2016-17 Welfare Revision Guide

Editing Shortcuts

- ✓ **D** is short for <u>development.</u> This note means that you should expand on your argument, typically answering the questions **how** and **why**.
- ✓ **P/V** means passive voice.
- ✓ **AWK** means <u>awkward.</u> Either your structure or word choice needs reworking. If you're not sure what's problematic, read the section aloud.
- ✓ **W** is short for welfare.
- ✓ **T** means <u>thesis statement</u> and **TS** means <u>topic sentence</u>.

Revising Versus Editing

- ✓ Revisions <u>need to be submitted to me in person</u>, with the latest draft stapled to all preceding drafts of the paper.
- ✓ The second draft of your paper should be a **revision**, not just an **edit**. A revision entails occasionally scrapping or rewriting a whole paragraph, restructuring the piece or sentences, even entertaining the idea that you need to develop a brand new argument.
- ✓ My big suggestions for revision are often written in the margins of the paper and describe sentences or paragraphs as a whole. <u>These are the most important changes to make in your paper</u>, so please do not ignore them.

Common Errors to Correct

- ✓ **<u>Topic sentences should not repeat the exact language of the thesis:</u>** remember, your goal is to replicate the argument, not repeat the exact same wording.
- ✓ **<u>Avoid the use of the passive voice</u>**: sentences are stronger when written in the active voice. Ask yourself if the subject of the sentence is responsible for the action of the verb. If so, that's active voice.
- ✓ **<u>Bookend your intro and conclusion</u>**: don't merely summarize the paper in the conclusion paragraph. Instead, return to the introduction in a meaningful way and tie the piece together at the end.
- ✓ **<u>Cite any specific research you used</u>**: every piece of specific, outside evidence or analysis that made its way into your paper must be cited, both with in-text citation and a works cited page. Failure to correct these errors in the second draft will be regarded as plagiarism.
- ✓ **<u>Use Rector in the paper</u>**: you should definitely include Rector somewhere in the intro paragraph. I'd also definitely recommend using him in the body of the piece, either as evidence or as a naysayer.
- ✓ **<u>Don't overwrite the obvious</u>**: some papers really suffered because the writer spent way too much time explaining obvious claims. Assume the reader can understand basic causality, i.e. don't spend four sentences explaining how not having enough money might mean someone can't afford to buy food which might mean they will go hungry.
- ✓ **<u>Avoid non-controversial claims</u>**: one of the biggest weaknesses of these papers was the amount of time spent arguing non-controversial topics. Whole paragraphs that explain how welfare means more money for the poor don't develop your argument in an interesting way. Move past the obvious to develop moral and intellectual arguments for and against welfare, and provide thoughtful analysis about why the program fails or succeeds. Ask yourself if your argument is something you need to spend time developing, and don't if it is not!

REVISION CHECKLIST

___ **STAMPY INTRODUCTION**

___ **RECTOR REFERENCED IN THE INTRO PARAGRAPH**

___ **ALL OUTSIDE RESEARCH IS CITED CORRECTLY**

___ **TOPIC SENTENCES ARE ARGUMENTS**

___ **800 to 1400 WORDS**

___ **GRAMMAR AND SPELLING CHECKED**

___ **TRANSITION LANGUAGE IN TOPIC SENTENCES**

___ **CONCLUSION TIES BACK TO INTRO**