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# Title

Introduction here. Explain the topic, your argument, speak in general (conceptual) terms, lay out the gist of your argument. In particular, make your argument right in the first paragraph about what you are going to demonstrate. Maybe it is: “The debate on immigration was transformed by 9/11. In the pre-9/11 world, the debate focused on x. Since 9/11, it has focused on y. By documenting these trends with a content analysis of 15,000 stories in x, y, and z newspapers over 35 years, I show the impact of foreign policy even on domestic policy debates.” Whatever you decide your thesis is, you will then organize the paper to explain the thesis, compare it to previous studies of foreign policy effects, or immigration framing, and then present and explain your data collection and results. Complete the first section by a paragraph such as the following. (This is called a transition paragraph, or a road-map.)

The paper is organized as follows. The next section gives background on the issue based on historical evidence and discusses previous studies of the topic… The following section develops a set of quantitative indicators of how the media has discussed xxx. It explains in detail the methodology chosen and discusses its likely accuracy. The following section presents the results, and their analysis. In the concluding section, I explain the significance of the findings.

# Background (level-A)

Explain the relevant literature and others who have previously studied this topic. Put your study in the context of others who have come before you.

At the end, transition to your own study, based on keywords. Here is what we wrote in the “framing the poor article” you read in class. See how it transitions away from the literature review and points to how we are doing it differently. Also, note that we are NOT MODEST; we take credit for what we are doing. If we don’t believe in what we are doing, why would the reader?

Previous literature has looked quantitatively at selected periods of times, or at a single program, or at changes in the racial composition of recipients. In this study, I examine the multi-dimensional framing during an uninterrupted period of almost 50 years and present a model to connect that framing with the public policy. We see a similar shift in framing, beginning in the mid-to-late 1960s, as that identified by other authors, and show that shift continues to become more negative even to the present day. We develop a similar argument here to that used by Baumgartner and colleagues (2008) in their study of capital punishment, but we make key adjustments to their methods. Most importantly, our coding of media coverage is based on a sophisticated set of key-word counts, not manual coding from the printed *Index* as the previous authors did. We explain our coding procedures below.

# Data Collection and Measurement (Level-A)

Explain here how you did your data collection. Here is how we explained it in the “framing the poor” article. This is a good template, but obviously you will revise to explain how you did your own.

## New York Times Stories on Poverty (Level-B)

Our first task is to identify all stories from 1960 to 2008 on the topic of poverty in the United States. First, we identified the common terms used to refer to situations of poverty, such as “poverty,” “welfare,” “low-income,” and “impoverished,” and developed an initial string of search terms. We developed these terms interactively over several weeks of searching, experimenting, and paying attention to the validity of the terms in different historical periods. We examined the *New York Times Index* for years in each decade, adjusting the string of terms in each decade to reflect the changing terms used to discuss poverty. Based on becoming familiar with the terms used by perusing the annual indices over the entire time period of our study, we then used the on-line version of the *New York Times* available through ProQuest, and limited our search to the abstract or citation so as to find the articles that focus primarily on poverty. The data covers the period between 1960 and 2007, the most recent year available through ProQuest. The searches restrict the occurrence of “false hits,” those stories that do not focus on US poverty, by excluding articles that include one of a number of different terms. Like our primary keywords, the string of excluded terms varies for each decade. For example, the search for the 1980s excludes stories that mention the Cold War because they generally relate to poverty in the Soviet Union. Determining the final sets of excluded terms required 200 different searches. Our test, based on reading a systematic sample of the stories retrieved, revealed that 92.3 percent of the stories were “true hits”—stories about US poverty issues. [[1]](#footnote-1) Table 1 shows our string of search terms. [[2]](#footnote-2)

(Insert Table 1 about here)

(You can either do this, or put the tables and figures right in the text, as you please.)

To determine whether the *New York Times* reflected a general focus that appeared in many newspapers across the country, or followed its own idiosyncratic trends with respect to welfare and poverty coverage, we compared it to four other newspapers: *Baltimore Sun*, *Washington Post*, *Los Angeles Times* and *Chicago Tribune*. We chose those newspapers for their political and geographic diversity, as well as the availability of their archives through ProQuest (and therefore the ability to precisely replicate the methods used in *The New York Times*). The *Chicago Tribune* is traditionally identified as a conservative newspaper. By including the remaining newspapers, spread across the country, we demonstrate the existence of national trends in focus on poverty. The search terms for the other newspapers are identical to those outlined in Table 1, with a few additional exclusions to prevent counting articles multiple times.[[3]](#footnote-3) Figure 1 shows the number of stories over time.

(Insert Figure 1 about here)

Figure 1 shows the results of searching according to the terms laid out in Table 1 for five different newspapers, as indicated. The *New York Times*, in the dark solid line, peaks with over 1,000 articles in the late-1960s and declines from there. Other newspapers are available only for shorter time periods but they show remarkably similar trends, suggesting that media attention to the War on Poverty was not the invention of a single newspaper but truly reflected a national mood toward greater concern during the period of heightened governmental focus on this issue.[[4]](#footnote-4) Once we identified the total number of articles on poverty for a given year, we did additional key-word searches to identify what frames of poverty were most prominent in the debate.

# Next Section, maybe more Data, or maybe not, depending

In the “Framing the Poor” article we went on to measure some other things, so our data section was quite long. You may or may not have more data after your discussion of how your issue has been framed over time.

# Discussion / Analysis

No matter how long your section is where you are explaining your data collection and what you found, now comes the time to discuss its implications. Speaking in conceptual terms rather than just in terms of your keywords, how do you interpret the results? What do they show? How does this relate to the question you posed, or the thesis you presented, in the first paragraph of your paper? Use the published articles from the course syllabus as a template for how to do this.

# Conclusion

The conclusion is different from the discussion / analysis. The discussion section interprets and makes sense of the data and results. The conclusion section should draw out the larger implications of what you have done. What have you learned, what is the larger meaning, beyond only your specific results?

# Tables and Figures

Table 1. Search Terms Used to Identify Poverty-Related Stories, 1960–2007.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Decade** | **Search Terms** |
| **2000s** | ENHAI(welfare OR poverty OR "low-income" OR "public housing" OR needy OR ghetto OR indigent OR impoverished) AND PDN(>1/1/2000) AND PDN(<12/31/2007) AND NOT ("endangering the welfare" OR Haiti OR Nazi OR Brazil OR China OR Africa OR India OR Iraq OR Europe OR Afghanistan OR animal) AND NOT AT(review) |
| **1990s** | ENHAI(welfare OR poverty OR low-income OR "public housing" OR ghetto OR needy OR indigent OR impoverished) AND PDN(>1/1/1990) AND PDN(<12/31/1999) AND NOT (Haiti OR "endangering the welfare" OR "Cold War" OR Iraq OR "United Nations" OR Brazil OR China OR Africa OR India OR Europe OR animal OR Soviet OR Russia OR Holocaust) AND NOT AT(review) |
| **1980s** | ENHAI(ghetto OR welfare OR poverty OR low-income OR "public housing" OR needy OR indigent OR impoverished) AND PDN(>1/1/1980) AND PDN(<12/31/1989) AND NOT (Rome OR Nazi OR Germany OR Panama OR "Central America" OR "Latin America" OR Haiti OR "Cold War" OR United Nations OR Brazil OR China OR Europe OR animal OR Soviet OR Russia OR India OR Africa) AND NOT AT(review) |
| **1970s** | ENHAI(ghetto OR (welfare AND NOT "Health, Education and Welfare") OR poverty OR low-income OR "public housing" OR slum OR needy OR indigent OR impoverished) AND PDN(>1/1/1970) AND PDN(<12/31/1979) AND NOT (Ireland OR Nazi OR Cuba OR Iran OR Germany OR Rome OR Brazil OR "Cold War" OR United Nations OR China OR India OR Europe OR animal OR Soviet OR Africa) AND NOT AT(review)For 9/5/1973 – 5/31/1978:ENHAI(ghetto OR (welfare AND NOT "Health, Education and Welfare") OR poverty OR low-income OR "public housing" OR slum OR needy OR indigent OR impoverished) AND PDN(>9/5/1973) AND PDN(<5/31/1978) AND NOT (Ireland OR Nazi OR Cuba OR Iran OR Germany OR Rome OR Brazil OR "Cold War" OR United Nations OR China OR India OR Europe OR animal OR Soviet OR Africa) AND NOT AT(front\_page OR review) |
| **1960s** | ENHAI(ghetto OR (welfare AND NOT "Health, Education and Welfare") OR poverty OR low-income OR "public housing" OR slum OR needy OR indigent OR impoverished) AND PDN(>1/1/1960) AND PDN(<12/31/1969) AND NOT (Israeli OR Japan OR Russia OR Nazi OR Europe OR Germany OR Brazil OR Rome OR "United Nations" OR China OR India OR Cuba OR Soviet OR animal OR Africa) AND NOT AT(Review) |

*Note:* The study uses two different strings of search terms for the 1970s because an error in ProQuest caused indexed in the database as “front page” to be counted twice. ENHAI limits the search to the abstract, and citation, not the full text.

Table 2. Identifying Five Frames of Poverty through Electronic Search Terms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Frame** | **Search Terms** |
| **Misery and Neglect** | poverty-stricken OR "urban renewal" OR despair OR shelter OR bleak OR blight OR hunger OR ghetto OR "neediest cases" OR homeless OR slum |
| **Social Disorder** | anger OR police OR killing OR violence OR "civil right" OR crime OR gang OR riot OR demonstrator OR (strike W/3 rent OR welfare OR worker OR union) OR protest OR ("community action" AND NOT "community action agency") |
| **Economic and Physical Barriers** | (student W/1 aid OR needy OR loan OR disadvantaged) OR industrial OR wage OR economy OR "affordable housing" OR "unemployment rate" OR disabled OR "poor children" OR elderly OR aged |
| **Laziness and Dysfunction** | able-bodied OR dependency OR "work requirement" OR mother OR "welfare family" OR father OR "welfare hotel" OR (drug AND NOT Medicaid OR Medicare OR company OR prescription) OR abortion OR "child welfare" OR workfare OR "welfare to work" |
| **Cheating** | chiseler OR cheat OR fraud OR ineligible OR overpayment OR corruption OR audit |

Note: These searches were run on the results obtained after searching for poverty-related stories through the search terms reported in Table 1.

Figure 1. Attention to Poverty in Five US Newspapers.



Note: these figures are PNG files generated in another software program, and pasted into Word with the Figure title and any notes done in Word. You can do this in Excel, R, or other programs.Figure 2. Five Frames of Media Attention to Poverty.
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# Appendix A. Measuring Government Aid to the Poor

These are just excerpts from the appendices in our paper. The idea is that if you do anything complicated, and it reads like along detour away from the main point, just put it in an appendix, and then explain it there. When you explain it, the idea is that if someone were to come along five years later and want to replicated exactly what you did, they could read your appendix and understand how to do it. A lot of what we put in here is called “robustness checking” (aka “bomb-proofing”) – just anticipating flaws that someone might raise, and explaining how you already thought of that, and it’s not a problem.

1. The search strings reported in Table 1 are the result of weeks of interactive adjustments to our procedures. For each year ending in 3, 6 or 9, we read 20 stories from the beginning of the year and 20 from the end. Of the 560 articles read through these procedures, 517 were true hits, reflecting a 92.3 percent accuracy of the searches. Of course, it is impossible to know how many stories we may have missed. We do believe these search terms have accurately assessed the level of attention to poverty across time, however. Even if we missed a certain percentage of all stories, trends over time would not be affected unless the percentage omitted differed across time, which we have no reason to expect. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Note that the terms listed in Table 1 represent the end product of an extensive set of tests and experiments designed to isolate a set of terms that accurately reflect poverty issues. The 92 percent accuracy attests to the refinements we made in the terms based on our initial trial-and-error efforts. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For example, the *Los Angeles Times* has many different versions, so that identical articles, which appear both in the San Fernando edition and the San Gabriel edition, often appear in a search as different articles. To eliminate this problem, the search in the *Los Angeles Times* excludes the articles in the San Fernando, San Gabriel, Orange County, San Diego, and valley editions. To mitigate this variability between newspapers, we read dozens of articles in each of the non-*New York Times* newspapers and excluded articles that contained a number of different terms. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Correlations between the total coverage in the *New York Times* and the four other papers shown in Figure 1 are: .92, .90, .84, and .92. Other newspapers correlate with each other at similar levels; the lowest correlation among all the newspapers reported is .84. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)