APPENDIX A
SIMPLIFIED ESSAY WRITING

Every piece you write should contain three elements:

I. **Introduction**

The introduction is intended to draw the reader into the body of material to follow. It should begin with a general statement or question, sometimes called the "thesis statement" or "thesis question," followed by a quick narrowing down to the main theme to be developed in the body. Set the stage quickly, give appropriate background, then move right into a transition sentence that will set up the reader for the body.

II. **Body (Argument)**

The body of a written piece is where you elaborate, defend, and expand the thesis introduced in the introduction. The body should support your main contention with supporting evidence and possible objections. A good body presents both sides of a case, pro and con. As you make your case, save your best argument for last. When presenting contrary views, be sure to set forth the strongest arguments so you can avoid being changed with erecting a "straw man."

The body includes three components:

Elaboration:	Spell out the details by defining, clarifying and adding relevant, pertinent information.
Illustration:	Paint a verbal picture that helps make or clarify your point(s). Well-illustrated pieces are easier to read and follow than those on a high level of abstraction.
Argumentation:	Give the reasons, justifications, and rationales for the position or view you have taken in the introduction. Draw inferences for the reader and explain the significance or assertions or claims being made.

When moving from one sub point or argument to another, use connecting or transition words and phrases that enable your reader to more easily follow the flow of your case.

The following is a partial list of logical connectors that you can use:

- *exceptions* - but, alas, however, etc.
- *illustrations* - for instance, for example, etc.
- *conclusions* - thus, so, therefore, consequently, etc.
- *comparisons* -similarly, by contrast, etc.
- *qualifications* - yet, still, etc.
- *additions* - moreover, furthermore, etc.

III. **Conclusion**

Make your final appeal to the reader, a finishing, all-encompassing statement that wraps up your presentation in a powerful or even dramatic fashion. Normally a single paragraph, brief and concise, will suffice. The purpose of the conclusion is to leave the reader with an idea or thought that captures the essence of the body while provoking further reflection and consideration.

APPENDIX B
HOW TO WRITE A CRITICAL PAPER

"CRITICISM"-n. The art, skill or profession of making discriminating judgments and evaluations.

FIRST, LEARN TO LISTEN AND READ CRITICALLY, ASK YOURSELF FOUR BASIC QUESTONS AS YOU READ AND LISTEN*:*

THE ESSENCE OF CRITICAL THINKING

1. What is the book/message about as a whole?
2. What is the author/speaker saying in detail, and how is it said?
3. Is the book/message true, in whole or in part?
4. What is the significance of the book/message?

SECOND, WRITE YOUR PAPER IN FOUR SECTIONS

FOUR ELEMENTS OF A CRITICAL PAPER

PART ONE: DESCRIPTION
Classify the book/message according to kind and subject matter. *Very briefly*, state what the whole of the book/message is about. Enumerate the major parts of the book/message in their order and relation. Define the problem or problems that the author/speaker is trying to solve.

PART TWO: INTERPRETATION
Find the important words (terms) in the book/message and determine the author's/speaker's meaning of these terms, with precision.

Identify the most important sentences (propositions) in the book/message, the ones that express the judgments on which the whole book/message rests. These are the foundational affirmations and denials of the author/speaker. They must be either premises or conclusions. State them in your own words.

Construct the author's/speaker's arguments, beginning with any assumptions and/or self-evident propositions. An argument is the author's/speaker's line of reasoning aimed at demonstrating the truth or falsehood of his or her claims, that is, the coherent series of reasons, statements, or facts that support or establish a point of view. If the arguments are not explicitly expressed in the book/message, you will need to construct them from sequences of sentences.

Determine the author's/speaker's solutions to the problem or question that he or she posed. Ask: Which problems were solved and which were not? Did the author/speaker know which were not solved?

PART THREE: CRITICISM
General Pointers.
From this point on, you will have a chance to argue with the author/speaker and express yourself, but keep in mind the following general maxims of scholarly etiquette:

Do not say that you agree, disagree, or suspend judgment until you have adequately interpreted the book/message. Do not begin criticism until you are able to say, with reasonable certainty, "I understand," i.e., I have done an adequate job with parts one and two. Complete the task of understanding before rushing in.

When you disagree, do so reasonably and not contentiously.

Demonstrate that you know the difference between knowledge and personal opinion by presenting good reasons for any critical judgments that you make.

Three conditions must be satisfied if controversy is to be well conducted:

- Make an attempt at impartiality by reading/listening sympathetically.
- Acknowledge any emotions that you bring to the dispute.
- State your own assumptions explicitly.

Determine, wherever possible, the *origins* and the *consequences* of the author's/speaker's arguments.
Try to locate the origins of the author's/speaker's ideas in the larger picture of history. What movements, currents of thought, or other thinkers might have influenced him or her? Then carry the author's/speaker's ideas to their logical conclusions. To the best of your ability and given the academic background that you already possess, relate the author's/speaker's ideas to those of other authors with whom you are familiar.

Judge the *soundness* of the author's/speaker's arguments.
As called for, show where the author/speaker is *uninformed*. To support your remarks, you must be able to state the knowledge that the author/speaker lacks and show how it is relevant, i.e., how it affects the conclusions.

As called for, show where the author/speaker is *misinformed*, where assertions are made that are contrary to fact. This kind of defect should be pointed out only if it is relevant to the conclusions. To support your remark, you must be able to argue the truth or greater probability of a position contrary to the author's/speaker's.

As called for, show where the author/speaker is *illogical*, where there are fallacies in reasoning. In general fallacies are of two sorts. There is the *non sequitur*, which means that the conclusion simply does not follow for the reasons that are offered. Then there is the problem of inconsistency, which means that two things the author/speaker has tried to say are incompatible. To make either of these criticisms, you must be able to show the precise respect in which the author's/speaker's argument fails to be forcibly convincing. Be concerned with this defect only if major conclusions are affected by it.

In addition, show where the author/speaker fails to draw any conclusions that are implied by the evidence given or principles involved.

If you have not been able to show that the author/speaker is uninformed, misinformed or illogical on relevant matters, you simply cannot disagree. You must agree, at least in part, although you may suspend judgment on the whole. If you have been convinced, you should admit it. If, despite your failure to support one or more of these critical points, you still honestly feel unconvinced, perhaps you should not have said that you understood in the first place!

Judge the *completeness* of the author's/speaker's arguments.
Define any inadequacy precisely. Did the author/speaker solve all the problems he/she started with? Did the author/speaker make the best use of available materials and resources? Did the author/speaker see all the implications and ramifications of the problem? Did the author/speaker make all essential or relevant distinctions in his or her presentation?

Judge the *value* of the book/message.
Your final evaluation must be concerned with the truth and significance of the book/message for a given purpose, i.e., its *value.* This judgment must be based on definite criteria. These criteria should be internal (soundness and completeness) as well as external (relevance to some purpose).

PART FOUR: (OPTIONAL) INTEGRATE THE ACADEMIC AND THE PERSONAL.
Engage the key idea(s) that are most provocative and alive for you. Consider how your experience is similar to or different from what you read. Identify any spiritual issues as they arose for you and your way of responding to or struggling with them. Describe which key ideas, if any, might be applied in your ministry.

SOURCE: *Adapted from Mortimer J. Adler and Charles Van Doren*, How to Read a Book: The Classic Guide to Intelligent Reading (*New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972*).

APPENDIX C
HOW TO WRITE A RESEARCH PAPER

"RESEARCH"- n. Scholarly or scientific investigation or inquiry. v. To study thoroughly; to seek out, to search again.

STEP ONE: CHOOSE A TOPIC
Select a specific, focused topic to research. Where do topic ideas come from? You can often find a topic by looking through your textbooks, particularly in the sections that list suggestions for further reading and study. You can go through lecture notes, examine books and articles in the library, look through subject catalogs or refer to encyclopedias. Often the most interesting topics for you personally are drawn from your own experience – your personal knowledge, interests and beliefs.

STEP TWO: NARROW YOUR TOPIC BY DEVELOPING SOME RESEARCHABLE QUESTIONS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO ANSWER

Rather than beginning with a preconceived thesis (a truth claim) that you then must rationalize, narrow your topic by developing a set of questions related to it. You might start with the classic journalists' questions Who? What? When? Where? How? Why? Or ask, What is positive about "X"? What is negative? What is merely interesting?

Consider your topic from different perspectives. The static perspective focuses on what is. The dynamic perspective looks at action and change. The relative perspective examines relationships and systems. Ask, for example: How can "X" be systematically described? How has "X" changed over time? What other factors are related to "X"? How is one element of "X" related to another?

Other strategies for question development can focus on narration, process, cause and effect, definition, classification and division, comparison and contrast. For example: In what sequence of events does "X" manifest? What precedes and what follows "X"? Is it possible to say what causes "X"? How can "X" be systematically defined? What classes and subclasses of "X" exist and how are they significant to the whole of "X"? How does "X" compare and contrast with "Y"?

Some ideas will seem worth pursuing; others will seem inappropriate for your purpose, audience or occasion. You will find yourself discarding ideas even as you develop new ones.

STEP THREE: SURVEY THE FIELD
Create a tentative bibliography of your topic by searching relevant databases, library catalogues and existing bibliographies in books. For computerized indexes, carefully choose key words that best capture the essence of your topic. Seek the help of a professional librarian if necessary.

Skim all of the works on the tentative bibliography to acquire a clearer idea of the topic and to ascertain which are most useful for your paper.

Find the passages in the books and articles that are most germane to your needs. Revise your research questions in light of what your literature survey reveals. Search and revise again if necessary.

STEP FOUR: WRITE THE PAPER
The following is a general structure to follow for many kinds of research papers. Adapt it to specific assignments as appropriate.

Introduction. Announce the subject, set the tone and gain the reader's attention and interest. Provide some general information on the background of your topic.

Statement of the Problem. Announce the purpose of your study. Give the reader a firm sense of what you're doing and why. List the questions that you will address. List your assumptions, those self-evident conditions that you take for granted. Describe your rationale, the underlying principles and logical basis for

your study. Define the scope of your work and discuss any weaknesses that you can perceive in your approach. Define the key terms that you will use in your paper. Stipulate meanings for ambiguous terms.

Summary of Investigation. Identify the principal works and authors, the main ideas dealing with your topic and any generally accepted concepts and explanations. Organize your review by themes, systematic propositions, historical sequences or other important ideas relative to the research questions that you asked.

Analysis of Findings. You must do more than ask and answer questions. You must show how your questions are answered differently and try to say why. You must be able to point to books and articles that support your classification of answers. In a research paper, the solution to the problem or the answer to the question often is found in the ordered discussion itself rather than in any set of assertions about it. Identify any contradictions, gaps, uncertainties and controversies that you uncovered. Sort, arrange and define the issues that arise. If a question is clear and if you can be reasonably certain that authors answer it in different ways, then an issue has been defined. It is the issue between the authors who answer the question in one way and those who answer it in or another opposing or variant way. Classify the authors according to their views on the issues. An issue is truly joined when two authors who understand a question in the same way answer it in contrary ways. Remember, however, that differences in answers can often be ascribed as much to different conceptions of the question as to different views of the subject.

Maintain objectivity. Remember than none of the opinions in conflict may be wholly true. Try to see all sides fairly. Make a deliberate effort to balance question against question, to forgo any comment that might be prejudicial and to check any tendency toward overemphasis or under-emphasis. Avoid animosity and *ad hominem* arguments. Do not cite authors out of context. Accompany interpretation of authors' views with actual quotations from their texts.

Conclusion. Ask yourself, what conclusions and implications can I draw from my study? Synthesize new information and personal insights in a way that is uniquely yours. Draw on your own insights, make connections, see similarities, and discern what is true. Evaluate your findings with respect to your own theological and philosophical perspectives. However, avoid polemics, triviality and weak theorizing. Make suggestions for future studies if appropriate.

ACADEMIC STYLE REQUIREMENTS
Prepare your paper using the editorial style of Kate Turabian's <u>Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations</u> (see *Scholarly Resources* that follows).

THINGS TO REMEMBER WHEN DOING HISTORICAL RESEARCH

History has been defined as a dialogue between the present and the past. Historical research is the systematic search for facts relating to questions about the past and the interpretation of these facts. By the studying the past, historians may hope to:

- Acquire knowledge about previously unexamined phenomena
- Better understand present institutions, practices and issues by studying the past.
- Interpret ideas or events that previously have seemed unrelated.
- Synthesize old data or merge it with new historical facts that have been discovered.
- Revise existing histories within the framework of new (and sometimes radical) interpretative frameworks.

Keep these points in mind as you do historical research:

1. Select a problem or topic for which historical sources are available.

2. Try to use primary as well as secondary historical sources. *Primary sources* (such as diaries, letters, manuscripts, etc.) are firsthand accounts. *Secondary sources* are published histories relating to your problem or topic. These histories include historical information, the historian's interpretations and conclusions, references to other secondary sources, and references to primary sources. An important issue is whether to use another historian's facts without checking the primary sources from which they were

derived. Consider the historian's reputation, likelihood of bias, and accessibility of primary source documents.

3. Subject your sources to external and internal criticism. In *external criticism*, the researcher raises questions about the nature of the historical source: Is genuine? Is the original copy? Who wrote it? Where? When? Under what conditions? *Internal criticism* involves evaluating the accuracy and worth of the statements contained in a historical document. Ask: Is it probable that people would act in the way described by the writer? Is it physically possible for described events to have occurred? Do facts and figures seem reasonable? Is the writer a competent observer? Is he or she biased? Be careful not to reject an observation just because it appears improbable.

4. Be aware of the personal values, biases, and interests that influence selection and interpretation of historical sources. *Revisionism* is the tendency to rewrite history according to the interests and concerns of historians. *Presentism* is the tendency to interpret past events using concepts and perspectives that have originated in more recent times. In planning your own historical study, consider at least two interpretative frameworks for explaining the phenomena. Even if you choose to operate primarily within one framework, the other will provide a basis for assessing the worth of your research procedures and thinking.

5. Make careful use of concepts from other disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, statistics, literary criticism, philosophy) to explain past events. Check the definition of each concept to determine whether it applies to the historical phenomena being studied. If necessary, provide a definition of the concept in the report.

6. Be careful with causal inferences. Causal inference is the process of reaching the conclusion that one set of events brought about, directly or indirectly, a subsequent set of events. Historians cannot "prove" that one event in the past caused another, but they can be aware of, and make explicit, the assumptions that underlie the act of ascribing causality to sequences of historical events. It is more defensible to identify an antecedent event as "a" cause that as "the" cause."

7. Limit generalizability of your interpretations to the people, places or institutions that are justified by the available historical information.

8. Synthesize facts into meaningful chronological and thematic patterns.