

**BE EVEN MORE EXPLICIT  
THAN YOU WOULD BE IN WRITING**

Because listeners in an oral discussion can't go back and reread what you just said, they are more easily overloaded than are readers of a print text. For this reason, in a class discussion you will do well to take some extra steps to help listeners follow your train of thought. (1) When you make a comment, limit yourself to one point only though you can elaborate on this point, fleshing it out with examples and evidence. If you feel you must make two points, either unite them under one larger umbrella point, or make one point first and save the other for later. Trying to bundle two or more claims into one comment can result in neither getting the attention it deserves. (2) Use metacommentary to highlight your key point so that listeners can readily grasp it.

- ▶ In other words, what I'm trying to get at here is \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ My point is this: \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ My point, though, is not \_\_\_\_\_, but \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ This distinction is important because \_\_\_\_\_.

## "WHAT'S MOTIVATING THIS WRITER?"

### *Reading for the Conversation*



**WHAT IS THE AUTHOR'S ARGUMENT?** What is he or she trying to say?" For many years, these were the first questions we would ask our classes in a discussion of an assigned reading. The discussion that resulted was often halting, as our students struggled to get a handle on the argument, but eventually, after some awkward silences, the class would come up with something we could all agree was an accurate summary of the author's main thesis. Even after we'd gotten over that hurdle, however, the discussion would often still seem forced, and would limp along as we all struggled with the question that naturally arose next: Now that we had determined what the author was saying, what did we ourselves have to say?

For a long time we didn't worry much about these halting discussions, justifying them to ourselves as the predictable result of assigning difficult, challenging readings. Several years ago, however, as we started writing this book and began thinking about writing as the art of entering conversations, we latched onto the idea of leading with some different questions: "What other argument(s) is the writer responding to?" "Is the writer

disagreeing or agreeing with something, and if so what?" "What is motivating the writer's argument?" "Are there other ideas that you have encountered in this class or elsewhere that might be pertinent?" The results were often striking. The discussions that followed tended to be far livelier and to draw in a greater number of students. We were still asking students to look for the main argument, but we were now asking them to see that argument as a response to some other argument that provoked it, gave it a reason for being, and helped all of us see why we should care about it.

What had happened, we realized, was that by changing the opening question, we changed the way our students approached reading, and perhaps the way they thought about academic work in general. Instead of thinking of the argument of a text as an isolated entity, they now thought of that argument as one that responded to and provoked other arguments. Since they were now dealing not with *one* argument but at least *two* (the author's argument and the one[s] he or she was responding to), they now had alternative ways of seeing the topic at hand. This meant that, instead of just trying to understand the view presented by the author, they were more able to question that view intelligently and engage in the type of discussion and debate that is the hallmark of a college education. In our discussions, animated debates often arose between students who found the author's argument convincing and others who were more convinced by the view it was challenging. In the best of these debates, the binary positions would be questioned by other students, who suggested each was too simple, that both might be right or that a third alternative was possible. Still other students might object that the discussion thus far had missed the author's real point and

suggest that we all go back to the text and pay closer attention to what it actually said.

We eventually realized that the move from reading for the author's argument in isolation to reading for how the author's argument is in conversation with the arguments of others helps readers become active, critical readers rather than passive recipients of knowledge. On some level, reading for the conversation is more rigorous and demanding than reading for what one author says. It asks that you determine not only what the author thinks, but how what the author thinks fits with what others think, and ultimately with what you yourself think. Yet on another level, reading this way is a lot simpler and more familiar than reading for the thesis alone, since it returns writing to the familiar, everyday act of communicating with other people about real issues.

### DECIPHERING THE CONVERSATION

We suggest, then, that when assigned a reading, you imagine the author not as sitting alone in an empty room hunched over a desk or staring at a screen, but as sitting in a crowded coffee shop talking to others who are making claims that he or she is engaging with. In other words, imagine the author as participating in an ongoing, multilateral, conversation in which everyone is trying to persuade others to agree or at least to take his or her position seriously.

The trick in reading for the conversation is to figure out *what views the author is responding to* and *what the author's own argument is*—or, to put it in the terms used in this book, to determine the "they say" and how the author responds to it. One of

paragraph come in the second paragraph, when he finally offers a first-person declaration and uses a constrictive transition, "though," thereby resolving any questions about where he stands.

**WHEN THE "THEY SAY" IS UNSTATED**

Another challenge can be identifying the "they say" when it is not explicitly identified. Whereas Zinzenko offers an up-front summary of the view he is responding to, other writers assume that their readers are so familiar with these views that they need not name or summarize them. In such cases, you the reader have to reconstruct the unstated "they say" that is motivating the text through a process of inference.

See, for instance, if you can reconstruct the position that Tamara Draut is challenging in the opening paragraph of her essay "The Growing College Gap."

"The first in her family to graduate from college." How many times have we heard that phrase, or one like it, used to describe a successful American with a modest background? In today's United States, a four-year degree has become the all-but-official ticket to middle-class security. But if your parents don't have much money or higher education in their own right, the road to college—and beyond—looks increasingly treacherous. Despite a sharp increase in the proportion of high school graduates going on to some form of postsecondary education, socio-economic status continues to exert a powerful influence on college admission and completion; in fact, gaps in enrollment by class and race, after declining in the 1960s and 1970s, are once again as wide as they were thirty years ago, and getting wider, even as college has become far more crucial to lifetime fortunes.

—TAMARA DRAUT, "The Growing College Gap"

**"WHAT'S MOTIVATING THIS WRITER?"**

the challenges in reading for the "they say" and "I say" can be figuring out which is which, since it may not be obvious when writers are summarizing others and when they are speaking for themselves. Readers need to be alert for any changes in voice that a writer might make, since instead of using explicit road-mapping phrases like "although many believe," authors may simply summarize the view that they want to engage with and indicate only subtly that it is not their own.

Consider again the opening to the selection by David Zinzenko on p. 195.

If ever there were a newspaper headline custom made for Jay Leno's monologue, this was it. Kids taking on McDonald's this week, suing the company for making them fat. Isn't that like middle-aged men suing Porsche for making them get speeding tickets? Whatever happened to personal responsibility?

I tend to sympathize with these portly fast-food patrons, though. Maybe that's because I used to be one of them.

—DAVID ZINCZENKO, "Don't Blame the Eater"

Whenever we teach this passage, some students inevitably assume that Zinzenko must be espousing the view expressed in his first paragraph: that suing McDonald's is ridiculous. When their reading is challenged by their classmates, these students point to the page and reply, "Look. It's right here on the page. This is what Zinzenko wrote. These are his exact words." The assumption these students are making is that if something appears on the page, the author must endorse it. In fact, however, we ventriloquize views that we don't believe in, and may in fact passionately disagree with, all the time. The central clues that Zinzenko disagrees with the view expressed in his opening

**See Chapter 6 for more discussion of naysayers.**

You might think that the "they say" here is embedded in the third sentence: They say (or we all think) that a four-year degree is "the all-but-official ticket to middle-class security," and you might assume that Draut will go on to disagree.

If you read the passage this way, however, you would be mistaken. Draut is not questioning whether a college degree has become "the ticket to middle-class security," but whether most Americans can obtain that ticket, whether college is within the financial reach of most American families. You may have been thrown off by the "but" following the statement that college has become a prerequisite for middle-class security. However, unlike the "thought" in Zinzenko's opening, this "but" does not signal that Draut will be disagreeing with the view she has just summarized, a view that in fact she takes as a given. What Draut disagrees with is that this ticket to middle-class security is still readily available to the middle and working classes.

Were one to imagine Draut in a room talking with others with strong views on this topic, one would need to picture her challenging not those who think college is a ticket to financial security (something she agrees with and takes for granted), but those who think the doors of college are open to anyone willing to put forth the effort to walk through them. The view that Draut is challenging, then, is not summarized in her opening. Instead, she assumes that readers are already so familiar with this view that it need not be stated.

Draut's example suggests that in texts where the central "they say" is not immediately identified, you have to construct it yourself based on the clues the text provides. You have to start by locating the writer's thesis and then imagine some of the arguments that might be made against it. What would it look like to disagree with this view? In Draut's case, it is relatively easy to construct a counterargument: it is the familiar

faith in the American Dream of equal opportunity when it comes to access to college. Figuring out the counterargument not only reveals what motivated Draut as a writer but helps you respond to her essay as an active, critical reader. Constructing this counterargument can also help you recognize how Draut challenges your own views, questioning opinions that you previously took for granted.

### WHEN THE "THEY SAY" IS ABOUT SOMETHING "NOBODY HAS TALKED ABOUT"

Another challenge in reading for the conversation is that writers sometimes build their arguments by responding to a lack of discussion. These writers build their case not by playing off views that can be identified (like faith in the American Dream or the idea that we are responsible for our body weight), but by pointing to something others have overlooked. As the writing theorists John M. Swales and Christine B. Feak point out, one effective way to "create a research space" and "establish a niche" in the academic world is "by indicating a gap in . . . previous research." Much research in the sciences and humanities takes this "Nobody has noticed X" form.

In such cases, the writer may be responding to scientists, for example, who have overlooked an obscure plant that offers insights into global warming, or to literary critics who have been so busy focusing on the lead character in a play that they have overlooked something important about the minor characters.

### READING PARTICULARLY CHALLENGING TEXTS

Sometimes it is difficult to figure out the views that writers are responding to not because these writers do not identify

those views but because their language and the concepts they are dealing with are particularly challenging. Consider, for instance, the first two sentences of *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, a book by the feminist philosopher and literary theorist Judith Butler, thought by many to be a particularly difficult academic writer.

Contemporary feminist debates over the meaning of gender lead time and again to a certain sense of trouble, as if the indeterminacy of gender might eventually culminate in the failure of feminism. Perhaps trouble need not carry such a negative valence.

—JUDITH BUTLER, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*

There are many reasons readers may stumble over this relatively short passage, not the least of which is that Butler does not explicitly indicate where her own view begins and the view she is responding to ends. Unlike Zinzhenko, Butler does not use the first-person "I" or a phrase such as "in my own view" to show that the position in the second sentence is her own. Nor does Butler offer a clear transition such as "but" or "however" at the start of the second sentence to indicate, as Zinzhenko does with "though," that in the second sentence she is questioning the argument she has summarized in the first. And finally, like many academic writers, Butler uses abstract, unfamiliar words that many readers may need to look up, like "gender" (sexual identity, male or female), "indeterminacy" (the quality of being impossible to define or pin down), "culminate" (finally result in), and "negative valence" (a term borrowed from chemistry, roughly denoting "negative significance" or "meaning"). For all these reasons, we can imagine many read-

ers feeling intimidated before they reach the third sentence of Butler's book.

But readers who break down this passage into its essential parts will find that it is actually a lucid piece of writing that conforms to the classic "they say / I say" pattern. Though it can be difficult to spot the clashing arguments in the two sentences, close analysis reveals that the first sentence offers a way of looking at a certain type of "trouble" in the realm of feminist politics that is being challenged in the second.

To understand difficult passages of this kind, you need to translate them into your own words—to build a bridge, in effect, between the passage's unfamiliar terms and ones more familiar to you. Building such a bridge should help you connect what you already know to what the author is saying—and will then help you move from reading to writing, providing you with some of the language you will need to summarize the text. One major challenge in translating the author's words into your own, however, is to stay true to what the author is actually saying, avoiding what we call "the closest cliché syndrome," in which one mistakes a commonplace idea for an author's more complex one (mistaking Butler's critique of the concept of "woman," for instance, for the common idea that women must have equal rights). The work of complex writers like Butler, who frequently challenge conventional thinking, cannot always be collapsed into the types of ideas most of us are already familiar with. Therefore, when you translate, do not try to fit the ideas of such writers into your preexisting beliefs, but instead allow your own views to be challenged. In building a bridge to the writers you read, it is often necessary to meet those writers more than halfway.

So what, then, does Butler's opening say? Translating Butler's words into terms that are easier to understand, we can

For more on the closest cliché syndrome, see Chapter 2.

see that the first sentence says that for many feminists today, "the indeterminacy of gender"—the inability to define the essence of sexual identity—spells the end of feminism; that for many feminists the inability to define "gender," presumably the building block of the feminist movement, means serious "trouble" for feminist politics. In contrast, the second sentence suggests that this same "trouble" need not be thought of in such "negative" terms, that the inability to define femininity, or "gender trouble" as Butler calls it in her book's title, may not be such a bad thing—and, as she goes on to argue in the pages that follow, may even be something that feminist activists can profit from. In other words, Butler suggests, highlighting uncertainties about masculinity and femininity can be a powerful feminist tool.

Pulling all these inferences together, then, the opening sentences can be translated as follows: "While many contemporary feminists believe that uncertainty about what it means to be a woman will undermine feminist politics, I, Judith Butler, believe that this uncertainty can actually help strengthen feminist politics." Translating Butler's point into our own book's basic move: "They say that if we cannot define 'woman,' feminism is in big trouble. But I say that this type of trouble is precisely what feminism needs." Despite its difficulty, then, we hope you agree that this initially intimidating passage does make sense if you stay with it.

We hope it is clear that critical reading is a two-way street. It is just as much about being open to the way that writers can challenge you, maybe even transform you, as it is about questioning those writers. And if you translate a writer's argument into your own words as you read, you should allow the text to take you outside the ideas that you already hold and to introduce you to new terms and concepts. Even if you end up dis-

agreeing with an author, you first have to show that you have really listened to what he or she is saying, have fully grasped his or her arguments, and can accurately summarize those arguments. Without such deep, attentive listening, any critique you make will be superficial and decidedly *uncritical*. It will be a critique that says more about you than about the writer or idea you're supposedly responding to.

In this chapter we have tried to show that reading for the conversation means looking not just for the thesis of a text in isolation but for the view or views that motivate that thesis—the "they say." We have also tried to show that reading for the conversation means being alert for the different strategies writers use to engage the view(s) that are motivating them, since not all writers engage other perspectives in the same way. Some writers explicitly identify and summarize a view they are responding to at the outset of their text and then return to it frequently as their text unfolds. Some refer only obliquely to a view that is motivating them, assuming that readers will be able to reconstruct that view on their own. Other writers may not explicitly distinguish their own view from the views they are questioning in ways that all of us find clear, leaving some readers to wonder whether a given view is the writer's own or one that he or she is challenging. And some writers push off against the "they say" that is motivating them in a challenging academic language that requires readers to translate what they are saying into more accessible, everyday terms. In sum, then, though most persuasive writers do follow a conversational "they say / I say" pattern, they do so in a great variety of ways. What this means for readers is that they need to be armed with various strategies for detecting the conversations in what they read, even when those conversations are not self-evident.

poor (Billingsley 1992). A significant part of the black experience, namely that of working and middle-class blacks, remains unexplored. We have little information about what black middle-class neighborhoods look like and how social life is organized within them. . . . this article begins to fill this empirical and theoretical gap using ethnographic data collected in Groveland, a middle-class black neighborhood in Chicago.

MARY E. PATTILLO, "Sweet Mothers and Gangbangers: Managing Crime in a Black Middle-Class Neighborhood," *Social Forces*, 1998

Pattillo explains that much has been said about poor African American neighborhoods. But, she says, we have little information about the experience of working-class and middle-class black neighborhoods—a gap that her article will address.

Here are some templates for introducing gaps in the existing research:

- ▶ Studies of X have indicated \_\_\_\_\_. It is not clear, however, that this conclusion applies to \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ \_\_\_\_\_ often take for granted that \_\_\_\_\_. Few have investigated this assumption, however.
- ▶ X's work tells us a great deal about \_\_\_\_\_. Can this work be generalized to \_\_\_\_\_?

Again, a good introduction indicates what you have to say in the larger context of what others have said. Throughout the rest of your paper, you will move back and forth between the "they say" and the "I say," adding more details.

### THE LITERATURE REVIEW: "PRIOR RESEARCH INDICATES . . ."

In the literature review, you explain what "they say" in more detail, summarizing, paraphrasing, or quoting the viewpoints to which you are responding. But you need to balance what they are saying with your own focus. You need to characterize someone else's work fairly and accurately but set up the points you yourself want to make by selecting the details that are relevant to your own perspective and observations.

It is common in the social sciences to summarize several arguments at once, identifying their major arguments or findings in a single paragraph.

How do employers in a low-wage labor market respond to an increase in the minimum wage? The prediction from conventional economic theory is unambiguous: a rise in the minimum wage leads perfectly competitive employers to cut employment (George J. Stigler, 1946). Although studies in the 1970's based on aggregate teenage employment rates usually confirmed this prediction, earlier studies based on comparisons of employment at affected and unaffected establishments often did not (e.g., Richard A. Lester, 1960, 1964). Several recent studies that rely on a similar comparative methodology have failed to detect a negative employment effect of higher minimum wages. Analyses of the 1990–1991 increases in the federal minimum wage (Lawrence F. Katz and Krueger, 1992; Card, 1992a) and of an earlier increase in the minimum wage in California (Card, 1992b) find no adverse employment impact.

DAVID CARD AND ALAN KRUEGER,  
"Minimum Wages and Employment: A Case Study of the  
Fast-Food Industry in New Jersey and Pennsylvania,"  
*The American Economic Review*, 1994;



Card and Krueger cite the key findings and conclusions of works that are relevant to the question they are investigating and the point they plan to address, asking "How do employers in a low-wage labor market respond to an increase in the minimum wage?" They go on, as good writers should, to answer the question they ask. And they do so by reviewing others who have answered that question, noting that this question has been answered in different, sometimes contradictory, ways.

Such summaries are brief, bringing together relevant arguments by several scholars to provide an overview of scholarly work on a particular topic. In writing such a summary, you need to ask yourself how the authors themselves might describe their positions and also consider what in their work is relevant for the point you wish to make. This kind of summary is especially appropriate when you have a large amount of research material on a topic and want to identify the major strands of a debate or to show how the work of one author builds on that of another. Here are some templates for overview summaries:

- ▶ In addressing the question of \_\_\_\_\_, political scientists have considered several explanations for \_\_\_\_\_. X argues that \_\_\_\_\_ . According to Y and Z, another plausible explanation is \_\_\_\_\_ .
- ▶ What is the effect of \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_? Previous work on \_\_\_\_\_ by X and by Y and Z supports \_\_\_\_\_ .

Sometimes you may need to say more about the works you cite. On a midterm or final exam, for example, you may need to demonstrate that you have a deep familiarity with a particular work. And in some disciplines of the social sciences, longer, more detailed literature reviews are the standard. Your instructor and the articles he or she has assigned are your best guides

for the length and level of detail of your literature review. Other times, the work of certain authors is especially important for your argument, and therefore you need to provide more details to explain what these authors have said. See how Martha Derthick summarizes an argument that is central to her 2001 book about the politics of tobacco regulation.

The idea that governments could sue to reclaim health care costs from cigarette manufacturers might be traced to "Cigarettes and Welfare Reform," an article published in the *Emory Law Journal* in 1977 by Donald Gasner, a law professor at the University of Southern Illinois. Garner suggested that state governments could get a cigarette manufacturer to pay the direct medical costs "of looking after patients with smoking diseases." He drew an analogy to the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, under which coal mine operators are required to pay certain disability benefits for coal miners suffering from pneumoconiosis, or black lung disease.

MARTHA DERTHICK, *Up In Smoke: From Legislation to Litigation in Tobacco Politics*, 2005

Note that Derthick identifies the argument she is summarizing, quoting its author directly and then adding details about a precedent for the argument.

You may want to include direct quotations of what others you have said, as Derthick does. Using an author's exact words helps you demonstrate that you are representing him or her fairly. But you cannot simply insert a quotation; you need to explain to your readers what it means for your point. Consider the following example drawn from a 2004 political science book on the debate over tort reform.

The essence of *agenda setting* was well enunciated by E. E. Schattschneider: "In politics as in everything else, it makes a great



difference whose game we play" (1960, 47). In short, the ability to define or control the rules, terms, or perceived options in a contest over policy greatly affects the prospects for winning."

WILLIAM HALTOM AND MICHAEL McCANN, *Distorting the Law: Politics, Media, and the Litigation Crisis*, 2004

Notice how Haltom and McCann first quote Schattschneider and then explain in their own words how political agenda setting can be thought of as a game, with winners and losers.

Remember that whenever you summarize, quote, or paraphrase the work of others, credit must be given in the form of a citation to the original work. The words may be your own, but if the idea comes from someone else you must give credit to the original work. There are several formats for documenting sources. Consult your instructor for help choosing which citation style to use.

### THE ANALYSIS

The literature review covers what others have said on your topic. The analysis allows you to present and support your own response. In the introduction you indicate whether you agree, disagree, or some combination of both with what others have said. You will want to expand on how you have formed your opinion and why others should care about your topic.

### "The Data Indicate . . ."

The social sciences use data to develop and test explanations. Data can be quantitative or qualitative and can come from a number of sources. You might use statistics related to GDP growth, unemployment, voting rates, or demographics. Or you could use surveys, interviews, or other first-person accounts.

Regardless of the type of data used, it is important to do three things: define your data, indicate where you got the data, and then say what you have done with your data. In a 2005 journal article, political scientist Joshua C. Wilson examines a court case about protests at an abortion clinic and asks whether each side of the conflict acts in a way consistent with their general views on freedom of speech.

[T]his paper relies on close readings of in-person, semi-structured interviews with the participants involved in the real controversy that was the *Williams* case.

Thirteen interviews ranging in length from 40 minutes to 1 hour and 50 minutes were conducted for this paper. Of those interviewed, all would be considered "elites" in terms of political psychology/political attitude research—six were active members of Solano Citizens for Life . . . ; two were members of Planned Parenthood Shasta-Diablo management; one was the lawyer who obtained the restraining order, temporary injunction, and permanent injunction for Planned Parenthood; one was the lawyer for the duration of the case for Solano Citizens for Life; two were lawyers for Planned Parenthood on appeal; and one was the Superior Court judge who heard arguments for, and finally crafted, the restraining order and injunctions against Solano Citizens for Life. During the course of the interviews, participants were asked a range of questions about their experiences and thoughts in relation to the *Williams* case, as well as their beliefs about the interpretation and limits of the First Amendment right to free speech—both in general, and in relation to the *Williams* case.

JOSHUA C. WILSON. "When Rights Collide: Anti-Abortion Protests and the Ideological Dilemma in *Planned Parenthood Shasta-Diablo, Inc. v. Williams*," *Studies in Law, Politics, and Society*, 2005

In the realm of teaching, Don McCormick and Michael Kahn, in a 1982 article in *Exchange: The Organizational Behavior Teaching Journal*, suggest that critical thinking can be taught better if we use the metaphor of a barn raising, instead of that of a boxing match. We should think of "a group of builders constructing a building, or a group of artists fabricating a creation together."

McCormick and Kahn make another point that, as I wrote in *The Argument Culture*, I came to believe is the most crucial and damaging aspect of the culture of agonism. Living, working, and thinking in ways shaped by the battle metaphor produces an atmosphere of animosity that poisons our relations with each other at the same time that it corrupts the integrity of our research. Not only is the agonistic culture of academe not the best path to truth and knowledge, but it also is corrosive to the human spirit.

After my reading group had discussed the academic memoir, I expressed my frustration to a group member. She commented, "It turns out that book wasn't the best example of the genre."

"But we didn't read an example of a genre," I protested. "We read a book by a person."

Refocusing our attention in that way is the greatest gain in store if we can move beyond critique in its narrow sense. We would learn more from each other, be heard more clearly by others, attract more varied talents to the scholarly life, and restore a measure of humanity to ourselves, our endeavor, and the academic world we inhabit.

## INDEX OF TEMPLATES



### INTRODUCING WHAT "THEY SAY" (p. 23)

- ▶ A number of \_\_\_\_\_ have recently suggested that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ It has become common today to dismiss \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ In their recent work, Y and Z have offered harsh critiques of \_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_.

### INTRODUCING "STANDARD VIEWS"

(pp. 23-24, 162-63, 181-82)

- ▶ Americans today tend to believe that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Conventional wisdom has it that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Common sense seems to dictate that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ The standard way of thinking about topic X has it that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ It is often said that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ My whole life I have heard it said that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ You would think that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Many people assume that \_\_\_\_\_.

INDEX OF TEMPLATES

**MAKING WHAT "THEY SAY"  
SOMETHING YOU SAY** (pp. 24-25)

- ▶ I've always believed that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ When I was a child, I used to think that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Although I should know better by now, I cannot help thinking that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ At the same time that I believe \_\_\_\_\_, I also believe \_\_\_\_\_.

**INTRODUCING SOMETHING  
IMPLIED OR ASSUMED** (p. 25)

- ▶ Although none of them have ever said so directly, my teachers have often given me the impression that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ One implication of X's treatment of \_\_\_\_\_ is that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Although X does not say so directly, she apparently assumes that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ While they rarely admit as much, \_\_\_\_\_ often take for granted that \_\_\_\_\_.

**INTRODUCING AN ONGOING DEBATE**  
(pp. 25-26, 182-83, 188)

- ▶ In discussions of X, one controversial issue has been \_\_\_\_\_.  
On the one hand, \_\_\_\_\_ argues \_\_\_\_\_. On the other hand,  
\_\_\_\_\_ contends \_\_\_\_\_. Others even maintain \_\_\_\_\_.  
My own view is \_\_\_\_\_.

*Index of Templates*

- ▶ When it comes to the topic of \_\_\_\_\_, most of us will readily agree that \_\_\_\_\_. Where this agreement usually ends, however, is on the question of \_\_\_\_\_. Whereas some are convinced that \_\_\_\_\_, others maintain that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ In conclusion, then, as I suggested earlier, defenders of \_\_\_\_\_ can't have it both ways. Their assertion that \_\_\_\_\_ is contradicted by their claim that \_\_\_\_\_.

**CAPTURING AUTHORIAL ACTION** (pp. 38-40)

- ▶ X acknowledges that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X agrees that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X argues that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X believes that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X denies/does not deny that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X claims that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X complains that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X concedes that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X demonstrates that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X deplores the tendency to \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X celebrates the fact that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X emphasizes that \_\_\_\_\_.

- ▶ X insists that \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ▶ X observes that \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ▶ X questions whether \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ▶ X refutes the claim that \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ▶ X reminds us that \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ▶ X reports that \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ▶ X suggests that \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ▶ X urges us to \_\_\_\_\_.
- 
- INTRODUCING QUOTATIONS** (p. 46)
- ▶ X states, "\_\_\_\_\_."
  - ▶ As the prominent philosopher X puts it, "\_\_\_\_\_."
  - ▶ According to X, "\_\_\_\_\_."
  - ▶ X himself writes, "\_\_\_\_\_."
  - ▶ In her book, \_\_\_\_\_, X maintains that "\_\_\_\_\_."
  - ▶ Writing in the journal *Commentary*, X complains that "\_\_\_\_\_."
  - ▶ In X's view, "\_\_\_\_\_."
  - ▶ X agrees when she writes, "\_\_\_\_\_."
  - ▶ X disagrees when he writes, "\_\_\_\_\_."
  - ▶ X complicates matters further when he writes, "\_\_\_\_\_."

**EXPLAINING QUOTATIONS** (pp. 46-47)

- ▶ Basically, X is saying \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ In other words, X believes \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ In making this comment, X urges us to \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X is corroborating the age-old adage that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X's point is that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ The essence of X's argument is that \_\_\_\_\_.

**DISAGREEING, WITH REASONS** (pp. 60, 172-73)

- ▶ I think X is mistaken because she overlooks \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X's claim that \_\_\_\_\_ rests upon the questionable assumption that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ I disagree with X's view that \_\_\_\_\_ because, as recent research has shown, \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X contradicts herself/can't have it both ways. On the one hand, she argues \_\_\_\_\_ . On the other hand, she also says \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ By focusing on \_\_\_\_\_, X overlooks the deeper problem of \_\_\_\_\_.

**AGREEING—WITH A DIFFERENCE** (pp. 62–64, 170)

- ▶ I agree that \_\_\_\_\_ because my experience \_\_\_\_\_ confirms it.
- ▶ X surely is right about \_\_\_\_\_ because, as she may not be aware, recent studies have shown that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X's theory of \_\_\_\_\_ is extremely useful because it sheds insight on the difficult problem of \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Those unfamiliar with this school of thought may be interested to know that it basically boils down to \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ I agree that \_\_\_\_\_, a point that needs emphasizing since so many people believe \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ If group X is right that \_\_\_\_\_, as I think they are, then we need to reassess the popular assumption that \_\_\_\_\_.

**AGREEING AND DISAGREEING****SIMULTANEOUSLY** (pp. 64–66, 173–74, 183)

- ▶ Although I agree with X up to a point, I cannot accept his overall conclusion that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Although I disagree with much that X says, I fully endorse his final conclusion that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Though I concede that \_\_\_\_\_, I still insist that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Whereas X provides ample evidence that \_\_\_\_\_, Y and Z's research on \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ convinces me that \_\_\_\_\_ instead.

*Index of Templates*

- ▶ X is right that \_\_\_\_\_, but she seems on more dubious ground when she claims that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ While X is probably wrong when she claims that \_\_\_\_\_, she is right that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ I'm of two minds about X's claim that \_\_\_\_\_. On the one hand, I agree that \_\_\_\_\_. On the other hand, I'm not sure if \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ My feelings on the issue are mixed. I do support X's position that \_\_\_\_\_, but I find Y's argument about \_\_\_\_\_ and Z's research on \_\_\_\_\_ to be equally persuasive.

**SIGNALING WHO IS SAYING WHAT** (pp. 71–73)

- ▶ X argues \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ According to both X and Y, \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Politicians \_\_\_\_\_, X argues, should \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Most athletes will tell you that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ My own view, however, is that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ I agree, as X may not realize, that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ But \_\_\_\_\_ are real and, arguably, the most significant factor in \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ But X is wrong that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ However, it is simply not true that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Indeed, it is highly likely that \_\_\_\_\_.

- ▶ X's assertion that \_\_\_\_\_ does not fit the facts.
- ▶ X is right that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X is wrong that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ X is both right and wrong that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Yet a sober analysis of the matter reveals \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Nevertheless, new research shows \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Anyone familiar with \_\_\_\_\_ should agree that \_\_\_\_\_.

**EMBEDDING VOICE MARKERS** (pp. 74-75)

- ▶ X overlooks what I consider an important point about \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ My own view is that what X insists is a \_\_\_\_\_ is in fact a \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ I wholeheartedly endorse what X calls \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ These conclusions, which X discusses in \_\_\_\_\_, add weight to the argument that \_\_\_\_\_.

**ENTERTAINING OBJECTIONS** (pp. 82, 174-75, 193-94)

- ▶ At this point I would like to raise some objections that have been inspired by the skeptic in me. She feels that I have been ignoring "\_\_\_\_\_," she says to me, "\_\_\_\_\_."
- ▶ Yet some readers may challenge the view that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Of course, many will probably disagree with this assertion that \_\_\_\_\_.

**NAMING YOUR NAYSAYERS** (pp. 83-84)

- ▶ Here many *feminists* would probably object that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ But *social Darwinists* would certainly take issue with the argument that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ *Biologists*, of course, may want to question whether \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Nevertheless, both *followers and critics of Malcom X* will probably argue that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Although not all *Christians* think alike, some of them will probably dispute my claim that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ *Non-native English speakers* are so diverse in their views that it's hard to generalize about them, but some are likely to object on the grounds that \_\_\_\_\_.

**INTRODUCING OBJECTIONS INFORMALLY** (pp. 84-85)

- ▶ But is my proposal realistic? What are the chances of its actually being adopted?
- ▶ Yet is it always true that \_\_\_\_\_? Is it always the case, as I have been suggesting, that \_\_\_\_\_?
- ▶ However, does the evidence I've cited prove conclusively that \_\_\_\_\_?
- ▶ "Impossible," some will say, "You must be reading the research selectively."

### MAKING CONCESSIONS WHILE STILL STANDING YOUR GROUND (pp. 89)

- ▶ Although I grant that \_\_\_\_\_, I still maintain that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Proponents of X are right to argue that \_\_\_\_\_. But they exaggerate when they claim that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ While it is true that \_\_\_\_\_, it does not necessarily follow that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ On the one hand, I agree with X that \_\_\_\_\_. But on the other hand, I still insist that \_\_\_\_\_.

### INDICATING WHO CARES (pp. 95–96)

- ▶ \_\_\_\_\_ used to think \_\_\_\_\_. But recently [or within the past few decades] \_\_\_\_\_ suggests that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ These findings challenge the work of earlier researchers, who tended to assume that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Recent studies like these shed new light on \_\_\_\_\_, which previous studies had not addressed.
- ▶ Researchers have long assumed that \_\_\_\_\_. For instance, one eminent scholar of cell biology, \_\_\_\_\_, assumed in \_\_\_\_\_ her seminal work on cell structures and functions, that fat cells \_\_\_\_\_. As \_\_\_\_\_ herself put it, "\_\_\_\_\_." (2007). Another leading scientist, \_\_\_\_\_, argued that fat cells "\_\_\_\_\_." (2006). Ultimately, when it came to the nature of fat, the basic assumption was that \_\_\_\_\_.

### Index of Templates

But a new body of research shows that fat cells are far more complex and that \_\_\_\_\_.

- ▶ If sports enthusiasts stopped to think about it, many of them might simply assume that the most successful athletes \_\_\_\_\_. However, new research shows \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ These findings challenge neoliberals' common assumptions that \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ At first glance, teenagers appear to \_\_\_\_\_. But on closer inspection \_\_\_\_\_.

### ESTABLISHING WHY YOUR CLAIMS MATTER

(pp. 98–99, 175–76, 194–96)

- ▶ X matters/is important because \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Although X may seem trivial, it is in fact crucial in terms of today's concern over \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Ultimately, what is at stake here is \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ These findings have important consequences for the broader domain of \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ My discussion of X is in fact addressing the larger matter of \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ These conclusions/This discovery will have significant applications in \_\_\_\_\_ as well as in \_\_\_\_\_.
- ▶ Although X may seem of concern to only a small group of \_\_\_\_\_, it should in fact concern anyone who cares about \_\_\_\_\_.