

## **LESSON 1 – INTRODUCTION TO ACADEMIC WRITING**

### **The Centre for Social Studies Induction Course in Academic Writing: An Introduction**

First of all, I would like to welcome you to the Centre for Social Studies (CSS) and wish you every success in your forthcoming studies. I hope that you will find the CSS to be a very friendly and productive centre of learning which aims at nothing less than helping you to achieve your academic and professional goals.

What you are holding is basically your introduction to the taught element of the Academic Writing course. During the course, I will cover the essential skills of writing on an English language Master's degree in seminar style with a range of activities.

The induction course will last for two weeks, and in the end you will produce a final essay. This course is meant to be a starting point for you in developing *advanced* academic skills, which will hopefully see great progress in your year here.

With best wishes,

Holly

Independent thought, critical dissent and reasoned dialectic are part of the very stuff of a humane education; hardly anyone, as I commented earlier, will demand that your essay arrives inexorably at certain pre-set conclusions. All that is being demanded is that you manipulate a particular language in acceptable ways...You can think or believe what you want, as long as you can speak this particular language. Nobody is especially concerned about what you say, with what extreme, moderate, radical or conservative positions you adopt, provided that they are compatible with, and can be articulated within, a specific form of discourse...Those employed to teach you this form of discourse will remember whether or not you were able to speak it proficiently long after they have forgotten what you said.

(Adapted from Eagleton, 1983,  
*Literary Theory*)

*What does this tell us about the form and content of academic essays?*

How does it imply that academic writing is different from other forms?

### ***Vocabulary***

**Dissent:** to differ in sentiment or opinion, esp. from the majority.

**Dialectic:** of, pertaining to, or of the nature of logical argumentation.

**Inexorable:** unyielding; unalterable.

**Articulate:** expressed, formulated, or presented with clarity and effectiveness.

## Which Community Does a Writer Belong To?<sup>1</sup>

Through our own reading we absorb a great deal about the culture in which the texts are embedded. We acquire a sense of the underlying values and ways of thinking, of what is acceptable to put into writing and which form I should take, and of how written material is organised. This process is assisted by reading the work of other learners within our own educational institution. Such knowledge is often not conscious though it can be (and sometimes is) brought to consciousness. Whether it is or not, it often underlines our own writing in our first language.

When, however, we are called upon to write in another language we may see our task as recoding, in the same way, with the same underlying assumptions, the ideas we originally express in our first language. This will be particularly true if most of the reading has been in the first language, but, even if most of the reading underlying a particular piece of writing is in the second language, general cultural assumptions will still have an influence. When a writer views the culture of a second language particularly favourably, he or she seeks to become an insider in a new writing community. It is important to establish first whether this perception that writing grows out of and reflects different cultures is a sound one.

There have been a number of reports in the literature of teachers who have been able to place fairly accurately in the nationality of writers of anonymous assignments. Robert Kaplan mentions this phenomenon in an early article, and this alerted him to the area of writing which he calls contrastive rhetoric. He defines the term in this way:

*My topic is contrastive rhetoric, that is, I am concerned with the notions that speakers of different languages use different devices to present information, to establish the relationship among ideas, to show the centrality of one idea as opposed to another, to select the most effective means of presentation.*

Eleven years earlier Kaplan had compared English paragraph structure, which he considered to be linear, with the following types: parallel, circular, digressing, and complex, which he associated with generic language types (Semitic, Oriental, Romance, Russian). Kaplan's central ideas are still widely accepted though the particularity of his work on paragraph structure has been challenged.

Kaplan has not been the only scholar to study this topic. The concept of contrastive rhetoric has been supported by a number of other writers. Michael Clyne (Smith, 1987) demonstrates that there are comparable differences between German and English academic writing, the latter paying greater attention to the importance of relevance and lack of repetition. Similarly, Maggie Jo St. John, in a recent article, comments that Spanish academics find the over-explicitness of British writing somewhat ridiculous.

It would seem that the learner writing in a second language should be taught to understand the thought processes and to study the "written" products, including the formal conventions of writing, in the target language. However, with only this approach it is too easy to become what Philip Riley would term a cultural imperialist. It is possibly somewhat arrogant and ethnocentric, for instance, to think that Spanish learners are invariably wrong not to be more explicit in their writing, but if they want to satisfy assessors within the British system they will need to be so. Some British writing might, indeed, benefit from influence in the other direction. How one deals with cross-cultural mismatches of this kind depends largely on the purpose of the writing and the intended audience.

To conclude, the whole area of contrastive rhetoric is more important than has been generally recognised and a consciousness of the kind of differences between societies can be of great importance to us. We can then decide how far to respect the existing traditions and how far to modify them to be in line with English academic norms, especially when they are the norms of those who will be assessing our work.

---

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from Brookes, Arthur and Peter Grundy. *Writing for Study Purposes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 31-4.

## LESSON 2 – TONE AND FORMALITY

Read the following text and try to identify the author's tone.

I don't have a future. Nobody has a future. The party's over. Take a look around you man (kind). It's all breaking up. Are you not familiar with the Book of Revelations of St. John, the final book of the Bible, prophesying the apocalypse?

He forced everyone to receive a mark on his right hand or on his forehead so that no one shall be able to buy or sell unless he has the mark, which is the name of the beast, or the number of his name, and the number of the beast is 666.<sup>2</sup>

What can such a specific prophecy mean? What is the mark? Well, the mark is the bar-code, the ubiquitous bar-code that you'll find on every bog roll<sup>3</sup> and every packet of johnnies<sup>4</sup> and every poxy pork pie, and every bar-code is divided into two parts by the three markers, and those three markers are always represented by the number 6. 666! Now what does that say? "No one shall be able to buy or sell" without that mark.

And now, what they're planning to do in order to eradicate all credit card fraud and in order to precipitate a totally cashless society, what they're planning to do, what they've already tested on American troops: they're going to subcutaneously<sup>5</sup> laser tattoo that mark onto your right hand or onto your forehead.<sup>6</sup> They're going to replace plastic with flesh. Fact.

In the same book of Revelations, when the seven seals are broken open and the Day of Judgement and the seven angels blow the trumpets, when the third angel blows her bugle, "...wormwood will fall from the sky. Wormwood will poison a third part of all the waters and a third part of all the land and many, many, many people will die."<sup>7</sup> Now, do you know what the Russian translation for wormwood is? Chernobyl.<sup>8</sup> Fact!

On 18 August 1999, the planets of our solar system are going to line up into the shape of a cross.<sup>9</sup> They're going to line up in the fixed signs of Aquarius, Leo, Taurus, and Scorpio, which just happen to correspond to the four beasts of the Apocalypse as mentioned in the book of Daniel.<sup>10</sup> Another fact!

Do you want me to go on? The end of the world is nigh. The game is up.

All right. I'm not saying that life will end, or the world will end or the universe will cease to exist, but man will cease to exist. Just like dinosaurs passed into extinction, the same thing will happen to us. We're not important. We're just a crap idea.

From Leigh, Michael "Naked"

---

<sup>2</sup> The Revelation of St. John the Divine 2. 1-5

<sup>3</sup> Toilet paper

<sup>4</sup> Condoms

<sup>5</sup> Under the skin

<sup>6</sup> US Army "Report on Eliminating the Need for Cash." 17 January 1991.

<sup>7</sup> Rev. 3.6-8

<sup>8</sup> Webster's Russian-English Dictionary. 5<sup>th</sup> Ed. Oxford, Ohio: U of P Press, 1987, p. 276.

<sup>9</sup> NASA

<sup>10</sup> Book of Daniel 5.8-19

## Attitude and Tone

### Truth, Lies, and Internet Content

*Adapted from an article by Terry Hansen<sup>11</sup> and from the CEU Writing Center*

Internet newcomers often **deplore** the high level of noise and rancour that characterise its content, and hate the clutter that fills their mailboxes, especially in Usenet group. Those accustomed to the filtered and rational picture put forth by the traditional media **despise** the intrusive nature of cyberspace.

When you leave the carefully crafted consensus reality imposed on us by the major TV networks and news magazines, which some viewers **can't stand**, and enter a medium controlled by ordinary people, who are often **fiercely anti-propagandist**, the picture changes profoundly. Cyberspace has not yet been subdued by the armies of marketing consultants, public relations firms, and government agenda setters who regularly work their magic on the commercial media's message. Indeed there are those who **firmly reject** this notion.

What emerges is a portrait painted by and for the common man who is **in favour of** a non-commercial agenda and who does not **see eye to eye with** politicians who **are all for** constraining the content. In cyberspace, the ideal of free speech has at last been realised, for better or for worse.

A number of journalists, particularly those **who buy into the notion of** media objectivity, have expounded self righteously on the cavalier attitude many cyberspace denizens have towards facts and truth. Perhaps the Internet reminds them too forcefully of their profession's "yellow journalism"<sup>12</sup> past. Early in the history of American newspapers, journalists had so thoroughly discredited their trade that they **were fed up with** their shabby image and were anxious to reaffirm their profession's credibility. To this end they **advocated** the ideals of science by emphasising facts and striving for objectivity.

Alas, objectivity has taken its lumps even in physics where the notion originated. Early in this century, quantum physics showed it's impossible to measure the locations of very small particles without displacing them. It doesn't take a nuclear physicist to figure out that a similar effect applies in human society. People who are aware they are being observed are never **indifferent to** this and are careful to adapt their behaviour accordingly. This effect is most

---

<sup>11</sup> Hanson, Terry. "Truth, Lies and Internet Content," *Cybernetics Digest*, February/March 1997, p. 2.

<sup>12</sup> Yellow Journalism – a term which has come to mean non-objective or florid newspaper reporting, using such journalistic practices as sensationalism or distorted or mislabelled pictures, in order to appeal to emotions and/or increase newspaper circulation.

powerfully manifested through television with its glaring lights and intrusive camera teams. But there are more subtle and sinister forces at work. It's no longer a secret that the US intelligence community employs agents in deep cover with media organisations. Their role is to sow propaganda and suppress unpleasant truths, a practice many senior journalists and editors **wholly disapprove of**, but are in no position to oppose.

Although most journalists **are convinced** that they have the god-like ability to see through the sophisticated and well-financed campaigns of professional media spin doctors, their audience **seems to have concluded otherwise**. According to public opinion polls, journalists and their products are not held in particularly high esteem.

Looking back over recent American history, we can see that many important stories went unreported until far too late. Notable examples which **back** this include the recently surfaced sordid career of former FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, “new” reports describing the shocking senility of President Ronald Reagan while in office; and the still mysterious destination for hundreds of billions of dollars that have vanished in the secret government’s “black budget.”<sup>13</sup> Clearly the public **feels strongly** that reporters haven’t been giving us the whole truth.

Given this, perhaps we **need to recognise** that the views and experiences of the common man **should not be dismissed** so quickly. The mystery, complexity, paradox, and conspiratorial flavour that characterise Internet content may come closer to describing the human experience than the sanitised “objective” mass media.

The fictional treatment of topics spurned by the mainstream has found support elsewhere, notably on television. The creator of the Fox TV series X-Files Chris Carter once remarked that “since the show started, I suppose people have sought me out. I was warned about nutcases, but these are regular folks. A banker will **be keen on** telling me about his experiences with aliens. Pilots and flight attendants come up to me and claim to have seen UFOs. One friend told me ‘I **don’t mind** if people call me crazy, you don’t know how accurate you are.’ He broke down, telling me about his visitations. I’ve known this person for two years. I **guess** I have no reason not to **believe** him.”

To be sure, while there are those who **adore** it, the Internet is capable of disseminating lies, mythology, and disinformation as effectively as any newspaper chain or television network. In order to not **dismiss** the value of this new **medium out of hand**, we should not abandon our critical faculties in cyberspace or anywhere else. Despite its faults, though, the Internet offers

---

<sup>13</sup> Black Budget is a slush fund that provides financial support for secret US government programmes under the guise of “national security.” See Robert Dreyfuss “Orbit of Influence: Spy Finance and the Black Budget,” *The American Prospect*, no. 25 (March – April 1996): 30-36.

a much-needed alternative to arrogant media professionals who too often have been less than honest about their limitations and agendas.

**Vocabulary:**

**Deplore:** to disapprove of; censure.

**Subdued/Subdue:** to reduce the intensity, force, or vividness of (sound, light, colour, etc.); tone down; soften.

**Cavalier:** carefree and nonchalant; jaunty.

**Shabby:** showing conspicuous signs of wear or neglect.

**Indifferent:** without interest or concern; not caring; apathetic.

**Florid:** reddish; ruddy; rosy.

**Spin doctor:** a person who publicises favourable interpretations of the words and actions of a public figure, especially a politician.

**Senility:** the mental and physical deterioration associated with aging.

**Conspiratorial:** of, relating to, or characteristic of conspirators or a conspiracy.

## Elements of Style

Directions: Decide whether these elements of style are informal or formal

ELEMENT OF STYLE	INFORMAL	FORMAL
Creating emphasis with words like “really”		
Using “I” and “We”		
Addressing individuals (e.g. you)		
Using headings and subheadings		
Using vague evaluative words like “awful” and “great”		
Avoiding phrasal verbs		
Using words like “Well” or “But” at the beginning of a sentence		
Using contractions		
Using technical terms		
Using slang words		

## Formal Expressions

Directions: Change the informal expressions to more formal ones.

1) look into →

2) get bigger →

3) get smaller →

4) get →

5) get better →

6) a big amount →

7) get rid of →

8) don't →

## **LESSON 3 – IDENTIFYING PLAGIARISM**

### **The Sardonic Plagiarist**

**By Miss Nora Ferenc**

Sometimes after I rock around the clock, I arrive home a little drunk, sit in my big armchair and think: to be or not to be, that is the question. I think deeply about this, but it always remains unanswered. I often go on to think about the man of my dreams. Are you lonesome tonight? – I often wonder. Of course that only gets me down. But I'm an optimist at heart, which often leads me to revel in the successes of my past, knowing that I came, I saw, I conquered.

1. Read the above text and underline any phrases that Miss Ferenc has stolen from another author.
2. Which famous people has she stolen from?
3. Now reword the famous quotations.
4. What do we call the act of stealing text or ideas from another author?
5. What is a well-known term for the reworking of a previously published text?

## Some Key Terms and the Relationships Between Them

Match the correct definition to the following terms:

A) Plagiarism	1) The act of giving credit to the original author by providing the reader with the author's name, the original publication name, and other important information such as year and place of publication, publisher's name, and page numbers.
B) Paraphrasing	2) Using the actual words of another author together with quotation marks and proper citation.
C) Summarising	3) The technique of highlighting the identity of a cited author by including his/her name in the text followed by a reporting verb, such as 'argues' or 'points out.'
D) Direct quotation	4) The act of taking ideas, writings, etc. from another person and using them as if they are one's own.
E) Citation	5) Synthesising a longer passage from another author's work to include only the main ideas.
F) Foregrounding	6) Putting the thoughts and words of another author into your own words, in a recognisably different form.

## **A Case Study of Plagiarism**

May is a graduate student who is writing a term paper for one of her courses. She incorporates whole sentences and paragraphs verbatim from several published papers. She does not use quotation marks, but the sources are suggested by statements like "(see . . . for more details)." The professor notes inconsistencies in the writing styles of different paragraphs of the text and check the sources, uncovering May's plagiarism.

After discussion with the faculty, May's plagiarism is brought to the attention of the chairman of the graduate school, whose responsibility it is to review such incidents. The graduate school regulations state that "plagiarism, that is, the failure in a dissertation, essay, or other written exercise to acknowledge ideas, research or language taken from others" is specifically prohibited. The chairman decides to....

### Questions

- Why is this considered plagiarism?
- What do you think the chairman decided to do?
- What do you think May could have done to prevent this from happening?

*Source:* National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine. (1995). *On being a scientist: Responsible conduct in research, second edition*. Retrieved September 2006 from [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=4917](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=4917)

## Using Sources Correctly

Read the following text quickly. Then look at the ways in which eight students used the ideas in different parts of the text in their own writing. Which of the extracts from students' writing uses sources appropriately for an English-speaking academic environment? (Note: one of the extracts below contains language errors.)

### **Government Aid to Industry**

Government aid to industry in the industrial countries increased substantially between 1973 and 1983 and measures to influence trade – largely non-tariff barriers against imports – proliferated. Since then the industrial countries' direct subsidisation of some industries may have declined, but they have significantly increased their use of non-tariff barriers to trade, perhaps using such barriers as a substitute for domestic industrial policy measures.

Industrial policy can be broadly defined as the deliberate attempt by a government to influence the level and composition of a nation's industrial output. Thus defined, it encompasses a wide variety of government actions, including those to improve the industrial infrastructure and to enhance national labour mobility and efficiency. This article takes a somewhat more limited view, being concerned mainly with government actions to foster specific industries, either so as to shift resources to activities that will use them more productively in support of adjusting goals, or to maintain resources in existing activities for security, political, or other reasons. The focus is thus largely on the more defensive aspects of such policies.

Industrial policies are implemented both through domestic measures, such as subsidies and tax incentives, and through trade measures such as tariffs and quantitative restrictions. The article looks both at policies' domestic effects and how they may effect trade flows, in particular those of developing countries.

### **Reasons for the policies**

Over the past 15 years, many governments have become increasingly concerned to shape the structure of industry and to ease the burden of industrial adjustment. A number of factors, including the inflationary environment of the early 1970s; the oil shocks and rising commodity prices; slower economic growth, which persisted in the early 1980s; the new capacity in developing countries which added excel capability in many traditional industries, such as shipbuilding and steel in industrial countries; the generally fiercer international competition; and the advent of new technologies played a role in pressing the need to transform the manufacturing sector. This continuing transformation led to concerns about the costs of change and disparities in income between national growth centres and regions in which traditional industries are located. Concerns also emerged about the continued viability of industries considered essential to the national interest.

**Extract 1**

Government aid to industry in the industrial countries increased substantially between 1973 and 1983 and measures to influence trade – largely non-tariff barriers against imports – proliferated. Since then the industrial countries' direct subsidisation of some industries may have declined, but they have significantly increased their use of non-tariff barriers to trade, perhaps using such barriers as a substitute for domestic industrial policy measures.

**Extract 2**

For a long time industry has been seen as essential for development. Governments may try to influence industry in its countries, this happens in the industrial and developing country. A number of factors, including the inflationary environment of the early 1970s; the oil shocks and rising commodity prices; slower economic growth, which persisted in the early 1980s; the new capacity in developing countries which added excel capability in many traditional industries, such as shipbuilding and steel in industrial countries; the generally fiercer international competition; and the advent of new technologies played a role in pressing the need to transform the manufacturing sector. It was necessary to change the structure of industry for governments.

**Extract 3**

Industrial policy can be broadly defined as the deliberate attempt by a government to influence the level and composition of a nation's industrial output. Thus defined, it encompasses a wide variety of government actions, include those to improve the industrial infrastructure and to enhance national labour mobility and efficiency. This essay will consider only a few aspects of policy. It will concentrate on policies for specific industries.

**Extract 4**

A broad definition of industrial policy would include a wide number of government actions, ranging from efforts to improve the industrial infrastructure of a country to actions designed to promote specific industries. The latter may involve shifting resources to more productive activities or making sure they remain in existing activities, for example, for security reasons.

Industrial policies may take the form of domestic measures like tax incentives or trade measures such as tariffs. In recent years, non-tariff barriers to trade have been increasingly implemented in industrial countries, possibly as a substitute for domestic measures.

**Extract 5**

During the past 15 years, many governments have become increasingly concerned to shape the structure of industry and ease the burden of industrial adjustment. Factors such as excess capacity in traditional industries, fiercer international competition and slower economic growth have been important in pressing the need to transform the manufacturing sector. This continuing transformation led to concerns about the costs of change and disparities in income between national growth centres and regions in which traditional industries are located.

**Extract 6**

There has in recent years been a growing tendency for governments in both industrialised and developing countries to influence the shape and structure of industry and their countries. Boonekamp cites factors such as “the inflationary environment of the early 1970s; the oil shocks and rising commodity prices; slower economic growth, which persisted in the early 1980s; the new capacity in developing countries which added excel capability in many traditional industries, such as shipbuilding and steel in industrial countries; the generally fiercer international competition; and the advent of new technologies” (1989, p. 30).

**Extract 7**

As Boonekamp has noted, government aid to industry in the industrial societies increased considerably in the year between 1973 and 1983 and measures designed to affect trade also grew rapidly, particularly in the form of non-tariff import barriers. The use of the latter may often have been adopted to substitute for domestic measures of industrial policy (Boonekamp, 1989).

**Extract 8**

Boonekamp (1989) noted that aid to industry increased substantially between 1973 and 1983. Measures to influence trade – largely non-tariff barriers against imports – proliferated. Since then the industrial countries’ direct subsidisation of some industries may have declined, but they have significantly increased their use of non-tariff barriers to trade, perhaps using such barriers as a substitute for domestic industrial policy measures.

Source: Clemens Boonekamp. “Industrial Policies of Industrial Countries.” *Finance and Development*, vol 26, no. 1, March 1989.



Homework #1: Write a half-page summary of this article.

## Why Must Scientists Become More Ethically Sensitive Than They Used To Be?

**JOHN ZIMAN**

**John Ziman** was brought up in New Zealand, studied at Oxford, and lectured at Cambridge, before becoming professor of theoretical physics at the University of Bristol in 1964. He was chairman of the Council for Science and Society from 1976 to 1990, and has written extensively on various aspects of the social relations of science and technology.

Fifty years ago when I came into science, we rarely talked about ethical issues. I do not mean that there were no such issues, or that scientists were not, individually or in unofficial groups, speaking and acting about them. But ethics as such did not figure regularly in public discourse about science, in or beyond the scientific world.

And yet nowadays, the ethics of science not only occupies media slots and Sunday supplements. It also energizes scholarly books, journals, conferences and curricula. Having spent most of my life urging my colleagues to be more "socially responsible," I am not unhappy about this. But how did this abrupt change of attitude come about? Why are scientists now expected to be so much more ethically sensitive than they used to be?

Some would see this as no more than a natural consequence of the increasing influence of science on society, magnified, perhaps by media frenzy. Others see it as the latest battle front in the perennial "science wars." But I go further and interpret it as symptomatic of the transformation of science into a new type of social institution. As their products become more tightly woven into the social fabric, scientists are having to perform new roles in which ethical considerations can no longer be swept aside.

Fifty years ago the world of science was divided into two types of institutions. In universities and in many publicly funded research organizations people practiced "academic science"; in industrial and governmental research and development laboratories they practiced "industrial science." These were two distinct cultures, closely linked in many ways, but dealing with ethical issues quite differently.

Academic science was intensely individualistic. People held personal appointments earned by published contributions to knowledge. Universities and research institutes had little direct influence on their research. Academic employees decided for themselves what they would investigate and how they would go about it. The only constraint--an immensely powerful one in practice--was that the results of their research would be closely scrutinized by other members of one of the innumerable specialized research communities that partition the scientific world.

Academic scientists belonged to a worldwide institutional web. The production of reliable public knowledge was so loosely organized that it almost seemed like the anarchist's dream: an active, orderly republic of free-born citizens with no central government. It functioned through a number of well-established practices such as peer review, respect for priority of discovery, comprehensive citation of the literature, meritocratic preferment on the basis of research performance, and so on. Although these practices were never formally codified or systematically enforced, they geared smoothly together. In 1942 Robert Merton argued that this was because they satisfied a set of "norms" that together constitute an "ethos" for science. Merton's analysis was highly idealized, and is rejected by most present-day sociologists.

Nevertheless, I believe that it still provides the best theoretical framework for an understanding of how these practices interact to produce the sort of knowledge that we recognize as peculiarly "scientific."

Paradoxically, however, this "ethos" has practically no conventional "ethical" dimension. At most, it defines a basic structure for a perfectly democratic, universal "speech community." While this is an essential prerequisite for ethical debate, such debate is banished from academic science itself by Merton's norm of "disinterestedness." In pursuit of complete "objectivity"--admittedly a major virtue--the norm rules that all research results should be conducted, presented, and discussed quite impersonally, as if produced by androids or angels.

But ethical issues always involve human "interests." Ethics is not just an abstract intellectual discipline. It is about the conflicts that arise in trying to meet real human needs and values. The official ethos of academic science systematically shuts out all such considerations.

Actually, this norm is not activated against one major human interest--the quest for knowledge. Scientists are certainly not supposed to be "disinterested" about the promotion of their own discoveries or the advancement of knowledge in general. In fact, this interest is often given priority over other, less exalted, concerns, such as the welfare of experimental animals, and even over wider human interests such as the long-term consequences of publishing research that might be used for evil.

The important point is that this "no ethics" principle is not just an obsolete module that can be uninstalled with a keystroke. It is an integral part of a complex cultural form. Merton's norms combine in various ways to motivate and license a wide range of practices and processes. There is no space between them for any other values or virtues than supposedly objective, disinterested truth. Academic scientists have always, of course, brought ethical considerations into their scientific work. But they have had to smuggle them in from private life, from politics, from religion, or from sheer humanitarian sympathy. And even now, many fine scientists instinctively resent the intrusion of this troublesome element into their orderly, committed way of life.

Now take industrial science. This has essentially the same knowledge base as academic science, but is sociologically quite distinct. Its structural principles are not uncodified norms since they are explicitly enforced by the corporate bodies, private and public, that pay scientists to work for them. I am not saying that these principles are completely antithetical to the academic ethos, but that there are certainly many contrasts. One is that industrial scientists do not, in general, "own" their research in the sense of undertaking projects of their own choosing and being free to publish their results entirely on their own initiative.

Industrial science is not just a subsidiary to academic science. It is a parallel culture in which talented persons use good science to produce valuable knowledge. But notice, once again, that there is no ethical term in its social algorithm. It is true that a specialized group of industrial scientists may come together to formulate a professional code covering various aspects of their work, and such a code may have strong indirect ethical implications such as explicit concern for public safety and human welfare. Yet it is not intrinsic to the research culture, and remains subject to their contractual obligations as hired hands and brains.

Yet industrial science--from agriculture through mental medicine, and missile manufacture to zookeeping--is intimately involved in the business of daily life. The personal values and needs of customers, patients, and other users have to be taken into account. Supposedly technical problems almost always have ethical aspects. Industrial scientists are much more likely to encounter ethical dilemmas than their academic contemporaries, and are not screened from them by any doctrine of "objectivity."

The trouble is that industrial scientists do not actually have a direct say in how these dilemmas are solved. This responsibility legally rests with their corporate employers, who are seldom scientists themselves. Indeed, for most industrial scientists, an active concern about ethical issues is just asking for trouble. Better to treat the welfare of their firm or country as the supreme good. Like academic scientists, they too feel emotionally more secure if they can keep "ethics" out of their scientific work.

Of course industrial scientists should not take jobs with firms or government agencies whose policies and practices are ethically unacceptable. Of course they should resign, or even blow a whistle of warning, if required to do unethical work. Of course, like other subordinates, they cannot escape personal blame for crimes committed on the orders of higher authorities. But these are moral dilemmas that are not specific to science or scientists, as such.

This division of science into two distinct cultural traditions, located in different types of institution, is highly schematic. Nevertheless, it shows that science has, as a whole, been insulated from ethics for two quite distinct reasons. On the one hand, academic scientists are supposed to be indifferent to the potential consequences of their work. On the other hand, industrial scientists do work whose consequences are considered too serious to be left in their hands.

In recent years, however, these two cultures have begun to merge. This is a complex, pervasive, irreversible process, driven by forces that are not yet well understood. The hybrid research culture that is now emerging has been called by some scholars "Mode 2," to differentiate it from the more traditional style of "Mode 1." I prefer to call it "post-academic," to show that it outwardly preserves many academic practices and is still partially located in "academia."

My point is that post-academic science has features that make nonsense of the traditional barriers between science and ethics. As we have seen, the two separate reasons for keeping ethical considerations out of the two separate scientific traditions are essentially inconsistent. Applied simultaneously to this new hybrid culture, they do not reinforce each other but tend to cancel each other out.

For example, post-academic research is usually undertaken as a succession of "projects," each justified in advance to a funding body whose members are usually not scientists. As the competition for funds intensifies, project proposals are forced to become more and more specific about the expected outcomes of the research, including its wider economic and social impact. This is no longer a matter for individual researchers to determine for themselves. Universities and research institutes are no longer deemed to be devoted entirely to the pursuit of knowledge "for its own sake." They are encouraged to seek industrial funding for commissioned research, and to exploit to the full any patentable discoveries made by their academic staffs--especially when there is a smell of commercial profit in the wind.

Indeed, it is argued that all Mode 2 research stems from problems "arising in the context of application." This does not mean that basic science will disappear. The path to the solution of many urgent and practical problems, such as finding a cure for AIDS, surely lies through many remote and apparently irrelevant domains of fundamental research. But the mere fact that such paths can be traced back into past human needs, and forward into a future where these needs might be met, gives them an explicit ethical dimension. Even the "purest," "most basic" research is thus endowed with potential human consequences, so that researchers are bound to ask themselves whether all the goals of the activity in which they are engaged are consistent with their other personal values.

For most industrial scientists the situation has probably not much changed. But the typical post-academic role of the independent scientific entrepreneur compounds moral risks with financial risks, and does not permit ethical problems to be pushed upstairs to non-scientific corporate managers. Should such scientists remain bound by the academic ethos that they tacitly acknowledged when they earned their PhDs?

Another feature of post-academic science is that it is largely the work of teams of scientists, often networked over a number of different institutions. Where, then, do the ethical responsibilities lie? Should the nominal leader be blamed for dishonest work by a junior member? What ethical code should apply to a team that includes scientists from both academia and industry? And to further complicate the problem, teams are often temporary. How will ethical considerations operate in such heterogeneous and evanescent settings?

These are only some examples of the way that the transition to post-academic science is forcing scientists to become more sensitive to ethical issues. One of the virtues of the new mode of knowledge production is that it cannot brush its ethical problems under the carpet. Science can no longer be "in denial" of matters that many of us have long tried to bring to the fore.

Source: Ziman, John (1998, December 4). Why must scientists become more ethically sensitive than they used to be? *Science Magazine*, 5395, 1813-1814. Retrieved October 1, 2005, from: <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/282>



## **LESSON 4 – PARAPHRASING TECHNIQUES**

### **Excerpt of a Plagiarised Piece**

Directions: Read the excerpt from a student's essay. Has the student plagiarised? If yes, how can you tell?

Two remarks might be given at the first sight. First, definition limited itself only to those transactions, which are covered by the Legal Guide and second sound strange that definition not covers eventual participation of third parties. Moreover, it seems unusual because of the formally offered definition just considered involvement of mentioned above third parties.

Further analysis of the given definition would show that barter transactions are presumably out of its scope. This is owing to the legal nature of bartering, which implies the exchange of goods rather than purchase. However, persistent investigation would lead to the conclusion that any countertrade definition is not perfect, and hence it seems more appropriate to apprehend countertrade from the point of view of its characteristic features.

### **Checklist for Identifying Plagiarism**

There are three basic ways in which writers intentionally or inadvertently plagiarised text in their own work.

1. Verbatim Copying: Word for word copying from the original source.
2. Modified Plagiarism: Copied with only minor changes from the original.
3. Stealing of Ideas or Research: Failure to give proper acknowledgement to the original source when the ideas or research are not those of the writer.

As it can be seen from the list, there is a definite relationship between types 1 and 2: the text is not sufficiently different from the original. Please note also how easy it is in the above example to tell the plagiarised text from that which is not. Even if your English is flawless, most academics have a definite register and specific use of vocabulary that still renders plagiarism easily recognisable. Paraphrasing, summary and quotation are your tools, but be aware that no more than about 10% of any academic work should be quoted material.

## Identifying Paraphrasing Techniques

Directions:

Compare the passage below and the paraphrase of it. What language techniques were used to write the paraphrase? (for example, use of synonyms)

The original passage:

Students frequently overuse direct quotation in taking notes, and as a result they overuse quotations in the final [research] paper. Probably only about 10% of your final manuscript should appear as directly quoted matter. Therefore, you should strive to limit the amount of exact transcribing of source materials while taking notes.

Lester, James D. *Writing Research Papers*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (1976): 46-47.

The paraphrase:

In research papers students often quote excessively, and consequently quoted material is not kept down to a desirable level. Since the problem usually originates during note taking, it is essential to minimise the material recorded verbatim.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Should the source be cited?

### *Alternating Word Forms: One Technique Towards a Full Paraphrase*

<i>to succeed</i> (verb)	<i>to persevere</i> (verb)	<i>to manage</i> (verb)
<i>success</i> (noun)	<i>perseverance</i> (noun)	<i>manager</i> (noun)
<i>successor</i> (noun)	<i>persevering</i> (adjective)	<i>management</i> (noun)
<i>successful</i> (adjective)		<i>managing</i> (adjective)
<i>succeeding</i> (adjective)		<i>managerial</i> (adjective)
<i>successfully</i> (adverb)		<i>managerially</i> (adverb)

### **ORIGINAL SENTENCE**

*A manager's success is often due to perseverance.*

### **POSSIBLE PARAPHRASES**

*A manager often succeeds because of perseverance.*

*Perseverance often leads to managerial success.*

*A persevering manager is often successful.*

*Successful management is often a result of perseverance.*

*A manager who perseveres often succeeds.*

*Success is often the result of perseverance on the part of a manager.*

*If a manager perseveres, he or she often succeeds.*

*Perseverance often contributes to a manager's success.*

*The success of a manager often stems from perseverance.*

And then of course, there are synonyms for *often*....

Directions:

Paraphrase each of the following sentences by changing the italicised words or phrases.

1. A variety of *definitions* of leadership have been proposed over the years.

Definition (noun) → define (verb)

---

2. Leadership has long been considered one of the most important factors influencing *performance* in organisations.

*performance* (noun) → *perform* (verb)

---

3. Early research focused on traits, or personality characteristics, *typically* found in leaders who had achieved *success*.

*typically* (adverb) → *typical* (adjective)  
*success* (noun) → *successful* (adjective)

---

4. Later researchers recognised that leadership also involves the *relationship* between a leader and his or her subordinates.

*Relationship* (noun) → *relate* (verb)

---

5. Fred Fiedler has suggested that there are three such “situational factors” deserving our attention: leader-member, task structure and position power.

Suggest (verb) → suggestion (noun)

---

*REPORTING VERBS.* When you are referring to what someone else has written, whether in a critical review or in any other type of writing assignment, the most commonly used verbs are *write*, *say*, *tell*, and *think*. However, there are a number of other verbs which can also be used to restate someone else’s ideas, and it is good to make use of these other verbs to provide variety in your writing.

We will divide these “reporting verbs” into four categories, based on the general area of meaning they convey. Although the verbs within each category are very close in meaning – *say* and *tell*, for example, are so close in meaning that they are considered interchangeable – you should be aware that for the most part the verbs have slightly different meanings. If you are not sure whether the verb you wish to use is appropriate for the context in which you wish to use it, consult a good dictionary to help you decide. In addition, note that the structures which the various verbs require may differ. These structures fall into three general categories: 1) Verb + Noun Phrase, 2) Verb + Preposition, and 3) Verb + Noun Clause. Furthermore, sometimes an indirect object must be present (“He reminds *the reader* that no studies have been done”), sometimes it is optional (“He remarks [to the reader] that the issues are complex”), and sometimes no indirect object is allowed (“He questions the results of earlier research”). Once again, if you are not sure which structure to use, *consult a good dictionary or advanced grammar book which gives many examples!*

A. *Neutral Verbs of restatement.* This category of verbs may be used when what you wish to report from another sources is simply informative and does not necessarily express an opinion or deal with a controversial issue. These verbs include the following:

add	inform (of, about)	remind (of, about)
clarify	present	report (on)
describe	remark	speak of

Note, in the usage examples, the various structures which possible.

Usage Examples

“McClelland <i>clarifies</i>	the goal of his training program.” the goals of his training program for the reader.”
------------------------------	--

*(Indirect Object optional: followed by a Noun)*

“McClelland <i>informs</i>	the reader of the many issues involved.” the reader that many issues are involved.”
----------------------------	--

(Indirect Object required: followed by a Preposition and a Noun or by a Noun Clause)

“McClelland <i>reports</i>	the results of that study.” the results of that study to the reader.” on the results of that study.” to the reader on the results of that study.”
----------------------------	--

	that the results of the study are inconclusive.” to the reader that the results of the study are inconclusive.”
--	--

(Indirect Object optional: followed by a Noun, by a Preposition and a Noun, or by a Noun Clause)

B. *Verbs of Restatement with a + or – Connotation.* This second category of reporting verbs is very close to the first category in that they both may be used to report simple factual information. The verbs in this category differ, however, in that they commonly assume a positive or negative connotation based on the information which is reported. These verbs suggest, in a very general way, that what is being reported is an expression of the writer’s personal judgment. These verbs include the following:

appraise (of)	explain	indicate
argue (about)	express	observe

#### Usage Examples

“McClelland <i>appraises</i>	us of the success of the program.”
------------------------------	------------------------------------

(Indirect Object required: followed by a Preposition and a Noun)

“McClelland <i>explains</i>	that the affiliative manager is not effective.” to the reader that the affiliative manager is not effective.” the success of the program.” the success of the program to the reader.”
-----------------------------	--

(Indirect Object optional: followed by a Noun or by a Noun Clause)

“McClelland <i>expresses</i>	his contempt for all such thinking.” to the reader his contempt of all such thinking.”
------------------------------	---

(Indirect Object optional: followed by a Noun)

C. *Verbs of Opinion.* This category of verbs is used with the content of what is being reported is an expression of another’s opinions, convictions, or suggestions. These verbs include the following (a + by a verb indicates that an author who uses this verb is expressing a positive opinion):

affirm +	claim	point out
agree (with) +	concur (with, in) +	praise +
applaud +	determine	support +
assert	expound (on)	think
believe (in)	maintain	

A few verbs in this category are always used to report a suggested course of action:

advise	set forth	urge
recommend	suggest	

Usage Examples

“McClelland <i>affirms</i>	the importance of the power motive.” that the power motive is extremely important.”
----------------------------	--

(followed by a Noun or by a Noun Clause)

“McClelland <i>believes</i>	in the importance of the power motive.” that the power motive is extremely important.” the results of a study done last year.”
-----------------------------	--

(followed by a Noun, by a Preposition and a Noun, or by a Noun Clause)

“McClelland <i>expounds</i>	on the importance of the power motive.”
-----------------------------	---

(followed by a Preposition and a Noun)

“McClelland <i>asserts</i>	that power is a very important motive.” the importance of the power motive.”
----------------------------	---

(followed by a Noun or by a Noun Clause)

“McClelland <i>supports</i>	the position taken by traditional theorists.”
-----------------------------	---

(followed by a Noun)

“McClelland <i>recommends</i>	a training course for managers.” that a manager be aware of the implications of power.”
-------------------------------	---

(followed by a Noun, or by a Noun Clause in which the verb is in the simple form)

D. *Verbs of Uncertainty*. A final category of verbs is used when the writer whose words you are reporting expresses doubt about or disagreement with the subject matter being dealt with. This category includes the following:

challenge	dispute	question
disagree with	doubt	suspect (of)
dismiss	mistrust	wonder (at)

Usage Examples

“McClelland <i>challenges</i>	the conclusions reached in that study.” (followed by a Noun)
-------------------------------	---

“McClelland <i>disagrees</i>	with the conclusions reached in that study.” (followed by a Preposition and a Noun)
------------------------------	--

“McClelland <i>questions</i>	the results of earlier research on power.” (followed by a Noun)
------------------------------	--

“McClelland <i>wonders</i>	whether the power motive has been underestimated.” at the suspicion surrounding the power motive.”
----------------------------	---

(followed by a Noun or by a Noun Clause)

### **PRACTICE**

Directions: To practice using a variety of reporting verbs, re-write the following sentences using one of the verbs from the group. Choose the verb that will convey the appropriate meaning. A change in structure will be required for some of the statements.

1. McClelland has observed that affiliative managers spend too much time on the telephone. (present, apprise, argue)

McClelland apprises us of the fact that affiliative managers spend too much time on the telephone.

2. McClelland describes the rationale for the training program which he conducts for managers. (point out, mistrust, present)

3. McClelland doubts the validity of the conclusions of Christ Argyris. (wonder, remind, claim)

4. McClelland remarks that power has been given a bad image by social scientists. (set forth, report, assert)

5. McClelland maintains that employees respond better to a well-defined authority system. (suspect, claim, support)

6. McClelland argues that managers must understand the positive side of power. (point out, dispute, express)

## Homework #2

### Successful Paraphrasing<sup>15</sup>

Directions: On a separate piece of paper, write a paraphrase of each of the following passages. Make sure you use the paraphrasing strategies that we have mentioned in class (synonyms, changing the sentence structure, etc.), and you should also cite the source (by using footnotes or embedded citation).

1. Of the more than 1000 bicycling deaths each year, three-fourths are caused by head injuries. Half of those killed are school-age children. One study concluded that wearing a bike helmet can reduce the risk of head injury by 85%. In an accident, a bike helmet absorbs the shock and cushions the head.

From "Bike Helmets: Unused Lifesavers," *Consumer Reports* (May 1990): 348.

2. While the Sears Tower is arguably the greatest achievement in skyscraper engineering so far, it is unlikely that architects and engineers have abandoned the quest for the world's tallest building. The question is: Just how high can a building go? Structural engineer William LeMessurier has designed a skyscraper nearly one-half mile high, twice as tall as the Sears Tower. Moreover, architect Robert Sobel claims that existing technology could produce a 500-story building.

From Ron Bachman, "Reaching for the Sky." *Dial* (May 1990): 15.

---

<sup>15</sup> Source: "Practice exercises in paraphrasing." Retrieved October 15, 2005 from [http://owl.english.purdue.edu/handouts/research/r\\_paraphrEX1.html](http://owl.english.purdue.edu/handouts/research/r_paraphrEX1.html).

## **LESSON 5 – PLANNING AND WRITING A PAPER**

### **FROM THE STUDENT HANDBOOK:**

#### **Essays and Assessment**

During each teaching period students are required to submit for each course one essay of about 3,000 words. These will count towards the final mark in the way shown in the table given on page 7. Up to 10% of the overall mark for any course may be awarded as recognition of students' active participation in the course. Such recognition is based upon the quality of presentations and reaction papers given by students during the course.

**Essay titles are normally chosen from a selection provided by the course lecturer. Only in exceptional cases may a student with the agreement of the course lecturer write on a topic other than one proposed by the lecturer.**

#### **The deadline for essays for courses in:**

**Teaching period 1 -13:00 on Tuesday February 3, 2009**

**Teaching period 2 -13:00 on Tuesday May 12, 2009**

**Teaching period 3 -13:00 on Monday October 12, 2009**

**1. You should hand in TWO copies of each essay at the office (room 276) before the deadline. Only essays brought to the office before the deadline (i.e. not those given to anyone else in the Department and not those brought to the office later) count as handed in on time.**

#### **2. All essays should be handed in with half page abstract (2 copies)**

If a student is unable to hand in a piece of work on time or will miss an examination, then s/he should supply good reasons in advance to the Academic Director to obtain the permission of the Chairman of the Department. In the case of absence or delay due to sickness, medical certificates should be provided (see also code of practice §5, p. 26). **Failure to submit work on time may mean either that the work will not be marked, or that it will be penalized by the award of lower grades ("Fail" or "D").**

## How to Tell a Strong Thesis Statement from a Weak One

### 1. A strong thesis statement takes a stand.

Your thesis statement should do more than restate the topic. You should express your position. For example, say you want to talk about the formal health care system in Poland. Here are two thesis statements:

**Informal institutions complement the formal health care system in Poland.**

This is a weak thesis. It is a statement of the facts and it fails to take a stand.

My argument is that deficiencies and uncertainties of formal health care institutions in Poland caused them to be complemented by informal institutions.

This is a strong thesis because it takes a stand.

### 2. A strong thesis statement is sociological.

Since you are a student of sociology, you need to make sure your topic relates to the field. Here are some bad and good examples:

**Drug treatments are effective in prolonging the lives of AIDS patients. Having AIDS increases the likelihood that a person will be depressed.**

These are weak thesis statements because the first is too medical and the second is psychological. They do not relate to sociology.

**This paper claims that treatment for HIV varies by social class and ethnicity.**

This is a strong thesis statement because it is sociological.

### 3. A strong thesis statement is specific.

This thesis statement is weak because it is vague.

**This paper suggests that there are various dimensions of "class" in the contemporary world.**

A revised thesis statement might look like this:

**This paper suggests that there are two dimensions of "class" in the contemporary world: one is based on economic capital, and one is based on cultural capital.**

This is a strong thesis statement because it is more specific.

## Traditional Outline

An outline is instrumental for organizing your ideas, arguments, or themes you will cover in the paper and the sources that support those ideas. **YOU DO NOT NEED TO INCLUDE THE OUTLINE IN YOUR PAPER (IT IS NOT A TABLE OF CONTENTS)**. Sometimes your professors will ask you to submit an outline of your paper so that they can see what you intend to write about. Even if a professor does not require an outline, it is highly recommended that you write one for yourself in order to organize and structure your essay.

### **Thesis Statement: This paper argues/claims/suggests that....**

#### I. Introduction

- A. What topic is this paper about?
- B. Thesis statement – what is the purpose of this paper? What are you arguing?

#### II. First theme: the first idea or topic that you will cover

- A. Research or reading relevant to topic 1
  - 1. supporting example or quotation
- B. Other research or reading relevant to topic 1
  - 1. supporting example or quotation
  - 2. next supporting example
- C. Analysis – how does this support your thesis statement?

#### III. Second theme: The next idea or topic that you will cover

- A. Research or reading relevant to topic 2
- B. Other research or reading relevant to topic 2
  - 1. supporting example or quotation
  - 2. next supporting example
- C. Analysis – how does this support your thesis statement?

#### IV. Third theme: The last idea or topic that you will cover

- A. Research or reading relevant to topic 3
  - 1. supporting example or quotation
  - 2. next supporting example
- B. Other research or reading relevant to topic 3
- C. Analysis – how does this support your thesis statement?

#### V. Conclusion

- A. summary of your main conclusions and how you supported your thesis statement.
- B. Final conclusions

### **Draft List of Reference**

## LESSON 6 – CITATION – INTRODUCTION TO THE APA STYLE

### QUOTATIONS AND REFERENCES

In order to avoid plagiarism, it is important to properly cite your sources in the text and provide a complete bibliography at the end. Whenever you directly quote another author or paraphrase (i.e. put an author's ideas in your own words) you should always provide references in the text. Although there are many acceptable ways of doing this, the Centre recommends using the Harvard System, which is widely used in the social sciences. In particular, we advise you to use the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (called the APA style). There is a copy of the manual in the library or you can purchase your own at any English-language bookstore in Warsaw.

#### References in the text

The APA style uses citations that are included in parentheses directly after the quotation or paraphrased text (also called "in-text citation"). The citation includes the author's last name, date of publication, and the page number (if you are directly quoting that author).

Here are some examples of citations for a text that has been paraphrased:

It is argued that nationalism assumes the national unit is also a unit of political organisation (Gellner, 1983).

Gellner (1983) argues that nationalism assumes the national unit is also a unit of political organisation.

*Here are some examples of citations for a passage that has been directly quoted:*

"Nationalism is primarily a political principle, which holds that the political and the national unit be congruent" (Gellner, 1983, p. 56).

Gellner claims that "[n]ationalism is primarily a political principle, which holds that the political and the national unit be congruent" (1983, p. 56).

#### Citing from the Internet

For Internet sources, you should cite as if you are citing from a book. The only difference is that you use the paragraph number instead of the page number. If the document is very long, you do not have to include the paragraph number.

Here is an example:

There are a number of advantages in this line of Defense (Viviano, 1995: para 3).

## **MAKING A BIBLIOGRAPHY**

You should always provide a complete bibliography at the end of your essay, which lists all the sources that you have referenced. Remember that the bibliography should be in alphabetical order by author's last name. Please see the APA manual for more information on how to make a bibliography.

Here are a few examples of how to make bibliographical entries for different texts:

### **A book**

Stark, O. (1991). *The migration of labour*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Ltd.

### **Two books by the same author, published in the same year**

Saunders, P. (1990a). *Social class and stratification*. London: Routledge.

Saunders, P. (1990b). *Social mobility*. London: Routledge.

### **A book by two authors**

Castles, S., & Miller, M. J. (1999). *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

### **A chapter of a book**

Honekopp, E. (1999). Germany. In John Ardittis (Ed.), *The politics of east-west migration*. (pp. 50-90). London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

### **A book with an editor or translator**

Layton-Henry, Z. (Ed.). (2001). *The political rights of migrant workers in Western Europe*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

### **A newspaper article**

Wilson, D. (2002, May 18). Do maquiladoras matter? *New York Times Magazine*.

### **An article in a journal**

Bustamante, J. A. (2004). Mexico-United States Labour Migration Flows. *The International Migration Review*, 31, 1-4.

### **Online document**

Leven, S. B. (2003). *Migration in figures*. Retrieved January 2, 2004, from <http://www.iom.int/articles.html>

## FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

### ***Q. What spacing should I use?***

A. The spacing should be 1.5 or 2.

### ***Q. What font should I use?***

A. New Times Roman (12 point).

### **Q. What do I do if I have a quotation within a quotation?**

A. Use single quotations marks for the quotation within a quotation. For example:

Ritzer argues that “their efforts to negotiate treaties reducing nuclear weapons have often become bogged down in trying to accurately assess ‘the relative throw weight’ of their respective nuclear arms” (Ritzer, 1982, p. 4).

Q. If I quote, for example Marx, but in a book for example by Derrida, who should I mention?

A. The idea of referencing is that you state where you found the words or ideas. Of course, there is little point not referencing Marx. So a good reference would include both, something like this: “.....” (Marx as cited in Derrida, 1986).

### **Q. Do I need to present short and long quotations differently?**

Yes. Quotations of less than four typed lines should be set in quotations marks within a sentence. Longer passages should be set off from the main text by being indented and single spaced. **You do not need to use quotation marks with indented, single-spaced quotations.**

## LESSON 7 – INTRODUCTION TO GIVING PRESENTATIONS

# PRESENTATION TIPS

Follow these steps to giving effective presentations.

- 1) Properly prepare – know your material inside and out.
- 2) Practice, practice, practice! Rehearse in front of a mirror. Have a friend listen and provide feedback.
- 3) Visualize yourself giving a successful presentation. Mind over matter!
- 4) Dress appropriately.
- 5) Respect the time limit. There's nothing worse than a long presentation that exceeds the time limit. When you are practicing your speech at home, time yourself so you know how long your presentation is.
- 6) Don't read off the paper. You can have your notes with you and you can even have the whole speech written down on paper, but you should take breaks to look at the audience and make eye contact.
- 7) Make a handout with the MAIN ideas (do not just give them a copy of your speech).
- 8) Don't apologize for any nervousness or problem – the audience probably never noticed it.
- 9) SMILE☺

## **LESSON 8 – TOEFL PREP**

### **WHAT IS THE INSTITUTIONAL TOEFL?**

The Institutional Testing Program (ITP) gives schools, colleges and universities, English language institutes, and other agencies throughout the world the opportunity to administer the TOEFL ITP test locally to their own students. The program uses retired versions of the paper-based TOEFL test.

The Institutional Testing Program is offered primarily to assist institutions in placing students in English courses at the appropriate level of difficulty or to determine whether additional work in English is necessary before an individual can undertake studies at an institution where English is the medium of instruction. The test can also be used to determine if non-native speakers of English have a sufficient command of the language to participate in a study abroad program.

Examinees' answer sheets are scored by Educational Testing Service (ETS) in Princeton, NJ, or TOEFL representatives in other countries. Test administrators will receive the scores, and they can expect score results approximately two weeks after receipt of the answer sheets.

Since these tests have been previously administered and are therefore not fully secure, they should not be used as an admissions test or substituted for the regularly scheduled TOEFL test. Individuals who wish to have score reports sent to other institutions or agencies must take the TOEFL test at a regularly scheduled administration. ITP scores are for use by the administering institutions only. There is no transcript service.

*Source:* "TOEFL official website." Retrieved from [www.toefl.com](http://www.toefl.com).

## **SECTIONS**

The ITP TOEFL takes approximately 115 minutes, and includes the following three sections:

Section 1 Listening Comprehension -- 35 minutes

Section 2 Structure and Written Expression -- 25 minutes

Section 3 Reading Comprehension -- 55 minutes

## **TESTING RULES**

- The test administrator will tell you where to sit.
- You must fill out a personal data information sheet at the beginning so listen to the instructions provided on the cassette carefully.
- Don't make notes or write in your workbook.
- No talking.
- No food (only drinks are allowed).
- No mobile phones.
- You must use a pencil.
- If you make a mistake, erase your answer and fill in the correct circle.
- If you finish a section early, you cannot work on any other section of the test. If you are caught working on another section your test will be taken from you.

## **STRATEGIES**

- Answer all questions – you are not penalized for guessing. However, don't waste your time on difficult items – just guess and continue.
- Take a look at a practice test so that you know what to expect.
- You should practice budgeting your time and learn to work with the time limitations. Take a few practice tests beforehand to learn how to pace yourself.
- Get enough sleep the night before the test and eat a good breakfast the day of the test.
- Don't forget your glasses 😊

### Homework #3

## Essay Assignment Academic Writing Induction Course 2008

Write a 1,000-word essay answering the following question:

### **Is the complete participant role ethical in sociological research?**

DEADLINE: Friday, November 7, 2008, by midnight

You should submit your essay by e-mail: [hbouma@css.edu.pl](mailto:hbouma@css.edu.pl)

Requirements:

- You must have a THESIS STATEMENT (i.e. an argument) in your introduction.
- You are required to use both sources that I have given you (see articles below). You can also incorporate other sources into your essay if they support your argument.
- You need to paraphrase ideas from these sources and also use direct quotations. Don't forget to properly cite your sources (using the American Psychological Association's Style - APA style).
- Regarding the direct quotations, you need to use one long quotation (over 40 words) and at least one short quotation. REMEMBER THAT LONG AND SHORT QUOTATIONS ARE PRESENTED DIFFERENTLY.
- You should have a reference list at the end including any sources that you used (follow the APA style).

## SPIES LIKE US



### WHEN SOCIOLOGISTS DECEIVE THEIR SUBJECTS

**Source: Allen, Charlotte. (1997, November). Spies like us. *Lingua franca*. Retrieved October 15, 2007, from <http://linguafranca.mirror.theinfo.org/9711/9711.allen.html>**

THEY CALL THEMSELVES GUINEAMEN. For more than two hundred years, they and their forebears have fished, hunted, raised livestock on, and otherwise made their living from a broad peninsula of marshland in a corner of the Virginia tidewater region, where the York River meets the Chesapeake Bay. Although many Guineamen now work outside the peninsula, a large number still ply the traditional Chesapeake waterman's trade, generating a distinctive local culture centered around the outboard skiff, Ford pickup, rubber wading boots, snap-brim cap, and plug of tobacco.

When I visited them one afternoon this past summer, members of two Guinea families were sitting in the yard in front of their trailer homes. When I explained to them why I was there, they began jeering and trading jibes. The target of their mockery was not another local but Carolyn Ellis, a sociologist at the University of South Florida, whose prizewinning 1986 book about the Guineamen, *Fisher Folk* (Kentucky), transformed her in their eyes from a beloved outsider and frequent guest into a traitor.

For nine years, from 1972 (when she was an undergraduate at the nearby College of William and Mary) to 1981 (when she completed her doctoral dissertation at SUNY Stony Brook), Ellis spent her weekends and summers researching a "kinship network" among a particular group of Guinea watermen. Her theory was that the Guineamen lacked the external social mechanisms--strong churches, economic cooperation, a sense of community beyond the extended family--necessary for them to prosper. The conclusions of the book were not flattering to the region, which already had a reputation for white-trash backwardness and marshland criminality.

In her writing, Ellis used pseudonyms to conceal her subjects' identities--a standard practice in sociology. Guinea became "Fishneck," and members of the local families she described were given plausible-sounding made-up names. But that didn't stop her words from causing hurt. Ellis's "Fishnecker" were often illiterate, obese, poorly dressed, and ignorant of basic hygiene. "Scarcity of plumbing meant baths were infrequent," she wrote. "That combined with everyday work with fish produced a characteristic fishy body odor, identified by outsiders as the 'Fishneck smell.'" What most riled the fishing families who had taken Ellis into their homes, fed her meals, and let her stay over on many nights, however, was that she never once let on that she was using them for sociological research. "I thought she was nice," fumes one Guinea woman whose family hosted Ellis often over the years. "But she turned out to be a liar."

SOCIOLOGISTS have argued over the propriety of deceptive research for decades. But in 1995, the debate took a decidedly heated turn. In April of that year, Ellis published a remorseful essay in the *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* enumerating the ways she had deceived her subjects. And her essay, which provoked much discussion among her colleagues, was not the only controversial confession that year: *The American Sociologist* published a far less remorseful account by a sociologist who some felt had used deceptive techniques to research police interrogation procedures. Finally, this spring, after two years of raging debate on the topic, the American Sociological Association (ASA) approved a set of stringent new ethics guidelines for professional conduct

More starkly than ever before, these events illustrate the degree to which the profession is caught in an uneasy bind between fulfilling research objectives and honoring ethical obligations. Sociological deception can take many forms, some more subtle than others, but all equally entangled in moral dilemmas: A researcher might not tell his subjects that he is using them for research purposes; or he might misrepresent the motives of his research; or he might violate a pledge to keep the identities of his subjects fully anonymous. In recent decades, researchers have practiced these forms of deception, and each has been earnestly defended and attacked within the profession. Ellis's behavior, it turns out, was unusual but not unique; in some ways, her deception was simply easier to see because--as she herself admitted--it was so blatant.

ACCORDING to her confession in the *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Ellis secretly tape-recorded conversations with her Fishneck subjects, eavesdropped on their small talk, and coaxed data out of them while pretending to be visiting socially or doing favors, such as writing letters, baby-sitting, and driving them to doctor's appointments. "Initially, I told a number of the Fishnecker who knew I was a college student that I was writing a paper on fishing," she writes. As the years passed, nearly everyone forgot about the college connection, until finally, Ellis writes, "I was just Carolyn coming to visit."

When he read her essay, veteran sociologist Herbert J. Gans of Columbia University was concerned. He wrote Ellis a reproofing letter. "I told her that I'm old enough to be her Dutch uncle and that what she did was wrong," says Gans. "She told people she was their friend. I told her, 'Yes, you use friendly methods, but you're always a researcher. You arrange to tell people every so often, I'm not your buddy. I'm a researcher.'"

Ellis agrees that she committed a sociological sin, and she said so with admirable candor in her essay--albeit after she had published her book, received a prize for it from the ASA, and won tenure at the University of South Florida. Still, she's convinced that deceiving her subjects was indispensable to her project's success. "I know I did them an injustice," she says from her Tampa office. "But I couldn't have done the study any other way. My study was predicated on my getting close to them, and if you're constantly reminding people that you're not one of them, you can't do that. They're afraid of the IRS, and I didn't want to make people suspicious of me."

Unlike Ellis, a significant number of sociologists who have engaged in deceptive research remain unrepentant. This group insists there is nothing unethical about deceiving one's subjects to a greater or lesser extent in the name of scientific research. Those who defend deceptive techniques claim subterfuge is sometimes the only way to elicit information from deviant and marginal groups--or from socially powerful groups that can otherwise justify secrecy. Defenders of deception typically use a cost-benefit analysis: If the deception doesn't hurt anyone very much and the payoff in data is high, covert research is worth doing.

Richard Leo's essay in the Spring 1995 issue of *The American Sociologist* made precisely this argument--in defiant, provocative language. Leo, then an assistant professor of sociology at the University of Colorado, boasted that he "consciously reinvented" his "persona" in order to gain admission into police interrogation rooms for research on his UC-Berkeley dissertation. Leo's larger point was that sociologists should have an evidentiary privilege--like doctors and lawyers--so they are not obliged to testify in court about what they see and hear in the field. But what struck many of his readers was his ardent defense of certain deceptive techniques. Leo declared that he had feigned conservative views (support for the death penalty, opposition to abortion and homosexuality) and had described his intimate relations with women in the same crude language he heard the cops use. In describing the ideological mask he had donned in order to study the ways officers question suspects, Leo proudly compared himself to "confidence men who wish to set up their marks." Leo's article had a crusading tone: He depicted police forces as deviant groups analogous to criminal gangs who broke laws (in the case of the police it was the Miranda rule and other constitutional protections) and required extreme measures to infiltrate.

**ELLIS SECRETLY TAPE-RECORDED  
CONVERSATIONS WITH HER FISHNECK  
SUBJECTS AND EAVESDROPPED  
ON THEIR SMALL TALK.**

Leo's essay provoked an angry counterblast from the eminent Yale sociologist Kai Erikson, who accused him of engaging "in a degree of deceit that is more widely known in espionage than in social research." As a graduate student during the 1950s, Erikson's own ethical standards had been less rigorous. He had applied for, but failed to receive, a position on a team of undercover social investigators led by the sociologist Leon Festinger whose mission was to infiltrate a doomsday cult by lying about their professional identities and pretending to be believers. (The project resulted in a famous 1956 book by Festinger and two colleagues, [When Prophecy Fails](#).) Soon after, Erikson changed his views about deceit and took an absolutist stance against it, a position he has held ever since. His arguments are both ethical and practical: It is morally wrong to lie, and it also tends to distort research. (By assuming a false persona, for instance, the sociologist forecloses opportunities to collect more complete information through direct questioning.)

Yet, as even Erikson was forced to acknowledge, Leo's case hardly constituted the most egregious example of deceptive fieldwork. After all, Leo had informed the police department (in a city that he calls "Laconia") that he was a sociologist, and he had provided the officers with an accurate written description of his project. However, he also cut his hair short, shaved off a budding beard, and put on a coat and tie before he headed for the station--which for him was decidedly out of character. He might simply have been following the dictate of Erving Goffman, who declared in his 1959 sociology classic, [The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life](#), that everyone is always role-playing and there is no such thing as one's true self. "I didn't lie to them about my views," insists Leo, who now teaches at UC-Irvine. "I just didn't try to argue with them when they raised the question of abortion or homosexuality. They'd say, 'You're not against the death penalty, are you?' And I'd just laugh. I know I gave the impression that I agreed with them. I just wanted them to think I was a normal person. From their point of view, a normal person was a conservative."

Of course, it is possible that Leo, a self-identified Berkeley graduate student in sociology, fooled no one on the Laconia force with his Joe Sixpack impersonation. "These guys have fantastic bullshit detectors, if you'll pardon my French," says Robert Jackall, a sociology professor at Williams College who spent more than five years prowling crime-ravaged precincts with New York City detectives as he researched his latest book, [Wild Cowboys](#) (Harvard, 1997). Jackall maintains that he did not need to use deception to go where he wanted, including interrogation rooms. "I just adopted the persona given to me by the police," he says. "They dubbed me the professor. They were teaching me, and they loved the symbolic reversal. I didn't have to penetrate anything."

Leo's response is that Jackall, a middle-aged tenured professor at a well-endowed liberal arts college, had time and job security on his side, which enabled him to dispense with deception, whereas he, Leo, a penniless doctoral candidate working on a law degree at the same time, could not afford to spend more than the five hundred hours he gave to his fieldwork in Laconia. "I was a full-time student in my twenties, and I just didn't have that kind of time," says Leo. "I had to get inside those interrogation rooms."

But many of Leo's colleagues aren't buying this kind of reasoning. The Leo-Erikson debate, which continued through several issues of *The American Sociologist*, resulted in a panel discussion on the morality of deceptive research when the thirteen-thousand-member ASA met for its annual convention in August 1996. Then, this past May, the ASA voted in favor of a new code of ethics that specifically addressed deceptive research techniques for the first time. The new protocol requires sociologists to obtain their subjects' informed consent "when behavior of research participants occurs in a private context where an individual can reasonably expect that no observation or reporting is taking place." Further, it explicitly bans tape-recording and videotaping without subjects' permission, as well as the use of assumed identities. Despite its hard-hitting rhetoric, however, the ethics code contains a loophole: A sociologist may obtain a waiver (from his university or the ASA) for all these constraints.

AFTER the publication of [Fisher Folk](#), Carolyn Ellis was wholly unprepared for her subjects' backlash. She hoped that the Guineamen would never learn of the book's existence. Although she traveled annually to the tidewater to update her research and to visit friends among the residents, she kept mum about her monograph. "They can't read," she says. "I never took the book to them. I didn't know how to deal with it, and I hoped they would never see it."

Perhaps she underestimated the literacy rate in Fishneck. (In *Fisher Folk*, she puts it at 50 percent.) She certainly underestimated the wrath of Victor Liguori, one of her former professors at William and Mary. A specialist in maritime sociology, Liguori has spent thirty years or so working on a still-unfinished magnum opus about Guinea. He knows many residents on the peninsula, and it was he who introduced Ellis to her first Guinea contacts, as part of his custom of taking interested students with him on his research excursions. Ellis sent Liguori a copy of *Fisher Folk* upon its publication--with an acknowledgment of his help, for he had shared his research notes with her. What happened after that is a matter of some dispute.

Ellis contends that Liguori, perhaps in a fit of professional jealousy because she had poached on his academic preserve, read the most damning passages of *Fisher Folk* aloud to the Guinea unlettered, suppressing everything positive she had to say about them and generally stirring up trouble. In her 1995 article, Ellis gave Liguori a pseudonym, "Professor Jack." Comparing him to a Pentecostal preacher on a Bible-thumping binge, she speculated: "Was he envious because he never finished his manuscript? Was any of his outrage justified? Or had he gone mad?" Liguori maintains that several Guineamen had obtained copies of the book, and others--who heard about it--contacted him and asked him to send them particular sections. Most of the Guineamen, he insists, read the book on their own--and then "went ballistic."

**ERIKSON ACCUSED LEO OF ENGAGING "IN A  
DEGREE OF DECEIT THAT IS MORE WIDELY  
KNOWN IN ESPIONAGE THAN IN SOCIAL RESEARCH."**

In any event, a friend eventually tipped off Ellis that several Guineamen were upset about her book, and she hastened to the marshes to beg for forgiveness. According to Ellis, after some angry exchanges about factual errors, geographical discrepancies, and broken confidences, nearly all her favorite Fishneckers forgave her. Liguori, however, contends that the Guineamen are unlikely to pardon Ellis so quickly. "One woman came up to me a month or two ago and asked, 'Is it true that she had bad things in there about the girls?'" Liguori told me in September. "And I still can't take one of my students into the marshes, especially if she's a young, attractive woman. Someone would say, 'Is she going to be another Carolyn Ellis?'" The Guineamen aren't the only ones who may be permanently shaken. Ellis herself hasn't done any fieldwork since completing her book. Her remorseful 1995 essay is representative of the work that has occupied her for the last twelve years: auto-ethnography--in which the subject is primarily the sociologist herself.

MODERN American sociology dates back to the 1920s, when the field, just beginning to get its bearings in this country, was regarded as a dubious European import. At the time, the discipline's stronghold was at the University of Chicago, where Robert Park eschewed the largely theoretical musings of his European predecessors--such as Max Weber--in favor of fieldwork based on long-term observation of one's subjects as they engage in social interaction. In Park's day, the possibility that a researcher at a local pub or political meeting might disguise his identity was virtually unthinkable.

Indeed, the ethics of deceptive research did not become a controversial topic in the profession until 1958. The occasion was a massive Cornell University study of participatory democracy in a local community and its unanticipated spin-off book, [Small Town in Mass Society](#), co-written by a former project employee, Arthur J. Vidich. The project sent teams of graduate students into Candor, NY, pop. 2,500, to gather statistics. Vidich moved to Candor in order to oversee data collection and supply a friendly human face that would encourage village residents to cooperate with the survey. Now a professor emeritus at New York City's New School for Social Research, Vidich says that Cornell even advised him to join a local church. Although he had no interest in religion, he gamely taught Sunday school.

As part of the study, Vidich was also supposed to gather material for a more qualitative analysis of Candor's social structure. When he was hired, his supervisors showed him the code of ethics they had drafted. Vidich read it but "found nothing in it," he says today, "that related to the practical exigencies of day-to-day fieldwork. The code of ethics was a statement of intent, not a guide to conduct." (There was no provision for a participant observer like Vidich himself, for example.)

After living in Candor for two and a half years, he took a job in Puerto Rico, and, together with Joseph Bensman, another sociologist, used what he had learned to write *Small Town..*. The book, which referred to Candor by the pseudonym "Springdale" and read like a Sinclair Lewis novel, exposed the political machinations of a clique of Springdale businessmen who ran the town behind its facade of folksy democracy. Springdale was supposed to be proudly self-reliant and scornful of urban ways, but Vidich and Bensman pointed out that the town relied heavily on federal and state intervention and was pervaded by mass culture. As they elaborated Springdale's political and social structure, Vidich and Bensman described specific townspeople and the roles they played. Although the sociologists did not use anyone's real name, it was clear to everyone in Candor who these figures were. The book became a local best-seller, à la *Peyton Place*--and a source of general outrage among residents. Vidich was

hanged in effigy, and the village's Fourth of July parade featured a float carrying an image of him bending over a manure spreader.

For many years afterward, sociologists, who feared that Vidich's conduct had jeopardized the field's newfound respectability, argued over whether he had done anything wrong. On the one hand, everyone in Candor knew he was the field director of a Cornell research project. On the other hand, many Candor residents might have thought (and been encouraged by Cornell to think) that the project consisted solely of the field-workers' demographic survey.

In the end, sociologists failed to resolve the ethical questions that Vidich's course of action raised. "You have to remember that things are never quite all they seem," says Jackall, a close friend of Vidich's. "Research subjects are also trying to use the research for their own agendas and aggrandizement. People simply forgot that [Vidich] was a researcher." Vidich himself remained unrepentant. In a 1964 essay (reprinted in later editions of *Small Town*), he railed against imposing ethical restraints on social scientists. "It would be dangerous for the freedom of inquiry," he wrote, "if the formalized ethics of bureaucracy prevailed or predominated in all research."

THE deception debate shook the profession a second time in 1970, and this time the fallout left permanent damage--at least in one well-regarded sociology department. That year, Laud Humphreys, an Episcopal priest-turned-sociology graduate student at Washington University in St. Louis, published [Tearoom Trade](#), a study of homosexual encounters in men's rooms (called "tearooms" in gay slang) at public parks. To gather data for his doctoral dissertation on rest-room sex, Humphreys pretended to be gay, and assumed the role of voyeur and "watchqueen"--or lookout--for the police. He also wrote down the license-plate numbers of participants in order to obtain their names and addresses. Then he waited a year, disguised his appearance, and interviewed about fifty of the tearoom regulars at their homes (sometimes in the presence of their wives and children), on the pretext of administering a social health survey. His descriptions of this second encounter made it possible that many of the men and their families would recognize themselves once the dissertation was published as a book. Humphreys cited situation ethics--the application of rules of conduct on a case-by-case basis, a popular topic at theology schools during the late 1960s--as a justification for his modus operandi. The controversy over Humphreys's covert techniques ultimately spelled the end of sociology at Washington University. There was talk of revoking Humphreys's doctorate, and one well-known member of the department, Alvin Gouldner, delivered a blow to Humphreys's head that hospitalized him overnight. As a result, Gouldner was stripped of his title, Max Weber Research Professor of Social Theory. The sociology department never recovered from the demoralization brought on by the Humphreys incident, and, in 1989, the university disbanded the program.

Alarmed by increasing reports of unethical research practices on campuses, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) issued a stern report on sneaky bio-medical and behavioral research in 1978. The report came in the wake of the St. Louis scandal and adverse publicity over the filmed experiments that Yale psychologist Stanley Milgram carried out between 1960 and 1963. In his most famous work, Milgram told volunteers they were participating in a learning experiment in which they would "punish" (by means of remote-control electric shocks of ever increasing voltage) students in another room who failed to match word pairs correctly. The shocks were imaginary; Milgram was actually testing the volunteers' willingness to follow orders, which many of them did punctiliously. Milgram's film of his experiments, grainy black-and-white footage aptly titled *Obedience*, depicts its unwitting subjects as analogous to Nazi concentration-camp guards. It is shown to this day in many undergraduate classrooms.

The HEW report led to federal regulations requiring all scientists who use government funds to conduct research on human beings to clear their procedures with institutional review boards

or human-subjects' committees at their universities. The boards are supposed to ensure that subjects give informed consent and to approve any exceptions to this rule. (Richard Leo, for example, got permission from UC's Human Subjects' Committee for his dissertation research on police forces.) The new ASA ethics code advises sociologists seeking waivers of its informed-consent and deceptive-research guidelines to clear their projects even when they are not using federal money.

THE CREATION of human-subjects' committees and the ASA's ethics protocol may force researchers to think twice before using deceptive techniques on a project. But neither innovation addresses the bigger questions that have dogged sociologists for years: When is deception of subjects permissible in social-science fieldwork? Should it ever be?

"We do cost-benefit analyses to justify deception," says Yale's Kai Erikson. "But most often it's we who get the benefit and they who pay the cost. There have been sociologists who have gone into religious groups or Alcoholics Anonymous. We don't know how much harm it does to research subjects. There are some people who say, 'I'm doing it for the sake of science.' They're doing it for themselves. One of the things that I've noticed is that people who disguise themselves are always looking at groups less powerful than they are. If a doctor pretends to be a patient, that's all right, we say. But if a patient pretends to be a doctor, he'll get arrested."

**ROBERT BALCH INFILTRATED A UFO CULT. "WE HAD TO TAKE NOTES IN BATHROOM STALLS, SO WE HAD TO GET UP EARLY AND WRITE THEM ON LITTLE SCRAPS OF PAPER," HE SAYS.**

Erikson's observation clearly applies to Ellis's relationship with the generally less educated, rural Guineamen, but not all researcher-subject relationships favor the more powerful party. Before starting to work on *Wild Cowboys*, for example, Robert Jackall published [Moral Mazes](#) (Oxford), a 1988 study of managerial ethics at a large (and pseudonymous) chemical-manufacturing company. Jackall ran into trouble starting his research because thirty-six corporations had flatly turned down his request to study ethics on their premises. As a desperation measure, he worked with a public-relations expert to devise a project description that would sound acceptable to a CEO. Eventually, he found his way into a chemical company that encouraged him to study the effect of chlorofluorocarbon regulation on corporate practices. Jackall took a crash course in chemistry from a fellow Williams professor, and he was soon inside the corporate doors asking questions about ethics.

His findings appeared first in a 1983 article in the *Harvard Business Review* and later in his book. Jackall concluded that the main "ethic" governing managerial practice was self-interest: protecting one's derriere and furthering one's career. He also found that organizational life was indeed a maze, a thicket of never-ending status jockeying and euphemistic doublespeak. (He included a glossary of job-performance-evaluation lingo, in which "quick thinking" meant "offers plausible excuses," and "requires work-value attitudinal readjustment" meant "lazy and hardheaded.") Jackall started receiving phone calls from managers deep within the company (and other companies) congratulating him for his acuity, but the top dogs demanded to know why he had been allowed on the premises. "All the managers had to do was pull my proposal out of the file and say, 'We thought he was here to study chlorofluorocarbon regulation,'" explains Jackall, adding that what looks like deception can sometimes be part of an elaborate linguistic code in which no one is really fooled and nearly everyone is satisfied--not least because there is always someone else to blame for the researcher's unflattering revelations.

Nonetheless, Kai Erikson maintains that deception of any kind is bad for the profession. "It jeopardizes the reputation of all the rest of us when some of us sneak around," he says. "And it's also very poor research." In her 1995 essay, for example, Ellis conceded that some of her

book's ribald facts about the Fishnecker's sex lives might have been tall tales. There are other, more horrifying stories of deception gone awry: sociology graduate students who checked themselves into mental hospitals or joined cults--only to discover that the people they were observing were other sociology graduate students.

After infiltrating the UFO cult that evolved into Heaven's Gate, Robert Balch, a sociology professor at the University of Montana, came to conclusions similar to Erikson's about the morality and practicality of undercover research. Ironically, Balch's concern was not about unfairly harming his subjects but about inadvertently helping them advance an ethically dubious cause. In 1974, he became intrigued by the flying-saucer-obsessed organization, which he thought might be linked with the disappearance of twenty young people in Oregon. The following year, he and a graduate student approached members of the group as researchers with some general questions. When the cult refused to cooperate, Balch and his student spent two months posing as members, traveling with the cult from town to town in the West as it promoted its beliefs to susceptible crowds. "We were expected to do things that we didn't want to do," Balch recalls. One evening he was obliged to promote the cult to an audience of ninety people. On another occasion, he found himself talking to a couple who had driven thousands of miles looking for the UFO group. "They had a kid," Balch recalls, "and I had to tell them, 'If you join the group, you have to leave your kid behind.' That was enough to persuade them not to join--but what if they'd decided to give up the kid?"

**DESPITE TROUBLING EXPERIENCES USING  
DECEPTIVE TECHNIQUES, FEW SOCIOLOGISTS  
BELIEVE COVERT RESEARCH SHOULD BE BANNED.**

As undercover investigators, Balch and his student were subjected to the same unwritten rules that bound everyone else in the cult: no idle socializing (all references to one's past life were forbidden). "We had to take notes in the bathroom stalls, so we had to get up early and write them down on little scraps of paper," says Balch. "I came away with the feeling that it wasn't ethical, and it wasn't the best way to get accurate information. I wouldn't trade the experience for anything, but on every other study that I've done, I've identified myself as a sociologist."

In the end, despite troubling experiences using deceptive techniques, few sociologists believe in hard-and-fast bans on covert research. Erich Goode, a sociology professor at SUNY-Stony Brook who sat on the ASA's deceptive-research panel in 1996 with Erikson and Leo, says that the decision boils down to a trade-off: "Less-than-complete honesty versus getting the information. Do you announce up front that you're a sociologist, say, when you're studying drug dealers?" Goode believes social scientists should be free to make the trade-off at their own discretion. Accordingly, he has not sought federal funding (with its accompanying constraints) for one of his favorite covert research projects: placing bogus personal ads in order to study the sociology of mate selection. In one experiment, he placed four different ads in four different publications, two purporting to be from women seeking men and two purporting to be from men seeking women. To do this, he invented four personae: a beautiful waitress, an average-looking female lawyer, a handsome taxicab driver, and an average-looking male lawyer. One need not be a sociologist to guess the breakdown of the nearly one thousand responses, the majority from men, that Goode received (and tabulated in several scholarly articles). The beautiful waitress was the overwhelming favorite for male respondents; women preferred the average-looking male lawyer (but not by so great a margin). Originally, says Goode, "I tried to do this kind of research aboveboard. I wrote to a couple running a newsletter focusing on personal ads and explaining that I was a sociologist, but I got no reply."

GOODE'S attitude--that the knowledge gained can sometimes justify the deceitful means--may not dominate the profession today, but it represents a powerful challenge to absolutists like Kai Erikson. And it represents a faction of sociologists who are unlikely to be content with the ASA's stringent professional guidelines or with guilty, after-the-fact conversions like

Carolyn Ellis's. As for Ellis, she has switched her main appointment at South Florida to communications (although she has retained a joint appointment in sociology). Her current projects fall under the rubrics of either auto-ethnography or "emotional sociology"--a brand-new subfield in which, as she describes it, the "emotionality of the researcher" plays a central role in the study.

In her recent essays, Ellis puts many of the emotional events of her life on display, including her abortion and her brother's death in the Air Florida crash of 1982. In 1995 she published her most ambitious piece of auto-ethnography to date, [Final Negotiations](#) (Temple). Nearly twice as long as *Fisher Folk*, the book is a grim, often poignant account of her tempestuous nine-year-plus relationship with Eugene Weinstein, the late chairman of the SUNY-Stony Brook sociology department. Weinstein was already dying of emphysema when Ellis met him in 1975 at a faculty party, where he passed her a coke and a kiss even though he had arrived with another woman. He had a tangled marital and romantic past (he and Ellis collaborated on an article on jealousy in open relationships). Two months after their marriage, in 1985, he died.

Ellis's book chronicles many details that might seem too tragic or intimate for other writers: LSD trips, sex with an oxygen tank in the bed, Weinstein's gradual mental decline, and his painful difficulties with elimination during his last days. Besides being fearfully ill, Weinstein was a demanding, complaining patient who could not stand to be alone. Ellis gritted her teeth and endured it--and then told it all in her book. Weinstein, she says, fully supported the project.

The sociologist who once practiced her profession by telling the secrets of people she had deceived in order to get close to them is still telling secrets. This time, however, the secrets are mostly her own or belong to those closest to her. For Ellis, auto-ethnography is a solution to the ethical quagmire surrounding deceptive research. But many sociologists are likely to find it an impractical one. Is researching oneself instead of observing others rather too high a price to pay for ethical purity?"

**Charlotte Allen is a contributing editor of *Lingua Franca*. Her book, [The Human Christ: The Misguided Search for the Historical Jesus](#), is forthcoming from The Free Press.**

Source: Nachmias, David & Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava. (1992). *Research methods in the social sciences*. London: St. Martin's Press.

## Participant Observation

The method of data collection most closely associated with contemporary field research is **participant observation**, whereby the investigator attempts to attain some kind of membership or close attachment to the group that he or she wishes to study.<sup>16</sup> In doing so, the participant observer attempts to adopt the perspectives of the people in the situation being observed. The participant observer's role is that of "conscious and systematic sharing, insofar as circumstances permit, in the life activities, and on occasion, in the interests and effects of a group of persons."<sup>17</sup> The observer's direct participation in the activities of the observed often entails learning their language, their habits, their work patterns, their leisure activities, and the like. The researcher assumes either a complete participant role or a participant-as-observer role.

### *Complete Participant*

In a complete participant role, the observer is wholly concealed; the research objectives are unknown to the observed, and the researcher attempts to become a member of the group under observation. The complete participant interacts with the observed "as naturally as possible in whatever areas of their living interest him and are accessible to him."<sup>18</sup>

For example, Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter studied a group of persons who predicted the destruction of the world. The nature of the group led the investigators to believe that if they presented themselves as researchers, they would be denied access to the group. Consequently, they posed as individuals interested in the activities of the group and became full-fledged members trying to be "nondirective, sympathetic listeners, passive participants who were inquisitive and eager to learn whatever others might want to tell us."<sup>19</sup> In another case student, Sullivan, Queen, and Patrick studied the motivations and attitudes of the personnel in a military training program. One of the researchers enlisted as a basic trainee and became a full member of the group. His identity, research objective, and role as a researcher remained unknown to members of the group, including his own commanding officer.<sup>20</sup>

Complete participant has been justified on the grounds that it makes possible the study of inaccessible groups or groups that do not reveal to outsiders certain aspects of their life. Presumably, the fieldworker is treated as just another member of the group. Despite this research advantage, the complete participant role has been severely criticized on methodological and ethical grounds. Kai Erikson, for example, rejects all field observations that do not make the role of the researcher and the intent of the study known beforehand because they constitute an invasion of privacy and may harm the observed:

---

<sup>16</sup> Rosalie H. Wax, "Participant Observation," *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* (New York: Macmillan, 1968), p. 238.

<sup>17</sup> Florence Kluckhohn, "The Participant-Observation Technique in Small Communities," *American Journal of Sociology*, 46 (1940): 331.

<sup>18</sup> Raymond L. Gold, "Roles in Sociological Field Observation," *Social Forces*, 36 (1958): 219.

<sup>19</sup> Leon Festinger, Henry Riecken, and Stanley Schachter, *When Prophecy Fails* (New York: Harper & Row, 1956), p. 234.

<sup>20</sup> Mortimer A. Sullivan, Stuart Queen, and Ralph Patrick, "Participant Observation as Employed in the Study of a Military Training Program," *American Sociological Review*, 23 (1958): 660-667.

The sheer act of entering a human transaction on the basis of deliberate fraud may be painful to the people who are thereby misled; and even if that were not the case, there are countless ways in which a stranger who pretends to be something else can disturb others by failing to understand the conditions of intimacy that prevail in the group he has tried to invade.<sup>21</sup>

Erikson points to the difficulties that may arise when one takes on a complete participant role and considers an incident reported in the Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter study, *When Prophecy Fails*:

At one point in the study, two observers arrived at one of the group's meeting places under instructions to tell quite ordinary stories about their experience in Spiritualism in order to create as little commotion as possible. A few days afterwards, however, the leader of the group was overheard explaining that the two observers had appeared upset, excited, confused, and unsure of their errand at the time of their original visit, all of which helped to confirm her suspicion that they had somehow been "sent" from other planet. In one sense, of course, this incident offered the observers an intriguing view of the belief structure of the cult, but in another sense, the leader's assessment of the situation was very shrewd: after all, the observers had been sent from another world, if not another planet, and she may have been quite right to sense that they were a bit confused and unsure of their errand during their early moments in the new job. "In both cases," the report informs us, the visits of the observers "were given as illustrations that 'strange things are happening.'" Indeed, strange things were happening; yet we have no idea how strange they really were. It is almost impossible to evaluate the reaction of the group to the appearance of the pair of observers because we do not know whether they were seen as ordinary converts or as extraordinary beings. And it makes a difference, for in the first instance the investigators would be observing a response which within the normal range of the group's experience, while in the second instance they would be observing a response which would never have taken place had the life of the group been allowed to run its own course.<sup>22</sup>

The complete participant role poses several methodological problems. First, observers may become so self-conscious about revealing their true selves that they would be handicapped when attempting to perform convincingly in the pretended role. Or they may "go native," that is, incorporate the pretended role into their self-conception and lose the research perspective.<sup>23</sup> Second, the decision what specifically to observe is most problematic because the researcher cannot evoke responses and behavior and must be careful not to ask questions that might raise the suspicions of the persons observed. Third, recording observations or taking note is impossible on the spot; these have to be postponed until the observer is alone. However, the time lags in recording observations introduce selective bias and distortions through memory.

---

<sup>21</sup> Kai T. Erikson, "A Comment on Disguised Observation in Sociology," *Social Problems*, 14(1967): 368.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 371-372.

<sup>23</sup> Gold, "Roles in Sociological Field Observations," p. 220.