

Comparative Liturgies

MUMIN 4262

Fall 2014



Scott Aniol, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Church Music and Worship

Revised August 6, 2014

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Fort Worth, Texas

© Copyright 2014 Scott Aniol
All rights reserved

MUMIN 4262 – Comparative Liturgies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Professor Bio.....	1
Course Syllabus.....	2
Course Description.....	2
Course Objectives.....	2
Course Work Required.....	2
Required Texts.....	3
Additional Reading.....	3
Books for Review.....	4
Attendance.....	4
Late Work.....	4
Statement on Plagiarism.....	4
Disability Assistance.....	5
Health and Safety Concerns.....	5
Evaluation.....	6
Grading Scale.....	6
Course Schedule and Assignments.....	7
Book Review Guidelines.....	8
Book Review Rubric.....	10
Research Paper Rubric.....	14

MUMIN 4262 Comparative Liturgies
School of Church Music
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
M 2:00–3:50
Fall 2014

Professor: Scott Aniol
E-mail: saniol@swbts.edu, saniol@gmail.com
Personal web site: www.scottaniol.com
Blogs: www.religiousaffections.org, www.artistictheologian.com
Facebook: www.facebook.com/aniol
Twitter: [@ScottAniol](https://twitter.com/ScottAniol)
Phone: 817-789-0103
Office: C58C
Office Hours: By Appointment

Professor Bio

Scott Aniol is an author, speaker, and teacher of worship, church music philosophy, culture, and aesthetics. He is an Assistant Professor of Worship at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, he founded Religious Affections Ministries, he lectures around the country in churches, conferences, colleges, and seminaries, and he has authored two books and dozens of articles. He is also Managing Editor of *Artistic Theologian*, the peer-review journal of the School of Church Music.

Scott holds a Bachelor of Music in Church Music from Bob Jones University, a Master of Music in Musicology with an emphasis in philosophy and aesthetics from Northern Illinois University, and Doctor of Philosophy in Church Music with an emphasis on worship and culture from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. His dissertation was “The Mission of Worship: A Critique of and Response to the Philosophy of Culture, Contextualization, and Worship of the North American Missional Church Movement.”

Scott has served as a minister of music and an elder in churches in Illinois, North Carolina, and currently at Church of Christ the King in Fort Worth.

Scott travels around the country and internationally through the ministry he started in 2008, Religious Affections Ministries (www.religiousaffections.org), speaking in churches, Christian colleges, seminaries, and conferences.

Scott has written three books, *Worship in Song: A Biblical Philosophy of Music and Worship* (BMH Books, 2009), *Sound Worship: A Guide to Making Musical Choices in a Noisy World* (RAM, 2010), and *By the Waters of Babylon: Worship in a Post-Christian Culture* (Kregel, Forthcoming). He has also presented academic papers at various meetings such as the Evangelical Theological Society and has dozens of articles and book reviews published in scholarly journals.

Scott is married to Becky and has two children, Caleb and Kate.

Course Syllabus

Course Description

A survey of the great liturgical traditions and the forms of music associated with the Eastern and Western Church and the community of their musical practices from the early post-biblical period to their relationship to Christian worship in the present day.

Course Objectives

1. Students will understand the development of Christian liturgy from the New Testament to the present.
2. Students will understand the importance of liturgy in the local church.
3. Students will understand the Baptist perspective on liturgy, especially baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Course Work Required

1. Read the **assigned readings** each week and be prepared for **discussion** in class. Students should be ready to briefly summarize their reading and are expected to contribute to class discussions. For each section of reading designated on the course schedule, students should **prepare five questions** for discussion in class.
2. **Article Presentations.** Each student will read and present 1–2 articles in class as assigned. The presenter will lead a discussion of the issues in the article as related to the broader course content.
3. **Book Review.** Students will write and present in class one book review (follow book review guidelines) chosen from the list below. Please email the professor your book choice; first come, first served. Students are required to [watch this video](#) if you have not already done so. Students will present their book review and lead a class discussion of its contents.
4. **Paper.** Students will choose a research question related to Baptist liturgy and write a 4,000-7,000 word (approximately 15-20 pages double-spaced) research paper. The structure of the paper will be as follows: (1) the paper will introduce the research question, (2) it will thoroughly present all possible answers to the question (the bulk of the paper), and (3) it will support one of the viable positions. Additional instructions:
 - a. Prepare a 200-500 word abstract of your paper to be emailed to the class one week prior to your presentation.
 - b. Submit a draft of your paper on Blackboard by midnight three days prior to your presentation.
 - c. Provide a draft of your paper for each classmate the day you present (either digitally or hard copy).
 - d. After receiving comments from the professor and colleagues, submit a final draft on Blackboard.
5. **Extra credit.** Additional reviews of approved books will receive up to 2 bonus percentage points on the final grade (up to two additional reviews). Visit one doctoral colloquium and write a short paragraph description for 1 bonus point.

Required Texts

Old, Hughes Oliphant. *Worship: Reformed According to Scripture*. Revised and expanded. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.

Senn, Frank C. *Introduction to Christian Liturgy*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

Ward, Matthew. *Pure Worship: The Early English Baptist Distinctive*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2014.

Additional Reading

[Apostolic Constitutions, 350.](#)

[Bauder, Kevin. "Believer Baptism" in *Baptist Distinctives and New Testament Church Order*. Schaumburg, IL: Regular Baptist Press, 2013.](#)

[Calvin, John. *The Form of Church Prayers*, 1545.](#)

[Chudnoff, Elijah. *A Guide to Philosophical Writing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.](#)

[Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, The, 400.](#)

[Early Primary Source Readings for Worship](#)

["Eucharistic Rite of *The Book of Common Prayer*, The," 1662.](#)

[Ellis, Christopher J. "Duty and Delight: Baptist Worship and Identity." *Review and Expositor* 100:3 \(Summer 2003\): 329-345.](#)

[Finn, Nathan. "Baptism as a Prerequisite to the Lord's Supper." *The Center for Theological Research*, 2006.](#)

[Hilton, James. "From Sabbath to Lord's Day: Examining the Ethics of Sunday." *Faith and Mission*, Vol 17, 3 \(Summer 2000\): 62-76.](#)

[Luther, *Liturgical Writings*](#)

[Piper, Adrian M. S. "Ten Commandments of Philosophical Writing."](#)

[Roman Catholic Mass, The, 1570](#)

Liturgies of the Western Church: Selected and Introduced by Bard Thompson. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1961.

[Thompson, Philip E. "Baptists and Liturgy—The Very Idea!" *Review and Expositor* 100:3 \(Summer 2003\): 317-323.](#)

[Westminster Directory, The, 1643.](#)

[Witvliet, John. "Toward a Liturgical Aesthetic."](#)

Books for Review

Bradshaw, Paul F. *Rites of Ordination: Their History and Theology*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014.

Burns, Stephen. *Worship and Ministry: Shaped Towards God*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2013.

Kennedy, Rodney Wallace, and Hatch, Derek C., eds. *Gathering Together: Baptists at Work in Worship*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Pub, 2013.

Peterson, David G. *Encountering God Together: Leading Worship Services That Honor God, Minister to His People, and Build His Church*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing, 2014.

Pfatteicher, Phillip H. *Journey into the Heart of God: Living the Liturgical Year*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Smith, James K. A. *Imagining the Kingdom: How Worship Works*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.

Spinks, Bryan D. *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day*. London: SCM Press, 2013.

Attendance

Students are expected to attend all meetings of all classes in which they are enrolled. A student's grade will be penalized for absences. Students absent from more than 20% of the class sessions will not receive credit for the course. This means that students missing more than six (50-minute) class meetings of a two-hour class will not receive credit for the course.

Late Work

Late work will be penalized 10% per day.

Cell Phone Policy

Cell phones are to be turned off and stored out of sight during class. If a student uses a cell phone during an exam, he/she will receive an immediate F on the exam.

Statement on Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the act of taking credit for ideas and words that are not one's own. Exploiting the work of another person without attribution and appropriate documentation involves both theft and deception. Plagiarism occurs when a writer does not give credit when borrowing an idea, opinion, or thesis of another writer, reproducing another's argument or line of reasoning, quoting a brief phrase or lengthy section from another source, slightly or thoroughly paraphrasing a passage, or completely restating a passage. Even when cited

appropriately, verbatim quotations, no matter how brief, must be identified by quotation marks.

As a form of intellectual dishonesty, plagiarism is condemned throughout the academic community, and under certain conditions in the public sector it can be a felony. Students who commit it may receive a failing grade for an assignment or for an entire course or be expelled from school; professional scholars may permanently ruin their academic reputations or lose their jobs. As Christian scholars, we are called to a high degree of academic, moral, and spiritual integrity and must be vigilant in guarding against committing this offense. Claiming ignorance or innocence in intent does not rationalize the behavior.

When a professor determines that a student is guilty of plagiarism, a conference should be held with the student to explain the charges of plagiarism and the severity of the offense. The professor may give a failing grade for the assignment. Repeat offenses will require conferences with the Dean of the School of Church Music and the Vice President for Student Services.

For additional information on what constitutes plagiarism and for techniques to avoid it, visit www.plagiarism.org.

Disability Assistance

Southwestern Seminary is in full compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and is committed to helping students with disabilities to be successful academically. Please contact the Office of the Registrar to provide documentation of disabilities. All academic assistance requests should be worked out with the individual professors at the beginning of each semester. At the request of the student, the Registrar's Office will provide summary information to instructors specified by the student. Please consult the catalog for the complete policy.

Health and Safety Concerns

As a musician, you use your body in very specific ways as you hone your craft as a student and perform for a lifetime as a professional. It is crucial, therefore, that you be aware of the physical hazards that musicians face on a daily basis and that you make appropriate and well-informed decisions to protect your body. The School of Church Music pledges to support you in this endeavor through education, guidance, and in providing a safe environment for music studies.

If you believe any environment on campus is aurally unhealthy, please discuss this with your ensemble director, private teacher, or music administrator for a possible remedy. If you are aware of any pain you experience as you practice or perform, your private teacher can help guide you to appropriate solutions. It is important not to delay seeking help before permanent damage takes place.

More information and resources are available online on the Current Students page on the School of Church Music website that will help you in your journey of becoming a safe and

healthy musician. It is important that you become well informed of risks and solutions and that you assume an active role in staying healthy for a lifetime of music making.

Evaluation

Reading/Contribution	15%	Article Presentation	15%
Book Review/Presentation	20%	Research Paper	50%

Grading Scale

Grades for the course will be calculated as follows:

A+	98-100%	B+	88-89	C+	78-79	D+	68-69
A	93-97	B	83-87	C	73-77	D	63-67
A-	90-92	B-	80-82	C-	70-72	D-	60-62
						F	0-59

The professor reserves the right to amend the syllabus as needed.

Course Schedule and Assignments

The following schedule is subject to the professor's revision. Adequate notice will be given to any significant changes.

DATE	LECTURE TOPIC	ASSIGNMENTS DUE
8/25	Introduction to Liturgy	Chudnoff; Piper, "Ten Commandments," Senn 1, Old 1 <i>Come prepared with definitions of the following terms: Eucharist, Offertory, Salutation, Sursum Corda, anamnesis, epiclesis, fraction, Preface, Canon, Pater noster, Collect, Gradual, oblation, anaphora, Words of Institution, Ordinary, Proper, Mass, Didache, Justin Martyr's Apology, Apostolic Tradition, Apostolic Constitutions, Ordo romanus (from Worship class)</i>
9/1	LABOR DAY	
9/8	History of Liturgy	Senn 2 <i>Come prepared to outline a rough sketch of the liturgy as it developed from the early church to the Reformation. Include the following liturgies: Didache, Justin Martyr, Apostolic Tradition, Apostolic Constitutions, Orthodox, Catholic, Luther, Calvin, Westminster, Anglican</i> Early Primary Source Readings Apostolic Constitutions, 350 The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, 400 Luther: "The German Mass and Order of Service," 1526 Calvin: "The Form of Church Prayers," 1545 The Roman Catholic Mass, 1570 The Westminster Directory, 1643 "The Eucharistic Rite of <i>The Book of Common Prayer</i> ", 1662
9/15	Elements of Liturgy	Old 4-6 Smith Book Presentation: _____
9/22	Order of Liturgy	Senn 3 Peterson Book Presentation: _____
9/29	FALL BREAK	
10/6	Theology of Liturgy	Paper Proposals Due Ward Burns Book Presentation: _____
10/13	Baptism and the Lord's Day	Senn 9, Old 2-3 Bauder Article Presentation: _____ Hilton Article Presentation: _____
10/20	Liturgy of Time	Senn 4-5 Thompson Article Presentation: _____
10/27	Library/Writing Day	
11/3	The Church Year	Senn 6-8 Pfatteicher Book Presentation: Sarah T _____
11/10	The Lord's Supper	Old 7 Spinks Book Presentation: _____ Finn Article Presentation: _____
11/17	Liturgy Today	Old 10 Kennedy Book Presentation: <u>James C.</u> _____ Ellis Article Presentation: _____
11/24	THANKSGIVING	
12/1	Paper Presentations	
EXAM Dec 10 10-11:30	Paper Presentations	

Book Review Guidelines

[Video: How to Write a Book Review](#)

Format

1. Between 700 and 900 words
2. Double spaced
3. Otherwise, follow SWBTS style manual (margins, page numbers, etc.).

Heading: A full bibliographic reference to the book should be placed two inches from the top of the page, but it is not centered.

Author. *Title*. Place of publication: Publisher, Year of publication. Number of pages.
List price.

Aniol, Scott. *Worship in Song*. Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books, 2009. 261 pp.
\$17.99.

Content

- Briefly introduce the author of the book.
- In 1–5 sentences, state the author’s thesis.
- In 5–10 sentences, *briefly* summarize the contents of the book. This should not occupy most of your review.
- In as many sentences as necessary, *thoroughly* describe how the author argues and supports his thesis. This should occupy the greatest percentage of your review. The objective in this section is to identify the author’s primary arguments that support his main thesis. Cite concrete examples from the book, including page numbers in parentheses (p. 67).
- Identify parts of the author’s argument that were particularly strong. Explain and support your opinion. Indicate what topics are covered in more detail in the reviewed book than they are elsewhere, why the analysis is convincing, and/or why this is an important addition to the scholarly debate. Cite concrete examples from the book, including page numbers in parentheses (p. 67).
- Identify parts of the author’s argument that were particularly weak. Explain and support your opinion. Are the author’s claims and arguments well supported? Point out what the book does not cover (either by intent or by accident), where there are alternative interpretations of the material discussed by the author, and/or material that according to the book’s stated purpose should have fallen within the purview of the book but was left unaddressed. Does the author have certain presuppositions that limit the value of the work? Cite concrete examples from the book (pp. 99–100).
- In 2–3 sentences, *briefly* comment on why a book on this topic is important, timely, or otherwise of value. Conclude with a few comments about the “usability” and format of the book. Does it have many illustrations or just text? Could it be suitable

as a textbook, or is it full of jargon of interest only to specialists? It is intended as something to be read straight through or in pieces as a reference?

Book Review Rubric

Title Page and Header: (5 pts possible)

- 5—the title page of the review follows the SWBTS manual of style for a book review exactly and the header on the first page includes accurate and complete bibliographic information for the book and is formatted correctly
- 4—the title page of the review contains 1-2 formatting errors *or* the bibliographic header contains 1-2 formatting errors (or they contain 1 error each)
- 3—the title page and/or bibliographic header contain more than 2 formatting errors
- 2—missing either title page or bibliographic header
- 0—no title page included

Introduction: (5 points possible)

- 5—the reviewer draws the reader's attention to the book, includes correct and current biographical information about the author, and includes a thesis statement for the book at the end of the introductory paragraph
- 4—the reviewer includes bibliographic information and a thesis but fails to draw the reader's attention
- 3—the review is missing either bibliographic information or a thesis statement
- 2—the review does not contain bibliographic information or a thesis statement
- 0—no introduction

Thesis: (10 points possible)

- 10—the reviewer correctly identifies the thesis (the one central, overarching idea or argument) of the book and states this thesis at the end of the introductory paragraph
- 8—the reviewer correctly identifies the thesis of the book but does not place it at the end of the introductory paragraph
- 6—the reviewer gets close to idea of the thesis
- 4—the reviewer states an incorrect thesis, but some attempt at a thesis statement is made at the end of the introductory paragraph
- 2—the reviewer states an incorrect thesis and it is not placed at the end of the introductory paragraph
- 0—no attempt at a thesis statement in the review

Summary and Arguments: (20 points possible)

20—the reviewer clearly and succinctly summarizes the main themes or arguments of the book, *tracing how the author develops his/her thesis*; summary shows generally that the reviewer has read the book in its entirety and with understanding

16—the reviewer summarizes some of the sections of the book clearly and succinctly but misses one or two important themes or arguments

12—the reviewer summarizes some of the sections of the book but both misses some important themes or arguments and also does not summarize clearly and succinctly

8—the reviewer summarizes some of the book's content but does not present the flow of the author's thesis development (i.e. misses the main points)

4—the summary of the book is incorrect and evidences that the reviewer did not read the book with understanding

0—no summary is included in the review

Critical Evaluation: (20 points possible)

20—the reviewer critically evaluates the author's development of the thesis and/or specific arguments made within the book, noting both strengths as well as weaknesses of the book; strengths and weaknesses presented reflect careful thought and evaluation and do not reflect the reviewer's personal opinions but instead interact with the arguments in a scholarly manner; strengths and weaknesses focus mainly on the book's information rather than the writing style of the author (though a mention of style is fine); evaluation shows generally that the reviewer has read the book in its entirety and with understanding

16—the reviewer presents both strengths and weaknesses of the book, but the critique does not show an understanding of the content of the book

12—the reviewer presents both strengths and weaknesses, but the critique is based on personal opinion or mainly the author's writing style rather than interacting with the thesis or arguments of the book

8—the reviewer presents only strengths or only weaknesses of the book, but the critiques presented are scholarly

4—the reviewer presents only strengths or only weaknesses, and the critiques presented are based on personal opinion or mainly the author's writing style rather than interacting with the thesis or arguments of the book

0—the entire review was summary; no critical review presented

Conclusion: (5 points possible)

5—the reviewer concludes the review with a brief section stating the reviewer’s opinion of the book as a whole and who would benefit from the book

4—the reviewer concludes the review with a brief section giving only his/her opinion of the book or only his/her recommendations of who would benefit

3—the conclusion simply summarizes the content again but does not insert the reviewer’s “voice” at all

2—the conclusion does not show respect to the author

1—the conclusion shows a lack of understanding of the book as a whole or indicates that the reviewer did not read the book

0—no concluding section

Citations: (10 points possible)

5—the review contains adequate citations (interacts with the thoughts of the author but does not use too many quotations); the parenthetical citations are all correctly formatted according to the SWBTS manual of style and the quotations are all correctly formatted and punctuated (capitalization, punctuation, ellipses, double and single quotation marks, block quotes, etc.)

4—the review contains adequate citations but includes 1-3 incorrectly formatted quotations or parenthetical citations

3—the review contains adequate citations but includes 4 or more incorrectly formatted quotations or parenthetical citations

2—the review does not contain adequate citations but the citations included are correctly formatted for the most part

1—the review does not contain adequate citations and the citations included are mostly incorrectly formatted

0—no citations included in the review

Organization and Length: (5 points possible)

5—the review follows the SWBTS manual of style and the professor’s specific instructions regarding organization (the professor’s instructions trump the SWBTS manual of style, where they differ) and includes appropriate section headings which are formatted correctly; the review meets the minimum and maximum length requirements as set by the professor

4—the review includes logical organization and section headings but does not follow the SWBTS manual of style and/or the professor’s specific instructions regarding organization and headings; the review meets the minimum and maximum length requirements as set by the professor

3—the review contains logical organization but does not contain section headings; the review meets the minimum and maximum length requirements as set by the professor

2—the review does not meet the minimum length requirement but contains some logical organization

1—the review does not meet the minimum length requirement and is not logically organized

Mechanics: (20 points possible)

20—the review contains few grammatical errors (1 per page or fewer detected); few spelling, capitalization, or typographical errors (1 per page or fewer detected); correct page numeration according to the SWBTS manual of style; correct font size and margins according to the SWBTS manual of style; and shows evidence of careful proofreading and editing

18—the review contains fewer than one error per page (or fewer than 5 total errors) but either page numeration, font size, or margins are incorrect

16—the review contains more than one error per page or 5-8 total errors but contains correct page numeration used and correct font size and margins

12—the review contains many errors throughout and/or contains some unintelligible sentences (more than one); page numeration is correct; font size and margins are correct

8—the review contains many errors throughout and/or contains multiple unintelligible sentences; either page numeration or font size or margins are incorrect

4—the review is unintelligible because of the amount and/or severity of errors

Subtotal: _____

On Time: (no points deducted from the subtotal)

Late: 10 points deducted per day (including weekends) _____

TOTAL GRADE: _____

Research Paper Rubric

Topic 15%	1 - Paper does not have a unified topic.	2 - The paper topic is too broad for the assignment.	3 - The paper topic is slightly too broad for the assignment.	4 -Paper's topic is somewhat narrowed.	5 -Paper has an appropriately narrowed topic.
<p>5: The project not only has a question, but the question leads to a problem-solving exercise in which information is a tool. <i>Or</i></p> <p>The question is focused clearly enough that the reader has a certainty about the paper's goal. <i>Or</i></p> <p>The question is absolutely singular—one goal expressed as one simple question</p> <p>4: The project has a fairly narrow topic but the question is merely informational in its goal. <i>Or</i></p> <p>The project has a fairly narrow topic but the question does not provide a clear mental image of the writer's goal. <i>Or</i></p> <p>There are two or more related questions on the same topic so that it is unclear which question is the primary goal. <i>Or</i></p> <p>The question is fairly narrow, but it is capable of being answered in a variety of ways.</p> <p>3: The project not only merely gathers information, but is itself a survey of a broad subject area without any question to answer. <i>Or</i></p> <p>Both the topic and its goal are not defined clearly enough to be understood. <i>Or</i></p> <p>There are two or more questions really dealing with different aspects of the topic, so that no attempt to unify them into one question is going to succeed. <i>Or</i></p> <p>The question is quite broad and is capable of being answered in a variety of ways.</p> <p>2: Topic is seriously flawed: answer can be found by consulting a single source; or supporting evidence is not possible because: 1) no relevant facts exist, or 2) the question is based on personal preference or taste, or 3) you cannot obtain or use the sources your reader will think are useful, or 4) someone else cannot plausibly disprove your answer, or 5) there are too many broad questions.</p> <p>1: Question cannot be answered given current state of knowledge. Different topic needed.</p>					

Sources 15%	1 - No sources used and/or paper plagiarizes sources.	2 - Sources are too few or are inappropriate for the topic. Direct quotations are overused in the paper, source material is rarely used in the paper, and/or patchwork use of sources.	3 - Minimal number of appropriate sources. Integrates some source material well.	4 - Most sources reflect an appropriate level of scholarship. Integrates most source material skillfully.	5 - Uses appropriate academic resources. Integrates source material skillfully.
<p>5: Reputable academic publishers, primary sources, articles 5+ pages long from scholarly journals, recent publications/reflects recent conversations, credible web sources. Skillful interaction with sources: direct quotations are used discriminately, summary and paraphrase are employed. Writer enters into the scholarly conversation through interaction with sources.</p> <p>4: Most of the sources used in the paper are academic sources. Skillful interaction with sources in most of the paper: direct quotations are used discriminately, summary and paraphrase are employed in most of the paper. Writer enters into the scholarly conversation through interaction with sources in most of the paper.</p> <p>3: Some of the sources used in the paper are academic sources. 3: Some of the paper contains skillful interaction with sources: direct quotations are used discriminately, summary and paraphrase are employed in some of the paper. Writer does not show evidence of entering the scholarly conversation: sources are not presented as scholarly dialogue about the writer's argument. Sources are not synthesized effectively (strings of Ibid., etc.)</p> <p>2: Popular publishers, short articles, dubious web sources used in the paper. Skillful interaction with sources rare in the paper. Quotations used in place of writer's own words and not expanded on.</p> <p>1: No sources used in the paper.</p>					
Central Claim 15%	1 - Paper lacks central claim.	2 - The central claim is difficult to identify, and may be too broad or too narrow.	3 - The central claim is too broad or too narrow. May be descriptive rather than analytic.	4 - Paper has a focused central claim, but no striking insights developed.	5 - Paper has a focused central claim that will require thoughtful support.
<p>5: Paper has focused central claim that directly states the writer's argument. Supporting the claim will require critical thinking.</p> <p>4: Paper has focused central claim, but may not require a high level of critical thinking.</p> <p>3: Central claim is too broad or too narrow for the length of the paper. It may describe the topic or describe what the paper will do instead of stating the writer's argument about the topic.</p> <p>2: Central claim is difficult to identify, or there may be more than one distinct central claim.</p> <p>1: No central claim given in the introduction.</p>					

Argumentation 20%	1 - The paper does not utilize reasons, evidences, or acknowledgements.	2 - Most of the paper does not utilize reasons, evidences, or acknowledgements.	3 - Reasons, evidences, and acknowledgements are utilized in some of the paper.	4 - Reasons, evidences, and acknowledgements are utilized in most of the paper.	5 - Paper utilizes reasons, evidences, and acknowledgements skillfully.
<p>5: Supports the main claim with cogent reasons, evidences, and acknowledgements utilized throughout the paper.</p> <p>4: Cogent reasons, evidences, and acknowledgments in most of the paper. Argumentation is successful in most of the paper. Weakens argument for main claim by failing to acknowledge and respond to alternate arguments against the main claim.</p> <p>3: Cogent reasons, evidences, and acknowledgments in some of the paper. Argumentation is successful in some of the paper. Weakens argument for main claim by often failing to support one or more reasons with evidence OR too often relies on citations to secondary sources as evidence.</p> <p>2: Cogent reasons, evidences, and acknowledgments lacking in most of the paper. Substitutes unsubstantiated personal opinions for evidence.</p> <p>1: Cogent reasons, evidences, and acknowledgments lacking in the paper. Paper fails to support main claim with an argument.</p>					
Organization and Logical Development of the Paper 20%	1 - Ideas are presented in a random fashion. Contains instances of unnecessary repetition, logical inconsistencies, and/or obvious contradictions. No effort to provide topic sentences or transitions in thought.	2 - Major lapses in the logical progression of ideas are evident: unnecessary repetition, logical inconsistencies, and/or contradictions. Some paragraphs have topic sentences. Transitions rarely used.	3 - Logical progression of ideas, but the organization has conspicuous lapses present. Many paragraphs lack topic sentences and transitions, and/or many transitions seem forced, not natural.	4 - Logical progression of ideas, but the organization has minor lapses present. Some paragraphs lack topic sentences and transitions, and/or some transitions seem forced, not natural.	5 - Organization is a logical progression of ideas/ events supporting the main claim. Topic sentences and natural paragraph transitions support the flow of thought.
<p>5: Organization is clear at both the micro and macro level. Sections are arranged in a logical order, and paragraphs have topic sentences, natural transitions, and are unified around one main idea.</p> <p>4: Sections are arranged in a logical order. Most paragraphs have topic sentences, natural transitions, and are unified around one main idea.</p> <p>3: Sections are arranged in a logical order. Some paragraphs have topic sentences, natural transitions, and are unified around one main idea.</p> <p>2: Serious flaws in organization at either the micro or macro level. Points may be repeated unnecessarily; ideas may be presented randomly at either the section or paragraph level. Topic sentences and transitions may be rare.</p>					

1: Serious flaws in organization at both the micro and macro level. No effort to provide topic sentences or transitions in thought.

Mechanics 15%	1 - Fundamental errors in grammar make paper difficult to understand. Shows no evidence of editing.	2 - At times, errors in grammar interfere with understanding. Shows little or no evidence of editing.	3 - Many grammatical errors. Shows little evidence of editing.	4 - Some grammatical errors. Shows evidence of editing.	5 - Few grammatical or issues noted. Shows evidence of careful editing.
--------------------------	--	--	---	--	--

5: Few errors (perhaps 5-8 in a 15-20 page paper) detected.

4: Some errors (several per page) detected.

3: Many errors detected per page and/or paper has occasional unintelligible sentences (not more than one per page).

2: Paper has more than one unintelligible sentence per page.

1: Paper is unintelligible because of the amount and/or severity of grammatical errors it contains.