

## *Paper 2 Review*

### General Comments

- A. A strong point of your paper is that in it you are trying to support your central claim that the ideas of Carnap and Kuhn are compatible. I think the biggest change you should make to your paper is to improve your presentation of that central idea. In your introduction, you should have pertinent background information smoothly transitioning into your thesis, your central claim and the major points which support it. Give your reader a roadmap. In your body paragraphs, you should start with topic sentences that alert your reader to what you will be discussing in the coming paragraph, what claim you will prove. Then provide the reader with context, a quote or two for evidence, and then lots of analysis of that quote or those quotes. Quoting and then analyzing, not just summarizing, the evidence you find from the texts you note at the end of your paper will make your arguments far more persuasive and precise. Give your reader evidence and reasoning— don't make him or her guess what you are trying to assert or prove. Finally, in your conclusion, you should not merely summarize your points. Demonstrate the link between and the significance of your thesis and all the evidence in your body paragraphs you used to support it. Use this kind of organization, and your paper will be far stronger and more persuasive.
- B. Eliminate liking verbs (was, is, to be, could be, has been...) and the passive voice ("The theory was replaced by Kuhn's ideas" is weaker and more confusing than "Kuhn's ideas replaced the theory"). Your writing will be more concise, direct, and persuasive. Also, read your paper out loud to make sure it flows and has an appropriate formal yet engaging tone.
- C. Be clear. Make sure that if you use a pronoun, a reader can easily identify which noun it refers back to. Avoid phrases like "it would appear" or "it might seem" or "it could be said." Be assertive, not vague or antagonistic, in order to be persuasive. Also, define your terms. Words and phrases like "linguistic framework," "theoretical postulates," "logical empiricism," and even "paradigm" need to be defined for your reader so you have a common vocabulary and he or she can understand what you are talking about.
- D. Proofread your work. I found numerous spelling and grammar mistakes, which distracted me from your ideas. Forgetting commas in particular was a little problematic. Have a friend or APM look over your final draft to make sure these details don't diminish your writing. Also, avoid repetitive word choice and sentence beginnings.
- E. Use Times New Roman font and one inch margins. Center your title, which should be single-spaced, and capitalize the appropriate words in it. Books should be underlined with the appropriate words capitalized; articles should be in quotes. Cite your quotes with parenthetical notes at the ends of sentences or footnotes, and add a bibliography at the end of your paper on a separate page.

## Specific Commentary

### Title and Introduction

- A. Your title is specific and pertinent to your central claim.
- B. Add commas in sentences 1 and 4. The apostrophe should come after the –s in “constituents” in sentence 2 because there is more than one constituent. Also, constituent might not be the best word choice here.
- C. I was a little confused by your first sentence, because, at least in my understanding, paradigms are the fundamental scientific assumptions about certain phenomena which guide future research. Paradigms do not relate to a change in philosophy about how science should be practiced.
- D. “Yet logical empiricism was replaced” seems awkward and incomplete. It is also in the passive voice, which should be eliminated.
- E. You begin two sentences with “It.” What does “it” refer to?
- F. Again, define your terms, craft a clear thesis, and give your reader a road map— how and with what points are you going to prove your central idea?

### Body Paragraph 1

- A. At the end of the second sentence, be specific. Kuhn’s what?
- B. “...with use of” in the third sentence is unnecessarily wordy.
- C. I’m not entirely sure, but “...the same” in the final sentence could be grammatically incorrect.

### Body Paragraph 2

- A. You state in the previous paragraph that theoretical postulates comprise the logistical framework. Why then can just one of them change as you explain in the second paragraph? Defining your terms will help clarify this.
- B. I wasn’t sure about the word “...re-appropriation.” Maybe something else could fit better in its place.
- C. “...my require” should be “...may require” in the final sentence.

### Body Paragraph 3

- A. Avoid starting sentences with “And...” Choose a different transition.

- B. Watch out for commas and conjugation (“...the symbolic generalization *resembles* the theoretical postulates).
- C. I was not sure what symbolic generalizations you were referring to. Please define or clarify.

#### Body Paragraph 4

- A. Avoid contractions like “don’t” in formal writing. The entire phrase “...don’t stop here” may be too informal as well.
- B. Cite quotes with footnotes or parenthetical notes at the ends of sentences, and use ellipses if you are cutting into a sentence.
- C. Who is the “He” in the second sentence?
- D. “...the correlation of” and “analogous” are redundant and the final sentence. You also use “notes” twice within this paragraph— vary your word choice.

#### Body Paragraph 5

- A. Kuhn himself did not replace logical empiricism. Also, while you have asserted that Kuhn’s ideas have replaced logical empiricism several times, you have never provided any evidence for this claim or even defined what logical empiricism is. See general comments.
- B. Be careful with commas and possessive plurals. Also, paradigms are based on group consensus and therefore are not personal. Use interdisciplinary instead of “cross-disciplinary.” What disciplines do you mean? Scientific fields? Paradigms? Use “people” instead of “persons,” and “observe” instead of “view.” Outcome of what? Who is “he” in the sixth sentence? Explain your sixth sentence assertion— Why would someone reject logical empiricism if all understanding was determined by interpretation and experience? Why is that significant? How does it relate to your thesis?
- C. “Though” is not necessary before “...even if it were true.” What is the distinction between theory and observation and why is it significant?
- D. Regarding the second to last sentence— who made the argument? What is the reasoning, the evidence? In the last sentence, be specific about what the two uses of “his” refer to.

#### Conclusion

- A. See general comments about conclusions. Don’t end your paper with an entirely new thought. If you have not somehow supported an assertion in your body paragraphs, it has no place in your conclusion.