General Rules For Written Papers:

PRODUCTION:

Type the paper using double spaces, or hand-write, legibly, using only one side of the paper.

MARGINS:

Except for page numbers, leave one-inch margins around all four edges of the page. Indent the first word of each paragraph five spaces from the left margin. Indent long quotation 10 spaces from the left margin for the entire body of the quote.

HEADING AND TITLE:

A research paper does not necessarily need a title page. Instead, one inch from the top of the first page, starting at the left margin, type your name, your teacher's name, the name of the course, and the date. Double space between these. Double space after the date and center the title on the page. Do not underline the title; put it in quotation marks or type in all capital letters.

Follow normal rules of capitalization. (See Sample First Page of Research Paper)

PAGE NUMBERS:

Place a page number in the upper right corner one-half inch from the top and flush with the right margin. Put the number 1 on the first page with your last name to the left of the 1. (See Sample First Page of Research Paper)

WORKS CITED:

Please not that in the Works Cited example listed below, there must be double spaces

within as well as between all entries.

See sample paper and works cited page below:

½ inch

Orlov 1

1 inch

Anna Orlov

Professor Willis

English 101

17 September 2008

Title is centered.

Online Monitoring:

A Threat to Employee Privacy in the Wired Workplace

Indent 5 spaces

As the Internet has become an integral tool of businesses, company policies on Internet usage have become as common as policies regarding vacation days or sexual harassment. A 2005 study by the American Management Association and ePolicy Institute found

Opening sentences provide background for thesis.

that 76% of companies monitor employees' use of the Web, and the number of companies that block employees' access to certain Web sites has increased 27% since 2001 (1). Unlike other company rules, however, Internet usage policies often include language authorizing companies to secretly monitor their employees, a practice that raises questions about rights in the workplace. Although companies often have legitimate concerns that

Thesis asserts Orlov's main point.

lead them to monitor employees' Internet usage--from expensive security breaches to reduced productivity--the benefits of electronic surveillance are outweighed by its costs to employees' privacy and autonomy.

Orlov 2

While surveillance of employees is not a new phenomenon, electronic surveillance allows employers to monitor workers with unprecedented efficiency. In his book *The Naked Employee*, Frederick Lane describes offline ways in which employers have been permitted to intrude on employees' privacy for decades, such as drug testing, background checks, psychological exams, lie detector tests, and in-store video surveillance. The difference, Lane argues, between these old methods of data gathering and electronic surveillance involves quantity:

> Technology makes it possible for employers to gather enormous amounts of data about employees, often far beyond what is necessary to satisfy safety or productivity concerns. And the trends that drive technology--faster, smaller, cheaper--make it possible for larger and larger numbers of employers to gather ever-greater amounts of personal data. (3-4)

In an age when employers can collect data whenever employees use their computers--when they send e-mail, surf the Web, or even arrive at or depart from their workstations--the challenge for both employers and employees is to determine how much is too much.

Sample research paper

Clear topic sentences, like this one, are used throughout the paper.

Another key difference between traditional surveillance and electronic surveillance is that employers can monitor workers' computer use secretly. One popular monitoring method is keystroke logging, which is done by means of an undetectable program on employees' computers. The Web site of a vendor for Spector Pro, a popular keystroke logging program, explains that the software can be installed to operate in "Stealth" mode so that it "does not show up as an icon, does not appear in the Windows system tray, . . . [and] cannot be uninstalled without the Spector Pro password which YOU specify" ("Automatically"). As Lane explains, these programs record every key entered into the computer in hidden directories that can later be accessed or uploaded by supervisors; at their most sophisticated, the programs can even scan for keywords tailored to individual companies (128-29).

Source with an unknown author is cited by a shortend title.

Orlov anticipates objections and provides sources for opposing views.

Some experts have argued that a range of legitimate concerns justifies employer monitoring of employee Internet usage. As PC World columnist Daniel Tynan explains, companies that don't monitor network traffic can be penalized for their ignorance: "Employees could accidentally (or deliberately) spill

confidential information . . . or allow worms to spread throughout a corporate network." The ePolicy Institute, an organization that advises companies about reducing risks from technology, reported that breaches in computer security cost institutions $100 million in 1999 alone (Flynn). Companies also are held legally accountable for many of the transactions conducted on their networks and with their technology. Legal scholar Jay Kesan points out that the law holds employers liable for employees' actions such as violations of copyright laws, the distribution of offensive or graphic sexual material, and illegal disclosure of confidential information (312).

These kinds of concerns should give employers, in certain instances, the right to monitor employee behavior. But employers rushing to adopt surveillance programs might not be adequately weighing the effect such programs can have on employee morale. Employers must consider the possibility that employees will perceive surveillance as a breach of trust that can make them feel like disobedient children, not responsible adults who wish to perform their jobs professionally and autonomously.

Transition helps readers move from one paragraph to the next.

Sample research paper

Orlov treats both sides fairly; she provides a transition to her own argument.

Yet determining how much autonomy workers should be given is complicated by the ambiguous nature of productivity in the wired workplace. On the one hand, computers and Internet access give employees powerful tools to carry out their jobs; on the other hand, the same technology offers constant temptations to avoid work. As a 2005 study by *Salary.com* and *America Online* indicates, the Internet ranked as the top choice among employees for ways of wasting time on the job; it beat talking with co-workers--the second most popular method--by a margin of nearly two to one (Frauenheim). Chris Gonsalves, an editor for *eWeek.com*, argues that the technology has changed the terms between employers and employees: "While bosses can easily detect and interrupt water-cooler chatter," he writes, "the employee who is shopping at Lands' End or IMing with fellow fantasy baseball managers may actually appear to be working." The gap between behaviors that are observable to managers and the employee's actual activities when sitting behind a computer has created additional motivations for employers to invest in surveillance programs. "Dilbert," a popular cartoon that spoofs office culture, aptly captures how rampant recreational Internet use has become in the workplace (see Fig. 1).

No page number is available for this Web source.

Fig. 1. This "Dilbert" comic strip suggests that personal Internet usage is widespread in the workplace. Source: Adams 106.

But monitoring online activities can have the unintended effect of making employees resentful. As many workers would be quick to point out, Web surfing and other personal uses of the Internet can provide needed outlets in the stressful work environment; many scholars have argued that limiting and policing these outlets can exacerbate tensions between employees and managers. Kesan warns that "prohibiting personal use can seem extremely arbitrary and can seriously harm morale. . . . Imagine a concerned parent who is prohibited from checking on a sick child by a draconian company policy" (315-16). As this analysis indicates, employees can become disgruntled when Internet usage policies are enforced to their full extent.

Illustration has figure number, caption, and source.

Orlov counters opposing views and provides support for her argument.

Orlov uses a brief signal phrase to move from her argument to the words of a source.

Sample research paper

Additionally, many experts disagree with employers'
assumption that online monitoring can increase productivity.
Employment law attorney Joseph Schmitt argues that,
particularly for employees who are paid a salary rather than
by the hour, "a company shouldn't care whether employees
spend one or 10 hours on the Internet as long as they are
getting their jobs done--and provided that they are not
accessing inappropriate sites" (qtd. in Verespej). Other
experts even argue that time spent on personal Internet
browsing can actually be productive for companies.
According to Bill Coleman, an executive at *Salary.com*,
"Personal Internet use and casual office conversations
often turn into new business ideas or suggestions for gaining
operating efficiencies" (qtd. in Frauenheim). Employers, in
other words, may benefit from showing more faith in their
employees' ability to exercise their autonomy.

    Employees' right to privacy and autonomy in the
workplace, however, remains a murky area of the law.
Although evaluating where to draw the line between
employee rights and employer powers is often a duty that
falls to the judicial system, the courts have shown little
willingness to intrude on employers' exercise of control over
their computer networks. Federal law provides few guidelines

Orlov cites an indirect source: words quotedin another source.

related to online monitoring of employees, and only Connecticut and Delaware require companies to disclose this type of surveillance to employees (Tam et al.). "It is unlikely that we will see a legally guaranteed zone of privacy in the American workplace," predicts Kesan (293). This reality leaves employees and employers to sort the potential risks and benefits of technology in contract agreements and terms of employment. With continuing advances in technology, protecting both employers and employees will require greater awareness of these programs, better disclosure to employees, and a more public discussion about what types of protections are necessary to guard individual freedoms in the wired workplace.

Orlov sums up her argument and suggests a course of action.

½ inch

Orlov 9

Heading is centered.

Works Cited

Adams, Scott. *Dilbert and the Way of the Weasel*. New

York: Harper, 2002. Print.

List is alphabet-
ized by authors'
last names (or by
title when a work
has no author).

American Management Association and e Policy Insti-

tute. "2005 Electronic Monitoring and Surveil-

lance Survey." *American Management Association*.

Amer. Management Assn., 2005. Web. 5 Sept.

2008.

"Automatically Record Everything They Do Online!

Spector Pro 5.0 FAQ's." *Netbus.org*. Netbus.org,

n.d. Web. 6 Sept. 2008.

Flynn, Nancy. "Internet Policies." *ePolicy Institute*.

ePolicy Inst., n.d. Web. 6 Sept. 2008.

First line of each
entry is at the left
margin; extra lines
are indented ½".

Frauenheim, Ed. "Stop Reading This Headline and Get

Back to Work." *CNET News.com*. CNET Networks,

11 July 2005. Web. 7 Sept. 2008.

Double-spacing is
used throughout.

Gonsalves, Chris. "Wasting Away on the Web."

eWeek.com. Ziff Davis Enterprise Holdings, 8 Aug.

2005. Web. 5 Sept. 2008.

Kesan, Jay P. "Cyber-Working or Cyber-Shirking? A First

Principles Examination of Electronic Privacy in

the Workplace." *Florida Law Review* 54.2 (2002):

289-332. Print.

Lane, Frederick S., III. *The Naked Employee: How Technology Is Compromising Workplace Privacy*. New York: Amer. Management Assn., 2003. Print.

Tam, Pui-Wing, et al. "Snooping E-Mail by Software Is Now a Workplace Norm." *Wall Street Journal* 9 Mar. 2005: B1+. Print.

Tynan, Daniel. "Your Boss Is Watching." *PC World*. PC World Communications, 6 Oct. 2004. Web. 7 Sept. 2008.

Verespej, Michael A. "Inappropriate Internet Surfing." *Industry Week*. Penton Media, 7 Feb. 2000. Web. 6 Sept. 2008.

A work with four authors is listed by the first author's name and the abbreviation "et al." (for "and others").