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Experiences of the Online Writing Center staff have revealed that students can easily misapply technicalities of Turabian format and that accurate sample papers in Turabian format can be very helpful toward resolution of student inaccuracies. This sample paper attempts to demonstrate writing a Liberty University class assignment, such as a research paper, in Turabian 7th edition (2007) format. This sample paper will make use of parenthetical in-text source citations with an accompanying Reference List of cited sources. The in-text citation with Reference List method is not as popularly used as is the footnote/endnote with Bibliography method, but Liberty University students use the in-text citation with Reference List format occasionally enough that this sample paper can be a useful resource. For more precise and thorough information see Turabian 7th edition manual, chapters 18-19.

The content in the following pages will consist of useful summaries of select material from the Turabian Manual concerning parts of the process of writing a research paper (project). The writing process can be conceived of as idea-development from planning through rough drafting to the final product. The final product should include the varied components of a well-organized, lucid, and coherent paper (project).

**Initial Thought and Research**

The completion of the research paper is an involved process. In planning how to research and write any project, the process should be broken up into stages or steps that are manageable if worked on one at a time. The researcher should decide what the stages or steps of the project will be. When all steps for rough drafts are properly completed, the researcher-writer will have a full final draft for submission (cf. Turabian et al. 2007, 3-4).
How Researchers Must Think

Researchers/writers must carefully think through their purpose and procedure because whether in the academic world or in other business or professional sphere, sound and reliable research and reporting are important and valued. Solid detailed research is not sufficient, however, to persuade readers to a writer’s viewpoint. The research must be arranged and reported in a fashion that readers discern as logically valid and factually trustworthy for explanation and argument (Turabian et al. 2007, 6). Because readers do not know how much research was conducted, they make judgments based on how seemingly reliable research is effectively presented. One expert writer’s technique is to imagine the readers as a panel of diverse jurors who will critically assess the written presentation for its worth or solid argument (Hacker 2006, 491-92).

Usually researchers/writers want to answer a question, evidence a point for persuasion, or learn information that is valuable to share with select others (Turabian et al. 2007, 6). Whatever the intent in writing, “[t]he most successful researchers know that readers care about a question only when they think that its answer might encourage them to say not So what? but That’s worth knowing!” (Turabian et al. 2007, 7). Therefore a writer can begin the research process by asking various effective investigative questions pertinent to the nature of the project.

Three Kinds of Research Questions

Various ways exist to categorize research questions. One easily memorable scheme is to divide investigative questions into descriptive, relational, and causal types. Descriptive questions apply to topics a writer simply wishes to explain. Relational questions refer to explaining how two or more things relate to one another. Causal questions deal specifically with causes and their effects (Trochim 2006, under “Types of Questions”).
The Turabian manual (2007) prefers a different scheme: “The most common questions in academic work are conceptual. The ones most common in the professions are practical” (8). There are also applied questions.

**Conceptual Questions**

In researching and writing to answer a conceptual question, the writer informs readers so that they will better understand a certain issue (Turabian et al. 2007, 8). Conceptual questions guide the researcher to address the nature of something. The writer may answer/discuss what or how features, or may concentrate on how the specific topic relates to other topics. Concepts (or things) relate to each other in many possible ways. Thus, answering conceptual questions defines select ideas for what they are and how they function.

**Practical Questions**

A practical research question a writer will attempt to answer in order to instruct readers how to fix, change, or improve something (Turabian et al. 2007, 9). The nature and function of a thing is not at issue, but how to alter that thing. To fix, change, or improve something means to alter its nature and/or adjust or redirect its function. Altering a thing does not mean that it can be solely a material or literal object. Immaterial things, ideas, arguments, or theories may also be altered.

**Applied Questions**

Addressing an applied question refers to a researcher investigating and explaining to readers an issue that needs to be clarified and understood in the process of trying to fix, change, or improve a thing (Turabian et al. 2007, 9-10). In other words, using and answering applied questions means obtaining a grasp of what else needs to be understood in order to change
something, or why changing a thing is desirable. At times a thing is sufficiently complicated so that knowing its nature, function, and how to change it is not enough. In such cases the nature, function, and alteration of other but related things must also be dealt with. Applied questions help to manage these more complex research-writing topics.

Significance of Questioning

Formulating and asking questions to guide one’s research effort has value for the writer, not only for the learning of information, but also to enhance motivation for one’s hypothesis. A college professorial study by Donham and partners demonstrates that students completing required research papers are more highly motivated and interested if the research project is guided by questions to answer rather than to simply report information (Donham, Heinrich, and Bostwick 2010, 8). The cause of the enhanced motivation is that research guided by questions instills greater personal “ownership and responsibility” (Donham, Heinrich, and Bostwick 2010, 9) for the topic within the student-writer.

Regardless of the type of question being answered by the writer, readers must perceive some value in their learning the information. The writer must assume and answer the readers’ unspoken question of “So what?” The more effectively the writer can answer the question “So what?” the more confidence he/she will have in the final written product. Thus the writer should understand the usefulness of the three types of research questions on the way to arriving at a hypothesis. The writer investigates, questions, and develops his/her general topic in ways to attain a final hypothesis (i.e., a final thesis statement).

Topic to Final Draft

Researching a project or paper can be time consuming, messy, and unpredictable, but it is
manageable if the research is planned and directed. A solid research project consists of many tasks from start to finish, but among these tasks are five essentials:

1. Ask a project question worth answering.
2. Find an answer that can be supported with good reasons.
3. Find reliable evidence to support the good reasons.
4. Draft a report that makes a good case for the answer to the question.
5. Revise that draft until readers will think the first four essentials are met. (Turabian et al. 2007, 12)

The significance of asking three types of research questions has been noted. The five writing process essentials above make clear the implementation of one overall project-guiding question to answer. The five essentials will be treated to certain extent in the following pages.

Processing the Topic

If the researcher is allowed to choose the topic, it will be useful to select an idea or issue that he/she is personally interested in; has debated, confronted, or investigated before; is anticipating future activities which will be made easier if this topic is researched now (Turabian et al. 2007, 14). Although the researcher-writer may achieve all these traits of topic familiarity, the worth of the research topic or a guiding research question remains uncertain. One aspect of the worth of a guiding research question is its power to address the project readers’ implicit “So what?” query, as previously discussed.

Find a Question in the Topic

Good researchers know that the best guiding question to find an answer to is not one that is simply intriguing to them, but “one that helps them understand some larger issue” (Turabian et
al. 2007, 13). A research question may be trivial or useless, but that is not certain until the answer to the question is found. A researcher’s most valuable ability is a keen skill of curious discernment; that is, a skill at seeing what is odd amidst the common, regular, or logical. That curiosity well-applied will result in a topic-guiding question to investigate and write about.

Managing the Topic

The research topic, to the extent that it serves to create a complete rough draft, must be mastered by the student-writer. In the following, certain aspects of mastering the writing topic for a complete rough draft will be summarized. The topic must be limited and firmly questioned to direct it for research. The information obtained from research must be carefully evaluated and organized. A guiding thesis statement (i.e., hypothesis) must be designed and clearly evidenced. Lastly, a complete rough draft must be organized, outlined, and composed on pages.

Topic constraints

Regardless of how the research topic was obtained, the topic must be made manageable, preferably before much time and effort spent in research. A topic like counseling, leadership, or theology is much too broad, resulting in endless research. The investigator must limit the topic to a specific point or question or controversy that will be feasible to research and evaluate (cf. Turabian et al. 2007, 14-15).

The topic may also need to be strictly limited within what information is accessible to the researcher due to time constraints, though plenty of valid information exists on most topics that Liberty University students commonly research (excluding dissertations). Ruthlessly limiting what information is used for research is of special importance in internet research, because some
information most easily accessible on the Internet is of uncertain origin and validity (Luyt et al. 2008, 318-19).

Topic interrogation

A variety of thought processes are available for topic interrogation. The investigator should consider primarily how and why questions to answer in order to deepen research and develop the topic and should not worry if questions and their answers overlap in content. For example, research questions might be about how the topic fits into a larger context, such as historical, cultural, geographical, religious, economic, or social context (Turabian et al. 2007, 15). What questions could be about the nature or definition of the topic itself. What if speculative questions address what would happen if the topic acted differently than it does, or if new and startling information about the topic was discovered. Accept or reject questions help decide whether a source of information is agreed or disagreed with, and what the result or implication is of that agreement or disagreement. What about this questions challenge the topic in ways that other researchers appear not to discuss sufficiently.

The Turabian manual (2007) suggests an additional research activity the investigator could use if time permits. It is to find an internet chat room on the topic, listen in on the discussion, and see what details, questions, or issues about the topic are raised and why (15-16). With this technique the researcher must remember the uncertain quality of internet research information. Content obtained from chat networks, discussion forums or public blogs may be relevant and supportive, but is not classified as scholarly source material (cf. Liberty University Library 2011, under “Scholarly Journals – What are They?”).
Assessing initial data

After initial questioning and researching, the information found should be used to judge the worth of the questions that have been asked and investigated. The apparent worth of the initial research data should be used to direct to next-step deeper research. The initial research data must be assessed to discern whether the research question(s) has been too easy to answer, or may indicate that disproof is surely arguable (Turabian et al. 2007, 17-18).

Answering the topic

Early in the research (i.e., in the first or second stage of investigation), a useful strategy is to take time to speculate several answers to the research question(s). These speculative answers should be written down to give them clarity of thought. “Putting a foggy idea into words is the best way to clarify it, or to discover that you can’t” (Turabian et al. 2007, 19). It does not matter if these speculative answers are far-fetched or orthodox. The importance of this exercise is to clarify in mind several different answers. As in-depth research of the topic continues, the speculative answers can be evaluated; one or some answers can be maintained as valid or useful, and the others discarded as incorrect or impractical. As questions and their answers are clarified and supported, hypothesis(es) for the paper are determinable.

Using hypothesis(es)

One of the chief goals of the first and second stages of research is to identify a thesis (short for “hypothesis”) statement for the writing project. This clarification is crucial to the degree that the researcher-writer has authority to choose the project topic. The hypothesis must guide the coherent written project. There are several aspects of hypothesis to consider.
Working hypothesis. In the process of questioning, researching, and answering, one best answer to the main research question will be apparent. This best answer can be called the working hypothesis (Turabian et al. 2007, 19). It does not matter if the working hypothesis is vague or precise. The important thing is that it is clearly identified, for it will now channel the in-depth research to follow. The subsequent in-depth research must test, refine, validate, or disprove the working hypothesis. Valuable time should not be spent on in-depth research that is not linked to a working hypothesis. A working hypothesis, however exciting, that appears again and again to be hopeless or invalid should be discontinued. As soon as possible the researcher should revise an invalid working hypothesis to make it valid, or reject it entirely and pursue a different speculative answer to the topic question or point (Turabian et al. 2007, 19). The working hypothesis must remain flexible and revisable throughout the entire research process.

An issue of method should be clarified. The Turabian 7th edition manual assumes that research questions/answers lead to a hypothesis(es); however, this is not the only feasible procedure. In cases where the student-writer has an assigned hypothesis(es) to write on, it is efficient and effective to use that hypothesis to suggest an overall project-guiding question(s), which can then channel the research and subsequent writing. This method is less time consuming, apparently commonly used in Liberty University courses, and illustrated by diagram in this paper’s appendix.

Reasons and final hypothesis. While the preferred working hypothesis is being established and in-depth research to support it continues, few or many logical reasons why the hypothesis is true and valid should be identified and written down to clarify and organize them. Each of these reasons for the working hypothesis should be researched and validated or rejected (Turabian et
al. 2007, 22). The final-draft written project will consist of a final hypothesis with logically acceptable reasons for it, buttressed by sound research.

**Pitfalls to avoid.** All hypotheses should be treated with caution. The working hypothesis must remain adjustable. The researcher-writer must not fall in love with his/her working hypothesis so much that it cannot be changed or rejected if sound research invalidates it. A hypothesis should not be maintained if insufficient reasonable support for it is found. The writer’s goal must be to reach an effectively argued and supported final hypothesis. Reputable research data which opposes one’s working hypothesis needs to be honestly considered for its worth. If a writer cannot adequately answer other writers who reject his or her hypothesis, the hypothesis is not worth continuing. However, full persuasion of others is not necessary; an honest, reasonable, coherent, and relevant answer is all that is necessary (Turabian et al. 2007, 20).

**Good hypothesis, no support.** The authors of the Turabian 7th edition manual (2007) state: “In fact, as experienced researchers know, most issues have few, if any, final answers, because there are no final questions” (20). This assertion draws attention to the ultimate preeminence of asking good questions over proving great answers. At times, a seemingly good hypothesis has no available evidence to validate it. This occurs often in scientific research and writing. In research cases of this sort where reliable evidence cannot be found, a wise response by the researcher-writer is to literally implement the working hypothesis into the project as a question. The writer should then focus on research which clearly demonstrates that the good question-hypothesis is worth asking and answering, but apparently has not yet been satisfactorily answered by past researchers (Turabian et al. 2007, 20).
Evidencing the hypothesis

In the research process it may become very difficult or unclear to the researcher-writer how to best evidence the working hypothesis. If this confusion occurs, a helpful strategy is to list in writing the specific kinds of evidence the researcher would love to see. These evidences can then be ranked according to their importance to the researcher (Turabian et al. 2007, 22). For example, first on the list will be what evidence is perfect and ideal to the hypothesis. Second on the list will be the second most ideal evidence. Third on the list will be the next most ideal evidence, and so forth. By subsequent in-depth research the writer can locate and evaluate the evidences on his/her prioritized list.

At the time of composing paragraphs into the body of the project, thus providing substance to the arguments for the hypothesis, one helpful strategy is “the Rule of 3.” That is, “find [three] supporting arguments for each position” taken. “Begin with a strong argument, then use a stronger one, and end with the strongest argument for [the] final point” (Research Guide for Students 2008, under “Step 4”).

Hypothesis as guide

Presenting a valid working hypothesis could be viewed as a destination to be reached in travel. The parts of the project serve as the route to the destination. In composing the complete rough draft of the project, the valid hypothesis should be used as a strict guide to writing the parts and sections of the paper. Particularly, the sensible order of sections, the introduction, and the conclusion (features of a project that can too readily be discounted as not very important) should not be treated haphazardly. A well done project outline will assist in giving all parts and sections their due roles and value.
Outline and order of full rough draft

The research and writing of the project must be logically outlined. The extent of outline depends entirely upon the intended length and depth of the final product. Standard outline format can be applied: first level - Roman numerals I, II, III, etc.; second level - capitalized letters A, B, C, etc.; third level - Arabic numerals 1, 2, 3, etc.; fourth level - small case letters a, b, c, etc.; fifth level - parenthetical Arabic numerals (1), (2), (3), etc.; sixth level – parenthetical small case letters (a), (b), (c), etc. Outline numerals and letters do not necessarily have to visibly appear in the project.

The easiest and most logically straightforward way to outline the completed rough draft project (not a thesis or dissertation) is to introduce the paper’s hypothesis(es) at the beginning, and follow by making the main points of the paper outline the reasons for the hypothesis. Each reason for the hypothesis might label a main section in the paper. Each main point/reason can then be explained and supported by solid research and argument (Turabian et al. 2007, 21-22).

With the project outline, the document’s order becomes visible.

Order of composition. A wise order of writing to follow is: First, formulate the working hypothesis. Second, compose in logical sequence the paragraphs of the body of the project that will evidence or argue for the hypothesis (see Appendix for an example procedure for writing paragraphs). Third, change the hypothesis, if need be, to make sure it encapsulates all the evidences or arguments used. Fourth, compose a tentative Introduction. Fifth, compose a tentative Conclusion (cf. Ellison 2010, 94-95). Following this order will allow the paper’s hypothesis to sufficiently guide and restrict the content of all parts and sections.

Introduction. The project’s hypothesis will guide the consistency of the Introduction if that
section is used to capture the reader’s attention and lead into the declaration of the hypothesis. Following that, the Introduction might summarize in preview the major sections used to develop or explain the hypothesis (Ellison 2010, 94-95). Both the Introduction and Conclusion are very important in aiding project readers to understand the thrust of the entire presentation.

**Conclusion.** A memorable Conclusion is as important to the paper as is a lucid Introduction. A wise Conclusion will restate and reemphasize the paper’s hypothesis in other words, in order to make it vivid and powerful to the reader. Reflection might also be made upon the major points that have been discussed, along with their significance for the readers’ lives. The Conclusion must make vivid the single main point the readers should learn; therefore, the Conclusion should not introduce new sources or material (Ellison 2010, 116-17).

The proofreading and polishing of the rough draft result in the final draft.

**Revising for Final Draft**

By the time the final written product (final draft) is submitted, it should be proofread and revised. Proofreading, editing, and revising may occur from once to many times depending upon the length and complexity of content of the draft, and relevant to the quality of English writing skills of the writer. All drafts of the project are rough except the one that is finally submitted to the intended reader(s). The final draft should be free of errors and intelligible for the reader(s).

Rough drafts are for the sake of the writer, not the readers (Turabian et al. 2007, 98). Having a proofreader other than the project writer is always helpful and discerning for project improvement. Regardless of what the writer thinks, the final draft will not be effective to its audience if the readers do not see and find in it what they are expecting. To this end, the writer must view the project draft(s) and its revisions as objectively and critically as possible (Turabian
et al. 2007, 98). The writer should critically evaluate the final draft for its quality as a whole and in its parts. It is also beneficial to not critically evaluate the final draft all in one sitting.

**Check the Whole**

Reviewing the entire project (paper) for unity of writing style is essential and can be compared to taking a bird’s eye, or wide-angle, view of the document. Unity of writing style refers to consistency throughout the document. That consistency reveals only one writer’s personality and perspective. If the project has more than one researcher-writer, they should try to make the document as consistent in style as feasible. In the final draft review, three project features should be assessed: logical flow, coherency, and relevancy.

Logical markers and flow

It is crucial for the readers that they clearly discern the logical flow and organization of the whole project. There are four key logic markers that enable readers to comprehend the structure of the paper. The readers should clearly recognize: (1) Where the Introduction ends. (2) Where and what the thesis statement is. (3) How one section changes to the next. (4) Where the Conclusion begins. When all four logic markers are evident and understandable, the flow of the whole document is intact (Turabian et al. 2007, 98-99).

Coherency

The paper may have intact logical flow without being entirely coherent. One way to understand coherence is to think of the paper as consistent throughout in content, style, and intent. Without coherence, the reader(s) will not understand the main point or argument of the paper. The following are some evaluation questions to help ensure coherence:

- Do distinctive key terms appear consistently throughout the paper?
Do pertinent key terms appear consistently throughout a section?

Are the beginnings of sections and subsections clearly recognizable?

Does each section relate to the preceding one?

Does each subsection relate to the preceding one?

Does each section make its main point clear?

Does each subsection make its main point clear?

Do all sections clearly relate to the whole? (cf. Turabian et al. 2007, 99-100)

Proper stylistic treatment of information paraphrased from sources found in research is an issue of coherence; a feature that is often misunderstood or ignored. To re-emphasize, coherence of writing style throughout the project includes that, aside from direct quotes from sources, the entire composition looks and sounds like it came from the same writer. Thorough coherence is much more difficult in projects written by teams, and requires pointed proofreading and revision, including upon information paraphrased from sources. Teacher Marika Dietsch comments on paraphrasing from sources: “[I]t should sound like something that you would say or write” (Rosevear 2008, under “A Way to Paraphrase”). Correct paraphrasing of information obtained in research is not just changing a couple words, but converting the idea(s) in the information into the paper writer’s own words and writing style.

Relevancy

Another important feature is relevancy of content. Relevancy concerns the project’s content being clearly and directly linked to the paper’s purpose. Particularly if the purpose of the project is to persuade, it is possible that a section, subsection, or particular argument be irrelevant to the thesis statement (hypothesis) of the paper. There are five evaluation questions that can be applied to the paper to determine if it is relevant throughout to the final hypothesis/claim. The
five tests are as follows:

- What is the claim (thesis, hypothesis)?
- What reasons support it?
- How much are the reasons relevant (linked) to the claim (thesis, hypothesis)?
- What specific evidence supports those reasons?
- What intelligent response can be given to objections and alternative views? (cf. Turabian et al. 2007, 50)

Asking and reasonably answering these five questions about the project will not ensure that the audience will be convinced, but the readers will clearly see and hear the argument. Along with making the whole of the final draft satisfactory, each paragraph can be evaluated.

*Check Paragraphs*

Each paragraph of a section or subsection should be clearly relevant (linked) to its section, and consequently linked to the paper’s thesis (hypothesis). Each paragraph should contain a sentence indicating its main point. The paragraphs of a section or subsection should be in a logical order, and the same applies to the sentences that constitute a single paragraph (Turabian et al. 2007, 100-01; cf. 109-19 about revising sentences).

It is advisable that individual paragraphs not be too short (less than five lines of text) or too long (a whole page). If the paragraph is too short, the point of the paragraph may not be substantial; if too long, the point may not be lucid. This suggested length rule does not apply to sectional introductions and conclusions, sectional transitions, lists, or points made intentionally emphatic (Turabian et al. 2007, 101). The rule is suggested for research papers, not necessarily for all kinds of papers. It can be helpful to not complete assessment of all paragraphs in just one sitting.
**Check After Cooling**

In the process of revising for the final draft, the “cool down” time refers to the period of time that the writer allows the written rough draft to sit idle after its completion and prior to reckoning it the final draft. Revising the draft again after cool down is a helpful technique if time allows for it. After cooling the writer can read the draft with a more objective critical eye and understanding than before (Turabian et al. 2007, 101). There may be only one cool down period between rough draft and final draft, but such limitation is not necessary. There can be as many cool down periods as the writer wishes to implement, depending upon the length and complexity of the final document and available time.

One revision technique useful after the cool down period is to paraphrase these parts of the paper: Introduction, introduction to each section, and Conclusion. When these paraphrases are put together, do they constitute a coherent whole? (Turabian et al. 2007, 101). If they do not, revision for coherency and relevancy among those parts of the paper is needed. In that case, the part(s) of the paper that appears to be weak in logic, coherency, or relevancy, must be adjusted so that it is clearly linked to the project’s thesis (hypothesis).

**A Final Analogy**

The process of revising rough drafts and achieving the final draft, as is now clear, is a complex process for the conscientious writer. The process should produce a document that is logically tightly knit together, like a lawyer’s argument. Before concluding this discussion, it may be helpful to offer a further analogy to the complete writing process. Teacher Stephen Broskoske relates his experience as follows:

Recently, I tried a new approach to teaching research papers that seems to help students understand the task more thoroughly . . . . I present to my students the analogy that writing a research paper is like a lawyer defending a court case. Students can relate to this
analogy . . . . I draw out the analogy in terms of how lawyers frame their case (as the students define their topic), search out evidence (as the students search for sources), present the evidence (as the students write the paper), and make the closing argument (as students draw a conclusion). I find that if I frame their thinking in this way, the students write better papers. (Broskoske 2007, 31)

The lawyer’s presentation analogy above does well to demonstrate the interrelationship of sound logic, coherence, and relevance throughout the written project’s final draft.

The goal of conducting the various steps of revising the rough draft is to achieve a neat final draft project that has the final hypothesis(es) at its core and as its guide. The completed final draft is ready for its reading audience.

**Conclusion**

Completion of an in-depth class assignment or project, such as a research paper, is an involved writing process if it is thoroughly well done. The Liberty University Writing Center has found that students have many misunderstandings regarding the correct implementation of Turabian writing format. On behalf of the 7th edition of the Turabian Manual (2007), this document presents one sample writing assignment (such as a research paper) so that Liberty University students can have another opportunity to view at least some features of Turabian format in effective and accurate illustration.

In actuality, some features of Turabian 7th edition format are flexible to the nature of an assignment; while some features are inflexible. To understand the applicability of precise format features, a student should make concentrated use of the Turabian manual as guide. One of the important but flexible elements of Turabian format is the use of either footnotes (or endnotes) with accompanying Bibliography (in chapters 16-17 of the manual) or the use of parenthetical in-text source citations with accompanying Reference List (in chapters 18-19 of the manual). This
sample paper has presented the parenthetical in-text source citation with accompanying Reference List method. Given the real possibility that the Turabian 7th edition manual is not accessible or comprehensible to a student, this sample presentation has some value as an illustrative resource on the writing process.

“Be diligent to present yourself approved to God as a workman who does not need to be ashamed, accurately handling the word of truth” (2 Tim. 2:15 [NASB]), admonishes the Apostle Paul. On behalf of such diligent and accurate handling of one’s work, there are many features to be considered and unified in order for a writing project to be well organized, coherent, and clear in meaning. The best quality writing process will begin by the researcher-writer going through questioning and planning, initial research and topic assessment, and designing a thesis statement (working hypothesis) to guide the research and writing. The researcher-writer must then accumulate valid and effective research data; compose appropriate sentences, paragraphs and sections of the project’s rough draft; allow a cool down time; and proofread, revise and edit the rough draft as many times as needed. The writer should end with a top-quality final draft containing a final hypothesis to submit to the reader(s).
Sample Process for Relating Paragraphs* to Hypothesis
(modified from: Heiman and Slomianko 1988, 192)

* The above diagram is simplified in order to demonstrate the entire research paper process. It is not suggesting that each research question, point, or argument requires only one paragraph. Each research question, point, or argument will require as many paragraphs linked in sequence as are necessary to effectively develop it for the paper’s hypothesis.
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