

Commentary for Common Patterns Samples

Sample 3: Trouble Some Child and its Problems (4 4 4 6 3 2)

- *Example of a medium paper that scores medium (NOT high) in prose (Readers were problematically scoring this a HIGH in prose style). Prose breaks down whenever writer integrates a source.*
- *Example of over quoted reports where the “prose glow” emanates from the sources.*

Row 1: Understand & Analyze Context

The report earned a score of 4 for this row because it provides adequate, though not precise focus (“military intervention towards Third World Countries”). The research is a varied mix of news and web sources, buttressed by academic journals; it provides the potential for complex treatment of the issue. However, the report does not deliver. The title does not signal the topic. The introduction identifies the problem, but establishes an argument rather than a focused review of literature through a precise lens.

Row 2: Understand & Analyze Argument

The report earned a score of 4 for this row because commentary is abundant, but in most places, does not demonstrate understanding of the sources. The writer integrates quotations from the sources into sentences that convey vague, tautological, or nonsensical ideas.

- Example from page 1: “In his research study, he focuses on how political risks are caused due to the exposure of ‘vulnerabilities and ineffective political risks’ (Reagan 914).”
- Example from page 1: “Although, military intervention may help Third World Countries, Reagan provides an intellectual insight on how political party tended to start a ‘rather bloody conflict that [they] have struggled over whether to intervene.’ (Reagan 90).”

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The report earned a score of 4 for this row because it offers some “effective explanation of the chosen sources,” and the evidence provided is, for the most part, relevant.

- For example, on page 3, the report references a Huffington Post article, noting the writer’s credentials: “Ivan Eland, a senior fellow and Director of the Center on Peace and Liberty.” The report doesn’t, however, comment on the Center’s mission or how that mission might reflect a certain stance.

In other places, commentary on credibility is unacceptably general and unconvincing.

- Example from page 1: “This study may be sort of valid because of the explanatory variables for risk and capabilities.”

- Example from page 2, “Since he personally experienced United States’ lack of support toward Cambodia, he is stating facts—not lies.”

Row 4: Understand & Analyze Perspective

The report earned a score of HIGH (6) on this row because it does put the sources in conversation with each other, particularly but not exclusively within paragraphs, and does weave a critical narrative.

Transitions control the critical narrative of the report. While perspectives do support one argument that the report is driving (military intervention causes harm), there are a range of perspectives within this stance (the advancement of risky behavior argument, the impact on citizens argument, the government corruption argument, the danger to the U.S. argument).

Row 5: Apply Convention (Attribution)

The report earned a score of HIGH (3) for this row because, while not free of error, attribution is, on the whole, consistent, clear, and complete.

- Noticeable Exceptions: “Menon” and “Alternative 1” are not on the Works Cited. “Regan” morphs to “Reagan” in text.

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Grammar & Style)

The report earned a score of MEDIUM (2) for this row because of problems with clarity/grammar throughout, but particularly when sources were integrated.

- Example from bottom of page 2, top of page 3, “During in the 20th century, President John F. Kennedy interfered the Third World Countries based on ‘American geopolitical interests’ instead of having the thought of establishing peace in these countries (Vartavarian).”
- Example from page 3, “Given these points, Porter, Eland, and Vartavarian mentions the U.S. minor source of aid onto these countries by providing valid researches and an interview due to significant personal experiences and those who work in the field of political associated with the concept of military.”