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**1. Why did you choose the news article you did?**I *clicked* on the article because it sounded interesting (although I probably should have a deep sense of interest and care for all of the tragic or terrifying news stories, I'll pick nature over those most of the time!). Coyotes are interesting, right? I *wrote* about the article because, even though there is very little information to expand upon (honestly I only used about seven or eight sentences from the entire article—hence the brevity on my part!), it sounded like a cool scene to visualize. The content would have been somewhat interesting even if I have written it really badly.

**2. How did you decide what scene of action to develop?**After reading the article, the intro section seemed to be the only actual *scene* of action*.* Much of the rest of the article was actually information about coyotes (and bats and ants!) or about the study itself, rather than the process.

**3. What rhetorical choices did you make in order to bring your story to life?**I have to do some explaining first – there were zero quotes of what was said during the scene I wrote about, so while I would have loved to include dialogue (which of course will draw an audience in!), I couldn't add any without being untrue to what we know happened.
But here are my rhetorical choices:

- Third person perspective, because I feel it would be a bit too assumptive to use first person on ol' Stanley–I added some possible thoughts of his based on other things I read about the study-- but first in first person I would have to make too many inferences about his thoughts for comfort.
- I used a lot of description because when you stick this article into narrative form, it's not as immersive without a decent setting. So I hopped onto Google earth and scoured the south side of Chicago, then checked a few weather webcams and some cemeteries.
- I used a voice that was *slightly* conversational at times, because that's my tendency. But I didn't go full-informal because that would break the spell of a night scene that was not intended to be amusing or insightful.
- My word choice/diction was not very complicated. This makes the text more inclusive/digestible to a broader audience.
- I am not sure what category of rhetorical device this falls under, but I tried to vary my sentence length. I am prone to bunch of long, drawn-out sentences peppered with short choppy ones. So I tried to do that, but with the addition of some medium-length ones. Because varied sentence length adds interest and pacing.

**4. How does your story differ from the original news piece? Why?**
My story involves more information about the setting, and less about Stanley Gehrt himself, actually. Also I totally omit all the information about bats and ants, and the statistics found throughout the article and how common coyotes are in Chicago. Obviously the way in which I convey the information is quite different, too. Not just listing off facts, but illustrating facts, which we can all agree is more fun.

**5. What did you find most challenging about this assignment?**
It was hard to turn seven sentences into at least 500 words. Also I tried pretty hard to find out how one would normally drug coyotes after live capture for research, but nothing detailed enough was out there. I also found myself researching Stanley and his work so I could get a better idea of him. Half of my brain kept telling me that the outside research was a waste of time because I wasn’t getting text on a page, but no, it was still important.

**6. What do you think you did well and where could you improve?**I like a few sentences of setting description, I suppose. I think I would pick a news article that was more dialogue heavy, ‘cause MAN I wanted dialogue in this, but I wasn't about to conjure it out of thin air. I also don't feel super comfortable about the Stanley's italicized internal thoughts. Even though I was basing these thoughts on information that I knew, I am still pretty unsure of telling the thoughts of a nonfictional character as if I knew them. Feels invasive.