

# Document analysis of a Statement in Social Media Underpinning Misinterpreted Historical Evidence: Letter Issued to Albert Einstein

Abeyweera G.H.

Department of English Language Teaching, Uva Wellassa University of Sri Lanka, Badulla, Sri Lanka

**Abstract:** *The use of historical evidence in underpinning one's own perception in relation to one's real encounters in life may rouse some misunderstanding mainly due to misinterpretation of statements of historic significance. If somebody provides a discourse which is more personal on some incidents occurred somewhere in a given social context in support of his colleague's failure and penitence over an attempt knowing the same is unethical procedure then, the connotative value of the chunk of the discourse is negatively interpreted. Thus, this concept paper attempts to provide document and thematic analysis of selected responses to a post in social media.*

**Keywords—** Perception, themes, connotation, misinterpretation, inappropriateness

## Introduction

The use of data in any given research is widely accepted particularly to prove the given research is reliable. However, according to Alex Rosenbalt & et (2014) *all 'just because data can be more accessible to broader audiences does not mean that those people are equipped to interpret what see'* though the data is more accessible to a larger audience, the data cannot be interpreted as one feels. They should be used and interpreted in a way it reflects direct meaning or alternatively be

transparent data or of evidences that are used to underpin personal statements. The evidences also are used at times to underpin what one experiences in real life particularly where in most of the cases failures occur. The gravity of such references mistakenly used implicates several facets of the parties involved. It reflects on one side the lack of perception towards the materials used however educated. On the other side, it suggests that one needs to encourage the failure rather than enlightening on the truth. Thus, the challenges of using evidences in supporting some failure may require balanced judgement.

## Materials

The letter issued to Einstein by the Dean of Science of the University of Bern is used for analysing the comments provided in the social media. Letter is used to underpin the incident. The comment provided in support of the incident experienced by his colleague is supported by the letter issued to Einstein to encourage him not to be penitent but to be courageous.

Facebook statement was supported by quoting the letter issued to Albert Einstein by the University of Burn disqualifying his application for the position of Associate Professor. This particular incident was alluded to a Sri Lankan context where a Professor's application for a Consultant in another Academic Institution was rejected by a Dean of a Faculty despite the strong recommendation had been provided by the Head of a relevant Department of Study who had sent the original application deviating the accepted protocol to the

Head of the Academic Institution for appointment. When the particular Dean had requested the Head of the Institution not to proceed by pointing out the violation of the protocol, the reply given Dean was "I do not want to consult Dean or to seek the concern of the Faculty, instead I shall table the application to governing Council the highest decision making body of a varsity and get him appointed". The reason behind this was that this particular Professor also is from the same institution where Head of the Institution and this Professor had worked together such that nepotism had to be performed. This news had been spread to Professor's other escort and being sympathetic rather being empathetic, one of his colleague had posted a statement in the social media.

This professor's application was rejected by the Dean of the Faculty due to a few reasons. One of the reasons was that application had not been channelled through accepted protocol. It had been directly forwarded without the knowledge of the Dean. The other reason was that even the Head of the Institution had indirectly discussed the matter with a few of his close associates albeit this is official. The third reason was that the abuse of power of the position: the Head of the Institution in treating his colleague. The practice of nepotism since his friend also is from the same institution where both had served together.

There are other external reasons why this particular application was rejected in considering at the faculty level. The applicant too had violated his protocol of channelling the application. It is to be channelled through his immediate Head, then the Dean of the Faculty in which he serves and finally his Head of the Institution to the other Academic Institution. The other reason being the imperative language used in his CV commanding the Head of another institution to appoint him to a faculty which implicates myriad things to understanding his tone which say he will not be a fitting applicant.

Most importantly, the grave crime ostensibly committed in the cover letter is his signature. The signature given in the cover letter distinctively differs from the original signature and it is suspected that it had been signed by somebody might be a

close associate or an acolyte serving in the Academic Institution.

Information gathered from his institution also implicates myriad things. He had been interdicted for three years due to abuse, misuse, manipulation of myriad things. Further, he had been rejected by the majority of his institution when he himself was contesting for the Headship of the institution and many articles had appeared on this too in public newspapers. Having stated the episode as such, one of his colleagues by knowing the situation well has posted a statement on social media, ***“Don’t worry if your application is rejected. Do you know Einstein’s application to University of Bern is rejected in 1907? It says “we find your assumptions to be more artistic than actual Physics”*** With the view to encourage him of his failure in his application to another academic institution. Discussions

In this document and thematic analysis, it is expected to research both present themes and emergent themes to gain the in-depth insight into the two situation where Einstein’s and Professor’s applications being rejected. The statement stated above ***“Don’t worry if your application is rejected. Do you know Einstein’s application to University of Bern is rejected in 1907? Due to “We find your assumptions to be more artistic than actual physics”*** despite the valid reasons for rejection of Einstein’s application for associate professorship though his Dean of Science not provided, the rejection provides a few vital themes for the reader. Einstein’s assumptions in his research are more artistic. Being artistic is extremely healthy whereas in physics what his Dean may have looked at assumptions was at times matters. Matters could have been artistic where Einstein’s attention was diverted towards art than that of physics. On the other hand, at time his Dean of Science may have failed to realize the potential of this applicant. This situation provides some insight into how amiss perception may avert a great opportunity for a remarkable contribution. Thus, in this case Einstein became the victim.

Although his application for a position of Associate Professor was rejected, the application itself ostensibly is having some elements of validity to be taken into account. This could be predicted from the letter issued to Einstein by the Dean of Sciences which the Dean precisely indicates in his letter that Einstein had posed some interesting theory in which the conclusion is provided as the nature of light and the fundamental connection between space and time was somewhat radical. His theory being radical is a positive element as Einstein might have challenged the previous theory on the relationship between space and time.

The other important aspect prominent in the theory is the validity and reliability and scientific as his theory had pointed out laws that govern the physical world in an artistic manner. Because of the very reason his paper had been published in *‘Annalen der Physik’*. To publish any article in a magazine or a journal particularly a research should contain at least basics of scientific elements such as, the unambiguous title, executive summary of his work that is the abstract, introduction, methods, discussion, acknowledgements and

literature cited etc. to be more scientific. Without these elements any writing will not be scientific.

The phrase *‘we feel that your conclusion about nature of light and the fundamental connection etc.’* indicates that decision of rejection was no single handled and it might have been evaluated by minimum two people to reach their conclusion. Thus, the conclusion of the Dean of Sciences too has some validity for rejection as it was decided by more than one. The overall assessment also is vital for consideration. It says *‘Overall, we find your assumption to be more artistic than actual physics’*. The line provides some deep insight into our understanding how amiss perception may have averted a great opportunity for a remarkable contribution and here being Einstein the victim. However, Einstein has been successful as his forthright healthy nature is to carve a lasting invention and he did it. Therefore, to be more artistic within little physics is extremely valuable where his Dean of Sciences or perhaps one among the board of evaluation may have oversighted potential of this radical applicant for an Associate Professorship while emphasizing the fact that where there no artistic and no physics matters more.

#### Conclusion

Having stated all the features that are evident from the letter issued to Albert Einstein, it is evident that there are ample facts to be extracted for reference and analysis. Underpinning letter issued to Einstein to another completely different situation to justify wrong doings of a professor by another professor is unethical and unacceptable in the context of academia. The connotative value of the chunk of the discourse is misinterpreted not by an ordinary layman but by an educated is solemn which at time a disgrace to the entire educated community. Thus, inappropriate allusions create mishaps in situations and spread falsehood depicting the signs of deterioration. It is recommended to use appropriate references to suit the contexts whatever the case it may be. The use of historical evidence to support certain situation ought to be selected with a circumspect approach without disturbing the values of the materials.

Thus, the use of historical evidence in underpinning one’s own perception in relation to his or her real encounters in life may rouse some misunderstanding mainly due to misinterpretation of statements of historic significance.

#### References

- Henige, D. (2005). *Historical Evidence and Arguments*, University of Wisconsin Press, USA
- Johnson, A. (1926). *The Historian and Historical Evidence*, Charles Scriber’s sons, New York
- Rapley, T. (2008). *Doing Conversation, Discourse and Document Analysis (Qualitative Research Kit)*, SAGE Publications Ltd
- Maccarella, T. (2018). *Mastering Document Analysis*, Sherpa Learning, LLC, USA
- Allen, M. (2015). *Foundations of Forensic Document Analysis: Theory and Practice*, Wiley Online Library
- Burke, P. (2001). *Eye witnessing: The use of Images as Historical Evidence*, Cornell University Press

Guest, G. Kathleen, M. at all (2012). *Applied Thematic Analysis, SAGE Publications Ltd*

Gee, J. P. (2014). *How to Do Discourse Analysis, Routledge Publishers*

Gee, J. (2013). *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Routledge Publishers*

Rosenblat, A. Kneese, T and Boyd, D (2014). *Interpretation Gone Wrong, Data and Society Institute*

1.