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:


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…

• 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:

• 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


**Journal Articles**


**Chapters in Edited Books**


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 triplets 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; Miehe 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” (Gutierrez 1999).

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