

## NORMS FOR MANUSCRIPTS TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE PSR

The PSR Board of Directors leaves to the Editor of the Review such questions as style, format, and the categories into which submitted manuscripts will be sorted for publication. But it does wish to make clear its policy (approved at a meeting held February 2, 1967) regarding the content of acceptable manuscripts, particularly those to be printed as articles, brief communications, research notes, or book reports.

### *General Norms Established by the PSS Board*

*Introduction.* The Board of Directors of the Philippine Sociological Society is concerned that material accepted for publication in the *Philippine Sociological Review* should meet certain requirements demanded by any journal hoping to be judged scholarly by international norms. This concern is understandable, since the Review is one of the Society's chief means for implementing its goals, among which is a raising of the level of research and instruction in the social sciences in the Philippines.

The Board's conception of norms for publishable materials, while based on generally accepted international criteria, is sharpened and modified by the fact that the Society's members are from many social science disciplines, and many of the Review's readers are either generalists or at least not specialists in all the disciplines represented in the articles we print. The Board does not lament this situation — on the contrary — but it believes that the Review's editorial policy should recognize it in a practical manner.

Another fact influencing the policy of the

Board is this, namely, that the social science tradition is not so well or so widely understood in the Philippines as is that of politics and controversy. Hence social science has a special job to do, namely, to preach by example the possibility of a dispassionate search for a better understanding of human behavior, one in which the goal is light, not heat; truth, not victory.

*Norms.* The Board feels that its norms should be as few and as flexible as possible. But we regard these four as an irreducible minimum.

1. By general norms, certainly, we must insist that any article submitted should in fact be a *genuine contribution to social science*. It must present either new findings or a new interpretation of old findings. It should not present what is already common knowledge, or is found in some readily available source. While this norm is meant to govern the evaluation of articles submitted for publication, it is not meant to prevent the Editor from publishing other materials, such as addresses given at the Society's annual convention, for their more general worth or historical importance.
2. The article should be written in *understandable language*. Not only should the text be grammatically correct (the Editor will help here), but it should *avoid unexplained jargon* likely to bewilder the social scientist or the generalist who does not speak the author's special language.

This does not preclude the use of technical terms proper to a particular discipline, or even newly coined words or phrases if these terms are clearly called

for (a) as short-hand references to save time and space, or (b) because the concepts they express are very special and best represented by unfamiliar words or phrases. In such cases each term should be explained the first time it is used.

3. The article must be written in a *responsible manner*. The author must hold himself accountable to his peers for what he writes. The implications of this requirement will differ, of course, with the kind of article in question.

Whether writing about his own work or another's the author should make clear, preferably in explicit terms, how definitive that work was, or is, meant to be, and the audience for which it was written. This distinction is called for because the expectations for a preliminary or exploratory study differ considerably from those for an advanced explanatory study of the same subject. Further, what is written for the general public and published in a general periodical should not be judged by the special norms governing contributions to a professional journal such as the PSR.

In describing preliminary or exploratory investigations, the author writing for the Review is expected to define the population of which he writes, and let readers know, preferably in some detail, the basis or bases for the impressions or tentative hypotheses he sets forth.

Where the study claims to be a definitive empirical study, much more is required. Here, beyond a definition of the population discussed, there should be all the additional refinements normally found in a scholarly paper, among them the following: discriminating use of terms such as assumption, hypothesis, finding, conclusion, and recommendation; adequate description of the method and techniques involved in the design and implementing of the research; a statement of limitations of the study, and at least an estimate of

the validity and generalizability of the findings.

4. The article must be *courteously written*. References to participants in the research, to individuals studied, to other general or particular populations, and to colleagues must be such as become a gentleman or lady who places high value on truth *and* courtesy.

If an author wishes publicly to contest the findings and interpretations of a colleague he is of course free to do so. Indeed, if the disputed issues are of importance, an exchange of opinion can be instructive for all readers of the Review. But the presentation of the criticism should be in good taste. Gratuitously disparaging or condescending statements, crude polemics, and arguments *ad hominem* have no place in scholarly publications.

#### *Particular Guidelines Established by the Editor*

*Categories.* For purposes of its placement within an issue of the PSR, manuscripts approved for publication will be classified (until further notice) as an article, a brief communication, a research note, a news item, or a book report.

An article will be distinguished from a brief communication or a research note principally on grounds of its completeness (or degree of finish) and/or its complexity. Length is not a primary consideration in this distinction.

The PSR distinguishes four kinds of book report, namely, the book listing, the book notice, the book review, and the review article. The *book listing* merely gives essential bibliographic data (for what these data are, see the Lynch-Corvera or Dizon bibliographies in PSR 17[2] or 19[1-2]). The *book notice* adds to bibliographic information a brief (50 words) statement of the book's content and the level of readers for which it seems appropriate. The *book review* (500 words) adds to the above an *evaluation* of the work's content, format, and typography, comparing it with earlier editions of the same, where it is appropriate. It also suggests related works, without elaboration on the latter's content, however. The *review article*

(2,000 words or more) discusses a number of books and/or articles which have unity of topic or author. It has all the features of the foregoing reports, but adds an overall evaluation of the contribution of the writings under review to social science or to our understanding of the Philippines.

*Style.* In general, we follow the norms of the Chicago *Manual of Style* (12th edition, revised; Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1969) and of Kate Turabian's *Manual for Writers* (3rd edition, revised; Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1967). However, it should be noted that source references without substantive content are made *in running text*, not in notes, by inserting within parentheses the author's name, year of publication, and page(s) referred to. The bibliographic data to accompany this brief reference will be placed under References at the end of the article. Examples of this kind of running reference, as well as of the PSR's norms for content notes and bibliography, will be found in any recent number of the Review (preferably from Vol. 18, No. 2, forward).

*Format and copies.* A special reminder about

format. Using 8½-x-11 inch paper, the author should prepare a *double-spaced* typescript original and at least two carbon copies of his manuscript. The original and one carbon, both on bond paper (*not* onionskin), should be submitted to PSR, with one or more other copies retained by the author as an insurance against loss. The editor may return a carbon copy to the author, marked to indicate suggested changes, but *submitted manuscripts will otherwise not be returned to the author.*

Margins are important. Authors should leave at least one inch on all sides to make it possible for the Editor to insert instructions to the printer. Content notes, numbered consecutively, bibliographic references, tables, and figures should be placed on separate sheets and *not* included within the text or at the bottom of text pages. Where the manuscript is intended as an article, the author should also add an abstract of 50–75 words summarizing its contents.

The Editor will generally acknowledge receipt of manuscripts by surface mail. If the author feels that a quicker reply is desirable, he should enclose sufficient postage to cover the added cost.



Tasaday boys warm themselves against the chilling damp of the rain forest, squatting beside a mountain stream where they catch fish, shrimps, tadpoles, and frogs. They produce fire by means of a fire drill rotated between the palms of the firemaker's hands.