Should I Wear This or That?

Jennifer Slagel
Mt. Pleasant Community High School

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©[2012?] Jennifer Slagel

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.
Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/oermaterials

Part of the Geography Commons

Recommended Citation
Slagel, Jennifer, "Should I Wear This or That?" (2012). Open Educational Resources. 199.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/oermaterials/199

This Lesson Plans is brought to you for free and open access by the Open Educational Resources at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Educational Resources by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.
Should I Wear This or That?
Created by: Jennifer Slagel
Mt. Pleasant Community High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level (Req.): 10th grade</th>
<th>Content Area (Req.): Human Geography</th>
<th>Unit (Opt.): Globalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to Other Disciplines (Opt.):</td>
<td>Goal (Req.): The students will be able to describe the advantages and disadvantages to using sweatshops for producing clothing, shoes, etc.</td>
<td>Objective (Req.): The students will be more aware of where they buy their clothing and what effect it has on the people who make it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame (Req.): One 90 minute block period</td>
<td>Materials Needed (Req.):</td>
<td>New Vocabulary (Opt.):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Colored Pencils</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scissors</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Glue</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Computers</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All documents attached to this lesson plan</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anticipatory Set/Introduction [Inquiry Question is required] (Req.): Where do you like to shop for clothing? What is your favorite clothing store?

Instructional Sequence/Procedure (Req.):
1. Have students answer the Anticipatory Set/Introduction questions while taking attendance. Then have the students share their answers with the rest of the class. Write their responses on the whiteboard.
2. Hand out the “Paper Doll Template” to each student. Give the boys in class the “Paper Doll Template for Males” and the girls in the class the “Paper Doll Template for Females.”
3. Explain to the students that they are going to have 10-15 minutes to use the Internet to find clothing for their doll from their favorite stores listed on the whiteboard. Explain to them that they may shop in more than one store or stick with just one store. Once they have found an item from a store they are to color that item on their “Paper Doll Template” and list on the clothing piece the following things: the brand name, the cost of the article of clothing, and the country in which the article of clothing is made. (They may have to do a simple Google search to find where the article of clothing is made. For example, “Where is Gap clothing made?”)
4. Once this is complete have the students cut out their doll and the pieces of clothing they chose for their doll. Then have the students glue the clothing onto the doll.
5. Read together as a class the article called “The Bangladesh Garment Factory Tragedy-10 Sweatshop-Free Clothing Companies.” Point out that the clothing stores they listed as their favorite more than likely use sweatshops to produce the clothing.
6. Give the students another “Paper Doll Template.” Again, giving the boys the male version and the girls the female version. Now have them dress their dolls in the same way using only...
sweatshop-free clothing companies. They may use any company from the list from the reading or they may search online for other companies that are sweatshop-free. Again, give them 10-15 minutes to complete this. Remind them to color the clothing and list the following on each article of clothing: the brand name, the cost and the country in which it’s made.

7. Once both dolls are complete have the students complete the “Should I Wear This or That Reflection.” There are two per page so you can just cut the sheet in half.

8. Hand out the document called “Nike-Behind the Swoosh Guiding Questions.” Show the video Nike Sweatshops-Behind the Swoosh (found on YouTube) as a case study to the use of sweatshops and the negative effects it has on the people who work in such places. The students should answer questions 1-7 as they watch the video. The students should answer questions 8-11 with a partner when the movie is finished.

9. At this point the students should have a fairly negative view of sweatshops and you could even lead a discussion about their thoughts and feelings using questions #8-11 as a starting point.

10. If time permits in class have the students read the article “The Noble Feat of Nike” and complete the graphic organizer that goes with it. If time runs out assign this as homework. This article discusses the benefits of Nike having sweatshops in other countries. The students should be shocked by this as most often times the media talks about how bad they are.

11. Formative Evaluation (Req.): In-class discussion after movie and after reading the article “The Noble Feat of Nike.”

Assessment (Req.): Have the students write a 1-2 page paper answering the following question: Which of the two outfits from your paper dolls would you or should you buy? Consider what you have learned from the video “Nike-Behind the Swoosh” and the reading “The Noble Feat of Nike.” Use evidence from one or both of these sources to support your answer.

Iowa Core Curriculum Standards Used (Req.):
- Economics- Understand the role of scarcity and economic trade-offs and how economic conditions impact people’s lives.
- Economics-Understand the local, state, regional, national and international factors that create patterns of interdependence in the global economy.

Common Core Curriculum Standards Used (Opt.):
- Reading for Literacy in History/Social Studies: Compare the point of view of two or more authors for how they treat the same or similar topics, including which details they include and emphasize in their respective accounts.
- Writing for Literacy in History/Social Studies: Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGS Standards Used (Req.):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 11 – The patterns and networks of economic interdependence on Earth’s surface.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Themes of Geography Used (Req.):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District Standards and Benchmarks (Opt.):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21st Century Universal Constructs (Opt.):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Disciplinary Standards (Opt.):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Essential Information (Opt.):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Resources (Opt.):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Should I Wear This or That? Reflection Questions

Name_________________________

1. Calculate the total money you would have spent on each doll.

   Doll #1: _______________   Doll #2: _______________

2. Which dolls clothing was more expensive?

3. Provide 2 reasons why you think this dolls clothing was more expensive than the other dolls clothing?

4. In the reading, “The Bangladesh Garment Factory Tragedy-10 Sweatshop Free Clothing Companies,” the author states “that no purchase can be considered “cheap” if human lives are the cost.” What do you think the author meant by this? Do you agree with this statement? Why or why not?

5. In your opinion, should you be buying Doll #1’s clothing or Doll #2’s clothing? Why?

Should I Wear This or That? Reflection Questions

Name_________________________

1. Calculate the total money you would have spent on each doll.

   Doll #1: _______________   Doll #2: _______________

2. Which dolls clothing was more expensive?

3. Provide 2 reasons why you think this dolls clothing was more expensive than the other dolls clothing?

4. In the reading, “The Bangladesh Garment Factory Tragedy-10 Sweatshop Free Clothing Companies,” the author states “that no purchase can be considered “cheap” if human lives are the cost.” What do you think the author meant by this? Do you agree with this statement? Why or why not?

5. In your opinion, should you be buying Doll #1’s clothing or Doll #2’s clothing? Why?
The Bangladesh Garment Factory Tragedy – 10 Sweatshop-Free Clothing Companies

By Intent on April 25, 2013

When we buy an item of clothing from a mall or outlet in the United States, we often don’t think about the hundreds, even thousands, of people laboring in factories around the world to bring these fashions to the racks.

The weight of this reality hit home, however, after news surfaced on Wednesday of the devastating collapse of a garment factory in Bangladesh. The disaster left at least 175 people dead, more than 1,000 injured, and countless others trapped in the rubble. This marks the worst industrial disaster in Bangladesh’s history, and points to the chilling underbelly of the fashion industry. According to reports, the building, which housed five garment factories in its eight stories, had developed cracks the night before, but workers were nonetheless ordered back in for work the next morning. If true, the accusation would make this not only a tragic display of negligence, but a human rights violation, at that.

This horrific incident may remind you of similar news from November 2012, when a fire broke out in another garment factory in the country, trapping workers inside and killing 112 people. These disasters are all too common. The garment industry comprises over 75% of Bangladesh’s international exports, with some of their largest buyers being H&M, Walmart, and Gap Inc. Consider that the average H&M women’s shirt is roughly $20, while the average hourly wage of a factory worker in Bangladesh is just $0.13. Roughly one third of the country’s population lives below the poverty line, a trend common among countries with some of the highest sweatshop labor exports around the world.

If all of this makes you a bit sick to the stomach, we completely understand. That’s why we’ve compiled a list of 10 clothing companies that do not use sweatshop labor. Hopefully collectively we can convey the message that no purchase can be considered “cheap” if human lives are the cost.

1. Eddie Bauer
2. Givenchy
3. Ben Davis
4. Union Jeans
5. Alternative Apparel
6. American Apparel
7. New Balance (Made in US collection)
8. Tom’s Shoes
9. Cut Loose
10. Flax
**Directions:** Read the article “The Noble Feat of Nike” and take notes on how each stakeholder of the Nike company benefits from the use of sweatshops. Some benefits/advantages may have to be inferred. In other words, the reading may not come right out and tell you the benefits of sweatshops, but based on what you read you should be able to infer what the benefit(s) might be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Advantages of Sweatshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee of sweatshop &amp; their family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company using the sweatshop (Nike, Apple, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Consumer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Country in which the sweatshop is located</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your opinion, is it counterproductive for Westerners to attack sweatshops when many people in developing countries look to them for upward mobility?
The Noble Feat of Nike

By Johan Norberg

The Spectator, 7 June 2003

Nike. It means victory. It also means a type of expensive gym shoe. In the minds of the anti-globalisation movement, it stands for both at once. Nike stands for the victory of a Western footwear company over the poor and dispossessed. Spongy, smelly, hungered after by kids across the world, Nike is the symbol of the unacceptable triumph of global capital. A Nike is a shoe that simultaneously kicks people out of jobs in the West, and tramples on the poor in the Third World. Sold for 100 times more than the wages of the peons who make them, Nike shoes are hate-objects more potent, in the eyes of the protesters at this week’s G8 riots, than McDonald’s hamburgers. If you want to be trendy these days, you don’t wear Nikes; you boycott them.

So I was interested to hear someone not only praising Nike sweatshops, but also claiming that Nike is an example of a good and responsible business. That someone was the ruling Communist party of Vietnam.

Today Nike has almost four times more workers in Vietnam than in the United States. I travelled to Ho Chi Minh to examine the effects of multinational corporations on poor countries. Nike being the most notorious multinational villain, and Vietnam being a dictatorship with a documented lack of free speech, the operation is supposed to be a classic of conscience-free capitalist oppression.

In truth the work does look tough, and the conditions grim, if we compare Vietnamese factories with what we have back home. But that’s not the comparison these workers make. They compare the work at Nike with the way they lived before, or the way their parents or neighbours still work. And the facts are revealing. The average pay at a Nike factory close to Ho Chi Minh is $54 a month, almost three times the minimum wage for a state-owned enterprise.

Ten years ago, when Nike was established in Vietnam, the workers had to walk to the factories, often for many miles. After three years on Nike wages, they could afford bicycles. Another three years later, they could afford scooters, so they all take the scooters to work (and if you go there, beware; they haven’t really decided on which side of the road to drive). Today, the first workers can afford to buy a car.

But when I talk to a young Vietnamese woman, Tsi-Chi, at the factory, it is not the wages she is most happy about. Sure, she makes five times more than she did, she earns more than her husband, and she can now afford to build an extension to her house. But the most important thing, she says, is that she doesn’t have to work outdoors on a farm any more. For me, a Swede with only three months of summer, this sounds bizarre. Surely working conditions under the blue sky must be superior to those in a sweatshop? But then I am naively Eurocentric. Farming means 10 to 14 hours a day in the burning sun or the intensive rain, in rice fields with water up to your ankles and insects in your face. Even a Swede would prefer working nine to five in a clean, air-conditioned factory.

Furthermore, the Nike job comes with a regular wage, with free or subsidised meals, free medical services and training and education. The most persistent demand Nike hears from the workers is for an expansion of the factories so that their relatives can be offered a job as well.

These facts make Nike sound more like Santa Claus than Scrooge. But corporations such as Nike don’t bring these benefits and wages because they are generous. It is not altruism that is at work here; it is globalisation. With their investments in poor countries, multinationals bring new machinery, better technology, new management skills and production ideas, a larger market and the education of their workers. That is exactly what raises productivity. And if you increase productivity - the amount a worker can produce - you can also increase his wage.

Nike is not the accidental good guy. On average, multinationals in the least developed countries pay twice as much as domestic companies in the same line of business. If you get to work for an American multinational in a low-income country, you get eight times the average income. If this is exploitation, then the problem in our world is that the poor countries aren’t sufficiently exploited.

The effect on local business is profound: ‘Before I visit some foreign factory, especially like Nike, we have a question. Why do the foreign factories here work well and produce much more?’ That was what Mr Kiet, the owner of a local shoe
factory who visited Nike to learn how he could be just as successful at attracting workers, told me: ‘And I recognize that productivity does not only come from machinery but also from satisfaction of the worker. So for the future factory we should concentrate on our working conditions.’

If I was an antiglobalist, I would stop complaining about Nike’s bad wages. If there is a problem, it is that the wages are too high, so that they are almost luring doctors and teachers away from their important jobs.

But - happily - I don’t think even that is a realistic threat. With growing productivity it will also be possible to invest in education and healthcare for Vietnam. Since 1990, when the Vietnamese communists began to liberalise the economy, exports of coffee, rice, clothes and footwear have surged, the economy has doubled, and poverty has been halved. Nike and Coca-Cola triumphed where American bombs failed. They have made Vietnam capitalist.

I asked the young Nike worker Tsi-Chi what her hopes were for her son’s future. A generation ago, she would have had to put him to work on the farm from an early age. But Tsi-Chi told me she wants to give him a good education, so that he can become a doctor. That’s one of the most impressive developments since Vietnam’s economy was opened up. In ten years 2.2 million children have gone from child labour to education. It would be extremely interesting to hear an antiglobalist explain to Tsi-Chi why it is important for Westerners to boycott Nike, so that she loses her job, and has to go back into farming, and has to send her son to work.

The European Left used to listen to the Vietnamese communists when they brought only misery and starvation to their population. Shouldn’t they listen to the Vietnamese now, when they have found a way to improve people’s lives? The party officials have been convinced by Nike that ruthless multinational capitalists are better than the state at providing workers with high wages and a good and healthy workplace. How long will it take for our own anticapitalists to learn that lesson?
Nike: Beyond the Swoosh Guiding Questions

1. Why did Jim Keady get fired from St. John’s University?

2. What was Jim and Leslie’s plan or goal in Indonesia? In other words, what was their purpose in going to Indonesia?

3. Explain the living conditions for the Nike factory workers in Indonesia.

4. How much money does the typical Nike factory worker make per day?

5. How were Jim and Leslie treated by Nike’s management company in Indonesia?

6. Why don’t the Nike factory workers protest or try to fight for better pay and working conditions?

7. How did the CEO of Nike, Phil Knight, respond when Jim asked him for a meeting to discuss the working conditions in Indonesia?

FAB & D – Find a Buddy & Discuss

8. Should Nike be held responsible for working conditions in foreign factories that it does not own, but where sub-contractors make products for Nike? Why or why not?

9. What labor standards regarding safety, working conditions, overtime and the like should Nike hold foreign factories to: those prevailing in that country, or those prevailing in the United States?

10. An income of $2.28 a day, the current base pay of Nike factory workers in Indonesia, is double the daily income of about half the working population. Half of all adults in Indonesia are farmers, who receive less than $1 a day. Given this, is it correct to criticize Nike for low pay rates for factory workers in Indonesia?

11. Do you think Nike needs to make any changes to its current policy? If so, what? Should Nike make changes even if they hinder the ability of the company to compete in the marketplace?

12. If sweatshops are a global problem, what might be a global solution to this problem?