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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Commenting on the power of detective fiction, Raymond Chandler proclaims in his 1944 work *The Simple Art of Murder* that, “All men must escape at times from the deadly rhythm of their private thoughts. It is part of the process of life among thinking beings” (12). It seems that some seventy-one years later, this proclamation still holds true. Popular culture in the twenty-first century is filled with new iterations of the fictional detective, with popular television shows like *Law & Order*, *The Mentalist*, *Psych*, and *Castle* earning longstanding positions on prominent television networks. The detective novel also holds a prominent place in American popular culture, with books by Patricia Cornwell, Sue Grafton, Sara Paretsky and countless others selling millions of copies annually. There are different theories that attempt to explain the popularity of this longstanding genre, including the pleasure derived from escapism, untangling puzzles, contemplating problems, and developing solutions. While all of these theories have their merits, I am interested in exploring the rhetorical aspects that are so integral to acts of detection and, hence, detective fiction. The process of detection involves acquiring and disseminating information—communication in multiple directions—which Dorothy L. Sayers discusses in her 1935 lecture, “Aristotle on Detective Fiction.” Referencing Aristotle’s *Poetics*, Sayers discusses the Denouement, which is one of the three necessary parts of a detective plot and draws upon a discovery, “either of the identity of the murderer, or of the means by which the crime was committed” (29). Of Aristotle’s five possible means of discovery - by the author, by material signs and tokens, through memory, through reasoning, and through bad reasoning by the other party (29-30) – it is discovery through reasoning that reveals the connection of rhetoric and detective fiction most prominently, at least in terms of traditional, male-centric ways of understanding detective fiction. Take for example the methods of logic, analysis, and abstraction
These methods are typically male-centric ways of understanding detective fiction, as evident in the iconic detective figure Sherlock Holmes, who takes rationality to an extreme level. In one instance he deduces the marriage status of a stranger by the fact that his hat was not brushed properly. This dissertation is an act of discovery in its own right, an investigation into how women employ rhetorical strategies in detection as it is portrayed in popular detective fiction, and whether those strategies complicate traditional notions of logical detection as described by Sayers in her connection between detection and Aristotle’s poetics. The ways that women use rhetorical strategies in detective fiction provide them with agency, empowering them with greater influence over their contexts.

**Research Subject And Research Questions**

I conduct close textual analyses of two representations in detective fiction, a selection of episodes from the Fox television series *Bones*, based on Kathy Reichs’ forensic anthropologist-as-detective series of books and Agatha Christie’s 1957 novel, *4:50 From Paddington*, featuring Miss Jane Marple. In deciding upon texts for this project I sought works that not only included male authority figures, such as police officers, I also worked to find a female or females that take on investigative roles in the storyline. Debating whether to focus on an American or British author, I chose Agatha Christie for her notable accomplishments in the genre, and her *4:50 From Paddington* specifically because it has representative age groups of women investigators. Miss Marple is either 87 or 90 years old (it is debated in the novel by two characters) and Lucy Eyelesbarrow is in her mid-thirties. I decided to go with a British female author and a text set after World War II because it focuses on Mrs. McGillicuddy, Miss Marple and Miss Eyelesbarrow, three main protagonist sleuths. This text shows interactions with others, specifically males in authority positions, and how each one went about communicating and
interpreting information. While a printed text by Kathy Reichs would seem complimentary to 4:50 From Paddington, I chose to focus the first part of my analysis on the Fox television interpretation of her novels featuring Temperance Brennan. This allows me to rhetorically analyze the communication practices embedded in a highly popular and current form of detective fiction – the TV crime series – which provides a unique glimpse into the interactions of a forensic anthropologist working with other scientists as well as a male F.B.I. agent.

Dorothy L. Sayers’ minute study of detective fiction through an Aristotelian lens focused on rhetorical practices as they are often understood through the lens of the rhetorical “tradition.” I examine these texts, however, through a different lens in order to try to discover if and how the women they portray deviate from traditional understanding of rhetorical practice and knowledge formation. My study concentrates on three specific knowledge-making practices—authorial, intuitive, and collective thinking – as described by Belenky et al. to explore how Temperence Brennan and Jane Marple, not to mention the female characters around them, generate knowledge and detect criminal activity within their sphere’s of influence.

Using a close textual analysis, I work to answer the following broad research questions:

• What are the feminist argumentative modes and expectations women in detective fiction practice?
• How do women acquire knowledge and communicate such knowledge to others in detective fiction?
• In what ways does authority affect knowledge gathering and communication?
• Is intuition, a sense of knowing something without concrete information, evident in these representations of female detective fiction?
• If intuition is used, how do others receive it?
• What are the instances of collective thinking and sharing of information between female and male characters?

• How does collective thinking affect knowledge making?

The dissertation then moves from a close reading of these popular texts into pedagogical application. The detective fiction genre offers examples and constructs of argumentative modes, and I argue that the detective fiction genre could provide writing students with an opportunity to meaningfully explore women’s argumentative modes, such as authorial, intuitive, and collective thinking, and rhetorical situations in a highly accessible and culturally relevant, though rhetorically neglected, media format. Examining the women’s rhetorical practices in such media, and comparing them with traditional understandings of rhetorical practice along the lines of the rhetorical tradition can serve to complicate oversimplified renderings of rhetorical practice based solely on a male-dominated rhetorical tradition.

**Chapter Overview**

In the rest of this chapter I briefly overview rhetorical strategies practiced by a selection of women throughout the rhetorical tradition in order to establish a historical context for the connection I am working with between women and rhetoric. I then provide a theoretical framework from which I can discuss women’s specific ways of making and communicating knowledge in their worlds. After establishing a theoretical framework, I will offer specific details about the close textual analyses I conducted on two pieces of detective fiction involving women detectives, including my research questions and methods. I conclude by offering my sense of my study’s potential implications for the teaching of writing as well as its limitations.

**Historical Context – Historical Women Rhetors**

The history of Western civilization is rife with examples of the marginalization of women. In certain periods and places, women have been denied the right to citizenship, property
ownership, education, and even the basic act of appearing in public – much less speaking in public. And even when such rights were technically granted by governmental decree, long-held cultural beliefs still held powerful influence in the realities of daily life, and, as such, often prevented women from actually realizing such rights.

Clearly women have made a lot of progress in actually realizing equality by the beginning of the twenty-first century, at least in the context of America. Indeed, news reports acknowledge that women now make up almost exactly half of the American workforce, and many expect that women may even become the majority of the work force before too long. But this is not to say that the struggle has ended. Sure, women do hold positions of power; we do have access to public forums; we are allowed, and often do, have powerful voices in the business of our government, our employments, our homes, and our personal lives. Expectations of women’s behavior, however, are still deeply entrenched in highly gendered cultural codes. For example, an aggressive and impassioned speech on a controversial issue given by a woman might be received much more negatively than if that same speech was given by a man. A woman who overtly expresses her emotions when taking a stand on a public issue may well be understood by some as weak or irrational, simply stumbling over her feminine proclivities.

There are other factors that are more pressing for women as well. For example, women may need to be more conscious of how we dress; we may need to be extra conscious of how sex appeal factors into our overall public presentation – especially when speaking on public issues. Granted these observations are not universally apparent, but clearly there is a need for concern, a need for more authentic understandings of empowerment for women, even in our contemporary American cultural context.
However, while, as I mentioned before, history is filled with examples of how women have been silenced, disempowered, and marginalized, there are a few compelling examples of how women who found powerful ways, under much more oppressive circumstances than we currently suffer, to be heard, to have influence on their worlds through the power of rhetoric. As such, in order to establish an historical context within the rhetorical tradition for women’s uses of rhetoric, I draw upon a few examples of women in the history of rhetoric, such as Aspasia, Christine de Pisan, and Mary Astell, in order to establish my formulation of women’s rhetorical strategies, which helps inform my analysis of such strategies as they play out in detective fiction. That is to say, by tracing these historical instances of women’s uses of rhetoric to influence their worlds, I work to reveal a rhetorical pattern that can serve as an analytical model for examining women’s rhetorical practices in contemporary popular culture.

Aspasia (5th Century BCE)

Aspasia is one of the oldest known woman rhetors. She is a powerful voice in women’s history despite the fact that what we know of her is being “filtered through the mouths of three male rhetors” (Ritchie and Ronald, 1), which establishes the context of male dominated rhetorical tradition—women behind the scene. For example, Aspasia is credited in Plato’s dialogue Menexenus as the true author of the famous Peloponnesian Wars funeral oration that is attributed to Pericles. Despite being recognized by both Plato and Socrates for her skill that “follows the conventions of a classical funeral oration, drawing on rhetorical ‘topics’ familiar to her audience, such as the heroic deeds of ancestors and the source of all goodness in Athenian soil” (Ritchie and Ronald, 1-2), and being present for the various rhetorical and political debates around her, Pericles delivered the speech because Aspasia was not allowed to address the public in such a manner. Despite her inclusion into the rhetorical society as a teacher and contributor,
Aspasia’s actual voice was silenced, only rearticulated through the male voices of her time.

Despite the stifling of her personal voice, however, she found vocalization through others. She found a way to be heard in cultural context that seemed incapable of hearing a female voice. This odd juxtaposition of simultaneously being heard and unheard, I believe, establishes a rhetorical pattern that found manifestation in other women rhetors later in the tradition who were operating under similarly confining cultural circumstances. Some could argue that through Pericles’ delivery of Aspasia’s speech her voice was heard. By maintaining the complex state of being heard and unheard simultaneously, Aspasia not only managed to gain the respect of other contemporary intellectuals as an equal if not superior rhetorician, but this state also set the groundwork for the influence of future women’s voices.

Christine de Pisan (1365-1430)

According to Joy Ritchie and Kate Ronald’s edited collection *Available Means: An Anthology of Women’s Rhetoric(s)*, Christine de Pisan’s (1365-1430), “use of innovative rhetorical conventions” mark her as “the first woman to support herself by writing” (32). While Aspasia herself may not have been able during her lifetime to publically vocalize her rhetorical work and thus had to rely on the influential men around her, Pisan assumed authority using allegories to supplant the notions of women’s voices through rhetorical maneuvers such as her “[selection of] stylistic features she admired most from both classical and early Renaissance humanist authors” to create a unique vehicle for her lessons in persuasion and morality (Redfern 78). One example is her work *The Book of the City of Ladies*, where three ladies represent reason, rectitude, and justice. The allegory works to *reconstruct* the history of women through the voices of women and help to “establish an authoritative feminine ethos” (Redfern 81). Pisan recognized that her voice may be hampered by her gender, and thus created the allegory that
Fortune caused her to experience a gender *transformation* after her husband died, which supposedly imbued her with “the strength to fend for herself” (Redfern 78). This transformative change “allowed her to move toward a womanliness that would be acceptable to both female and male audiences” (Redfern 79). Pisan’s strategy of rhetorically reconstructing history and constructing a transformation of self demonstrates both her awareness of cultural constraints – her rhetorical situation – and, driven by her need to be heard, her creative strategy for subverting those cultural constraints.

*Queen Elizabeth I (1533-1603)*

Similar to Christine de Pisan, Queen Elizabeth I was also keenly aware of the cultural constraints of her time. Using her knowledge of audience and situation she constructed numerous identities for her royal position in order to be a persuasive leader. In *Available Means: An Anthology of Women’s Rhetoric(s)*, Joy Ritchie and Kate Ronald contend that “Throughout her reign, Elizabeth constructed herself in a variety of roles: monarch, nurturer, virgin, mother to England. In the speech [“To the Troops at Tilbury”] Elizabeth takes on the identity of the strong, demanding monarch, blurring the boundaries between queen and king” (48). The speech is a true testament to the powers Queen Elizabeth I invokes as a rhetor. “In the speech, Elizabeth takes on the persona of a male military commander who will remain with the soldiers to the bitter end. At the same time, she uses contemporary assumptions about gender roles to her own ends: “I know I have the body but of a weak and feeble woman; but I have the heart and stomach of a king, and of a king of England too,” she declares. Thus, Elizabeth constructs multiple identities for her crown and, in the process, shows a shrewd awareness of audience and situation” (48).
Mary Astell (1666 – 1731)

Through the allegorical representations of three ladies, Pisan was able to safely voice women’s thoughts, feelings, and worthiness. Mary Astell, famous for her essay, “A Serious Proposal To The Ladies,” employed a similar reinvention strategy to publically argue women’s issues of reason, rectitude, and justice. Using Descartes’ notion of “the vernacular as the language of scholarship” (Sutherland, 106), Astell worked to show that women are natural thinkers and writers, thus “claim[ing] a place for women in logic and rhetoric” (107). Astell creatively uses the claims of inferiority lodged against women, by acknowledging certain feminine characteristics, but reframing those characteristics in superior ways:

she points out that men have always complained that women speak too much rather than too little. It follows that one cannot seriously question the fact that they are endowed with reason. If their reasoning powers are in any way inferior to men’s, that is because of a lack of exercise. The remedy is to provide the exercise and thus strengthen the faculty. (Sutherland 107)

She concedes that women do speak a lot, especially to one another, but then she spins that concession into an assertion that conversation is a rhetorical act, and granting that, women have a natural ability at an important rhetorical activity, an activity that can be honed through further “exercise.” This simple example of spinning a supposed defect into a strength – this act of antiphrasis – illustrates, again, the notion of reinvention or reconstruction as an effective rhetorical strategy.

Sojourner Truth (1797-1883)

Sojourner Truth was a powerful orator who employed ethos, logos, and pathos, in her quest to educate people about “religious inspiration, abolition, and women’s rights, […] the truth
about slavery and about the racism of the women’s movement” (Ritchie 143). Aiding her speaking prowess was her “commanding physical presence” (143). “She was a dark-skinned African American woman, well over six feet tall, with a booming voice, and her left hand was disfigured from a childhood accident. All these physical characteristics added to people’s fascination with Truth” (143). Because “Truth never learned to read or write,” her speeches were transcribed, “usually by white people, which poses specific questions regarding the transcribers’ motives and methods” (143). Putting the controversy aside, Sojourner Truth’s most famous speech “Aren’t I a Woman” “broke open the ideology of the nineteenth century’s assumption about “true womanhood” (144).

While each of these women rhetors lived and held influence in different times and places throughout history, relying upon different rhetorical strategies for making themselves heard, I see commonality tracing through all of them. In different ways, they all understand the constraints imposed upon them, yet they successfully reframe, even reinvent those constraints in ways that work in their favor. Aspasia sets the problematic precedent as a woman who was heard in a context unable to hear women. Granted, we do not know anything about her from any of her existing texts, but, looking back from our current perspective, we can see a challenging of rigid, binary gender constraints. Her presence in history cannot be neatly classified into the categories of woman or man; her presence in history is dependent on both genders at once. Pisan and Astell, from the perspective of hindsight, seem to do similar things. They manipulate and challenge culturally assigned gender constraints, often conceding culturally assumed feminine weaknesses only to reinvent, reframe, and hence refute those weaknesses. The keys to making this happen, as I see it, are awareness and creativity. These women were very conscious of the nature of their
respective cultural constraints, and that awareness allowed them to use their minds to creatively subvert those constraints.

To bring this all back to the present, the pattern I have been tracing through these historical figures in the rhetorical tradition seems to hold true into the twenty-first century as well. Sara Hayden’s article “Negotiating Femininity and Power in the Early Twentieth Century West: Domestic Ideology and Feminine Style in Jeannette Rankin’s Suffrage Rhetoric” focuses on K.K. Campbell’s 1983 article, “Femininity and Feminism: To be or not to be a Woman” and her 1989 study, *Man Cannot Speak For Her: A Critical Study of Early Feminist Rhetoric*. As Hayden summarizes:

Campbell argues, for example, that in their efforts to persuade the public, early women reformers relied on their personal experiences in the formation of their claims, utilizing a series of examples and anecdotes from their daily lives. Similarly, rather than arguing deductively, a form of argument reflective of formal education that women were denied, women's experience as craft learners led them to present their claims inductively and in a personal tone, mimicking the face-to-face, step-by-step process of learning the arts of housewifery. Further, Campbell claims that women rhetors spoke to their audiences not as experts but as peers, recognizing the experiences of their audience members and inviting their audiences to participate in the creation of arguments. By utilizing this set of strategies, women rhetors were able to avoid appearing aggressive or argumentative, and although they spoke about public issues, they couched their discussions in private terms. Through the tools of feminine style, women were
able to empower their female audience members and maintain an appearance of femininity. (85)

I offer this brief overview and analysis of these women rhetors in order to trace and reveal a rhetorical pattern between them involving cultural awareness and subversion as means to being heard and causing change. I continue to build on this historical foundation, this pattern, by offering a more contemporary and theoretical perspective on how women acquire and share knowledge in places not typically studied by rhetoricians – popular genre fiction. Together, the rhetorical pattern I have traced here combined with the theoretical overview I provide below constitutes the basic theoretical framework informing my textual analysis of detective stories involving female detectives.

**Past to Present – Tracing Feminine Rhetorical Practices**

The rhetorical maneuvers historical women rhetors employed are evident in several modern female fictional investigators. For example, Aspasia’s voice rearticulated through male voices of her time is similar to Theodore Tinsley’s Carrie Cashin character, which appeared in *Crime Busters*, later renamed *Mystery Magazine*, spanning 1937-1942. This early example of a hard-boiled detective hid her true identity, owner of the Cash and Carry Detective Agency, through her front man, Aleck Burton. Cashin’s insights were expressed through Burton when dealing with clients and not surprisingly this rhetorical maneuver manifested itself in the NBC television series, *Remington Steele*. Created by Michael Gleason and Robert Butler, *Remington Steele* aired from 1982-1987 and featured a trained detective, Laura Holt, and her front man, an unnamed conman who took on the persona of Remington Steele—the figurehead title she created in order to get hired. Decades after Carrie Cashin appeared in the pulps, the notion of a female detective still unsettled many. Somehow a female sorting through evidence, chasing down criminals, and solving mysteries either did not seem possible or not suitable for a woman.
Women utilized different means to assume and project authority. Whereas Aspasia, Cashin, and Holt projected their knowledge and insight through men, Christine de Pisan used feminine rhetorical practices to reconstruct history and construct a transition of self. Pisan’s allegorical maneuvers can be seen in Agatha Christie’s 1936 Miss Jane Marple, characterized as an “old maid” who resides in the small country town of St. Mary Mead in England. In the majority of her stories, Miss Marple uses past experiences and storytelling to solve mysteries. Comparing and contrasting her life experiences in order to explain how she arrives at her conclusions regarding a mystery helps to clarify for others what has happened, but also serves as a means to express herself that is more acceptable. Her gender, age and supposed fragility are a contention throughout most of the works. Somehow an old-biddy does not convey the necessary acumen to solve mysteries. Yet it is exactly this perception that allows her to move about undetected in order to gain knowledge.

These examples of female rhetorical practices show readers the kinds of rhetorical moves women in detective fiction parallel of others. Given these connections and others it seems prudent to explore these feminine rhetorical practices further. One way of exploring these practices further is focusing on Belenky, et al.’s seminal text, *Women’s Ways of Knowing*.

**Theoretical Framework – Women’s Ways of Knowing**

My theoretical framework draws on Mary Belenky, Blythe Clinchy, Nancy Goldberger, and Jill Tarule’s *Women’s Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice and Mind*, which addresses different methods of developing knowledge, including silence to received, subjective, procedural, and constructed knowledge. While some people have criticized Belenky et al., claiming that their book essentializes how women perceive knowledge, a criticism I address in more detail later in this dissertation, working with this model within a larger analytical framework allows me to usefully apply it to the media under consideration for my content.
analysis. Below I outline the different “ways of knowing” the authors describe in their book, and how those ways of knowing relate to each other sequentially, in order to provide a sense of how this work informs my textual analysis. My close textual analysis is guided by three different ways of knowing, as they are articulated in Belenky et al.’s seminal work, which include authorial and intuitive knowledge, and collective thinking (sharing). Each of these female rhetorical practices provides a separate critical lens for my textual analyses.

Authorial knowledge is a twofold rhetorical practice. In the early stages of knowledge making, many women perceive authority figures as insightful about a particular subject. For example, many new college students perceive their teacher as an authority figure, especially on his or her particular class subject. This inherent authority is challenged by the seasoned student whose experiences enable her to challenge this perception. This procedural stage enables women to look first to an outside authority for the “correct” answer and enable them to develop reasoned reflection and confidence in a verbal give and take to obtain and communicate knowledge. The other aspect of authorial knowledge is when women become the authority themselves. While some may argue that Belenky et al.’s construction stage negates an authorial stance because one can view other’s opinions as valid in addition to her own, I argue that a woman does obtain authority in knowledge and is able to feel secure in her authority as evident in listening to and validating other people’s knowledge as well.

Intuitive knowledge, or those in a subjective state of knowing, are women who are more trusting of themselves and their experiences. Their experiences inform their knowledge about the world around them and about themselves (Belenky et al. 16). What could be described as a gut feeling (54, 57) is actually the unarticulated association of a variety of experiences and situations that creates, typically subconsciously, knowledge (69). For example, if one is entering
a classroom that she hasn’t entered before, she has an intuitive idea what the room will consist of based on her previous experiences. The classroom may differ in some ways, for example, a chalkboard versus a dry erase board, yet her previous experiences enable her to associate certain objects and locations as part of what constitutes a classroom.

Collective knowledge can be thought of in terms of Belenky et al.’s constructive stage of knowing. This stage solidifies confidence in one’s own knowledge base because of the belief that there is not one specific answer for everything. This stage allows for the communication of knowledge, a willingness to accept other people’s opinions as valid, and the willingness and ability to convey one’s own thoughts. One can think of it in terms of situational knowledge. Three people can have dinner in a restaurant and each one can have a different experience. Recognizing each other’s experience and opinions in this stage demonstrates collective knowledge.

Methods

Based upon the female rhetorical practices established above I developed a bulleted list of the analytical criteria to guide my reading of the text and its analysis.

- In what ways is authority attributed?
- Does the perceived authority validate certain knowledge over others?
- Who exhibits intuitive knowledge? How is that conveyed?
- Are there any transitions between authorial and intuitive knowledge? If so, how is this transition presented? Who is involved?

Chapter Overviews

Chapter 1: Introduction
My introduction traces and reveals patterns of cultural awareness and subversion that female rhetors have employed in order to be heard and promote change. I discuss the different rhetorical strategies of Aspasia, Christine de Pisan, and Mary Astell. These strategies, coupled with the different ways of knowing outlined by Mary Belenky, Blythe Clinchy, Nancy Goldberger, and Jill Tarule, provide an analytical lens to interpret my print and visual texts, in an effort to address the questions: In what ways do women create knowledge? In what ways do women communicate knowledge?

Chapter 2: Theoretical Lenses

In this chapter I offer a detailed discussion of the analytical potential the Belenky et al. text provides for considering women’s rhetorical practice in detective fiction. Much like I have tried to do here, but in more detail and development, this chapter will describe exactly how my theoretical approach informs and shapes my approach to analyzing the texts being studied, and it will make the argument for why it is a useful approach for complicating, and thus enriching, traditional understandings of rhetorical practice.

Chapter 3: Close Analysis: Bones

This chapter provides a write up of my close content analysis of several episodes of Fox’s Bones series. I continue my discussion of collective knowing, authorial and intuitive knowledge as portrayed in these examples and how they connect to my project as a whole. I also discuss Andrea Lunsford and Lisa Ede’s 1990 seminal work Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaborative Writing.

Chapter 4: Close Reading: 4:50 From Paddington

This chapter provides a write up of my content analyses on Agatha Christie’s 4:50 From Paddington. My discussion focuses on three particular lenses: collective knowing, authorial and
intuitive knowledge. By looking at two different examples of the detective fiction genre, golden age and contemporary, I hope to illustrate the female rhetorical practices present and what that means for generating knowledge.

Chapter 5: Textual Analysis Implications

This chapter discusses my sense of what the content says about how detective fiction characterizes women’s ways of knowing and communicating in contemporary popular culture and what I believe to be the consequence of this characterization for contemporary popular culture. Lastly, considering my thoughts regarding both these questions, I will explore the potential of detective fiction for teaching rhetorical practices to novice students.

Conclusion

The teaching of writing involves the teaching of critical thinking. Kathleen Galotti’s, “Valuing Connected Knowing in the Classroom,” states, “critical thinking is thinking that examines assumptions behind conclusions. It is rational—it is reasoning that is uncontaminated by emotions or personal feeling” (281). Yet, separate or rational thinking is not the only type of thinking that students use. As Galotti also notes, “connected knowing is personal and collaborative and draws on personal experiences and reactions” (282). Connected knowing is important to the teaching of writing because acknowledging and encouraging its application can help students gain a sense of confidence in their own knowledge. Exploring the potential of detective fiction as an introduction to feminist rhetorical practices in a range of curricular contexts offers many examples and constructs of argumentative modes and rhetorical situations.
CHAPTER 2: FEMINIST RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter outlines a feminine rhetorical practice set forth in Mary Belenky, Blythe Clinchy, Nancy Goldberger, and Jill Tarule’s *Women’s Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind*. This seminal work explores different methods of how women develop knowledge, including authorial, subjective, and constructed knowledge. These ways of knowing are characterized by perspective taking vantage points. For example, women in the authorial stage of knowing assign those they get information from, such as a teacher, newscaster, or nurse, as expert. According to Belenky et al., these women lack the confidence in their own voice and experience to believe that they too have the knowledge and capabilities of others. This stage of knowing may be caused by a lack of interaction with others that would provide evidence of similarities of thoughts and actions. If women could interact, compare, and learn that their opinions are as valid as others, they would move out of the authorial stage of knowing. Those in this stage do not give credit to opinions; rather, only facts because “facts are true; opinions don’t count” (Belenky et al. 42). Those who are able to redefine the nature of authority are able to move beyond the authorial position of knowing into intuitive or subjectivist knowledge. This intuitive knowledge position is important because, Belenky et al. argue, “It is the position at which their views of experts and expertise undergo radical change. The orientation to authority shifts from external to internal” (68). Truth or knowledge in this stage, Belenky et al. assert, is “intuitive reaction, experienced and felt” (69). This shift between thinking and feeling occurs during subjective knowing. Women in the subjective stage of knowing are able to “view truth as unique to each individual, an accident of personal history and experience” (69). Here the idea of absolute truth or knowledge shifts from everyone to the individual. This subjective stage sets the groundwork for entering into the collective or constructive stage of knowing because without
the belief that each person has his or her own truth, a person in the constructive stage of knowing would not be able to express her own beliefs and integrate them with information from others.

Each stage of knowing is connected to one another. Without the initial authorial stage and the subsequent questioning of authority, an individual could not move into the subjective stage. Conversely, without the validating of other’s knowledge as well as one’s own, an individual could not move into the constructive stage of knowing. While the constructive stage appears to be the most integrating of knowledge, allowing the individual to feel confident in her own voice while recognizing the importance of others’ opinions and feelings, it is not necessarily a bad thing to be limited to the authorial and subjective stages, all of which are effected by an individual’s opportunities and experiences that enable her to move beyond her current way of knowing.

A natural consequence of this particular feminist framework is acknowledging the continuing debate between essentialism and constructionism. Essentialism, defined by Diana Fuss in *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature & Difference*, is “a belief in true essence—that which is most irreducible, unchanging, and therefore constitutive of a given person or thing” (2). Whereas constructionism is defined in “opposition to essentialism and . . . insists that essence is itself a historical construction” (2). Constructionists, Fuss argues, “are concerned above all with the production and organization of differences, and they therefore reject the idea that any essential or natural given precede the processes of social determination” (2-3). I believe in biological essentialism; men and women are characterized as such due to chromosomal and anatomical factuality verses philosophic idea. However, my research project aligns itself with constructionism due to my belief that we are social creatures that learn and adapt to our
My close textual analysis is guided by three different ways of knowing: authorial and intuitive knowledge, and collective thinking (sharing). Each of these female rhetorical practices provides a separate critical lens for my textual analyses. While I have gone into a brief explanation here of how these practices interrelate with each other, in the next section, I expand on each stage of knowing to establish a more fully-formed basis from which I will develop an analytical heuristic to help guide my close textual analyses.

**Authorial Knowledge**

In the early stages of knowledge making, many women perceive authority figures as “being all-powerful, if not overpowering” (Belenky, et al. 27). Belenky, et al., describe women in this stage as “in denial of self and in dependence on external authority for direction” (24) and while they have “develop[ed] language, they do not cultivate their capacities for representational thought. They do not explore the power that words have for either expressing or developing thought” (25). This “underdeveloped representational thought” means their available ways of knowing are “limited to the present (not the past or the future); to the actual (not the imaginary and the metaphorical); to the concrete (not the deduced or the induced); to the specific (not the generalized or the contextualized); and to behaviors actually enacted (not values and motives entertained)” (27). Women in this stage of knowing do not acknowledge their own inner voices and look upon those in authority positions to hold all the answers. Similar to a teacher who is deemed an expert in his or her subject area and therefore should know all the right answers, women in this stage also perceive themselves through the knowledge and opinion of others. Women who gain experience and develop confidence, for example, those who attend parenting classes, try the techniques at home, and gain confidence in their abilities, are able to challenge
the inherent perception of authority to realize they are an authority themselves. Moving into this stage of authorial knowledge causes women to “move away from silence and an externally oriented perspective on knowledge and truth” to “a new conception of truth as personal, private, and subjectively known or intuited” (54). This shift allows women to feel confident in their own authority and listen to and validate other people’s knowledge as well.

**Intuitive Knowledge**

Women who are more trusting of themselves and their experiences are in a subjective state of knowing or practicing intuitive knowledge. Their experiences inform their knowledge about the world around them and about themselves (Belenky et al. 16). What could be described as a gut feeling (54 & 57) is actually the unarticulated association of a variety of experiences and situations that creates, typically subconsciously, knowledge (69). For example, if one enters a restaurant for the first time, she has an intuitive idea what the restaurant will look like and how people will behave based on her previous restaurant experiences.

Subjectivism, according to Belenky, et al., is “dualistic in the sense that there is still the conviction that there are right answers; the fountain of truth simply has shifted locale. Truth now resides within the person and can negate answers that the outside world supplies” (54). This authorial shift, from external to internal, is an “important adaptive move in the service of self-protection, self-assertion, and self-definition” (54). One way a woman can experience this shift in authority is when she becomes a mother. Obtaining knowledge from others, such as their own mother or a nurse, provides authorial knowledge. This knowledge, coupled with the experience of nurturing a baby, moves one to intuitive knowledge. This is evident when a mother is able to differentiate her baby’s cries for food, diaper change, or sleep. By listening to her inner voice about her baby’s needs, a woman in this stage is able to listen to the voice or cry of others.
“This interior voice has become,” according to Belenky et al., “the hallmark of women’s emergent sense of self and sense of agency and control” (68). A woman in this subjective knowledge making stage acknowledges her feelings and their importance as a means to interpret personal experiences. A subjective knower is thus able to acknowledge others’ point of view and their own personal journey to achieve it. Personal truth based on feelings and experiences seems contradictory to the study of science. How can science be absolute when an individual’s knowledge is also true? Belenky et al. recognize that “silent and authority-oriented women often perceived scientists as ultimate authority and looked to science for final answers” (71), some subjective knowers moved beyond this stage to maintain a “passionate rejection of science and scientists” (71). Similar to a rejection of science, subjectivists often lean towards nonverbal expression as a means to communicate. Linking words to authorial guidance, subjectivists “often prefer to express themselves nonverbally or artistically so as to bypass the categorizing and labeling that the use of language implies” (74). While not all women who experience authorial knowledge develop into intuitive or subjective knowing, women must go through subjective knowing in order to experience the collective or constructive stage of knowing.

**Collective or Constructive Knowledge**

Collective knowledge, or in Belenky et al.’s term, constructive stage of knowing, is a stage where an individual develops a new identity. A person in this stage of knowing derives confidence in her own knowledge base and believes no one holds the answer for everything. The communication of knowledge, a willingness to accept other people’s opinions as valid, and the willingness and ability to convey one’s own thoughts are the hallmarks of this stage of knowing. Authorial or received knowers view knowledge as outside themselves. Subjectivists or intuitive knowers acknowledge the importance of other peoples’ experiences and recognize themselves as makers of knowledge. Collective or constructive stage of knowing can be viewed as situational
knowledge. Five people may attend the same college class and each of them can have a different experience. Those in this stage of development recognize that each person’s experience and opinions as valid. They can also converse about the similarities and differences to expand their knowledge.

My textual analysis will utilize Belenky et al.’s authorial and intuitive knowledge, and collective thinking (sharing). Each of these stages of knowing provide an integral step in understanding the power of voice whether it is following the knowledge of others without question, developing a voice of one’s own, or the confidence in one’s ability to create knowledge and share it with others. This feminist rhetorical lens will analyze Agatha Christie’s 4:50 From Paddington and the Bones television series in a new way. I hope to shed light in some of the ways women are shown to acquire knowledge in popular culture. Most importantly, I feel my research endeavor coincides with Belenky et al.’s position that “our basic assumptions about the nature of truth and reality and the origins of knowledge shape the way we see the world and ourselves as participants in it. They affect our definitions of ourselves, the way we interact with others, our public and private personae, our sense of control over life events, our views of teaching and learning, and our conceptions of morality” (3).

Using Belenky et al.’s feminist rhetorical lens will enable me to gain a perspective not guided by the masculine dominated rhetorical canon. This lens is not necessarily better than the traditional lenses; rather, this perspective adds to the existing knowledge and provides a unique perspective on how women create knowledge. In short, my study should broaden people’s understandings of women’s ways of creating and using knowledge through my answering the following questions:

- What are the feminist argumentative modes and expectations women in detective fiction
practice?

- How do women acquire knowledge and communicate such knowledge to others in detective fiction?
- In what ways does authority affect knowledge gathering and communication?
- Is intuition, a sense of knowing something without concrete information, evident in these representations of female detective fiction?
- If intuition is used, how do others receive it?
- What are the instances of collective thinking, sharing of information, between female characters present?
- How does collective thinking affect knowledge making?

Patricia Lina Leavy, supporting content analysis of popular texts, cites Süheyla Kirca, in “The Feminist Practice of Content Analysis,” who writes “since popular culture is a significant site for struggle over meaning, which offers the culture’s dominant definitions of women and men, it is therefore crucial to intervene in the mainstream to make feminist meanings a part of everyday common sense” (223). By using Belenky et al.’s feminist lens to examine women’s rhetorical practices in the Bones television series and Christie’s 4:50 From Paddington, I provide insight into how our culture reflects ideas of meaning about men and women woven in popular forms of detective fiction, which is still one of the most popular forms of fiction in American culture. Belenky et al.’s lenses provide a methodical and reveling way of examining women’s rhetorical practices in this particular instance of popular culture.

Looking at the different ways women create knowledge in the detective fiction genre is not without some obstacles beyond the essentialism and constructionism debate. For example, the detective fiction genre requires certain formulaic characteristics. B.J. Rahn’s “Seeley
Regester: America’s First Detective Novelist,” discusses the conventions inherent in the classical detective novel. Drawing on Edgar Allan Poe’s *Dupin* series, “The Murders in the Rue Morgue” (1841), “The Mystery of Marie Roget” (1842), and “The Purloined Letter” (1845), where his male protagonist, Le Chevalier C. Auguste Dupin, is sought by police to solve seemingly unsolvable mysteries, Rahn argues that there are nine parts of the detective formula a work must follow. These include:

1. A murder occurs within a closed environment—sometimes a locked room.  
2. The police are called in to investigate the crime but remain baffled even after examining the circumstantial evidence and interviewing witnesses and suspects. They sometimes arrest an innocent person.  
3. A gifted but eccentric amateur detective with encyclopedic knowledge, intuitive insight, and great capacity for deductive reasoning is consulted.  
4. He then visits the scene of the crime, examines the physical evidence, conducts research, interviews the crime, examines the physical evidence, conducts research, interviews the witnesses and suspects, and forms a hypothesis using logical deduction to explain how the crime was committed—including means, motive, and opportunity.  
5. He tests his hypothesis by reconstructing the crime and confronting the villain—often the least likely suspect—in a dramatic climax.  
6. The ending usually preserves the comic worldview, because the culprit is apprehended and the moral and civil order restored.  
7. The denouement includes a full explanation of any unanswered questions or obscure points of the mystery.  
8. Of course, the balance of the tale is devoted to discovering who-done-it.  
9. The sleuth is sometimes assisted by a
trusted but less able friend who, in addition to performing minor tasks, may keep a written record of the case and later publish it. (49-50)

It is interesting to note that Rahn discusses this formula for classical detective fiction while examining *The Dead Letter*, an 1867 book by Seeley Regester, pseudonym of Mrs. Metta Victoria Fuller Victor (49). Imbedded in the formula is the presumption that the detective is male. This pushes the examination of a selection from the *Bones* series and *4:50 From Paddington* further because each of these works has a female protagonist operating in the constraints of a traditionally male dominated genre.

**Heuristics**

To conduct my analyses, I selected episode five from each of the six television seasons of *Bones*, and looked at the Black Dog and Leventhal 2007 publication of Agatha Christie’s original 1957 work, *4:50 From Paddington*. I chose episode five because it would not have conflicting information like story carryover that typically happens with episodes in the beginning and ending of television seasons. For each work I addressed questions pertaining to each of the specific Belenky et al.’s lenses. The chart below illustrates the basic guiding heuristic for my analysis of the *Bones* TV episodes and the Agatha Christie novel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorial Knowledge</th>
<th>Intuitive Knowledge</th>
<th>Collective Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this scene reflect behavior where a person assigns knowledge based solely on the authority of another person?</td>
<td>Does the character recognize the opinions of others as well as his or her own?</td>
<td>Is there an expression of thoughts and feelings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this character welcome opinions from others?</td>
<td>Does the scene show a shift from external to internal knowledge?</td>
<td>Does a character recognize the knowledge contribution of others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this character only want to hear the facts from others?</td>
<td></td>
<td>If the character recognizes the knowledge contribution of others, how is it expressed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gathering data from the *Bones* episodes consisted of downloading transcripts from PB Works, [http://bonestv.pbworks.com/w/page/10717822/Episode-Transcripts](http://bonestv.pbworks.com/w/page/10717822/Episode-Transcripts) for seasons one and two, and [http://www.bonesfansonline.com/transcripts](http://www.bonesfansonline.com/transcripts) for seasons three through six. I used two different websites for transcripts because PB Works only had complete transcripts for seasons one and two. The fifth episode from each of the available six seasons were printed and highlighted according to the specific data gathering questions. After using an orange highlighter for authorial, yellow for intuitive, and green for collective, each color-coded section was tallied to indicate whether the knowledge expression was a singular instance, such as collective, or one that overlapped, as often happened with intuitive and collective. I used the questions listed for each of the types of knowledge to help guide my understanding of what constitutes authorial, intuitive, and collective. If a scene contained a person explaining something or welcoming the information another person had, I deemed it authorial. If a scene included something that indicated a shift from external to internal knowledge, like indicating how one felt in a particular situation, I assigned it intuitive. Anywhere there was an expression of thoughts as well as feelings I labeled it collective. What differentiated collective from authorial knowledge despite both recognizing another’s opinion is the added component of feeling. If a scene focused on just information then I attributed it to authorial knowledge. If a scene not only had information but also something to indicate acknowledgement of feeling, either in the speaking character or those around him or her, I labeled it collective.

I used the same coding procedure for *4:50 From Paddington*; however, only key instances are transcribed onto my computer for research purposes. After coding all of the texts
analyzed, I offer my conclusions on the implications of my findings for each data set, *Bones* in chapter three and *4:50 From Paddington* in chapter four.

This chapter provided a detailed description of Belenky et al.’s authorial and intuitive knowledge, and collective thinking (sharing), which I used to textually analyze the *Bones* television series and Agatha Christie’s *4:50 From Paddington*. I acknowledged the importance of my research and what I hope to gain, in addition to vetting the essentialism verses constructionism paradigm. In the following chapters I applied Belenky et al.’s authorial and intuitive knowledge, and collective thinking rhetorical lens to the texts and explored the implications for how women obtain and create knowledge.
CHAPTER 3: BREAKING THE BONES:

ANALYZING THE WAYS OF KNOWING FEATURED IN THE BONES TELEVISION SERIES

“I’ve found over the years that nothing clears up a difficult case so much as stating it to another person. I talk, they listen, and in talking, I make connections I may have otherwise missed.”

Sherlock Holmes speaking to Jane Watson in Elementary

This chapter discusses the Fox network television series Bones, which is based on the book series that features protagonist Dr. Temperance Brennan by real-life forensic anthropologist Kathy Reichs. For my analysis I chose the fifth episode of each of the seasons from the first to the sixth and applied Belenky et al.’s Ways of Knowing rhetorical viewpoint. I wanted a select sampling, knowing that if I chose the first episode of each of the seasons I might have run into a continued storyline from the previous season’s cliffhanger, and the very first episode of the series might not have represented a strong depiction of the knowledge use of the characters as the first episode is usually one where the writers are laying the groundwork for the series and thus spending their time introducing the characters, location, and hinting at personalities. I focused on the television series because it features a strong female character and her interactions with others of similar scholarly training. Whereas the book series focuses on just Dr. Brennan’s perspective because it is written in first-person, the visual adaptation provides multiple prospectives despite not being introspective. The television series also provides the character of F.B.I. liaison, Special Agent Seeley Booth, who is not in the book series. He is an interesting addition to the dynamics of the show because he appears to embody traits traditionally ascribed to women such as empathy. His relationship with Dr. Brennan helps to emphasize their
respective traits and juxtaposes the American society’s expectations of how men and women should behave.

Going into this project I had the belief that Bones would have more instances of authorial knowledge than any other character because of her training as a forensic anthropologist, the location of the Jeffersonian legal-medical lab where most of the conversations take place, and the concentration of the interactions between Bones and Agent Booth. It was surprising that Bones and Booth share an equal percentage of authorial knowledge. As the following analysis will reveal, Bones is well versed in the forensic details that human bones and at times non-human provide. She is inept when it comes to the inner workings of the justice system and thus relies on Booth’s knowledge as a former Army sniper turned F.B.I. agent to apply her authorial knowledge in the context of criminal investigations and prosecutions. The following chapter will provide character overviews, findings of authorial, intuitive, and collective knowledge, knowledge use and character background. A list of characters and an overview of the episodes discussed in this chapter are located in Appendixes A and B.

Character Overview

• Dr. Temperance “Bones” Brennan works in the fictional Jeffersonian that is loosely based on the Smithsonian. The Jeffersonian functions as part museum, part research and teaching institution, and part legal-medical laboratory.

Bones’ scientific investigative team at the Jeffersonian consists of several people who are specialists in their field. Her main experts are Jack Hodgins, Angela Montenegro Hodgins, Zack Addy, Daniel Goodman, Camille Saroyan, and Lance Sweets.

• Dr. Jack Hodgins, an expert in forensic entomology, palynology, chemistry, and mineralogy;
• Angela Montenegro Hodgins, Bones’ best friend and an artist, who provides forensic reconstructions through a variety of mediums, such as, computerized facial renderings;
• Dr. Zack Addy, a former graduate student of Dr. Brennan’s who specialized in forensic anthropology and mechanical engineering and who eventually left the Jeffersonian in season three;
• Dr. Daniel Goodman, a forensic anthropologist turned administrator, assumed the role of director of the Jeffersonian Institute after season one, causing his replacement,
• Dr. Camille Saroyan, a trained pathologist, to have a recurring role as an administrator from season two till present;
• Dr. Lance Sweets, a psychologist employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (F.B.I.) who also works in conjunction with Brennan and Booth starting in season three onward.

Dr. Brennan works with several graduate students after Zack Addy’s departure. Wendell Bray, Daisy Wick, and Arastoo Vaziri are the three that were in the episodes used in my data analysis. Each forensic anthropology student brings his or her own unique perspective to the position.
• Wendell Bray is a working class scholarship student whose neighborhood ponied up funds to send him to school.
• Arastoo Vaziri is a practicing Muslim who initially hid his American background in order to avoid having to explain his religious beliefs to his scientific-minded coworkers.
• Daisy Wick is an annoyance to Bones and her staff because of her inappropriateness in scientific inquiry due to her extreme hyperactivity and search for personal recognition, yet is given a chance to redeem herself in the scientific community of the Jeffersonian
because of her ongoing relationship with Dr. Sweets, who tries to teach her breathing techniques and other behavior awareness to lessen her irritating impact on the others.

**Findings: Percentage of Authorial Knowledge in Bones Series Seasons 1-6**

Before I discuss the findings, here is an example of Belenky et al.’s authorial knowledge from their *Women’s Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind*, in the *Bones* episode titled, “The Perfect Pieces in the Purple Pond.”

**Wendall:** “I’ve looked at the remains over and over and I can’t find any cause of death.”

**Brennan:** “Without the head, we may never discover cause of death, and without cause of death, it’s much less likely that we’ll solve the crime.”

**Wendall:** “This fracture, on the right metacarpal in the last two fingers? It’s got a nickname. The ‘boxers fracture.’ It happens if you slug someone without keeping your wrist dead straight. Yeah, so.”

**Brennan:** “How did you know that?”

**Wendall:** “I fought Golden Gloves when I was a kid. If you x-ray my hand, it doesn’t look much different than this.”

**Brennan:** “I don’t expect anyone to live up to Zack’s standards, Mr. Bray, but that is extremely good work.”

This scene from the television series illustrates an example of authorial knowledge because in this scene Brennan assigns knowledge based on the authority of Wendall, she welcomes his opinion, and wants to hear the facts. Brennan is the traditional authority in most situations at the Jeffersonian. She has reached the highest levels in academia and established first-hand experience when called to consult on various forensic anthropology expeditions. Yet, in this scene she is at a loss as to the cause of death, and when her assistant ponders the possible cause of the finger fracture, she listens intently and acknowledges his wisdom.
The frequency of authorial knowledge in the television series *Bones* was determined by using specific heuristic questions such as:

- Does this scene reflect behavior where a character assigns knowledge based solely on the authority of another person?
- Does this character welcome opinions from others?
- Does this character only want to hear the facts from others?

Typically authorial knowledge was assigned to a specific character who either exhibited his or her authorial knowledge in an explanation, or requested specific information from another character due to his or her perceived expertise. Figure 3.1, Authorial Knowledge Frequency Seasons 1-6, shows the combined amount of authorial knowledge of all characters displayed in episode five of each of the six seasons. Figure 3.2, Frequency of Character Exhibited Authorial Knowledge Seasons 1-6, shows the amount of authorial knowledge a specific character exhibited in the combined six seasons. Perceived discrepancies appear when examining the amount of authorial knowledge of certain characters, for example, Dr. Lance Sweets and Wendell Bray. However, the authorial knowledge frequency is low because it reflects some characters’ absence since they were not present for the entire six seasons.

![Figure 3.1 Authorial, Intuitive, and Collective Knowledge Frequency Seasons 1-6](image-url)
The combined exhibited frequency of authorial knowledge for seasons one through three appears relatively equal. In season one episode five there were nine instances. Season two episode five had seven, and season three episode five had eight. There was a leap in the amount of exhibited authorial knowledge between the first half of the combined seasons and the second. Seasons four through six appear to have a greater frequency of exhibited authorial knowledge. Season four episode five had fourteen, season five episode five had nineteen, and season six episode five had sixteen.

![Figure 3.2 Percentage of Character Exhibited Authorial Knowledge Seasons 1-6](image)

Over the course of the six seasons of *Bones* the highest percentage of authorial knowledge came from Dr. Jack Hodgins, the bug and slime guy, followed closely by Dr. Camille “Cam” Saroyan who is in charge of the Jeffersonian forensic-medical laboratory. Next are Zack, Vaziri, Daisy, Angela, Bones, Booth, and finally Dr. Lance Sweets. Wendell, while in the episodes analyzed, did not exhibit any instance of authorial knowledge. The amount of authorial knowledge attributed to Hodgins can be due to a number of factors, for instance, as seen in the Character Chart in Table 3.1. Hodgins appeared in 128 out of 128 episodes and thus can be seen
as a central character alongside Bones, Booth, and Montenegro. Because he is an expert in forensic entomology, palynology, chemistry, and mineralogy, much of his knowledge base is factual as evident in the “Mummy in the Maze” episode.

**Hodgins**: “That’s a common misconception, though the lack of poison doesn’t make the bite any less painful. This is an urticating hair from the Theraphosinae family.”

**Zack**: “It appears to be barbed.”

**Hodgins**: “Yeah. It’s very irritating. Hey, little-known fact: tarantula hair was the main ingredient in itching powder for decades.”

**Zack**: “Is there any correlation between these hairs and the fact that Stella Higgins scratched herself so badly, and pulled out her own hair?”

**Cam**: “She’s bitten all over. There had to be dozens of tarantulas on her so, yeah, there’s a correlation.”

**Hodgins**: “I was operating under the assumption that the mysterious spore was transported by the tarantula, but I was wrong.”

**Brennan**: “How do you know?”

**Hodgins**: “Because there’s no tarantula hairs on Judith Evans, but plenty of the spores and particulates. She has carcinogenic dibenzopyrene isomers, asbestos, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, manganese and barium and steel dust.”

**Cam**: “Which adds up to?”

**Zack**: “Internal combustion engines.”

**Hodgins**: “Traffic, except for the steel dust. I have no clue about the steel dust.”
Findings: Percentage of Intuitive Knowledge in Bones Series Seasons 1-6

The interaction between Bones and Zack in the “A Boy in the Bush” episode contains an example of intuitive knowledge. In it Bones recognizes the opinion of her graduate student Zack and acknowledges her own. In addition, this scene shows a shift from external to internal knowledge; from discussing the age and cause of death of a young boy to how to handle the feelings that an investigator has when working with young victims.

**Brennan**: “Something wrong?”

**Zack**: These are the smallest remains I’ve ever worked on.”

**Brennan**: “That’s a valid observation, Zack, but it’s not helpful to the investigation.”

**Zack**: “Sorry, Dr. Brennan.”

**Brennan**: “I was at Waco, Branch Davidian compound. I helped identify children who had been killed in the fire. Seventeen of them.”

**Zack**: “So, you’re saying I’ll get used to it?”

**Brennan**: “No, I’m saying you’ll never get used to it. We’re primates. Social creatures. It’s coded into our DNA to protect our young. Even from each other.”
**Zack:** “So, I’m always going to feel terrible?”

**Brennan:** “What helps me is to pull back emotionally. Just…put your heart in a box.”

The frequency of intuitive knowledge in *Bones* was determined by using specific heuristic questions such as, does the character recognize the opinions of others as well as his or her own, and does the scene show a shift from external to internal knowledge? Intuitive knowledge was assigned to a character that displayed an interest in the opinions of others and/or expressed his or her opinion. In addition, the character was classified as expressing intuitive knowledge if he or she displayed a shift in spoken thought from external, factual knowledge, to internal knowledge based on his or her life experiences.

Percentage-wise, the combined analysis of the instances of intuitive knowledge in episode five throughout the *Bones* series, seasons 1-6, show that Wendell had the most with 50%. Dr. Lance Sweets follows, along with Daisy, Angela, Bones, Vaziri and Booth closely matched, Cam, Zack, and Hodgins.

**Findings: Percentage of Collective Knowledge in Bones Series Seasons 1-6**

![Figure 3.4 Percentage of Character Exhibited Collective Knowledge Seasons 1-6](image)

In “The Bones that Weren’t,” an example of collective knowledge is exhibited between Bones, Booth, and Booth’s girlfriend, Hannah.

**Brennan:** (Enters) “I looked at your X-rays.”
Hannah: “Yeah, well, the doctor said it was nothing. I should be out in the morning.”

Brennan: “That’s a very bad idea.”

Booth: “Why?”

Brennan: “Because Hannah has suffered a hairline avulsion fracture of the femur.”

Hannah: “The doctor said it was a little nick on the bone.”

Brennan: “An avulsion fracture is caused when a tendon or ligament pulls off a piece of bone. If you stress your leg incorrectly, the tendon could pull that shard of bone out farther than it already is and sever the femoral artery. You’d bleed out and die before anyone knew what had happened.”

Hannah: “You sure?”

Brennan: (Nods) “I’ll talk to the chief surgical resident. I believe he’ll want to operate on you this evening.

Hannah: “So basically, you saved my life.”

In this episode there is an expression of thoughts and feelings, especially between Bones and Hannah, and both Hannah and Booth recognize the knowledge contribution of Bones, and it is expressed by Booth urging Bones to further her explanation of what she sees in Hannah’s X-ray and Hannah acknowledging that Bones’ knowledge ultimately saves her life.

The frequency of collective knowledge was determined by using specific heuristic questions such as:

- Does a character express thoughts and feelings?
- Does a character recognize the knowledge contribution of others?
- Does a character recognize how the knowledge contribution is expressed?
Collective knowledge was evident when a character expressed his or her own thoughts and feelings, prompted such expression from his or her colleagues, and recognized the knowledge contribution, either authoritative or intuitive, from others.

The combined analysis of the instances of collective knowledge percentage-wise in episode five throughout the *Bones* series, seasons 1-6, show that Wendell has the most with 50%. Next are Booth, Sweets, Bones, Angela, Zack, Vaziri, Daisy, Hodgins and Cam.

**Findings: Percentage of Character Use of Three Types of Knowledge in *Bones* Series**

**Seasons 1-6**

![Chart showing the percentage of character use of collective, intuitive, and authorial knowledge for different characters in *Bones* series.]

Figure 3.5 Percentage of Character Use of All Three Types of Knowledge Seasons 1-6

Bones and Booth exhibit similar high levels of authorial and collective knowledge, with each instance almost matching the corresponding knowledge level. Similarly, Angela has high instances of both authorial and collective knowledge, with nearly matching corresponding knowledge levels. Hodgins and Cam each display higher authorial knowledge instances than intuitive or collective. Dr. Sweets has gradations in his knowledge levels, which grow in small increments from authorial to intuitive, with the highest being collective. Wendell has no
instances of authorial knowledge; however, he does exhibit nearly equal instances of intuitive and collective knowledge. Daisy, Vaziri, and Zack share similar instances of knowledge. Each have high authorial, low intuitive, and a medium amount of collective knowledge displayed.

**Analysis: Knowledge Use and Character Background**

I had many preconceived notions about the amount of authorial knowledge displayed in the television series prior to my analysis. I believed Bones would have had the highest level because of her educational background as a forensic anthropologist, the Jeffersonian legal-medical lab location where most of the conversations between characters take place, her position as being not only the lead character but the established expert in her field, and the number of interactions between her and Special Agent Seeley Booth. Surprisingly, Bones and Booth share an equal percentage of authorial knowledge. Despite having forensic anthropology expertise, Bones relies on Booth’s knowledge of the justice system and his ability to apply her authorial knowledge in the context of criminal investigations and prosecutions.

Another surprise came when looking at the percentages regarding intuitive knowledge use. Because Bones is portrayed as a person who relies mainly on scientific evidence to guide her in her thoughts and feelings about a subject, and Booth’s portrayal focuses on his natural knowledge of human nature, I believed that Booth would have had a higher percentage of intuitive knowledge use. I was also surprised when I noticed that while Booth did exhibit more collective knowledge use than Bones, he scored lower in the percentage use of intuitive knowledge than Bones. Refocusing my definition of intuitive knowledge of having base knowledge of a subject coupled with one’s own experiences that guide one’s actions, versus just a gut feeling about another’s actions, helped to clarify for me why Bones would have more instances of intuitive knowledge than Booth. Bones is a scientist who looks at evidence to guide her “feelings” about an object, person, or situation. She is able to recognize the opinions of other
people as well as she does her own. Therefore, Bones is able to recognize what others have said as that person’s authority on a particular subject. Her scientific perspective enables her to employ a questionable attitude towards nearly everything, whereas Booth, because of the parameters of his job that require him to solve a case with special attention to maintaining evidence for prosecution, is not always in a position to keep an open mind to the opinions of others. However, the frequency he does exhibit indicates his willingness to try. Due to the amount of conversations he has with Bones, most of his frequency can be attributed to his working to keep an open mind to the opinions of Bones.

Not surprising was Booth’s slightly higher percentage of instances of collective knowledge than Bones. Because Booth spends a lot of time interacting with people and working to develop a rapport, there is a natural give and take of feelings and knowledge recognition. Bones’ high percentage of collective knowledge expression is interesting given her background and belief in empirical science. Most of her incidences of collective knowledge involve expressing her thoughts and feelings to clarify either her own knowledge or those others have expressed. For example, in “The Mummy in the Maze,” Bones questions the religious beliefs of Pastor Bill Jonas after hearing about his church’s practice of doing a Hell House of “fornication, theft, murder, gambling, usury, sodomy, and abortion” on Halloween in order to remake “a pagan holiday, Halloween, into a positive celebration of Christian values.”

Bones: “Ancient Egyptian religious beliefs endured for almost 4,000 years, twice the length of Christianity.

Booth: “Look, any of your kids suddenly disappear?”

Pastor: “No.”
**Bones**: “What if the children that you save from abortion grow up to be usurers and sodomites?”

**Pastor**: “I don’t respond to mocking semantics, Dr. Brennan.”

**Booth**: “Nor do I, but she’s serious.”

**Pastor**: “In that case, my serious answer would be that in being given a chance to live a life, the aborted soul will have a multitude of opportunities to repent for their sins and live bathed in the Holy Spirit.”

**Brennan**: nods and says, “Thank you.”

Belenky et al.’s three stages of knowing, authorial, intuitive, and collective, build on each other and in many ways overlap. The authors state, “In a sense, each perspective we have described can be thought of as providing a new, unique training ground in which problems of self and other, inner and outer authority, voice and silence can be worked through. Within each perspective, although partial solutions are possible, new problems arise” (134). Incidences of authorial knowledge are nearly equal to collective knowledge for Bones. While those in the authorial knowledge stage strive for factual information, it is part of the collective knowledge to recognize the knowledge contribution of others.

Andrea Lunsford and Lisa Ede’s 1990 seminal work *Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaborative Writing* found the hierarchical mode present in most instances of collaboration (133). It is characterized by structure, goals, and those engaged in the collaboration following set roles that are defined by “someone outside of and hierarchically superior to the immediate collaborate group or by a senior member or leader of the group” (133). The hierarchical mode of collaboration, according to Ede and Lunsford, has “multiple voices and shifting authority,” (133). “Knowledge in this mode is most often viewed as information to be
found or a problem to be resolved. …This mode of collaborative writing is, [they] argue, highly productive, typically conservative, and most often, in [their] experience, a masculine mode of discourse” (133). Ede and Lunsford also came across a mode of collaboration they deemed dialogic, which was not as popular as the hierarchical collaborative mode often seen in the professions they studied. The dialogic collaborative mode is loosely structured and the roles enacted within it are fluid: one person may occupy multiple and shifting roles as a project progresses. In this mode, the process of articulating goals is often as important as the goals themselves and sometimes even more important. Furthermore, those participating in dialogic collaboration generally value the creative tension inherent in multivoiced and multivalent ventures. What those involved in hierarchical collaboration see as a problem to be solved, these individuals view as a strength to capitalize on and to emphasize. In dialogic collaboration, this group effort is seen as an essential part of the production—rather than the recovery—of knowledge and as a means of individual satisfaction within the group (133).

This mode the authors deemed feminine.

Lunsford and Ede’s hierarchical mode of collaboration closely aligns itself with Belenky et al.’s authorial knowledge, where knowledge recognition is generally based on a hierarchy. Their dialogic collaborative mode is similar to Belenky et al.’s intuitive knowledge where hierarchy and attainment of goals is blurred and an emphasis is placed on individual contribution and multivoiced collaboration.

Given their background and role in forensic science at the Jeffersonian, Cam and Hodgin’s high percentage of authorial knowledge use compared with their instances of intuitive
and collective knowledge is expected. Both have specialized scientific training, which influences their knowledge expression and gathering. For example, in “The Mummy in the Maze,” Hodgins, Cam, Zack, and Bones discuss their interpretation of the evidence they have analyzed.

**Hodgins:** “Because there’s no tarantula hairs on Judith Evans, but plenty of the spores and particulates. She has carcinogenic dibenzopyrene isomers, asbestos, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, manganese and barium and steel dust.”

**Cam:** “Which adds up to?”

**Zack:** “Internal combustion engines.”

**Hodgins:** “Traffic, except for the steel dust. I have no clue about the steel dust.”

**Cam:** “Well, Stella’s tox results show chloroform, ephedrine, theophylline, clonidine and methamphetamine. Judith’s remains show trace evidences of the same compounds, but in different concentrations.”

**Bones:** “Ephedrine is synthetic adrenaline.”

**Hodgins:** “Most of those are heavy stimulants.”

**Zack:** “Their metabolisms would race. Heart rates would accelerate dangerously.”

**Cam:** “Spiders, live burial, drug-induced panic…is our murderer literally scaring girls to death?”

While Cam does verbalize what all the evidence suggests, that the perpetrator is scaring his victims to death, this scene shows how Hodgins typically focuses on the facts of the evidence. This reinforces my notion that the majority of their scenes in the Jeffersonian legal-medical lab tend to show specific, authorial knowledge.
The psychological training of Dr. Lance Sweets, the F.B.I. behavior scientist, helps explain the high percentage of incidences of intuitive knowledge expression. His background promotes recognition of other people’s opinions as well as his own, and enables him to shift from external to internal knowledge when necessary. Angela shows a slightly lower percentage of intuitive knowledge expression than Sweets. Due to her artistic background and her role in creating facial reconstructions of the unrecognizable, Angela appears more feeling and presumably more able to recognize the feelings of others. However, it is revealing that Sweets exhibits more intuitive knowledge than Angela.

The graduate assistants, Daisy, Zack, and Vaziri, display nearly equal amounts of authorial, intuitive, and collective knowledge usage. Wendell is the exception because in the episodes examined, he doesn’t express any authorial knowledge; however, he does engage in instances of intuitive and collective knowledge half the time. Given their status as graduate students assisting in the Jeffersonian lab it is understandable that Daisy, Zack, and Vaziri would have a sound percentage of authorial knowledge usage. They are expected to be able to explain the different forensic material presented to them and inquire if they either do not know about something or are in need of further explanation for their own clarification. Their status as newbies promotes intuitive and collective knowledge expression. Because of their limited background in forensic science, at least out in the field where they can see the world applications of their book learning, they are pushed to acknowledge the opinions of others, such as Dr. Temperance “Bones” Brennan. Her opinion, along with the other experts they are able to work with at the lab, helps the graduate assistants recognize their own knowledge base and promotes and reinforces the shift from external knowledge where the graduate assistants recognize something from one of their textbooks or class lectures to internal knowledge where the graduate
assistants recognize that they have the knowledge base and experience to adequately analyze what it is that is presented in front of them and provide feedback to the group at large. Recognizing one’s own knowledge, the knowledge of others, and sharing such knowledge with others is an example of feminist knowledge.

The graduate students’ status traditionally would have them engaging in hierarchical modes of collaboration; however, because of their use of intuitive and collective knowledge, they engage in Ede and Lunsford’s dialogic mode of collaboration where the individual’s knowledge and input are valued. The graduate student assistants are pushed by the experts around them to express their thoughts and feelings about what they are working on in order for them to practice making the intuitive leaps expected at that level of knowledge use. While this is a power issue in that persons in a limited power position are pushed by those in power to express their thoughts and feelings, it is also a feminist issue in that the thoughts and feelings of others are recognized and welcomed. In addition, their roles as graduate assistants reinforce their need to recognize the knowledge contribution of others. In “A Night at the Bones Museum,” Angela, Hodgins, Daisy, and Cam discuss what evidence is missing in mummified remains they examined at the Jeffersonian laboratory.

**Angela:** “There’s the embedded object.”

**Hodgins:** “Based on the density of the image, it’s most likely Nile stone.”

**Daisy:** “What’s that in the center?”

**Cam:** “Can you enhance it?”

**Hodgins:** “It’s crystalline in structure. It’s a corundum in the trigonal crystal system and the hexagonal scalenohedral class.”

**Daisy:** “A mineral of some sort?”
**Hodgins**: “If the CAT scan were in color, it’d be red and really expensive.”

**Cam**: “A ruby.”

**Angela**: “Yeah, a giant ruby.”

**Cam**: “It’s right where Anok’s heart would be.”

**Daisy**: “Anok’s bleeding heart must refer to the ruby.”

This exchange between the experts and Daisy, one of the graduate assistants, reflects her need for clarification of information, for instance, hearing Dr. Hodgins’ scientific description of what was encased in the mummified remains, Daisy asked, “A mineral of some sort?” Daisy then makes an intuitive leap to the story of Anok’s bleeding heart as reference to the giant ruby in his chest. Here she displays collective knowledge by expressing her thoughts and also by recognizing the knowledge contribution of others and taking ownership of her own interpretation of what it all means. This is an example of a feminist argumentative mode because Daisy is embracing collective knowledge where she is acknowledging the knowledge contribution of others and how it is expressed, and offering her own interpretation and clarification of what it means.

**Analysis: Interdisciplinarity**

*Bones* is not unique in its tendency to follow two main characters despite being an ensemble cast. Much of the show’s conversations are between Bones and Booth, taking place in the Jeffersonian, Booth’s F.B.I. assigned SUV, the crime scene, the F.B.I. building, the Royal Diner, or the Founding Father’s Bar. The supporting cast’s knowledge expression usually takes place in support of the two main characters’ investigation and is done in the Jeffersonian lab and occasionally the crime scene. While the focus is on Bones and Booth, their efforts would be thwarted if not for their diversely knowledgeable colleagues. This is feminist because it represents a collection and collaboration of knowledge. For instance, in “The Mummy in the
Maze,” Bones and Booth are searching for where the suspect is hiding his most recent abductee with the hope of preventing her murder. The team discusses what they found at the Jeffersonian lab.

**Hodgins**: “All right, now, ignoring the Hawaiian pollen, these 126 sites represent loci where the necessary concentrations of particulates can be found: underground garages, tunnels, etc.”

**Bones**: “Dr. Sweets says we can assume that the murderer works for a living.”

**Hodgins**: “You want us to go on psychology?”

**Bones**: “Let’s assume the killer has to get back and forth from his…”

**Zack**: “In comic books, it’s always called a lair.”

**Bones**: “…from his lair in time for his job, sometimes during high traffic hours. Can you remove the sites which make that improbable?”

**Zack**: “Assuming he needs to sleep.”

**Hodgins**: “Say, six hours a night.”

**Bones**: “Twelve-hour shift.”

**Zack**: “Leaving six hours for travel and torture.”

**Hodgins**: “At a maximum of two hours travel time. So, what, remove everything more than a hundred miles away?”

**Zack**: “Too simplistic. If it’s on a highway, it could be up to 120 miles away. Secondary roads, taking traffic patterns into account, less than 50. Depending on the time of day and weather conditions…”

**Bones**: “It’ll go faster if you do the calculations in your head, Zack, and don’t explain it to us.”
Zack: “Thank you.”

Hodgins: “How many does that leave?”

Zack: “Thirty-one.”

Hodgins: “No. No way the police can hit all those, not spread thin on Halloween.”

Bones: “We can narrow it down further. Factor, mummification.”

Zack: “Yes, particulates plus mummification requires…”

Bones: “A steady, continuous supply of dry air.”

Hodgins: “A large oven with blowers.”

Bones: “I’d like to assume that the automotive particulates arrived with the blowing air.”

Hodgins: “Heated underground parking lots.”

Zack: “How’s that not guessing?”

Bones: “Einstein referred to such assumptions as acceptable “intuitive leaps.”

Zack: “I acknowledge Einstein as a scientific authority.”

Here the Jeffersonian team works together to deduce what the evidence is, where it came from, and where the perpetrator could currently be found. They know each others’ intellectual vulnerabilities, such as Zack’s need for scientific accuracy, and address the need in order to move forward. Bones is well versed in forensic anthropology, yet she struggles with motives behind behavior if attributed to one person. She tries to apply an anthropological explanation for behavior but is often dumbfounded. Her partnership with Booth provides her with a sounding board as to why individuals behave the way they do. Booth, having worked with Bones for several years, is well aware of her social awkwardness and tries to provide her with knowledge of people and guidance of social norms.
Dr. Camille “Cam” Saroyan has a background in law enforcement, medical science, and administration. She serves as a type of rudder, guiding the other experts to maintain their focus in not only finding the truth with science but also taking into account the applicability of their findings in court. Dr. Saroyan often has to deal with Dr. Jack Hodgins’ need for laboratory experiments, which he justifies by their scientific applicability. Hodgins admits that he’s the bug and slime guy, not wanting to delve into the psychological ramifications of a crime; rather, how the particulates found help explain what crime took place. Angela appears to walk the line between both worlds, as exemplified in “A Night at the Bones Museum,” where she uses her art and twenty-first century technology to create an artistic rendering of the inside of mummified remains to help the team.

**Angela:** “The paint residue was found inside the compacted area in Anok’s chest. Now, I laid a grid over that area. Next, Hodgins inspected each section of the grid for chemical residue, assigning values based on our color differential. It was kind of like paint by numbers.” (Brennan looks at her, she has no idea what she’s talking about.) “Okay. Anyway, bone for white, kermes insect for red, and wode for indigo. Okay, now I reshaped, refined and cropped the edges. And finally, I removed the grid.”

**Bones:** “Hieroglyphs.”

**Angela:** “Yeah. A negative impression. Because they were left by the object that was hidden inside the chest.”

**Bones:** “Ange, very good.”

**Angela:** “I know, right? Next, we take the object out and we look on the bottom and we have the positive image of the hieroglyphs.”

**Bones:** “Amazing, but many of these characters are incomplete.”
Angela: “Yeah. Well, some of the paint residue had faded too much and couldn’t be retrieved.”

Bones: “But if we can decipher this, it could tell us what was inside.”

Angela: “I know.”

Here, because of Angela’s background in art, she was able to determine that the particulate remnants correspond to colors and was able to use technology to map out what design made an impression in the mummified remains.

Each of these characters, Bones, Booth, Cam, Hodgins, and Angela, is presented as an expert in his or her field. Yet, they would not be as successful as they are without each other’s input and willingness to listen. Cam and Hodgins rely so much on authorial knowledge, wanting to express and hear facts, that they sometimes miss the human motivations that Booth recognizes. Conversely, Booth may recognize feelings and behavior but he does not always have the scientific proof required by the United States court system to convict and requires the expertise of the Jeffersonian team.

*Bones* exemplifies the need for interdisciplinarity and shows how people with diverse backgrounds, specializations, and motivations can work together and employ authorial, intuitive, and collective knowledge to different degrees to achieve success. Each character, with the exception of Wendell, demonstrates these ways of knowing. Because these ways of knowing are present in each character, they are able to not only express facts and recognize the authority of someone’s knowledge; he or she is also able to recognize opinions too. There is a give and take of knowledge between characters that enables them to build on existing knowledge, which exemplifies the knowledge lenses that Belenky et al. were talking about in their *Women’s Ways*
of Knowing. This interdisciplinarity reflects the dialogic use of different research methods and methodologies in rhetoric and composition as well.

Rhetoric and composition as a field encompasses a vast array of research methods and methodologies to examine and explain human expression, such as ethnography, interviews, and surveys. The feminist way of knowing developed by Belenky et al. is one example of how rhetoric and composition takes a research method and applies it to means of expression to determine, in the case of my dissertation, how knowledge is generated and applied in women’s detective fiction. My examination of the Bones television series shows that there is no one particular way of knowing that is best. Authorial, intuitive, and collective knowledge were demonstrated in the episodes examined and each was used by the characters, with the exception of Wendell, to explore and promote knowledge making. Chapter four further explores Belenky et al.’s authorial, intuitive and collective knowledge making in Agatha Christie’s 4:50 From Paddington text. There are four main female protagonists that exhibit the different rhetorical lenses and work together to solve murders.

**Conclusion**

Studying the Bones television series using Belenky et al.’s Women’s Ways of Knowing lens matters to rhetoric and composition studies because it provides a popular research tool (Bones) to examine how knowledge is used and expressed in a pseudo-realistic work situation. It works in a similar way to Ede and Lunsford’s study because they chose common professions to examine, marketing and business organizations. Both worked to link their research and their research findings to professional work outside of the academy itself, which is something of real value for the discipline of rhetoric and composition as well as, at least potentially, people outside of the discipline. By examining the communication and knowledge making practices as they are performed on Bones, I seek to build on the work of these previous scholars by shedding light on
how knowledge making occurs in a popular culture representation of professional work involving multiple participants from various disciplinary backgrounds.

Lunsford and Ede challenged the notion of invention. They postulated that invention is not done in a vacuum, that knowledge absorbed and communicated in a variety of ways and invention may be attributed to one person but is the result of many interactions with people, institutions, and connections. Similarly, Karen Burke LeFevre’s *Invention as a Social Act* defines invention as “occurring when individuals interact dialectically with socioculture in a distinctive way to generate something” (33). Belenky et al.’s work took what Ede and Lunsford started and branched out to say invention is a form of dialogic modes of collaboration and also involves different knowledge modes, such as authorial, intuitive, and collective. These modes of knowledge are rooted in hierarchy because one does start in the authorial knowledge base and through interaction and experience may go to intuitive and possibly collective.

*Bones* is an accessible example of both Lunsford and Ede’s and Belenky et al.’s ideas of invention. Despite being pressed to reach goals, a typical aspect of the hierarchical collaborative mode, *Bones* pushes its characters for knowledge expression and thus exhibits Belenky et al.’s authorial, intuitive, and collective knowledge making modes. This is important for those teaching rhetoric and composition because it reminds us of the traditional masculine hierarchical mode of learning and the possibilities to promote other invention strategies addressing all students. Group conversation, asking for individual contributions, and relating experiences can and do help to ease one out of the authorial mode of learning. Time and an enriching environment can aid in the transition from authorial to intuitive mode of learning and while these things can help with going from intuitive to collective, it is up to the individual to work on making the connections and thus the leap to that stage of learning.
In the next chapter, I will continue building on this line of inquiry by applying Belenky et al.’s knowledge making framework to a more classic piece of popular culture, Agatha Christie’s *4:50 From Paddington*, a mystery novel featuring a prominent female character who is highly skilled in solving crimes but struggles to be heard in a society dominated by traditional, male-oriented knowledge making practices.
CHAPTER 4: TRAIN OF THOUGHT:

ANALYZING THE WAYS OF KNOWING FEATURED IN AGATHA CHRISTIE’S 4:50 FROM PADDINGTON

“At least I have got a grip of the essential facts of the case. I shall enumerate them to you, for nothing clears up a case so much as stating it to another person, and I can hardly expect your co-operation if I do not show you the position from which we start.” (389)

Sherlock Holmes speaking to John Watson in Silver Blaze

This chapter discusses the novel 4:50 From Paddington written by mystery and detective fiction writer Agatha Christie. Miss Jane Marple, one of Christie’s most famous protagonists, is featured in the story as the catalyst for the investigation. However, the main female sleuth is Miss Lucy Eyelesbarrow. I chose this British work because it features several women as investigators, at least as far as our modern notion of investigators might be applied, since the story presumably takes place in 1957, the date of publication. To the entire work, I applied Mary Belenky, Blythe Clinchy, Nancy Goldberger, and Jill Tarule’s Women’s Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind, which explores different methods of how women develop knowledge, including authorial, subjective, and constructed knowledge. Figure 4.1, Knowledge Categories, provides a visual of the different ways of knowing. For your reference, people in the authorial stage of knowing will look upon an authority figure and assign knowledge based on that role. Often, teachers, nurses, and medical doctors are viewed as experts and thus authorities on what they discuss. People in the subjective or intuitive ways of knowing experience a shift from external to internal knowledge (Belenky 68). Individuals in this stage of knowing view truth as unique to the individual (69). For example, three people may attend a lecture and each will come away with a different experience and insight to what happened.
Collective ways of knowing, also known as constructive or situational knowledge, are the most integrative. Those individuals in this stage are confident in their knowledge and recognize the importance of others’ opinions and feelings. With numerous characters, 4:50 From Paddington seemed likely to contain examples of each way of knowing. I chose the original 4:50 From Paddington novel because the adaptations changed the stories and there are many versions to choose from. For example, a cursory search on Imdb.com (internet movie database) lists three different movies: Agatha Christie’s Miss Marple: 4:50 From Paddington, a 1987 movie starring Joan Hickson; 4:50 From Paddington, a 2004 movie starring Geraldine McEwan; and Agatha Christie’s Miss Marple IV: 4:50 From Paddington, a Masterpiece Mystery from 1989. Faced with several movie options, I chose to work with the original novel to see how a famous woman writer created the interactions among characters in 1957, a time period where women were not faced with a lot of choices. Women were expected to find a successful single man, get married, have children, and work in the home. Fulfillment was not voiced until Betty Friedan’s 1963 work, The Feminine Mystique. In the 1950s, women were thought to be content making beds, grocery shopping, cooking, and chauffeuring their children to their activities (57).

Coding Methodology

First I read through 4:50 From Paddington to refresh my memory of the story prior to rereading the novel using Belenky et al.’s Women’s Ways of Knowing. Upon rereading I looked for instances where the scene reflected behavior where a character assigned knowledge based only on the authority of another person, a character welcomes the opinion of another, or only wanted to hear the facts from others, which fell under the authorial knowledge coding. Collective knowledge is where there was an expression of thoughts and feelings, or when a character recognizes the knowledge contribution of others, and notices how the knowledge contribution of others is expressed. Each expression of knowledge was highlighted in a particular color to
denote the particular type of knowledge used. Both types of knowledge were marked when both instances of knowledge were exhibited and each counted separately in its own category. Figure 4.1, Knowledge Categories, illustrates the different criteria for each way of knowing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Authorial Knowledge</strong></th>
<th><strong>Intuitive Knowledge</strong></th>
<th><strong>Collective Knowledge</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this scene reflect behavior where a person assigns knowledge based solely on the authority of another person?</td>
<td>Does the character recognize the opinions of others as well as his or her own?</td>
<td>Is there an expression of thoughts and feelings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this character welcome opinions from others?</td>
<td>Does the scene show a shift from external to internal knowledge?</td>
<td>Does a character recognize the knowledge contribution of others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this character only want to hear the facts from others?</td>
<td></td>
<td>If the character recognizes the knowledge contribution of others, how is it expressed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1 Knowledge Categories

When counting up the frequency of each category, I looked to the beginning and ending of a particular instance and counted that as one. For example, if a character was about to interact with another and was having an internal dialogue, that internal dialogue would be counted as one instance. Each knowledge category was tallied according to instances and character involvement. If both characters were involved in a scene then both characters were counted for that knowledge category in that instance.

Prior to starting this part of my research, I believed that Miss Marple would have had the most instances of authorial, intuitive, and collective knowledge because of her role as the main protagonist. I believed that since 4:50 From Paddington was written by a female, somehow her female characters would have more authority, recognize the opinions of others as well as their own, and express their own knowledge and opinions as well as acknowledge others’.” I believed
that the novel would take the opportunity to portray its characters in what Ede and Lunsford
demean dialogic collaboration, similar to Belenky et al.’s intuitive ways of knowing, where
hierarchy and attainment of goals is blurred and an emphasis is placed on individual contribution
and multivoiced collaboration. However, I was shocked to see that intuitive knowledge had the
lowest occurrence in the novel (Figure 4.1). Despite having four main female characters, 4:50
From Paddington maintained a traditional hierarchy of collaboration, guided by two male police
officers.

**Novel Overview**

Before traveling further with my analysis, let me provide a brief overview of the novel.
The story begins just five days before Christmas. Mrs. Elspeth McGillicuddy is traveling by
train, hence the title 4:50 From Paddington, to St. Mary Mead to visit Miss Marple prior to
Christmas—and witnesses a murder on a train traveling parallel to hers. Despite notifying the
ticket collector and demanding some sort of action be taken, she is put off and left to question
what she saw, at least until she discusses the matter with Miss Marple. Believing her friend and
not getting anywhere with starting an investigation into the matter after talking with Sargent
Cornish, Miss Marple decides to ride the same train two days before Christmas to get a better
idea of what Mrs. McGillicuddy saw.

Reenacting the crime, so to speak, Miss Marple gets an idea of how the murderer got rid
of the body and decides on a plan. Believing the body to have been pushed out of the train as it
passed by Rutherford Hall, she hires Miss Lucy Eyelesbarrow, a free lance domestic who does
short term assignments, to find the body. With only three weeks to search the grounds and find
the body, Lucy Eyelesbarrow gets settled as a domestic servant for the Crackenthorpe family
during the Christmas holiday under the guise that she needs to be close to her ailing aunt, aka
Miss Marple. Maintaining contact via telephone and short visits, Lucy finds the body of a woman who was strangled on the premises, which sets the stage for more murder and mayhem.

**Main Character Overview**

Miss Jane Marple is an unmarried senior citizen living in St. Mary Mead, England. She is a friend of Elspeth McGillicuddy, who witnesses the murder on the train, and Lucy Eyelesbarrow, whom she hires to find the body. Detective Inspector Dermot Craddock’s uncle is a friend of Miss Marple and he told Dermot of her crime solving skills. Miss Marple wrote to Detective Inspector Craddock about the investigation and was hoping Scotland Yard would send him to investigate once the body was found. Inspector Bacon assists Detective Inspector Craddock’s investigation. Elspeth McGillicuddy is a senior citizen who is traveling to visit Jane and then on to Ceylon, in the beginning of the story. What she witnessed was the main thrust of the narrative; however, Mrs. McGillicuddy is only seen at the beginning of the novel and at the end. Lucy Eyelesbarrow studied math at Oxford and is not only scholarly but entrepreneurial as well. Realizing a need for good domestic help, enjoying people, and liking money, she went into private service to those who can afford her. She works weeks at a time, travels a great deal, and met Miss Marple when Mr. West hired her for his aunt when she had fallen ill.

Miss Marple, Elspeth McGillicuddy, Lucy Eyelesbarrow, and Emma Crackenthorpe embody the gendered roles for women inherent in that time period and also reflect the changing notions brewing. For example, Miss Marple is cast as a spinster lady who engages in traditional woman’s roles through gardening and adhering to teatime. Mrs. McGillicuddy, similar to Miss Marple, goes about doing the predicable feminine activities of shopping and visiting her friend during Christmastime. Lucy Eyelesbarrow embodies the traditional female role of domestic; however, she is shown to expand beyond the traditional role because she has her degree and could enter academia, and as a freelancer, she can charge whatever she deems appropriate.
Emma Crackenthorpe, while much younger than Miss Marple and Mrs. McGillicuddy, also adheres to the traditional gendered role for women. As the only surviving daughter she lives at home with her father, who claims to be ill, and wishes to be married. All these female protagonists and the roles they fill make this a great novel to examine for women’s ways of knowing.

The Crackenthorpe Family

Rutherford Hall is a huge mansion built in 1884. It is home to the Crackenthorpe family, although only Emma and her father Luther live in it full time. Josiah Crackenthorpe, Luther’s father, made his fortune in candy and decreed in his will that Luther cannot sell Rutherford Hall, and placed his fortune in trust, the income of it goes to Luther for life but after Luther’s death the capital of the trust is split equally among his children and their children if their parent has died. The mansion will go to the eldest surviving son or his child.

Luther Crackenthorpe is depicted as a crotchety old skinflint who is determined to outlive all of his children so they cannot enjoy the money he believes is his by rights. He has four sons and two daughters. A widower, he is not opposed to marrying again and is especially keen on Lucy. Emma Crackenthorpe is Luther’s only living daughter. Unmarried and considered middle-aged, she abides by her father’s wishes and tries to make the best of what little money he funnels into the household budget. She is secretly engaged to Dr. Quimper, who frequently makes house calls to check on his hypochondriac patient, Luther. Edmund Crackenthorpe was the eldest son of Luther and was killed in the war. Although it is not stated, I believe Agatha Christie meant World War II. Cedric Crackenthorpe is another son of Luther. He lives abroad, is not married, and considers himself an artist. Harold Crackenthorpe lives in London and is
married to an Earl’s daughter. Alfred Crackenthorpe is the black sheep of the family. It is unclear what he does or where exactly he lives.

Edith Crackenthorpe Eastley is Luther’s deceased daughter. She was married to Bryan Eastley. Bryan Eastley was a pilot in the war. He and Edith have a son, Alexander, who stays with Bryan when he is home from boarding school. Alexander Eastley is Edith Crackenthorpe and Bryan Eastley’s only child. He is very keen on adventure and looks everywhere to find some, usually with his school chum James Stoddart-West.

**Findings: Percentage of Character Use of Three Types of Knowledge in 4:50 From Paddington**

![Figure 4.2 Percentage of Character Use of All Three Types of Knowledge Chapters 1-27](image)

The graph above, Figure 4.2, shows the rate of authorial, intuitive, and collective knowledge use by the main characters in *4:50 From Paddington*. Overall, the four main female protagonists, Miss Marple, Lucy Eyelesbarrow, Mrs. McGillicuddy, and Emma Crackenthorpe showed different expressions of authorial, intuitive, and collective knowledge than what I initially expected. For example, I thought that Miss Marple and Lucy Eyelesbarrow would have displayed the highest amounts of authorial knowledge use. Instead they exhibited 22% and 19%.
Mrs. McGillicuddy exhibited the most of all four of them with 24%, which I believe is because she was the catalyst for the story. Authorial knowledge assignment was guided by three heuristic questions: Does this interaction reflect behavior where a person assigns knowledge based solely on the authority of another person, does this character welcome opinions from others, and does this character only want to hear the facts from others? Using the guiding heuristic questions it is obvious that authorial knowledge will be attributed to members of the police investigating the murders.

Miss Marple displays little authorial knowledge use throughout the novel until the very end when she sums up the case:

“He saw a chance you see,” said Miss Marple, “of marrying a rich wife, Emma Crackenthorpe. Only he couldn’t marry her because he had a wife already. They’d been separated for years but she wouldn’t divorce him. That fitted in very well with what Inspector Craddock told me of this girl who called herself Anna Stravinska. She had an English husband, so she told one of her friends, and it was also said she was a very devout Catholic. Doctor Quimper couldn’t risk marrying Emma bigamously, so he decided, being a very ruthless and coldblooded man, that he would get rid of his wife” (283).

It is possible that her authorial knowledge most often occurs when she is called upon to explain the case to the others. She has been the one listening and gathering the various pieces of information brought to her by Inspector Craddock and Lucy, not to mention her own interactions with the Crackenthorpe family. Lucy Eyelesbarrow’s authorial knowledge was often mixed with intuitive and collective as well. For instance, when talking with Inspector Bacon she exhibits all three ways of knowing:
“Well as far as Miss Marple is concerned I’ve done my job. I’ve found the body she wanted found. But I’m still engaged by Miss Crackenthorpe, and there are two hungry boys in the house and probably some more of the family will soon be coming down after all this upset. She needs domestic help. If you go and tell her that I only took this post in order to hunt for dead bodies she’ll probably throw me out. Otherwise I can get on with my job and be useful” (76).

In this instance, Lucy acknowledges Inspector Bacon’s knowledge of her purpose for working at Rutherford Hall and his authority to let the Crackenthorpes know. She also acknowledges her own authority by expressing Emma Crackenthorpe’s need for domestic help during this busy time and what would happen, based on her experience and intuition, if Emma learned the true reason for Lucy’s employment. Lucy exhibits a shift from external to internal knowledge and expresses her thoughts and feelings to Inspector Bacon, which demonstrates intuitive and collective knowledge use. Mrs. McGillicuddy engages in collective knowledge use when discussing what she witnessed on the train with Miss Marple over “cowslip wine” and later “chamomile tea” (Christie 15):

“Jane,” said Mrs. McGillicuddy, as she took an appreciative sip, “you don’t think, do you, that I dreamed it, or imagined it?”

“Certainly not,” said Miss Marple with warmth.

Mrs. McGillicuddy heaved a sigh of relief. “That ticket collector,” she said, “he thought so. Quite polite, but all the same—”

“I think, Elspeth, that that was quite natural under the circumstances. It sounded—and indeed was—a most unlikely story. And you were a complete
stranger to him. No, I have no doubt at all that you saw what you’ve told me you saw” (15-6).

Later on the same page, Miss Marple and Mrs. McGillicuddy go on to talk specifics about what she saw:

“The man had his back to you, you say. So you didn’t see his face?”
“No.”
“And the woman, you can describe her? Young? Old?”
“Youngish. Between thirty and thirty-five, I should think. I couldn’t say closer than that.”
“Good-looking?”
“That again, I couldn’t say. Her face, you see, was all contorted and—”
Miss Marple said quickly: “Yes, yes, I quite understand. How was she dressed?”
“She had on a fur coat of some kind, a palish fur. No hat. Her hair was blonde.”
“And there was nothing distinctive that you can remember about the man?”
Mrs. McGillicuddy took a little time to think carefully before she replied.
“He was tallish—and dark, I think. He had a heavy coat on so that I couldn’t judge his build very well.” She added despondently, “It’s not really very much to go on.”
“It’s something,” said Miss Marple. She paused before saying: “You feel quite sure, in your own mind, that the girl was—dead?”
“She was dead, I’m sure of it. Her tongue came out and—I’d rather not talk about it….”
“Of course not. Of course not,” said Miss Marple quickly. “We shall know more, I expect, in the morning” (Christie 16-7).

Here, Miss Marple helps Mrs. McGillicuddy express what she saw on the other train while traveling to St. Mary Mead. Mrs. McGillicuddy expresses intuitive knowledge use because she recognizes the opinion of others, in this case the ticket collector’s disbelief that she witnessed a murder, and shifts from external to internal knowledge when she more firmly believes that she saw what she saw. Part of this conversation is an expression of collective knowledge because Miss Marple expresses her thoughts and feelings that help Mrs. McGillicuddy realize that the ticket collector would think such a sighting to be unbelievable. Also, Miss Marple believes Mrs. McGillicuddy saw the murder and recognizes the importance of her telling others what she saw.

Since 4:50 From Paddington maintains traditional hierarchical, thus masculine, modes of discourse, it was unusual that Bryan Eastley, Alexander’s father, does not exhibit any authorial knowledge in the novel. He does not assign knowledge based on authority, welcome the opinions from others, or wish to hear only the facts. This oddity may be attributed to limbo role—neither a full Crackenthorpe nor outsider. Bryan is not a fixture at the Rutherford Hall and therefore is not believed to hold much information about the comings and goings of its visitors. His son refers to him by his name, Bryan, verses dad, which indicates that his son, who lives away in boarding school during the academic year, does not view his father as much of an authority figure. Intuitive knowledge use shows similar frequency between Miss Marple (19%), Lucy Eyelesbarrow (22%), and Emma Crackenthorpe (14%). The frequency jumps to 38% with Mrs. McGillicuddy because she struggles to recognize her own knowledge as being valid, thus shifting from external knowledge, what she saw happen on the other train, to believing what she saw and convincing others. Miss Marple and Lucy both exhibited the same amount of collective
knowledge use, 59%. Mrs. McGillicuddy exhibited a bit lower frequency with 38%, and Emma Crackenthorpe exhibited the most amongst the four women with 70%. Mrs. McGillicuddy, whose appearance in the novel is limited to the very beginning and ending, having a higher frequency of collective knowledge than Miss Marple and Lucy seems strange. However, she is adamant in expressing her thoughts and feelings about witnessing the murder and getting someone to believe her. Emma, the only living female of the Crackenthorpe family and the caretaker of her father and Rutherford Hall, exhibits the highest of collective knowledge because she adheres to a traditional gendered role for women where she recognizes the knowledge contribution of others. While there are a few instances where she expresses her thoughts and feelings, she typically defers to the male authority. For example, after being questioned by the police regarding the body found in the sarcophagus, Emma Crackenthorpe recalled a letter she received signed by Martine Crackenthorpe:

“What did you do on receipt of this letter, Miss Crackenthorpe?”

“My brother-in-law, Bryan Eastley, happened to be staying with me at the time and I talked to him about it. Then I rang up my brother Harold in London and consulted him about it. Harold was rather skeptical about the whole thing and advised extreme caution. We must, he said, go carefully into this woman’s credentials” (Christie 136).

Here, Emma Crackenthorpe expressed her thoughts to her brother and brother-in-law and then deferred to their authority in keeping the matter secret, at least until prompted by Doctor Quimper.

Findings: Percentage of Authorial Knowledge in 4:50 From Paddington

Received knowers, or those in the authorial knowledge stage, according to Belenky et al.’s *Women’s Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind*, are people who
equate “status with truth,” “there are no gradations of the truth—no gray areas,” and “if a thing is partly wrong, it is worthless” (41). People who are receiving knowledge are in the authorial knowledge mode where they view those in authority positions as being the harbingers of correct knowledge. In my study, one could be in the authorial knowledge mode if he or she received knowledge in a black and white fashion or expressed that kind of factual knowledge to others.

There are three guiding heuristics for authorial knowledge use in 4:50 From Paddington: does this scene reflect behavior where a person assigns knowledge based solely on the authority of another person, does this character welcome opinions from others, and does this character only want to hear the facts from others? The graph below, Figure 4.3, shows the rate of authorial knowledge use by the different characters throughout the novel.

Figure 4.3 Percentage of Character Exhibited Authorial Knowledge Chapters 1-27

For example, Inspector Bacon and Detective Inspector Craddock’s jobs are to gather the facts from others and figure out who committed the murders. Thus, their high percentage of authorial knowledge, 51% and 59% respectively, is expected. They not only embody authority through their jobs, their manner and intent of searching out not only the facts but also opinions of others (under the guise that the person may not know that she knows something) is evident
through most of the novel. One conversation between Detective Inspector Craddock and Inspector Bacon in chapter 20 of *4:50 From Paddington* serves as an example of authorial knowledge:

“Arsenic again?”

“Seems so. Of course it could have been a relapse, but Quimper doesn’t think so and Johnson agrees.”

“I suppose,” said Craddock, doubtfully, “that Alfred was meant to be the victim?” Bacon sounded interested. “You mean that whereas Afred’s death wouldn’t do anyone a penn’orth of good, the old man’s death would benefit the lot of them? I suppose it might have been a mistake; somebody *might* have thought the tea was intended for the old man.”

“Are they sure that that’s the way the stuff was administered?”

“No, of course they aren’t sure. The nurse, like a good nurse, washed up the whole contraption. Cups, spoons, teapot—everything. But it seems the only feasible method.”

“Meaning,” said Craddock thoughtfully, “that one of the patients wasn’t as ill as the others. Saw his chance and doped the cup.”

“Well, there won’t be any more funny business,” said Inspector Bacon grimly.

“We’ve got two nurses on the job now, to say nothing of Miss Eyelesbarrow, and I’ve got a couple of men there, too.” (224)

This scene expresses authorial knowledge for both characters, Bacon and Craddock, because it demonstrates their exchange of factual knowledge. Both investigators discuss what they know about the recent death of Alfred Crackenthorpe. It shows that Bacon welcomed the
opinion of Craddock when he speculates about Alfred being the intended target. In addition, the scene reflects behavior where knowledge is based on the authority of a person. For example, Bacon was aware of the theories of administration of the poison because in his capacity of an inspector he talked with those present but he was not completely sure how it was given. It is indicative of the traditional gendered male roles present throughout the novel because it is the two official male detectives (inspectors) who have the findings of the authorities, such as Johnson, and deduce what occurred.

Prior to my analysis, I believed that Miss Jane Marple would have had the highest percentage of authorial knowledge interaction. She is, after all, Agatha Christie’s long adored female protagonist in numerous novels. Therefore, I was very surprised that her authorial knowledge interaction was similar to the majority of characters, such as Alexander Eastley (23%), and lower than Cedric Crackenthorpe (25%). The two characters who displayed the most authorial knowledge were Inspector Bacon with 51% and Detective Inspector Craddock with 59%. Recall that authorial knowledge assignment was guided by three heuristic questions: Does this interaction reflect behavior where a person assigns knowledge based solely on the authority of another person, does this character welcome opinions from others, and does this character only want to hear the facts from others? Using the guiding heuristic questions it is obvious that authorial knowledge will be attributed to members of the police investigating the murders.

Another surprise is that Emma Crackenthorpe only scored a 16% for authorial knowledge use. I found this surprising because most females, in my opinion, are the keepers of the family secrets. They know what is going on and usually stay connected with various family members and act as a sort of ‘bridge of information.’ For example, when talking to Inspector Craddock, Emma replies, “You have seen three of my brothers. I had another brother, Edmund, who was
killed in the war. Shortly before he was killed, he wrote to me from France” (134). Of all the family members that Edmund could have written to—his parents or his brothers, he chose Emma. In 4:50 From Paddington, Emma’s three brothers scored higher: Alfred 22%, Harold 18%, and Cedric with 25%. One reason why she may have exhibited less authorial knowledge is that when the detectives asked questions she felt a duty to guard her family’s secrets, as exhibited in withholding a letter from Edmund’s wife, Martine. Emma Crackenthorpe’s secretiveness regarding Martine’s letter could be construed as an example of authorial knowledge. She would be adhering to the gendered women’s roles whereby a woman is expected to remain quiet about things outside of her domestic domain. When Inspector Craddock asked why she was not forthcoming with the recent correspondence, Emma responded, “My brother-in-law, Bryan Eastley, happened to be staying with me at the time and I talked to him about it. Then I rang up my brother Harold in London and consulted him about it. Harold was rather skeptical about the whole thing and advised extreme caution” (136). In this instance Emma was the receiver of personal correspondence from Edmund’s long lost wife. She felt obligated to check whether or not she should let the letter be known to the police and consulted family members for their opinions. Another reason may be that her brothers felt free to convey what information they knew, viewing themselves as authorities in their own right. When Inspector Craddock questioned Alfred about Martine’s letter, he got a lot more information than he anticipated:

“This Martine did not at any time apply to you?”

“To me? Good Lord, No. That would have been a laugh.”

“She would be more likely, you think, to go to our brother Harold?”
“Much more likely. His name’s frequently in the papers. He’s well off. Trying a touch there wouldn’t surprise me. Not that she’d have got anything. Harold’s as tight-fisted as the old man himself. Emma, of course, is the softhearted one of the family, and she was Edmund’s favorite sister. All the same, Emma isn’t credulous. She was quite alive to the possibility of this woman being phony. She had it all laid on for the entire family to be there—and a hardheaded solicitor as well” (173)

This interaction demonstrates that Alfred felt very free to tell the inspector about his family’s business, such as, who are the misers in the family, who confides in whom, and who would be the most susceptible to a request for money.

Alexander Eastley’s frequency of authorial knowledge (23%) is a bit astonishing because he is not a dominant character, at least for the purposes of investigation, in the novel. His authorial knowledge frequency is higher than Miss Marple’s (22%) and Lucy Eyelesbarrow’s (19%). His higher frequency is attributed to the curiosity and view of authority attributed to his age. Because he is either a young teenager or near about, he is undaunted by the brutality of the found body and sees the viewing of the body as a sort of adventure for him and his friend, James. Lucy keeps both of the boys occupied by enlisting them to find clues that they take on with gusto. Because of his age, Alexander views every adult as an authority, so he asks many questions to gain knowledge of what is going on and guidance as to what he may do, which he breaks occasionally. Both Alexander and James wanted to go to the inquest regarding the body found on the estate. Having been told no, the family was shocked to see the boys in town after the inquest had ended. “The boys, in spite of aggrieved protests, had been left behind at Rutherford Hall, but they now appeared grinning from ear to ear” (79). “We came on our
bicycles,” said Stoddart-West. “The policeman was very kind and let us in at the back of the hall. I hope you don’t mind, Miss Crackenthorpe,” he added politely (80). “She doesn’t mind,” said Cedric, answering for his sister. “You’re only young once. Your first inquest, I expect?” (80). “It was rather disappointing,” said Alexander. “All over so soon.” (80). In this instance the boys’ curiosity comes through. Nothing was going to stop them from attending the inquest and having done so and learned what they could, they were let down by the lack of further discussion.

Findings: Percentage of Intuitive Knowledge in 4:50 From Paddington

Those who have moved into the intuitive or subjective knowledge perspective are those who “no longer [adhere] to a dualistic perspective on truth and knowing” (Belenky 53). They are “no longer subject to the dictates and whims of external authorities and no longer agreed with what some people thought was a simple matter of right and wrong” (53). “The discovery that firsthand experience is a valuable source of knowledge emerges” (61), and the awareness that absolute truth “will never exist” (63), helps propel those in this stage to acknowledge their experiences, beliefs, and thoughts, as well as recognize those in other people.

Figure 4.4 Percentage of Character Exhibited Intuitive Knowledge in Chapters 1-27
There are two guiding heuristics for intuitive knowledge use in *4:50 From Paddington*: does the character recognize the opinions of others as well as his or her own, and does the scene show a shift from external to internal knowledge? Both are evident in this scene when Lucy Eyelesbarrow responds to Harold Crackenthorpe’s inquiry as to why she looked in the sarcophagus in one of the buildings on the estate:

“Really,” she said in a hesitating voice, “I hardly know….I did feel that the whole place needed a thorough clearing out and cleaning. And there was”—she hesitated—“a very peculiar and disagreeable smell—”

She had counted accurately on the immediate shrinking of everyone from the unpleasantness of this idea (81)

Here Lucy recognizes the opinion of others as well as her own and senses that people would wonder how she found the body, i.e., what made her look into a sealed sarcophagus. She also shows a shift from external to internal knowledge when she decides the best way to get out of discussing the matter further is to mention how awful the smell was of the decomposing body.

Elspeth McGillicuddy (38%), Inspector Bacon (23%) and Lucy (22%) are the characters who exhibited high intuitive knowledge use. It was not shocking to find that Mrs. McGillicuddy scored the highest because she had to work hard to convince others that she witnessed a murder. Therefore it seems reasonable that she would shift from external knowledge, i.e., what she saw, to internal knowledge, i.e., believing what she saw was real and trying to convince others of what happened.

It is interesting that Inspector Bacon (23%) exhibited more intuitive knowledge, 1%, higher than Lucy (22%). Because of his work as a police inspector it is expected that he is searching for just the facts. However, because he is working with Detective Inspector Bacon, he
needs to be open to the opinion of him and his fellow colleagues. He also needs to be able to take in the opinion of others and follow his ‘gut’ in determining if he or she is being truthful.

Lucy Eyelesbarrow (22%) is expected to be high in intuitive knowledge. She is Miss Marple’s woman about town and thus is placed in Rutherford Hall to gather information and weigh that information with both external and external knowledge. For example, when trying to figure out where a murderer would hide a body, Lucy considered what she knew. “There’s a rough lane, alongside a factory wall. He’d probably come that way, turn in under the railway arch and along the back drive. Then he could climb the fence, go along at the floor of the embankment, find the body, and carry it back to the car” (Christie 56). It is a bit unexpected that her percentage of intuitive knowledge use is not higher, mainly because she is one of the few people that interacts with everyone. However, unlike Mrs. McGillicuddy, Lucy did not have to struggle to shift from external knowledge to internal knowledge because she absolutely believed there was a body on the premises of Rutherford Hall. Lucy had assigned the utmost authority in such criminal matters to Miss Marple, and when Miss Marple said Lucy would find a body Lucy believed she would without a doubt.

“When [Belenky et al.] asked subjectivists how they learned best, they frequently mentioned knowledge obtained by observing the self as well as observing others” (85). Despite not having many incidences of intuitive knowledge use, Miss Marple did exhibit this subjectivist type of learning. A conversation with Inspector Dermot Craddock illustrates:

“Really I’m not at all clever, just, perhaps, a slight knowledge of human nature—living, you know, in a village.”

She added, with more composure: “Of course, I am somewhat handicapped, by not actually being on the spot. It is so helpful, I always feel, when people remind
you of other people, because types are alike everywhere and that is such a valuable guide” (Christie 180).

When put to the task, Miss Marple provides examples of her observations and how they fit with her knowledge base:

“All one can do is to observe the people concerned, or who might have been concerned, and see of whom they remind you” (Christie 181).

“Like Cedric and the bank manager?”
Miss Marple corrected her.

“The bank manager’s son, dear. Mr. Eade himself was far more like Mr. Harold, a very conservative man, but perhaps a little too fond of money—the sort of man, too, who would go a long way to avoid scandal” (181).

Reading others in order to meet their needs is part of the traditional gendered female role. Mothers, for example, in anticipating their children’s behavior at a gathering, usually plan ahead and engage in a number of things, from having their children take a nap prior to the activity to bringing along games and snacks to keep them occupied. In 4:50 From Paddington, Miss Marple read those around her, in part with the information that she had obtained from Inspector Craddock and Lucy, and also from her own observations while visiting Rutherford Hall. This observational behavior provided subjectivist learning where Miss Marple demonstrates a shift from externalizing the behavior of others to internalizing that knowledge and applying it to different, yet similar, types of people.

**Findings: Percentage of Collective Knowledge in 4:50 From Paddington**

In the collective or constructed knowledge stage, according to Belenky et al., people “find a place for reason and intuition and the expertise of others” (133). Those in this stage have “learned the profound lesson that even the most ordinary human being is engaged in the
construction of knowledge” (133), and they “understand that answers to all questions vary depending on the context in which they are asked and on the frame of reference of the person doing the asking” (138). Those in the collective/constructed stage of knowing “become aware that questions and answers vary throughout history, across cultures, from discipline to discipline, and from individual to individual” (138).

Figure 4.5 Percentage of Character Exhibited Collective Knowledge Chapters 1-27

The graph above, Figure 4.4, shows the amount of collective knowledge demonstrated by each character throughout the novel. There are three guiding heuristics for collective knowledge in 4:50 From Paddington: Is there an expression of thoughts and feelings, does a character recognize the knowledge contribution of others, and if the character recognizes the knowledge contribution of others, how is it expressed? Collective knowledge was evident when a character expressed his or her own thoughts and feelings, prompted such expression from his or her colleagues, and recognized the knowledge contribution, either authoritative or intuitive, from others. One example is when Miss Marple discusses particulars of the crime with Lucy:
“You know,” said Miss Marple thoughtfully, “it’s really quite a clever way to have planned a crime—and I think it was very carefully planned. There’s something so anonymous about a train. If he’d killed her in the place where she lived or was staying, somebody might have noticed him come or go. Or if he’d driven her out into the country somewhere, someone might have noticed the car and its number and make. But a train is full of strangers coming and going. In a non-corridor carriage, alone with her, it was quite easy—especially if you realize that he knew exactly what he was going to do next. He knew—he must have known—all about Rutherford Hall—its geographical position, I mean, its queer isolation: an island bounded by railway lines” (56).

In this instance, Miss Marple expresses her thoughts regarding the crime and her feelings that it was quite an ingenious way of disposing of a body. She recognizes the knowledge contribution of others and expresses that recognition when she believes Mrs. McGillicuddy’s account of the murder and proceeds to cast her thoughts on where the body would go if the victim is killed on a moving train.

The combined analysis of the instances of collective knowledge percentage-wise in 4:50 From Paddington, show that Bryan Eastley had the highest with 82%, Luther Crackenthorpe was second highest with 80%, and Harold Crackenthorpe came in third with 75%. All three characters are essentially suspects in the initial murder throughout the book. They all expressed their thoughts and feelings, sometimes unprompted, and while they may not have always recognized the knowledge contribution of others in terms beyond correction, they did express the most instances of collective knowledge as a whole.
Bryan Eastley, the son-in-law to Luther Crackenthorpe, has a unique place in the family’s dynamic. He is a part of the family because he was married to Edith Crackenthorpe, Luther’s daughter; however, since Edith died he visits Rutherford Hall on special occasions and is not privy to the inner workings, i.e., the family disagreements, knowledge, and history. When approaching Inspector Craddock on whether or not he should be interviewed he said, “I don’t exactly belong to the family” (104). His high collective knowledge may be attributed to his wanting to know what is going on around him and also to provide some context for Lucy Eyelesbarrow, his love interest. Luther Crackenthorpe, the matriarch of the family, is determined throughout the novel to give his opinion about his family and what is going on to anyone who will listen. Therefore it is not a shock to see that he exhibits the second highest percentage of collective knowledge use.

Inspector Bacon (26%) and Detective Inspector Craddock (32%) did not express much collective knowledge. I had believed that since they were investigators that they would exhibit more collective knowledge use than what they actually did because they questioned witnesses (recognizing the knowledge contribution of others), and would discuss their findings (expression of thoughts and feelings). Upon reflection, both investigators did not express their thoughts and feelings much to others beside themselves, and while they did recognize the knowledge contribution of witnesses and suspects they wanted more facts than feelings.

Similar to my analysis of the Bones series discussed in chapter 3, Belenky et al.’s three stages of knowing, authorial, intuitive, and collective, build on each other and in many ways overlap. The authors state, “In a sense, each perspective we have described can be thought of as providing a new, unique training ground in which problems of self and other, inner and outer authority, voice and silence can be worked through. Within each perspective, although partial
solutions are possible, new problems arise” (134). In *4:50 From Paddington*, incidences of collective knowledge use were evident for each major character. Intuitive knowledge was present, with the exception of Bryan, and was expressed more than authorial knowledge that occurred most often with the two inspectors—Craddock and Bacon. Again, I was surprised at these findings because Miss Marple is supposed to be the main protagonist of the novel. *4:50 From Paddington* is dubbed a *Miss Marple mystery*. Unlike in *Bones* where everyone has some sort of specialized knowledge, *4:50 From Paddington* has generalized knowledge sprinkled between several people. For instance, when Craddock and Miss Marple travel to France to speak with Madame Joliet about one of her former ballerinas, they also converse with other members of the ballet troupe:

“She liked to pretend things—stories about having been the mistress of a grand duke or of a great English financier or how she worked for the Resistance in the war, even a story about being a film star in Hollywood” (157). “Another girl said: “I think that really she had had a very tame bourgeois existence. She liked to be in ballet because she thought it was romantic, but she was not a good dancer. You understand that if she were to say, ‘My father was a draper in Amiens,’ that would not be romantic! So instead she made up things” (157).

Inspectors Craddock and Bacon, Lucy and Miss Marple need to be receptive to other people’s thoughts and feelings in order to gain a better understanding of who is involved, the motivations of those involved, and how the various pieces of information fit together. While this collaboration would seem to follow Ede and Lunsford’s dialogic mode of discourse that aligns itself with Belenky et al.’s intuitive knowledge, it is far more similar to the traditional hierarchical mode of collaboration because hierarchy and attainment of goals is not blurred.
Unlike in *Bones* where the collaboration is dialogic because the “group effort is seen as an essential part of the production—rather than the recovery—of knowledge and as a means of individual satisfaction within the group” (Lunsford 133), in *4:50 From Paddington* the traditional and masculine mode of collaboration, that of hierarchy, is present throughout. It is characterized by structure, goals, and those engaged in the collaboration following set roles that are defined by “someone outside of and hierarchically superior to the immediate collaborate group or by a senior member or leader of the group” (Lunsford 133). “Knowledge in this mode is most often viewed as information to be found or a problem to be resolved. …This mode of collaborative writing is, [they] argue, highly productive, typically conservative, and most often, in [their] experience, a masculine mode of discourse” (133).

In the beginning of the novel, one could argue that Mrs. McGillicuddy broke out of the traditional hierarchy by confiding in her friend, Miss Marple and setting out to gather more information by re-riding the train. Yet, the hierarchical structure prevailed. After Mrs. McGillicuddy witnessed the murder on the parallel train, she contacted the ticket collector and told him what she saw. Then, believing he may not report her account she wrote down what she saw and gave the enclosed message to a porter after she had disembarked from the train to bring to the stationmaster’s office. After no word about the appearance of a body appeared in the newspaper the next morning, Miss Marple took her friend into town to talk to Sergeant Frank Cornish so that he could “pass the information to the proper quarter” (Christie 19). In keeping with the traditional knowledge hierarchy he responded, “you reported it to the railway officials, and you’ve come and reported it to me. That’s the proper procedure and you may rely on me to have inquiries instituted” (20). Upon receiving word that no body has been found and likening her sighting to that of something “less serious” (22), even Miss Marple concludes, “you’ve
reported what you saw—to the railway people and to the police. No there’s nothing more you can do” (23). Mrs. McGillicuddy used the structure that was set in place for reporting a crime on a train. She passed along what she knew to each person involved and shared similar goals. The goal of the authorities was to locate the body, if any, whereas the goal of Mrs. McGillicuddy was to have the body found in order to be believed.

Knowledge acquisition in *4:50 from Paddington* follows a hierarchical model because it is characterized by goals, structure, and those engaged in the collaboration follow set roles that are defined by “someone outside of and hierarchically superior to the immediate collaborate group or by a senior member or leader of the group” (Lunsford 133). A murder is committed, like in *Bones*; however, while Miss Marple and Lucy may find out things and pass along the information to the police, it is Inspectors Craddock and Bacon who have the authority to obtain more information. They have one initial goal—to find the murderer. They have a set structure that utilizes rules and procedures, such as the inquest, to find out additional information and have the ruling of murder to pursue the matter further. They systematically interview all the persons involved and whom they perceive to be involved. Even if Miss Marple is known for being “as sharp and as shrewd as they make them” (Christie 19), she must go through the traditional authority hierarchy to achieve her goals of catching a murderer and proving her friend right.

**Analysis: Multiple Perspectives**

*4:50 From Paddington* is an interesting detective fiction story because traditionally the main protagonist detective is followed throughout the story locating clues and deducing what happened in a flourish is absent. Here, Miss Marple is the expected detective but her “own bodily weakness” (Christie 29) prevents her from “go[ing] here, there and everywhere, making inquiries and finding out things” (29). So she takes the form of an armchair detective where the information is brought to her to parcel out. Miss Marple is not an authority per se; rather, she
has the uncluttered mind and analytical abilities to take what information is before her and extrapolate. For example, when discussing the deceased woman’s body and personal effects, Miss Marple suggests looking into traveling theatrical companies in order to find out her identity: “Touring from place to place and perhaps not many home ties. One of those young women would be much less likely to be missed” (117). Miss Marple does not have a high percentage of authorial knowledge use (22%) because she is not in a recognized authorial position like Detective Inspector Craddock or Inspector Bacon, and she does not assign knowledge primarily based on the authority of a person. She exhibited a high percentage of collective knowledge use because she recognized and welcomed the knowledge contributions from others and expressed her thoughts and feelings to aid in the investigation.

Mrs McGillicuddy is not a detective nor engaged in such activities. She is the sole witness to the murder and thus exhibits equally high intuitive and collective knowledge use (38% and 38% respectively). She recognizes and is often exasperated by the opinions and knowledge expression of others. Conversely, she demonstrates the greatest shift from external to internal knowledge when she commits herself to what she saw on the train.

Detective Inspector Craddock and Inspector Bacon demonstrate the highest authorial knowledge use, 59% and 51%. Their traditional position of hierarchical authority in the novel enables the reader to see the knowledge expression of others when they perform their duties during their investigation. Their authorial knowledge expression is most notable in their conversations with each other where they exchange their ideas and develop further lines of inquiry. However, such exchanges also fall into collective knowledge. One example is the brief interaction between Detective Inspector Craddock and Armand Dessin of the Paris Prefecture.
Craddock has traveled to Paris in an attempt to learn the identity of the body found in the sarcophagus:

“It is an idea only,” Dessin warned him. “I have a picture here of the corps de ballet. That is she, the fourth from the left. It says anything to you, yes?”

“It could be,” he said. “I can’t go further than that. Who was she? What do you know about her?”

“Almost less than nothing,” said the other cheerfully. “She was not important, you see. And the Ballet Maritski—it is not important, either. It plays in suburban theaters and goes on tour. It has no real names, no stars, no famous ballerinas.

But I will take you to see Madame Joliet who runs it” (Christie 153).

In this exchange between two police officers there is an expression of thoughts and feelings, and recognition of knowledge contribution of another.

There are additional perspectives offered by the Crackenthorpe family members, but none have the instances of authorial knowledge the police officers provide. They do, however, have high instances of collective knowledge because they express their thoughts and feelings, and recognize others’ contribution. By offering their beliefs, whether about family history or speculation about the identity of the murdered woman, they contribute to the greater body of information.

**Conclusion**

4:50 *From Paddington* exemplifies the traditional masculine hierarchy in knowledge exchange, despite featuring four female protagonists. The novel keeps to the historical moment in which it was written where men and women had set gendered roles. One elderly lady witnesses a murder on a neighboring train and is thought to be daft by the ticket collector. The one person who believes her is another elderly lady who, instead of letting the male controlled
police force deal with the information given, goes about to locate the body and any surrounding clues. This veer from the traditional feminine role is what Agatha Christie sneaks into her novel. Another example is Lucy Eyelesbarrow. She works as a domestic servant, a very traditional role for women, yet she retains an autonomy that her other female characters in the novel do not possess. Lucy is able to take the jobs she wants, vacation where she wants, and make large purchases without the permission of a male relative. By imbuing her characters with tradition and incorporating small steps outside of the male hierarchy, Agatha Christie was able to sell her work to her readers as an acceptable piece of literature while spreading seeds of hope that the hierarchy could or would change. A radical departure from the traditional hierarchy would not probably have been received well. Yet without the intrepidness of Miss Marple and Lucy Eyelesbarrow, the police would not have even known that a murder had taken place, let alone solved who committed it.

Using Belenky et al.’s feminist rhetorical lenses to examine 4:50 From Paddington helped to illuminate the different modes of knowledge use exercised by Agatha Christie. The novel adheres to traditional masculine hierarchy; however, viewing it with a different rhetorical lens shows that Christie balanced the expectations of the time period where women occupied traditional women’s roles, such as preoccupation with the domestic sphere, while striving to engage in their curiosity, intelligence, and fortitude.

While the women’s ways of knowing approach proved useful and enabled a better understanding of Christie’s novel, in the conclusion of this dissertation I demonstrate the value of this analytical approach to pedagogical practice in composition studies. I discuss how an understanding of women’s ways of knowing could help teachers get a better idea of where their students are in terms of giving and receiving knowledge. It could help teachers understand
where their students fall on the women’s ways of knowing scale—authorial, intuitive, or collective knowing. By turning away from the view of students’ minds being empty pails and the teacher as the pitcher who pours in knowledge, this pedagogical approach would emphasize the different stages and help to create strategizes to recognize that stage and build. In the context of this discussion, I draw on composition scholarship such as Paulo Freire, and other later feminist scholars such as Jacqueline Jones Royster and Gesa Kirsch.
CHAPTER 5: NO BONES ABOUT IT, THE TRAIN OF THOUGHT CONTINUES

“Human behavior flows from three main sources: desire, emotion, and knowledge.”

Plato

The purpose of this dissertation has been to explore how women use rhetorical strategies in detection as it is portrayed in popular detective fiction, such as the television series Bones and Agatha Christie’s 4:50 From Paddington, and whether the Belenky et al.’s women’s ways of knowing feminist rhetorical lens complicate traditional notions of logical detection as described by Dorothy L. Sayers in her connection between detection and Aristotle’s poetics. This was significant to my study because I wanted to learn whether women’s use of rhetorical strategies in detection provide them with agency, empowering them with greater influence over their contexts. I chose detective fiction as my research medium because the genre is inherent with people seeking knowledge and expressing it to others. Additionally, detective fiction provided a fertile area of study because despite its tremendous popularity in western culture, it has not been the subject of significant rhetorical study and analysis. This neglect could result from a prevalent impression that detective fiction is simply passive entertainment that is unworthy of intellectual study of any kind. Indeed, the field of rhetoric and composition is rife with rhetorical studies of political speeches, advocacy literature, literary fiction (Booth, Burke), student writing, and other forms of communication deemed important to history or cultural advancement. Additionally, however, as Royster and Kirsch have pointed out recently, feminist scholars have sought non-traditional texts to look for and reveal unheralded rhetorical feminist voices and reinscribe them into our current understanding of the scope of rhetoric. The work of feminist scholars to discover and reveal voices marginalized as unworthy of or inconvenient to rhetorical study has enlarged, complicated, and, ultimately, enriched our thinking about the scope of rhetorical study. My study
of detective fiction seeks to contribute to this broader movement to challenge the boundaries of
the scope of rhetorical study. I believe such study is valuable because it reveals rhetorical
complexity in information consumed by thousands of people in popular western culture.
Because it is “popular” fiction, never revered for its literary merit, detective fiction has been seen
as insignificant; however, its significant presence and force in popular culture cannot be ignored.
Indeed it does have a strong hold in the collective mindset of contemporary popular culture. Thus,
detective fiction is unique because it has been marginalized from an academic study standpoint
despite being treasured for its entertainment value in popular western culture. This unique
situation makes detective fiction an important area for rhetorical study.

Using a nontraditional rhetorical lens to examine the television series Bones enabled me
to see how the characters pushed for knowledge expression, thus exhibiting Belenky et al.’s
authorial, intuitive, and collective knowledge-making roles. This finding is important when
considering teaching rhetoric and composition because it reminds us of the traditional teacher-
centered mode of learning and the possibilities to promote other invention strategies addressing
all students. Group conversation, asking for individual contributions, and relating experiences
can and do help to ease one out of the authorial mode of learning. Time and an enriching
environment can aid in the transition from authorial to intuitive mode of learning and while these
can support a move from intuitive to collective, it is up to the individual to work on making the
connections and thus the leap to that stage of learning. Clarifying feminist pedagogy, Susan C.
Jarrett draws on Paula Treichler and explains that the “basic practices of feminist pedagogy are
ones it shares with the pedagogical innovations of the process revolution in writing instruction:
the decentering or sharing of authority, the recognition of students as sources of knowledge, a
focus on processes (of writing and teaching) over products. But what makes feminist pedagogy
distinctive is its investment in a view of contemporary society as sexist and patriarchal, and of
the complicity of reading, writing, and teaching in those conditions” (116). Jarrett continues
“Two practices that have become standard within composition are especially useful for
advancing these feminist goals: collaboration and revision. As Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford
explain in *Singular Texts/Plural Authors*, writing collaboratively challenges the notion of an
isolated and autonomous self—a masculinist model—and replaces it with a multivocal, relational
writing process” (Jarrett 124). By recognizing each other’s contributions to discussions in a
classroom setting and promoting knowledge exchange which could lead to revision, Belenky et
al.’s model strives to achieve the feminist goals put forth by Lunsford and Ede. It would be an
interesting research endeavor to bring in one or two detective stories into the classroom and see
how men and women view knowledge exchange and to provide students with an outline of
Belenky et al.’s rhetorical lenses beforehand to see what gets valued in the stories and why.

I acknowledge there are some limits to the type of study I have conducted with these
media. For example, my study does not take into account how characters change over a
significant amount of time because I only looked at a select sample where the characters are
featured. Nevertheless, both the method and results of my study offer new insights into the study
of rhetoric, broadly speaking, as well as the teaching of rhetoric in writing in a classroom setting.

In the remainder of this concluding chapter, I will focus on demonstrating the value of the
women’s ways of knowing analytical approach to both pedagogical practices and research in
composition studies.

**Pedagogical Implications**

The overall theme of women’s ways of knowing is that individuals have knowledge;
however, it is not knowledge in the traditional academic sense of listening to authority, i.e.,
teachers, and taking copious notes. Knowledge gained through experience, such as motherhood,
is recognized. “Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other” (72), Paulo Freire in his Pedagogy of the Oppressed illustrates. Freire’s “banking concept of education [where] knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing” (72) illuminates the long-held hierarchical notion of education. In the banking concept of education, “the more students work at storing the deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world as transformers of that world. The more completely they accept the passive role imposed on them, the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is and to the fragmented view of reality deposited in them” (73).

By not recognizing students’ inherent knowledge and experience, and adhering to the banking concept of education, teachers are indelibly placing individuals in a passive role. Freire’s solution is “to transform [students’ internal] structure so that they can become beings for themselves” (74) and “to achieve this, [humanist, revolutionary educators] must be partners of the students in their relations with them” (75).

If teachers become more aware of Belenky et al.’s women’s ways of knowing—authorial, intuitive, and collective—and where their students would fall in that spectrum of receiving and imparting knowledge, then these “humanist, revolutionary educators” (Freire 75) could work with students as co-creators of their world. Jacqueline Jones Royster and Gesa E. Kirsch’s Feminist Rhetorical Practices: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies supports taking the “pedagogical opportunity” to “build from the ground up” via our classrooms to engage students to “critically, creatively, [and to use] strategically what we know, while being primed to be open to and to expect discoveries as we look critically at ourselves in the context of
others around the globe” (128). Doing so enables educators and students alike to discover new voices in nontraditional places.

Joy S. Ritchie’s, “Confronting the “Essential” Problem: Reconnecting Feminist Theory and Pedagogy,” argues that “the strength of feminism is its ability to hold in tension an array of theoretical and practical perspectives and, thus, to arrive at a clearer understanding of the varied nature of women’s positions” (255). “Feminist classrooms,” according to Ritchie, “are not simply revisionary because they break with canonical content; they are also revisionary because they demand critical rather than solipsistic modes of thought and because they assert an ethical rather than a nihilistic stance” (270). Citing a women’s literature course as a place for “diverse and multidimensional perspectives,” Ritchie explains that such richness results from “the dynamic of the entire course, from students’ reading and interaction and the critical dialogue with lived experience that interaction makes possible” (270), which coincides with Belenky et al.’s argument of women’s ways of knowing.

In “Theoretical, Political, and Pedagogical Challenges in the Feminist Classroom,” Robbin D. Crabtree and David Alan Sapp contend the term “feminist” is “an ethical stance that positions gender concerns as central to culture and power” (131), and “define feminist pedagogy as a set of classroom practices, teaching strategies, approaches to content, and relationships grounded in critical pedagogical and feminist theory” (131). Crabtree and Sapp argue “this pedagogical approach attempts to create new forms of knowledge, grounded in principles of personal liberation, critical democracy, and social equality, and to break down boundaries and create new democratic spaces. Like liberation pedagogy, feminist pedagogy is associated with formalized optimism and is humanizing, offering self-reliance as a goal” (132). Central to feminist pedagogy, they insist, are to “share in the intellectual and spiritual growth of students, to
raise awareness about the world in which students live, to respect and encourage student voices and to help students critically reflect on and analyze their place in society, especially in terms of racism, sexism, oppression, and domination” (132). Similar to Paulo Freire’s push for active learning, Crabtree and Sapp believe that feminist pedagogy practiced in the classroom “results in developing student independence from traditional roles as passive consumers of education and encouraging students to take more responsibility as co-constructors of knowledge and instigators of social change” (132). In addition to developing the necessary skills in “critical thinking, reading, and writing,” Crabtree and Sapp believe that applying a feminist pedagogy also instills the “skills associated with negotiation, assessment, and decision making in a struggle against human suffering, oppression, and exploitation” (132).

Similar to Crabtree and Sapp, Nancy Buffington’s “When Teachers Aren’t Nice: bell hooks and Feminist Pedagogy,” “stresses interaction and connectedness” (4) and argues that the classroom that uses feminist pedagogy “becomes a safe environment where everyone feels nurtured and able to speak and write, where conflicts are resolved and everyone remains connected” (4). Dale Bauer offers a way for students to engage critically in the classroom. In “The Other “F” Word: The Feminist in the Classroom,” Bauer “compel[s] students to work through [their resistance] in literature by confronting fears and values mediated by the form of fiction” (393), for example, assigning Pat Barker’s Blow Your House Down (1984), a detective/murder mystery novel, as a way to examine, discuss, and dismantle cultural stereotypes. Similar to Bauer’s desire for critical engagement, bell hooks argues that “most of what people are learning about gender, race, [and] class [comes] from media and especially movies” and since “one doesn’t have to read or write adequately to watch a film,” they are “the perfect tool” for “teaching critical thinking and critical theories” (hooks and Sealey 148, 157). Using film as a
learning tool necessitates watching it together and helping students “deconstruct […] what’s happening in the film,” which enables them to “see things completely differently” (148). “Film,” according to hooks, is a “site of multiple intentionality and possibility” (157).

While Bauer and hooks do not specifically focus their discussions on the detective fiction genre, they make a case for using film and the mystery genre in the feminist classroom. By analyzing detective fiction in its much older form (the novel) and its newer form (television) with a similar rhetorical framework, my study advocates the use of these media in the writing classroom and shows how its inclusion promotes critical thinking.

Ritchie, Buffington, Bauer, hooks, Crabtree and Sapp echo what Belenky et al. are calling for in *Women’s Ways of Knowing*, finding out what students know and encouraging them to apply their knowledge in a safe environment, such as teaching others in the classroom about a particular topic. These scholars, combined with Freire’s call to move away from the banking concept of education, support Royster and Kirsch’s current movement toward a new framework for feminist pedagogy.

**Research Implications**

Looking back at the traditional rhetorical canon’s 3R’s (rescue, recovery, (re)inscription), Royster and Kirsch rediscovered often overlooked women rhetors by looking at nontraditional rhetorical behavior by women, such as women’s groups, small political activists, and slave narratives (132). This shift of focus helps support my overall research because I have looked to the nontraditional location of popular entertainment, a television show and mystery novel, to demonstrate models of rhetorical behavior. In the beginning of this dissertation I discussed five women who shifted the rhetorical tradition in order to move the field beyond “the exclusive possession of Western, elite, white males” (133) to make and communicate knowledge. The rhetorical maneuvers that these historical figures employed can be seen in the characters I
studied as well. Aspasia communicated her message through male rhetors. In *4:50 From Paddington*, Miss Marple would observe something, such as, noticing the victim’s misshapen toes and realizing she could have been a dancer, and instead of having the power to investigate the finding she conveyed her knowledge to the police. Christine de Pisan used feminine rhetorical practices to reconstruct history and construct a transition of self. Miss Marple embodies Pisan’s allegorical tendencies when she frequently references incidences that have happened in St. Mary Mead to things that have happened or people that she is reminded of during an investigation. Mary Astell reframed claims of inferiority to her advantage. Booth, in the *Bones* television series, often feigned inferiority when dealing with Dr. Brennan. Because of her specialized knowledge base, Dr. Brennan did know more about forensic science than her partner, F.B.I. Special Agent Booth; however, in some circumstances he knew it was better for the situation to let her feel intellectually superior and used those moments to his advantage. Queen Elizabeth practiced reinvention when she admitted her lack of strength but then conceded her strengths. In *4:50 From Paddington*, Lucy gives the impression that she is just hired domestic help and downplays her education. However, when Miss Marple approached her to search for the body, Lucy did not question her own ability to be Miss Marple’s investigator. Sojourner Truth challenged marginalization similarly to Queen Elizabeth, where she subverted constraints and for the most part made them work against themselves. She invoked the most traditional forms of rhetoric—ethos, logos, and pathos. By recovering these once lost voices and reinscribing them into the rhetorical cannon, we have enriched our understanding of the power of rhetoric. Miss Marple resembles Sojourner Truth’s way of subverting constraints to her advantage. Others view her as an old bitty who sips tea and meanders in conversations about village life. However, Miss Marple flips the perceived constraints upon her—age, thinking, and
lack of vigor, to maneuver herself into the lives of her suspects where she keenly observes all that goes on and uses teatime to gather intel.

My study of 450 from Paddington, for example, follows in the footsteps of the feminist movement that sought to reveal and inscribe these important women into the broader rhetorical tradition. Ms. Marple is a fictional character featured in a form of popular entertainment. Perhaps for this reason, she has not been seen as an important voice warranting rhetorical study. Despite the fact that Ms. Marple is not a real person in the world, her real presence in the minds of thousands of readers cannot be denied. Her voice, the strategies she employed to be heard in a world that marginalized voices like hers, and her defiance of her expected cultural role have performed a real and powerful cultural role to entertain, at the very least, but likely also to inspire and provoke new perspectives on what women’s voices can accomplish. The consequences of Miss Marple’s work in 4:50 from Paddington on broader culture are intangible, difficult to pin down and point to, and therefore, studying her rhetoric is inconvenient and complicated. Nevertheless, she is a voice that many have heard and responded to in some way, and like Aspasia or Sojourner Truth before her, she is every bit as worthy of rhetorical consideration.

Royster and Kirsch have shown just how important investigating nontraditional examples of rhetoric can be through their new feminist framework for change that includes critical imagination, strategic contemplation, social circulation, and globalization.

“While many of the new areas of inquiry in feminist rhetorical studies—contributions to community, civic life, public discourse, rhetorical performance and prowess—have been reaching beyond our national borders and our Western heritage, they have still been measured, compared, and held to the standards of
evaluation for Western traditions. Hence, the challenges of global feminist rhetorical inquiry are not just the challenges of acquiring knowledge but also the challenges of how that knowledge is measured and valued. Shifting knowledge is just one piece of the puzzle in re-forming the landscape. Shifting the measures of evaluation is another” (Royster and Kirsch 127).

Taking on this shift in knowledge and evaluation is the adaptations of new rhetorical frameworks in addition to women’s ways of knowing, such as, critical imagination, strategic contemplation, social construction, and globalization. These new rhetorical frameworks put forth by Royster and Kirsch can be seen in the rhetorical examples of Aspasia, Christine de Pisan, Mary Astell, Queen Elizabeth, and Sojourner Truth and in turn the characters I analyze in Bones and 4:50 From Paddington. The historical figures’ rhetorical maneuvers are still being employed to bring the marginalized voices to the forefront. To help illustrate the significance of the moves that I have made in my study by analyzing marginalized texts from a novel analytical framework, I would like to briefly turn to Royster and Kirsch’s feminist framework as a model that performs similar moves.

Critical Imagination

“The use of critical imagination functions as one of several inquiry tools available for developing a critical stance in order to engage more intentionally and intensely in various intellectual processes. The idea is to account for what we “know” by gathering whatever evidence can be gathered and ordering it in a configuration that is reasonable and justifiable in accord with basic scholarly methodologies. The next step is to think between, above, around, and beyond this evidence to speculate methodically about probabilities, that is, what might likely be true based on what we have in hand” (Royster and Kirsch 71).
Much of early feminist rhetoric by women must be examined by using critical imagination, which can be construed as “educated guessing” or hypothesizing, “as a means for searching methodically, not so much for immutable truth but instead for what is likely or possible, given the facts at hand” (Royster and Kirsch 71). This is evident when considering Aspasia of Miletus, c. 410 B.C.E., who is considered to be the first female rhetor. Because all of her accomplishments are second hand through the writings of Plato, Cicero, and Plutarch (Ritchie 1), we must hypothesize about her given what these men wrote about her during an age when most “Athenian women were confined almost exclusively to the home and rarely permitted a public voice or education” (Richie 1). In addition to Aspasia, Sojourner Truth’s life also benefits from using critical imagination.

Few pictures survive to show the illuminating presence that Sojourner Truth cast as a public figure. According to Joy Ritchie and Kate Ronald’s *Available Means: An Anthology of Women’s Rhetoric(s)*, Truth’s body was an extension of ethos. She integrated the reality of her physicality (a dark-skinned African American woman, over six feet tall, with a disfigured left hand, and a booming voice), into her arguments to abolish slavery, the lack of women’s rights, and telling the truth about slavery and racism of the women’s movement (143-44). Yet, when we read her famous “Speech at the Women’s Rights Convention, Akron, Ohio” 1851, commonly referred to as “Aren’t I a Woman,” at face value we would develop a very different perspective of her. Using critical imagination one goes beyond the words on the page and realizes that since Sojourner Truth never learned to read or write, her speeches were transcribed, probably by a white person who may have interjected her own agenda into the transcription (Ritchie 143). Thus a whole new perspective is cast onto the available speeches.
Critical imagination does not just hypothesize about past events; rather it draws on Clifford Geertz’s notion of tacking in and tacking out. “Tacking in” is essentially using longstanding analytical tools to examine “existing resources, fragmentary and otherwise, and existing scholarship to assess what we now understand and to speculate about what seems to be missing” (Royster and Kirsch 72). “Tacking out” is when we are aware of what we do know by traditional means and from there “use critical imagination to look back from a distance (from the present to the past, from one cultural context towards another, from one sociopolitical location to another, and so on) in order to broaden our own viewpoints in anticipation of what might become more visible from a longer or broader view, where the scene may not be in fine detail but in broader strokes and deep impressions” (Royster and Kirsch 72). I advocate for critical imagination to be applied to the detective genre in the writing classroom. The genre is a rich area that encompasses history, cultural mores, and politics, to name a few. Developing the skills to “tack in” and “tack out” using an aspect of detective fiction, for example, women’s roles as investigators in detective fiction during 19th century England, could potentially provide information ranging from the number of women who appeared in traditional detective works to other published stories where women acted as investigators but did not have an assigned role.

My study of the characters from 450 from Paddington and Bones “tacks out” as it examines marginal texts through close textual analysis; from an academic stance, it “looks back” upon a body of work long-considered to be external to the traditional scope of rhetorical analysis. Moreover, the women’s ways of knowing analytical framework provides a novel framework, one that has not typically been used in the way that I have used it for my study, and it therefore has provided a fresh and revealing perspective on a body of work not previously examined. Thus, the fruit of this study has been to reveal new voices to our cannon of rhetorical study and, I
believe, to reveal a vast realm of popular fiction as legitimate and fertile ground for further rhetorical study. Moreover, by leveraging women’s ways of knowing as an analytical framework for studying rhetorical texts, my work on this study has recovered a means of understanding that could be applied to texts that have already been studied from different analytical perspectives, possibly revealing fresh perspectives on these familiar texts.

**Strategic Contemplation**

Taking time to contemplate what one has found and to withhold judgment “in order to make the time to invite creativity, wonder, and inspiration into the research process” is strategic contemplation (Royster and Kirsch 85). By taking one’s time and not judging, the researcher is able to engage in an outward and an inward journey during the research process. The outward journey in strategic contemplation is data gathering. According to Royster and Kirsch it is “looking up, down, under, and around the rhetorical situation in order to take in the sights (e.g., walking the streets, seeing the buildings, examining the scale of things), carefully collecting details, information, experiences, all of which can help researchers better understand a historical period, a place in time and context, a particular rhetorical figure, or a specific practice as it exhibits rhetorical effects” (85). The inward journey is essentially how the researcher reacts. It is how the researcher “process[es], imagine[s], and work[s] with materials; how creativity and imagination come into play; how a vicarious experience that results form critical imagination, meditation, introspection, and/or reflection gets mapped, perhaps simultaneously, as both an analytical one and a visceral one” (85). For example, if one were to gain a better understanding of Mary Astell’s (1666-1731) *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies*, which argued for elevating women’s status through education, not only would one gain a better sense of the material through traditional (outward journey) data gathering, such as reading other socio-political material
written during that time period, one could also focus on the inward journey and imagine herself living at that time period with all the relative restrictions.

Social Circulation

Social circulation is “understanding complex rhetorical interactions across space and time” (Royster and Kirsch 98). This process examines both the use of and power generated from the fluidity of language, which Royster and Kirsch believe “can help us see how traditions are carried on, changed, reinvented, and reused when they pass from one generation to the next” and “enables us to see metaphorically how ideas circulate not just across generations but also across places and regions in local, global, and transnational contexts. It helps us to see how ideas resonate, divide, and are expressed via new genres and new media” (101).

Christine de Pizan (1365-1430), according to Maureen Quilligan in Ritchie and Ronald’s Available Means: An Anthology of Women’s Rhetoric(s), repeatedly uses the words “Je, Christine” (“I, Christine”), which is “a signal mark of Christine’s authority, a ‘signature’ in more ways than one. Christine de Pizan’s claim to authority marks her use of innovative rhetorical conventions and her position as the first woman to support herself by writing—as one of the pioneers in women’s rhetorical history” (32). This illustrates how examining the use and power of language, such as referring to oneself as I, can show a shift in ideas, and thereby exemplifies social circulation. The Book of the City of Ladies, which was modeled on Augustine’s Civitate Dei, helped expand the argument regarding the social roles of women. Through her language Pizan “claimed the authority to “talk back” to men and challenged and resisted misogynist representations of women as evil, inferior, defective, and deficient, instead claiming women’s rights to respect, to education, and to public speech and writing” (Ritchie 32).
Globalization

The basic argument of the globalizing point of view, according to an epigraph by Wendy S. Hesford, cited in *Available Means: An Anthology of Women’s Rhetoric(s)*, “is that our understanding of global feminist rhetorical studies is interwoven with a need to critique our understanding of globalization and global feminist studies over time” (Royster and Kirsch 110). The “challenge has been and continues to be to seek out and consistently enact an agenda that expects and acknowledges a multidimensional sense of diversity as a core value and that does so with both local and global curiosity and respect” (Royster and Kirsch 112). The goal of the globalization point of view is to extend “the boundaries of locally defined assumptions, values, and expectations regarding how rhetorical performance is constituted and valued. The intention in doing so is basic—to shift rather dramatically the scope of conceptual and operational possibilities beyond elite, white, male, European-based habits and measures” (Royster and Kirsch 112). Moving beyond the three R’s (rescue, recovery, (re)inscription) that is one dimension of viewing the canon of rhetoric, to incorporate Belenky et al.’s women’s ways of knowing and Royster and Kirsch’s new framework into the classroom is a way to start shifting how individuals view various rhetorical performances and values (Royster and Kirsch 132). These feminist frameworks look for and rediscover women rhetors where traditional lenses have not. They have explored women’s groups, small political activists, and slave narratives, to name a few, in order to discover new voices. I have sought in my dissertation to move beyond traditional models of rhetorical behavior to shine a light on how women seek and communicate knowledge. Because I used Belenky et al.’s women’s ways of knowing as my feminist rhetorical lens, if I or others were to pursue and expand this research in the future, the Royster and Kirsch framework would be a good place to start.
Critical Imagination Spotlighting Bones and 4:50 From Paddington

Critical imagination, according to Royster and Kirsch, involves taking into “account for what we “know” by gathering whatever evidence can be gathered and ordering it in a configuration that is reasonable and justifiable in accord with basic scholarly methodologies. The next step is to think between, above, around, and beyond this evidence to speculate methodically about probabilities, that is, what might likely be true based on what we have in hand” (71).

Applying Clifford Geertz’s notion of tacking in and out (Royster and Kirsch 72), the initial (tacking in) inquiry would focus on what research scholarship is available. For example, uncovering what has been written previously regarding the television series Bones and the novel 4:50 From Paddington. Depending on the focus of the research, the novels that the Bones television series is based on could be consulted as well. Tacking out would require moving beyond the traditional scholarship and applying one’s critical imagination to look more broadly at the past, present, and various contexts of the work, looking at what was occurring during the time period in which the work originated (72). For example, with 4:50 From Paddington, it would be beneficial to find out what specifically was happening with the women’s movement when it was written and whether or not the movement influenced Agatha Christie’s choices. Finding personal correspondence from the author may shine a light on whether she was conscious of the movement, or whether her publisher pushed for a particular type of story.

Likewise with Bones, how did the television show emerge from the book series, and why is it so vastly different? One of the many benefits of living in the technological age is the advent and access of blogs, Facebook, and websites. How do fans react to Kathy Reichs’ Bones series—both book and television? Do they influence her writing? If so, how? Agatha Christie’s work has maintained a place in popular culture for decades. Why? How do the movie adaptations
differ from the original stories? Why, given the time period in which the stories are written, are they still popular? Were the stories available to all? How did Christie’s novels change over the course of her authorship? Did she emphasize some things more than others? Expanding research beyond the scholarly to include what is available provides multiple avenues to tackle research questions, ideas of context, motives, and alternative viewpoints.

**Strategic Contemplation: Bones and 4:50 From Paddington**

The approach pushes the researcher to take everything into consideration and withhold any judgment while processing the information (Royster and Kirsch 85). The research journey in strategic contemplation calls for an outward journey that happens in real time and space, and keeps with traditional ideas of fieldwork such as archives, city or country where the author worked or the subject is set, and any historical sites (85). The inward journey requires introspection, reflection, noticing the process of gathering information, and to imagine what took place during the production of the materials (85).

Researching *4:50 From Paddington* using this approach would involve fieldwork that would have me walking the streets of England and riding the 4:50 from Paddington train. I would be able to note how it felt to ride a train and imagine the ride during the time period. What would be the sights and smells? How crowded would the train be during the holidays? Do the windows actually open? I could imagine how Agatha Christie might have come up with her idea for the story. I could visit the police station and imagine the reaction of Miss Marple and Elspeth telling the officers of that time of seeing a murder. I could search out where she wrote most of her stories and look up archival documents.

The inward journey of this research approach would involve reviewing all of the field notes and archival documents for *4:50 From Paddington*. Contemplating strategically on the process of gathering the information, noting what was available and where, what was not
available, and imagining what took place when the materials were produced. Posing questions regarding what was happening in England, the world, and Christie’s personal life at the time she wrote *4:50 From Paddington*. Pondering how such events influenced what was written, how accurate was the setting for the story, how popular was train travel at that time period, and what was the sociocultural makeup of the country.

The strategic contemplation applied to studying the *Bones* television series would involve a trip to the 20th Century Fox Studios, Century City, Los Angeles, California to view filming of the series. It would include contacting Far Field Productions, Josephson Entertainment, and 20th Century Fox Television, which are the three production companies associated with the series and interviewing the producers and writers, in addition to viewing the entire series. Because the Jeffersonian is fictional, I would research to see if there are any locations that do forensic anthropology as their primary means of investigation. Further fieldwork would involve contacting a coroner and police department in a large city, probably Los Angeles, to find additional information about a homicide investigation; Finding out who is the first responder; When, if need be, does the department call in experts? Does the coroner’s office have on hand numbers for specialists they consult or is finding them based on a case-by-case basis? I would look to what is happening culturally to see if there is an influence in the writing of the show or vice-versa. I would also note what technologies are available for forensic detection and how realistic is the portrayal on television.

The inward journey of research continues after gathering all the fieldwork notes. I would contemplate the people and processes involved with the production of *Bones*. Speculating about the interplay between real life and fictional portrayal, I imagine what influences the writing and production of the show. What is the sociocultural makeup of the production company? What
are their objectives in producing the show? Is it to entertain, inform, or provide an avenue for advertisements? Has there been growth of characters during the duration of the series, and if so, what prompted it?

**Social Circulation Surrounding Bones and 4:50 From Paddington**

Social circulation is a term of engagement (Royster and Kirsch 101) that is used for “understanding complex rhetorical interactions across space and time” (98), focusing on “the fluidity of language,” power and enduring traditions (101). It “enables us to see metaphorically how ideas circulate not just across generations but also across places and regions in local, global, and transnational contexts. It helps us to see how ideas resonate, divide, and are expressed via new genres and new media” (101). Language, in this approach, “include[s] words, sounds, and images as symbolic representations [and] is the medium for negotiating these various processes of expression, communication, and persuasion and for enabling culturally informed action” (102).

Applying social circulation to 4:50 From Paddington would have me looking at the word choices that Agatha Christie used for expression by her characters. Did certain characters use words that other characters did not? Why? How often did female characters speak? What kind of language did they use and what context? Reading similar stories by other authors at the time would offer a comparison of language. Expanding the search outside of England to other authors of the time period would provide insight on how people in certain situations, in particular countries, and in interesting situations.

*Bones’* language use could be analyzed as well using social circulation. Reviewing transcripts to note what language is used, when it is used and by whom, could offer insight into the power differentials of the characters portrayed in the series. Viewing other similar shows that aired during the broadcast of *Bones* and noting how language is used could provide a way to compare what language is popular vernacular and what is preferential to that particular show. Is
new language being introduced and why? Asking and seeking answers to questions like these can point our thinking in new, fresh directions about the power of language, communications, and, thus, rhetoric. Making such moves, therefore, has the potential to expand our thinking about the scope of rhetorical study and the workings of rhetoric itself.

**Globalization in Bones and 4:50 From Paddington**

Jacqueline Royster and Gesa Kirsch note “we are witnessing now a continuous process of worldwide decolonization and a remaking of paradigms and frameworks in support of all manner of sociocultural imperatives, including knowledge creation” (112). They further argue that “the challenges of global feminist rhetorical inquiry are not just the challenges of acquiring knowledge but also the challenges of how that knowledge is measured and valued. Shifting knowledge is just one piece of the puzzle in re-forming the landscape. Shifting the measures of evaluation is another” (127).

The globalization point of view welcomes new voices and looks beyond traditional models of rhetorical behavior. Popular entertainment models, such as the *Bones* television series, are welcomed with this approach. This approach calls to look at *Bones* and *4:50 From Paddington* from “within our nation, in our communities, in our classroom” (127). How are these works a reflection of our communities? What values are portrayed? Whose values? What do these works say about our nation as an outgrowth of popular fiction? How can these works be incorporated into our classrooms today? What can they teach us about communication, values, and power? The genres of *Bones* and *4:50 From Paddington* provide an insight into the time period they were created. Looking at the results from my research about *4:50 From Paddington*, we see that a woman writer subverted traditional rhetorical means to gain and impart knowledge. Agatha Christie used the literary form of storytelling, the traditional jobs available to women at the time, and knowledge of one’s community (the people of St. Mary Mead in this case) to
communicate knowledge. The values of that time period are evident in the story told—lineage, money, knowledge, and duty, and power is evident in overt and covert forms. Luther Crackenthorpe is believed to have monetary power but it is limited due to his father’s will. Miss Marple is seen as having limited power, however, she is able to use the information she obtains to figure out who has the motive for murder. The police are seen as the absolute authority, yet they turn to Miss Marple for guidance. *Bones*’ focus on forensic science reinforces its value for solving crimes in the 21st Century. Group communication that focuses on scientific language is highly valued and encouraged. Power is disbursed to those that encourage group effort and an unbiased search for scientific facts. The main protagonist’s name may also be the name of the television series; however, the value of knowledge, truth, and cooperation are characteristics of her team members. Booth may have the authority to arrest people, but he does so on the recommendation of the team. The knowledge models I have used in my study contribute to the understandings of the Royster and Kirsch analysis because both encourage acknowledgement of what is known, i.e., the facts, and what is not known, i.e., the intuitive. Both encourage a broader understanding of the knowledge available.

**The New Framework**

Royster and Kirsch’s proposed feminist framework consisting of critical imagination, strategic contemplation, social circulation, and globalization, moves beyond the three R’s of rhetorical inquiry to welcome new points of view, additional values, and voices. It pushes the researcher to examine scholarly and non-scholarly materials with a keen eye, deep thought, and a curiosity to see where it all leads. When applying Royster and Kirsch’s framework, it helps to have a few research questions in mind to get started, so as not to become bogged down with so much information and no way to narrow it. Keeping an open mind, however, enables the researcher to realize a line of inquiry should it present itself.
When researching popular culture, it helps to keep an open mind. Often, popular culture is cast beneath literature as something not worthy of being researched. People forget that popular culture is just culture that is happening now, and it draws and maintains fans. For example, the first publication of a Sherlock Holmes story in Britain in 1887 would be considered popular culture at that time. Popular culture often encompasses the communication, values, and power of that time period and thus offers a glimpse, especially utilizing Royster and Kirsch’s framework, and for my dissertation, Belenky et al.’s women’s ways of knowing, of history’s far reaching effects.

Both *Bones* and *4:50 From Paddington* exhibit and value cooperation. Cooperation in *Bones* is a part of the production of knowledge and can be seen as a masculine mode of discourse (Lunsford 133). There is a hierarchy to the squints’ procedures and while they do engage in a discussion about what they have found, they pass it along to Booth who has the option of acting on what the team found or not. In the beginning of *4:50 From Paddington*, Mrs. McGillicuddy seemingly breaks out of the traditional hierarchical mode when she confided in her friend, Miss Marple, about what she saw on the train. However, the hierarchical model was evident when Mrs. McGillicuddy passed along what she saw to the ticket collector, the porter, and eventually followed up with Sergeant Cornish in St. Mary Mead. Cooperation in *4:50 From Paddington* is more often due to the authorial presence of the police who use their position to elicit knowledge and base their findings on all that they have heard.

Who gets to have knowledge and how that knowledge conveyed is also prevalent in both research mediums. For example, in *4:50 From Paddington*, Mrs. McGillicuddy has the knowledge that a woman has been murdered on a passing train. Despite having this knowledge, she is not believed at first because there is no body to be found, and she could not give a good
description of either the murderer or the victim. In *Bones*, each member of the squint squad has snippets of knowledge but it is not until they come together to discuss each person’s findings are they able to sort out exactly what they know. In “The Mummy in the Maze,” Hodgins figures out that one of the victims has the spore “Atronecium from the Haleahi Nebulae,” which is a Hawaiian orchid hybrid.” In addition, there are “metal particulates.” Angela learns from the F.B.I. that over 100 snakes have been purchased from three pet shops. Gathering around to find another kidnapped girl the team goes through each piece of information and scrutinizes it. Crossing off Hawaii as a possible site, they focus on the particulates, the spore, and where someone would be able to release that many snakes. They likewise take into consideration that the site would need “a steady, continuous supply of dry air” for the mummification process. Taking each piece of information and making “intuitive leaps,” the squints figured the location was a subway that would provide “warm, dry air,” and ventilation. Narrowing down the subways to one near a florist that carries the Hawaiian flower. Cooperation and the conveying of knowledge are the goals of the squint team.

The purpose of my dissertation has been to investigate how women employ rhetorical strategies in popular detective fiction, the ways in which women’s use of rhetorical strategies in detective fiction provides them with agency and knowledge. I applied Belenky et al.’s women’s ways of knowing that focused on three specific practices women use in generating knowledge: authorial, intuitive, and collective. I learned that there is a pattern of women’s use of rhetoric to influence their worlds. Through awareness and creativity, women have couched their arguments in private terms. Through cultural awareness and subversion women have fought to be heard and cause change.
By applying Belenky et al.’s women’s ways of knowing to study the television series *Bones* and Agatha Christie’s *4:50 From Paddington*, I have learned how both female and male characters formulate and communicate knowledge. Other researchers may view my dissertation as a way to examine knowledge creation and use in popular culture. Those in a writing classroom may use my example as a way to engage students in examining a cultural artifact—whether that is a film, short story, letter, or novel. Likewise, I hope my research helps writing teachers view their students in a refreshed light. That each student is not a blank slate waiting and wanting to be filled with scholastic knowledge; rather, a seasoned traveler awaiting new experiences as she moves forward.
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## Character Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bones Characters</th>
<th>Portrayed by Actor/Actress</th>
<th>Number of Episodes</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Temperance “Bones” Brennan</td>
<td>Emily Deschanel</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2005-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Agent Seeley Booth</td>
<td>David Boreanaz</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2005-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Montenegro</td>
<td>Michaela Conlin</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2005-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jack Hodgins</td>
<td>T.J. Thyne</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2005-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Camille “Cam” Saroyan</td>
<td>Tamara Taylor</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lance Sweets</td>
<td>John Francis Daley</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2007-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Millegan</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2005-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Daniel Goodman</td>
<td>Jonathan Adams</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell Bray</td>
<td>Michael Grant Terry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Wick</td>
<td>Carla Gallo</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2008-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arastoo Vaziri</td>
<td>Pej Vahdat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2009-2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Character/Actor Chart (Imdb)

Table 3.1 provides an overview of the characters described in my study, the actors and actresses who portray them, the number of episodes each character appears in, and a timeframe. This chart is to orient the reader to the amount of perceived interaction based on the number of shows the characters were in.
APPENDIX B

Episode Overview

The fifth episode of each of the available six seasons was chosen as part of my data analysis. They are listed here with a brief synopsis to provide the reader with an overview of the episode and storyline.

Season 1.5 “A Boy in a Bush.” A young boy was found murdered in a vacant lot. Bones and Seeley are called in to identify the boy and sift through the possible suspects, including his mother who lied about her relationship with him.

Season 2.5 “The Truth in the Lye.” A man is found liquefied in a bathtub at a construction site. Not only does his boss have a problem with him, so do his two wives and his mistress.

Season 3.5 “The Mummy in the Maze.” A seemingly innocent amusement park during Halloween conjures up real bones when a mummified corpse is found on the premises, causing an investigation that summons the ghosts of girls past when it is learned that several young girls have gone missing the same time of year for several years.

Season 4.5 “The Perfect Pieces in the Purple Pond.” Pieces of a corpse are found in an industrial area, minus the head. The investigative team looks into the victim’s life in order to learn why he died. Note: This episode is technically the fourth of the season because the first two were part of a two-part special.

Season 5.5 “A Night at the Bones Museum.” Charred mummified remains found on an electrified fence lead the team to a murdered Jeffersonian curator.
Season 6.5 “The Bones that Weren’t.” A dancer’s body is found buried at a construction site and the team is put to the test when the concrete is dug up and it appears the majority of the dancer’s bones had disappeared.