**USE THE CUT-AND-PASTE COMMAND TO BRING RAW MATERIAL TOGETHER THAT MIGHT BELONG IN SAME PARAGRAPH.**

**EXAMPLES:**

**A PARAGRAPH OF SIMILARITIES:**

B31 students have similar problems doing research writing. don’t understand thesis, don’t grasp task, don’t know how to proceed, such as gathering evidence, where to look.

M87 “disappointments” in teaching research paper: students not interested, can’t read for topic, papers are illogical, spliced together, and plagiarism.

M87 reading for topic in magazines, books, and other sources, learn to distinguish between fact and speculation.

B32 in searching for evidence, it must be substantiated, PART OF COURT CASE APPROACH

B32 “believable evidence . . . must be respected, scholarly material.”

**A PARAGRAPH OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES:**

M87 personal approach, things that affect students, such as work and family.

M 88-89 problems with approach—students don’t want to get personal, can’t grasp logic, ignore evidence contradictory to main pt rather than modifying thesis. But problems can be overcome.

B does not mention.

B32 search of lit will help determine if there is sufficient evidence

M not mentioned?

**B**32 find more sources than you need.

M does not mention?

B31 best to frame assignment like law, with analogy of supporting a legal case. finding topic = framing case, searching evidence = sources, present evidence = write paper, concluding argument, conclusions. impersonal, logical, dispassionate, lawyerly

**LET YOUR EVIDENCE HELP YOU WITH YOUR PREMISES, MODIFY ACCORDING TO ASSIGNMENT**

**ORGANIZE SENTENCES FIRST; MAKE SURE READER CAN SEE POINTS OF COMPARISON. KEEP TRACK OF WHO SAID WHAT**

B31 students have similar problems doing research writing. don’t understand thesis, don’t grasp task, don’t know how to proceed, such as gathering evidence, where to look.

M87 “disappointments” in teaching research paper: students not interested, can’t read for topic, papers are illogical, spliced together, and plagiarism.

M87 reading for topic in magazines, books, and other sources, learn to distinguish between fact and speculation.

B32 in searching for evidence, it must be substantiated, PART OF COURT CASE APPROACH

B32 “believable evidence . . . must be respected, scholarly material.”

MAYBE YOUR POINT: THESE SIMILARITIES ONLY HIGHLIGHT THE DIFFERENCES.

**SAMPLE:**

**The similarities between Broskoske and Marshall also emphasize the differences in approach over time. Both begin their essays with generalizations about student difficulties with the assignment. Broskoske suggests that the “problems” arise from a lack of previous experience in the form, since new writers don’t understand research writing, making a thesis, grasping the task, or how to find evidence (31). Marshall uses the term “disappointments” instead, while lamenting the same issues. Students don’t understand why or what they should do, which seems to fuel the mistakes that create splicing, illogicality, and plagiarism. Both scholars emphasize the idea of process that can be taught and learned in steps. Broskoske argues that the search for supporting materials should aid one in substantiating evidence in a paper: “believable evidence . . . must be respected, scholarly material” (32). Marshall stresses “reading for the topic,” learning to distinguish between fact and speculation (87).**

**HOWEVER, THE PROMISE OF THE PREMISE IS UNFULFILLED: THE IDEA OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN SIMILARITIES.**

**The similarities between Broskoske and Marshall also emphasize the differences in approach over time. Both begin their essays with generalizations about student difficulties with the assignment. Broskoske suggests that the “problems” arise from a lack of previous experience in the form, since new writers don’t understand research writing, making a thesis, grasping the task, or how to find evidence (31). Marshall uses the term “disappointments” instead, while lamenting the same issues. Students don’t understand why or what they should do, which seems to fuel the mistakes that create splicing, illogicality, and plagiarism. Both scholars emphasize the idea of process that can be taught and learned in steps. Broskoske argues that the search for supporting materials should aid one in substantiating evidence in a paper: “believable evidence . . . must be respected, scholarly material” (32). Marshall stresses “reading for the topic,” learning to distinguish between fact and speculation (87). Ultimately, her approach is personal, her emphasis on students writing about themselves and their lives, a way to avoid “disappointments” for everyone, including the instructor. But Broskoske’s angle, almost thirty years later, seems almost completely impersonal, the lawyer and the court case, the “problems” he mentions simply things to be overcome, not deficiencies that should be felt by reader and writer.**