

4. M. Mulkay, *The Word and the World: Explorations in the Form of Sociological Analysis* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1985).

5. In an empirical inquiry of this kind, it would of course not be necessary to limit the context under consideration to the philosophical.

6. The rhetorical significance of my dwelling on these mistakes of P&M's is this: do not trust them with texts.

7. P. Halfpenny, 'Theory and Data in Social Research', *International Review of Sociology*, New Series, No. 3 (1987), 190–220. This article is marred by several serious misprints: a corrected version is available from the author.

8. S. Woolgar, 'Interests and Explanation in the Social Study of Science', *Social Studies of Science*, Vol. 11 (1981), 365–94.

9. In relation to P&M's reference to Sacks, I agree, his findings, too, are often more easily understandable when stated in simple language, as his jargon also tends to be pretentious and obscure.

Peter Halfpenny is Senior Lecturer in Sociology and Director of the Centre for Applied Social Research at the University of Manchester. His interests include the sociology and philosophy of the natural and social sciences, especially forms of explanation.

Author's address: Department of Sociology, University of Manchester,
Manchester M13 9PL, UK.

Responses and Replies (continued)

Are Editors Being Exploited?

John M. Swales

In the May 1988 issue of *Social Studies of Science*, the Editors raise the problem of what seems to be a growing practice of authors submitting drafts rather than finished products to journals. The following incident throws an unexpected light on this phenomenon. But first a little background.

I work in the general field of what might be called the Language Arts and Sciences, wherein I co-edit a small and rather specialized journal. Over the last few years, it has become an increasingly valued practice for the journal editors in the general field to hold an annual meeting at one of the major US conventions. At the 1988 meeting, the editors of the leading journals in two of the major sub-fields (both journals with rejection rates hovering around 90%) recounted this story.

They independently received at the same time the same manuscript — despite strict and prominently displayed journal policies that require authors to undertake that their manuscripts are not being considered for publication elsewhere. The editors only discovered the double

Social Studies of Science (SAGE, London, Newbury Park and New Delhi),
Vol. 19 (1989), 152–53

submission when they happened to choose the same person as one of the reviewers, who got on the phone and said 'Did you know that . . .?'. The two distinguished editors of the distinguished journals decided to write to the miscreant to the effect that he or she need not bother darkening their editorial doorsteps with further manuscripts while the present editors remained in office.

The editors confessed to the meeting that they had been expecting an abashed, even grovelling, response from a colleague so obviously caught *in flagrante delicto*. Not a bit of it. 'Ah', came the reply, 'but I didn't really submit to your journals because I only sent you drafts. In the past I have received such wonderful reviews from your journals that I have been easily able to revise the papers so that they are immediately acceptable elsewhere. I didn't really plan on making it into *your* journals; what I wanted was the feedback'.

In a comparable way, my own editorial experience over the last three years makes me suspect that we are receiving increasing numbers of manuscripts that have been rejected by journals in adjacent specializations. The manuscripts are appropriately formatted, but are neither conceptualized according to the expectations of my field, nor address its central literature. They seem to be negotiating some other discipline's knowledge claims. Many of these submissions come from hard-pressed assistant professors, and may be accompanied by letters with muted appeals for assistance. Such manuscripts put me in something of a quandary. While I am as anxious as the next person to gather recruits, I can easily foresee the dismissive comments of the reviewers. If there is an aspect of this trend that disturbs me, it is that a growing minority of authors apparently feel that it is not really necessary even to read up on back issues of a journal *before* submitting to it. Thus, the editors are expected, after the event, to offer advice on how a submission could be restructured to meet the preliminary requirements of a particular research front. At time I feel the new word-processing age is ushering in an era where certain common courtesies are in retreat; at others I am surprised at an ostensible lack of enlightened self-interest.

I therefore believe that there is indeed the problem of draft submissions raised in the May Editorial. However, from my coign of vantage, it is not just a problem of *roughness*, but also one of *inappropriate fit*. Others of us may need to follow Edge and MacLeod's lead and demonstrate that the age of gullibility is over. No more Mr and Mrs Nice Guys.

John M. Swales is Professor of Linguistics and Director of the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan. He is Co-editor of the *English for Specific Purposes* journal and is currently completing a book for Cambridge University Press entitled *A Genre-based Approach to Academic English*.

Author's address: English Language Institute, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA.