

Guidelines for Authors: *Science as Culture*

Mission statement: Our culture is a scientific one, defining what is natural and what is rational. Its values can be seen in what are sought out as facts and made as artefacts, what are designed as processes and products, and what are forged as weapons and filmed as wonders. In our daily experience, power is exercised through expertise, e.g. in science, technology and medicine. *Science as Culture* explores how all these shape the values which contend for influence over the wider society. The journal encompasses people's experiences at various sites – the workplace, the cinema, the computer, the hospital, the home and the academy. The articles are readable, attractive, lively, often humorous, and always jargon-free. *SaC* aims to be read at leisure, and to be a pleasure.

Hands-on approach: The SaC editorial team devotes a significant effort to improve draft papers. We aim to give authors clear guidance; hence our editorial requests often go beyond those of the reviewers. Our editorial team then reviews every revised paper and may request further changes if necessary. This can mean that submissions go through several revisions before acceptance. But an invitation to revise a paper does not mean that it will be accepted for publication.

Research Papers: structure and content

In addressing the journal's mission statement, research papers must have the following structural and substantive features. Research papers that significantly diverge will be returned to the author. They should follow the structure below.

Abstract (200-250 words): should straightforwardly summarise the argument – *rather than* say what you or the article does. Avoid phrases such as 'The article is about...', 'The article (or author or we) examines/discusses...', 'It is demonstrated/argued that...', etc.

Main points here should correspond to text in the Conclusion.

Keywords: 3-6 keywords should be listed after the Abstract.

Introduction: This should be written to draw in readers who are non-specialists but interested in critical perspectives. It should start with a publicly important issue – not an academic one – such as a news story, event, piece of legislation etc. It should relate to people's experience of science, technology, expertise, etc. And it should minimise empirical detail, which belongs later.

Regarding the publicly important issue, the Introduction should also pose general questions (not dependent upon analytical concepts) which will be answered in the Conclusion.

Such questions should be analytical-descriptive, not only normative-prescriptive.

These questions can be followed by a brief summary of answers, corresponding to the Abstract.

This section should not exceed 1000 words; it should aim to set up the questions.

Analytical perspectives: The questions in the Introduction provide a rationale for bringing in analytical perspectives relevant to a cultural analysis of technoscience. At least one concept should clearly relate to *SaC* themes, e.g. perspectives from STS literature and/or cultural studies.

The concepts should be adequately explained, with some direct quotations from the original authors, so that readers can judge how appropriately the article uses them. The author should explain just a few analytical concepts that will be used, rather than give a long literature survey.

Empirical Analysis: Should analyse empirical material by drawing upon analytical perspectives that were introduced earlier. This should not introduce theories or concepts that have not been explained previously. All this can be several sections.

Conclusion: This should summarise the preceding argument by bringing together key points which already appeared in the article – rather than assume that the reader remembers them.

It should clearly answer the questions posed in the Introduction, while elaborating on key words in the title. The Conclusion also should summarise how analytical perspectives have illuminated the case.

These tasks may sound obvious, but many first-draft articles neglect them.

Total length: 10k words maximum, including all text (References, notes, etc.).

Stylistic Guide

Before an article is accepted in final form, it must follow the stylistic guidelines below.

Easy reading: Please minimize the length of each sentence and paragraph, in order to make the reading easier. Maximum 6-7 sentences per paragraph.

Headings: Please insert several subheadings (upper & lower-case letters in **boldface**), within which you can also use sub-subheadings (upper & lower-case letters in *italics*). As a rough guide, try to include approx. 3-5 headings for every thousand words. Each one should start on a new line.

Endnotes: Numbered notes should be used only for making substantive points and should be minimized, by integrating essential points into the main text. The published article will put all the notes at the end, just before the Bibliography/References section, so your manuscript should do likewise.

Inverted commas: These should be used only for direct quotations from public debates or from specific sources cited. Otherwise inverted commas (scare quotes) should not be used, e.g. for irony or a distancing effect; such usage substitutes for the analysis that must be done.

Quotations: Quotations should be enclosed with single quote marks, or with double marks for quotes within quotes. Long quotations should be indented, not enclosed in quote marks.

Citations/references: All references should use the Harvard style (author, year, page); each one should refer to an item in the alphabetical Bibliography. Please try to put citations at the end of a sentence, not in the middle, for easier reading.

Bibliography/references:

Standard format is similar for articles in books or journals, as follows:

Surname, Initial. (year) Title of article, *Journal/Book Title*, vol.(no.), pp.ii-xx (City: Publisher).

Other information needed:

Biographical note of a couple sentences for the Contributors section, placed at the end of the article.

Optional items

Illustrations

Please suggest some illustrations, e.g. diagrams, publicity items, photos, etc. See previous *SaC* issues for examples. Ideally, you would send us a good reproducible copy of each illustration, with a permissions letter/message – or at least some guidance about how we can obtain a good original and permission. If you request permission on our behalf, then please explain that we are a relatively small-circulation journal, in order to minimize any reproduction fee. If the proposed fee is more than nominal, then we will judge whether the picture warrants the payment.

For each one, insert the caption and credit (acknowledgement of source) in the appropriate place.

Audiovisual material

Beyond the article itself, the online version can include extra material, e.g., animations, movie files, sound files and text files. Such files should be submitted after acceptance of the final manuscript, to a special email address provided for that purpose. It is in the author's interest to provide the highest quality figure format possible. Please contact the T&F [Production Department](#) if you have any queries.

Submission Procedure

All submissions (except draft book reviews) should use the online system

<http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/csac>

Referee procedure: *SaC* submissions are refereed single-blind: referees see authors' names, but not vice versa. Articles are evaluated vis à vis criteria in the first page of the above guidance.

Les Levidow, Co-Editor, *SaC*

July 2020

https://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authors/csac_edit_guidelines.pdf