

Technical differences between MLA and APA in-text citations:

- MLA requires first names upon authors' first mentions; no first names in APA.
- APA requires dates in parenthetical citations.
- MLA prefers present tense ("X argues ..."); APA prefers past ("X argued ..." or "X found that ...").
- When quoting, APA requires a "p." before page numbers. APA also places commas between author, year, and page number: (Toulmin 85) in MLA vs. (Toulmin, 1977, p. 85) in APA.
- Compare:
 - **MLA:** Stephen Toulmin argues for a "moving picture" account of our intellectual enterprises and procedures" (85).
 - **APA:** Toulmin (1977) argued for a "moving picture" account of our intellectual enterprises and procedures" (p. 85).
 - **APA:** Some philosophers have argued for a view of intellectual pursuits as ideas in motion (Toulmin, 1977).

Conceptual differences between MLA and APA:

- MLA is designed for humanistic, quote-heavy writing; APA is designed for data-driven scientific writing and usually eschews direct quotation.
- APA writing is good at efficiently communicating *when* research was conducted: e.g., "Numerous researchers have found that writing is hard (Rees, 2017; Brown, 2015; Wetherbee & Bruce, 2012)." MLA doesn't care much about dates.

MLA Style (Original)

Stephen Toulmin's approach to evolutionary epistemology also differs, notably, from that espoused by Karl Popper, who suggests the evolution of knowledge is convergent rather than divergent. For Popper, the systematic criticism of theories leads to their refinement and, eventually, their unification, like thickets of bramble collapsing into a single, smooth stem (261-63). Toulmin's disciplinary focus allows more epistemological plurality. Efforts toward knowledge-making, for Toulmin, are *rational* (as opposed to positivistically *logical*) insofar as they advance to the needs, goals, and ideals of their disciplines; this rationality is internal and *contextual*, and therefore not quite synonymous with the quest for Truth one detects in Popper's epistemological vision (Toulmin, *Human* 83-86). As Toulmin puts it, "Questions of rationality are concerned . . . with *the conditions on which, and the manner in which, [people are] prepared to change [disciplinary] doctrine as time goes on*" (84; italics in original). Rationality, in other words, means responsiveness to change; it is the capacity for disciplines to evolve based on conceptual innovation and shared ideals.

Edited for APA Style Citations and Verb Tense

[No first name] Toulmin's (1977) approach to evolutionary epistemology also **differed**, notably, from that espoused by [no first name] Popper (1979), who **suggested** the evolution of knowledge is convergent rather than divergent. For Popper, the systematic criticism of theories leads

to their refinement and, eventually, their unification, like thickets of bramble collapsing into a single, smooth stem **[page numbers optional when paraphrasing]**. Toulmin's disciplinary focus **allowed** more epistemological plurality. Efforts toward knowledge-making, for Toulmin, are *rational* (as opposed to positivistically *logical*) insofar as they advance to the needs, goals, and ideals of their disciplines; this rationality is internal and *contextual*, and therefore not quite synonymous with the quest for Truth on detects in Popper's epistemological vision. As Toulmin (1977) **put** it, "Questions of rationality are concerned . . . with *the conditions on which, and the manner in which, [people are] prepared to change [disciplinary] doctrine as time goes on*" (p. 84; italics in original). Rationality, in other words, means responsiveness to change; it is the capacity for disciplines to evolve based on conceptual innovation and shared ideals.

Revised for APA Style Sentence Structure (More in the Style of Science Writing)

Toulmin (1977) offered a different approach to evolutionary epistemology from that of that of Popper (1979), who suggested the evolution of knowledge is convergent rather than divergent. Popper claimed the systematic criticism of theories leads to their refinement and unification. Toulmin offered a disciplinary focus allowing more epistemological plurality, arguing that efforts toward knowledge-making are *rational* (as opposed to positivistically *logical*) insofar as they advance to the needs, goals, and ideals of their disciplines. This rationality is internal and *contextual*, and therefore differs from Popper's epistemological vision. Rationality, Toulmin suggested, emphasizes responsiveness to change.

Works Cited (MLA)

Popper, Karl R. *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*. Rev. ed., Oxford UP, 1979.
Toulmin, Stephen E. *Human Understanding: The Collective Use and Evolution of Concepts*. Princeton UP, 1977.

References (APA)

Popper, K. R. (1979). *Objective knowledge: An evolutionary approach* (Rev. ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Toulmin, S. E. (1977). *Human understanding: The collective use and evolution of concepts*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.