

My early assignment meets four of Lunsford's criteria; it does not encourage risk-taking or topic choosing. But, then, it is designed as the second assignment of the semester. Later ones attack these two criteria, as well as the other four. For example, mid-way through the semester, I ask students to write about a time they were stereotyped or to stereotype a group and then show how the stereotype is not always true by using specifics about someone who does not fit that stereotype. One student wrote about policemen: she said they were violent, uncaring, and prone to seek danger. In her refutation, she used examples of her uncle and friends who do not demonstrate those characteristics, but in fact, disapprove of violence, demonstrate concern beyond that expected, and avoid danger unless compelled to deal with a dangerous person or situation. Unlike the earlier assignment, this one requires some risk-taking and meaning-making because students must decide to take a stand that may not be popular with other students and to reveal some of their own prejudices. In addition, each step of the preparation fulfills Lunsford's criteria: each relates the language arts, uses collaboration, deals with grammar in the context of the assignment, provides practice in inferring and generalizing, and engages students in discussion. In particular, the preliminary steps unite the language arts. Again, students read previous student papers and professional essays, discuss their essays in editing groups, listen and take notes on peers' advice, and read each other's essays looking for specifics and generalities.

Building on these two and other assignments, my students finish the semester with their most difficult assignment as they engage in an analysis of the audience for a magazine they choose. This assignment requires them to discover the specifics and determine what underlying generalization they support. For example, they must decide if the magazine editors believe that the audience for their publication is primarily black or white, young or middle aged, poor or middle class. Brighter students will even develop generalizations on a higher cognitive level by deciding what ideals or beliefs the editors think their audiences hold. This assignment, too, meets Lunsford's criteria by utilizing the same approaches as the earlier ones.

These assignments, then, employ all of the language arts in an effort to develop students' general to specific schema. Students demonstrate that they have mastered the schema in the first assignment when their essays contain a thesis labeling the character aspect and developing it with two short narratives. Those who are more proficient will also usually add generalizations to introduce each story and a generalization as a conclusion. Similarly, they demonstrate the ability to move from general to specific and back again in the other assignments by forming generalizations and using specifics to support them.

Summary

Vital to proficient writing, the ability to move from general to specific and back again is one of the writing schemas that Basic Writers lack. Teachers who carefully compose Basic Writing assignments can help students develop the ability to move from general to specific. One way to develop this schema is through employing all the arts of language in each assignment. Rather than concentrate on the concern expressed by researchers and theorists about the amount of information contained in an assignment, the Basic Writing teacher needs to provide activities that develop a common schema for students to call on regardless of the final assignment's information level.

WORKS CITED

- Bartholomae, D. "Teaching Basic Writing: An Alternative to Basic Skills." *Journal of Basic Writing* 2 (1979): 85-109.
- Bartholomae, D. and Anthony Petrosky. *Facts, Artifacts and Counterfacts*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1986.
- Coles, W. *The Plural I: The Teaching of Writing*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978.
- Cooper, C. and Odell, L. "Considerations of Sound in the Composing Process of Published Writers." *College Composition and Communications* 10 (1976): 103-115.
- Graves, D. "Balance the Basics." *Balance the Basics: Let Them Write*. New York: Ford Foundation Papers on Research about Learning, 1978.
- Hennings, D. "A Writing Approach to Reading Comprehension - Schema Theory in Action." *Language Arts* 59 (1982): 8-17.
- Lunsford, A. "Assignments for Basic Writers: Unresolved Issues and Needed Research." *Journal of Basic Writing* 5 (1986): 87-99.
- Lunsford, A. *Report of the 1987 Coalition of English Associations Conference*. 78th Annual Convention of the National Council of Teachers of English, St. Louis, MO, November, 1988.
- Shaughnessy, M. *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Squire, J. "Composing and Comprehending: Two Sides of the Same Basic Process." *Language Arts* 60 (1983): 581-589.
- Stotsky, S. "Research on Reading/Writing Relationships: A Synthesis and Suggested Directions." *Language Arts* 60 (1983): 627-642.
- White, E. M. *Teaching and Assessing Writing: Recent Advances in Understanding, Evaluating, and Improving Student Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.
- Witrock, M. "Writing and the Teaching of Reading." *Language Arts* 60 (1983): 600-606.

READING FOR PLEASURE: THE RESEARCH PAPER RECONSIDERED

Janet Kotler
Robins School of Business
University of Richmond

Let's talk about the research paper—granted, a dispiriting proposal. But although it bores everybody damn near to death, a great many college courses, certainly every composition class, have A RESEARCH PAPER (business communication texts, depressingly, often call it THE LONG REPORT) embedded in them like stone.

And we all hate it.

Students hate it because they believe they've been writing research papers half their lives and already know how, but they also hate it because they don't believe they *can* make valuable judgments about what they read: it's all been said, and anyway, the teacher already knows more than they can possibly dredge up. So they naturally dread the prospect of having to restate what they feel can't be said any better way.

We teachers hate it, first, because students resent it and become surly at its approach. We hate it because our students (cornered by us) "choose" such global topics that the data *is* too difficult for them to master. Too difficult, but at the same time,

easy for them to hide behind. Most topics, assigned or otherwise, leave little room for students' own thinking, even though that's usually what we claim we're after.

Not to mention the boring mechanics of it all—those awful stacks of notecards, and the outlines, and the forced marches to the library, and the bibliographies, and the bizarre footnotes.*

What might a good research assignment look like? It would enable students to do their own thinking about a manageable topic. It would encourage them to differentiate between belief and reality. It would guard against their abandoning hope at an early stage, and semi-consciously copying from secondary sources; that is, it would eliminate the Biden Effect. (And who among us has not had our hearts sink as the familiar style of *U.S. News & World Report* or *Business Week* appears abruptly in the middle of the eighth paragraph?)

In short, a good assignment puts the student in a position where she can make sense of the data before her and confidently arrive at a supportable conclusion, without the burdensome knowledge that someone else—some professional—has done all of this, better, already.

(One could of course make an argument for getting rid of the research paper altogether. That happy thought is based on a number of surveys of executives and managers that show that memos and letters are the most common kind of professional writing, and that argue consequently that we should put most of our teaching eggs in that basket, since the largest proportion of our graduates will work in business and the professions.)

Still, the peculiar demands of our situation—that a basic composition or communication course should be all things to all people—argue for retaining it. For one thing, in addition to preparing students to do the kind of writing they'll need to on the job, we are, subtly or expressly, expected to teach students to master "academic" writing—so all their history and psychology and economics professors—our colleagues—won't have to keep reading drivel. And, of course, for the history and psychology and economics professors, "academic" writing is the research paper.

So there we are. But I think there are some persuasive reasons other than these political ones to keep working at it. We need to remember that at bottom we are teaching concepts in our writing courses, not just form. [For example, a 1983 study reported that while managers "rarely or never" wrote long, research-based reports, their writing was expected to be "clear and direct," and that "clarity of purpose" was its most important criterion (Storms 17). Bennett and Olney reported similarly that 91% of their professional respondents said they often had to write analytical reports, 80% of them "frequently." These subjects, too, ranked "clarity," "listening skills," and "analytical ability" as qualities most of their colleagues' writing lacked (Bennett and Olney 17)].

The research strategy that I've developed addresses, I think, these central concerns. It's a vehicle for teaching students to *listen* very carefully to the specific words on the page, to be aware of connotations. It teaches *analytical skills* as students compare, line by line, word by word. It encourages *careful reading* whose aim is *clarity of thought*. Because there's a clear goal at the end, a specified question to be answered, students' real curiosity propels them forward. And mercifully, it's nearly drivel-proof. I've used

*Bizarre footnote: I once had a student who footnoted an idea—footnote 17 in her paper—with the memorable phrase born of desperation, "I know I read this somewhere." That was followed, astonishingly, by footnote 18, which read simply, "Ibid."

variations of this strategy in freshman composition, in upper level writing courses, and in junior and senior year business communication courses, always with happy results.

Here's how it works: Students choose a controversial news event reported by six to eight newspapers. They describe, first, each account, based on analytical questions I've posed. (See assignment.) Then they compare accounts to arrive at a thesis. The aim is to answer the question, for example, "What really happened on the night of December 13th?" And the further question, "Why do you believe what you do?"

There are a couple of caveats I ought to warn you about, and a couple you need to tell your students about.

First, there must be *an event*. A sort of general, ongoing problem—the U.S. trade imbalance, for example—won't do. Second, the event must be *controversial*. "George Bush was elected" isn't. In the examples I'm about to discuss, the arrest in Tampa of Mets' pitcher Dwight Gooden and the U.S. bombing of Libya, the events were controversial because, in the first instance, there was considerable dispute about whether Gooden had provoked the arrest or was the victim of police hostility, and in the second, reasonable observers strongly disagreed about the wisdom of the attack as a means of deterring terrorism. Third, to preserve your own sanity, limit the number of students who can focus on a single story. (Failing to do precisely that one semester, I was inundated by so many papers on the Baby M case that I fervently wished the infant had been strangled at birth.) Finally, on principle, you should do the assignment yourself.

The principal concern to warn your students about—and this won't make you unduly popular—is that most of the material they'll be working with is on microfilm, necessitating the use of microfilm readers which seem designed to bring out Luddite impulses in the most mild-mannered of us. They should be aware, too, of the "microfilm window," that period of two to four months where printed copies of most newspapers have strayed or been swiped but when libraries don't yet have microfilm copies available.

And students need to be reminded of the distinction between news reports and editorials.

You do need a reasonably good library. Ours has on film the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *London Times*, and the local papers. But the state library, public library, and the library of another local university have others, so a good range is easily obtainable. Depending on where you are, you may need to make adjustments.

Here, then, is the evidence: excerpts from the two papers I mentioned above.

DWIGHT GOODEN'S ARREST

Late Saturday night, December 13, 1986, New York Mets' pitcher Dwight Gooden and four other black baseball players were arrested in Tampa, Florida for disorderly conduct, violently resisting arrest, and battering police officers. The men were driving in three separate cars, and were said to be weaving across lanes. Police stopped them, and shortly thereafter a scuffle began between the nine white officers and the five blacks. The police claim Gooden started the fight; Gooden claims he was harassed and the victim of racial prejudice.

According to the police, Gooden got out of his car yelling and making threatening advances. Gooden says he merely asked why he had been stopped, and got no answer. Who is telling the truth? Was the officer attacked by Gooden or did the police use unprovoked violence, perhaps out of racial bias?

I read articles published in seven newspapers on December 15, 16, or 27, the first days that the story appeared. I immediately began noticing similarities and differences among accounts.

The *Richmond Times-Dispatch* leans toward the police in its report of the arrest. Only three paragraphs of the 23 focus on Gooden's claims. One of these notes that a Mets' spokesman, Jay Horowitz, says Gooden "suffered bruises on the head and left arm, and last night he thought his hand was broken." In another paragraph, Horowitz says Gooden "told me that he had been handcuffed and ankle-cuffed during the incident." These statements provoke some sympathy for Gooden, but they are unsupported claims. Other papers mentioned witnesses who attest that he was mistreated.

Gooden's injuries and claim that he was mistreated lose their power to convince when the police spokesman is immediately quoted as saying, "It was all pushing, shoving, and kicking. There were no weapons involved." A broken wrist and bruises to the head seem less likely from simple "pushing and shoving." And the only direct quote from Gooden—"I don't know what I did. They never told me what they stopped me for; I'm really in the dark about it"—makes him seem guilty because of his claim of complete innocence. It's hard to believe that Gooden has no idea what he did to attract the officers' attention.

The remainder of the article cites claims against Gooden. The paper reports that Gooden began scuffling with the arresting officer immediately after being stopped. The *New York Times* and the *Free Press*, on the other hand, report that profanities were uttered and threatening gestures were made by Gooden prior to the scuffle. In other words, the *Times-Dispatch* implies that Gooden began a fight for no reason, when other accounts report a period of hostile verbal exchange.

The *Dispatch* also quotes police spokesman Cotter in a way that downplays the officers' failure to give Gooden a blood alcohol test: "I can't speculate what was originally on the officer's mind who stopped them, but with the violent reaction that the officers received they couldn't really give them a sobriety test." The *NYT* and the *Free Press* mention that the test was given at a hospital, but don't emphasize Gooden's violent reaction. The *Dispatch*, however, gives the impression that the officers couldn't have administered a BAC test even if they'd suspected alcohol was a factor.

Near the end of the story, the *Dispatch* lists some of Gooden's baseball achievements, but the next—and final—paragraph notes his recent problems, such as missing the World Series victory parade and rumors of drug involvement.

The *Times-Dispatch*, by thoroughly countering the claims of Gooden that it prints, gives an account biased toward the police version of events.

The *Fredericksburg Free Press* prints a full account of the police officers' story, but shows more sympathy for Gooden because of its focus on the racial issue. The first paragraph notes that the Tampa chapter of the NAACP is investigating the arrest. In the fourth paragraph, NAACP president Gilder is quoted as saying, "We will definitely investigate this because these young men are some of the finest in Tampa, a credit to the community." The *Free Press* is the only paper to include this significant quote. And by placing it at the beginning of the article, the paper suggests that readers should question the police motives.

The *Free Press* mentions Gooden's BAC test only in passing—to say that the test results will not be released.

The *New York Times* gives equal space to each side, but is more sympathetic to Gooden. Its headline, "Gooden, Mets' Star, Is Arrested After Fight With Tampa Police," is less negative than

the headings of either the *Free Press*—"Gooden Arrested in Police Scuffle" or the *Dispatch*—"Gooden Arrested After Scuffle With Police."

The *Times*' second paragraph begins a detailed, five-paragraph summary of the injuries received by those involved. Gooden's injuries receive more attention than the officers'. A long report of Gooden's injuries includes a quote from Horowitz—"Dwight was pretty well beaten up. He has bruises on his head, a bloodshot eye, and cuts on his arms"—and mentions Gooden's injured wrist.

The *NYT* also quotes witnesses who said, "Gooden was beaten to the ground with nightsticks and flashlights before being handcuffed and shackled." The *Dispatch* fails to mention any witnesses, only repeating Gooden's claims that he was handcuffed. Further, the witnesses' statements appear at the beginning of the article, showing that the *Times* considers these more important than the unreleased results of the BAC test, which is not even mentioned until the end.

The paper follows its discussion of injuries with a paragraph which notes that four other Mets have been arrested this year for assaulting police officers (in Houston). But Gooden's recent problems are not mentioned.

The *Times* article describes the December 13 incident in detail, and mentions some new points which weaken the officers' case. The first of these is that it reports that Gooden was driving a silver Mercedes with a "DOC" license plate, "a familiar sight in Tampa." This suggests that the officers knew who they were arresting despite their widely reported claim otherwise.

The *Times* quotes Gooden's attorney, Charles Erlich, at length, and in doing so, focuses on Gooden's side of the story. Erlich says Gooden and the drivers of the other two cars made a left turn "into a major, four-lane divided thoroughfare," and that as they did, Officer Smith stopped them. Erlich is reported as saying that the road was congested with traffic and that the men could not have been "weaving in and out of traffic." This comment weakens the officers' claim. The policemen's account is briefly mentioned later.

Two paragraphs are devoted to the officers' description of Gooden's violent outburst, which they interpreted as a threat. But the next paragraph again quotes Erlich, who claims that the officers told Gooden to "shut up" when he asked why he had been stopped. Again, Gooden's accusations are supported with evidence from witnesses who saw the pitcher being beaten severely for no apparent reason. The *NYT* causes readers to suspect the police account further when it points out that all five defendants are black, but all nine officers are white. The article doesn't emphasize the racial issue as much as does the *Fredericksburg Free Press*'s, but it does note it as a possible factor.

[The paper continues for another six pages, and concludes:]

When I began the assignment, I had no biases either way. But now my sympathy lies with Gooden.

I found myself heavily influenced by the *New York Times*' reports. Although the paper presented both Gooden's claims and the officers' claims fairly equitably, there seemed to be more supporting evidence for Gooden's allegation that he had been unjustly mistreated. Too, I believe the *Times*' information is accurate because of the overall quality of their reporting.

No other paper reported that Gooden's Mercedes "is a familiar sight in Tampa." This fact seemed important to me, since I could no longer believe that the Tampa police were unaware of who was driving the car.

I was also persuaded by the Tampa NAACP's interest in the case. The fact that all the officers are white and all the players

black, combined with reports that Tampa has had racial problems and recent confrontations between the police and black citizens I found incriminating for the police.

On the blood alcohol content front, the quotes in the *Times* from Dr. Thomas McKell were convincing. If the medical director of a large hospital states that a .111 level is "not really that high" and that "There are lots of people who can tolerate that much without being impaired. The law doesn't look at it that way, but there is a lot of difference between a 90 pound woman and Dwight Gooden," then it's harder for me to believe Gooden was drunk.

I also was swayed toward Gooden's side when I realized that in many papers, Gooden didn't get equal coverage. Some focused so much on the police version that their reports seemed very biased.

But Gooden got my full-fledged support when I read comments and accounts from witnesses. The police never cited any witnesses for their case, and it's unlikely that all witnesses who 'testified' for Gooden were lying. If what they said is true—that he was beaten with nightsticks by as many as six officers—then I believe the officers' actions cannot be justified as being merely defensive.

* * * *

THE U.S. BOMBING OF LIBYA

On the night of April 15, 1986, the United States of America 'fought fire with fire.' The U.S. bombed military targets in Libya after numerous terrorist attacks which left many Americans dead or injured. The bombing destroyed buildings and killed a number of people, including some civilians. This was the first time that the United States had lived up to its promise of retaliation. Reports in the *Washington Post*, the *London Times*, and the *Richmond Times Dispatch* all suggested that the U.S. had acted ruthlessly and brutally, while articles in the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Christian Science Monitor* supported the actions. Only the *New York Times* presented a neutral and objective view.

For starters, three of the five front page articles in the *Post* were very negative. The paper cast doubt on the morality of the attack, and portrayed the U.S. as cold-blooded killers. The main headline, "Quaddafi's Daughter Reported Killed," is an effective way to suggest that the Americans acted with little regard for civilian life. Emphasizing that we had killed an innocent child—especially a little girl—is a powerful way to conjure negative emotions. The other front-page headlines, "Arab Nations Condemn Air Raids," and "'Soft Targets' for Terror Concern U.S.," challenge the sensibility of the raids. Not only have we angered the Arabs (oil prices?) but we may have endangered ourselves more in provoking renewed terrorist acts.

... "Quaddafi's Family 'in Terror'" headlines the continuation of the front page article, again reminding the reader of the Americans' brutality. The article reported the number of people killed or injured, and in doing so provided gruesome details of the injuries. Describing Quaddafi's children as "bleeding from the nose and ears," the reporter blames the injuries on concussions from the bombs. Much graphic detail and suggestive adjectives stirred negative emotions. And not once did the *Post* article mention that the targets of the air raids were terrorist installations.

The other articles were similarly biased against the U.S. attack. The only positive article was printed at the bottom right corner of the last page, where it would have the least chance of being read. The *Post's* lack of support, however, was minimal compared to the *London Times*.

"Quaddafi's Adopted Baby Daughter Dies" headlined the *London Times*' front page. Tears are flowing before the reader gets to the first paragraph. These emotionally charged words are much stronger than the *Post's*, and portray the U.S. as an immoral tyrant, no better than Quaddafi and his terrorists. The *Times* does not mention that the child's death was unintentional.

Other articles continue the attack: "U.S. Bombers Kill 100 in Libyan Raids" contradicts other reports that only 15 persons were killed. But the picture next to that article suggests that even 100 may be an understatement—it shows crumbled buildings with people walking amidst the rubble. The caption reads, "Residents of Tripoli inspecting their devastated homes in the somber aftermath of the American bombing raids." There were no pictures of destroyed terrorist camps, or charred military equipment—only homes . . .

... One article in particular illustrates the *London Times*' disgusted attitude. It appears in the upper right corner of the first page of the special section devoted to the attack. The headline says, "Bombers Hit Sleeping City Before a Shot Can be Fired by Defenders." The text begins by making reference to how attacks are carried out in books—after a warning. Then the journalist reports, "They came without warning over the brilliantly lit city"—a sitting duck, unfairly bombed without warning. The story also includes (in boxes) factual data in five categories: population, area, armed forces, economy, and a brief political history. The reader cannot help but notice the huge military, economic, and political advantages enjoyed by the United States, further underlying the perception of Americans as bullies.

... *The Wall Street Journal* generally supported the actions of the United States, although it did not cover the event as extensively as other major papers. One front page column was devoted to the incident. Headlined "Weighing the Cost: Raid on Libya is Viewed as Short-Term Risk," the article reports the event in business terms—cost, short-term risk. The article presented the facts with few adjectives to cloud the report. However, the *Journal* struck a positive note when it reported that it was unlikely the Russians would reprimand the Libyans. The tone of the whole piece suggests optimism: the raids may have reduced, if not ended, Libyan terrorism.

The *Journal* devoted only a brief article later in the paper to discussion of the bombing's impact. It was the only paper to include a readers' poll, and a chart showing terrorist attacks over the previous six months. Entitled "Countdown to Conflict: the U.S. and Libya," the chart listed ten specific events that reminded people that we had not acted without reason.

While justification was the tone of the *Journal*, the *Christian Science Monitor* seemed to show actual support. The entire front page was devoted to the raids. "U.S. Raid on Libya Marks Shift in War on Terrorism" and "Libyan Strikes Get Strong Bipartisan Support in Congress" imply a decisive victory against terrorism. The *Monitor's* lead article reports that "support heavily outweighed criticism," and that the U.S. was justified in being disappointed with lack of European support for economic sanctions. The same picture of ruined buildings that appeared in the *Post* appears here with a different caption: "Buildings allegedly destroyed by U.S. Bombs," casting some doubt on whether the destruction resulted from U.S. bombs or Libyan missiles . . .

On the *New York Times* maintained marginal neutrality in reporting the attack. The front page carried as many positive headlines as negative ones. And only the *Times* printed the transcript of Reagan's address.

The headlines were as close to impartial as you could reasonably get: "American Bombers Strike Military Targets in Libya" is typical. The lead article supplies factual details describing what happened, when, and with what kind of military hardware, without the rampant adjectives that characterized other papers' reporting. With every fact, the writer included reference to his source – "Mr. Speakes described the targets as Libya's 'terrorist infrastructure'" – acknowledging unidentified sources where that was the case.

Even the *Times'* pictures lacked emotional wallop: no photos of crumbling buildings or cheering soldiers, no dead babies, no maps with 'line of death' circles. One picture shows three men standing by a pillar; the caption simply gave their names and positions and reported that they were listening to Reagan's address. Another picture showed Reagan delivering the speech.

The only evidence of bias was the phrases from the speech transcript that the *Times* chose to highlight. Three were bold-faced: "Evidence is Now Conclusive" and "Actions Can't Be Ignored" suggested U.S. justification; "Secure World is Nearer" implies optimism that terrorism will end in the future. Obviously, Reagan was defending our action in the most positive way possible, but the fact that the *Times* highlighted these three phrases in particular may indicate its slight support . . .

* * * *

I quote from these two papers at some length partly because I enjoyed reading them – unlike my response to most every other "research assignment" I have ever tried to deal with. The first was written by a senior accounting major whose previous work had showed her to be a competent, if uninspired, writer. The second was produced by a junior marketing major who had been struggling with writing for the first eight weeks of the term. What seems to me to have happened in both cases is that the students were truly engaged with what they were doing here, and that that engagement shows itself strongly in the intelligence and *life* of the papers. (The two I've quoted here are typical responses, not unusual cases.)

I like this way of handling the research paper because its design guides students to topics they can be interested in, it confines them to texts short enough to encourage slow, attentive reading, it steers them sharply away from relying on other people's generalizations, it teaches something about 'truth' and 'belief,' and it sensitizes students to language and its arrangement. Beyond that, journalistic writing by definition conveys to students, sometimes subliminally, the power of tight writing.

The beauty of it for us teachers is that students' data is organized in front of you so that you can easily judge the validity of the conclusions and the rigor of the thought. The beauty of it for students is because they have had to organize data according to a system of inquiry, they can't fail to have something to say, can't fail to produce a statement that they can take responsibility for.

And the beauty of it for all of us is that no one is bored.

The Assignment:

Make a working outline of the differences and similarities you've noticed in the accounts. Structure your discussion according to your discoveries. A rough form to follow would look something like:

- I. A brief description of the event, stating only the established *facts* of the case, and a sentence or two explaining the controversy.

- II. A comparison of accounts. In analyzing the news stories, you'll want to consider:

- 1) what's mentioned first?
- 2) what facts are included; which are left out?
- 3) what kinds of nouns, verbs, adjectives are used?
- 4) where does the account appear—front page? buried?
- 5) how much space—in column inches—is devoted to the story?
- 6) how big is the headline? What's its emphasis?
- 7) is there a photo? what kind? what does it suggest?
- 8) who's portrayed as the good guy, the bad guy, the victim?

You need to begin each section of your comparison with a generalization such as "*The Washington Post* is sympathetic to X . . ." (support with evidence); "*The New York Times*, although also sympathetic, includes a fuller view of X's opposition, and is more reserved in its sympathy than the *Post*" (support with evidence); "But the *Roanoke Times and World Report* leans strongly toward Y, . . ."

Continue analyzing and comparing as you go.

- III. Write a clear, articulate description of what you now believe is true, or of where your sympathies lie.

As you analyze and compare accounts, DON'T LET THE DATA OVERWHELM THE GENERALIZATION: you can't simply throw facts on the page and expect me to make the inferences. It's your job to stare the facts in the eye and ask: So what?

WORKS CITED

- Bennett, James C., and Olney, Robert J., "Executive Priorities for Effective Communication in an Information Society." *Journal of Business Communication* 23 (1986).
- Storms, C. Gilbert, "What Business School Graduates Say About the Writing They Do at Work: Implications for the Business Communication Course." *ABCA Bulletin* XLVI (1983): 9-13.

ENTHYMEMES AND FEMINIST DISCOURSE: MEDIATING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE IDENTITY

Don Kraemer
Temple University

Of the many assumptions this paper makes, I think two are worth mentioning at the outset. One of these assumptions is that women and men do not use different languages but rather often have differences of style. There is ample research, such as that by Pamela Fishman on heterosexual couples and Jennifer Coates on gender-mixed groups, that demonstrates how telling – how loaded with cultural capital – these stylistic differences are. These differences – and the differences they make – ought not to be casually bracketed. Men and women can and do, however, regularly cross from one style to another. Margaret Thatcher's parliamentary delivery can sound characteristically male, and the surface features of former President Reagan's appropriation of the personal and private seem to have many of the earmarks of women's discourse. But what constitutes men's and women's discourse are not surface features but social relations, so my second