

Contents

Learning Goals and Overview

Lesson Plan

Handout 1: Determining the Speaker

Handout 2: Determining the Speaker Key

Handout 3: Sample Summary

Handout 4: “Don’t Blame the Eater”

Handout 5: Student Text Before

Handout 6: Student Text After

Learning Goals

At the close of the workshop, students will be able to:

- Describe the benefits to readers of a writer’s comprehensive, ethical attribution.
- Accurately and fairly summarize a short, provided text.
- Describe the rhetorical benefits of comprehensive, ethical attribution, such as establishing authority, earning readerly trust, supporting claims, and enabling writers to participate in scholarly conversations.

Overview

The workshop consists of three primary activities:

- In order to internalize a reader’s needs for effective attribution, students examine texts whose citations and quotation marks have been removed. Together, they attempt to determine whose voice is present in various moments in the text.
- Students read a text and a summary of it to determine if that summary is fair. Having extracted principles for summarizing as well as features of effective, accurate summary, they then produce their own summaries.
- Students compare a before-and-after set of revised texts to analyze how the use of comprehensive, ethical attribution bolsters authority and rhetorical power.

Lesson Plan

Introduction

Begin by introducing the workshop as a way of examining some of the issues of ethics, authority, and responsibility in writing with research. Acknowledge that while this is decidedly not a how-to MLA or APA workshop, students who want help later with those nuts-and-bolts skills should make an appointment with a Writing Center consultant, or use the archive of citation resources on our website.

Part One: Understanding Readerly Needs

1. **Ask students, “Why do we include quotations and citations in our papers?”** Potential responses include:

- meeting the requirements of a professor or discipline;
- demonstrating that one has read a text or has done research;
- providing evidence;
- providing a trail back to the text; etc.

Record responses on the whiteboard as they are given. Elicit student identification of prevailing themes in the responses:

- *Who are the primary beneficiaries in these responses?*
- *When is it a teacher or external entity?*
- *When is it the reader?*
- *When is it the writer?*

2. **Distribute Handout 1, “Determining the Speaker.”**
 - Foreground the activity that follows as a way to more clearly understand the effects of ethical, consistent citation.
 - Introduce Handout 1 as a student text from which the quotation marks and citations have been removed.
 - Ask students to read the text and identify throughout who is speaking: the student writer himself, a source that’s directly quoted, or a source that’s paraphrased or summarized.
3. **Share out and discuss student perceptions of authorship.**
4. **Distribute and read aloud Handout 2, “Determining the Speaker Key.”** Ask students to articulate the ambiguities in meaning that arise from ambiguities in authorship, such as whether the writer is making an argument or skeptically analyzing someone else’s argument.
5. **Revisit the original question of “Why do we include quotations and citations in our papers?”** Ask students to reflect on their experiences as readers with and without quotations and citations:

- *What changed between the two versions?*
- *What do you understand better?*
- *How did your opinion of the author change?*

Elicit understanding that writers have a responsibility to accurately and consistently cite unoriginal material.

Part Two: Summarizing Effectively

1. **Segue from the benefits of citation to the responsibilities of writers to report sources fairly.**
 - Ask, “What are other responsibilities—beyond citation—of a writer to his/her reader when writing with sources?”
 - Record responses on the whiteboard.
2. **Distribute Handout 3, “Sample Summary.”**
 - Ask one student to read Handout 3 aloud.
 - Facilitate a brief discussion of expectations for the text being summarized:
 - *What do you expect the text that’s described in this writing to sound like?*
 - *What is its main argument?*
 - *What’s its tone?*
3. **Distribute Handout 4, “Don’t Blame the Eater.”** Take turns reading paragraphs aloud as a group.
4. **Guide a stepped discussion to analyze the fairness and accuracy of the summary from Handout 3.** As conversation unfolds, continue to record responses on the board that identify benefits of ethical writing for readers and writers:
 - **Comparing and contrasting:** “What did the summary lead you to believe that was different in the actual text? What did it get right?”
 - **Effects:** “What is the effect on you as a reader now that you’ve read both texts? What do you think about the writer of the summary? The writer of the article?”
 - **Extracting effective features:** “Based on your experience, what are the characteristics of a fair summary?”
5. **Ask students to write their own two-sentence summary of “Don’t Blame the Eater.”** Share out and reflect on these.

Part Three: Exploring Rhetorical Benefits

1. **Transition from responsibilities to the rhetorical benefits available to a writer who uses sources responsibly and ethically.**

2. **Distribute Handout 5, “Student Text Before.”** Ask a student to read aloud. Facilitate a discussion directed at describing the writer and the students’ perceptions of her argument and authority:
 - *Do you trust this writer? Why/Why not?*
 - *Has she established authority?*
 - *What do you need to know in order to trust or believe what she’s saying?*
3. **Distribute Handout 6, “Student Text After.”** Ask students to read quietly to themselves, marking those places where the writer establishes authority and credibility.
 - Discuss responses as a whole group.
 - Elicit understanding of how source use creates authority and communicates that the writer is trustworthy and participating honestly in an active scholarly conversation.

Determining the Speaker

For Berger, this illusion of free will is exactly why the suit might become the classic and easily taught example of class hegemony, for what looks like freedom is actually the cunning elite forcing the naïve masses unknowingly into subservience. Berger goes on to explain that the turn-of-the-century working class, conforming to these norms which had nothing to do with either their inheritance or their daily experience, condemned them, within the system of those standards, to being always and recognizably to the classes above them, second-rate and this indeed is to succumb to a cultural hegemony. Hegemony's power seems to rest in its indirect nature. If people recognize change or manipulation, they immediately resist it; but if it is deeply layered within social relationships, it remains undetectable by the average citizen. It creeps into the minds of the lower classes, removes freedom of choice, and supplants its own ideas, the ideas of the dominant elite.

Determining the Speaker Key

For Berger, this illusion of free will “is exactly why the suit might become the classic and easily taught example of class hegemony” (430), for what looks like freedom is actually the cunning elite forcing the naïve masses unknowingly into subservience. Berger goes on to explain that the turn-of-the-century working class, “conforming to these norms which had nothing to do with either their inheritance or their daily experience, condemned them, within the system of those standards, to being always and recognizably to the classes above them, second-rate [and this] indeed is to succumb to a cultural hegemony” (430-31). Hegemony’s power seems to rest in its indirect nature. If people recognize change or manipulation, they immediately resist it; but if it is deeply layered within social relationships, it remains undetectable by the average citizen. It creeps into the minds of the lower classes, removes freedom of choice, and supplants its own ideas, the ideas of the dominant elite.

Sample Summary

David Zinczenko's article, "Don't Blame the Eater," is nothing more than an angry rant in which he accuses the fast-food companies of an evil conspiracy to make people fat. I disagree because these companies have to make money.

Student Text Before

WANTED

Objects of Desire: Black Girls Need Not Apply

A fetish is a story masquerading as an object.

Robert J. Stoller, M.D., *Observing the Erotic Imagination*

There is an ongoing phenomenon in American society of affluent, high-profile and professionally successful black males marrying white women. Parallel to this is affluent, high-profile, wealthy white males marrying Asian women. Both patterns have been subjected to criticism, intellectual analysis, and debate on radio, blogs, books and beauty salons. Critics of these pairings reject love as the reason for the unions of black males with white women and of white males with Asian women. They offer racism and self-loathing on the part of black males and fetishizing of Asian and white women as more plausible explanations.

Student Text After

WANTED**Objects of Desire: Black Girls Need Not Apply**

“A fetish is a story masquerading as an object.”

Robert J. Stoller, M.D., *Observing the Erotic Imagination*

For over four hundred years in the United States, a combination of law, social restriction and cultural taboo has discouraged interracial marriages from taking place. Up until 1967, most states had laws prohibiting interracial marriages. In 1967 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Loving v. Virginia* that all such laws were unconstitutional. As a recent *USA Today* article notes:

Since that landmark *Loving v. Virginia* ruling, the number of interracial marriages has soared; for example, black-white marriages increased from 65,000 in 1970 to 422,000 in 2005, according to Census Bureau figures. Factoring in all racial combinations, Stanford University sociologist Michael Rosenfeld calculates that more than 7% of America's 59 million married couples in 2005 were interracial, compared to less than 2% in 1970. (Crary, 2007)

The level of attention and debate directed at interracial marriages seems disproportionate to the actual occurrence of interracial marriages. The ongoing debate on interracial marriage is sharp, passionate and critical, taking place on radio programs and Internet blogs, in academic circles, books, beauty salons and barbershops. A quick search of Amazon.com on the topic will bring up several books with provocative titles such as: *Why Black Men Love White Women*, by Rajen Persaud; *Black Men in Interracial Relationships: What's Love Got To Do With It?* by psychologist Kellina Craig-Henderson, and *It Ain't All Good: Why Black Men Should Not Date White Women*, by John Johnson. The focus is not just on interracial relationships, but interracial relationships between black men and white women. Sexual and romantic unions between black males and white females provoke strong visceral and critical reactions from many, but particularly from black women.

Black men are marrying outside their race at nearly triple the rate of black women. In addition, it is the most eligible black men—educated, affluent, high profile and professionally successful—who are disproportionally marrying white women. This is significant because statistical evidence indicates that the pool of eligible, educated and professionally successful black men is very small. The ABC Television news program *Nightline* reported in a December 23, 2009 broadcast that black women outnumber black men by 1.8 million. *Nightline* estimated that if one began with a group of 100 black men, and then subtracted men without high school diplomas, unemployed men, and incarcerated black men between the ages of 25 to 34, there would be only 54 eligible black men left. *Nightline* did not account for the portion of the 100 black men who may be gay, which would further reduce the pool. Forty-two percent of black women have never been married, double the percent of white women who have never been married (Davis & Karar, 2009). The following additional statistics further illustrate how small the pool of eligible educated black men is, especially in comparison to the pool of eligible educated black women:

- High mortality and incarceration rates exist among black men (Crowder & Tolnay, 2000).

- Black women make up 24 percent of the professional-managerial class vs. 17 percent of black men (Cose, 2003).
- Thirty-five percent of black women are enrolled in college vs. 25 percent of black men (Cose, 2003).
- Black men have lower earnings and lower levels of education relative to whites (Crowder & Tolnay, 2000).

Interracial marriage is not limited to black men and white women, as white men are marrying Asian women at a rapid rate. Nicholas Kristof of the *New York Times* (2002) notes that “[a]bout 40 percent of Asian-Americans and 6 percent of blacks have married whites in recent years.” Journalist and blogger Steve Sailer (2003) analyzed the 2000 U.S. Census data and concluded that “18 percent of Asian wives have white husbands.” The black male/white female and white male/Asian female pairings are the subjects of diverse and loaded critical theories that seek to explain the across-racial-line attraction:

Some say the most common black-white pairing—a black man married to a white woman—may be more frequent because of shared feelings of powerlessness. “They both occupy an incongruent status in society,” said Prof. Charles Willie, a black sociologist at Harvard University, who is himself married to a white woman. “They both should be dominant, he because he is male, she because she is white. But because of racism and sexism, they are not respected as dominant.” (Wilkerson, 1991)

The suggestion is that these relationships are not born from genuine “mutual affection” but from other, more powerful economic and socio-psychological influences. Black men are accused of subscribing to Eurocentric beauty standards, of rejecting their own race and of trying to culturally assimilate when they date and marry white women. The central criticism leveled at white men involved with Asian women is that these white men are inspired by fetish fantasies. Black men are also accused of having fetish impulses towards white women. The fetish theory proposes that white and Asian women become fantasy objects regarded with awe, eliciting unquestioning reverence, provoking desire, sparking curiosity and embodying the ideals of beauty (“Fetish,” 2010).

Don't Blame the Eater

DAVID ZINCZENKO



IF EVER THERE were a newspaper headline custom-made for Jay Leno's monologue, this was it. Kids taking on McDonald's this week, suing the company for making them fat. Isn't that like middle-aged men suing Porsche for making them get speeding tickets? Whatever happened to personal responsibility?

I tend to sympathize with these portly fast-food patrons, though. Maybe that's because I used to be one of them.

I grew up as a typical mid-1980s latchkey kid. My parents were split up, my dad off trying to rebuild his life, my mom working long hours to make the monthly bills. Lunch and dinner, for me, was a daily choice between McDonald's, Taco Bell, Kentucky Fried Chicken or Pizza Hut. Then as now, these were the only available options for an American kid to get an affordable meal. By age 15, I had packed 212 pounds of torpid teenage tallow on my once lanky 5-foot-10 frame.

Then I got lucky. I went to college, joined the Navy Reserves and got involved with a health magazine. I learned how to manage my diet. But most of the teenagers who live, as I once did,

DAVID ZINCZENKO is the editor-in-chief of *Men's Health*, a monthly magazine that focuses on fitness. This piece was first published on the op-ed page of the *New York Times* on November 23, 2002.

DAVID ZINCZENKO

on a fast-food diet won't turn their lives around: They've crossed under the golden arches to a likely fate of lifetime obesity. And the problem isn't just theirs—it's all of ours.

Before 1994, diabetes in children was generally caused by a genetic disorder—only about 5 percent of childhood cases were obesity-related, or Type 2, diabetes. Today, according to the National Institutes of Health, Type 2 diabetes accounts for at least 30 percent of all new childhood cases of diabetes in this country.

Not surprisingly, money spent to treat diabetes has skyrocketed, too. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimate that diabetes accounted for \$2.6 billion in health care costs in 1969. Today's number is an unbelievable \$100 billion a year.

Shouldn't we know better than to eat two meals a day in fast-food restaurants? That's one argument. But where, exactly, are consumers—particularly teenagers—supposed to find alternatives? Drive down any thoroughfare in America, and I guarantee you'll see one of our country's more than 13,000 McDonald's restaurants. Now, drive back up the block and try to find someplace to buy a grapefruit.

Complicating the lack of alternatives is the lack of information about what, exactly, we're consuming. There are no calorie information charts on fast-food packaging, the way there are on grocery items. Advertisements don't carry warning labels the way tobacco ads do. Prepared foods aren't covered under Food and Drug Administration labeling laws. Some fast-food purveyors will provide calorie information on request, but even that can be hard to understand.

For example, one company's Web site lists its chicken salad as containing 150 calories; the almonds and noodles that come with it (an additional 190 calories) are listed separately. Add

Don't Blame the Eater

a serving of the 280-calorie dressing, and you've got a healthy lunch alternative that comes in at 620 calories. But that's not all. Read the small print on the back of the dressing packet and you'll realize it actually contains 2.5 servings. If you pour what you've been served, you're suddenly up around 1,040 calories, which is half of the government's recommended daily calorie intake. And that doesn't take into account that 450-calorie super-size Coke.

Make fun if you will of these kids launching lawsuits against the fast-food industry, but don't be surprised if you're the next plaintiff. As with the tobacco industry, it may be only a matter of time before state governments begin to see a direct line between the \$1 billion that McDonald's and Burger King spend each year on advertising and their own swelling health care costs.

And I'd say the industry is vulnerable. Fast-food companies are marketing to children a product with proven health hazards and no warning labels. They would do well to protect themselves, and their customers, by providing the nutrition information people need to make informed choices about their products. Without such warnings, we'll see more sick, obese children and more angry, litigious parents. I say, let the deep-fried chips fall where they may.