Creating Perspectives

Unit Overview

During this year, you have explored the idea of perspective by learning about and applying various critical lenses to literary texts. All of these perspectives allow you to view texts through a particular set of ideas or assumptions, in effect reading the texts differently depending on the perspective being explored. Looking at real events, rather than literary texts, poses the different but related challenge of discerning which version of reality is closest to the objective truth. This challenge is particularly significant in the context of how the media relate events. From reporting a war in a foreign country to covering a local city council meeting, the media have an obligation to report news events in a manner that is balanced, representing the facts of the story in an objective manner. In this unit, though, you will explore how the meaning of something is seldom limited to its facts. You will be asked to analyze the reporting of events, looking at all aspects of the reports. This unit asks you to become an active rather than passive viewer of journalistic texts, recognizing that journalistic reporting, like a literary text, needs to be read or “decoded” carefully.

Essential Questions

How do media sources impact our understanding of the truth and significance of an issue?

How can media texts be constructed to support an agenda or interpretation?
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Learning Focus: Exposing Perspectives

Gone are the days when Americans relied on just the major national television news networks and local TV news in the United States. Twenty-four-hour news stations have filled the cable channels, and competition for viewers has never been greater. Additionally, countless magazines vie for attention on the racks at supermarkets and in newsstands. Local city newspapers and nationally distributed papers compete for market share. Countless sites devoted to news have cropped up on the Internet, and numerous chat rooms and Web logs (blogs) devoted to current events have been established. With so many sources for news available, individuals have the opportunity to select their news sources. This raises a number of interesting questions, though: How do you know the news from all these sources is true? What drives the selection process? Which sources are most reliable? How can bias be detected? Is bias a problem?

We are not passive consumers of media; rather, as active participants we bring our own sets of interests, experiences, assumptions, and biases to what we read, see, and hear, as do those who produce what we read, see, and hear. When we care about an event, we want to know how to determine what is true about the event and how to get close to that truth. However, recognizing our own filters—those personal interests, experiences, assumptions, and biases—and how they significantly impact our ability to discern the truth is important.

Recognizing the filters of the media source is equally important. In earlier levels, you studied how nonfiction visual texts use techniques such as primary and archival footage to explore their subjects. You also examined how biased language and rhetorical slanders can be used to construct a representation of a subject. And you also looked at how cinematic techniques such as lighting and camera angles influence the representation of a subject in a film. In nonfiction media, the journalist is both camera and director, choosing what to focus on and how to present it. In this way, the journalist has as much power as the film director to shape images and opinion, to create verbal and actual pictures, and to adapt and edit. These choices often consciously reflect or can be read through a particular critical lens. Your job in Embedded Assessment 1 will be to expose how the coverage of an event reflects or is shaped by one such lens. In a sense you will become the journalist, reporting on a critical perspective that shapes or is revealed in the work of others.

Independent Reading: You have read a variety of texts throughout this level. For independent reading for this unit, choose a genre you like and a subject that you would enjoy reading about. Read something just for your enjoyment.
Essential Questions

1. How do media sources impact our understanding of the truth and significance of an issue?

2. How can media texts be constructed to support an agenda or interpretation?

Unit Overview and Learning Focus

Predict what you think this unit is about. Use the words or phrases that stood out to you when you read the Unit Overview and the Learning Focus.

Embedded Assessment 1

What knowledge must you have (what do you need to know) to succeed on Embedded Assessment 1? What skills must you have (what must you be able to do)?
Complete the following graphic organizer with information about current events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Event</th>
<th>Details/Facts I Know About the Event</th>
<th>Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Event</td>
<td>Details/Facts I Know About the Event</td>
<td>Information Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Event</td>
<td>Details/Facts I Know About the Event</td>
<td>Information Sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Read the following terms and list what you know about the meaning of each term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Bite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constructing Public Opinion

SUGGESTED LEARNING STRATEGIES: Quickwrite, Marking the Text

In a most ordinary moment on a normal day at work in the Chicago bureau of a major national newsmagazine, I came to a realization that has bothered me ever since. Everyone knows how much power the press has in shaping the news, how its choice of stories and words influence readers. But one afternoon, talking about a rather silly feature story we were doing on pop culture, someone joked, “You know, we can start a trend just by calling it a trend!”

I stopped dead. It was true. But I was the only one not laughing.

Of course, this was hardly an original insight. Walter Lippman—journalist, military intelligence specialist during World War I, propagandist, political scientist, author, and adviser to the presidents—made the same observation a generation ago. These words from his book, Public Opinion, bear repeating:

Every newspaper when it reaches the reader is the result of a whole series of selections.... In order that [the reader] shall enter he must find a familiar foothold in the story, and this is supplied to him by the use of stereotypes. They tell him that if an association of plumbers is called a “combine” it is appropriate to develop his hostility; if it is called a “group of leading businessmen” the cue is for a favorable reaction. It is in a combination of these elements that the power to create opinion resides.

Why is it so easy to lead people into new behaviors, desires, and attitudes? Why don’t people think more critically and see through some of the airy media stories that have no real substance—the stories that are less news than public relations or marketing? As Lippman noted, it’s the result of “apathy, preference for the curious trivial as against the dull important, and the hunger for sideshows and three-legged calves.”

These days, sideshows and curious trivia have actually gained even greater importance in an industry that has become a confusing mix of news and entertainment. Still, there are people who would like to pay attention to the more consequential events and issues that used to be called news. These can

ESSAY
In general, you should vary the length of your sentences. Too many lengthy sentences tend to wear the reader out. Too many short sentences become dull and monotonous. Now and then, however, a writer can use a series of short sentences to grab readers’ attention.

Notice the second paragraph in this article. It is very short compared to all the other paragraphs, and it comprises three very short sentences. Those short sentences set off in a paragraph by themselves stop us, the readers, in our tracks, forcing us to think about what the writer is saying. She is saying, “Pay attention! I am worried (‘not laughing’) about the way the press’s choice of stories and choice of words shape culture.”

As you write, think about the lengths of your sentences, not just as a way to create variety, but also as a way to create power and emphasis.
be hard to discern when politics itself has become trivialized.¹ Hence the need to become intelligent news consumers: to learn how to pick through massive fields of information for substantive² and fair reporting.

This is a tall task. The manipulation of public opinion is of great importance to both the government and the media. And it takes on added urgency in the months before an election.

Last year [2001], veteran CBS newsman Bernard Goldberg shocked the media world with his book, *Bias: A CBS Insider Exposes How the Media Distort the News*. He minced no words in laying out the fundamental problem. “The old argument that the networks and other ‘media elites’ have a liberal bias is so blatantly true that it’s hardly worth discussing anymore,” he writes. “No, we don’t sit around in dark corners and plan strategies on how we’re going to slant the news. We don’t have to. It comes naturally to most reporters.... When you get right down to it, liberals in the newsroom see liberal views as just plain ... sensible, reasonable, rational views, which just happen to coincide with their own” (emphasis added).

Consider this exchange from [Cable News Network] CNN’s *American Morning* show. The panelists are talking about the quality of the reporting from the Middle East. Anderson Cooper says, “On both sides of this issue, people see this so clearly one way or the other. It’s really fascinating.” Paula Zahn: “And it clearly colors their reaction to reporting, and I think it’s, you know, very difficult for people to separate their own personal views from the way they interpret the news.” Jack Cafferty: “The news media is [sic] only objective if they report something you agree with.” Zahn: “Right.” Cafferty concludes: “Then they’re objective. Otherwise they’re biased if you don’t agree, you know.”

For these three CNN personalities, the news media themselves are impervious³ to the predispositions and prejudice that afflict their audience. But contrary to what CNN might have us believe, bias is a real problem. You can see it in all the ways the media interpret, frame, and produce the great issues of our day. They slant the news according to their ideologies and find sources who will back them up. Over my 23 years with a newsmagazine, it often did a good—sometimes very good—job of reporting and analyzing news and its impact. But sometimes it didn’t. Sometimes the editors assigned reporters to a story that had been preconceived in the New York headquarters—a story with a foregone conclusion. . . .

In a world of media spin, it’s not easy to keep one’s own balance. First, know what your core values are, what you hold to be objectively true. Be discriminating in your selection of news sources and carefully scrutinize
everything you hear and read—see how it resonates with what you believe.

Note how news gatherers select subjects and how they cover them. What photographs do they choose? Do their accounts sound slanted, or do they present compelling voices from both sides of an issue?

Notice their sources: Do you hear from the same set of “experts” again and again? I find this especially annoying. The newsmagazine I worked for is still using some of the same old liberal “news analysts” they used when I first arrived in the Midwest bureau more than two decades ago. And you see them all over television news as well. When the topic is Catholicism, the networks all call on the same dissident priests and ex-priests, feminists, and “Catholics for a Free Choice”: Andrew Greeley, Eugene Kennedy, Charles Curran, Richard Sipe, Frances Kissling, and so on. Paula Zahn has continually used Sipe as the go-to expert on the troubles within the Church, always describing him as a “retired priest.” He’s an ex-priest, Paula. There’s a difference.

“They don’t want our new, fresh sources when they’ve got the regulars who give them the quotes they want,” Ruderman says, sharing my observation that the major media, like the newsmagazine we worked for, have all taken the easy route of using dog-eared Rolodexes to call on the same talking heads. “They never wanted my sources when they didn’t fit the mold of what they wanted the story to say. They had a preconceived idea of the status quo, and so they would always go to the status-quo sources for their standard comments.”

It’s interesting how much of Lippman’s analysis from 70 years ago still applies to the media. In the foreword to the 1997 edition of Public Opinion, Ronald Steel recalls that from a young age, Lippman studied politics and the press. “In Liberty and the News he concluded that the newspaper stories of one of the seminal events of the century (the Russian Revolution) were distorted and inaccurate, based not on the facts but on the ‘hopes of the men who composed the news organization.’”

Lippman then posed a more fundamental problem, as Steel relates: “How could the public get the information it needed to make rational political judgments if it could not rely on the press? Unbiased information had become essential, he argued, because ‘decisions in a modern state tend to be made by the interaction, not of Congress and the executive, but of public opinion and the executive’... For this reason the accuracy of news reporting, the protection of the sources of public opinion, had become the ‘basic problem of democracy.’”

The power of public opinion, which is supposed to be the driving force behind most important decisions in a democracy, can itself be driven or steered by the prejudices of unofficial opinion-makers. Vigilance and self-awareness are its only protection. Which is why, wherever they get their news, intelligent citizens will take nothing for granted except their principles.

4 *status quo*: the existing condition or state of affairs
by Tyler Cohen

Both left-wing and right-wing commentators lament media bias. The right wing cites the predominant Democratic orientations—often 80 to 90 percent—of major journalists. The left wing cites the right wing pundits, such as Rush Limbaugh, or the growing success of Fox News.

Why do the major media sometimes slant to the left, and other times slant to the right? The answer is simple: viewers want them to. We look to the media for entertainment, drama, and titillation before objectivity. Journalists, to get ahead, must produce marketable stories with some kind of emotional slant, which typically will have broader political implications. The result: it looks like media bias when in fact journalists, operating in a highly competitive environment, are simply doing their best to attract an audience.

Consider the [2003] war with Iraq. Leading up to the war, and during the fighting, CNN and other American media treated the Bush regime with kid gloves. We saw little of the civilian casualties that filled news screens around the world. Yet after the war the American media appear to be far more critical of the Bush plans. Almost every day [in late 2003] we hear about suicide bomb attacks, and until lately we have had little exposure to rebuilding progress in Iraq.

What happened? Has the media changed its collective mind about our foreign policy? Maybe, but a simpler explanation operates. In each case the media chose the presentation that made for the best story. “Heroic American fighters” was the best and most marketable story before and during the major fighting. “Suicide bomber attacks” has proven to be a forceful story in the last few months. “American soldiers rebuilding schools” doesn’t draw as big a crowd. In fact recently the pro-war side has done better by pushing “outrage that war critics neglect progress in Iraq” as a slant.

The media appear obsessed with personal scandals, such as the victims of toxic waste dumps, or women whose breast implants have poisoned their bodies.... The media thus appear to be hard on corporations, sympathetic to government regulation, and, as a result, “left-wing.” But again, they are looking for a good and marketable story, and yes this includes Monica Lewinsky. Journalists are seeking to advance their careers more than a political agenda.

1 titillation: excitement or stimulation
2 Monica Lewinsky: the intern whose relationship with President Bill Clinton helped lead to Clinton’s impeachment trial and subsequent acquittal

Writers use rhetorical questions to focus readers’ attention. The writers do not expect answers from their readers; they intend to answer the questions themselves.

Note the rhetorical question that introduces the second paragraph in this article. The question identifies the topic of the paragraph and the second sentence begins to provide the answer.

The third paragraph begins with two questions—the first fairly open and the second more specific. This rhetorical technique is used to draw the reader to the topic of the paragraph one step at a time.
For purposes of contrast, look at crime. Crime, and crime victims, make among the most compelling stories. Remember the obsession with the [Washington] DC area sniper case? Not surprisingly, people who watch TV receive the impression that crime is very high, if only because they see so much crime on TV. The contrasting reality is that most people in America lead very safe lives. Nonetheless the “left-wing” media appear to take a “right-wing” stance when it comes to warning us about crime, again in search of a better story.

Media favor coverage that can be packaged. The OJ trial, for instance, had dramatic developments with some frequency, regular characters, and a fairly simple plot line. It resembled a daily soap opera, and not surprisingly it was immensely popular on TV. For similar reasons, serial killers will receive attention disproportionate to their number of victims.

Some economic points have an especially hard time getting a fair shake from the media. It is easy to show how a government program put Joe Smith back to work. Arguably the expenditure was a waste, once we consider the “hidden costs of opportunities foregone,” but this abstract concept does not make for an easy visual, much less a good interview. In similar fashion, the media do little to show the benefits of free trade.

In sum, media bias may not be as harmful as many people think. It is perhaps sad that we do not look much to the news for objective information, but this same fact limits the damage that slanted coverage can cause. Keep in mind that many definitions of media bias mean that the media think one way, and the citizenry thinks another way. So clearly the media have not succeeded in forcing us all into the same mold.

We should resist the temptation to think that the TV screen, or the newspaper Op-Ed page, or the blogosphere for that matter, is the critical arena deciding the fate of the world. In reality, these media are a sideshow to the more general human preoccupation with stories. We use TV and other media to suit our personal purposes, not vice versa. No, the media are not fair, but they are unfair in ways different than you might imagine. They are unfair because you, collectively, as viewers, want them to be unfair.

3 OJ trial: O.J. Simpson, a famous retired football star and a movie actor, was tried and eventually acquitted of killing his wife and another person in 1994.
After discussing the two articles, reflect on the following questions.

1. How much did your opinion before reading the two essays influence your perspective on which author was more persuasive regarding media bias?

2. How much did your opinion before reading the two essays influence your perspective on which author was more correct regarding media bias?

3. What’s the difference between being persuasive and being correct?

4. In general, to what extent does our perspective on what is correct influence our perspective on what is persuasive and vice versa?

5. Based on the two articles and on your previous experience analyzing media, what are some specific things you can look for that reveal bias in a text you are reading, watching, or listening to?
While writers and directors can influence our perspective on a subject through the use of selection and omission, source control, and other manipulations of content, rhetoric itself may be the most powerful tool through which our perceptions can be influenced. In addition to the use of titles and labeling (and loaded language in general), the following rhetorical slanters (adapted from Brooke Noel Moore and Richard Parker’s *Critical Thinking*, 8th ed, 2007) identify key techniques often used by writers.

**Rhetorical analogy:** The use of a figurative comparison (sometimes a simile or a metaphor) to convey a positive or negative feeling toward the subject.

*Example:* “The environment needs global warming like farmers need a drought.”

**Rhetorical definition:** The use of emotively charged language to express or elicit an attitude about something.

*Example:* Capital punishment is “government-sanctioned murder.”

**Rhetorical explanation:** Expressing an opinion as if it were fact, and doing so in biased language.

*Example:* Joe “didn’t have the guts to fight back” as compared to Joe “did not take a swing.”

**Innuendo:** The use of language to imply that a particular inference is justified, as if saying “go ahead and read between the lines.”

*Example:* “Think carefully about whom you choose; you want a president who will be ready to do the job on day one.”

**Downplayers:** The use of qualifier words or phrases to make someone or something look less important or significant.

*Example:* “She got her ‘degree’ from a correspondence school.”

**Hyperbole:** The use of extravagant overstatement.

*Example:* “This school administration is fascist!”

**Truth Surrogates:** Hinting that proof exists to support a claim without actually citing that proof.

*Example:* “There’s every reason to believe that . . .”

**Ridicule/Sarcasm:** The use of language that suggests the subject is worthy of scorn.

*Example:* “. . . the news media themselves are impervious to the predispositions and prejudice that afflict their audience.”
### Writing Prompt

Write a response exposing the bias evident in the way the news story reported the event. Include relevant quotes and appropriate commentary to support your conclusions. As you draft your text, be sure to include an accurate and honest representation of divergent views represented in the story. Select an organizing structure appropriate for the purpose, audience, and context of this task.
### News Source 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facts</th>
<th>News Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who?</td>
<td>Bias by Headline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
<td>Bias by Photos, Captions, Camera Angle?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When?</td>
<td>Bias through Selection/Omission?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where?</td>
<td>Bias by Source Control?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td>Bias by Placement? Statistics/Crowd Control?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How?</td>
<td>Bias through Labels/Titles/Loaded Language?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Writing Prompt:** Write a response exploring the bias evident in the way the news story reported the event. Include relevant quotes and appropriate commentary to support your conclusions. As you draft your text, be sure to include an accurate and honest representation of divergent views represented in the story. Select an organizing structure appropriate for the purpose, audience, and context of this task.
Framing the Investigation

SUGGESTED LEARNING STRATEGIES: Quickwrite, Marking the Text, Discussion Groups, Notetaking, Think-Pair-Share

Reading Guide for “The Dixie Chicks,” by Betty Clarke
Use the following questions as you analyze Clarke’s review.

1. What is being reported (the who, what, where, when, why, and how of the event)?

2. How is it being reported? How subjective/objective is the coverage? Identify and list (or highlight in the article) specific textual details (titles, labeling, omission, etc.) that reveal bias in the article.

3. What is the target audience for the article? How does the text’s rhetorical context affect what it talks about and how (its language and its tone)? What inferences can you draw about the writer’s expectations regarding the audience’s perspective on the subject covered?

4. If you only read this article, what would you think is the key issue? In other words, how does the article frame the truth and/or significance of the news event (the Dixie Chicks controversy)? Is the controversial quote cited for its political implications or for some other reason?

5. What critical lens or lenses are evident in how the text approaches the issue? Which dominate or are absent? What specific language reveals the lens(es) at work?

© 2011 College Board. All rights reserved.
The Dixie Chicks are the good-time girls the country establishment loves to hate. Too direct, too old-fashioned, too modern ... you name it, it’s been slung at the Texan trio. The old vanguard liked their women feisty but second-class, preferably wearing cowgirl outfits and a smile. But the Dixie Chicks were renegade ladies of country who sung gleefully about killing abusive spouses and dressed like an older Britney Spears. Add the success they have had selling a progressive bluegrass sound to fans ignorant of banjos and whistles and you have an emasculating threat.

And they don’t know when to stop. “Just so you know,” says singer Natalie Maines, “we’re ashamed the president of the United States is from Texas.” It gets the audience cheering – at a time when country stars are rushing to release pro-war anthems, this is practically punk rock.

Aside from courting controversy, the band has sold 25m LPs since their debut album, *Wide Open Spaces*, was released in 1998 and made the fiddle sexy. Featuring two sisters, Martie Maguire and Emily Robinson, along with the effervescent Maines, their passion for tradition and love for pop made the country genre a contender again. Their latest album, *Home*, won three Grammys.

Although their outfits are more New York than Nashville, the music is proud of its roots. “Long Time Gone” adopts the chatty style of Loretta Lynn and the poignancy of Hank Williams, Robinson’s nifty banjo flowing beneath Maguire’s sparky fiddle. “Tortured, Tangled Hearts” is similarly quick and quaint, Maines recalling Dolly Parton before she became Country Barbie.

Bluegrass’s charm lies in its rawness, but the Dixie Chicks have polished the mountain sound and made it palatable for a new audience. This does mean that “Truth No.2” creeps into Celine Dion territory, Maines grabbing each phrase and shaking her head like a puppy with a toy. But it’s in the giddy “Sin Wagon,” which turns religious worship into a hymn for sex, that the Dixie Chicks hit their stride, shrieking, shouting, unrepentant.

---

1. *vanguard*: the leaders of a movement
2. *renegade*: a rebel, an outlaw
3. *emasculating*: destroying strength, making less masculine
4. *palatable*: agreeable, acceptable
5. *unrepentant*: unashamed, unremonseful
The following two statements were published on the Dixie Chicks’ official website. What differences do you note in the tone and the content of the two messages?

Statement from the Dixie Chicks with respect to statements being reported in the British media, March 12, 2003:

We’ve been overseas for several weeks and have been reading and following the news accounts of our governments’ position. The anti-American sentiment that has unfolded here is astounding. While we support our troops, there is nothing more frightening than the notion of going to war with Iraq and the prospect of all the innocent lives that will be lost.” Maines further stated, “I feel the President is ignoring the opinions of many in the US and alienating the rest of the world. My comments were made in frustration and one of the privileges of being an American is you are free to voice your own point of view.”

Statement from Natalie Maines of the Dixie Chicks, March 14, 2003:

As a concerned American citizen, I apologize to President Bush because my remark was disrespectful. I feel that whoever holds that office should be treated with the utmost respect. We are currently in Europe and witnessing a huge anti-American sentiment as a result of the perceived rush to war. While war may remain a viable option, as a mother, I just want to see every possible alternative exhausted before children and American soldiers’ lives are lost. I love my country. I am a proud American.
Developing Guiding Questions

In preparation for further investigation of the Dixie Chicks controversy, use the following process to develop focus questions to guide your research.

1. Review the description of the critical perspectives in Appendix 1. Which ones seem relevant to this topic? Why? Which ones do not? Why not?

2. Based on background knowledge and your preliminary investigation of the topic, brainstorm connections between each relevant lens and the topic.

3. Draft an initial closed (yes/no) question linking the lens to the subject.
4. Modify the question to make it open-ended by using one of the following stems:
   a. To what extent did X influence Y?

   b. In what ways did . . . ?

   c. What does the controversy surrounding (this topic) reveal about attitudes towards the (underlying issue)?

   d. What recurring story patterns are evoked by . . . ?
To prepare for the work you and your group members will do as you complete this unit’s embedded assessments, you will complete two tasks.

1. **Analyzing a Text**: You will first analyze a text to see how it constructs the meaning and significance of the Dixie Chicks controversy. You will then present your findings to your classmates.

2. **Making Connections and Synthesizing Evidence**: Second, you will use the presentations of your peers to map connections with other texts, identifying textual evidence from those that are relevant which link to a lens of your choice. You will be expected to synthesize this evidence in support of an informal written analysis of what is revealed when looking at the controversy through that particular lens. **Note**: You will use the questions on the next page to guide your group’s analysis of your article.

### Planning Your Presentation

Once you have completed your analysis, come up with a plan for how to present the article to the class. Your group’s presentation to your peers should include:

- **The most significant information from your article related to the who, what, when, where, why, and how of the event.** In particular, include a discussion of how the article portrays the original incident. Does it defend, criticize, or objectively report what happened? What new insights or later events does it emphasize?

- **A discussion of how the article frames the controversy.** What issue(s) does it focus on? What does it say about the issue(s)? How biased is it in the way it discusses the Chicks, the music industry, country music fans, etc.? How slanted is the language?

- **An analysis of what lens(es) you connected to the text.** To construct your commentaries, begin with one of the following stems:
  a. When viewed as a(n) _________ text, this article reveals that ________. (Use this stem if you think the article itself explicitly discusses the subject through a particular lens.)
  b. When we read this article through a _________ lens, we notice that _______________. (Use this stem if you are applying the lens to the article to focus on reading it from a particular perspective.)

- **Quotes from the text to support your claims about its rhetoric and its perspective.**

### Literary Terms

**To synthesize** is to combine ideas from different sources to create, express, or support a new idea.
Questions for Analysis

Use the following questions as you analyze each of the articles in this activity.

1. What is being reported (the who, what, where, when, why and how of the event)? Summarize the information covered in the article and how it links to the original news event.

2. How is it being reported? How subjective/objective is its coverage? Identify and list (or highlight in the article) specific textual details (titles, labeling, omission, etc.) that reveal bias in the article.

3. What is the target audience for the article? How does the text’s rhetorical context affect what it talks about and how (its language and its tone)? What inferences can you draw about the writer’s expectations regarding the audience’s perspective on the subject covered?

4. If you only read this article, what would you think is the key issue? In other words, how does the article frame the truth and/or significance of the news event (the Dixie Chicks controversy)?

5. What critical lens or lenses are evident in how the text approaches the issue? Which dominates or is absent? What specific language reveals the lens at work? How does this affect your reaction to the content covered?
In the early 1990’s, the Dixie Chicks were a cowgirl revival troupe playing for tips on the Texas dance hall circuit. By the end of the decade, they were Nashville, and pop, superstars. Their albums “Wide Open Spaces” and “Fly” sold more than 10 million copies each. They won a clutch of Grammys. Their 2000 tour grossed more at the box office than those of Bruce Springsteen and Britney Spears. Most striking of all, the Dixie Chicks achieved success not by cleaving to the conservative dictates of the country music industry but by taking risks that could just as easily have been big mistakes.

The three women — Natalie Maines and the sisters Emily Robison and Martie Maguire — cultivated their own sense of fashion, favoring post-punk, neo-hippie styles over the more conventional ensembles worn by their female counterparts. They insisted on playing their own instruments instead of employing the usual session musicians. They played banjo (Ms. Robison) and fiddle (Ms. Maguire), instruments often dismissed as quaint by country radio programmers. They sang about dicey topics like “mattress dancing” and doing away with an abusive spouse. Displaying a “love it or leave it” attitude like that of Waylon Jennings, Willie Nelson and the other “outlaws” of the 70’s, the Dixie Chicks reinvigorated the moribund Nashville music scene of the late 90’s.

“Home,” the album they’ll release on Tuesday on their new Open Wide Records label, an imprint of Sony Music, is likely to shake up and challenge the Nashville establishment further, suggesting that it has lost touch with its roots. Most of the record’s 11 tracks will no doubt be deemed too long...
for airplay, some running as long as six minutes. There are no drums on this bluegrass-steeped album, something that is virtually unheard of in commercial country music, and “Long Time Gone,” the record’s first single, includes a punning jab at radio playlists.

Written by the Nashville singer-songwriter Darrell Scott, “Long Time Gone” all but dares country stations not to play it. “We listen to the radio to hear what’s cookin,’” goes one line. “But the music ain’t got no soul/They sound tired but they don’t sound Haggard/They got money but they don’t got Cash.”

The Dixie Chicks insist they weren’t trying to force the hands of radio programmers by releasing “Long Time Gone” as a single. “I don’t look at the song as a political statement,” said Ms. Maguire, seated on a wraparound sofa with Ms. Robison and Ms. Maines in a Tuscan-style bed and breakfast off Nashville’s Music Row. Ms. Maguire, 32, who was born in York, Pa., and Ms. Robison, 30, who was born in Pittsfield, Mass., spent their early childhood years in southeastern Pennsylvania, where they studied the violin using the Suzuki method of learning by ear. Ms. Maines, the lead singer, who will be 28 in October, was born and raised in Lubbock, Tex. Her father is Lloyd Maines, an esteemed producer and steel guitarist best known for his work with the charismatic roots rocker Joe Ely.

“We’ve had a lot of controversy in our career, and it’s never been intentional,” Ms. Maguire continued. “We didn’t release ‘Goodbye Earl’ — a comic tale of revenge akin to “Thelma and Louise” — “to get back at wife beaters. We’re more lighthearted than that. Everyone has their own opinion about what should be on the radio, and I think there’s room for all different people.”

The Dixie Chicks also maintain that the bluegrass arrangements on “Home” don’t constitute that much of a departure from the bold, expansive music on their last two albums. “We still have our core sound,” Ms. Robison said. “We’ve peeled back a few layers, but I think people will still recognize it as us.” Indeed, in contrast to the Appalachian cast of the soundtrack to “O Brother, Where Art Thou?,” which despite sales of six million received a lukewarm response from country radio, the music on the Dixie Chicks’ new album evinces both traditional country and modern pop sensibilities.

Doubtless some will view the success of “Long Time Gone,” which was No. 2 on the Billboard country chart this week, as a sign that the strictures of country radio are loosening a bit. The Dixie Chicks’ next single, a cover of Fleetwood Mac’s “Landslide” done in the ambient bluegrass style of Alison Krauss and Union Station, will certainly test that notion.

---

2 *evinces* shows, demonstrates
3 *strictures* limits, restrictions
But country stations can't afford to ignore any record the Dixie Chicks put out at this point. While Garth Brooks was feigning retirement and Shania Twain was off having a baby, the trio sold 21 million albums, doing more than any of their peers to see country music through its recent slump in sales.

"Do we have a choice not to play the Dixie Chicks?" asked Darren Davis, a program director for the Infinity Broadcasting network. "Sure, we have a choice, but one also has a choice to cut off one's nose to spite their face. The Dixie Chicks are the biggest of the big right now. We play their music as often as we can get it on the air."

Lon Helton, the Nashville bureau chief for the trade magazine Radio and Records, said he believes the ascendancy of the Dixie Chicks has as much to do with the integrity of their musical vision as with any demands of the market.

"The Chicks have to be given tremendous credit for knowing who they are musically, for saying, 'This is what we do; anyone who wants to do so is free to play it,'" Mr. Helton said.

For a while, it appeared that no one would be playing the Dixie Chicks' new album. Last summer, after the trio approached Sony about renegotiating their record deal, Sony filed a lawsuit against them for breach of contract. The Dixie Chicks responded with a suit of their own, charging that Sony had withheld $4.1 million in royalties. An 11-month legal battle ensued, along with speculation about whether the trio would leave Sony; then, surprisingly, the parties settled out of court. The terms of the agreement weren't made public, but The Los Angeles Times reported in June that the deal included a $20 million bonus for the group and an increase in its royalty rate to about 20 percent.

Had the Dixie Chicks' suit gone to court and been settled in their favor, the decision might have had far-reaching implications, perhaps making it easier for artists to renegotiate long-term contracts. "That would have been so awesome," said Ms. Maines. "We would have been in the history books if we'd have taken it to the end. We definitely meant to do more for the industry. It just got to the point where we had done as much as we could without jeopardizing our careers.

"We have families, we have kids now," added Ms. Maines, who is married to the actor Adrian Pasdar, with whom she has a 1-year-old son. Ms. Robison, who is married to the singer-songwriter Charlie Robison, is six months pregnant.

"We also didn't want to be the kinds of people who put our pride in front of our logic," Ms. Maguire said. "Sony had to swallow their pride, too, and I think they had to swallow a bigger dose of pride than we did."
Wrangling with a giant entertainment conglomerate is a long way from entertaining conventioneers on the street corners of Dallas, which is what Ms. Robison and Ms. Maguire did in 1989 as founding members of the Dixie Chicks. The original group, a neo-cowgirl quartet that took its name from “Dixie Chicken,” a song by the funk-rock band Little Feat, also included Laura Lynch and Robin Macy on guitars and vocals.

That incarnation of the band enjoyed considerable popularity in Texas in the early 90’s. The Dixie Chicks also played at Bill Clinton’s 1993 inauguration and released three albums on an independent label, the first of which they titled “Thank Heavens for Dale Evans.” Yet while amply talented, the group never really transcended its status as a regional or kitsch act until Ms. Maines replaced Ms. Lynch in 1995. (Ms. Lynch retired from performing and married a rancher and winner of the Texas state lottery. Ms. Lacy had left the group in 1992.)

Ms. Maines, who grew up watching her father play with Mr. Ely — who opened for the Clash during their 1980 tour — brought a rock ‘n’ roll swagger to the Dixie Chicks, and a big, brassy voice, that had been absent from the early edition of the group. Her arrival, however, didn’t sit well with the trio’s core fans or with the news media in the Dallas-Fort Worth area, both of which accused the women of selling out to a younger, pop-leaning audience. “We used to get hate messages on our voice mail,” Ms. Robison said.

The burnished production that galvanized the first two albums the Dixie Chicks made for Sony might have struck some as a compromise. But no one can accuse them of selling out on “Home,” a subtle but commanding record that is something of a return to the trio’s Texas roots even as it casts judgment on the slick, crossover aesthetic that now defines country music. The women recorded the project not in Nashville but, as its title suggests, at home, in Austin. (Ms. Robison and her husband live in San Antonio.) They produced the album, do-it-yourself style, with Ms. Maines’s father, who first introduced his daughter to Ms. Robison and Ms. Maguire.

Similarly, the updated mountain sound of “Home” recalls the albums the Dixie Chicks made before Ms. Maines joined the group. The sisters had sung behind Ms. Maines on the previous two albums, but this time the women recorded their vocals as a trio, in the fashion of the early Dixie Chicks. They also worked with first-call bluegrass musicians, including the guitarist Bryan Sutton, late of Ricky Skaggs’s band, as well as the mandolinists Adam Steffey and Chris Thile, the latter of the trio Nickel Creek.
The Dixie Chicks arranged most of the material on the album, much of it consisting of thoughtful and thought-provoking compositions from left-of-center singer-songwriters like Patty Griffin, Radney Foster and the team of Tim O’Brien and Gary Nicholson. Although they weren’t credited as producers on “Wide Open Spaces” and “Fly,” “they had a real good idea of how they wanted things to sound,” said Mr. Maines, who played steel guitar on the two earlier albums.

“They definitely know what they’re doing,” he said. “They’re really savvy about what they want to sing and how they want it to sound.”

In many respects, making “Home” validated the risk-taking ethos the trio has always embraced. “It was nice to test our producing skills and realize how involved we were in that aspect of the making of ‘Wide Open Spaces’ and ‘Fly,’” said Ms. Robison. “We knew we were, but we were still so new to Nashville. It was nice, this time, to know that we could trust our ears, and that we had total freedom to go anywhere we wanted.”
McCarthyism, as the term was originally coined, was meant to describe the abuse and distortion of information by a government committee at the expense of an individual's rights and reputation.

McCarthyism is characterized by false accusations, smears and extracting a pound of lie from an ounce of truth. Although a demagogue, Sen. Joseph McCarthy had the goods on some of his targets; others were innocent victims.

Whatever the Dixie Chicks are, they are not innocent victims.

They said what they said where they said it. Holding people to account for their words and actions isn't McCarthyism. The Chicks are certainly free to oppose the Iraq war and to tell the world that they're ashamed to hail from the same state as President Bush. Just as the rest of us are free to tell the Chicks that we think they're idiots.

We're also free to not buy their CDs and to not pay to see them in concert. Radio stations are in business to attract and please listeners in order to sell their advertisers' products. If listeners are sufficiently turned off by the Chicks to tune out stations when they play their music, you can expect stations to play less of it. This is known as commerce, not McCarthyism.

The Dixie Chicks have no constitutional right to have their music played on commercial stations. And Tim Robbins and Susan Sarandon have no “right” to be invited to private functions like the Baseball Hall of Fame Dinner. Freedom of disassociation and freedom of association are opposite sides of the same coin. After Michael Moore's boorish behavior at the Oscars, it's understandable that the baseball folks would be leery of trusting this duo to refrain from indulging their anti-Bush, anti-war activism at a festive, nonpolitical affair.

Boycotting is a common tool of leftists and practitioners of racial politics. Conservative targets of such campaigns have included Rush Limbaugh, Laura Schlesinger and Anita Bryant.
Jesse Jackson has amassed a fortune extorting corporations. Gay activists organized a boycott of the entire state of Colorado after voters approved Amendment 2. Why is it a legitimate tactic when lefties do it, but McCarthyism when country music fans turn their backs on the Dixie Chicks?

When Wyoming Sen. Alan Simpson questioned Anita Hill at Clarence Thomas’ Supreme Court confirmation hearings, one columnist accused him of using McCarthy-like tactics. To which Simpson replied, “Accusing someone of McCarthyism is a McCarthyist tactic itself.”

It wasn’t just that the Chicks voiced their opposition to the war and dissed the president of the United States. Others have done that with impunity. It was how and where they did it. It might have been a principled, courageous act had they taken on a patriotic, flag-waving crowd in Lubbock, Texas. Instead, they pandered to an anti-American audience in London. When word got back home, all hell broke loose.

Then, the Chicks made matters worse with a pathetic, damage-control exercise, talking out of all sides of their three mouths in an incoherent interview with Diane Sawyer on ABC’s Primetime.

Robbins’ and Sarandon’s politics might cost them a gig or two while gaining them some new ones, but they haven’t damaged their careers.

They’re still heroes to the Hollywood left and the white wine-and-brie crowd that supports the arts and contributes to National Public Radio.

But unlike Robbins and Sarandon, the Dixie Chicks aren’t all that political - they’re probably not smart enough. They’re in over their heads. And they made the perfectly stupid business move of alienating their core audience.

They angered white males from Texas, Oklahoma, Mississippi and Alabama who drive pickup trucks with bumper stickers emblazoned with American flags, the kind of people who admire the Marine Corps more than Jane Fonda.

Popularity is fleeting, and aspiring country groups are lined up around the block. The Dixie Chicks might have to wash off their makeup, swap the spiked high heels for sandals, learn some folksy protest songs and start working the coffee houses in Greenwich Village.

Free speech has consequences - good and bad - as well it should.
Last night’s *Primetime Thursday*, which featured Diane Sawyer interviewing the Dixie Chicks about their recent woes, was one of those broadcast moments that make you want to put your foot through the television. In case you’ve been out working in the garden this past month, the occasion for the show was a relatively innocuous remark the Chicks’ lead singer, Natalie Maines, made at a concert in London just before the war. “Just so you know,” she said from the stage, “we’re ashamed that the president of the United States is from Texas.” The Associated Press picked up the line; country music stations fanned the flames; and within a few weeks the Dixie Chicks’ newest record, *Home*, which had been No. 1 on both the country and pop charts, was being boycotted across the country.

This is silly but not unpredictable. What followed was disgusting: CD-crushing radio promo events, vandalism of Chick Emily Robison’s home, threats on the Chicks’ lives, and a campaign of hatred directed at three of the most talented women in the music industry. Bruce Springsteen occasionally gets flack for his political remarks, but he doesn’t get called a slut.

The Chicks themselves may have inadvertently made things worse. When Jonathan Franzen ticked off the Oprah folks, it was as distressing to see his furious backpedaling as it was to see the arrant frenzy that his remarks occasioned. It would have been easier on him—and probably shortened the story’s news life—if he’d just insisted, “Yeah, I said it. Yeah, I meant it. If you want to talk about it, we can do that. If you want to scream at me, I’m going to have to tune you out and get on with my life.” God knows Maines and her two bandmates might have saved themselves a little heartache if they’d done the same.

---

1 *innocuous*: harmless
Still, they have the burden to bear of being from Dallas, where women tend to be a) spirited and b) polite. Not always an easy balance to maintain, but last night Maines did her best. When Sawyer prompted the three of them to ask for forgiveness, in a gruesome moment of utterly fake primetime piety, the trio paused. You could see them struggling with their pride, their conviction, and their desire to get along. Instead, Maines kept her cool and her dignity. “Accept us,” she said. “Accept an apology that was made ... but to forgive us, don’t forgive us for who we are.” And she went on to point out, as if it needed to be said, that the practice of dissent is fundamental to democracy.

That wasn’t good enough for Sawyer. She spent an hour trying to bend the Chicks with a combination of false sympathy and crass sensationalism. Time and again, she cut back to a typeset insert of Maines’ original remark, as if Maines had called for the pillage of Crawford. “Ashamed?” Sawyer said, incredulously. “Ashamed?” In the tradition of a Stalinist show trial, the women were forced to affirm their patriotism and their support for the troops. At every point they—who are, after all, entertainers with no particular training in political science—were thoughtful, modest, and firm. At every point Sawyer tried to force them into a crude, Manichean choice. “Do you feel awful about using that word about the president of the United States?” she asked at the start of the interview—in a prime example of the sort of leading question no self-respecting first year AP stringer would ask. “Well,” replied Maines, carefully, “ ‘awful’ is a really strong word.” Later, when Maines was trying to apologize and clarify, Sawyer said, “I hear something not quite, what, wholehearted. …”

Well, I heard something not quite—what—honorable in Sawyer’s presentation of the affair: an attempt to take a trivial matter that had blown up into an absurd controversy, and blow it up even more under the guise of simply covering the story. Essentially, she asked the women to choose between abasing themselves on national television or stirring up more hatred against themselves. It was a depressing moment in an ugly time.

For what it’s worth, I have profoundly mixed feelings about the war, and if I were to sit down with Natalie Maines, I’m sure we’d have much to disagree about. But, just so you know, I’m proud that the Dixie Chicks are from Texas. What’s more, I’m embarrassed that Diane Sawyer is a member of my profession.

---

2 Manichean: a world view that divides things into either good or evil, allowing no ambiguity
3 abasing: humiliating
Is Dixie Chicks protest a conspiracy?

by John Kiesewetter (March 2003)

Are the Dixie Chicks victims of a right-wing conspiracy?

That’s what their manager, Simon Renshaw, has told country music stations being pressured to drop the Chicks’ music after lead singer Natalie Maines criticized President Bush last week.

In an e-mail to stations distributed by Sony Music, their label, Renshaw says the protest has been orchestrated by the Free Republic, a Web site “for independent, grassroots conservatives,” according to founder Jim Robinson of Fresno, Calif. The Web site also alleges that recent anti-war protests are “communist-organized demonstrations.”

“Our company is being targeted by a radical right-wing online forum,” Renshaw says in the e-mail. “You are being ‘Freeped,’ which is the code word for an organized e-mail/telephone effort attempting to solicit a desired response.”

On March 10, Maines told a London audience: “Just so you know, we’re ashamed the president of the United States is from Texas.”

Four days later, the Lubbock native apologized by saying, “I apologize to President Bush because my remark was disrespectful. I feel that whoever holds that office should be treated with the utmost respect.”

Country music stations in Dallas-Fort Worth and Kansas City have been deluged with e-mails and calls demanding that the Dixie Chicks be dropped from the airwaves.

Complaints didn’t arrive at WUBE-FM (105.1) until Monday. Only one person called Thursday when the B105 morning show read the story, says Tim Closson, operations manager.

“We broke the story on Thursday, and got very little reaction to it. We mentioned it again on Friday, and only got a few calls,” he says.

The Chicks remain on B105. Closson says he “seriously considered indefinitely pulling all Dixie Chicks music... (but) our decision came down to one thing: We believe in the constitution. We believe in the freedom of speech.”

At Middletown’s WPFB-FM (105.9), the Dixie Chicks were dropped Monday for the week by Mark Evar, operations director.
“They’re telling us that the minute the Dixie Chicks come on, they’re going to change the station - and we don’t want to lose any listeners,” Evar says.

The Chicks’ manager, in his e-mail, says the group’s Web site “was totally overrun (Sunday) and had to be closed down, and our publicist’s servers and telephone system failed under the weight of the calls.”

“This is an extremely active and well-organized group. As always the ‘squeaky wheel gets the grease’ and these weasels know how to squeak,” Renshaw says.

Renshaw apparently used the word “weasel” because the Free Republic Web site uses that term.

Says the Free Republic home page: “As war with Iraq becomes imminent, more and more of the ‘useful idiot’ leftist weasels are crawling out of the woodwork. So-called ‘anti-war’ protests are popping up in cities all across the nation.

“We will not allow these communist organized demonstrations (to) go unanswered. Patriotic Americans are countering these terrorist supporting leftists wherever and whenever they pop up.”
The Dixie Chicks: America Catches Up with Them

by Jon Pareles (May 2006)

THE DIXIE CHICKS call it “the Incident”: the anti-Bush remark that Natalie Maines, their lead singer, made onstage in London in 2003. “Just so you know, we’re ashamed the president of the United States is from Texas,” said Ms. Maines, a Texan herself.

It led to a partisan firestorm, a radio boycott, death threats and, now, to an album that’s anything but repentant: “Taking the Long Way” (Open Wide/Monument/Columbia). The Dixie Chicks – Ms. Maines, Emily Robison and Martie Maguire – were the top-selling country group of the late 1990’s and early 2000’s. After country’s gatekeepers disowned them over politics, they decided to keep their politics and let country music fend for itself.

The Incident is very much at the center of “Taking the Long Way.” The album could have been “way safe and scared,” Ms. Maines said. “We could have pandered.” They didn’t. The new songs are filled with reactions, direct and oblique 1, to the Incident. There are no apologies.

“We had to make this album,” Ms. Maines said. “We could not have gotten past any of this without making this album. Even if nobody ever heard it.”

The Dixie Chicks were in New York this month to make media appearances and to perform at the party for this year’s Time 100, the magazine’s list of influential people, which includes them. Sitting around a dinner table in a Chelsea loft that Ms. Maines owns but hasn’t used much – a former gallery with artist friends’ paintings parked on the brick walls – the three Dixie Chicks dug into takeout Italian food and sipped red wine. “I’ve thought about all this way too much,” Ms. Maines said.

“Taking the Long Way,” due out on Tuesday, is the first Dixie Chicks album on which group members collaborated in writing all the songs. The first single, “Not Ready to Make Nice,” declares, “I’m not ready to back down/I’m still mad as hell,” and starts with a tolling guitar more suitable for a Metallica dirge than a honky-tonk serenade. The Dixie Chicks and their manager insisted to their record company that “we need to approach everything like not one radio station is going to play one single song,” Ms. Maines said. Asked about country radio, she said, “Do you really think we’re going to make an album for you and trust the future of our career to people who turned on us in a day?”

1 oblique: indirect
Instead the album wraps gleaming California rock around its raw emotions. Although there's plenty of country in the music, “Taking the Long Way” reaches not for the lucrative yet insular country airwaves but for an adult pop mainstream. Meanwhile the core country audience may not be so hostile anymore. The album arrives at a time when approval for President Bush has dropped to as low as 29 percent, in a recent Harris Interactive poll.

On Amazon.com, preorders recently placed “Taking the Long Way” at No. 5 in a Top 10 that also includes albums with antiwar songs by Bruce Springsteen, Neil Young, Paul Simon and Pearl Jam.

For those who expect knee-jerk Republicanism from country singers, the Dixie Chicks never fit the stereotype to begin with. “I always knew people thought that about us, and it bugged me,” Ms. Maines said. “Because I knew who we were, and I knew who I’ve been my whole life. So to me it was such a relief for people to know.”

The Incident occurred on March 10, 2003, 10 days before the United States invaded Iraq. “It felt pretty trite to me to be doing a show on what was supposed to be the eve before war,” Ms. Maines said, “and not say anything about it. At that stage too everyone in Europe, or everyone outside of the U.S., talked about the U.S. like we all thought one way. So it was important for me to let them know that you can’t group us all into one.”

Her remark was reported in Britain and quickly picked up. Right-wing blogs and talk shows vilified the Dixie Chicks as unpatriotic and worse, and the Incident reached the nightly news . . .

The complaint that she criticized the president on foreign soil has been a talk-radio talking point. Ms. Maines dismisses it. “It wasn't like we played 20 shows in America and I was saving up this comment for London,” she said. “I was in London when the war was about to start. That's where I said it. I would have said it anywhere, because I didn't think that it was a bad thing to say or a controversial thing to say.”

. . . Ms. Maines's free speech was costly. Country radio stations were bombarded with calls demanding that the Dixie Chicks be dropped from playlists. Within days, songs from the Chicks’ 2002 album, “Home,” virtually disappeared from American airwaves. They had the No. 1 country single that week with “Travelin' Soldier,” which mourns a soldier killed in Vietnam; it plummeted to No. 63.

vilified: defamed or slandered
The Dixie Chicks’ two previous albums, “Wide Open Spaces” (1998) and “Fly” (1999), had each been certified “diamond” for shipping more than 10 million copies in the United States. Without airplay, “Home” stalled that March at six million.

“I understand everybody was in a place of fear, and everybody’s nerves were on edge, and mothers were sending their sons and daughters off to war, and tensions were high,” Ms. Maguire said. “But you know when it continues and continues and people are still mad about it, I think back to those words and think: How is that bad, what she said? It’s so harmless. It’s so nothing.”

The United States concerts on the Dixie Chicks’ tour were already sold out. Promoters offered refunds, although there were more requests for new tickets than there were returns. Protesters showed up outside concerts; others burned Dixie Chicks albums.

“We have video footage of this lady at one of the shows protesting, holding her 2-year-old son,” Ms. Maines said. The woman commanded her son to shout along with an angry chant. “And I was just like, that’s it right there. That’s the moment that it’s taught. She just taught her 2-year-old how to hate. And that broke my heart.”

The band received death threats, including at least one, in Dallas, that the F.B.I., considered credible. A newspaper printed Ms. Maines’s home address in Austin, Tex., and she ended up moving first outside the city and then to Los Angeles. On the American tour a handful of boos were drowned out by fervent cheers. Suddenly there was more at stake than toe-tapping tunes.

In a way there always had been. The Dixie Chicks were never a typical country act. They got started in Texas, not Nashville. And their music is built around a country rarity: female instrumentalists. Ms. Robison plays banjo, and Ms. Maguire plays fiddle; they are sisters, and they helped found the Dixie Chicks as a bluegrass band in Dallas in 1989. After Ms. Maines replaced the group’s lead singer in 1995, the Dixie Chicks became a voice of assertive, irreverent femininity in mainstream country. They also brought the sound of the banjo, once considered “too country,” back to country radio.

While the Dixie Chicks’ music was never confrontational, each album grew bolder. In the upbeat “Goodbye Earl,” a hit from “Fly,” an abused wife murders her husband and gets away with it. The album “Home” — made in Austin and produced by the Dixie Chicks themselves along with Lloyd
Maines, Natalie's father — deliberately set aside the slick, electric sound of current country for a largely acoustic, bluegrass-rooted production and some haunted songs back to country radio.

After their own tour ended — it was the top-grossing country music tour of 2003 — the Dixie Chicks joined the Vote for Change concert series supporting John Kerry. They had babies; Ms. Maguire and Ms. Robison both had twins. And they decided to record their next album in Los Angeles. The producer they chose was Rick Rubin, who has made albums with the Beastie Boys, the Red Hot Chili Peppers, Johnny Cash and Shakira. The Incident had sparked Mr. Rubin's interest.

“After the Incident everyone started taking what they said seriously,” Mr. Rubin said by telephone from Los Angeles. “To take a band that's popular not for that reason and give them that power seemed very exciting. “It's the biggest thing that's ever happened to them, and it rattled them and it changed them,” he added. “The pain of it is really lingering. I thought they needed to somehow address what happened in a way that was truthful about how they felt, whatever that was. I just wanted it to be an honest reflection of that, but also told in a way that if you didn't know what happened to them and just heard the songs, you might relate to it anyway.”

On previous albums the Dixie Chicks wrote the more lighthearted songs and got serious material from other songwriters. This time, Ms. Maines said, “We knew we had things to write about.” Mr. Rubin brought in co-writers including Gary Louris, from the Jayhawks, and Dan Wilson, from Semisonic. “They took the fear out of us,” said Ms. Maines. “You know, ‘You need to say that because that's the truth and that's the way you feel.’”

. . . The Dixie Chicks sound determined not to whine on “Taking the Long Way,” and they focus on personal reactions, not protests. The album is a defiant autobiography of their career, and “Not Ready to Make Nice” mentions the death threats after the Incident. But until it does, the song could be about the resentment following any breakup or betrayal.
“Lubbock or Leave It,” a fierce country-rocker, describes Ms. Maines’s Texas hometown as a hypocritical “fool’s paradise” with “more churches than trees,” blind to its own problems. But there aren’t many other specifics on the album. Without the Dixie Chicks’ back story, the songs work as meticulous pop vows of loyalty and determination.

Still, the Incident keeps peeking through the pretty arrangements. The countryish mandolin and pedal steel guitar of “Everybody Knows” carry the confession: “All the things I can’t erase from my life/Everybody knows.” An affectionate ballad, “Easy Silence,” praises a companion who provides a refuge when “Anger plays on every station/Answers only make more questions.” In the fiddle-topped waltz “Bitter End,” one verse mocks fair-weather supporters: “As long as I’m the shiniest star,/Oh there you are.” The album’s finale, a gospel-soul anthem called “I Hope,” insists, “I don’t wanna hear nothin’ else/About killin’ and that it’s God’s will.”

Three years after the Incident the Dixie Chicks insist that it liberated them. “When, no matter what you do, everybody’s going to punch holes in it, then you just go and you do what you want,” Ms. Maguire said. “And that’s the most freeing place to be.”

Ms. Maines added: “It will mean a lot to me if people buy the album just sort of out of protest. The naysayers and the people who were so organized to take us down did a really good job. And they succeeded. So it feels good to let the music win out in the end and say, ‘Even your hatred can’t stop what people want to listen to.’”

A smiling Ms. Maguire had the last word. “See you at the diamond record party,” she said.

---

3 **hypocritical**: insincere
4 **meticulous**: careful and precise
Three years into the Iraq War, the American public is making next week’s election a national referendum on the policies that got us there and seem to offer no end in sight. In a democratic culture with free speech at its core, one of the earliest challenges to those policies came from an unlikely source: three Texas-bred women called the Dixie Chicks. They may not have seen themselves as a political band, or even political people, when they made their antiwar feelings clear on the eve of the invasion at a March 2003 concert in London. But they put themselves squarely against the momentum growing in the country music/red state community, which was lining up behind the government’s march to war.

The story of what happened to the band after lead vocalist Natalie Maines’ fateful comment — “just so you know, we’re ashamed the President of the United States is from Texas” — is the subject of Shut Up and Sing, the latest documentary from Barbara Kopple and co-director Cecilia Peck. To tell their story, the band made sure their experience would be treated seriously by teaming up with Kopple, whose films include the Oscar-winning Harlan County USA (striking coal miners in Kentucky) and Bearing Witness (women war correspondents in Iraq). On her part, Kopple was drawn to a story that, she says, has “become the center of a larger political debate. Their personal transformation in so many ways has come to represent the political climate we have in the U.S. right now.”

The Dixie Chicks were country music superstars in 2003 and the best selling women’s band ever. Having been named entertainers of the year by the Academy of Country Music two years before, their Top of the World tour sold out $49 million worth of tickets in one day, and they won eight Grammies including the 2003 best country album. But once Maines’ comment became known, and when the band refused to back down, the country community quickly turned against them.

Did the Dixie Chicks pay a higher price for speaking out because they were women? Kopple believes women get into trouble for speaking their minds when the expectation is that “men are the ones to speak out, to take
a stand, and a woman's role is to stand with her man. I think these ideas still permeate our culture.” Apparently to the country music world, seeming unpatriotic in a time of war is a far worse sin than being a convicted wife batterer like Tracy Lawrence, who has been able to rehabilitate himself with his fans.

The least discussed piece of this story is how the continuing consolidation of media into the hands of a few large corporations created a situation that allowed the Dixie Chicks to be literally erased from the airwaves. “Travelin’ Soldier” was the number one single when it was removed from playing rotation. Cumulus Media, a consortium of 306 radio stations, told their affiliates not to play the Chicks’ music. Several disc jockeys who broke the ban were fired according to press reports. First denying there was a blacklist against the band, Cumulus CEO Lewis Dickey was forced to admit the truth during a Senate Commerce Committee hearing on July 8, 2003. Commenting on the dangerous effect of media consolidation, with enormous power and influence falling into very few hands, Kopple says, “too often those hands are attached to men more interested in the bottom line and blind ‘patriotism’ than creativity, risk-taking and progress.”

The hate pouring onto these women was clearly sexist. Fans trashed their cds. At arenas, protestors’ signs and slogans ranged from the ugly to the ridiculous — “strap her to a bomb and drop her over Baghdad” and “try the chicks for treason” to “free speech is ok except in public.” Kopple points out an irony: “Women's voices are often considered dangerous. Ours are often the voices of change, of peace, of moderation, and of forgiveness.”

While shut off from their country fan base, the Dixie Chicks were propelled into a completely different musical and political universe. On the cover of Entertainment Weekly and interviewed by Diane Sawyer, the band was introduced to an audience that fell in love with the music and the message. The recording of their new “comeback” album is highlighted throughout the film. Recording it and writing their own songs for the first time functioned as a catharsis for the hell they went through. Their dismay with the country world is clear in the first single, “Not Ready to Make Nice,” an anthem of unrepentant anger.

Theirs is the best sort of feminist story: all about what happens when women stand up for what they believe in. At the end of the documentary, Kopple shows the Dixie Chicks returning to the arena in London where the controversy began. Maines restates her comment, this time with a big smile on her face. Kopple got to know her subjects well while following them around for over a year. “I think, more than anything,” she says, “their experience has highlighted that — although the cost of speaking your mind and being yourself can be high — the cost of being silenced is much higher.”

1 catharsis: release, cleansing
On Sunday night at the 49th annual Grammy awards, the Dixie Chicks took home five awards, including best album, record and song of the year.

It was a long road, indeed, for the Chicks, whose enormous fan base and ticket sales famously plummeted\(^1\) in 2003 after lead singer Natalie Maines remarked on the eve of the Iraq war that the group was “ashamed the president of the United States is from Texas.” Within days, radio stations were refusing to play their music, and fans were demanding refunds. Death threats were later issued.

Throughout the ordeal, the group remained admirably unapologetic, insisting that dissent is (or at least should be) a vital liberty in America. They further maintained this position in their album *Taking the Long Way* (which won the Grammy for best album) and especially in the song “Not Ready To Make Nice,” in which they directly addressed their critics: “It's too late to make it right/ I probably wouldn't if I could/ Cause I'm mad as hell/ Can't bring myself to do what it is/ You think I should.”

Despite the group’s successes, the grudge has held, particularly among the Nashville music establishment. The Country Music Association completely snubbed the Chicks at its awards ceremony in May.

Such an affront\(^2\) on the part of country music is not only cowardly, but also quite antithetical to the genre’s history. For, while country music today is often equated with pickup trucks, rebel flags, and men with mullets, it also has a brave and, dare I say, liberal streak in its closet.

Take Johnny Cash, for instance. Not only did many of his most famous lyrics center on “the poor and the beaten down,” including a poignant attack on this country’s treatment of American Indians, but also Cash was a vocal critic of the Vietnam War, as in his famous song “Man in Black”: “I wear the black in mourning for the lives that could have been/ Each week we lose a hundred fine young men.”

---

\(^1\) plummeted: declined suddenly and steeply  
\(^2\) affront: insult
And then there is Willie Nelson, who on Valentine’s Day 2006 released a love song about gay cowboys, titled, “Cowboys Are Frequently, Secretly (Fond of Each Other).” Perhaps more seriously, he has been an avid supporter of presidential hopeful Dennis Kucinich, who, while arguing for universal health care and a swift withdrawal from Iraq, is probably the furthest left of any Democratic candidate.

Women in country music – like the Dixie Chicks – have a long tradition of being particularly bold in speaking out against some of the very conventions their record labels and conservative fan base celebrate. Back in 1933, the Carter Family, which consisted of A.P. Carter; his wife, Sara Doughtery Carter; and her cousin, the groundbreaking guitar player Maybelle Addington Carter, sang about a young woman who chose to commit suicide rather than marry. In Sara’s sorrowful croon, we hear her say, “I never will marry/ I’ll be no man’s wife/ I expect to live single all the days of my life.” Needless to say, she later divorced A.P.

Perhaps most memorable are some of Loretta Lynn’s lyrics, particularly from the 1960s and 1970s. Released in 1966, her song “Dear Uncle Sam” was an early anti-Vietnam protest song. And though she once feigned dozing off while listening to feminist advocate Betty Friedan speak as a fellow guest on The David Frost Show, Lynn was a pretty controversial women’s advocate. In “I Wanna Be Free,” she wrote of the liberating effect of divorce: “I’m gonna take this chain from around my finger/ And throw it just as far as I can sling ‘er.” She did the same thing for birth control in “The Pill”: “The feelin’ good comes easy now/ Since I’ve got the pill.”

As daring as some outlaw artists have been, the country music establishment has often proved even more dogged in its conservative views. Lynn has purportedly had more songs banned than any other country music singer. And Cash, never completely at home in the country music world, once said that “the very idea of unconventional or even original ideas ending up on ‘country’ radio” was “absurd.” No wonder, then, that in his gay cowboy song, Willie Nelson lamented that “you won’t hear this song on the radio/ Not on your local TV.”

With the November election, particularly with strong Democratic gains in Virginia and Missouri, Republican politicians may have to rethink their long-standing Southern strategy. Similarly, with last Sunday night’s awards, country music should embrace the fact that its greatest assets have never been scared of controversy or doing the right thing.

To quote the great Dolly Parton – who has sung a few feminist, antiwar, and progressive anthems herself – “You’ll never do a whole lot unless you’re brave enough to try.”

3 feigned: pretended
WHAT do Jimmy Carter and the Dixie Chicks have in common? They’re southerners who’ve traded “up” on their southernness. They hit their best moments long ago, but have ridden positive press far beyond their natural shelf life. They think a lot of themselves. Good teeth. What else, what else ...? Oh, right—they’re all 2007 Grammy winners!

Jimmy Carter won the Grammy for the Best Spoken Word Album of 2006, sharing the honor with actress Ruby Dee. Carter and Dee beat out nominees Al Franken and Bill Maher for this year’s Grammy. Yet Carter isn’t the first ex-president to win this cutthroat competition. Bill Clinton actually won two Grammys back to back in 2004 and 2005, the first for his memoirs, My Life, sharing the second with Mikhail Gorbachev in the coveted Best Spoken Word Album for Children category.

In 1997, Clinton’s wife of record, Hillary, won a Grammy for reading aloud her book It Takes a Village; last year that honor went to Barack Obama for his memoirs. In 2004, Franken won for his book Lying Liars, and the year before that Maya Angelou won her third Grammy in the category. Other winners include Jesse Jackson and Garrison Keillor.

But let me stop you right there. Politics has nothing to do with the selection process. This was a straightforward judgment based solely on merit, damn it. So if you’re listening, Ted Kennedy, you’d better bring your A-game if you hope to beat the likes of Rush Limbaugh!

Which brings me to the Greatest Band of All Time. The Dixie Chicks won five Grammys in the Stick It to the Fascists category, including for their Best Song, “Not Ready to Make Nice,” a poignant reminder that the Chicks weren’t going to be cowed by the war-lusting American public.

Recall that in 2003, on the eve of war, Natalie Maines, the middle one in most pictures, said in London that she was “ashamed” President Bush was from her native Texas. She quickly apologized, saying, “As a concerned American citizen, I apologize to President Bush because my remark was disrespectful.” “I love my country,” she continued. “I am a proud American.”
When this didn’t improve sagging sales among the bloody jingoists\footnote{jingoists: extreme, aggressive patriots} who made them rich in the first place, the Chicks decided to appeal to a different audience. “The entire country may disagree with me,” Maines told Britain’s Daily Telegraph, “but I don’t understand the necessity for patriotism.” Through “gritted teeth” she asked, “Why do you have to be a patriot? ... You can like where you live and like your life, but as for loving the whole country ... I don’t see why people care about patriotism.”

On Grammy night, Maines proclaimed, “I think people are using their freedom of speech with all these awards. We get the message.” Of course, the “people” in question were members of the record industry, and only someone with a thumbless grasp of free speech would think it was at issue in the first place. The people who criticized the Dixie Chicks in the first place were people too, exercising their free speech. They just weren’t the ones who mattered — at least to those nonpartisan\footnote{nonpartisan: free from bias} adjudicators\footnote{adjudicators: judges} of raw talent who award Grammys.
Analyzing Presentations

As you listen to the presentations of the other groups, use the space below to create a concept map. Record titles, ideas, and page numbers as you make connections between your guiding question and the information presented in the other groups’ presentations.

My guiding question:

Writing Prompt: Now that you have heard all the other presentations on the Dixie Chicks controversy, write an argumentative essay in which you use evidence from the various articles you have discussed to answer your guiding question and to persuade others to your own position. Include relevant quotes and appropriate commentary to support your conclusions, as well as information on the complete range of relevant perspectives on this controversy. Be sure to represent the divergent views from the various articles accurately and honestly. Select an organizing structure that is appropriate for the purpose, audience, and context of this task.
Documentary films may use both primary and archival footage. **Primary footage** refers to footage shot by the filmmaker for the text at hand. **Archival footage** is footage taken from another, previously recorded, source.

**Nonfiction Film Viewing Guide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What Do You See</strong> (primary or archival footage, interviews, still images, the filmmaker)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What Do You Hear</strong> (dialogue, narration, diegetic and nondiegetic sound)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What Do You Read</strong> (subtitles, graphics, labels, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How Is It Put Together</strong> (editing sequence, transition devices, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What Is the Effect</strong> (what is the theme/message of the video, what “truth” does it convey about the subject)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literary Terms**

A **documentary** is a film based on factual events.
**Modes and Styles in Nonfiction Film and Television**

When we watch films and television shows that are fictional, we are aware that the creators/writers are not showing us reality. However, when we watch nonfiction films and television shows, we tend to assume that what we see is absolute reality and truth. Yet nonfiction films and television shows, as well as nonfiction books and articles, are shaped by their creators.

One way to analyze nonfiction films and television shows is to look at the documentary modes, or methods, the creators use to shape their creation. One critic has identified four modes—**expository**, **observational**, **interactive**, and **reflexive**—that the creators of nonfiction films and television shows use. Read the explanation of each mode below and consider the questions that follow each explanation.

**Expository Mode**  The film explains a subject to the viewer. Think of a historical documentary or nature show. In “Direct Address,” a voice-over narrative tells us information about the subject. In “Indirect Address,” no central narrator talks directly to the audience, but we are shown (or hear) other people talking about the subject as we look at images of it. With either form of address, the filmmaker/creator is making choices about what to explain and how to explain it, but the viewer is not necessarily aware of those choices.

- How does the speaker’s tone influence perception of the subject?
- What do you notice when comparing what is heard with what is being shown at the same time?

**Observational Mode**  This is a “fly on the wall” mode, in which the camera seems to follow the subject without commenting on it. This mode features minimal editing or cutting, little or no use of non-diegetic sound, and no voice over or interaction between the filmmaker and what is being filmed. It comes across as exclusively “showing,” rather than “telling,” which suggests extreme objectivity. The camera is merely recording reality instead of constructing it. Nevertheless, the filmmaker/creator chooses what reality the camera will record.

- What is not shown?
- How do framing, angle, and lighting potentially influence our perceptions of the subject?
Interactive Mode  The filmmaker/creator’s presence is evident; we may hear the questions being asked or see the filmmakers engaging with the subjects. We also get the sense that those on film are aware of being filmed and are perhaps modifying how they present themselves as a result of this awareness. Think reality TV: the situations themselves only exist because the film/show is provoking them into existence. Again, the filmmaker/creator is making the choices, though the viewer may be a little more aware that those choices are being made.

• Is the filmmaker provoking reactions for the sake of entertainment or to make a persuasive point? Or both?
• How much does the filmmaker’s presence affect our sense of reality?

Reflexive Mode  The text calls attention to itself as a constructed text, through deliberate editing or sound effects or satirical self-examination. It may expose its own apparatus via shots of the film crew at work. When using this mode, the filmmaker/creator is saying, ”Look, I’m creating this film/show. Watch me.” The viewer is aware of some, if not all, of the choices being made.

• How does the text’s reflection on itself impact our willingness to consider the film’s message?
• Can a text be reflexive and still claim to be objective? Truthful?
**Modes of Nonfiction Film/Television:** As you watch each of the clips listed in this chart, try to determine which documentary mode is most prevalent. The modes may change between and within scenes, but which one seems to be dominant in the clip? Then identify a list of stylistic features you notice in the clip, before ending with an analysis of how the clip’s mode contributes to its interpretation of the subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Mode and Stylistic Features</th>
<th>Effect on Viewer’s Perspective of the Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shut Up and Sing, Chap. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shut Up and Sing, Chap. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News War</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Writing Prompt:** How did each mode influence the way you felt as you watched the information being presented? Based on your answer, write an explanation identifying which mode you might use in your group’s project and why you might use it.
To define a preliminary topic and issue for your individual and group assessment, work with your group members to complete the following steps.

1. Based on the different ways in which the class exploration approached the Dixie Chicks controversy in this unit, generate a list of criteria for evaluating potential issues as topics for your own essay.

2. With these criteria in mind, brainstorm a list of potential topics and issues. Consider topics and issues that are of broad interest and that provoke inconsistent or opposing reactions.
3. With your group members, discuss the possible topics and issues you might explore. Then use the chart below to consider what approaches each of you might individually take to complete Embedded Assessment 1. Help one another craft guiding questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>Relevant to this topic/issue?</th>
<th>What elements of the issue/topic does criticism link to?</th>
<th>What could be the guiding question?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archetypal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marxist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Proposal Template

The research proposal is a one-page expository essay that informs the reader about your group’s chosen “event” or issue, discusses information you have already learned, explains which critical perspective you plan to use to examine the issue and why, defines your guiding question, and indicates where and how you will continue to conduct research to answer it.

Components of the Proposal

Event/Topic:

Review of the Issue: Write a summary of what you currently know about your chosen event or issue.

Which critical perspective will you apply while exploring the issue? What are some ways in which it links to your topic?

Initial Guiding Question (open-ended or specific):

Research Plan: Where and how will you further explore or research the issue?
When choosing sources for your research, consider both primary and secondary sources that will provide multiple relevant perspectives on your research topic and major research question. Evaluate the validity, reliability, and relevance of each source you plan to use.

**Criteria for Evaluating Sources**

**Who is this author? How can you determine the credibility of this author? Consider the author’s occupation, reputation, or credentials.**

**To what extent and in what ways does the author establish credibility in the text; e.g., Is the writing objective? Is there a clear presence of logic? Is there personal testimony? Are other examples or experts cited to support the author’s position?**

**Is bias evident in the language of the text? Consider the author’s rhetoric: Are slanters used (page 278)? To what effect? To what extent? How does this impact the author’s credibility?**

**How does the text link to your critical perspective? How might you use it to support your analysis? Explain. What quotes might you cite as support for your claims?**

**What does the text’s publication context reveal about its agenda? How might you use its context to reinforce your claims about the text or about your subject itself?**
Use the sample below as a model for the annotations you write for your five sources. Note that the example includes a summary of the source, an assessment of the usefulness of the source in providing information about the topic, and a reflection on how the source might be used to help inform research.

**Book Entry**

Author(s). *Title of Book*. Place of Publication: Publisher, Year of Publication: pages.


The author provides a rationale as well as concrete lesson plans for teaching documentary film and narrative modes in the high school classroom. An explanation of modes and styles as well as practical guidelines for investigating them in a high school language arts class are included. This source challenges teachers to incorporate documentary film into their curriculum. The suggestions are accessible to teachers from different contexts and provide a valuable teaching tool.

**Web Site Entry**

Author(s). *Name of Page*. Date of Posting/Revision. Name of institution/organization affiliated with the site. Date of access <electronic address>.


The author gives a comprehensive discussion of the MLA format and provides numerous examples of entries for readers to model. This source is an invaluable tool for the novice researcher as it provides step-by-step explanations. The examples of electronic forms are especially helpful when documenting sources from the Internet.

**Literary Terms**

**Credibility** is the quality of being trusted or believed.
Examining How an Issue Is Presented in Media Texts

SUGGESTED LEARNING STRATEGIES: Discussion Groups, Drafting, Self-Editing/Peer Editing, Sharing and Responding

Assignment

Your assignment is to write an argumentative essay asserting a particular critical interpretation of an “event” using evidence from at least five of the texts you have gathered alone and with your group members to support your argument. As needed, conduct additional research to gain multiple perspectives on the topic. Refer to the information on page 318 as you evaluate both secondary and primary sources and the information you have collected for validity, reliability, and relevance to your topic.

Steps:

Planning

1. Based on your research plan, you have been collecting articles and other resources about a topic that you and your group will be presenting to the class. This individual assignment asks you to show your insights regarding your topic by using quotes and observations from your sources to present a particular critical interpretation of the issue. Evaluate the validity, relevance, and reliability of the information you have collected. Discard information and sources you deem unreliable.

2. In preparation for writing the essay, reread each text critically, marking it for evidence that links to the critical interpretation you are making. Consider both the article’s content and the rhetoric the writer uses to discuss the subject. Identify quotations to use in your essay, and write commentary about the quotations you plan to use. Incorporate the quotes and commentary into your essay.

Drafting/Preparing

3. Define your thesis, paying careful attention to how your own reaction to your “event” or issue is influencing your response to the texts you are analyzing. Your thesis may be stated as a direct response to the guiding question you have used throughout your research.

4. Select an organizational pattern that reveals your perspective and presents accurate information that is relevant to your central thesis and your supporting concepts and themes. As you draft your essay, analyze the multiple views and evidence from your research. Identify the views that support your thesis, and accurately quote and cite evidence from those sources. Anticipate and respond to contradictory views and information. Analyze opposing viewpoints and their supporting evidence, and acknowledge them as part of your counter-argument. Anticipate readers’ questions about your thesis, evidence, and counter-argument and provide a response. Incorporate a variety of rhetorical strategies to argue for your thesis. Conclude your essay with an effective summary and call to action.
Revising/Presenting

5. Within your group, review one another’s essays using the Peer Review guidelines on the next page. As you read the essays of your peers, focus on each writer’s rhetoric and his or her use of textual evidence as support for the interpretive claims made in the essay.

6. Proofread and edit your paper for final publication. Refer to a style manual to document sources and format your paper appropriately.

In preparation for receiving a peer review, use the questions below to self-evaluate your own work. You might also review the scoring guide to ensure that you are fully addressing the expectations for the assignment.

Peer Review

At various stages in the writing process, you have benefited from interacting with your peers, who have given feedback on your guiding question for research and your prewriting. Now you will receive feedback on the first draft of your argumentative essay, and you will provide feedback on the essays written by your peers. As you read one of your classmates’ essay drafts, you will serve as a peer reviewer. Your classmate will use the feedback you provide to revise his or her thoughts and compose a second draft of the essay. Similarly, you will be provided with feedback on your draft from several classmates. Please read carefully and be specific in your response as you review your peer’s work. Suggestions to guide your responses are provided.

Guide for Peer Review

1. What is the writer’s thesis?
2. How well has the writer developed the thesis?
3. What suggestions would you make to improve the argumentative essay? Be specific.
4. What evidence is there that the material was carefully chosen?
5. How has the writer made the topic understandable to the reader?
6. Is the material/information in the essay well documented? Explain.
7. What evidence is there that the writer is dealing with a specific critical perspective?
# SCORING GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Ideas**         | The essay effectively combines the sources and the writer’s position to argue how a particular lens can be used to interpret a single issue or controversy in multiple texts. The cohesive, sustained argument includes:  
• a thesis that contextualizes the issue and presents the critical lens;  
• support and commentary that convincingly links the citation of a variety of source material to a demonstration of the writer’s position;  
• a conclusion that goes beyond a summary of the thesis by suggesting the larger significance of the writer’s position in understanding the issue. | The essay adequately combines the sources and the writer’s position to argue how a particular lens can be used to interpret a single issue or controversy in multiple texts. The sound argument includes:  
• a straightforward thesis that briefly contextualizes the issue and identifies the critical lens;  
• support and commentary that clearly connects the various source material to the writer’s position;  
• a conclusion that is logical yet may be somewhat repetitive of the thesis. | The essay tries to combine the sources and the writer’s position yet inadequately argues how a particular lens can be used to interpret a single issue or controversy in multiple texts. The attempted argument includes:  
• a weak thesis or one that is lost in a summary of sources;  
• support that paraphrases source material with no commentary or analysis linking to the writer’s position; sources may be misunderstood;  
• a conclusion that returns directly to the attempted thesis or is missing. |
| **Organization**  | The essay’s organization aptly reinforces the ideas of the argument. Ideas move smoothly and logically with successful use of transitions enhancing the essay’s coherence. | The essay’s clear organization supports the ideas of the argument. Ideas are easy to follow. Transitions are used to move between ideas. | The essay’s lack of organization detracts from the argument, making the ideas difficult to follow. It may lack transitions and jump too rapidly between ideas. |
| **Use of Language** | The essay demonstrates a mature style that advances the writer’s ideas. Precise diction and skillful use of syntax help to create a convincing voice. Standard writing conventions (including spelling and accurate citation of sources) are followed. | The essay demonstrates a style that adequately supports the writer’s ideas. Logical diction and syntax help to create a suitable voice. Standard writing conventions (including spelling and accurate citation of sources) are followed; errors do not seriously impede readability. | The essay demonstrates a limited style that ineffectively supports the writer’s ideas. Lapses in diction or syntax may not allow a suitable voice to sustain throughout the essay. Errors in spelling and standard writing conventions impede readability and sources may be inaccurately cited. |
### SCORING GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence of Writing Process</strong></td>
<td>The essay demonstrates thoughtful planning (including an extensive annotated bibliography), significant revision, and careful editing in preparing a publishable draft.</td>
<td>The essay demonstrates adequate planning (including a complete annotated bibliography), revision, and editing in preparing a publishable draft.</td>
<td>The essay lacks evidence of planning (annotated bibliography may be incomplete or missing), revision, and/or editing. The draft is not ready for publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Learning Focus:
Creating Perspectives

Twelve words are casually referenced in a concert review. The words are picked up by a blog halfway around the world that encourages its readers to call radio stations demanding the offender's music be pulled from rotation. Within days, the result is a firestorm of backlash against the performers, including CD burnings, plummeting sales, a ban from radio play by a major radio conglomerate, and even death threats. Three years of soul searching later, the band rises like a phoenix from the ashes, releasing a critically hailed and briskly selling CD and garnering major awards from the music industry. True story. Sounds like a movie, though, doesn’t it? And, indeed, it became one in the documentary, Shut Up and Sing.

Documentaries present powerful accounts of stories such as this one, but there are many other media channels that are growing increasingly popular for the way they record and present “true” stories. In the first part of this unit, you were exposed to many such channels: documentary film, television, investigative journalism, television interviews, online magazines and websites, radio newscasts, and various traditional print genres. Analyzing these media channels is only one half of understanding how media impacts our understanding of issues and information. Becoming a producer of one of these media texts, using the conventions of a selected media channel to present an exposé on a controversial subject is another way to understand the power of media presentations. By presenting ideas via a media production, you exercise the power to influence how your viewers understand a subject. In this way, you will be responsible for creating others’ perspective on the truth as you think it should be seen.
You will be watching a film clip twice. The first time you will view it without sound, and the second time the visuals will be accompanied by the sound track.

1. As you watch the film clip, make a list of the visual images you see.

2. Based on these images, what do you think the tone of this scene is? Brainstorm some possible tone words. Choose the one that seems to fit best, then describe what kind of music you would expect to hear that would support this tone.

3. As you watch the clip a second time, make a descriptive list of all sound elements in the scene (music, dialogue, background sounds, etc.).

4. How has the addition of the sound elements affected the tone of the scene? How is the resulting tone similar to or different from what you expected?

Quickwrite: After closely analyzing the musical and visual elements of the scene, write a paragraph on your own paper beginning with the following stem: In the opening scene of (film title) ____________ the director establishes a ________ tone in order to suggest ______________. Develop the paragraph with specific examples from both the sounds and images in the scene.
Planning a Documentary Media Text

Long before you actually develop your documentary, you have to begin thinking about some of the basic components of a good plan. You need to focus on your topic or issue, your audience, and why you chose this particular topic or issue. Below are some questions you should ask and answer before you go further in planning your documentary.

- **Topic/Issue**  What is your topic/issue? What event, person, text, conflict, etc., are you focusing on? What critical lenses are you using to illuminate that subject for your audience? What messages or interpretation of the topic/issues do you wish to convey?

- **Purpose**  What is your purpose? What do you want your audience to think/feel/know/do as a result of viewing your text?

- **Audience**  Decide on an audience to whom you’d like to address your argument. You must settle on an identifiable audience that you expect will have some interest in your topic. Your audience may not be “my teacher” or the other students in your class.

- **Tone**  What tone will best help you achieve your desired purpose? What specific music, visual text, voice-over narrative, sound effects, etc., could you use to advance your tone? What images will best evoke the desired response in your viewers?

- **Speaker**  Who are you as the speaker? Think about the various documentary modes: will you be observational, expository, interactive, or reflexive in your text? To what extent? Why?

- **Occasion**  What is the occasion for your media text? Are you developing it in response to an incident or event, or to celebrate or acknowledge a situation? Would this be screened in a theater or shown on a television channel of some kind?
Developing Your Media Text

Working in groups, you have generated several questions to guide your investigation of media and media channels. Now you’re ready to create a central question on a topic and write thesis statements relating to the question.

Revisiting Your Guiding Questions: Review the guiding questions you previously generated as a group, and write the questions each of you used in the space below.

Defining a Common Question: Work together to define a common guiding question. The goal is to identify a question that is broad enough to be an umbrella under which each of your individual questions falls.

Writing Thesis Statements: Once you have your central question, write thesis statements that answer the questions for each of the lenses that will be used by members of your group.
Identifying Characters and Roles: Using your collective research on your issue, decide who will be your “main characters.” These may be actual people who were involved in or influenced by the event, or they may be composite characters that represent particular points of view. Decide in your group who will play each character as well as who will be the narrator/host/interviewer, if one or more will be included. Write the roles and responsibilities here.

Choosing a Media Channel and Identifying Its Conventions: Brainstorm a list of media channels that you might use to present your various points of view. Choose the option you think would best allow your group to explore your subject. Then make a list of typical structural and stylistic conventions of that channel. You might dissect a professional model to help you identify key features to emulate.
# Nonfiction Film Treatment

**Our thesis:**

**Our media channel/format:**

**Conventions of this format:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What will the audience see?</th>
<th>What will the audience hear?</th>
<th>What will the audience think/feel?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What images/“characters” will be shown? What mode(s) will be used? What angles, framing, composition, etc., will be used to show our subjects?</td>
<td>(include dialogue/voice-over, music, diegetic sounds, etc.). What tone are we striving for?</td>
<td>What perspective will each lens provide? What will they learn about the subject? What will they believe/know after each segment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Juror Ballot**

You will view a documentary provided by your teacher, and will complete a Juror Ballot as a model of your task as an audience member for your peers’ media presentation. Your task as a juror is to assess the quality of the argumentative text you’re viewing and the degree to which you find it successful in reaching the intended audience.

### Section 1: Dialectical Journal
As you encounter evidence of the critical perspective(s) the presenter (in this case, the director) uses, make a note of what you see or hear and record a response using the same reading skills that you would normally bring to bear on a written text.

**Critical Perspective(s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide evidence based on what you see or hear.</th>
<th>Your response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2: Argumentative Thesis
Paraphrase the group’s thesis statement. If there are more than one, be sure to include each.

---

**Word Connections**

Voir dire is derived from the Anglo French and means “to speak the truth.”
Section 3: Quickwrite

After viewing the film, respond with your overall impressions in the form of a quickwrite, with an emphasis on providing due praise for the parts of the presentation that are done well.

Section 4: Evaluating the Text

For each of the areas listed below, discuss the choices made by the group. How effective were these choices at supporting the presentation of their argument to their target audience?

Mode(s)

Style and Conventions

Tone (images and sound)

Section 5: Suggestions for Improvement

Make suggestions for improvement of the presentation’s content.
Creating a Media Text

SUGGESTED LEARNING STRATEGIES: Visualizing, Mapping, Self-Editing/Peer Editing, Sketching, Sharing and Responding, Discussion Groups, Rehearsal

Assignment

Your assignment is to create a documentary text in a media channel of your choice (TV news magazine, documentary film, news broadcast, podcast, etc.) in which you transform the information you gathered into an argument concerning the topic or issue you have chosen. Your presentation should last 10 to 15 minutes. It may be recorded or presented live. Each group member will take on a role (or roles), research that role, and use the research to write his or her portion of the presentation. Refer to page 318 as you evaluate both primary and secondary sources and your researched information for validity, reliability, and relevance to your topic.

Steps:

1. With your film treatment as a general guide, use the information and quotations you have gathered from your research and your individual essays to create a script for your text. Each person will be responsible for creating the voice of his or her character(s). Keep in mind the conventions of the documentary model you have selected as you draft your script.

2. Much of what you write will be based on the information you have gathered from your research. Summarize, paraphrase, and quote information as needed. Document sources in the script by using footnotes or endnotes according to format guidelines provided by your teacher. Synthesize information from multiple points of view, and use that information as you write your script and design your multimedia presentation. Remember to collect and use appropriate graphics and other images to support your argument.

3. Edit your individual portions into a coherent script for the program.

4. As a group, you must submit a written annotated bibliography with your presentation. Your annotated bibliography will be a list of citations of books, articles, and documents your group consulted. Each citation should be followed by an annotation that briefly describes the source, including what lens it links to, how it frames the event, and how you are using it in your script/performance.

5. Depending on the approach you have chosen (live or recorded), rehearse or film your performance. If filming, factor in time for editing, which is generally far more time-consuming than the filming itself.

6. Present your documentary media text to the class. You will evaluate, and be evaluated by, a jury of your peers using the Juror Ballots.

7. You will complete a self-reflection using the feedback provided in the juror ballots you receive.

TECHNOLOGY TIP  Use available technology to help you create your media text. You may want to reserve time in the computer lab. If needed, ask for help in learning to use presentation software, video equipment, or graphics programs.


**Juror Ballot**

As you view a group’s documentary media presentation, you will complete this Juror Ballot. Your task as a juror is to assess the quality of the media text you’re viewing and the degree to which you find it successful in reaching the intended audience.

### Section 1: Dialectical Journal

As you encounter evidence of the critical perspective(s) the presenter (in this case, the director) uses, make a note of what you see or hear and record a response using the same reading skills that you would normally bring to bear on a written text.

#### Critical Perspective(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide evidence based on what you see or hear.</th>
<th>Your response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2: Argumentative Thesis

Paraphrase the group’s thesis statement. If there are more than one, be sure to include each.
### Section 3: Quickwrite

After viewing the film, respond with your overall impressions in the form of a quickwrite, with an emphasis on providing due praise for the parts of the presentation that are done well.

### Section 4: Evaluating the Text

For each of the areas listed below, discuss the choices made by the group. How effective were these choices at supporting the presentation of their argument to their target audience?

- **Mode(s)**

- **Style and Conventions**

- **Tone (images and sound)**

### Section 5: Suggestions for Improvement

Make suggestions for improvement of the content of the documentary media text or presentation.
**Guided Self-Reflection**

Based on the feedback you received from your peers, to what extent did you succeed in presenting your argument persuasively? Quote peer comments to support your assessment.

What could you revise about your presentation to improve its effectiveness? Be specific.

How has your engagement with nonfiction media in this unit affected your understanding of how it functions? Do you approach reading/viewing any differently now? Explain.

How has your study of critical theory this year impacted the way you view literature, media, and the world around you? Explain.
## SCORING GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparatory Texts</strong></td>
<td>The scripts and annotated bibliography reveal an insightful analysis and mature understanding of the event.</td>
<td>The scripts and annotated bibliography demonstrate careful analysis and clear understanding of the event.</td>
<td>The scripts and annotated bibliography reveal a limited analysis and understanding of the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>The documentary demonstrates thorough investigation, insightful application of the lenses, and thoughtful understanding of the event. Its organizational structure is precisely appropriate to the media channel and enhances the intended message to the audience. Participants demonstrate a polished performance that creates focus and maintains energy.</td>
<td>The documentary demonstrates adequate investigation, application of the lenses, and clear understanding of the event. Its organizational structure is appropriate to the media channel and makes clear the intended message to the audience. Participants demonstrate an organized performance that creates coherence.</td>
<td>The documentary demonstrates inadequate investigation and/or misunderstanding of the lenses or how they apply to the event. Its organizational structure is inappropriate to the media channel and may convey an unclear message to the audience. Participants demonstrate a disorganized performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence of Collaboration</strong></td>
<td>Throughout the entire process of planning and presenting, the group cooperates and works successfully to maintain purpose and to achieve goals. Equal sharing of responsibility is evident.</td>
<td>Throughout the process of planning and presenting, the group works together adequately to maintain purpose and achieve goals. Sharing of responsibility is mostly balanced.</td>
<td>Throughout the process of planning and presenting, the group’s cooperation is lacking, which impedes their ability to maintain a purpose or achieve goals. Responsibilities may not be equally divided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SCORING GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Text</td>
<td>The reflective text demonstrates a thorough and detailed analysis of the entire process including planning, rehearsing, and performing/recording the scene. It includes insightful commentary based on the audience’s evaluation of the final performance.</td>
<td>The reflective text demonstrates adequate analysis of the process of planning, rehearsing, and performing/recording the scene. It includes commentary based on the audience’s evaluation of the final performance.</td>
<td>The reflective text demonstrates inadequate analysis of the process of planning, rehearsing, and performing/recording the scene. Commentary based on the audience’s evaluation of the final performance may be weak or missing. Analysis and evaluation may be replaced by summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Critical Perspectives Timed Writing

Compose an expository essay in response to the following writing prompt. Take a moment to prewrite and plan your essay before beginning. Your essay will be assessed as a first draft with an emphasis on the development of your ideas. You will have 50 minutes to draft your essay.

Writing Prompt: Consider your favorite film or television program. How are your perceptions, opinions, conclusions, or enjoyment of this film or program altered when you apply different critical perspectives? Be sure to identify the critical perspectives in your response. Use rhetorical devices as needed to convey meaning to your readers.
Reflection

An important aspect of growing as a learner is to take the time to reflect. It is important to take into account where you have been, what you have accomplished, what helped you to learn, and how you will apply your new knowledge in the future. Use the following process to record your thinking and to identify evidence of your learning.

Thinking about Concepts

1. Using specific examples from this unit, respond to the Essential Questions:
   - How do media sources impact our understanding of the truth and significance of an issue?
   - How can media texts be constructed to support an agenda or interpretation?

2. Consider the new academic vocabulary from this unit (Media Channel) as well as academic vocabulary from previous units and select 2–3 terms of which your understanding has grown. For each term, answer the following questions:
   - What was your understanding of the word prior to the unit?
   - How has your understanding of the word evolved throughout the unit?
   - How will you apply your understanding in the future?

Thinking about Connections

3. Review the activities and products (artifacts) you created. Choose those that most reflect your growth or increase in understanding.

4. For each artifact that you choose, record, respond to, and reflect on your thinking and understanding, using the following questions as a guide:
   - a. What skill/knowledge does this artifact reflect, and how did you learn this skill/knowledge?
   - b. How did your understanding of the power of language expand through your engagement with this artifact?
   - c. How will you apply this skill or knowledge in the future?

5. Create this reflection as Portfolio pages—one for each artifact you choose. Use the model in the box for your headings and commentary on questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thinking About Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Entry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concept:

Description of Artifact:

Commentary on Questions: