Traditional Gesture of Handshaking

Posted on September 17, 2018

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/traditional-gesture-of-handshaking/

Outline

Thesis statement

- Against the proposition of eliminating the traditional gesture of handshaking.
- The promotion of safety standards and hygiene removes the risks of germ transmission.

Introduction

- What are the claims of the central argument
- Is it in support of eliminating handshaking or against it
- A brief overview of the solution

Main argument

- First paragraph
- Risks involved in the practice of handshakes are less serious.
- Eliminating the spread of germs or infections is not possible by eliminating the practice.
- The actual cause of transmission of infections is not handshaking but a lack of hand washing.
- People give less time to hygiene.
- Second paragraph
- Handshakes are important in maintaining interactions.
- Survival of human relationships, professional or personal, is not possible without such a practice.
- Third paragraph
- Antiseptic soaps and sanitizers are sufficient for controlling the spread of infections.
- Removing compassionate care will influence the quality of care, thus affecting patients' health.

Counter-argument

- Removal of handshakes will enhance protection and eliminate the spread of germs.

- The health of people is more important than greetings.

Conclusion

- The main argument presents strong claims supported by evidence.
- Refutation of the counter-argument due to weaker claims.

Research Template

Author’s Purpose/Argument:

Argument/Opinion	Evidence/Facts	Your Commentary/Analysis
1. Lickerman argues Although handshakes involve numerous benefits, they carry risks of transmitting infections. 2. Hinda argues that eliminating a handshake from the practice of greeting is impossible. 3. Feingold argues that engaging in better hand hygiene will eliminate the potential risks that a handshake carries. 4. Shah argues that the debate on handshakes leads to conflicting situations reflected through no harm versus compassionate care.	1. Evidence reveals that a handshake gives an idea of an individual’s personality due to emotional expressiveness and increases the chances of being hired for a job. Facts also indicate that handshakes pass infections due to inadequate washing and negligence of sterile techniques. 2. Medical research identifies transmission of infections due to handshakes. 3. Facts depict that shaking hands with doctors and patients is risky as it transmits bacteria and other organisms. 4. Evidence suggests that shaking hands with doctors carries serious risks for patients and visitors due to the germs they contain in their palms.	1. Handshaking contributes to health hazards as it continues to spread diseases. 2. Instead of removing handshakes from the practice of greeting people, the better approach is to promote safety measures and hygiene. 3. The analysis of the study indicates the need for promoting handshake hygiene. 4. Removing handshakes from healthcare practices will affect the concept of compassionate care.

1. Source information: Alex Lickerman

Evaluating Sources

Directions: reflect on the reasons you are choosing to use this document in your research. Answer in complete sentences.

Why are you choosing to use this source?

The reason for choosing the source is that it explains the idea behind ‘no shaking hands’.

Does this source directly support your argument, or does it provide a counterargument for refutation? Is it a balanced article that you can use for both?

The source provides direct support to the argument as it explains how difficult it is to remove the tradition of greeting. It is a balanced article as it explains the pros and cons of shaking hands.

How does this article appeal/not appeal to each of the following:

Logos

Logic is visible in the facts provided by authors, such as the transmission of germs and bacteria.

Ethos

The evidence strengthens the claims, as the article mentions, “in a hospital setting where it has been shown to reduce rates of patient infections” (Lickerman 2).

Pathos

Pathos convinces the audience about the risks involved in shaking hands. The article emotionally appeals to people to think about how the simple practice of shaking hands can transmit disease.

Which of the article’s three appeals will you use in your own argument? Explain how.

I will use logos in the argumentative analysis as the article includes sufficient facts associated with the research topic.

Is the information in this article reliable? How do you know?

The article is reliable as the author is a practicing doctor and is involved in various research related to hygiene. The author is a founder of Health Communication Inc. and is working to enhance patient-doctor relationships.

2. Source Information: Dave Hinda

Evaluating Sources

Directions: reflect on the reasons you are choosing to use this document in your research. Answer in complete sentences.

Why are you choosing to use this source?

The source contributes to the argumentative analysis as it highlights the arguments for and against shaking hands.

Does this source directly support your argument, or does it provide a counterargument for refutation? Is it a balanced article that you can use for both?

The source is a counter-argument as it explains that eliminating the traditional practice of handshakes can protect people from developing infections or contagious diseases.

How does this article appeal/not appeal to each of the following:

Logos

Logos are visible throughout the article as the author includes research from health institutes concerning the transmission of infections through contact between people who shake hands.

Ethos

Ethos is visible in the article as the author himself is a doctor and builds relevance of the topic with the real-life experiences of the people.

Pathos

Pathos constantly appears in the article as the author persuades the audience about the danger of shaking hands. Pathos emerges as the author states that the removal of handshakes enhances protection.

Which of the article's three appeals will you use in your own argument? Explain how.

I will use pathos as the article holds more significance for the readers and takes them to a state where they think about the adversities of a handshake.

Is the information in this article reliable? How do you know?

The source is credible as the author is a doctor in Colorado researching the enhancement of people's health.

3. Source Information: Murray Feingold

Evaluating Sources

Directions: reflect on the reasons you are choosing to use this document in your research. Answer in complete sentences.

Why are you choosing to use this source?

The source is helpful for the main argument as it provides a deeper analysis of the issue.

Does this source directly support your argument, or does it provide a counterargument for refutation? Is it a balanced article that you can use for both?

The article directly supports the main argument as it proposes enhancing the concept of a hygienic handshake.

How does this article appeal/not appeal to each of the following:

Logos

The logic is apparent in the article as the author includes facts related to the spread of disease and infections. Logic is also visible in the research conducted by healthcare institutes.

Ethos

Ethos represents the credibility of the author and the discussion of real-life experiences. Ethos is visible as the source explains the impossibility of removing the practice of shaking hands.

Pathos

The article convinces the readers that the appropriate solution is to adopt hygiene measures rather than removing handshakes.

Which of the article's three appeals will you use in your own argument? Explain how.

I will use ethos as the article explains different scenarios indicating how people encounter difficulty in interacting without handshakes.

Is the information in this article reliable? How do you know?

The information in the article is unreliable as the author himself is a doctor but represents personal views. The article does not include facts from credible sources.

4. Source Information: Allie Shah

Evaluating Sources

Directions: reflect on the reasons you are choosing to use this document in your research. Answer in complete sentences.

Why are you choosing to use this source?

The source is helpful for the argument analysis as it explains the practical implications of removing the handshake.

Does this source directly support your argument, or does it provide a counterargument for refutation? Is it a balanced article that you can use for both?

The source does not support the argument and provides a counter-argument as it places more emphasis on the importance of handshakes.

How does this article appeal/not appeal to each of the following:

Logos

Logic is visible as the article highlights the findings that state the connection of handshaking with the transmission of disease.

Ethos

Ethos emerges as the source involves evidence from credible sources, such as the inclusion of Mr. Sklansky's claims, as he researched the topic at the University of California.

Pathos

Pathos becomes prominent as the source explains how miserable it would be to eliminate handshaking. It convinces the people about the significance of handshaking and the warmth it conveys.

Which of the article's three appeals will you use in your own argument? Explain how.

I will incorporate pathos from the article as it convinces the people to continue the traditional practice

of shaking hands.

Is the information in this article reliable? How do you know?

The information included in the article is credible as it concentrates on the findings of well-known researchers like Sklansky. The information strengthens the claims presented in the article.

Rough Draft

Introduction

American Journal of Median Science revealed the association between shaking hands and health hazards. The gesture of handshaking is capable of transmitting infections, thus deteriorating people's health. To overcome the health hazards resulting from shaking hands, the research suggests the need to find appropriate solutions. There are many benefits of handshaking as well, so its removal leads to a conflicting situation.

Main argument

Removing the practice of shaking hands from healthcare settings or the daily lives of people is not so simple. The main argument is against the notion of eliminating the traditional handshaking practice. The gesture of handshaking is relevant to compassionate care, remaining one of the vital components of quality care. It is also difficult to end the traditional practice as it is a necessary element of interaction. The doctors have a role as caregivers that stresses the need to build strong interactions with the patients. Without handshakes, the relationship between caregivers and clients will change, posing greater risks for healthcare institutes (Lickerman, 2012). The main argument claims that handshakes are not the only cause of spreading germs. People's encounters with different things, such as cell phones and keyboards, also transmit germs. Handshakes pose less serious risks for people in terms of health (Feingold, 2014). The main reason for the spread of infections is the fact that people take less care of hygiene, as research depicts that they spend fewer than ten seconds washing their hands. To overcome the risks of infection transmission, the more appropriate approach is to promote hygiene (Shah, 2014).

Counter-argument

The counter-argument claims that the elimination of handshaking from healthcare settings will minimize the risks of disease transmission. The health of people is more important than the old tradition of greeting. As the practice spreads germs, the effective solution is to eliminate it. Other ways of greeting can be used under such circumstances (Hinda, 2014).

Conclusion

Stronger facts and evidence support the main argument suggesting improving hygiene conditions. The most suitable solution to eliminate the risks associated with the practice of handshaking is to promote the use of antiseptic soaps and sanitizers. The supporting claim that eliminating the practice will compromise the quality of care strengthens the central argument. Similarly, there are other causes responsible for the spread of germs, depicting the need to control them. The counter-argument does not provide sufficient support to prove the claim, thus leading to its refutation.

Argumentative Analysis

Statement: Though shaking hands carries risks of transmitting germs, it is impossible to eliminate the practice from human lives, thus suggesting the need to promote hygienic handshakes.

The central argument claims that the practice of handshaking involves numerous risks for the people engaged, reflecting the need for enhancing hygiene. Through improving hygiene, such as regular hand washing and the use of sanitizers, the possible risks of infection transmission can be eliminated. The main argument does not identify the elimination of handshaking as a proposed solution for removing the risks involved because it also recognizes the significance of handshaking. The claims state that the handshake is a traditional human practice playing a crucial role in interactions, thus depicting the impossibility of its removal.

The practice of handshaking involves less serious risks for the people. The argument supports the claims by including medical researchers who prove the association of handshakes with the transmission of germs and infections. Lickerman identifies the potential harms involved in the practice and rejects the proposition of eliminating it from our daily routines. The author states, “In one observational study of female college students, only 2 percent washed their hands for more than ten seconds” (Lickerman, 2012). The claims of the author reflect that the actual cause of transmission of infections is not handshaking but it is no hand washing. People in the current world care less about hygiene and spend less time washing their hands with soap. The research provided by the author reflects that people do not wash their hands after shaking hands, which can eliminate the possibility of catching germs. The source contributes to the main argument as it emphasizes promoting hygiene among people.

Handshaking is an old tradition and a necessary part of the greeting, posing greater risks for its elimination. It is more appropriate to find other solutions rather than removing the practice because it is the central element in maintaining interactions with each other. The argument claims that handshaking is not as serious as smoking, so it does not have any slogans like ‘no handshaking.’ Feingold supports the main argument and identifies the significance of the practice in daily life. He mentions, “is it serious enough to prohibit the time-honored gesture of shaking hands” (Feingold, 2014). The article reflects concerns regarding the topic of germ transmission. The source contributed

to the main argument as it explains doubts related to the practice of handshaking. Though the gesture of shaking hands poses risks of infection transmission, it is not as serious to remove it. Survival of human relationships, professional or personal, is not possible without such a practice. The claims also propose that the benefits of the practice make its elimination impossible.

With the invention of infection-control antiseptic soaps and sanitizers, the need to eliminate handshakes from healthcare settings is trivial. Advancements in medicine have allowed society to enjoy the benefits of better health and hygiene. Shah (2014) claims that the increased use of sanitizers by doctors does not pose risks of germ transmission. The article supports the main argument as it considers the removal of handshakes as inappropriate and useless. The source identifies the role of doctors as caregivers and shows its relevance to patients' wellness. Without proper warmth and compassionate care, the medical team will be unable to give quality care, thus making the removal of the handshake impossible. Compassionate care is as important as eliminating the spread of infections from hospitals and other healthcare institutes. Without proper gestures of greeting, the doctors cannot make the patient feel relaxed, thus affecting the quality of care. To support the claim, Shah includes Sklansky's words, "We touch keyboards, we touch phones. We tough doorknobs. We touch our eyes and mouth. We have to go to the bathroom and such. That how germs end up on hands" (Shah, 2014). The source contributes to the main argument as it clearly states ending handshakes does not remove the chances of germs spreading.

The counter-argument emphasizes the elimination of the traditional practice of shaking hands as it will protect people from the spread of infections and germs. Hinda's claim is against the central argument as he suggests the removal of a handshake from healthcare settings. Hinda mentions, "removing the handshake from healthcare settings may ultimately recognize as an important way to protect the health of patients and caregivers rather than a personal insult to whosoever refuses it" (Hinda, 2014). The risks of the handshake are even greater in healthcare settings as the doctors are unable to wash their hands after attending to many patients. Shaking hands with the patients involves more threats as they carry germs. The author identifies protecting the health of patients as more important compared to compassion and greeting. The article also claims that there can be other sources used for greeting, such as a distant salute or words. The counter-argument rejects the idea presented in the central claim about the promotion of hygiene and regular hand washing. It recognizes the elimination of the practice as the only solution to overcome the risks of germ transmission.

The argumentative analysis depicts that the main argument is stronger as the evidence supports the claims. Eliminating handshakes is not possible in daily lives or in healthcare settings, and it is not the only cause of infection transmission. The researchers suggest the promotion of hygiene settings, such as the use of handwashing and sanitizer, as a more appropriate choice for ending germ transmission. The supporting evidence for the main argument leads to the refutation of the counter-argument.

References

Feingold, M. (2014). *Dr. Murray Feingold: Should you shake hands with your doctor?* Retrieved 03 14, 2018, from https://www.uticaod.com/article/20140701/news/140709901

Hinda, D. (2014). *Is your handshake as dangerous as smoking*? Retrieved 03 14, 2018, from https://denver.cbslocal.com/2014/05/20/is-your-handshake-as-dangerous-as-smoking/

Lickerman, A. (2012). *Don't shake hands*. Retrieved 03 14, 2018, from https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/happiness-in-world/201202/dont-shake-hands

Shah, A. (2014). Does shaking hands with your doctor spread disease? *StarTribune.*