Developing the Writing Process:
Summary and Analysis Exercise

Due Date:
The assignment is due in the first section of Week 2 (either January 17 or 18).

Overview:
There are two common forms of academic writing that you will be asked to develop at UCSD. They are called by many names, but they are usually identified as summary and analysis. Both are used in science, social science, and humanities writing. A **written summary** generally condenses the main ideas from a longer text into a shorter form. In contrast, a **written analysis** closely examines the arguments and evidence used in historical documents, speeches, policy papers, literature, films, music lyrics, research studies, lab experiments, and engineering proposals – pretty much anything that involves written or visual work. In your DOC 2 papers this quarter, you will be asked to develop both of these writing skills.

Directions:
To complete this assignment, choose one (1) of the following texts from your DOC 2 Reader:
* *Bradwell v. Illinois* (1873)
* Margaretta Midura, "John v. Jennifer, A Battle of the Sexes" (2013)

Write two paragraphs about your chosen text. The first paragraph should summarize the text in your own words. The second paragraph should analyze **one part** of the text.

Your assignment should be no more than 1.5 pages.

Successful assignments will be typed and double-spaced, with one-inch margins and 12 point font, and will be stapled if necessary.

The assignment will count toward your final "Section Assignments and Participation Grade."

Student Writing Tips:
Students who recently took DOC 1 are encouraged to review paper #3, which incorporates the elements of summary and analysis in that assignment.

When writing, it can be helpful to imagine the primary reader of your paper is a friend or family member who is not attending this class (rather than your professor or TA).

How to Write a Summary and Analysis:

A *summary* is a condensed, shortened version of something – often a longer piece of writing, or even a movie or television show, a situation, or an event. In writing a summary, you provide readers with *only* the main points and the key support. And, you write it mostly <u>in your own words</u>. If it is necessary to quote material, that quotation should be as brief as possible.

In contrast, an *analysis* breaks down the points or parts of a piece of writing and considers how they work together to convey a main point. This involves critical thinking: e.g., raising questions, challenging assumptions, and identifying contradictions in your reading – all skills that you worked to develop in DOC 1.

There are usually at least <u>four parts</u> to an analytical piece of writing – 1) a topic sentence or main claim that you want to make about the text; 2) evidence or examples that support the claim you are trying to make; 3) explanatory sentences in which you attempt to unpack your examples and show readers how they support the claim you are trying to make; and 4) a conclusion sentence that attempts to convey the significance or the "so what?" of your analysis for readers.

In DOC 2, a strong written analysis of a text will often draw on the DOC "tools" and concepts that were introduced in DOC 1. These are all tools that can be used to ask questions about a text. For example, "Is this court case an example of patriarchal ideology? If so, what is an example of it?" Or, "Does this study identify any contradictions? If so, which ones?"

Sample Summary and Analysis

Here is a sample student summary paragraph taken from a previous "Summary and Analysis" assignment:

<p style="text-align:center">Racial Hierarchies in <u>People v. Hall</u></p>

In Ronald Takaki's <u>A Different Mirror</u>, Takaki analyzes the example of the unjust 1854 California Supreme Court decision, <u>People v. Hall.</u> He argues that Chinese immigrants experienced unjust forms of legal discrimination in the 19th century United States. The case was based on the trial of George Hall, an Irish-American white man from California who was accused of murdering Ling Sing, a Chinese immigrant miner. When the case went to trial, one white man and three Chinese-American witnesses testified against Hall, and Hall was found guilty of murder based on this testimony. However, Hall's lawyer appealed the case. He argued that an existing California law provided that "no black or mulatto person, or Indian, shall be permitted to give evidence in favor of, or against, any white person" (189). The judges agreed with Hall's attorney and Hall was set free. When Hall was set free, Ling Sing's murder remained unpunished, and the statute established a new form of legal racial discrimination against Chinese immigrants in California. According to Takaki, this case contributed to a long period of discrimination against Chinese immigrants in the United States. This period is known as the era of "Chinese Exclusion," and is named for the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.

The <u>People v. Hall</u> is an example of an unjust law. The Court's ruling is unjust because it justifies a racial hierarchy that ranks Chinese immigrants as inferior to those who were considered "white" citizens in California in the 19th century. For example, in their ruling, the California Court argued that Chinese immigrants were "a race of people whom nature has marked as inferior, and who are incapable of progress or intellectual development beyond a

certain point, as their history has shown" (<u>People v. Hall</u>). In this argument the Court uses the language of "nature" to validate the notion of racial hierarchy. According to the court, a person's appearance can "mark" them on a racial hierarchy of superior/inferior human beings based on intellect.   Specifically, the Court claims that because Chinese immigrants were intellectually inferior to white people, they could not be relied upon to give proper legal testimony against them. In using this kind of reasoning, the Court advances the notion of scientific racism, which was becoming more established in the nineteenth century, to argue that Ling Sing was racially different and inferior to Hall, his white counterpart. The long-term consequences of the case are significant. It is a strong example of how the ideology of white supremacy became established in the California legal system. Conversely, those who were considered "other" (in this case, Chinese) could not depend on the courts for protection from injustice. The classification of "other" placed these men and women in a subordinate position in the racial hierarchy of the era and opened the doors to new other forms of injustice, such as job discrimination and mob violence. These injustices continued for the next one hundred years.

Summary Discussion Questions:

1) What are the elements of the summary? What information is provided in the first few sentences? In the middle? In the last few sentences? How would the summary read if you removed any of these elements?

2) How does the writer transition between each part?

3) As a reader of this summary, do you possess the main facts of the case, even if you did not read Ronald Takaki's description of it?

Analysis Discussion Questions:

1) What "question" is the analysis paragraph answering?

2) Does the paragraph begin with a claim/ topic sentence? Is it fact or argument? How would the paragraph read if this topic sentence were removed?

3) Does the paragraph include supporting details? How can you identify them? What transition phrase is used? Why do you think the writer chose these details? Are they well chosen?

4) Does the paragraph explain or analyze the supporting details/example? Is it effective? How would the paragraph appear if the paragraph ended after the quotation?

5) How does the paragraph conclude? Is it a successful conclusion?