

CHICAGO INDIRECT REPORTING EXAMPLES

UNDERSTANDING CHICAGO INDIRECT REPORTING EXAMPLES IN ACADEMIC WRITING

CHICAGO INDIRECT REPORTING EXAMPLES ARE CRUCIAL FOR STUDENTS AND RESEARCHERS ADHERING TO THE CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE, PARTICULARLY WHEN CITING SOURCES WITHOUT DIRECTLY QUOTING THEM. THIS METHOD OF PARAPHRASING AND SYNTHESIZING INFORMATION REQUIRES CAREFUL ATTENTION TO ATTRIBUTION TO AVOID PLAGIARISM AND ENSURE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY. UNDERSTANDING HOW TO EFFECTIVELY REPHRASE IDEAS FROM SOURCE MATERIALS, INTEGRATE THEM INTO ONE'S OWN ARGUMENTS, AND PROVIDE PROPER CITATIONS IS A FUNDAMENTAL SKILL IN ACADEMIC WRITING. THIS ARTICLE WILL DELVE INTO THE NUANCES OF INDIRECT REPORTING ACCORDING TO CHICAGO STYLE, EXPLORING VARIOUS SCENARIOS, COMMON PITFALLS, AND BEST PRACTICES FOR SEAMLESS INTEGRATION OF SOURCE MATERIAL INTO YOUR WORK. WE WILL COVER THE PRINCIPLES OF PARAPHRASING, SUMMARIZING, AND WHEN AND HOW TO USE INDIRECT DISCOURSE, ALL WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF CHICAGO'S COMPREHENSIVE GUIDELINES.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- UNDERSTANDING THE CORE PRINCIPLES OF INDIRECT REPORTING
- KEY DIFFERENCES: PARAPHRASING VS. SUMMARIZING
- CONSTRUCTING EFFECTIVE INDIRECT REPORTING IN CHICAGO STYLE
- COMMON SCENARIOS FOR INDIRECT REPORTING
- AVOIDING PLAGIARISM WITH CHICAGO INDIRECT REPORTING
- ADVANCED CONSIDERATIONS FOR INDIRECT REPORTING
- CONCLUSION: MASTERING INDIRECT REPORTING IN CHICAGO STYLE

UNDERSTANDING THE CORE PRINCIPLES OF INDIRECT REPORTING

INDIRECT REPORTING, IN THE CONTEXT OF ACADEMIC WRITING AND THE CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE, REFERS TO THE PRACTICE OF CONVEYING THE IDEAS OR INFORMATION FROM A SOURCE IN YOUR OWN WORDS WITHOUT USING QUOTATION MARKS. THIS IS FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT FROM DIRECT QUOTATION, WHERE YOU REPRODUCE THE EXACT WORDS OF THE ORIGINAL AUTHOR. THE PRIMARY GOAL OF INDIRECT REPORTING IS TO INTEGRATE THE ESSENCE OF AN EXTERNAL SOURCE'S ARGUMENT OR FINDINGS INTO YOUR OWN NARRATIVE SEAMLESSLY, DEMONSTRATING YOUR UNDERSTANDING AND ENGAGEMENT WITH THE MATERIAL. IT ALLOWS FOR A SMOOTHER FLOW OF TEXT AND INTEGRATES THE SOURCE'S IDEAS AS PART OF YOUR OWN THOUGHT PROCESS, RATHER THAN PRESENTING THEM AS DISTINCT, QUOTED SEGMENTS. THIS TECHNIQUE IS VITAL FOR BUILDING A COHERENT ARGUMENT AND SHOWING HOW EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP SUPPORTS YOUR THESIS.

THE CORE PRINCIPLE UNDERPINNING ALL FORMS OF INDIRECT REPORTING IS THAT THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND THE ORIGINAL PHRASING BELONG TO THE SOURCE AUTHOR. THEREFORE, EVEN WHEN YOU ARE NOT QUOTING VERBATIM, YOU MUST STILL ACKNOWLEDGE THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEA. FAILURE TO DO SO CONSTITUTES PLAGIARISM, A SERIOUS ACADEMIC OFFENSE. CHICAGO STYLE, LIKE OTHER MAJOR CITATION SYSTEMS, MANDATES A CLEAR AND CONSISTENT METHOD FOR THIS ACKNOWLEDGMENT, PRIMARILY THROUGH FOOTNOTES OR ENDNOTES, AND A CORRESPONDING BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRY. EFFECTIVE INDIRECT REPORTING

DEMONSTRATES NOT ONLY A MASTERY OF THE SOURCE MATERIAL BUT ALSO A SOPHISTICATED ABILITY TO SYNTHESIZE AND ARTICULATE COMPLEX IDEAS WITHIN YOUR OWN SCHOLARLY VOICE.

KEY DIFFERENCES: PARAPHRASING VS. SUMMARIZING

WHILE BOTH PARAPHRASING AND SUMMARIZING FALL UNDER THE UMBRELLA OF INDIRECT REPORTING, THEY SERVE DISTINCT PURPOSES AND DIFFER IN THEIR SCOPE AND DETAIL. UNDERSTANDING THESE DISTINCTIONS IS CRUCIAL FOR APPLYING THEM CORRECTLY IN YOUR CHICAGO-STYLE RESEARCH.

PARAPHRASING IN DETAIL

PARAPHRASING INVOLVES RESTATING A SPECIFIC PASSAGE OR IDEA FROM A SOURCE IN YOUR OWN WORDS AND SENTENCE STRUCTURE. THE LENGTH OF A PARAPHRASE IS TYPICALLY SIMILAR TO THAT OF THE ORIGINAL PASSAGE. THE INTENT IS TO CAPTURE THE FULL MEANING OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT BUT TO EXPRESS IT DIFFERENTLY, OFTEN TO CLARIFY A COMPLEX POINT, ADAPT IT TO YOUR ARGUMENT'S SPECIFIC NEEDS, OR INTEGRATE IT MORE SMOOTHLY INTO YOUR PROSE. WHEN PARAPHRASING, IT IS IMPERATIVE TO CHANGE NOT ONLY THE WORDING BUT ALSO THE SENTENCE ORGANIZATION. SIMPLY SWAPPING OUT A FEW WORDS OR REARRANGING A CLAUSE IS INSUFFICIENT AND CAN STILL BE CONSIDERED A FORM OF PLAGIARISM. EACH PARAPHRASE REQUIRES A CITATION TO THE ORIGINAL SOURCE.

SUMMARIZING EXPLAINED

SUMMARIZING, ON THE OTHER HAND, CONDENSES THE MAIN POINTS OR THE ENTIRETY OF A SOURCE INTO A MUCH SHORTER FORM. A SUMMARY CAPTURES THE OVERARCHING ARGUMENT, KEY FINDINGS, OR MAIN IDEAS WITHOUT DELVING INTO THE SPECIFIC DETAILS OR SUPPORTING EVIDENCE PRESENT IN THE ORIGINAL TEXT. SUMMARIES ARE TYPICALLY MUCH SHORTER THAN THE ORIGINAL MATERIAL AND ARE USED TO PROVIDE CONTEXT, BACKGROUND INFORMATION, OR A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF A SOURCE'S CONTRIBUTION TO A FIELD. LIKE PARAPHRASING, SUMMARIZING ALSO NECESSITATES A CITATION TO THE ORIGINAL SOURCE, ENSURING THAT THE READER CAN LOCATE THE COMPLETE WORK IF THEY WISH TO EXPLORE IT FURTHER.

CONSTRUCTING EFFECTIVE INDIRECT REPORTING IN CHICAGO STYLE

CREATING EFFECTIVE INDIRECT REPORTS WITHIN THE CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE FRAMEWORK INVOLVES MORE THAN JUST REPHRASING. IT REQUIRES CAREFUL INTEGRATION INTO YOUR OWN WRITING AND PRECISE ATTRIBUTION.

ATTRIBUTION MECHANISMS: FOOTNOTES AND ENDNOTES

CHICAGO STYLE PRIMARILY USES A SYSTEM OF NUMBERED NOTES, EITHER FOOTNOTES (APPEARING AT THE BOTTOM OF THE PAGE) OR ENDNOTES (COLLECTED AT THE END OF THE DOCUMENT), FOR CITATIONS. WHEN YOU INDIRECTLY REPORT INFORMATION, YOU WILL PLACE A SUPERScript ARABIC NUMERAL AT THE END OF THE SENTENCE OR CLAUSE THAT CONTAINS THE REPHRASED INFORMATION. THIS NUMERAL CORRESPONDS TO A SPECIFIC NOTE CONTAINING THE FULL BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAILS OF THE SOURCE. THE FIRST TIME A SOURCE IS CITED, THE NOTE WILL INCLUDE ALL RELEVANT PUBLICATION INFORMATION. SUBSEQUENT CITATIONS TO THE SAME SOURCE CAN USE A SHORTENED FORM.

THE ROLE OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHY

COMPLEMENTING THE FOOTNOTE OR ENDNOTE SYSTEM IS THE BIBLIOGRAPHY, WHICH APPEARS AT THE END OF THE ENTIRE WORK. THE BIBLIOGRAPHY LISTS ALL SOURCES THAT WERE CONSULTED AND CITED IN THE TEXT. FOR EACH INDIRECT REPORT YOU MAKE,

THE FULL BIBLIOGRAPHIC ENTRY IN THE BIBLIOGRAPHY PROVIDES COMPREHENSIVE DETAILS ABOUT THE SOURCE, ALLOWING READERS TO EASILY FIND AND CONSULT THE ORIGINAL MATERIAL. THE FORMAT OF BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRIES IN CHICAGO STYLE IS SPECIFIC AND REQUIRES ATTENTION TO DETAIL REGARDING AUTHORS, TITLES, PUBLICATION DATES, AND OTHER ESSENTIAL INFORMATION.

SYNTHESIZING AND INTEGRATING IDEAS

EFFECTIVE INDIRECT REPORTING GOES BEYOND SIMPLY PRESENTING ONE REPHRASED IDEA AT A TIME. IT OFTEN INVOLVES SYNTHESIZING INFORMATION FROM MULTIPLE SOURCES TO BUILD A MORE ROBUST ARGUMENT OR TO PROVIDE A COMPREHENSIVE OVERVIEW OF A TOPIC. WHEN SYNTHESIZING, YOU MIGHT GROUP SIMILAR IDEAS FROM DIFFERENT AUTHORS AND PRESENT THEM TOGETHER, CLEARLY ATTRIBUTING EACH POINT TO ITS RESPECTIVE SOURCE. THIS DEMONSTRATES A DEEPER ENGAGEMENT WITH THE LITERATURE AND YOUR ABILITY TO DRAW CONNECTIONS AND COMPARISONS BETWEEN DIFFERENT SCHOLARLY PERSPECTIVES. THE GOAL IS TO WEAVE THE BORROWED IDEAS INTO YOUR OWN ARGUMENT SO THEY CONTRIBUTE TO YOUR UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION TO THE DISCOURSE.

COMMON SCENARIOS FOR INDIRECT REPORTING

VARIOUS ACADEMIC SITUATIONS CALL FOR THE USE OF INDIRECT REPORTING. RECOGNIZING THESE SCENARIOS CAN HELP YOU APPLY THE TECHNIQUE APPROPRIATELY.

INTRODUCING BACKGROUND INFORMATION

WHEN YOU NEED TO PROVIDE CONTEXT OR BACKGROUND FOR YOUR ARGUMENT, INDIRECT REPORTING IS OFTEN MORE EFFICIENT THAN DIRECT QUOTATION. YOU CAN SUMMARIZE OR PARAPHRASE KEY HISTORICAL EVENTS, ESTABLISHED THEORIES, OR FOUNDATIONAL CONCEPTS FROM PREVIOUS RESEARCH TO SET THE STAGE FOR YOUR OWN ANALYSIS. FOR EXAMPLE, WHEN DISCUSSING A CONTEMPORARY ISSUE, YOU MIGHT INDIRECTLY REPORT ON ITS HISTORICAL ROOTS AS EXPLAINED BY A PROMINENT HISTORIAN.

SUPPORTING CLAIMS WITH EVIDENCE

MUCH OF ACADEMIC ARGUMENTATION RELIES ON SUPPORTING CLAIMS WITH EVIDENCE FROM EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP. INSTEAD OF QUOTING EVERY PIECE OF SUPPORTING DATA OR EVERY EXPERT OPINION, YOU CAN EFFECTIVELY PARAPHRASE OR SUMMARIZE RELEVANT FINDINGS. THIS ALLOWS YOU TO PRESENT A SERIES OF SUPPORTING POINTS CONCISELY AND MAINTAIN A FOCUSED NARRATIVE. FOR INSTANCE, YOU MIGHT INDIRECTLY REPORT ON SEVERAL STUDIES THAT HAVE DEMONSTRATED A PARTICULAR PHENOMENON.

EXPLAINING COMPLEX THEORIES OR CONCEPTS

SOMETIMES, THE ORIGINAL WORDING OF A COMPLEX THEORY OR CONCEPT FROM A SOURCE MIGHT BE DENSE OR DIFFICULT FOR YOUR INTENDED AUDIENCE. INDIRECT REPORTING ALLOWS YOU TO REPHRASE THESE IDEAS IN SIMPLER TERMS WHILE STILL ACCURATELY CONVEYING THE ORIGINAL MEANING. THIS MAKES THE INFORMATION MORE ACCESSIBLE AND DIGESTIBLE FOR YOUR READERS, DEMONSTRATING YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE MATERIAL BY BEING ABLE TO EXPLAIN IT IN A NEW WAY.

REFERENCING ESTABLISHED KNOWLEDGE

WHEN REFERRING TO WIDELY ACCEPTED FACTS OR THEORIES WITHIN A FIELD THAT ARE NOT ATTRIBUTABLE TO A SINGLE, EASILY

QUOTABLE SOURCE, INDIRECT REPORTING IS THE APPROPRIATE METHOD. YOU MIGHT INDIRECTLY REPORT ON GENERAL FINDINGS OR COMMON UNDERSTANDINGS THAT ARE PART OF THE ESTABLISHED DISCOURSE, ENSURING YOU CREDIT THE BROADER BODY OF SCHOLARSHIP OR SPECIFIC FOUNDATIONAL TEXTS IF APPLICABLE.

AVOIDING PLAGIARISM WITH CHICAGO INDIRECT REPORTING

THE SPECTER OF PLAGIARISM LOOMS LARGE IN ACADEMIC WRITING, AND UNDERSTANDING HOW TO CORRECTLY EMPLOY INDIRECT REPORTING IS A KEY DEFENSE AGAINST IT. PLAGIARISM OCCURS NOT ONLY WHEN YOU COPY TEXT WORD-FOR-WORD WITHOUT ATTRIBUTION BUT ALSO WHEN YOU REPHRASE SOMEONE ELSE'S IDEAS TOO CLOSELY WITHOUT PROPER CITATION.

UNDERSTANDING 'CLOSE PARAPHRASING'

A COMMON PITFALL IS "CLOSE PARAPHRASING," WHERE A WRITER CHANGES ONLY A FEW WORDS OR THE SENTENCE STRUCTURE SLIGHTLY WHILE RETAINING THE ORIGINAL AUTHOR'S PHRASING AND IDEAS. THIS IS CONSIDERED PLAGIARISM BECAUSE THE ORIGINAL WORK IS STILL TOO CLOSELY IDENTIFIABLE. TO AVOID THIS, ENSURE YOUR PARAPHRASE GENUINELY REFLECTS THE MEANING IN YOUR OWN UNIQUE SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION AND VOCABULARY. ALWAYS ASK YOURSELF: "WOULD SOMEONE FAMILIAR WITH THE ORIGINAL SOURCE RECOGNIZE THIS AS MY OWN WORDING AND STRUCTURE?"

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONSISTENT CITATION

THE MOST DIRECT WAY TO AVOID PLAGIARISM WHEN USING INDIRECT REPORTING IS TO BE SCRUPULOUS WITH YOUR CITATIONS. EVERY TIME YOU BORROW AN IDEA, FACT, OR INTERPRETATION FROM A SOURCE, NO MATTER HOW BRIEFLY OR HOW MUCH YOU REPHRASE IT, YOU MUST INCLUDE A FOOTNOTE OR ENDNOTE. THIS CONSISTENT HABIT ENSURES THAT ALL BORROWED MATERIAL IS PROPERLY ATTRIBUTED, SAFEGUARDING YOUR ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND GIVING CREDIT WHERE IT IS DUE.

DEVELOPING YOUR OWN VOICE

WHILE INDIRECT REPORTING INVOLVES USING OTHERS' IDEAS, IT SHOULD NOT STIFLE YOUR OWN VOICE. THE GOAL IS TO INTEGRATE THESE IDEAS INTO YOUR ARGUMENT, USING YOUR OWN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK AND COMMENTARY. YOUR UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION LIES IN HOW YOU SELECT, INTERPRET, SYNTHESIZE, AND PRESENT THE BORROWED INFORMATION TO ADVANCE YOUR OWN THESIS. THIS ACTIVE ENGAGEMENT WITH SOURCES, RATHER THAN PASSIVE BORROWING, IS THE HALLMARK OF STRONG ACADEMIC WRITING.

ADVANCED CONSIDERATIONS FOR INDIRECT REPORTING

AS YOU BECOME MORE PROFICIENT IN INDIRECT REPORTING, YOU MAY ENCOUNTER MORE COMPLEX SITUATIONS THAT REQUIRE NUANCED APPLICATION OF CHICAGO STYLE PRINCIPLES.

INDIRECTLY REPORTING FROM SECONDARY SOURCES

WHEN YOU CITE A SOURCE THAT ITSELF CITES ANOTHER SOURCE, THIS IS KNOWN AS AN INDIRECT CITATION OR CITING "TWO BOOKS BACK." CHICAGO STYLE GENERALLY ADVISES AGAINST THIS PRACTICE WHENEVER POSSIBLE, ENCOURAGING YOU TO FIND AND CONSULT THE ORIGINAL SOURCE. HOWEVER, IF THE ORIGINAL IS INACCESSIBLE, CHICAGO STYLE PERMITS CITING THE SECONDARY SOURCE IN WHICH YOU FOUND THE INFORMATION, BUT THIS MUST BE CLEARLY INDICATED IN THE NOTE. FOR EXAMPLE, A NOTE MIGHT READ: "QUOTED IN SMITH, BOOK TITLE, 45, CITING JOHNSON, ORIGINAL WORK TITLE."

ATTRIBUTING MULTIPLE IDEAS IN ONE SENTENCE

IT IS POSSIBLE, AND OFTEN EFFICIENT, TO INDIRECTLY REPORT MULTIPLE DISTINCT IDEAS FROM DIFFERENT SOURCES WITHIN A SINGLE SENTENCE OR A CLOSELY RELATED SERIES OF SENTENCES. IN SUCH CASES, EACH DISTINCT IDEA OR PIECE OF INFORMATION REQUIRING ATTRIBUTION MUST BE FOLLOWED BY ITS CORRESPONDING FOOTNOTE OR ENDNOTE NUMBER. THIS ENSURES CLARITY AND AVOIDS ANY AMBIGUITY ABOUT WHICH PART OF THE SENTENCE BELONGS TO WHICH SOURCE. CAREFUL PLACEMENT OF NOTE NUMBERS IS KEY TO MAINTAINING ACCURACY.

WHEN NOT TO INDIRECTLY REPORT

THERE ARE INSTANCES WHERE INDIRECT REPORTING MIGHT NOT BE THE BEST CHOICE. IF AN AUTHOR'S ORIGINAL WORDING IS PARTICULARLY IMPACTFUL, CONCISE, OR UNIQUELY PHRASED, A DIRECT QUOTATION MIGHT BE MORE APPROPRIATE. SIMILARLY, IF YOU ARE ANALYZING A SPECIFIC LINGUISTIC FEATURE OR RHETORICAL STRATEGY EMPLOYED BY AN AUTHOR, DIRECT QUOTATION IS OFTEN NECESSARY. USE YOUR JUDGMENT TO DETERMINE WHICH METHOD BEST SERVES YOUR ARGUMENTATIVE PURPOSE AND ACCURATELY REPRESENTS THE SOURCE MATERIAL.

CONCLUSION: MASTERING INDIRECT REPORTING IN CHICAGO STYLE

MASTERING INDIRECT REPORTING WITHIN THE CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE IS AN ONGOING PROCESS THAT REFINES YOUR ABILITY TO ENGAGE WITH SCHOLARLY SOURCES EFFECTIVELY AND ETHICALLY. IT IS ABOUT MORE THAN JUST AVOIDING PLAGIARISM; IT IS ABOUT SKILLFULLY WEAVING THE INSIGHTS OF OTHERS INTO THE FABRIC OF YOUR OWN ARGUMENT, DEMONSTRATING YOUR COMPREHENSION AND ANALYTICAL PROWESS. BY UNDERSTANDING THE PRINCIPLES OF PARAPHRASING AND SUMMARIZING, ADHERING TO CHICAGO'S CITATION CONVENTIONS, AND DILIGENTLY PRACTICING THESE TECHNIQUES, YOU CAN ENHANCE THE CLARITY, CREDIBILITY, AND INTELLECTUAL DEPTH OF YOUR ACADEMIC WORK. CONSISTENT PRACTICE AND A COMMITMENT TO ACCURATE ATTRIBUTION WILL SOLIDIFY YOUR ABILITY TO USE INDIRECT REPORTING AS A POWERFUL TOOL IN YOUR SCHOLARLY ARSENAL.

FAQ

Q: WHAT IS THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF INDIRECT REPORTING IN CHICAGO STYLE?

A: THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF INDIRECT REPORTING IN CHICAGO STYLE IS TO CONVEY THE IDEAS, ARGUMENTS, OR INFORMATION FROM A SOURCE IN YOUR OWN WORDS WHILE STILL GIVING FULL AND ACCURATE CREDIT TO THE ORIGINAL AUTHOR THROUGH PROPER CITATION, THEREBY AVOIDING PLAGIARISM AND INTEGRATING EXTERNAL SCHOLARSHIP INTO YOUR OWN NARRATIVE.

Q: HOW DOES CHICAGO STYLE DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN PARAPHRASING AND SUMMARIZING?

A: CHICAGO STYLE DIFFERENTIATES BETWEEN PARAPHRASING AND SUMMARIZING BY THEIR SCOPE AND LENGTH. PARAPHRASING RESTATES A SPECIFIC PASSAGE OR IDEA IN SIMILAR DETAIL AND LENGTH BUT IN YOUR OWN WORDS, WHEREAS SUMMARIZING CONDENSES THE MAIN POINTS OR ENTIRETY OF A SOURCE INTO A MUCH SHORTER FORM. BOTH REQUIRE CITATION.

Q: WHEN IS IT APPROPRIATE TO USE INDIRECT REPORTING INSTEAD OF A DIRECT QUOTATION IN CHICAGO STYLE?

A: IT IS APPROPRIATE TO USE INDIRECT REPORTING WHEN YOU WANT TO INTEGRATE INFORMATION SMOOTHLY INTO YOUR PROSE, EXPLAIN COMPLEX IDEAS IN SIMPLER TERMS, PROVIDE BACKGROUND CONTEXT, OR SUPPORT CLAIMS WITH EVIDENCE WITHOUT DISRUPTING THE FLOW WITH DIRECT QUOTES, OR WHEN THE ORIGINAL WORDING IS NOT PARTICULARLY UNIQUE OR IMPACTFUL.

Q: CAN I AVOID CITATION IF I REPHRASE AN IDEA FROM A SOURCE SIGNIFICANTLY?

A: NO, EVEN IF YOU REPHRASE AN IDEA FROM A SOURCE SIGNIFICANTLY, YOU MUST STILL CITE IT. THE ORIGINAL THOUGHT OR CONCEPT BELONGS TO THE SOURCE AUTHOR, AND ANY INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTION, REGARDLESS OF THE WORDING USED TO EXPRESS IT, REQUIRES ATTRIBUTION TO AVOID PLAGIARISM.

Q: WHAT ARE THE MAIN COMPONENTS OF A CHICAGO STYLE CITATION FOR AN INDIRECTLY REPORTED IDEA?

A: THE MAIN COMPONENTS OF A CHICAGO STYLE CITATION FOR AN INDIRECTLY REPORTED IDEA INVOLVE A SUPERScript NUMBER IN THE TEXT CORRESPONDING TO EITHER A FOOTNOTE AT THE BOTTOM OF THE PAGE OR AN ENDNOTE AT THE END OF THE DOCUMENT, WHICH CONTAINS THE FULL BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAILS OF THE SOURCE, AND A CORRESPONDING ENTRY IN THE BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Q: WHAT IS "CLOSE PARAPHRASING," AND WHY SHOULD IT BE AVOIDED IN CHICAGO STYLE?

A: "CLOSE PARAPHRASING" OCCURS WHEN A WRITER CHANGES ONLY A FEW WORDS OR SLIGHTLY ALTERS THE SENTENCE STRUCTURE OF AN ORIGINAL TEXT WHILE RETAINING MUCH OF THE AUTHOR'S PHRASING AND ORIGINAL STRUCTURE. IT SHOULD BE AVOIDED BECAUSE IT IS CONSIDERED A FORM OF PLAGIARISM, AS THE WORK IS STILL TOO CLOSELY TIED TO THE ORIGINAL.

Q: HOW SHOULD I HANDLE CITING A SOURCE THAT REFERENCES ANOTHER SOURCE (INDIRECT CITATION) IN CHICAGO STYLE?

A: IN CHICAGO STYLE, IT IS BEST TO FIND AND CITE THE ORIGINAL SOURCE. IF THE ORIGINAL SOURCE IS INACCESSIBLE, YOU CAN CITE THE SECONDARY SOURCE WHERE YOU FOUND THE INFORMATION AND CLEARLY INDICATE THAT YOU ARE CITING INDIRECTLY IN YOUR NOTE, FOR EXAMPLE, "QUOTED IN [SECONDARY AUTHOR], [SECONDARY TITLE], [PAGE NUMBER], CITING [ORIGINAL AUTHOR], [ORIGINAL TITLE]."

Q: DOES CHICAGO STYLE HAVE SPECIFIC RULES FOR THE LENGTH OF A PARAPHRASE?

A: WHILE THERE IS NO STRICT WORD COUNT, A PARAPHRASE IN CHICAGO STYLE IS GENERALLY EXPECTED TO BE OF ROUGHLY SIMILAR LENGTH TO THE ORIGINAL PASSAGE IT IS REPHRASING, AIMING TO CAPTURE THE FULL MEANING AND DETAIL OF THE SPECIFIC IDEA BEING CONVEYED. SUMMARIES, CONVERSELY, ARE SIGNIFICANTLY SHORTER.

[Chicago Indirect Reporting Examples](#)

Chicago Indirect Reporting Examples

Related Articles

- [chicago manual in-text citations](#)
- [chicago manual grammar usage](#)
- [chicago manual of style 17th edition news](#)

[Back to Home](#)