

The Role of Sources

Almost any record of experience is potentially a source: a text, image, or object; a televised debate or a set of statistics. It becomes a source of something, however, only when it plays a particular role in a particular scholar's work. This chapter defines some of the common roles that sources play, in terms of what they provide a scholarly writer and what stance a writer takes toward them. It then considers the importance of using reliable sources and of acknowledging your use of them reliably.

1.1 Sources of What?

A source usually provides a paper with one of two things: (1) it provides *factual data* to interpret and use as evidence, or (2) it provides *ideas about data*, to build upon or dissent from. A distinction is sometimes made on this basis between "primary" and "secondary" sources (see Box A). More specifically, a source of factual data usually provides one of the following:

- *exact text* of a written, spoken, or visual composition (such as that provided in a published edition or on an audio or video recording);
- *statistics or measurements* (such as those tabulated or graphed in a research article);
- a *summary record* of an experience (such as that given in an ethnographic report or eyewitness testimony);
- *information* (such as that assembled in a biography or a textbook).

When a source provides a paper with ideas, it is often providing one of the following:

- a particular *claim* made by another writer about the topic you are addressing, along with the reasoning that supports the claim; or
- a general *concept*—a term, theory, or approach—that has appeared in discussion of other topics and that you apply to your own.

Either facts or ideas, finally, may be brought into a paper in the role of a *comparative case*, which illuminates the main case under consideration by similarity or contrast.

But to make use of a source in any of these ways, a writer must define a stance toward it. The three basic stances you can take toward a source are *yes*, *no*, and *sort of*. You can affirm or accept it, and say to it, "Yes, and so . . ." You can reject or disagree, and say to it, "No, rather . . ." Or you can qualify or modify the source, and say to it, "Yes, but . . .," "Yes, except . . .," or "Yes, if . . ." Your stance toward a source of factual data will often be one of acceptance, although you may call into question the completeness or accuracy of provided facts; your stance toward sources of ideas will vary. All scholars, in making their contribution to the larger understanding of a subject, accept and build on the work of others, but they often discover where their contribution lies through reasoned disagreement with and qualification of that work.

A student writer, Jeff, having done much reading for a term paper on the Civil War, sketched out the following brief proposal to organize his thoughts. Bolded words suggest what a source will be a source of; capitalized words suggest the stance that Jeff will take toward it:

The **claim** of many historians that the North won the war with greater manpower and resources is true, **BUT** such a large event has many contributing causes. Linn and others have **proposed** that Lincoln's leadership was crucial. I will **SUPPORT** this **view** **BUT** argue that a particularly influential and underestimated aspect of that leadership was his skill at crafting memorable speeches on key occasions to give immediacy to abstract ideals.

Some of the articles that Jeff has read will provide this argument with claims (*proposals, views*) about why the North won. Toward these claims Jeff's stance in his paper will be "Yes, but." He won't try, wisely, to refute outright a scholarly consensus about material resources, but rather will qualify the importance claimed for them. Likewise, Jeff will modify the claims made for the importance of Lincoln's leadership by focusing on a specific aspect that he thinks deserves more notice. These moves of qualifying and modifying will provide the motive for his paper. In the rest of his proposal, bolded italics indicate what his sources will be sources of, and capitals indicate the stance Jeff will take toward them:

I first **ACKNOWLEDGE** the importance of the North's material resources in the outcome of the war, citing statistical **data**. **BUT** I then give **examples** of cases where inspiring leadership influenced military outcomes in the face of resources. Referring especially to the **example** of Churchill's galvanizing speeches in WWII, I invoke Simmons's **USEFUL notion** of "rhetorical turning points." I **compare** Lincoln's situation to Churchill's and note the **fact** that he **TOO** at key points in a war came up with striking and stirring phrases to unify his audience.

I then analyze the **details** of several Lincoln speeches to show how he creates "moral vividness" (in the linguist Denby's **APT TERM**) by finding the right metaphors for the occasion. I trace the effect of his words by analyzing the **report** of the speeches in subsequent newspaper accounts. I **contrast** these speeches with speeches given by the Southern leader Jefferson Davis that, in a similar situation, do **NOT** have the same effect.

To **REFUTE** a possible objection to my argument, I address the **claim** implied in several popular accounts of Lincoln's life that his skill at speaking was not crafted responding to a particular situation but a natural product of his simple and direct personality. I **compare** the **texts** of early speeches and speeches in draft form to the **QUITE DIFFERENT** speeches Lincoln later gave, to show that he worked deliberately to create his effects. I **DRAW UPON evidence** of his letters and conversations to show that he was aware of the historic work that his speeches had to do.

Some of the works that Jeff has read will provide his paper with factual data: *report, details, texts, evidence, and fact*. They will document

the fact that Lincoln did give speeches at key junctures, what exactly Lincoln said and wrote, what concerns were on his mind at the time, and what impact the speeches had. Accepting the accuracy of these sources, Jeff's stance is "Yes, and so." He says "Yes, and so" also to the applicability of certain general concepts: Simmons's *useful notion* and Denby's *apt term*. And finally, some of Jeff's sources provide comparative cases. He accepts the fundamental comparability of Churchill's situation to Lincoln's, saying "Yes, and so." He rejects the comparability of Davis's speeches to Lincoln's ("No, rather") and of Lincoln's drafts with his delivered speeches; and he uses the latter contrast to *refute* the claim that Lincoln's speeches emerged naturally from a homespun character.

It's a sketchy proposal, but writing it forces Jeff to bring his sources into a purposeful order, based on his own thinking, and allows him to move forward. His plan may be too ambitious: he may find he lacks enough information to attribute a precise impact to speeches. Rather than taking on directly the large issue of what won the war, he may end up focusing (as good student papers in the humanities often do) on the workings of one or two primary documents—speeches and letters—in the *context* of the large issue. But because he has sketched a plan in advance, the difficulties will become apparent early—to Jeff himself or to his instructor, classmates, or others with whom he shares his plan (see section 3.4 #9).

The source roles described are common in college writing of all kinds. Shorter assignments may invite you to work with only one of these source roles. You may be asked to analyze a piece of complex textual data (e.g., argument, poem, novel, film), to agree or disagree with a given claim, to apply a general theory to a particular case, or to compare two works or how two theories apply to a case. Longer assignments, for which you may be required to define your own issue and find your own sources, expect you to use those sources in whatever ways are required to make a persuasive case for your way of looking at the material. Since you will be relatively new to the field in question and can't possibly know all the scholarship, that way of looking isn't expected to be completely new, but it is expected that you'll use sources to say something of your own, not just to repeat them.

1.3 Citing Sources Reliably

However reliable your sources may be, your reader must be able to see that they're reliable and trust that you are acknowledging them reliably—that you are reliably making clear what comes from you and what comes from your sources. You show this by citing, making a notation in your paper that refers to publication information you provide elsewhere (common methods are described in Chapter 4).

But what constitutes reliability in citing? When should you cite—and why? You should cite on the following occasions:

(a) *Whenever you use factual material—e.g., data, information, testimony, or a report—that you found in a source.* You need to make clear to your readers *who* gathered the information and *where* to find its original form. Even if these matters are common knowledge in the field, if *your* knowledge of them isn't firsthand, your readers need to know where your version of the facts came from.

(b) *Whenever you use ideas—e.g., claims, interpretations, conclusions, or lines of reasoning—arrived at by another person,* so your readers know that you are summarizing thoughts formulated by someone else, whose authority your citation invokes, and whose formulations readers can consult and check against your summary.

(c) *Whenever you use a special concept, term, or theory that you found in a source.*

(d) *Whenever you make use of a source passage's distinctive structure, organizing strategy, or method,* such as the way an argument is divided into distinct parts, sections, or kinds; the way a distinction is made between two aspects of a problem; or with regard to a new procedure for studying some phenomenon (in a text, in the laboratory, or in the field) that was developed by a particular person or group. Citing tells your readers that the strategy or method isn't yours and allows them to consult its original context.

(e) *Whenever you quote verbatim.* When you cite a passage of two or more words in a row, or even a single word (a characterization or label, for example) that is distinctive or striking. Your readers need to be able to verify the accuracy and context of your quotation, and to credit the author of the source for crafting the exact formulation. Words you use verbatim from a source must be put in quotation marks, even if you use only two or three words; it's not enough

simply to cite. (If you go on to use the quoted word or phrase repeatedly in your paper, as part of your analytic vocabulary, you don't need to cite it each subsequent time; however, you do need to attribute the terms at the outset.)

You should cite for all of these occasions, even in situations that may seem to you nonstandard. The rules apply, that is, to

- **all uses of sources:** including summaries and paraphrases, even where the source provides only "background" information to your argument (such as historical context or a survey of previous work done);
- **all types of assignments:** including problem sets, computer programs, lab and other reports, collaborative projects, and take-home exams (the fact that your instructor may recognize your use of a course text doesn't change the need to acknowledge it);
- **all types of sources and media:** including numbers, images, graphs and charts, oral communications, films and videos; media including Internet and databases, class sourcebooks and class texts, and lectures.¹

Finally, although you aren't required to mention the help you have received informally, acknowledging such help is a generous and honest gesture and a good habit to develop (see Box C).

Why cite so scrupulously? The consequences of discovered plagiarism (see section 3.1) are to be avoided, obviously, but doesn't frequent citation weaken a paper by making you seem less thoughtful and too dependent on others? If you find yourself citing sources for almost everything in your paper or even for entire paragraphs, you have a problem. You may be citing "common knowledge" (see Box D) or citing inefficiently (see Box O); or, more likely, you're giving too much rehash of other people's ideas and need to generate more of your own—you need to step beyond your sources. But once

1. A lecture is a carefully constructed presentation by an authority in the field, and may itself draw on other authorities; thus, you should cite if you use a distinctive idea, phrase, or piece of information from a lecture. Some instructors may want you to regard their lectures, given for the purposes of their class only, as common knowledge not to be cited. Ask about this before incorporating lecture material.

[C] ACKNOWLEDGING UNCITED SOURCES: Whenever you write a paper of more than a few pages, you draw on many influences: not only sources you can cite as sources of something definite, but also less immediate, less definite sources, such as the lessons of former teachers, conversations or e-mails with friends, class discussions, or an inspiring book you read over the summer. When you have benefited substantially from ideas in sources like these that won't appear in your list of references, you should acknowledge them in a footnote or endnote (see section 2.5). Doing so shows you to be both generous and intellectually self-aware.

Remember, however, that your sources may themselves be using phrases and ideas from their reading or lectures. If you write a paper that depends *heavily* on an idea you heard in conversation with someone, you should check with that person about the source of the idea. Also be aware that no instructor will appreciate your incorporating his or her ideas from conversation verbatim into your paper, but will rather expect you to express the ideas in your own way and to develop them.

you have a case to make, careful citing is at once a service, a moral obligation, and an argumentative advantage.

Your citation says several things to your readers. For one, it says, *"Here is where I found this idea, these words, or this information. Here you can verify the summary of the idea I am giving you or find the full context for the words I have paraphrased or quoted—in case you wish to check them or pursue the matter yourself."* Your citation allows your readers to find in a source what you have found and to make use of it themselves. Such readers are particularly grateful to have it made clear, moreover, exactly what in your paper comes from the source and what comes from you. Your citation also says, *"This person deserves the credit for gathering these materials together or for coming up with these thoughts or words; I hereby acknowledge my indebtedness."* Saying this is only fair to the author in question. Life is short, and he or she has spent many precious hours and days working out the ideas and words that you are casually perusing, assuming that he or she would be fairly credited for them. If you don't credit the author for this work, you implicitly credit yourself for it. If you credit vaguely or sloppily, you create confusion in the minds of others as to what

the scholar has accomplished, probably in the process making the accomplishment seem less than it is.

Citing is only fair, also, to the community of students and teachers of which you are a part. It is only fair to other students in your class who fairly acknowledge any help they get from sources. It is only fair to your instructors, who agree to take your ideas seriously—even when they are uninformed and fragmentary—so long as you take the scholarly process seriously by taking yourself seriously as a thinker and as a potential source for other thinkers. When you pretend to have thought or written something that you haven't, you aren't honoring the bargain, and you are in fact treating the process as a game.

Being helpful and fair in your citing also makes your argument stronger. When you analyze data or text from a source, your citation says, *"This scholar has collected the material I'm working with (as you can verify); it's a reliable basis for my conclusions."* When you support or build on a source's idea, it says, *"These learned scholars have found this to be so; it's not just my idiosyncratic opinion or blithe assumption."* When you challenge an idea, it says, *"This learned scholar has this view, as you can verify for yourself: I am not taking on a fool, or creating a straw man."* Citing not only gets you credit for having read these scholars; it also makes your own contribution stand out against the contributions of others—others whose company elevates you.

Reliable citing strengthens your paper, finally, by manifesting intellectual character. It establishes you as not just honest but also helpful, open and generous, serious, careful, and confident enough in your own thinking and reading, and in the intellectual process, to give credit where it is due—to acknowledge other views. Intermittent, casual, sloppy, or vague citing raises suspicion and makes your readers skeptical; ready and consistent citing puts your readers in a generous state of mind, willing to notice and give you full credit for the thinking you have done.

[D] “COMMON KNOWLEDGE”: Unless you are closely studying a common phrase like “all the world’s a stage” or “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” you don’t need to cite a source when you use it. These are common locutions, known to all educated readers. Nor do you need to cite information that is either familiar to educated readers or easily available in many general sources (such as encyclopedias, dictionaries, and basic textbooks). The date of Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, the distance to Saturn, the structure of the American Congress, the date of birth of the discoverer of DNA, the fact that Sigmund Freud developed such ideas as the unconscious and the Oedipus complex—such information, in its basic form, is widely accepted and not based on a particular interpretation or point of view; it counts as common knowledge. In the paper excerpted in section 2.2, Jennie doesn’t need to cite her passing references to the notion of “oral fixation” (line 6) or the fact that gentlemen used to have an after-dinner cigar separate from the ladies (lines 40–41).

The line between common and uncommon knowledge isn’t always clear, but it is your responsibility to take care that an assumption of common knowledge doesn’t lead you into plagiarism. If Jennie had gone on to say that the after-dinner cigar ritual occurred even in matriarchal societies—an unfamiliar idea brought to light by the work of certain scholars—she would have needed to cite a source, both to show that the idea has a solid basis and to credit those scholars. If Jennie’s argument had mentioned particular aspects of Freud’s fixation theory, details that aren’t familiar to most readers, she would have needed to cite Freud (or the source for her account of his theory). She would have needed to cite in this paper written for her ethics class, even though the details of Freud’s theory *had* been common knowledge in the psychology seminar she took the previous semester. Ideas that are common knowledge in one academic field are often not in other fields. When in doubt on this score, ask—or cite anyway, to be safe.

Note, finally, that when you draw a *great deal* of information from any single source, you should cite that source even if the information is common knowledge, since the source (and its particular way of organizing the information) has made a significant contribution to your paper.

2

Integrating Sources

Whatever role sources play in an argument, they do their work well only if you use them efficiently and always make clear their relationship to your own thinking. This chapter summarizes the basic ways in which sources can appear and basic guidelines for effectively integrating them.

2.1 Ways of Bringing a Source In

At any given point in your paper, a source will appear in one of a few basic forms. You will summarize or paraphrase its main ideas or findings, give its gist, or simply mention it in passing. Or you will reproduce parts of the source exactly, by replication or quotation.

(a) *Summary*: You reduce a source text to its main point and aspects, using your own words but sometimes including quoted words or phrases from the source. When writing an essay about plagiarism in American universities, for example, you might summarize section 1.1 of this book as follows:

The same source, Harvey notes, can play different roles in different situations, depending on a writer’s purposes. He thus suggests that sources are best described by “what they are sources of” in a paper (data and ideas of different kinds) and what stance a writer takes toward them (accepting, rejecting, or qualifying).¹

This style of citation refers your reader to a footnote (see section 4.2) that gives the relevant pages in this book. You will usually be summarizing longer texts than this—whole chapters, articles, or

books—so two key requirements, that a summary be both accurate and concise, will present a greater challenge. Two further requirements of summarizing are always to make clear whom or what you are summarizing (*Harvey notes*) and to put your summary in your own words, except for phrases you place in quotation marks (or words in the source that have no real synonyms). This means that, to avoid plagiarizing, you must recast both the language *and* the sentence structure of the source.

(b) **Paraphrase:** With the same requirements in force, your encapsulation follows more closely the source's particular order of presentation or reasoning:

Sources, Harvey suggests, are best described by the role they play in particular papers. This is a matter both of the kind of material that a source is offering and of what attitude or "stance" a writer takes toward it. While some sources tend to offer mainly factual material, including exact wording, statistics, testimony, and information, others provide ideas, including claims and concepts. Writer stances, he notes, tend to be accepting, rejecting, or qualifying (Harvey 3).

This citation uses in-text, author-page style (see section 4.3). You should encapsulate by paraphrase, rather than summary, when the particular logic or order of a source's presentation is important to your argument. You will sometimes need to paraphrase not to encapsulate a long text, but to clarify a single pithy or difficult statement or concept. Such interpretive or explanatory paraphrasing, especially useful when writing about artistic or philosophical texts, will usually be longer than what it paraphrases. Unpacking the meaning of the short saying used later in this book, to take a trivial example, you might paraphrase thus:

On this point Harvey invokes the proverb that "a stitch in time saves nine," by which he seems to mean that a step taken early to address a worsening situation will prevent the need for more difficult and elaborate action later on (38).

Your citation refers your reader to the page on which the saying is found, your sentence having made clear with the words *he seems to mean* that the paraphrase is your own.

(c) **Gist:** You give only the main claim or thrust of a work or argument—in a sentence or so—without indicating many or any of its aspects or reasons. To give the gist of section 1.1, you might say that

Harvey suggests that sources are best described by which one of a few basic roles they play in a given paper (2008).

This citation and those in the following examples illustrate in-text author-year style (see section 4.4).

(d) **Mention:** You refer to the source in passing, invoking it as part of a general characterization:

Some analysts, such as Harvey, stress the roles that different sources play (2008).

(e) **Citation Only:** You relegate the name of the source to a parenthetical citation or footnote:

Still other analysts see the roles that sources play as the determining factor (Harvey, 2008).

(f) **Exact reproduction:** You replicate exactly an element of another source, such as a data table or a figure (e.g., a chart, graph, diagram, or map), or you quote exactly the words of the source, either embedding those words in one of your sentences or (if more than four lines of type) quoting them as an indented block. Reasons to quote a source directly include the following:

- The source author has made a point so clearly and concisely that it can't be expressed any better.
- A certain phrase or sentence in the source is particularly vivid or striking, or especially typical or representative of some phenomenon you are discussing.
- An important passage is sufficiently difficult, dense, or rich that it requires you to analyze it closely, which in turn requires that the passage be produced so the reader can follow your analysis.
- A claim you are making is such that the doubting reader will want to hear exactly what the source said. This will often be the case when you criticize or disagree with a source; your reader wants to feel sure you aren't misrepresenting the source—or creating a straw man (or woman). In addition, you need to quote *enough* of the source so that the context and meaning are clear.

2.3 Rules for Quoting

For both quotations that you embed in your own sentences and quotations that you quote as indented blocks, observe these general rules:

(a) *Quote only what you need or is really striking.* If you quote too much, you may convey the impression that you haven't digested the material or that you are merely padding the length of your paper. Whenever possible, keep your quotations short enough to embed gracefully in one of your own sentences. Don't quote lazily; where you are tempted to reproduce a long passage of several sentences, see if you can quote instead a few of its key phrases and link them with a concise summary.

(b) *Quote verbatim*, carefully double-checking the source after you write or type the words even if you have pasted in the quotation (texts can get jumbled in electronic transmission). Quote verbatim even if the source passage itself is misspelled or ungrammatical, indicating this by adding in brackets after the problematic word or phrase the italicized Latin word [*sic*], meaning "thus": Hemingway wrote that his editor "had a verry [*sic*] nice time at the bar." See Boxes G and H for the few minor exceptions to the rule of verbatim quotation.

(c) *Construct your own sentence so the quotation fits smoothly into it.* Jennie has done this at lines 15–18: *Such a bird has proved, writes Diamond, "that he must be especially good at escaping predators, finding food, resisting disease; the bigger the handicap, the more rigorous the test he has passed."*

(d) *Usually announce a quotation in the words preceding it* (as Jennie does in line 15 with *writes Diamond*) so your readers enter the quoted passage knowing who will be speaking and won't have to reread the passage in light of that information. Announcements before longer quotations should also suggest what the reader should be listening for in the quotation (see 2.4c).

Withholding the identity of a quoted source until a citation at the end of the quotation is acceptable only when the identity of a quoted source is much less important than, or a distraction from, what the source says. This might be the case, for example, if you were giving a quick sampling of opinion—say, in a history paper, giving a series of short quotations illustrating a common belief in

the divine right of kings, or in an English paper, quoting from a few representative early reviews of Walt Whitman.

(e) *Choose your announcing verb carefully.* Don't say "Diamond states," for example, unless you mean to imply a deliberate pronouncement, to be scrutinized like the wording of a statute or a biblical commandment. Choose rather a more neutral verb ("writes," "says," "observes," "suggests," "remarks," "argues") or a verb that catches exactly the attitude you want to convey ("laments," "protests," "charges," "replies," "admits," "claims," "objects"). Choose verbs carefully when summarizing and paraphrasing sources as well.

(f) *Don't automatically put a comma before a quotation*, as you do in writing dialogue. Do so only if the grammar of your sentence requires it (as Jennie's sentence at line 15 does, whereas her sentence at line 36 does not).

(g) *Put the period or comma ending a sentence or clause after the parenthetical citation*, except after a block quotation (see section 2.4f).

(h) *Indicate clearly when you are quoting a passage* as you found it quoted in another source (see Box F).

2.4 Quoting Blocks

If you need to quote more than four lines of prose or two verses of poetry, indent the passage as a block. Jennie does this when she quotes three consecutive sentences of Diamond's book at line 26 ("I'm strong and I'm superior") that give a particularly vivid statement of Diamond's theory. Doing this makes her paper more persuasive by giving her criticisms a specific focus, and it reassures readers that she is not misrepresenting Diamond by selecting a few weak or misleading phrases.

Quote a block only when you will consider closely the language of your source—for example, when discussing a speech by Lincoln, an argument by Kant, an eyewitness account of a revolution, or a key policy statement, but rarely in a science or social science paper—and only when you will follow up your quotation with some commentary on it. Otherwise, long passages of other people's

[G] FITTING QUOTATIONS TO CONTEXT: There are a few cases in which you may need to adjust a quoted passage, in a very minor way, to fit its context in your paper.

(1) **To punctuate the end** of an embedded quotation, use whatever punctuation your sentence requires, not the source author's punctuation. In Jennie's sentence at lines 15–18, Diamond may or may not end his sentence after "passed"; however, since the student ends her own sentence there, she uses a period. *Put a period or comma inside the close-quotation mark*, as in lines 18 and 36 in the excerpt from Jennie; put colons and semicolons outside the close-quotation mark.

(2) **To emphasize** certain words in a quoted passage, in order to make them stand out, place in parentheses after your close-quotation mark the phrase (*my emphasis*) or (*emphasis added*). If the author has italicized the words, indicate this by adding (*Smith's emphasis*).

(3) **To add or change** a word in a quotation to make it fit into the grammar of your own sentence, which you should do only rarely, put brackets [] around the altered word. A source passage like "nostalgia for my salad days" might appear in your sentence as *he speaks of "nostalgia for [his] salad days."* A source passage like "I deeply distrust Freud's method of interpretation" might become *Smith writes that he "deeply distrust[s] Freud's method of interpretation."* Use this cumbersome device rarely; always try to construct your sentence so you can quote verbatim. If you need to change only an initial capital letter to a lowercase letter, do so silently, without putting brackets around the letter.

(4) **If the passage you quote contains a quotation**, use single rather than double quotation marks to indicate the source author's quoting.

(5) **To indicate a line break** in a quoted passage of poetry, use a slash (/), inserting a space before and after the slash: *Hamlet wonders if it is "nobler in the mind to suffer / The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" or physically to act and thus escape them forever.*

voices will drown out your own voice and will take up space that you should be devoting to your own ideas. The basic rules for quoting blocks are as follows:

(a) *Indent all lines 10 spaces (or 1") from the left margin*, to distinguish a block from a paragraph break. Single-space the block, to distinguish it further from the rest of the text, unless your instructor prefers double-spaced blocks (as do many publications for manuscript submissions).

(b) *Don't put an indented block in quotation marks*; the indenting replaces quotation marks. Only use quotation marks in an indented block where the source author is quoting or is reporting spoken words (as when Homer reports Achilles's funeral oration in the *Iliad*).

(c) *Tell your readers in advance who is about to speak and what to listen for*. Don't send them unguided through a long stretch of someone else's words. Notice how Jennie sets up the block quotation in lines 23–25, telling us beforehand both what we will be listening to and what we should listen for: *Diamond's characterization of the message that human teenagers send by smoking and drinking creates an image of a strutting animal.*

(d) *Construct your lead-in sentence so that it ends with a colon*—pointing the reader ahead (as Jennie does at line 25) to the quotation itself. Occasionally, clarity or momentum may be better served by having your lead-in sentence run directly into your quotation, in which case you may require a comma or no punctuation at all. But this should be the exception, not the rule.

(e) *Follow up a block quotation with commentary that reflects on it and makes clear why you needed to quote it*. Your follow-up—unless you have discussed the quotation in the sentences leading up to it—should usually be a few sentences long, and it should generally involve repeating or echoing the language of the quotation itself, as you draw out its significance. Any quotation, like any fact, is only as good as what you make of it. After her block quotation of Diamond, Jennie follows up at length, echoing the language of the quotation ("*remain alive and healthy*," line 36) in her analysis of it. Another way to state this rule would be to *avoid ending a paragraph on a block quotation*. End with follow-up commentary that pulls your reader out of the quotation and back into your own argument about the quoted material.

(f) When using an in-text, parenthetic system of citation, put your citation of a block quotation outside the period at the end of the last sentence quoted. This makes clear that the citation applies to the whole block, not only to the last sentence quoted. Note that the citation (199) comes at the end of the block quotation in line 31 of Jennie's paper.

[H] OMITTING WORDS BY ELLIPSIS: To omit words from the middle of a passage that you are quoting, use ellipsis points: three spaced periods inserted at the point of omission. "Even to take drugs once or twice," Diamond writes, "I must be strong enough to get past . . . the misery of my first hangover" (199). If a sentence ends within the omitted portion, add an extra, fourth period and space, before the ellipsis, to indicate this. Don't use ellipsis marks at the start of a quotation, and only use them at the end if you are quoting a block and have omitted words from the end of the last sentence quoted. Don't omit only single words or short phrases, and never omit words in a way that gives a false sense of what the passage says (see section 3.3a). If the text you are quoting itself contains ellipsis marks, put them in square brackets [. . .].

2.5 Using Discursive Notes

Use a discursive or "content" footnote or endnote (a note that includes comments, not just publication information) when you want tell your reader something extra to the strict development of your argument, or incorporate extra information about sources. In the first case, for example, you may want to direct your reader to a further reading or mention the ideas of another writer that are similar to or different from yours:

5. See chapter 3 of George Folsom's *Rectitudes* (London: Chatto, 1949) for an excellent summary of Gnostic doctrine and a slightly different critique of the ontological argument, stressing agency rather than effect.

Or you may want to briefly amplify or explain something you have said, as on p. 11 of this book and in the following example:

6. These differences are not small: in 1990 the US spent 45 percent more per capita than Canada, nearly three-quarters more than Germany and three times as much as the United Kingdom (Kingshorn 121; Connors 11).

Or you may want to notice, as an interesting side note, a connection to or implication of your argument that your paper does not develop:

12. The use of the word "smelly" in this passage is illuminated by Jeffrey Myers's observation that Orwell "uses odor as a kind of ethical touchstone" (62). Orwell concludes his essay on Gandhi, Myers notes, by remarking "how clean a smell he has managed to leave behind" and says that the autobiography of Dali, the moral antithesis of Gandhi, "is a book that stinks."

Except in a long paper or thesis, however, use such notes sparingly. In most cases, if the note is really interesting enough to include, you should work it into the argument of your paper (or save it for another paper).

Discursive notes that give extra information about sources include notes that announce a nonstandard edition or your own translating:

3. All translations from Pasteur are my own; I use the Malouf edition, which is based on an earlier and more complete draft of the treatise.

And notes that explain something about your citing system, your use of terms, or the meaning of your acronyms and abbreviations:

5. See chapter 3 of George Folsom's *Rectitudes* (London: Chatto, 1949) for an excellent summary of Gnostic doctrine and a slightly different critique of the ontological argument, stressing agency rather than effect.

2. Unless otherwise noted, references to Locke are to *Second Treatise of Government*, ed. C. B. Macpherson (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1980), which is cited by page number only.

3.2 Forms of Plagiarism

Plagiarism can occur in any kind of paper or presentation, from a short problem set or response paper to a long research paper or thesis. More common than wholesale copying, especially in longer papers, is piecemeal or "mosaic" plagiarism, in which a student mixes words or ideas of a source with his or her own words and ideas, or mixes uncited words and ideas from several sources into a pastiche, or mixes properly cited uses of a source with improperly or uncited uses. At any point in any paper, however, plagiarism usually takes one of the following forms:

(a) *Uncited data or information*: If you read p. 30 of this book for a paper you are writing on plagiarism in American colleges, and then you say in your paper that Harvard College required 24 students to withdraw for academic dishonesty in 2006–7 and you don't cite this booklet (p. 30), you are plagiarizing information that is not common knowledge. You need to cite such information, again, even when it isn't part of your main argument—when it appears in a "background" section of a paper or in accounts of previous work done on the topic. Your citation must accurately reflect your process: if you claim that you found the information about academic dishonesty at Harvard in the *Administrative Board* volume itself (which you have not read), instead of as cited in *this* volume, you are misleading your reader and possibly embarrassing yourself (see Box F).

(b) *An uncited idea, whether a specific claim or a general concept*: Suppose you read the first paragraph of the previous page and then write this in your paper:

Many have attempted to give simple definitions of plagiarism. Harvey, for example, defines it as "passing off the information, ideas, or words of another as your own, by failing to acknowledge their source."³ But plagiarism is not in fact a simple sin: rather, it involves the dastardly trio of lying, cheating, and stealing. Essentially it means stealing the brainchild — the idea — of another writer and claiming it as your own, thereby gaining unfair advantage over others who have done their own work. "Plagiarism" is a particularly appropriate word for the theft of brainchildren, since it comes

from an ancient Latin word for pirates who stole young boys and girls.

3. *Writing with Sources, Second Edition* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2008), 29.

Here you properly cite the quotation in the first sentence, and the Latin etymology of child-stealer given in the last sentence is common (dictionary) knowledge. But the idea of stealing a *brainchild* is not common, nor is the claim of the triple sin involved in plagiarism. These distinctive ideas are plagiarized from the final paragraph on p. 29 of this book, even though you present them in a different order and in different words, because they are uncited. Like the "But" that begins your second sentence, your citation in the first sentence of the passage is a deception. It makes readers think that you are fair and scrupulous, and that you have a viewpoint distinct from the source's, when in fact you are being both unscrupulous and unoriginal.

(c) *An unquoted but verbatim phrase or passage*: Suppose that you have read the last paragraph on p. 30 of this book and you write this:

Plagiarism, as Harvey suggests, is often the result of fatigue and panic. Imagine that it is 3:00 A.M. The student in question, a good student and certainly not the kind who would cold-bloodedly plagiarize a whole paper, has started on his paper too late. By the next afternoon, he has neither the time nor the inclination to fight the blending and blurring of his sources' words into his own. Imperceptibly, he crosses a moral line.⁴

4. *Writing with Sources, Second Edition* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2008), 30.

Here you end the passage with a citation that acknowledges a general reliance on the ideas of the source text, thus implying that all of the language is your own. Yet, you have in fact borrowed several distinctive phrases verbatim, without quotation marks: "cold-bloodedly," "neither the time nor the inclination," "blending and blurring," "crosses a moral line." You may fix on certain words in a source as more striking than those around them, but this is all the more reason to give credit for the words by quoting, not simply citing. Beware of this kind of plagiarism, especially when you are

summarizing background material that you don't think an "essential" part of the paper, or that you feel the source author has already summarized quite nicely.

(d) *An uncited structure or organizing strategy*: Suppose that, having read p. 30, you write this:

The occasions of plagiarism vary. Kim, a foreign student, simply didn't understand American notions of intellectual property and citation. In his paper he relied heavily on the idea of one book, to the exclusion of his own ideas, thinking that this was the best way to honor the writer's authority. Michelle steeped herself so thoroughly in her sources that, when she wrote her paper, she took over a fundamental idea in them as a given and accidentally reproduced some of their most striking turns of phrase. Eric, having taken invertebrate biology only because it fit neatly into his schedule, did almost none of the course reading and simply printed out a term paper he found on the Internet. Glenn and Sara, more typical cases, actually liked the invertebrate course and intended to write good papers for it, but simply ran out of time to come up with their own ideas. Hurriedly bringing his paraphrased notes over into his draft, just a few hours before the deadline, Glenn started letting his sources' ideas mix in with his own. About this same time, Sara, who had been staring at her blank computer screen all morning, was finally overwhelmed by anxiety and went looking for the paper her roommate had shown her that she had written for the same class last year.

Your words and details here are indeed original, and the general idea that plagiarism occurs in different circumstances is obvious enough to count as common knowledge and doesn't need citing. You have, however, taken the structural framework or outline of the passage directly from the source passage, which considers patch plagiarizing a result of (a) ignorance of the rules, or (b) oblivious absorption of an idea or replication of a phrase, in addition to (c) wholesale plagiarizing out of indifference or laziness, and (d) plagiarizing in a time panic, either by careless note-taking or deliberate copying. Providing no citation, you plagiarize a distinctive intellectual structure or way of proceeding with a topic—even though, again, your language differs from that of your source and your invented examples are original. You could have fairly introduced

this latter fact and been credited for it by saying, for example, "The occasions of plagiarism (as mapped in a general way by Harvey) vary widely."

[J] AVOID AMBIGUOUS CITING: Students who have cited incompletely may find themselves accused of plagiarism. Sometimes an author's name is mentioned in the student paper, at the point at which a source has been drawn upon, but no publication information has been provided in a citation or reference list. Or, author and publication information is provided in a list of references but not cited at the point in the paper where the source is drawn upon. Or, author and publication information are cited for a passage that draws heavily on a specific section of a source, but no page number is provided. These are occasionally real oversights; but when readers are unable to find enough information to allow them to verify a source, they may suspect that the incomplete citing is attempting to disguise an over-reliance on a source—as it sometimes is. Students who then protest that the source *is* mentioned in the paper, and that they were simply sloppy about citing, face the difficult task of proving that their plagiarism was accidental.

3.3 Other Misuses of Sources

(a) *Misrepresenting Evidence*: When you have an idea or interpretation that you wish to be true—especially when the assignment is due shortly—you may be tempted to fudge your evidence to make it seem true. You may be tempted to ignore or sweep under the carpet evidence that you know doesn't fit, in which case you are simply betraying your own intelligence. However, you may also be tempted into more serious violations of academic honesty. You might be tempted to quote or paraphrase a source out of context or in misleading excerpts, so it seems to say what you want. You would be doing this if, in your essay on plagiarism in American colleges, you argued that most plagiarism in college papers is accidental, and you wrote the following:

Harvey believes that, although sometimes a panicking paper-writer "has neither the time nor the inclination" to resist the incursion of a source's ideas, students are "confused about the rules of acknowledgment."⁵

5. *Writing with Sources, Second Edition* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2008), 30.

The quoted passages can indeed be found on p. 30 of this volume, but the emphasis there—that only a *few* students are confused—is the opposite of what your summary implies.

Still more seriously, you might be tempted into altering or fabricating a source or some data. Because this kind of deception violates the basic principle of scholarly communities, in which members build on one another's work (the principle of valid reasoning based on true evidence), and because such a deception may suggest an inclination to commit similar acts in later life, it will usually result in serious action by the instructor, the department, or the university.

(b) **Improper Collaboration:** This occurs when two students submit more or less identical written work for an assignment on which they have worked together, and which is not a group presentation. Collaborative discussion and brainstorming is a vital activity for professional scholars; indeed, most articles in the sciences and social sciences have multiple authors. However, the author or authors of articles not only acknowledge in the completed article the contribution of other discussants, they also write the article on their own. When you are asked to collaborate on a project but are required to submit separate papers, you must write up your paper on your own, acknowledging the extent of your collaboration in a note (see section 2.5).

You and your partner, that is, should not compose the report or exam answer as you sit together—instead, you should only take notes. If you divide up aspects of the assignment (assuming the assignment permits this), you should not write up your aspect and e-mail it to your partner, but bring your notes to your meeting. Additionally, you should *discuss* each other's notes, not just photocopy them. Finally, beware of your partner's request, at the last minute and in a panic, to read over your finished report; you may be tempting him or her to plagiarize. Professional scholars do ask one another to read drafts; but again, in these cases only one paper is

being produced, not two. If you're unsure about your instructor's policy on collaboration, ask.

(c) **Dual or Overlapping Submission:** Don't take it upon yourself to decide that work you plan to submit for one course, though in many places identical to work you will submit or have submitted for another course, is "different enough" by virtue of small changes you have made (e.g., an added section or an altered introduction or conclusion). When you are running late and need to submit a paper, don't simply submit a cut-and-pasted version of the paper you submitted for another course. Either act will land you in disciplinary trouble. You must first get permission from both instructors for such submissions. Be aware that, should your instructors give you permission for dual submission, they will likely require from you a longer paper than they require of other students in the course.

(d) **Abetting Plagiarism:** You are also guilty of misusing sources if you knowingly help another student plagiarize—whether by letting the student have or copy from your own paper, or by writing a paper or part of a paper for the student (as, for example, when in the course of "editing" a paper for another student, you go beyond correcting mechanical errors and begin rewriting significant portions of the paper). Any of these actions makes you liable to disciplinary action. It is right to be generous and collegial; however, when another student asks you for help with a paper, try whenever possible to phrase your comments as questions that will draw out the student's own ideas.

[K] AVOID ALL-BUT QUOTING: If your own sentences follow the source so closely in idea and sentence structure that the result is really closer to quotation than to paraphrase, you are plagiarizing, even if you have cited the source. You may not simply alter a few words of your source—even of a source such as an abstract you read for a literature review. You need to recast your summary into your own words and sentence structure, or quote directly.

[M] ENCOUNTERING "YOUR" IDEA IN A SOURCE: Should this happen, don't pretend that you never encountered the source—but don't panic either. If it's your major idea and you're near the end of work on the paper, finish writing your argument as you have conceived it. Then look closely at the source in question; chances are that its idea isn't exactly the same as yours, that you have a slightly different emphasis or slant, or that you are considering somewhat different topics and evidence. In this case you can either mention and cite the source in the course of your argument ("*my contention, like Ann Harrison's, is that . . .*" or "*I share Ann Harrison's view that . . .*"), but stress the differences in your account—what you have noticed that Harrison hasn't. Go back and reshape your argument slightly, to bring out the different emphasis. If the argument in the source really *is* the same as yours, and you are in the midst of a long paper, go to your instructor, who may be able to suggest a slightly different direction for your paper. If you aren't writing a big paper, and haven't time to recast, use a note of acknowledgment:

12. In the final stages of writing this paper, I discovered Ann Harrison's article "Echo and Her Medieval Sisters," *Centennial Review* 26.4 (Fall 1982), 326-40, which comes to the same conclusion. See pp. 331-2.

Don't try to use such a note to cover plagiarism. Your instructor will know from your paper whether you had your own, well-developed idea before reading the source, and may ask you to produce your rough notes or drafts. (To be safe, always hold onto your notes and drafts until a paper has been returned.)

4

Styles of Citation

How you cite sources matters less than when you do, but knowing how makes it easier to cite when you should. This chapter describes several common styles of citation, first giving basic rules of the style and then special cases.

4.1 Documenting a Source

Your basic task in citing is to give your readers enough information to locate and verify any source you use. "Enough" information includes

- the name of the author or authors (or organization, if no author is listed)
- the title of the item (or Web page)
- the name of any volume (or Web site) that includes the item
- the date of that volume's (or site's) publication
- the page number(s) to which you refer (for e-sources, use the paragraph or section number)

When your source is an article in a journal, you also need to give its volume number, issue number (unless the pages run continuously through the volume), and inclusive page numbers of the article. When your source is a book, you need to give the place of publication and (if published after 1900) the name of the publisher. When your source is a Web site, you must give the URL and date of your access or retrieval.

What matters most, however, is that you signal the availability of this information at the point at which you draw on the source, and