

Prof. Didier Maillat, Yvonne Dröschel
Department of English - Linguistics
University of Fribourg

Stylesheet for English Linguistics

1. Title page

<p>Title of the (Pro-)Seminar you attended</p> <p>Title of seminar paper/essay</p> <p><i>Optional: decoration (cartoon, photograph, drawing, etc.)</i></p> <p>Your Name</p> <p>University of Fribourg Department of English - Linguistics</p> <p>Date</p>
--

2. Style and organisation of your essay/thesis

1) Proseminar papers should be 3,000 words, whereas seminar papers should be 4,000 words. A BA thesis should count between 30 and 40 pages (10,500 to 14,000 words). An MA thesis should count between 60 and 100 pages. Do a word count on your computer and **put the corresponding figure at the end of your essay or thesis.**

2) Use a neutral impersonal style where possible, i.e. avoid *I*. Never use contractions (e.g. use *do not* instead of *don't*, or *is not* instead of *isn't*). You can use the font and size you like (according to your common sense), but use 1.5 line spacing to leave room for comments and corrections. Always write in whole sentences, i.e. with a subject and verb. When giving sums and numbers, note that the English convention is to use a comma (e.g. 10,000 native speakers of Italian are ..., there are 2,684 people living in village X, etc.).

3) Set the right margin. Your text should not look like this:

The Highlands and Islands of western and northern Scotland spoke Gaelic, another Celtic language which had been brought across from Ireland in pre-mediaeval times. And the populations of the Northern Isles still spoke the Scandinavian language, which they had inherited from their ancestors. It was not until the 17th century that the English language began the geographical and demographic expansion which was to lead to the situation in which it finds itself today, with more non-native speakers than any other language in the world.

This expansion began in the late 1600s, with the arrival of English-speakers in the Americas.

But like this:

The Highlands and Islands of western and northern Scotland spoke Gaelic, another Celtic language which had been brought across from Ireland in pre-mediaeval times. And the populations of the Northern Isles still spoke the Scandinavian language, which they had inherited from their ancestors. It was not until the 17th century that the English language began the geographical and demographic expansion which was to lead to the situation in which it finds itself today, with more non-native speakers than any other language in the world.

This expansion began in the late 1600s, with the arrival of English-speakers in the Americas.

4) Always run a spell check before submitting your essay. Essays with too many grammatical and spelling mistakes will not be accepted.

5) Organise your text in sentences and paragraphs (a paragraph always consists of several sentences). As a rule of thumb, a paragraph corresponds to one argument and/or idea. Use the *enter* key to leave a line gap between two paragraphs.

6) Always give all your sources. Whenever you give information that is not yours, you **must** make it clear where you have taken it from. Plagiarism is an important issue in academia and constitutes a serious offence. Stealing intellectual property is not only unfair but also a criminal act (see the section on Plagiarism below).

Always write the name of the author, then in brackets the year of publication **and** the page number where the passage may be looked up. For example, the above passage is taken from:

Trudgill, P. & Hannah, J. (1994) *International English*. London: Edward Arnold.

If you want to quote this passage, you should write something like: ... as Trudgill and Hannah (1994: 4) write:

The Highlands and Islands of western and northern Scotland spoke Gaelic, another Celtic language which had been brought across from Ireland in pre-mediaeval times. [...]

If you make references to a book or article in your text (i.e. without quoting in a separate paragraph as illustrated in the above examples), you use the following technique:

“quote the original in inverted commas”, then add in brackets the name of author, year of publication: page number where quoted passage can be looked up (for instance: McMahon 1994: 258). Make sure both quotation marks are of the above type.

If you are writing about Celtic languages, for example, you quote authors in your paper as follows:

Gaelic, for instance, "another Celtic language which had been brought across from Ireland in pre-mediaeval times" (Trudgill and Hannah 1994: 4), was spoken in the Scottish Highlands until At the end of a sentence, place the reference before the full stop: " [...] from Ireland in pre-mediaeval times" (Trudgill and Hannah 1994: 4). When leaving out parts of the passage you are quoting, indicate this by square brackets [...] as follows:

The Highlands and Islands of western and northern Scotland spoke Gaelic, another Celtic language which had been brought across from Ireland in pre-mediaeval times [...] It was not until the 17th century that the English language began the geographical and demographic expansion which was to lead to the situation in which it finds itself today, with more non-native speakers than any other language in the world.

Do not give full references in your text (by using footnotes, etc.), and generally try to avoid using footnotes wherever possible. Complete information about your sources

should be given in the *references*, and interested readers can get additional information about secondary literature there.

3. References (starting on a new page)

The following section is taken from a practical textbook which describes how to tackle a research project in linguistics. We highly recommend students to take a close look at this book when they are planning to write an essay in English linguistics. The reference is:

Wray, A. and Bloomer, A. (2006) *Projects in Linguistics: A practical guide to researching language*. London: Hodder Education, 225-34.

How do I refer to a book?

In the text, give the author's name followed by date of publication (example 1). Where appropriate, give page numbers too (example 2).

- (1) Wardhaugh (1993).
- (2) Wardhaugh (1993: 64-8)

In the reference list, give the author's name, initial (s), date in brackets (although note that, in some versions of this system, the date is not in brackets, and it is followed by a colon; in others, there are neither brackets nor a colon), and titles in italics, followed by a full stop, place of publication followed by a colon, publisher, and full stop:

- (3) Wardhaugh, R. (1993) *Investigating language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

As you build up your list of references, apply strict alphabetical order by author surname.

What if the book is an edited collection of papers by other people?

In the text, use the same conventions as for a book (examples 1 and 2). In the reference list, add '(ed.)' for one editor or '(eds)' for two, after the author name(s) and initial(s), but before the date:

- (4) Giglioli, P.P. (ed.) (1972) *Language and social context*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

However, consider whether it is really the edited collection itself that you should be referencing. If you are pointing to material within that collection, refer to the specific chapter, using the name of its author. Thus, to draw on the paper by Goffman that is included within the collection by Giglioli, refer to Goffman (1972), not Giglioli (1972), and reference the work as outlined below under 'How is a paper in an edited book notated?'

How is a paper in an edited book notated?

In the text, give the author of the paper and the date of the edited book. Do not mention the editor(s) of the book here:

(5) Smith (1996)

In the reference list, give the author with the initial(s), date, title of paper (not in italics; in some versions of this system the title of a paper is put in inverted commas), followed by a full stop. Then write 'In', followed by the book details, as described above. Finally, give the page numbers of the paper, preceded by a comma (or, in some versions, a colon, or a comma and 'p.' or 'pp.')

(6a) Smith, P.K. (1996) Language and the evolution of mind-reading. In Carruthers, P. and Smith P.K. (eds) (1996) *Theories of theory of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 344-54.

Note that, if you are listing several items from the same collection, one option is to shorten the individual references (example 6b) by cross-referring to a single reference for the collection (example 6c). Doing this is only worthwhile if you have at least two items from the same collection, otherwise it increases the word count and space taken rather than decreasing it. Also, it is imperative that you *do* provide the entry for the collection (example 6c), since entries like example 6b are *not permissible* without it.

(6b) Smith, P.K. (1996) Language and the evolution of mind-reading. In Carruthers, P. and Smith, P.K. (eds), 433-54.

(6c) Carruthers, P. and Smith, P.K. (eds) (1996) *Theories of the theory of mind*. Cambridge University Press, 344-54.

What are the conventions for a paper in a journal?

In the text, proceed as above (example 5). In the reference list, give the author(s) with initials, date, title of paper (not in italics; in some versions of this system the title is put in inverted commas), full stop. Then give the title of the journal, in italics, volume number, part number in brackets if appropriate, and pages, preceded by a comma (or, in some versions, by a colon, or a comma and 'p.' or 'pp.')

- (7) Brakke, K.E. and Savage-Rumbaugh, E.S. (1995) The development of language skills in bonobo and chimpanzee - I. Comprehension. *Language and Communication* 15 (2), 121-48.

Note that this is not necessary to name the publisher of a journal.

Are there any special conventions for referencing more than one work by the same person?

Practice varies. It is common simply to see the name repeated on line after line where there are a lot of references to one person's work. That is the practice adopted in this book. However, another option is to replace the name by a long dash after its first occurrence:

- (8) Trudgill, P. (1974) *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
– (1978) *Sociolinguistic patterns in British English*. London: Arnold.
– (1983) *On dialect*. Oxford: Blackwell.

If you choose to adopt this convention, it is a good idea to wait until the last minute before replacing the repeated names by dashes. This is to avoid accidentally inserting another author's work (here, it might be, say, something by Turnbull) under the first entry, so that the later entries are attributed to the wrong person.

What should I do if I have referred to more than one work by the same person, published in the same year?

Since it would be confusing to have two or more works all referred to as, say, Crystal (2003), the convention is to label them a, b, c, and so on. You should use these letters both in the main text and in the reference list, and ensure that you always use the same letter for the same one. Look at the entries in this book for the two works by Crystal that were published in 2003, to see how this operates. Note that the use of letters is local to the piece of writing in question. If you find such a letter in someone else's references, do not simply adopt the letter as if it were a permanent part of the reference - it is not and, if you are only referring to that one work, you don't need it. You should never have in your reference list a date with a letter after it unless there is at least one other work by that author with that date, also with a (different) letter after it. Note also that there is nothing intrinsic in the publication that is referred to as 'a'. Someone else might list it as the 'b' publication.

What if there is more than one author with the same surname?

In the reference, list the authors in alphabetical order of their forenames or initials. In the text, because authors are referred to by surname only, there is the potential for confusion if both authors have published in the same year. If this occurs in your work, add the initial in the text reference, for example G. Cook (2001), so that the reader knows which Cook (2001) reference you mean. In this book we only narrowly missed having this problem with the names Brown, Carroll, Wells and White, and we do indeed have it with Cook.

What if there are two authors?

In the text, give both names, linked by 'and' (example 9) and, in the reference list, give both, with initials (example 10). If there are editors, put '(eds)' before the date (example 11).

- (9) Graddol and Swann (1989)
- (10) Graddol, D. and Swann, J. (1989) *Gender voices*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- (11) Carruthers, P. and Smith, P.K. (eds) (1996) *Theories of theory of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

When an author has co-authored with others, which order do the works go in on the reference list?

To illustrate how to do this, we will use some made-up authors, so that we can imagine various permutations (example 12). We'll call the first author Penelope Wilkinson. First put all the single-authored work by that person, in order of year; then sort the co-authored works alphabetically by the second author's name, and list them in that order. Works by the same two authors are in date order:

- (12) Wilkinson, P. (1986)...
- Wilkinson, P. (1989)...
- Wilkinson, P. (1994)...
- Wilkinson, P. and Armitage, S. (1988)...
- Wilkinson, P. and Cooper, M. (1983)...
- Wilkinson, P. and Cooper, M. (1991)...

If a two-author team has also written with a third person, put the three-author work at the end of the list of works by the first two authors, even if it is of an earlier date than some of them. If there is more than one work by the same three-author team, put them in date order:

- (13) Wilkinson, P. and Armitage, S. (1988)...
- Wilkinson, P. and Cooper, M. (1983)...
- Wilkinson, P. and Cooper, M. (1991)...
- Wilkinson, P., Cooper, M. and Bryant, Q. (1984)...
- Wilkinson, P., Cooper, M. and Bryant, Q. (1991)...

Wilkinson, P., Cooper, M. and Caradine, K. (1984)...
Wilkinson, P., Cooper, M., Collins, R. and Bryant, Q. (1989) ...
Wilkinson, P. and Davies, K. (1987)...

In other words, clear up all the works by the author on his/her own before doing the two-author works. Clear up everything by each two-author team, including works with extra authors, before moving onto the next two-author team. Remember that the order in which the author's names appear on a book or paper is extremely important and you must not change it. So, in the penultimate line of example 13, Bryant is listed after Collins, and it is Collin's name that determines the position of the reference, below the publication with Caradine.

It there are lots of authors, do they all have to be mentioned each time?

In the text, on the first occurrence of the reference, give all the names and, after that, use '*et al.*', which means 'and other' (so don't use it to replace just one co-author!):

(14) Bates, Bretherton and Snyder (1988)... Bates *et al.* (1988)...

In the reference list, give all the authors with their initials, linking them with a comma until the last two, which are linked with 'and':

(15) Bates, E., Bretherton, I. and Snyder, L. (1988) *From first words to grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

What if an author has published more than one work with several other authors in the same year?

If Smith, say, has published two papers with Jones, Brown, and White, both in 2005, then you can refer to them as Smith *et al.* (2005a) and Smith *et al.* (2005b) (see above). If Smith has published with different co-authors in the same year (or with the same co-authors, but listed in a different order), it is more awkward. They will be differentiated in the reference list but, if you refer to them in the text just as 'Smith *et al.* (2005)', the reader will not know which work is being referred to. Yet it would be odd to refer to them as (a) and (b) since the authorship lists are not identical. One solution is to opt out of using '*et al.*' for the particular works and list all the authors each time you mention them. This is the best option if there are only three authors. For more than tree authors, see how far down the list of authors the differences lie. You may be able to refer to 'Smith, Jones, *et al.* (2005)', and so on. You can only do this if at least two names remain captured by '*et al.*'.

How do I handle family names with more than one part?

Names like Robert de Beaugrande and Wilhelm von Humboldt can be difficult: should they be listed alphabetically under the second or the third part of the name? Where three names are given, such as Alonso Zamora Vicente, Susan Ervin Tripp or Suzette Haden Elgin, does the middle one count as the first part of the family name, or as part of the given name? Don't give yourself a hard time over this: individuals with such names will have their own preferences, but other forces are at play too, including the practices of individual publishers. Here are some handy hints for what to do:

- Go back to the source of your information. If you have read the name in a book or article, find it in the reference list and follow the practice there. If you have something by the author him-/herself, there may well be citations of his/her other works in the reference list, so check there.
- Aim for consistency in your own reference list. So if you choose to list De Beaugrande under 'D', do the same for De Saussure, and list Von Humboldt under 'V'. If you list De Beaugrande as 'Beaugrande, R. de' then it will be 'Saussure, F. de' and 'Humboldt, W. von'.

Some names from other countries can be difficult to list too. In China, it is customary for the family name to precede the given name in everyday usage, and this can mean that in a reference, the given name is inadvertently listed as a surname. Additional complications arise because many Chinese scholars adopt western practices when presenting their name, and because it is not always easy even for a Chinese person to tell which name is the family name and which the given name. In order to list the name correctly, check the author's own publications to see how reference is made to his/her previous works. You can also search for the author's web pages for the same purposes.

Where do I find the information I need?

In a book, the details are usually in the first few pages at the front. Be careful to copy the author's names and the book or paper title correctly. The date of publication will normally be on the same left-hand page as the ISBN number and the British Library or Library of Congress (or other national library) cataloguing data. It is not usually difficult to spot the publisher (but beware of giving the printer or typesetter by mistake). However, it is sometime difficult to work out the place of publication. If there is an address for the publisher, give the town and, if American, the state as well. If there are several addresses, give the top one, or the one associated with editorial as opposed to marketing concerns. Some large publishing houses publish simultaneously in two countries (such as the UK and the USA): if you can't tell which country the book was probably commissioned in, give both places.

In a journal, the name of the journal and the volume number and part should be printed somewhere on the article as a header or footer. If they are not, and you have

the whole journal in your hand, look in the front, on the back cover. If you have only a photocopy, you obviously needed to write down the details when you made the copy. If you didn't, you have a problem, so remember to do that in future! To find details you forgot to write down, use a web search engine such as Google, to see if anyone has listed it on a website. Alternatively, see what electronic search facilities your library has.

How do I reference a work with no apparent author?

This situation can arise when you cite an official report, a newspaper article, or a large work such as dictionary or encyclopedia. For an official report (example 16) or newspaper (example 17), treat the commissioner or publisher of the report as the author. For a dictionary give the name (example 18). Do the same for an encyclopedia, unless the author's name is given at the foot of the article, in which case, treat it like a paper in an edited volume (example 19):

- (16) Department for Education and Science (1975) *A language for life* (The Bullock Report). London: Department for Education and Science.
- (17) *Times* (2005) Google must win 'keyword' battle. *The Times*. 22 October, p.66.
- (18) *Oxford English Dictionary* (2nd edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (19) Cameron, D. (2006). Gender. In Brown, E.K. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier, vol. 4: 733-9.

If a book has more than one edition, or has been reprinted or revised, which date should I use?

Inside a book all sorts of information is given any only some of it is relevant to academic referencing needs. The basic rule is to give the earliest date for the text in its current form. When a new edition of a book is produced, material is added and the page numbers end up different, so it is important that you indicate which edition you have used, and give the correct date for that edition. Indicate an edition by putting '(nth edition)' after the title, where *n* stands for the edition number (e.g. 3rd, 4th). However, when a book is reprinted or comes out in paperback, the material is not altered, so you should not make any reference to reprint or paperback dates. Sometimes there is a date given for a reprint with revisions. In this case, give the reprint date, and in the reference, put '(revised edition)' after the title.

What if the date of publication different from the copyright date?

Use the publication date, unless there is evidence to the contrary in the reference lists of others. If there is a large discrepancy it will probably be because the work has been re-issued, in which case the ‘copyright’ date coincides with the original date of publication. In the case of key papers that end up in ‘reader’, it can be useful to indicate the original publication date as well (see the section ‘Which date?’ on p. 233).

If I am referring repeatedly to the same work, do I have to keep mentioning it?

It certainly is possible to overdo referencing of the same work. If you are drawing heavily on one source for a while, it is acceptable to write something like: ‘In the following discussion, much has been drawn from the work of Brown (2005).’ However, have a think about why you are so dependent on one work. Could it indicate that you have not read sufficiently widely? See Chapter 21 for guidance on how to work efficiently with multiple sources.

If you refer more than once to the same work, it is possible to use the abbreviations *op. cit.* (short for *opere citato* - ‘in the work cited’) or, if there is no other reference in between, *ibid.* (short for *ibidem* - ‘in the same place’). Both indicate that the referencing information is exactly the same as last time, including the page number, if any (example 20). If the page number is different indicate this (example 21):

- (20) According to Brown (2005: 10) ... In addition, (*ibid.*)
- (21) According to Brown (2005: 10) ... In addition, (*ibid.*: 17)

However these abbreviations are used much less frequently than they used to be. If you use *ibid.*, only introduce it in the final draft, as it *must* refer to the immediately preceding reference. As text often gets moved around, added or removed in the rewrites, you could end up with an *ibid.* referring back to the wrong work if you put it in too soon.

What should I do if I can’t italics or I am writing by hand?

Wherever italics would occur (in reference lists and also in the main text), it is acceptable to use underlining.

Is it possible to put into the reference list a work that has not yet been published?

Yes. If you have had sight of a paper or book that is currently being printed but hasn’t yet appeared, write *forthcoming* or *in press* where you would otherwise write the date and, if it is a paper and the page numbers are not available, omit them. It is also

possible to refer to a work that is at an earlier stage. Do this in the same way as above, but replacing *forthcoming* or *in press* with *in preparation*. Beware of using these labels when you have found the reference in another source. A work that was forthcoming, in press, or in preparation in 2004 is probably published by now, so you need to try and find its publication date.

If, in the text, I refer to more than one work at once, what order do I list them in?

There are two permissible orders: alphabetical (example 22) and chronological (example 23). Whichever you choose, be consistent. If you are mentioning several works by the same author, you will save words by using alphabetical order:

(22) ... (Brown 1998, 2004; Smith 1999, 2001; White 2000)

(23) ... (Brown 1998; Smith 1999; White 2000; Smith 2001; Brown 2004)

Suppose I asked an expert about something face to face or by email - how do I acknowledge the source of my information?

You can write 'Brown (personal communication)' or 'John Brown (personal communication)', depending on whether the reader will know from the context who Brown is - often you check a fact with a researcher whose work you are already engaging with. You should not list anything in the reference list at the back. Information from your lecturers, family, or friends will not usually make the grade of a 'personal communication' citation.

How do I reference information from my lecture notes?

Ask your lecturer if it is okay to reference your lecture notes. Usually it is not recommended. Go and find the information in a published source and refer to that instead.

Which date?

Sometimes a work has more than one publication date, because it is a re-issue or a modern edition (prepared by someone else) of a classical work, or a reprint (sometimes edited) in a 'reader'. By referring to the original and the later date, you signal to the reader that you have used the more recent one, and that many page

numbers will be from that, not the original. Examples in the reference list of this book include Maltz, D. and Broker, R. (1982/1998) and Carroll, L. (1865/1971).

How do I reference something I found on the Internet?

Internet referencing conventions are not fully standardized yet, and you may see various practices. However, keep in mind the golden rules of *all* referencing:

- 1 Give due credit to the author
- 2 Make it possible for your reader to track the work down.

These two principles, between them, lead to the following recommended good practice for referencing a web source. Use the following:

- the author's name or that of the organization that the author represents;
- the title of the piece;
- the address;
- the date on which you last accessed it.

If you cannot tell who wrote or authorized the page, look for a link to a home page, or remove sections of the address from the right, to see if you can find one. Since not all material from the internet is trustworthy, be suspicious about pages that you cannot associate with a named person or organization with credentials.

- *Don't* just provide the web address as the reference. This is the equivalent of referencing a book by saying which shelf it is on the library. (However, if it is indeed the address rather than the information on the page that you are referring to, then it is acceptable to give the web-page address in the main text. ... In your project, such a reference is likely to be the exception rather than the rule, so think twice before taking this course of action.)
- Make sure you give the *full and correct web address* for the material, so that the reader can go straight there. For each web address that you give, try entering the address yourself and see whether it does get you to the right place.
- By way of illustrations of the above observations, it is *not good* practice to write:

(24) There is no single agreed definition of formulaic language
(www.cf.ac.uk/encap/clcr/flarn/formulaiclanguage.html).

Instead, you should find out who wrote the material and name that person (example 25a) and/or his/her affiliation (example 25b) and give the Internet reference list at the end (examples 26a, 26b):

- (25a) There is no single agreed definition of formulaic language (Wray 2005).
- (25b) There is no single agreed definition of formulaic language (Formulaic Language Research Network, Cardiff University, 2005).
- (26a) Wray, A. 2005. What is formulaic language? (www.cf.ac.uk/encap/clcr/flarn/formulaiclanguange.html). [Last accessed 6th January 2006]
- (27b) Formulaic Language Research Network, Cardiff University. 2005. What is formulaic language? (www.cf.ac.uk/encap/clcr/flarn/formulaiclanguange.html). [Last accessed 6th January 2006]

4. Re-submission

If an essay has to be re-submitted, students are required to hand in the original version together with the revision.

5. Plagiarism

This is how the *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers* defines plagiarism:

To use another person's ideas or expressions in your writing without acknowledging the source is to plagiarize. Plagiarism, then, constitutes intellectual theft and often carries severe penalties, ranging from failure in a course to expulsion from school (Gibaldi 26).

In the English Department, students who plagiarise will fail the related course. On a second occurrence, the student will also be referred to the Dean with a recommendation that s/he should be excluded from the department.

There is no excuse for plagiarism. Unintentional plagiarism is still plagiarism--if in doubt, ask your instructor.

5/12/06