Gettysburg COLLEGE

Department of Sociology Style Guide

Our Department is concerned that students be aware of certain rules for the preparation of papers and essays. By making them aware of certain procedures that should be followed in writing papers, the Department hopes to increase the effectiveness of the presentation of their ideas. To this end, the faculty members have decided on a set of guidelines that should be followed in writing papers for courses offered by the Department. These procedures are by no means fixed; alternate forms or options may be noted by individual professors.

This style guide reviews the procedures for organizing and presenting papers and essays. It also reviews American Sociological Association reference formatting.

Organization of Papers

One of the most difficult problems encountered by a student in writing a paper or essay is that of organization. While all papers may not fit into the organizational format given below, this is the general pattern that should be followed. Organization is the most important aspect of communication in written assignments. Typing and spelling errors are annoying, but lack of organization is a serious barrier to understanding.

1. Every standard term paper or essay should have a beginning, middle, and end, which represent the introduction, development of idea(s), and conclusion, respectively. State clearly what you intend to say in the paper at the beginning. Then follow through on it in the body of the paper. Finally, summarize and/or conclude with general statements; do not end on a detail that belongs in the body of the paper.

2. There should be clear transitions and explicit linkages between detailed examples and the points they are meant to exemplify. Don't make the reader have to guess what your point is or imagine the relevance of apparently random statements.

3. One useful tool in the writing of well-organized papers is the outline, which can be general or more specific to suit your needs. A brainstorming sheet for random ideas can serve as raw material for the subsequent construction of an outline.

Presentation of Papers

Before doing final revisions and turning in a paper, be sure you are using a consistent style of writing, citations, and format. Two excellent books on style, grammar, and formatting (except for citations and references, discussed later) are:

Miller, Jane E. 2015. *The Chicago Guide to Writing about Numbers, Second Edition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Turabian, Kate L. 2013. *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers Theses, and Dissertations, 8th Edition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Prepare your paper in the following manner:

Type your paper (including footnotes and bibliography) on standard white paper, using 1-inch margins and double-spaced lines.

1. Always back up your computer files. Too many students have lost many hours of work to a disastrous computer glitch by carelessly neglecting to copy their files to alternate forms of back-up.

2. Revise. Your paper will be considerably better if you review and revise it for organization, logical structure, clarity of expression, grammar and spelling. "Overnight wonders" are an oxymoron.

3. Proofread. Extensive typographical errors detract from your credibility, distract the reader, and advertise that you completed the paper in haste.

4. Attach a cover page with the paper title, author, course number, date, and honor code (written out in full and signed).

5. Include page numbers.

6. When submitting hard copies, staple your paper and add a blank sheet at the end of the paper for comments.

7. Be sure to keep copies of all of your work.

Citation and Reference Formatting
The Department of Sociology expects all students to follow the citation and reference formatting guidelines of the American Sociological Association (ASA). A copy of the ASA style guide is available at the reference desk of Musselman Library and these guidelines are summarized below.

In-Text Citations
In-text citations in ASA format include the last name of the author(s), year of publication, and page numbers when using a quotation. Any sentence that refers to the work of a particular author should include a citation, whether or not it contains a quotation. Examples:

*   When the author's name in the text, follow it with the year in parentheses:
    …Goffman (1963) argues…

*   When the author's name is not in the text, enclose the last name and year in parentheses, typically at the end of the sentence. Note that the period goes *after* the citation because the citation is a part of the sentence:
    …(Goffman 1963).

- When quoting, the page numbers follow the year of publication after a colon. Note that there are no spaces between the year, the colon, and the page number. This is true even when the quote appears later in the sentence:
  …Goffman (1963:25) argues…
  …(Goffman 1963:25).

- Give both last names for papers by two authors:
  …(West and Zimmerman 1987).

- For sources with three authors, give all last names the first time a work is cited in the text and use the first author and the abbreviation "et al." (Latin for "and others") for subsequent citations:
  …(Pescosolido, Grauerholz, and Milkie 1997). And later …(Pescosolido et al. 1997).

- For sources with four or more authors, use "et al." every time:
  …(Armstrong et al. 2014).

- When you are using multiple citations to support the same point, separate citations with a semicolon:
  …(Burgess 1968; Marwell et al. 1971).

Bibliographic References
Complete references for all sources should follow the text of your paper in a section titled "References." This section should not contain anything that is *not* cited with an in-text citation in the paper.

List the references alphabetically by the last name of the first author. **For single-authored works**, type the last name, then the first name. **If there is more than one author**, reverse only the name of the first author (ex: "Jones, Arthur B., Colin D. Smith, and James Petersen"). List the full names of all authors. If there are two or more items by the same author, list them in the order of year of publication. If the author's publications appeared in the same year, distinguish them by adding letters (Bernstein 1976a, 1976b).

References should be double-spaced with indents after the first line. There should not be empty lines between references.

Below is the general format for a few commonly used reference types and some examples; more examples can be found on the last two pages:

Books
Typical Format: Lastname, Firstname Initial. Year of Publication. *Book Title*. City of Publication: Publisher.

Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York:

    Simon and Schuster.

Mason, Karen O. 1974. *Women's Labor Force Participation and Fertility*. Research Triangle

    Park, NC: National Institutes of Health.

Journal Articles
Typical Format: Lastname, Firstname Initial. Year of Publication. "Article Title: Subtitle."
Journal Name Volume(Number):First page-Last page.

Armstrong, Elizabeth A., Laura T. Hamilton, Elizabeth M. Armstrong, and J. Lotus Seeley.

    2014. "'Good Girls': Gender, Social Class, and Slut Discourse on Campus." *Social*

    Psychology Quarterly 77(2):100-122.

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1(2):125-

    151.

Chapters in Edited Books
Typical Format: Lastname, Firstname Initial. Year of Publication. "Chapter Title." Pp. First
page-Last page in *Book Title,* edited by Firstname Initial Lastname. City of Publication:
Publisher.

Adler, Patricia A. and Peter Adler. 1994. "Backboards and Blackboards: College Athletes and

    Role Engulfment." Pp. 131-145 in S*ociological Footprints: Introductory Readings in*

    Sociology (6th ed.), edited by Leonard Cargan and Jeanne H. Ballantine. Belmont,

    California: Wadsworth.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 2002. "Chapter Fourteen: Arlie Russell Hochshild on the

    Management of Emotion." Pp. 297-316 in *Self, Symbols, and Society: Classic Readings*

    in Social Psychology, edited by Nathan Rousseau. Lanham, MD: Rowman and

    Littlefield.

mate test case in which cultural distinctions are salient in the realm of gastronomy. Just as a researcher would go to Silicon Valley to study technological boundaries, we went to France to understand the operation of categorical boundaries in the culinary realm. French haute cuisine occupies a central place in French culture and exists as a gastronomic field in which the primary product (food) is linked to secondary intellectual discourse (Ferguson 1998). The categories of cuisine consist of codes, and can be empirically analyzed as a set of elements: techniques, and ingredients (Ferguson 2004:18).

At the start of the 1970s, the logic of classical cuisine defined the identity of French chefs until it was challenged by the rise of nouvelle cuisine with its own distinctive logic and role identities of chefs. Thus, classical and nouvelle cuisines were two oppositional categories with identifiable blueprints and codes of conduct. The sociological puzzle is not only that classical cuisine faced a high-status competitor, nouvelle cuisine, but also that borrowing-driven bricolage blurred the boundaries of both categories over time. In the following discussion, we develop a theoretical explanation for the antecedents of borrowing and its effects on external evaluations by critics, then test the resulting hypotheses in a study of French haute cuisine.

BOUNDARIES, BORROWING, AND BRICOLAGE

In his insightful account of ethnic identities, Barth (1969:15) suggested that it is the "boundary that defines the group, not the cultural stuff that it encloses" and urged researchers to pay attention to boundary dynamics. Building on Barth's insight, Hannan and Freeman (1989:57) postulated that segregating processes establish boundaries, whereas blending processes erode boundaries. Although Hannan and Freeman (1989:54–57) mentioned that technological factors and transaction costs may create boundaries, they singled out institutionally driven segregation as the most important process. Thus, in their view, nominal differences become transformed into real differences with social consequences through collective action, endorsement by powerful actors with the ability to impose sanctions, or taken-for-granted assumptions.

A canonical axiom in the social sciences is that categories establish social and symbolic boundaries, and thereby constitute the identity of actors (DiMaggio 1997; Douglas 1986; Mohr and Duquenne 1997; Tajfel and Turner 1979; Zerubavel 1997). More recently, a number of scholars have argued that strong categorical boundaries are a prerequisite for segregation, suggesting that categories entail a code of conduct enforced by critics who have the power to impose sanctions on code violators (Polos, Hannan, and Carroll 2002; Zuckerman 1999).

In a series of papers, Zuckerman and his collaborators argued that conformity to categorical imperatives is necessary lest members face role conflict, confuse critics, and receive penalties such as downgraded valuations. According to this line of reasoning, critics make judgments of similarity first, and then make judgments of taste (Phillips and Zuckerman 2001; Zuckerman 1999; Zuckerman et al. 2003). These arguments mesh well with accounts of how critics are third parties who establish evaluative frameworks (Becker 1991; Hirsch 1972). Carroll and Swaminathan (2000) showed that because craft brewers were defined as the antithesis of "industrial" beers, contract breweries that sourced beer from mass producers but sought to portray themselves as craft beers had lower vital rates than microbrews and brewpubs. Similarly, Zuckerman and Kim (2003) demonstrated that films classified as major films fared well in the mainstream market, but floundered in the art house market.

However, categorical boundaries can be undermined even in the case of oppositional category pairs. This is shown by the following studies of nonmarket contexts. Stein (1997:25) analyzed how feminists collectively contested the dominant meaning of lesbianism, and "reframed the meaning [of homosexuality], suggesting that the boundaries separating heterosexuality and homosexuality were in fact permeable." Other studies have depicted national borders as sites for creolization. Thus, accounts of the Mexican American border show that the division of individuals into opposing spheres such as "Mexican" or "American" has been replaced by mixed categories such as "Chicano," "Latino," and "Hispanic" (Gutiérrez 1999).

Even in the case of opposed category pairs, the "clarity of a set of boundaries is not a per-

Social Construction of Synergies in Mergers and Acquisitions: When Biomérieux and Pierre Fabre Invent the 'Theranostic' Concept to Justify their Merger," Revue Française de Gestion, *forthcoming.*

Rodolphe Durand *is Associate Professor in Strategy and Business Policy at HEC Paris, and his research analyzes the role of tangible and intangible capabilities in strategic management. His most recent publications, coauthored with Roland Calori, is "Sameness, Otherness? Enriching Organizational Change Theories with Philosophical Considerations on the Same and the Other,"* Academy of Management Review, forthcoming.

REFERENCES

Aldrich, Howard. 1979. *Organizations and Environments.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Axelrod, Robert and Michael Cohen. 2000. *Harnessing Complexity: Organizational Implications of a Scientific Frontier.* New York: Free Press.

Barnett, William P. and Glenn R Carroll. 1995. "Modelling Organizational Change." *Annual Review of Sociology* 21:217–36.

Baron, James N. 2004. "Employing Identities in Organizational Ecology." *Industrial and Corporate Change* 13:3–32.

Barth, Frederick. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Beaugé, Bénédict. 1999. *Aventures de la cuisine française, cinquante ans d'histoire du goût.* Paris, France: Nil Editions.

Becker, Howard. 1978. "Arts and Crafts." *American Journal of Sociology* 83:863–89.

———. 1991. "Art World Revisited." *Sociological Forum* 5:497–502.

Benjamin, Beth A. and Joel M. Podolny. 1999. "Status, Quality, and Social Order in the California Wine Industry, 1981–1991." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44(3):563–89.

Blute, Marion. 1979. "Sociocultural Evolutionism: An Untried Theory." *Behavioral Science* 24:46–59.

Brewer, M. B. 1991. "The Social Self: On Being the Same and Different at the Same Time." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 17:475–82.

Bryson, Bethany. 1996. "Anything but Heavy Metal: Symbolic Exclusion and Musical Dislikes." *American Sociological Review* 61(5):881–96.

Campbell, John L. 2005. "Where Do We Stand? Common Mechanisms in Organizations and Social Movements Research." Pp. 41–72 in *Social Movements and Organization Theory,* edited by Gerald F. Davis, Doug McAdam, W. Richard Scott, and Mayer N. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Carroll, Glenn and Michael T. Hannan. 2000. *The Demography of Corporations and Industries.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Carroll, Glenn and Anand Swaminathan. 2000. "Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the American Brewing Industry after Prohibition." *American Journal of Sociology* 106:715–62.

Clemens, Elisabeth and James Cook. 1999. "Politics and Institutionalism, Explaining Durability and Change." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:441–66.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1987. "Classification in Art." *American Sociological Review* 52:440–55.

———. 1991. "Constructing an Organizational Field as Professional Project." Pp. 267–92 in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis,* edited by W. W. Powell and P. J. DiMaggio. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1997. "Culture and Cognition." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23:263–87.

Douglas, M. 1986. *How Institutions Think.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Escoffier, A. [1903] 1993. *Guide Culinaire.* Paris, France: Flammarion.

Ferguson, Priscilla. 1998. "A Cultural Field in the Making: Gastronomy in 19th Century France." *American Journal of Sociology* 104:597–641.

———. 2004. *Accounting for Taste.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fine, Gary Alan. 2004. *Everyday Genius: Self-Taught Art and the Culture of Authenticity.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fischler, Claude. 1993. *L'Homnivore.* Paris, France: Odile Jacob.

Gutiérrez, D. G. 1999. "Migration, Emergent Ethnicity, and the 'Third Space': the Shifting Politics of Nationalism in Greater Mexico." *Journal of American History* 86(2):481–518.

Hannan, Michael T. and John Freeman. 1989. *Organizational Ecology.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Haunschild, P. R. and A. S. Miner. 1997. "Modes of Interorganizational Imitation: The Effects of Outcome Salience and Uncertainty." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42:472–500.

Hedstrom, Peter. 1994. "Contagious Collectivities: On the Spatial Diffusion of Swedish Trade Unions." *American Journal of Sociology* 99:1157–79.

Hirsch, Paul. 1972. "Processing Fads and Fashions: An Organization Set Analysis of Culture Industry Systems." *American Journal of Sociology* 77:639–59.

Jasso, Guillermina. 2001. "Studying Status: An Integrated Perspective." *American Sociological Review* 66:96–124.

Lamont, Michele and Virag Molnar. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries Across the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:167–95.