

# WRITING A GRADUATE PAPER

## Global University Form and Style Guide

All papers should be written and documented according to guidelines presented in the current edition of the *Global University Graduate Studies Form and Style Guide*. In addition to the *Form and Style Guide*, you should also have a copy of Kate Turabian's *Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, ninth edition, revised by Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, Joseph M. Williams, and University of Chicago Press editorial staff, 2018.

NOTE: This Student Handbook as a whole does *not* follow the form and style requirements of Global University's *Graduate Studies Form and Style Guide*. Writing assignment templates may be found on the library website in the graduate section.

## Elements of a Good Essay

An essay is a formal composition consisting of several paragraphs that develop a central idea—for example, the answer to the essay question. In order to answer a question with a response written in essay form, one must summarize, analyze, and evaluate the material pertaining to the subject. Only then is one ready to create a composition that accurately presents what he or she has learned about the topic.

The essay should be a compilation of your knowledge of a given subject, derived from the reading you have done. It should be a creative effort and not just a compilation of the opinions of other writers who are authorities on the subject. The objective is for you to synthesize your own ideas on the subject and present the conclusions that you have reached regarding the issue. The answer that one develops for the essay question should *not* be a short research paper. While it is appropriate to credit the source of items that are direct quotes with an in-text reference citation, the answer to the essay question should not contain the depth of explanation that would be required in a research paper.

In preparing a formal research paper, students are taught to follow certain well-defined steps that usually require them to present the views of several authorities on the subject, carefully documenting the sources of their information. They may not even attempt to answer the question that is raised by the issue they have chosen to investigate. Instead, beginning students may limit their goal simply to showing that the question is worth pursuing. However, in answering essay questions, students are called upon to be more creative and project into their answer more of what they have derived from their study of the topic. To do this, they must be somewhat detached from the often-mechanical requirements of creating a research paper. Detachment is a skill that many students are continually struggling to perfect.

In order to answer an essay question properly, you must think for yourself and formulate answers to the issues raised by the question. While you should utilize what you have learned from reading about the subject, as you would in preparing a research paper, you must remember that *the goal of the essay question is to reveal how you analyze, synthesize, and make valuations about the various issues that form the topic*. If you use a particular author's point of view in answering an essay question, it is quite satisfactory merely to state that point of view in your own words, being sure to include the author's name. If it is necessary to use a direct quotation, place it in quotation

marks or indent and single-space it and identify the source with an in-text reference citation. For example, you might say: Earle Cairns agrees with Augustine that “the course of human history proceeds to and from the cross” (1981, 16).

As in a research paper, it is never permissible to use the exact words of an author without giving him or her credit. It is even forbidden to paraphrase so closely that it is clear that what you are saying came largely from another writer. This is called “borderline” plagiarism, pure and simple, and it is unethical, immoral, and even illegal to take someone else’s work and pass it off as your own. However, you may use an author’s ideas as a sounding board for your own thoughts on a subject, but you must create an entirely new wording using your own language and giving the cited author credit for his or her work.

A good essay should contain a thesis statement in the first paragraph. This thesis statement should express the central idea to be covered in the essay. In the case of an essay question, it should be a restatement of the question in declarative form. For example, the essay question, “How was Augustine’s approach to Christianity influenced by his earlier adoption of Manichean teaching?” could be rephrased in this manner, “Augustine was greatly influenced by the teachings of the Manicheans and was later able to become their foremost opponent as Bishop of Hippo.” The remainder of the first paragraph should contain introductory remarks explaining that Augustine was able to refute effectively the teaching of the Manicheans because he had spent fourteen years in their ranks, giving him an intimate knowledge of their beliefs. This introductory paragraph is followed by several paragraphs that develop this one central idea. The final paragraph should be the conclusion, summarizing what has been said.

Many implications may be derived from the major categories or levels of learning in the cognitive domain of a taxonomy of educational objectives (such as Benjamin Bloom’s). The major categories for the cognitive domain in such a taxonomy are usually given as follows:

1. Knowledge (remembering previously-learned material)
  2. Comprehension (ability to grasp the meaning of material)
  3. Application (ability to use learned material in new situations)
  4. Analysis (ability to break down material into component parts to understand its organizational structure)
  5. Synthesis (ability to put parts together to form a new whole)
  6. Evaluation (ability to judge the value of material for a given purpose)
- (Martin and Briggs 1986, 66–69).

In order to write a good essay, it is not necessary for you to be familiar with all of these implications. It is beneficial, however, for you to be aware that the goal of a good essay question is to encourage you to phrase your answers in terms of the higher levels of these objectives. These higher levels or categories are obviously *analysis*, *synthesis*, and *evaluation*. A good answer to an essay question should therefore concentrate on carrying out these functions rather than being limited to reciting *knowledge*, demonstrating *comprehension*, and *applying* material that has been learned (the lower three levels or categories).

You should also keep in mind the process of *reflection*, *evaluation*, and *valuation* (the REV principle) when you approach an essay question. It will always be a challenge to move up the scale to the higher levels of the cognitive domain of the taxonomy when you write the answer to an essay question. It can be done, however, and you will be amply rewarded by your efforts to improve your ability in this skill. Keep trying and your writing skills will benefit greatly. It is well worth the effort,

as one's writing ability is a critical skill; improving it also enhances one's ability to speak more effectively and to think more clearly.

### **The Use of Critical Thinking in Writing Research Papers**

What is critical thinking? Critical thinking does not mean *to criticize someone or something* in the sense of finding fault or presuming someone to be wrong. Instead, the term refers to the need for a researcher to look *beyond* what is being said by a writer or speaker in order to determine the real message that the author is trying to convey. It is the process of trying to discover the underlying meaning of what is really being said. This requires the researcher to take what an author has articulated (however convincing it may seem to be) and attempt to understand the actual meaning that the author is expounding. The researcher must then evaluate it as to its intrinsic value and decide how applicable and valuable it is for the purpose for which he or she intends to use it (Troyka 1996, 110).

Everyone has an agenda to promote, and all writers tend to do some “editorializing” about the issue they are discussing. Some authors “editorialize” more than others and seek to advance their point of view in an obvious manner, giving little credence to other points of view, if they mention them at all. Others are more subtle and may seek to present a balanced view of most of the major ideas about the subject, while cautiously advancing the view that they favor. Whether or not they seek to obscure or “camouflage” the fact that they are promoting a particular point of view often depends on the degree to which they desire to convince their audience. Some authors will attempt to conceal their intentions entirely while seeking to convince the reader. Others may seek to assure the reader that they are laying aside their own biases in examining an issue. They feel that, if their argument is couched in terms that seem to be factual and logical, the reader will be more likely to accept it (Booth, Colomb, and Williams 1995, 144–145). This is widely accepted as the best manner in which to win over a reader, not because the author is trying to be deceitful, but because he or she is trying to be—or at least trying to appear to be—unbiased in reporting the facts.

At the opposite end of the spectrum is the writer who resorts to emotional declarations that often have little to do with reason or an impartial approach to gathering facts. In this case, the writer has already decided what is correct and uses generalizations, exaggerations, and prejudicial statements in an attempt to impose his or her opinion as fact on the reader. The statements utilized are often laden with invective toward anyone who dares dispute the author. They may also consist of emotionally-charged terms designed to arouse feelings of anger, hatred, resentment, and animosity towards the person or object at which they are directed. When writers engage in long harangues and diatribes against those who disagree with them, it is easy to recognize this as an attempt to overwhelm the reader with the volume or force of their argument rather than with its logic.

In order to keep from being unduly swayed by whatever approach an author may use, the researcher should carefully assess the validity of each statement that the author makes. The researcher must be somewhat skeptical of everything that he or she reads, since the goal of many authors is to propagate their point of view by making it look like a fact when, in reality, it is only their opinion. Usually an author's biases will be discerned fairly readily. There are many times, however, when an author will state something so unequivocally that it will appear to be an undisputed fact. At the same time, the researcher may not be conversant enough with the point in question to determine whether the author's statement is fact or merely opinion. In this case, the researcher must engage in a bit of detective work by analyzing the factors that influenced the author's perspective (Troyka 1996, 118).

Two examples that point this out are Josephus, the Jewish author who wrote about the conquest of Palestine by the Romans, and the Greek historian Herodotus, who traveled across the ancient world and reported on what he saw. In one of the writings of Josephus, *The Jewish War*, there are times when the reader can discern that what he is saying is being phrased obviously in such a way as to present himself in the best possible light. Despite this, he remains, arguably, the most important ancient Jewish historian, since little would be known about the events in Palestine during the two centuries prior to the destruction of Jerusalem without his writings. When the reader becomes aware that Josephus was captured by the Romans in the early stages of the Jewish war and that he attempted to get the Jewish forces to surrender because he felt they had no hope of success, it is much easier to understand his perspective. This, in turn, helps in assessing the value of his writings (*The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Revised Edition, s. v. "Josephus, Flavius").

Likewise, after reading Herodotus' description of the Great Pyramid in Egypt, the reader may be duly impressed with his account. He estimated that it "took 100,000 men working for twenty years" to construct this one huge monument. But if the reader is also aware that on some of his other trips, Herodotus wrote about some rather unusual things, such as a creature known as the *phoenix*, then the reader's estimation of him as a reliable witness may be lowered somewhat. If, however, the reader is aware that most historians familiar with Herodotus regard him as a trustworthy witness and, indeed, have accorded him the title, "Father of History," then the reader will undoubtedly want to move him back up the scale of reliability. The reader will also want to move Herodotus farther up this scale as a reliable witness after recognizing that those scholars most familiar with Herodotus state that, in almost every case where there is any doubt as to the reliability of his account, it is obvious that he was simply recording what someone else had described to him. He did not claim to have seen it himself. Most scholars also accept as very clear the distinction between when Herodotus is simply recording something he heard, which may be regarded as a fable, and when he himself is giving eyewitness testimony (de Selincourt 1962, 118–124).

If the researcher suspects that an author has intentionally tried to distort the difference between his or her opinion and the facts, it is imperative to gather whatever evidence is available and begin to analyze it. He or she should then summarize what is known about the evidence and evaluate its accuracy and how useful it will be in separating fact from fiction. This is an ongoing process, and the components of this process may not always follow in a neatly arranged order. It may be necessary to go back and forth between the various steps several times and even begin in the middle or at the end and go backwards before a clearer picture emerges. Remember, the goal of critical thinking is to pull together the credible evidence and analyze, evaluate, and summarize, and then interpret it.

Research is more than just finding out what happened. Its most important function is to put the evidence together in an effort to answer the question, "What does it mean?" Once the researcher has assembled and evaluated the evidence, he or she can put it together, or "synthesize" it. This involves creating a new structure that will present the most accurate view of the relationships involved in the subject being considered. Doing this allows the researcher to appraise analytically the information that has been developed through the process of critical thinking (Booth, Colomb, and Williams 1995, 156–158).

The two types of reasoning most commonly used to reach a conclusion in critical thinking are inductive reasoning and deductive reasoning. *Inductive reasoning* moves from specific facts to the formulation of a general principle to reach a conclusion. *Deductive reasoning* follows the opposite pattern, where the researcher moves from general evidence to a specific conclusion (Troyka 1996,

140–143). Deductive reasoning is considered to be the stronger of the two and is sometimes referred to as the “scientific method.” (The *scientific method* may be properly defined as being the process by which a problem is identified, the necessary data is accumulated, and a hypothesis is proposed and then tested by the empirical method) (*The Random House College Dictionary*, revised edition, s.v. “scientific method”). *Empirical evidence* is that which can be observed and verified by the five senses: sight, hearing, smell, taste, or touch. The process is accomplished by experimentation apart from any reliance on factors that are not measurable by the experimenter.

Deductive reasoning consists of two premises and a conclusion that is drawn from them. Together the three parts are referred to as a *syllogism* (Troyka 1996, 141). A syllogistic form of reasoning would follow this pattern: Premise 1: All Greeks are human. Premise 2: Aristotle is a Greek. Conclusion: Aristotle is human. The development of this form of reasoning is credited to Aristotle. An example of an incorrect application of syllogistic reasoning would be the following: Premise 1: All birds can fly. Premise 2: An ostrich cannot fly. Conclusion: An ostrich is not a bird. In this case, the syllogism was begun with a false first premise which rendered the conclusion incorrect.

In contrast to deductive reasoning, inductive reasoning would begin with specific facts and attempt to move to a general conclusion. It seeks to uncover something that has not been known before. One would ordinarily study the Bible inductively in order to arrive at a conclusion that could then be applied in one’s life. Deductive reasoning, on the other hand, is an attempt to move from a general principle that is already known and apply it by reaching a specific conclusion (Troyka 1996, 140–143).

In working through the processes of critical thinking, the researcher encounters different kinds of evidence with differing degrees of reliability. Written evidence is usually categorized as being a primary source or a secondary source. A *primary source* simply indicates that the person who is responsible for it was a participant or an eyewitness whose account is based on direct observation. A *secondary source* is an account based on a primary source, meaning the author did not receive the information first-hand. Primary sources are obviously better, but a secondary source can be extremely valuable. It might even prove to be more reliable than a primary source, especially if the originator of the primary source is known to be biased to the extent of seriously distorting the facts (Troyka 1996, 134–136). Keep in mind, however, that there could be no secondary source without a primary source, regardless of how flawed the primary source might be.

Julius Caesar’s work, *Commentaries on the Gallic War*, was written while he was busy subduing the Germanic tribes in the area of modern France and Belgium. It is an excellent example of a primary source and to this day remains one of the best narratives on military and political strategy. Caesar wrote this account to keep himself in the public eye during his absence from Rome while his chief rival, Pompey, was governing that part of the republic. Caesar obviously wanted to present a favorable view of himself, but his writings also present an accurate picture of the life of the Germanic tribes that he encountered (Chambers et al. 1995, 107–108). For a more balanced picture of Caesar himself, a well-written biography will provide the researcher with the significance of his effect on the Roman state and the ancient world. Autobiographies, especially, should be interpreted from the standpoint of critical thinking since even the most honest and forthright accounts are usually not as revealing as even a mediocre biography. Details that are unflattering and damaging to the reputation of the writer are usually omitted from an autobiography, although the reader may find many details there (that present the author favorably) which could not be found anywhere else.

To repeat this final word of caution for the researcher, beware of illogical and hasty conclusions by the authors whose works you will encounter while conducting research. They are present in every type of writing and are not always easily recognized. These conclusions are an attempt by the author to beguile the reader into accepting his or her position or interpretation without investigation. It may be the most well-informed opinion available to the reader on the subject, but it is still an opinion and should not be accepted without first questioning its accuracy, authority, relevance, and support from other sources.

This is the essence of critical thinking, and the reader would be well advised to first consider the motivation of the author, the point of view of the author, and finally—and most importantly—the logic of the author. Does the author argue on rational or emotional or ethical grounds? Does the author mount a personal attack on his or her adversaries rather than appealing to logic? Does the author's case rest on unsupported generalities or ambiguous statements or information taken out of context? Does the author appeal to prejudice or guilt by association? Does the author ignore the real question and discuss an irrelevant issue? Are the author's ideas contradictory, or is his or her logic flawed (Troyka 1996, 144–147)?

These are but a few of the questions that the researcher must pose in determining how to assess the significance and reliability of an author's work. Doing careful research and putting together the results is similar to constructing any other finely-crafted object. It is a craft that requires a great deal of meticulous work, but the results are usually quite gratifying.

### **Proofreading and Revising Research Papers**

The first draft of a research paper is always a “diamond in the rough” and must be reread and revised many times. There are no shortcuts. It is almost always necessary to make numerous changes in punctuation, word choice, verb tense, spelling, use of modifiers, sentence structure, and paragraph divisions, all of the things on which the researcher did not closely focus when he or she was trying to present the ideas that the research generated. Questions of fact must be verified and often altered to describe what actually occurred and not to what the researcher remembered as being accurate. The only way for you, the researcher, to do this effectively is to reread your first draft many times and search for ways to implement these revisions by type or category. For example, while checking for correct verb tense usage, you may find other types of mistakes that need to be corrected. Make a brief notation and return when you are working with the appropriate category. It is only by rereading and revising a first draft many times that it will ever become what you actually intended to say.

A first draft is usually written from notes that have been taken from pertinent sources on the subject. It may be written in outline or skeletal form and then developed more fully, or you may prefer to write a more complete version directly from your notes. It will be necessary to produce several drafts from the first rough draft, with each subsequent draft becoming more acceptable through the process of revising, editing, and proofreading the manuscript. After several drafts, you probably will have overlooked some errors so many times that they seem to be correct. At this point, it is helpful to have someone else proofread your paper if possible. He or she will probably be able to point out some final corrections that need to be made. This will help you produce a paper that is freer from error and that flows more smoothly. Ordinarily, the more you revise your paper, the more presentable it will become. Good writing is created by persistent rewriting until the desired result has been achieved.

A research paper is more difficult and takes much longer to produce than other types of writing because all of the sources used must be documented accurately. This involves citing the exact location in your paper where you have used another author's material. For papers submitted to Global University, you should document your sources according to the style described in the current edition of the *Global University Graduate Studies Form and Style Guide*. For those instances where the form or style issues are not covered in the *Form and Style Guide*, consult *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations* by Kate L. Turabian, ninth edition, revised by Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, Joseph M. Williams, and University of Chicago Press editorial staff, 2018. The works you use should also be listed in the reference list you compile at the end of the paper. Giving proper credit to the authors you have consulted to write your research paper is second in importance only to presenting the results of your research clearly. You should be guided by these two goals, especially when you are proofreading your first draft. If you have inadvertently used too many of another author's words, that is the time to catch it. You may forget later and think they are your own words and ideas.

You may use another author's work by summarizing it, paraphrasing it, or by directly quoting it. But you must acknowledge clearly in your paper that it is another author's work, or else you are taking it without giving credit. This, as we have already indicated, is *plagiarism*. It is never acceptable to use someone else's work without giving due credit. A researcher should also avoid the tendency of "borderline plagiarism." This consists of paraphrasing another writer's work so closely that your paraphrase bears a striking resemblance to the original work and is easily recognizable because of the similarity in wording. This type of writing may be considered plagiarism even if the source is cited (Booth, Colomb, and Williams 2010, 167–69). If a very close paraphrase is used, even when the source is given, the information should be presented as a direct quotation instead of merely changing a few words. A researcher may begin by summarizing another author and then slowly drift into paraphrase and from there into close paraphrase, which is, again, a form of plagiarism (Booth, Colomb, and Williams 2010, 169–70).

*How to avoid being guilty of plagiarizing another author's work is the single most important ethical concept for a researcher to grasp.* It is not only a problem for those who are beginning to do research; it can also be a pitfall for even the most experienced researcher. Anyone doing research must constantly guard against the tendency to lapse into a pattern of summarizing or paraphrasing another author's work too closely. This happens most often when the researcher attempts to produce an account of the results of his or her research hastily, without first assimilating the material. The researcher should therefore pay close attention to this problem when proofreading in order to avoid the danger of including questionable passages in the first draft. These passages should either be discarded or radically altered, and the authors who have been consulted must be given credit when their work is used.

The temptation to rely too heavily on the words of another author becomes greater as deadlines approach, and even the most conscientious researcher may feel pressured to do this. The researcher should become thoroughly familiar with what constitutes plagiarism and determine in advance to avoid it studiously even if it means not meeting a deadline. The reputations of many well respected authors have been irrevocably damaged by revelations that they have engaged in some form of plagiarism. No one is immune, and every writer must constantly guard against even unintentional forms of plagiarism. The researcher, and the researcher alone, must bear the consequences if it is discovered that he or she has appropriated another author's work without giving proper credit. It is much better to err on the side of caution than to risk doing something that, even years later, may

result in public humiliation when discovered (Booth, Colomb, and Williams 2010, 170). This is the most important goal when proofreading—insuring that nothing you have written can in any way be considered the words or ideas of someone else that you have used without giving them proper credit.

Once this notion is firmly fixed in your mind, you are ready to proceed with proofreading, revising, and rewriting. It is best to go ahead and write with a free-flowing style both when creating the first draft and when revising it. Much of what you write in later drafts will also need to be revised substantially or even discarded, but you must have raw material with which to work.

Getting started and working through the intermediate stages when the manuscript does not even resemble the finished product is the most difficult part, even for the veteran researcher. Only experience gives you, the researcher, the reassurance that the rough outline and your scribbled notes will eventually become an impressive document. As a fledgling researcher, you must rely solely on whatever faith can be mustered in your own determination to see this accomplished. After a few hours of work, you will normally begin to become interested in the problem or question because of its own merits. For both the veteran and the beginning researcher, this is usually sufficient motivation to spur them on to the necessary effort.

### **The REV Principle**

The REV principle should be used throughout all your courses. The first step is **Reflection** on the content of the course as you consider how the subject matter under investigation relates to your own theology of ministry and ministry goals or objectives. The second step, **Evaluation**, is the process of critical analysis and the cognitive ordering of information and materials into thoughtful and potentially useful patterns and structures. The third step, **Valuation**, invites you to apply the acquired knowledge and skills in a personally integrated, effective, and cohesive fashion.

### **Standards for Written Work**

When doing written assignments to be sent to your mentor for evaluation, you should keep in mind that the higher your writing standards, the better your grade. Clarity, form, grammar, and punctuation are more important than agreement or disagreement with the idea conveyed. Quality of content is more important than quantity. The goal is not to change your writing style but to develop it into acceptable form. Research included in your paper should be three to five citations per page with an emphasis on peer reviewed journals. The following tips will help to develop your writing skills.

### **Content/Development**

- Cover all key elements of the assignment in a substantive way.
- Make content comprehensive, accurate, and (if applicable) persuasive.
- Organize major points logically, state them clearly, and support them with specific details, examples, and/or analysis.
- Where appropriate, support major points with theory relevant to development of the ideas, and use the vocabulary of the theory correctly.
- Integrate theory and practice with practical experience from the “real world.”
- Do adequate and timely research for the topic.
- Make the context and purposes of the writing clear.



## Organization

- Make the structure of the paper clear and easy to follow.
- Emphasize the central theme or purpose and direct it to the appropriate audience.
- Have ideas flow in a logical sequence.
- Provide sufficient background and preview major points of the topic in the introduction.
- Maintain the flow of thought throughout the paper, and make smooth paragraph transitions.
- Let the conclusion flow logically from the body of the paper.
- Review major points in the conclusion.

**Format.** Although all papers should be written according to the current *Global University Graduate Studies Form and Style Guide*, the following general guidelines should be kept in mind when writing papers:

- Include a cover page with each paper.
- Include a reference list with each assignment.
- Lay out the paper effectively and use reader-friendly aids (sections, summaries, tables) when appropriate.
- Use headings and italics to aid in the readability of the paper, but do not “overdo” their use.
- Utilize references appropriately. Include in the final assignment references from a diversity of research sources, which may include commentaries, books, journals, course textbooks, and interviews as appropriate.
- Make the paper neat, while giving attention to format requirements.

## Grammar/Punctuation/Spelling

- Follow rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation.
- Spell words correctly; use a dictionary as needed. (Note: It is acceptable to use either the American or British variation of English spelling, whichever is customary for you.)

## Readability/Style

- Use complete, clear, concise sentences.
- Construct sentences well, and use strong structure.
- Use sentence transitions as needed to maintain the flow of thought.
- Use words that are precise and non-ambiguous.
- Make the tone appropriate to the content and assignment.

## GRADUATE PAPER INSTRUCTIONAL VIDEOS

Below is a list of videos designed to help you as you complete your course assignments. In these videos, you will find a general overview of course structure, as well as instructions for how to format and write your papers and how to submit your work using Turnitin.

ACADEMIC INSTRUCTIONAL VIDEOS	
<a href="#">How Courses Work, Instructional Design</a>	Reviewing the graduate curriculum instructional design; how courses are structured
<a href="#">Form and Style</a>	Reviewing the Graduate Studies Form and Style Guide

<a href="#">How To Use Templates</a>	Instruction for using a writing assignment template that is pre-formatting to comply with the Graduate Form and Style Guide
<b>TURNITIN TUTORIALS</b>	
<a href="#">Turnitin New Student Account</a>	These three videos instruct students in setting up their accounts and using Turnitin to submit and review papers.
<a href="#">Turnitin Student Classes &amp; Assignments</a>	
<a href="#">Turnitin Student Similarity Reports &amp; Feedback</a>	

## HELPFUL SUGGESTIONS

We hope you have an excellent research, learning adventure and feel confident about your studies in the Global University degree or certificate program of your choice. You are very special to us, and we are here to serve you as you pursue your degree. Keeping in mind the following tips will contribute to successful completion of your selected program by independent study.

1. Approach your studies with a maximum effort from the start. This will save you from the added pressure of trying to catch-up later.
2. Work closely with your assigned mentor, a special person who can be depended on for support and advice when needed. Course mentors are assigned from approved faculty and are experts in their fields.
3. Do not become discouraged if a mentor asks you to rewrite a paper. The purpose of a rewrite is to help you excel.
4. Learn how to manage your time efficiently and effectively. With independent study comes the responsibility of making choices as to how much time you will need for your studies.
5. Make your schedule for turning in assignments and stick to it. The fillable program and course journals will allow you to plan and track your progress. They are available at <https://globaluniversity.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Program-and-Course-planner.pdf>
6. Take the initiative. Global University has the services and people dedicated to helping students. To receive their assistance, you must first let them know you need the help.
7. Get involved in active ministry in your local church. This will allow you to apply what you are learning through independent study.