

Essay 3
Review 2

Overall:

The essay presents some interesting ideas. A good job was done when picking out the quotes from Hollinger's work; they meld well into the paragraphs. The quotes help the ideas flow. The ideas put forth in this paper while they are good ones for the sake of argument are not put across well. The sentences are very messy and poorly written. It is difficult to understand what you are trying to say, and the only way to understand is as a whole. Basically the sentence structure, your syntax is very poor. In your two body paragraphs you present two ideas, which I am having a hard time identifying in your thesis. Your thesis should be very clear and explain what you are trying to argue.

Paragraph I:

- ❖ The first sentence while it is true has very little relevance to the overall point of the paper. You don't have to leave it out but find some way to integrate it better.
- ❖ The next to sentences are important to your paper make sure to keep them in, they lay the basis of Kuhns argument.
- ❖ The sentence about Hollinger's work could be broken into two. First state that Hollinger made this work, then in a separate sentence use the quote. Sometimes it is more effective to have a few concise sentences.
- ❖ The next sentence, which I assume to be your thesis, is very "wish-washy," and a run on. Make a point and stick with it. Pick a standpoint that works with the rest of your paper this thesis is too vague and doesn't shed light on anything.

Paragraph II:

- ❖ The first part of this paragraph is, namely the first two questions you deliver are answered in correctly. Kuhn went into deep detail discussing the development of a paradigm and what exists before it. It is the important fact gathering that occurs in the beginning of science. Kuhn also accounts for what happens when scientists are wrong. He says that they can be wrong and in normal science in fact they will sometimes be wrong which is exactly why a revolution occurs.
- ❖ The next part of this paragraph that Kuhn is very vague in discussing the beginning of paradigms does has a good basis. This example of Earth being round is explained very poorly, your sentences are inconsistent, and where did Aristotle come from? You can use this example but it needs to be bettered explained and relate it more to your original idea.
- ❖ Form another separate paragraph for the idea of nature that you discuss. The idea has merit but it is too much intertwined with this paragraph make it have its own separate paragraph.

Paragraph III:

- ❖ The topic of this paragraph was in no way addressed in the thesis; keep the idea but address it earlier in the introduction.
- ❖ I like this paragraph on the whole, but you could make it better. Remember what we talked about in class about the kind of people who create new paradigms and break old ones. It not everyday scientist who does this.
- ❖ Watch your syntax; reread your writing I think it will do you well.
- ❖ Also most scientists do stay within the constraints of a paradigm that is why revolutions don't occur everyday.
- ❖ With the examples you list at the end, think about them most of those fields are almost preparadigmatic. While these could be good examples don't just bring them up at the end of the paragraph. Explain them more and don't just leave the reader unsatisfied.

Paragraph IV:

- ❖ So as a conclusion this is good.
- ❖ Where do the first two sentences come from though, I am not sure why you would include these.
- ❖ This paragraph is really your thesis. It is here where your ideas and what you are trying to prove is expressed which is good but you should also put this in another form at the beginning of the essay.