

STEP 5: WORKS CITED & ROUGH DRAFT

Nov 17-2:32 PM

Rough Draft

It **MUST** have:

Due Tuesday, 12/17

1. **In-text citations**
2. **updated works cited page** (DO NOT TURN IN YOUR ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY! TAKE THE ANNOTATIONS OFF IT and UPDATE IT).
3. **Rubric** attached

It will not be accepted without these 3 things! As always, it should be typed, double-spaced.

Dec 9-2:48 PM

Works Cited

A Works Cited page should list only the works that you actually cited in your paper—not other sources you consulted. Works should be listed alphabetically by author's last name or title (if no author is present). The second line of an entry should be indented. Skip a line after each entry.

FOR A BOOK:
 Author's last name, first name. Title of book. Place of publication: Publisher, copyright year.
Example: Fogle, Bruce. Training Your Dog. New York: DK Publishing, 2001.
If you only used part of a book:
 Fogle, Bruce. Training Your Dog. New York: DK Publishing, 2001, pp. 50-55.

FOR AN ARTICLE IN A REFERENCE BOOK
 Author. "Title of Article." Title of Book. Editor. City of Publication: Publisher, Year.
Example: Lampard, Eric Edwin. "Industrial Revolution." *World Book Encyclopedia*. Chicago: World Book, 2000.

FOR AN ARTICLE IN A REFERENCE BOOK THAT IS ANONYMOUS OR UNSIGNED
 "Title of Article." Title of Book. Editor. City of Publication: Publisher, Year.
Example: "Tuberculosis." *Human Diseases and Conditions*. Ed. Neil Izenberg. New York: Scribner's, 2000.

FOR A MAGAZINE OR NEWSPAPER ARTICLE:
 Article author's last name, first name. "Title or headline of article." Name of magazine or newspaper. Date of magazine or newspaper, page(s).
Example: McGill, Kristy. "A Baltic Scramble." Faces. May, 2003, p. 27.

FOR AN INTERNET ADDRESS
 Author's last name, first name. "Title of item." [Online] Available <http://address/filename>, date of document or download.
Example: DiStefano, Vince. "Guidelines for Better Writing." [Online] Available <http://www.usa.net/~vinced/home/better-writing.html>, October 5, 2002.

MATERIAL ACCESSED FROM A DATABASE (EBSCO, GaleNet, ABC-CLIO, etc.)
 Author. "Article Title." Periodical Title Date of print publication (if available): Pages. Database Name. Name of Providing Library. Day, month, and year of access. <<http://addressofdatabasehomepage>>.
Example: Brown, Susan. "Writing the Perfect Paper." High School Weekly 12 Sept. 2004: 22. EBSCOhost. Tappan Zee High School. 25 Nov. 2004. <<http://www.epnet.com/>>.

For easy and fast results, use www.easybib.com!

English 11R Research Paper – SAMPLE DRAFT

**Cell Phones in the Hands of Drivers:
A Risk or a Benefit?**

As of 2000, there were about ninety million cell phone users in the United States, with 85% of them using their phones while on the road (Sundeen 1). Because of evidence that cell phones impair drivers by distracting them, some states have considered laws restricting their use in moving vehicles. Proponents of legislation correctly point out that using phones while driving can be dangerous. The extent of the danger, however, is a matter of debate, and the benefits may outweigh the risks. Unless the risks of cell phones are shown to outweigh the benefits, we should not restrict their use in moving vehicles; instead, we should educate the public about the dangers of driving while phoning and prosecute irresponsible phone users under laws on negligent and reckless driving.

We have all heard horror stories about distracted drivers chatting on their cell phones. For example, in a letter to the editor, Anthony Ambrose describes being passed by another driver "who was holding a Styrofoam cup and a cigarette in one hand, and a cellular telephone in the other, and who had what appeared to be a newspaper balanced on the steering wheel—all at approximately 70 miles per hour" (123). Another driver, Peter Cohen, says that after he was rear-ended, the guilty party emerged from his vehicle still talking on the phone (127). Admittedly, some drivers do use their cell phones irresponsibly.

The dangers are real, but how extensive are they? To date there have been few scientific reports on the relation between cell phone use and traffic accidents. In 1997, Donald Redelmeier and Robert Tibshirani studied 699 drivers who owned mobile phones and had been in accidents. The drivers, who volunteered for the study, gave the researchers detailed billing records of their phone calls. With these data, the researchers found that "the risk of a collision when using a cellular telephone was four times higher than the risk when a cellular telephone was not being used" (433).

Paper is titled

Statistic is cited with author's name and page number in parentheses.

Thesis asserts author's main point.

If the author is named in a signal phrase, it does not need to be repeated in the citation; only the page number is in parentheses.

A summary is introduced with a signal phrase naming the author; a page number is given in parentheses.

Although this conclusion sounds dramatic, Redelmeier and Tibshirani caution against reading too much into it:

Our study indicates an association but not necessarily a causal relation between the use of cellular telephones while driving and a subsequent motor vehicle collision. . . . In addition, our study did not include serious injuries. . . . Finally, the data do not indicate that the drivers were at fault in the collisions; it may be that cellular telephones merely decrease a driver's ability to avoid a collision caused by someone else (457).

Pointing out that cell phones have benefits as well as risks, the authors do not recommend restrictions on their use while driving. Unfortunately, most states do not keep adequate records on the number of times phones are a factor in accidents. As of December 2000, only ten states were trying to keep such records (Sundeen 2). In addition, currently there is little scientific evidence comparing the use of cell phones with other driver distractions: fiddling with the radio, smoking, eating, putting on makeup, shaving, and so on.

Alasdair Cain and Mark Burriss of the Center for Urban Transportation Research surveyed research on the cell phone issue as of 1999 and concluded that there is "no nationally-accredited document to prove the connection between mobile phone use and traffic accidents." Because research results have been so inconclusive, it makes sense to wait before passing laws that might well be unnecessary.

In 2000, researchers at the Harvard Center for Risk Analysis found that the risks of driving while phoning were small compared with other driving risks. Whereas the cell phone user's chances of dying are about 6 in a million per year, someone not wearing a seat belt has a risk of 49.3 per million, and someone driving a small car has a risk of 14.5 per million (3). Because of this comparatively small risk, regulation of phones may not be worth the cost of the legislation as well as the additional burden such

Block Quote
5 lines

Long quotation is introduced by a sentence naming the authors.

Long quotation is indented, no quotation marks are needed.

Ellipsis dots show that words have been omitted.

legislation would put on law enforcement officers.

In addition to the risks, there are benefits to using phones on the road. Matt Sundeen reports that drivers with cell phones place an estimated 98,000 emergency calls each day and that the phones "often reduce emergency response times and actually save lives" (1). The phones have business benefits too. According to transportation engineer Richard Retting, "Commuter time is no longer just for driving. As the comforts of home and the efficiency of the office creep into the automobile, it is becoming increasingly attractive as a work space" (qtd. in Kilgannon A23). Car phones also have personal benefits. A mother coming home late from work can check in with her children, a partygoer lost in a strange neighborhood can call for directions, or a teenager whose car breaks down can phone home.

Unless or until there is clear evidence of a direct link between cell phone use and traffic accidents, the government should not regulate use of cell phones while driving. A better approach is to educate the public to the dangers of driving while distracted and to enforce laws on negligent and reckless driving.

Educational efforts can work. In the last twenty years, government and private groups have managed to change the driving habits of Americans. Seat belts are now regularly worn, people commonly appoint designated drivers when a group is drinking, small children are almost always put in safety seats, and most drivers turn on their headlights in rainy weather.

Enforcing laws against negligent and reckless driving can also work. Even groups concerned with safety support this view. For instance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration advises states to enforce their reckless and negligent driving laws and, where necessary, to strengthen those laws; it does not call for restrictions on use of the phones (United States, Dept. of Transportation). The California Highway Patrol opposes restricting use of phones while driving, claiming that distracted drivers can

Clear topic Sentences and transitions are used throughout.

An indirect source—words quoted in another source—is cited with the term "qtd. in."

No citation is needed for common knowledge.

Government source is listed under "United States" in the works cited list and in the parentheses.

already be prosecuted (Jacobs). It is possible, of course, that some states do not enforce their laws to the extent necessary. In such instances, citizens should put pressure on highway patrols to step up enforcement, for without fear of prosecution many drivers will not change their behavior.

The use of cell phones while driving is probably here to stay—despite the risks—unless future studies prove that the risks clearly outweigh the benefits. However, public safety concerns are real. To address those concerns, we should mount a major educational campaign to educate drivers about the dangers of driving while distracted and insist that laws on negligent and reckless driving be enforced as vigorously as possible.

The paper ends with the author's stand on the controversy.

↙ on separate page!

Works Cited

Ambrose, Anthony. Letter. *New England Journal of Medicine* 337.2 (1997): 128.

Cain, Alasdair, and Mark Burris. "Investigation of the Use of Mobile Phones while Driving." *Center for Urban Transportation Research*. College of Engineering, University of South Florida, Apr. 1999.

Cohen, Peter J. Letter. *New England Journal of Medicine* 337.2 (1997): 127.

Harvard Center for Risk Analysis. "Cellular Phones and Driving: Weighing the Risks and Benefits." *Risk in Perspective*. President and Fellows of Harvard Coll., July 2000. 15 Mar. 2001. <<http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/pdf/cellphones.pdf>>

Jacobs, Annette. "Guest Opinion: No New Laws Needed for Driver Distractions." *Wireless Week*. Advantage Business Media, 24 May 1999. 12 Mar. 2001. <<http://www.wirelessweek.com/News/May99/gopn524.htm>>

Kilgannon, Corey. "Road Warriors with Laptops." *New York Times*. 15 Aug. 2000: A23.

Redelmeier, Donald A., and Robert J. Tibshirani. "Association between Cellular-Telephone Calls and Motor Vehicle Collisions." *New England Journal of Medicine* 336.7 (1997): 453-58.

Sunden, Matt. "Cell Phones and Highway Safety; 2000 State Legislative Update." *National Conference of State Legislatures*. Natl. Conf. of State Legislatures, Dec. 2000. 11 Mar. 2001. <<http://www.ncsl.org/print/transportation/2006cellphone.pdf>>

United States of Transportation. Natl. Highway Traffic Safety Administration. "An Investigation of the Safety Implications of Wireless Communications in Vehicles." *NHTSA*. Natl. Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Nov. 1997. 12 Mar. 2001. <<http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/research/wireless/>>

List is alphabetized by authors' last names (or by title, if a work has no author).

First line of each entry is left margin; all subsequent lines of the entry are indented.

Works are single spaced with spaces in-between each entry

Introduction

General

↓

Specific Thesis

- **Start general:** You can write a general statement about character flaws, or be more creative by using an interesting quote, anecdote, or fun fact.
- Ease into topic
- Provide thesis last (one concise statement that answers the question: What is your research proving?)

When to Cite?

-Whenever you directly quote a source.

In an interview, he said, "I felt myself losing control" (Poole 23).
 ↳ no comma, period outside

-When you switch sources within a paragraph

He was born in Omaha, Nebraska to a family of four (Poole 23). When he was sixteen, he moved to New York City where he met his first wife (Ganley 34).
 ↳ signals a source switch

-Whenever you include information that is not common knowledge. You may know certain things, but you find the details in a source.

* /

-At the end of a paragraph

Mar 27-3:43 PM

What to include:

– Author and page where info. was found:

...blah, blah, blah (Golding 32).

> If your source continues to a different page, just cite the page.

...blah, blah, blah (Golding 32). Yadda, yadda, yadda (36).

It's assumed that the information is the same source, but a different page.

Mar 27-3:52 PM

HOW TO CITE:**What to include (cont.):**

- > If no page # is available, just cite author
- > If no author, cite Article/Webpage title
- > NEVER CITE THE WEBSITE!

Punctuation:

- > (Author Page). - notice there's no comma and the period goes to the right of the parentheses

Mar 27-3:52 PM

Works Cited Page

If you cite it, use it. If you use it, cite it.

...*blah, blah, blah* (Clearly 12). *Yadda, yadda, yadda* (Berger). *Blabbity, blabbity..* ("Legislation Now!").

List alphabetically

Works Cited

✓ Berger, Ham. "The Truth About Guns." Time Magazine...

✓ Clearly, Seymour. "Guns and Hand Grenades." www.gunsandgrenades.com...

✓ "Legislation Now!" Psychology Today....

Smith, John and Jane Zole
(Smith and Zole).

Mar 27-3:45 PM

- **Hanging indent:**

An Article in a Newspaper or Magazine

Author(s). "Title of Article." Title of Periodical D
 → *Month Year: pages.*

Poniewozik, James. "TV Makes a Too-Close Call." Time
 → *20 Nov. 2000: 70-71.*

Mar 27-3:54 PM

Rough Draft Research Paper/English 11R Name: _____ Score: _____/50 pts maximum

CRITERIA	EXEMPLARY (5 points)	HIGH QUALITY (4 points)	GOOD QUALITY (3 points)	ACCEPTABLE (2 points)	UNACCEPTABLE (1 point)
Research	Excellent research—thorough and detailed	Very good research; details are pertinent and relevant	Main points established; more detail would enhance understanding	Some research shown; Not well-developed	Lack of research shown; may include irrelevant details
Sources	4 or more legitimate sources are used in the paper *No more than 2 internet	3 sources	2 sources	1 source	There are no sources
Works Cited	Perfect or nearly perfect format	Shows very few minor errors in format	Shows some errors, but mostly correct format	Some attempt made at using correct format; some citations are correctly formatted, others are not	No Works Cited; No attempt made at using correct format
Internal Citations	8 or more internal citations are present in the paper	7 – 5 internal citations are present in the paper	4-3 internal citations are present in the paper	Only 2 internal citations are present in the paper	There is only one internal citation or none at all
Meaning	Establishes and maintains a clear purpose and focus throughout the writing—original and insightful	Purpose and focus are clearly established. Clear awareness of audience	Purpose and focus must be inferred – not clearly stated. Thesis is basic or lacks specificity	Attempts to establish a purpose; focus is not fully clear. Poor awareness of audience. Lacks clarity.	Purpose and focus are not apparent. No awareness of audience. No thesis.
Development	Richly developed; supporting details are rich, interesting, and full	Fully developed; details are pertinent or explicit and provide idea/information in depth	Details are adequate to develop ideas/information, but limited in depth; Details are not always clearly elaborated	Thinly developed; Details lack elaboration – merely listed or unnecessarily repetitious; Some details do not support the focus	Not developed; Details are minimal, inappropriate, random, or non-existent; Serious errors in content
Organization	Ideas are arranged logically to support argument. They flow smoothly and are clearly linked to each other. The reader can follow line of reasoning.	Ideas are arranged logically to support argument. They are usually clearly linked to each other. For the most part the reader can follow line of reasoning.	Ideas are arranged logically to support argument. They flow smoothly and for most part are linked to each other. The reader can generally follow line of reasoning.	In general, the writing is arranged logically, although occasionally ideas fail to make sense together. The reader is fairly clear about what the writer intends.	The writing is not logically organized. Frequently, ideas fail to make sense together. The reader cannot identify a line of reasoning and loses interest.
Language	stylistically sophisticated, using language that is precise and engaging	language is fluent and original, with evident awareness of audience and purpose	appropriate language, with some awareness of audience and purpose	basic vocabulary with little awareness of audience or purpose	language is imprecise, unsuitable, inappropriate, or incoherent
Grammar/Mechanics	Very few or no errors with complexity	Very few errors	Some minor errors	Several errors that do not interfere with meaning	Many errors; shows lack of proofreading
Format	Paper is titled, typed double-spaced, 12pt font	Paper is typed, double-spaced, 12pt font	Paper is typed, but does not meet all formatting criteria	Paper meets some but not all formatting criteria	Paper is not typed

Attachments

Research Process 2011.pdf

11r note cards.notebook

Research paper 11R process complete.doc