

UNIT 1 Opposites Attract?

Reading 1 Dating and Mate Selection

by Ron Hammond, Ph.D., and Paul Cheney, Ph.D.

Copyright 2009, Paul Cheney. Used by permission.

Sixty years ago, if you were of marrying age, you might have chosen a mate based on your parents' opinions or you might have made the selection based on your potential partner's character, health, or wealth. Today, we search for soul mates.

When we interact with people, we filter them as either being among our pool of possible partners or not. We ask ourselves if the person we're talking to belongs in or out of the pool of people we might consider a possible date or mate. Filtering is the process that answers this question.

One common filter that springs to mind is physical appearance. A few desirable traits make an individual more attractive to everyone. These include above-average height as well as symmetry in facial features, but mostly our perception of physical beauty is highly subjective. Most of us tend to compare ourselves to averages or to others we know. That is how we come to define our personal level of attractiveness. Indeed, there is a reason we judge ourselves as being more or less attractive. We often limit our dating pool to those we believe to be in the same level of beauty in which we place ourselves.

But what if you don't have those universally desirable traits just mentioned? You are not excluded from the date- and mate-selection market; dating and mating selection choices are actually based for the most part on homogamy. Homogamy is the tendency for people to choose partners of similar attractiveness, background, interests, and needs. But what about the common wisdom that opposites attract? Do opposites really attract? Yes—in the short term. However, they typically don't form committed, long-term relationships together.

One of my students challenged this, saying, "My husband and I are so different. He likes Mexican food, and I like Italian. He likes rap, and I like classical music. He likes water skiing, and I like camping and hiking." I interrupted her and said, "So you both like ethnic food, music, and the outdoors. Do you vote on similar issues? Do you have similar family backgrounds? Do you come from similar economic classes?" She answered yes to all three questions.

It would seem there are good reasons for this. In the research, we tend to find patterns showing that homogamy can support a long-term relationship. Homogamous couples last longer because their

similarities produce fewer disagreements and interruptions in daily routines. I believe that we filter homogamously, even to the point that we tend to marry someone like our parents. Here's why: people from similar economic classes, ethnic groups, and religions, with similar political opinions and lifestyles, tend to hang out with others like themselves.

One of the most influential psychologists in the 1950s and 60s was Abraham Maslow, with his famous pyramid of the hierarchy of needs. According to Maslow, we select partners based on needs. Individuals from homes in which they were not nurtured through childhood are likely to still have an unfulfilled need for nurturing and are likely to be attracted to those who satisfy that need. On the other hand, persons from nurturing, supportive homes do not have the same need. Instead, they are attracted to those who promise growth and support in other areas of life.

The general principle, then, is that the more similar two people perceive themselves to be, the more likely their relationship will continue and succeed. Notice the word *perceive*. In fact, actual similarities are not as important as the *belief* that common characteristics exist. Furthermore, certain individuals value one background trait over others. They may be more willing to overlook differences in traits that are not as important. Still, the relationship is less likely to develop if there are few or no common traits. On the other hand, it is more likely to develop if there are more common traits, especially in areas that the individuals consider very important.

As you've read through this chapter, you have learned a great deal about how we (perhaps even you) include others in or exclude them from our pool of possible partners. From levels of physical attractiveness to a range of political opinions, we include those who are remarkably similar to ourselves. So, at the end of the day, opposites might not really attract after all. And given that homogamy tends to strengthen a relationship, perhaps it is best that they don't.

UNIT 1 Opposites Attract?

Reading 2 Differences That Don't Divide

by Sandra Z. Lee

Tristan and Hannah are as different as any two people could be. Tristan loves football, but Hannah hates sports. Hannah loves technology; Tristan, on the other hand, doesn't know the first thing about computers. He's from a large family with four brothers and sisters. She's an only child. They don't even share the same race. Tristan is white, and Hannah is black. The list of differences between them goes on and on, yet somehow their relationship works well. They've been happily married for fifteen years. With so little in common, how did they ever end up together?

Unlikely relationships like theirs are somewhat curious. Most people assume that successful couples have more similarities than differences. That is the conventional wisdom: having a lot in common with a spouse or partner should make life easier. After all, there would be less cause for conflict and unhappiness.

However, research actually shows that this might not be the case. A Columbia University study found that some couples are just too alike for their own good. Over three years, researchers studied 732 men and women. They found that couples with the most similar personalities had some of the weakest relationships. In surveys about levels of intimacy, commitment, and overall happiness, those couples scored low. Clearly, having a lot in common is no guarantee of a successful marriage.

Relationships between very different people may even have advantages. In his 2007 study of couples, Robert Levenson of the University of California showed that different personalities can complement each other. Differences can help couples balance each other out and cope better with life's difficulties. For instance, someone with an outgoing nature can make up for a partner's shyness. In turn, the outgoing partner can learn to enjoy more time alone.

The causes of attraction between very different people may go even deeper. A recent study at Rutgers University revealed a physiological reason that some opposites attract. In the study, Dr. Helen Fisher reviewed research on the subject of attraction. She learned that an abundance of certain hormones is associated with specific personality traits. Individuals with high levels of testosterone tend to be competitive and analytical. They are more often attracted to their opposites. These introspective and nurturing individuals have high levels of the hormone estrogen. On the other hand, people with more

curious or flexible personality types tend to be attracted to people like themselves. Similarly, people who are less anxious and more social are attracted to others of the same personality type. These two groups tend to have moderate levels of testosterone and estrogen. So, it seems that opposites do attract for certain personality types, but not for all.

Genetics may also explain why opposites sometimes attract. A University of New Mexico study suggests that our genes strongly influence our choice of partner. The authors of the study found that a woman's unhappiness in a relationship is linked to her partner's genes being too closely matched to her own. This strategy may have evolved in order to avoid the dangers that come with inbreeding. Such dangers include harmful mutations and decreased overall health.

As with everything in life, there's no one approach to finding love. Like Tristan and Hannah, people with very different upbringings, personalities, and interests can still have a long-lasting relationship. Their complementary characters, not to mention their hormones and varied genetic makeup, may even benefit them in the long run. But at the end of the day, all of this research doesn't really offer much advice for people looking for a perfect match. However, don't rule out someone who's very different. The best approach is just to leave your options open and allow yourself to be surprised by what you find.

UNIT 2 To Trust or Not to Trust?

Reading 1 Hug, Hit, or Ignore? *Cultural Differences in Dealing with Strangers*

by Erin B. Taylor

Copyright 2012, PopAnth. Used by permission.

London. The subway. My train suddenly stops in the middle of nowhere. A few minutes pass with no announcement. Time drags until, finally, I catch the eye of the girl sitting next to me and we exchange a few words. Then I notice two young, well-dressed men smirking at us from the other end of the carriage. Have I done something wrong?

I realize that I have broken the golden social rule: never talk to strangers, even if out-of-the-ordinary events are occurring. It strikes me as quite perverse. City dwellers everywhere go to great lengths to protect their personal space. But in the case of a possible emergency, isn't this going a little too far?

Last year, back in Sydney, I had the opposite experience. Having just flown in after an absence of six months, I was stunned to notice how friendly people were to strangers. Everywhere I went, I spied people striking up conversations with people whom they evidently didn't know. These weren't just vague, impersonal conversations, either. Names, dates, places, hopes, and dreams were all revealed in the space of approximately five minutes. (I'm told that Australian men will even talk to strangers while peeing into a urinal—an expression of intimacy if ever I've heard one.)

The contrast with my experience on the London underground was striking. In fact, I was rather confused, because I know that Sydney isn't always as friendly a place as my observations suggested. Just as in any other city, most people ignore each other as much as possible. Moreover, people seem as equally ready to throw insults and punches at each other as they do to compare lottery results or buy a stranger a drink. A night out on the town in Sydney might result in a new best friend for life, or a black eye for a week.

Like a good social scientist, I developed a theory to explain this behavior. I call it the "hug or hit" rule of social engagement. This rule states that Sydneysiders (and possibly all Australians) feel that we have the right to interact with strangers if we feel like it, and the obligation to respond if people interact with us. We feel that we should be able to treat each other as intimate friends, even if we have never met before in our lives. However, we also feel that we have the right to reprimand other people if they don't behave

in accordance with our social rules. In other words, our claim to intimacy makes us social and antisocial at the same time.

The English have exactly the opposite rule. Indeed, not only should you never talk to strangers; you aren't even allowed to give away the most basic information to people you meet in private. Standing next to a stranger at a party? You can talk about the weather as a way to break the ice, but you don't dare to offer your name, or ask the other person what they do for a living. In her hilarious book *Watching the English*, Kate Fox explains that if you want to get to know someone, you must trick them into giving you information by asking indirect questions. "Nosy parker" is the worst insult that someone can throw at you.

So, why the difference? It may have a lot to do with what we think constitutes an ideal society. In Australia, we believe that egalitarianism and "mateship" are at the core of our identity. To refuse to talk to other people is to treat them as inferior. In England, Fox tells us, many of the rules about privacy are set up to maintain the class system: "keeping to yourself" means that it will be difficult to get to know members of another class.

The problem with this theory of difference is that it only tells us what people think should be done, not what they actually do. In reality, Australia is also a classed society, and the English also have many ways of maintaining egalitarianism. Plus, both societies are changing. As Australia becomes wealthier, the gap between rich and poor increases. It seems that our new hobby is to buy into exclusive suburbs, build high walls around our houses, and drive to work. Conversely, as English people travel more and their society becomes increasingly multicultural, people are questioning the class system and rules about privacy are losing their attraction.

Could it be that we will eventually develop the same rules of social interaction? If so, I'm going to seek out those two young men on the train and make them talk with me. If they talk, I will give them a hug. If they refuse, then I can seek comfort in the fact that I have the right to hit them for their social transgression.

UNIT 2 To Trust or Not to Trust?

Reading 2 Brief Encounters: Why I Love House-Swapping

by Emily Kasriel

Copyright 2011, Guardian News & Media Ltd. Used by permission.

Despite our willingness to open our house and lives to strangers, our latest home exchange didn't get off to a good start. Only hours after we arrived in France, my mobile rang. At that moment we were feeling rather smug and, even, a little French. We were filled with crusty rye bread and anchovy tapenade from the local market. The person calling was the father of our French home exchange family. Details of the welcome I had prepared raced through my mind: leaflets of current London highlights—check; homemade lemon drizzle cake—yep; Italian wine . . .

And then I remembered a minor detail that had somehow slipped my mind: the keys. I closed my eyes and imagined our French family and their fears. They had handed over all their precious possessions to English foreigners, who would sweep their rural idyll clean, and then create havoc and abandon it. I frantically got back on the phone, desperate to reach friends with a spare set of keys. Thankfully, our neighbors, who are French themselves, were willing to provide a temporary home to these recreational refugees, who were marooned with as much luggage as Ryanair would allow.

This wasn't the first time we had swapped our home with total strangers via a holiday exchange website. Our first tentative try was at the start of 2009 in the home of architect Cedrick and his family. His chic Parisian apartment had African masks on the muted grey walls, and a rich pink bathroom. The following summer we exchanged with Geraldine and her daughters. We stayed in their light-filled terraced Cornish home. Lying in Geraldine's bed with the balcony doors wide open, listening to the River Tamar lapping against the side of her home, was calming and memorable. The fact that these people were strangers lessened the degree of discomfort I felt on intruding into their lives.

But for this latest journey, now a home swap "graduate," I was looking for a way to exchange more than a place to stay. In an email to Nicola (the owner of the home I would be living in) prior to the holiday, I asked for names of children that ours could meet and hopefully have fun with. I sought to deploy our offspring as a convenient subterfuge, a socially acceptable excuse to engage with the locals.

It worked. Two days after we arrived in France, we were perched with Nicola's friends on wooden planks overlooking a Languedoc village square watching a traditional dancing and bull-blessing ceremony. In

another encounter, neighbors Eric and Pascale invited us to dinner—homemade Languedoc fish pie and local goat's cheese steeped in honey. Pascale later came round to deliver the weekly box of organic vegetables and taught me how to cook a *fromage frais* and leek quiche.

Though my forgetfulness in the matter of keys might suggest otherwise, my attitude toward house swaps and my trust in strangers had evolved. As Internet visionary Clay Shirky argues, the Internet gives us opportunities to share with people outside our immediate circle. Trust usually develops over time with repeated encounters. But when you enter into the house-swapping game, it is immediate and quite intense—though brief and not usually repeated. What is interesting is the ease with which we felt able to trust this digitally mediated encounter. We shared not only everything we own but also our relationships with friends and neighbors. In essence, we were temporarily swapping our lives.

When we returned home, I felt a little usurped. Our French London neighbors had already been thanked for their hospitality the previous week with an invitation to dinner around our table.

Then I got this email. “Hi, Emily. Thanks to you we exchange not only our home but also the people. When I was traveling around East Berlin in 1990, I felt I was open to the world. . . . This sensation of connection *partage* is possible thanks to travel and the meeting of the other. Our exchange is the *nouvelle* experience for the all family. We left the barriers at home and we try to bring back this openness we had in the other home. The kids have been transformed by the English language, culture, and sharing with people. They are rich. *Merci*, Nicola.”

My desire for a deeper encounter had been echoed. A slight blurring of the lines of our separate identities had taken place. One of the ideals of a holiday is to have a transformative experience that lingers long after you return to your daily routine. As we learn to become a little less precious about our separateness, swapping homes and lives may become an increasingly attractive and popular adventure.

UNIT 3 Helping the Homeless

Reading 1 Should You Give Money to Homeless People?

by Derek Thompson

Copyright 2014, The Atlantic Monthly Group. All Rights Reserved.

Giving money to the homeless is an economic crisis of the heart. It involves a tug-of-war between the instinct to alleviate suffering and the knowledge that a donation might actually encourage the anguish of the poor.

We're all familiar with our mothers' reasons not to empty our pockets for beggars*. "The best help is a shelter, not a dollar," she's told us. "They'll only use it on [something bad] anyway!"

The studies seem to back up mom, to a degree. One report from the Department of Housing and Urban Development found that six out of ten homeless respondents admitted problems with alcohol or drugs. Given the likelihood of self-reported bias, the actual number could be even higher. Studies on homeless income find that the typical "career panhandler" who dedicates his time overwhelmingly to begging can make between \$600 and \$1,500 a month. But since panhandlers often have no way to save their money, they have a good reason to spend most of their day's earnings quickly. This creates a tendency to spend on short-term relief, rather than long-term needs, which can feed this dependency on alcoholic relief.

The Case for Giving

What do economists say about the instinct to help the homeless? (For these purposes, I'm ignoring the altruism factor, the idea that if giving 50 cents makes us feel good then it's an inherently justifiable donation.) Some argue that giving cash to cash-needy people is the most efficient way to spend it. Indeed, the Congressional Budget Office has stated explicitly that the most efficient government stimulus targets the poorest Americans. And who's poorer than a homeless person? What's more, if you donate to a charity, there are administrative costs and time lags. If you put your money in the hands of a beggar, however, it's fast, easy, and guaranteed to be spent immediately.

But the fact that beggars are likely to spend their money quickly is also the problem. Food stamps are considered highly effective government spending. But they're earmarked for food. Unemployment benefits can go a long way. But recipients have to prove that they're looking for work. A dollar from your hand to a homeless person's has no such strings attached.

But what would happen if we provided both money and strings? *Good* magazine found a British non-profit that identified 15 long-term homeless people, asked what they needed to change their lives, and just bought it for them. Some asked for items as simple as shoes, or cash to repay a loan. One asked for a camper van. All were given 3,000 pounds and a “broker” to help them manage their budget. Of the 13 who agreed to take part, 11 were off the street within a year, and several entered treatment for addiction. The lesson: The homeless often need something more than money. They need money and direction. For most homeless people, direction means a job and a roof. A 1999 study from HUD asked homeless people what they needed most: 42 percent said help finding a job; 38 percent said finding housing; 30 percent said paying rent or utilities; 13 percent said training or medical care.

But What Should You Do?

Organizations can do more for the needy than we can with the change in our back pocket. But does that mean we shouldn't give, ever?

The consistently entertaining economist Tyler Cowen worries that giving to beggars induces bad long-term incentives. If you travel to a poor city, for example, you'll find lots of beggars by touristy locations. If the tourists become more generous, the local beggars don't get richer. They only multiply. Generous people attract more beggars. Cowen writes:

“The more you give to beggars, the harder beggars will try. This leads to what economists call 'rent exhaustion,' which again limits the net gain to beggars . . . If you are going to give, pick the poor person who is expecting it least.”

I'm certain that there are some cases in which donations to an especially needy beggar are justified. But the ultimate danger in panhandling is that we don't give to every beggar. There's not enough change in our purses. We choose to donate money based on the level of perceived need. Beggars know this, so there is an incentive on their part to exaggerate their need, by either lying about their circumstances or letting their appearance visibly deteriorate rather than seek help.

If we drop change in a beggar's hand without donating to a charity, we're acting to relieve our guilt rather than the underlying crisis of poverty. The same thing applies to the beggar who relies on begging for alcohol. In short, both sides fail each other by being lured into a fleeting sense of relief rather than a lasting solution to the problem of homelessness.

Note: Academic research, journalism articles, and everyday conversation often use the words homeless, beggar, and panhandler to describe the same group. But if we're being precise, not all homeless people are beggars, and not all beggars are homeless

UNIT 3 Helping the Homeless

Reading 2 Down, Out, and Dying for a Warm Bed

by Marcus Warren

Copyright 2004, Telegraph Media Group Limited. Used by permission.

Please, God, let it be dawn soon. Let there be light and not the cruel orange glare of street lamps, but the rosy fingers of a new day and an end to this hell. Then it will all be over: my shivering, the bone-chilling cold of Montreal in May, and this bed, a plastic sheet under a motorway.

It feels as though it must be four in the morning, three at the absolute earliest. My feet are wrapped in a garbage bag, and the rest of me is covered in three layers of hand-me-downs and a torn plastic poncho. I fish my mobile phone out of my pocket, even though I've broken the strict rules of the exercise by bringing it with me, and see that the time is 12:54 in the morning.

A "street retreat," I have learned over the past couple of days, makes many demands of those taking part, among them the forsaking of all material possessions, such as mobiles. The rules are simple and explicit: you are not allowed to bring bedding, books, food, money, jewelry, watches, a change of clothes, or other "conveniences"; and in order to prepare ourselves fully for what lies ahead, we are told not to wash our hair or shave for five days prior to hitting the streets. The aim of the retreat is, according to the organizers, to "experience the unknown and the wholeness of life."

On the first day, the money that I received after rattling a polystyrene coffee cup for three-quarters of an hour amounts to zilch. Jonathan, a 25-year-old with a messy beard and teeth the color of tobacco, is a money magnet, seducing strangers into handing over cash just by walking up to them. "You have to believe in the goodness of people," he says. "You have to believe that you will get that two-dollar coin, and I know very well that had you stayed fifteen minutes longer, you would have made some money."

The night passes without incident, except for the laughter of those among us who can see their warm, inviting apartments from our bed of concrete. At first light, we stumble through the discarded needles that litter what had been our bedroom floor. But the group's spirits are surprisingly high, and people seem to be taking something positive from the experience.

"I feel free," says Claude Emile Racette, a 43-year-old acupuncturist, as we shuffle into the dining room of the Notre Dame-de-Bon-Secours convent for breakfast. "I feel joy knowing that they [the homeless] are the same as us. It's just that you can see their sickness, their death, and their aging."

In fact, the spectacle of homeless men killing time, the only resource they have in abundance, is anything but joyful. One man we meet outside the convent offers us drugs to help us make it through the next night.

"I'd say to anyone who asks me whether to join a street retreat, 'Try it, wake up', " says Pierre Racine, 54, a psychologist and another retreat. "It's not just an enlightenment thing, it's a wake-up call." The trouble is that the homeless around us look as though they want not a wake-up call, but more sleeping pills. I start to wonder whether this is an experiment in empathy with the poor or one of personal enlightenment.

Somehow we survive, realizing that some boundaries between ourselves and the real homeless may have been crossed by our living on the street. Beyond our modest donations to charity, however, have we helped the poor in any way at all? For "enlightenment," should we read "self-indulgence"?

And yet, maybe you can make the world a better place, one person at a time. In *Down and Out in Paris and London*, George Orwell lists the lessons he learned from his travels through the underworlds of those two cities. Never again would he think that the homeless were simply "drunken scoundrels," "nor expect a beggar to be grateful" if he gave him a penny.

Day One At four o'clock in the afternoon, I practice meditation and take part in the first group "council" meeting. Two hours later, I line up for free soup and food handouts from the Salvation Army van. Later on that evening, at 8 p.m., I take shelter from rain under a pavilion in Chinatown, and at 10:30 I get some free hot dogs and hot chocolate from a van for homeless youngsters. Thirty minutes later, I hunt for overnight shelter, rejecting the park bandstand as too exposed and wet.

Day Two Finally, at one in the morning, I bed down for the night in an underpass, only to awaken four hours later at daybreak. At eight o'clock, I head for the open doors of the convent because after prayers they serve a hot breakfast of pizza and chips. At 12:15, I'm back on the street begging, but I don't make any money. At 1 p.m., I attend another council meeting, and slowly recover from the shame of begging. At five in the afternoon, I get in line for free supper with skateboarders and dope-smoking teens. By 9:30 p.m., I find overnight shelter under a motorway, but despite my exhaustion I can't sleep for the cold.

Day Three I wake up at five in the morning and warm up in the Metro. I start walking through the streets. At eight o'clock, I practice some meditation and have another council meeting. Finally, at nine in the morning, the retreat ends. It's time for a shave.

UNIT 4 Terror on the Screen

Reading 1 Why Some People Love Horror Movies While Others Hate Them

by Margarita Tartakovsky, M.S.

Copyright 2014, PsychCentral.com. All rights reserved. Used by permission.

Some people thoroughly enjoy scary movies. They've seen dozens of scary films—over and over. They line up for horror flicks on opening night. They have DVD collections of them at home. Personally, I wouldn't be caught dead watching a scary movie. They totally frighten me, leaving me unsettled for days—the images going through my mind again and again. With Halloween upon us—the prime season for horror films—I was curious to find out why some people savor scary movies. And others, like me, hate them.

The Excitation Transfer Process

According to Glenn Sparks, Ph.D., a professor at Purdue University, one reason for the appeal is how you feel after the movie. This is called the excitation transfer process. Sparks's research found that when people watch frightening films, their heart rate, blood pressure, and breathing rate increase.

After the film is over, this physical arousal lasts, Sparks said. (We're just not aware of it.) That means that any positive emotions you experience—like having fun with friends—are intensified, he said. Instead of focusing on the fright you felt during the film, you recall having a great time. And you'll want to come back for more, he said.

However, if your experience was negative, you might not. For instance, let's say you were on a date that wasn't going well, or you got into a car accident on your way home. Again, because your lingering arousal heightens any emotions you experience, the negative feelings might cause you to skip a scary flick in the future.

Different Wiring

Some people are simply wired to enjoy high levels of physical arousal, Sparks said. According to the literature, about ten percent of the population enjoys the adrenaline rush. (Not surprisingly, these individuals also love roller coasters. Not surprisingly, I do not.)

Similarly, wiring may explain why others hate scary movies. Specifically, some people have a harder time ignoring unwanted stimuli in their environment, Sparks said. For instance, they might be very sensitive to the temperature in a room or to the tag on their shirt. These people are more likely to have intense reactions to horror films.

Novelty

Some people turn to scary movies because these movies are novel. All of us are wired to pay attention to new and different things in our environment, Sparks said. Since danger disrupts routine, curiosity about change is important for survival. Sparks compared the pull of frightening films to stopping at the scene of a bad accident: “You don’t see that every day,” he said.

Still, negative emotions can trump novelty, Sparks said. If we experience high levels of fright, seeing a scary movie just isn’t worth it. “Negative emotions are stored in the amygdala [and], in contrast to positive emotions, are particularly resistant to being extinguished,” Sparks said. Thus, people might “suffer lingering emotional fallout if something in the environment reminds them of a scene,” he said. After seeing *Jaws*, some people stopped swimming in the ocean and felt uncomfortable around lakes and pools, according to Joanne Cantor, Ph.D., Professor Emerita and Outreach Director at the Center for Communication Research at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Gender Socialization

Research suggests that more men than women enjoy scary movies, possibly because men are taught to be brave and enjoy threatening things, Sparks said. Men may derive pride from not letting a scary film bother them, Sparks said. It’s the idea of mastering something threatening, he said.

“Men often like [scary films] as date movies because women are more likely to seek physical closeness when they’re scared and men can show off their strength and bravery,” Cantor said. (This is aptly called “the cuddle effect.”)

In one study, males liked a horror movie more when they saw it with a female who was scared, and females liked the movie more when they saw it with a male who wasn’t scared.

Kids and Scary Movies

Parents need to be especially careful about what their kids watch, according to both experts. Cantor’s research found that college students who watched scary movies or shows before the age of 14 had

trouble sleeping. They also felt anxious about typically safe activities or even stopped engaging in such activities altogether.

“Until the age of 5 to 7, seeing is believing,” said Cantor, who wrote the book *Teddy’s TV Troubles* specifically for calming down kids after they’ve been scared by visual media.

Even if it’s make-believe, she said, it’s still scary for young kids. For older kids, realistic threats such as kidnappings and child molestation are scary, whereas teens, like adults, are more scared over abstract threats such as disease and the supernatural.

“Parents need to pay attention to how their children react to movies before deciding if a particular show is right for them. Intense fright reactions are much easier to prevent than to undo,” Cantor said.

UNIT 4 Terror on the Screen

Reading 2 Horror Movies Haunt Us Long After They're Over

by Meredith Richards

When I was 7, I went to a slumber party where we watched a couple of horror movies. In one of them, a man who was murdered at sea returns as a zombie to get revenge on his killers. I was old enough to know that movies weren't real. I was even familiar with the star actor, a likable guy known mostly for comedy roles. Yet he scared me out of my wits. For weeks afterward as I tried to go to sleep, some small part of my 7-year-old brain believed he would show up in my room as the walking dead, dripping water and seaweed. Needless to say, there were some sleepless nights. And that frightening image is just as vivid to me now, decades later.

Fans of the genre like to say that horror movies are all in good fun—harmless entertainment. They might even tease kids who are frightened by these movies for being “wimps” or “wusses.” But as my experience suggests, there are unwanted psychological effects linked to watching horror movies, particularly for children. And these effects can last far beyond a few weeks of sleeping with the lights on.

Even kids who are too young to understand the content of a scary movie can be significantly upset by it. Children under the age of about 5 cannot tell fantasy from reality. This makes violent on-screen images both confusing and disturbing for them. A 2006 study found that, for toddlers, even the scary music and the sense of tension among the other viewers in the room can be sufficient to cause anxiety, nightmares, and aggressive behavior in the period right after viewing a horror film. In fact, too much TV and movie viewing is unhealthy for toddlers in general. It interferes with brain development and can contribute to ADHD. Experts in pediatric psychology, such as Dr. Daniel Schechter of Columbia University, recommend no more than thirty minutes a day for children under 6.

Horror movies have a negative impact on older children as well, and the effects can last into adulthood. In 1999, some researchers surveyed 150 college students about their experiences with horror movies. Ninety percent reported having been frightened by a horror film when they were children or teens. The average age of the experience was 14. Symptoms included nightmares (of course), crying, shaking, nausea, and fear of dying. Most reported having trouble sleeping or other behavior disruptions as a result of watching the scary movie. But perhaps most concerning was how long the effects lasted for a significant number of the students. Whereas some said they were fine after a week, twenty-six percent

said they still felt “residual anxiety” from the scary images. And half of the students reported a continuing fear and avoidance of something associated with the film, such as the sight of blood—whether in real life or on the screen. Phobias produced in this way can last a lifetime, according to researchers. (You have to wonder how many potentially brilliant doctors the world has lost to horror movies.)

Why do frightening scenes affect us so powerfully? The problem is that even when we know a scary image is not real, our brains and bodies react as if it were. That physical reaction is the same reason some people find violent movies such fun to watch. Our heart and breathing rates increase; our palms sweat and our muscles tense; we gasp and cover our eyes. Brain scans show how this works. A research team used functional MRI to monitor the brains of fifteen children between the ages of 8 and 12 as they watched three different videos: a scene from a children’s show, a nature scene, and a violent scene. Thus, the researchers were able to isolate the different parts of the kids’ brains that were active during the different videos. Compared with the non-violent scenes, the violent one produced more activity in the center for emotional processing and in the amygdala, where the fear reflex is located. Significantly, the center for memory storage was also more active, indicating that we find violent images more memorable. This result helps explain why scary movies can have such lasting emotional consequences.

So no matter how old you are, don’t be embarrassed about saying no when your friends suggest a horror movie marathon. You may be ensuring sweeter dreams for everyone that night. You could even be protecting your psyche as well as theirs from the triggering of terrifying childhood memories. And, please, if you ever host a slumber party for 7-year olds, stick to *Finding Nemo*.

UNIT 5 What Is a Friend?

Reading 1 How Do We Choose Our Friends?

by Kevin Worth

The average adult has 2.03 close friends. At least, that is what a 2011 study at Cornell University found. Yet the same adult likely has about 150 social contacts, people he or she knows and interacts with on a more or less regular basis. Numerous researchers, most notably the anthropologist Robin Dunbar, have come to this same figure for social contacts (now known as “Dunbar’s number”). But how do we narrow 150 down to 2.03? How do we select the people who go from acquaintance to friend? The common-sense answer is that we seek out friendships with certain people because of their excellent personal qualities, but the answer coming from psychological research is more complex. Apparently, our choice of friends largely results from a mix of proximity, similarity, and self-interest.

To begin with the obvious, we’re inclined to become friends with people who happen to be around. We tend to form friendships with people we see often in our neighborhoods, at school, or at work. One famous US study from 1950 that looked at residents of a two-story apartment building found that people who lived on the same floor developed closer friendships than did people who lived on different floors. In a 2008 experiment at a German university, students were randomly assigned to seats for a single gathering. One year later, students who had sat near each other were more likely to be friends than were those who had not.

Of course, we do not develop relationships with everyone around us, so nearness isn’t enough. Similarity is very important as well. Psychologists use the term homophily to describe our preference for those with whom we have things in common, such as age, sex, race, class, physical traits, and interests. Research has found that the more of these characteristics people share, the more likely they are to become friends. Brain scans show that we find it easier to empathize with those whom we perceive as similar to ourselves. One theory is that homophily evolved as a side effect of our natural instinct to prefer those who share our DNA—our relatives.

Another factor considered when making a friend may be his or her value to us as help in a conflict. Evolutionary psychologists reason that the behavior of our closest relatives—other primates—resembles our own. Thus, they look to non-human primates for clues to explain human friendship. These species also form warm, long-lasting relationships with individuals they are not related to. Primate friendship has

perhaps been most thoroughly studied in the rhesus macaque, a type of monkey native to Asia. Rhesus macaques usually live in groups of about thirty. They do two things a lot: cultivate friendships by grooming each other, and fight over food and mates. And they tend to groom other monkeys of higher social status, who are more likely to be helpful in a fight. In a 2009 study titled “The Alliance Hypothesis for Human Friendship,” two psychologists present evidence that we share a somewhat similar behavior with our primate cousins. The authors looked at how people ranked their friends on a social networking site. While social status didn’t matter, it was found that people tend to highly rank the friends who, in turn, rank them highly. They see less value in those who rank them lower. The researchers theorize that this is because, like the macaque, we view friends most importantly as allies. And the more a friend cares, the more likely he or she is to defend us in a conflict.

Granted, this is a pretty cold view of friendship. It is also an incomplete one. Such research sheds some light on how and why we make friends, but not on how we sustain those friendships. Meeting by accident, having a few things in common, and needing someone to back you up in a fight aren’t enough to make a friendship last for a lifetime. Yet many do. Plus, even if the reasons we choose our friends appear less than admirable, the feelings we have for those friends remain genuine. The ways they make our lives better remain real. Consider one last finding from friendship research: Having even one close friend can make you much happier than having none. And if you have 2.03, that’s even better.

UNIT 5 What Is a Friend?

Reading 2 Friends, Enemies, and Frenemies

by Samantha Crowley

Which people in your life can you call true friends? Genuine enemies? Some people are easy to categorize. The person you've hung out with since you were 8, who would do anything for you and vice versa, is an easy one: friend. That jerk who spread mean rumors about you and never apologized could be considered an enemy. But others are a bit harder. Years ago, I had a co-worker who helped me when I was new on the job, and whom I also saw socially. But she occasionally made jokes about me and seemed unwilling to talk about anything personal. It was hurtful and confusing: Which category did she fall into? Friends are extremely important to our physical and mental health, and enemies can often be destructive to it. It is therefore a good idea to clarify which categories the people in our lives fall into, and behave accordingly. Psychologists have found quite reliable ways to identify real friends, enemies, and "frenemies"—those who fall somewhere in between.

True friendships seem to involve certain positive emotions and behaviors. Mutual liking, care, and empathy are necessities, but genuine friendship needs certain things besides an emotional bond. One is equality. Although we don't like to keep score when it comes to our friends, true friendship is never obviously one-sided. People who always take and rarely give, or who seem to feel superior to you, are not really your friends. Equality is probably necessary for another crucial aspect of friendship: trust. Friends can tell each other their problems and embarrassing secrets and feel confident that they won't regret it. Further, our friends are what the psychiatrist Dr. Paul Dobransky calls critical advocates for us. In other words, they are always on our side, yet they are also willing to offer constructive criticism. Friends will tell you that you'd better stop playing computer games and write the paper that's due tomorrow, because they care. Moreover, they will do it in a way that does not make you feel stupid. If there are people in your life who meet all these criteria, be grateful. And keep them around.

If friends are people who care about each other and who want each other to flourish, enemies are those who dislike each other and wouldn't mind seeing each other fail. That much doesn't require insight from psychology. But there is an important difference between a fairly harmless enemy and a destructive one. The less serious kind of enemy relationship is often described as a "personality conflict." You do not get along with that person and have no desire to. He or she is also quite often a rival—romantically,

professionally, or otherwise. But as long as this mutual coldness and competition do not cross the line into actual harm, it is enough to keep this kind of enemy at a distance.

However, a different reaction is called for when an enemy is also a bully. Enemies in this category lack the maturity to control their hostility. The result is insults, attempts to undermine your happiness or your reputation, and even physical violence. This is a serious matter that must be dealt with firmly. Sad cases such as that of Phoebe Prince, a 13-year-old immigrant to the US who committed suicide after constant bullying, have raised public awareness of such destructive behavior. For the sake of your welfare (as well as theirs), such enemies cannot be ignored. They must be confronted and stopped, preferably with the help of a counselor or other professional.

Last are the in-between relationships—those with our frenemies, or what psychologists call our “toxic” friends. Frenemies might be sort-of friends who fail one or more of the tests for true friendship, such as trust. Or they might combine some aspects of friendship with some of hostility. The co-worker I mentioned earlier, who wouldn’t confide in me and sometimes put me down, did both. Either way, the feelings a frenemy produces in you are not the positive kind that friendship brings. So, what should you do? First, decide whether the relationship really is hopeless. Could the person’s bad behavior be temporary—maybe the result of personal troubles? If so, tell him or her how you feel and try to save the friendship. If you think the problem is deeper, it is probably best to distance yourself from your frenemy, at least emotionally.

Friends make our lives fuller and happier because they care for and support us. Enemies undermine us, sometimes dangerously, and frenemies might do a bit of both. I eventually decided that true friendship with my frenemy co-worker was not going to happen, and the result was a little more peace of mind. Can you recognize each of these kinds of relationships in your own life? Your well-being might depend on it.

UNIT 6 Beauty Sells

Reading 1 The Power of Beauty in Advertising

by Jason Ng

Two handsome young men sit by a pool on a hot day, looking a bit bored. Then one of them opens a canned drink and takes a sip. Suddenly, party music begins playing. A group of lovely, smiling young women in bikinis appear, eager to try that delicious drink for themselves. This magic beverage is a beer, and the scene is from a TV commercial selling it. Companies use very attractive people to sell their products for a great reason: It works. And it works whether the product is a beer, a shampoo, or a car. The power of beauty in advertising is undeniable, and it has deep roots in human psychology.

First of all, we human beings are fascinated by attractive people, so they are an excellent way to draw attention to a product. Across cultures, women prefer men who are taller than they are, and men prefer women who are shorter than they are. Both men and women like facial symmetry and smooth skin in the opposite sex. Men prefer female faces with large eyes and full lips, while women prefer male faces with strong jaws and broad foreheads. The reward centers in our brains light up when we see people with these attractive traits, which are signs of health, youth, and genetic fitness. Indeed, these preferences appear to be hard-wired. For example, babies as young as one day old stare longer at faces that are rated as attractive by adults. The average person comes across hundreds of ads every day, so there is tough competition to catch the consumer's eye. It makes sense for ads to feature something that everyone loves to look at: beautiful people.

Surely, the power of beauty is magnified by what psychologists call the “halo effect.” Beautiful people are not just beautiful; they are also intelligent, interesting, and kind—or so we think. We tend to attribute all kinds of great qualities to attractive people simply because they are attractive. Now, consider that ads do not just sell a product; they sell a lifestyle. Thanks in part to the halo effect, we often suspect that the good-looking people in the ads have better, fuller lives than we do. We want to be like them, and we feel that if we buy that beer, shampoo, or car, then maybe we can be. The key word is feel, not think. The purpose of beautiful people in ads is to trigger positive emotions, which are then transferred to the product, even if the viewer is not consciously aware of it.

Numerous studies support the idea that looks have a powerful effect on consumer attitudes and decisions. When an ad features a beautiful model, we find the ad more believable, we like the product

more, and we are more likely to buy it. A recent experiment also confirms that the effect is emotional, not rational. Psychologists at the University of California monitored the brains of twenty-four adults watching TV ads. Some of the ads used evidence such as facts and figures about the product. The other ads used non-rational influence (NI), such as an attractive person. They found that activity in the decision-making centers of the subjects' brains was lower during the NI ads. It seems that the sight of a beautiful person might make people more likely to spend money without thinking too carefully about it first. "Watch your brain and watch your wallet," said Dr. Ian Cook, the lead researcher.

None of this means that we are powerless against advertising. It simply means that we should be aware of how advertisers use our psychology against us. Beauty is a powerful force in all areas of life, and advertising is no exception. To be persuaded by beauty to spend money is both very human and very avoidable. So the next time you are drawn to an ad with a good-looking model, remember: Watch your brain and watch your wallet.

UNIT 6 Beauty Sells

Reading 2 For Women's Sake, Let's Close the Gap Between Ads and Reality

by Christina Westcott

In 2011, a British lawmaker named Jo Swinson noticed something about two London billboard ads for a cosmetics brand. One of them featured the actress Julia Roberts, and the other the model Christy Turlington. What Swinson noticed was that the images had obviously been manipulated to make the women appear nearly perfect and younger than they were. Arguing that the company was lying about what its products could do, Swinson managed to get the ads taken down. She also inspired an American named Seth Matlin to propose the Truth in Advertising Act of 2014, a law now under debate in the US Congress. Matlin is the founder of a website devoted to improving girls' self-esteem. If it passes, his proposed law will regulate the extent to which advertisers can manipulate images. Matlin says he wishes to protect girls like his daughter from the unrealistic standards of female beauty promoted by so many ads. As his and Swinson's efforts show, advertisers are coming under increasing pressure to end practices that are both dishonest and harmful to girls and women. And it is about time.

The practice that gets the most criticism is the use of unrealistic images of women in ads. The difference between how women look in ads and how they look in real life is enormous, for two reasons. One is the strong preference for very thin women in the beauty and fashion industries. Most models in the US wear a size 0 to 4. Size 6 is viewed as "plus-sized." A 2004 study used a 3-D scanner to examine over ten thousand American women and found that their average size was 14.

The other reason is photo retouching. Advertisers edit pictures of already thin models to make them look even thinner and add to the effect by also removing any wrinkles or flaws. When this is done badly, the results can be quite funny. Do an online search for "Photoshop fails," and you will see countless examples of models with missing limbs or heads attached at unlikely angles. But more often the result is a perfection that no living woman can achieve. Sometimes, it's too much even for the models themselves. Erin Heatherton, a model for Victoria's Secret, commented to the *New York Post* that she dislikes how her face is changed in her photos: "I feel like it looks like someone else. I guess it's not fair. . . . You look better, but it's a lie."

Girls and women have to compare themselves with such lies daily, and as a result many suffer in a variety of ways. In 2009, the beauty company Dove polled over a thousand women about ads and their

effects. Ninety-six percent said that ads showing women are not realistic; 40 percent said that ads made them feel self-conscious about their own appearance. A survey of girls between 10 and 14 in the US and UK, also by Dove, found that more than three-quarters of them felt “fat, ugly, and depressed” after viewing photos of models and actresses. The American Academy of Pediatrics reported that 47 percent of the girls they surveyed had been influenced by magazines to believe they were overweight. Yet only 29 percent of them actually were. And a 2001 study found that girls who want to lose weight are 40 percent more likely to smoke cigarettes, since they help control the appetite.

False advertising is illegal in most countries for a reason. Lying about what a product can do harms the consumer financially, at the very least. False beauty images do much worse. No product can make the average woman—or any woman—look like the model in the average ad. Considering the damage done by manipulated and unachievable beauty standards, advertisers have a moral duty to change their ways. The question is whether they will do so by choice or only under the threat of legal penalties. There are some positive signs within the fashion industry. Organizers of major runway shows in Spain, Germany, and the UK have chosen to ban underweight models, for example. However, proposed laws such as the Truth in Advertising Act remain highly controversial.

The Truth in Advertising Act has supporters in both major political parties in the US. Thousands of people have signed a petition in support of the law. Yet when Matlin met with lawmakers to discuss it and invited leaders in advertising to attend, they all declined. Advertising is a \$400-billion-a-year business in the US alone, and companies don't wish to give up such lucrative strategies. As more and more people come to realize the alarming effects of unrealistic advertising, advertisers may find they have no choice.

UNIT 7 Studying Online: Future or Fad?

Reading 1 Online Learning: Tutors at Your Fingertips

by Katie Hughes

Copyright 2014, Telegraph.co.uk. Used by permission.

The rich have long been able to whisk their children's private tutors onto a yacht in Monaco, or jet over the Atlantic and onto a movie set. But now the less affluent among us can also have a tutor at our fingertips. This is true, wherever we happen to be in the world, thanks to the advent of virtual tuition. Now students need only log in online to enjoy a one-to-one lesson with the tutor of their choice.

Nearly one in four young people in the UK has received private or home tuition at some point according to recent research. But so far the focus has been on traditional face-to-face tuition.

That's about to change. Now the Tutors' Association is also turning its attention to the emerging online sector. So are many parents.

The online tutoring service Tutorhub has been among those at the receiving end of parents' attention. "We've seen a 500 percent growth in demand over the last twelve months, across every subject imaginable, at every level—especially from students in rural areas," says its founder, Jon Ellis.

"With an online teaching hub, you can offer a lot of specialist knowledge that students aren't able to find locally." And the price of this knowledge averages £20 per hour.

It's a similar story for MyTutorWeb. Since its launch last year, this online service has enabled 3,500 tutoring sessions, delivered at £17 an hour. On most days, it signs up six new parents in search of tutors.

"Enhancements in technology and broadband over the last few years enable us to offer high-quality, one-to-one teaching for children at an affordable price," says the founder of MyTutorWeb, Robert Grabiner.

So virtual classrooms increasingly replicate real ones. When a lesson is over, students can play it all back to reinforce their learning. And if it's just a quick math question that's proving problematic, there's no need to pay for a full hour. Online tutoring often allows sessions to be as long or short as you like.

“It’s very easy setting up a tutorial,” says 15-year-old Adrian Markovac, who logs on to MyTutorWeb four times a week. “My online tutor leads me through lessons just like any normal teacher would in school. We both upload things to the whiteboard so that we can see them at the same time.”

But a virtual lesson doesn’t have to be restricted to one teacher. And this is where the (more expensive) multi-discipline tutoring agencies come into their own, by having face-to-face teachers on site to boost their virtual services.

“We can do online interview preparation with multiple tutors to replicate the feel of a real-life situation, or we can hold group debates,” says Nathaniel McCullagh of Simply Learning Tuition, which charges £58 an hour for tutoring in person or online.

Multi-discipline agencies know all their tutors personally and offer online pupils the same benefit—at a price. “The tutor and online tutee can have a few sessions face-to-face first,” says Emily Jack of Kings Tutors, which is based in London and Edinburgh. “Then they can have online sessions throughout the term.”

If tutors aren’t known personally, is a child’s online safety at risk? Jon Ellis ensures Tutorhub teachers are thoroughly checked for criminal backgrounds.

MyTutorWeb prioritizes applications from tutors with the same checks, and both sites implement a strict screening process, hide students’ contact details from teachers, and enable lessons to be recorded for playback to parents. Their sites show feedback from both students and parents.

The Tutors’ Association will soon ensure all online tutoring agencies are similarly vigilant, says its vice-chair, Kate Shand. “The intention is to keep raising standards through training.”

The fact that schools are increasingly working with virtual providers will also reassure parents. TLC Live has given online tuition to, among others, 6- to 16-year-olds in schools since 2012.

There is little doubt, however, that online tutoring is better suited to some age groups and topics than others. “I find that . . . university law and classics students are more mature in their understanding of what I’m explaining than younger tutees,” says international private tutor Adam Muckle. There can also be technical difficulties or difficulties in building a rapport in an online medium.

But it is much easier to find a good tutor online than one who lives around the corner. As Nathaniel McCullagh puts it: “A great tutor online is worth much, much more than an average tutor face-to-face.”

UNIT 7 Studying Online: Future or Fad?

Reading 2 Don't Believe the Hype About Online Ed

by Sarah Newhart

In last Friday's issue of the *Daily Times*, Mr. Jeremy Forbes had nothing but praise for online education. Even though he admitted to never having taken an online course, he went on about the flexibility and affordability of taking classes from home, ending with the conclusion that it's the future of education and that everyone should rush off and try it.

Well, I've enrolled in an online course myself, and I can tell you that it's not all it's cracked up to be.

Mr. Forbes wasn't incorrect in praising the flexibility and affordability of online classes. I attended classes from home whenever it was convenient. Even while sick, I still "went" to class. But despite this extraordinary convenience, my experience proved to be negative overall. To make a long story short, I withdrew from the course within a few weeks. I learned the hard way that online education doesn't compare to the benefits of having personal interactions with teachers and fellow learners.

So why not study from the comfort of home if it's affordable and flexible? I'll tell you why. Learning requires intense focus. The fewer distractions there are, the more easily you can learn. Can you really concentrate on classwork at home? Based on my own experience with online learning, the answer is clearly "no."

To start with, the home is filled with distractions. While taking the course, I was constantly bombarded with them, both online and off. As the teacher lectured, I'd find myself wondering what the weather would be like for my evening run. So I'd check the weather. Then I'd get a text from friends filling me in on the latest drama. So I'd jump onto social media. After that, my dog would whine at my feet, imploring me to play with her.

It follows, then, that a good place to learn is one with fewer distractions—a traditional brick-and-mortar classroom. Indeed, it may be the last place that allows students to concentrate on learning.

Some readers might suggest that doing two distinct activities at the same time, like petting your pooch while studying online, is far from impossible. After all, you would just be multitasking. You can do more than one thing at a time. Yes, perhaps you can—but not well.

In one controlled study, Russell Poldrack of the University of California found that multitasking seriously impacts cognitive functioning and our ability to learn. According to his study, information learned while multitasking is harder to recall immediately. It is also less permanently fixed in one's memory. To really learn something, we need to focus on one task and one task only.

Of course, students in the classroom are not completely isolated from the world outside. But most teachers strongly discourage the use of digital devices. And they are able to minimize other kinds of intrusions. These include family, roommates, friends, and yes, dogs. Students in the classroom are therefore more able to concentrate and engage with other people who are there.

Loss of focus isn't the only drawback of online education. Online students lose valuable in-person interaction. Making education a personal, real-life experience, with eye contact and body language, helps students develop social and presentational skills. Online experiences can't stand up to personal interactions in the classroom. I'm not alone in thinking so. In a study by the Lumina Foundation and Gallup, only thirty-two percent of the 1,000 adults surveyed agreed that online institutions offer high-quality education. Among those who disagreed, their lack of the "human element" was frequently cited as the main reason for giving these institutions a failing grade.

Maybe the difficulty in focusing and the lack of human interaction are why so many students like me fail to finish online courses. My own school, Columbia University, conducted a study of 51,000 community college students and found that students taking online courses were more likely to fail or drop out than the ones who took the same classes in a traditional setting—a fact that I can now attest to. In addition, the researchers discovered that the students with more credits from online classes were less likely to graduate than were students with a greater number of credits from traditional classes.

From Mr. Forbes's perspective, taking classes from home may sound perfect. But while doing so may be convenient and save time and money, it can also set students up for failure. Studying online from their living rooms, students are too easily distracted. But perhaps more than anything else, students need the human element to learn effectively. As far as I'm concerned, it's "class over" for online education. I'll stick with the traditional classroom any day.

UNIT 8 I Want to Be Like You

Reading 1 We All Need Role Models to Motivate and Inspire Us

by Susan Krauss Whitbourne, Ph.D.

Copyright 2013, the author. Used by permission.

Who do you most admire—a former teacher, a world leader, your boss? As adults, we tend to give little thought to the concept of role models. We regard role models as figures that children seek among the adults in their lives. But if you think about it, you'll no doubt agree that the people you admire as an adult provide your most important life lessons.

Role models who uphold high ethical or moral values are typically not the people who make the news. We've all been exposed to public figures who qualify as "anti-role models." Their antics include aggression toward paparazzi or abuse of illegal drugs. Unfortunately, the attention these anti-role models receive can lead others to lose their moral compass. They start to believe that, by misbehaving every once in a while, they too can get more out of life.

In your own life, you encounter plenty of anti-role models. Consider work settings. Perhaps one of your bosses has a reputation for breaking the rules. At meetings, he brags about how he sold faulty merchandise to a client. Or perhaps this individual misled a customer into agreeing to an unfair deal. You may end up thinking that the way to get ahead is to do the same.

But what about the opposite situation? At a staff meeting, one of your co-workers admits to one of those questionable dealings. Instead of offering congratulations, your supervisor expresses concern and disappointment. As a result, you might acquire the expectation that if you were to engage in this behavior yourself, bad things would happen to you. Your supervisor, then, has acted as a role model. He or she demonstrates that certain behaviors are acceptable and others are not.

Managers learn to be ethical or not from someplace. But where? In a study published in June 2013, Pennsylvania State University-Erie researchers Michael Brown and Linda Trevino looked into this. They learned the factors that lead managers to be seen as ethical leaders. When employees have ethical leaders, they like them more. Just as importantly, they will behave in more positive ways within the organization. Clearly, it's to everyone's advantage to have supervisors who are positive role models.

Brown and Trevino reasoned that ethical leaders probably weren't born that way. Nor did they dream it up themselves. We are taught lessons about morality by others, to a certain extent. But it is more likely that we acquire our moral sense through vicarious processes. One way people become ethical leaders is by having ethical role models when they are young.

Mentors are a second source of learning. These people take us under their wing and guide us in the workplace. They show us that we ourselves need to be honest and fair in our dealings with others.

The third way to learn how to be an ethical leader, Brown and Trevino argue, is by observing "top" managers. Those who have made it to the ranks of executives have legitimacy because of their status. Furthermore, when those at the top of the ladder are ethical, they relay these expectations to their underlings. These people, in turn, pass down the lesson that you'll be rewarded for being honest, direct, and fair.

But which combination of these has the greatest impact? Brown and Trevino wanted to find out. So they surveyed 217 managers and 659 employees who reported directly to these managers in a large nationwide insurance company. They asked the managers to rate the quality of the ethical role modeling they had received in childhood. They also asked to what degree they felt they had been ethically mentored and how ethical their own top bosses seemed to be. Their supervisees, in turn, rated the ethical leadership shown by their managers in their own day-to-day dealings.

Nearly all of the managers reported that they had had ethical role models as children. However, having positive childhood role models had no impact at all on how ethically their supervisees perceived the managers. Instead, the employee ratings of their managers rested most heavily on whether the managers reported that, as adults, they had been ethically mentored.

Having adult role models, then, directly impacts your own self-perception. Just as importantly, it informs how others perceive you. If those around you seem to succeed by using questionable ethics, you'll eventually unlearn even the most morally upright values you acquired in childhood.

An inspiring message from the study is that people actually prefer ethical leaders. When you play fair, communicate directly, and demonstrate high standards, others look up to you. If for no other reason than to be liked and respected, taking the moral high ground may ultimately benefit both you and those who look to you for inspiration.

UNIT 8 I Want to Be Like You

Reading 2 The Problems with Athletes as Role Models

by Alex Ashe

Copyright 2013, yesweekly.com. Used by permission.

In 1993, Nike released an advertisement with then-pro basketball player Charles Barkley declaring, “I am not a role model.” The ad is so relevant today that this line could probably replace the increasingly ambiguous “Just Do It” as Nike’s slogan.

Nike fired the cyclist Lance Armstrong immediately after his drug use became clear. It proved to be a smart move. His lying, wrongful-defamation lawsuits, and attempted justification of his behavior have overshadowed his cheating. Along with his championships, sponsorships, and dignity, Armstrong lost the support of millions of people.

In 2012, an inspiring story hit the news. Sprinter Oscar Pistorius had made history by becoming the first double amputee to compete in the Olympics. Just six months later, he was charged with the murder of his girlfriend, Reeva Steenkamp.

And then there’s Tiger Woods’s fall from grace. News of the golfer’s many affairs turned his world upside down in an instant. By destroying his family life, Woods immediately went from being one of the most marketable athletes of all time to being a pariah. The most shocking part about the scandal was that Woods had enjoyed an immaculate reputation since his start in the 1990s. He was responsible for popularizing golf for both the black community and an entire generation of young people worldwide. Woods is now a mere mortal. And his legend continues to fade.

Of course, it’s perfectly fine to look up to star athletes for their work on the field. But we need to change our expectations of how athletes should act once the final whistle is blown.

By viewing pro athletes as role models, we set ourselves up for disappointment. There seems to be an increasing trend of inspirational sports stories being revealed as too good to be true.

Why is this? With decade-long contracts and huge endorsement deals (worth amounts many people can’t even comprehend), pro athletes have never been less able to relate to the average citizen.

Many athletes have gotten to where they are with little to no emphasis on academics. Many pro baseball and basketball players have forgone higher education. With the NBA now requiring players to spend a minimum of one year in college, academics are just a front for some players. During the recent college basketball championships, commentator Dick Vitale described the rule as “a mockery of the academic system.”

Because they live lives rooted in both luxury and stress, it’s difficult for professional athletes to maintain perfectly clean images. With the non-stop media coverage, it’s even harder for them to get away with their mistakes.

Who, then, should kids view as role models?

It’s ironic that so many sports stars turn out to be false idols when perhaps the most genuine and charitable athlete comes from a business often described as “fake.”

Pro wrestling is practically a soap opera, starring live-action superheroes and supervillains. Characters, storylines, and matches are presented with great amounts of silliness, drama, and exaggeration. In rare instances, however, pro wrestling writers put bits of truth and reality into the product. This is the case with John Cena of World Wrestling Entertainment (WWE). Cena is a superhero in the ring—and outside as well.

He is the Make-A-Wish Foundation’s all-time leader in wishes granted. He’s granted more than three hundred wishes, and hopes to make it to a thousand. As the foundation’s most requested wish-granter, Cena has been placed in the role model position for American children. What’s refreshing is that he’s actually suited for the task of being a positive influence.

The world of wrestling is infamous for steroids and stunts gone wrong. But Cena stands as a symbol of positivity. A champion of “hustle, loyalty, and respect,” he’s served as the face of WWE during its transformation into family-friendly entertainment. Since his 2002 entrance into wrestling, Cena has never played the role of the villain. In other words, he is often written to overcome difficulty and evil, all to show that good things happen to good people.

It’s for these exact reasons that Cena draws criticism from the more seasoned wrestling fans. Instead of a respectable role model, they tend to look for edgy characters like Stone Cold Steve Austin or the Rock. But then again, there’s a reason why we don’t rely on bloodthirsty wrestling fans to determine our role models.

Yes, kids probably need sports role models. But they should be their coaches or someone close who can teach them the difference between right and wrong.

Perhaps Charles Barkley said it best back in 1993.

“Parents should be role models.”

UNIT 9 The Road to Happiness

Reading 1 The Ingredients of a Happy Childhood

by Angela Neustatter

Copyright 1992, The Independent. Used by permission.

As parents, we want to give our children a happy childhood. But how do we achieve it? This is an interesting question, but the happy childhood we imagine may not be so simply given or so willingly received. Nor is there a straightforward recipe which, if followed, will guarantee that the "gift" is perfect.

Most important, believes Hugh Jenkins, director of the Institute for Family Therapy, is that parents should allow children to be who they are with respect for their feelings, tastes, and ideas. Jenkins points out that certain conditions can provide a basis for childhood happiness.

Kids must feel loved. Indeed, the lack of self-esteem in those who do not has been the subject of many studies. In terms of a child's experience, though, what does love mean? Child development expert Penelope Leach says that a child should feel that at least one person of importance thinks he or she is just wonderful. This makes a person value and love himself or herself. It makes the person capable of valuing and loving other people. And this, surely, is a vital source of happiness.

Unconditional love means that children know they are important enough that, no matter how much they misbehave, their parents will never turn them away. It means, says child therapist Miranda Passey, that they can believe that their feelings matter and that their problems will not be ignored.

It is difficult for children to be happy if they do not feel secure. Physical security, feeling safe and protected at home, is clearly important. But how does a child come to feel that the world is a secure place? "Children are helped to feel secure," Leach says, "when their wishes are considered, and their ideas and thoughts are taken seriously. They also need to know what is expected of them, that their parents care where they are and what they are doing. It can be very frightening for children if they are allowed to do as they please even when they know it is unwise or dangerous."

Justice is all-important to children's sense of well-being; those who feel their reasons and defenses have no voice against the "always-right" parent may live with a suppressed rage which will surface later in life, or turn into depression.

Passey explains that it is important that parents show they are strong enough to make mistakes and admit it. “Then the child can respect the parents when they are firm about knowing best or being right and understand that it is reasonable,” she says. “In turn, they themselves feel respected if a parent considers their feelings important enough to apologize when appropriate.”

Most parents agree that play is a good thing. “But for many ‘privileged’ children,” Leach says, “life is packed full of activities intended to be fun, perhaps, but also to improve the child. That is very different from play. While at play, children generate their own ideas and rules. They are free to explore fantasies and let their imaginations run. In this kind of play, children solve problems, work through things which worry and puzzle them, and experience real enjoyment.”

Observing children using play as a form of communication, Passey agrees. “For a child to be able to play,” she says, “there has to be a mental space which allows something to happen.” She recalls seeing a 2-year-old who trailed about the room saying “What shall we do now?” and had never been able to explore for himself what he might want to do. “This child found it hard to play because his mother was very anxious,” Passey explains. “She controlled him closely, so he was never free to explore the world in his own way.”

Memories of happy childhood often include times when happy parents joined in. Happiness shows in the faces of small children when they are joined in building a brick house or when Mom or Dad dresses up as a monster and joins in a fantasy game. Perhaps this is why family holidays, when parents have more time for their children, are so often pulled from the memory as examples of happy times.

In the end, a key point is that we not only stop and think about who our children are, but that we enjoy them. As Hugh Jenkins says, “Children are made happy by their parents’ happiness.” Or, as poet Ogden Nash put it, “Children aren’t happy with nothing to ignore. And that’s what parents were created for.”

UNIT 9 The Road to Happiness

Reading 2 Failure: The Real Key to Success

by Runner O'Brian

Parents can be a bit sensitive when it comes to their kids. As a high school science teacher, I probably know this better than most people do. Just last week, I had a two-hour meeting with a parent who, upset about her son's failing grades, decided that I was the problem. "If you gave him passing grades," she insisted, "his self-esteem would improve, and then he might actually start doing better."

Give him good grades that he doesn't deserve, and then true success will follow. She honestly believed this. "I've read studies," she said. "I know what I'm talking about."

I can't exactly blame her. She's done some research and read parenting books. Sadly, that "research" was probably the same touchy-feely nonsense that I, too, read as an undergraduate in the 1990s, much of which has been thoroughly proven incorrect by now. So what will I do? For one, I won't give in to her demands. Her son will fail my course if he doesn't change his habits; and as cruel as this might sound, he could be a better student for it.

Unfortunately for today's children, many parents won't agree. Overprotective parents are afraid their children will suffer from low self-esteem if they fail, insisting that their children will fare better in sports and school if they start the learning process with inflated confidence. They hover around teachers and coaches, making sure that their children encounter as few hurdles along the way as possible. But in my opinion overprotecting children does more harm than good. When kids aren't allowed to fail or make mistakes, they don't build the skills they need to succeed.

Once upon a time, awards were earned. But if you attend any children's awards ceremony today, you'd be hard-pressed to figure out who actually achieved anything. The worst performing students receive the same praise as the winning teams and the most hardworking scholars. Trophies are no longer reserved for the best, but are handed out like Halloween candy—to anyone who shows up. But does this really help anyone? Could trophies gained through no particular effort actually lower the performance of winners and losers alike?

Perhaps. Rewards motivate when they have value. And a basic law of economics states that the value of anything is inversely proportional to its supply. Rewards are no different. So by passing them out to,

well, everyone, their supply increases to such an extent that they are made worthless. There's no longer a connection between a difficult accomplishment and a reward. Indeed, such rewards lose the very effect that they were designed to produce—they no longer motivate anyone. The result? Marginal players, as well as winning teams and top students, simply stop working so hard. Why bother? After all, they'll each get their prize regardless.

Sadly, it gets worse. A pervasive sense of entitlement makes failure more difficult to accept in the real world—specifically, in the workplace. Here, bosses don't pass out prizes so freely, choosing instead to reward performance. Coddled kids—now young adults—have a very difficult time adjusting when they haven't experienced the benefits of meaningful failure in the past. As a teacher, I can tell you that it's triumph over adversity that builds true self-esteem. Jean M. Twenge of San Diego University sums up the problem nicely. In her book *The Narcissism Epidemic: Living in the Age of Entitlement*, she asserts: "The 'everybody-gets-a-trophy' mentality basically says that you're going to get rewarded just for showing up. That won't build true self-esteem; instead, it builds this empty sense of 'I'm just fantastic not because I did anything but just because I'm here.' " The effect of limited self-esteem plays itself out every day on the job, where fragile young workers shatter like fine china at the first hint of difficulty.

Ms. Twenge found that "millennials"—children born between 1982 and 1999—are having a particularly tough time of it. After graduation, they aimed for prestigious careers with big paychecks without considering the real effort required to achieve them. When these goals weren't easily attained, they finally experienced the taste of real failure for the first time—and quit. To prevent this from happening, parents must teach their children how to earn rewards from an early age so that they can take that skill with them into the real world.

Failure hurts, but it must be practiced before it can be overcome. When parents are overprotective of their children's self-esteem, they actually hinder their kids' potential for success. Accomplishment feeds self-esteem, not the other way around. Children can only achieve success if they're allowed to make mistakes—and learn in the process. I don't enjoy failing students; but as in the age-old philosophy, it really is for their own good. The students I fail learn a hard lesson, but it's better than learning nothing at all.

UNIT 10 Living Online

Reading 1 Social Media: Bringing People Together for Good

by Rachel Munro

Do you feel strangely lonely and disconnected from the world if you find yourself without an Internet connection? More and more of us do. Social networking is the single most common online activity. Approximately a quarter of the world's people already use social media, and more start doing so every day. The average user enjoys five hours a week on networking sites. At the same time, those sites have a bad reputation these days. People blame them for everything from lost productivity at work to a rise in self-obsession and the end of civility in public discourse. However, this criticism is misplaced. Social media is simply a tool. Like any tool, it is intrinsically neither good nor bad; it has good uses and bad uses. And the good uses are good indeed. At its best, social media empowers people to make their lives better through career building, personal connections, and activism.

Maintaining a social media presence is becoming a must for professional development. A 2012 study by Careerbuilder.com found that forty-five percent of companies had investigated job applicants on social media sites and that many more planned to begin doing so. You could view this as snooping, but why not view it as a chance to create an online presence that will impress potential employers? In addition to the major social networking sites, career sites such as Monster.com and Goinglobal.com allow users to post their résumés, interests, and goals. Job seekers can also perform fine-tuned searches of openings to find the perfect match—anywhere in the world. And once users obtain their dream job, social media allows them to make useful contacts with others in their industry so they can exchange ideas and keep up with trends. Of course, this mixing of the social with the professional means that people must be cautious about what they post online. But that seems like a small price to pay for such an invaluable career development tool.

Online networking has also made it easier than ever to maintain a healthy social support system. Globalization means that families and friends are often separated by thousands of miles. The Internet makes physical distance irrelevant for staying in contact. Since many services offer video chat, you can “attend” important events such as weddings even if you're on another continent. This ease of communication is particularly important for those who might otherwise be isolated due to disability or health problems. Furthermore, people facing illness, addiction, or other life challenges are increasingly using online services to seek out other users who understand what they are going through. Facebook

alone has thousands of support groups. A writer for the blog SailingAutisticSeas.com explains the value of social networking to parents of children with autism: “Parents can post a status on Facebook about a milestone their child reached or about a bad day they are having. . . . We do these things knowing that somewhere out there another parent will get it, celebrate with us, and even empathize.”

Social sites can improve life on a larger scale, too, by bringing attention to important causes. For one thing, charities can reach millions of potential donors with a few keystrokes. After the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, for example, the Red Cross used its accounts on Twitter and other sites to request donations. In two days, it raised \$32 million in funds. And it is not only large organizations that can harness the power of social media. In January 2011, Wael Ghonim, an Egyptian computer engineer, created a Facebook page about a young man named Khaled Saeed. Saeed had died while being held by police, apparently after being severely beaten. Ghonim’s page, titled “We Are All Khaled Saeed,” gained hundreds of thousands of followers. It became a gathering place for critics of President Hosni Mubarak’s regime. When Ghonim called for mass protests, others echoed the call on social media, and tens of thousands took to Cairo’s Tahrir Square. On February 11, 2011, Mubarak resigned. Granted, social media did not cause the protest movement or the change in government. But it certainly helped enable them. The Internet gives a voice to every person on earth, no matter how poor or powerless. This makes it an unequalled way to spread ideas for positive change.

Social media brings all kinds of people together: colleagues, distant loved ones, strangers with problems in common, and those who care about the same cause. And their lives can be made better for it. Social media gives each of us the power to reach others, and whether that power is a force for good or evil depends on us. What will you use it for?

UNIT 10 Get Some Rest

Reading 2 Narcissism: The Dark Side of Social Media

by Theodore Ng

Every year, Oxford Dictionaries chooses a Word of the Year—the word or phrase that has attracted the most interest over the previous twelve months. In 2013, that word was “selfie”: a photo that you take of yourself, usually to share online. According to Oxford, use of this word went up by 17,000 percent during 2013. This is not surprising to anyone who uses Facebook, Twitter, or similar services, all of which are full of such photos. Selfies are just one way in which online socializing encourages obsession with ourselves and how others see us. The rise of social media is definitely both rewarding and increasing narcissism, and that is bad for everyone.

It's important to be clear about the definition of narcissism. In psychology, the term can refer to a major personality disorder. But more generally, it is also a personality trait that we all have to a greater or lesser degree. Experts in the field use a test called the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) to measure this trait. It has a 40-point scale, with an average score of about 15. People who score above 20 on the NPI are termed narcissists. They have certain aspects in common. In particular, they tend to brag, love attention, believe they are “special,” and have trouble empathizing with others. In short, to be a narcissist is to be self-centered, with an inflated ego.

Social media sites are inherently a narcissist's dream. For one thing, narcissists prefer shallow relationships because deep ones require them to think about others' feelings, not just their own. And what could be shallower than a Facebook “friendship”? Gaining large numbers of online friends—or, better yet, “followers”—feeds narcissists' sense of their own importance. And posting photos and constant status updates satisfies their desire to show off. Sure enough, there is a great deal of research showing that narcissists have more social media contacts and post more often. In one 2013 study, subjects took the NPI and then supplied information about their Twitter use. The study's authors found a considerable correlation between frequent tweeting and a high NPI score.

It's likely that Internet socializing not only attracts narcissists but also creates them. Because you have total control over how you present yourself online, you tend to present only the best version of yourself. You post your most clever thoughts and remarks. You share your most flattering selfies, taken in the most interesting places. And you “like” the movies, music, and TV shows that you think will make the

best impression. Moreover, as you browse your contacts' pages, you are ceaselessly forced to compare yourself with other users' best selves; hence, it becomes a competition. You feel the pressure, even if you use social sites mainly for staying in touch, for charity work, or for other non-narcissistic reasons. In 2009, two psychologists wrote a book called *The Narcissism Epidemic*, presenting evidence that there are more narcissists today than ever before. And a major reason, they persuasively argue, is social media's emphasis on self-promotion.

The links between social media and narcissism should make us all think twice before logging in. The reason is that self-obsession and egotism aren't just annoying; they are harmful. Extreme self-confidence can be charming—but only for a little while. Few of narcissists' admirers stay around for long after getting to know them better, and that must get lonely. However, it is not narcissists but the people around them who suffer the most. One aspect of narcissism measured by the NPI is called "entitlement / exploitativeness." This relates to narcissists' tendency to expect a lot and give little. A recent study of US Facebook users found that narcissists are less likely to offer social support and more likely to seek it. And, of course, the selfish behavior of narcissists is not limited to cyberspace. Research has found that they tend to blame other people for their own failures, react aggressively to any criticism, and show reluctance to cooperate if they are not in charge.

To sum up, there is increasing evidence that social media use goes hand-in-hand with narcissism, and narcissism isn't pretty. But let's say you are that rare fan of online sharing who does not score through the roof on the NPI. It's easy to become depressed by your relatively small number of followers and likes, or lack of attractive selfies compared to those of so many of your contacts. You might begin to think there is something wrong with you. There isn't. You're just not a narcissist. Stay away from social media so you can keep it that way.

UNIT 11 Get Some Rest

Reading 1 US Racking Up Huge Sleep Debt

by Stefan Lovgren

Copyright 2005, National Geographic. Used by permission.

In her fast-paced job as a reporter for the Orange County Register, a southern California newspaper, Gwendolyn Driscoll says that she moves very quickly through the day.

Arriving home late in the evening, she has little time for housework or catching up on her reading. Even less for sleep. Most nights, she gets about six and a half hours of shut-eye.

“I could definitely do with another hour,” said the 35-year-old Driscoll. “But sleep just isn’t a priority.”

Perhaps it should be.

Sleep experts say that adults need seven to eight hours of sleep per night. Anything less may harm their health. Sleep deprivation could affect mental alertness. It could harm the immune system and even increase the risk of diseases like diabetes as well.

“Sleep is just as important to our overall health as are exercise and a healthy diet,” said Carl Hunt, the director of the National Center on Sleep Disorders Research in Bethesda, Maryland. The center is part of the National Institutes of Health.

Food and water are biological needs. And so is sleep. If totally deprived of shut-eye, humans ultimately die. Yet millions of Americans just don’t get enough of it. Today, Americans on average sleep one hour less per night than they did twenty to thirty years ago.

“The dependency on caffeine and the whole Starbucks culture is certainly one proof that our society is sleepier than ever before,” said William Dement, a sleep researcher at Stanford University in Palo Alto, California.

The trend, researchers say, is partly due to the country’s 24/7 culture, with its ever-escalating expectations of around-the-clock services, information, and entertainment.

Hunt says that lifestyle changes are directly impacting the number of hours Americans sleep each day. They also affect when during the twenty-four hours that sleep occurs.

Studies show that one in five adults suffers from daytime sleepiness. Among those aged 18 to 34, fifty percent say that daytime sleepiness interferes with their daily work.

The costs are enormous: US\$15 billion in health-care expenses and as much as \$50 billion in lost productivity in the US alone according to one estimate.

Sleep disorders may also result in a person not getting enough sleep. Insomnia is the most common sleep disorder. Restless leg syndrome, a neurological condition which also disrupts sleep, is almost as common. Additional people suffer from narcolepsy (unexpected attacks of deep sleep) and sleepwalking.

Some 30 million in the US suffer from a sleep disorder known as sleep apnea syndrome. For those affected by this, the airway in the back of the throat can collapse. This results in frequent episodes of shallow breathing. At times, no air goes into the lungs at all. Low levels of oxygen in the blood will cause a person to partially “awaken,” enough to take a few deep, snorting breaths.

Sleep deprivation has a very negative impact on cognitive abilities, creativity, and alertness. It has been shown to adversely affect language skills, decision-making, and memory.

“Without sufficient amounts of sleep, we feel drowsy and are unable to concentrate,” Hunt said. He noted that some people can develop mood changes and can even begin to hallucinate. All of this can lead to a lower quality of life.

Researchers warn that sleep deprivation can seriously diminish the immune system. It can also decrease body temperature and lower the release of growth hormone. It can even cause an increase in heart rate and blood pressure.

Researchers say there is certainly an association between sleep loss and obesity and diabetes. A lack of sufficient sleep leads to increased appetite and late-night snacking as well as decreased physical activity.

Compared to an average total sleep time of seven to eight hours per night, the risk of developing obesity rises twenty-three percent with just six hours of sleep per night, fifty percent with only five hours per night, and seventy-three percent with four hours per night according to Hunt.

Not surprisingly, there is also a strong link between sleep deprivation and traffic accidents. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, drowsy driving each year causes four percent of the 100,000 to 150,000 motor vehicle crashes in the US.

What most people don't realize, researchers say, is that sleep deprivation also accumulates over time. People who don't get enough sleep build up a "sleep debt," which can't be eliminated by a simple power nap on the weekend.

Dement and colleagues have published a study that documented the results of lowering the sleep debt.

"Some of the improvements in performance, in mood, in cognitive ability, and in energy were really dramatic, almost superhuman," he said.

UNIT 11 Get Some Rest

Reading 2 A Real Cure for Insomnia

by Charles N. Reilly, M.D.

We all know what it feels like to get less sleep than we need. All-nighters of studying or partying can mess up our routines for sure. But it usually only takes another good night's sleep to get us back on track. Yet for some people, it isn't so easy.

A colleague of mine during my residency work at New York Hospital Queens could never seem to get enough sleep. She often came in to work exhausted and would complain of having spent the night tossing and turning in her bed. It affected not only her work, but her memory and relationships with others as well. On one frightening occasion, it almost caused her to make a fatal mistake during a surgery. Despite my assertion that sleeping medications did more harm than good, she decided to try drug therapy for her sleeplessness. But I can't blame her. She was at her wit's end.

As a doctor, I understand the value of drugs. There are many health conditions for which drugs are the only answer. In this case, however, it isn't clear how beneficial sleeping aids really are, especially when compared to the alternative. Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, or CBT, is a more effective and less harmful method of treating sleeplessness.

Once she started taking sleep medications, my colleague noticed an improvement in her ability to fall asleep and stay asleep. But no one should take sleeping aids for more than a few days, or a few weeks at the most. Sleeping pills can be highly addictive. Once the meds are stopped, they can lead to an even worse case of insomnia than the patient had before. To make matters worse, the quality of sleep, as my colleague discovered, isn't as good as natural sleep, and leaves you feeling sleepy the next day.

CBT, on the other hand, presents no such danger. The components of CBT involve forming healthy behaviors and environments, or "sleep hygiene," which are most helpful to habitual, natural sleep. Having a cool bedroom, avoiding caffeine and exercise at night, and developing relaxing habits before bed are all examples of good sleep hygiene. By practicing such behaviors, people establish sleeping habits that work indefinitely, rather than for just a few weeks.

In addition to being addictive, sleeping pills also have a negative effect on overall health. Dr. Daniel Kripke, co-director of research at Scripps Clinic in San Diego, found in a study of 10,500 people taking

sleeping pills that the prolonged use of such meds led to a thirty-five percent higher risk of cancer. Dr. Kripke claimed that people taking sleeping pills regularly have an even greater risk of developing lymphoma, lung, and other cancers than do people who smoke. His study also found that patients taking sleep medications were more than four times as likely to have died during the 2.5-year follow-up study as those who did not take the drugs.

While it's true that sleeping pills do provide relatively fast relief of the problem, the relief is short-lived and involves proven long-term risks. On the other hand, CBT requires time and effort to become effective but has no negative effects in the long run. Restriction therapy—a component of CBT which includes cutting out naps and putting off bedtime until late at night—may require up to six weeks to have a positive effect on the patient. The patient is also encouraged to identify habits that might have been preventing sleep. Dr. Donn Posner, director of Behavioral Sleep Medicine at Lifespan Hospitals in Rhode Island, recommends changing these habits. He instructs his patients not to spend time in the bedroom or on the bed unless it's time to go to sleep. He also recommends avoiding exercise or working before bed as it can excite the patient to the point where he or she cannot relax.

Another clear advantage of CBT over drug therapy is a doctor's ability to individualize respective treatments. Whereas drug formulas cannot be personalized for each patient, CBT treatment can. My colleague's sleep diary—detailing all of her habits and quirks—allowed her doctors to prescribe treatments that were exclusive to her condition.

Of course, creating new habits is time-consuming and difficult. But the upside is that once the good habits are formed, they can be kept up indefinitely with no negative side effects. I'm happy to say that after my colleague tried (and failed) the drug therapy route, she went for the healthier CBT option. She is now on the road to permanent relief from her condition—something drug therapy was never able to offer her.

UNIT 12 The Ethics of Eating

Reading 1 How I Learned to Stop Apologizing for Being Vegetarian

by JC Niala

Copyright 2013, wagingnonviolence.org. Used by permission.

It is an argument used by parents of picky eaters the world over: “Think of the starving children in Africa.” But in Kenya, where those starving children can be found on your doorstep, this argument applies to nearly anyone who chooses to limit the food he or she eats. When I tell people that I am a vegetarian, they assume it must be for medical reasons. Why else would an African woman who can afford to eat meat refuse what so many of her fellow citizens don’t have the luxury of turning down?

My reasoning, however, stretches back to when I was a little girl, growing up on my parents’ estate, surrounded by animals both domestic and wild. Having gotten to know them as I did, it was not hard to imagine how greatly they suffered when taken to the slaughterhouse. Such thoughts made me view the meat that I ate differently. Yet when I tried to talk with adults about it, I was told that animals were different, or that God provided them for us to eat. The only person who told me otherwise was our gardener, who was against hurting any animal (even a deadly Black Mamba snake) just because you could.

While his logic persuaded me, it would take another decade for me to truly become a vegetarian. And even then, I hardly dared admit it was because of my larger commitment to nonviolence. Recently, however, thanks to my 5-year-old daughter, I’ve begun to examine my own inaction when it comes to animal rights.

In January 2008, when Kenya was rocked by post-election violence, Kibera—the neighborhood just across the road from where I live in Nairobi—was hit the hardest. I had always been scared to enter Kibera, Africa’s largest poor urban area. Nevertheless, I decided to venture among the burning tires to see what I could do to help.

Although it seems naive to me now, I felt that a large part of people’s frustrations were based on not being able to feed their families. So with the help of an inspiring youth group, I started an organic vegetable farm in the heart of Kibera. Although normally there would have been a symbolic killing of a goat to celebrate the farm’s subsequent success, my newly acquired friends understood that I would not

pay for an animal to be killed. Still, they laughed at what to them seemed like a very odd diet because I never fully explained to them why I had completely stopped eating meat.

Over the next few years, my inhibitions about raising a vegetarian child in a meat-eating culture kept me from talking about my choice. Although my daughter knew we were vegetarian, I never really told her why, and she never really asked. It all came to a head when a family friend offered her a rib at a barbecue. Without any hesitation, she refused and said loudly that she didn't eat animals because they were her friends. People thought it was cute.

I soon started to write down her answers to the inevitable questions, which increased as she grew older. Unlike her mother, she did not apologize for being a vegetarian. She talked about why she didn't think it was right to hurt animals. Eventually, these quotes formed the basis of a book about being vegetarian that we published recently, called *Cows Are Too Big to Eat*.

It did not end there. When the board at her small community-run school announced that they were going to introduce meat into the previously vegetarian menu, my daughter spoke up again. I was taken by surprise, but I wasn't willing to cause too much trouble. However, when I discussed it with my daughter, she said, "Mama, what are we going to do about it?"

Noting that her response had included "we," I asked for her comments so that I could draft a letter to the board. She asked me to write that if they were worried about protein, then the children could eat cheese and drink milk. Thus, a cow would not have to be killed. The board responded by doing a survey, which led to a reversal of the decision to introduce meat into the school, at least for the kindergarteners.

It's hard to say if my daughter will take up the fight again next year when she moves on to primary school. Like most children, she lives firmly in the present. But that's OK. It's me who is thinking about the future. And going forward, I know that I will no longer be ashamed to say why I am vegetarian. It took nearly two decades, but thanks to my daughter I make no apologies for wanting to live a life of nonviolence, with respect toward all animals.

UNIT 12 The Ethics of Eating

Reading 2 Feelings Aside, Vegetarianism Doesn't Make Sense

by Steven Ming

The 1995 movie *Babe* starred a very cute pig that talked, had friends, and dreamed of winning a sheep-herding contest. If you don't think twice about eating pork or bacon after seeing that film, then you have no heart. *Babe* is a 92-minute argument for vegetarianism, and it is powerful. Its human star, James Cromwell, became a vegetarian during the making of the film. He explained his decision in an interview with *TakePart*, an online magazine: "I think the character I played had an ability to see animals as sentient beings, with as much a destiny and a drive and aspiration as he had."

Here's the problem, though: it's just a movie. Pigs can't talk. And while no one can prove it, it's a safe bet that they don't dream of winning contests, either. The moral arguments against eating meat are like *Babe*; they have an emotional appeal, but they cannot stand up to objective scrutiny. In fact, including meat in your diet is both morally acceptable and necessary for your health.

The most powerful weapon vegetarians have is the undeniable cruelty of the meat industry. There is no excuse for making a living thing suffer unnecessarily. And there is no doubt that pigs, cows, chickens, and other animals that we eat do, in fact, suffer. In factory farms, millions of animals receive abuse that would be rightly condemned (and in many places, be made illegal) if suffered by a family pet. These animals live short, miserable lives in tiny cages without ever seeing daylight, just because it is cost-effective. This is criminal.

Concern about animal cruelty is an excellent reason not to buy meat that comes from factory farms. Yet it is not a logical reason to give up meat altogether, since meat can be, and is, produced humanely. Those who object to the methods of industrial agriculture can try a farmers' market, or look for labels that read "organic," "free-range," or "cruelty-free." Granted, these labels are not always accurate; verifying them requires some research on the shopper's part. A growing number of websites, such as *EthicalFarms.org* and *CrueltyFreeEating.com*, aim to help consumers with that.

What about the idea that it is wrong to take a life, any life, in order to eat? Death is sad, but tell that to Mother Nature. Besides a few species of bacteria that eat minerals, all animals' diets depend on the deaths of other living things. Humans are no exception. According to the Harvard School of Public Health, people need forty-six to fifty-six grams of protein every day. With protein, of which our muscles

and organs are mainly composed, quality counts as much as quantity. Animal products have high-quality protein, meaning they contain all the amino acids (the “building blocks” of protein) essential for our health. No vegetable does. Meat, along with dairy and eggs, is also high in vitamin B12, which is integral to healthy brain function and the production of blood. It is not found in any plant.

If you still doubt the importance of animal products to good nutrition, read *The Vegetarian Myth* by Lierre Keith. Ms. Keith was a strict vegetarian for twenty years and remains passionate about animal welfare. In her 2009 book, she describes long-term health problems that she eventually concluded were due to her diet. After studying the evolutionary roots of our need for animal products, and despite her deep reluctance to take life, she became an advocate of ethical meat-eating. As she puts it, “life isn’t possible without death.”

That is true, by the way, even of a vegetarian diet. Aren’t plants living things, too? The usual objection to this line of reasoning—echoing James Cromwell—is that sentience makes the difference. But in nature there is no clear line between sentient and non-sentient. Scientists have found that plants can distinguish relatives from strangers; they “cry out” in response to stress by releasing a certain gas; and they grow faster when classical music is played to them. Apparently, there is no way for humans—or other animals—to avoid eating feeling beings.

It is admirable to care about the lives and the suffering of animals. However, to abandon meat-eating out of guilt is to take emotion too far, at the expense of our own health. If the title character of *Babe* was a normal pig, he was an omnivore, as we humans are. He ate leaves, grains, insects, and worms. He could experience pain, much like we do, and that’s reason enough to treat him in a kinder way than the typical factory farm would. But he also killed in order to live, just like we do. We must eat meat responsibly, but we must eat meat.