# Individual Research

## Long-Term Targets Addressed (Based on NYSP12 ELA CCLS)

I can generate additional questions for further research. (W.7.7)  
I can quote or paraphrase others’ work while avoiding plagiarism. (W.7.8)  
I can select evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research. (W.7.9b)

## Supporting Learning Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Learning Targets</th>
<th>Ongoing Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• I can read to find out specific information.</td>
<td>• Researcher’s notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I can quote or paraphrase others’ work while avoiding plagiarism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Created by Expeditionary Learning, on behalf of Public Consulting Group, Inc.  
© Public Consulting Group, Inc., with a perpetual license granted to Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound, Inc.
## Agenda

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Opening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Return Mid-Unit 3 Assessment Entry Task (5 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Choosing an Ad for Analysis (5 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Reading a Group Text (20 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Synthesizing Your Findings—Teacher Modeling (10 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Closing and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Marking Your Text (5 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Homework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. If needed, finish color-coding in the researcher’s notebook in preparation for writing the End of Unit 3 Assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Continue your independent reading.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Complete Ad Analysis homework, Lesson 8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Teaching Notes

- Mid-Unit 3 Assessments (from Lesson 7, with teacher feedback) are returned in Opening A. Note that students will take notice of one thing they did well on the assessment and one thing they would like to continue to improve.

- In this lesson, students choose the ads they will analyze in their performance task. Although they write a research synthesis (Part I) before writing the performance task (Part II), it is the ad that will determine what they will research, as well as which sources they will choose to synthesize.

- Students work with a partner to create the final performance task. Consider how you want students to be paired: assign pairs yourself, allow controlled choice, etc. To be successful, students will need to collaborate effectively with their partners; consider how your existing class culture and routines can support this.

Note that because students work in pairs, they will create one final product between them.

- After deciding on an ad, students choose a pertinent text to read from the Suggested Texts chart. The texts range in difficulty and complexity. Consider substituting the provided simplified summaries, and/or using the scaffolded vocabulary support, for the two articles from the *New York Times*. “Guys and Dolls No More?” is the most complex. If you decide this text is too complex for your students, consider using it as an extension or challenge activity.

- The texts provided in the Suggested Texts chart are only a small sampling of possible texts to use. Consider gathering more texts based on your students’ needs and abilities.

- To make sure students have access to the source they need to best address their supporting research question, consider making a few extra copies of each source.

- After reading their texts and marking important details, students work with a partner. As in previous lessons, students should talk out their ideas before writing them down. This exercise is meant to improve the coherence of their ideas and subsequently their notes.

- During Work Time C, students use the Model Research Synthesis to get a better understanding of the expectations for their research and final product. The teacher helps students see how each paragraph in the model paraphrases a different source using a displayed model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Teaching Notes (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Finally, students use colored pencils to make note of relevant research questions, sources, and details from those sources in their researcher's notebook. This exercise will also help them prepare for the End of Unit 3 Assessment that begins in the next lesson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In advance:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Decide on student pairings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Assess students’ Mid-Unit 3 Assessments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Prepare the packet of ads for students to choose from. Suggested ads are provided in Lesson 3 supporting ; however, choose any ads available based on your professional judgment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Post: Learning targets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individual Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Vocabulary</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| synthesis         | • Mid-Unit 3 Assessment (from Lesson 7; returned in this lesson with teacher feedback)  
                    • Ad for Analysis (from Lesson 3; one packet per student)  
                    • Researcher’s notebook (from Lesson 2; one per student)  
                    • Researcher’s roadmap anchor chart (begun in Lesson 4)  
                    • Suggested Texts chart (one to display)  
                    • Document camera  
                    • “Men Are Becoming the Ad Target of the Gender Sneer” (suggested text #1) (enough for one per student)  
                    • “Guys and Dolls No More?” (suggested text #2) (enough for one per student)  
                    • “Geena Davis, Media Equalizer” (suggested text #3) (enough for one per student)  
                    • “Body Image and Eating Disorders” (suggested text #4) (enough for one per student)  
                    • Model Research Synthesis (one per student and one to display)  
                    • Model Research Synthesis: Annotated version (for teacher reference)  
                    • Colored pencils (three colors per student)  
                    • Ad Analysis homework, Lesson 8 (one per student) |

Opening

A. Return Mid-Unit 3 Assessment Entry Task (5 minutes)

- As students enter, greet them and hand back their corrected Mid-Unit 3 Assessments. As an entry task, ask students to look over the assessment and put a star next to something they did well. Then, ask them to circle something they need to work on as they continue researching.
- Invite students to turn and talk with a partner about what they starred and circled.
- Remind students to remember these skills as they continue their research.
## Work Time

### A. Choosing an Ad for Analysis (5 minutes)
- Hand out the Ad for Analysis and ask students to choose the ad they want to analyze in their performance task.
- Explain that they are doing this now so they can determine how to proceed with their research today. It will also help them choose which sources they will read in class today.
- Encourage students to choose an ad that jumps out at them as surprising, fascinating, or shocking— one to which they have a strong reaction—this will help make the research and analysis engaging and interesting.

### B. Reading a Group Text (20 minutes)
- Ask students to take out their researcher’s notebook.
- Direct students’ attention to the researcher’s roadmap anchor chart and ask them to identify where they think they are right now. Listen for students to say: “Evaluating Research,” or Step 5. Remind them that periodically pausing to think about what they have learned so far and what else they need to research is an important step in the research process.
- Project the Suggested Texts chart on a document camera.
- Based on the ad they chose in Work Time A, have students select a text to read today. Place the suggested texts on a central table and invite students to pick up their chosen text:
  - “Men Are Becoming the Ad Target of the Gender Snee”
  - “Guys and Dolls No More?”
  - “Geena Davis, Media Equalizer”
  - “Body Image and Eating Disorders”
- Arrange students in pairs. Students’ choice of text does not have any bearing on whom you pair them with.
- Explain to students that they will now loop back on the researcher’s roadmap. Remind them that this is an important part of the process and not a step backward.

## Meeting Students’ Needs
- If you have struggling readers, direct them to “Body Image and Eating Disorders.” This is a simple bulleted fact sheet.
- Consider assigning heterogeneous groups.
- Consider suggesting that pairs split the longer articles and each read a page during this time.
### Work Time (continued)

- Ask a student to explain how reading a text for research is different from reading a novel. Listen for students to articulate that when you read for research, you skim for the gist and identify the sentences that relate to your supporting research questions. You go back and read these parts more closely to thoroughly understand them and paraphrase them. Remind students that this sometimes means reading around those parts (i.e., the sentences that come before and come after them) to make sure students really understand.

- Direct students to write down the pertinent Works Cited information from their chosen text in their notebooks.

- Ask students to starting reading their text, skimming and rereading when necessary, marking the text for details or facts they think are important enough to paraphrase their own words.

- Assure students they will have time to talk through the facts they identified with their partner, but they must work silently on their own first for the next 10 minutes.

- As the students work, circulate to assist. Consider joining a struggling reader or individually conferencing as needed.

- After 10 minutes, instruct students to share what they marked with their partners. Working together, they should paraphrase the pertinent information and write it in their researcher’s notebook under Section 4. Encourage them to paraphrase it orally first to improve the coherence of their notes.

- If pairs finish early, they can read another article and enter it into the notebook under Section 5.

### C. Synthesizing Your Findings—Teacher Modeling (10 minutes)

- Direct students to Section 3 in their researcher’s notebook.

- Ask a student to define *synthesize* (bring together different parts to make a whole). Explain that in Lesson 9 they will write summary paragraphs on what they have learned from their research. This will be their end of unit assessment. The ideas they have been diligently paraphrasing will be the parts they will organize together.

- Praise them for diligently paraphrasing and avoiding plagiarism.

- Distribute and display the Model Research Synthesis using the document camera.

- Explain that you modified the overarching research question for the model from: “How do advertisements use gender roles to use products?” Instead, this model answers the question: “How do advertisements use *language* to sell products?”

- Students will benefit from seeing how the model was constructed while still being able to think when they write.

- Ask students to read along silently as you read the Model Research Synthesis aloud.
**Work Time (continued)**

- When you’re finished, reread the first sentence. Point out that this sentence answers the overarching research question: “How do advertisements use language to sell products?” Annotate the displayed model by writing: “answers overarching research question” above the first sentence; ask students to do the same.

- Continue to annotate the model, focusing on how each paragraph summarizes a single source. See **Model Research Synthesis: Annotated version (for teacher reference)** in the supporting materials. Also point out that the very same paraphrased sentences you modeled for them in Lesson 5 have been arranged in Paragraph 1. (They are underlined.) By paraphrasing what they have learned, they have already done much of the work in this paragraph.

---

**Closing and Assessment**

**A. Marking Your Text (5 minutes)**

- Distribute three different **colored pencils** to each student. Instruct students to spend a few minutes reading through their researcher’s notebooks.

- Ask them choose one color of pencil to circle one source that they’ll use in their research synthesis in Lesson 9.

- Then, ask them to use the same color to circle the paraphrased notes that they’ll use to address the research question associated with that source.

- Repeat this for two other sources, having students use a different color for each supporting research question and its relevant information.

- Remind students that once they choose a source, they do not have to use all the notes from that source. Research is about choosing which notes best answer the overarching research question, and best help them analyze the ad they have chosen.

- Hand out the **Ad Analysis homework, Lesson 8** and explain that this is the same type of work that was assigned in Lesson 3.

---

**Homework**

- If needed, finish color-coding in the researcher’s notebook in preparation for writing the End of Unit 3 Assessment.

- Be sure to continue your independent reading.

- Complete Ad Analysis homework, Lesson 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Texts</th>
<th>Topics Discussed in the Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. “Geena Davis, Media Equalizer,” New Moon Girls, July/Aug. 2012.</td>
<td>• Female stereotypes and gender roles in the media, especially television and film</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Men are becoming the ad target of the gender sneer

By COURTNEY KANE

Published: January 28, 2005

 ARE today’s men incompetent, bumbling idiots? Judging by portrayals in some advertising, the answer seems to be yes—much to the dismay of some men.

The portrayals began as a clever reversal of traditional gender roles in campaigns, prompted by the ire of women and feminist organizations over decades of ads using stereotyped imagery of an incompetent, bumbling housewife who needed to be told which coffee or cleanser to buy.

As those images disappeared, the pendulum swung, producing campaigns portraying men in general, and husbands and fathers in particular, as objects of ridicule, pity, or even scorn. Among them are ads for Bud Light, Domino’s, Hummer, T-Mobile, and Verizon.

The “man as a dope” imagery has gathered momentum over the last decade, and critics say that it has spiraled out of control. It is nearly impossible, they say, to watch commercials or read ads without seeing helpless, hapless men.

In the campaigns, which the critics consider misandry (the opposite of misogyny), men act like buffoons, ogling cars and women; are likened to dogs, especially in beer and pizza ads; and bungle every possible household task. Most marketers presenting incompetent, silly male characters say their campaigns provide a harmless comedic insight into the male mentality while also appealing to women. But men who describe themselves as rights activists are increasingly speaking out against the ads as a form of male-bashing, especially when the ads disparage the roles that fathers play in their children’s lives.

“You can’t routinely denigrate a given segment of the population mercilessly,” said Richard Smaglick, a founder of an organization known as the Society for the Prevention of Misandry in the Media, which runs fathersandhusbands.org, a Web site. “We’re trying to wake up the industry to get business leaders to recognize that this isn’t the way to build relationships with their customers.”

Some critics label the campaigns a reaction to the political correctness that makes it no longer permissible to use stereotypes of women.

Paul Nathanson, who wrote “Spreading Misandry: The Teaching of Contempt for Men in Popular Culture,” with Katherine K. Young, said the issue was larger than just what was presented in advertising.
Men Are Becoming the Ad Target of the Gender Sneer

“Negative imagery in advertising is part of negative imagery in popular culture in general,” Dr. Nathanson said. “If you add up the way men are presented in popular culture, then it is a problem because the message is that that’s what men are.”

Then there are the longer-term effects, Dr. Nathanson said, asking, “How do boys form a healthy identity?” if they are constantly exposed to anti-male stereotypes.

Martyn Straw, chief strategy officer at BBDO Worldwide in New York, part of the Omnicom Group, offered an explanation.

“In advertising and in general communications,” Mr. Straw said, “there is the notion that things that are ‘negative’ are always much funnier than ‘positive,’ which can get very schmaltzy.”

“In order to not cross over the line into denigration,” Mr. Straw said, the situation portrayed in an ad needs to be truthful and funny. If those elements are in place, he added, “it’s not really bashing, it’s just having a funny look at the way men work sometimes and the way they approach things.”

Critics have compiled lists of ads they deem offensive. One Web site, Standyourground.com, in cooperation with the Men’s Activism News Network, lists 30 brands it asks men to avoid buying because of what they regard as male-bashing advertising; the list includes Budweiser, Hummer, J. C. Penney, and Post-it notes.

One of the companies most cited is Verizon Communications, for a commercial for its Verizon DSL service created by McGarry Bowen in New York. The spot shows a computer-clueless father trying to help his Internet-savvy daughter with her homework online. Mom orders Dad to go wash the dog and leave their daughter alone; the girl flashes an exasperated look of contempt at him.

A Verizon spokesman, John Bonomo, said, “It was not our intention certainly to portray fathers as inessential to families.” The commercial has run its scheduled course, he added, and is no longer appearing.

In many ways, said Ann Simonton, coordinator of Media Watch in Santa Cruz, Calif., an organization that challenges what it considers to be racism, sexism, and violence in the media, such commercials play on stereotypes of both sexes. For instance, speaking of the Verizon spot, Ms. Simonton said, “One might be able to interpret the women as being very nagging.”
Men Are Becoming the Ad Target of the Gender Sneer

(Suggested Text #1)

Summary

A new trend in advertising is to portray men as stupid, foolish, and clumsy. This new portrayal began as a reaction to criticism that women were often portrayed in ads as incompetent, and needing to be told what to do. Now, many people consider the “man as a dope” to be reverse sexism, a form of “male-bashing.” This is particularly troublesome to people who believe this view of men in ads makes a negative comment on men’s ability to be effective parents.

Marketers defend this portrayal of men as simply a way of adding humor to the advertisement. Others, however, wonder if young male viewers will be able to find positive role models in these kinds of ads. Many view it as a larger problem: the fact that negative stereotypes of both men and women dominate American advertising.

Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ire</td>
<td>anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pendulum</td>
<td>a metaphor for public opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>momentum</td>
<td>movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapless</td>
<td>incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misandry</td>
<td>hatred of men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misogyny</td>
<td>hatred of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denigrate</td>
<td>to demean or put down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schmaltzy</td>
<td>sickeningly sweet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guys and Dolls No More?
(Suggested Text #2)

By Elizabeth Sweet

IMAGINE walking into the toy department and noticing several distinct aisles. In one, you find toys packaged in dark brown and black, which include the “Inner-City Street Corner” building set and a “Little Rapper” dress-up kit. In the next aisle, the toys are all in shades of brown and include farm-worker-themed play sets and a “Hotel Housekeeper” dress.

If toys were marketed solely according to racial and ethnic stereotypes, customers would be outraged, and rightfully so. Yet every day, people encounter toy departments that are rigidly segregated—not by race, but by gender. There are pink aisles, where toys revolve around beauty and domesticity, and blue aisles filled with toys related to building, action, and aggression.

Gender has always played a role in the world of toys. What’s surprising is that over the last generation, the gender segregation and stereotyping of toys have grown to unprecedented levels. We’ve made great strides toward gender equity over the past 50 years, but the world of toys looks a lot more like 1952 than 2012.

Gender was remarkably absent from the toy ads at the turn of the 20th century but played a much more prominent role in toy marketing during the pre- and post-World War II years. However, by the early 1970s, the split between “boys’ toys” and “girls’ toys” seemed to be eroding.

During my research into the role of gender in Sears catalog toy advertisements over the 20th century, I found that in 1975, very few toys were explicitly marketed according to gender, and nearly 70 percent showed no markings of gender whatsoever. In the 1970s, toy ads often defied gender stereotypes by showing girls building and playing airplane captain, and boys cooking in the kitchen.

But by 1995, the gendered advertising of toys had crept back to midcentury levels, and it’s even more extreme today. In fact, finding a toy that is not marketed either explicitly or subtly (through use of color, for example) by gender has become incredibly difficult.

There are several reasons gender-based marketing has become so prevalent. On a practical level, toy makers know that by segmenting the market into narrow demographic groups, they can sell more versions of the same toy. And nostalgia often drives parents and grandparents to give toys they remember from their own childhood.
Such marketing taps into the deeply held beliefs about gender that still operate in our culture; many parents argue that their daughters and sons like different things. This is particularly true for boys: parents tend to stick with gender-typed toys for boys, either because they understand that the social costs for boys who transgress into the “pink” zone are especially high in a homophobic culture or because of their own desire for gender conformity.

This becomes a self-reinforcing cycle: As toys have become more and more gender segregated, the social costs of boundary crossing and the peer pressure to stay within the lines are huge, for kids and parents alike.

But if parents are susceptible to the marketers’ message, their children are even more so. In a study on parental toy purchases led by the psychologist Donna Fisher-Thompson, researchers who interviewed parents leaving a toy store found that many bought gender-typed toys because their kids had asked for them, and parents were a bit less likely to choose gendered toys—at least for girls—on their own.

Moreover, expert opinion—including research by developmental and evolutionary psychologists—has fueled the development and marketing of gender-based toys. Over the past 20 years, there has been a growth of “brain science” research, which uses neuroimaging technology to try to explain how biological sex differences cause social phenomena like gendered toy preference.

That’s ridiculous, of course: It’s impossible to neatly disentangle the biological from the social, given that children are born into a culture laden with gender messages. But that hasn’t deterred marketers from embracing such research and even mimicking it with their own well-funded studies.

For example, last year the Lego Group, after two decades of marketing almost exclusively to boys, introduced the new “Friends” line for girls after extensive market research convinced the company that boys and girls have distinctive, sex-differentiated play needs.

Critics pointed out that the girls’ sets are more about beauty, domesticity, and nurturing than building—undermining the creative, constructive value that parents and children alike place in the toys. Nevertheless, Lego has claimed victory, stating that the line has been twice as successful as the company anticipated.

The ideas about gender roles embedded in toys and marketing reflect how little our beliefs have changed over time, even though they contradict modern reality: Over 70 percent of mothers are in the labor force, and in most families domestic responsibilities are shared more equitably than ever before. In an era of increasingly diverse family structures, these ideas push us back toward a more unequal past.
Guys and Dolls No More?
(Suggested Text #2)

Summary

Toys in American are rigidly divided in how they are marketed between “boys” and “girls.” This division has not always been a problem, but since the 1970s, the market for “boy toys” versus “girl toys” has increased, and is now at levels we have never seen before.

There are several reasons why this is occurring. One is that marketers are aware that if they can market strictly to smaller groups such as “girls” and “boys,” they can sell more versions of the same toy.

In addition, marketers are also tapping into beliefs in America that are still strong about the differences between boys and girls. This results in a cycle: Families feel threatened if their boy or girl plays with toys that are not for “boys” or “girls”; they buy gender-specific toys; the marketers make more gender-specific toys; and so on. In fact, the children themselves are more likely to buy gender-specific toys than their parents are.

There has been a growth of research that scientists believe documents that difference in gender lies in the brain. Marketers have used this research to develop even more gender-specific toys, even though gender differences are both biological and social. The Lego Group, for example, recently developed a girl-specific line of Legos. Some people feel this line doesn’t allow girls to have the same constructive and creative relationship with Legos that boys do because of how the Legos are marketed.

The article makes the final point that in the home and in the workforce, the relationship between males and females is more equal than ever before. However, gendered toys push our ideas about gender equality backwards.
Guys and Dolls No More?
(Suggested Text #2)

Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>domesticity: having to do with the home</th>
<th>conformity: fitting in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unprecedented: never seen before</td>
<td>susceptible: easily affected by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equity: equality</td>
<td>phenomena: events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prevalent: widespread</td>
<td>deferred: put off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demographic: having to do with human populations</td>
<td>distinctive: individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nostalgia: a longing for the past</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transgress: to go beyond the set limits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homophobic: afraid of homosexuality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When little girls and boys watch movies and TV, what ideas do they develop about girls and women? Actor Geena Davis didn’t like what she saw, so she took action. She started the Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media (seejane.org), which works to improve the images of girls and women in children’s media. As an actor, Geena is known for playing strong female roles—check out the movie *A League of Their Own* (she’s in an all-women baseball league), or the 2005–06 TV series “Commander In Chief,” in which she plays the first female U.S. president. Geena shared her activist inspiration with *Daughters*, a NMG sister publication that’s now a website (daughters.com) with great advice for parents of girls and girl advocates.

“My eyes were really opened when I started watching preschool television with my daughter when she was about two years old. I noticed that there weren’t nearly as many female characters as male characters. It seemed that on the majority of young children’s programming, even on public television, my daughter and the other children watching didn’t see a world like the real one, in which girls and women make up half of the population. And the female characters that did appear were too often covered with bows and jewelry and cared a great deal about their appearance.

“I kept watching, and got more and more frustrated. I saw that the majority of TV shows, videos, and movies designed specifically for children—whether the shows were animated, live-action, or puppets—are dominated by male characters and male stories. Studies have shown that in large part we learn our self-worth by seeing ourselves reflected in the culture. What message are we sending to girls and boys? It’s just as important to me for my two boys to see girls playing vital roles in the stories they watch. My sons will most likely be husbands and fathers, and I want them to value women as much as I want my daughter to feel valued.”

Read these facts from the Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media and do your own research as you watch family movies and TV. Don’t forget to check animated animals: How many are girls? How many are boys? Ask questions about the roles girls play.

- Males outnumber females 3 to 1 in family films, even though females make up a little more than half of the population in the United States. This male-female ratio is the same as it was in 1946!
- Females are almost four times as likely as males to be shown in sexy attire and nearly twice as likely as males to be shown with a tiny waistline.
- Females also are underrepresented behind the camera. In a study of more than 1,500 content creators, only 7 percent of directors, 13 percent of writers, and 20 percent of producers were female.

Reprinted, with permission, from New Moon Girls magazine; New Moon Girl Media, Duluth, MN. www.newmoon.com
Body Image and Eating Disorders
(Suggested Text #4)

Media and Marketing Promote Impossible Physical Standards

• A life-size Barbie doll would have a 16-inch waist.¹

• Action figures, such as G.I. Joes, have “bulked up” in recent years.² Boys today rate these new, more muscular figures as healthier than the old ones.³

• A study of 500 models found that almost half were malnourished, according to World Health Organization standards.⁴ The average American woman is 5' 4" tall and weighs 140 pounds. The average American model is 5' 11" tall and weighs 117 pounds.⁵

Increased Body Dissatisfaction

• An increasing number of reality TV shows such as ABC’s Extreme Makeover glamorize dramatic changes to physical appearance and have been criticized for promoting unhealthy body image.⁶

• In one study, more than half of boys ages 11–17 chose as their physical ideal an image only possible to obtain using steroids.⁷

• Television shows continue to feature impossibly thin actors in lead roles.⁸

• Discontent with how we look starts young. About 42% of first- to third-grade girls want to be thinner⁹, and 81% of 10-year-olds are afraid of being fat.¹⁰

Dangerous Ideals

• Most magazines airbrush photos and use expensive computer technology to correct model’s blemishes and hide their figure flaws.¹¹

• One out of every 150 girls between the ages of 14 and 16 years suffers from anorexia nervosa—bulimia is considered to be more common.¹²

• 55% of teenage girls and 25% of teenage boys reported dieting in the previous year.¹³

• Over one-half of teenage girls and nearly one-third of teenage boys use unhealthy weight control behaviors such as skipping meals, fasting, smoking cigarettes, vomiting, and taking laxatives.¹⁴
Media and Marketing Are Linked to Body Dissatisfaction and Eating Disorders

- Adolescent girls’ discontent about body image is directly correlated to how often they read fashion magazines.¹⁵
- Viewing television commercials leads to increased body dissatisfaction for both male and female adolescents.¹⁶
- After television was introduced in Fiji there was a significant increase in eating disorders among adolescent girls.¹⁷
- Research shows that ads featuring thin models increase women’s negative feelings about themselves, but also increase the positive image of the brands being advertised. Women report being more likely to buy products from ads with skinny models than ads showing average models.¹⁸
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Language has a very strong influence on the target audience of consumers, especially when it uses gendered language or persuasive techniques in language.

According to Duke Today, researchers have determined that language geared toward men or women in job ads can indicate whether men or women typically work in that job. Duke Today reports that no participant in the study demonstrated that they were aware of the impact of gendered language. Researchers, Duke Today reports, believe that “it’s likely that companies unintentionally place gendered job advertisements.”

Ads can appeal to our emotions (pathos), our logic (logos), or our sense of values (ethos). The language they use can cause us to feel sad, happy, or empathetic; it can provide scientific-sounding evidence, or counter-arguments; or, it can assure us that the company is not just out for our money, but really cares for us (Renee Shea, The Rhetoric of Advertising, www.apcentral.com).

Ads can even target our socio-economic class. A recent study done at Stanford University concluded that expensive potato chips used language on their bags to target upper-class customers, using more difficult language and more claims about health. (http://www.stanford.edu/~jurafsky/freedmanjurafsky2011.pdf)
Language has a very strong influence on the target audience of consumers, especially when it uses gendered language or persuasive techniques in language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First sentence answers overarching research question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>According to <em>Duke Today</em>, researchers have determined that language geared toward men or women in job ads can indicate whether men or women typically work in that job. <em>Duke Today</em> reports that no participant in the study demonstrated that they were aware of the impact of gendered language. Researchers, <em>Duke Today</em> reports, believe that “it’s likely that companies unintentionally place gendered job advertisements.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ads can appeal to our emotions (pathos), our logic (logos), or our sense of values (ethos). The language they use can cause us to feel sad, happy, or empathetic; it can provide scientific-sounding evidence, or counter-arguments; or, it can assure us that the company is not just out for our money, but really cares for us (Renee Shea, <em>The Rhetoric of Advertising</em>, <a href="http://www.apcentral.com">www.apcentral.com</a>).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ads can even target our socio-economic class. A recent study done at Stanford University concluded that expensive potato chips used language on their bags to target upper-class customers, using more difficult language and more claims about health. (<a href="http://www.stanford.edu/~jurafsky/freedmanjurafsky2011.pdf">http://www.stanford.edu/~jurafsky/freedmanjurafsky2011.pdf</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ad Name/Description: ____________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions about Meanings and Messages</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is this ad about (and what makes you think that)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What ideas, values, information, and/or points of view are overt? Implied?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is left out of this message?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What techniques are used?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Why were those techniques used? How do they communicate the message?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How might different people understand this message differently?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What is my interpretation of this and what do I learn about myself from my reaction or interpretation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>