

# Outline

WRTG 3030: Environmental Health Science, Policy, and Ethics

## General Overview of Research Project:

The major research project for this course consists in the following two components.

Literature Review: demonstrates knowledge of scholarship and contemporary debates relating to your topic, and how your argument fits into and advances the conversation.

Outline: organizes the major ideas your paper, providing a clear blueprint of your argument.

Research Paper: defends a thesis or hypothesis related to your major—via conceptual reasons, descriptive and empirical evidence, and effective logical analysis—on an issue that has some problematic broader social, political, economic, or environmental implication; and satisfies the conventions of research and writing in your discipline.

## General Overview of Grading Criteria:

Literature Review	5-7 single-spaced pages Includes <i>at least</i> 10 scholarly sources Constitutes 10% of final course grade
Outline	3-4 single-spaced pages Constitutes 10% of final course grade
Research Paper	15-18 double-spaced pages Constitutes 35% of final course grade

---

## DIRECTIONS FOR OUTLINE (ONLY)

In 3-4 single-spaced pages, your task is to concisely outline the different components of your research paper. The substance of your argument, as well as the structure of your paper, may well change as you continue your research; so this outline is tentative. However, the aim here is to have you neatly organize your thoughts and identify those areas of the paper that need more work than others.

Your ideas here do not have to be fully-articulated, and your outline should not be in paragraph form: that is, your outline should not read like a rough draft of your eventual research paper. That said, the bullet-pointed explanations to the questions below that you incorporate into your outline must be detailed and specific. By reading your outline, I should clearly understand your whole project, what literature you're drawing on, and the approach you will take to defend your claim or hypothesis.

### 1. Introduction.

- The introduction has three general aims: (a) to successfully hook your average reader, (b) to briefly explain the topic of your paper, and (c) to explain the thesis you will defend in the paper.
- Explain what empirics will you start with—what descriptive or empirical facts and what other rhetorical appeals will you use to hook your reader? Remember, you should strive to appeal to wider audience by demonstrating the broader relevance of the problem your paper engages.
- How will you qualify your thesis, or how will you format your hypothesis? (Remember that with hypotheses, you must incorporate probabilistic language and relative causal direction.)
- How will you blueprint your argument (if at all) in the introduction?

### 2. Background.

- The background section has three general aims: (a) to give your audience necessary context to understand your topic and argument—which will subsequently require that you (b) explain

some of the key debates in the current literature on your topic—and (c) to explain your starting assumptions.

- What introductory ideas will you explain and what concepts will you define for your reader (and how will you define your concepts)?
- What components of your literature review paper will you include in this section of your paper? You should not simply cut-and-paste your literature review in this section of your term paper.
- What assumptions will you make, and why are these assumptions necessary and/or plausible? That is, knowing that you cannot realistically address all relevant aspects, tangents, and implications of your argument, how will you narrow the scope or focus of your paper?

### 3. Core Argument.

- Explain your central thesis. Are you defending a descriptive, empirical, or normative claim? Make sure your thesis is properly qualified: remember that we do not (and you should not try to) defend absolute claims.
- Alternatively, explain your central hypothesis if your project will engage in a more sophisticated and thorough scientific analysis that analyzes quantitative or qualitative data to support a generalized causal explanation. Here, too, make sure your hypothesis is properly formatted—including the necessary probabilistic language and relative causal direction.
- What will your three required reasons and three pieces of evidence be? And from which authors specifically will you borrow these reasons and this evidence?
- What will your warrant be: what fundamental idea, concept, or value must be true for your argument to be true (a fundamental idea, concept, or value that you will assume is true)?

### 4. Counterarguments.

- What are two plausible objections to your argument that you anticipate exploring in your paper? And from which authors specifically will you borrow these objections?
- Why is each objection strong or plausible? That is, why would reasonable people accept the objection as true?
- How will you refute each objection? That is, despite the objections' plausibility, why do the objections ultimately fail to show that your position is wrong?

### 5. Conclusion.

- The conclusion should do much more than simply summarize the argument your reader can be expected to already understand after reading your paper: this concluding section should focus on identifying the broader importance of your topic.
- What are 1-2 possible implications of the truth of your argument?
- For example, if your argument is right, what are some key policy or normative implications? Or what does this mean for our current understanding of your subject? Or what does this mean for your field of study? Or what are some key limitations of your analysis and what are some prospects for future research on your topic?
- How you will integrate these implications into your conclusion?

Paper 3 Grading Rubric

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

WRTG 3030: *Environmental Health Science, Policy, and Ethics*

<i>Specific Requirements</i>	<i>Poor/ Omitted</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>% of Total Earned</i>
<b>Introduction (20%):</b> explain the empirics you'll start with and what rhetorical appeals will you use to hook your reader, whether and how you will qualify your claim or hypothesis, and how (if at all) you will you blueprint your argument.	✓	✓	✓	✓	%
<b>Background (20%):</b> explain the introductory ideas you'll note and the concepts you will define for your reader (and define your concepts), the components of your literature review that you will include in this section, the assumptions will you make, and why are these assumptions necessary and/or plausible (how will you narrow the scope or focus of your paper?).					
<b>Core Argument (20%):</b> Explain your (properly formulated) central thesis or hypothesis, what your three reasons and three pieces of evidence will be (and try to identify the specific authors from whom you will borrow these reasons and evidence—optional), and what your warrant will be.					
<b>Counterarguments (20%):</b> explain <u>two</u> plausible objections to your argument that you anticipate exploring in your paper, why each objection is strong or plausible, and how you anticipate refuting each objection.					
<b>Conclusion (20%):</b> explain the broader importance of your topic and argument—discussing 1-2 possible implications of the truth of your argument—and explain how you will integrate these implications into your conclusion.					
Grade:					
Comments:					