I have designed this so that you don't have to write. If you would just take down the email address, I can email everything to you so you don't have to write down a bunch of the stuff that I say, especially the web sites, because they're long and complicated. My name is Scott Lewis, psych science grad student. Had to learn APA, thought it was awesome! So I came to teach APA.
So what is APA? Well, APA stands for American Psychological Association. The fifth edition is now on its way out, and they have a new sixth edition. The sixth edition is this blue-looking manual here. And the majors that will use APA are the social sciences of psychology, sociology, business, economics, nursing, social work, social work, criminology. These are the majors that will use APA style. So if you're going into those majors you'll need to know it; if you're not, these are people that do it.
APA is different than MLA. It's kind of a shame, because everyone comes in knowing MLA, and there are subtle tweaks to the different styles, and so you kind of come in knowing how to do something and then you have to unlearn it. One of the biggest differences is, when you cite something, it's just the last name and the year. I know in MLA you cite page numbers a lot. That's not generally done unless you're quoting in APA, and you generally don't quote in APA. You rarely use the first person in APA. It's usually talking about bodies of works, of studies, and things like that, and you're talking about those authors. You're not talking about what you did or what you think. And the biggest difference is disambiguation. So something that is ambiguous is capable of being understood in two or more possible ways. And when you disambiguate, you establish a single semantic or grammatical interpretation. APA is all about disambiguation. When you write something or say something, it's meant that it is interpreted in that way and that way only. MLA is what I call flowery language; you kind of use analogies and things like that, and so it can be interpreted differently. APA is not like that. When you say something, it has to be taken exactly how you meant it, and if it can be taken another way, then you either have to rewrite that sentence or clarify it. So it's really, really big to disambiguate anything that you say in APA style.
So APA style: what it prefers and how to do it. So the importance of including relevant studies. A lot of students when they’re writing in APA, you know, they feel that they kind of have to cover the whole body of research, even if it's not relevant to what they're talking about. No, no. You only pick out the studies that are relevant to what you want to talk about, and either supports or disconfirming what you're talking about. If something, you know, is just marginally related, there's no need to talk about it.
When you do site studies -- whoa! -- you want to keep procedures and [inaudible] research to a minimum, and you want to describe the main findings; relevant, methodological issues; and conclusions. So this is something -- it's a little tidbit of an article I have. And so they say, "In support of this perception-action integrative model, recent functional neuro-imaging studies revealed shared neural, neuronal substrates for empathy to the pain of others. And you can see that they've cited what: one, two, three, four, five, six studies. So they just kind of say, "Hey, these people found some brain stuff." Here's the six -- and they kind of continue on, saying, "These studies have indicated that watching others in painful situations tap into the neural mechanisms that mediate the affective motivational component of pain processing." And so, you know, they don't go into what the people did, how they did it, all -- you know -- what they used to measure things. You can do that when the studies are really, really relevant. And so you might start something where you say, "Hey, blanket statement: a bunch of these guys found some stuff." And you pick out one to kind of, to be your hallmark. You say, "This was -- " and you kind of talk about their methodology, especially if it's extremely relevant or it's something that you're going to do as well.
This is one of the things that I find a lot in students' writings. The words "proof" and "proves" aren't used in APA. Research does not ever prove a theory. We have evidence that supports a theory or hypothesis. That's one of those things that you kind of have to work out of your vocabulary. It will come to the point that whenever anybody says "proof" or "proves," even outside of academia, this little red flag will go up, and whoa! When you want to say "proof" or "proves," instead say "the evidence suggests" or "provides support for" or "indicates." And so you can easily write -- like, if you're writing out stuff and you kind of slip and use "proof" or "proves," you can easily just kind of throw in "indicates." So you say like, "this study proves this theory" -- oh -- drop "proof," plug in "indicates" and it works perfectly fine. So these are just some real easy phrases or words you can plug right in and kind of just keep moving on and work yourself out of the habit of using "proof" or "proves."
Anthropomorphism: it's also one of the big ones that they've tried to get away from in APA. It's done generally in the English MLA where you anthropomorphize objects and we relate to them and we talk about fluffy things. What is anthropomorphism? It's an interpretation of what is not human or personal in terms of human or personal characteristics. So it's kind of like a blah, big chunk of "what?!" And all it is attributing human characteristics or qualities to animals or inanimate objects. So when we talk -- and we do this all the time. We do it in our language. It's a big part of us. We're wired to kind of do this, and so it's really tough to get away from. One of the easiest things is studies can't "say" anything. So a lot of people like to say, "Oh, well, studies say this." It's like -- and that's like saying, "This paper says that this theory is wrong," or this -- you know, [inaudible] this can't speak. You know, to say is to speak. There's no mouth; it can't say anything. It "suggests" or, you know, "indicates," things like that. It's one of the things that's kind of hard to directly point out. It's one of those things you just practice and you, when you're reading or writing, you go, "Oh, wait, I'm kind of talking about this object; I need to not do that." So you just have to be aware of it. A lot of the professors might just kind of mark on it. I don't, I don't know if they would be marking down for it. But it's something that can come up.
Colloquial expressions, jargon and abbreviations: we have to avoid them all. Colloquial expressions we have to avoid, and there are words like "gonna." So this is in, you know, when you're typing it up. Expressions like "dead as a doornail" or "more than one way to skin a cat." We use these stuff in our language, so it's of course going to show up in our writing, because we write like we speak. But when you're writing in APA style we have to avoid using those expressions. One of the reasons is APA style, like I was saying earlier, you're trying to disambiguate. So if someone from a different culture -- it's one of the easiest examples -- reads "dead as a doornail," they might not know what the heck that means. They don't, they're not from this culture, they don't understand an expression, so now you've lost that individual reading the paper. They have no idea what you're talking about. If you say, "hey, more than one way to skin a cat," meaning there's more than one way to do something, they're like, "Wait, did you skin a cat in the -- wait, did they look at people skinning a cat? What's with this cat all of a sudden?" And I know it's silly, but that's what happened. I mean, we have different cultures, different types of people reading papers, and we can't use these phrases because they don't mean literally what we're talking about. They mean something else. You're not skinning a cat, and there aren't more than one ways to skin [inaudible]. Don't use excessive jargon. This is kind of a fishy one because jargon is the continuous use of tech, technical vocabulary.
You kind of fall into it when you start using and learning that technical vocab from your studies, and so then you start using it all the time. It's usually okay to do that; it's just when you start using it when it's not really appropriate that it starts to kind of, "okay, you could've just said such and such; why'd you use this, you know, jargon phrase?" Abbreviations you can use. It's not something that should be avoided; you just have to use them appropriately. So initially when you use an abbreviation you list out what it is. So like, right here, "short-term memory": the first time I use it I would write "short-term memory" and then following that have in parentheses "STM." And then when I refer to short, short-term memory further in my paper, I can just use "STM" without anything in parentheses or anything like that. So whenever you use an abbreviation, you have to spell it all out, follow it with the abbreviation, and then you can use it after that. If you have an exceptionally long body of work, it's usually a good idea to cite that abbreviation again. So if you've got, you know, four pages go by and you're been using the abbreviation, or maybe you've, you know, haven't used it for a couple pages and then use it again, it's a good idea to bring it back. Because you could be like, "STM," and the reader goes, "wait, what was STM?" and they have to flip back. Try to avoid doing that. You should list out the full words, even for common abbreviations. When you're doing papers for your own major, it's kind of weird, 'cause like, "Oh, we talked about short-term memory in class and call it STM, and now I'm writing this paper, and you know what it is, and I know what it is, so why do I have to spell it out?" and it's just -- you just do. Just be -- you get it habit. You just kind of follow along.
So now. We're running into the mechanics of APA, so this -- you know, all that previous stuff was like writing style and things like that. And these are the hard-set mechanics of what your paper will physically look like, margins, things like that. They're changed to the new sixth edition. This is the fifth edition. I thought it was kind of important to show it, just in case, you know, you're flipping through the books and you see them or whatever. Fifth edition is black with red; sixth is blue. I know we like to feel like, "Oh, people like to crank out books, and they only change a couple things, and they just charge you thirty bucks again." Actually not the case this time. There are relevant changes in the sixth edition, and there are relevant changes to students in the sixth edition. So it is kind of important to touch on them and to know some of the changes, especially if your professor knows about them and is going to harp on them and dock you points if you're not a, not following them along.
Some of the things that didn't change: your paper should include three major sections. I should preface all of this stuff that your professor has the final say on if it should follow this format to the 'T' or not. Some people -- you know, those, the, like -- right here we've got three major sections: you've got a title page, a main body, and your references. Some professors don't care if you have a title page; some professors even don't want it. They say, "No title page; just turn it in." It's important to know, like, what the basics are so you can kind of ask questions like, "Hey, do you care if I use a title page? Is it okay I used a title page? Things like that. so I'm going to go over all this stuff, but you should know that it's always a good idea to kind of ask your professor when you guys are talking about the papers to what extent do you have to follow APA. Some professors are pretty relaxed about it. They kind of just want the loose APA; some professors have the whole manual in checklist form and if you don't do it perfectly, they -- yeah, it's kind of silly. So we've got three major sections. It'll be a title page looking like this. An abstract, which you can see that I don't include here because students don't need to do them. You'll have the main body, and the main body will have methods, participants, materials, things like that. And you'll have a references page. Now the full APA format is intending for you top submit this to be published, so it's assuming that you, you know, ran an experiment, so you had a methods, and you're talking about participants.
For a student writing a paper, that's not necessary. So you wouldn't have a "participants" or a "methods"; you're just pretty much going to go straight into a discussion. And you just have the title of your paper and go into a discussion. If you want to use headers, you can. I generally find that on such short paper, you won't use them. And since you don't do a full-on experiment, you're not using an abstract, so it's not really a major section, because the abstract would be your paper. You're kind of talking like, "Hey, I'm going to talk about the stuff in my paper. Here we go!" so it's kind of irrelevant. Just title page, name, body, references. Everything is one-inch margins. I believe Word 2007 -- I think it defaults to one-inch margins, and if it doesn't, it calls it "normal" and then defaults to something else; it's kind of silly. Twelve-point font all the way through. Times New Roman is kind of the accepted. They say a serif font, but some of the stuff online says Times New Roman only. And everything is double-spaced. So pretty much when you would kind of open your document, you would do one-inch margins, 12-point font, Times New Roman, double-spaced, and then start typing. I actually would highly advise that, you know, after this, or, you know, you build a template for yourself that has all the basics in it and just blank or text in stuff where like the title of the page would be. And anytime that you would do a paper, you just open that template, save it as a new document, and then change the things that are relevant so you don't have to do this formatting stuff every single time.
Alright. So now here are some of the changes from the fifth edition. There's a page header on every single page with the page number and the title. The fifth edition just has a few words from your title and the page number. They've since changed that, and now you have the title, the full title of your paper and the page number. The title of your paper is going to be on the left-hand side, and the page number is on the right-hand side. On the first page, so your title page, it'll actually have the words "Running head" written out like that: running head. "Head" is lower-case, a call-in, and then the title, but it's only on the title page. They made it nice and complicated, which isn't that complicated. They've also added in that we're doing two spaces after periods now. I have seen references that say two periods -- or, two periods -- two spaces after a period. I've seen them say one or two. And I've seen ones that say two if you're submitting it to a publication, one if you're just writing a paper. So that would be something that's very important to ask your professor, like, "Hey, do you want two spaces after a period? Or is it okay to do one?" I like doing one; that's just how I do it. And I think two is kind of silly. The reasoning behind it is that it's more legible. It's easier on the eyes, because people that write this stuff are really old, and so they don't like looking at computer screens, I guess. So I have seen them talk about using one space is acceptable in papers that you turn in in class. This is only for periods -- or, shouldn't just say periods. I just think of periods, but the punctuation at the end of a sentence, so a period or question mark or things like that. A period that's uses like a decimal place, it's still one period. And anything else in a sentence would still be one period, it's just the punctuation at the end is two spaces now to separate the sentences. Some professors like it; some don’t. I think it's silly, but the professors are like, "Yeah! I can read this stuff now." So be aware of that.
So now we're going to get into in-text citations, so this is kind of the meat of APA. This is, "Hey, I'm talking about some stuff that previous researchers have done, and I'm citing it." So you have to always remember that authors do not claim the words and ideas of another as their own; they give credit where credit is due. So when you're writing the stuff, if you found out things that you didn't know or that essentially a lay person wouldn't know, so just someone walking along the street, you cite a reference for it. Even sometimes when it's stuff that people think is common knowledge, especially in psychology, we actually test that, and so we'll run an experiment, and so sometimes it's a good idea to even say, "Hey, yeah, that thing that we generally think is true between these two groups, we’ve studied it, and yes, it's true." So you would cite that. You must always credit any source you paraphrase or directly quote. Like I said earlier, we generally don't directly quote in APA. So you won't run along that too much, and a lot of the professors like to really push that. They kind of force you to not quote, just to kind of get out of the habit. When you do cite a source, you just have the author followed by the year. The year is always after the author, even when you use it in a sentence. So you always think, "author, year." if you have multiple authors or multiple citations, you still use the comma between name and year and use a semi-colon between the multiple citations. When you quote a source is the only time that you actually include a page number, and so then it would kind of follow the MLA format. And you use a 'P' and a period and then the page numbers that it's from. If it's multiple pages, it's "pp." So it's the plural for pages is two P's. That's the only time you'll actually be using a page number.
So. Alright, so the format for citing sources and texts is always the last name of authors, followed by the year of publication, like I said earlier. There's two ways to do it. You can use it -- I think it was just called in-text or parenthetical. This first one is an in-text, so I would've, have stated their name like this, the name of the author in, in line, like in text, and then the year of publication after that. Or I can be a little more broad or vague in whose study it was and then put their name in parentheses afterwards. So it follows the same format. You know, like if I'm saying, "Further research by Erskine [phonetic] is confirmed," I'm not waiting until the end of the sentence to put the year; I'm doing the year right after I mention who did it. Same with here because they're in parentheses. I'm pretty sure that when you talk about a study that's relevant, you cite that study right then and there, unless it kind of makes sense to cite it at the end of the sentence. I've seen evidence both ways. I'm usually citing it right when I tell somebody, "In a recent study, boom, blah blah blah blah." Rather than saying, "In a recent study, things were found dah dah," and kind of cite it, you can kind of do it either way. So I don't know the definitive answer on that one, if you do it at the end. If in the sentence, like the first half of the sentence, refers to some studies and the latter half refers to some different studies, you would definitely separate the citations so half the citations would come up earlier. You don't want to talk about a couple different things, like three different topics in a sentence and then have all the citations at the end, because then, you know, how would you order them? They're supposed to be in chronological order, and say if you used, you know, you talk about differences between A and then some B differences and some C differences, and you had three studies talking about A, B and C, you could, you know, and then they were in that order, you wouldn't know. And that's pretty much what you're doing. You're saying, "Hey, found some stuff about A." Boop, here's my cite.
I talk some, I found some stuff about B. Boop, my cite. Found some stuff about C. Boop, there's my cite. And you can have it all in the sentence. Does that make sense? Alright. So within a paragraph, you need to only include the year when first reference, the first time you talk about the study you include the full citation. As long as subsequent references with, references within that paragraph cannot be confused with other studies, you can just refer to the author. So hey, I got, you know, recent study, Erskine [phonetic], I cite it, and I'm still talking about this study, I can just use his first name. I don't have to continually put 2004 in it because it's the same study, the same body of work. It just clutters it up. If he has different studies, then you kind of run into it, and it makes sense to put it because you could have two different studies. And if you're talking about this one and then you're talking about that one and then talking about this one, you'll need to kind of say the 2003 one, the 2004 one, the 2003 one. When you have multiple author citations, you join the names in the running text by the word "and." And so if you had, like, three, so it was John Smith and Black, and you wrote it in text similar to this, you use the word "and." If you use it in the parenthetical sense, so like this one, you're going to use the ampersand, the little sign. One of the kind of easy ways to think about it is when you're looking at stuff that's inside parentheses, the format follows the references page; it's kind of like a little window that you're looking at the references page. So any kind of formatting that's going to go on there, it's going to be identical to the references page. So you can guess if I'm writing it in parentheses with the ampersand, what am I going to use on references page? Ampersand or the "and" word? Ampersand, because it's what's in the parentheses. You use the word because you're just writing it out in the sentence, and you never use symbols unless they're statistic symbols that, you know, like the Greek symbols. Even now they're getting away from that in the, in the fifth edition.
So these are the different, the rules for citing different numbers of authors. I've got it a couple different ways. The running text is, you know, when you're using it in the sentence itself and parenthetical materials when it's parentheses. So one author, it's just the name and the au -- the year afterwards. You have two authors, like I said earlier, you've got the "and" in the sentence, and when you're using it in parenthetical, you've got the ampersand. Three authors: the first time you use it, you write everybody out, and the subsequent ones you can use "et al." So you can shorten it so you're not cluttering with these extra guys that did all this hard work that aren't getting spoken of later on. When you have it in parenthetical citations, the first citation you list everybody out with the ampersand, and then subsequent ones, you can use "et al." Six or more authors, I actually didn't double-check if they changed this; I believe six or more you can, you go straight into "et al.," because it would be a lot of authors, and you'd almost have a whole line of authors and it just kind of clutters it up. So you go straight into "et al." I can't remember if I talk about "et al." afterwards.
Here's another way of displaying the same exact information. I know it seems kind of silly, but it's just one of those things that some people see it different ways, and it's just one of those things that once you're comfortable with it you won't start second-guessing yourself. So one or two authors, you're always citing everybody all the way through. Three, four, five authors, you're citing all authors the first time, and you can use "et al." the second time or subsequent times. Six or seven authors, only the first author all the way through. And now in this, in the fifth edition, when you have eight or more, you use an ellipses between the sixth and the last one. So essentially, when you have six, you list -- in the references, I'm sorry -- in the references page when you have six, you list them all. When you have seven, you list them all. When you have eight, the seventh gets dropped with an ellipses and it's the sixth, ellipses, and the eighth. Everything after that you would use the last guy and all those -- you know, so seven, eight, nine, ten, duh duh duh duh duh, to the last one, they all get dropped. So I guess it's kind of a bummer if you're the seventh guy and then they add on an eighth you're like, "Awww, my name's not going to be on it. Your name is." So. It's just, you know, they get, they get long and excessive. It used to be, I believe -- it went up to six or seven and then they didn't care about anybody else. So if you were the eighth, ninth, tenth guy you never got cited anywhere. Now they're kind of changing it so you can get that last person in there, and everyone else is an ellipses. Odd, but one of the changes.
I didn't speak about et al. et al., the trick to remember that is -- is it alright if I walk around on the board? -- it's always "E-T-A-L period." And you'll get -- I know once when I did it, it is, "What is this? Where do I put the period? I don't know." This stands for "and others." It's Latin, and it stands for "et," I believe it's A-L-L-I. So al. is an abbreviation for "alli." I believe it's pronounced "Ali"; I don't speak Latin, so I don't know. And so it's pretty much "and others." We're abbreviating others, so it's just like you were doing this: "and others," an abbreviation. So it wouldn't make sense that we would be putting a period here at "and"; we're not doing anything to "and." We're doing anything to "others," the word "others"; it's just the Latin word of "others." So it's kind of the, you know, it's the knowledge of help. It's one of the things that I see goofed a lot with that period and sometimes a little comma in there, you know, and you're like, "Whoa! Like, that doesn't make sense at all!" I guess I can leave that up there.
So now we'll get into quotations. Like I had said earlier, quotations generally aren't used in APA. They're only really used if you're talking, like, specifically about their definition or if you're talking about the way that they had said something, and you're kind of providing evidence or rebutting that, that's kind of when you would quote. The way it is is, you know, pretty much like MLA. You have the quote, you do the comma, space, and then list out the parenthetical citation just like you would normally. You just have to include the page number that it came from. When you use it in text, you use it just like a normal citation: last name, the year following it, a comma, and then what we spoke about with the page at the end. Instead of the page number being up here, the page number is at the end of the sentence. The only time you indicate page numbers is for direct quotes. When you read journal articles and things like that, you'll notice that they may or may not have page numbers. A lot of students like to look at journals and go, "Oh, well, they used it here; I should use it in mine." Journal articles follow their own formatting. It's roughly APA, but they get their own rules, and they can do whatever they want. So its kind of misleading when you're reading a bunch of stuff, and they're doing it some way and the school says, "Nope! You got to do it this way." So the only time you're ever going to use page numbers in APA format is when you directly quoted. For a singular page, you have one P, and for plural pages, you have two P's. Only one period, though. Quoting a source that was quoted in another source: this is one of the things that actually comes on, so -- it can happen where I have a source that talked about a source that I can't find, or you're talking about them talking about the source. And so if I have a study done by Black, and he's talking about Smith study, and I want to talk about how Black talked about Smith's study, I would talk about that original source "as cited in" Black. It kind of comes up. It's generally not used, because when you cite someone "as cited in," you can kind of have this infinite regression from the facts, essentially. It's one of the reasons why we get myths and things like that that get perpetuated in the literature. Because you say, "That guy cited it." And then another study says, "That guy cited that guy." And "that guy cited that guy that cited that guy that cited that guy that cited that guy that cited that guy."
And no one actually looks at the original source to see if it's even true what they're stating, things like that. One of the big ones right now that actually kind of comes up at some of the workshops that if I've seen it I've chopped it down, but they had that one that was like you remember ten percent of what you hear and twenty percent of what you do or whatever. I think it ends up to being ninety percent of what you do or something. That's actually a myth, and there's no evidence in support of that. But when you look it up, it's cited all over the place, with different cites, stuff like that. And people have tracked it down, and it, it's just ghost; like there's nothing there. And that can happen when you do stuff, like, "as cited by." It's safe to do it if you actually check the document, but if you check the document, then why wouldn't you just cite the document directly? You know, it's like, if I've got one study that's talking about this, and then I talk about this guy talking about this, well, then why don't I just talk about this one directly? So it can happen if I can't find this one, or if I want to talk about how they're talking about the study, then it would be kind of relevant. Does that make sense? It's kind of one of those things; it's a little pitfall that people can kind of fall in. So if Ebbinger [phonetic] and Lewis had a study, and they talked about a Lewis and Lewis study, I would say, "In Lewis and Lewis's study, as cited in." so the Ebbinger and Lewis would be what I have, and they're talking about the Lewis and Lewis study. In your references you cite the secondary source, so that's the one that, like, the one that you have. If they're talking about something, and you don't have it, you're talking about the one you have. It's never, never appropriate to talk about that primary source if you don't have it. If you're using a secondary source to talk about it, then you cite your source. You can't talk about that study if you haven't read it. It's can come to that same problem. You can talk about stuff that they never even mentioned because you're going off of what this guy said. So. [inaudible] be mad, chewing you guys out like you did it.
So, references page. I'm going to go through all this stuff and I'm actually going to show you guys a little, a little demo about it. So the references page is on its own, it's its own page. It has the header of "references." It still has a page number on it. It uses hanging indent format, and so that's the flip-flop of, like, a normal paragraph where the first sentence is indented and everything else is flush. It's flip-flopped, so the first line is flush and everything else is indented. So the indent is hanging out over the edge; that's why it's called the hanging indent. So you don't indent the first line, and everything else for that reference is underneath and indented. You arrange the entries on your references page alphabetical order by the last name of the first author, and if you have an author that one, it's like, one author and then that same author that had somebody else, you put the single author first. So like, nothing precedes something. So if you have one, and then like if you have Smith, and then Smith Johnson, Smith comes before Smith Johnson because nothing comes before another name. If you have multiple articles by the same author, you arrange them by year of publication, earliest first. It's called chronological order. Your references should be in alphabetical order by first and then by chronological after that. So if you have three bodies of work that you don't know how they should go, because all the authors are the same or it's the same author, then you put them in chronological order. Works by different authors with the same last name are arranged alphabetically by the first initial. So if you have two Smiths, but one's a John and one's a Betty, you're going to go "B. Smith" first and then the John Smith or whatever.
And then this hanging indent demo. I have done this demo on the new Word and the old Word, and it's the same either way. So here's my references page. Pretty much I went through and said, "Hey, I've got my header of 'references'," and I've just hit enter. I typed in this first reference when I got to the end. I hit enter, typed in my next reference, and they're in the correct order. So I haven't put double-spacing on it yet; I haven’t done anything.
The easiest way to do that if you haven't set it up to have double-spacing, since I'm going to have double-spacing for the whole document, I'll highlight everything, from references all the way down. I can right-click it, and go to paragraph.
When I get paragraph and you know, of course you're probably familiar with spacing, so I can change the spacing to "double," and then everything's double-spaced. And then you can come up here to "indentation" and "special." You drop-down this, you can see "hanging" -- hanging indent. It's defaults to point five, which is what you want, and you hit okay, and boom.
Now my references page is appropriately formatted. So you can see that the first two, the name starts here, and when it wraps down to that second line, is when indent happens. Same for here. So you can see that the authors are all hanging out; it's much easier to see who did what. And all the relevant information is indented underneath that. That is the same for the old Word, so you can do it in 2007 or older. Oh, yeah.
So now we're going to get into the end here, so these are -- I'm going to go over real briefly the online resources. You guys took down my email address so you don't have to write that down now, because trying to write down this URL is kind of annoying. The Online Writing Lab, so the OWL, at Purdue is talked about a lot. Whenever I mention it people seem to know about it, so it's used a lot. It is spot-on for, as far as I can tell, right now. It's updated with the sixth; there's, they've updated sample papers, they've updated all their information, and there's a ton, a ton of information on it. The Long Island University has a color coded reference, so if you kind of just want to see how you should be filling out a references page or something like that, this is really awesome. They give you a grasp of how it should all look. They color-code all the little bits and pieces so you can kind of see like, "Oh, yeah, I see that the title of this is this" and such. And then the Merriam-Webster's dictionary is what APA uses as their dictionary, and so I always kind of think it's important for the students to use that rather than dictionary.com or something like that. And yes, they're all dictionaries, but when you're talking about trying to disambiguate things, then you're getting down to definitions, and this is kind of the appropriate source for those definitions.
My email again, making sure that people get it. I actually kind of wanted to show you guys, since we've got time, this one.
So this is the Purdue site, the -- You can always just Google OWL and Purdue -- no -- and that gets you to it. But it's -- I -- my link goes directly to the APA style rather than kind of like the whole home page thing. Over here on the side is an overview workshop and this formatting and style guide.
And there's all this information. And you can get types of papers, all of the, how you should reference things, basic rules, footnotes, and -- pretty much all the things that I didn't cover because there's way too much information to go over in one presentation. You know, if you're -- here's a sample paper that they have so you can see what it looks like, if that helps you out.
The color-coded link is -- this is one of the ones that I found early on when I was learning this. I find that it really helps me. So you can see, you know, that the author's in blue, the date's in pink, the title of it's in some kind of blue and a red. And so you can see all of the pieces of a reference and how they differ across different types of references. I found it extremely useful to say, "Oh, yes, the author and the year, like, it's always in the same format." These are the important things.
You can see in a journal article, for instance, you've got their name, the title of their work, the title of the journal italicized, and if you come down at "book," it goes straight into, you know, italicized name of the works, because you can think of journal articles like chapters in a book. And so you don't have the title of the chapter; you just go straight into what the book is called. So this is -- well, I find extremely useful for that references page and looking stuff up.
Another tip and things that I haven't gone over are the EPSCO hosts databases.
Are you guys familiar with the databases? Ah, they're awesome. One of the things that they have –
I'm going to go to psych info here, because it's one I use a lot.
They've got handy features -- ooooh, which I can't think.[typing sounds] I'll just do a quick search. They will give you a citation that you can copy and paste. It used to be wrong, and now it's almost right. If you want to think of that as wrong, you can.
I'm just going to go to the first one -- this was not the best example, because this is actually one of the ones that's correct. If you go up here to this gold page, you can see that is says, "cite this article."
You click that page, and you get a little window that opens up and you get this APA references. You can copy and paste that. I highly recommend that. It is accurate for everything but edited books. When they have a book with editors, for some reason they don't put the editors in there, and you have to manually put them in, you have to type them up. Everything else, though, that I've checked has been spot-on. It used to be that they did a kind of a global format, and you had to pull out the pieces that weren't appropriate for your citation, right now it's spot-on, and you just -- boop! -- copy, paste, and there you go. You can see now as well they use a DOI and DOI is a digital object identifier. A lot of the professors either don't know what the heck that is or are all about it. A DOI is very similar to a URL, which is like a web site address, but a DOI will be persistent no matter how many changes they make to the document. It is a persistent link to the digital form of whatever reference it is that will stand no matter how many times they change it. They used to have you listing out the database that you found it and the retrieval date; you don't have to do that anymore. So don't ever do, like, a database or a retrieval date. You just plug in the DOI if you have it., I think they say if you don't have it, then do the database or the web site address. But now it's all about DOI. DOI is awesome.
You can go to doi.org, type in the small, little, short address, and it goes to either directly to the article that you had, or a page that says, "These are the places that you can find it." And it doesn't matter if they change the article or physically move it to another place; you can still find it, because the way that the internet works, when you access a document through the internet, it is, you know, reading a file that is saved physically on a hard drive somewhere. The DOI gets around that by kind of taking a step back. It doesn't matter where that PDF is saved originally; it's giving you a link that says, "I know where it is. You come to me, and I, I'll tell you where to find it." Before, if any changes, and kind of maybe even just change the name of the document, and then you cited it, and then someone went to find it, and they had since changed it, they wouldn't be able to find that article, and they'd have to go to the database themselves and search for themselves. So it makes it really, really easy to find sources, which is a good thing. A lot of students get freaked out, because like, "Oh, my gosh, then they could check up on what I'm, what I'm citing." And it's actually the flip-flop, where the professor goes, "Oh, that's pretty cool! I'm going to check it out." And it makes it a lot easier, because you used to have to come to the database itself and use the right words so you could find it and kind of scroll through everything. It was a pain in the butt. But it made it easier. So definitely use that.
Like I said, if you email me, I can give you two PDFs that have sixth-edition changes, and they kind of contradict themselves. One thing is it's kind of, it's kind of wonky. I can give you the PowerPoint, this one. I can give you the references handout.
The references hand-out I have in a rich text, so you can use it no matter what computer you're on. So you can kind of have this on maybe a flash drive when you're working on labs and stuff. And it's just a quick reference with how to do the stuff, some basic examples and most commonly cited stuff. The web sites that I talked about, so they're linked so you would have those. Steps on how you would do the hanging indent, and then a quick little table of doing the in-text citations. So you kind of have a little quick reference with you at all times rather than carrying around a sheet of paper that you got from your professor. Alright? If there aren't any other questions, we can get out of here.