around on some manuscripts considerably. Sometimes up to ten reviewers will have been asked before two respond positively. Soliciting reviews for Illustrations is generally harder than for regular papers. Up until now, we have not been using an online system to help in the administration of submissions and reviews, and many authors and reviewers look on this positively. However, particularly in an attempt to speed up the reviewing process for each submission, the editors have recently been discussing with CUP the possibility of moving *JIPA* to an online submission/review system. This will undoubtedly reduce some of the personal contact between editors and reviewers and will also involve an increase in the cost of producing *JIPA* so it is a move that will need to be discussed and sanctioned by Council members.

Quite a few books are regularly sent out for review. *JIPA* now has two Review Editors to follow up on reviews and ensure that reviewers respond in a timely manner.

Production issues

The copy-editor prepares the electronic files for typesetting, ensuring font compatibility and specifying how the detailed phonetic representations peculiar to a phonetics journal are to be typeset. The copy-editor deals with authors at first proofs and with the authors and editors at second proofs to clear up errors of formatting. Many of these errors continue to involve phonetic symbol shapes/sizes, although these have been minimal in recent issues.

We are working to ensure that the phonetic fonts specified in the Instructions for Contributors are familiar to and useable by the typesetters (the typesetters' preference for free SIL fonts notwithstanding). There have been problems processing copy produced in LaTeX, but Word has not been a problem. The (non-)embedding of fonts in a file has sometimes been an issue.

The production editor at the Press deals with front/back matter and covers. Proofs of these pages are sent to the editor for proofreading. Changes are queried well in advance: for example, *JIPA* 45.3 contains the new list of IPA Council members; the new Editors and new Editorial Board will appear in *JIPA* 46.1. The production editor is also in close contact with the copy-editor to match the Table of Contents with prepared copy and to coordinate CJO/*JIPA* layout.

Illustrations are submitted in various formats with varying styles of charts and font usage. All of these are now easily handled by the copy-editor who either reformats and/or reworks the artwork or requests different formats, if necessary.

We are extremely indebted to Ewa Jaworska, our copy-editor, for her continuing diligent efforts on behalf of *JIPA*.

Cambridge University Press continues to produce *JIPA* at a reasonable cost to members (who pay nothing other than their annual dues) and institutions (for whom the subscription in 2015 is £195 or US\$308 per year for print only, £213 or US\$339 for print and online, and £163 or US\$257 for online only). We have been using a revenue-sharing formula that subtracts expenditure from revenue and then splits CUP's surplus for *JIPA*. As of 2012 the agreement is based on a royalty on revenue of 40%. The *Journal* has earned an average yearly net income over the last four years of £18,364, peaking in 2012 at £24,041, but dropping to £15,222 in 2014. Due to factors such as economies being made by libraries, income for the Association from *JIPA* has declined, even if our subscription rates have remained competitive. In the case of the IPA, it is important to remember that the cheapest way to receive the *Journal* is to join the Association for an annual fee of €45 (€22.50 for student members).

Finally, we are continually reminded of our debt to our reviewers and Editorial Board members for their conscientious and prompt responses, especially when they are under editorial pressure and their reviews are needed urgently. Reviewers produced some 369 evaluations for *JIPA* over the past four years (some colleagues contributing more than one review), which is almost identical to the 368 assessments reported for the previous four-year period. Careful and thoughtful reviews have been provided consistently, whether a submission has needed only minor revision, whether substantial changes have been necessary, and even where a paper could not be accepted. In the latter cases, the task is even more arduous, and the reviewers deserve our praise and thanks for their exceptional service.

From volume 46 (2016), *JIPA* will be edited by Amalia Arvaniti, with Linda Shockey and Anne Wichmann continuing as Reviews Editors.

Adrian P. Simpson and Amalia Arvaniti

Editors of *JIPA*