Taking Action Toward More Socially Just Academic Work

The 4Rs
- Pick up dog food - senior formula; chicken/lamb #ok
- NOT salmon!
- Grade design analysis; make video how to access grading comments
- Finish letters of recommendation; upload to Interfolio
- Date night! Place w/reservations or place w/ cheap margaritas? Ask Tony
- Replace blazer buttons (Find g'ma's old buttons)
Recognize
Reveal
Reject
Replace
Recognize
Reveal
Reject
Replace
Example: Journal review process
#Narrow is Reviewer 2 code for “white male readers probably won’t be interested.” My collaborative research on racialization of hair with @thePhDandMe was called “somewhat specialized” and “narrow.” Meanwhile, almost every single human being on earth and in space has/had hair 😳
**Specific**

**DO:** Give detailed comments. Explain why something is strong/well done or why something is problematic/confusing/lacking.

**DO:** Give actionable feedback. Suggest specific actions for the author to take to improve the manuscript.

**DO:** Consider coherence. Note whether sections inform one another: e.g., theory explicitly informs interpretation of findings.

**DON'T:** Don’t mark every instance of a problem. Instead, mark the first couple and then note for the author to fix throughout.

**DON'T:** Don’t proofread. Instead, focus on the major arguments and contribution to the field.

---

**Knowledgeable**

**DO:** Familiarize yourself with the journal. If the manuscript is not a good fit, suggest a more appropriate venue.

**DO:** Describe the contribution to the field. Detail how the manuscript extends (rather than just replicates) existing research.

**DO:** Look for gaps in the literature. Suggest additional sources—especially by multiply marginalized and underrepresented scholars—that could inform and improve the manuscript.

**DON'T:** Don’t assume research validity/trustworthiness. Instead, evaluate according to criteria appropriate for the type of scholarship: e.g., theory building, empirical study, etc.

**DON'T/DON'T:** Don’t accept a review request for a manuscript you are unqualified to review. But don’t underestimate your own expertise and reject a relevant review request either.

---

**Kind**

**DO:** Advocate for inclusivity. Suggest how language could be more inclusive: e.g., written intentionally for diverse audiences, eliminating oppressive rhetoric and unnecessary jargon.

**DO:** Advocate for the author. Approach reviewing as you would mentoring. Review others the way you'd want your manuscript to be reviewed.

**DON'T:** Don’t point only to faults in a manuscript. Instead, use your experience to uplift others through constructive criticism.

**DON'T:** Don’t do the. Instead, be considerate of all stakeholders by promptly responding to review requests.

**DON'T:** Don’t make assumptions. Do not make statements about the author’s identity, background, or experience based on assumptions you draw from the manuscript.
Recognize
Reveal
Reject
Replace
Humans rarely get something right the first time. Expect to revisit your R’s.
The 4Rs are iterative.

Humans rarely get something right the first time. Expect to revisit your R’s.

That’s okay.
To be able to recognize, you may need a reveal.

That’s okay.
We need coalitions.

To be able to recognize, you may need a reveal.

That’s okay.
It’s not always possible to do all 4Rs.

That’s okay.
Do what you can do.

It’s not always possible to do all 4Rs. That’s okay.
Folx have different margins of maneuverability.

That’s okay.
Folx have different margins of maneuverability.

We need coalitions.

That’s okay.
Recognize
Reveal
Reject
Replace
Recognize
Reveal
Reject
Replace