



SCENARIOS FOR DISCUSSION

Dissemination

SCENARIO 1

Updating Published Work

After you have published an article, in which you reported qualitatively on three participants, one of the three participants lets you know they identify as being gender fluid and do not wish to be represented in print (even via pseudonym) as a woman. The research design had led you to select one woman, one man, and one non-binary student as the three participants; the analysis focuses on the relatively different experiences of the participants that they attributed to their gender identities. It will thus not be a simple find and replace for pronouns or a pseudonym to make the publication reflect the gender fluid identity of one participant. Although the journal has a mechanism for reporting a name or gender change, it does not have a mechanism for more substantial manuscript revisions. What should you do?

SCENARIO 2

Limited Reviewers' Understanding

You get back reviews from a STEM education journal, regarding a manuscript in which you reported on the experiences of women and non-binary students in a Calculus I course. Since you had 137 women participants, you reported many of those findings quantitatively using a hierarchical linear model (students nested in courses, nested in campuses). You had 6 non-binary participants, so you reported their results descriptively. Reviewer #2 recommends your manuscript be rejected because of the different analytic techniques employed, and suggests that to be published, you should drop the non-binary students from the dataset and just report quantitatively on the women via hierarchical linear models. What should you do?

SCENARIO 3

Journals Not Accepting Pronouns

When working with a STEM Education Journal, the author included their pronouns (they/them) in the author bio as part of a manuscript submission. During the page proof process, a copy editor had changed the pronouns to she/her/hers. The author re-corrected the pronouns to they/them, but the published article showed she/her/hers. The author protested to the journal editor, and the pronouns were eventually corrected (this is an online only publication). The journal editor conveyed that the longstanding journal copyediting guidelines say to use he/she and not they as singular pronouns. What advice would you give the author? The journal editor?

SCENARIO 4

Arbitrary Gender Categories

You are reviewing a manuscript, and see that the participants are described as cis-gender women, transgender women, cis-gender men, transgender men, and non-binary as five major categories. The authors state they are using these five categories, but do not provide a rationale for this particular set of gender categories. Based on the findings, the two categories of women are statistically the same as each other (no significant differences), and the two categories of men are statistically the same as each other (no significant differences). The authors reported all of the findings using five gender categories; should they have collapsed their analysis to the three categories with statistical differences (men, women, and non-binary students)? What advice should you give the authors in your role as a reviewer?

SCENARIO 5

Cis-hetero-Normative Deficit Framing

Your manuscript is returned with reviewers requesting that you compare the experiences of gay students to the experiences of straight students (normalizing the experiences of straight students). You want to avoid the deficit orientation that normalizes the experiences of straight students compared to gay students. This particular journal has a high impact factor and you know it would help your tenure case to have a publication in this journal. Should you accede to the reviewers' requests? How can you address the reviewer concerns?

SCENARIO 6

Risk of Re-identification

A group of researchers, all from the same university, conducted a study about departmental culture and student belonging in three engineering departments on campus. Through their interviews, it became obvious that mechanical engineering has a number of homophobic faculty members, which makes many students uncomfortable, including one lesbian mechanical engineering student interviewed. Although the researchers plan to anonymize the university name in their research, it isn't a stretch to assume readers might figure out the research was conducted at the institution where all the authors work. Further, there are so few women mechanical engineering majors that there is a real chance the woman interviewed could be identified by anyone familiar with the current students, if she is listed as a lesbian mechanical engineering major. The student's sexuality is an important dimension of her narrative, and is salient to the researchers' analysis of departmental culture. Retaliation (overt or subconscious) by the faculty members is possible, during the woman's final year before graduation. What should the researchers do? Should the researcher report the hostile department climate to anyone?



PRISMATIC is supported in part by a grant from the National Science Foundation (DUE-2220269). All PRISMATIC activities and findings are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funding agency.

