

ENG 1010: The Literature Review

If you wanted to join an intellectual conversation that was already going on when you entered the room, you probably wouldn't jump right in — instinctively, you would listen for a little while to get a feel for what had already been said. Likewise, when professional scientists and academics want to enter into the intellectual conversations going on in scholarly journals, they first need to do their homework and find out what other people have been researching, writing, and arguing before them. To show that they know enough about the conversation to join it, they often write **literature reviews**. Literature reviews serve several purposes:

1. they situate your work within the larger framework of writers who have come before;
2. they add credibility to your own writing (showing you have done your research, are familiar with the conversation);
3. they give credit to other writers and thinkers for their contributions; and
4. they recommend avenues for future research.

Most often a literature review is merely a section near the beginning of a larger paper, but stand-alone literature reviews get published too. Stand-alone literature reviews are written by researchers to help the other researchers who will come after them, to gather together lots of relevant research in a small space. This is the kind of lit review you will be writing.

Literature reviews analyze and sometimes judge the sources they cover, but literature reviews do not take sides on the issue. They are written from a neutral standpoint. **Your own agenda or opinion on the issue/topic should not be evident in your Literature Review.**

Literature reviews seek to answer the following questions:

- 1) "What do my sources say about this issue?"
- 2) "Who are the major players in the conversation and what are their arguments?"

Literature reviews require you to synthesize the conversation or debate going on around your topic. You need to identify the major speakers, the claims they make, and the evidence for those claims—and put all of these together in a way that overviews and explains the most important parts of the conversation for a newcomer who is new to the issue/topic.

NOTE: All facts and claims in the Literature Review should be attributed to their sources.

Synthesizing Sources

For your Annotated Bibliography assignment you were asked to use the following four sources (plus an additional source of your own choosing):

1. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/posteverything/wp/2017/08/16/the-whole-point-of-confederate-monuments-is-to-celebrate-white-supremacy/>
2. <http://thefederalist.com/2017/08/18/in-defense-of-the-monuments/>
3. <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/08/take-the-statues-down/536727/>
4. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t0jQTHis3f4>

For your Literature review, you will be asked to read an additional two sources:

1. <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/447824/new-orleans-confederate-monuments-robert-e-lee-memory-hole>
2. <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/08/20/why-there-are-no-nazi-statues-in-germany-215510>

Plus, you will also be asked to find another source of your own choosing. (We will spend some time talking about locating and evaluating sources.)

In total, then, your literature review will incorporate eight sources (five from the annotated bibliography, plus an additional three).

What does it mean to synthesize?

Synthesis is about pulling together information from a wide range of sources, drawing connections between the ideas and information presented, and pulling conclusions from that information. It's a complicated process that moves well beyond simple summary. Synthesis explores conversations by analyzing and combining multiple sources to identify main/common ideas, make meaningful comparisons and contrasts, discuss overlaps and gaps, understand oppositions, and make judgments about which points/ideas/evidences are central to your issue/topic and which are peripheral.

Synthesis asks you to identify not just how sources speak to your specific issue/topic/research question, but also how sources speak to each other.

For this complicated activity, we will be using a synthesis matrix as a guide. (See back page.)

Structuring Your Literature Review

Your literature review will have an introduction, a number of body sections with bold subheadings, and a conclusion.

Since your literature review is about synthesizing sources, you will organize your review by IDEAS, and not by SOURCES.

Introduction: Since this is **not** an argumentative paper, you will **not** present a traditional thesis/argument/main claim in this paper. Instead, use the intro to establish the significance of the topic: Why is this topic important to cover and discuss? Who and/or what may be affected by this? What is the problem? If you like, your introduction may include a quick preview of the major trends or controversies (the subtopics) you will be describing in the review.

Body: Organize your literature review by dividing it up into sections with bold subheadings. This simplifies your organization and makes it more obvious. Your sections should correspond to the rows in your synthesis matrix. A section can (and often will need to) have more than one paragraph in it. Use topic sentences at the beginning of paragraphs and sections to highlight similarities and differences, as well as points of agreement and disagreement among sources.

Conclusion: Instead of summarizing what you've already said, conclude with an overview of the current state of the conversation and what is left to explore in future research or writing. This section is not about you or what you have left to do; it is about the total body of argument and research that has been done: what are the questions no one is asking? What are the major "sticking points" (premises about which authors disagree) that will need to be resolved? Where does the conversation seem to be going? What trends do you predict?

Format

1. APA format: double-spaced; 12-point font; 1-inch margins.
2. including an APA-style title page, including a title that indicates this is a literature review and specifies the topic;
3. including subheadings to indicate the topics covered by your synthesis matrix;
4. with an APA-style "References" section at the end of the paper;
5. saved electronically in a Microsoft Word-compatible format: .doc, .docx, or .rtf (for uploading to Blackboard)

Length

Minimum 4 pages (counting References page), but it may need to be longer than that to incorporate information from all 8 sources.

Attribution

Most of the sentences in the body of your Literature Review will need to be attributed as well as cited. Attributions are parts of your sentence that identify the source of a fact or claim. Here are some examples:

- "According to Huxley..."
- "In the opinion of Herbert Jackson, however,..."
- "Washington argues..."
- "Jones disagrees, saying..."
- "She goes on to say..."
- "Carrington's notion of 'health food' includes..."

Why use attribution? Because...

1. **attribution cuts down on the number of in-text citations you need.** You will still need in-text citations, but attribution can extend a single citation across many sentences. The key to avoiding plagiarism is always to make sure it's crystal clear from the text where every piece of information comes from. Attribution helps you do that.
2. **attribution helps you maintain a neutral stance.** If you cite without attributing [example: "Obama's policies are wrong (McCain, 2012)"], then it looks like you're making the claim and using the source to back you up. If you attribute [example: "McCain (2012) argues that Obama's policies are wrong"] you can clearly state somebody else's claim without associating yourself with it.

Citation

Citations aren't complete unless they have two parts:

1. an in-text citation in parentheses in the appropriate sentence or sentences, and
2. a bibliographic citation on the References page.

Structuring Your Paragraphs

The following model provides an effective way to structure these paragraphs and work in direct quotations to support your efforts to synthesize these sources' arguments.

Topic sentence, introducing idea/topic and its relationship to the conversation. Summary & Quotation Sandwich, Source #1. Transition sentence, identifying relationship between sources' points/arguments. Summary & Quotation Sandwich, Source #2. Summarizing sentence to conclude the section.

Here is an example of what this looks like, based on editorials about Colin Kaepernick (you may remember that he began taking a knee during the national anthem).

The Definition of Patriotism

Scholars and writers disagree about the nature of patriotism, and therefore about Colin Kapaernick's protest. Kareem Abdul-Jabar argues that patriotism isn't just celebrating holidays or visiting warm memorials. He writes, "Patriotism ... [is] supporting what the Fourth of July celebrates or what those war memorials commemorate: the U.S. Constitution's insistence that all people should have the same rights and opportunities and that it is the obligation of the government to make that happen." In other words, he believes that patriotism is about people's fundamental rights, rather than just the ceremonies that honor them. According to this definition, Kaepernick is acting patriotically by standing up for the neglected Constitutional rights of African Americans. Not all writers agree with Abdul-Jabar's definition of patriotism. According to Jay Ambrose of the *Bluefield Daily Telegraph*, "Not standing up during the Star Spangled Banner is a way of being disrespectful to America. Arising from our seats and even putting our hands over our hearts is a deeply embedded patriotic ritual by means of which we honor the founding ideals that still instruct us." In his view, the flag represents American ideals, so failing to honor the flag is failing to honor America, and therefore a deeply unpatriotic act.

Others suggest that the way you view the patriotism of the national anthem depends entirely on your perspective. Writing in *USA Today*, Dan Carney argues, "Americans are a diverse lot who show their patriotism in many ways." For some Americans, he says that the "flag and anthem belong to all" and represent all of American society, while for others, the flag and anthem represent only the police and military. The editorial board of the *Reading Eagle* seem to fall into that second category of Americans. They advise Kaepernick to "point his protest in a more respectful direction" and to "consider that more than a million Americans have died defending his right to sit down during the national anthem." Basically, since they associate the anthem with the military, they see Kaepernick's decision to kneel during the anthem as an act that opposes or devalues military sacrifice. Ultimately, for each of these authors, the difference between supporting or opposing Kaepernick's protest depends heavily upon their definition of patriotism.

Racial Inequality & Effective Protest

Most sources agree that racial inequality is at the heart of Kaepernick's protest, and that his assertion that oppression exists is not misplaced. According to the *Reading Eagle*, "Few would argue that America is without racial

injustice.” They add that America has a “sizeable race relations problem.” Their argument acknowledges that racial inequality exists and that Kaepernick’s protest of it is not wrong in idea, only in form. Other writers agree that Kaepernick is protesting a legitimate problem. Ambrose notes that “serious racial issues still linger in this country” and Abdul-Jabar writes that we “still need to call attention to the same racial inequalities.” In other words, none of these writers disagrees that Kaepernick has valid reasons for his protest. The *Reading Eagle* goes so far as to say that “you’d have to have your head buried beneath a pretty big rock to deny there’s a problem.”

However, where sources begin to disagree is on the effectiveness of Kaepernick’s protest as a way to help end racial inequality. Some, like Abdul-Jabar, see protesting as worthwhile if it involves “speak[ing] up” and calls protests like Kaepernick’s “the responsibility of patriots.” The essence of his argument is that governments need to be reminded when they fail to uphold the Constitution, and protests—like Kaepernick’s—are worthwhile because they serve as reminders. The writers on the staff at the *Reading Eagle* have a different view. They say their problem is with the methods of his protest, saying, “What we don’t get, not even a little, is Kaepernick’s approach toward affecting the change he and so many of us so desperately want.” In making this comment, they are insisting that Kaepernick’s means of protest (his “approach”) is the problem. In the *Reading Eagle*, the editors go on to add that Americans “have, however slowly and imperfectly, moved steadily toward the mark, not only legislatively but socially” and that Kaepernick doesn’t do enough to acknowledge that. Ambrose makes a similar point when he asks readers to “understand that slavery was ended.” Basically, these sources are suggesting that Kaepernick’s protest loses legitimacy because it fails to appropriately recognize that racial inequality today is not as bad as it once was. So, while the existence of racial inequality is fairly uncontested, the extent of the problem is debated alongside the effectiveness of Kaepernick’s protest in addressing the inequality.

Remember Your Templates

For Describing a Conversation, Generally:

A number of _____ have recently suggested that _____.
In responding to the issue of _____, some believe that _____.
Many writers and scholars agree that _____.
There is disagreement among _____ about _____.
While some have suggested _____, others have argued _____.
Although most sources agree _____, some think that _____.
The issue of _____ has resulted in many different opinions and arguments.
Few sources agree on what should be done about _____, but some common concerns have emerged, including _____.
Though not all sources have considered the idea that _____, those who have are worried about _____.

For Summarizing Specific Sources:

In his article _____, X supports the view that _____.
The author of _____ advocates for _____.
X believes _____.
_____ earns the author’s praise because _____.
X emphasizes _____ in order to argue that _____.
X’s article, _____, questions whether _____.
In this article, X offers harsh critiques of _____ for _____.
In his article, X suggests that _____.
X denies that _____.
_____, X argues, is why _____.
The article insists that _____ by reminding us that _____.
X praises _____, while also suggesting that _____.
In fact, X demands that _____.
In order to reinforce her point that _____, X rejects the idea that _____.
X supports the idea that _____, complaining that _____.

For Introducing Quotations:

X states, "_____"
 As the *Newsweek* writer X puts it, "_____"
 According to X, "_____"
 X agrees when she writes, "_____"
 X complicates the matter when she writes, "_____"
 X disagrees, saying, "_____"

For Explaining Quotations

Basically, X is saying _____.
 In other words, X believes _____.
 In making this comment, X argues that _____.
 X is insisting that _____.
 The essence of X's argument is that _____.

Verbs for making a claim

Argue
 Assert
 Believe
 Claim
 Emphasize
 Insist
 Observe
 Remind us
 Report
 Suggest

Verbs for expressing agreement

Acknowledge
 Admire
 Agree
 Celebrate the fact that
 Corroborate
 Do not deny
 Endorse
 Extol
 Praise
 Reaffirm
 Support
 Verify

Verbs for questioning or disagreeing

Complain
 Complicate
 Contend
 Contradict
 Deny
 Deplore the
 Qualify
 Question
 Refuse
 Reject
 Renounce
 Repudiate

Verbs for making recommendations

Advocate
 Call for
 Demand
 Encourage
 Exhort
 Implore
 Plead
 Recommend
 Urge
 Warn

The Daily Show's Effect on Media and Politics: A Literature Review

Sam A. Student



Abstract

Keywords: Daily Show, media, politics, literature review

Introduction

The Daily Show, a late-night news and comedy program, has become a significant force in American media and politics. This literature review explores the impact of the show on these domains, drawing on academic research and critical analysis. The review is organized into several sections, each focusing on a specific aspect of the show's influence.

Media Influence

One of the primary areas of research is the show's effect on the media landscape. Scholars have examined how the Daily Show's format, which blends news with comedy, has challenged traditional news broadcasting. The show's hosts, particularly Trevor Noah, have been praised for their ability to address complex political issues in a relatable and humorous way. This has led to a reevaluation of the role of late-night television in the public sphere.

Political Impact

Another major area of study is the show's political impact. The Daily Show has been instrumental in shaping public opinion and influencing political discourse. Its coverage of major events, such as the 2008 and 2016 presidential elections, has been widely analyzed. The show's hosts have often taken strong stances on political issues, which has resonated with a large segment of the audience.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the Daily Show's effect on media and politics is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. This literature review has provided an overview of the key findings in this field of research. Further exploration is needed to fully understand the show's long-term impact on American society.

The Daily Show's Effect on Media and Politics: A Literature Review

Introduction

Although there is heated debate on whether or not Jon Stewart and The Daily Show has had a positive or negative influence on the realms of politics and media today, one thing is certain: Jon Stewart is one of the most talked about media personalities in our world today and his influence goes far beyond that of The Daily Show. The show has had a long rooted history and had been in existence a good ten years before Stewart took on the duties of host. It was not until Stewart became host, however, that the show began to pick up a faithful audience along with scathing critics. Much debate stems off the constant line Stewart walks between satirical comedian and hard-hitting news correspondent. Stewart has repeatedly made note that he himself is not a journalist; however, his loyal viewers have embodied him as the new champion of news. This serious contradiction is always brought up from critics of the show. So how has The Daily Show revolutionized both the political and media stage all while being just a half hour comedy program on Comedy Central?

Influence on Viewers

There is a general consensus among researchers and writers that The Daily Show has influence in the way that it provides news to young people. In a study conducted by Michael Zeiss-Strange, researchers contrasted the responses of students who had viewed the 2004 presidential election coverage on The Daily Show to those of students who had viewed similar reportage on CBS' Evening News. The study showed that the more "cynical and apathetic" Daily Show viewers seemed to be more confident about their own ability to understand politics than those who had "consumed the network news" (245). In the study, researchers made clear that The Daily Show viewers and CBS Evening News viewers only looked to their specific program for their daily news. However, what they soon realized is that Daily Show viewers were more likely to be readily interested in politics and better apt to recognize corporate-owned media. Zeiss-Strange calls this the "Daily Show Effect" and believes that political pundits show more interest in the political thinking of college students because of it.

Maureen Dowd further explained this "Daily Show Effect" during an interview with Stephen Colbert, a Daily Show correspondent who rose to fame with the creation of his own show with a similar format and agenda to that of The Daily Show. Colbert rationalizes since he and Jon Stewart have no credibility to lose, unlike the political figureheads who frequent their show, that he and Stewart can easily manipulate these political pundits on their shows (p. 6). Dowd argues that it is hard to distinguish between reality and the distorted truth that both Stewart and Colbert create. Interestingly enough, Colbert agrees 100% with Dowd on her assumption and makes it clear that it is something he and Stewart do on purpose and goes along with the format of the show. She continues by adding that when politicians are invited as guests on the show they must come prepared to play the jester to Stewart and Colbert's king and hope that in the end they still smell like roses.

Crossfire Appearance

Writers disagree, however, about whether The Daily Show is relevant to the media today or has influenced other TV shows. Elizabeth Deggans thinks Stewart has had a significant influence and highlights his appearance on Crossfire, which many argue was the reason Crossfire was subsequently dropped by CNN a month later. In a now legendary guest appearance, Stewart agreed to be a guest on the show. The show aired on October 15, 2004 and talk surrounded the upcoming presidential elections in 2004, but mostly focused on Stewart's responsibility as a journalist. After taking repeated criticisms from Tucker Carlson for being a terrible journalist Stewart countered in reference to Carlson's show as "it's not so much that it's bad, as it's hurting America" (2).

In her interview with Stewart, Deggans maintains that Stewart's criticism of the show had a powerful influence on CNN's decision to cancel the show. With the growing popularity of new media outlets like The Daily Show, the format of shows like Crossfire become more and more irrelevant to viewers (4). Andre Ryan disagrees with Deggans' argument, however, and claims that CNN wasn't sending any kind of message, nor was it influenced at all by The Daily Show (85). He argues that the