

COMP I - Mr. Fleck Research Paper "Specs"

How Long Does It Have to Be?

1 title page

6-8 pages in the body (double-spaced, 1" margins, 12-pica)

1 works cited page =

8 -10 pages total*

When Is It Due?

Fri., Dec. 7, 2012

How Much Is It Worth?

The research paper will count three assignments for your 2nd quarter grade, and will count as your final exam for the COMP I course (20% of your overall grade). In short, it's big.

What Do I Have to Write About?

You're lucky--you get to choose your own topic (subject to my approval). Topics can include:

- Sports
- Music
- Popular culture
- Author studies
- Movies
- History (WW2, Iraq, etc.)
- Current Events
- Hobbies
- Social Issues

Try to pick something you can live with for 3-4 weeks.

How Many Sources Are Required?

Three, minimum, and they should be mixed (you can always do more). Sources can include:

- Books
- Magazines
- Newspapers

- The Web
- Interviews
- Documentary videos/DVDs

Sources should be cited in the MLA format (more information on that to follow).

Notes: www.bibme.org is a terrific resource
 Wikipedia (and similar) is not an acceptable source for college papers.

How Am I Supposed to Write About A Topic?

There are generally two types of papers:

- Analytical paper - when you examine something in detail
- Argumentative paper - where you argue a point of view

You'll write an argumentative paper for this assignment.

How Do I Begin?

I'll need a topic from you the next time I see you. We'll then start developing it into a *thesis statement*.

* * *

** If you are planning on attending a four-year college, it is recommended that you do a research paper of **10 pages** in the body, for a total of **12 pages**.*

GRADING:

The paper will be graded based upon the following rubric:

COMP I
 Research Paper Grade Sheet

Category	Y	N
Title Page		
6-8 Pages in Body		
Works Cited Page		
3 or more sources		
Thesis stated clearly		
Citations throughout body		
Standard Grammar/Mechanics		
On Time		

Simple Outline Trick

Use the following “prompts” to get your paper started:

Research Paper Writing Prompts

1. Pretend your topic is a person. Introduce yourself to it, and tell it a few things you know about it already.
2. Pretend you're the host of a talk show, and your topic is your guest. Ask it a few questions.
3. Pretend your topic is a criminal accused of a crime and you're a police interrogator. It refuses to answer your questions. Tell it where you intend to find the answers to your questions if it won't talk (can be people or places)?
4. Pretend your topic is the star of a show, and you've been asked to introduce it to the audience. Write what you would say about it to get the audience prepped.

RESEARCH TIPS

How not to waste your time.....

GET WHILE THE GETTIN'S GOOD

If you're like most people, you don't have a lot of time to waste doing things that waste time. And since time is limited, you want to get the most out of any time you put in researching—either in a library or on the internet.

Here are some traps people fall into that waste a ton of time and cause frustration:

- Having a topic too big (e.g., Googling “sports”)
- Having a topic too small (“I'm only interested in how the Peking strain of bird flu affects Asian microbes in Livingston Manor.”)
- Having no topic (“If I aimlessly surf the 'net, a wonderful topic will magically suggest itself.”)
- Printing everything you can find on the 'net about your topic, and planning to go through it later (yeah, right).

SO WHAT AM I GONNA DO?

You're gonna be smart, that's what you're gonna do. Here's how:

- Encyclopedias are always a good place to start. On-line encyclopedias--such as Wikipedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page)-- can be helpful, **but professors never allow it to be cited as a source since it's unreliable** (*anyone* can edit it). HOWEVER, oftentimes, Wikipedia articles cite their (legitimate) sources, so if you have no place else to go.....
- Read what you find RIGHT AWAY (that's right....RIGHT AWAY!!). You're on the computer NOW--when's a better time to read what's in front of you going to happen? It's NOT. Instead of printing reams you'll never read, read now and jot down what you need.
- Write down where you're getting your information RIGHT NOW (that's right--NOW) while it's in front of you--this way, you can easily find it again later if you need to (avoids dumb statements like, “Uh, I found a website last week, and I can't remember anything about it except it had stuff I wanted to use....”)
- Cut and paste quotes you want to use right away. This avoids wasting time waiting in line at the printer.

- Avoid the temptation to waste time. We'll devote no more class time to research than has been scheduled. That means the rest comes out of your time. When would you rather work--in class, or during your own precious leisure time?

HOW DO I CITE THE SOURCES?

Plug in the relevant information at www.bibme.org (thank you, Leila Zilles).

THE BENEFIT

Following these tips now will make the project infinitely easier when the time comes to write it!

* * *

"Weaving" Sources Into the Body of Your Paper

The Idea

Research papers are arguments built on sources. In order to give your argument force, you should "weave" those sources into the body of your work and credit it. A simple rule of thumb is to ask yourself as you write, "Was I born with this knowledge? No? Then where did I find it?" *This is essential to avoid charges of plagiarism.*

Samples

See how sources are weaved into the body excerpts from a research paper about Steven Spielberg below (your job is to do the same thing):

Schindler's List represented a giant leap forward in Spielberg's career as an adult filmmaker. From the beginning of his career, thanks to films like E.T. and Hook, the knock on the director was that he was just "a big kid with a studio and millions of dollars to play with" (Charles Higham, Spielberg: The Man and His Movies, p. 257). In fact, even those he worked with thought Spielberg was very childlike. Julia Roberts, who played Tinker Bell in Hook, once said, "Steven *is* Peter Pan, the boy who never grew up" (Higham, p. 258). Schindler's List changed all that. According to David Meyers,

Schindler's List forever changed the critic's charge that Spielberg was just a little boy at heart. The seriousness of the subject matter, and the grim way in which it was photographed, evidenced a maturity and a psychological connection with his subject matter never before seen in Spielberg's work. Trading in swooping crane shots for hand-held, more personal shots, Schindler's List anticipates the gritty world depicted in

Spielberg's works to come, pointedly the masterpiece Saving Private Ryan (David Meyers, Films of the 20th Century, p. 408).

Considering what Meyers has said, there can be no doubt that it is Schindler's List where a line can be drawn between all the films that can before, and all the films after.....

* * *

WOMAN DON'T WANT TO LOVE ME:

Why the Band Chicago Deserves to Be In the Rock N' Roll Hall of Fame

Bill Fleck

Effective Writing, Per. 6

Mrs. Kelty

Feb. 20, 2012

Consider the following statistics: 22 Gold records. 18 Platinum records. Eight multi-platinum albums. Five Number 1 albums in a row, 21 Top 10 hits, and more than 122 million records sold worldwide—38 million-plus in the U.S. alone (AllMusic.com).

Let's add to those stats hit records in five decades, a Top 10 concert draw even in recent years, one of the Top 10 U.S. selling groups ever, and the 39th best-selling artist of all time (RIAA.com).

Are we talking about Aerosmith? Guns N' Roses? Pearl Jam? Slipknot? Destiny's Child?

No—we're talking about Chicago, the venerable jazz-rock outfit that first busted out on national scene in 1969.

With statistics as amazing as these, with an undoubted decades-long influence in the world of popular music, and with fans numbering in the millions worldwide, you would certainly think that Chicago has been enshrined among the immortals in the Rock N' Roll Hall of Fame.

You would be wrong.

Chicago has been eligible for induction since 1994—25 years after its influential (and now classic) first album--CHICAGO TRANSIT AUTHORITY--was released. But every year, Chicago is snubbed by the Hall's selection committee. Why?

According to Allmusic.com, “ Chicago has been singularly underrated since the beginning of its long career, both because of its musical ambitions (to the musicians, rock is only one of several styles of music to be used and blended, along with classical, jazz, R&B, and pop) and because of its refusal to emphasize celebrity over the music. The result has been that fundamentalist rock critics have consistently failed to appreciate its music” (Allmusic.com).

Bottom line? The band Chicago clearly belongs in the Rock N' Roll Hall of Fame. And yet year after year, they are passed over while bands without half of their sales, longevity, and influence are routinely inducted.

What's going on? To begin to examine that question, we need to look at the Rock N' Roll Hall of Fame itself.

According to the Hall's website,

The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum, Inc. is the nonprofit organization that exists to educate visitors, fans and scholars from around the world about the history and continuing significance of rock and roll music. It carries out this mission through its operation of a world-class museum that collects, preserves, exhibits and interprets this art form and through its library and archives as well as its educational programs (rockhall.com).

Part of this mission is to, “recognize the contributions of those who have had a significant impact on the evolution, development and perpetuation of rock and roll by inducting them into the Hall of Fame” (rockhall.com). By any standard, Chicago has had

a “significant impact on the evolution, development and perpetuation of rock and roll.” Certainly among the rock bands that have featured horn sections (Blood Sweat & Tears, Earth Wind & Fire, The Ides of March, The Electric Flag, Chase, *etc.*), Chicago is the most famous; that they represented an evolution in rock music (the so-called jazz-rock subgenre) is also beyond dispute. As one music historian puts it, “Jazz record sales plummeted as rock sales soared, and younger audiences increasingly chose the Beatles, Jimi Hendrix, or the politically-oriented folk music of Bob Dylan over jazz. New hybrids of rock and jazz developed as a result, some fueled by jazz players interested in rock and funk, others by rockers interested in jazz. A few late-60s jazz-rock acts like Blood, Sweat, and Tears and Chicago made inroads onto the pop charts” (academic.cengage.com). In short, you don’t have to be Sherlock Holmes to figure out that Chicago meets the Hall’s criterion for induction.

But what might actually be happening is that Rock N’ Roll Hall of Fame co-founder (and publisher of *Rolling Stone*) Jan Wenner may be personally acting out a vendetta of sorts against Chicago. It’s no secret that Wenner controls the Hall, and the nominating committee consists of current and/or former employees of his magazine (“*Rolling Stone Magazine Hits A Sour Note With Hall of Fame Nominations*,” foxnews.com). It’s also no secret that *Rolling Stone* magazine has little or no respect for Chicago.

In the various editions of The Rolling Stone Album Guide, Chicago is described as, “a lounge act, the very type of band the group had begun its life parodying. After [*guitarist Terry*] Kath—the closest thing to a virtuoso in the group—died in a gun accident...the muse didn’t completely desert the group, [*but*] any attempt to maintain musical credibility outside of the pop world did” (Rolling Stone Jazz & Blues Album Guide, 3rd

edition). In the 2004 edition, Chicago is dismissed as, “furry-headed guys [*who*] employed a lot of horn players and dabbled in jazz-fusion schlock, but they were never as slimy as Blood, Sweat and Tears. Their forte was harmlessly groovy soft-rock hits...They didn't have a star frontman: just a logo, goopy ballads, a little R&B grit now and then, smooth '70s lingo...and a name that disguised how totally L.A. they were. It was a version of hippiedom for people who had to get up in the morning” (Rolling Stone Album Guide, 4th edition).

Contemporary *Rolling Stone* reviews of Chicago's albums were generally no kinder. Consider this statement from the magazine's review of *Chicago 13* in 1979: “Yet, for all the bland (and ineffective) calculation, it's hard to find this band offensive--it doesn't exhibit enough smarts for that. Because they're too stupefying to be taken seriously; the only people these guys are likely to fool are themselves” (musicboomerstyle.art.officelive). As Peter Cetera (vocalist and bassist with Chicago from 1967 to 1985) once put it, "You know, as far as *Rolling Stone* goes, I read it all the time, mostly when I'm taking a shit. I always buy it and they have given us seven bad reviews on seven straight albums and every one's sold a million. It's probably that somewhere along the line we didn't kiss ass and it really pissed off some guy in the front office" (Joseph, 53).

Connecting the dots here, it's plain to see that *Rolling Stone* publisher Jan Wenner controls the Rock N' Roll Hall of Fame, and, in turn, that *Rolling Stone* has never liked Chicago. While Chicago cannot claim to be as influential as, say, the Beatles or the Doors, it's obvious to (perhaps) more impartial observers that Chicago should be inducted. “I can't think of any other artist or band that is more deserving than Chicago,” writes *Daily Sentinel* columnist Rock Cesario. “Without naming names, in my opinion,

there are at least a dozen acts that should not have been inducted into the Hall of Fame before Chicago” (Cesario, gjsentinel.com/entertainment) Cesario goes on to explain Chicago’s credentials in this way:

In the early days, when all of the band members had equal voice, it was all about the music. Their first three albums were all two-LP sets, which was unheard of at the time...I cannot think of any other band at the time that had such a unique blend of rock, jazz, soul, pop, R&B and classical music..With Robert Lamm, Terry Kath and Peter Cetera, Chicago had three of rock’s best singers, as well as two guitarists, a bassist, drummer, a percussionist and two keyboard players. This put Chicago in elite company with bands such as the Allman Brothers, Grateful Dead, Steely Dan, Santana and Traffic, all of whom are in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. Maybe it is due to the fact that as a group, Chicago never cared for the spotlight as much as the music, nor did they “play” to the critics...but the facts speak for themselves...the impact they had on music in the late 1960s through the early ‘70s is proof enough to me that they belong in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame (Cesario, gjsentinel.com/entertainment).

Goldmine writer Phill Marder sees it this way:

Four members of the original Chicago appeared on Chris Isaak’s excellent show, which runs on Sundance. Isaak asked them point blank – and I paraphrase – “Just who did you piss off?”

Isaak’s query revolved around the Rock & Roll Hall of Fame’s failure to induct (or even nominate) the group that now ranks as the most popular – chartwise – the United States ever has produced. How can this be?...from 1969 until Peter Cetera departed in 1985, there was nothing less than top quality work from this group, especially before the 1978 death of lead guitarist Terry Kath...the group re-surfaced with a string of blockbuster hits in the late ‘80s that garnered public approval but, evidently, proved too schmaltzy for critical blessing.

But Chicago's initial core, which included Danny Seraphine on drums, gave us some of the most innovative works of the Rock era...

With Kath...providing a raw edge, Chicago ran off 10 consecutive Top 10 albums from 1970 to 1977, including a string of five straight No. 1 LPs. Five straight No. 1 albums!...That is a truly unbelievable achievement and the original Chicago seven should be acknowledged by the Hall of Fame" (Marder, goldminemag.com).

Marder goes on to write, "Obviously, those in command of nominating artists feel the intelligence and taste of the majority of record buyers can be described using the same phrase that leads us to picture the rear portion of a horse. It would be nice if the Hall of Fame had the guts to reveal just who holds the public in such low esteem" (Marder, goldminemag.com). In other words, Marder is saying that committee members who deny Chicago entrance are also saying something insulting about the musical tastes of Chicago's fans. Given the *Rolling Stone* comments cited above, it's hard to deny the truth of Marder's point.

Members of the band Chicago are often philosophical when it comes to the snub. "At this point, it's sort of funny," said keyboardist/vocalist Robert Lamm, the writer of many of Chicago's hits. "We've gotten over being hurt. ... There's some kind of personal vendetta going on. We don't know the root of it, and at this point, it doesn't matter" (*Chicago's Hall of Fame Career Missing Only A Plaque*).

But the truth is, it does matter. Even today, Chicago is a perennial draw on the concert circuit, playing more than 100 dates per year. While it's true that they're no longer packing arenas, they appear regularly on network television and are treated as Rock N' Roll elder statesman. And certain members of the band, particularly Lamm, are still deeply involved in the creation of new music.

Because of their success with power ballads in the 1980's, Chicago is pigeon-holed by critics as somewhat wimpy purveyors of soft-rock sap; while this can certainly be said of their singles during that era, it ignores the groundbreaking, almost avant-garde sound they forged in the late 1960s. Chicago was instrumental (with bands like Santana and Steely Dan) in introducing both jazz and Latin sounds onto the pop charts in the 1970's. And anybody who has ever heard the deep cuts on their albums—including the once-shelved but now available *Stone Of Sisyphus* from 1993—knows that Chicago can rock with the best of them. Chicago belongs in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. Period.

Works Cited

- Cesario, Rock. "It's a shame Rock and Roll Hall of Fame has blown off Chicago | GJSentinel.com." *GJSentinel.com - Grand Junction breaking news, sports, opinion, entertainment and multimedia*. N.p., n.d. Web. 7 Feb. 2012.
<<http://www.gjsentinel.com/entertainment>>
- "Chicago (Biography)." *AllMusic.com*. N.p., n.d. Web. 2 Feb. 2012.
<www.allmusic.com/artist/chicago-p3885/biography>.
- "Chicago." *Music Icons at Living Life...Boomer Style*. N.p., n.d. Web. 3 Feb. 2012.
<<http://musicboomerstyle.art.officelive>>.
- "Chicago's hall-of-fame career missing only a plaque - Tampa Bay Times." *Tampa Bay, Florida news | Tampa Bay Times/St. Pete Times*. N.p., n.d. Web. 7 Feb. 2012.
<<http://www.tampabay.com/features/music/chicagos-hall-of-fame-career-only-missing-a-plaque/1087149>>.
- "Jazz-Rock Fusion." *academic.cengage*. N.p., n.d. Web. 2 Feb. 2012.
<<http://academic.cengage.com/resource>>
- Joseph, Ben. *Chicago: Feeling Stronger Every Day*. Kingston, Ontario: Quarry Press Inc., 2000. Print.
- Marder, Phill. "Chicago seven yet to be noticed by Rock & Roll Hall of Fame | Goldmine Magazine." *Worlds Largest Marketplace for Collectible Records, CDs and Music Memorabilia - GoldMineMag.com*. N.p., n.d. Web. 7 Feb. 2012.
<<http://www.goldminemag.com/blogs/make-me-smile-induct-chicago-into-rocks-hall-of-fame>>.
- "Peter Cetera: On Being Overlooked for the Rock & Roll Hall of... | www.star103fm.com." *Tulsa's Classic Rock Online | www.star103fm.com*. N.p., n.d. Web. 3 Feb. 2012. <<http://www.star103fm.com/news/entertainment/celebrity-news/peter-cetera-being-overlooked-rock-roll-hall-fame/nGDpp/#c104746>>.
- "RIAA - Recording Industry Association of America." *RIAA - Recording Industry Association of America*. N.p., n.d. Web. 2 Feb. 2012.
<http://www.riaa.com/goldandplatinum.php?content_selector=top-selling-artists>.
- "Rolling Stone Magazine Hits a Sour Note With Rock and Roll Hall of Fame Nominations." *foxnews.com*. N.p., n.d. Web. 2 Feb. 2012.
<www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,298681>
- "The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum | RockHall.com." *The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum | RockHall.com*. N.p., n.d. Web. 2 Feb. 2012.
<<http://rockhall.com/>>.