

11

A GUIDE TO REFERENCE AND DOCUMENTATION

By making explicit the sources of your ideas and information, you let the reader know the full extent of the conversation in which you are taking part. You may use sources for many purposes, and the ways in which you refer to the source materials depend on those purposes. Whenever you cite another writer's work, whether by paraphrase, summary, or direct quote, you must document it. Proper documentation makes your use of source materials legitimate and allows the reader access to those sources. In this chapter, the documentation rules of both parenthetical reference systems and notes are presented according to the Modern Language Association (MLA), American Psychological Association (APA), and American Chemical Society (ACS) formats.

Revealing Sources

The informed writer draws on knowledge gained from many sources. Writers use existing knowledge as a storehouse that provides examples, evidence, and quotations from respected authorities as support for their ideas. The writer also uses existing knowledge as a foundation upon which to construct an orderly base of facts and ideas that most educated people will accept as reasonable—so that the writer doesn't have to prove every point from the beginning. On this shared foundation the writer can build new and ambitious structures. If the writer ignores the solid foundation of existing knowledge and builds instead on the shifting sands of fad and whim, the structure is likely to collapse and few readers will put much faith in it.

The uses of knowledge go beyond metaphorical storehouses and foundations: the knowledge you discover in sources provides the context and much of the content for your informed writing. Other writers' ideas can inspire you to continue your research or rouse you to debate their points in your writing. As we have mentioned, you must decide whether your sources should be accepted, rejected, or compared to other sources. Several authors can provide multiple perspectives on your subject, or your research can put the writings of these authors into new perspective. You also need to consider that your writing may serve as your reader's entry into the ideas of previous writers. In short, informed writing takes place within a complex world of continuing reading and writing.

The people who read your writing may not be aware of all the facts and ideas you have discovered through your own reading. In fact, they may have come across very different information through other books. For this reason you need to make explicit what source materials you are relying on. You must identify, through reference and documentation, those points of connection between your thoughts and the thoughts of other writers who came before you. *Reference* is the art of mentioning other writers' words, ideas, or information in the course of your own argument. *Documentation* is the technique of accurately identifying the precise source of others' words, ideas, and information. Through skillful reference and correct documentation, you can demonstrate the relationship of your own comments to the ongoing written conversation, making it easier for you to communicate what you want to say and easier for your reader to understand your meaning. Your reader will come to know the full discussion instead of just eavesdropping on one disconnected fragment.

There are other narrower—but still important—reasons for proper reference and documentation. First, you will be more likely to convince your readers of the validity of your ideas if you can show that you are building on the solid foundation of respected earlier work and that you are taking into account what is already known about your subject. Second, you should repay a debt of gratitude to writers whose work you have used; they are the ones who stocked the storehouse of ideas for you. Third, intellectual borrowing without giving credit is a form of theft called *plagiarism*. Plagiarism is passing off someone else's work—whether in the exact words or in paraphrase—as your own. There should, however, be no need to hide any of your sources if you are actively working with the material and are using the sources to develop your own thoughts. Indeed, the more clearly you identify what others have said, the more sharply your own contribution to the subject will stand out.

Using References

During the periods when you are selecting a subject, gathering information, and developing your thoughts, you will look at many sources with only a vague idea of the eventual use you will make of the material in your final paper. Many of those sources you may never use directly. As you give shape to your final statement, *you must decide not only what source material you will mention but also the purpose of each reference*. You must know how each bit of cited material advances the argument of your paper, for if you lack a clear idea of why you are mentioning someone else's work, your paper is in danger of losing direction. You do not want your paper to deteriorate into a pointless string of quotations that leaves your readers wondering what you are trying to communicate.

The purpose of any reference must fit in with the argument you are making and with the kind of paper you are writing. Otherwise the reference is an intrusion, distracting the reader from understanding and evaluating your main point. For example, in the middle of a technical paper reporting the chemical analysis of a new pesticide, it would not be appropriate to quote the political statements of the producer or of environmental groups. But you might want to mention—and even describe in detail—a new method of chemical analysis developed by another chemist., particularly if that new method allowed the user to obtain more precise and trustworthy results. The reference must be more than loosely connected to the subject: it must fit the exact logic of the argument you are making at the place where the reference is made.

In the past, you probably have used references most frequently to quote or paraphrase the words of an authority who agrees with a statement you have made. In political debates and other situations where you are trying to persuade the audience on less than totally rational grounds, the fact that a respected person has said something similar to what you have said—only perhaps more elegantly—may lend some acceptability or believability to your claims. In persuasive debate, citing authority remains an effective strategy, particularly if you can embarrass the opposition by showing that one of its heroes really supports your side on the issue. Political journalists delight in such tactics. However, persuasion through passing mention of an authority will not lend strength to a scholarly analysis for a professional audience. In a scholarly paper your argument must stand up to scrutiny on its own merits without regard for the graceful words of poets or the reputation of your idea's supporters.

In more serious academic writing, you can use the authenticated findings of other researchers to support your own findings—but only in carefully limited ways. One way is to follow your general point by citing another researcher's specific data or a case study as evidence. Another way is to present all your own evidence and reasoning and then compare your conclusions to those of other researchers, showing how both studies—yours and theirs—are consistent and confirm each other. In both these situations you retain primary responsibility for your argument and use other studies only to show that your conclusions agree with what others have found.

Just as you look to some writers for support, so you may also turn others—to attack what you consider foolish nonsense. In persuasive debate situations, where destroying your opponent's arguments is almost as good as making your own case, quoting the opposition's ideas as the first step in tearing them apart is often a good tactic. While attacking, you may sometimes have the opportunity to bring in your own, more praiseworthy ideas. But in academic or professional writing, where your purpose is establishing the truth and not gaining votes, you should attack only in limited circumstances, such as when an error is so convincing and so firmly believed by most experts that it stands in the way of more accurate thought. Then you should show why the

cited ideas are wrong, but you should not ridicule them as outrageous or foolish. Ridicule may be an effective political tool, but it undermines the cooperative community necessary for rational academic discourse. The insults traded by nineteenth-century German philosophers may be amusing to read in retrospect, but they only created deeper divisions among philosophers than were necessary. If, however, you do find a fair critique of another writer's argument a useful way to advance your own argument, you should refer as precisely as possible to the specific ideas you are criticizing—even to the extent of lengthy quotation. This detailed reference should then become the starting point for your specific and carefully argued criticisms.

At times your essay may call for interpretation or analysis of primary-source material. One example would be a paper in which you were trying to understand Thomas Jefferson's thinking through an examination of his letters. In this kind of textual analysis, as with critiques, you need to make specific reference to the exact ideas or passages being analyzed, by quotation, paraphrase, or summary, along with page and line reference. This reference identifies exactly what material you are working with and allows the reader to compare your interpretation and analysis to the original in order to judge whether your arguments are convincing. Similarly, if you are comparing the thoughts of two or more writers, you need to present enough of the originals so that the reader can understand and evaluate your comparison. Put yourself in your readers' position and analyze how much they need to know of the originals. Such specific comparisons of two arguments can serve as the basis for your own synthesis, resolving the conflicts between the two earlier writers. Extensive comparison, interpretation, and analysis of the thoughts of a number of writers may be necessary if you are tracing the evolution of ideas on a particular issue. In all the uses of reference mentioned in this paragraph, opinions expressed in the sources are what is being studied. That is, you are analyzing the opinions you cite rather than just citing them in support of your idea. The sources are part of the subject you are discussing.

At other times, various writers' works may serve as a general background for your own ideas. You may be building upon someone else's theory; or your own findings may be understood fully only when they are set against other research findings; or you may borrow a method of analysis from another writer. In all, such cases you may have to discuss the original sources at some length in order for your readers to understand the ideas, assumptions, information, and methods that lie behind your own approach. Even more specifically, your paper may present an experiment or argument testing someone else's theory; you must then certainly let the reader know the source of the theory in question.

In the course of your own reading and writing, you may discover many other uses for mentioning the work of others. You will also develop a sense of the most effective and important places to bring in references. In citing source material, you must always know why you are citing it and how it fits most effectively into your ongoing argument. You must never let your use of sources overwhelm the forward impetus of the main statements of your paper.

Two structural devices can help you maintain the forward motion of your writing while still discussing all the relevant references: a review-of-the literature section and the content footnote. In many essays a *review of the literature*, limited to those items specifically relevant to the essay, can provide most of the necessary background (see page 176). Such a review, usually presented early in the essay—perhaps directly after the introduction—frees the writer to follow his or her own line of thought, with fewer interruptions, later in the essay. If some sources develop interesting sidelights to your main issue or if other sources make points you want to answer, discussing either might interrupt the flow of your main argument. In that case, you can place the secondary discussion in a *content footnote*. Such footnotes are also the place to discuss detailed problems with evidence, further complexities of background, and additional reviews of literature limited to a specific point made in passing.

Methods of Reference

Each time you refer to another writer's work, you need to decide in how much detail to report the content of that reference. You have a range of options, varying in explicitness from identification of a concept by the use of name only (e.g., the Freudian Oedipus complex) to lengthy quotation of the writer's original words. Each option has advantages and disadvantages that must be weighed in every reference situation. The decision of which option to use should be based on the nature of the material cited, the need to provide your reader with a precise understanding, and the role the reference takes within your larger argument. The following specific considerations may help you choose among the alternatives.

Reference by Name Only

In each field the writings of certain key individuals are so well known that any person familiar with the field will recognize a concept—or even a whole series of findings—just from a short *tag name*. Sometimes the tag names include the name of the original author or researcher, as in *Bernoulli's effect* or the *Michelson-Morley experiment*; at other times the name is more generalized, as in *the second law of thermodynamics*. The three examples cited all have complete and precise meanings to trained physicists. Similarly *Turner's thesis* has a definite meaning to any historian, and *Grimm's law* is recognized by any linguist. Such tag names allow you to bring in a concept quickly without any pause in the forward motion of your ideas.

However, you must consider not only whether all your readers will recognize the reference but also whether they will understand it exactly the way you do and grasp the way you are applying it to the subject under discussion. Philosophers will recognize Plato's *allegory of the cave*, but they will probably disagree on its meaning. Turner presented his thesis concerning the role of the frontier in American history in several different versions. The reader could easily mistake the aspect of Turner's thought you have in mind and therefore misinterpret how that thought fits in with the point you are making. If the references used are even more indefinite, the potential for confusion increases. Just think of the grab bag of separate meanings different readers attach to the term *constitutional guarantees of freedom* or to the phrase *President Reagan's foreign policy*. In short, rely on tag names only when their application is so limited and self-evident in the context of your argument that the reader will not mistake your meaning. If any possibility for confusion exists, use a more explicit means of reference.

Summary

As described fully in Chapter 4, a summary allows you to explain in a short space aspects of the source material that are relevant to your argument. You can focus on the most important points pertaining to your discussion, letting the reader know how you understand the ideas you are referring to. You can also adapt the summary to fit into the continuity of your prose and the organization of your essay. The summary is particularly useful for establishing background information, for reviewing an established theory, and for reporting supporting data from other studies. In these situations the reader frequently does not need all the details of the original and is not likely to question your interpretation of the original. However, in those situations that require a detailed examination of the source material or where you are presenting a controversial interpretation or critique of the original, you may need to give a more complete paraphrase—or even a direct quotation. Particularly if you are using the summary to introduce a source you will then attack, you must not make your task too easy by exaggerating the weaker parts of the

original and leaving out the stronger points, the qualifications, and the explanations necessary for an accurate assessment. Such straw man tactics keep you from confronting the more basic points of dispute and lead readers to suspect the integrity of your argument.

Paraphrase

Detailed restatement of a passage in the form of a paraphrase lets you keep control of the style and continuity of the writing (see Chapter 3). Paraphrase allows you to move smoothly from your own points to the source material, preventing the disconcerting shifts of tone of voice that often result from excessive quotation. You can also keep the focus on your main argument by emphasizing certain points in the paraphrase. Paraphrase is indispensable when the original source never makes an explicit and complete statement of the relevant ideas in one place; you must then reconstruct the important material in a single coherent paraphrase. Two other kinds of special material, transcripts of spoken conversation and the condensed prose of reference books, usually must be paraphrased in order to be easily readable. Because of the importance of sustaining the logical order of your argument and keeping your own statement sharply in focus, you should generally prefer paraphrase to exact quotation for reporting sources in detail.

Quotation

Direct quotation is the most obvious and most abused form of referring to another writer's thoughts. It should be used only when you will analyze the exact words of the original text or when the meaning is so open to interpretation that any change of words might lead to distortion. Occasionally you may want the direct testimony of other writers if their phrasing is so precise and stirring that the rhetorical effect strengthens your own argument or if you need to re-create the mood of a historic confrontation. In any case, it is not enough just to quote and move on: you must work the quotation into the line of your argument. You need to underscore the relevance of the quotation to the point you are making and to indicate what the reader should understand from the quotation. You must therefore select the quotation carefully to make the point you wish to make—and no more. Keep the quotations short and relevant; always explicitly indicate their relevance. Unless you can give good reasons for including the quotation, the reader may skip over it. The greatest danger of using quotations is that they may remain foreign, undigested lumps interrupting your ongoing argument.

Depending on the needs of your paper, you may want to use several methods of reference within a short space. For example, you may use a summary to introduce the context of a reference, followed by a paraphrase of the key points and a quotation of an important phrase you will analyze later.

Whatever methods you use to refer to source materials, you should give an accurate representation of the original. Moreover, you should use the material in ways that are consistent with the original form, intent, and context. The greater the detail in which you present the source material, the less chance there is that you may—unintentionally or intentionally—distort, twist, or unfairly deride the material. Even direct quotation can turn a meaning around by leaving out an important context or a few key words. Reasons of intellectual honesty should keep you on guard against the possible unfair use of sources. More practically, if the reader knows the original and catches you distorting it, the penalty is steep: loss of the reader's trust in your judgment and honesty. In matters of written communication, losing the reader's trust is losing the whole game.

Punctuating References

When you refer to sources by name or paraphrase, you are using words and sentences that are your own and are therefore punctuated in the same style as the rest of your writing—except for the documentation of bibliographic information, discussed later in this chapter. You need to be careful, however, to make clear through the phrasing of your sentences exactly where the borrowed material begins and ends. It is necessary to distinguish your own thoughts and ideas from those you obtained from sources.

Direct quotation, because it promises accurate reproduction of the words of the original source, presents special problems of punctuation. First, the other writer's words need to be set off from your own. Whenever you use the exact words of your source, even for just a short phrase, you must set off the quoted words. When you summarize an author's work in the course of your own writing, you must be careful to mark the author's original words with quotation marks. For short quotations—that is, quotations of five or fewer typed lines—this may be done through quotation marks, as I am now doing in quoting the theoretical physicist John Ziman, "A scientific laboratory without a library is like a decorticated cat: the motor activities continue to function, but lack coordination of memory and purpose."

For quotations within short quotations, the interior quotation should be marked with *single* quotation marks, as in the following example: "Toulmin shares Kuhn's view that there are periods in science when knowledge does not cumulate. He calls them 'recurrent periods of self doubt,' during which scientists tend to question whether science can explain anything."

Longer quotations need to be set off from the main body of your writing. You begin them on a new line, indent ten spaces, and double-space the entire quoted passage. Double-space again before returning to your own words. This form of quotation is called a *block quotation*. When you set off the quoted material in this way, do *not* use quotation marks to begin or end the quotation, for they would be redundant. As an example, I will quote what the sociologist Robert Merton has to say about the use of reading in his field.

No great mystery shrouds the affinity of sociologists for the works of their predecessors. There is a degree of immediacy about much of the sociological theory generated by the more recent members of this distinguished lineage, and current theory has a degree of resonance to many of the still unsolved problems identified by the earlier forerunners.

However, interest in classical writings of the past has also given rise to intellectually degenerative tendencies in the history of thought. The first is an uncritical reverence toward almost any statement made by illustrious ancestors. This has often been expressed in the dedicated but, for science, largely sterile exegesis of the commentator. It is to this practice that Whitehead refers in the epigraph to this chapter: «A science which hesitates to forget its founders is lost." The second degenerative form is banalization. For one way a truth can become a worn and increasingly dubious commonplace is simply by being frequently expressed, preferably in unconscious caricature, by those who do not understand it. (An example is the frequent assertion that Durkheim assigned a great place to coercion in social life by developing his conception of "constraint" as one attribute of social facts.) Banalization is an excellent device for drying up a truth by sponging upon it.

In short, the study of classical writings can be either deplorably useless or wonderfully useful. It all depends on the form that study takes. For a vast difference separates the anemic practices of mere commentary or banalization from the active practice of following up and developing the theoretical leads of significant predecessors. It is this difference that underlies the scientists' ambivalence toward extensive reading in past writings.

Notice that the beginnings of paragraphs within the quotation are double indented and that the quotation from Whitehead within the block quotation is set off by double quotation marks. For quotations within a quotation typed in block form, use single or double quotations—as in the original.

Because you are claiming to present the exact words of the original, you must clearly mark any additions, deletions, or other changes. The only unmarked change you may properly make is converting the opening letter of the quotation to a capital or a lower-case letter in order to fit the grammatical context of your introductory sentence. If you delete some words from the quotation because they are not relevant to your argument, you must indicate the deletion by an *ellipsis*, which is three dots (...). If the ellipsis begins at the end of a complete sentence, you must use a fourth dot—as a period where one normally belongs—to indicate the end of the complete sentence. The material deleted from the following quotation by the anthropologist Jack Goody requires the use of both three-dot and four-dot ellipses:

There are two main functions of writing. One is the storage function that permits communication over time and space, and provides man with a marking, mnemonic and recording device.... The second function of writing ... shifts language from the aural to the visual domain, and makes possible a different kind of inspection, the reordering and refining not only of sentences, but of individual words.

In the original text this quotation was preceded by the phrase "We have seen that ...," but because the deletion did not come in the middle of the quotation, it did not require an ellipsis. Further, since the remaining part of the sentence could stand independently as a grammatical sentence, the *t* of the first word, *there*, was capitalized. You may also have noticed that there was no double indentation for the paragraph beginning; double indenting is needed at the beginning of a quoted paragraph only when the quotation extends to a second paragraph.

You should avoid adding anything to the exact quotation. Your comments on the quoted material should be placed either before or after the quotation. However, you may occasionally have to add a word or two of explanation to clarify the meaning of the quotation, either because the quotation uses material clarified earlier in the original text or because you need to summarize deleted material to bridge two parts of the quotation. All added material must be put in square brackets—[interpolation]. If your typewriter does not have brackets, add them by hand. Do not use parentheses, because they may be confused with parentheses used by the original writer. The historian Elizabeth Eisenstein, for example, in discussing the chilling effect of censorship on scholarship, notes that on "hearing of Galileo's fate in 1633, he [Descartes] stopped working on his grand cosmological treatise and perhaps clipped the wings of his own imagination by this negative act."

If the quotation contains an error of spelling, grammar, or fact, you should not correct the error. Rather place the italicized or underlined word *sic* in square brackets directly after the error. The Latin word *sic* means "thus" and indicates that the original was phrased exactly thus, including the error. As one third-grader remarked, "We must all sometimes "eat our missteaks [*sic*]."

On rare occasions you may wish to emphasize a word or phrase in a quotation by underlining or italicizing it. If you do, you must indicate that you—not the original author—are assigning the emphasis, as in the following quotation from the political scientist Paul Boller: "Quotemanship—the utilization of quotations to prove a particular point—has in recent years become a highly *skilled* art [emphasis added]."

Making the Most of References

Not only must you yourself know why and how you are using a reference, the reader must also understand what you want to show by the reference and what conclusions you have drawn from it. A reader may find material drawn from sources puzzling, or even interesting, for the wrong reasons. Therefore, you must give the reader specific guidance as to the relevance of the material to your argument and the full set of implications for your thought. You need to introduce the reference—that is, to show how the material fits into the continuity of your essay—and then you need to follow the reference with interpretation, analysis, or other discussion.

The introduction to the reference serves as a transition between the ideas you are developing yourself and the material you are bringing in from sources. You need to connect the material with your previous statements and then to indicate where the material comes from. Even though the details of the source may be fully stated in a footnote, the reader usually needs to be given at least a general idea of the source in the text in order to evaluate the material. So that the reader may properly understand the reference, you may also have to include some background information in the introduction.

Transitions are, of course, necessary throughout your writing, but they are unusually important before references because you are introducing material foreign to your own statement. That external material, particularly if it is quoted in its original form, may seem quite distant from what you are saying unless you show the reader the point of connection. In fact, unless you make the justification for the material obvious to the reader, the material may appear so digressive that the reader will skim over it to get back to what seems to be the main line of the argument. Further, since the inserted material may seem to have a number of interpretations for your statement, you must specify the interpretation you want the reader to consider.

Depending on the material and the function of the reference, the introduction may be short and direct, such as "These findings concerning growth rates are confirmed by a similar experiment conducted by Jones," or it can be quite complex, incorporating much background, interpretation, and directiveness:

This long-standing ambivalence Smith felt towards authority figures can be seen even in his letters as a teen-ager. The following passage from a letter to his father, written when Smith was only fourteen, shows his desire to be respectfully at odds about his father's opinions. Notice particularly how the polite phrases at the beginning of sentences almost seem ironic by the end when he starts to assert his own contrary opinion.

Here the introduction was lengthened by the necessity of identifying the exact feeling "at odds" and the particular features of the quoted material that indicate the conflict.

Once you have presented the reference, you should not leave the reader in the dark about the specific conclusions or inferences you want to draw from it. Draw out the conclusions and relate them to the larger points of your essay. If you include a quotation to be interpreted or analyzed, you must carry out those tasks in full detail—and not simply rely on a few brief general comments. Similarly, if you cite a set of detailed data, let the reader know exactly what you have found in the mass of specifics. You have gone to the trouble of presenting quotations or data, so go to just a bit more trouble to wring all the meaning out of them that you can. Often you will find that, in the process of making your analysis or conclusions explicit for your reader, you yourself will become more precise about the consequences of the cited-material. Only rarely will the meaning of the reference be so clear-cut and self-evident that no discussion is needed. What you may at first

consider tedious belaboring of the obvious may turn out to be the kind of attention to detail that leads to interesting new thoughts.

The introduction and discussion of sources are the main means you have of showing how other writers' thoughts and information can be assimilated into your own argument. No matter how much you have thought through your reading, your references will seem like pedantic quote-dropping to your reader unless you tie them directly into your argument. Only through thoughtful transitions and discussions of the source material can you maintain the continuity of your thoughts and keep everything under the control of your main argument. No matter how many sources you use, yours must be the controlling intelligence of the paper.

Documentation: What and How

What to Document

You must give full documentation—that is, specifically identify the source you are using—each time you directly refer to the work of another writer. You must also do so each time you use material—facts, statistics, charts, ideas, interpretations, theories, or the like—from another writer, even though you do not directly mention the writer's name. In other words, whenever someone else's work appears within your writing—whether undisguised through direct reference and quotation or submerged through paraphrase and summary into your own argument—you must give credit to the specific source, either in the form of in-text documentation or in notes.

You can decide for yourself whether to document those sources that you have not explicitly used in the final version of your essay. If certain ideas or information from other sources lie behind your own original ideas, you may want to identify such sources in a bibliographical discussion within a footnote. In the bibliography, you may mention all the books you have consulted, or only those that you found useful, or all those that other readers may find useful, or only those that you have actually cited in your essay. Choosing which kind of bibliography is appropriate to each piece of writing will be discussed later.

There are only two exceptions to these general rules: common knowledge and deep sources of your thinking. *Common knowledge* is the information that most people familiar with your subject would already know and that few experts would dispute. (For example, most people know—and few would dispute—that separation of powers is one of the principles behind the United States Constitution.) If a number of your sources mention the same fact or idea with little discussion and with no disagreement among them, you can generally assume that this fact or idea is part of common knowledge and therefore does not need documentation.

What you should consider common knowledge does depend, to some extent, on the particular audience. In addition to the general shared knowledge of our culture, each subgroup has its own shared common knowledge, which may be unknown to other groups. To students of English literature, for example, it is common knowledge that T. S. Eliot was partly responsible for the revival of metaphysical poetry in this century. But readers without a specialized interest in English literature might not even know what metaphysical poetry is, let alone whether it was revived by T. S. Eliot, whoever he might be. If you were writing as one expert to another, you would not need to document your claim about Eliot. But if you were writing as a nonexpert to other nonexperts, you would need to document the claim and to indicate what expert you are relying on. The *deep sources* of your thinking are those ideas and information that you came across long before you began work on the essay in question. Even though you did not have your current project in mind when you read those materials—perhaps many years ago—they may have

influenced how you approached the current problem and how you interpreted the material that you did search out particularly for this project. However, such influences may be so far in the back of your memory that there is no way to identify which writers helped shape your thinking with respect to your current project.

At some point in your intellectual growth, you may find it interesting and enlightening to try to reconstruct your intellectual autobiography and to trace how your thoughts and interests grew in relation to the books that you read at various points in your life. Such self-searching may lead you to reread and rethink the sources of your ideas. But for most of your writing, you need not go back to these earlier sources; such a deep search may, in fact, distract you from the immediate task at hand. So it remains a matter of judgment whether or not to include any deep sources, even in cases where you know them. Include them only if they will increase the strength and clarity of your argument. Generally, your direct responsibility is only to document those sources that you sought out and used for the current project.

How to Document

As the following sections will explain, you may document in one of several ways: by using in-text mention, parenthetical short references and a list of works cited", or footnotes or endnotes. Different disciplines follow particular format rules for each of these options. This chapter will explain the formats favored by the Modern Language Association (widely followed in many of the humanities), the American Psychological Association (widely followed in the social sciences), and the American Chemical Society (followed in some sciences and technological fields). If you have further questions about these formats or formats favored in other disciplines, you may consult the following style manuals.

Style Manuals

- American Institute of Physics. *Style Manual*. 3rd ed. New York: American Institute of Physics, 1978.
- American Mathematical Society. *A Manual for Authors of Mathematical Papers*. 8th ed. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 1984.
- American Medical Association. *AMA Manual of Style*. 8th ed. Baltimore, MD: Wilkins & Wilkins, 1989.
- American Psychological Association. *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. 4th ed. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 1994.
- Council of Biology Editors. *CBE Style Manual*. 5th ed. Bethesda, MD: Council of Biology Editors, 1983.
- Dodd, Janet S., ed. *The American Chemical Society Style Guide: A Manual for Authors of Papers*. Washington, DC: American Chemical Society, 1986.
- Fleischer, Eugene B. *A Style Manual for Citing Microform and Nonprint Media*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1978.
- Gibaldi, Joseph, and Walter A. Auerbach. *The MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*. 3rd ed. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1988.
- Harvard Law Review. *A Uniform System of Citation*. 15th ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Law Review Association, 1991.
- National Association of Social Workers. *Information for Authors About NASW Publications*. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers, 1985.

Turabian, Kate. *A Manual for Written of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations*. 5th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

University of Chicago Press. *The Chicago Manual of Style for Authors, Editors, and Copywriters*. 14th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Because so many specific formats are available for documentation (although they all generally follow the principles explained in this section), you should inquire which system your teacher or the journals in your discipline prefer. Often, on the page describing submission procedures, journals include a short statement on their documentation style. Whichever system you choose, be consistent and use it throughout your piece of writing.

In-Text Mention Every time you mention or quote a source—or any idea, fact, or piece of information from that source—you must indicate at that point in the text the documentation of the reference. The documentation includes author, title, and publication information for general references to a work. If the reference is to a specific fact, idea, or piece of information, you must also include the exact page on which the original item appears.

If the bibliographic information is concise and can be incorporated smoothly into the text of your writing, you may do so and thereby avoid excessive notes. In the following example of in-text documentation, the information fits naturally into the flow of the discussion.

The publication in 1962 of Thomas Kuhn's challenging study *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press) caused historians and philosophers of science to re-evaluate their ideas about how scientific knowledge advances. From the very first page of the book, Kuhn takes issue with the traditional view of scientific growth, which he claims derives from "the unhistorical stereotype drawn from science texts."

Parenthetical Systems Many academic disciplines now document sources through a short reference in parentheses in the text linked to fuller information in a list of works cited or references at the end of the paper or chapter. A number of similar systems of parenthetical references currently exist. The most common system, used throughout the social sciences, is the *author-date system* recommended by the American Psychological Association (APA). In this APA style, each piece of information or quotation requiring documentation is immediately followed by the author's last name, the date of the publication, and (if necessary) the specific page reference. If the author and/or the date is clearly mentioned nearby in the text, such information should not be repeated in the parentheses. The reader can then easily find more complete bibliographical information in the references list. The APA format for the reference list is described on page 367. The following sample illustrates how these references are referred to in the text under the APA system.

Some studies have indicated that perceptual distortion is multi-causal (Jones, 1958; Smith & Smith, 1965; Brown, 1972). Green contested this, claiming "only a single cause stands behind all the perceptual distortion observed in earlier studies" (1979, p. 158). In 1983, however, Green reversed his opposition when he found some errors in his own laboratory procedures.

Also used are the *author-title system* (Kinney, "New Evidence on Hinckley's Theory," p. 357) and the *numerical system* (35, 357). The numerical system is often used in engineering and scientific fields and is one of those recommended by the American Chemical Society. In this system, each item on the list of references is given a reference number. In the parenthesis this

reference number may be underlined or italicized to distinguish it from the page reference that follows. The format of the reference list is described on pages 368-369. The Modern Language Association (MLA) recommends the use of a parenthetical system, suggesting that the parenthetical reference contain only the minimum amount of information necessary to identify the item on the list of works cited (which should be prepared according to MLA bibliographical form, as detailed on pages 212-216). In many cases the author's name will suffice as a parenthetical reference, but that may need to be supplemented by a short version of the book's or article's title if several different sources by the same author are referred to. If the source is adequately identified in the text itself, no parenthetical information is needed. Page references, however, should be supplied if appropriate, as in the illustration below of the MLA system.

The question of influence has been approached historically (Jones), but the psychological approach has recently been argued (Smith, *A New Approach*). Green has even suggested that influence is "entirely a matter of psychological projection" (137). But Smith, in his case study of Coleridge's influence on his friends (*Romantic Forces*), finds a wider range of psychological issues. Even though this study has been called "nonsense" (Edwards 236), Smith has continued the argument in his latest book, *Coleridge, Once Again*.

Note that in the MLA system there is no comma between the author's name and the page number, and no "p." before the page number.

Notes Until about a decade ago footnotes (or endnotes) were widely used in the humanities, but then the Modern Language Association changed its recommendation and now prefers a parenthetical reference system. Both the sciences and social sciences had moved away from notes earlier this century. However, a few disciplines, notably history and philosophy, still find that the note system best fits their needs. For further details on note format you may consult Turabian's *Manual*, *The Chicago Manual of Style*, or *The MLA Handbook for Writing of Research papers*, which describes notes even though it does not recommend their use. Selections in this book taken from sources using notes can be found on page 219.

Reference Lists and Bibliographies

Bibliographies are lists of sources related to the subject of your writing. However, in a bibliography you do not indicate the specific information you have used or the location of that information in the sources. Thus a bibliography serves only as a general listing of the sources that you have used or that your readers may wish to use.

Because bibliographies can vary in completeness and selectivity, it is better to label the bibliography in your paper with one of the more specific titles presented below than to use the loose overall term *bibliography*.

The two most common types of bibliography indicate the sources you actually used in preparing your paper. A *Works Consulted* bibliography lists all the materials you looked at in the course of your research on the subject, although you usually omit the titles that turned out to be irrelevant to your subject. A *Work Cited* or *References* bibliography presents only those so you actually refer to in the course of your paper. Both the *Works Consulted* and the *Works Cited* bibliographies demonstrate the quality of your research and the bases of your own work. They also allow readers to search out any of your references that seem potentially useful for their purposes. These two kinds of bibliographies are those that are usually attached to formal essays.

Bibliography for the Reader

Other kinds of bibliography are directed more toward reader use. In the *Complete Bibliography* you list all works on the subject—even if you did not consult them for the present project and even if you have never seen the publications. The preparation of such a complete listing requires such an exhaustive and extensive search for materials that it is frequently a project in itself. The primary purpose of compiling a *Complete Bibliography* is to help future scholars on the subject quickly discover the materials relevant to their new projects. Thus a *Complete Bibliography* must meet high standards for completeness and reliability. The kind of bibliography usually titled *For Further Reading* is directed more toward the nonscholarly reader who would like to know more about the subject but who does not intend to go into the subject as deeply as the writer. This list is therefore usually short and selective, presenting sources that expand topics raised in the preceding work but that are not too technical for the general reader. If you feel that a few comments on each source listed might make either the *Complete Bibliography* or the *For Further Reading* list more useful to the reader, you can turn either into an *Annotated Bibliography*. In your annotations you may comment on the content, quality, special features, viewpoints, or potential uses of each source. The annotations should come right after the formal bibliographic listing of each book, and your comments may range from a few fragmentary phrases to a full paragraph. The following examples of annotated entries are from the bibliography at the end of H. C. Baldry, *The Greek Tragic Theatre* (New York: Norton, 1971).

- R C. Flickinger. *The Greek Theater and Its Drama* (Chicago University Press, 1918; 4th edition 1936, reprinted 1965). Greek drama explained through its environment. Detailed discussion of technical problems.
- A. E. Haigh. *The Attic Theatre* (Oxford University Press, 1889; 3rd edition revised by A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, 1907; New York, Haskell House, 1968). Still useful in part, but out of date on many aspects.
- A. W. Pickard-Cambridge. *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens* (London & New York, Oxford University Press, 1946). The standard work, fully documented and illustrated, on the history of this theatre down to the Roman Empire.

If you wish to discuss relationships between works or problems that arise in a number of sources, you may want to write a *Bibliographic Essay* instead of simply presenting a list. The bibliographic essay is closely related to the *review of the literature* discussed on page 176, except that the bibliographic essay is done after the project is completed rather than in the early stages. As such, it should focus either on the usefulness of particular sources for your project or on the potential usefulness of the sources for future readers—either scholarly or nonprofessional.

Bibliography Format

Bibliographies are organized as alphabetized lists by the last name of the author (or the first word of the title for anonymous works). For the sake of clarity and usefulness, the bibliography can sometimes be broken up into several titled categories—with the entries still alphabetized within each category. For example, the 'works by an author who is the main subject of the study may be separated from critical and biographical works about the author. Or extensive archival sources may be listed separately from more conventional print sources. The' bibliographic essay is, of course, organized around the topics discussed and is the only exception to the general rule of alphabetical listing:

Each bibliographic entry contains three kinds of information: author, title, and publication information. Because bibliographies are alphabetized, the author's last name must be put first; a comma follows the last name to show that the order is reversed. Because the comma is required for that function, *periods* must be used between the major divisions of information. Note that each period is followed by two spaces.

Modern Language Association Bibliographic Form

Following are the basic rules for MLA form. For more details, consult *The MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers* (see page 208).

Basic Bibliography Punctuation

For a Book

- First line flush with left margin; second and following lines indented
- Author's last name first, followed by comma and first name
- Book title underlined
- Colon between place of publication and publisher
- Periods between major parts and at end

Author, Jane. Any Old Title. City: Publisher, 1995.

For an Article in an Anthology

- Article title in quotation marks; book title underlined
- Editor after book title, name in normal order
- Inclusive pagination of article at end; second page number abbreviated

Author, Jane. "The Articulate Article." The Scholarly Collection. Ed. Tom Jones. City: Publisher, 1995. 140-4-1.

For an Article in a Periodical

- Article title in quotation marks; periodical title underlined
- Volume number after periodical title
- Date of issue in parentheses, followed by colon
- Inclusive pagination of article at end
- If the article appears on nonconsecutive pages, first page listed with a + sign (12+)

Author, Jane. "This Month's Title." Metropolis Quarterly 35 (1995): 12-26.

Modifications of Basic Form

Depending on the nature of your sources, you may have to modify the basic models in the following ways.

Author

If no author is given, begin directly with title. Also:

If two authors: Author, Jane, and John Writer.

If three authors: Author, Jane, Joan Scribbler, and John Writer.

If four or more authors: Author, Jane, et al.

Multivolume Set

If citing all of a multivolume set, use title of entire set for main entry, followed by number of volumes; use inclusive dates for main publication date.

Author. My Life. 3 vols. City: Publisher, 1992-94.

If you are referring to only one volume of a multivolume set that uses a separate title for each volume, give the title of the single volume, then the publication information for that single volume, followed by the volume number and title of the multivolume work. Then give total number of volumes in set and their dates.

Author. My Childhood. City: Publisher, 1992. Vol. 1 of My Life. 3 vols. 1992-94.

Edition

If other than the first edition, list edition number or name after the main title.

Author. Title. 2nd ed. City: Publisher. date.

Translator and/or Editor

List after edition information in the order they appear on the book's title page.

Author. Title. Edition. Trans. Jane Jones. Ed. John Jones. City: Publisher, date.

Series

List series title and number of this volume in the series just before the publication information.

Author. Title. Edition. Translator. Editor. American Biographical Classics 37. City: Publisher, date.

Date of Publication

This is the first publication date unless you are citing a more recent edition or unless another edition (such as a paperback edition) is specified. In that case, give the date of the original edition before the publication information of the edition being cited.

Author. Title. 1957. City: Publisher, 1993.

Type of Periodical

For popular magazines and newspapers, omit the volume number and parentheses; give the exact date of the issue for weekly or biweekly magazines. For monthly or bimonthly periodicals, give the month and year of the issue.

Author. "Title of Article." Newspaper 17 June 1993: A8.

Author. "Title of Article." Monthly Journal Jan. 1994: 76-78.

Book Review

If an article in a periodical is a book review, directly after the title place *Rev. of* followed by title of book and author. If the article has no title, simply use *Rev. of*

Author. "Writing About Disaster." *Rev. of Disaster*, by S. Smith. Periodical information: pages.

Samples of MLA Documentation**Book, Single Author**

Bettelheim, Bruno. The Uses of Enchantment. New York: Knopf, 1976.

Book, Two Authors, Translator, Part of Series

Jung, Carl G., and Carl Kerényi. Essays on a Science of Mythology. Trans. R. F. C. Hull. Bollingen Ser. 22. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963.

Book, Group Authorship, Translator

Zuni People. The Zunis: Self-Portrayals. Trans. Alvina Quam. New York: New American Library, 1974.

Book, Anonymous Author, Joint Editors and Translators

The Mwindo Epic. Ed. and trans. Daniel Biebuyck and Kahombo C. Mateene. Berkeley: California UP, 1969.

One Volume in Multivolume Work (separate titles for each volume, revised edition)

Campbell, Joseph. Primitive Mythology. Rev. ed. New York: Penguin, 1962. Vol. 1 of The Masks of God. 4 vols. 1962-65.

One Volume in Multivolume Work (one title for whole set)

Gaster, Theodore H. Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament. Vol. 2. New York: Harper, 1969. 2 vols.

Unpublished Dissertation

Edmondsen, Herbert Paine, Jr. "Aspects of the Prometheus Myth in Ancient Greek Literature and Art." Diss. U of Texas at Austin, 1977.

Pamphlet

Kirkwood, G. M. A Short Guide to Classical Mythology. New York: Holt, 1959.

Article in an Anthology

Hyman, Stanley Edgar. "The Ritual View of Myth and the Mythic." Myth: A Symposium. Ed. Thomas Sebeok. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1955. 136-53.

Article in an Encyclopedia

Lang, Andrew. "Mythology." Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1911 ed.

Article in a Scholarly Journal

Eickelman, Dale F. "Form and Composition in Islamic Myths: Four Texts from Western Morocco." Anthropos 72 (1977): 447-64.

Article in Popular Magazine (monthly)

Goleman, Daniel. "Greek Myths in Pop Fiction: Jason and Medea's Love Story." Psychology Today Apr. 1976: 84-86.

Article in Newspaper (unsigned)

"Origins of Walt Disney Cartoon Character Mickey Mouse in Mythology Noted." New York Times 3 Dec. 1977: 23.

Review in Magazine (unsigned, untitled)

Rev. of Zalmaxis, The Living God, by Mircea Eliade. Choice 10 (1973): 604.

Congressional Record

Cong. Rec. 15 Mar. 1980: 3751.

Court Case

(87 S. Ct. 311 refers to the volume, name, and 'page of the journal reporting the decision.)
Clagett v. Daly. 87 S. Ct. 311. U.S. Supreme Ct. 1966.

Interview

Thapar, Romila. Personal interview. 9 June 1977.

Film

The Golem. Dir. Henrik Galeen and Paul Wegener. Audio Brandon, 1920.

Radio or Television Program

"On the Road in Oscaloosa." Narr. Charles Kuralt. CBS Evening News. 28 Jan. 1980.

Recording

Jimenez, Alfonso Cruz. Folk Songs of Mexico. Folkways, FW 8727. 1959.

American Psychological Association Bibliographic Form

As discussed on page 209, the American Psychological Association recommends linking in-text parenthetical documentation to a complete reference list at the end of the paper or chapter. Following are the basics of the recommended style for that reference list. Note that in this style each period is followed by one space. For more complete details, see the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (see page 208).

For a Book

- First line flush with left margin; second and following lines indented
- Author's last name first, followed by a comma and initials (no full name)
- Two or more authors separated by &, not *and*; last name first for all names (compare with MLA)
- Date of publication in parentheses, following author's name
- Book title underlined, only the first word capitalized (except for proper nouns)
- Colon between place of publication and publisher; if not a major city, give post office abbreviation of state
- Periods to separate major divisions and at end

Author, J., & Author, H. (1995). Any old title. Hobbittown. PA: Big Feet Press.

For an Article in a Periodical

- Year in parentheses after author's name
- No quotation marks for article title, only first word capitalized

- Journal title underlined, all major words capitalized, followed by volume number and inclusive pages, all separated by commas
- Volume number underlined
- All page numbers given in full

Author, J. (1995). This month's title. Metropolis Journal, 35. 140-141.

Sample APA Reference List

References are alphabetized by first author's last name.

REFERENCES

- Gerwin, D. (1974). Information processing. data inferences, and scientific generalization. Behavioral Sciences, 19, 314-325.
- Greeno, J. G. (1976). Indefinite goals in well-structured problems. Psychological Review, 83, 479-491.
- Klahr, D. & Siegler, R. S. (1977). The representation of children's knowledge. In H. Reese & L. P. Lipsitt (Eds.), *Advances in child development* (pp. 27-52). New York: Academic Press.
- Newell A., & Simon, H. A. (1972). Human problem solving. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Polanyi, M. (1967). *The tacit dimension*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

American Chemical Society Bibliographic Form

As discussed on page 209, the American Chemical Society allows the option of referring to texts by numbers placed in parentheses in the main text. These numbers are then correlated with a reference list. For more details, consult *The American Chemical Society Style Guide* (see page 208).

For a Book

- All lines flush with the left margin.
- Author's last name first, followed by a comma and initials (no full name)
- Semicolon between multiple authors; always last name first
- Title underlined, all major words capitalized
- Semicolon after title
- Publisher followed by a colon and city of publication, then comma and year of publication; period at end

Author, J.; Author H. Any Old Title; Publisher. City, 1995.

For an Article in a Periodical

- No article title, just author, journal title, year, volume, and page reference
- Journal title abbreviated according to a standard list appearing in the *ACS Style Guide*
- After the journal title, the year in boldface (or with a wavy underline), followed by a comma
- Volume number underlined, followed by single page number (the opening page of article) and period

Author, J. A. Old Title. **1995**, 60, 2360.

Sample ACS Reference List

LITERATURE CITED*

- (1) Ruzicka, J.; Hansen, E. H. Flow Injection Analysis. 1st ed.; Wiley: New York, 1981.
- (2) Olsen, S.; Pessenda, L. C. R.; Ruzicka, J.; Hansen, E. H. Analyst **1983**, 108, 905.
- (3) Hongbo, C.; Hansen, E. H.; Ruzicka, J. Anal. Chim. Acta **1985**, 169, 209.
- (4) Hansen, E. H.; Ruzicka, J.; Ghose, A. K. Anal. Chim. Acta **1978**, 100, 151.
- (5) Albert, A.; Serjeant, E. P. The Determination of Ionization Constants, 3rd ed.; Chapman and Hall: New York, 1984.
- (6) Wmdheuser, J. J.; HiguChi, T. J. Pharm. Sci. **1962**, 51, 354.
- (7) Carlin, H. S.; Perkins, A. J. Am. J. Hosp. Pharm. **1968**, 25, 271.
- (8) Newton, D. W.; Kluza, R. B. Drug. Intell. Clin. Pharm. **1978**, 12, 546.
- (9) CRC Handbook of Hormones, Vitamins, and Radiopaques; CRC Press; Boca Raton, FL, 1986; p. 248.
- (10) Williams, R. R.; Ruehle, A. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1935**, 57, 1856.
- (11) Cookson, R.F. Chem. Rev. **1974**, 74, 5.
- (12) Benet, L. Z.; Goyan, J. E. J. Pharm. Sci. **1967**, 56, 665.
- (13) Lange's Handbook of Chemistry; McGraw-Hill: New York, 1985.
- (14) Brooks, S. H.; Berthod, A.; Kirsch, B. A.; Dorsey, J. G. Anal. Chim. Acta **1988**, 209, 111.
- (15) Ruzicka, J.; Hansen, E. H. Flow Injection Analysis, 2nd ed.; Wiley: New York, 1988.
- (16) Loscascio-Brown, L.; Plant, A L.; Durst, R. A. Anal. Chem. **1988**, 60, 792.
- (17) Brooks, S. H.; Leff, D. V.; Hernandez Torres, M. A.; Dorsey, J. G. Anal. Chem. **1988**, 60, 2737.

EXERCISES

1. For a research paper you have written or are currently working on, list the sources you refer to in the course of the paper. Explain (1) why you have included each reference, (2) what you hope to accomplish by the reference, (3) whether you have presented the reference through

* Taken from Brooks, H. B.; Rullo, G. Analytical Chem. **1990**, 62, 2059.

- quotation, paraphrase, summary, or title or author's name only, and (4) why you have chosen each method listed in (3).
2. In the library, find a scholarly journal from an academic or professional field that interests you. Describe in detail the documentation system and the format of notes and bibliography used in the journal. You may find a statement of documentation policy in the first few pages of each issue.
 3. Using the MLA format presented in this book, write a bibliography entry for each of the following items. Also write reference list entries following the APA and the ACS styles. Show how mention would be made in your essay for each of the items in each style.
 - a. A paraphrase of an idea from page 121 of *Writing Space: The Computer; Hypertext, and the History of Writing*, by Jay David Bolter. This 1991 book was published by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates of Hillsdale, New Jersey.
 - b. A quotation from page 78 of an article by Bart Kosko and Saturn Isaka from the July 1993 issue of *Scientific American*, a monthly publication. The article is entitled "Fuzzy Logic" and appears on pages 76 to 81 in volume 239, number 1, of the journal.
 - c. A summary of an idea from pages 110 to 112 of the book *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. The book was published by Cambridge University Press, located in Cambridge, England, in 1991, and was written by Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger.
 - d. A quotation from page 273 of an essay by Wallace Chafe, entitled "The Flow of Ideas in a Sample of Written Language." The article appears in a volume edited by William C. Mann and Sandra Thompson. The volume has the title *Discourse Description: Diverse Linguistic Analyses of a Fund-Raising Text* and was published in 1992 by John Benjamin's Publishing Company of Amsterdam. The entire essay appears on pages 267 to 294 of the book.
 - e. A mention of a review that appears on pages 341 to 343 of volume 2, issue 3, of *Technical Communication Quarterly*. The issue appeared in the summer of 1993. The book reviewed was *Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric in North America* by Nan Johnson.
 4. For the sample student research paper printed on pages 188-194 of Chapter 10, analyze each of the references to determine the purpose of the reference in the context of the research paper, whether the author presented the reference through quotation, paraphrase, summary, or title or author's name only, and the specific documentation techniques used.
 5. The following excerpts from *The Weaker Vessel* by Antonia Fraser discuss the changing attitudes toward and expectations of women in marriage. In these excerpts identify where each reference to source material is made and the method used to present the reference-name, summary, paraphrase, or quotation. Then discuss the reason for each reference and the appropriateness of the reference method used.

[COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL REMOVED]