Practical Guidelines for Writing a Paper in Linguistics

Revised version, January 2016

This document is meant as a reference guide for writing papers in linguistics at our department. The following guidelines are applicable to all levels of our programmes (i.e. both B.A. and M.A., including final papers such as *Staatsexamen* or M.A. theses), but certain details (e.g. the specific structure of an empirical paper) may depend on the specific topic area at hand and thus vary across courses. Therefore, please talk to your respective instructors about their particular expectations in terms of content, style and form.

The reference guide covers two major aspects:

1. How to write a paper in linguistics

1.1 What are you supposed to do in a term paper?

In general, the successful composition of a term paper demonstrates:

- that you have acquired a certain amount of expertise in a particular subfield of linguistics, so that you know your way around basic concepts, research interests and debates in the field
- that you can collect relevant academic literature on a particular topic in this field in a sophisticated and independent manner
- that you can identify (for your particular topic area) a 'problem' or question worth researching
- that you can read and understand previous research on this question conducted by professional linguists
- that you can write a *coherent* piece of text in which you discuss a manageable selection of this research from a particular *perspective* (i.e. with a certain goal in mind that you pursue systematically and consistently throughout the paper) or – depending on the specific course – that you can provide a small empirical study yourself
- that your writing adheres to certain formal standards of *academic* discourse (lucid and register-adequate English, professional text formatting, conventional ways of citation and referencing, sensible structuring of the paper, and a reader-friendly way of making your goals, analyses and results transparent)

1.2 From a research question to the structure of the paper

It follows from the third point above that you can never cover an entire topic area in your paper; you always need to narrow a potential topic down to a very specific research question, i.e. a particular problem within the topic area that you deal with. Therefore, probably *the* most important conceptual step in the planning of your paper is to distinguish between a **topic area** that you are interested in, and a very specific **goal** that you pursue in your paper. It is one of the most common mistakes to confuse those two things, leading to students writing about a certain topic (area) without having a precise goal in mind. So, always set out to answer a specific question! Prior to writing your paper, you should always consult your instructor for confirming the suitability of your specific topic and goal.

Once you have identified a research question, i.e. a particular problem, hypothesis or general goal, the following points are worth noting:

- Deal with the topic in an **objective** and **reliable** way, adhering to the general principles of academic work. Remember that a term paper is not a personal report; we are neither interested in your intuition nor in a personal narrative or review. Throughout the writing process, take the academic literature you read on your topic as an example of good scientific practice, i.e. as a role model for the general approach, procedure, structure, style, formulations etc.

- Never lose sight of your specific **goal** in the paper. Students sometimes get lost in the literature on the topic or in specific aspects of the topic that are not immediately relevant to their own investigation. Therefore, it is crucial that every part of the paper is immediately **relevant** to your hypothesis, i.e. at any stage of your analysis it is clear to the reader why this paragraph is important for achieving your goal. If you can't justify this, cut it out!

- The **structure** of the paper reflects your particular way of dealing with the topic, specifically your line of argumentation. Therefore, structure your paper in a sensible way, and remember that the internal structure of larger sections reflects how you **weight** the different aspects of your research question.

1.3 Typical structure of a paper

Every scientific paper is framed by an introduction and a conclusion section. The 'main body' in between is then structured according to your own preferences. It is generally *not* advisable to have only one 'mega-section' between the introduction and the conclusion; rather, your argumentation stretches over several sections. Here is an example:

Imagine a term paper (written in a B.A. seminar on second language acquisition) deals with the factors that affect the degree of foreign accent in L2 learners. The following table of contents is adapted from an actual student paper dealing with this topic (don't worry about the terms; it's the outline that is of interest here):

Table of Contents

This outline shows you that the topic is first **contextualized** (§2), i.e. embedded in its theoretical context. It is here that the topic is properly introduced and defined, and that relevant theoretical literature is surveyed. The author then **narrows down** the scope of her paper (§3) to the three factors that she sets out to investigate in particular, i.e. her specific goal in this paper is to argue for the importance of precisely those three factors. After providing some important information on these factors (§3.1-3.3), the author then analyses, discusses and compares selected **empirical evidence** on which her hypothesis is based, namely two case studies dealing with the specific factors she is interested in (§4). [The discussion of empirical research was a required aspect of this paper.] Finally, a conclusion section rounds off the paper, followed by a list of the references from the paper.

On the basis of this example, some common misconceptions can be mentioned:

- On the one hand, it is mandatory that your own discussion be embedded into previous research and proceed from a presentation (and precise definition) of the concepts relevant to your specific goal. That is, never start your discussion of a topic in a 'theoretical vacuum', as if you had never attended a course in this area and never bothered to read the foundational literature on the topic. This may seem self-evident, but papers sometimes read just like that.

- On the other hand, it is a myth that your paper has to be split up *evenly* into a 'theoretical' and an 'analytical' section. The length of the theoretical embedding of the topic depends entirely on the specific goal you pursue in the paper. In other words, don't summarise and discuss unnecessary aspects of the literature in order to 'fill pages'.

- Although we sometimes speak of a 'main body' (as a term that neatly captures everything but the introduction and conclusion of your paper), *never* actually call any section in the paper 'main body'! The substantial part of your paper is rather divided into several sections, each of which receives its own meaningful title, just as in the example above.

1.4 What makes a good 'introduction' and 'conclusion'?

In general, those two 'framing' elements of your paper are just as important as the actual discussion, so do not ever neglect them!

The **introduction** reveals the topic area in which your paper is situated and identifies a specific problem or research question within this area. In other words, this initial part of the introduction leads from the topic area to your specific goal. In this, it answers the question of why you conduct this study, what makes it interesting, etc. Once you have narrowed down your scope like this, you essentially 'foreshadow' how you are going to approach your research question. Specifically, you inform the reader about how the paper is going to be structured, and what you are going to do in the individual sections, i.e. what kinds of steps you are going to take in order to reach your goal, what kinds of data you are going to use, etc. Again, we will give you an authentic example of a student paper here (3rd semester, the seminar was on second language acquisition again):

1. Introduction

The issue of how age influences the acquisition of a non-native language is one of the most controversial and frequently investigated topics in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) (cf. Muñoz 2008a, Singleton 1995, among many others). It is commonly assumed that children are better language learners than adults, in the sense that they learn a second language more effectively and can achieve better ultimate results in that language (cf. Abello-Contesse et al. 2006: 7). Based on these assumptions, many countries have promoted early language instruction in primary schools or even in kindergarten. For example, the European Commission, in its publication *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004-2006* (2003) expresses its intention to encourage the early learning of foreign languages in each of its member states. However, the conception that *the younger the better* is frequently based on research conducted in immersion settings (Muñoz 2006a: vii). In those studies, older and younger learners that have immigrated to the country of the target language (TL) are compared with respect to their second language (L2) proficiency. Such naturalistic contexts, in which learners are exposed to their L2 on a daily basis, are obviously very different from classroom contexts which offer only limited exposure to the TL.

This paper focuses on the effects of learners' initial age on foreign language learning in a minimal input situation in order to examine whether a younger starting age is also beneficial under these conditions. In a first step, it is necessary to briefly review some general assumptions about the issue of age in the field of SLA. Secondly, in chapter 3, basic differences between naturalistic and formal settings will be pointed out in order to demonstrate why starting age does not necessarily have the same effects in both contexts. Based on this examination, I will make predictions about the influence of learners' initial age in formal language settings. Chapter 4 provides a close analysis of two previous studies which both examine possible advantages of a younger starting age in a minimal input situation, but draw

different conclusions concerning this research question. In the subsequent chapter, I am going to seek possible explanations for the different results in order to give an outlook on whether an early start is advantageous or not.

The **conclusion** section typically refers back to the introduction: it takes up your goal again and what your agenda of the term paper was. It then summarises your findings and indicates what you have not been able to discuss. It may also point to potential for future research, i.e. questions that follow from your findings.

1.5 Further remarks

At advanced stages of your studies, you are often required to go beyond discussions of previous research, conducting a small **empirical** study of your own instead. Because of the different scope and approach of such studies, they typically have a somewhat different structure. If this applies to your paper, please consult *Appendix 1* ('Structure of an empirical investigation').

This concludes our survey of general aspects of term papers. For further questions, please consult the individual instructor supervising your paper. In general, it may be very helpful to also ask him or her about the specific **criteria for the evaluation and marking of the paper**, so that you know what to keep an eye on during the writing process.

2. Stylistic, formatting and citation conventions in linguistics

2.1 Stylistic questions

In general, your style of writing the paper is as important as the contents and will be reflected in your mark on the paper. Specifically, your language proficiency will either be marked along with the other aspects of the paper, or error-free and stylistically appropriate production will actually be taken for granted, and any serious flaws may negatively affect the acceptance and mark of an otherwise satisfactory paper. A general recommendation is to have your paper **proofread** by someone else before submission.

With regard to **style**, you should always incorporate and refresh your knowledge from your practical *Academic Writing* classes. Try to aim at the clearest possible way of presenting your study, i.e. keep your words relatively simple ('scientific' does not mean 'particularly complex' or 'rhetorically elaborate'!). Get rid of every line that you can dispense with.

Be absolutely precise and consistent in your use of **terminology**! Every topic area in linguistics comes with some specific terminology; you should define relevant terms when they first occur, and use them consistently throughout the entire paper. It is not 'bad style' at all to use the same scientific words multiple times, so refrain from using synonyms that potentially lead to confusion! (German and English differ with regard to the stylistic acceptability of **synonyms**. As far as terminology is concerned, neither language accepts synonyms. But for 'ordinary' text, German is more restrictive, and it is considered bad style to use the same word multiple times. English is somewhat less restrictive here.)

With regard to more specific language problems (e.g. typical lexical and grammatical **mistakes**), take a look at *Appendix 3* at the very end of this document.

2.2 Layout and typographic conventions

In terms of **layout**, what is expected is that you provide a professionally formatted text: Do not submit sloppy documents. For your running text, a common standard is a document with an 11-12pt font size,

2.5cm margins and a 1.5 space between lines. Enhance readability by **justifying** the flow of the text (**Blocksatz**; this holds for the main text, all footnotes as well as for the list of references at the end)!

Avoid the use of unnecessary emphasis in the form of underlining, bold marking or italics. Note that these have conventional uses:

- You may <u>underline</u> a word, phrase or passage in a direct quote in order to emphasise it, but you have to state that you added the emphasis: (emphasis added, A.G.)
- You may use **bold** markings for highlighting particularly important parts of your examples.
- Use *italics* for book titles (e.g. *Words in the Mind*) and for metalinguistic references, i.e. lexical items, phrases, constructions you discuss as examples: the word *blue*

Some common **notational conventions**:

- phonetic transcription in angle brackets, e.g. *till* [tʰɪl], phonemic transcription in slashes /tɪl/
- morphemes appear in winged brackets: {-ed}
- lexemes or semantic concepts appear in small caps: DOG, GO, BLUE
- ungrammatical sentences are marked with an asterisk: **She it saw.*
- questionable sentences are marked with an initial superscript question mark: *ᵎOne needs only reflect for a second.*
- common abbreviations in the text: *e.g.* (for example), *i.e.* (that is), *viz.* (namely), [sic!] (inserted immediately after a mistake in the original source that is quoted)

Page numbering begins with number 1 on the first page of actual text, i.e. on the page of the introduction (i.e. the table of contents does not count)!

Divide your sections into meaningful **paragraphs**. Each new paragraph (apart from the very first one after a headline) is indented by some spaces, e.g.

We are now aware of the formal properties of verb-first constructions in German.
    It is also interesting, however, to take a closer look at the meaning of such constructions and how they are employed in actual discourse. ...

Paragraphs should not be too different in length; while some aspects of a section need more elaboration than others, you should never open up new paragraphs for one or two sentences only.

2.3 Use of examples

Whenever you need to exemplify a linguistic construction that you talk about, such examples are set off from the text, numbered consecutively, indented and put in *italics*:

Subject-modifying relative clauses typically follow the subject NP directly in English:

(1)   *The man I saw on the street was talking to his neighbour.*

Unlike in example (1), it is actually preferable to identify the source from which your examples are chosen, i.e. it is always better to cite attested or authentic examples rather than sentences that you have made up yourself. This enhances the empirical reliability of your paper. For instance, your example may be taken from a reference grammar (cf. example (5) below, taken from a grammar of the American language Wappo); alternatively, it may be taken from a newspaper or an actual corpus of English, such as the BNC or the ICE-GB, or the *Oxford English Dictionary*. In such cases, you briefly mention the source right after the example and provide the full reference of the corpus in the bibliography (cf. the section on 'online sources' in §2.6 below):

(2)   *I'm going back to Denmark for two weeks.* (ICE-GB: S1A-089 #093:1:B)

(3)   *Take hede lest eny man deceave you.* (1526 TINDALE *Mark* xiii, OED)

If your example is taken from an online source (other than a conventional corpus), you have to provide the full URL and the date of access in brackets.

(4)   *Our letters crossed.*
       (<http://www.utexas.edu/cola/centers/lrc/books/type04.html>, 10/6/2009)

Example sentences from **languages other than English** receive a morpheme-by-morpheme separation, a literal morpheme-by-morpheme translation ('glossing'), and an idiomatic translation. The example also provides the relevant information on the language and where you took the example from:

(5)   Wappo (Wappo-Yukian: California; Thompson and Li 2006: 142)

       He k'ew-i   [ew-ø   mehlah-ukh]   hak'-še?.
       DEM man-NOM   fish-ACC   catch-INF   want-DUR
       'This man wants to catch fish.'

As you can see, the first line names the language, the family it belongs to, where it is spoken, and the source of the example. The second line then spells out the original example (in italics), but separates all morphemes by hyphens.[1] The third line provides a gloss for each morpheme; the grammatical abbreviations need to be explained at the beginning or end of the paper (in a list of glosses); they are typically spelt in SMALL CAPITALS and the spaces between the words line up with the example line above. Finally, a translation into English is provided. Such an elaborate procedure is necessary for sentences, clauses and phrases from other languages. If you refer to **single words** and their inflections from more familiar languages, you can integrate them with the running text, e.g.

The same phenomenon can also be observed in the formation of the future tense in French, as in *demander**ai*** (ask-**1SG.FUT**, 'I will ask').

A note on IPA symbols: If your examples contain special phonetic symbols, there are several ways of inserting them into your paper: (i) If you use a font like Times New Roman, Arial or Gentium Plus, some text processors provide the relevant characters as symbols, e.g. *MS Word*: "Einfügen" > "Symbol" > "Weitere Symbole" > "Subset: Phonetische Erweiterungen" und "Subset Zusätzliche Phonetische Erweiterungen". (ii) You can install a font like "Doulos SIL" that contains all IPA characters and use that font for your paper. (iii) You can use the online IPA keyboard (<http://westonruter.github.io/ipa-chart/keyboard/>), click on the symbol you are looking for and copy-and-paste it into your paper.

2.4 Illustrative material

Sometimes it is necessary to include tables and figures into your paper. If you think they might disturb the flow of the text (because they are too long or elaborate), you can put them into an **appendix** at the end of the paper. More often, however, illustrative material can be placed in the sections where you discuss it.

In those cases, it is important that all tables and figures get their own consecutive numbering (Figure 5, Table 2), and every figure or table also has a headline/title (e.g. Table 1: Interrogative pronouns in English)! If you paste tables or figures from other articles, make sure you cut out the original numbers and labels and integrate the material properly with your own text (i.e. a 'Fig.4' in the original article may be your 'Fig.1', in keeping with your counts). Try to avoid scanning as far as possible: Most tables are easy to reproduce, and graphs should be pasted directly from the online version of an article into your paper.

---

[1] Throughout the paper, make sure you distinguish properly between **hyphens** (-) and **dashes** (–). Some text processors tend to automatically transform hyphens into dashes, but this is inappropriate in many contexts. Think of the German distinction between 'Bindestrich' and 'Gedankenstrich' and the difference might become clearer.

2.5 Text-internal references to previous research

It is a serious 'crime' in academics is to steal other people's ideas, known as **plagiarism**. It is important to know and to state what previous research has found out about the topic, but you have to make it explicit when you are referring to other people's ideas, either by direct quotes or by paraphrasing their main findings or arguments.

Direct quotes

Direct quotes can be integrated directly with your own running text, even within sentences:

Laitinen suggests that "the use of the pronominal forms [...] through time constitutes a change in the typological tendencies in English" (Laitinen 2008: 155).

As this example demonstrates, the original quote is framed by *"..."*, and the quote closes before the reference is given and the sentence is concluded with a full stop. If the quote itself ends with a full stop in the original, you can either adopt the same practice or place the full stop in front of the quotation marks, the reference then standing behind the quote without any punctuation afterwards (i.e. never insert two full stops!). As can also be seen above, if it is necessary to leave out some material of the quote, [...] can instead be inserted into the quote. In general, one should avoid *changing* the wording of quotes, but if this is absolutely necessary, then the substituted material also appears in [...]:

The theoretical context for my paper is a model developed by Croft (2006), which provides a framework for "analyzing language change that integrate[s] functional-typological and variationist sociolinguistic approaches to historical linguistics" (Croft 2006: 34).

Here, the form integrate[s] was adapted to agree with a singular subject (which may have been plural in the original). Sometimes, such changes become necessary because the original authors use an abbreviation that your reader does not know and hence you may wish to spell it out within the quotation, e.g.:

"Salience and [cross-linguistic influence] seem to interact in the acquisition of the English definite article by Finnish speakers" (Jarvis and Pavlenko 2008: 185).

(In this example, the original abbreviation CLI has been replaced by [cross-linguistic influence].)

In general, **be careful in your use of direct quotes**:

- Avoid making your paper an assembly of quotations by using too many of them! You should only fall back on a direct quote if it succinctly makes a point that contributes to your line of argumentation (or presents a counter-position that you intend to challenge).
- Try to avoid 'quotations from third sources', i.e. something like "...." (Croft 2003: 17, cited in Evans and Green 2006: 122). Always quote *from the original source* and list this source in the reference section at the end of the paper. It is bad practice to copy quotations made in textbooks, rather than quoting an author's opinion directly. This entails, however, that you also consult the original source, i.e. that you check at least whether the original quotation fits the argumentative context in which you want to use it.
- If you happen to quote from the exact same publication (i.e. also the same page) twice and in relative proximity (e.g. interrupted only by a few of your own sentences, and no other source!), you can mark the second quotation with (ibid.) rather than listing author, year and page number again.
- Finally, try to avoid long quotations. As a rule of thumb, if a quote is longer than three lines, set it apart from the text (as an extra paragraph, indented, no need to use quotation marks then):

Declerck describes the temporal schema of the Present Perfect as follows:

[A] present perfect locates a situation in a period of time that starts before t_0 and leads up to it. The situation located in this period can either lie entirely before t_0 and lead up to (and

include) t_0. In the former case the present perfect is said to have an 'indefinite' ('existential') meaning, in the latter it is 'continuative'. (Declerck 1991: 28)

It is thus clear that the Present Perfect differs in its temporal schema from the Simple Past (Preterite).

Indirect quotes

With indirect quotations, you *paraphrase* someone else's claims, opinions or statements, and it is here that discourse markers like *according to X, following X, in keeping with X*, etc. come into play:

According to Croft (2003: 59ff.), word order patterns in the languages of the world are shaped by competing motivations.

Following Lakoff and Johnson (1980), I will argue that the concept of TIME is conceptualised and structured metaphorically in terms of orientation and movement in space.

As Krug (2000: 244-245) notes, the quasi-modals represent an open class, which can admit new members.

In contrast to previous work (e.g. Chomsky 1969), I claim ...

Note the use of ff. in the first example. This is used if you are referring to a concept that is elaborated over a several pages in the original publication. A single f. is sometimes used to abbreviate 'this and the immediately following page'. As an alternative (which is actually used more widely), you can simply spell out the actual stretch of pages, e.g. Croft (2003: 59-69).

It is important to realise that a paraphrase is composed of **your own words**. Indirect quotations do not consist in changing one or two words of the original sentence, or in retaining the original words but putting them in the passive rather than the original active voice. Even if the source is pointed out, such minor reformulations are way too close to the original wording and will be considered as plagiarism. Therefore, try to put the original thoughts into your own words from the beginning: This way, you will not only be on the safe side but also produce more 'authentic' language. (If you begin by replacing individual words and structures in the original, you will often end up with odd collocations, stylistic and sometimes even grammatical mistakes.)

Other references

Sometimes references to other sources are necessary to provide **support for your own claims**. In other words, whenever you make certain claims or statements in your paper that you cannot reasonably be argued to have come up with yourself, insert a reference to an authoritative source that the reader can turn to in order to verify your statement. This is done far too infrequently in term papers, but it is good academic practice. In such situations, the reference is typically introduced by cf. (Lat. *conferre*, 'compare', German *siehe*)). We saw one example of this earlier, and we shall repeat it here:

The issue of how age influences the acquisition of a non-native language is one of the most controversial and frequently investigated topics in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) (cf. Muñoz 2008a, Singleton 1995, among many others).

Avoid footnotes. All references within the text are made explicit in the text itself (author's name year: page). This may differ from the use of footnotes in literary studies, so be sure to follow the linguistic conventions. Therefore, use footnotes only for the following:

- additional information that is useful to know but would disturb the smooth flow of the main text (e.g. additional references to secondary sources, contrary positions in the literature)
- further explications that enable a better understanding of terminology, quotations and minor aspects of the topic
- cross-references to statements of your own text (e.g. cf. §1.2 above).

2.6 Reference section

All references made in the text, i.e. all works cited or referred to in the text, are listed in alphabetical order at the end of the paper. This section is entitled **References**. It is mandatory that all works that appear in the references are mentioned somewhere in your paper, and, conversely, that all references in the text are listed in the reference section. This may seem self-evident, but it is actually a common source of mistakes.

The entries in the reference section are listed **alphabetically**. If an entry stretches over more than one line, all lines but the first one are **indented** (by, e.g., 0.5cm). In linguistics, it is *not* common to distinguish between primary and secondary sources, although primary data sources like corpora and dictionaries may be set off from the other references and be grouped into a coherent category (e.g. 'Data sources' as opposed to 'References').

In order to grasp which 'rules' of typography apply in the reference section, it is necessary to understand, first of all, that there are different types of publication, each of which requires a certain amount of information to be specified for the reader. Here are the most common types of publication you will encounter, along with the respective information needed and the conventional way of citation in linguistics.

Monographs	A monograph is a book written by one or more people.

(Some students think that books are called monographs because they were written by a single author ('mono'), but that is not what the name stands for. The decisive criterion is that the author or authors are responsible for the contents of the entire book, rather than just for an essay within the book.)

For a monograph, it is essential to know: the name(s) of the author(s), the year of publication (typically in brackets), the title of the book, the particular edition (if a particular book was 'updated' and republished as a 2nd, 3rd or 4th edition), the place where it was published, and the publishing company. Note that even if you quote only from particular pages of the book in your paper, the entry for the book in the bibliography *never* contains those pages, i.e. you always quote the entire book. As for the form, the title of a monograph is always put in *italics*, and it is common (though not obligatory) to capitalize each content word of the title.
In sum, entries for monographs look like this:

Aitchison, Jean (1999). *Linguistics.* 5th ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2005). *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sometimes monographs as well as collections of essays (cf. below) appear in a particular book **series**. You can mention this series as an additional piece of information on the title; it would then be inserted right before the place of publication, e.g.

Bybee, Joan (1985). *Morphology. Typological Studies in Language 9.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

(In this case, we are dealing with a monograph, entitled *Morphology*, which appeared in the book series *Typological Studies in Language* published by John Benjamins Co.; it is the 9th book of the series.)

A paper in a collection of essays	Scientists do not just write entire books. They also write shorter contributions (called articles, essays or simply papers), and they typically publish those works in one of two ways: either the work appears in a journal ('Fachzeitschrift', cf. below) or in a book that collects multiple papers on a specific topic. Such books are called collective volumes ('Sammelbände') and they have editors rather than authors, i.e. someone who is responsible for collecting and 'editing' the articles in the form of a book. If, in your own paper, you refer to a specific article from such a volume, then the necessary information for the bibliography is (in this order): the name(s) of the author(s) of the article, the year of publication, the title of the article, the title of the collective volume (in italics), the name(s) of the editor(s) of the book, the place of publication, the publishing company, and, finally, the specific pages of the article within the book. Here's a typical example:

Biber, Douglas, Jack Grieve and Gina Iberri-Shea. 2009. "Noun phrase modification." In: *One Language, Two Grammars? Differences between British and American English.* Eds. Günther Rohdenburg and Julia Schlüter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 182-193.

Some common stylistic questions: The title of the article can but need not be put in inverted commas; whichever way you choose, be consistent throughout the bibliography. This also applies to the capitalization of all content words in the title of the essay. As mentioned above, collective volumes, too, may appear in a book series, and again you may (but need not) mention the name of the series (in the same style as outlined for monographs above). One editor is always abbreviated by ed., while multiple editors are abbreviated by eds.

Sometimes you may refer to the entire volume rather than to a specific article that appeared in it, e.g. if you want to provide an example of a book that deals with a specific topic. Then the bibliographical entry looks like this (compare it to the one above):

Rohdenburg, Günther and Julia Schlüter (eds.) (2009). *One Language, Two Grammars? Differences between British and American English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

A final comment: A specific type of collective volume is represented by **encyclopaedias or handbooks** which contain short reference articles on specific topics. Such works are highly recommended for gaining overviews of particular topic areas; their contents thus typically differ from the more specific research articles found in collective volumes. In terms of quotation and style, however, such publications are treated just like collective volumes, i.e. you need to identify the particular author of the encyclopaedia or handbook entry, the editors of the entire book etc. Here's an example:

Ehlich, Konrad (2000). "Deixis." In: *Metzler Lexikon Sprache.* 2nd ed. Ed. Helmut Glück. Stuttgart, Weimar: Metzler. 138-139.

A journal article	Articles that appear in journals work similarly, but this time there is no editor (since the journal is not a unique book and no-one is uniquely responsible for any specific edition). You need to mention (in this order): the name(s) of the author(s), the year of publication, the title of the article, the title of the journal, the volume (i.e. specific issue of the journal, 'Jahrgang') and the page numbers of the article within this issue.

Dahl, Östen (1979). "Typology of sentence negation." *Linguistics* 17: 79-106.

The title of the journal appears in *italics* (just like a book title), the issue number does not; there is a colon right behind the issue number.

An online source	This is a somewhat more difficult issue since many scenarios are possible.

If an author has put an article on his private website (and the article has not been published 'properly' yet), you can list this paper as an ordinary article (i.e. by providing the name(s) of the author(s), the year in which the article was written, the title of the paper, the information that it is a yet **unpublished manuscript** (rather than a proper publication), and the URL at which it is located. Finally, you provide the date of your access to the URL:

Bickel, Balthasar (2008). "A general method for the statistical evaluation of typological distributions." Ms., University of Leipzig. Available online at <http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~bickel/research/projects/publ.html>. 23 March 2009.

As you can see, the most common practice is to use Ms. for manuscript and to also provide some information as to where the manuscript was written. You then add that the paper is available online and you typically put the actual URL in <...>. The same quotation procedure also applies to **doctoral dissertations** that have not been published in printed format, but which may be available to you online:

De Beule, Joachim (2007). "Compositionality, Hierarchy and Recursion in Language: A Case Study in Fluid Construction Grammar." Ph.D. dissertation, Vrije Universiteit Brussel. Available online at <http://arti.vub.ac.be/~joachim/#Publications>. 2 April 2010.

If, by contrast, you cite an **entire online source** for which no particular author can be identified, you need to start the entry in the bibliography directly with the title of the online publication,

e.g.

Oxford English Dictionary. Available online at <www.oed.com>. 7 February 2010.

Some minor aspects:

- The respective **first names** of authors are usually spelt out in full in the reference section. You may, however, also abbreviate them (e.g. Huddleston, R. and G.K. Pullum (2005) ...), but then you have to do so consistently, i.e. throughout the bibliography.

- If a work is **co-authored** or **co-edited** by more than two authors, you are allowed to shorten its reference in the text (**not** in the bibliography) by using *et al.*:

    (Quirk et al. 1985: 378)

- If you need to make reference to two works of the same author that were published in the exact same year, you differentiate them by small letters after the year of publication:

    (cf. Haspelmath 2005a), Nichols 1986b.

    Note, however, that if such symbols are used in the sources that you quote from, but you do not have multiple references to the same author, the symbols become superfluous for your own paper!

- Some books are so successful that they are continually **reprinted** (while the content remains unchanged), and others are **revised** (rewritten, updated, etc.) into a **new edition**. Crucially, only the latter process is reflected in the bibliography, i.e. if you use the second or third edition of a particular book, you need to indicate this (cf. the entry on Aitchison 1999 above). For reprints, by contrast, you stick to the original year of publication and do NOT indicate the year of the reprint. For example, the very famous *Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* by Quirk et al. was published only once, viz. in 1985, and so it is always cited as 1985. The particular reprint of the grammar that you may find in the library (e.g. 1989, 1992, etc.) is not important here.

Generally, there is, of course, some room for minor variations in these citation forms. What is important, however, is that you are **consistent** in your own way of citing all references.

2.7 Declaration of academic integrity

Wie in der Institutsratssitzung vom 19.01.2005 beschlossen wurde, ist allen schriftlichen Arbeiten der Studierenden folgender vom Fakultätsrat vorgeschlagener Passus beizufügen:

Hiermit erkläre ich, dass ich die vorliegende Arbeit selbst angefertigt und alle von mir benutzten Hilfsmittel und Quellen angegeben habe; alle wörtlichen Zitate und Entlehnungen aus fremden Arbeiten sind als solche gekennzeichnet.

[Unterschrift der/des Studierenden]

This declaration is attached to your term paper as the very last page.

Appendix 1: The structure of an empirical investigation

At advanced stages of your studies, typically in the M.A. programme and in final theses, you are often required to go beyond discussions of previous research. Instead, depending on the seminar or topic, you may be asked to conduct your own empirical study. This may be done on the basis of corpora, questionnaires, language samples etc. Since such papers are invariably more complex and include specific analytical techniques (such as the presentation of data, statistical analysis etc.), their structure is typically somewhat more elaborate than what we saw earlier. The basic structure (introduction – several main sections – conclusion – references) remains the same, but you need to also include the following '**building blocks**':

Contextual embedding (typically briefly in the introduction and one or two following sections)
1. Background and preview
    Why are you conducting this study? What makes it interesting? Short statement of purpose and research question.
2. Linguistic phenomenon
    Describe the linguistic phenomenon you investigate (e.g. relative clauses, resultative construction): define the category, describe its features (e.g. inflectional variation, word order variation), provide examples.
3. Literature review
    If there are previous studies, summarize the main findings and say what you intend to do in your study based on previous work (e.g. look at a particular phenomenon that has not been investigated thus far; challenge a previous hypothesis; replicate a previous study to see if the results of that study carry over to other data; etc.). If there are no previous studies, make that clear: "This is the first study to investigate ...."
4. Preview / explicit hypothesis
    State your hypothesis (or hypotheses) and if necessary explain it/them in more detail. This may include a preview of your most important results.

Methods
1. Subjects, corpus, and materials
    Describe the data you investigate. If you conduct an experimental or questionnaire study, characterize your subjects and describe the materials you have used. If you conduct a corpus study, characterize the corpus (e.g. size, kind). You may want to include summary tables of your data, but don't present the results of your analysis at this stage.
2. Procedure
    Describe the way you have collected the data. How did you conduct the experiment? How did you search for particular constructions in the corpus?
3. Coding
    Describe how you have categorized the data. Give an overview of all categories and state how you assigned a particular response (in an experimental study) or a particular instance (in a corpus study) to a particular category.

Results
1. Descriptive summary of results
    (i) In the social sciences (e.g. psychology, sociology) you first present your results and then discuss them. In linguistics, the results and the discussion are often combined in one section, but if you find it appropriate you can separate them.
    (ii) Present tables and figures to summarize your findings, but don't present your findings twice, i.e. first in a table and then in a figure.
    (iii) Preparing tables and figures can be difficult. Don't give long tables including hundreds of numbers; nobody has the time to look at them. The tables and figures in the text serve to provide easy access to your most important findings. The appendix may include a more detailed summary of your results presented in more comprehensive tables.
    (iv) You need to discuss the results presented in tables and figures! The figures/tables alone are not sufficient. Say what the descriptive statistics suggest.

2. Inferential statistics

Once you have described your data, submit them to statistical analysis. Say what type of test you have used and present the relevant measures (e.g. p-value, F-value, degrees of freedom, effect size, confidence intervals). If it is not obvious why you used a particular test, explain your decision, but don't describe obvious choices (e.g. I have used a chi-square test because the data are frequency data). Say also what the statistical analysis suggests, i.e. how the results should be interpreted.

Discussion (typically, there is a separate discussion section, and some of the points below can also be incorporated into the conclusion section)

1. Provide a short summary of your results
2. Theoretical implications: If possible consider your paper from a broader theoretical perspective and mention implications of your study for related questions.
3. Future direction of research: Mention open questions: What should be done in the next step? Ideas for an experiment. Etc.

Appendix

If the data are too comprehensive to be included in the text, include them in the appendix. If the data are very comprehensive, you might only present parts of your data in the appendix.

References

List all articles and books you have cited (see below).

Appendix 2: How to find and read academic literature

Classes on research techniques are offered in the form of the B.A. ***Schlüsselqualifikation***: *Recherche und Dokumentation*, and B.A. seminars in linguistics typically incorporate some information on specific online databases for your research. In general, a highly recommended online resource is the ***Bibliography of Linguistic Literature*** (just google the term once you are logged in with your university computer ID).

Note that the mark of your term paper will always reflect or evaluate the **depth and breadth of your literature research**, i.e. whether or not you manage to tap variegated sources of literature, consult different types of publications (i.e. specific articles rather than just the most general textbooks that you happened to have found on a library shelf), and how many works you actually consulted (it is simply not sufficient to hand in a term paper with two or three references).

As for the efficient **reading** of academic literature, make use of the different techniques you acquired in your practical *Reading* classes. There is no 'gold standard' here since the whole point of consulting the literature is not to write a summary of reviews. Rather, you have to read and discuss the relevant literature in pursuit of your goal. Some helpful questions during the reading process may be the following:

✓ *What does the text deal with exactly?*
✓ *What's the specific perspective from which the topic is considered?*
✓ *What's the author's method of tackling the question?*
✓ *What's the structure of the text? How does it reflect the author's line of argumentation?*
✓ *What are the central hypotheses and findings?*
✓ *Do these findings point to further research? Are there any open questions?*

As was mentioned earlier, try to see every article you consider as a **role model** for your own paper. Note recurrent terms and phrases that the authors use (cf. also 'collocations' in Appendix 3 below), and incorporate them into your own writing. Get a feel for good introductions and conclusions, and appreciate the way in which specific research questions are developed and tackled by means of empirical methods.

Appendix 3: Recurrent practical language mistakes in term papers

Collocational and other logical lexical-choice mistakes

- lack of awareness of the precise meaning and use of certain discourse markers (*due to, according to*), and the misuse of logical connectors such as *therefore, consequently, thus*, etc. (in contexts where no logical connection or conclusion is actually given or possible)
- prepositional mistakes (*decide on, independent of*)
- difference between *by/in contrast* and *on the contrary* (look them up again, they're not the same!)
- underuse of the correct cleft constructions for emphasis: *It is only when/not until X that Y...*
- mass-count noun distinction (e.g. the use of *research* as a count noun should be avoided, don't use *'researches'* in the sense of 'studies' or **a research by X*; also make sure you choose the appropriate quantifying determiners (e.g. *less time* but *fewer studies, much research* but *many arguments*))
- use of *what* (instead of *which*) as a relative pronoun in sentential relative clauses (e.g. **Indian English has been influenced by Hindi, what explains a number of its phonological properties.*)
- wrong use of *own* (e.g. **In this section, I will present an own investigation.*)
- confusion of *obvious* and *apparent* (something may be apparent from a table, but not necessarily obvious)
- specific lexical combinations that do not make sense: *'this may answer the reason why X', 'the phenomenon means that X', 'plays an important factor', 'the findings claim', 'the point is about X', 'to show a reason'.* None of these combinations exists, but all of them were found recurrently in term papers! Therefore, think carefully about what you intend to say, and check whether the combination would make sense in German (the mistake is actually not so much collocational but logical in nature, i.e. you cannot 'show a reason', neither in English nor in German; likewise, something cannot 'play a factor', etc.)

Use of tense-aspect-mood
This is a notoriously difficult area of English grammar, particularly for German learners of English, even if they are very advanced. Here are some common trouble sources:

- misuse of past tense where either present perfect or past perfect would have been required
- inconsistent use of tenses, particularly in the flow of text and in reported speech (no feeling for required tense shifts, underuse of the past perfect in reports on experiments)
- past tense of some modal expressions (*die Teilnehmer sollten* = 'they should', *could* used as widely as German *konnten*)

Here, your course on *Grammar I* provides the best remedy: When unsure, go back to the Gr1-reader.

Word order
- German-induced patterns of word order (time before place and related things, pre- instead of postmodification, e.g, participles (**a point which is in most studies excluded* > *a point which is excluded in most studies*), and quite a few other patterns that should strike you as really German)

Comma punctuation
- Commas before nominal/complement clauses are used in German (*Ich denke, dass...*), but not in English (*I think that...*)!
- Please note the semantic difference between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses: The latter (in contrast to the former) are normally set off by commas!

Precise use of terminology and the correct scientific concepts
- Make sure you know the differences between *theory, model, hypothesis, prediction, cause, effect* etc. and use those terms precisely!