

This article supports the point of view of the teacher on plagiarism and will contrast nicely to other articles that discuss it from the student's point of view and that of other professionals.

Silverman, Gillian. "It's a Bird, It's a Plane, It's Plagiarism Buster!" *Newsweek* 15 July 2002: 12. Print.

This article pertains specifically to students stealing from the Internet. It raises the idea that plagiarism is partially due to the nature of students' lives. It suggests that students are either too busy or too free to do other things, and so they tend to do homework at the last minute, which causes them to turn to plagiarism.

This article supports different points of view on plagiarism, the point of view of the schools and the point of view of the student. By looking at several different viewpoints I can make a better response to the issue.

Spigelman, Candace. "The Ethics of Appropriation in Peer Writing Groups." *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World*. Ed. Lise Buranen and Alice M. Roy. Albany, NY: SUNY P, 1999. 231-40. Print.

This article discusses how students talk about and think about intellectual property in writing groups that are part of a class. It discusses the problem that some courses want students to work alone, so that their ideas are always theirs alone. The writer quotes the students discussing their feelings about where ideas come from and the need to credit people as well as books for influencing their thinking.

This article will be useful because it makes the idea of plagiarism more complicated. The author doesn't just quote people for and against plagiarism, but students trying to understand what to do in different situations.

Straw, Deborah. "The Plagiarism of Generation 'Why Not?'" *Community College Week* 14.24 (2002): 4-6. Print.

This article explains the rising complications with plagiarism specifically upon the high-school level and also on the collegiate level. It uses statistics from universities and high schools around the country to represent this idea while also including quotes from various school officials. The article considers the part the Internet has played in the growing incidence of plagiarism. After introducing the problem, the article questions who is likely to be an offender. It suggests that the higher entrance requirements at colleges cause students in high

schools to try and get the highest grade point averages that they can, even if it means plagiarizing. The article concludes by providing possible ways of attacking the dilemma.

The source is a credible one that gives me ample information to create a sound base for my research. This article provides a background scene I can use to help the audience to better understand the situation. Also, it gives me statistics to prove that the situation exists and is becoming more of a problem every year.

Questions

1. What kinds of sources does the writer of the bibliography use? How directly do they address his particular project?
2. Do you agree with the writer's assessment of the reliability of the sources in this bibliography? Which ones seem questionable? Why?
3. How precise are the summaries? Where should they be clearer?
4. What are the criteria for the responses? Are they applied consistently? Do they seem reasonable? How could they be improved?
5. The audience for this bibliography seems to be primarily the writer himself. How might it be adapted to communicate the content and value of the sources to another audience, for example, to an audience more interested in reading about plagiarism than in writing about it?
6. How informative is the introduction? How might it be revised to disclose more clearly the researcher's purpose in writing the annotated bibliography?

MOVING FROM SUMMARY TO SYNTHESIS: ESTABLISHING RELATIONSHIPS

A synthesis shows one or more significant relationships among sources. Synthesis draws on techniques of comparison and contrast, but it demands acknowledging nuanced relationships among sources and guiding readers through them. For example, to explain the consensus of a significant body of opinion in a field, you can draw on the ideas of a number of authors, attributing variations of ideas or different approaches to the appropriate source. Synthesis uses your responses to make judgments, and the success of a synthesis will depend in large degree on how good your judgment is and how well you understand the sources in the context of their field. Although a synthesis may be based on your response to the sources and may point toward your developing argument, like other uses of sources, it requires a fair and accurate reflection of what the source actually says.

Summarizing accurately and for a purpose is a good starting point for synthesizing, and the purposes suggested for summaries in the previous section can be expanded into the governing purpose for a synthesis. The key to writing an effective synthesis is to show the relationship of sources—often different in kind and in purpose—to each other and in relation to a field or an issue. Synthesis is also used to set a context for an argument. Synthesis requires more than merely pasting a number of summaries together, but requires that you identify and even argue for a particular relationship among the sources. An effective synthesis not only brings together a body of information from a

number of sources, but also—and most importantly—provides the reader with a map to navigate the field. Before you can write an effective synthesis, you must reach a clear idea about the relationships among the sources and how they fit into the field to serve as a guide for your readers.

FOCUS POINTS: SAMPLE TOPIC SENTENCES FOR SYNTHESSES

A synthesis can draw on a variety of organizing principles, depending on the topic and purpose of the paper you are writing. The topic and purpose should be evident in a topic sentence that orients the reader to your intentions. For example, a synthesis might:

1. **Establish considerable overall consensus in a field or among a group of writers, with which you might be preparing to agree or disagree.**
 - Although they might disagree on some particulars, most physicians agree that mental and physical processes affect each other in subtle but important ways.
 - These historians define *professionalization* as a sequence of activities a group of practitioners consciously undertakes to move from amateur to professional status, including forming an organization that distinguishes insiders from outsiders and producing documents like codes of conduct, codes of ethics, and requirements for entry.
 - Rebecca Moore Howard's distinction between cheating and incomplete learning initiated a body of research that takes a developmental view of teaching students to incorporate sources into their writing.
2. **Claim more or less sharply divided sides to the issue (a dichotomy), either to identify specific sources typical of opposite lines of reasoning or to identify the range of thinking about the issue.**
 - The scholars who address issues of plagiarism tend to fall into two camps: those who look at all instances of "borrowing" stories, ideas, phrases, or complete texts as wrong; and those who distinguish cheating from allusion, "sampling," and inadequate documentation.
 - While most physical education departments have come to emphasize competitive sports, a few hold on to an older ideal of providing personal fitness education for all students, an ideal that has regained some popularity in recent years.
 - Current thinking about plagiarism ranges from the position that any almost any form of unattributed imitation is wrong, as seen in the work of Thomas Mallon, to the motive-based distinctions recommended by Rebecca Moore Howard.
3. **Show several points of view from which the issue can be analyzed, resulting in differing predictions about outcomes or prescriptions for courses of action.**
 - Studies of international teaching assistants tend to focus on either the effects of their teaching on American undergraduates or the impact of teaching American students on the education of international graduate students.
 - While downloading music from the Internet looks like a reasonable use of freely available resources to many of those who do it, it looks like theft to the record companies. For some recording artists, the issue is less about compensation and more about maintaining artistic control over their material.

There are variations on these strategies that can be used to articulate the "state of the field" you have been studying. Two kinds of synthesis very common in academic fields are the history of an idea, issue, or controversy within a field, and the literature review

this context, “literature” means published previous research in a field, not creative writing). A crucial factor in all kinds of synthesis is how well the writer establishes and maintains a clear and consistent presence (possibly personal, but not necessarily so) as a guide through the material. Notice the tone of assurance in the previous examples.

Because synthesis can be used to document the agreement or overlap among significant groups within a field or to define a common warrant for argument among authors writing about different topics, it can help you to understand the larger significance of your inquiry, as well as to establish a context for a claim. For example, the following synthesis shows how the readings by Mike Rose, Rebecca Moore Howard, and Alfie Kohn—arguments about different topics—are all founded on similar warrants about the nature of learning.

AMPLE 6.4 *Synthesizing Warrants*

What has been called the “progressive” view of education considers the human interaction of teacher and student to be the most essential aspect of learning. Underlying this way of thinking are the assumptions that teachers and students are naturally interested in teaching and learning as much as they can, as well as they can; that teaching and learning are personal and interpersonal activities, best conducted in a nurturing environment; and that benign self-interest and good will can serve as sufficient motivation for good work. Thus, for example, Alfie Kohn argues that the “external” motivation of the tough grade is not only unnecessary, but detrimental to the educational process. In a similar vein, Rebecca Moore Howard assures us in “Forget about Policing” that “patchwriting” students will grow out of the practice as they gain enough understanding of a field to use their own words, which they will do more effectively under the guidance of an understanding teacher than a firm disciplinarian. Mike Rose undertakes his journey across America to look at people more than at institutions, to consider the possibility of educational reform as “the day-to-day human reality of social change” (8). These progressive educators assume that the essential honesty and good will of people working together are more important for learning than are rules and institutional structures.

Such a synthesis could be used as the introduction to a thesis arguing for or against the progressive assumptions outlined in the last sentence. It could also serve as the basis for much longer synthesis, which would include summaries and perhaps longer quotations and more paraphrases from the sources to illustrate the range of agreement and nuances of disagreement within that general consensus. Or it could serve as a basis for reflection on or response to these authors’ positions.

REVIEWING THE LITERATURE

The process of inquiry demands close and critical reading that distinguishes among sources that establish a context, sources that suggest claims or reasons for use in an

argument, and sources that provide important evidence to support your reasoning. When you find sources difficult to understand, use *Focus Points: Reading Arguments* (p. 21) to help you work your way through them. Once you can summarize accurately the overall point and purpose of a source, you can consider more fully what role it would best play in your project.

FOCUS POINTS: WORKING WITH THE LITERATURE

- Some sources may agree with the argument you are constructing and others might disagree; as a research writer, you need to demonstrate the degree of agreement and disagreement among the sources (i.e., the extent of the controversy) and to give reasons for your own position toward them.
- Writing a critical synthesis of sources is called “reviewing the literature” in most fields. The term *literature* in this case does not mean creative writing or fiction, but the previous publications in a field (for instance, the literature of suicide prevention or the literature of eating disorders). The term *critical* means that the writer makes judgments about the accuracy, relevance, and value of the sources.
- Most academic studies start with a short review of the literature to set the context for the argument or hypothesis to be examined. There are also standalone surveys of the literature, such as the annotated bibliography and literature review. Examples of literature reviews can be found in the Readings, particularly in Jane Tompkins’ “‘Indians’: Textualism, Morality, and the Problem of History” and in Motoko Rich’s “Digital Publishing Is Scrambling the Industry’s Rules.”
- All variations of “working with the literature” involve taking clear research notes, writing summaries and syntheses, and addressing a particular audience, in many cases an audience that knows the field in general but is less familiar than you with the specific issue.
- As with other kinds of writing from sources, a good first step toward producing either an annotated bibliography or a literature review is to review what you have already written, such as your notes, the working bibliography, and summaries and syntheses written for previous assignments. Skim through this earlier work to review your ideas, and then extract what you consider the most reliable, interesting, and important sources to include in your selection. Based on your developing expertise:
 - Select the sources that seem most relevant for appraising the context and significance of your inquiry.
 - Identify sources that provide background for your project and decide how much background is needed.
 - Identify sources that offer evidence for or against your reasons.
 - If you find sources that you strongly agree or disagree with, make note of those responses. Keep these written responses so that you can apply them to evaluating the evidence, warrants, or reasoning in those sources. You might modify or change those evaluations as the project develops.
 - Sources do not speak for themselves; you must explain how you are using them to support your position. Your voice—your response to the sources—should be clearly distinguished from the voice of the source, whether you are using summary, paraphrase, or quotation.

- The purpose of reviewing sources is to decide how to synthesize them into a coherent document. This reviewing and synthesizing can help not only to organize the sources, but even more importantly, to reveal gaps in the research that should be filled. You can cut and paste pieces of earlier summaries, syntheses, and responses into the developing draft—provided that you bring the references with them and clearly distinguish your own responses from the authors' voices.
- As you work with the literature, recheck the formatting of the sources taken from your working bibliography. Even experienced researchers make mistakes with formatting references because this work demands an attention to detail difficult to sustain, and mistakes are easier to recognize when you put the bibliography aside for a while. This is also a good time to double-check the spelling of authors' names and of words in titles. As always, make certain that you have clearly distinguished quotations from paraphrases. If you are not sure, go back to the source and check.

WRITING A LITERATURE REVIEW

A literature review is a synthesis that demonstrates how sources reflect and build on each other, that provides a map through the previous literature, and that develops an understanding of a particular question. Often literature reviews convey an argument, report a point of view, or evaluate the sources in relation to each other. Literature reviews serve a number of purposes:

- *Many papers assigned in college courses are extended literature reviews*, in which students are asked to review, synthesize, and formulate an interpretation of what has been previously written about an issue.
- *Some literature reviews serve as the introduction to a paper*, setting the context for the thesis or hypothesis, or giving the history of previous investigations. (See Focus Points: Synthesizing the History of a Field, page 123.)
- *Literature reviews can also be used as evidence to explore or support claims*. For example, Jane Tompkins' essay, "Indians': Textualism, Morality, and the Problem of History," printed in the Readings, uses a long review of literature, first of historians and then of eyewitnesses, to lead to her final conclusions about the limitations of history.
- *Some long literature reviews, called "review essays," are published to summarize and evaluate the significant publications in a field over a period of time*, so that readers can keep up with the research. These review essays, which consider important recent publications in the context of a longer history of consensus or controversy in the field are common in history, literature, and various humanities and social science disciplines. They are also found in journals like *Science*, to help scientists keep up with developments in fields other than their own specialty, or like the *New York Review of Books*, which serves a similar purpose in the humanities and social sciences. The literature review by Robert Macfarlane, "The Burning Question" (in the Readings) is aimed at an even more general audience.
- Carefully consider to whom and for what purpose you are presenting this information. Are you writing to an audience with considerable knowledge about a particular domain, or to an audience with interest in the field, but little knowledge about it?

FOCUS POINTS: WRITING A LITERATURE REVIEW

- Choose the sources that seem most valuable to your research projects.
- Follow a process similar to the one proposed for writing an annotated bibliography: draw on your notes, summaries, syntheses, and responses, to re-see and reevaluate your reading in the field, as you develop a position toward the sources in your inquiry. Add to the literature review by referring to additional sources at points where they illuminate or contradict your initial sources or raise questions yet to be researched.
- Like any synthesis, a literature review needs a clear and purposeful organization, derived from an interpretation of the meaning of the sources. Referring to your written responses, consider the relationship of the items in the literature to your topic and to each other. Reflect on how the various sources relate to a central question or purpose, especially if your sources do not fit neatly into a preestablished framework.
- Extract from your working bibliography the references for the sources used in the review and paste them in alphabetical order at the end of the review.

FOCUS POINTS: REVISING A LITERATURE REVIEW

These questions for self-evaluation reflect the audience orientation of the literature review and may help you to address its purpose more clearly. They may also point out where the relationship among sources needs to be clarified or reconsidered.

- Reread the paper. Describe in informal words the criteria by which you have selected and evaluated the sources it reviews for reliability and relevance. Did you make those criteria clear in the introduction?
- How well does the literature review reflect how your research relates to questions being asked by researchers in its field? Can you state this relationship more clearly?
- Has the review established a context for an argument derived from your inquiry?
- Does the review anticipate the larger significance of your inquiry—the “so what?” How can you make this significance more precise?
- What parts of the literature review do you really believe in? Highlight them, and explain with a note in the margin.
- What parts of the literature review seem weak to you? Are there points where you are not sure your readers can follow you? Or parts where you are uncertain about your accuracy or clarity of expression? Highlight those parts and write your specific questions in a marginal note.

REVIEWING THE HISTORY OF KNOWLEDGE WITHIN A FIELD

As suggested previously, many research studies begin with a short history of the development of ideas about a topic in its field. This kind of synthesis provides a context for the inquiry and demonstrates the existence and importance of the gap that the researcher proposes to fill—either a lack of knowledge or a presumed mistake in previous

understanding or interpretation (Booth, Colomb, and Williams 185). Recounting the history of a topic or of a field's approach to it also helps establish the writer's ethos as an authority by demonstrating that the writer has done the necessary groundwork and is building upon existing common knowledge in the discipline. Many academic writers use this kind of synthesis as an introduction to their claims, but researchers in different fields give the history of their research issue in different ways.

In the humanities, a disciplinary history may go back several centuries, if a question has been central to the field. In the sciences, on the other hand, researchers seldom trace questions very far into the past, but they often look one or two steps back into past understanding of a question, to provide a context for the present research project or interpretation of results. When writing to specialists in a very narrow field, researchers sometimes refer only to the problem itself, expecting their audience to already know the history of attempts to solve it. For example, in their groundbreaking paper on DNA, mentioned in Chapters 1 and 2, Watson and Crick give the history of the problem in three short paragraphs, mentioning only two earlier studies (one not yet published), before they go on to state: "We wish to put forward a radically different structure. . ." (337–38).

FOCUS POINTS: SYNTHESIZING THE HISTORY OF A FIELD

- Identify stages of development and acknowledge shades of agreement and disagreement among your sources over time.
- Consider whether the controlling assumptions, or central warrants, of the field remain substantially the same over time, or whether there were major paradigm shifts at particular historical moments.
- Make sure your chronological sequence is accurate, and use one or two particular sources to represent each important stage.
- Keep in mind the different uses for which you might use this history, and the different audiences for different projects. For example, this history may be adapted later to serve as a draft of the introduction to another paper or as background material for a Web site.
- End the historical synthesis with a current controversy that needs to be resolved and, if applicable, identify the historical precedents for the stand you expect to take.
- Add references drawn from your working bibliography, and proofread the piece.

DISTINGUISHING VOICES

Even though interpretation is crucial to synthesis, writers need to be careful not to misrepresent what the sources say. Whether you agree or disagree with an author or position, it is important to represent the position fairly and accurately before arguing for or against it. The transition from summary to response must be absolutely clear. One way to show the difference between your own thinking and that of a source is to name the author of the source before citing it. It can help to return immediately to using your own words and tone, which will seldom be as fully professionalized as that of an expert. It can, however, be difficult to show when you are returning to your own thinking and

your own voice, particularly in fields that do not allow the use of “I” and when using online sources that lack page numbers. Another way is to use transition words as cues when moving from the source to your voice:

- *On the other hand . . .*
- *To question this line of reasoning, however . . .*
- *Jones’s ideas have dominated the field for a decade, but . . .*

Reading out loud and listening to the voices can help you hear whether or not you have made the distinction.

MAINTAINING A POINT OF VIEW

Researchers use sources in a number of ways, as you have already discovered:

- Sometimes writers use sources to provide authoritative evidence to support a claim.
- Sometimes they agree with the source’s argument and want to extend it or build on it in some way.
- Sometimes writers use a source to distinguish their own position from that of the source, or to argue against it.
- To make their attitudes toward their sources clear, writers use cues to indicate where there are consensus and controversy and to state their own agreement or disagreement with a source.

It is important to distinguish your own position from the positions of your sources, not just to avoid a charge of plagiarism (see Chapter 3) or to avoid misrepresenting the source. Maintaining a consistent point of view reflects your judgments about the issues in your inquiry—and thus provides grounds for your argument.

In “The Dangerous Myth of Grade Inflation” (see Readings, p. 260), Alfie Kohn cites an often-quoted source in order to critique its methodology and conclusions; his rhetorical cues to agreement and disagreement are in italics:

The fact is that *it is hard to substantiate even* the simple claim that grades have been rising. Depending on the time period we’re talking about, *that claim may well be false*. In their book *When Hope and Fear Collide* (Jossey-Bass, 1998), Arthur Levine and Jeanette Cureton tell us that more undergraduates in 1993 reported receiving A’s (and fewer reported receiving grades of C or below) compared with their counterparts in 1969 and 1976 surveys. *Unfortunately, self-reports are notoriously unreliable, and the numbers become even more dubious when only a self-selected, and possibly unrepresentative, segment bothers to return the questionnaires.* (One out of three failed to do so in 1993; no information is offered about the return rates in the earlier surveys.)

Notice that his claims about his source’s methodology are not absolute—he leaves room for argument—but they are clear. He is not criticizing the methodology of surveys, but pointing out the unreliability of this particular survey because it does not

meet criteria most social scientists consider necessary for generating reliable survey data. Kohn is equally clear about his agreement when he cites sources that support his argument:

To get a more accurate picture of whether grades have changed over the years, one needs to look at official student transcripts. Clifford Adelman, a senior research analyst with the U.S. Department of Education, did just that, reviewing transcripts from more than 3,000 institutions and reporting his results in 1995. His finding: "Contrary to the widespread lamentations, grades actually declined slightly in the last two decades." Moreover, a report released just this year by the National Center for Education Statistics revealed that fully 33.5 percent of American undergraduates had a grade-point average of C or below in 1999–2000, a number that ought to quiet "all the furor over grade inflation," according to a spokesperson for the Association of American Colleges and Universities. (A review of other research suggests a comparable lack of support for claims of grade inflation at the high-school level.)

Writing much more personally and informally, as suits the newspaper opinion (or op-ed) piece "What Every Student Knows: Thou Shall Not Copy" (see Readings, p. 255), Robert Rivard clearly takes issue with readers who sent e-mails criticizing the firing of a local weatherman for representing downloaded weather reports as his own. The cues are again italicized:

I've personally read more than 125 e-mails and letters now, the majority of them critical of editors and KENS management. To sum up our critics: We like Albert and do not think he deserved to lose his column or his job.

Many of those protesting our decision scare me.

What's wrong with what he did, anyway, they demand? Doesn't everyone do it, both at the Express-News and throughout society? Who do we think we are, acting against such a popular television personality? Isn't plagiarism something only journalists think is wrong?

Thank God for the teachers who have written in our defense.

Although Rivard's informal tone here would be more appropriate for an "I-Search" paper than for a more formal research paper, he too offers strong and clear cues to his disagreement with the complaining readers and to his agreement with the teachers who disparage plagiarism.

Notice that these writers do not let sources "speak for themselves" or by themselves. Instead, they engage their sources in conversation in order to make a point. Although sometimes a writer's stance toward sources is direct agreement or disagreement, in academic writing the response is often nuanced, neither completely agreeing nor completely disagreeing with a source. Writers often find some validity in a source despite shifts in the consensus of their discipline. They may find some useful information in a source, even if they disagree with its conclusion. The more complicated the response to the source, the clearer the writer's rhetorical cues need to be.

In academic writing, writers are apt to respond to their sources as members of a discipline or of a group within it, in which case they adjust their ethos to mediate between a personal stance and what they identify as a conventional professional consensus. Therefore, it is useful to notice when a writer uses “we” or “us” and to consider who is included in those collective terms. For example, who is included and excluded in “our” when a writer says, “from our best evidence . . .” or “our usual position is . . .”? Writers often use a plural pronoun like “us,” rather than the personal “me,” when invoking a collective professional consensus rather than a personal opinion. To be effective, however, the pronoun must reflect actual consensus—a warrant or position that many or most people in the field would accept—or the argument can be dismissed as “unwarranted” and the writer perceived as not authoritative.

One way to practice conversation between writers and their sources is by using these cues when writing responses to sources throughout the inquiry. By consciously using cues to represent how the sources contribute to your growing body of reasoning and evidence and to point out arguments you find compelling or weak, you can lay groundwork for your argument as you write in other genres.

Exercises

6.1 PRACTICING QUOTATION

Working with one of the sources in the Readings, or with a source related to your developing topic, write the following kinds of quotations. Use the guidelines for punctuating quotations in this chapter.

1. A quotation of a single sentence that is introduced and followed by at least one sentence of your own.
2. A set-off quotation of 3–5 sentences, clearly and specifically introduced.
3. A quotation of 3–8 words that is integrated into a sentence of your own.

6.2 PRACTICING PARAPHRASE

Starting with the quotations you have already written, write three paraphrases that restate the author’s meaning in your own words.

1. Consider how much of the context of the quotations you need to include in order not to alter the author’s meaning and presumed intention.
2. Read the paraphrases of some of your classmates. Did any of them seem to come too near to the author’s wording at any point? If there is any doubt, help each other rephrase them.

6.3 PRACTICING SUMMARY

Working with the same source, try summarizing, using one of the strategies described in the chapter.

1. Write a summary of about 150 words.
2. Discuss with a group of your classmates:
 - How well do you think your summary is structured?
 - Does the “formulaic strategy” seem too constricting?
 - How did you—or could you—modify it?
3. Trying to summarize often shows writers where they do not really understand a source. Highlight parts of the original source that you still are not clear about.
4. Identify which key words you included in the summary.

5. Write another 150-word summary using a different source.
6. Review the summary and condense it into summaries of one or two sentences that are appropriate for each of the four purposes demonstrated in this chapter (pp. 110–111). If you have another purpose in mind, you can substitute it, but be sure to identify it.
7. Discuss your revisions with your group, taking particular care to look for distortions of the author's meaning, and revise as necessary.

6.4 WORKING WITH SUMMARY AND SYNTHESIS

1. Take one of these summaries, and with a small group of students consider how it might be used to shape a synthesis involving the other readings in the research you have consulted in your inquiry.
2. Read at least two or three related sources in your working bibliography. Write a synthesis of the sources, based on important aspects of their claims or reasoning.
3. Working with the group, consider how the syntheses could be modified to be used for different purposes (see pp. 117–119). Write an opening statement for each kind of synthesis.
 - Highlight the words that serve as cues for the different purposes and describe how the opening statements change as you move from purpose to purpose. Using another color, highlight key words.
 - Add cues and key words as needed.
 - Make a list of those cues for later reference.

6.5 SYNTHESIZING SOURCES

1. To help organize your own thinking, write a synthesis of five sources relevant to your topic, identifying both the consensus and the controversy in the field you are working with. If there is an historical aspect to the controversy, this can be a good way to organize a synthesis to be adapted into an introduction.
2. Follow the synthesis with your preliminary thesis statement. Did the synthesis provide enough context to identify your argument as part of an ongoing conversation in its field? If necessary, revise the thesis to make it more specific or to show the significance of your project more clearly.
3. List any other possible significance of or uses for the research you are doing. What can be done with what you expect to show, and why does it matter?
4. With a group of fellow students, consider the revisions needed to make this synthesis, which you wrote to help organize your own thinking, to make it work to provide an argument for other audiences: the group, your class, and your instructor.
5. Based on these analyses, write a short paragraph or a bulleted list that describes the direction in which you plan to take the inquiry.

6.6 LISTENING FOR VOICE IN A SYNTHESIS

Work in groups of four for this exercise.

1. Each group member should take a part to read, and the writer should listen. One person should read any direct quotations, one should read summaries and paraphrases, and one should read the writer's part, including reflections, responses, transitions, and thesis.
2. Discuss what you heard; the writer should take notes on the discussion.
 - Does the writer's voice clearly guide you through the relations among the sources?
 - How authoritative does the writer's voice sound? Is it convincing without being arrogant? How might it be modified?