

## Introduction:

- The relevant background needed to understand the argument.
  - This is not just a summary of every event, but generally includes most, if not all of the following:
    - Factual information
    - Names, Dates, Places,
    - People Groups,
    - Conceptual assumptions
    - Limits of the investigation/research
    - Relevance of the specific investigation (why is this investigation including the limits imposed worthy of one's time to research?)
    - Statement of the thesis statement (why is this particular paper worthy of one's time to read when I could read the wikipedia page on the topic, or a book on the topic, or another paper on the topic?)

The number of paragraphs in the introduction is dependent on the topic and the type of assignment. For a 2000 word paper, one paragraph should be sufficient and two should be the most.

For a 5000 word paper, less than a three paragraph introduction is recommended.

## Body paragraphs:

- Topic sentence
  - The topic sentence must
    - Be clear,
    - Be an argument rather than a fact
    - Make an argument that can be proven within the paragraph,
    - Clearly proves part of the thesis.
  - In the following sentences:
    - **Defend the topic sentence with factual information and secondary source validation.**
    - Quotes from primary sources are often very helpful.
      - But it is imperative that the writer make clear how a primary source quote supports/helps prove the topic sentence.
      - It is best if the quote and the illustration of the support (which is the analysis) is part of the same sentence rather than separated by two sentences (two sentences or hanging it on the end with words like "this is important because..." or "...which shows..." is usually what we refer to as "bolt on analysis").
    - Quoting from secondary sources can be helpful, but...
      - You should only quote when the historian is saying something *better* than the way you can say it.
        - Your paper should be unique to you, which means that a historian was rarely thinking about the sentence in the *exact* same way that you were thinking about it when they wrote it.
      - You should not have stand alone quotes, and rarely will you use the whole sentence.
      - You must still cite the historian with a <sup>superscript</sup> notation at the end of the sentence even when you are not directly quoting.
      - Direct quotes will be in quotation marks and have a notion at the end of the sentence (e.g. "This is a direct quote."<sup>1</sup>) While paraphrases will have a citation without quotation marks (e.g. Sometimes I only need the idea and not the exact words.<sup>2</sup>).
    - *Stronger paragraphs will articulate the differences in the historians' arguments while still supporting the overall topic sentence.*
  - Conclusion sentence:
    - Reassert the topic sentence and illustrate how the point being made in the paragraph supports the thesis.

## Conclusion paragraph:

- Reassert each of the main points made in the previous paragraphs.
- Reassert the thesis

## Issues to look out for:

Comment from graders and what to watch out for.

9

As each of these sources show, the failed attempts at a Franco-Mongol alliance were largely due to a lack of coordination and common goals. Also, the evidence suggests that misfortune leading to incoordination was detrimental for the attempts at a Franco-Mongol alliance. This answer is more powerful than other possible answers because every possible answer will trace back to incoordination and inefficiency in communicating about military plans that ruined the chances at an alliance between the Franks and Mongols.

has a number of sources, but of superficial kind which means it is difficult to answer the question with any depth. It is a summary of source content rather than a developed investigation.

A source is a source is a source is not correct!

One must evaluate sources in order to recognize how much weight one must give that source when using it to support an argument.

## Must have academic sources. (University Press published books, peer reviewed academic journal, Primary source material.)

12

### Bibliography

?  
metmuseum.org. Accessed October 21, 2019.  
[https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/suly/hd\\_suly.htm](https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/suly/hd_suly.htm).

?  
metmuseum.org. Accessed October 21, 2019.  
[https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/otto1/hd\\_otto1.htm](https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/otto1/hd_otto1.htm).

"Ottoman Art." Education. Accessed October 19, 2019. <https://education.asianart.org/explore-resources/background-information/ottoman-art>.

"Saudi Aramco World : The Golden Age of Ottoman Art." AramcoWorld. Accessed October 21, 2019. [https://archive.aramcoworld.com/issue/198704/the\\_golden\\_age\\_of\\_ottoman\\_art.htm](https://archive.aramcoworld.com/issue/198704/the_golden_age_of_ottoman_art.htm).

"Suleiman The Magnificent." Crystalinks. Accessed October 20, 2019.  
<https://www.crystalinks.com/suleiman.html>.

Research is very limited

### Bibliography

"Franks." Wikipedia. Wikimedia Foundation, December 3, 2019.  
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Franks>.

"Philip IV of France." Wikipedia. Wikimedia Foundation, November 25, 2019.  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philip\\_IV\\_of\\_France](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philip_IV_of_France).

Letter of Oljeitu to Philippe le Bel, 1305.  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C3%96jait%C3%BC#Military\\_alliance](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C3%96jait%C3%BC#Military_alliance)

Moncure, Billy. "A Pagan Crusade-The Franco-Mongolian Alliance." WAR HISTORY ONLINE, February 25, 2019. <https://www.warhistoryonline.com/instant-articles/the-franco-mongolian-alliance.html>.

"Philip IV of France." Wikipedia. Wikimedia Foundation, November 25, 2019.  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philip\\_IV\\_of\\_France](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philip_IV_of_France).  
YouTube. Real Crusaders History. Accessed December 11, 2019.  
<https://youtu.be/xJhJHS6CSM>.

limited sources - over half are Wiki.

**You must be able to prove any statement that you make in a history paper. “What if...” or “If this would not have happened....” statements are impossible to prove. Even statements that are not hypothetical, can be problematic if there is a lack of focus and substantiation.**

But they did have two daughters, though what they wanted was a son and this was a huge issue for them. “The union was further complicated on a political level by their lack of a son and heir to the French throne”<sup>8</sup> because they would not have anyone to take over Louis’ position if anything were to ever happen to Louis, so because Louis could not have a son with Eleanor, he “arranged to have their marriage annulled at the Council of Beaugency on grounds of consanguinity in 1152”<sup>9</sup>, and there after about eight months later Eleanor married Henry II.

needs substantiation and focus

Lack of substantiation means that you have presented some argument, but you have not illustrated why that argument is valid. You have made claims (normative statements) without facts (positive statements) to back them up.

**Simply name dropping a historian does not mean that you have supported your position.**

the countryside.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, all of these preparations, strategies, and tactics allowed the crusaders to be victorious which also improved the Reconquista era. Rupert Matthews, the author of the source, includes that the crusaders did not get much loot and he also provided the amount of losses the crusaders had which could lead to a person concluding a different answer.<sup>9</sup> This source is from

Unsp

“unsp” stands for unsupported

and some went on to go to the Holy Land or back home.<sup>13</sup> Because of this, a reasonable person might argue that this was a major factor in the battle. The crusaders that stayed were in it all for the rewards. They thought that they already got so far and risked their lives that they should just remain there and get the recompense.

Unsp

**Must stay on topic.**

ports: Gallipoli, Eceabat, and Canakkale. The Gallipoli port is important because this is where the Allies attempted to invade during the Gallipoli Campaign. The author discusses that the Dardanelles’ location gives it “international political importance.”<sup>3</sup> This political importance is the Straits Question. This is the “...controversy over restrictions on the passage of warships through the Bosphorus, the Sea of Marmara, and the Dardanelles...”<sup>4</sup> The author mentions briefly that the strait “has always been of great strategic and economic importance as the

but this predates WWI

**The analysis is bolted on to this paragraph. Bolt-on analysis is at least analysis, but it does lead the grader to wonder where the analysis is while they are reading.**

The Battle at Sorbara allowed for Pope Gregory to have hope for the correction of the papacy before his death. The battle took place at a Modenese castle that was being sieged by Marquis Oberto.<sup>10</sup> Under the influence of Bishop Anselm, Matilda proceeded to ambush them in

<sup>7</sup> Duff, Nora.

<sup>8</sup> Eads, Valerie. *Mighty in War: The Campaigns of Matilda of Tuscany*. Ph.D. Dissertation: City University of New York, 2000.

<sup>9</sup> Eads, Valerie.

<sup>10</sup> Sophie Cassagnes-Brouquet, "In the service of the Just War: Matilda of Tuscany (eleventh-twelfth centuries)", *Clio* [Online], 39 | 2014.

the middle of the night on July 2, 1084. Because of the confusion the ambush created, she slaughtered the besiegers and gained five hundred horses and plenty of armor and treasures. The victory gave her the opportunity to campaign for Pope Gregory VII again after having to suppress the internal conflicts in her surrounding territories. Moreover, this allowed for her to financially support Pope Gregory VII, who was still in exile. This victory raised the morale of the supporters of Pope Gregory VII and Matilda and undermined the power of the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV, which was important to encouraging her soldiers in future campaigns against the crown. Matilda was able to take Rome in 1086 and instate Pope Victor III, who was deemed the legitimate successor of Pope Gregory VII.<sup>11</sup> Although he was only Pope for a short period of time, it allowed Matilda and her supporters to plan for a new Pope which was Pope Urban II in 1088, who wished to reinstate the Gregorian principles.<sup>12</sup> Matilda's aide in Pope Urban II's campaigns illustrates the necessity of her military expertise when fighting against Henry IV.

This is all very narrative and does not show analysis.

(Different paper from above).

In conclusion, Raymond of Poitiers' poor leadership skills were the primary cause of the failure at the Battle of Inab because of his lack of strategy when he did not have a plan to defeat Nur al-Din and recklessness for immediately going to Inab without his cavalry<sup>15</sup>. Although there was another factor to affect the outcome of the battle, like Nur al-Din's efficient leadership skills, Raymond's poor leadership still would have doomed his army.

The response is narrative with limited knowledge.

Detecting a failing research paper:

1. **Overt Plagiarism** - blatant copy of another work.
  - This can be the entire paper or a section.
  - In the strictest sense, even one sentence is enough to be declared plagiarized.
2. **Improper referencing.**
  - This is plagiarism that results from:
    1. Using someone else's words without quotation marks and proper footnote reference.
    2. Using someone else's idea without proper footnote reference.
    3. Eliminating quotation marks by only changing key words (usually verbs, sometimes adjectives, sometimes making nouns more general — all of which usually only weakens what was originally said).
    4. Citing a quote or paraphrase, but not properly including page numbers.
3. **Only summarizing or narrating a historical event rather than analyzing.**
  - Narrating what happened is not doing history.
    1. Academic history is about doing historical analysis.
    2. Historians ask and answer "Why" questions about causes and consequences of changes and/or continuities over time. They seek to understand the significance of an event from multiple perspectives. They continually seek the an elusive understanding of why things occurred the way they did and why those things re important.
    3. Antiquarians simply "collect the past;" they only narrative what occurred without answering "Why" questions.
4. **Using improper sources**
  - A few examples:
    1. Wikipedia
    2. Encyclopedia Britannica
    3. Pretty much anything with the word encyclopedia in the title
    4. [history.com](http://history.com)
    5. [historynow.com](http://historynow.com)
    6. Pretty much any website with the world history in the website title
    7. [JCunningham.org](http://JCunningham.org)
    8. There is nothing special about .org websites compared to .com when it comes to academic credibility.
      - All sources must be critically analyzed.
    9. [TheOnion.com](http://TheOnion.com)
    10. [bobknowshistory.edu](http://bobknowshistory.edu)
      - Edu websites are required to be associated with a recognized educational institution, but you must still critically analyze them.
      - A professor writing out some of his ideas on his website is different from a professor submitting a paper for academic peer review.
  - Stick with university presses and peer-reviewed journals for secondary sources if at all possible
5. **Falling off topic**
  - When your question purports to answer one thing but you end up answering something else.
  - You should alter your stated question and research goal and make sure that you have answered it.
6. **Doing a paper that is not academically in the subject it purports to be.**
  - A History paper is a history paper
    - Papers cannot be current events, politics, science, film, or any other subject.
    - One example would be doing a paper such as a history of science paper and turning it in as a science paper, or vice versa.
- 7.