

COVER SHEET: Request for Approval to Use W-Designation

TYPE I. PROFESSOR COMMITMENT

- () Professor Dr. Janet E. Goebel Phone x2261
- () Writing Workshop? (If not at IUP, where? when? No, but I would be happy to teach one for you. ✓)
- () Proposal for one W-course (see instructions below)
- () Agree to forward syllabi for subsequently offered W-courses?

TYPE II. DEPARTMENT COURSE

- () Department Contact Person _____ Phone _____
- () Course Number/Title _____
- () Statement concerning departmental responsibility
- () Proposal for this W-course (see instructions below)

TYPE III. SPECIFIC COURSE AND SPECIFIC PROFESSOR(S)

- () Professor(s) _____ Phone _____
- () Course Number/Title _____
- () Proposal for this W-course (see instructions below)

SIGNATURES:

Professor(s) Janet E. Goebel

Department Chairperson James L. Gray

College Dean Phil Joyce

Director of Liberal Studies CD [Signature] 2/13/92

COMPONENTS OF A PROPOSAL FOR A WRITING-INTENSIVE COURSE:

I. "Writing Summary"--one or two pages explaining how writing is used in the course. First, explain any distinctive characteristics of the content or students which would help the Liberal Studies Committee understand your summary. Second, list and explain the types of writing activities; be especially careful to explain (1) what each writing activity is intended to accomplish as well as the (2) amount of writing, (3) frequency and number of assignments, and (4) whether there are opportunities for revision. If the activity is to be graded, indicate (5) evaluation standards and (6) percentage contribution to the student's final grade.

II. Copy of the course syllabus.

III. Two or three samples of assignment sheets, instructions, or criteria concerning writing that are given to students. Limit: 4 pages. (Single copies of longer items, if essential to the proposal, may be submitted to be passed among LSC members and returned to you.)

Please number all pages. Provide one copy to Liberal Studies Committee.

** More than equivalent graduate credit + experience.*

ere.

I. WRITING SUMMARY

Introduction to Literary Analysis aims to prepare beginning English majors (and minors, when possible) to do the kinds of close reading, literary analysis, and critical writing expected of them in subsequent courses. By agreement of the pool of professors who teach the course, students will read in three major genres, master technical terminology (100 terms set as a minimum), and be introduced to some of the various schools of literary criticism. It is expected that examinations will focus primarily on essay questions, and that a minimum of one critical paper (1500 words) will be completed by all students. The class size (maximum 25) allows instructors to use group projects, discussion, and the Socratic method if they so choose.

Most professors who teach Literary Analysis either assign a journal requirement or increase the minimum number of papers. Writing about literature has always been one of the two major focuses of this course. As in almost all English courses, revision and the editing process are part of teaching students to write. We also expect students to regularly take notes in class.

SPECIFIC WRITING ASSIGNMENTS

1. QUIZZES, WRITTEN DISCUSSION PROMPTS, AND TAKING NOTES. All three types of writing seek to motivate students to keep up with assignments, participate in class, and to ask for help before an exam or paper falls due. All three are difficult to describe according to your categories I. 2. b-f. Some classes do not require quizzes or pre-discussion written prompts at all; students demonstrate that they are achieving the goals of these assignments through class discussion.

I rarely see students' notes and cannot venture a guess as to how much they write. However, I allow and encourage students to bring their notes to class for the essay portion of examinations. Since the examinations ask for analysis rather than regurgitation of content, I talk long before exams about good notetaking and its role in preparing for the kinds of exams I give. I find this practice usually results in students forming study groups and learning from each other's notes. Typical outcomes of these student-generated study groups are a larger synthesis of notes about the material organized into useful categories and speculation about the kinds of essay questions I might ask followed up with attempts to prepare practice answers.

Grading? Quizzes and written discussion prompts fall into my "class participation" category -- 15% of course grade -- along with other elements of participation. Notes are not graded.

2. EXAMINATIONS: As my treatise on taking notes indicates, my examinations are somewhat different from courses which focus exclusively or primarily on mastering content. Each of the three examinations in the course asks for increasing ability to apply content in analysis, to compare and contrast, and to synthesize.

Goebel 1

The amount of writing varies widely from student to student. While there is no opportunity for revisions of essay exam answers, there is a great deal of pre-writing instruction, including 1) formal lecture and examples on how to write an exam essay, 2) discussion of old exam questions and sample answers, and 3) an oral group presentation preceding the exam which targets the same skills and information.

First hour exam: (10% of course grade) 50% definition (no notes allowed). Students are asked to clearly show they understand the meaning of assigned technical terms and to provide an accurate working definition of five critical methodologies. 50% essay (notes allowed). Students are required to apply several of the critical methodologies to a work of literature, defending their own thesis statements as to which method is most productive/helpful/illuminating. Essays are graded on: 1) whether or not the student has a thesis statement, 2) how well the student defends his/her thesis statement with logic and examples, 3) how well the student seems to understand the work and methods he/she is talking about, and 4) whether or not the student answers the question asked.

Second hour exam: (10% of course grade) 30% definition (no notes allowed). Students are asked to clearly show they understand the meaning of newly assigned technical terms and to provide an accurate working definition of four additional critical methodologies. 70% essay (notes allowed) Same as first exam but this time students are responsible for a total of 9 critical methodologies. Some essay questions will use technical terms from the first exam.

Final exam: (15% of course grade) 10% definition (no notes allowed). Students are asked to clearly show they understand the meaning of all technical terms and can provide working definitions of all critical methodologies addressed in the course (total of 9). 90% essay (notes allowed) Same as first exam but this time students are responsible for a larger body of literary works and questions require somewhat more sophisticated analysis.

3. PAPERS AND PEER EDITING (30% of course grade): I force writing students to go through at least one thorough and formal revision of each paper and walk them through a peer editing process. As the syllabus indicates, I require that students submit a polished, typed draft of a paper and five xerox copies thereof on, for example, Monday. On Monday students exchange papers with an assigned editing group and are given formal instruction (both written and oral) on how to peer edit. Groups meet to exchange papers and each student is asked to discuss with his/her group what problems he/she had in putting the paper together and what kind of attention would be especially welcomed. Peer editors take home with them five papers from five writers and are assigned for the following class period to thoroughly edit the papers as if they themselves were rewriting them. I stress that simply focusing on mechanics or writing "great job" is not helpful and give them

samples of good student editing which addresses all the components of a good paper. At this time I also give them a copy of my "holistic grading" sheet so they know exactly what I am looking for in a paper. On, for example, Wednesday, students return to class with edited papers. Groups meet and each student's paper is discussed for a minimum of ten minutes by the whole group. Paper writers take home with them the five editors' comments to use or disregard as they revise the paper for Friday. When students submit their final copy of a paper, they also submit the five edited copies with editors' names clearly indicated.

My system of evaluating papers is summarized in the attached "holistic grading" sheet. I grade only the revised products, none of the drafts. I do not grade on improvement. However, in the case of papers assigned well before the end of the semester, students may rewrite the graded revision as many times as possible before the 13th week of the term -- the final grade is the grade for the last submitted revision. I also grade the editing based on how students applied their skills in writing and analyzing literature to the task.

Paper A (5% of course grade) and Editing A (5% of course grade)

All students write about the five critical methods introduced in the first part of the course as applied to a single literary work of my choosing. Goals: 1) to review and master the five approaches 2) to practice application with the specific task of making a judgment about which critical method is most useful, 3) to practice writing a sustained argument with a clear thesis statement, logic, evidence from texts (which will need to be correctly cited/documented), and organization. 4) to reintroduce students to the Writing Center and to the very useful process of prewriting and peer editing. 5) to catch students who have serious writing deficiencies not previously identified and take remedial action. This paper may be subsequently revised. Having all students write about the same literary work is quite deliberate; I want them to be able to critique each others' work with a sense of confidence, and I want to encourage prewriting interaction. Length is generally 5-7 typed pages.

Paper B (15% of course grade) and Editing B (5% of course grade)

All students write about one of five novels. Assignment requires them to analyze this work using, where appropriate, technical terms they have learned in the course and applying their knowledge of critical methodologies. Goals: 1) to facilitate mastery and ability to critically discuss just about everything we have learned in the course, 2) to encourage greater independence in thinking about literature, both independence from the rest of the class and from a "right" interpretation or critical viewpoint, 3) to further develop skills in writing and analysis. This paper goes through the peer editing process, but comes too late in the semester for further revisions. Length is generally 8-12 pages.

4. SELF EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTION TO GROUP PROJECTS:

Learning to work in a group is important for students, but assigning a grade to group projects is difficult. Often, some

students do more work (sometimes MUCH more work) than others. If the presentation of group work is oral, it's hard to escape the assumption that those who talk most did most of the work. The written self-evaluation attempts to address these problems by making students somewhat accountable for their individual contributions and giving an opportunity for those who are ill at ease addressing a class orally to write about other aspects of the presentation. I take the written evaluations into account in grading the group project. Students write two of these (one for each project); typically each is 2-3 pages.

II. COPY OF SYLLABUS (attached)

III. SAMPLES OF ASSIGNMENT SHEETS, etc.. (attached). Please note that I deliberately give most instructions orally with visual reinforcement on the blackboard. I find that too many handouts lead students to the conclusion that taking notes and attending class regularly isn't necessary -- if it's really important, there will be a handout. I save my minimal xerox budget for sample papers and exercises.

Dr. Janet Goebel
201C Leonard Hall
Office Hours:

Spring 1992

MWF 10:30 - 11:45 and 1-2
No office phone; messages 357-2261
Mailbox in Leo 110

EN 210 LITERARY ANALYSIS

Welcome to the course that asks the two questions: 1) Is this the right major for you? and 2) How serious are you?

En 210 is the first course in the major for English. Its lays the foundation to the rest of your work in the major and is, therefore, challenging and designed to help you become a professional. Like any profession, the study of literature has its own set of technical terms/jargon which must be mastered. Like most disciplines, the analysis of literature has some rather formal paradigms or models which professionals usually employ -- in English we call these models for thinking about literature "Critical Methodologies." Part of your professional training as an English major is to master the language and methodologies of your chosen discipline and to integrate that knowledge into your own analysis of literature.

Some of what we do in this discipline happens orally, in classrooms and in small groups. The serious student takes seriously all opportunities for improving his/her skills in these situations. Much of what we do in English is written: we read works and what other people have said about them, then we write what we think. As in just about every field and every kind of writing, there are conventions that readers expect of us. Before we can violate conventions to a purpose, we must master them. The skills of written and oral communication are as important in this foundation course as mastering content. Brilliant analytical skills are of limited use if one cannot communicate.

Our goals for this course are very ambitious, but my experience is that they can be achieved if we all work very hard. I expect no previous knowledge of literary terminology or critical methodologies. I expect some previous experience in writing essays. Regardless of your past experience, know that I want you to succeed and will do everything I can to help you. Take advantage of my help during office hours (and any other time you see the light on in my office), use the resources open to you in the Writing Center, and use other students -- mentors or peers.

The pace is brisk and classroom participation is part of the grade. Plan on being in class EVERY DAY.

Goebel 5

TEXTS FOR THE COURSE:

Holman's A HANDBOOK TO LITERATURE. 5th edition (1986)
Guerin's HANDBOOK OF CRITICAL APPROACHES TO LITERATURE 2nd ed.
Stevens' GUIDE TO LITERARY CRITICISM AND RESEARCH (1992)
Gibaldi's MLA HANDBOOK (any edition since 1986)
Bettelheim's THE USES OF ENCHANTMENT (any edition)
Hoffmann's TALES OF HOFFMANN (any edition)
Shakespeare's HAMLET (any edition)

AND 2 OF THE FOLLOWING (see syllabus -- we'll discuss this):

Lawrence's LADY CHATTERLY'S LOVER (any edition)
Mann's TONIO KROEGER
Gorky's MY CHILDHOOD
Hesse's STEPPENWOLF
Zola's NANA

TENTATIVE SYLLABUS

(I stress the word tentative. Since this is not a lecture course, our progress will depend on how your learning is going. We may slow down or speed up from time to time. The only way you can know with certainty what is going on in class is to be in class.)

UNIT I: SHORT GENRES (tales, short stories, and a poem)

- 1/24 DUE TODAY: pp. 3-19 in Bettelheim. Additionally, if you have little memory of fairy tales, find a collection in the library and begin reading. Suggestions: "3 Little Pigs," "Snow White," "Cinderella," "Hansel and Gretel," "Jack and the Beanstalk."
TODAY'S TERMS: fable, fairy tale, legend, Maerchen, folktale
IN CLASS: Discussion of reading assignment
- 1/27 DUE TODAY: Part I of Bettelheim (pp. 23 - 156)
TODAY'S TERMS: empathy, fancy, fantasy, imagination
IN CLASS: Discussion of reading assignment
- 1/29 DUE TODAY: Part II of Bettelheim (pp. 159 - 310)
TODAY'S TERMS: Oedipus Complex, Electra Complex
IN CLASS: Discussion of reading assignment
- 1/31 DUE TODAY: pp. 82-93 in Stevens, pp. 120-131 in Guerin
IN CLASS: Discussion of reading assignment & Bettelheim
- 2/3 DUE TODAY: Hoffmann's "The Sandman"
TODAY'S TERMS: grotesque, Gothic, Apollonian, Dionysian sensibility, short story
IN CLASS: Discussion of reading assignment

Spiegel 6

- 2/5 DUE TODAY: Hawthorne's "Young Goodman Brown" in Guerin text
TODAY'S TERMS: predestination, Calvinism, Puritanism,
parable
IN CLASS: Discussion of reading assignment
- 2/7 DUE TODAY: Guerin: Traditional Approaches (17-31; 58-65)
TODAY'S TERMS: protagonist, persona, flat character,
textual criticism
IN-CLASS: Applying traditional approaches.
EXPLANATION OF UNIT I GROUP PROJECT
- 2/10 DUE TODAY: Guerin: Psychological & Mythological Approaches
(pp. 138-142, 151-164, 175-184, 191-2)
TODAY'S TERMS: archetype, Freudianism, myth, sign, icon
motif, leitmotif, Jungian Criticism
IN CLASS: Discussion of reading assignment
- 2/12 DUE TODAY: Guerin: Formalistic Approach (69-84; 90-99;
117-8)
TODAY'S TERMS: symbol, allegory, personification,
ambiguity, narrator, connotation, dissonance
IN CLASS: Discussion of reading assignment.
- 2/14 DUE TODAY: Guerin: Exponential Approach (193-204; 209-219)
TODAY'S TERMS: analogy, imagery, metaphor, fatalism, irony,
paradox, theme
IN-CLASS: Discussion of reading assignment.
GROUP ASSIGNMENTS FOR PROJECT I
- 2/17 DUE TODAY: Marvell's "To His Coy Mistress" in Guerin
TODAY'S TERMS: accent, Carpe Diem, conceit, convention,
couplet, decorum, meter, Renaissance, rhyme,
rhyme scheme, scansion, four ages
IN CLASS: Discussion of today's terms as applied
to Marvell. Some time to work on group projects.
- 2/19 Group Project Preparation Time
- 2/21 Analysis of "To His Coy Mistress" and one E.T.A. Hoffmann
story by PSYCHOLOGICAL & MYTHOLOGICAL METHODS.
- 2/24 Analysis of "To His Coy Mistress" and one E.T.A. Hoffmann
story by TRADITIONAL METHODS.
- 2/26 Analysis of "To His Coy Mistress" and one E.T.A. Hoffmann
story by FORMALIST METHOD.
- 2/28 Analysis of "To His Coy Mistress" and one E.T.A. Hoffmann
story by EXPONENTIAL METHOD.
- 3/2 DUE TODAY: written evaluation of your individual
contribution to your group project.
TODAY'S TERMS: criticism; criticism, types of; critique
IN CLASS: review for First Hour Exam

Goebel 7

IN CLASS: review for First Hour Exam
3/4 FIRST HOUR EXAM

3/6 IN CLASS: Introduction to critical paper writing and explanation of Paper A requirements. In-class exercises.

SPRING BREAK

UNIT II: DRAMA

- 3/16 DUE TODAY: Shakespeare's HAMLET
TODAY'S TERMS: antagonist, climax, soliloquy, tragedy
IN CLASS: Discussion of HAMLET
- 3/18 DUE TODAY: Guerin's Traditional and Exponential Approaches to HAMLET (pp. 38-47; 227-237).
TODAY'S TERMS: anachronism, Commonwealth Interregnum, foil, foreshadowing, Freytag's Pyramid, Hubris, Hamartia, humours, interior monologue, milieu, tragic flaw
IN CLASS: How successful are these approaches to HAMLET?
- 3/20 DUE TODAY: Guerin's Formalistic, Psychological, and Mythological Approaches to HAMLET (pp. 108-116; 131-133; 164-172). Stevens pp. 13-20; 82-93.
TODAY'S TERMS: Elizabethan Age, drama, dramatic conventions, dramatic irony, dramatic propriety, dramatic structure, poetic justice, revenge tragedy, setting, static character, stock character, unities, denouement, public theaters, catharsis, New Criticism.
IN CLASS: What is the best approach to Hamlet? Brief review of paper requirements.
- 3/23 DUE TODAY: (at BEGINNING of class) Paper A and 5 xerox copies
IN CLASS: Exchange of papers for peer editing. How to edit.
- 3/25 DUE TODAY: Your editing of your classmates' papers.
IN CLASS: Group discussion of editing and return of papers.
- 3/27 DUE TODAY: Your revision of Paper A and the five edits of your paper returned to you on 3/23.
IN CLASS: Introduction to other kinds of criticism.
- 3/30 DUE TODAY: Guerin on Feminist & Sociological Criticism (pp. 245 -249; 272- 278). Stevens on same (pp. 68-81).
TODAY'S TERMS: feminism, Marxism, genetic fallacy
IN CLASS: Feminist & sociological criticism applied to HAMLET
- 4/1 DUE TODAY: Guerin on History of Ideas criticism (253-7) Chpt. II of Stevens (43-60)
TODAY'S TERMS: Hebraism, didacticism, historicism, historical criticism, moral criticism
IN CLASS: Historicism applied to Hamlet

Goebel 8

- 4/3 DUE TODAY: Guerin on Genre Criticism (249-53)
 Stevens on same (21-26)
 TODAY'S TERMS: genre, genre criticism, autotelic,
 allusion, ambivalence, metacriticism
 IN CLASS: Genre criticism applied to HAMLET
 Review for Second Hour Exam
- 4/6 DUE TODAY: Your questions about Unit II.
 IN CLASS: Review for Second Hour Exam. Explanations of
 1) Group Project B 2) Paper B
- 4/8 SECOND HOUR EXAM

UNIT III: THE NOVEL

- 4/10 DUE TODAY: Peruse the 5 novels on reading list.
 IN CLASS: Assignment of groups for Group Project B.
 Group time
- 4/13 DUE TODAY: Finish the novel your group is working on.
 TODAY'S TERMS: novel, novella, point of view, realism,
 omniscient point of view, naturalism,
 naive narrator or hero, unreliable narrator,
 sensual/sensuous, Bildungsroman.
 IN CLASS: definitions & group project time
- 4/15 Group Presentation on Mann's "Tonio Kroger" as analyzed from
 perspective of 4 kinds of criticism in Unit II and 1 from
 Unit I.
 TODAY'S TERMS: aesthetic distance, hedonism
- 4/17 Group Presentation on Lawrence's LADY CHATTERLY'S LOVER as
 analyzed from perspective of 4 kinds of criticism in Unit
 II and 1 from Unit I.
 TODAY'S TERMS: erotic literature, decadence, pornography

EASTER MONDAY

- 4/22 DUE TODAY: last day to submit rewrite of Paper A
 Group Presentation on Gorky's MY CHILDHOOD as analyzed from
 perspective of 4 kinds of criticism in Unit II and 1 from
 Unit I.
 TODAY'S TERMS: anti-hero, existentialism, philistinism
- 4/24 Group Presentation on Hesse's STEPPENWOLF as analyzed from
 perspective of 4 kinds of criticism in Unit II and 1 from
 Unit I.
 TODAY'S TERMS: tautology, mysticism, aestheticism
- 4/27 Group Presentation on Zola's NANA as analyzed from
 perspective of 4 kinds of criticism in Unit II and 1 from
 Unit I.
 TODAY'S TERMS: dilettante, cynicism, comparative literature

- 4/29 DUE TODAY: abstract of Paper B (on one of five novels above,
but NOT the one you worked on in your group)
TODAY'S TERMS: abstract, annotation, plagiarism,
a priori judgment, analysis
IN CLASS: review for final exam; group work on abstracts
- 5/1 DUE TODAY: Paper B and five xerox copies.
IN CLASS: exchange of papers with editing group
review for final exam
- 5/4 DUE TODAY: Your editing of five classmates' papers.
IN CLASS: Group discussion of editing and return of papers.
- 5/6 DUE TODAY: Revision of Paper B and the five copies of your
original edited by classmates.
IN CLASS: Review for final exam.

FINAL EXAM: tba

GRADING SYSTEM:

- 15% CLASS PARTICIPATION. This includes participation in class discussion (you must be in class to participate) and any exercises or quizzes I may see fit to add.
- 20% TWO GROUP PROJECTS Project A - 7% Project B - 13%
- 20% TWO PAPERS Paper A - 5% Paper B - 15%
- 10% PEER EDITING OF PAPERS Edit A - 3% Edit B - 7%
- 35% EXAMINATIONS 1st - 10% 2nd - 10% Final - 15%
Examinations are comprehensive.

POLICIES:

I do not give make up quizzes or examinations unless justified by 1) a letter from your doctor or 2) prior arrangement.

I do not accept late papers or late editing. Because the peer editing process involves other students, I am very rigid about this. Even though I do not grade the first copy of your papers, it must be submitted at the beginning of class on the due date along with 5 xerox copies -- IF NOT, THE GRADE IS A "0" for the paper. Similarly, editing is of no use unless submitted in time for the writer's revisions. LATE EDITING IS NOT ACCEPTED.

- It is not necessary to call to say you will be absent unless 1) the absence affects the paper editing process or 2) you will miss an examination. See policies above.

UNIT I TERMS

accent	allegory
ambiguity	analogy
Apollonian	archetype
Carpe Diem	conceit
Calvinism	convention
couplet	criticism
criticism, types of	critique
decorum	Dionysian
connotation	dissonance
Electra Complex	empathy
fable	fancy
fatalism	fantasy
flat character	folktale
formalism	Freudianism
Four Ages	Gothic
grotesque	Hebraism
imagery	imagination
irony	Jungian criticism
icon	legend
leitmotif	Maerchen
metaphor	meter
motif	myth
narrator	Oedipus Complex
paradox	parable
persona	personification
predestination	protagonist
Puritanism	Renaissance
rhyme	rhyme scheme
scansion	sensibility
short story	symbol
textual criticism	theme

UNIT II TERMS

allusion	ambivalence
anachronism	antagonist
autotelic	catharsis
climax	Commonwealth Interregnum
denouement	didacticism
drama	dramatic conventions
dramatic irony	dramatic propriety
dramatic structure	Elizabethan Age
feminism	foil
foreshadowing	Freytag's Pyramid
genetic fallacy	genre
genre criticism	hamartia
historical criticism	historicism
hubris	humours
interior monologue	Marxism
metacriticism	milieu
moral criticism	New Criticism
poetic justice	public theaters
revenge tragedy	setting
soliloquy	static character
stock character	tragedy
tragic flaw	unities

UNIT III TERMS

abstract	aesthetic distance
annotation	anti-hero
apriori judgment	Bildungsroman
comparative literature	decadence
determinism	erotic literature
existentialism	dilettante
cynicism	hedonism
mysticism	naive hero or narrator
naturalism	novel
novella	omniscient point of view
philistinism	plagiarism
point of view	pornography
realism	sensual/sensuous
tautology	unreliable narrator

Which of the following are NOT thesis statements? Why?

1. I want to tell you about the many defects in the company's proposed budget.
2. Freshman orientation at IUP is a condescending waste of time.
3. It's not only the poor who get government handouts.
4. Saddam Hussein, leader of Iraq, fought against Iran.
5. Operation Desert Storm: Wisdom or Folly?
6. My husband is a terrible cook.
7. My husband cooks all the meals for our family.
8. Saddam Hussein is an evil criminal, not an Arab hero.
9. Some American pilots have been taken prisoner.
10. Saudi Arabian women have a different way of life than American women.

WHAT A GOOD THESIS IS:

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1. restricted | The world is in a terrible mess.(broad) |
| 2. specific | Hemingway's war stories are good.
(abstract) |
| 3. unified | Detective stories are not a high form literature, but people have always been fascinated by them, and many fine writers have experimented with them.
(too many ideas.) |
| 4. controversial | Drug addiction is one problem. (Who would argue?) |

My summer vacation was a great time.
(Who would care?)

All of the statements below are theses, but some are better than others. Identify the problem thesis statements. Suggest improvements.

1. British and American poets throughout the centuries have vastly overrated the glories of romantic love.
2. In the novel Carrie, Stephen King does a good job.
3. The recent bombing of Israel shows that no defensive weapon is completely reliable.
4. Some people in Iraq are happy.
5. Natural beauty must be preserved, but government agencies often make foolish decisions on this matter, and jobs must also be preserved.
6. Poetry is hard.
7. Stormin' Norman is the most admirable leader in the Gulf War.
8. Saudi Arabia has a ridiculous attitude regarding women driving cars.
9. Sir Walter Scott was the most published author of the 19th century.
10. I wouldn't want to live in Iraq.

Assignment:

1. Make up ten GOOD thesis statements about "Young Goodman Brown."
2. Make up five BAD thesis statements about "Young Goodman Brown."

SUPPORT / RESEARCH
ANALYSIS
CONT.

Research predominates and your argument is lost. Possible plagiarism.
Analysis missing.
No critical sophistication in characterizing arguments & sources.

You need more or more thorough analysis. You aren't using everything you know about criticism to characterize arguments & sources. How about some more counter-arguments to show you've thought this through? Sometimes you

Your analysis shows critical sophistication and awareness of counterarguments. Every reference to an outside source is analyzed in terms of your argument. You use literary and critical terms to clarify, where appropriate.

→ ignore this line

No counter-arguments -- have you considered alternative viewpoints?
No application of literary or critical terms.

don't explain or analyze references to outside sources. Use more literary and critical terms to clarify or characterize.

Much irrelevant material. Important terms undefined. Many logical fallacies.

Some material not clearly relevant to your thesis. Important terms occasionally undefined. Some logical fallacies.

Everything in the paper is clearly relevant to thesis. All major terms are defined. Free of logical fallacies.

LANGUAGE, MECHANICS
SPELLING

MANY ERRORS

A FEW ERRORS

PERFECT - shows pride in your ideas!

x 2

- _____ language vague, general or abstract. (Make more concrete and specific)
- _____ words used incorrectly / incorrect word choices
- _____ slang -- language too informal -- forbidden words
- _____ passive voice confuses. (Make the doer of the action the subject of your sentence)
- _____ run-on sentences OR sentence fragments. (Often helps to read aloud to yourself or a friend)
- _____ faulty parallelism (often this becomes very confusing -- see Elements of Style for basic rules)
- _____ disagreement between singular and plural terms (again, see Elements of Style for rules and examples)
- _____ misuse of apostrophe (possessives, contractions, plurals)
- _____ comma splices and/or other punctuation errors
- _____ spelling and/or typing errors
- _____ failure to proofread carefully

MLA FORM ?
Documentation
(paper only)
x 2

MANY ERRORS

A FEW ERRORS

PERFECT

- _____ margins and spacing
- _____ headings on first and subsequent pages
- _____ title
- _____ quotation format for short and long quotes
- _____ paraphrasing format
- _____ parenthetical errors (i.e. what's inside the parentheses isn't in right form)
- _____ use of elipsis
- _____ all quotes introduced
- _____ inadvertent plagiarism (unclear if some lines are yours or part of a quote or paraphrase)

HOLISTIC GRADE ANALYSIS
(for paper only -- separate sheet for annotated bibliography)

	1	2	3	4	5
IDEA / THOUGHT THESIS STATEMENT x 4	Uninteresting, trite idea. Thesis is not controversial. Reflects little or no serious thought of your own. A rehash of other people's ideas with little more than transitions inbetween -- cut and paste. Possible plagiarism. Topic far too broad for this assignment.	Idea not approached in an original way. Thesis is muddled or insufficiently controversial. Thesis seems too broad. You need to think more deeply about these ideas. Not enough of your own thought here. You seem to rely too much on your sources. Idea/thesis needs to be narrowed somewhat.	Idea not approached in an original way. Thesis is muddled or insufficiently controversial. Thesis seems too broad. You need to think more deeply about these ideas. Not enough of your own thought here. You seem to rely too much on your sources. Idea/thesis needs to be narrowed somewhat.	Interesting, creative, original idea. Thesis is clear and controversial, but narrow enough for parameters of this assignment. Shows serious thought and sophistication. Your ideas shine through. Paper is genuinely interesting to read. Thank you!	Interesting, creative, original idea. Thesis is clear and controversial, but narrow enough for parameters of this assignment. Shows serious thought and sophistication. Your ideas shine through. Paper is genuinely interesting to read. Thank you!
ORGANIZATION x 3	Thesis absent, unclear, or extremely difficult to discern. Title poor or missing. Introduction poor or missing. Order of ideas not systematic but random. Can't follow your line of thought, and you don't offer a statement of organization. Rhetorical form non-existent or doesn't work. Few or no effective transitions to help guide reader. Paragraphing is random, not based on shifts in ideas. Conclusion poor, missing, or introduces new ideas.	Thesis hard to find. Nondescript or inappropriate title. Introduction too long, too short, or doesn't really introduce thesis well. Order of ideas not always clear -- sometimes things seem out of place. Needs a statement of organization to guide us through the argument. Rhetorical form chosen is not the most effective way of presenting these ideas. Transitions occasionally rough and abrupt. Paragraphs sometimes too long, too short, or don't reflect shift in ideas. Conclusion ineffective.	Thesis hard to find. Nondescript or inappropriate title. Introduction too long, too short, or doesn't really introduce thesis well. Order of ideas not always clear -- sometimes things seem out of place. Needs a statement of organization to guide us through the argument. Rhetorical form chosen is not the most effective way of presenting these ideas. Transitions occasionally rough and abrupt. Paragraphs sometimes too long, too short, or don't reflect shift in ideas. Conclusion ineffective.	Thesis is properly placed at end of introduction. Intriguing and appropriate title. Introduction heightens reader interest and sets up thesis well. Clear and reasonable pattern of ideas. Statement of organization and good, steady transitions guide reader smoothly through the paper. Internal summary where needed. Paragraphing is unit of organization and rarely too long or too short. Conclusion effectively reiterates argument.	Thesis is properly placed at end of introduction. Intriguing and appropriate title. Introduction heightens reader interest and sets up thesis well. Clear and reasonable pattern of ideas. Statement of organization and good, steady transitions guide reader smoothly through the paper. Internal summary where needed. Paragraphing is unit of organization and rarely too long or too short. Conclusion effectively reiterates argument.
SUPPORT / RESEARCH ANALYSIS x 8	Argument has serious problems. Assertions and opinions are vague and generalized. You lack logic altogether. No clear, specific convincing evidence to back up your ideas.	Argument not perfectly consistent. Some assertions left unsupported or weakly supported. Needs more logic, primary references, or information from secondary sources. Try to be clearer and more specific in supporting your assertions.	Argument not perfectly consistent. Some assertions left unsupported or weakly supported. Needs more logic, primary references, or information from secondary sources. Try to be clearer and more specific in supporting your assertions.	You support your ideas with a combination of solid logic/reasoning, references to the primary text, and information from secondary sources where needed. All of your assertions and opinions are supported by clear, <u>specific</u> , and appropriate evidence. You have done adequate research on the topic relevant, but subordinate to your own argument.	You support your ideas with a combination of solid logic/reasoning, references to the primary text, and information from secondary sources where needed. All of your assertions and opinions are supported by clear, <u>specific</u> , and appropriate evidence. You have done adequate research on the topic relevant, but subordinate to your own argument.
	Where's the research? OR		You need to do more research on some points. Your research sometimes gets in the way of your own argument.		

Spiegel 16