Writing in the Disciplines

Sociology Interview: Prof. Linda Deutschmann

The discussion group of third-year English students is joined by Dr. Will Garrett-Petts (host) and Dr. Linda Deutschmann (Professor of Sociology).

Dr. W. F. Garrett-Petts: This seems a good moment to welcome you to the second in our series of interviews on "Writing in the Disciplines". I'm joined today by Dr. Linda Deutschmann, a sociologist at UCC (Thompson Rivers University). Welcome Linda. Perhaps the first thing we should do is get to know you a little bit, in terms of your own background. What drew you to the field of sociology? Were you drawn? Or did you just find yourself working in the field by accident like many of us?

Prof. Linda Deutschmann: Well, when I first was introduced to sociology it was just one of the courses we had to take. There was a certain distribution of undergraduate courses, it was there, and I didn't know what sociology was. But I had a very good experience. My first year was really easy. I had the advantage of having experienced many cultures before: as a I moved around, so I'd had some first-hand experience to bring to the study of cultures. They say a fish is the last one to discover water, that you don't realize how much in your life (your views and attitudes) has to do with the culture that you were raised in. But if you have experienced different cultures, then fields like sociology and anthropology will come a lot more easily to you. Things won't be such a shock.

Garrett-Petts: Is that an essential part of sociology then? Is sociology about finding different vantage points to reveal the ordinary or reveal what should be obvious?

Deutschmann: That can be part of it. Just being aware of the way in which society impacts us. Now some people at the end of first year think that all sociologists talk about is how society makes us what we are, and that we see human beings as programmed robots. In fact, good sociologists do bring in psychology, and so on, as part of what makes people human. But we're really interested mainly in people… I guess the easiest way to get into this is a bit of an oversimplification, but we're interested in people at that point where you start playing roles. The role of a student, the role of an instructor, the role of the head of a

college, or whatever. We're not so much interested in your personality as such. We may say, well, what difference does it make to choosing a role? If you're going to choose to be a sociologist, you're probably a certain kind of person. You probably like libraries. You probably like, and find interesting, people. These are things that you really need to have if you want to choose this profession. So, your personality is part of it, but the role is there, and you have to adapt to the role.

Garrett-Petts: So, it's your roles, it's the groups, the social groups that you belong to?

Deutschmann: The role is your connection to all those social groups. Like when you play the role of daughter or son or significant other – that's what links you to a particular grouping of people. You may play many roles, and you're integrated with many groupings of people, some of which are as small as just a friendship group, some of which may be big like a college or some other educational institution.

Garrett-Petts: So when you first started studying sociology, then, you found you were good at it...

Deutschmann: That helps!

Garrett-Petts: You had that sense of distance from the society where you were studying and that gave you greater insight. This is a series called *Writing in the Disciplines*: how do you write yourself into a discipline like sociology? What kind of writing did you do when you first came in contact with sociology, and what did you learn about writing as a student early on?

Deutschmann: One of my first discoveries about writing as a sociologist was actually in a political science course--when I had to do a paper, it was called, *Is the Supremacy of Parliament Compatible with Constitutional Principles?* This is the kind of subject you get stuck with in political science. See why I chose sociology? [Laughter] Anyway, I wrote this paper and basically, in reading about English parliamentary history and so on, I discovered this interesting contrast between England and Germany. I ended up looking at the fact that in Germany there'd been no tradition of democracy, no parliamentary institutions--and

that's mainly why when they tried to bring in these institutions, they didn't work very well. My argument was that the people were not ready. They didn't have the values, they didn't have the norms, they didn't have the way of life that went with these new, imported institutions that were sort of grafted onto the top of their society. So I wrote this paper, and I really thought it was a great paper, and I get it back and I get a C-: the comment reads, "too sociological." [Laughter] Oh, maybe I'm a sociologist, I think. Right. I bet the instructor, who was a brilliant man, had no criticisms to make of the analysis that I had made. It was second year paper. He had no criticisms that were substantive; he just didn't like the variables that I had chosen to discuss-- things like norms, and values, and culture, and that sort of thing. He just didn't think that was the important stuff. So that's one of the big differences between fields: what you think is important.

Garrett-Petts: We're really talking about topics, and about approaches to those topics. How do you know when you got a good topic--that is, when you're writing a sociology paper? How do you know you've got a winner, one that's worth putting all that effort into?

Deutschmann: There's a whole lot of things that go into that. Part of it is just a matter of personal satisfaction. In choosing my thesis topic, I was sitting in classes that were on race and ethnicity, for example; and the instructor was a French-Canadian from the West (an interesting combination there) and everybody else in the class was from some defined nationality: they were German, they were Ukrainian, or they were from somewhere. And (in spite of my last name) I am a WASP (white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant). And I sat there listening to all of these people saying that the white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestants have caused devastation in their lives-- that WASPs were responsible for all of their identity problems, and you get a little tired of that after a while. Surely this isn't the whole story, I asked myself: your identity as a German Canadian isn't really framed by what my ancestors did to you, right? That may be part of it, but that's not the whole story. So, I became increasingly dissatisfied. All of a sudden I thought, why hasn't anybody ever looked at the white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestants? So I went to the library, and I tried to find "a book," even one book on white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestants. I did find one American book – it's only about half the size of this one [She holds up a copy of the Sociology text] that covered all of the Nordic groups, including the English and the Scots and the French and the Germans and the Norwegians, and so on. And there was nothing, nothing there at all about who these people are (the WASPS) who are supposedly causing all these problems. So, there was my thesis research.

Garrett-Petts: One of the things that we've been talking about in our English 303 is the degree of personal investment that one is allowed within the various disciplines. Sometimes that shows itself in using the first-person pronoun: I or we. Very often that is prohibited, we're not allowed to do that. It sounds to me like your own research interests, even if they're not going to be expressed in a personal manner, come out of personal experience and a personal enthusiasm.

Deutschmann: Certainly. If you look at practically every biography or autobiography of somebody in sociology, and you look at what they chose as their topics, you find that the topic holds biographical significance. People like Howard Becker, for example, writing papers on marijuana users and jazz musicians. He hardly could make up his mind whether he wanted to be a jazz musician or a sociologist.

Garrett-Petts: Or a marijuana user? [Laughter]

Deutschmann: Well, he doesn't say that. Laud Humphries, who is famous for some of his writing about homosexuals using public washrooms for their meeting places – years after he did his study, it came out that he, himself, was homosexual. Obviously, your interests, to some extent, are going to be wrapped up in your work. It can influence the way you do your work. You have to be self-aware as a researcher. I think we're becoming more conscious that you have to be aware of such influences when you choose to discuss, and the way you discuss it.

Student: So then do you suggest that the first-year student find a subject that interests them? Do you give them a lot of leeway? You don't give them a set thesis that they have to answer?

Deutschmann: We (Sociology professors) differ in that. I co-taught with someone who used to give the students a list. I tend to say to students, 'What is it you want to do?' If you want to become a teacher, if that's what you're thinking about doing, then find something in that area because you'll work harder, you'll be more interested, and the product will probably have more meaning to everybody than if you don't. The only thing I watch out for is

sometimes students are caught up in causes: abortion, euthanasia. Those papers on such topics often tend to be very badly done because it takes a long time to overcome your pre-programming, and to actually use the tools of what you're learning in sociology or political science or history or whatever field you are studying. If you're so wrapped up that you have preconceived opinions and you want to convert your instructor, and convert the world and prove that you're on the side of right and good, it's probably not going to be a very good paper because you're just not able to attend to the new stuff that you should be bringing in. So, I do tell people, if you're really wrapped up in something, like if you're going through a divorce, this is the wrong time to do a paper on divorce – at least for most people.

Garrett-Petts: It goes back I suppose to what you said right at the outset, about being from "outside the group" or "outside the society" to be able to see your topic when you're in the midst of what you want to investigate: you don't have the kind of objectivity necessary to do a good job.

Deutschmann: It may be very difficult. I'm not saying that you can't gain enough distance, and I think a person who has been through a divorce is probably in a better position to write about divorce but maybe two years afterwards, when you're able to gain that little bit of distance, and you're able to analyze, and you're able to realize that your experience isn't the whole thing. Your experience is one example, but there may be unique features in your particular experience. If you want to do a study on divorce, you have to recognize that other people may have had different experiences.

Student: On the other hand, you want to see some personal commitment within the work itself from the student. What would you be looking for when grading a paper, that the student is committed to the topic at least?

Garrett-Petts: What are the signals? What are the signposts that you've got somebody who has got that enthusiasm for the subject, someone who is committed to it?

Deutschmann: Well, for one thing, seriously looking at what has been done before. You have to be prepared when you go in to do any kind of study. Preparation is often the name of the game. One of the things... I no longer ask my students to do just 'a paper.' I have it

broken down into smaller units to make sure that they get all these individual things. And I think this is happening elsewhere in the college too. If you're taking Geography, you won't have one essay to do; you'll have several different parts to work on. The first thing I do is I make people go to the library and learn how to use socio-file, learn how to use the Humanities and Social Sciences Index. By breaking the writing into parts, that that's all they have to do for that assignment, I make sure that nobody decides that's not really an important part of the essay, a part that can be skipped, and that they'll concentrate on some other feature.

Garrett-Petts: This is at first year?

Deutschmann: All years. I'm doing it in my third-year courses too, because a lot of people out there will say, "Oh, I did this in one of my other classes." But a large number of them were still struggling and they'll hand in the assignment, and they'll say there was a line up for socio-files, so they didn't get this part of the assignment done. Well, that indicates to me something about commitment: yes, I know the library can be frustrating, that's life. Just because there's a line-up doesn't mean you're excused from doing the assignment. A student who cares will ask the librarian whether there are times of the day when the socio-file is not backed up. That student will come in at that time, re-organize their life so that they can do it. That shows that you care that you're going to do the thing properly. So that's one of the signs I look for. Think about what it is you want to do with your paper, where you want to go, and you may want to come and see your instructor to talk about it, especially if you are feeling lost. We find we have a great variety of students here, and I don't want to be sitting down boring students who already know and understand something; I don't want to repeat it for them. You can't assume that just because your professor doesn't talk about something that it isn't important. So, if you're feeling a little lost, contact your professor. There are various ways of contacting people. I know not all of us are in our offices all day. I am, of course. [Laughter] But you can leave notes in their boxes and ask questions– "Could you raise this in class please, sir?" –to get that information, that feedback that you need.

Garrett-Petts: I think that it is difficult to get that message across as strongly as some of us might want to. Like you, I've taught in other places, and in many other places, particularly in the University of Alberta, my students would not come and see me during office hours. I asked it in class about a month and a half into teaching, and they thought it was for graduate students. Some students only come and see me if there is an incredible problem. That's not the message that you're giving, is it? You're saying, "come for

clarification."

Deutschmann: Reasons for talking outside of class may be quite individual. Some of you will have had very good high school training: you actually know a subject from an object, and those little details in sentences. I have third-year students who don't. So some students need a lot more guidance, and asking for help is also one way of showing that you care. Strategically too, if you're following the instructor's suggestions for your paper, to some extent the instructor has to share the responsibility for the result. Strategically, this can help you. If your essay writing goes off the track, the instructor says, "Oh, Lord, I should have told her…" or whatever, and they're not going to take marks off for something that may be partially their fault. If you follow the instructions that you've been given and the essay doesn't come out quite right, then it is a matter of shared responsibility.

Garrett-Petts: A moment ago you went from talking about the research process to talking about subjects and verbs and objects. How important is the actual writing of a paper, the quality of writing, for a sociologist like you, or for sociologists generally? I'll step back for a second and I'll give you the stereotype: Here's what my students sometimes tell me. "Yes, writing is important in English classes; yes, we'll spend 10, 15 maybe 40 hours for a term paper in English. But in sociology, in psychology, they don't care about the writing; it's not important to them." That's the stereotype.

Deutschmann: Well sociologists do care. I can tell you one experience. I'm co-writing a paper in sociology. It's on co-evolutionary theory of crime. I don't really understand evolutionary theory that well – my colleague is the one who does that. I do the "crime part" really well. [Laughter] But she wrote up the paper, and she's one of these people who is extremely brilliant, her ideas run way ahead of her ability to get them down on paper. She recently sent it in… now it's a brilliant paper, but it's incomprehensible. Basically, this is exactly what came back as feedback from the journal editors: that this is an unreadable paper; forget it. You've missed your chance, because the paper has been read by other people (some of whom may be doing the same kind of work) and you bet they're going to get those ideas into their papers, and they're going to get those ideas published before we will.

Student: What I'm just curious about, do you have some sort of workshopping where you would get a group of students together and say, "ok you might have a similar area or similar topic. Maybe you guys should give one another feedback." I'm in history, and that sort of thing never happens there. You've got this topic of your own and you go out there and write about it. Sometimes when I get the chance, I'll talk to somebody who is in that class and say, "what's going on? Maybe we should give a little feedback to one another." I find that helpful. I wonder why we always have to do it outside of class, and why it isn't more commonplace...I guess part of the problem is you only have a certain amount of time to get your ideas across and so many weeks, that some professors don't feel they can spare the time?

Deutschmann: You'll find some of your instructors are playing around with trying to do group projects, projects which get this feedback loop going. But it's very difficult in terms of teaching strategy because there's almost always one or two people who do most of the work, and one or two people who don't show up and don't do what they're supposed to do. It just complicates the whole issue. So, a lot of us sort of experiment with these things and then draw back, that is, if we have to submit an individual mark for you, it really should reflect your work. You will find some people who are trying to do things like that, and I often try to do things somewhat like that in my seminar groups. I have a two-hour lecture and a one-hour seminar for each group, and sometimes we engage in feedback sessions. But to some extent what you need to do as a student is work in your seminar group. I assume you have these in history? Let your instructor know that you'd like some time to do that, that you would like to discuss those issues.

Student: Yeah, sometimes we only get to do that at the very last minute. But I'm not really talking about a group project, just discussing what is going on in the writing of a paper. Perhaps somebody else can tell you, "Well, I've got some information on that, or I'm doing a similar topic, and we seem to have some overlapping ideas so maybe we should discuss them." I'm wondering if that collaborative writing process is gaining more acceptance.

Garrett-Petts: You're really talking about writing as being a more collaborative experience, rather than the individual researcher working on an individual topic alone? The romantic idea of the writer in the garret?

Student: For instance, in English we have our own separate topics, and we might all have our own story to work on. Then we get together and read each other's work. Sometimes people can notice the mistakes, the grammatical mistakes. Sometimes they can offer positive feedback. I guess maybe we're just not used to writing to an audience. You know, in high school you've got one audience and it's your teacher. In university, it's still the same case, but you're writing even more. You're more geared to writing to a set audience.

Deutschmann: This is important in writing. There's various ways of getting at that, some of which are more efficient than others. Certainly, students, if you're all reading each other's story, and then giving/receiving feedback, and then you re-write your story according to the feedback – yes, I can see there are ways of doing that. I think most of us have something like that in our course somewhere. In my deviance class, they do a class presentation, and the class reacts to the presentation. A week later, they're supposed to hand in a paper based on the presentation. So, they do get some feedback on what they've done. But you were asking about the connection between – and I think this is related to what you were saying – the connection between writing skills and sociology. The bottom line is communication. If you can't communicate effectively, responsibly and in terms of the norms of the particular field, you're not going to be respected. You're not going be listened to.

Garrett-Petts: I'm going to take you through some examples of published writing in sociology, and I wonder if you could react to them? I think you've got a handout there. Here's my observations – as someone who teaches writing at UCC (TRU). I went through five articles that happen to be in our textbook, five articles that happen to be written by sociologists, or at least purported to have been written by sociologists, and here's some of the features of writing in sociology that I found. Number one: heavy nominalization; compound nouns being used a fair amount. I'll give you some examples. "Predominant behavior systems. Go responses. Other-directed person. Age and class-graded group." That's the kind of language that comes out of the social sciences rather than out of the humanities, where we might put a line through that and say, "Can you explain what you mean in clearer or more concise terms?" Now, this isn't a critique that I'm offering here. I'm asking the question "Why?" Why is that kind of language, the heavy nominalization, nouns linked together, a feature of your field? Or do you see it as being a feature of sociology?

Deutschmann: In some ways. What you're using there are terms. For us, words like "other directed." The whole article, Riceman's early work, was on such things as "other directed". Having read his book on "other directed", he assumes that you then can use that term, and it means all that stuff that's already been written on the subject.

Garrett-Petts: So, it's kind of shorthand?

Deutschmann: It's like when you're in mechanics, you learn the word *carburetor* and it covers that round thing that does whatever [Laughter] – because it's a lot faster to get the information across.

Garrett-Petts: That round thing, though, is difficult to identify?

Deutschmann: Whenever I'm talking to people in English, I suddenly become very conscious, like I'm e-mailing something to one of you people...

Garrett-Petts: It's okay, my relatives say things like, and "does he grade the letters home."

Deutschmann: Certainly, there is a lot of vocabulary. First-year sociology is almost entirely a matter of learning new vocabulary: can you use these words correctly? What you're calling nominalization: it's really that we need to say a lot without having huge books. But when you use a term like a "social class," you usually have to have define it, even in sociology. Because "class" means different things to different people. Class can be a subculture, for example; it can refer to the way you dress, the way you speak – that's subculture. Or it can be used in Marxist terms as a matter of how you make a living. Are you an owner of the means of production, or are you a worker who has to sell your work to somebody who owns that?

Garrett-Petts: It seems to me that what you're doing in the field, or what people within the field are doing is privileging the key terms: they're drawing attention to them in their writing.

Deutschmann: You're always privileging something. You're making a selection as soon as you start to write. As soon as you put down one word, you have excluded all the five hundred other words that you might possibly have used.

Garrett-Petts: So, there's a premium then on the language that you're using...

Deutschmann: I love the computer because once you've written a sentence and you look at it and you think, "no, that's not what I wanted privileged." Then you can change it without having to start another paper.

Garrett-Petts: Let me throw another one at you. This is great, for I don't usually get the opportunity to ask all of these questions of someone in another field. Might language use relate to disciplinary biases as well? I mean, I teach English, and I think a certain kind of writing is good. But again, that’s not really what I’m saying here, I think we need to understand what works well in different fields. What I'm trying to do is note some differences, for example, not very complex sentence structures. A lot of embedding of subordinate clauses...

Deutschmann: You're talking about Talcott Parsons(?)

Garrett-Petts: ...a heavy use of qualification, where a term is introduced and it is usually qualified/contextualized within that sentence, lots of parentheses added for clarification. That's all part of the discourse?

Deutschmann: It can be, yes. As a sociologist, in trying to get the information across, you're more interested in that information than you are in making it an easy read for people. Some sociologists write much more coherently than others do, of course. Talcott Parsons is an absolutely incredibly bad example to follow, though. He was a great speaker. You could understand him when he stood up and he talked to you about politics or anything else – but his written work... he was educated partly in Germany, and he adopted quasi-German sentence structure: the verb at the end and twenty-six lines of words with no commas. It really was almost like doing the double crossticks. You do it as a test of your

ability to sustain attention, and so on, and you had to be cold sober when you hit Talcott Parsons. Now there are other people: I mentioned Howard Becker. I don't think anybody would have any difficulty reading Howard Becker. He's writing about things you can relate to, and it's always fairly well grounded. You can track it back to the reality he's talking about fairly easily. So there really are huge differences.

Garrett-Petts: Let me try one third aspect that I've noticed as a difference between the sort of writing I'd expect to see from my own students in English, and the published writing in sociology: an absence of direct quotation. In English Studies we make a point of quoting the author's original words – and then we comment on or analyze those words. There's much more paraphrasing that seems to go on in sociology. Could you talk to that?

Deutschmann: I think it depends on which sociological literature you are referring to here. There are different literatures within sociology. If you're doing what basically could be summarized as "the quantitative approach," then you're going to get very little direct quotation: these researchers have already turned things into numbers. The reality of direct quotation disappeared several phases back. In my area, which is qualitative research, we use a lot of direct quotes. Half of an article may be direct quotations, often of interviews. I think we do a fair amount of quoting. Like I would quote Talcott Parsons and then put a translation after it if I were trying to explain his ideas to students.

Garrett-Petts: Now are these block quotations that you would set off, or do you work the words into your own sentence structure?

Deutschmann: Both. To some extent this depends on where you're publishing and what the publishers want. There are many different kinds of journals in sociology. I brought some of these things. [Dr. Deutschmann holds up some books] Criminology is partly sociological. You can be a sociologist or a political scientist and do criminology. There's things like the Sociopsychology Quarterly, which is mainly sociology despite the word of psychology in its title. This is the Journal of Canadian Sociology and Anthropology. They all have different formats, and if you're thinking about publishing, you have to think – and I realize that most of you are not ready for this part of the thing...

Garrett-Petts: Do you want your students to publish or to think about publishing?

Deutschmann: My third-year students: I want them to at least know what they have to do. One of the assignments I make them do is read articles in journals, and I ask them to report on two aspects: the way the article is formulated – the organization, like "how long was the introduction?", and you find those little introductions at the beginning. They really tell you whether you're going to be interested in that article or not. There's a real standard format for putting those things together. What information do you put in those little introductions – it's usually ten sentences, no more than that – where you explain what your subject is, what your method was. After reading this introduction, the person looking in that journal can say, "Am I going to read this article or not?" And then you have the body of the paper, which is often organized according to sometimes chronological order, sometimes logical order; and there's usually a methodology section. I ask my students to look at this, and what they find is that it doesn't matter which journals they're reading, there's this standard format. The second part of the assignment asks the students to focus on the article's content. So, I want people to know that there is a format for communicating with others in your field. Different occasions demand different formats. There's a certain format for a lecture. You come in and you really expect your instructor to do certain things and not other things. Then we don't have to discuss this every time we come in. We don't have to work out what our formula is; the agenda is already set, and, once class begins, we can discuss the content.

Garrett-Petts: We really only have a minute left – which is typical, eh? Look the professors have monopolized the time. What haven't we covered? What still needs to be asked about writing in the field of sociology?

Student: Often as first- or second-year students when we don't know what the instructors are expecting as far as writing goes. Sometimes what happens is that, if we're not assertive enough to see you in your office first, we get the paper and "C" grade after rather than before. I'm just wondering if you would consider...how you feel about having previous student "A" papers on reserve in the library for students to have a look at, so they have an idea of what an "A" paper looks like before they write their own papers?

Garrett-Petts: As a model?

Deutschmann: It may be something that we may end up working toward. At the moment the problem is that your papers are really between you and your professor – there's this whole public information issue. I'm not even allowed to post your marks unless I have your permission to do so.

Student: I'm assuming that you would get permission.

Deutschmann: Something like that could be worked out, but you also have to realize that an "A" paper is relative to the instructions that you were given in a particular course. I used to have students in Toronto who would...I was teaching "Crime and Deviance," which was a very popular course... I had over 600 students a year, and there were other universities in the Toronto area. So, there were lots of papers written for similar courses floating around. I would have somebody who handed in a paper, and I would give them a "C" and they would say "but this got an 'A'". In some other professors' course at York University – well, if you were to look at that professor's course structure, that essay that got an "A" in his course might be a much smaller component of what the student did. It might have been a very good essay for something that was only worth ten percent. I can see what you're saying, though, when you ask for models – but at the same time you have to be careful about that...

Garrett-Petts: ...there's not a generic "A" paper?

Deutschmann: There's not just a generic "A" paper. Certainly, there are some differences between "A" papers and "B" papers and "C" papers. The "A" paper has some real ideas in it, is very well researched, and is properly written. If you've got really serious grammatical problems and you're not communicating – you're using the right words, but you're not putting them together properly – you're not going to get an "A." But the content is crucial. I had one student... the first paper I read here after coming to UCC (TRU) started off, "this paper is to grasp the horrific problem of prostitution." You can see that this student really started off badly: while it is nice to tell your reader what the paper is about, this opening is pre-judgmental. Prostitution is a horrific problem if you're living in a community where you've got prostitutes plying their trade on your front lawn. That's a horrific problem. But to

start off your essay that way is just not very professional sounding. It presented a bad combination of grammatical difficulties and a lack of professional distancing. As I remember it, the essay was actually not a badly researched essay--but the way it started meant it was never going to be an "A" paper. After the first sentence, it couldn't be an "A" paper.

Student: Do you have a particular style guide that you recommend to students as well?

Deutschmann: Certainly there are many good books out there and I brought one...

Garrett-Petts: You follow the APA style, do you?

Deutschmann: There is a sociology version, but most of us will accept the APA...it just depends on your instructor. Some instructors do insist on 'the' sociology way of doing it, which is covered in a book such as this one. This is the "Student's Sociology Handbook" which is really quite a good little book. It's from the 1970s, actually, but it does give examples of good writing. It does tell you what kind of periodicals were available at that time. It doesn't mention things like socio-file because that resource didn't exist back then. But it has whole sections on the research paper, where you go to the library and you do research, but there is also the analytical paper, where you look at ideas and you're analyzing connections between ideas and the use of ideas. There's the kind of paper where you're talking about the problems in the field. You get a lot of that kind of thing. The one thing we haven't mentioned that I want to work into the conversation, one thing that we do that you won't find in English, is the crediting of sources. It's just fundamental in sociology. A lot of people think, "I'm going to write this brilliant paper, I am going to have as few sources as possible so the instructor will think I'm brilliant". And the instructor will give you a "C" and you'll say, "but I had all these brilliant ideas". You receive the low grade because you haven't grounded your ideas in prior research; you haven't shown that you are developing your ideas on top of a pile of people who've worked in similar areas – that actually that grounding of ideas... I know that when I published (I did a textbook in deviance) my editor kept coming back and saying, "where's your source here?" So even for somebody who's fairly experienced like I am, this business, this demand that you keep on saying where these ideas came from and who's had similar ideas before and spell out how

your ideas are maybe a little different or combines theirs, is quite different from other kinds of writing.

Garrett-Petts: We started off talking about disciplinary bias and I think you've just demonstrated some there: let me stress that the use of sources and the centering of one's ideas within an on-going critical conversation is central to English Studies as well. I think the more that message gets out and the stronger the both of us say that same kind of thing, probably the less confusion there will be. I learned a lot talking with you today, and I thank you very much. [To the students] And I thank you. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]