



Journal of Appalachian Studies Media Reviewer Guidelines

What can be reviewed?

JAS welcomes substantive and insightful reviews from scholars and lay experts that address formal, aesthetic and/or sociocultural context of media works, defined as anything that is not a book, or that challenges traditional ideas of the book.

Reviews of plays, games, music (published or performed), exhibits, media collections (photo archives or YouTube video playlists, for example), digital phenomena, websites/blogs, social media projects or platforms, television shows or series, films, radio works, book arts, media campaigns, etc. are encouraged.

Works that push boundaries of traditional forms are of particular interest. The work should be contemporary, published or performed within the last year.

How should it be reviewed?

Submissions that engage with current academic and popular discourses in media, cultural, and Appalachian studies and place particular aspects of the chosen media work within broader social, political, and historical contexts are encouraged. Weigh your review towards analysis/criticism over description/summarization.

Keep your audience, and their interests, in mind. *JAS*'s primary concern is to promote understanding of the Appalachian region, so be sure and appropriately engage with the field of Appalachian studies in your analysis. Discussions of how a piece of media is or could be received within a specifically Appalachian context, for example, are encouraged.

Carefully consider form when formulating your discussion of the work. Exhibits, for example, should go beyond a discussion of the objects on display and include critical assessments of curatorial rationale, organization, presentation, etc., along with a consideration of how viewers engage with the exhibit.

Logistical Considerations

1. At the beginning of your review, include a detailed bibliographic entry for the work using Chicago Style. If the form of your media work raises questions with regard to authorship or other bibliographic considerations—such as a crowd-sourced piece, video game, etc.—do your best and make a note to the media editor in your draft submission.
2. Reviews of single works should be approximately 750 words; for essay-reviews or comparative pieces, aim for 1500 words. If you have ideas for a more lengthy piece, contact the media review editor.
3. Generally avoid the first person point of view.
4. If you would like to include an image with your review (a film still, for example), contact the media review editor.

5. Include a one-sentence bio at the end of your review that includes affiliations and areas of study/expertise.
6. Use Chicago Style citation.
7. Use Times New Roman and double space.
8. Submit the completed review within **8 weeks** of receiving your assignment.
9. Be prepared to revise the review if necessary.

Questions regarding the review process can be emailed to the media review editor, Christopher Miller, at cmiller27@RADFORD.EDU.