

## Sociology of Race and Ethnicity

Impact Factor: 2.8

5-Year Impact Factor: 3.9

### Submission guidelines



#### Submit manuscript

Please read the guidelines in full before submitting your manuscript. Manuscripts not conforming to these guidelines may be returned.

Submit Manuscript 

### Electronic Submission

All manuscripts must be submitted electronically via SageTrack's ScholarOne Manuscripts. To access this system, go to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/sre>. You will be required to register with the system before electronically submitting your manuscript to *SRE*.

### Manuscript Preparation Guidelines

Please go to [this link](#) to read the SRE Manuscript Preparation Guidelines.

Guidelines for *SRE* authors can also be found on our Sage Track site <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/sre> under "Instructions and Forms."

Additional details on preparing manuscripts for ASR are published in the ASA Style Guide (7th ed., 2022) available from the American Sociological Association.

### Accessibility Guidelines

Authors should familiarize themselves with [Sage's Accessibility Guidelines](#) to ensure their manuscripts meet recognized accessibility standards.

### Authorship:

Parties who have made a substantive contribution to the article should be listed as authors. Principal authorship, authorship order, and other publication credits should be

based on the relative scientific or professional contributions of the individuals involved, regardless of their status.

Please note that AI chatbots, for example ChatGPT, should not be listed as authors. For more [information see the policy on Use of ChatGPT and generative AI tools](#).

### **Acknowledgements:**

All contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in an Acknowledgements section. Examples of those who might be acknowledged include a person who provided purely technical help, or a department chair who provided only general support.

Please supply any personal acknowledgements separately to the main text to facilitate anonymous peer review.

### **Ethics:**

Submission of a manuscript to another professional journal while it is under review by *SRE* is regarded by the ASA as unethical. Significant findings or contributions that have already appeared (or will appear) elsewhere must be clearly identified. All persons who publish in ASA journals are required to abide by ASA guidelines and ethics codes regarding plagiarism and other ethical issues. This requirement includes adhering to ASA's stated policy on data-sharing: "As a regular practice, sociologists share data and pertinent documentation as an integral part of a research plan. Sociologists generally make their data available after completion of a project or its major publications, except where proprietary agreements with employers, contractors, or clients preclude such accessibility or when it is impossible to share data and protect the confidentiality of the research participants (e.g., field notes or detailed information from ethnographic interviews)" (ASA [Code of Ethics](#), 2018).

### **Funding:**

*Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* requires all authors to acknowledge their funding in a consistent fashion under a separate heading. Please visit the [Funding Acknowledgements](#) page on the [Sage Journal Author Gateway](#) to confirm the format of the acknowledgment text in the event of funding, or state that: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests:**

*Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* encourages authors to include a declaration of any conflicting interests and recommends you review the good practice guidelines on the [Sage Journal Author Gateway](#).

Thank you for agreeing to review a manuscript for *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity (SRE)*. Reviewing peer manuscripts is one of the cornerstones upon which our discipline is built. As such, it is very important that you take reviewing seriously. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* publishes only the best sociological work in the study of race and ethnicity – regardless of theoretical, epistemological, and methodological orientation. As a peer reviewer, you should reap intellectual benefits of the review process, benefit from reading the most cutting-edge research in the sociology of race and ethnicity, and have the additional satisfaction of constructively assisting the author in making their manuscript the strongest and most contributive it can be. All of this emerges from your prompt, full, and constructive peer review of the manuscript.

In addition to publishing original full-length manuscripts, *SRE* also publishes pieces on the pedagogy of sociology of race and ethnicity. If you are reviewing for this section, please note that the Pedagogy Section of *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* provides a space dedicated to publishing cutting-edge work related to the teaching of the sociology of race and ethnicity, from introductory undergraduate courses to advanced graduate courses. Manuscripts should not exceed 2500- 3000 words in length, including references and footnotes. Papers might address theory, teaching assessment and reflection, analysis of resources, class exercises, service learning or a combination of these topics. All submissions should be clearly informed by the current literature, and (if applicable) provide evidence of teaching effectiveness.

Recently, the American Sociological Association published an article on the best practices of reviewers in the discipline (Brunnsma, Prasad, and Zuckerman 2013). What the authors found is summarized here:

- The average time spent on reviewing manuscripts was 3.4 hours with fairly wide variation. Often this variation depends on the qualities of the manuscript;
- Related, the best reviews tend to be ones that are done fairly soon after agreeing to do the review, instead of awaiting the final reminder;
- Lengths of reviews range from 1-3 single-spaced documents;
- Those who review many manuscripts have found that it is better to write the review with the “forest” in mind – the big picture, central issues and arguments in the manuscript, while not forgetting the “trees.” In other words, long lists of negative and problematic details without the bigger picture, makes the reviews less useful for the author;
- Importantly, they found that reviews that are constructive, kind, supportive, are much more useful than those that are destructive, mean, etc. In other words, review unto others as you would have them review unto you.

Our conclusion was this:

“Although the responses do not reveal a silver bullet that can magically reduce manuscript review times, one element of good practice is clear: when you agree to do a review, actually put into your schedule the time that it will take to do it (three to four hours on average). It may be helpful to both author and reviewer if reviewers keep comments to big picture, substantive issues, particularly ‘how the argument holds together; connections between argument and analysis; methodological clarity and appropriateness.’”

At *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* we agree with these sentiments of best reviewing practices and believe this will lead to shorter review times, stronger reviews, and, ultimately, a much healthier journal with indeed the best sociological research in race and ethnicity.

One of the top (and most effective) journals in our discipline is *Gender & Society*. What follows is drawn heavily from their *Guidelines for Gender & Society Reviewers* (2011). These guidelines provide more specific advice for reviewing manuscripts in a journal that desires not only the strongest reviews, but also the most constructive, supportive, and kind ones.

- First, read the paper;
- Begin by identifying the paper’s aims, as you see them (this may differ from the author’s statement), clearly stating what the paper argues, and what its contribution is meant to be. This should be one or two sentences that help the editor and author know whether the paper’s main point has come across. In addition, note the strengths of the paper (even if you do not think the paper as a whole is strong);
- Next, present the comments you see as most central to an effective revision of the paper. As Ferree (2004) notes, the core of the review should identify whether the research question contributes to larger theory, whether the analysis actually answers the research question, and whether the conclusions flow from the analyses. Identifying weaknesses can help the author craft a stronger paper, which sometimes means reframing the piece theoretically, refocusing the question, or reinterpreting the analysis;
- Here, you want to provide clear advice about how the author might address the problems you have identified or the questions you have raised. For example, if you feel the author is missing crucial references that would help them build a better argument, provide those references; if you think the author needs to provide more information about methods, explain what is missing; if you have problems with the analyses or feel that they are not persuasive enough, explain how the analyses could become more persuasive. Do not be overly specific and nitpicky, rewrite the paper for the author, or flood the author with many pages of comments;
- End with the small points that will not dramatically change the paper’s form or argument, such as formatting of tables or figures, excessive use of jargon, writing errors, or other minor changes. Reviewers need not provide line-by-line editing. The



journal will help with copy-editing the manuscript – the reviewer’s time and attention is better spent on ensuring that the argument is sound;

- After writing the review, go back through it and edit out any language that seems emotionally laden. For example, rather than saying “This paper is terrible,” you might note, “This paper has weaknesses in both its theoretical framework and its empirical analyses,” or even “While focused around a very interesting case, this paper currently has weaknesses in both its theoretical framework and its empirical analyses.” Using neutral or supportive language will make the author much more likely to heed your comments. You may indeed feel that the paper is terrible, and that the author has wasted your time and energy. But that frustration shouldn’t spill into your review. The goal is to improve the paper. Very occasionally, the reviewer may be so at odds with a paper that it is difficult to write a fair review. In this case, be honest with the editor and author about the intellectual disagreement that affects your reading of the paper;
- Finally, make sure that your review does not notify the author of your recommendation (as the final call is the editor’s); if recommending a rejection, feel free to list a more appropriate journal.

The best review is a constructive review that truly betters the paper. Thank you so much for taking part in this work for the journal!

**Guidelines for *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* reviewers can also be found on our SageTrack site <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/sre> under "Instructions and Forms."**

### **Soliciting Book Reviews**

*Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* (SRE) is pleased to receive requests to review recently published books (typically within 18 months of publication, but up to 3 years) in the fields of sociology of race and ethnicity and likely to be of interest and relevance to the journal’s readership.

Given that it has been difficult to promote and review books published during the pandemic, every effort will be made to find reviewers for titles that have been released since the start of 2020.

We are especially interested in reviewing books published with presses that tend to receive less coverage in book reviews, and books by authors from historically marginalized backgrounds.

**Authors** of new books are always welcome to contact the editors to inquire about getting their book reviewed in SRE. You may wish to identify some possible reviewers. Please also include the information for a contact at your publisher.

*Publishers* are welcome to send announcements about relevant titles to the editors via email.

will not give preference for reviews to those books we receive hard copies of. We understand that shipping and giving away free copies is costly and may disadvantage smaller

publishers. For these reasons—as well as to expedite the review process—we always welcome electronic copies of books.

**Potential reviewers:** thank you for your interest in reviewing for SRE! The journal welcomes correspondence from anyone—faculty, graduate students, and independent researchers—who is interested in reviewing for the journal. Potential reviewers should contact the editor directly with requests to review any titles that have caught their attention. Please note that when requesting a book for review, it helps to describe briefly why you think a review of the book would be appropriate for the journal, and why you are a good fit to be the reviewer. It is common practice for the reviewer to be at an “arms-length” distance from the author(s) of a book, e.g., may be an acquaintance at most of the author(s), but not a friend, a collaborator, department colleague, or otherwise have a close personal or professional relation with the author(s).

The journal encourages and welcomes co-authored book reviews, especially co-authorships that may have a mentoring component, e.g., a faculty member and a graduate student mentee.

SRE primarily accepts requests for single book reviews and, less frequently, reviews of two books (paired reviews) and two to four books (thematic or review essays). Edited volumes will be considered for review in rare circumstances.

### **Guidelines for Writing Single Book Reviews**

A review of a single book should be around 800-1000 words, including references. They are normally due 2 months after receipt of a hard or electronic copy of the book, though we understand if extra time is needed.

An effective book review should:

- Help introduce the book to readers.
- Summarize the book’s aims, the claims it makes, and how it uses evidence (and certain methods) to support those claims. Chapter-by-chapter summaries are not necessary so long as the review describes the book’s main claims.
- Identify the book’s intended contributions or interventions and describe how effective the book was in making those contributions and interventions.
- Describe a good audience for the book and who would benefit the most from reading the book.
- Fairly assess the book’s strengths and weaknesses/limitations.
- Where possible, contextualize the book in larger trends and patterns within and outside of the sociology of race and ethnicity, and society more generally.
- Be professional and courteous throughout, and mindful of the American Sociological Association’s [guidelines on ethics](#).

We strongly encourage reviews that are creative and take unique perspectives and formats, so long as the general criteria above are met. For example, the review might also:

- Describe how the book can be used for classroom instruction. **We strongly encourage reviews that speak to the usefulness of a book for teaching.**
- Speak in the first-person “I” and situate the reviewer’s own relationship to the book, and bring in personal stories (e.g. How did you first come across the book? How and why might you connect with it personally?).
- Be organized thematically (around central themes in the book, or larger themes the reviewer has identified) and not linearly (e.g., chapter-by-chapter snapshots).
- Be organized around a key quotation that aims for a thick description assessment of the book, and uses that quotation as a window into the book’s events, arguments, actors, etc.

The editors welcome any suggestions and ideas for non-standard reviews.

### **Guidelines for Paired Reviews**

A review of two books should be around 1600-2000 words, including references. They are due 3 months after receipt of a hard or electronic copy of both books, though we understand if extra time is needed.

These reviews should be greater than the sum of two otherwise separate reviews. In addition to following the “effective book review” guidelines for single books, a paired review should also:

- Provide equal coverage of the two books.
- Highlight what makes the books distinctive and similar.
- Compare the strengths and weaknesses between the books.

### **Guidelines for Thematic Reviews**

The length of a thematic review of 3-4 books can be negotiated with the editor, but will normally be *greater* than the sum of 800-1000 word individual reviews. A good baseline for a 3-book review is 3000 words. The submission deadline can be negotiated with the editor, but ideally be within 3-4 months after receipt of a hard or electronic copy of all books, though we understand if extra time is needed.

In addition to following the “effective book review” guidelines for single books, a thematic review should also:

- Use the extra words available to lay out the terrain and history, and explain why the shared topics of the books have become popular and important.
- Provide equal coverage of all the books.
- Compare the strengths and weaknesses among the books.

- Include a title.

## Special Features

The Reviews section will introduce two new features: “Conversations,” which are casual interviews with authors of noteworthy books; and “Our Two Cents,” a set of (four or more) brief, single-point reflections of a noteworthy book, with or without a reply from the authors. The section will also occasionally host more standard book symposiums for both new and older books.

## A Note for First-Time Book Review Authors

The editors are especially interested in helping early career scholars and graduate students, and those writing reviews for the first time. Students preparing for exams, reading closely for dissertation research, and other scholars who are reading texts closely are in a great position to write reviews, but may need additional guidance. For these scholars, the Book Review Editor is happy to discuss ideas, answer questions, etc. prior to the submission of the completed review.

## Style Conventions

References should be avoided if possible. Where they are essential, they should [follow the journal's guidelines](#).

Quotations in the text should be enclosed in double quotation marks. Provide the page numbers in a parenthetical notation, e.g. (p. XX). Large quotations (40 words or more) should be set out as extracts.

At the beginning of the review, the following information should be given, using this format:

AUTHOR'S NAME

TITLE: SUBTITLE

Place of publication: publisher, year of publication, price, ISBN., number of pages.

Reviewer name and affiliation

For example:

LISA NAKAMURA

CYBERTYPES: RACE, ETHNICITY, AND IDENTITY ON THE INTERNET

New York: Routledge, 2002, \$36.95, ISBN. 978-0-415-93837-2, 192 pp.

in Banks, University of Springfield

The Editors reserve the right to edit, to request revisions, and to reject reviews.

## **Name Change Policy**

Sage has introduced a policy to enable name and pronoun changes for our authors. ASA journals published by Sage follow this policy. Going forward, all requests to make a name or pronoun change will be honored. This includes, but is not limited to, name changes because of marriage, divorce, gender affirmation, and religious conversion. For more information, read Sage's [Name Change Policy](#).

## **Orcid**

As part of our commitment to ensuring an ethical, transparent and fair peer review process Sage is a supporting member of [ORCID, the Open Researcher and Contributor ID](#). ORCID provides a unique and persistent digital identifier that distinguishes researchers from every other researcher, even those who share the same name, and, through integration in key research workflows such as manuscript and grant submission, supports automated linkages between researchers and their professional activities, ensuring that their work is recognized.

The collection of ORCID iDs from corresponding authors is now part of the submission process of this journal. If you already have an ORCID iD you will be asked to associate that to your submission during the online submission process. We also strongly encourage all co-authors to link their ORCID ID to their accounts in our online peer review platforms. It takes seconds to do: click the link when prompted, sign into your ORCID account and our systems are automatically updated. Your ORCID iD will become part of your accepted publication's metadata, making your work attributable to you and only you. Your ORCID iD is published with your article so that fellow researchers reading your work can link to your ORCID profile and from there link to your other publications.

If you do not already have an ORCID iD please follow this [link](#) to create one or visit our [ORCID homepage](#) to learn more.

### **Browse journal**

---

Current issue

OnlineFirst

All issues

Free sample

## Journal information

---

Journal overview and metrics

Editorial board

**Submission guidelines**

Reprints

Journal permissions

Subscribe

Recommend to library

Advertising and promotion

## Keep up to date

---



Facebook



X



LinkedIn



YouTube



RSS feed



Email alerts

[View all options](#)

---

## Also from Sage

**CQ Library**

Elevating debate

**Sage Data**

Uncovering insight

**Sage Business Cases**

**Sage Campus**

Shaping futures

Unleashing potential

**Sage Knowledge**

Multimedia learning resources

**Sage Research Methods**

Supercharging research

**Sage Video**

Streaming knowledge

**Technology from Sage**

Library digital services

