

The Forgotten Personality

Katie Angeles

*University of California, Riverside
Riverside, California*

In this essay, Katie Angeles explores personality types, with a particular focus on one type: the phlegmatic. Aware that her audience might not know what she means by “personality types,” Angeles briefly explains the history and concept of personality types, along with current ideas about what shapes the human personality. Of course, she had to do research to understand personality types, so she cites her sources. Angeles then explains what the *phlegmatic* type is, by contrasting it with the other personality types and by giving examples of its characteristics. These explanatory strategies ensure that the reader will understand and remember the “forgotten” personality.

The next time you’re at a party or any other type of social gathering, look around. Some people are telling stories and making everyone laugh, others are making sure everything is running smoothly and perfectly, and a few individuals are the bold ones who liven things up and “get the party started.” These are the obvious personalities—the “life of the party,” the “busy bee,” and the “leader.” Personality experts call these personalities sanguine (the popular one), the melancholic (the perfect one), and choleric (the powerful one). However, there’s one personality that’s not so easy to spot, and therefore is usually forgotten—the peaceful phlegmatic.

What makes people the way they are? Why do some people command the spotlight, while others are experts at fading into the background? Personality types were first identified around 400 BC, when the Greek physician Hippocrates noticed that people not only looked different, but also acted differently. He believed that each

person's personality type was related to a particular body fluid they had in excess: yellow bile, black bile, blood, or phlegm. These were classified as the "four humors" (Funder 203). Around AD 149, a Greek physiologist named Galen built on Hippocrates' theory, stating that sanguines had an excess amount of yellow bile, melancholics had extra black bile, choleric had more blood than others, and phlegmatics had an extraordinary amount of phlegm (Littauer 16). In later years, more theories evolved—American scientist William Sheldon believed that personality was related to body type, while people in India said that metabolic body type contributed to the way people behave (Funder 373). Ultimately, these theories were proven incorrect; but we still recognize different personality types. Today, what do we think determines personality?

As *Time* magazine reported on January 15, 1996, D4DR, a gene that regulates dopamine, is usually found in people who are risk takers (Toufexis par. 2). However, researchers suspected that the gene itself wasn't the only cause of risk-taking and that other genes, as well as upbringing, contributed to this phenomenon (Toufexis par. 3). At the time the report appeared, people were worried that parents would use prenatal testing to weed out certain genes that invoked undesirable personality traits (Toufexis par. 6). Since all personalities have their good and bad sides, this would have been a controversial development. Thankfully, parents are not yet able to test for their child's future personality.

Moreover, we know that even though people may be born with a certain personality, the way they are brought up can also contribute to how they relate to others later in life. For example, birth order has been shown to affect personality type (Franco par. 1). Firstborn children tend to be choleric since they have the job of leading their siblings; middle children are usually phlegmatic since they're in a prime negotiating spot; and the youngest are generally sanguine because they're used to being spoiled (Franco par. 2-4). Parents can also influence the way a child's personality turns out.

Each personality type has its strength, but a strength taken to an extreme can become a weakness. While sanguines love to talk, sometimes they may talk too much. Although choleric are born leaders, they may use their influence in negative ways. Melancholics are perfectionists, but they may prefer being right to being happy, and phlegmatics tend to be easygoing and agreeable, but they may be too passive and have a fear of conflict. Their laid-back attitude can

be very frustrating to the most fast-paced personalities, such as choleric and melancholic.

Phlegmatic people are hard to notice because they're usually not doing anything to call attention to themselves. While the sanguines are talking and loving life, the choleric are getting things done, and the melancholic are taking care of the little details, the phlegmatics distinguish themselves by simply being laid-back and easygoing. Even though phlegmatic people tend to fly under the radar, it's very noticeable when they're not around, because they are the peacemakers of the world and the glue that holds everyone together. They are low-maintenance, adaptable, even-keeled, calm, cool, and collected individuals. They are usually reserved, yet they love being around people, and they have a knack for saying the right thing at the right time. Phlegmatics also work well under pressure. However, they hate change, they avoid taking risks, they are extremely stubborn, and it's very hard to get them motivated or excited, which can translate into laziness (Littauer 21). Aside from these traits, the phlegmatic's characteristics are hard to define, because phlegmatics tend to adopt the traits of either the sanguine personality or the melancholy personality.

Most people are a combination of personalities—they have a dominant and a secondary personality which combine the traits of the personalities. For example, some phlegmatics are phlegmatic-sanguine, making them more talkative, while others are phlegmatic-melancholy, causing them to be more introverted. It's not possible to be phlegmatic-choleric, since phlegmatics avoid conflict and choleric are fueled by it (Littauer 24, 25). People who try to resist their natural personality type can wind up unhappy, since they are trying to be someone they are not.

All personalities have emotional needs. The sanguine needs attention, affection, approval, and activity; the melancholic needs space, support, silence, and stability; the choleric needs action, appreciation, leadership, and control; and the phlegmatic needs peace, self-worth, and significance (Littauer 22). If people don't have their emotional needs met, their worst sides tend to emerge. For example, if a phlegmatic, an easygoing, type B personality, is in a family of all choleric, or "go-getter," type A personalities, the phlegmatics may find themselves masking their true personality in order to survive. This can be very draining for phlegmatics, and sooner or later, their negative side will emerge.

Phlegmatics are very adaptable—they get along with everyone because they are able to meet the emotional needs of all the individual personalities. They listen to the sanguine, they follow the choleric, and they support the melancholic. In return, the sanguine entertains them, the choleric motivates them, and the melancholic listens to them. However, if phlegmatics feel like they're being taken for granted, they will become resentful. Since they have an innate need for peace, they won't say anything, and people won't know that there's a problem (Littauer 125).⁹

Even though phlegmatics are often overlooked, they have a lot to contribute with their ability to work under pressure, their diplomatic skill, and their contagious contentment. So the next time you're checking out personalities at a party, try looking for the phlegmatic first—it will be the first step to overcoming the trend of the forgotten personality.¹⁰

WORKS CITED

- Franco, Virginia. "Siblings Birth Order and Personality Types." *Essortment*. Pagewise, Inc., 2002. Web. 21 Nov. 2006.
- Funder, D.C. *The Personality Puzzle*. 2nd ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 2001. Print.
- Littauer, Florence. *Personality Plus for Couples: Understanding Yourself and the One You Love*. Berrien Springs: Baker Publishing Group, 2001. Print.
- Toufexis, Anastasia. "What Makes Them Do It." *Time*. Time, 15 Jan. 1996. Web. 16 Nov. 2006.

Gambling and Government Restriction

Luke Serrano

*University of California, Riverside
Riverside, California*

For some people, gambling is a harmless diversion, and a chance to win a few extra dollars. For others, it is an addiction that draws them away from their families and into unpayable debt. Should people be allowed to have their fun, or should the government step in to prevent them from developing a crippling gambling addiction? In this essay, Luke Serrano examines these opposing positions as presented by a pair of psychologists specializing in gambling addictions, and a financial analyst. Serrano clearly presents the two sides' arguments, but achieves the goal of the assignment by finding what they have in common: a belief that compulsive gambling is real, and serious. As you read, think about how harmful something has to be before you believe the government should ban or regulate it.

Throughout history people have looked for sources of entertainment to temporarily take their minds off of responsibilities and problems. While some people are satisfied with a simple game or a television show, others have the desire to make their entertainment even more interesting by investing money in it. Having something at stake in a game provides people with a rush that does not come from simply playing the game. Archaeological evidence suggests that gambling dates as far back as 2300 BC to ancient China, India, Egypt, and Rome ("The History of Gambling" 1). However, almost as long as there has been gambling, there have been people trying to put an end to it. Authority figures have noticed that gambling can serve as a distraction that keeps people away from what they are supposed to be doing. In medieval England, gambling was outlawed

when King Henry VIII discovered that his soldiers were spending more time gambling than working on drills and marksmanship (1). In the United States, gambling was outlawed in Nevada until 1931 when casino gaming was legalized and Las Vegas began its rise as one of the largest gambling hot spots in the world (1). It now brings in over 30 billion dollars in revenue each year (Dunstan 2). Two main views of gambling have arisen from the effects it has had on people. Both sides believe government regulation has a great effect on gamblers, and that gambling addiction is a real problem that requires treatment. Their viewpoints diverge because one side believes that gambling causes serious problems and should be illegal; the other believes that gambling is not a problem and that restrictions do more harm than good.

Those who argue that gambling is a problem point to the personal and social issues created by those who gamble too much. Arnie and Sheila Wexler are both certified compulsive gambling counselors in New Jersey. Sheila developed the compulsive gambling treatment program at the New Hope Foundation in Marlboro, New Jersey (Wexler and Wexler 1). The Wexlers firmly believe that compulsive gambling is a disease similar to drug and alcohol addiction. They argue that "the disease can be much more insidious [than drug or alcohol addiction] because it is more difficult to detect and can have a more devastating effect on friends and families" (2). The devastating effects compulsive gambling can have on people have led the Wexlers to call for the outlawing of gambling in the United States.

Some people, however, believe that compulsive gambling is not a pressing issue. Quantitative analyst Guy Calvert represents a Wall Street firm and is an adamant believer that the growing prevalence of compulsive gambling is just an exaggeration (Calvert 1). In his essay "The Government Should Respect Individuals' Freedom to Gamble," Calvert says, "individuals should not be prohibited from gambling just because some people find it addictive" and he claims the "dangers of prohibiting gambling outweigh the benefits" (1).

The argument for the prohibition of gambling centers on the detrimental effects that gambling can have on people. The Wexlers argue that compulsive gambling is "a progressive disease" that goes through phases (Wexler and Wexler 3). The first phase of gambling addiction is the phase in which the gambler reports a series of wins or streaks. This phase can reoccur throughout the gambling addiction, but the initial win streak is the hook that draws the gambler in

(Wexler and Wexler 3). This hook gives the gambler a taste of wealth and the illusion that the wealth and luck will continue. The next phase of compulsive gambling is the losing phase. The losing phase is the phase in which gamblers lose the money that they might have won and begin to chase their losses (Wexler and Wexler 3). At this point, the gambler begins to borrow money to cover bets that he or she cannot pay. This is when the desperation phase begins. It is the last phase, at which point the gambler will do anything to put down the next bet (Wexler and Wexler 3). Family, friends, and work no longer matter. The desire to get the same rush as from the first big win is the only thing that matters. Families are destroyed, friendships are ruined, and careers are lost because the gambler cannot go without betting long enough to take care of responsibilities. Studies estimate that "the number of compulsive gamblers in this country is between 10 million and 12 million, approximately 5 percent of the general population" (Wexler and Wexler 5). The sheer number of compulsive gamblers and the devastation that comes with them are the reasons that the Wexlers believe the only viable action is the prohibition of gambling.

In contrast to the prohibition argument, the no-restrictions argument says the prohibition of gambling would be detrimental to the United States. Calvert argues that measures to suppress gambling would "usher in a new era of public corruption, compromising the integrity of government officials, judges, and the police" (2). He gives the prohibition of alcohol as an example of what would happen if gambling became illegal (Calvert 1). Crime would rise because of the underground lifestyle that is brought with illegal gambling. In addition to being harmful, Calvert says, the prohibition would be unnecessary because most people do gamble responsibly. Most people who go to casinos "are not crazed, welfare-dependent casino desperadoes; they are in many respects better off than the average American." Studies show that the average household income of casino players is 28 percent higher than that of the U.S. population (Calvert 4). Gambling is used the majority of the time as a source of entertainment, not as a fix for the compulsive gambler. Furthermore, the banning of gambling would not deter the truly compulsive gambler (Calvert 2). It is the nature of an addict to find the next fix no matter what the cost. Illegality would do nothing to stop the compulsive gambler, just as heroin's being illegal does nothing to stop the junkie. Like an alcoholic or drug addict, a compulsive gambler has to want to get help to get better.

Although the two parties disagree on whether the government should regulate gambling, they do agree that compulsive gambling is a problem and an addiction. In one instance described by the Wexlers, a man came to a treatment center and seemed to be having withdrawal symptoms after a gambling binge. He had dilated pupils, he was sweating and shaking, and he suffered severe mood swings (Wexler and Wexler 2). The similarities between compulsive gambling and drug and alcohol addiction are undeniable. Calvert agrees, saying, "pathological gambling can and sometimes does result in genuine human misery" (Calvert 5). Both parties agree that this is a problem that needs to be solved. People who have gambling problems need treatment because without it there is no stopping the addiction. 6

In 1996, members of an estimated 32 percent of all U.S. households gambled at a casino, amounting to about 176 million visits to casinos (Calvert 2). These staggering numbers show that gambling has a great effect on Americans, whether it is positive or negative. The arguments both for and against gambling bring forth valid points. On the one hand, the prohibition argument claims compulsive gambling is a serious problem and the only way to stop it is by prohibiting gambling completely. On the other hand, the pro-gambling supporters argue that gambling is a legitimate institution which provides entertainment and economic growth for the United States; moreover, this party argues that the prohibition of gambling would cause more harm than good for the American people. Despite the different opinions that exist about gambling, it is a large part of American recreation and is an issue that should not be taken lightly. 7

WORKS CITED

- Calvert, Guy. "The Government Should Respect Individuals' Freedom to Gamble." *Gambling*. Ed. James D. Torr. San Diego: Greenhaven P, 2002. N. pag. Excerpt from "Gambling America: Balancing the Risks of Gambling and Its Regulation." Cato Policy Analysis 18 June 1999. *Opposing Viewpoints Resource Center*. Web. 1 Dec. 2009.
- Dunstan, Roger. "Pivotal Dates in Gambling History." *American Gaming Association*. American Gaming Association, 2003. Web. 2 Dec. 2009.
- "The History of Gambling." *Gambling PhD*. Gambling PhD.com, 2003. Web. 2 Dec. 2009.

Wexler, Arnie, and Sheila Wexler. "The Hidden Addiction: Compulsive Gambling." *Legalized Gambling*. Ed. Mary E. Williams. San Diego: Greenhaven P, 1999. N. pag. Contemporary Issues Companion Ser. Rept. of "The Hidden Addiction." Professional Counselor June 1997: n.pag. Opposing Viewpoints Resource Center. Web. 1 Dec. 2009.

TXTing: b8 it or luv it

Courtney Anttila

*Southwest Minnesota State University
Marshall, Minnesota*

Many adults—instructors, journalists, and cultural commentators of all varieties—have begun to complain that, with the proliferation of instant messages and texting, students are losing the ability to write correctly. Courtney Anttila defends texting, arguing that it is simply another phase in the evolution of the constantly changing English language. Anttila cites linguistic research to show that misuse of texting slang is less common in formal contexts than alarmists might think. Anttila argues further that most students can “code-switch” between the language they use when sending casual text messages and the more formal language that is appropriate when writing for school. As you read her essay, think about how you decide which conventions of language use—vocabulary, style, voice, and the like—are appropriate in your own academic writing.

In 2005, about 7.3 billion text messages were sent within the United States every month, up from 2.9 billion a month the previous year (Noguchi). In August 2007, there were 92.5 million (or 43 percent) of mobile users actively using short-message-service (SMS), also known as text messages, and 41 million subscribers sent texts nearly every day (“M:Metrics Study”). Just imagine how many thumbs are typing messages at this moment. Human beings have been communicating in shorthand languages for years using different techniques such as Morse code, smoke signals, and other encrypted codes (Barker). Texting has created a “code” that people can decipher because most abbreviations are spelled phonetically; the slang is used in everyday life, and it is an extremely convenient way to communicate (Barker). Some see texting slang as butchering the English language. However, texting demonstrates the constant

developmental change and manipulation of language that happens over time and creates a new literacy for people to communicate with (O'Connor).

During the 1990s, instant messaging on a computer was the craze. A type of slang developed to communicate quickly while typing—"LOL" instead of "laughing out loud," "gr8" instead of "great," and other abbreviations and letter replacements. But using this shorthand form of communication just on the computer was not enough. Now, texting has become more popular than ever, and people can send 160-character messages from their phone to anyone who can receive them—allowing them to communicate with practically anyone at any time. Most texters don't even need to blink when deciphering the texting and instant messaging (IM) language used today. 2

Students and other text-message users have made the new language increasingly detailed over the years, letting people send more information in a smaller amount of space. This "texting language" can become so encoded into the minds of the users that they don't even have to change how they read or think to understand the message. But it is not appropriate all the time. Imagine a 15-year-old boy applying for a summer job and writing this: "I want 2 b a counsclor because I love 2 work with kids" (O'Connor). It is clear what he is saying, but most people would be appalled at this language on an application because it isn't Standard English. Fortunately, people change their type of language depending on their situation daily; children rarely talk to their parents the same way they talk to their friends, and parents do not speak to their children the way they speak to their coworkers. Students' academic writing is not being as negatively impacted by texting as some people think. In the article "Txts r gr8 but not in exams," Ian McNeilly, a twelve-year secondary English teacher and director of the National Association for the Teaching of English, states, "I don't think text message and MSN messenger styles are a sign of declining standards, but changing literacies. Children are usually capable of differentiating between the two" (Barker). Texting slang is not a threat to students' writing for school or for work. 3

People may assume that texting replaces or damages Standard English because adolescents who text are not writing grammatically correct messages. Although there have been some instances where the "texting slang" has been used in inappropriate places, there is no 4

direct correlation between people who text and poor scores on standardized English texts. In fact, the use of text-message abbreviations is connected positively with literacy achievements (Smith). There has been research suggesting that using text abbreviations might have a correlation to children's reading and writing skills. Researchers at Coventry University studied thirty-five eleven-year-olds and related their use of cell phones to their English reading, writing, and spelling skills. The researchers found that the children who were better at spelling and writing were the ones who texted the most (Smith). They found no evidence linking children who texted and a poor ability to use Standard English. Researcher Beverly Plester is "interested in discovering whether texting could be used positively to increase phonetic awareness in less able children, and perhaps increase their language skills, in a fun yet educational way" (Smith).

Texting slang is also considered to be much more common than it actually is. A researcher in language and communication at the University of Washington, Crispin Thurlow, studied 135 nineteen-year-old students at Cardiff University and analyzed 544 of their text messages (Barker). Thurlow found only 20 percent who used abbreviations, and 35 percent who used apostrophes correctly in their messages (Barker). Tim Shortis, who is carrying out a PhD in text messaging as a vernacular language at London University's Institute of Education, said "You get initialisms such as LOL for laugh out loud and letter and number homophones such as r and 2, but they are not as widespread as you think. There are also remarkably few casual misspellings" (Barker).

Not only do people make the wrong assumption that using texts is automatically a burden to the English language, but they also worry that texting has brought more cheating into classrooms. Now instead of passing notes, there is the option of sending electronic messages with cellular phones. It is true that phones allow their users to send and receive messages relatively quickly and secretly; however, students who cheat will find a way regardless of texting. And although some students text during class, teachers are getting better at detecting when students are using their cell phones. Cheating is not a new phenomenon; it has always been an issue in school, and it will continue to be. But it is not a problem solely because of texting.

Texting technology has not only made communication easier, but has also allowed young people to become more comfortable

with writing daily. Although students have always had to write in school, they previously talked mostly to their friends on the telephone. E-mail and instant messaging have made writing to people less intimidating—and hassle-free. Now, with texting, this generation has shown improvement in writing ability. Today's students write more and are better able to explain their thoughts and feelings with words (O'Connor). Even though they might not use the best grammar, kids are getting practice with their writing, and it shows. Adolescents have now surrounded themselves with less formal writing, and they are familiarizing themselves with the strategies that are important for written communication.

Until the next communication innovation comes along, texting and its language are not going to go away. Texting is a part of the continual development of English and has a large impact on today's world. Though texting is a distraction when abused, it has helped put the written word back into our lives, making people more comfortable with the skill of writing. Texting has shown students a way to practice their writing skills outside of class. It is a convenient way for many people to get in touch . . . & it's a fast, EZ way 2 communic8.

WORKS CITED

- Barker, Irena. "Ttxts R Gr8 But Not in Exams." *The TES*. TES Connect, 9 Feb. 2007. Web. 7 Feb. 2008.
- "M:Metrics Study: 92.5 Million Active SMS Users Make Short Code-Based Mobile Marketing the Most Effective Platform for Mobile Advertisers." Blog posting. *Club Texting*. Club Texting Wireless Promotions, 25 Oct. 2007. Web. 2 Nov. 2007.
- Noguchi, Yuki. "Life and Romance in 160 Characters or Less." *Washington Post*. *Washington Post*, 29 Dec. 2005. Web. 22 Oct. 2007.
- O'Connor, Amanda. "Instant Messaging: Friend or Foe of Student Writing?" *New Horizons for Learning Online Journal* 11.2 (2005): n. pag. Web. 22 Oct. 2007.
- Smith, Alexandra. "Texting Slang Aiding Children's Language Skills." *The Guardian*. *The Guardian*, 11 Sept. 2006. Web. 7 Feb. 2007.

Energy Drinks

Tan-Li Hsu

*University of California, Riverside
Riverside, California*

In this essay Tan-Li Hsu takes on energy drinks for their high levels of caffeine (which aren't mentioned on the labels) and their marketing campaigns aimed at teenagers. Although energy drinks can certainly help teens pull all-nighters, they can also lead to serious health problems. Hsu cites news articles reporting studies about caffeine abuse in teenagers; he also cites the American Beverage Association, which defends its labeling practices. By bringing his opposition into the debate and refuting their claims, Hsu strengthens his own position.

Like many of Hsu's other readers, you may never have thought before about caffeine levels in energy drinks or the dangers of caffeine. As you read, think about how Hsu presents the issue to his readers, and consider his strategies for convincing them of his argument.

Ever since Red Bull energy drink was introduced in the United States in 1997, the market for energy drinks has been continually expanding. Roland Griffiths, a professor of psychiatry and neuroscience at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine and author of a study published in the journal *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, estimates that the market for energy drinks now totals at least \$5.4 billion a year (Doheny). These popular drinks are packed with caffeine, a stimulant that is able to freely diffuse into the brain and temporarily increase alertness. Although the Food and Drug Administration places a limit on how much caffeine food products can contain—71

milligrams for each 12-ounce can—energy drinks are considered to be dietary supplements and not food products, allowing the caffeine content of these drinks to remain unregulated (Roan). As a result, hundreds of brands of energy drinks with ridiculous amounts of caffeine not specified on labels flourish in the market.

Furthermore, marketers intentionally target teenagers who are more susceptible to drinking multiple cans because they tend to live active lifestyles that leave them sleep deprived. It's no wonder that "[t]hirty-one percent of U.S. teenagers say they drink energy drinks, according to Simmons Research. That represents 7.6 million teens" ("Teens"). With the increased usage of energy drinks combined with the lack of caffeine content and warning labels on cans, emergency room doctors and poison control centers are reporting more cases of caffeine intoxication (Seltzer). Energy drink manufacturers are putting teenagers in danger by not clearly indicating the amount of caffeine on labels and by marketing highly caffeinated energy drinks to teenagers.

All energy drinks list caffeine as an ingredient on labels, but many don't specify how many milligrams of caffeine are in the drink. Some brands, like "Wired" and "Fixx," have 500 mg of caffeine per 20-ounce serving, about ten times the caffeine found in cans of soda (Doheny). Another ingredient, guarana, is a source of caffeine that adds to the drinks' already high caffeine content. Unsuspecting teens who crave a buzz by drinking several cans of energy drinks are unknowingly putting themselves at risk for the irregular heartbeat and nausea associated with caffeine intoxication. In rare cases, such as that of nineteen-year-old James Stone, who took "two dozen caffeine pills for putting in long hours on a job search," intoxication may even lead to death by cardiac arrest (Shute).

It is possible to promote responsible consumption of energy drinks by including possible health hazards along with caffeine content on can labels that encourage drinking in moderation. The reason why such warning labels don't already exist is because marketers are more concerned with money than the health of consumers. "Vying for the dollars of teenagers with promises of weight loss, increased endurance and legal highs . . . top-sellers Red Bull, Monster and Rockstar . . . make up a \$3.4 billion-a-year industry that grew by 80 percent last year" ("Teens"). By warning about the possible health hazards of drinking too much caffeine, manufacturers of en-

ergy drinks risk a decrease in purchases. Maureen Storey, a spokeswoman for the American Beverage Association, argues that "most mainstream energy drinks contain the same amount of caffeine, or even less, than you'd get in a cup of brewed coffee. If labels listing caffeine content are required on energy drinks, they should also be required on coffeehouse coffee" (Doheny). This argument has some validity, but it fails to include ingredients in energy drinks that function as a hidden source of caffeine, such as guarana. Guarana is a berry that grows in Venezuela that contains a high amount of guaranine, a name for caffeine derived from the guarana plant. Assuming that energy drinks and coffee have the same amount of caffeine, the risk of caffeine intoxication from energy drinks is much higher because of the guaranine.

It is obvious that marketers are taking advantage of teens and encouraging them to drink more with attractive brand names such as Rockstar, Monster, and Cocaine Energy Drink that promise to enhance performance. There are many reasons why marketers target teenagers instead of a more mature age group. The first is that teens are more easily tricked by claims that energy drinks will increase endurance and mental awareness. Also, teens are out partying late at night more often than adults who recognize the importance of a good night's sleep. It's no surprise that marketers are targeting exhausted teenagers who are more likely to purchase these drinks than an adult who makes sure he is in bed by 10 p.m. However, marketers fail to realize the consequences of such marketing techniques. A study led by Danielle McCarthy of Northwestern University showed "a surprising number of caffeine overdose reports to a Chicago poison control center" ("Teens"). "Although adults of all ages are known to use caffeine, it is mainly abused by young adults who want to stay awake or even get high, McCarthy said" ("Study").

Another reason why marketers shouldn't incite teens to buy energy drinks is that the half-life of caffeine in a young body is significantly longer than in an adult's body (Shute). Half-life is the time required to remove half the amount of a substance to prevent accumulation in the body. With a longer half-life in teens, caffeine can accumulate more easily and increase the risk of caffeine intoxication. Preteens are getting hooked on caffeine as well: "A 2003 study of Columbus, Ohio, middle schoolers found some taking in 800 milligrams of caffeine a day—more than twice the recommended maxi-

300 milligrams" (Shute). The problem for preteens is especially dire because "their body weight is low," as Wahida Karmally, the director of nutrition for the Irving Center for Clinical Research at Columbia University Medical Center, explains (Shute). Moreover, researchers do not know how such high levels of caffeine consumption affect the child's developing body.

Manufacturers argue that marketing to teenagers and preteens is acceptable because energy drinks can be part of a balanced lifestyle when consumed sensibly. While convincing, this argument does not demonstrate a clear understanding of the scope of the problem. If a student drinks an energy drink while studying at night and can't sleep because of it, he might drink another in the morning to help wake up. According to Richard Levine, a professor of pediatrics and psychiatry at Penn State University College of Medicine and chief of the division of adolescent medicine and eating disorders at Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, "too much caffeine can make it harder to nod off, even when you're tired. Then you risk falling into a vicious cycle of insomnia caused by energy drinks followed by more caffeine to wake up" (Seltzer). Those who fall into this cycle become addicted to energy drinks and this addiction threatens the very idea of sensible consumption. For example, 15-year-old Eric Williams explained that "he used to drink two to four energy drinks a day, and sometimes used them to stay awake to finish a big homework project (Seltzer). The headaches he got when he didn't drink them convinced him to quit "although it took him two weeks" to break the habit (Seltzer). Teens shouldn't rely on energy boosters to achieve a balanced lifestyle; they should learn time management and get into the habit of a good night's sleep every day.

Exciting brand names, appealing promises of enhanced performance, and lack of clear warning labels have allowed energy drink manufacturers to intentionally target a younger audience. With these tactics, the energy drink market has grown into a billion dollar industry. Although manufacturers are enjoying profits, consumers are placing themselves at risk for serious health problem associated with caffeine intoxication. The most susceptible to intoxication are teenagers who drink either to delay exhaustion or to get a buzz. Caffeine content and overdose warnings must be placed on energy drinks in order to make teens aware of the potential dangers of drinking too much.

WORKS CITED

- 7
- Doheny, Kathleen. "Energy Drinks: Hazardous to Your Health?" *WebMD Health News*. WebMD, 24 Sept. 2008. Web. 18 Jan. 2009.
- Roan, Shari. "Energy Drinks Can Cause Caffeine Intoxication." *Booster Shots*. Los Angeles Times, 28 Sept. 2008. Web. 16 Jan. 2009.
- Seltzer, Rick. "Heavy Use of Energy Drinks Can Threaten Teens' Health." *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*. Atlanta Journal-Constitution, 27 Aug. 2008. Web. 16 Jan. 2009.
- Shute, Nancy. "Over the Limit?" *U.S. News*. U.S. News & World Report, 15 Apr. 2007. Web. 12 Jan. 2009.
- "Study: More People Abusing, Getting 'High' on Caffeine." *Fox News*. Fox News, 24 Feb. 2009. Web. 24 Feb. 2009.
- "Teens Abusing Energy Boosting Drinks, Doctors Fear." *Fox News*. Fox News, 31 Oct. 2006. Web. 24 Feb. 2009.
- 8