While reading the first article, I felt bombarded by studies that showed that college students felt that their peers are “overly” or “too” sexual. The writer then assumed that this meant that college students *actually are* engaged in high sexual activity. This is a typical case of an individual misinterpreting the study. Just because college students *feel* as if their peers are engaged in high sexual activity does not mean the *actually are*. Some of the content I didn’t agree with, and other pieces of it seemed biased. Then I read the second article (correcting the first). This article actually dug deeper into the research and had better backups for their claim. They clarified what the Washington Post’s article stated, and then proved why the author’s assumptions were untrue. The writing and logic flowed better and seemed more easily understood.

Both articles were well written, but when reading Freita’s and then Hess’s article, Freita’s starts to show some weaknesses in backing up claims and making assumptions.