Close reading:
1. Read with a pencil in hand, and annotate the text. This entails “underlining or highlighting key words and phrases – anything that strikes you as surprising or significant, or that raises questions – as well as making notes in the margins.”
2. Look for patterns in the things you’ve noticed about the text – repetitions, contradictions, similarities.
3. Ask questions about the patterns you’ve noticed – especially “how” and “why.”
   a. Textual/literal questions – meaning is found directly in the text; you can literally put a finger to the answer in the text.
   b. Inferential – meaning is found between the lines of the text; thus, readers should interpret, reason and analyze the elements of the text.
   c. Thematic – readers must move beyond the lines of the text to connect to universal ideas and themes.
4. Make connections to other texts you read/watched or life experiences.
5. Circle and define new or unknown vocabulary words.
6. Look for bias. Describe the tone the author uses. What does the bias or tone suggest about the author’s attitude toward the issue?
7. Highlight the sentence that contains the main idea and the conclusion of the piece.
8. Underline three main details and write Detail 1, 2, 3 next to each of these sentences.

The first part of literary analysis is pulling things apart to see how they work. More importantly, students must also be able to evaluate these workings or interpret why the audience should care about them. In other words, interact with texts in three ways:

   • Factual—the who, what, when, where of a text
   • Inferential/Inductive—the how or why of a text
   • Analytical—the so what, or application of ideas from the text.

Summary (use the academic summary format):

• Start with a strong IVF statement (I – identify the title, author, source and date of publication; V – use a strong verb; F – finish with a clear main idea). Use MLA style for punctuation (“Minor Titles” vs. Major Titles) and format.
• Expand on the main idea from your IVF statement using specific details (the ones you underlined in the text) and vivid examples (1-2 for each detail).
• Restate the author’s conclusion that should reveal the significance of the piece.
• Remember summaries must remain neutral. Do not add any personal information.

Are cell phones dangerous?
The scientific consensus has long been that they are not – though recently, some troubling research has led to new doubts. As soon as mobile phones began hitting the market in the 1980s, concerns were raised that the electromagnetic radio waves they emit might cause brain tumors and other types of cancer. But as cell phones became ubiquitous, at least a dozen major studies found no such link. The Food and Drug Administration said recently that three large epidemiological studies since 2000 showed “no harmful effects” from cell phone use, and the World Health Organization holds a similar view. The theory that cell phones pose health risks, says Dr. Eugene Flamm, chairman of neurosurgery at New York’s Montefiore Medical Center, “defies credulity.”

What’s the basis of that contention?
Cell phones emit non-ionizing radiation, waves of energy that are too weak to break the chemical bonds within cells or to cause the DNA damage known to cause cancer. There is simply no known biological mechanism to explain how non-ionizing radiation might lead to cancer. But some researchers say that the lack of a known mechanism does not rule out the possibility that one exists and has yet to be understood. They also say that older studies on cell phone safety contained a major flaw.
Some effects can be long-term and dormant for a period of time.

Details:
- **Why?** Teens are the ones who are often first adopters of new tech. They are addicted to their phones.
- **What does the industry say?**
  - Citing the authority of the World Health Organization, cell phone companies say the technology poses no known risks and requires no precautions. They also stress that radiation levels from cell phones fall well within government safety guidelines. “The overwhelming majority of studies that have been published in scientific journals around the globe show that wireless phones do not pose a health risk,” says a spokesman for the Wireless Association, the leading industry trade group.
  - But cell phone makers and service providers are nervously awaiting the results of an ambitious international research effort, called Interphone, on the health impact of cell phone use being conducted by WHO’s International Agency for Research on Cancer. The study, culling and analyzing data spanning more than a decade from 13 countries, is expected to be published later this year.

What does the industry say?

Detail 2: Why? Teens are the ones who are often first adopters of new tech. They are addicted to their phones.

Details:
- **Why?** Teens are the ones who are often first adopters of new tech. They are addicted to their phones.
- **What does the industry say?**
  - Citing the authority of the World Health Organization, cell phone companies say the technology poses no known risks and requires no precautions. They also stress that radiation levels from cell phones fall well within government safety guidelines. “The overwhelming majority of studies that have been published in scientific journals around the globe show that wireless phones do not pose a health risk,” says a spokesman for the Wireless Association, the leading industry trade group.
  - But cell phone makers and service providers are nervously awaiting the results of an ambitious international research effort, called Interphone, on the health impact of cell phone use being conducted by WHO’s International Agency for Research on Cancer. The study, culling and analyzing data spanning more than a decade from 13 countries, is expected to be published later this year.

What does recent research show?

- Two major studies have found an association, though not a causal relationship, between cell phone use and certain cancers. Last year, the American Journal of Epidemiology published data from Israel finding a 50 percent higher risk of cancer of the parotid, a salivary gland near the ear, among habitual cell phone users. A Swedish analysis of 16 studies in the journal Occupational and Environmental Medicine showed a doubling of risk for acoustic neuroma, a tumor that occurs where the ear meets the brain, after 10 years of heavy cell phone use. “There are some very disconcerting findings that suggest a problem,” says Dr. Louis Slesin, editor of Microwave News, an industry publication that tracks the research, “although it’s much too early to reach a conclusive view.”

So it’s safe to say that many people are going to be concerned about the info about the cell phone risks. Will some countries exclude long time cell phone use or use for kids and teens?

- Many experts say it will raise new red flags. They’re basing that expectation on the fact that some of the countries involved in the study, including Israel and Sweden, have already gone public with their own results. A recent analysis by Swedish oncologist Dr. Lennart Hardell looked at 10 European studies published between 2001 and 2007, most of which will also be part of the Interphone study. Hardell found “a consistent pattern of association” between certain brain cancer studies in five Northern European countries and found a “significantly increased” risk after cell phone use of more than 10 years.

What is the flaw?

- As the FDA itself acknowledges, most of the studies examined cell phone use over a period of about three years – not long enough to rule out the possibility of long-term effects. “It takes at least 10, 20, or 30 years to see exposure to cancer,” says Israeli neuroscientist Dr. Siegal Sadetzki. She points out that it took decades before scientists could prove that people exposed to radiation at Hiroshima had a much higher incidence of brain tumors. Critics also say that the studies have largely ignored the impact of cell phones on teenagers and preteens, whose developing brains may be more vulnerable, especially since many of them tend to use cell phones for hours every day (see box).
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So what should consumers do?

- Nobody is saying we should all throw away our cell phones. But many health experts have stepped forward in recent months to say they now have enough concern that they are advising users to take some precautions – such as using speaker mode or earpieces, rather than holding the phone directly to your head. Just last week, the director of the prestigious University of Pittsburgh Cancer Institute, Dr. Ronald Herbeman, warned his faculty and staff to limit cell phone use because of the possible cancer risk. Herbeman cited a “growing body of literature” – including unpublished studies – that link long-term cell phone use to adverse health effects, though he acknowledged the findings are far from conclusive. “We shouldn’t wait for a definitive study to come out,” Herbeman said, “but err on the side of being safe rather than sorry later.”

Worrying about the kids

- Advocates who worry about cell phones’ impact on human health say they’re most concerned about children, who face a lifetime of exposure. “They may be much more affected,” says Dr. Paul Rosch of New York Medical College. “Their brains are growing rapidly, and their skulls are...
thinner.” Some researchers are now advising that pending further study, children should use land
lines to speak to friends, and use cell phones only in emergencies. Dr. Siegal Sadetzki, the Israeli
researcher, says, it’s reasonable to assume that whatever harmful effects cell phones produce
“will accumulate,” so children are particularly at risk. That doesn’t mean banning cell phones, she
says, but finding ways to reduce radiation exposure among users. “Nobody will stop using this
technology. There are car accidents and still we keep driving cars,” she says. “The question is,
what precautions do we take?”

Source: The Week  August 8, 2008

What is the author’s purpose?
The author writes to inform the reader about the possible harmful effects of cell phone use.

Who is the intended audience?
Cell phone users, general public that is considering a cell phone purchase

Summary example:

Published in The Week on August 8, 2008, the article “Do Cell Phones Cause Cancer?” by the editorial staff explores the concerns about the electromagnetic radio waves emitted by cell phones that “might cause brain tumors and other types of cancer.” Recently released studies, supported by The Food and Drug Administration and the World Health Organization, “showed ‘no harmful effects’ from cell phone use.” The kind of energy that cell phones emit is not mutagenic; it is too weak to cause any change to cells. Yet, some scientists express concern for there might simply not be enough information for humans to fully understand the effects of non-ionizing radiation in cell phones. Due to the short term nature of these studies, the long-term effects may be largely neglected which means teenagers and children may be impacted the most without realizing it. “A Swedish analysis of 16 studies in the journal Occupational and Environmental Medicine showed a doubling of risk for acoustic neuroma, a tumor that occurs where the ear meets the brain, after 10 years of heavy cell phone use.” Not surprisingly, the cell phone industry sides with the recent studies and claims “no precautions” are necessary. However, these companies “are nervously awaiting the results of an ambitious international research effort, called Interphone, on the health impact of cell phone use being conducted by WHO’s International Agency for Research on Cancer.” As a result, the author cautions the reader to “err on the side of being safe rather than sorry later.” Banning cell phones might be impossible in today’s technological word, yet the consumers should be aware of the possible harmful effects and take all possible precautions.

I know a bunch of people who are not going to part with their precious phones even if it is for their own good.