

Review of: "Support for Campus Censorship"

Steve Stewart-Williams¹

¹ University of Nottingham, Malaysia Campus

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a very interesting paper reporting important data for current discussions of censorship in science and academia. Overall, the research is well-done; Study 1 was pre-registered and included an attention check, and the sample sizes were generally good. The paper is also well-written and clear. Some comments, suggestions, and criticisms...

-Given the nature of the passages that participants were exposed to, it might be an idea to put the ethics statement in the text of the Methods section, rather than in a footnote.

-It would be good to see effect size estimates for the ANOVAs.

-Figure 1 is much wider than it is tall, which makes it a little difficult to read. The flags in Figure 2 are a nice touch.

-“This study [Study 2] was not preregistered because we could not anticipate sample sizes for two of our three samples (both relied on our ability to recruit as many participants as possible within a limited time frame).” I would have recommended pre-registering anyway, but just mentioning that you couldn’t guarantee sufficient sample sizes for two of the samples.

-I’d be interested to know if there were any sex differences in censorship intentions - that is, differences based on the sex of the participants. This would be especially interesting for the gender-and-leadership item.

-I like that “Black” and “White” are both capitalized. This strikes me as the right way to deal with the capitalization issue.

-“The overall pattern across samples appears consistent with our hypotheses...” This paragraph mixes past and present tenses in describing the results. Others might too; I just happened to notice it in this paragraph.

“Such patterns are consistent with the idea that people interact with information in ways meant to reverse existing hierarchies.” They might not necessarily be meaning to *reverse* them; they may instead be meaning to apply a counterweight, thereby reducing and eliminating them.

-Given that the study relied on self-report data, how seriously can we take the findings? Perhaps the authors could bolster their discussion of this issue in the Limitations section by citing research on the predictive validity of questionnaire responses. It might also be worth noting that, for better or for worse, the method used here is widely used in psychology. Given the “non-PC” findings, there’s a risk that critics will cite weaknesses of self-report data as a reason to dismiss these data, when they wouldn’t if the results had come out the other way - a practice Lee Jussim calls *rigor mortis selectivus* (killing social science through selective calls for rigor).

-“Tocsin” is a pretty obscure word. Consider changing it to something more boring but comprehensible, like “alarm.”