

# ***Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race***

## **INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS**

### **Aims and Scope**

*Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* (DBR) is an innovative periodical that presents and analyzes the best cutting-edge research on race from the social sciences. It provides a forum for discussion and increased understanding of race and society from a range of disciplines, including but not limited to economics, political science, sociology, anthropology, law, communications, public policy, psychology, and history. Each issue of DBR opens with remarks from the editors concerning the three subsequent and substantive sections: STATE OF THE DISCIPLINE, where broad-gauge essays and provocative think-pieces appear; STATE OF THE ART, dedicated to observations and analyses of empirical research; and STATE OF THE DISCOURSE, featuring expansive book reviews, special feature essays, and occasionally, debates. For more information about the *Du Bois Review* please visit our website at <http://hutchinscenter.fas.harvard.edu/du-bois-review> or find us on Facebook and Twitter.

### **Manuscript Submission**

DBR is a blind peer-reviewed journal. To be considered for publication in either STATE OF THE ART or STATE OF THE DISCIPLINE, an electronic copy of a manuscript (hard copies are not required) should be sent to: Managing Editor, *Du Bois Review*, Hutchins Center, Harvard University, 104 Mount Auburn Street, Cambridge, MA 02138. Phone: (617) 384-8338; Fax: (617) 496-8511; E-mail: [dbreview@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:dbreview@fas.harvard.edu). In STATE OF THE DISCOURSE, the *Du Bois Review* publishes substantive (5–10,000 word) review essays of multiple (three or four) thematically related books. Proposals for review essays should be directed to the Managing Editor at [dbreview@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:dbreview@fas.harvard.edu).

### **Manuscript Originality**

The *Du Bois Review* publishes only original, previously unpublished (whether hard copy or electronic) work. Submitted manuscripts may not be under review for publication elsewhere while under consideration at DBR. Papers with multiple authors are reviewed under the assumption that all authors have approved the submitted manuscript and concur with its submission to the DBR.

### **Copyright**

Upon acceptance of your manuscript, a Copyright Transfer Agreement, with certain specified rights reserved by the author, must be signed and returned to the Managing Editor's office (see address under "Manuscript Submission" above). This is necessary for the wide distribution of research findings and the protection of both the authors and the Hutchins Center for African and African American Research at Harvard University.

### **Manuscript Preparations and Style**

Final manuscripts must be prepared in accordance with the DBR style sheet (see below) and the Chicago Manual of Style. Manuscripts requiring major reformatting will be returned to the author(s). Submitted manuscripts should be prepared as Word documents with captions, figures, graphs, illustrations, and tables (all in shades of black and white). The entire manuscript should be typed double-spaced throughout on 8½" × 11" paper. Pages should be numbered sequentially beginning with the Title Page. The *Title Page* should state the full title of the manuscript, the full names and affiliations of all authors, a detailed contact address with telephone and fax numbers, e-mail address, and the address for requests of reprints. At the top right provide a shortened title for the running head (up to thirty characters). The *Abstract* (up to 300 words) should appear on page 2 followed by up to eight *Keywords*. If an *Epigraph* is present, it should precede the start of the text on page 3. Appropriate heads and subheads should be used accordingly in the text. *Acknowledgments* are positioned in a section preceding the *References* section. Corresponding author's contact information should appear at the end of the body of the text. DBR prints no footnotes, and only contentful endnotes. (All citations to texts are made in the body of the text.) The *References* section should list only those works explicitly cited in the body of the text. *Figures*, figure captions, and *Tables* should appear on separate pages. *Appendices* should appear separately. **IMPORTANT:** Electronic copies of figures are to be provided, with the graphics appearing in TIFF, EPS, or PDF formats. Word (or .doc) files of figures not in digital format are not acceptable.

### **Corrections**

Corrections to proofs should be restricted to factual or typographical errors only. Rewriting of the copy is not permitted.

Race has been a major determinant of social and economic allocations in North America ever since the first Africans were brought here to perform servile labor in the early 1600s. The costs associated with low SES have thus been borne disproportionately by African Americans throughout U.S. history. But the costs of being Black run deeper than that. As Phelan and Link point out, racism is a social force that has produced a “massive multiplicity” of disadvantages that operate at the individual, family, neighborhood, and institutional levels. Thus, gains in education or income do not confer the same socioeconomic benefits to Blacks as they do to Whites in terms of social status, economic security, housing and neighborhood security, wealth accumulation, or socioeconomic transfers to children. Further, there is evidence that Blacks’ recurrent exposure—across the socioeconomic spectrum—to individual, communal, and institutional acts of racial discrimination is an additional source of health-damaging chronic stress that weathers their bodies prematurely.

— MARY R. JACKMAN AND KIMBERLEE A. SHAUMAN

In light of the scientific and pseudo-scientific discourse about the contribution of genes to social inequality, it is of great interest which groups are most likely to hold such beliefs, and which groups are less likely to admit to them. Understanding variation in the receptiveness to—and diffusion of—genetic accounts of inequality is an important path to identifying the mechanisms of socialization into essentialist thinking. According to our data, older people and those with higher education are more likely than others to believe in genetic causes of racial inequality, and at the same time, are less likely to say so. Women are just as likely as men to have such beliefs, but much less likely to admit to it. Thus, in addition to the empirical contribution of gauging more accurately levels of essentialism in the non-Black population, this work also offers new empirical data on the variation in socially desirable reporting across groups. Again, these findings furnish evidence for new reflections on American socialization into the expression of socially desirable stances on racial inequality.

— ANN MORNING, HANNAH BRÜCKNER AND ALONDRA NELSON

African American women and kin primarily settled in Plantation districts where, by 1910, they had lower odds of owning farms. Their movement up the ladder was increasingly limited by labor laws and debt peonage. Most often, Black women in sharecropping families worked in the fields, earning less than the men. Black women not working in the fields were designated as “dependents” and listed with children on contracts. Thus, the economic system of sharecropping, supported by the new racial state, reinforced patriarchal family structure with separation of external/paid work and internal/unpaid work into gendered realms. Women’s work in slavery, now in sharecropping, was masculinized whereas men’s work was not systematically feminized in either system. In this way, race and gender hierarchies structured the lives of freedwomen and all women as they forged their versions of freedom, interdependence, and independence in post-slavery Arkansas.

— CHERYL ELMAN, BARBARA WITTMAN, KATHRYN M. FELTEY,  
COREY STEVENS AND MOLLY HARTSOUGH

Cambridge Core

For further information about this journal please  
go to the journal website at:

[cambridge.org/dbr](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X20000041)

CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS