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As the title suggests, *Practical Argument*, Short Third Edition, strives to make argumentation *practical* by helping students to realize that arguments are, indeed, everywhere. Accordingly, the introductory chapter focuses on reframing students’ understanding of arguments as fights or quarrels; in addition, by focusing on common examples that students encounter in everyday life, the introductory chapter allays the trepidation many feel when confronted with formal argument. More than most texts, *Practical Argument*, Short Third Edition, focuses on demystifying argumentation by offering common and practical explanations and examples in each chapter. And, recognizing the demands of teaching, here in this manual we distill the key ideas of each section and essay, suggest additional teaching ideas or resources, help to negotiate some of the common problems students encounter with the material, and provide responses for each exercise. In short, we’ve striven to make *Practical Argument*, Short Third Edition, not only practical for students but also practical for instructors.

The manual for *Practical Argument*, Short Third Edition, mirrors the pattern of the text. For example, as the text’s introduction is divided into seven sections, so is the manual’s coverage of it. As we have done for the introduction, for each chapter of the text the instructor’s manual offers a comprehensive guide to ensure that you will find assistance and support for each page of the text.
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Model Syllabus

This model syllabus is planned for a ten-week term, with three meetings per week. It reflects a scaffolded approach to teaching the forms of argumentation presented in *Practical Argument*. This syllabus follows a progressive pattern of teaching less sophisticated to more sophisticated concepts in argument. The page numbers on the syllabi refer to the student edition of *Practical Argument, Short Third Edition*. Suggestions for additional topics for writing assignments supplement those in the book.

QUARTER SYSTEM SYLLABUS

Ten-week term, three meetings per week

WEEK 1: INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION: Recognizing Argument 3

Week 1, Class 1:
Discussion: Course introduction, Introduction to Argument.
Assignments: Chapter 1: The Four Pillars of Argument 23; At Issue 23; The Elements of Argument 24;

Week 1, Class 2:
Discussion: The Four Pillars of Argument, Discuss answers to At Issue questions
Assignments: Chapter 2: Thinking and Reading Critically 59; Reading Critically 61; Becoming an Active Reader 62; Chapter 1: David Leonhardt, Is College Worth It? Clearly, New Data Say 33; Marty Nemko, We Send Too Many Students to College 37; Jennie Le, What Does It Mean to Be a College Grad? 41

Week 1, Class 3:
Discussion: In-class critical reading activity
Assignments: Chapter 1 Readings: Dale Stephens, College Is a Waste of Time 43; Bridget Terry Long, College Is Worth It — Some of the Time; Mary C, Daly and Leila Bengali, Is It Still Worth Going to College? Writing Assignment: Construct a template for your own argument about the value of a college education.

WEEK 2: VISUAL ARGUMENTS

Week 2, Class 1:
Discussion: Review templates in small groups, introduce first paper assignment
Assignments: Chapter 3: Decoding Visual Arguments 83; Thinking Critically About Visual Arguments 83; Using Active Reading Strategies with Visual Arguments 84; Select a visual for the first paper assignment: Analyze and decode the argument of a visual text

Week 2, Class 2:
Discussion: How to read a visual argument, take a first look at student visual selections in small groups
Assignments: Chapter 3: Complete exercises 3.1 and 3.2; Chapter 3: Writing a Critical Response; Outline visual argument paper

Week 3, Class 3:
Discussion: In-class review of Katherine Choi's annotated student paper
Assignments: Write a first draft of the visual argument paper

WEEK 3: WRITING A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS
Week 3, Class 1:
Discussion: In-class peer review of first paper
Assignments: Chapter 4: What Is a Rhetorical Analysis? 100; Considering the Rhetorical Situation 101
Week 3, Class 2:
Discussion: Rhetorical analysis: examine Bilgutay's analysis of Thomas's essay to prompt discussion
Assignments: Continue working on your paper using suggestions from the peer review
Week 3, Class 3:
Discussion: Class rhetorical analysis of Politics and the English Language
Assignments: Chapter 4: Considering the Means of Persuasion: Logos, Pathos, Ethos 108; Considering the Writer's Rhetorical Strategies 109; Assessing the Argument 112;

WEEK 4: WRITING A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS
Week 4, Class 1:
Discussion: In-class activity on the means of persuasion: logos, pathos, and ethos
Assignments: Rajeev Ravisankar, Sweatshop Oppression 117; Nicholas D. Kristof, Where Sweatshops Are a Dream 120
Week 4, Class 2:
Discussion: In-class activity on the means of persuasion: logos, pathos, and ethos
Assignments: Continue working on first paper
Week 4, Class 3:
Discussion: Final draft of first paper due.
Assignments: Chapter 8: Finding Sources 288; Evaluating Sources 290; USA Today, Time to Enact "Do Not Track" 298; Jonathan Mahler, Who Spewed That Abuse? Anonymous Yik-Yak App Isn't Telling 310

WEEK 5: EVALUATING SOURCES
Week 5, Class 1:
Discussion: Introduction to evaluating sources, Discuss the sources used in Orwell's Politics and the English Language and why they might have been chosen.
Assignments: Chapter 8 At Issue readings; answer At Issue questions
Week 5, Class 2:
Discussion: Criteria for evaluation; discuss answers for first set of At Issue questions; In-class discussion of requirements for final paper
Assignments: Chapter 8 At Issue readings; answer At Issue questions
Week 5, Class 3:
Discussion: Evaluating Websites 301; Workshop with campus librarian: using the library's resources
Assignments: Locate some examples of sources you might use for your final paper
WEEK 6: ROGERIAN ARGUMENT, TOULMIN LOGIC, AND ORAL ARGUMENT

Week 6, Class 1:
Discussion: Introduction to Rogerian argument and Toulmin logic
Assignments: Chapter 6: Structuring Rogerian Arguments 193; Writing Rogerian Arguments 195; Zoya Kahn, Why Cell Phones do not Belong in the Classroom 196

Week 6, Class 2:
Discussion: Rogerian Argument: Classroom Activity
Assignments: Understanding Toulmin Logic 199; Constructing Toulmin Arguments 200; Writing Toulmin Arguments 202; Jen Davis, Competitive Cheerleaders are Athletes 203; Begin research for final paper

Week 6, Class 3:
Discussion: Focus on Toulmin logic
Assignments: Understanding Oral Arguments 206; Planning an Oral Argument 206; Delivering and Oral Argument 211; Composing an Oral Argument 000; Chantee Steele, An Argument in Support of the “Gap Year”; Writing Assignment: Write either a Toulmin or Rogerian argument that supports your position in the debate about online education; then highlight key points, and reformulate the argument in brief for oral delivery; Continue researching for paper.

WEEK 7: UNDERSTANDING LOGIC

Week 7, Class 1:
Discussion: Mini class presentations of writing assignment, exhibiting oral argument skills
Assignments: Chapter 5: What is Deductive Reasoning? 125; Constructing Sound Syllogisms 125; Recognizing Enthymemes 129; Writing Deductive Arguments 133; Paper outline based on research

Week 7, Class 2:
Discussion: Deductive Reasoning
Assignments: What is Inductive Reasoning? 137; Making Inferences 139; Constructing Strong Inductive Arguments 140; Writing Inductive Arguments 144; Revise paper outline

Week 7, Class 3:
Discussion: Inductive Reasoning; In-class discussion of William Saletan, Please Do Not Feed the Humans 000
Assignments: Continue work on final paper outline; Recognizing Logical Fallacies 147

WEEK 8: UNDERSTANDING LOGIC AND RECOGNIZING FALLACIES

Week 8, Class 1:
Discussion: Logical fallacies
Assignments: Begin drafting research paper; Wendy Kaminer, Progressive Ideas Have Killed Free Speech on Campus 175; Judith Shulevitz, In College and Hiding from Scary Ideas 178; Eric Posner, Universities Are Right to Crack Down on Speech and Behavior 183; answer At Issue questions for the three assigned readings from Chapter 5

Week 8, Class 2:
Discussion: Logical fallacies; In-class logical fallacy debate
Assignments: Exercise 5.11; continue drafting research paper

Week 8, Class 3:
Discussion: Work in small groups to refine drafts of research papers
Assignments: Continue working on first draft of final paper; Chapter 7: Drafting a Thesis Statement 258; Understanding Your Purpose and Audience 259; Gathering Evidence 260; complete Exercise 7.7 260
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WEEK 9: WRITING AN ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAY
Week 9, Class 1:
Discussion: First draft of final paper due; in-class peer review of first draft
Assignments: Chapter 7: Structuring Your Essay 265; Establishing Credibility 267; Drafting Your Essay 270; Polishing Your Essay 277
Week 9, Class 2:
Discussion: Strategies for editing your final paper; In-class activity: Understanding your audience
Assignments: Continue revising your final paper; Chapter 7: Checklist: Questions about Your Essay's Structure and Style 274; Checklist: Questions about Your Essay's Supporting Evidence 274; Grammar in Context: Pronoun-Antecedent Agreement 278; Proofreading, 278; Grammar In Context: Contractions vs. Possessive Pronouns, 278; Choosing a Title, 279
Week 9, Class 3:
Discussion: In-class discussion of common grammatical errors in academic writing
Assignments: Continue working on final draft of paper; Chapter 11: Understanding Plagiarism 370

WEEK 10: USING SOURCES RESPONSIBLY
Week 10, Class 1:
Discussion: Plagiarism in the Internet age, Intentional vs. accidental plagiarism
Assignments: Continue working on final draft of paper; Chapter 11: Trip Gabriel, Plagiarism Lines Blur for Students in Digital Age 389; Elizabeth Minkel, Too Hard Not to Cheat in the Internet Age? 393; K. Balibalos and J. Gopalakrishnan, Okay or Not? 401; At Issue questions for assigned readings in Chapter 11
Week 10, Class 2:
Discussion: Final paper due; In-class discussion of At Issue readings and responses
Assignments: Prepare brief presentation of final paper topic
Week 10, Class 3:
Discussion: Presentations of final papers; closing questions/comments
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PART 1

Understanding Argument
An Introduction to Argument

Recognizing Arguments, p. 3
This part of the introduction offers examples of common arguments (lawyers defending clients, an employee who thinks she or he deserves a raise, a job-application letter) and concludes by offering a few reasons why they are assigned. By pointing to argumentation's real-world efficacy, the text makes a case for the importance of assigning arguments in school.

Since the text offers real-world examples and a list of debatable questions students might encounter in your course, you might consider asking students to list more real-world examples or to compose more questions you might debate in a college classroom. This could be a good time to talk about debatable claims, which segues to the next section, "Defining Argument."

Defining Argument, p. 4
Introducing terms such as spin and propaganda, this part of the introduction first defines an argument by what it is not: a quarrel, positive or biased slant, or denial of another's position. It then offers a brief differentiation between informal and formal arguments and resolves that "An argument takes a stand and presents evidence that helps to convince people to accept the writer's position" (p. 5).

Teaching tip: Many of your students are likely familiar with right-wing commentators Sean Hannity and Ann Coulter and left-leaning commentators Rachel Maddow and Keith Olbermann. To discuss bias and spin, consider bringing in a documentary news story about a recent event that two of these politically disparate commentators discuss. Read the news story first, and then view and discuss clips of each commentator. You may naturally begin discussing debatable claims here — it's likely one of the commentators will resort to a statement of taste or an expression of faith, both problematic, nondebatable statements that are also discussed in this section of the text.

As you discuss debatable claims, consider preparing a list of facts that students could turn into debatable claims. Since the text stresses the idea that arguments
have multiple sides and the commentators we watch frequently show only two, this is a good place to encourage students to think from multiple viewpoints as they reformulate facts as claims and attempt to negotiate the either/or fallacy (p. 7); you might even rewatch the clips of the commentators and encourage students to think about perspectives left out of their coverage.

**Logos, Pathos, and Ethos, p. 14**

Drawing from argument’s Aristotelian roots, here the introduction defines persuasion as “a general term that refers to how a speaker or writer influences an audience to adopt a particular belief or to follow a specific course of action” (p. 14) and focuses on the three major appeals Aristotle names in *The Art of Rhetoric*: logic (*logos*), emotion (*pathos*), and character (*ethos*). Generally, students easily grasp appeals to emotion, but appeals to logic and character are a bit more difficult.

**Teaching tip:** To explain these appeals, you might turn to television commercials for insurance or medication; encourage students to see the use of experts such as doctors or others we esteem, such as celebrities, as appeals to ethos (character) that attempt to establish credibility for a product. Further, these commercials also frequently compare price or effectiveness, making an appeal to a viewer’s logic. For example, if a commercial proclaims, “Nine out of ten doctors recommend X,” then the viewer who doesn’t use X asks him or herself, “Why am I using Y?”

**Teaching tip:** Advertisements, the most common everyday arguments we encounter, are a great place to find visual appeals (like the images included in this text) and textual appeals. Clip a few ads, and distribute them to groups of two or three students. Have students discuss the ads in their groups and then present their ideas to the larger class. In lieu of presenting, have students write about the appeals they identified.
The Four Pillars of Argument

Centered on the benefits and costs of a college education, this chapter focuses on identifying and learning to mirror effective argument structure. The chapter first introduces several key concepts and a useful metaphor for thinking about argument.

The Elements of Argument, p. 24

Drawing on students’ existing knowledge of the essay format (introduction, body, conclusion), the text suggests that argument is built from these basics: the introduction contains an argumentative thesis statement, the body includes evidence and refutation, and the conclusion resolves with a convincing concluding statement. The building metaphor continues as the text uses words and visuals of an Ancient Greek temple to conceptualize argument. The argument—the top of the temple—is supported by a thesis, evidence, refutation, and a concluding statement—the four pillars, which give shape to and buttress the argument. As the metaphor is presented, the text briefly defines each pillar.

Teaching tip: Remember that thesis statements are difficult for students no matter how many times they’ve been taught and that students frequently do not evaluate the sources from which they draw evidence. You might want to spend some time talking about both thesis statements and good and bad evidence. Consider giving students practice by assigning a topic and having small groups work out mock thesis statements for each topic. Further, it's likely that students have been taught that a conclusion summarizes the main points of an argument, while a concluding statement asks students to think about a logical next step or recommendation for future action. Help students transition from summary-focused conclusions to concluding statements by suggesting that they consistently ask of essays they read and write, “So, what do we do now?” Since refutation will likely be the newest concept for your students, you may want to have the class share their team-generated thesis statements on the board and together think of at least one possible counterargument and refutation for each thesis. This approach shows students the importance of a thesis statement in directing the content and shape of an argumentative essay.
Sample Student Essay: “Why Foreign-Language Study Should Be Required,” p. 28

With each structural element clearly labeled in the text, this student essay argues in favor of college foreign-language requirements because the global economy necessitates that Americans speak more than one language. The student argues that speaking a second language makes students more employable, enriches students’ understanding of culture and education, and even strengthens relations between nations. The author poses and refutes the counterargument about the time and work required to learn a second language by arguing in favor of cutting less-important requirements (such as physical education) to meet the demands of language study. The author poses a second counterargument and refutation: positing that some may argue that requirements limit students’ control of their own studies (including their majors), the author reminds us that students may change majors and that studying another language exposes students to other possibilities. In a concluding statement, the author claims that students have become too narrowly focused and overlook the broader implications of language study for their future.

Exercise 1.1, p. 29

This exercise directs students to read Andrew Herman’s “Raise the Drinking Age to Twenty-Five” and to answer four questions (p. 31) about the essay’s argument structure. You will find a brief summary of the essay and sample responses to those questions below.

Summary of “Raise the Drinking Age to Twenty-Five” by Andrew Herman, p. 30

In this essay, the writer argues that our current approach to underage drinking is a failure and must be changed; he proposes that the drinking age be raised to twenty-five. In the process, he presents the high social costs of drinking and its many harmful effects — what he calls the “the sheer prevalence of alcoholic destruction” (para. 12). Herman also addresses a common counterargument: that the drinking age should be lowered.

**Teaching tip:** Because Herman employs several rhetorical strategies and appeals, consider using this essay to review the content covered in the text’s introduction by asking students to identify his means of persuasion.

Identifying the Elements of Argument, p. 31

1. The writer’s thesis is in paragraph 5: “A dramatic change is needed in the way society addresses drinking and the way we enforce existing laws, and it can start with a simple change: making the drinking age 25.” Student rewrites of Herman’s thesis will vary but should stress that a change is needed in the drinking age, with the clear proposal of raising the age to twenty-five.

2. Students are asked to list three arguments the author uses; here is a list of some of the author’s arguments, paraphrased:
   - Current laws are ineffective at limiting underage drinking, so a change must be made (para. 4–5).
Underage drinking is driven primarily by access to — and the availability of — alcohol, particularly through legal-aged friends (para. 6).

* Alcohol takes a terrible toll on younger people, and college students are responsible for a large portion of these problems (para. 9–12).

* Increasing the drinking age will make it more difficult for college students to get alcohol (para. 16).

3. Herman cites those who argue that other countries have lower drinking ages, which facilitates a “gradual transition to alcohol” for young people and reduces the harmful consequences of drinking (para. 14). To Herman, this makes little sense: if people under twenty-one are abusing alcohol, it seems counterproductive to increase their access to their access to alcoholic beverages. He also draws an analogy between alcohol abuse and animal abuse: “A parent who observes their children abusing the neighbor’s dog would be irresponsible to get one of their own without altering such dangerous behavior” (para. 15).

Students should point to the final two paragraphs of Herman’s essay:

> “Because of this, and the hundreds of thousands of victims each year in alcohol-related situations, I ask that you consider the very real possibility of taking the life of another due to irresponsible drinking. If this is not enough, then take time to think, because that life could very well be your own.”

In their own versions, students should capture the way in which the writer moves from empathy and compassion for others — the possibility of taking another’s life — to the visceral response of self-interest in asking readers to consider the risk to their own lives.

Reading and Writing About the Issue: Is a College Education Worth the Money?, p. 32

Returning to the questions raised about college costs at the outset of this chapter, this section collects six argumentative essays and two visual arguments on this debate. The texts illustrate, discuss, and comment on the issues surrounding the cost of college. You will find a summary of each selection and sample responses to the questions in each At Issue.

Summary of “The Rising Value of a College Degree” by David Leonhardt, p. 33

For David Leonhardt, the evidence is clear: “… from almost any individual’s perspective, college is a no-brainer. It’s the most reliable ticket to the middle class and beyond.” To support his argument, he focuses on data showing the growing pay-gap between those who graduate from college and those who do not. He also takes issue with journalists and experts who exaggerate the controversy and skepticism around higher education. They may be needlessly stoking anxieties that could have negative consequences: “The decision not to attend college for fear that it’s a bad deal is among the most economically irrational decisions anybody could make in 2014.”
Teaching tip: Twice in the article, Leonhardt notes that education cannot solve all our economic problems, which goes against the conventional wisdom that education is a kind of universal panacea. Where does this idea come from? Ask students what connections they see between issues of inequality, innovation, national productivity, and global competitiveness and American higher education.

At Issue: Sources for Structuring an Argument, p. 36

1. While the wording may be variable, the key component of the argument is the gap between college graduates and “everyone else”: “Because the pay gap between college graduates and those without college degrees has reached a record height, a four-year college degree is now more important than ever.”

2. Leonhardt relies largely on statistics, but he includes some other forms of evidence such as the expert opinion of MIT economist David Autor (para. 10) and a personal anecdote (para. 19).

3. The diagram puts Leonhardt’s data in graphic form and provides a visual argument about the disparity between those who graduate from college and those with only high school degrees. For example, he refers to the relative pay of non-degree holders as “flat”: the graph shows that “flatness” in a striking and literal sense.

4. As Marty Nemko focuses on the large number of high school graduates who attend college only to drop out, he might agree with the second part of Autor’s assertion: that “too few people are prepared for college” (para. 10). But Nemko would point out that this suggests too many people go to college, not too few. He would also likely dispute the implicit causal links about college degrees suggested by Autor and Leonhardt. For Nemko, such wage gaps are not a function of college degrees because “you could lock the college-bound in a closet for four years and they’d earn more than the pool of non-college-bound — they’re brighter, more motivated, and have better family connections” (para. 4).

5. Leonhardt also addresses opposing arguments as they are presented by media stories and the “public discussion today” and counters them with facts about the financial benefits of college (para. 11–13). For Leonhardt, “experts and journalists” spend too much time discussing the limitations of education — particularly, in the form of anecdotes and the straw-man argument that college degrees do not “guarantee success” (No one believes it does). Even given the high costs of higher education, the decision not to attend is economically irrational — and Leonhardt suggests that those who encourage such decisions are irresponsible.

6. The writer compares the significance and value of a high school education “not many decades ago” when it, like college degrees now, “was considered the frontier of education.” Students should have different views of this analogy and its effectiveness. Certainly, it evokes the ways in which changing socioeconomic circumstances and expectations lead to changing demands on young people seeking careers in a competitive global environment.
Summary of “We Send Too Many Students to College” by Marty Nemko, p. 37

According to conventional wisdom, a college degree is essential to a successful career. Marty Nemko strongly disagrees, citing high tuition costs, bored students, poor job prospects for many graduates, and deceptive, unaccountable colleges that “make money whether or not a student learns, whether or not she graduates, and whether or not he finds good employment” (para. 12).

Teaching tip: As they navigate higher education, students are in an excellent position to respond to Nemko’s arguments, claims, and evidence. Have them consider their own levels of satisfaction with college instruction, as the writer discusses in paragraph 8. Do they agree that there is a “Grand Canyon of difference between what the colleges tout in their brochures and websites and the reality” (6)?

At Issue: Sources for Structuring an Argument, p. 40

1. While students may debate responses to the question, the title (“We Send Too Many Students to College”) best sums up Nemko’s position. The second and third statements are specific aspects of the writer’s general position; the last statement restates Nemko’s main point as a memorable analogy.

2. Nemko uses logic when he presents (and draws inferences from) data from the U.S. Department of Education (2), researchers at UCLA Berkeley (8), and the Pew Charitable Trusts (9). He appeals to pathos when he recounts the sad and illustrative stories of Jill Plesnarski (4) and Brian Morris (5). He begins his essay with an appeal to his authority and credibility as an empathetic career counselor.

3. Nemko uses several arguments to support his thesis in paragraphs 2 to 4:
   - If a student is in the bottom 40% of his high school class and attends college, he or she is highly unlikely to graduate with a degree.
   - While in college, those students will learn little of practical value, accumulate debt, and likely end up in low-wage jobs that they could have held with a high school diploma.
   - Even students who are prepared for higher education and attend college are “increasingly unlikely to derive enough benefit to justify the often six-figure cost” and the time it takes to graduate (4). Only 40% of freshmen graduate in four years; 45% never graduate at all.
   - While college graduates do earn more over a lifetime than non-college graduates, Nemko argues that this is because “college-bound” students are “brighter, more motivated, and have better family connections” (4).
   - The financial advantages of having a college degree are eroding; he illustrates this with the story of Jill Plesnarski.

4. Nemko presents these two opposing arguments and then tries to refute them:
   - “Colleges love to trumpet the statistic that, over their lifetimes, college graduates earn more than nongraduates” (4): he counters that “ever more employers are offshoring ever more professional jobs” and presents the anecdote of Jill Plesnarski, who works in a sewage treatment plant, to illustrate
his point. The writer does not refute the fact that college graduates earn more over a lifetime; moreover, one can argue that a competitive, increasingly educated global workforce makes college degrees more valuable, not less. He also does nothing to address the relative financial value and earning potential of different college degrees.

- “Colleges are quick to argue that a college education is more about enlightenment than employment” (6): arguably, Nemko does a better job of refuting this point, although he fails to support some of his generalizations (“Colleges tend to educate students in the cheapest way possible”). His data from the UCLA Your First College Year survey indicates that many students are unsatisfied with their education; a study from the Pew Charitable Trusts suggests that many students leave college unprepared. This evidence supports his claim about a “Grand Canyon of difference between what the colleges tout in their brochures and websites and the reality” (6).

5. While responses may vary, students should consider the complex implications of Nemko’s analogy. For example, the notion of weak students as “defective products” (10) implies that students are passive and lack agency or responsibility for making the most of their education. Likewise, they are (arguably) the consumers of a product as much as the product themselves.

6. Nemko proposes that high school graduates consider apprenticeships, career training at community colleges, the military, and on-the-job training in a small business. He seems to address his argument to “parents and guardians” (11) as he writes, “If your student’s high school grades and SAT or ACT are in the bottom half of his high school class, resist colleges’ attempts to woo him” (12). High school students, college students, and college faculty, administrators, and admissions committees might find Nemko’s discussion challenging and useful as well.

7. The list of successful people who do not hold college degrees may hold a powerful emotional appeal, particularly to those uninterested in pursuing higher education. Certainly, the examples of Michael Dell and Quentin Tarantino show that it is possible to be successful without a college degree. At the same time, these are all exceptional people. Their individual stories and successes do not invalidate the empirical and statistical evidence that people with college degrees are more likely to get jobs, earn more money, and increase their social mobility than those without college degrees. Moreover, one can argue that historical examples such as George Washington and Thomas Edison (however inspiring) do not seem especially relevant to the contemporary world, the current realities of the global workforce, and the economic and societal expectations around education.

Summary of “What Does It Mean to Be a College Grad?” by Jennie Le, p. 41

While Jennie Le understands the practical importance of a college degree, she also sees its symbolic meaning: “For me, this degree symbolizes my family being able to make and take the opportunities that we’ve been given in America . . . ” (para. 6).
She defends the value of an undergraduate education, even if it is not worth as much as it was in the past.

*Teaching tip:* Le writes about the “symbolic” meaning of her college degree. Students might consider the larger meaning of higher education in their own lives and family histories.

**At Issue: Sources for Structuring an Argument, p. 42**

1. The first paragraph describes the undergraduate life that Le is leaving behind; her experience shows her immersed in the academic, social, and extracurricular activities of the college. The second paragraph shows the life she anticipates after graduation. Taken together, this introduction sets up her reflections on a larger question: “What does it mean to hold a college degree?” (3). She could have opened her essay in a variety of ways, such as beginning with her question (“What does it mean to hold a college degree?”) or with her coworker’s claim that an undergraduate diploma is “standard and insubstantial.”

2. The fullest statement of Le’s thesis is in the final paragraph of her essay. She might have stated her thesis earlier in the essay; she might also have incorporated her perspective as the daughter of an immigrant into the statement itself, as the degree has special resonance to her from that perspective: it is an “outstanding feat” to her. Doing so would more explicitly tie her to larger American themes, such as social mobility and the immigrant experience.

3. Le presents an opposing argument in paragraph 3: college degrees are now so common that they have little value and are not worth showing off. Le refutes this by pointing out that only 27% of Americans have bachelor’s or graduate degrees. For her, the degree means the possibility of a comfortable life and the opportunity for social mobility. That meaning is especially poignant for the writer, given that her mother moved to the United States from Vietnam to give Le and her brothers educational, economic, and social opportunities. Le might strengthen her argument by citing evidence that a college degree will “likely mean a comfortable living and the opportunity to move up at work and in life” (4).

4. The writer’s argument is deeply personal in paragraphs 5 and 6, yet it also connects with archetypal stories of successful American immigrants and the meaning of education. The successes of her brothers — in technology, dentistry, and business — supports her belief that she will also succeed. While statistics about the financial value of education might help her argument elsewhere, they would be less relevant to the “symbolic” value of her education as she discusses it here.

5. Le concedes that undergraduate degrees are more common and less valuable than they were in the past. However, that concession pales compared to the opportunity for economic and social advancement that her college education represents. Students may disagree about whether this concession harms or strengthens her argument. They might also reflect on what Le means by “power” and “value” when she discusses the bachelor’s degree.
Summary of “College Is a Waste of Time” by Dale Stephens, p. 43

Dale Stephens argues that “higher education is broken” (para. 1). After dropping out of college himself, he urges his peers to consider alternatives to a four-year degree: “College fails to empower us with the skills necessary to become productive members of today’s global entrepreneurial economy” (3). To that end, he is leading UnCollege, a “social movement empowering individuals to take their education beyond the classroom” (7) and start companies, projects, and organizations outside of educational and corporate institutions.

Teaching tip: Consider putting this essay in conversation with Smith’s “Yes, a College Education Is Worth the Costs.” Ask students to compare and contrast the two arguments. Then ask students to evaluate which of the two essays seems more persuasive and why.

At Issue: Sources for Structuring an Argument, p. 44

1. While his assertion that “higher education is broken” is important to his argument, it is not the thesis of his essay. It does provide support and a rationale for this thesis. Better statements of his main argument can be found in paragraphs 6 and 7:
   - “Learning by doing — in life, not classrooms — is the best way to turn constant iteration into true innovation. We can be productive members of society without submitting to academic or corporate institutions” (6).
   - “We must encourage young people to consider paths outside college” (7).

2. Stephens’ criticisms of college education:
   - It rewards conformity, competition, regurgitation, and theory rather than independence, collaboration, learning, and application.
   - It is expensive, including opportunity costs.
   - Learning in life is superior to learning in a classroom.
   - It is increasingly unnecessary as a signal to potential employees as the Internet allows people to sell their skills on their own.

3. Thiel fellows each receive $100,000 and mentorship from entrepreneurs. By referring to his status as a Thiel fellow, Stephens appeals to ethos: he is following the proposal he recommends and exemplifying his own advice. He also draws on the experience of his own dissatisfaction with higher education.

4. For some of his claims, Stephens draws on evidence, as when he discusses the costs of higher education and the failure of colleges to improve thinking and writing skills (4). Elsewhere, he implicitly uses his own experience and observations to make broad generalizations, as when he writes that college “rewards conformity rather than independence, competition rather than collaboration, regurgitation rather than learning, and theory rather than application” (2). Similarly, he asserts, “We are the disruptive generation creating the ‘free agent economy’ built by entrepreneurs, creatives, consultants, and small business envisioned by [journalist and futurist] Daniel Pink in his book, A Whole
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New Mind: Why Right Brainers Will Rule the Future” (6). Stephens might be strengthening his case by demonstrating the empirical existence and contours of the “disruptive generation” and the “free agent economy,” then showing how they are independent of higher education.

5. Stephens addresses two counterarguments in paragraphs 9 and 10:

- He concedes that some people want a formal education; not everyone should drop out of college, especially those pursuing fields like medicine. By qualifying his argument against higher education and allowing room for choice, Stephens strengthens his position.

- He dismisses the argument that “college dropouts will sit in their parents’ basements playing Halo 2, doing Jell-O shots, and smoking pot.” Stephens claims: “These are valid but irrelevant concerns, for the people who indulge in drugs and alcohol do so before, during, and after college. It’s not a question of authorities; it’s a question of priorities.” This seems a less convincing counterargument, as is evident in the phrase “valid but irrelevant.” By moving immediately to substance abuse, Stephens sidesteps the more difficult question of how the authority, structure, discipline, accountability, and direction offered by a college program might channel the energies of students and get them to discover and focus on their own priorities.

6. His use of “we” implies a flattering sense of shared talents, goals, and prospects: “We can be productive members of society without submitting to academic or corporate institutions. We are the disruptive generation creating the ‘free-agent economy’ . . .” (3). The pronoun draws readers in to a mutual sense of individualism, rebellion, and opportunity — especially when he addresses his “peers” (9).

Summary of “College Is Worth It — Some of the Time” by Bridget Terry Long, p. 45

As the title suggests, the question of college’s value is complicated for Long. In her view, higher education remains a good investment for a majority of students, but three main factors ultimately determine the value of a degree for any given individual: “the college attended, the field of study, and the cost or debt taken.” She also argues “we have reached a time when the benefits of college may not far exceed the costs for increasing numbers of students.”

Teaching tip: Long writes about the key factors that determine whether college is worth it, including the specific college attended and the chosen field of study. Beginning with these two factors, you might ask your students how they calculate the worth or value of their own higher education. What role do these two factors play in their own decision-making process? What important variables or other measures of worth might Long be leaving out?

At Issue: Sources for Structuring an Argument, p. 47

1. The writer makes this claim because it shows that she’s an expert in the economics of higher education; presumably, she has given her opening
question — and her topic, in general — a lot of thought. It is an appeal to ethos: her authority and credibility.

2. Long asks, “Is it still worthwhile to attend college?” As she claims this “has been a constant question,” she seems to assume some skepticism about higher education on the part of her readers: the question is in the air, a persistent part of current public discourse about the value of college. She could have made other choices for her introduction: she might have chosen to begin with a clear statement that college is worthwhile rather than a question; she might have stated the value of a college degree depends on factors such as the specific institution and major; she might have started with a specific quotation from a college skeptic, which she could then address. Students can suggest other rhetorical strategies, as well as their various benefits and drawbacks.

3. The conversation has become complicated in that college is generally worth it, but “not always”: “We no longer think that all educations are financially good investments — the specifics matter” (para. 2). The three important factors are “the college attended, the field of study, and the cost or debt taken” (para. 2).

4. **Thesis:** Generally, college is worthwhile, but not always, as its value depends on three important factors.

   **Factor 1:** Students at highly selective or competitive colleges, which have greater resources, generally receive greater financial returns on their investment.

   **Factor 2:** Students who choose fields of study such as engineering and the sciences make the most money; students in less lucrative fields, such as education, may still be highly employable.

   **Factor 3:** Students must factor in the level of debt against the amount of money they will likely make as graduates to determine whether college is worthwhile.

5. Long concludes that for most students in most circumstances, college is a good investment, but “we have reached a time when the benefits of college may not far exceed the costs for increasing numbers of students” (para. 9). But she also concludes that even if a relatively small percentage of students make a “bad investment” in their higher education, that “translates into thousands and thousands of students each year” and creates “a problem that cannot be ignored” (para. 10). Her larger conclusion reaffirms her points in the opening paragraph, even if her reservations suggest the “complicated” nature of the question.

6. Long’s complications of — and reservations about — the worth of a college degree (arguably) verge on undermining the claim in the opening paragraph with qualifications. For example, she might have begun her essay with a thesis slightly rephrased from a claim in paragraph 9: “While for most students, most combinations of college/major/debt they would choose are worthwhile investments, we have reached a time when the benefits of college may not far exceed the costs for increasing numbers of students.” This also implies a trend: if things continue on their current course, college may soon not be worth it for most students.

7. She might recommend providing more support for high school students considering college as they make their decisions — guidance that focused on the three factors highlighted in this essay. For Long, such guidance would be
especially important for the financial aspects of higher education: “Unfortunately, students typically have such poor counseling on how much debt is appropriate given their plans, and with large levels of unmet financial need, many turn to multiple sources of debt, such as credit cards and private loans, without fully understanding how this will affect them over the longer term” (para. 8). You might ask students what sort of guidance would be useful, as well.

Summary of “Is It Still Worth Going to College” by Mary C. Daly and Leila Bengali, p. 48

Two economic researchers use recent U.S. survey data of annual labor earnings to determine the continuing value of a college degree. They conclude that college is worth the money and that “for the average student, tuition costs for the majority of college education opportunities in the United States can be recouped by age forty, after which college graduates continue to earn a return on their investment in the form of higher lifetime wages.” The writers rely heavily on empirical data and graphs, which should provide an opportunity to discuss how to deploy this kind of evidence and visual argument in accessible academic essays.

Teaching tip: Daly and Bengali view the answer to the question in their title (“Is It Still Worth Going to College?”) entirely in financial terms. Ask students about the strengths and weaknesses of this kind of analysis. Can most of the benefits of a college education—even the less tangible ones, like better critical thinking skills, improved cultural literacy, or strong social networks—ultimately be measured in dollars and cents? Why or why not?

At Issue: Sources for Structuring an Argument, p. 53

1. The word “still” implies that, in the past, a college degree has been a worthwhile investment. The question-form suggests that more recently, some people have become skeptical of that worth, however.

2. The article does not look like a piece of journalism or essay for a general audience. Rather, it appears to be more specialized and, perhaps, less accessible. For example, the charts are more demanding and leave out some explanation: in Figure 1, students may not know what “constant annual premium” means, or the significance of a Moody’s AAA bond-rating. The article also includes references to other scholarly sources, as well as endnotes, as a scholarly article would.

3. The writers use exclusively statistical data. It would be difficult, given the way Daly and Bengali wish to quantify the value of a college degree, to incorporate, say, a personal anecdote or another form of evidence. At the same time, this quantitative approach excludes the possibility that higher education could have less tangible or “measurable” value.

4. Daly and Bengali write, “Although the value of college is apparent, deciding whether it is worthwhile means weighing the value against the costs of attending. Indeed, much of the debate about the value of college stems not from the lack of demonstrated benefit but from the overwhelming cost” (para. 10). The
distinction is between the fact that, in the context of empirical and aggregate data, a college degree has significant economic value (on one hand) and the fact that, for any individual student that value may or may not be worthwhile, given individual goals, abilities, financial circumstances, and other factors.

5. Arguably, the reliance on sources such as the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), the College Board, and others implies a kind of ethos: the writers are experts who are conversant with credible authorities on this topic. The writers might have referred to their own qualifications in the article, but they are not trying to be “personal” or explore their expressive voices: an explicit appeal to ethos might draw attention away from the empirical data that is the focus of their work. Likewise, a highly emotional anecdote or example would likely cause dissonance with the purpose and tone of the article.

Template for Structuring an Argument, p. 55
For this exercise, students follow the template and fill in the blanks to create their own argument. A sample response defending the value of a college education is included below; the given text is in boldface.

Whether or not a college education is worth the money is a controversial topic. Some people believe that because a college degree is the key to achieving the American Dream, as well as success in a competitive global market, higher education remains valuable. Others challenge this position, claiming that colleges are overpriced and ineffectual institutions that burden students with debt, even as they fail to prepare students for productive lives after graduation. However, many people place too much emphasis on anecdotal evidence that highlights exceptional entrepreneurs who succeed without higher education. Although both sides of this issue have merit, it seems clear that a college education is still a worthwhile investment because having a degree not only increases the chances of getting a better job and making more money over a lifetime, but also can help graduates lead richer, more satisfying lives overall.

Exercise 1.2, p. 55
This exercise asks students to revise their responses for the template exercise by taking into account two friends’ opinions on the issue. Remind students that academic debate is useful and that this issue has multiple viewpoints, not just two sides. Emphasize respect for others’ opinions.

Exercise 1.3, p. 55
This exercise asks students to write an essay addressing the question “Is a College Education Worth the Money?” and to cite the texts from pages 28–48. First, you may want to remind students that the facts and ideas they have encountered in the preceding essays and visuals can be used as supporting evidence in their own arguments. To that end, it may be useful before assigning this exercise to review direct quotation — including the introduction of quotations — and MLA or APA format for in-text citation. You might also consider allocating a class meeting or a portion of a class meeting to a partnered or small-group writing assignment where students can work together (in a computer lab or in the classroom) to negotiate a position.
and compose a single essay. If you are concerned that some students may not be able to argue their own or multiple perspectives, consider assigning them to rewrite the joint essay from a different perspective as homework.

**Exercise 1.4, p. 55**

This exercise asks students to review the argument checklist on page 27 and to label each portion of the essay: thesis statement, evidence, refutation of opposing arguments, and concluding statement.

*Teaching tip*: To give students extra practice identifying these elements, consider having them label classmates’ essays rather than their own.

“Practical Experience Trumps Fancy Degree” by Tony Brummel, p. 56

**Exercise 1.5, p. 56**

This exercise asks students to evaluate an argument using the guidelines and suggestions from this section on the pillars of argument. Responses should vary, depending on which elements students think are most important. For example, they may notice that Brummel’s essay does not address counterarguments. He writes, “Being successful in business is absolutely not contingent on having a bachelor’s degree” (para. 2). The implication is that many (unspecified) people argue that being successful in business is “absolutely contingent on having a bachelor’s degree.” Who holds that position or denies the anecdotal evidence that individuals can achieve great success without going to college? Brummel may be creating a straw man rather than addressing a real argument, even as he ignores stronger, more specific counterarguments and evidence. While this book considers the straw man and other fallacies later (p. 149), you might use this example to discuss the fallacy.

**Exercise 1.6, p. 56**

This exercise demonstrates that images can make arguments, even if by suggestion, association, or metaphor. You may want to discuss the way the visual elements on the cover rely upon — or even circumvent — the pillars of argument. For example, the image of a credit card carries a negative connotation of irresponsible consumer debt, yet obtaining more education is usually seen as a responsible or virtuous act.
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CHAPTER 2

Thinking and Reading Critically

This chapter focuses on what has become a passionate debate in our time — the relationship between violence in the media and violent behavior of young people. While most students will likely be familiar with this discussion, the chapter’s content seeks to draw out the complexities surrounding the issue (parental responsibility, gun regulations, the history of violence on television and in video games) and reminds students that this is not a simple two-sided debate.

Thinking Critically, Reading Critically, and Becoming an Active Reader, pp. 60–64

To make the chapter relevant beyond just this one issue, the text asks students to learn to become critical readers. You may need to underscore this point with students — specifically, because most students will assume that to be critical is to criticize. Instead, remind them that to read critically is to assess and examine rather than simply argue against or challenge. Secondly, this chapter encourages students to be active, rather than passive, readers, and it introduces them to various techniques that will help them with reading comprehension (highlighting, annotating, summarizing).

Teaching tip: Your students are likely to have very strong opinions about the subject matter of this chapter, so you’ll want to make sure that their discussions about violence in video games or in movies stay centered on the essays provided. Consider having them brainstorm a list of who is affected by this discussion (children, parents, media companies, government leaders, victims of violence, gun manufacturers, and so on) so that they have in mind what kinds of arguments would work for what kinds of audiences. This list will help them build, as well, on the means of persuasion covered in the book’s introductory chapter. In other words, by discussing what kinds of arguments would work for parents of young children versus what arguments a teen video gamer might believe, your students will quickly see the value of critically assessing arguments for strength or for bias (another concept that is introduced in the beginning pages of this chapter).
Exercise 2.1, p. 63

This exercise asks students to read “Violent Media Is Good for Kids” by Gerard Jones and then answer a series of questions, in preparation for class discussion. You will find a brief summary of the essay and possible responses to those questions below.

Summary of “Violent Media Is Good for Kids” by Gerard Jones, p. 64

In this essay, comic-book author and father Gerard Jones argues that in some cases “creative violence” can provide children with much needed outlets for their fears and anger and even bring a sense of empowerment and selfhood. Jones draws on his own experiences as a child, when he found courage through the dual-identity of the Incredible Hulk, and he describes how his son followed a similar path to empowerment through comic-book characters. Finally, Jones discusses recent psychological studies arguing for the usefulness of violent entertainment that allows children to explore feelings they’re often told to suppress. Using real-life examples to support these studies, Jones details the ways that several children dealt with difficult family situations by writing violent stories or listening to rap. In the end, Jones does not argue that violent entertainment is harmless but rather that it helps more people than it hurts.

Identifying the Elements of Argument, p. 67

1. Because Jones’s essay relies so heavily on personal experiences, his thesis is delayed until the end, when in the next-to-the-last paragraph he writes, “I’m not going to argue that violent entertainment is harmless. I think it has helped inspire some people to real-life violence. I am going to argue that it’s helped hundreds of people for every one it’s hurt, and that it can help far more if we learn to use it well.” Students may paraphrase the quotation as saying that more good derives from violent entertainment than ill. Talk with your students about why a delayed thesis is useful in this essay and how the author builds his credibility and support in a way that leads to this statement as a conclusion.

2. Jones’s main arguments rely on personal experience: the way he found courage as a child in the character of the Incredible Hulk (paras. 2–5), the way his son has used “creative violence” in comic books as an outlet (6), the experiences of several children Jones has known or worked with who found ways to express their anger and fear through violent stories and even “gangsta rap” (13–15). Jones also weaves in current psychological studies regarding violence and creative expression among children (9–12).

3. Jones acknowledges the current debate surrounding violence in the media and the effects of so-called “junk culture” (7), and he admits in his concluding statements that, in some cases, violent entertainment does cause children to act out violently (16).

4. Students should look at the second half of Jones’s final paragraph, which broadens the discussion to a more historical view. He says parents condemn “Mortal Kombat” and play-fighting, alike, in ways that suppress their children’s need to “feel what they feel,” and he compares this suppression with the ways
Victorians suppressed their children's sexuality. He advocates balance, instead, in a way that allows for “natural aggression” without necessarily condoning extreme violent behavior.

Highlighting, p. 67
This section introduces the technique of highlighting important parts of an essay (such as the thesis, topic sentences, supporting points, and so on). Suggestions for markings to highlight text appear in a box. Then, a sample essay shows how a student, Katherine Choi, highlighted a magazine article titled “When Life Imitates Video” by John Leo.

Teaching tip: Remember that most of your students will feel a bit strange about writing in their actual books (in fact, many of them have been told not to write in books at all). To help ease their anxieties, think about showing them your own highlighted books or articles and explaining how and why you highlight your own reading material. This sharing will make active reading seem like less of an activity for inexperienced readers.

“When Life Imitates Video”
by John Leo, p. 68

Exercise 2.2, p. 70
This exercise asks students to read through student Katherine Choi’s highlighting of Leo’s article “When Life Imitates Video.” When students are through reading, you might open things up for discussion and ask them to consider what markings they’ve seen in Katherine’s highlighting and what they would do differently if they were to highlight Leo’s article. Remind them that they want to highlight the main points of the essay so that they can quickly reference them but that students’ highlighting will vary, depending on their particular ways of reading.

Exercise 2.3, p. 70
This exercise directs students to reread the first essay in the chapter, “Violent Media Is Good for Kids,” and to practice highlighting by underlining, starring, circling, and marking the essay’s main points. It also reminds students that it can be useful to mark words or references they don't understand by putting a question mark above them, then coming back to them later. When they’re finished, have students discuss this experience, either in small groups or in a large group, so that they can consider the benefits of such focused attention to an essay. Most students (especially, first-year students) say they have a hard time with reading comprehension, so you might remind them that highlighting will help them find ways to remember and engage with what they read.

Annotating, p. 70
This section introduces annotating as a supplement to highlighting. A box provides suggested questions that will lead students to make notes on an essay. Then the Leo essay appears again, this time with notes by Katherine, the student.
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Exercise 2.4, p. 73
For practice with annotating — marking their responses to what they read — this exercise has students return, again, to "Violent Media Is Good for Kids" by Jones. Students should mark where they agree or disagree with Jones and why, summarize the most important points, look up unfamiliar words or references and write in the definitions, and note passages they’d like to return to when writing about Jones’s essay.

Exercise 2.5, p. 73
To compare their new annotating methods, have students exchange their annotated essays with one another and consider the ways that their responses to the text were similar and different. Also, have them discuss how their classmates’ responses help them to realize new things about Jones’s essay.

Exercise 2.6, p. 73
To help students interact with a fellow college student's opinion on the effects of violent media, this exercise asks them to read a letter to the editor of a college newspaper and then highlight and annotate the letter in response to several questions. Possible responses to these questions appear below.

- Students should identify the thesis at the end of the first paragraph where the writer states, “Some states have already passed laws which ban minors from the viewing or purchasing of these [violent] video games without an accompanying adult. I believe this law should not exist.” As students restate the thesis, they should acknowledge that the writer’s main argument is against laws that prohibit the sale of graphic, violent video games to minors; the author is not against laws that rate such games, as she indicates in paragraph 2.

- In paragraph 3, the writer cites studies reported by universities such as MIT and UCLA. The studies denounce laws that prohibit the sale of certain video games to minors because, according to the studies, such games are not found to have adverse effects on children. Then the writer takes this conclusion a step further by saying there are benefits to violent video games — that they provide a “safe outlet for aggression and frustration, increased attention performance, along with spatial and coordination skills” (para. 3). The idea that violent entertainment provides an outlet for emotions is Jones’s primary argument, and he discusses several children he’s known who, after needing an outlet for anger and fear as children, went on to success in school, college, and beyond.

- In paragraph 4, the writer of the letter to a college newspaper notes that there are people who disagree with her opinion, and she writes that they believe research shows that violent video games lead to antisocial behavior and even delinquency. For this reason, some people believe there should be laws restricting who can play graphic or violent video games. But the writer says that children know the difference between real life and video games and are also aware of the consequences of turning to violence and weapons. In some ways, Jones addresses similar concepts when, in the concluding paragraph of his essay, he argues that parents should allow their children to express natural feelings of aggression or anger, not keep feelings bottled up. Both writers, then, argue that...
some expressions of anger or frustration are natural for children and that these feelings shouldn’t be repressed. Consider asking students their opinions, and ask them which writer seems more effective in making his or her argument.

- The writer to the college paper seeks to overturn laws restricting the sale of violent video games to minors. In her closing paragraph, she implores the major software companies that make violent video games to write to Congress and protest these laws. Jones, in his essay, argues more for the emotional and personal value of “creative violence,” which he claims can help children develop a sense of selfhood and stability—a different approach from this letter’s arguments about legality.

**Exercise 2.7, p. 75**

The APA document takes a position that media violence is harmful and that, as a whole, the profession of psychology must act to reduce that harm. One possible thesis statement: *As media violence has so many clearly established negative effects on children and society, the American Psychological Association and professional psychologists need to take an active role in reducing these dangerous consequences.* Reading the APA document against Jones’s “Violent Media Is Good for Kids” should provoke lively discussion and writing. For the most part, the APA’s recommendations seem antithetical to Jones’s argument. He writes, “We send the message to our children in a hundred ways that their craving for imaginary gun battles and symbolic killings is wrong. . . . Even when we don’t call for censorship or forbid Mortal Kombat, we moan to other parents within our kids’ earshot about the ‘awful violence’ in the entertainment they love. We tell our kids that it isn’t nice to play-fight, or we steer them from some monstrous action figure to a pro-social doll.” He argues that such symbolic violence helps children work through anger and fear. Compare his claim with one recommendation from the APA document, which “urges the television and film industry to foster programming that models pro-social behaviors and seeks to resolve the problem of violence in society.” At the same time, the APA points to the empirical research that viewing mass media violence leads to increases in aggressive attitudes, values, and behavior, particularly in children, and has a long-lasting effect on behavior and personality, including criminal behavior. Jones would seem to sidestep this issue, for the most part.

**Teaching tip:** The APA statement on Violence in Mass Media was first published in 1994. It includes the claim that “in recent years the level of violence in American society and the level of violence portrayed in television, film, and video have escalated markedly” (para. 2). However, in the decades since, the level of violent crime in the United States has generally decreased. Ask students if this complicates the argument against violent media—especially in the context of cause-and-effect relationships between representations of violence and violent behavior.

**Writing a Critical Response, p. 77**

The final section of this chapter asks students to go a step beyond simply understanding arguments and, instead, demonstrates how they may respond to arguments critically. To do so, this section reminds students that critical evaluation
involves both examining the features of any given text to identify how the writer makes his or her argument and asking plenty of why and how questions: why did a writer include this particular means of persuasion, why did the author include this information as support, why is the writer taking this stance, how will the writer’s strategies impact readers? After reading previous sections of this chapter, students should be able to identify the main parts of an argument essay and should have strategies for how to highlight these main parts and annotate their response to the text while reading. Specific questions for critical reading are also provided in this section, along with a paragraph that outlines, step by step, how to write a critical response (pp. 77–78). You might consider writing out these various steps on the board so that students can easily know whether they’ve included enough elements for a critical response.

**Teaching tip:** Students often have a difficult time transitioning from identifying the parts of an essay to being able to write about an essay critically. Keep reminding them that while they should identify the main parts of the writer’s argument, they also should include their response — not just whether they liked the essay or not but whether the author’s argument was successful or well supported or how the author attempted to connect with readers. And remind students that they can actually identify elements that are not successful; often students hesitate to criticize published work.

### Summary of “When Life Imitates Video” by Student Katherine Choi, p. 78

Providing a sample critical response for your students is crucial if they are to understand how to go about writing such a text. Keep in mind that most of them have never written this kind of essay before, so a focused discussion about Katherine’s method and organization could be quite helpful to them. Katherine responds to the essay “When Life Imitates Video” by John Leo. She opens her response by stating the main point of Leo’s essay — that violent video games can actually lead to violent behavior. Then Katherine goes on, in paragraph 2, to outline Leo’s subsequent main points and to explain both their usefulness and their shortcomings. She acknowledges that Leo’s argument is “convincing, up to a point” but says that the study he relies on most for evidence is never cited by name and that his rhetorical style is weak. In later paragraphs, Katherine criticizes Leo for speaking in generalizations, for misunderstanding why children play violent video games in the first place, and for making unsubstantiated connections between violent video games and the military. Ultimately, Katherine argues in her response that Leo does not establish a substantial cause-and-effect relationship between violent video games and violent behavior and that his argument is not convincing.

**Teaching tip:** After reading Katherine’s critical response, students will likely feel that their responses have to criticize the authors they’re writing about. Remind them that when an author is successful in his or her argument they will want to tell why the writer is able to make such an argument, and they might even discuss why it’s a fresh or new argument as well.
According to Gerard Jones, violent media can actually have positive effects on young people because those media can give children much-needed outlets for feelings of anger, frustration, sadness, and aggression. Jones also believes that violent media are a positive influence on children because they allow children to explore these feelings in a controlled environment. Jones makes some good points. For example, he says that “even in the most progressive households, where we make such a point of letting children feel what they feel, we rush to substitute an enlightened discussion for the raw material of rageful fantasy. In the process, we risk confusing them about their natural aggression in the same way Victorians confused their children about their sexuality” (para. 17). However, Jones does still acknowledge that a link between violent media and violent behavior likely exists, but he believes that for every one person hurt by violence in media, one hundred people are helped by using such media as an outlet. All in all, Jones’s essay is a well-balanced and personal look at the issue of violence in the media, both addressing the need for children to express their feelings and cautioning us to remain aware of the possible risks of violent media.

Exercise 2.8, p. 81
Now it is time for students to try their own hands at writing a critical response. This exercise asks them to return to the paragraph they wrote in the template exercise and to develop it into a more substantial response to Jones’s essay. Remind them to refer to the highlighting and annotating they did earlier and to think in terms of what was successful about Jones’s essay and what was unsuccessful (or less convincing).

Teaching tip: One of the things students will struggle with the most in writing a critical response is organization. Before you ask them to write a fully developed response to Jones’s essay, you might return to the paragraph that discusses the various parts of a critical response (pp. 77–78). Listing these components bullet-style might supply the students with a ready-made outline for their own critical responses.
Continuing the debate about violent media images begun in Chapter 2, Chapter 3 asks students to broaden their discussion by considering the cultural effects of violent visual images. At the same time, this chapter encourages students to apply the critical-reading strategies learned in the previous chapter to visual arguments. Clarifying that not all images are visual arguments, the text differentiates an advertisement, chart, or Web page from an informational diagram, for example.

Teaching tip: Because we live in a society where we are inundated by images, students frequently receive those images passively — they consume them without thinking critically about them. As a continuation of the prior chapter, consider asking students to collect or document violent images they see around them. Ask them to watch TV with paper and pen or their camera phones in hand. Also, consider bringing in a variety of visual images (diagrams, ads, posters) for students to categorize, first, by whether or not they make an argument and, second, by the dominant appeal that the image uses. This activity reinforces the text’s introductory chapter and introduces this chapter’s attention to identifying appeals in visual arguments.

Thinking Critically about Visual Arguments, p. 83
Drawing on the previous chapter’s focus on thinking critically, the text asks students to see similarities between written and visual arguments and to evaluate the logic and fairness of those arguments.

Teaching tip: Help students learn to read visual texts through in-class analysis. By and large, students do not know what to look for or how, so thoroughly cover and discuss the list of reading strategies in the next section of text.

Using Active Reading Strategies with Visual Arguments, p. 84
This section reminds students that previewing, careful reading, highlighting, and annotating, the tools for actively reading a written text (covered in Chapter 2), can help with decoding visual arguments as well. As when approaching a written text,
students should approach a visual text with pen in hand in search of main ideas, purpose, and intended audience. As the text points out, encourage students to look for words/body copy, the size and orientation of images, use of white space, use of color and shading, presence of people, activities, expressions, and gestures.

Teaching tip: The text box titled “Comprehension Clues” (p. 84) offers a good list of things to consider when approaching visual images, but it is not exhaustive. Consider reading and discussing these clues as a class, applying them to a particular image. Then, try to add to the list other clues students should look for when approaching a visual text.

Reminding students that visual images also make appeals, a second text box (p. 85) describes how visual images deploy logos, pathos, and ethos. A cartoon and brief analysis follow; spend time talking about the cartoon’s intended audience and purpose, how it makes an argument, and what appeals it makes.

Teaching tip: If you did not earlier have students identify and categorize visual arguments by dominant appeals, have students identify and classify them now; advertisements (drawn from a variety of magazines) or comic strips are great visuals to use for this assignment.

Gun-Related Murders and Video Game Consumption (graphs and explanation), p. 87

These graphs refute the belief that increases in video game popularity and consumption correlate with — or cause — higher rates of gun-related murders. The two graphs work together to create one visual argument; to help students understand it quickly and succinctly, the red-colored textual elements help organize and clarify the meaning of the plotted points on the two graphs.

Teaching tip: Provide or have students bring in other visual arguments to practice this valuable skill.

Teaching tip: At first, students may not even notice where the U.S. data point is plotted. It is an outlier, at the top of the graph. Ask them how they interpret the meaning of this piece of data: How do they make sense of it? Why might America be such an outlier in this context?

Exercise 3.1, p. 87

Identifying the Elements of a Visual Argument, p. 91

1. The five images are a “Caveman Cartoon” (argumentative); a pie chart labeled “Distribution of Language, Sex, and Violence Codes in PG-Rated Movies” (informative); a photograph of a boy playing a first-person-shooter video game (informative); a chart labeled “Types of Death, by Percentage of Films” (informative); and an infographic labeled “Why Gaming Is a Positive Element in Life” (argumentative).

The first cartoon and final infographic are most clearly argumentative; the cartoon suggests that blaming violence on violent images is silly; the final infographic’s title is essentially a thesis statement; its data is designed to support the argument that negative views of video games rest on myths and that these games can have positive effects on the lives of gamers. For example, the infographic designers claim that gaming improves skills such as collaboration and problem solving.
2. A main idea for each may be stated as follows:

- “Caveman Cartoon” Main Idea: Blaming violence — a timeless human activity — on graphic representations of violence (whether cave drawings or violent television shows) is silly and off-base, particularly with regard to children.

- “Distribution of Language, Sex, and Violence Codes in PG-Rated Movies” Main Idea: Nearly half of all movies rated PG earn that rating because of violence only or some violent content in addition to the prevalence of sex and violent language in the film.

- “Boy Playing Violent Video Game” Main Idea: Arcade games allow children to participate in vicarious gun violence.

- “Types of Death, by Percentage of Films” Main Idea: Children's cartoons include the deaths of many characters, who die in a variety of ways; characters in these movies are actually more likely to die than characters in adult dramas — especially parents.

- “Why Gaming Is a Positive Element in Life” Main Idea: Despite myths and rumors about the dangers of video games for young people, these games are not harmful and can even have benefits.

3. How each visual supports its main idea follows:

- The “Caveman Cartoon” points out that violence was integral to humanity since the earliest humans; the common assumption that violent media is to blame for violent behavior is as ridiculous as the idea that violent cave drawings led to violent behavior among “cavemen.”

- “Distribution of Language, Sex, and Violence Codes in PG-Rated Movies” shows that the prevalence of violence in PG-rated films surpasses the prevalence of sex or only violent language.

- “Boy Playing Violent Video Game” shows a young boy holding a simulated pistol.

- “Types of Death, by Percentage of Films” includes the percentages of deaths in children's cartoons by various types of death (drowning, etc.), in comparison with adult dramas.

- “Why Gaming Is a Positive Element in Life” presents a variety of statistical data, from the amount of time gamers spend playing World of Warcraft and the number of households that have game consoles to the percentage of parents who play video games with their children to socialize with them.

4. Answers will vary. For example, the “Caveman Cartoon” requires the word of the boy’s mother to make the cause-and-effect claim about media representations and violence. Similarly, “Types of Death, by Percentage of Films” does not include a graphic representation of its claim that characters die more often in children's cartoons than adult dramas; rather, it asserts that claim in its text.

5. The visuals have different purposes, and student responses may vary. Some suggestions:

- The purpose of the “Caveman Cartoon” is to question the connection between media violence and violent behavior.
• The purpose of “Distribution of Language, Sex, and Violence Codes in PG-Rated Movies” is to make people aware of the prevalence of violence in PG-rated movies.
• The purpose of “Boy Playing Violent Video Game” is to show that seemingly harmless amusements encourage children to mimic violence.
• The purpose of “Types of Death, by Percentage of Films” is to highlight the surprising prevalence of death in children’s cartoons, as well as the various ways characters die.
• The purpose of “Why Gaming Is a Positive Element in Life” is to defend video games and video game players against common arguments against this activity, as well as provide interesting facts about gaming.

6. Answers will vary; most of the visuals could appeal to a variety of audiences — neutral, friendly, and hostile. You might discuss why one visual might be more effective with a hostile audience than another visual. For example, the “Caveman Cartoon” is a disarming one-panel comic that reframes the issue of media violence and violent behavior in a surreal and humorous context; it might cause both hostile and friendly audiences to examine their assumptions about media violence.

7. Different visuals make different appeals. For example, “Distribution of Language, Sex, and Violence Codes in PG-Rated Movies” relies primarily on logos. In contrast, the image of a child in “Boy Playing Violent Video Game” makes a wordless emotional appeal (pathos) through its imagery.

8. Responses should vary. Have students consider what kinds of questions, issues, and controversies best lend themselves to effective visual arguments. You might also have them suggest memorable images that could be used in debates about violent media.

Highlighting and Annotating Visuals, p. 91
Highlighting and annotating visual arguments, just like highlighting and annotating textual arguments, help us to look more carefully at each element in an image. The text suggests that students star, box, and circle important parts of an image and write about each of the identified elements in the margins.

A sample student annotation of a video game called Grand Theft Auto IV follows.

Teaching tip: Ask students to critique and add to this sample annotation; it's a good annotation but intentionally not exhaustive.

Exercise 3.2, p. 92
This exercise asks students to (1) highlight and annotate a visual argument and (2) identify its central message. The image, titled “Silence the Violence,” shows a stylized image of an isolated, implicitly unsupervised young child sitting closely in front of a television with a remote control; protruding from the television screen are various images of violent aggression: a fist, a hand grenade, a gun, a bomb, etc. Beneath the image is a slogan in an imperative form: “SILENCE the VIOLENCE.” In the top left is a block of text, with the heading that claims, “Media violence
will affect your children." The text itself is in a relatively small font, which students may want to note: because of this design choice, its message—that media violence is harmful, according to the American Academy of Pediatrics—has a quiet seriousness that contrasts with the image below. Some will read the central message as “Children consume a lot of media violence and it will affect their behavior.” Others may react to its emotional appeal. (“Innocent, young children are being subjected to violent media.”) Still other students may find it melodramatic, unrealistic, or ineffective. The focus on television may even seem dated to contemporary students, who probably consume media on their laptops and mobile devices. You might consider audience as well: this image seems targeted at parents (as suggested by the phrase “your children”).

Exercise 3.3, p. 93
This exercise asks students to interview a classmate about an experience with video games and actual violence, to discuss any links that the classmate sees between the two, and to write a paragraph summarizing the interview.

Teaching tip: Because the assignment does ask students to consider their experiences with actual violence, discussion may touch on uncomfortable areas of student disclosure (child abuse, domestic violence, assault, etc.). As you present the assignment to students, you may want them to focus on violence in their communities rather than on themselves, or you may want to preface the assignment by reminding students that they do not need to talk about more than one experience that they feel comfortable sharing.

Exercise 3.4, p. 93
This exercise asks students to recall Gerard Jones’s argument in “Violent Media Is Good for Kids,” which they read in Chapter 2 (pp. 64–67), and to assess the images included in that essay with a critical eye. Students should discuss whether or not the images support Jones’s central argument.

While student responses will vary, each image reinforces Jones’s central argument that comic-book images and fantasy violence help children to negotiate their own feelings of powerlessness. Each visual is empowering: a central figure gains control of a situation and indulges in over-the-top self-expression. The images combat what Jones sees as a society problematically encouraging only acceptable social behavior to the detriment of developing healthy aggression in children.

Responding Critically to Visual Arguments, p. 94
Encouraging students to recall what they learned in Chapter 2 about writing critical responses to written arguments, this section offers a useful series of questions to prompt students to write a critical response to visual arguments. The text suggests that students first identify audience and purpose before analyzing a visual text. A sample student analysis of the advertisement for Grand Theft Auto IV (p. 95) follows.

Teaching tip: If you spent time asking students to add to the annotation of the Grand Theft advertisement, continue this work by having students add to this
sample response. Ask students to evaluate the sample essay, to provide more evidence, and to make and support additional assertions about the visual text.

**Template for Responding to Visual Arguments, p. 97**

A visual posted on the site mediaviolence.org shows a young child playing a video game in a dark room. The visual makes a powerful statement about the influence of violent media on children. The central image shows a small boy alone in the dark, sitting on the floor and holding a video game remote control; he is totally absorbed in the game, and the only light is the glow of the video screen on his face.

The background enhances the central image because the blackness emphasizes the child's isolation and contrasts with the powerful hold of the lighted screen on his attention. The visual includes words as well as images. These words suggest the violent nature of popular video games and contrast with the image of an innocent child. The goal of the organization that posted the visual seems to be to highlight the violence in video games for parents who may think such games are innocent and to suggest that this media violence may affect children in negative ways. The visual is effective because it captures a complex issue in a simple image and a few resonant words, which allows the reader to draw a clear inference about the possible dangers of violent video games.

**Exercise 3.5, p. 97**

This exercise asks students to reflect on their paragraph response to the previous exercise and to write a more fully developed critical response to “Silence the Violence” on p. 92. Have students return to the highlighting and annotating of the image they used in Exercise 3.2 as they construct a more in-depth response to the image.

*Teaching tip:* Since this may be your students’ first sustained attempt at analyzing a visual argument, consider having them work in small groups to develop their ideas together before they write on their own.
What Is a Rhetorical Analysis? p. 100

Focusing on Martin Luther King Jr.’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail” (p. 100), the text asks students to begin thinking about rhetorical analysis — that is, how a writer uses strategy to convince his or her audience. As the text warns, students may know or focus on the negative connotation of rhetoric as empty manipulation, so here the text explains rhetoric from the academic perspective. The text defines rhetoric and rhetorical analysis in terms of the situation within which the writer is writing: for whom she or he is writing, how she or he attempts to persuade, and what strategies she or he uses to form an argument.

Considering the Rhetorical Situation, p. 101

Considering the rhetorical situation of any piece of writing requires analyzing the writer, purpose, audience, topic, and context of the writing. The text explains each of those five concepts through examples from King’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail” and offers lists of universal analytical questions for each. (As students perform their own rhetorical analysis in Exercise 4.2, p. 119, direct them to return to these questions.)

Context is perhaps the most difficult of these concepts for students to grasp, largely because it requires social, political, and historical knowledge students might not have; always remind students to read headnotes and to scan a text for historical or cultural references (p. 92). While you should encourage students to recall what they have learned about the time period during which a text was written, this is also a good time to make a plug for the importance of research.

Teaching tip: To encourage research, you might ask students to underline any of King’s references that they do not understand and to look them up later; parlay this advice into a short writing assignment asking students to discuss how learning this new information affected their thoughts about the letter.
Considering the Means of Persuasion: 
*Logos, Pathos, Ethos*, p. 108

This section reviews the terms *logos*, *pathos*, and *ethos*, introduced on p. 14. Generally, students easily grasp appeals to emotion, but appeals to logic and character may be a bit more difficult.

*Teaching tip:* While the text draws on King’s letter to give examples of these appeals, the identification of them is certainly not exhaustive. Consider giving students an excerpt of King’s letter and asking them to mark each kind of appeal in a different color highlighter/marker/pen. Also, advertisements, the most common everyday arguments we encounter, are a great place to find visual appeals (like the images included in this text) and textual appeals. Clip a few ads and distribute them to small groups (two or three works best); have students discuss the ads in their groups and then present their ideas to the larger class. In lieu of presenting, have students write about their ads’ rhetorical situations and the appeals they identified.

Considering the Writer’s Rhetorical Strategies, p. 109

As writers and readers, it’s important to think about rhetorical strategy on the structural and stylistic level. As this portion of the chapter makes clear, the tenor and placement of the thesis statement as well as the organization — the arrangement of points or ideas — are important components of an essay’s rhetorical effect. You might use this opportunity to discuss the type and caliber of evidence or sources that an author may include and why he or she might choose to include or exclude the refutation of opposing viewpoints.

The text reacquaints students with the stylistic techniques of metaphor, simile, and allusion and again offers examples from King’s letter. Students will most likely be more familiar and adept at spotting metaphors and similes than they will be at recognizing allusion. Since the examples given of each strategy are not exhaustive, have students search for more examples in King’s text; pay particular attention to what they identify as allusion. Additionally, expect students to be unfamiliar with the uses of the second set of stylistic rhetorical strategies the text names: parallelism, repetition, and rhetorical questions. Parallelism will likely be the most difficult concept of the set for students to identify because it is more difficult to define and identify (perhaps try diagramming a few sentences to teach the concept). Students usually quickly grasp the use of repetition and rhetorical questions for effect and reflection.

Assessing the Argument, p. 112

It is important for students to understand that the purpose of rhetorical analysis is to assess an argument’s effectiveness. The text evaluates “Letter from Birmingham Jail” as a highly effective argument because of its expert use of appeals and rhetorical strategies. A checklist for performing a rhetorical analysis is available for students to refer to as they write their own analyses.
Summary of “Terror’s Purse Strings” by Dana Thomas, p. 113

In this *New York Times* op-ed, author Dana Thomas argues that the long-reaching arms of terrorism affect even the counterfeit handbag industry and that only consumers can stop this crime. She delays this thesis until the article’s final paragraph. Appealing to *ethos* by citing reputable research from Interpol and the Global Anti-Counterfeiting Group, Thomas also appeals to *logos* as she argues that we must stop purchasing counterfeit bags because the “rackets are run by crime syndicates that also deal in narcotics, weapons, child prostitution, human trafficking, and terrorism” (para. 6). Offering her own experience as evidence as well, she appeals to *pathos* in the story of a raid on a “decrepit tenement,” where children aged eight to thirteen, who were likely “sent off” or “sold” by their families, were left “jobless” and “homeless” afterward (8–9). Here Thomas also makes a literary allusion to *Oliver Twist* and a bit later makes a historical allusion when she likens luxury manufacturers that will not authenticate goods to complicit Victorians, who wished to distance themselves from the taint of ill repute. She insists that consumers must stop buying fakes to end the supply chain; consequently, she claims, illicit activities, terrorism, and child labor will end.

While Thomas makes a compelling and persuasive argument, encourage students to question her conclusion. The conclusion is too far-reaching — she seems to think that counterfeit purses hold, as her title suggests, terrorism’s purse strings. This is a provocative argument that largely capitalizes on our contemporary political context and the popular memory of former president George W. Bush’s “war on terror.” Finally, Thomas’s conclusion that the children who labor in counterfeiting sweatshops would be returned home overlooks numerous other industries unrelated to handbag counterfeiting that rely on child labor.

Student Response: “A Powerful Call to Action” by Deniz Bilgutay, p. 115

Student author Deniz Bilgutay clearly identifies the means of persuasion and the rhetorical strategies that Thomas uses in “Terror’s Purse Strings.” As marginal notations throughout the essay point out, Bilgutay analyzes context, topic, purpose, audience, stylistic rhetoric, evidence, appeals, organization, and thesis. She recognizes that Thomas fails “to provide the evidence needed to establish connections between some causes and their effects” and so is justifiably critical of the author’s overzealous conclusion.

Exercise 4.1, p. 117

For this exercise, students follow the template and fill in the blanks to create their own one-paragraph rhetorical analysis of “Sweatshop Oppression” by Rajeev Ravisankar on pp. 117–18.

Exercise 4.2, p. 119

Student responses will vary. The following sample rhetorical analysis identifies in brackets the elements of the argument’s rhetorical situation, the means of persuasion, and rhetorical strategies that Nicholas Kristof uses in “Where Sweatshops Are a Dream.”
Writing on the opinion pages of The New York Times [context], Nicholas Kristof, a columnist who writes frequently about global labor practices and who has lived in East Asia [writer's ethos], argues that the “best way to help people in the poorest countries isn’t to campaign against sweatshops but to promote manufacturing there” (14) [topic]. Kristof writes in response to Democratic rhetoric and action regarding labor standards and fair trade agreements [context]. But he also wants to change the way his readers view low-wage labor abroad [audience]. Ultimately, Kristof hopes to affect policy in practical ways: “One of the best things America could do for Africa would be to strengthen our program to encourage African imports called AGOA, and nudge Europe to match it” (14).

Kristof assumes his readers share his values [audience] and want to become more informed, even if his argument will “shock” well-meaning Americans at first. In fact, he sympathizes with their understandable response: “I am glad that many Americans are repulsed by the idea of importing products made by barely paid, barely legal workers in dangerous factories” (8) [audience]. He understands this reaction to conditions that seem immoral, as well as his readers’ desire for U.S. policy that respects human rights. He does not criticize his readers for being ignorant; he does not accuse them of being naive “bleeding hearts” either. Instead, he advances his argument through first-person accounts from poor scavengers in Cambodia that might appeal to his readers’ sympathies; his interviews support the view that a sweatshop is a “cherished dream, an escalator out of poverty” (5) for many people in poor countries [logos]. While this testimony offers specific evidence for Kristof’s main point, the writer also colors his argument with emotional appeal, particularly in his use of the second person [style]: “Then the smoke parts and you come across a child ambling barefoot . . . ” (3) [pathos].

The writer relies on many stylistic techniques throughout his column. He describes the garbage dump in Phnom Penh as a “Dante-like vision of hell” (2) [metaphor, allusion]; he uses rhetorical questions and hypothetical responses of implied readers (“When I defend sweatshops, people always ask me . . . ” (9)); he addresses the reader conversationally (“Look, I know that Americans have a hard time . . . ” (16)). He also relies heavily on ethos, ending his essay by asking his readers to “take it from 13-year-old Neuo Chanthou” (16), a scavenger who ekes less than a dollar a day at the dump and who asserts, “A factory is better” (17). Kristof’s use of this firsthand reporting strengthens his argument, as it brings together logos, pathos, and ethos. His rhetorical strategy, which presumes readers share his values and genuinely want “to help people in the poorest countries” (14), makes his appeal effective as well. To make his argument even stronger, he might provide empirical data showing how specific programs like AGOA help the economies and populations of Asian and African countries.
CHAPTER

Understanding Logic and Recognizing Logical Fallacies

To further students’ understanding of what makes a solid argument, this chapter focuses on the difference between arguments built on logic and those propped up by logical fallacies. The chapter — divided into sections on deductive reasoning, syllogisms, enthymemes, inductive reasoning, and inferences — shows how to construct and write deductive and inductive essays. Next, the chapter covers logical fallacies so that students may recognize them in others’ arguments and avoid such fallacies in their own work. The final part of the chapter brings together all these discussions about good and bad arguments in a debate over whether colleges have gone too far to accommodate students with disabilities.

Teaching tip: Sometimes the principles of logic, reasoning, and logical fallacies can seem academic and somewhat removed from students’ day-to-day lives. To motivate students, you might have them practice recognizing these concepts in familiar pop-culture texts such as magazine ads. Ask each student to bring in a magazine ad or two; then have students examine the ads to see what kind of reasoning they use and even what kinds of fallacies they rely on (and there will be many). This activity will give students quick practice and will serve as good preparation for the more weighty and substantial set of readings that they will work with at the close of the chapter.


This section describes the kind of argument built on a series of premises, or assumptions, that leads to a certain conclusion. Traditionally, this process is illustrated with a syllogism, which the text tells us consists of a major premise (a general statement that relates two terms), a minor premise (an example of the foregoing statement), and a conclusion. That is, deductive reasoning moves from true statements to a logical conclusion. Examples from the Declaration of Independence show students a real-life example of deductive reasoning, but you may want to provide a few everyday examples of your own to help them understand the logical progression of this kind of argumentation.
Chapter 5  Understanding Logic and Recognizing Logical Fallacies

Constructing Sound Syllogisms, p. 126

Building on the previous section on deductive reasoning, this section provides a closer look at syllogisms and how they are used to construct sound arguments (arguments that are both valid and true). It also stresses that a valid syllogism is not true if one of the premises is false. The text provides examples of true and untrue syllogisms, and these examples relate to the At Issue topic for the chapter — accommodations for college students with disabilities. This section goes on to examine syllogisms in more depth looking at syllogisms with illogical middle terms, syllogisms with key terms that shift meaning, and syllogisms with negative premises. Be sure to cover all these examples, and give your students plenty of time to practice with these terms.

Recognizing Enthymemes, p. 129

Here the text introduces enthymeme as a syllogism that leaves out part of its argument — usually, the major premise — because it is obvious or assumed. But sometimes the omitted underlying belief or assumption is questionable and undercuts the argument. Students can use the Bumper-Sticker Thinking box to practice what they’ve learned about syllogisms and enthymemes, or they can collect their own bumper-sticker sayings. The goal is to analyze the kind of logic used by each bumper sticker: what is being said, what is assumed, what logic is combined, and so on.

Exercise 5.1, p. 131

This exercise asks students to read a short paragraph about drunk driving and then present its main argument in the form of a syllogism. An example follows.

Major premise: Laws should deal only with actions that damage person or property.

Minor premise: Laws that make it a crime to drive with a blood-alcohol concentration of .08 or higher allow the government to criminalize the content of drivers’ blood rather than drivers’ actions.

Conclusion: Drunk-driving laws are a violation of civil liberties.

Students may discuss whether the major premise begs the question of what laws are. It makes an assumption that not all legal scholars would share.

Exercise 5.2, p. 132

This exercise asks students to read an excerpt from a passage about human rights and to answer a set of questions. Possible answers are provided.

1. By citing the United Nations and the Declaration of Independence, this writer assumes, first, that readers recognize the authority of both the international organization and a founding document of the United States. The writer also, without stating so directly, operates on current interpretations of the Declaration of Independence (that "basic rights apply to everyone"); while the writer
mentions slavery, she does not acknowledge that slavery was a part of U.S. history even after the Declaration was signed. The writer also uses phrases such as “basic rights” and “inherent value” without defining them, thereby assuming readers will know what the terms mean. Finally, the writer assumes that everyone should have basic human rights and that, ethically, governments are supposed to uphold those rights.

2. The writer supports her argument by referencing both the United Nations and the Declaration of Independence as evidence. The writer also uses a common-sense approach, saying that because everyone experiences life, all individuals have inherent value.

3. The major premise is that a person's inherent value means he or she should be afforded certain basic human rights.

4. A syllogism that expresses the essay's argument:

   **Major premise:** A person's inherent value means he or she should be afforded certain basic human rights.

   **Minor premise:** Each person's value comes from his or her capacity to experience life, not from intelligence or usefulness to others.

   **Conclusion:** Everyone is entitled to basic rights.

5. Ask students to consider their own syllogisms and evaluate them for truth, validity, and soundness.

**Exercise 5.3, p. 132**
This exercise asks students to evaluate the soundness of arguments. Suggested responses are provided in parentheses after each given argument.

1. Sound.

2. Not sound because there is no qualifier. The first premise does not state that Alison always orders eggs or oatmeal; it just states that she should.

3. Not sound because syllogisms in which both premises are negative cannot have a valid conclusion.

4. Sound.

5. Not sound, because the first premise is untrue. Only equilateral triangles have three equal sides.

**Exercise 5.4, p. 133**
This exercise asks students to read the enthymemes that appear on bumper stickers, to supply their missing premises, and to evaluate them as arguments. Possible responses follow each enthymeme.

1. Missing premise: if you love your pet, you love animals, so you shouldn't eat meat because to do so causes cruelty and death to animals. This is not necessarily a strong argument, because, in reality, the animals people eat are not usually the same animals they keep as pets.
2. Missing premise: that civilized nations do not engage in terrorism. Here the bumper sticker is arguing that there is no difference between terrorism and war, and it assumes that, in both cases, there are civilian casualties and planned destruction. This argument is a difficult one to identify as sound, because often the strategies of war and terrorism are quite different, however, depending on one's political leanings, certain comparisons can be made and argued.

3. Missing premise: that men don't need to ask for help and that doing so makes them less “manly.” This argument is certainly not sound, because it relies on antiquated assumptions about masculinity.

4. Missing premise: that all immigrants move to countries only because they love those countries and (implicitly) admire the ideals and culture of those countries; it also suggests they wish to imitate its citizens. While this powerful statement can apply to many immigrants, people may immigrate for a variety of reasons other than admiration for a particular country or the desire to assimilate. They may move because they are political exiles or because they must follow their families or economic opportunities. Some may even hold critical or disdainful opinions of the country where they move. As the assumption is too general, it is not sound.

5. Missing premise: that “local” food is always healthy, organic, and environmentally beneficial, and that eating “local” is necessarily a healthy and virtuous act, as recognized by both the car’s driver and the person reading the bumper sticker. The argument is not sound: it does not define what it means to “eat local” or establish why doing so is desirable. Without the premise, the sticker could be endorsing eating at a local fast-food restaurant or buying products at a local convenience store.

6. Missing premise: both the driver of the car and the person reading the bumper sticker don’t approve of the job being done by a current elected official. That major premise coupled with the stated minor premise “I didn’t vote for him” leads to the conclusion “Don’t blame me.”

7. Missing premise: that any literature that has been banned, legally or otherwise, is inherently beneficial to a reader. This assumption has a rebellious appeal: the “authorities” are afraid of informed or thoughtful people and want to control them; if those in power do not want people to read a book, then that book must be essential reading. This bumper sticker may suggest a powerful and persuasive truth: many great books — D.H. Lawrence’s *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, Mark Twain’s *Huckleberry Finn* — have been banned over the years. Moreover, legal restrictions on literature are a hallmark of authoritarian governments. But the argument is difficult to identify as sound, because a ban on a book (by a parent, a school, a government) says little about the book’s quality or value to any particular reader, as compared to unbanned books. Highly sexual or violent literature may not be allowed in elementary school libraries. Adolph Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* has been banned in Germany; while one may want to investigate the book to understand history, the fact of its ban seems like an insufficient motive for reading it.
8. Missing premise: love can and should solve all problems. This bumper sticker says that love is the only solution, presumably excluding other actions such as war or any other aggressive behavior. Of course, this can be a difficult argument to make, and likely your students will have strong opinions on this idea. While loving in all situations can be very difficult and even a powerful response, there are often situations that require more aggressive actions. And the wording of this bumper sticker presents a problem because, in reality, love is not the “only” solution.

9. Missing premise: discussions surrounding abortion should focus on the fetus as a child rather than uphold the idea of a woman’s choice. Clearly, this bumper sticker would be on the car of someone who is pro-life. This argument is hard to evaluate objectively because it is based on individual beliefs about ethics and when life (and the designation child) actually begins.

10. Missing premise: while “patriotism” may seem to encourage thoughtless conformity and uncritical nationalism, a truly patriotic person must remain individualistic, critical, and skeptical — and will best serve the country by doing so. The bumper sticker assumes a shared and particular understanding of the word “Think”: a definition that implicitly makes the word a synonym for “question,” “criticize,” and even “resist.” While encouraging critical thinking is admirable, there are no grounds for assuming that every subjective act of thought is “patriotic” (a word that can be difficult to define, in any case). A person reading the slogan may “think” that it is a good idea to imprison members of a particular religious group, ban “Think. It’s patriotic” bumper stickers, or use deadly violence to stop the government from enforcing any laws. The act of thinking does not automatically confer “patriotism.”

Writing Deductive Arguments, p. 133

Here students learn how to make deductive arguments into strong deductive essays. Most important, students who write deductive arguments should remember to support them with pieces of evidence that, together, reach a specific conclusion. A student essay provides an example of a deductive argument.

Exercise 5.5, p. 134

This exercise directs students to read “College Should Be for Everyone” and to answer questions (p. 136) about the essay’s structure as a deductive argument. You will find a brief summary of the essay and sample responses to those questions below.

Summary of Student Essay “College Should Be for Everyone”
by Crystal Sanchez, p. 134

In this essay, student Crystal Sanchez lays out the reasons that every U.S. citizen should be encouraged to attend college and get a degree. Additionally, at the end, Sanchez moves her argument a step further when she states that the government has the obligation to offer all students access to a college education. Sanchez’s essay relies
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on a deductive style of argumentation, and each topic sentence provides support for the argument. Her evidence for why everyone should go to college includes “a college education gives people an opportunity to discover what they are good at” (para. 2); many current jobs will not exist in this country in ten years; “more and more jobs are being phased out or shipped overseas. Americans should go to college to develop the skills that they will need to get the best jobs that will remain” (3); and “education is an essential part of a democratic society” (4).

Identifying the Elements of a Deductive Argument, p. 136

1. A paraphrase of Crystal’s thesis: Given that education means advantages such as higher income for individuals and a more robust government, all U.S. citizens should go to college and earn a diploma.

2. Crystal’s main points are her topic sentences: the first sentences of paragraphs 2, 3, and 4. In spite of Crystal’s designation of her third argument as “the best reason,” students may differ in identifying the strongest argument and the weakest.

3. Crystal refutes the opposing arguments of insufficient room for all students and underprepared students. She could have addressed the extreme cost of providing higher education to every willing U.S. citizen, changes in government spending since the time of the G.I. Bill, and government’s current role in making college more affordable to students (in the way of grant money, loans, scholarships, and so on).

4. In the conclusion, Crystal reiterates that every American should be able to go to college, and she restates her main points of support. Finally, Crystal looks to the future and argues that not only will Americans who go to college benefit personally but also the entire nation will benefit from having a more prepared workforce.

5. A syllogism that expresses the essay’s argument:

   **Major premise:** People who have a college education enjoy increased wages, opportunities, and benefits.

   **Minor premise:** Only 28% of Americans had a bachelor’s degree in 2004.

   **Conclusion:** The U.S. government should encourage every citizen to attend college and get a degree.

What Is Inductive Reasoning? p. 137

In contrast to deductive reasoning, inductive reasoning refers to arguments that come out of a list of observations and lead to a certain conclusion. The section opens with a series of observations about pollution and how, given these observations, we conclude that runoff pollution is a problem that must be addressed as soon as possible. Following that is a discussion about Francis Bacon’s use of the scientific method, and the text gives real-life examples of the various ways that argumentation can reach inductive conclusions (particular to general, general to general, general to particular, and particular to particular).
Making Inferences, p. 139
One of the primary components of inductive reasoning is the inductive leap, or inference. This section discusses how an inference is what allows a person to make a conclusion based on observations. It reminds students, too, that because inductive conclusions are based on a person’s ability to infer, they are never certain (as deductive arguments are), only probable. Students are also cautioned to be on the lookout for hasty generalizations, which are overly broad inferences — meaning the gap between the observations/data and the conclusion is too big.

Constructing Strong Inductive Arguments, p. 140
Finally, with this section, it’s time to show students how all this information about inductive arguments can be used in their own work. Here, students see that the conclusions they reach through inductive reasoning are only as strong as the support they provide. In a sense, this section instructs students on what problems can occur when trying to make inductive arguments, including the dangers of broad generalizations, insufficient evidence, irrelevant evidence, and an overlooked exception to the rule.

Exercise 5.6, p. 140
This exercise asks students to read a series of arguments and label those that use deductive reasoning with a D and those that use inductive reasoning with an I. The answers appear in parentheses after each argument.

1. Deductive; you may ask students’ input on whether this is a sound argument.
2. Inductive; the argument infers that “it makes more sense” to buy the Fiesta because it gets better gas mileage than the Honda Accord.
3. Inductive; one has to infer, based on the evidence, what Montresor’s plans were and how long he had these plans.
4. Deductive; since a patient is a person, the minor premise is a form of “Garrett is a person,” and the syllogism is sound.
5. Inductive; this argument does not lead to a certain conclusion, but it does lead to a probable one. Reaching this conclusion, however, depends on assuming that the pollution found in the ocean is harmful to swimmers.

Exercise 5.7, p. 141
This exercise asks students to read a series of arguments and decide whether they are deductive or inductive. If the argument is inductive, students should tell how strong or weak it is; if the argument is deductive, students should evaluate its soundness. The answers appear in parentheses after each argument.

1. Inductive. This argument is strong, based on the evidence provided, though the conclusion is not certain. Instead, one needs to infer that The Farmer’s Almanac and the National Weather Service know what they’re talking about and can make reliable predictions.
2. Deductive. This argument starts with a larger premise about walled towns in Europe, and the conclusion that follows is a logical one.

3. Inductive. This argument is based on a series of observations that lead to a probable conclusion — that the boys who were playing broke the window.

4. Inductive. Because the argument is overly simplistic and incomplete, it is weak.

5. Deductive. The major premise and minor premise — the first and second statements, respectively — lead to a logical and strong conclusion that George Martin has an advanced degree.

6. Inductive. The inference that all men are like the speaker’s last two boyfriends is a hasty generalization.

7. Inductive. This argument infers that the pharmaceutical company knows best, and it leaves out a vital explanation of why the government pulled the drug.

8. Inductive. Because the two statements have no correlation, this is a weak argument.

9. Inductive. Inferring that Harry Potter is the only exception to the rule makes for a weak inductive argument.

10. Inductive. This is a strong argument, based on what the speaker has observed and his or her inference that the teacher will be consistent.

Exercise 5.8, p. 142

This exercise asks students to read an inductive paragraph and to answer questions that follow it. A short summary and answers are provided below.

Summary of “Football Fanatics” by Pooja Vaidya, p. 142

In this brief excerpt, Pooja Vaidya describes going to a football game between the Philadelphia Eagles and the Dallas Cowboys and experiencing what a professional football game is like in the United States. Pooja describes the aggressive, emotional behavior of the Eagles fans and explains various fan rituals and cheers. Pooja concludes that, for many Eagles fans, “a day at the stadium” is just an “opportunity to engage in behavior that in any other context would be unacceptable.”

1. The first statement cannot be concluded from the paragraph. Although some fans engage in violent behavior at Eagles games, there’s no indication that all of them do so.

2. The writer’s conclusion is that fans at a football game behave in ways that would be unacceptable in any other context. All the following observations lead him to his conclusion:
   - Fans at the stadium paint their faces or chests.
   - Fans at the stadium wear capes, jerseys, and colored wigs.
   - Fans at the stadium join in cheers and fight songs; they become outwardly emotional when their team is losing.
   - Fans at the stadium often drink a lot before and during the game, causing them to become unruly in public.
Some Eagles fans treat fans of the other team (the Cowboys) with disrespect and won’t let them sit in their section.

3. The writer could have given more examples of what the fans do at the game (things they yell or say to one another, other rituals or superstitions about the game, and so on), or he could have provided some contrast to what he wrote about; for instance, how did the people he was with behave? Or how was the atmosphere at the football stadium different from the atmosphere at arenas where other sports are played? As it stands, his argument requires readers to infer what is normal and acceptable based on what he describes as abnormal and unacceptable behavior; his answers to these other questions might have helped readers.

4. Your students will probably disagree on this question.

5. Students will probably conclude that the paragraph makes a strong inductive argument: most people do not engage in these behaviors anywhere else, nor would such behavior elsewhere be acceptable. However, students may disagree with Pooja’s apparent disappointment at the fans’ behavior.

Writing Inductive Arguments, p. 144

As in the section on writing deductive essays, this section helps students to put what they know about inductive arguments into prose form. As with deductive essays, students learn to present evidence (facts, observations, or examples). In addition, they learn that because their readers will need to take an inductive leap to reach a conclusion, writers need to be sure their link between the data and conclusion is strong.

Exercise 5.9, p. 144

This exercise directs students to read “Please Do Not Feed the Humans” and to answer questions (p. 136) about the essay’s structure as an inductive argument. You will find a brief summary of the essay and sample responses to those questions below.

Summary of “Please Do Not Feed the Humans” by William Saletan, p. 144

In this essay, Saletan examines the current obesity epidemic and explains that it is a problem not just in the United States or Europe but has become a global issue. He cites data from both the World Health Organization and the United Nations that concludes “for every two people who are malnourished, three are now overweight or obese” (para. 3). Saletan explains the ways that socioeconomics and technology have led to an overweight population — how fast food, technological advancements, and everyday work requirements have changed. He also notes that the historical relationship between economic class and health has completely inverted itself. In the past, the rich were the ones who could afford luxury and excess, and they were the ones who became fat; now, the cheapest foods are often the least healthy, so those who are poor are the ones who are fat. As a result of all these observations, Saletan concludes that we must change our behaviors, from the foods we eat to the amount...
we exercise, and he says programs that help the poor must begin providing and subsidizing healthy food choices like fruits and vegetables.

Identifying the Elements of an Inductive Argument, p. 146

1. Saletan’s thesis comes in paragraph 13, when he states that we must burn more calories and eat fewer calories to begin with.

2. You might want to point out to students that Saletan’s thesis is an example of the delayed thesis — a way of accumulating support for a thesis before making it. There are several reasons that authors choose this structure, and in Saletan’s case, he likely puts the thesis later in his essay so that readers are more likely to accept his solution. If he had started the essay by saying that we need to exercise more and change the foods we eat, readers may have felt that they were being criticized and may have been less receptive to his argument. As it is, by the time readers reach Saletan’s thesis, his argument is so strong that readers can’t help but agree with him.

3. Saletan amasses several lines of support for his conclusion, as follows:
   - Statistics from the World Health Organization and the United Nations prove that people around the world are overweight and suffering health problems as a result (para. 3).
   - Socioeconomic information reveals that “fat is no longer a rich man’s disease” and that obesity has actually become more of a problem among the poor (4).
   - Technology has made life easier so that we work less and burn fewer calories (5, 6, 11, 12).
   - Our diets often include processed foods, more sweeteners, and high levels of animal fat and salt (7 and 8).
   - The abundance of fast food and larger portions make unhealthy foods more affordable and accessible, while healthy foods are more expensive and less affordable for lower-income families (8 and 9).
   - Our mentality about food, eating, and exercise has not changed to compensate for our easy lifestyles (14).

4. Saletan’s conclusion comes right after his thesis, at the end. So when he states that we need to change how we eat and to exercise more, he quickly follows with advice about tackling the mentality that keeps us from doing so. See if your students follow this inductive leap and if it makes sense to them.

5. Have students explain why they think Saletan’s reasoning is strong or weak. If they say it is weak, ask them what Saletan could have covered to make the argument more compelling.

Recognizing Logical Fallacies, p. 147

Now that students have covered ways to make deductive and inductive arguments, they also need to understand what lines of argumentation are weak and should be avoided. This substantial section on logical fallacies covers a variety of ways
that some seemingly valid arguments rely on inaccurate or intentionally misleading uses of logic. Several examples are given for each. The logical fallacies covered include begging the question; circular reasoning; weak analogy; *ad hominem* (personal attack); hasty or sweeping generalization; either/or fallacy; equivocation; red herring; slippery slope; you also; appeal to doubtful authority; misuse of statistics; *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* (after this, therefore because of this); *non sequitur* (it does not follow); and bandwagon appeal.

**Exercise 5.10, p. 160**
This exercise helps students identify logical fallacies. It directs them to decide which of the given statements are logical and which rely on fallacies. If the statement is not logical, students are asked to identify the fallacy that best applies. Keep in mind that, in some cases, more than one logical fallacy can be identified. Answers follow.

1. Hasty generalization
2. Non sequitur
3. Non sequitur
4. Slippery slope fallacy
5. Begging the question
6. Hasty generalization
7. Weak analogy
8. Circular reasoning
9. Weak analogy
10. Bandwagon appeal
11. Non sequitur or hasty/sweeping generalization
12. Appeal to doubtful authority
13. Bandwagon appeal
14. Either/or
15. Logical argument using deductive reasoning
16. You also
17. Slippery slope
18. Circular reasoning
19. Because this argument says that the new software “must be” the cause of the problem, it relies on the *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* argument. There could be other reasons that the computer is not working.
20. Bandwagon appeal

**Exercise 5.11, p. 161**
This exercise asks students to read the essay “Immigration Time-Out” by Patrick Buchanan and identify logical fallacies that he uses as part of his argument. Here is a summary of the essay followed by a list of the fallacies your students may identify.
Chapter 5  Understanding Logic and Recognizing Logical Fallacies

Summary of “Immigration Time-Out” by Patrick Buchanan, p. 161

In response to recent debates surrounding immigration policies in the United States, politician and conservative political commentator Patrick Buchanan argues in this essay that America needs to call a time-out on immigration. He opens his discussion with a reference to California’s Proposition 187 — legislation that proposed to cut off social welfare benefits to illegal aliens in the state — and states that this referendum reveals conflicting visions of what America can and should be in the future. Buchanan believes that continued or increased levels of immigration would cause unrest in the United States and would uproot traditional American culture.

Logical Fallacies in “Immigration Time-Out” by Patrick Buchanan, p. 161

- **Non sequitur:** Buchanan cites the chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, who argues that, by 2050, the “majority of Americans will trace their roots to Latin America, Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Pacific Islands” (para. 4). Buchanan argues that this increase in immigrant populations will automatically lead to social and political unrest. He states that “consequences will ensue” (9) and says these new immigrants will break the law, protest, and get into conflicts with one another. This is a non sequitur because he is arguing that one thing will inevitably result from another, when in reality, Buchanan’s argument is based on panic and illogical assumptions. You may also ask your students what they think about his apparent fixation with Mexicans and other Hispanics, as he constantly cites them in negative ways.

- **Either/or fallacy:** Buchanan’s whole argument involves an either/or fallacy because he states that either immigration must be stopped entirely (if even for a short time) or “if no cutoff is imposed . . . the message will go out to a desperate world: America is wide open” (8). He leaves no room for anything in between. Also, Buchanan uses the either/or fallacy when, in his conclusion, he states that either “we” must decide what America will be like in 2050 or “others will make those decisions for us” (13).

- **Begging the question or circular reasoning:** Buchanan begs the question when he states, “If America is to survive as ‘one nation, one people’ we need to call a ‘time-out’ on immigration, to assimilate the tens of millions who have lately arrived” (12). He assumes that America is “one nation, one people,” when one could argue that America has always been a diverse nation, made up of immigrants living side by side and constantly changing what it means to be American. This line of thinking can also be considered circular reasoning because one would have to subscribe to his first statement (that America once was “one nation, one people”) to believe his subsequent statements.

---

**Teaching tip:** There are several other logical fallacies that your students may find, so make sure you open up discussion for their input. Also, the Buchanan essay will likely spark discussion in class, as many of his statements are built on controversial, even xenophobic, thinking about people from other nations.

---

**Exercise 5.12, p. 163**

This exercise asks students to choose three logical fallacies they identified in the Buchanan essay and then to rewrite the passages in a way that changes Buchanan's
statements into logical arguments. Suggest that students remove words such as *must* and *will* and substitute language that allows for more discussion of the issue. For instance, Buchanan states, “Crowding together immigrant and minority populations in our major cities must bring greater conflict” (9); this statement could be tempered by replacing *must* with *may* or *could*. Part of the problem with Buchanan’s essay is that he speaks as if chaos and crime are a *certain* result of more immigration, a relationship that cannot be proven ahead of time. Because most of Buchanan’s arguments are based on logical fallacies, your students may find it difficult to rewrite excerpts in ways that don’t change his thinking altogether. Take this as an opportunity to discuss how his whole essay might be reworked to be more logically sound.

**Reading and Writing about the Issue: How Free Should Free Speech Be?** p. 164

This section includes six texts from a variety of genres. The texts illustrate, discuss, and comment on the meaning and status of free speech — especially arguments about whether colleges and universities should limit expression that might be offensive or harmful. You will find a summary of each selection and sample responses to the questions in each At Issue.

**Summary of “Should Neo-Nazis Be Allowed Free Speech” by Thane Rosenbaum, p. 165**

In this essay, Thane Rosenbaum acknowledges that Americans see freedom of speech as inviolable but suggests “America’s fixation on free speech has gone too far” (para. 5). Pointing to other countries that have enacted laws against hurtful speech, noting speech regulations that already exist in the United States, and citing scientific evidence that emotional injuries are as damaging as physical injuries, the writer claims that common decency and civility should take precedence over freedom of speech. Along the way, he questions basic assumptions underlying the American legal system.

**At Issue: How Free Should Free Speech Be?** p. 167

1. The first five paragraphs establish that other civilized, pluralistic countries do place restrictions on the freedom of expression. The writer also anticipates the objections of American readers, who might find these limitations “undemocratic” (para. 4) and “wholly foreign” (para. 5). But Rosenbaum sets the stage for an argument that will question American assumptions about freedom of speech and challenge the premises of the American legal system, which — perhaps erroneously — seems based on a nursery rhyme: “Sticks and stones can break my bones but names can never hurt me” (para. 8).

2. Rosenbaum moves freely between induction and deduction. For example, he uses induction to assert “the United States is an outlier among democracies in granting such generous free speech guarantees”: using specific instances of countries such as Brazil and France, he infers his conclusion (para. 6). He uses
a similar approach when he claims, “even in the United States, free speech is not unlimited” and supports the assertion with particular examples. In contrast, he deploys deduction when he explores the privileging of physical harm over emotional in the legal system. But he uses induction to establish the general premise for his deductive argument: he refers to specific studies that support the claim that emotional pain can be as persistent and injurious as physical pain (para. 9). But then he relies on that general premise — that pain “has a shared circuitry in the human brain, and it makes no distinction between being hit in the face and losing face” — to argue that laws should treat each kind of pain equally (paras. 9–11). His conclusion also presents a deductive argument that begins from the premise: “Free speech should not stand in the way of common decency” (para. 14).

3. The writer uses a variety of evidence. First, he points out that other pluralistic countries have found ways to regulate speech; second, he uses examples to show that the U.S. already places legal limitations on speech (para. 7). Third, in paragraphs 9 and 10, he relies on scientific evidence to support his claim that emotional pain is just as injurious as physical pain — and should be considered as such by the law. Fourth, he points to similar laws that seek to regulate other dangers: “We impose speed limits on driving and regulate food and drugs because we know that the costs of not doing so can lead to accidents and harm. Why should speech be exempt from public welfare concerns when its social costs can be even more injurious?” (para. 11). While Rosenbaum does refer to some hypothetical instances in paragraph 6, he might have chosen more specific examples that illustrate the harm that speech can cause.

4. A reader who rejects Rosenbaum’s premise that physical and emotional harm are equivalent, or that the social costs of offensive speech are worse than physical harm, might find the analogy problematic: in the case of driving-, food-, and drug-regulation, the law seeks to protect drivers and consumers from physical accidents, illness, and death.

5. The writer anticipates objections to speech laws in paragraph 4; he also preempts the claim that free speech is absolute or sacrosanct in America by pointing out limitations that already exist (para. 7). Implicitly, he responds to those who might ask, “How would we decide what speech should be off-limits?” in paragraph 13: “Of course, everything is a matter of degree. Juries are faced with similar ambiguities when it comes to physical injury . . . Jurors are as capable of working through these uncertainties in the area of emotional harms as they are in the realm of physical injury.” As this debate has a long tradition, Rosenbaum might have addressed specific objections from specific writers; moreover, he could have responded more explicitly to those who worry that government restrictions on free speech could be taken too far and silence dissent or public debate.

6. He emphasizes the point that free speech is not absolute or unquestionable; in fact, from his point of view, “common decency” and civility take priority over freedom of speech. He might have ended with a particularly repellent example of unregulated free expression. Likewise, he could have concluded — referring
to his earlier examples of countries with speech regulations — that framing the issue as a conflict between “free speech regulations” and “democracy” is a false dichotomy.

Summary of “The Unfree Speech Movement” by Sol Stern, p. 168

For former student radical Sol Stern, a veteran of the Free Speech Movement at the University of California at Berkeley, the idealistic promises of 1960s radicals have taken an ironic turn. While the “movement promised greater intellectual and political freedom on campus, the result has been the opposite,” and Berkeley — even as it pretends to embrace the legacy of the Free Speech Movement — now “exercises more thought control over students than the hated institution that we rose up against half a century ago” (para. 1). But Stern goes beyond merely engaging in nostalgia for lost ideals. In fact, he is mostly unsentimental about former radicals because “the Free Speech Movement’s fight for free speech was always a charade” (para. 5). Implicitly, Stern’s critique goes beyond Berkeley to what he sees as enforced left-wing orthodoxy at American colleges and universities.

At Issue: How Free Should Free Speech Be? p. 171

1. Responses may vary, but for one version: While Berkeley’s revolutionary Free Speech Movement of the 1960s promised diversity and freedom of expression, that ideal has now turned into a new authoritarian orthodoxy as liberals and leftists demand ideological orthodoxy on campuses. He places his thesis in his first paragraph.

2. Stern appeals to ethos at several points, beginning in the opening paragraph: “I played a small part in the Free Speech Movement, and some of those returning for the reunion were once my friends, but I won’t be joining them.” He follows up on this appeal in the second paragraph by speaking in the first-person plural: “We early-1960s radicals believed ourselves anointed as a new ‘tell it like it is’ generation. We promised to transcend the ‘smelly old orthodoxies’ (in George Orwell’s phrase) of Cold War liberalism and class-based, authoritarian leftism.” In essence, Stern is establishing his status as a person who understands the inner workings of the original Free Speech Movement and sympathizes with its once-legitimate cause. But that status also implicitly grants him privileged insight into the movement’s flaws and failures.

3. “Kitsch” usually refers to art, music, objects, places, and other things that exhibit poor taste, sentimentality, or tackiness, but can be appreciated in an ironic or knowing way. The process of becoming “kitschy” often involves moving from seriousness and sincerity to irony or even frivolity. When Stern writes that “The Berkeley ‘machine’ now promotes Free Speech Movement kitsch” by renaming campus locations after Mario Savio or dubbing a dining hall the “Free Speech Movement Cafe,” he means that the university has taken something serious and important and made it trivial and silly.
4. Responses may vary. As Stern focuses almost entirely on Berkeley, his experience and perceptions carry a certain weight; had he engaged in a much broader critique of speech restrictions at American universities—or America, in general—he would have needed more evidence. At moments when he does engage in wider claims, as when he refers to the “Tenured radicals” who “now dominate most professional organizations in the humanities and social studies,” he needs to explain what that means, specifically, and support the assertion with more data.

5. Stern means that, as part of an enforced orthodox left-wing political ideology, students must take a course “on the ‘theoretical or analytical issues relevant to understanding race, culture, and ethnicity in American society,’ administered by the university’s Division of Equity and Inclusion” (para. 4). He sees this required course as self-evidently antithetical to “intellectual diversity” without explaining why or how. This could be seen as a false dilemma (Why does taking this course negate “intellectual diversity”?) or even a red herring.

6. Stern discusses Aptheker because, from his point of view, she exemplifies how the Free Speech Movement has gone wrong: it welcomes a left-wing “feminist-studies” professor while rejecting speakers like Condoleezza Rice “who may not toe the liberal line” (para. 14). Aptheker herself embraces the mantle of free speech, while her “new awareness, a new consciousness” is actually merely left-wing authoritarian orthodoxy, emblematizing (for Stern) the end of the “intellectually open university” (para. 15).

Summary of “On Freedom of Expression and Campus Speech Codes” by the American Association of University Professors, p. 172

In this statement on campus speech codes, the American Association of University Professors argues that prohibitions on speech and expression are antithetical to the very idea of a university. As they write, “Free speech is not simply an aspect of the educational enterprise to be weighed against other desirable ends. It is the very precondition of the academic enterprise itself” (para. 8). While they acknowledge the concerns of those who might be subject to offensive and hostile speech—especially as universities become more diverse—the writers oppose speech codes and propose other ways of addressing offensive of speech that are compatible with the mission of higher education.

At Issue: How Free Should Free Speech Be? p. 174

1. The wording of responses may vary, but here is one version:

   **Major Premise:** Freedom of thought and expression is an essential precondition for any institution of higher learning.

   **Minor Premise:** Prohibitions on racist, sexist, homophobic, ethnically demeaning speech—however offensive—inhibit freedom of thought and expression.
Conclusion: Colleges and universities should not implement speech codes or ban such expression.

2. This statement is aimed primarily at instructors, administrators, and those who govern institutions of higher education: it is addressed to those who are in a position to influence and shape policies and practices at colleges and universities. See, for example, the list of recommendations (para. 7).

3. The writers are addressing a conflict between two competing values. On the one hand, universities and colleges are required to allow free thought and expression as central to their mission. These institutions must even tolerate “ideas we hate” (para. 8). On the other, universities and colleges are becoming more diverse; hostility and intolerance to those “who differ from the majority” (para. 4), especially in the form of hateful speech, may undermine the community. They present their solution in paragraph 7.

4. The writers want to show their understanding of both the complexity of the issue and the legitimate concerns of those who may be the target of offensive or hateful speech. As they concede, “Individuals and groups that have been victims of such expression feel an understandable outrage” (para. 5). The writers concede that arguments in favor of speech regulations “strike a deeply responsive chord in the academy” (para. 5). But they argue that, nevertheless, “by proscribing any ideas, a university sets an example that profoundly serves its academic mission” (para. 5). The writers draw upon a set of ideas and principles to address counterarguments (e.g., “We cannot sanction the view that the Constitution, while solicitous of the cognitive content of individual speech, has little or no regard for that emotive function which, practically speaking, may often be the more important element of the overall message sought to be communicated” (para. 5)).

5. The writers present their suggestions for “deal[ing] with incivility, intolerance, offensive speech, and harassing behavior” in a way that is compatible with the mission of a university. The writers separate it to distinguish it from their exploration and diagnosis of the problem; the list also suggests a proposal, program, or specific course of action.

6. They mean that “free speech” is not just an element or an aspect of higher education among many other elements or aspects, which can be balanced with (or accommodated to) other elements of academia. Rather, from their point of view, it is a necessary precondition — an essential, foundational, even definitional — cornerstone of the university that cannot be removed or diminished without destroying the entire edifice.

Summary of “Progressive Ideas Have Killed Free Speech on Campus” by Wendy Kaminer, p. 175

Writer Wendy Kaminer begins with her personal experience as a panelist at a discussion at Smith College devoted to “challenging the ideological echo chamber” (para. 1). From her perspective, the panel was spirited but inoffensive. But
from the perspective of some of the participants and the campus newspaper, the panel — and Kaminer, in particular — was offensive and hurtful. For Kaminer, this experience is representative of a broader trend in academia. She asks, “How did we get here? How did a verbal defense of free speech become tantamount to a hate crime and offensive words become the equivalent of physical assaults?” (para. 7). In the process of answering these questions, the writer highlights the problem with granting the subjective “feeling realities” of those who may feel slighted or of a victimized unquestionable status. According to Kaminer, these responses “belong in a therapist’s office,” as when they are codified into laws and regulations, “they lead to the soft authoritarianism that now governs many American campuses” (para. 14).

At Issue: How Free Should Free Speech Be? p. 177

1. Kaminer might have explained more thoroughly the context for “challenging the ideological echo chamber” panel in her opening anecdote, as well as given more background on the notion of “trigger warnings,” which she refers to in the first paragraph. She might have provided more historical context, as well: debates about speech codes, “political correctness,” and similar topics have a long history. She might have explained what makes this iteration of the debate — or the problem — distinctive.

2. Her discussion of the panel establishes the context for her argument and introduces her key points. It is an illustrative story about how a rigorous, but seemingly inoffensive, discussion of language and ideas might be described as “an explicit act of racial violence” or an event that makes students “feel unsafe” (para. 5).

3. These rhetorical questions, which anticipate the curiosity of her readers, determine the structure of her argument and the essay itself: Kaminer’s answers to these questions constitute much of what follows.

4. For Kaminer, “feeling realities” are “felt” responses that allow people to define assaults and discrimination by “subjective, emotional responses of self-proclaimed victims” (para. 12). Presumably, this is in contrast to more objective or empirical forms of discrimination and victimization. “Feeling realities” can be dangerous because they encourage the “tendency to take subjective allegations of victimization at face value,” which can lead to “the presumption of guilt and disregard for due process in the progressive approach to alleged sexual assaults on campus” (para. 13). According to Kaminer, they are a “recipe for arbitrary, discriminatory enforcement practices, with far-reaching effects on individual liberty” (para. 13).

5. Kaminer does not provide extensive support for the notion that this is widespread, although she suggests that it is: “These days, when students talk about threats to their safety and demand access to ‘safe spaces,’ they’re often talking about the threat of unwelcome speech and demanding protection from the emotional disturbances sparked by unsettling ideas” (para. 6). She does provide some examples in addition to her own experience, including a debate at Brown University that was canceled. But more instances would help support her implication that this is a large, systemic problem.
6. Kaminer has overlapping purposes. She wants to inform her readers about a current situation ("How did we get here? How did a verbal defense of free speech become tantamount to a hate crime and offensive words become the equivalent of physical assaults?")

Summary of “In College and Hiding from Scary Ideas” by Judith Shulevitz, p. 178

Judith Shulevitz argues that college campuses have become places where students seek to hide from challenging and discomforting views rather than engaging with them. Using a variety of examples, she claims that the concept of the therapeutic “safe space,” where people are sheltered from any troubling ideas, is leaking into classrooms and the campus at large. And that is a problem: “People ought to go to college to sharpen their wits and broaden their field of vision. Shield them from unfamiliar ideas, and they’ll never learn the discipline of seeing the world as other people see it” (para. 16).

At Issue: How Free Should Free Speech Be? p. 182

1. While Shulevitz describes a literal “safe space” at Brown University in paragraph 4, the term (as she explains) has a more general meaning that refers to places where people can be shielded from any viewpoints, speech, attitudes, questions, or ridicule that might make them feel uncomfortable. She writes that in certain contexts, “[a]s long as all parties consent to such restrictions, these little islands of self-restraint seem like a perfectly fine idea” (para. 6). The problem is that the notion that people need protection from discomforting ideas “has a way of leaking out and spreading” (para. 7). So people demand that other spheres — classrooms, for example — become spaces where no one can be challenged or questioned.

2. She means that classrooms need to be places where ideas, viewpoints, and “comfort zones” are challenged and questioned; that process is necessary for intellectual rigor and intellectual growth. That process is incompatible with the idea that classes must be “safe spaces.”

3. Shulevitz relies on inductive reasoning: she uses a variety of specific examples to support the generalization that there is a “conviction, increasingly prevalent among college students, that their schools should keep them from being ‘bombarded’ by discomfiting or distressing viewpoints” (para. 5). This strategy makes sense: the writer wants to argue that a harmful trend exists. So she supports this argument with particular instances.

4. She includes several viewpoints that, either implicitly or explicitly, run counter to her own, as in the cases of Katherine Byron (paras. 1–4) and protesters at Northwestern University (paras. 10–11). Readers might detect some condescension in her account of Emma Hall in the fourth paragraph. But Shulevitz’s most direct and pointed response to a counterargument occurs in paragraph 20, when she addresses the work of Mari J. Matsuda. She quotes Matsuda directly.
and appears to represent her work fairly; then Shulevitz uses the example of Zineb El Rhazoui to challenge Matsuda’s point.

5. Shulevitz appeals primarily to logos, as she uses examples and logical demonstration to make her case.

6. For the most part, this does not undercut her argument. She focuses on an overall climate of anxiety and overprotectiveness, which manifests itself in many ways other than anti-hate speech codes.

**Summary of “Universities Are Right to Crack Down on Speech and Behavior” by Eric Posner, p. 183**

In this provocative essay, legal scholar Eric Posner argues that, in implementing speech codes and other restrictions, colleges and universities are simply giving students what they need — and what they desire: “While critics sometimes give the impression that lefty professors and clueless administrators originated the speech and sex codes, the truth is that universities adopted them because that’s what most students want” (para. 8). He characterizes college students as immature and, therefore, in need of strong guidance. Noting that conservatives and libertarians dislike speech codes and restrictions, Posner argues that they should embrace these rules rather than criticizing them: “Both groups should be pleased that students are kept from harm’s way, and kept from doing harm, until they are ready to accept the responsibilities of adults” (para. 13).

**At Issue: How Free Should Free Speech Be? p. 186**

1. Posner begins with a brief summary of examples to support the claim that a moral panic about speech and sexual activity in universities has reached a crescendo” (para. 1). He might have given specific instances and named particular universities; he might also have provided a clearer definition of “trigger warning.” Yet, the focus of the article is not on the specific measures, but the rationale and the causes behind them.

2. Some readers might see a false dilemma here, as the writer sorts responses to new campus rules into either qualified celebration or outrage. Others might wonder if the writer is engaging in hasty generalizations with regard to the views of liberals, libertarians, and conservatives. Still others might see question begging in the argument at the end of the paragraph: colleges and universities should treat students like children because students are children.

3. Student responses may vary based on their experiences. Most will be able to cite discussion-based courses that went beyond the narrow dictates of professors — although you may want to discuss the “pedagogical value” of allowing students to express their opinions.

4. The writer seems to want to change his readers’ minds about the origins, validity, and effects of speech restrictions on college campuses — particularly readers who are libertarian or conservative. At the beginning of the essay, Posner describes them as “up in arms”; in his conclusion, he urges libertarians to “take heart” and conservatives to “rejoice” at these rules, rather than opposing them.
5. Three possible examples:

- For the claim “Conservatives and libertarians are up in arms” (para. 2), he could quote a range of specific libertarians and conservatives.

- In paragraph 9, Posner writes: “Society seems to be moving the age of majority from 18 to 21 or 22.” He might provide other particular examples of this shift to support this broad claim about “society.”

- In paragraph 12, he claims that “students . . . who, apparently recognizing that their parents and schools have not fully prepared them for independence, want universities to resume their traditional role in loco parentis.” This is another broad generalization about what a large demographic “wants,” which would require hard data or even statistical evidence to substantiate. It does not follow from the existence of contemporary “speech and sex codes” that college students presume or desire what Posner claims.

6. This question should draw a lively range of opinions. Many students might challenge Posner’s claims about their immaturity, especially his suggestion that young people “no longer experience the risks and challenges that breed maturity” (para. 11).

Template for Writing a Deductive Argument, p. 187

This is a sample of a deductive argument as it might appear in the template.

One of the basic principles of the United States is the constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech. With few exceptions, all Americans agree that a vigorous exchange of views — and even tolerance for unpopular or even offensive opinions — is essential to a robust democratic society. In college, students must be prepared to be active and engaged citizens in that society, which means they must learn to think critically, experience different perspectives, and test their own convictions and viewpoints against other perspectives. For example, some students may hold opinions that have never been challenged or questioned. By having the right to express themselves freely, these students can express their opinions and engage with those who have different points of view. Through this process, they may change their minds, or they may have their views confirmed after testing them against the alternatives. Therefore, a free and open discussion can lead to true intellectual growth and, ultimately, a more informed and critically aware democracy. Not everyone agrees with this view, however. Some people argue that university campuses and classrooms should be safe spaces, in which students can feel secure and protected from uncomfortable discussions or ideas that they may find offensive. This argument misses the point. When the a university limits the speech of some students because others may be upset by their comments, they create an authoritarian environment in which people are afraid to speak their minds, test alternative points of view, or challenge certain ideas. For this reason, colleges should not impose speech codes on students in classrooms or on campus.

Template for Writing an Inductive Argument, p. 188

This is a sample of an inductive argument as it might appear in the template.

The number of students demanding protection from distasteful ideas is growing yearly. Some students complain that classrooms are unsafe spaces. These
students fear ridicule, racism, and the daily micro-aggressions that can be hurtful and offensive to those marginalized because of their race, ethnicity, religion, gender identity, or other aspect of their identity. A number of studies have shown that so-called “safe spaces” and trigger warnings go a long way toward calming students’ fears and creating a hospitable learning environment. For example, some students who have been victims of rape might want to know ahead of time if a textbook or an in-class discussion will include a discussion of rape. By knowing this, they can prepare themselves for the topic — or even avoid it in some circumstances — rather than being exposed to material that might cause them trauma or pain. As a result, “trigger warnings,” which simply give such students a “heads-up” that the material might be offensive, hurtful, or otherwise unsettling, have become an effective and courteous way of protecting students from unnecessary emotional harm. The best way for colleges to deal with this problem is to embrace civility, community, and the idea that all students should feel welcome. That might mean recommending trigger warnings, requiring classes to be “safe spaces,” and even curtailing certain kinds of offensive speech that have no place in the classroom. Free speech advocates, however, argue that such considerations may limit the kinds of speech and ideas that can be expressed on campus. Although this may be true, it is also true that hurtful, offensive, or cruel speech serves no real educational function in a welcoming academic community. For this reason, it would make sense to support the university as it institutes speech codes that protect students while also keeping the school’s academic discussions as vigorous and open as possible.

Exercise 5.13, p. 188
This exercise asks each student to interview several of his or her classmates and instructors about college accommodations for students with disabilities and then to revise the drafts of the paragraphs they wrote in Exercises 5.13 and 5.14 accordingly.

Teaching tip: When students are interviewing one another, remind them that they should be jotting down the reasons that their interviewees either agree or disagree that colleges should do more to accommodate students with disabilities. These notes should provide the students with specific observations or opinions that they can then use as support in their paragraphs. You may also want to remind students to write some of the more salient comments down word for word and quote them in their revisions.

Exercise 5.14, p. 189
This exercise asks students to put all their reading and discussion to work by constructing an essay that is either for or against more accommodations for disabled college students. Students are instructed to refer to the readings on pages 165–186 and to use primarily inductive or deductive reasoning while arguing their points. Remind students that they’ll need to document any sources they use, and be sure to discuss your expectations for source documentation (and refer students to Chapter 10 for documentation help).

Exercise 5.15, p. 189
This exercise asks students to return to the essay they wrote for Exercise 5.14 to see if they committed any logical fallacies. If their essays contain any fallacies, they
should underline them, correct them on a separate sheet of paper, and then revise their drafts accordingly.

**Teaching tip:** Oftentimes finding fallacies in one's own work can be difficult, so you may want to suggest that students exchange papers and identify logical fallacies in one another's work.

**Exercise 5.16, p. 189**

Finally, this exercise asks students to go back to Chapter 1 and review the four pillars of argument. Then students should return to their own essays and be able to identify these four elements in their own work. If anything is missing, they should revise accordingly.

**Teaching tip:** If students have trouble with this exercise, you may suggest that they first return to one of the essays on pages 165–186 and identify the four pillars of argument there; then, with this practice, students can return to their own work with a fresh eye.
Rogerian Argument, Toulmin Logic, and Oral Arguments

This chapter helps students to identify and write three major forms of argument — Rogerian, Toulmin, and oral. For each form, the chapter first explains the structure and writing; then includes a sample student essay, labeled with each of the form’s major elements; and concludes with a list that distills the pattern of each form’s structure of argumentation. The At Issue topic for this chapter is distance learning; since most universities now offer a variety of online courses, the growing debate about distance learning is likely to pique student interest — some may even have personal experiences to share.

**Teaching tip:** Because Rogerian, Toulmin, and oral arguments differ significantly, don't try to cover all three in one class period. In fact, if you want students to learn the nuances of each form, teach one a day, and have students compare and contrast the forms; this approach will ensure that students can differentiate one form from another.

**Understanding Rogerian Argument, p. 192**

Challenging the notion that argument must be confrontational, psychologist Carl Rogers suggested that by finding common ground, by considering so-called opponents more as colleagues, and by searching for cooperation, a writer or speaker is more likely to find a mutually agreeable solution.

**Teaching tip:** Ask students to consider one unsuccessful argument they’ve recently made and to identify why it was unsuccessful; it’s likely that the argument failed because students were too combative or unwilling to see the merit of a different perspective. Then have students write about how their argument differed from a Rogerian approach, and ask them to consider whether or not making a Rogerian argument would have led to a more successful outcome.
Structuring Rogerian Arguments, p. 193

Noting the differences between Rogerian argument and traditional argument, the text here gives the example of writing to the manufacturer about a broken video game console. In the example, the console breaks a week after its warranty expires, and a store can do nothing for the consumer. Stressing the interest the company has in maintaining consumer satisfaction and, thus, purchasing loyalty, the letter is not confrontational but cooperative.

Exercise 6.1, p. 195

This exercise asks students to choose an At Issue topic from any chapter in the book and write a sentence stating an opinion on the issue. Students should then attempt to plan a Rogerian argument by (1) listing two areas of common concern they might share with someone who holds the opposite position, (2) summarizing the main concerns of someone who holds the opposite position, (3) summarizing their own views, and (4) writing a sentence that explains how their views might benefit individuals (including the opposition) or society in general.

For example, a student might choose to write about the higher education debate discussed in Chapter 1 of this book. He or she might support the position that too many people attend four-year colleges and that high school graduates should weigh other options before pursuing a traditional degree. He or she might note common concerns and areas of agreement: the hope that people make the most of their talents; the need for people to find careers that provide financial stability and personal satisfaction; and the desire for a prosperous American economy. Then, he or she might summarize the opposing argument: in the past, college has always been a good financial investment, as well as a key to social mobility and a well-paying job; higher education also gives students an appreciation of history, culture, and ideas. In contrast, the summary of his or her own view might focus on the high cost of college, the problem of student debt, the high unemployment rate of graduates, and the various options that might be better choices than a traditional four-year college, including trade schools and online programs. The final point might focus on the educational, economic, and social changes that are making a college education increasingly unnecessary.

Writing Rogerian Arguments, p. 195

Rogerian arguments are typically used to address controversial issues in a quest for compromise. The text also suggests that while Rogerian arguments may produce an entire essay, they may also function as part of a more traditional argument—for example, as the refutation sections of a more traditional argument. Here the chapter also contains a useful feature that explains how a Rogerian argument can be structured.

Exercise 6.2, p. 196

This exercise directs students to read “Why Cell Phones Do Not Belong in the Classroom” and to answer questions (p. 199) about the essay’s structure as a Rogerian argument. You will find a brief summary of the essay and sample responses to those questions below.
Sample Student Essay: “Why Cell Phones Do Not Belong in the Classroom”
by Zoya Kahn, p. 196

Modeling a Rogerian argument, this student author argues that it is fair for college instructors to prohibit students from using cell phones in class.

Identifying the Elements of a Rogerian Argument, p. 199

1. In the first paragraph, the writer anticipates that both students and instructors understand that cell phone use and texting can be “disruptive.” She establishes the shared view that universities require a “respectful learning environment,” and that cell phone use undercuts that goal. Throughout the essay, she uses phrases like “everyone’s interest” (para. 1) to build rapport. She could have also suggested that both students and professors benefit when all the individuals in a classroom are engaged and attentive.

2. Kahn states her position in paragraph three, where she presents most of her evidence. She cites studies that show how cell phones impair the performance of students, decrease their ability to focus, and lessen their ability to retain class material. In paragraph 4, the writer refers to findings from a cell phone company suggesting that cell phones can “detract from school safety and crisis preparedness.”

3. Readers should notice that Kahn opens her essay with student concerns about the fairness of cell phone bans. However, she addresses opposing points of view primarily in the second paragraph: that cell phones make students “reachable” in any on- or off-campus emergency; that only a few students misuse their phones, so restricting usage for the entire class is unfair; that most students are honest and courteous about using phones; those who are not honest and courteous will disregard phone restrictions, in any case.

4. The conclusion emphasizes the validity of student concerns, while affirming that “it is also fair for instructors to ask students to turn [cell phones] off during class” (6). Kahn places responsibility on the instructors to use their authority in a respectful way, by limiting cell phone use “only when necessary” (6). Instead of highlighting conflict, she focuses on “everyone’s best interest”: the integrity of classrooms, the academic success of students.

5. If Kahn had chosen to write this as a traditional argument, she would have focused less on compromise, counterarguments, and areas of shared agreement. Instead of writing a thesis that highlighted “everyone’s interest,” she might have taken a less accommodating approach to the perspectives of students. Likewise, she could have placed more emphasis on supporting her position — perhaps by expanding on the evidence in paragraph 4.

Understanding Toulmin Logic, p. 199

Philosopher Stephen Toulmin noticed that formal logic rarely accounts for the arguments waged in everyday life. In *The Uses of Argument* (1958), Toulmin names and defines the structure of these everyday arguments, which have three main parts: claim (usually stated as a thesis), grounds (evidence to support the claim), and
warrant (the stated or implied inference that connects a writer’s claims to his or her grounds).

*Teaching tip:* Remind students that Toulmin logic is useful for constructing arguments but that a sound argument using Toulmin logic can be made only if students avoid the logical fallacies covered in Chapter 5.

**Constructing Toulmin Arguments,** p. 200

As Toulmin observed, arguments require more than a claim, grounds, and warrant. The full model that he identifies begins with but builds onto these elements. The text identifies and defines seven elements of a Toulmin argument: claim, reason, warrant, backing, grounds, qualifiers, and rebuttals.

*Teaching tip:* Because this argument structure will be new to most of your students, it is helpful to give several in-class examples of arguments you have already covered in class. For example, consider returning to the debate about the value of a college education (Chapter 1) or media violence (Chapters 2 and 3) to find topics for which students can build Toulmin arguments.

**Exercise 6.3,** p. 201

This exercise asks students to choose an At Issue topic by looking through the text’s table of contents and constructing a Toulmin outline for the topic. The text provides a list of the Toulmin elements and lines on which to write. As suggested above, using examples from chapters already covered as a class can teach these concepts and reinforce those previously covered.

- **Claim:** A college education is worth the costs.
- **Grounds:** (supports the claim) Evidence that shows how a college degree leads to greater fulfillment, social mobility, and economic prosperity.
- **Warrant:** People want financial success, personal satisfaction, and national prosperity.
- **Backing:** (supports the warrant) Evidence that shows the need for educated citizens and an educated workforce in a global economy; problems caused by the lack of education.
- **Qualifiers:** Not every American should get a four-year college degree.
- **Rebuttals:** Refute claims that college is too costly; refute claims that college no longer leads to financial success, personal satisfaction, or national prosperity.

**Writing Toulmin Arguments,** p. 202

This portion of the text compares Toulmin arguments with the classical model and suggests that Toulmin’s focus is more realistic and useful in its consideration of opposing arguments. Unlike the classical model, which presents ideas as absolute
facts, the Toulmin model concedes that these are opinions even though they advance a particular argument. A list shows where in an essay each element of a Toulmin argument occurs; a sample student essay follows.

Exercise 6.4, p. 203
This exercise directs students to read “Competitive Cheerleaders Are Athletes” and to answer questions (p. 205) about the essay’s structure as a Toulmin argument. You will find a brief summary of the essay and sample responses to those questions below.

Sample Student Essay: “Competitive Cheerleaders Are Athletes” by Jen Davis, p. 203
Modeling a Toulmin argument, the student author argues that competitive cheerleaders are athletes; elements of the argument are labeled in the essay and in the margins of the text.

Identifying the Elements of Toulmin Argument, p. 205
1. While answers will vary, students should provide a summary such as the following: Cheerleaders should be recognized as athletes. The grounds for the argument can be worded as follows: Competitive cheerleaders engage in a physically demanding, often risky team activity that pits them in competition and meets any reasonable definition of “sport.” The warrant can be stated as follows: Recognizing cheerleaders as athletes will help them give them the respect and support that they deserve.

2. Opinions about this argument’s backing will vary. Davis might have included more specific details about the consequences of not viewing cheerleading as a sport — perhaps specific examples of funding problems, limits on participation, or evidence of disrespect toward cheerleaders.

3. Davis qualifies her argument several times. She concedes that while competitive cheerleading is a sport, this does not mean that “all cheerleaders are athletes or that all cheerleading is a sport” (para. 4). Moreover, she acknowledges that the NCAA has a good reason to be cautious about redefining sports. The writer’s main qualification is that cheerleading is a “competitive” team sport. But she might have chosen to broaden her argument beyond competitive cheerleading. For example, cheerleaders who lead fans in cheering on teams may also perform physically demanding stunts or “maintain impressive levels of physical fitness” (3), but given Davis’s qualifications, they are not “athletes.”

4. According to Davis, critics see cheerleading as “entertainment that occurs on the sidelines of real sporting events” (1). While their view seems to beg the question (it simply assumes that there are “real sports” and exhibitions), Davis might explain further why cheerleading is not merely an exhibition, like a pageant or a dancing competition. Student responses to this question will vary, but some may offer further objections for rebuttal, such as the following:
   - The distinction between cheerleaders who lead fans in cheers and competitive cheerleaders needs to be explained further.
recognizing cheerleading as a sport might be a slippery slope to the reclassification of innumerable activities, which could become a problem under Title IX.

5. Once they understand the Toulmin model, students generally like that it provides a rubric for a well-planned and easy-to-follow argument with prescribed elements and locations for the elements. Other students may see these qualities as disadvantages because they can make arguments formulaic, and they might discount more nuanced approaches—particularly in accounting for others’ perspectives, as the Rogerian argument does.

Understanding Oral Arguments, p. 206

Like written arguments, oral arguments have an introduction, body, and conclusion; they also address and refute opposing points of view. However, there are differences in presentation because the audience listens rather than reads. The text suggests that students use transitional phrases (“my first point,” “let me sum up,” etc.) to guide their audience; use simple, direct language; repeat key information; and include visuals.

Planning an Oral Argument, p. 206

This portion of the text suggests some tips for constructing a more effective oral argument; choosing a good topic, knowing one’s audience and time limit, identifying the thesis statement, preparing speaking notes, using visual aids, and practicing are a few of the suggestions offered.

**Teaching tip:** Consider drawing these tips into classroom conversation by having students identify topics that might work as oral arguments; ask students to consider each numbered tip and the way they might account for it in an oral argument on the topics they’ve identified. This type of practice planning will help them as they prepare to write and deliver their own oral arguments.

Here the text also discusses in greater detail how to choose and prepare visual aids; since preparation may cause anxiety for some students, spend some time brainstorming about how to make visual aids, stressing that neither handmade posters nor computer programs like Microsoft’s PowerPoint are the only options.

**Exercise 6.5, p. 210**

This exercise asks students to select three At Issue topics that they might deliver as an oral argument and to list three possible visual aids for each.

**Teaching tip:** Repeatedly drawing from one topic for in-class examples may help students see how they can argue in different ways. Here again, we draw from the debate about whether a college education is worth the money.

*Visuals for an oral argument in favor of drinking tap water*

- Graph showing the unemployment rate for college graduates versus those with only high school diplomas
• Graph showing the difference in the lifetime earnings of college graduates versus those with only high school diplomas
• Handouts showing job growth in fields and sectors that require highly trained workers
• Chart that shows less well-known correlations between earning a college degree and lower divorce rates, better health, or longer life spans

Delivery of Oral Arguments, p. 210
Delivery is one of the most important parts of oral argument; the text offers students several helpful pointers to consider before delivery, including speaking slowly and clearly, moving purposefully, and accepting some degree of nervousness.

Teaching tip: Since most students will not have had extensive experience speaking in public, the thought of delivery will frequently cause anxiety. Help prepare students to speak in front of their classmates from the beginning of the semester — consider using introductory ice-breaking activities to acquaint students with one another, require students to speak in class once a week as part of their participation grade, or actively build speaking activities into your lesson planning (such as group work that includes a presentation of the group’s discussion or findings).

Composing an Oral Argument, p. 213
You might acknowledge that many people first fully write out arguments they intend to present orally and then prepare speaking notes from their full-text versions — this may be a good suggestion to emphasize in class, particularly for first-time speakers with fears. The text also includes an outline for an oral argument.

Exercise 6.6, p. 214
This exercise directs students to read “An Argument in Support of the ‘Gap Year’” and to answer questions about the essay’s structure as an oral argument. You will find a brief summary of the essay and sample responses to those questions below.

Modeling the typical organization of an oral argument (outlined on p. 213), this student author argues in favor of a “gap year” — working or studying abroad for a year before attending college or taking a year off during college.

Identifying the Elements of an Oral Argument, p. 220
1. For transitions, students will likely indicate the final sentence of the first paragraph (“As the rest of my speech”), the second sentence of the third paragraph (“This slide shows”), and the first sentence of the final paragraph (“After considering the benefits”).
Teaching tip: Consider asking students if these transitions are clear enough or where and how students might add additional transitions.

2. Opinions about the author’s use of simple, direct language will vary; the author’s topic sentences are particularly clear and direct. Some students may point to the fifth paragraph as ripe for simplification; the author reintroduces a scholar she mentioned at the beginning of the speech by last name only, which should be clarified again for the audience. Students may also point to specific words for simplification.

3. The argument does repeat key information; importantly, the author’s thesis names three specific reasons for supporting a gap year — reasons that she then repeats in the topic sentence of each paragraph following. Perhaps the author could structure topic sentences to repeat the previous key idea as she announces the next — for example, paragraph 4 might begin as follows: In addition to increasing student’s options while in school, a gap year may also help students gain admission to a better school.

4. The speaker identifies the opposing arguments as “parental concerns about ‘slackerdom’ and money.” Although she addresses them, the writer could more fully refute them than she does here by, for instance, discussing how some of the resources listed on Slide 4 include guidance on setting goals, providing structure, and obtaining funding.

5. Answers and opinions will vary, but some may suggest including a more detailed handout, photos of gap-year projects, or a testimonial excerpt from a “gapster.”

6. Students could have a number of questions for the speaker; this would make a good class exercise.

Reading and Writing about the Issue:
Is Online Education Better Than Classroom Education? p. 221

Returning to the debate about online education from the beginning of the chapter, this section collects opinion columns and Web sites responding to this debate. Each essay and image is followed by an At Issue section with several questions about structure; you will find here a brief summary of each written argument and sample responses to questions.

Teaching tip: Try beginning this section with a classroom debate about online education. Because this issue directly affects students, a lively debate will encourage students to think through argumentation — to raise claims and provide evidence of their own — before reading the opinions of others. As you may have students who have tried distance learning, this debate will also give them an opportunity to reflect on and speak from experience. As students debate, you might make a list of pros and cons on the board, laptop, or transparency. Revisit this list after students have read the sources in this section, and have them consider how their views have changed.
Summary of “The Evolution of Online Schooling” (infographic), p. 223

The infographic presents a timeline of online learning that reaches back to early attempts to use radio for remote education. The visual also includes more recent milestones in online education, such as the introduction of Moodle in 2001 and the establishment of Harvard Open Courses in 2012.

At Issue: Sources for Using Alternative Approaches to Argument, p. 223

1. The purpose is to show the steady and robust development of online education, an evolution that stretches back before the Internet to earlier remote technologies such as radio and television. The infographic also emphasizes the contemporary prevalence of online learning, as it notes that now twice as many people earn online degrees than those who get traditional degrees.

2. The infographic seems to be addressing those considering an online degree or simply weighing their different options in higher education. This touting of online education’s history and success might persuade perspective students to investigate such programs.

3. The main message seems to be: From its humble beginnings, the development of online learning has been a story of technological innovation, increased access to higher education, and educational success for many graduates.

4. The creators of the infographic include an implicit appeal to ethos by including references to their sources. While many visual presentations avoid citations, their inclusion here does add to the credibility of the infographic — presuming that readers find the sources credible.

5. Responses may vary based on visual preferences and aesthetic tastes. The infographic has both strengths and weaknesses. The bold typography in each section of the timeline helps highlight the significance of each milestone. But some may find the icons (logos, company names, graphics) distracting. Likewise, some might argue that the inclusion of early phenomenon such as “radio education” in the 1930s is superfluous. You might ask students if this information could be presented in a different form of timeline — perhaps one that was oriented horizontally instead of vertically.

6. This should spark a discussion of what is really significant about online education. For example, some may find the early history of remote education less important than the fact that twice as many people now earn degrees online as they do at traditional universities. Others may highlight the moments when highly prestigious institutions such as Duke University and Harvard began participating in online education.

Summary of “The Risks and Rewards of Online Learning” by Chris Bustamante, p. 224

As president of Rio Salado, the country’s largest online community college, Chris Bustamante argues that “online learning is an increasingly vital part of producing the number of qualified graduates needed to meet future workforce demands — when
it is done correctly” (para. 5). Bustamante suggests that his school’s development and success provide a model for Web-based learning. According to the writer, the stakes are high and the need for education is a national imperative: “Our country can’t continue to allow millions of people who are college material to fall through the cracks” (17). He believes that affordable, innovative, online learning is a key to meeting that need.

At Issue: Sources for Using Alternative Approaches to Argument, p. 226

1. By “healthy skepticism,” Bustamante means that people are justified in questioning the value of online education. Online education is a relatively new development; some want to see evidence that it is effective and worthwhile. The writer concedes that this is an understandable response. Students may have their own responses and questions. For example, they may wonder whether employers will take Web-based degrees as seriously as traditional four-year college degrees.

2. The claim is in paragraph 5: “Any way you look at it, online learning is an increasingly vital part of producing the number of qualified graduates needed to meet future workforce demands — when it is done correctly.” That final qualification sets up the essay: Bustamante shows how Rio Salado does online education “correctly.”

3. While Bustamante focuses on the example of one school, many of his points could be applicable to other college programs: the extensive use of adjunct faculty, virtual library services, and its “corporate ‘systems approach’” (12). He also notes that creating a successful school “won’t happen overnight” (12). Students will weigh the risks and rewards in different ways. Other schools may not have the same faculty, resources, organizational skills, or student population as Rio Salado.

4. Bustamante’s purpose is to persuade readers — especially those with “healthy skepticism” — that online learning can be effective, especially at a time when the country needs a more highly trained workforce. He wants to show Rio Salado as an innovative and “cost effective” model of “new, convenient, and high-quality educational options for students who might otherwise have missed out on a college education” (17). He also wants readers to understand that online education has adapted and improved over the last decade and a half.

5. Bustamante does not address specific counterarguments, although he considers the view of skeptics generally (4). He explains how Rio Salado works, and he touts its strengths, resources, and relatively low costs. But he might have anticipated those who would ask about graduation rates, job placements for graduates, and other indicators of a successful degree program.

6. In Bustamante’s view, our current higher system is too expensive; it also “allows millions of people who are college material to fall through the cracks” at a time when the country needs a more highly educated workforce. He believes that online learning can help improve these problems by providing low-cost education, training, skills, certifications, and licensure to “more students in more
places” (17). For example, the flexibility of Web-based courses can be “customized” for the “complex” lives of non-traditional students (10). The idea of re-imagining has another connotation. Most people imagine higher education as a traditional, four-year experience on an idyllic college campus. Bustamante wants to change people’s image so that it includes institutions of online learning.

Summary of “Reliance on Online Materials Hinders Learning Potential for Students” by David Smith, p. 228

In this student newspaper opinion column, David Smith argues that the Internet has made learning “easier,” but not “better” (para. 8). He acknowledges the benefits of new technologies: databases like EBSCO that give access to information, social Web sites like Facebook that encourage connections between people, and programs like Blackboard that help organize academic life. Ultimately, however, he believes that students need the structure, discipline, and deadlines provided by face-to-face classes: “There will never be an adequate online substitute for the watchful eye and the stern voice of a professor . . .” (16).

At Issue: Sources for Using Alternative Approaches to Argument, p. 230

1. The thesis implied in paragraph 8 can be rephrased: While the Internet has made learning easier, it has not made learning better.

2. The first seven paragraphs establish that the Internet and other technologies suffuse the lives of students, often in beneficial ways. These specific examples also support his claim that the Internet has “made learning easier” (8).

3. Smith misapplies the phrase “begs the question”: he uses it to mean “raises the question,” or “leads us to ask.” Begging the question is a form of circular reasoning and a logical fallacy. In its most obvious form, people beg the question when they support a statement by rephrasing the statement in different words.

4. According to Smith, traditional classroom courses provide “structure and organization” (10). Students must attend classes and complete assignments under the “ever present” professor, or face consequences. In contrast, online courses remove the “sense of structure”; without the regular face-to-face interaction with instructors, students feel no urgency or motivation.

5. The writer supports his assertion with anecdotal evidence in paragraph 11 and hypothetical examples in paragraph 14.

6. Smith means that the Internet is a means to an end — to get information, to make connections, to organize courses and academic life — and not the end in itself. He is warning students and professors not to confuse convenience and access to information with education.

7. He uses Rogerian argument when he acknowledges common ground with those who might disagree with him. He even begins his column by encouraging students to be “thankful” for the ways technology enables their education.
Smith concedes that the Internet is a “powerful tool” that can offer more “information than even the most practiced scholar would know what to do with” (6). He might have chosen a more Rogerian approach when describing courses taken through online services. His characterization of these classes leaves little room for common ground.

8. Student responses will vary. You might discuss his description of watchful, stern-voiced instructors, who seem to function almost entirely as disciplinarians rather than, say, motivators or figures who introduce students to the pleasures of learning.

Summary of “Online Education Needs Connection” by Elena Kadvany, p. 231

Elena Kadvany argues that the “idea of a virtual university should not replace the traditional, but instead should merge with it” (para. 11). She sees the real value of online courses, especially for a generation that spends so much time on the Internet. But she thinks that “there’s no match for the value of real-time, person-to-person educational experiences” (15). She proposes a hybrid model that takes advantage of both.

At Issue: Sources for Using Alternative Approaches to Argument, p. 232

1. Students may disagree over this question, depending on how they interpret the essays. The verb “pit” implies a zero-sum battle. But several of the essays here (including Kadvany’s own) endorse both online learning and traditional classroom courses. The debate seems characterized by tension and ambivalence, not hostility. Even John Crisp (“Short Distance Learning,” p. 233) is careful not to “disparage” online education.

2. Kadvany uses the term “business model” to suggest that some view the mission of colleges and universities in financial terms instead of educational terms. These people see the cost-effectiveness of online courses, but they may not consider the effects of this model on academic quality. In this context, “business model” carries a subtle negative connotation.

3. After the financial crisis, people became more conscious of costs and more wary of debt. Schools have responded to this demand by trying to “reinvent themselves” accordingly. For some prospective students, online education seems to promise career-focused higher education at a much lower price than a traditional four-year degree. Colleges and universities see financial opportunities in this model. But according to Kadvany, these institutions must avoid becoming too enamored of online learning: “Higher learning, however, is about a level of personal interaction and commitment that cannot be re-created online” (9).

4. Kadvany does not provide evidence to support this generalization. After she makes the claim, Kadvany describes her positive experience with a “hybrid” Spanish class; however, she does not use the anecdote to illustrate the “personal interaction and commitment” in any concrete way. The writer might
have explained how the Spanish class supported her point. She might have also provided other evidence to show that face-to-face learning leads to better educational outcomes.

5. The writer endorses a compromise throughout the essay. In her view, universities should take advantage of both online learning and traditional, face-to-face courses. However, her argument could be more explicitly Rogerian. In her second paragraph, she notes a stark divide between supporters of online learning and supporters of traditional education. Kadvany might have used a Rogerian strategy by establishing some shared agreement between both sides of this debate. One presumes, for example, that all of these people want prospective students to have good opportunities for a quality education at a reasonable cost.

Summary of “Short Distance Learning” by John Crisp, p. 233

Professor John Crisp accepts that Web-based education is a major trend at colleges and universities. He argues, however, that traditional face-to-face courses “preserve a fine touch of humanity” that online learning cannot replace (para. 4). Recounting the stories of his students, Crisp presents his classroom as a “rich mixture of human experiences in one ephemeral microcosm” (13).

At Issue: Sources for Using Alternative Approaches to Argument, p. 234

1. Crisp appeals to ethos in different ways throughout the essay. For example, he notes the amount of time he has spent with his students over the course of 15 weeks; this suggests that he has gotten to know his classes as “communities” and that he understands his students as individual human beings (1). But Crisp builds his credibility in other ways as well. He admits that he is in “no position” to criticize proponents of online education (2); he implicitly admits his own limitations as an instructor (7); clearly, he cares about the overall well-being of his students: “A young man came to class so depressed that I took him to one of the college’s counselors . . . ” (11). His assessments seem honest, rather than self-serving. As his argument focuses on the “humanity” of traditional college classes, this deliberately modest style reflects his own humanity.

2. On one level, this essay is a personal “reflection,” as Crisp implies in the first sentence. He presents his essay as an address to students, as well; this audience is implied by the last sentence. But his argument also seems aimed at all proponents of online education — students, parents, administrators, and policy makers — who may believe that traditional classes are obsolete or unnecessary. As he asks in paragraph 12, “Does that happen in online classes?” His question — and its implied answer, “No” — is directed at that audience.

3. His purpose is to illustrate the “fine touch of humanity” evident in face-to-face college courses. Crisp’s examples support this aim; they show how traditional classrooms function as a “microcosm” of rich human experiences. Online learning cannot perform that function, according to the writer.
4. Crisp means that traditional classrooms are communities of human beings with deeply personal connections. This community amounts to more than course content, a grade, or even a set of skills: “So we learned about more than just writing this semester” (10). The relationships between instructors and students, and students and other students, reveal the essence of humanity: “birth, mating, sickness, death, frustration, laughter, storytelling, aspiration, failure, and learning” (13). Crisp’s examples support this claim well. He does not believe that online learning can replace these human relationships or create similar communities.

5. Students may disagree over logos, pathos, and ethos in Crisp’s column. His argument relies primarily on pathos (his examples), so that would be the longest side of the triangle. But Crisp does not appeal to his readers’ emotions to mislead them or cover over facts. Indeed, his point is that the classroom allows for a range of human experiences and human emotions, as he notes in paragraph 13. He would have a hard time capturing the “fine touch of humanity” with statistics, charts, and graphs. Yet, his specific examples function as an appeal to logic: the reader can “know” this humanity exists from the instances he recounts in paragraphs 5 to 12. He leaves open the question of whether this touch of humanity is essential to a good education.

6. Crisp writes, “Proponents [of online learning] contend that a community of learners can develop among students scattered by geography but connected by the Internet, and I’m not in a position to say they’re wrong” (2). For its proponents, however, the primary appeal of online learning is usually other qualities such as cost or convenience. Few people would argue that Internet-based classes are better at creating real human communities than face-to-face classes. Crisp might have cited a specific “proponent” to make his point; he might also have more specifically explained why the “fine touch of humanity” is important in higher education.

7. The last sentence is a deliberate — and effective — understatement: given the “rich mixture of human experiences” in his classes, this final line implies that the “pleasure” is deep, meaningful, and rewarding in a way no online class could reproduce. His “good luck” is also poignant, given the aspirations, struggles, and tragedies of the semester. Students may disagree about whether Crisp should have ended the essay after the summing-up in paragraph 13.

8. Student responses to this question will vary. An oral version of this argument might have a stronger, sharper thesis in the first or second paragraph. Crisp could also simplify his third sentence; its multiple numbers might be difficult to process with the ear. He could simply add up the hours he has spent with his students (perhaps including his time spent reading their work) and use this larger number. The argument could use more repetition of Crisp’s main claims to reinforce them. So after giving a specific example, he could repeat his point about the “fine touch of humanity,” or even repeat his key question: “Does that happen in online classes?” His argument does not lend itself to obvious charts, diagrams, or graphs. However, he could include some visuals.
A comparison of class sizes between an online university (which may have thousands of students in a course) and his own classroom

- Images of specific students to accompany their stories
- A handout or transparency showing the specific work of a student
- Some visual representation of the “ephemeral microcosm,” which could reinforce the various aspects of humanity in paragraph 13

Summary of “A Plea for Close Learning” by Scott L. Newstok, p. 236

In this essay, Scott Newstok addresses the increasing prevalence of — and enthusiasm for — online learning by reminding readers that the most effective education must involve “close learning”: the spontaneous, focused, creative, and often laborious collaboration between instructors and students as they tackle topics, problems, questions, and texts. For Newstok, who remains skeptical of online learning programs, proximity and presence are an essential part of the educational process: “As retrograde as it might sound, gathering humans in a room with real time for dialogue still matters” (para. 16).

At Issue: Sources for Using Alternative Approaches to Argument, p. 240

1. Newstok wanted to jolt his readers with the realization that enthusiasm for — and debates about — “distance learning” is not new at all. His strategy is effective. It not only gives historical context for his argument, but immediately raises the larger themes — about technology and proximity, for example — that his essay explores.

2. He means that MOOCs and other online programs can deliver prerecorded lectures, pedagogical materials, online discussion forums, academic assignments, and other educational material and platforms for distance students to use or consume. But he wonders if thinking in terms of such “content” misses important aspects of education: presence, closeness, personal interaction, and other elements that he ascribes to “close learning” (para. 5).

3. By “close learning,” he means the instruction and intellectual (and presumably, personal) development that arises from “the laborious, time-consuming, and costly but irreplaceable proximity between teacher and student” (para. 6). As one example, he offers the model of the “old fashioned Socratic seminar,” where “students and teachers are always at a crossroads, collaboratively deciding where to go and where to stop; how to navigate and how to detour . . .” (para. 7). In contrast, online education presumes that “passively seeing” is the equivalent of “learning” (para. 7).

4. In paragraph 4, in a Rogerian concession to those who may disagree with him, he writes that many supporters of MOOCs “speak from laudably egalitarian impulses to provide access for disadvantaged students.” But he anticipates objections and counterarguments most explicitly in paragraphs 14 and 15,
Part 2  Reading and Responding to Arguments

where he addresses critics who might mistake “[d]evotion to close learning” for an “anti-technology stance.” He maintains that close learning is “entirely compatible” with new forms of media and technology (para. 14). His refutation here is effective, although he might have elaborated more on how to increase the accessibility of “close learning,” as he suggests in his final paragraph.

5. A Toulmin analysis of the argument might consider the following elements:

The Claim:  As online learning becomes more prevalent, we need to make sure that we make sure the end goal is close learning, which is best achieved in the traditional classroom.

The Warrant:  We — educators, the business world, and society, among others — want students who are creative, persistent, spontaneous, focused, and engaged with both their course material and other human beings, rather than passive consumers of educational “content” or information.

The Grounds:  “Close learning” conventions, like the Socratic seminar, enable creative, collaborative, spontaneous, and focused learning; students can ask for clarifications; teachers can shift the class’s attention to keep them focused; “blended” or “flipped” classrooms are more effective than their purely online counterparts; MOOCs have low completion rates. Newstok appeals primarily to logos in this argument, but he also deploys ethos, particularly when he draws on his own teaching experiences to illustrate how “close learning” is compatible with new media and technologies: “I teach Shakespeare, supposedly one of the mustiest of topics. Yet my students navigate the vast resources of the Internet . . .” (para. 14).

6. Newstok uses both deductive and inductive logic in this essay, but the structure of the argument is primarily deductive. He establishes a general premise or definition of “close learning” as both the best form — and best goal — of education. He then argues that traditional classroom instruction, such as the Socratic seminar, has been the best way to achieve close learning, in contrast to most online learning, which too often privileges the passive viewing of instructional materials at a distance. He therefore remains highly skeptical of online education, as it provides access to educational “content,” but it may not be providing opportunities for “close learning”.

Summary of “Old Flames and New Beacons” by Ray McNulty, p. 241

In this article, Ray McNulty provides a full-throated endorsement of online learning — flipped classrooms, blended classrooms, and supported distance learning — as the bold new frontier of learning: “Striking a match on the correspondence school model, technology has ignited a virtual wildfire of prospects for education” (para. 2). He seeks
to debunk myths and erroneous misperceptions about these programs and reassure educators that online schools (such as his own institution, Penn Foster) provide both a rewarding learning experience and practical training that help their graduates succeed.

**At Issue: Sources for Using Alternative Approaches to Argument**, p. 244

1. The title refers to an illustrative moment from the writer’s experience: he sees a video of a pop music concert. Traditionally, audience members held up lighters at concerts; now, they hold up their glowing cellphones, which achieve a similar, glowing effect. He uses this as a metaphor: technology-enabled online learning (“new beacons” of light) can improve on the effects and benefits of traditional in-class learning (“old flames”). The metaphor also evokes the traditional conception of learning as “enlightenment.”

2. According to the writer, students “know nothing firsthand about, or can scarcely remember, a time before laptops and cellphones” (para. 3). Implicitly, they are comfortable and fluent with technology and (he argues later in the essay) embrace it as part of their education. However, many educators “still do not take full advantage of [technology] in their teaching” because they are “flummoxed” by a dilemma: “If they integrate virtual learning strategies, will they work themselves into obsolescence? If they maintain the status quo, will they be able to fully engage students?” (para. 3). You might want to ask students if McNulty overstates the value and role of new technologies in the education process.

3. In the “flipped classroom,” the professor posts recorded lectures and other digital material online, which students view and study; class meetings are then freed-up for discussion, application, and the reinforcement of the material. The “blended classroom” mixes in-class lectures with online assignments, “giving students opportunities for both group and independent learning” (para. 6). “Supported distance learning” delivers online course material to students remotely, with little or no actual classroom learning. He discusses these models so readers — educators, in particular — understand the variety of online learning; his discussion also allows him to tout the benefits of each model for different kinds of learners, topics, and educational goals.

4. He explores these myths in paragraphs 8 through 15. The myths include: distance learning is only for adults (paras. 9–10); employers do not value online credentials (para. 11); hybrid and online learning are effective only for studying “academic” subjects, not learning more practical hands-on skills (para. 12); online students are isolated and unsupported (para. 14); good teaching is less important in online learning (para. 15). McNulty rebuts these myths in different ways, from showing that 100% of students who took his own online school’s veterinary technician program passed the credentialing exam (para. 12) to his highly rhetorical assertions about the role of good teachers in online education (e.g., good teachers are still those who “aspire to inspire” (para. 15)). Readers might question some of his arguments: for example, the fact that all the Penn Foster students passed a credentialing exam does not necessarily “debunk” the
notion that distance learners must go it alone, without the valuable and vibrant dialogue from teachers and peers…” (para. 13). It merely means that students in this one applied field passed a credentialing exam.

5. Student responses may vary. The headings do give shape and structure to the essay; they alert the reader to the general focus of each section. So, for example, the series of paragraphs debunking common perceptions of online learning programs is designated: “Snuffing out the Myths.”

6. McNulty’s intended audience appears to be teachers and professors. This becomes most obvious in his closing sentence: “As an educator, how will you choose to light up learning?” But the article seems designed, in part, to alleviate the concerns of “flummoxed” educators (para. 3) and get them excited about the prospect of teaching in online and distance learning programs.

Summary of “Trading Classroom Authority for Online Community” by Pete Rorabaugh, p. 246

In this essay, Rorabaugh argues that “student-centered” online education encourages students to “own their learning more” (para. 2). Moreover, he sees digital pedagogy and digital culture changing the educational focus away from experts and traditional authority and “giving it to participants” (para. 3). In this new model, students become creators and authorities themselves, taking responsibility for doing the work “that the experts used to do” (para. 4). He is unabashedly optimistic about this transition, as the “Web and digital culture create ideal citizens who investigate things ‘just because’” (para. 5).

At Issue: Sources for Using Alternative Approaches to Argument, p. 247

1. As Rorabaugh explains, the “Wild West” analogy suggests a sphere that is “primitive” and “lawless” (para. 1); implicitly, those who thrive in such places are rugged, self-reliant, independent, versatile, resourceful individuals who can accept “an expansive sense of responsibility,” as well as the challenge of living with few rules. He acknowledges that this was an early characterization of the Web, but claims that the analogy still applies to online, “student-directed learning” (para. 1). Students could find this analogy a stretch decades after the development of the Web, particularly as the comparison implies a vaguely romantic notion of online learning as a “wild” frontier. In contrast, the Internet can seem just as much like a series of gated communities, retail shopping centers, or fun playgrounds. But educators and students are still trying to discover the strengths, weaknesses, and potential of online learning, so the “Wild West” analogy — with its implication that the rules have not quite caught up with the “realities on the ground” — may have value.

2. In paragraph 4, Rorabaugh makes the claim, “A revolution is growing online that takes this trend to an extreme — digital citizens are building educational communities without institutions. ‘Learning’ no longer means, or needs to
mean, ‘going to school.’ It can just mean developing good observation and critical thinking skills.” The rest of the essay elaborates on how educators and students must adapt to that “revolution,” whether online or in the traditional classroom. For example, the writer proposes that in this de-centered framework, students must be “ready to share the work that the experts used to do” (para. 4).

3. Other examples include the assertion that students in a digital environment “carry more responsibility for their own progress” (para. 3), “[t]raditional classrooms, the ones inspired by factories, create ideal students who follow instructions well” (para. 5), and the “Web and digital culture create ideal citizens who investigate things ‘just because’” (para. 5). The claim that the Web creates “ideal citizens,” in particular, would require some form of empirical data about learning, investigation, study habits, and other aspects of education to substantiate. For example, one might argue that “investigating” non-specified “things” online — regardless of a person’s motivation — is not intrinsically worthwhile or educationally valuable.

4. Rorabaugh spends no real time addressing challenges to his assumptions or substantive counterarguments. For example, a skeptic might ask the writer to present actual evidence that online students are actually “own[ing] their learning more” (para. 2) or becoming “ideal citizens” who follow their research interests purely for the sake of satisfying their intellectual curiosity (para. 5). Likewise, others might wonder about the value of students “blogging publicly” (para. 4) after gathering research with Wikipedia (para. 5): should students respect — familiarize themselves with — the work of accomplished researchers and scholars in a field before become self-styled expert “content creators” themselves?

5. He seems to assume that his readers already accept many of his premises about online learning — for example, that it is liberating, revolutionary, and (implicitly) superior to the traditional classroom. Likewise, he assumes that his audience will accept changes, such as the shift away from actual experts, as positive developments (paras. 3–4).

The writer could make several changes to his argument to make it Rogerian. Most importantly, he would likely have to concede some of the strengths and advantages of the traditional classroom instead of dismissing it as (implicitly) a backward, staid, and “factory-inspired” space that “create[s] ideal students who follow instructions well” (para. 5). Inversely, he might focus more on the ways in which these two models of education might supplement each other toward a common goal; he does gesture toward this in his third paragraph, when he discusses the “core values” for the classroom. But Rogerian argument would place even more emphasis on those shared core values.

**Template for Writing a Rogerian Argument, p. 248**

This exercise asks students to complete a template for a Rogerian argument. They should make the case that the drawbacks of online education must be addressed before these programs can be successful. A sample response is provided; the given text is in boldface.
More and more students are taking online courses, both the students and the colleges benefit. For example, students can earn degrees and certifications without the enormous expense of a traditional, four-year degree, while universities can use innovative online programs to revitalize themselves — and their relevance — in a global, high-technology marketplace. In addition, online education allows older and nontraditional students access to higher education while they work, take care of their families, or meet other obligations. However, online education does have some drawbacks. For instance, online students may not be held accountable or keep focused on their work because of the anonymity of the Internet and the lack of regular class meetings. These problems could be easily solved. First, keep enrollment in online courses low enough that professors can keep track of their students’ progress. Second, build strict requirements, deadlines, and regular reminders into the course so that students remain focused and disciplined. If these problems are addressed, both students and colleges would benefit because online learning offers the promise of higher education to more people than traditional universities could possibly educate.

Template for Writing a Toulmin Argument, p. 249

This exercise asks students to complete a template for a Toulmin argument in favor of online education. A sample response is provided; the given text is in boldface.

Many colleges and universities have instituted online education programs. These programs are the best way for nontraditional students, many of whom require flexible scheduling, to be able to take college courses that are affordable. If colleges are going to meet the rising demand for education, they must be sure that students are qualified to take the courses. In addition, schools must ensure that students and faculty are able to use the computer software systems that are set up for use in online instruction. The online course I took provided a number of benefits to me since it was affordable and fit my schedule. Recent studies show that online education can be just as good or even better than traditional instruction. In addition, the decreased cost of online courses and the flexibility they provide are enormous benefits. However, some people argue that too many online courses set students up for failure because they are not qualified to complete college-level work and they do not have the support that they need to complete their schoolwork. They also say that robust technical help must be provided for students at all times, day and night, in case there are problems. These arguments, while having merit, do not tip the balance toward solely traditional education. For this reason, online education is a flexible, lower-cost alternative to traditional education that isn't going to go away.
PART 3

Writing an Argumentative Essay
Planning, Drafting, and Revising an Argumentative Essay

Both Chapter 7 and Chapter 8 are dedicated to the writing process, reminding students how the various steps of planning, structuring, drafting, and revising apply to argumentative writing. The opening section of this chapter helps students to find ways to choose and narrow their topics, and it gives helpful tips on topics to avoid. As for its thematic content, Chapter 7 begins with an At Issue on whether college campuses should “go green,” and each of the exercises relates to this theme, as does the sample student essay at the end of the chapter.

Choosing a Topic, p. 254
You may want to find out what “going green” initiatives are taking place on your college campus or in your town — or even ask students to do this research. They can then incorporate what they find into class discussions or work in the various exercises. This work may help students to tailor their writing to campus-related issues and make the work more useful.

Exercise 7.1, p. 255
This exercise is a brainstorming activity, of sorts. It asks students to consider the At Issue information about going green (p. 253) and then to list ten possible topics they could write about in an essay. After making this list, students should pare it down by considering what interests them, which topics they know something about, which they care about, and which they have an open mind about. Ideally, these criteria should help them when choosing topics for other papers as well. Topic selection is key to a successful argumentative essay because students write their best papers when they are interested in their topic and are invested in convincing readers of their position.
You may want to supplement this brief section by introducing your students to some techniques for freewriting, brainstorming, or clustering. Ask your students what they've done for invention in the past, and generate a list of options on the board. Remind them that whether they make a bulleted list, freewrite, or create a visual (for example, a web, "mind map," or chart), what is important is that they find a technique that works for them.

**Exercise 7.2, p. 258**
This exercise asks students to freewrite about their chosen topic from Exercise 7.1. If they are unfamiliar with freewriting, students may be inhibited. Make sure that they understand the goal: to continue writing, even if the writing is associative rather than logical or they have to repeat words and phrases.

**Exercise 7.3, p. 258**
This exercise asks students to continue working on their topic. You may suggest that they try at least two different ways of brainstorming to see what works for them. From this brainstorming session, they may be able to make informal outlines of what they would cover if they were writing a paper on going green.

**Exercise 7.4, p. 258**
This exercise asks students to draw a cluster diagram to help generate ideas. These visuals can help writers see connections and associations that may not be evident in freewriting or brainstorming. While all these methods can be effective, the goal is for students to find a way of generating ideas and angles on topics that work best for them.

**Exercise 7.5, p. 258**
This exercise asks students to make an informal outline, similar to the one on page 257, based on the information and ideas they brainstormed. Remind them that they do not have to follow the outline given but can create their own, based on what they'd want to write about in their own papers.

**Drafting a Thesis Statement, p. 258**
After generating a topic, brainstorming, and drafting a brief, informal outline, students should have a rough thesis statement in mind. This statement can change, of course, based on information they find, but in order to draft, they should have a rough idea of what they want readers to understand about their topic. The thesis should also provide a way to organize their papers. It is important that students understand that thesis statements should be debatable, not factual or merely preference based.

*Teaching tip:* Most students will have already heard about thesis statements (see Chapter 1). Many students have a hard time with thesis statements and, as a result, hate thinking about them. But you might help by reminding them that
a good thesis statement is not merely a task for the writer; instead, it also provides a goal for readers by defining exactly what the paper is about and what they should understand from reading the paper.

**Exercise 7.6, p. 259**
This exercise provides useful practice with thesis statements, based on the information and ideas students generated in the earlier exercises, and asks students to consider which of their possible thesis statements is most promising.

**Understanding Your Purpose and Audience, p. 259**
One of the most important aspects of argumentative writing is understanding the audience. This section prompts students to consider a likely audience for their paper and then to tailor their writing and information to that audience. This assignment can be tricky for students because when they’re writing papers for a class, there often isn’t a direct audience beyond the instructor. You might overcome this difficulty by reminding students that, in peer-review and small-group situations, they will be reading one another’s work, so they really will have an audience. This fact might help them to think about what fellow students already know about going green, why students may be skeptical about their ability to be green while in college, and so on. Or to help them think about possible audiences outside the class, you might suggest that students can later use the information they include in their papers for letters to the editor in the school paper or even a letter to school administrators.

**Exercise 7.7, p. 260**
This exercise has students reconsider the thesis statements they drafted and decide how various audiences might respond to these statements. It might be helpful to brainstorm a list of possible audiences, either as a class or in small groups, so that students have a variety of possible audiences to choose from.

**Gathering Evidence, p. 260**
The next step of the writing process is to collect evidence (though you may remind students that, in some cases, they’ll need to collect a bit of evidence, commentary, information, or other research even earlier in order to get through the brainstorming and thesis-writing steps).

**Evaluating the Evidence in Your Sources, p. 261**
By reminding students that their sources must be accurate, relevant, representative, and sufficient, this section helps them to decide exactly what sources are useful for their paper and, more important, why they should be trusted. You might also want to remind students that it’s important to consider these criteria for Web sources as well—as many students will want to do some of their research online but don’t always consider if certain Web sites are legitimate and trustworthy. For more information on this issue, see Chapter 8.
Detecting Bias in Your Sources, p. 261

Sometimes students assume that any source that has a hint of bias should not be used in a paper, but this section gives you a chance to talk about bias in class and figure out when and how overtly biased sources can be used. The bulleted list provided in the text suggests how to detect bias; it may take students some practice in order to catch on. Consider bringing in a few examples of slanted language or a written text that presents only one side.

Exercise 7.8, p. 262

This exercise, which asks students to consider what evidence they might use to support their thesis statements from Exercise 7.6, can be opened up for class or small-group discussion.

Exercise 7.9, p. 262

This exercise can be a challenge for some students, as it can be difficult to detect our own biases. You might help them by having them consider what values, beliefs, or experiences led them to feel the way they do about going green and about the environmental movement. For instance, students who grew up in a town that did not offer curbside recycling may be more biased against a college recycling program because they think it will take too much time and effort.

Exercise 7.10, p. 262

This exercise is most useful if your students are actually going to write a full-length paper on the topic of going green on college campuses. It asks them to gather evidence, look for bias in the sources they find, and document each source carefully.

Refuting Opposing Arguments, p. 263

As we mention in the responses to the essays in Chapter 5, it is important that students’ papers speak to the opposing sides of the argument in a way that refutes these opposing points. In doing so, students may choose to defuse the either/or fallacy implicit in many arguments by simply finding and explaining common ground between the opposing opinions, or sides. Or students may acknowledge the strengths of an opposing viewpoint while also pointing out its shortcomings.

Exercise 7.11, p. 264

This exercise asks students to look closely at how a student writer addresses counterarguments. In these examples, the writer presents two counterarguments, identifies their weakness, and refutes them.

**Counterargument 1:** Being “green” is too expensive and will raise tuitions.
**Weakness:** Exaggerated claim with insufficient support
**Refutation strategy:** Show that only small increases in fees are effective; in specific cases, students do not object to fees; if schools are spending too much money, students can lobby for change or go elsewhere.
Counterargument 2: Schools that want to “go green” are authoritarian; such measures seek to control how students think and diminish academic freedom.

Weakness: Illogical reasoning

Refutation: Achieving sustainability requires critical thinking; it encourages inquiry to solve real-world problems, not merely academic quandaries in the “ivory tower.”

Revising Your Thesis Statement, p. 264

This brief section reminds students that their thesis statements should be not only debatable, as discussed earlier, but also specific. You might suggest that they ask how? and why? in response to their thesis so that, as the example shows, they can add more information and support, making the statement more compelling.

Exercise 7.12, p. 265

This exercise has students practice making their thesis statements stronger and more specific by considering possible refutations to counterarguments. They should return to the thesis statements they crafted in Exercise 7.10 and revise them by acknowledging and refuting the most important opposing argument.

Teaching tip: Your students will likely need some help with this exercise, and it may be a good idea to have them put their revised statements on the board so that all students can see the variety in how such theses can be structured. It will also be useful to explain that the individual parts of their thesis statements can provide a structure for the upcoming essay.

Structuring Your Essay, p. 265

Planning an essay’s structure can be one of the most important parts of the writing process. Students who are unsure how to organize or structure their paper often lack one of the four main components of an argumentative essay: thesis, evidence, refutation, and concluding statement. This section helps them to think of these four elements as sections of their essays, and you should encourage them to consider the order in which they present these four elements. Naturally, students need to understand why certain arguments should be structured in certain ways, and the goal is to get your students to consider the best way to organize their own argument. Have them once again consider their readers — what readers know, what they will need to know upfront, what their objections will be, and so on.

Using Induction and Deduction, p. 266

Just as students should consider their argument’s structure, they should also think of the argument in terms of inductive and deductive reasoning. Will they be using a deductive argument, built on major and minor premises that add up to a conclusion? Or will they use an inductive argument, presenting a series of observations that, taken together, lead to an inductive leap by which they arrive at a conclusion?
Identifying a Strategy for Your Argument, p. 266

Students should be open to letting their topic, purpose, and point of view suggest the strategy. While a specific assignment may require the use of one of these strategies, students should view them pragmatically.

Constructing a Formal Outline, p. 267

Students should consider which kind of argument they will build throughout the paper and then construct their formal outlines accordingly.

Exercise 7.13, p. 267

This exercise asks students to continue working with the material they’ve collected (their thesis, evidence, and so on) by constructing a formal outline for their paper. You may consider giving them suggestions on various outline strategies—a numbered list, a bulleted list, a combination of Roman numerals and letters, and so on. Then encourage them to find an outline strategy that works for them.

Establishing Credibility, p. 267

As students consider what will go into their papers, they should also be thinking about how they can use the three means of persuasion—logical, emotional, and ethical appeals. Each of these appeals will make them appear more credible to readers and will make their arguments more balanced.

Being Well Informed; Being Reasonable; and Being Fair, pp. 268–69

These sections help students establish themselves as writers that their readers can trust. To do so, students must demonstrate their command of the material and their reasonableness. Among the ways students can accomplish both goals is to establish common ground with readers (remind them of the Rogerian style of argument) and to maintain a reasonable tone (tell them not to rely too much on emotional language).

Teaching tip: When students are passionate about their argument or are writing about a controversial topic, it can be difficult for them to remain fair, to not distort or exaggerate evidence, and to not quote out of context. The section “Being Fair” reminds them of that, and you may want to stress that for readers fairness often equals credibility.

Drafting Your Essay, p. 270

Finally, it’s time for students to draft their essays. This section revisits the basics of essay writing, such as following the structure of an argumentative essay, using transitions, connecting various points in the essay with coordination and subordination, defining terms, using clear language, and showing confidence in their own mastery of the material. You might have students skim this section in preparation
for writing their drafts and then return to this section later for suggestions on what and how to edit.

**Exercise 7.14, p. 273**
Quite simply, this exercise asks each of your students to draft an essay of his or her own, incorporating the thesis statement, outline, supporting evidence, and so on, from earlier exercises.

**Revising Your Essay, p. 273**
As the final component of the writing process, revision is an essential step that allows your students to mold their drafts into complete, thorough, and convincing arguments. It is important to establish the difference between revising and editing: the former involves more significant changing and restructuring of the essay, and the latter refers to superficial changes in grammar, spelling, or formatting. When it comes to revision, one thing most students ask is *how* to revise. The sample questions in this section are useful, then, as they have students consider matters such as how much supporting evidence they’ve used, whether they’ve consulted a wide variety of sources, or how they’ve attempted to refute opposing arguments.

**Getting Feedback, p. 275**
One of the most effective strategies for revision is to get feedback from trusted peers. Often, when writers are asked to evaluate their drafts, they have a hard time being objective and determining if their argument is clear. This section instructs students on the various forms of valuable feedback they might get — from instructors, from the college’s writing center, and from their peers.

*Teaching tip:* A good way to help students practice getting feedback is to have them work in groups that go through the revision questions supplied in the previous section on pages 273–274. You might also want them to consider the kinds of feedback they can give beyond answering the provided questions: students can summarize for the writer what each paragraph is about, they can evaluate whether the argument is well supported or convincing, they can suggest information to add or background that might be helpful, and they can even provide an opposing viewpoint to which the writer may need to respond.

**Exercise 7.15, p. 277**
This exercise directs students to read one another’s drafts and then give feedback. You may have them exchange drafts in class, email drafts, or combine the two methods (have them jot down feedback on emailed drafts and then bring the marked-up drafts to class to discuss with each other).

**Adding Visuals; Editing; Proofreading; Choosing a Title, pp. 277–79**
At the final stages of drafting, students should consider how they can further strengthen their argumentative essays by adding visuals (compelling photos,
charts, maps, and so on), by editing and proofreading for smaller details, and even by choosing a title. These are processes that students might not consider, so you might want to explain why they should be looked at as part of the overall argument of their essays.

**Exercise 7.16, p. 279**
Students may disagree about the suitability and effectiveness of these titles. However, here are some sample responses for discussion.

- **Green Campuses:** This title may be too general. It suggests a broad survey of a subject, but not an argument.

- **It’s Not Easy Being Green:** Some readers may appreciate the allusion to Kermit the Frog, of the Muppets; others might find it too cute, or miss the allusion altogether. The title might work for an argument that focuses on the difficulties of making campuses more environmentally friendly. The title would probably be more suitable for an opinion column or blog post than for a formal academic essay.

- **The Lean, Mean, Green Machine:** As with “It’s Not Easy Being Green,” this title might be too flippant. Students should be wary of titles that rely on wordplay or rhyming.

- **What Students Can Do to Make Their Campuses More Environmentally Responsible:** This title suggests a position and a proposal, but it is wordy.

- **Why Campuses Should Be Green:** This title is simple, serious, and concise. It prepares the reader for a specific argument.

- **Planting the Seeds of the Green Campus Movement:** This title might be appropriate for a history of environmental action on campuses. It might also work for a proposal argument encouraging action on a campus with no or few existing environmental initiatives.

- **The Green Campus: An Idea Whose Time Has Come:** This title prepares the reader for a specific argument. However, it is somewhat clichéd.

**Student Essay, “Going ‘Green’” by Shawn Holton, p. 280**
This sample student essay provides a model for students to use as they think about planning, drafting, and revising their own work. We have included the model on the topic of the chapter so that students can clearly connect the topic of the paper to the examples that have been used throughout the chapter.

**Exercise 7.17, p. 284**
This exercise asks students to incorporate a visual. As with including textual sources, visuals should be used to support and strengthen students’ positions and not merely to decorate the paper.
PART 4

Using Sources to Support Your Argument
Since so many of your students are engaged in online social networking, this chapter’s thematic focus — the debate about whether social-networking sites threaten our privacy — is likely to pique their interest. The chapter opening introduces students to this debate with some background information and useful statistics, which will be further developed by a series of readings later in the chapter. Like the chapters preceding it, this chapter, of course, also focuses on skill development: students will learn to evaluate print and online sources for objectivity and credibility.

Teaching tip: Ask students how they maintain their privacy online, or whether they consider this a problem when they use social-networking sites. Have them reflect on the assumptions and principles they apply when they consider questions of privacy.

Finding Sources, p. 290

With questions for students to ask about the sources they encounter and with tips to help students evaluate the sources, this section introduces six major criteria for evaluation: accuracy, objectivity, credibility, currency, comprehensiveness, and authority. Subsections define and explain each criterion in some detail: An accurate source is factual and free of error; even errors in spelling can raise doubts about a source’s credibility. Credibility, which refers to trust of an author, relates to accuracy, objectivity, and currency; a credible writer is an accurate writer, who looks at facts objectively and at the most current information on a particular topic. Credibility also involves the reputation of the author and of the author’s sources; here the text suggests students consider the scope of an author’s expertise by looking at book reviews or at Amazon.com for a list of other works the author may have written. Objectivity also relates to credibility; while it is virtually impossible to find a wholly unbiased argument, objective writing explores data on all sides of an issue and reveals rather than hides its biases. Currency, particularly important in writing about science or technology, asks students to consider how recently the information has been written. Students should consider the comprehensiveness of the source — that is, the depth of an author’s exploration of a subject and the scope...
of the author’s reach. Finally, they should consider the authority of the source. A print source usually has authority when the writer has the expertise to write about a subject.

Exercise 8.1, p. 296
This exercise asks students to read and evaluate three sources for use in writing a three- to five-page argumentative essay; in their evaluation, students should consider accuracy, credibility, objectivity, currency, comprehensiveness, and authority. The sources, found on pages 296–301 of the text, are listed and briefly summarized and evaluated below.

- “Bigger Brother: The Exponential Law of Privacy Loss,” by Nicholas Thompson, p. 296 Using examples such as Facebook and Zynga, this short essay from The New Yorker contends that the more time people spend online, the better companies get at gathering accurate and detailed information about users. The article is current and accurate in its factual claims, but it is also speculative, opinionated, and limited in its scope.

- “Time to Enact ‘Do Not Track,’” editorial in USA Today, p. 298 This editorial from USA Today argues that while new Federal Trade Commission restrictions on Facebook are helpful, lawmakers should go further to help people protect their online privacy by creating a universal, legally enforceable Do Not Track mechanism. The article is factual and current, but also biased. It contains no firsthand research; its anonymous authors are, presumably, not authorities on the subject.

- “Privacy and Facebook” by Rebecca MacKinnon, p. 299 In this essay from her 2012 book, Consent of the Networked, Rebecca MacKinnon considers the role of Facebook in the 2009 Iranian Green Movement, which opposed then-President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. At the time, Iranian authorities used information from Facebook — made available by a switch in the site’s privacy settings — to crack down on dissidents. While this essay credibly and accurately explores a significant historical example of an Internet privacy issue, one that may be important for student writers to include in their essays, this article is not comprehensive, its example is not current, and its reporting is secondhand.

Exercise 8.2, p. 301
Drawing on the reading and thinking that students did in Exercise 8.1, this exercise asks students to write a one- to two-paragraph evaluation of each of the sources, offering evidence to support each point. A sample evaluation of each article follows.

- “Bigger Brother: The Exponential Law of Privacy Loss,” by Nicholas Thompson, p. 296 This article comes from a respected general interest magazine devoted to culture, reporting, and criticism. The article appears accurate and credible, as when Thompson — who has a history of covering technology as a journalist — cites a professor of computer engineering to support his view. It is also current and provides hyperlinks to other sources. However, Thompson is not objective (as he accuses Facebook of trying to “humbug” its users); his argument about the Exponential Law of Privacy Loss is clever, but ultimately, a matter of opinion and speculation.
“Time to Enact ‘Do Not Track,’” editorial in *USA Today*, p. 298  This is an editorial from *USA Today*; it advocates a specific position instead of remaining objective, but it does support this advocacy with evidence. The editorial is current and it appears to be free of factual errors. However, as it focuses on one current event — the enactment of an FTC provision and the need for a specific regulation — this source does not give a comprehensive account of the Internet privacy issue. Likewise, the editorial provides no firsthand research or reporting; the writers do not seem to be experts on technology or the law.

“Privacy and Facebook” by Rebecca MacKinnon, p. 299  The source is accurate and credible: MacKinnon is a relatively well-known journalist, media critic, and activist. Her book was published by Basic Books, a reputable mainstream publisher of books about current affairs, economics, science, and other fields. She relies primarily on established public history — of the events surrounding the Green Movement in Iran in 2009, of the shifts in Facebook policy that year, and of Facebook's response to a public outcry. She quotes an anonymous Internet commenter from the technology news site ZDNet (para. 3) but does no original reporting. The source does not appear objective, as she is clearly skeptical of Facebook's financial motives and (as she characterizes them) Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg's "personal conviction that people everywhere should be open about their lives and actions" (para. 3).

Evaluating Sources, p. 301

This section of the chapter reviews the key criteria for evaluating print sources (accuracy, credibility, objectivity, currency, comprehensiveness) and applies them to Internet sources. The textbox "Using a Site's URL to Assess Its Objectivity" (p. 304) helps students decipher domain names. The textbox "Avoiding Confirmation Bias" (p. 305) alerts students to the tendency people have to accept, without critical interrogation, information that supports their own beliefs.

**Teaching tip:** Ask students to use the criteria outlined in this chapter to assess their favorite news sources. Consider turning this assessment into a short writing assignment so that students practice organizing and writing this type of evaluation; additionally, having students focus on sites that they visit regularly encourages students to personalize — to apply what they are learning to their own lives outside the classroom.

Exercise 8.3, p. 307

This exercise asks students to evaluate two home pages for accuracy, credibility, and other factors that help determine the quality of sources. The exercise focuses on the evaluation process, as students identify specific elements of the sites that help them make their judgments.

- *The Chronicle of Higher Education* home page, p. 307  As it has a .com domain name, this is a commercial Web site. It is devoted to covering issues of interest to college professors, administrators, and support staff. The site is clearly intended to help those professionals with their careers; job listings make
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up a prominent spot, in addition to articles of interest to those in higher education. The topics of the articles show the serious intent of the publication. Though it is a commercial site, it does not include advertisements.

- **Glamour magazine home page, p. 308** *Glamour* is a commercial site that includes advertisements for clothing and skin treatments, although it may be difficult to distinguish between editorial content and advertising. The overt content of the *Glamour* page somewhat undermines its credibility as a research source, as features like “Jennifer Aniston On the Age When It’s No Longer Appropriate to Wear Bikinis” do not lend themselves to citation in an academic essay. To its credit, the site does not try to mislead readers that *Glamour* is a “serious” or “scholarly” publication.

**Exercise 8.4, p. 298**

Following up on Exercise 8.3, this exercise asks students to consider the mission statements for *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Parade*.

- **The Chronicle of Higher Education mission statement, p. 309** The “About The Chronicle” page helps to establish further the credibility, currency, and authority of the publication. Students will see that it has a large staff of “more than 70 writers, editors, and international correspondents.” It lists the awards and accolades that *The Chronicle* has earned. It also includes contact information for queries (e.g., questions about possible submissions) and for questions about editorial content.

- **Glamour magazine mission statement, p. 310** The mission statement contains an implicit bandwagon appeal or *ad populum* fallacy: *Glamour*’s popularity and larger readership does make it authoritative as a source, particularly for women who want to have it all: “the dream job, the perfect look, the right guy.” The statement is aspirational, and makes no pretense of being a scholarly or authoritative source for serious news or research.

**Exercise 8.5, p. 310**

For this exercise, students must do their own research on the Web to evaluate these sites. They may come to different conclusions, depending on how they weigh the various criteria for evaluation. You will find below brief summaries of the sources as well as suggestions for discussion.

- **“Who Spewed That Abuse? Anonymous Yik Yak App Isn’t Telling” by Jonathan Mahler, p. 310** In this article from *The New York Times*, media reporter Jonathan Mahler writes about “Yik Yak,” a popular social-networking app that allows users to post anonymously by geographic location: only posts within 1.5 miles appear. According to Mahler, “It has become the go-to social feed for college students across the country to commiserate about finals, to find a party or to crack a joke about a rival school” (para. 7). But Yik Yak has also become a forum for anonymous abuse, racist attacks, and even threats of mass violence. Mahler does his own direct reporting for this story, which touches on issues of free speech and the problem of restricting the use of such apps; he interviews a range of sources with a variety of viewpoints, including the creators of Yik Yak.
Yak, Tyler Droll and Brooks Buffington. You might ask students if Mahler remains “objective” in his reporting, or whether his choice of quotations and the structure of the article make it biased toward a particular point of view.

**“All Eyes on You” by Jennifer Golbeck, p. 316** In this deep dive into the issue of privacy, both online and off, Jennifer Golbeck, a professor of computer science and information studies, reflects on the various implications of our surveillance society. She explores the question, “How does this constant surveillance affect us and what, if anything, can we do about it?” (para. 6). You might discuss how authority operates in this article. On the one hand, Golbeck is writing for *Psychology Today*, which is a respected magazine of popular science reporting, but not a scholarly journal. Her article is, in some ways, personal and uses the first-person “I.” On the other hand, Golbeck — herself an authority on technology and information studies — interviews a broad range of experts and cites multiple sources to fashion a comprehensive account of her subject.

**“My Creepy Instagram Map Knows Where I Live” by Craig Desson, p. 322** Writing for the online newspaper *The Start*, Craig Desson tests a program called Creepy, which “will create a Google map showing where you’ve been, based on what you’ve shared on Instagram, Twitter and Flickr” (para. 3). He finds the results unnerving, as it would allow users to find his address. As he writes, “It’s true that 20 years ago, a phonebook might have led a stranger to my home address . . . [but] The trouble with Instagram tracking is that most users have no idea their photo-sharing app is also building a detailed history of where they work and live” (para. 9). Desson’s piece is relatively current and presumably an accurate account of his experience with Creepy. But you might use this as an opportunity to discuss the limitations of first-person anecdotes, which generally are not comprehensive or objective.

**“Is Online Dating Safe?” by Sharon Jayson, p. 323** In this article from *USA Today*’s Web site, Sharon Jayson begins by writing about proposed Senate legislation that would force companies “to get customers’ permission before collecting location data off their mobile devices and sharing it with others” (para. 2). Jayson uses this news peg to discuss issues of privacy and safety in the context of online dating services and apps. It is a brief article, but Jayson does interview the legislation’s sponsor, Senator Al Franken, as well as some other sources. You might discuss how Jayson’s superficial “take” on the subject could lead a researcher to questions and problems that would require deeper investigation of more comprehensive sources.

**“Should Athletes Have Social Media Privacy? One Bill Says Yes” by Sam Laird, p. 326** Sam Laird reports on Senate Bill 434 introduced in the 2012 Maryland State Legislature that would prohibit coaches and administrators from forcing college students and applicants (especially college athletes) to allow monitoring of their Facebook, Twitter, and other social media accounts. Laird’s main source is an attorney “whose work frequently involves sports and social media” (para. 7). This blog post, which appeared on Mashable.com, focuses briefly on one piece of legislation at the state level, so it does not include
enough reporting or sourcing to be comprehensive. It might, however, serve to illustrate an example of the kind of problems and issues that exist around social media and privacy in the context of colleges and college students.

Questions on “Should Athletes Have Social Media Privacy? One Bill Says Yes,” p. 327

1. As this is an article from a blog, students could go to the original posting at http://mashable.com/2012/02/06/athletes-social-media-privacy-bill/#j6AKrX2VjSog (or simply Google the author and title of the selection to find the post). There, students can click on the hyperlinked sources that Laird cites, such as the link to Maryland Senate Bill 434. This might be a good opportunity to discuss the purposes of citing sources and the methods professional researchers use, such as MLA citation style. You might also refer students to the information earlier in the chapter to help them determine the objectivity, currency, and comprehensiveness of the sources Laird uses.

2. At the blog post, students can click on Laird’s name for a brief biography. While it includes some information about his experience and qualifications, students might not be able to determine whether Laird is “respected in his field” from it. Students might look at Laird’s other work and see whether other writers on the subject of sports (Laird’s specialty) cite him as an authority.

3. Although Laird is discussing legal and legislative issues, he writes for a general reader. Moreover, as he is primarily a sports writer for Mashable.com, it is likely that his audience is comprised largely of sports fans, mostly interested in the ways the legal issue intersects with college athletics.

4. This blog post is probably too slight and thin to be a good research source. Students writing research papers about legislative attempts to maintain student privacy or the issue of college athletes and online social media could cite this article. However, they would be better off going to the original source—the proposed legislation as well as more scholarly legal views of the subject.

5. In the years since 2012, the use of social-networking sites has grown. While the specific legislation may be unimportant, the issues and questions it raises around college students and online privacy are still relevant.
For many students, the very idea of research — of finding sources, interpreting them, and then distilling them into useful information — is a daunting task. This chapter helps to simplify the process by having students break research into steps. First, they need to clearly understand the sources they find; second, they should identify and choose the quotations and ideas that they’ll need to incorporate into their work. You’ll want to advise students to summarize general ideas and information, to paraphrase more developed information, and to quote word for word the most salient ideas. The text provides examples of all three kinds of citations and reminds students to use direct quotations only when absolutely necessary.

The thematic content of this chapter continues from Chapter 8 — whether social-networking sites threaten our privacy. All the sample sources and data, as well as the essays and exercises, pertain to this issue. Because of their familiarity with the debate that surrounds social-networking sites, it’s a good time to remind students that “common knowledge” about such sites can be summarized briefly and does not require documentation. Also, you may want to encourage students to consider, for every writing assignment, what their readers already know about the topic and how much background to provide for them.

**Summarizing Sources, p. 329**

This is a good opportunity to discuss with students the reasons for summary. It is important for researchers and writers to get a sense of the work that others have done on a subject. There’s no reason for students to think that they have to invent an entire subject on their own. You can point out that it is actually much easier and much more efficient for students to see the work that others have done. Students
must, however, be able to position themselves in relation to a source. Rather than simply summarizing the work of another, they must then be able to take the next step and distinguish that writer’s ideas from their own and discuss how and why they would employ the summary.

**Exercise 9.1, p. 331**

This exercise asks students to provide a two-sentence summary of the given passage. Next, they should edit their summaries down to one sentence. Remind students that their two- and one-sentence summaries should convey the main idea of the paragraph as well as provide proper documentation for the source.

*Two-sentence sample summary:*

At a time when people's attention is fragmented by innumerable media choices, those who can capture that attention and make connections will capture wealth, power, and influence as well. In a world of self-publishers, we face only two options: promote ourselves online, or be left behind (Cashmore, p. 331).

*One-sentence sample summary:*

As attention is the “new currency” in our fragmented media marketplace, we have a simple choice between promoting ourselves online or fading “into a lonely obscurity” (Cashmore, p. 315).

**Paraphrasing Sources, p. 332**

Sometimes students don’t really grasp the distinction between summarizing and paraphrasing and think that paraphrasing is merely a long summary. In some cases, it might help to make a sports analogy when comparing the two: A summary is like recounting a football game by giving just the score and saying which team won; in contrast, a paraphrase is like giving a play-by-play of the game, providing more details about each pivotal point. In this way, quoting is like showing the highlight reel, where fans actually get to go back to the original action and see it and hear it firsthand. This analogy distinguishes not only the ways students can interact with sources but also the ways each interaction has a different purpose.

**Exercise 9.2, p. 334**

This exercise gives students practice paraphrasing and directs them to return back to the passage by Pete Cashmore in Exercise 9.1. Students should paraphrase the excerpt by Cashmore and then consider how their paraphrases are different from their summaries. Here are sample responses.

*Paraphrase:*

Our attention is more fragmented than ever by billions of options on television, the Internet, radio, online social networks, downloadable music, and other media channels. The people who can use these networks and media resources to grab the public’s attention will become powerful, wealthy, and influential; their connections will help them increase their connectedness and their influence even more. This landscape provides us with only two options: we can use these new media and social
technologies to promote ourselves and acquire power, or we can ignore them and “fade into a lonely obscurity” (Cashmore, p. 331).

Paraphrase vs. summary:
A paraphrase is a more thorough presentation of the paragraph, following its main points fully and accurately. The example follows Cashmore’s ideas in order, and when the paraphrase does borrow a phrase from Cashmore, it is presented in quotation marks.

Exercise 9.3, p. 334
In this exercise, students are directed to read the provided paragraph and circle any distinctive words or phrases they might want to quote. Students should then write a paraphrase, incorporating these words or phrases. Remind them, again, that each paraphrase needs proper documentation. You may have students discuss what words or phrases got their attention and why. Possible choices and an example paraphrase follow.

Distinct words and phrases: “responsibility and caveat emptor,” “let the buyer beware,” “potential consequences,” “outside viewers,” “lighthearted presentation of one aspect of a person,” “aware of the downsides”

Paraphrase:
When it comes to privacy on social-networking sites, there are two important guidelines: “responsibility and caveat emptor” (“Beware,” p. 333). This means, first, that people should carefully and responsibly describe themselves and their friends; similarly, employers and others must access this information with open minds. Second is the idea “let the buyer beware,” which means that everyone using Facebook needs to realize the effects of sharing information even if material on Facebook is only a “lighthearted presentation of one aspect of a person” (“Beware,” p. 333). Facebook can be valuable, but users need to understand its negatives (“Beware,” p. 333).

Quoting Sources, p. 335
It is useful to remind students that choosing a good quotation is a crucial skill. A writer may make a point in particularly striking language or in a wonderfully concise way, and so that might make for a good quotation. Quoting is also a good way to bring authority to a student work. Accuracy is important when quoting, as is including information on the source of the quotation.

Exercise 9.4, p. 336
This exercise presents three paragraphs and asks students to choose particular words and phrases they’d want to quote if using this source in an argumentative essay. Ask why they chose the words and phrases they did. Underscore that they should limit quoting and that, in some cases, it is more effective to quote only brief phrases rather than long passages.

Exercise 9.5, p. 336
This exercise has students read an essay by Shelley Fralic and highlight its most important ideas, draft a summary of one paragraph, and paraphrase another
paragraph. Students should properly document for their summaries and paraphrases. Consider having students do this work individually and then have them come together to compare their work in small groups. Below is a summary of the essay.

Summary of “Don’t Fall for the Myths about Online Privacy”
by Shelley Fralic, p. 336

Shelley Fralic looks at the recent phenomena of privacy hoaxes on Facebook and other social media sites. Fralic explains that there is no way for users of these sites to control what information is tracked and collated, despite Facebook’s privacy settings, or ultimately useless copyright protection disclaimers. Ultimately, Fralic encourages readers to think about their willingness to relinquish personal information online — effectively becoming “digital captives” — and be smart about what information they share.

Working Source Material into Your Argument, p. 338

Now that students have had practice summarizing, paraphrasing, and quoting, it’s important to help them work this material into their essays. This section gives students tips on how to introduce source material with identifying tags and how to smoothly incorporate others’ phrases and ideas into their sentences.

Teaching tip: Many students have a tendency to use “drop quotes,” meaning that they don’t introduce a quotation or indicate that it’s from an outside source. Instead, they just drop the quotation into the text of their essay and let it stand on its own, without comment. This approach often distorts meaning and can confuse readers, who don’t know who is speaking or how to interpret the quotation. You should emphasize that you don’t want each student to constantly write, “Alison George said,” at the beginning or end of every quotation. Instead, encourage them to change things up and try different approaches.

Exercise 9.6, p. 341

This exercise has students return to what they wrote for Exercises 9.1 and 9.3 and add identifying tags that blend the source information into their own words. They should vary the tags that they use, integrating the borrowed material sometimes into the beginning of a sentence, sometimes into the end, and sometimes as a full sentence or so. Remind them to include proper documentation, whether as part of the signal phrase or in parentheses.

Synthesizing Sources, p. 341

The final section of this chapter has students consider how they can combine summary, paraphrase, and quotation to form a synthesis — a piece of writing in which students interact with their research sources while also presenting their own ideas. In some cases, these sources provide support for a student’s thesis, and in other cases
they provide a counterpoint. The excerpt in the text comes from a sample student essay and should help your students blend sources smoothly into their own writing.

Teaching tip: You may remind your students that researched, argumentative essays are in many ways like a conversation. Students need to represent the people who have gone before them and who have specific expertise; at the same time, students need to add their own ideas and reasons for those ideas. In this way, summary, paraphrasing, and quoting not only bring their readers up to speed on the issue (in this case, the debate about privacy and social-networking sites) but also give writers themselves something to build on when presenting their own perspective. In short, remind students that their research should allow them to acknowledge the discussion that has gone before them and then to insert their own stance on the subject.

Exercise 9.7, p. 343
This exercise asks students to return to their paraphrase of the passage from Pete Cashmore’s “Privacy Is Dead, and Social Media Hold Smoking Gun.” Encourage students to engage with Cashmore’s text instead of merely reiterating his points or repackaging his argument: they can disagree with the claims in the passage, qualify them, extend them with new examples, or undercut them with counterexamples. They might even begin by addressing his conclusion, which presents a stark choice: “participate or fade into a lonely obscurity.”
Although many students receive a crash course in MLA-style documentation in high school, they generally come to college writing classes with some degree of anxiety about documenting their sources — particularly as they learn of the severe consequences for academic dishonesty. And, as we all know, teaching documentation is tedious — as instructors, we’re forced to focus on punctuation, spacing, and indentation, on teaching the nuts and bolts of a source rather than its content. To make your job easier, this chapter contains a formatting guide with examples for most of the sources (periodicals, books, Internet sources) your students are likely to cite in their research essays. The chapter ends with a well-documented sample student essay that uses a variety of these sources so that students have another example of MLA-style documentation for in-text citation and a works-cited page. Since this chapter acts as a handbook for citation, there are neither At Issue readings nor exercises.

Teaching tip: Finding good sources and integrating and documenting those sources can well be a daunting task for students. Consider scheduling a class appointment with the reference librarian; most university libraries offer in-library class research sessions that focus on helping students negotiate the physical and virtual spaces of their campus library. Another useful activity is a library scavenger hunt. In an antiquated form, this project sent students to locate obscure sources and facts from the cobwebbed corners of the library’s second basement; today’s version of the hunt can ask students to find a variety of print and electronic sources based on their own research topics. Provide a general list of eight to ten types of sources for students to find; to practice documentation skills, require students to type or handwrite their finds as a works-cited page.

Students will likely ask you about online documentation machines like EasyBib and NoodleTools — some universities even subscribe to documentation services. Regardless of one’s opinion about the sites or services, the end product is only as accurate and precise as the information entered by the student. Be sure to tell students that these sites are not a fail-safe; remind them to attend to the details of correctly entering all source information and to double-check every source entry — particularly the more complicated entries.
Using Parenthetical References, p. 345
This section of the text offers a brief explanation of the rules and exceptions for parenthetical references, including the rule for using long quotations.

Preparing the Works-Cited List, p. 347
This section of the text offers a brief explanation of the rules for preparing a list of works cited and includes a bulleted list of common rules for abbreviation, punctuation, and formatting.

Periodicals, p. 347
This section offers a brief explanation and one or two examples of how to cite the following periodical sources:

- Journals
- Magazines
- Newspapers
- Editorials, letters to the editor, or reviews
- Political cartoons or comic strips
- Advertisements

Books, p. 350
This section offers a brief explanation and one or two examples of how to cite the following textual sources:

- Books by one author
- Books by two or three authors
- Books by more than three authors
- Two or more books by the same author
- Edited book
- Translation
- Revised edition
- Anthology
- Work in an anthology
- More than one work in the same anthology
- Section or chapter of a book
- Introduction, preface, foreword, or afterword
- Multivolume work
- Article in a reference work
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Audiovisual Sources, p. 354

- TV show
- Film

Internet Sources, p. 355

This section offers a brief explanation and one or two examples of how to cite the following Internet sources:

- Entire Web site
- Document within a Web site
- Online video
- Blog post and blog comments
- Tweet
- Podcast
- Message from an email discussion group
- Online book
- Part of an online book
- Article in an online scholarly journal
- Article in a magazine
- Article in an online-only magazine — an Ezine
- Article in a newspaper
- Article from a library database

Legal Case, p. 359; Government Document, p. 359

These sections of the text offer brief explanations about citing a court opinion or a government document found in print or online.

Sample Student Essay: “Should Data Posted on Social-Networking Sites Be ‘Fair Game’ for Employers?” p. 361

Arguing that social-networking sites should be fair game for potential employers, this student author asserts that we must recognize that the Internet has redefined our notions of *public* and *private*. She advocates thoughtful, responsible online posting that avoids applauding indiscretion or risqué self-construction. The essay cites seven sources and includes a works-cited page.
Using Sources Responsibly

Perhaps one of the most vexing issues in any writing class, plagiarism is something you want your students to understand — and avoid — in both their college careers and their professional lives. Academics and professionals often insist that any unattributed borrowing is plagiarism. Misunderstandings about plagiarism are especially common now due to our online culture: resources are easy to find, and text can easily be cut and pasted by students who forget (or don’t choose) to document their sources. This chapter helps students recognize and avoid the many forms of plagiarism, and it reminds them why plagiarism is a serious matter. The At Issue readings at the end of the chapter help you to relate discussions about plagiarism to Internet sources, campus life, and even broader issues of ownership and intellectual property; with this more expansive discussion of plagiarism, students see how difficult yet necessary defining plagiarism is.

Understanding Plagiarism, p. 370

This section gives students various definitions of plagiarism and acknowledges the difficulty of determining whether something is plagiarized intentionally or unintentionally. Most important, students are reminded to document any information they take from sources, including direct quotations; summaries or paraphrases of someone else’s original ideas; someone else’s opinions, judgments, and conclusions; and statistics or other data from charts or graphs in a source. “Common knowledge” is the term given to familiar quotations or phrases, broadly known information, and the writer’s own ideas or conclusions; these do not need to be documented.

Teaching tip: You’ll want to spend some time helping students understand what information they need to document and what information or ideas they don’t need to document. The concept common knowledge can be difficult to grasp, but remind students that if information is available to the public and appears in a variety of sources, then it is considered common knowledge. Whether information is common knowledge or not may depend on a writer’s intended audience. For instance, common knowledge in the advertising world may not be so “common” when a student writes an analysis of advertising campaigns for his composition class.
in doubt, students should err on the side of caution and document rather than not
document their sources.

Exercise 11.1, p. 374
This exercise asks students to consider a series of statements and say whether
each requires documentation or not. Students should also be able to explain, more
important, why they would or would not need to document these statements. Sam-
ple responses are provided below.

1. No documentation necessary: In most cases, this statement would be common
knowledge, though if the writer wants to name specific awards that Goodwin
has won, then he or she may need to cite sources.

2. No documentation necessary: This fact is common knowledge and can be
found in a variety of sources or simply by looking at the book.

3. No documentation necessary: For those who are familiar with the controversy
surrounding Goodwin's book, this statement is common knowledge; it may
also be considered common knowledge because it is information that's avail-
able in several sources.

4. No documentation necessary: This statement reflects the writer's own opinion
on the book's controversy.

5. Documentation needed: This statement uses a direct quotation, either from
another source or from Goodwin herself, so it must be documented.

6. Documentation needed: This statement uses a direct quotation from Good-
win herself, so it must be documented.

7. Documentation needed: While this is not a direct quotation, the information
in this statement is either a summary or a paraphrase of a source that needs
to be documented.

8. Documentation needed: This statement is likely not the writer's original idea
but is based on information that the writer found in an outside source, so it
needs to be documented.

9. Documentation needed: This statement gives information about Goodwin's
response to the allegations, so it is information that the writer could not have
had without the help of an outside source.

10. Documentation needed: This statement is likely derived from a source that
then lists who believes Goodwin's "reputation as a historian" was hurt. The
writer needs to attribute the information, as it is not his or her original idea.

Exercise 11.2, p. 375
This exercise directs students to read an editorial and decide what information
they would need to document and what they would not need to document. In each
case, students should underline two sections of text in the editorial and note why
they should or should not be documented. This is a good exercise to share in small
groups, because it encourages students to process the information used in the edito-
rial and then consider the kind of information it is, not just what it is says.
Summary of “Cheaters Never Win”  
from the Austin American-Statesman, p. 375

Providing an up-to-the-minute look at plagiarism, this article discusses the ease with which students plagiarize by means of the Internet—from buying whole term papers to finding and using information without documentation. The article also provides insight into the ways plagiarism is punished at certain schools and explains the many ways students “lose out” on their education by taking the easy road of plagiarism.

Teaching tip: Before discussing this editorial with your students, you might want to refresh your memory on your own school’s plagiarism policy. You may also want to photocopy your department’s description of plagiarism (if there is one) or even try to have your students draft a definition of plagiarism for the class.

Two excerpts that need documentation:

- Student Judicial Services at the University of Texas defines plagiarism as “representing as your own work any material that was obtained from another source . . .” (para. 5). This statement includes a direct quotation from the University of Texas and needs to be documented.

- The Center for Academic Integrity found last year that more than 70 percent of college students admitted to having cheated at least once . . . (6). This statement needs to be documented, because the information is taken from another source and is not simply the writer’s own knowledge or opinion.

Two excerpts that do NOT need documentation:

- If you think that’s an exaggeration, do an Internet search of “free term papers.” You’ll find cheathouse.com, Cheater.com . . . (2). This statement is the writer’s own words and work, based on an online search. The information does not come from someone else’s work.

- Strict disciplinary action should follow students who are caught . . . (7). This statement expresses the writer’s opinion and, therefore, does not need documentation.

Revising to Eliminate Plagiarism, p. 376

When students think of revision, they rarely think of it in terms of preventing plagiarism. But revision is a good time for students to take a second look at the information and ideas they’re including in their papers and decide what needs to be documented, if it isn’t already. The text explains the guidelines that guard against plagiarism and gives examples that ignore the guidelines.

Exercise 11.3, p. 379

This exercise has students read a paragraph from a research paper and two sources on which it is based. The assignment is to make specific changes to the provided paragraph by referring to the source material. At the end of the exercise, you might discuss with students why these changes should be made, how the changes clarify meaning, and how the revised paragraph avoids plagiarism.
While plagiarism is often considered an academic issue, this set of readings and questions helps students think about the problem in broader terms. Some articles are focused on academic plagiarism and policies, but Jack Shafer looks at how plagiarism can be an issue outside the classroom as well. The Posner article takes a more humorous look at the history of plagiarism on college campuses, in history books, and even in film and theater. The goal is for students to think of how plagiarism links to issues of attribution, ownership, and even copyright, as well as how plagiarism has implications beyond their academic coursework. Ideally, this discussion will also encourage students to choose not to plagiarize and to realize that attributing information will improve their own credibility as writers.

Summary of “Sidebar: Comparing the Copy” by Jack Shafer, p. 383

This article from *Slate* compares opening passages from four different news stories about mad cow disease. The first paragraph is from a *Bloomberg News* article, the second is from the *New York Times* (and lifts passages from Bloomberg without attribution), and there are two other opening passages from the Toronto *Globe and Mail* and the *Omaha World-Herald* with very different wording. This compilation should help students see the ways that attributions are necessary even in the news world, and it reminds them that when they do their own writing it’s best to take a different approach and word things in a unique way so that they avoid plagiarizing. Following the article is a list of questions for your students to consider.

At Issue: Sources for Understanding Plagiarism, p. 385

1. Passages in the *New York Times* story that are too close to the original *Bloomberg News* story:
   - Both *Bloomberg* and the *New York Times* article have similar phrasing, such as “to resume imports of Canadian cattle” and “after an appellate court . . . because of mad cow disease” (paras. 2, 5); “The first shipments from Canada may arrive at U.S. slaughterhouses” (3).
   - Both sources use the same quotation from Mike Johanns, they set the quotation up in the same way, and both say that Canadian and U.S. officials “are coordinating how to certify animals for shipment” (3, 6).
   - Both stories write about the U.S. courts ruling “in favor of the government, which argued / had argued that Canadian cattle / cows under 30 months of age don’t /did not pose a risk of mad-cow disease.”

2. We do not include all of the similarities, but here are some starting points:
   The first paragraphs of the *Globe and Mail* story and the *New York Times* story both include the information that Canadian cattle imports will resume. The fourth paragraph of the *Globe and Mail* story discusses the U.S. appeal court
panel decision, as does the last paragraph of the *New York Times* story. The first paragraphs of both the *Omaha World-Herald* story and the *New York Times* story report that Canadian cattle will be able to be imported into the United States shortly. The fourth paragraph of the *Omaha World-Herald* article and the third paragraph of the *New York Times* story quote Agriculture Secretary Mike Johanns.

3. Students’ findings for question 2 should prepare them to answer this question. See if they agree that the Toronto and Omaha stories are “starkly different” from the Bloomberg story; have them justify their responses by referring to earlier information in this chapter.

4. For this question, students are likely to go back to the articles and compare *exact wording*. Remind them that they should also consider where the articles summarize or paraphrase similar information without attribution, because plagiarism is not just lifting text word-for-word. You might remind students that the original source is the conference call with the agriculture secretary. Do the articles make it sufficiently clear that the call is the source of the information?

5. Students should support their conclusions about the *New York Times* and plagiarism by citing copy from the four excerpts as well as from earlier Chapter 11 text that describes plagiarism. Do students think the *New York Times* story represents significant plagiarism? Is it intentional? What might be the restrictions for reporting on news from a conference call? How could such plagiarism be avoided?

**Summary of “How to Fight College Cheating” by Lawrence M. Hinman, p. 386**

Hinman discusses what he calls “disturbing” evidence that an increasing percent of high school and college students cheat or plagiarize (para. 1). He says that, while students have always cheated, it has become easier to do so with the availability of sources, and even “term-paper mills,” online (5). The response from teachers and administrators has been to fight this development with more technology, by turning to plagiarism-detection software and the like. But Hinman says this strategy is not enough. Instead, he poses three main ways to combat cheating and plagiarism: professors who work more closely with students in order to see the process of their thinking and working, students who have a better sense of integrity and responsibility, and students who are willing to come forward and confront academic dishonesty.

**At Issue: Sources for Understanding Plagiarism, p. 387**

1. Hinman admits that students have always cheated, but that before the Internet, students had to plan ahead to cheat. They could order a term paper and have it faxed, have someone else write one for them, or draw on the collection of papers that many fraternities and sororities kept on file. But now students can order a paper online and have it printed out immediately, ready for class the
next day. Hinman also mentions that cutting and pasting research sources is very common now, as students take sentences and paragraphs from Internet sources, even if not plagiarizing a whole paper.

2. Student responses will vary, of course, but each student should understand that Hinman thinks good teaching is the best way to prevent cheating and plagiarism. His subsequent points come from this assertion.

3. **Hinman's view of plagiarism-detection sites:**
   - Hinman calls anti-plagiarism services “the academic equivalent of mandatory urine testing for athletes” (para. 4). He admits that these services can catch students, but they don’t prevent students from cheating.
   - Instead, he states that each side will continue to construct “more elaborate countermeasures to outwit the other” so that the situation will “undoubtedly continue to spiral” (5). Clearly, according to Hinman, other measures must be taken on the preventive side.

4. Hinman outlines several ways that “good teaching” can combat cheating and plagiarism:
   - Professors need to change their curriculum, not allow it to fall prey to “routine, lack of interest, and overwork” (6).
   - Professors need to know their students and give them assignments that require regular interaction with their professors (6–7).
   - Professors should help students develop work that is “a meaningful development of their own interests” (7).
   - Professors need to be familiar with their students’ writing so they can detect inconsistencies as a sign of plagiarism (7).

5. **Hinman’s additional remedies:**
   - Hinman states that instructors need to “encourage the development of integrity” in their students (8). This includes a “sense of responsibility about one’s intellectual development” and an understanding that cheating is “inconsistent with one’s identity” (8).
   - Teachers must encourage students to see academic dishonesty as something that hurts all students, not just the cheater. Students who plagiarize often do get good grades, and their cheating can take scholarships, recommendations, and admission spots away from qualified students (9). Students who know about cheating must be willing to confront it (9).
   - Ask your students whether these seem like possible remedies or if Hinman is being overly idealistic. Also ask them who Hinman puts the burden on (the teachers) and see if they think that is fair.

6. To help your students identify opposing arguments and possible rebuttals by Hinman, consider asking them what objections they have to Hinman’s article. What limitations do teachers face with class size, curriculum requirements, and time limits that might make Hinman’s advice difficult? Might readers argue that Hinman needs to put more responsibility and
7. Some of Hinman’s observations and recommendations still seem valid, although students may disagree over the prevalence of essays bought from term paper sites. The article could use some updating with more recent data on cheating and the effectiveness of anti-plagiarism services. Her recommendations—that engaged teachers vary assignments, that educators promote integrity in students, that students be encouraged to see plagiarism’s unfair consequences instead of being told the false cliche that cheaters only harm themselves—remain as legitimate now as they were in 2004.

**Summary of “Plagiarism Lines Blur for Students in Digital Age” by Trip Gabriel, p. 389**

Writing in the *New York Times*, Trip Gabriel looks at the prevalence of plagiarism and considers the possibility that its prevalence indicates a generational shift. Professors traditionally “admonish[ed] students to give credit to others and to follow the style guide for citations, and pretty much left it at that” (para. 4). Now, however, digital technology and the Internet are changing how students “understand the concept of authorship and the singularity of any text or image” (7). Gabriel cites a range of experts and students to build up a multifaceted view of plagiarism; explanations range from the decline of the Enlightenment idea of authorship to the laziness of college students.

**At Issue: Sources for Understanding Plagiarism, p. 391**

1. Gabriel could have structured the essay in another way. However, his main point is that plagiarism has become more complex in an age of digital media and the Internet than it was previously. These examples suggest the complexity of the problem at the outset of Gabriel’s article. They are not merely examples of plagiarism; they also support the idea that today’s students view originality, intellectual property, and information differently than their predecessors.

2. A better thesis for this article might be in paragraph 7: “Digital technology makes copying and pasting easy, of course. But that is the least of it. The Internet may also be redefining how students—who came of age with music file-sharing, *Wikipedia*, and Web-linking—understand the concept of authorship and the singularity of any text or image.” Gabriel’s primary purpose is not to take a stand on whether plagiarism is good or bad. Rather, his goal is to suggest that digital media and the Internet have changed the relationship between students and information, originality, and authorship—and that this change has also changed the nature of plagiarism.

3. Drawing on the observations of students, professors, and administrators, as well as anthropologist Susan Blum, the article proposes that digital media and the Internet may have changed people’s understanding of information and
intellectual property. This shift may be increasing the prevalence of plagiarism. One student claims, “Because you’re not walking into a library, you’re not physically holding the article, which takes you closer to ‘this doesn’t belong to me’ . . . everything can belong to you really easily” (14). According to Blum, “Our notion of authorship and originality was born, it flourished, and it may be waning” (18). Still, Gabriel leaves room for other explanations, such as the number of students who plagiarize because they are “unprepared for the intellectual rigors of college writing” (27).

4. “Pastiche” refers to a piece of writing, art, music, or other form that presents itself as a self-conscious imitation of some other work. In some cases, the creators of pastiches assemble unusual or deliberately incongruous parts from their predecessors. This practice can describe a wide range of cultural artifacts, from T.S. Eliot’s poem “The Waste Land” to contemporary hip hop music. A collage is a form of art, music, or writing where an artist assembles various preexisting elements, possibly including pieces of other works, into a coherent whole. Students may disagree over whether these practices are suitable for academic writing. For example, many artists deliberately and openly present their works as derivative or influenced by predecessors to achieve particular — and novel — aesthetic effects. In contrast, students hastily copying and pasting from Wikipedia without attribution do not seem to be producing anything of similar intellectual value.

5. Wilensky rejects the theoretical explanations of Blum and writer Helene Hegemann. She worries that viewing plagiarism in these ways lowers standards and encourages laziness. For Wilensky, originality and creativity still matter. She finds it insulting that some would excuse plagiarism with an explanation such as Hegemann’s: “‘There’s no such thing as originality anyway . . . ’” (22). You might encourage students to consider these questions in broader fields of art, music, and movies, as well as in the context of academic writing.

6. Gabriel’s conclusion is not a strong summing-up, or forceful restatement of a position. However, the final paragraph is subtle and evocative in its implications. First, it plays upon another generational stereotype: that of “helicopter parents” who hover over their children to protect them or — in this case — do their work. Second, it reveals that plagiarism is not unique to the younger generation of students; in fact, this example shows that parents are willing to engage in the practice as well. Moreover, it suggests a culture in which parents may be actively or passively encouraging their children to cheat, regardless of ethics or the need for academic honesty.

Summary of “Too Hard Not to Cheat in the Internet Age?” by Elizabeth Minkel, p. 393

Elizabeth Minkel’s New Yorker essay is a response to Trip Gabriel’s “Plagiarism Lines Blur for Students in Digital Age” (p. 389). In Minkel’s view, Gabriel wrongheadedly “excuses youthful copycats” by blaming the Internet and the “Digital Age” (para. 1).
While Gabriel speculates about a younger generation’s new relationship to information and originality, Minkel sees college students “acting as college students always have” (1). Instead of coming up with excuses or explanations for plagiarism, she writes, professors need to encourage students “to produce original work” (para. 5).

At Issue: Sources for Understanding Plagiarism, p. 394

1. Gabriel’s argument does not excuse plagiarism, although it does imply that the Internet and digital media, generally, have complicated the problem of plagiarism for both students and professors. He writes that the Internet “may also be redefining how students . . . understand the concept of authorship and the singularity of any text or image” (para. 7). Notice that he qualifies this statement with the word “may”; he cites some sources who seem to agree with this premise and others who do not.

2. Minkel’s summary leaves out the skeptical sources that Gabriel includes in his article. Her reading of “Plagiarism Lines Blur for Students in Digital Age” implies that Gabriel makes a more pointed and unqualified argument than he actually does in his article.

3. The student cited by Minkel appears to embody the “two types of people pulling these excuses.” The student seems to be “using the Digital Age argument” to his advantage in a “crafty” way (2); he also seems to be “confused” or “fuzzy on plagiarism” (4), independent of technological developments. But Minkel may be transferring her hostility toward excuse-making and false claims of some “new Reality Hunger-type wave of open-source everything” onto Gabriel’s article (4). He does not endorse either of these positions.

4. Minkel’s tone is frustrated and annoyed. The characterization of Gabriel’s article in the first paragraph makes it sound facile and pretentious. Her rhetorical “Really?” in the second paragraph suggests annoyance, as does her cynical view of “crafty” students who take advantage of Digital Age arguments to justify their own dishonesty. Likewise, she seems superior to the “completely clueless” students who “just don’t understand the concept of plagiarism” (2). In her own words, she finds academic discussions of an open-source generation “frustrating” (4). Her New Yorker readers are likely to be familiar with this topic; some students, however, might be put off by her tone.

5. By identifying herself as a recent college graduate, Minkel appeals to ethos. This implies that she can speak with authority about the attitude of contemporary students. She writes, “I was well aware of the necessity of avoiding minefields of unattributed — and often incorrect — information on the Web” (2). If she is representative of other students, Minkel’s experience undercuts the argument that undergraduates are working through some complex new relationship with originality and authority.

6. The final paragraph sums up her main point. She criticizes Gabriel’s article because (to her) academic theorizing about Digital Age plagiarism excuses academic dishonesty, as a practical matter. Such discussions teach students only “how to lie and get away with it” (5). Educators and students would be better
served by recommitting to the idea of “original work.” Her conclusion is effective, although the final line about plagiarizing politicians may seem like a non sequitur to some students without more elaboration.


Posner laments the fact that most people define plagiarism simply as copying or borrowing without attribution. Such practices are commonplace in our society, Posner states, and it is for this reason that many students are confused as to why some forms of plagiarism are wrong. Posner cites examples of how theater, literature, music, and other fields constantly endure borrowing and reinvention — all without any attribution to the original source. He says that students must be better educated about academic plagiarism because such copying “disrupt[s] the system of student and scholarly evaluation” (para. 4). The writer also posits a more useful definition of plagiarism as that which is copied without acknowledgment so as to be deceptive (12).

At Issue: Sources for Understanding Plagiarism, p. 397

1. Posner says that plagiarism is usually seen as “the capital intellectual crime” (1), “fraud” (3), “copying” (6), and a form of “theft” (6). But Posner believes that there need to be distinctions between these various definitions. For instance, plagiarism and copying are not the same, according to Posner; he proposes that plagiarism be “confined to literal copying, and moreover literal copying that is not merely unacknowledged but deceptive” (12).

2. Posner argues that plagiarism committed by students and professors is the most serious. In paragraph 4, he supports this view by stating that students and professors who plagiarize “disrupt the system of student and scholarly evaluation.” In other words, some forms of plagiarism are not as harmful, but in an academic setting, plagiarism robs students of the process of learning and developing. See if your students have arguments against this view and the plagiarism hierarchy Posner creates in this article, or if they agree.

3. In paragraphs 7 and 8, Posner gives many examples of alluding to, copying, and borrowing that occur in theater, literature, art, and movies. Students will likely be familiar with several of his examples and may comment on nonacademic “plagiarism.”

4. In paragraph 16, Posner says that even judges conceal their original thinking and, instead, appeal to their predecessors for “rules and principles.” Posner is arguing that, just as those who interpret the law build on the ideas of others, so do writers; all writers, as Posner would argue, build their ideas on others’ ideas, so the idea of a “universal moral law” against copying is simply unfair.

5. Posner says that the demand to punish plagiarists is a backlash against the postmodern idea that journalists and historians are not truthful and instead
rely on relativism when approaching the facts of news or history. In these
disciplines, punishing plagiarism is a way to gain back credibility (18).

6. See if students agree that Posner upheld this claim in his essay, and find out
why they think he did or didn't. Then, to answer the second part of this ques-
tion, you might consider telling students a bit about copyright and ownership
throughout history or even in other countries (for instance, in the nineteenth
century in the United States, it was common for writers to lift whole passages
and storylines from other writers, or to reprint, without citation, newspa-
per excerpts or other published writing). Ask students how our thoughts on
individualism and originality might be a more modern-day, American concern
and how this might spill over to what Posner believes is an unfair comparison
of plagiarism to copying.

Summary of “Plagiarism and BuzzFeed’s Achilles’
Heel” by Dylan Byers, p. 398

In this article from Politico, media reporter Dylan Byers considers the plagiarism
accusations against BuzzFeed editor Benny Smith, the ethics of BuzzFeed’s “curated”
content, and the larger media discussion around these issues. Byers claims that the
controversy — and the apparent pleasure that journalists have taken in Smith’s
downfall — are understandable: “In the eyes of many journalists, BuzzFeed is con-
tantly walking a fine line between aggregation, or ‘curation,’ and theft” (para. 3).

At Issue: Sources for Understanding Plagiarism, p. 399

1. If students are unfamiliar with BuzzFeed, they may want to spend a little time
on the site viewing its content. They are likely to have a variety of views on this
subject, which might touch on the fundamental idea of “originality.” You may
want to discuss the use of the term “curate,” as well, which has come to have a
slightly different — and perhaps more positive — connotation than “aggre-
gate.” Curation suggests a process that is more deliberate and specific; more-
over, curation also implies that the “found” Web material has been organized
or reframed in some creative way for a particular audience, instead of merely
gathered and placed in one location.

2. As a figure of speech, an Achilles heel refers to an area of (often fatal) vul-
nerability or weakness despite one's overall strength or vitality. In the case of
BuzzFeed, the site is enormously popular and successful, but its reliance on the
work of others may lead to its downfall.

3. In the introduction, the reference to a parody in The Onion introduces some
key themes of the article, including implicit silliness of BuzzFeed's content
and the view of BuzzFeed among many journalists: “It appealed to reporters
because it was a clever knock on the state of digital journalism” (para. 1). He
returns to The Onion again in his conclusion because, essentially, the parody
has become reality: according to a Bloomberg News writer, BuzzFeed faces pla-
giarism charges over “an article it did about former President George H. W.
Bush’s socks” (para. 18).
4. Aggregators and curators find content around the Web and place it in a single location, as in the case of BuzzFeed or the *Huffington Post*. Presumably, they should give credit, but (as Farhad Manjoo notes in a passage cited by Byers's article) “often — and, from what I can tell, deliberately — their posts are hard to trace back to the original source material” (para. 6). You might compare this to writing in an academic context, in which sourcing must be scrupulously clear.

5. Manjoo acknowledges BuzzFeed’s success and influence, but he thinks they “pilfer” (i.e., “steal”) material, particularly from Reddit, while simultaneously making it difficult to find the source of that material (paras. 6–7). Chen believes that BuzzFeed has a “plagiarism problem” that raises questions about “journalistic ethics” (paras. 8–9). Gawker’s J.K. Trotter clearly believes that BuzzFeed is guilty of plagiarism (para. 15).

6. As Manjoo implies, deliberately hiding sources or making them difficult to trace suggests deliberate deception, as opposed to accidentally leaving out attributions (forgetting to use quotation marks or the phrase “according to”). Students may or may not find the latter more excusable.

7. While responses may vary, students are likely to believe that forty instances of plagiarism are reasonable ground for dismissal — even for contributors to a “curated” content site, like BuzzFeed.

8. Byers does not take a strong position on BuzzFeed and plagiarism, other than to say their approach to curating content is “a little seedy” (para. 15). His article is more of a “meta” story, reporting on the media discussion about BuzzFeed. But the article does include some elements of argument. His main point or thesis is probably best represented in the following sentence: “In the eyes of many journalists, BuzzFeed is constantly walking a fine line between aggregation, or ‘curation,’ and theft” (para. 3). He supports this claim by citing some evidence, such as responses from journalists. However, he does not refute counterarguments, nor does he use a traditional concluding statement that reinforces the position of the thesis.

---

**Summary of “OK or Not?” by K. Balibalos and L. Gopalakrishnan, p. 401**

In this series of three poll questions from the WriteCheck.com blog, respondents are asked about common scenarios that may — or may not — be plagiarism. The authors then discuss the results to both inform readers and help students make ethical choices about academic honesty.

**At Issue: Sources for Understanding Plagiarism, p. 404**

1. Plagiarism is a complex issue, and while questions around collaboration and the use of Internet sites like *Wikipedia* may be straightforward, the question of possible self-plagiarism is more nuanced.

2. Student responses should vary. As the final question seems the most complex, make sure to cover it in the discussion.
3. They state their purposes in the second paragraph: “This new poll series brings to light common scenarios — specifically focused on plagiarism and perhaps a few examples of other forms of academic misconduct — and helps students to better think critically about situations in order to make ethical choices.”

4. The intended audience for the poll questions is students; at the same time, the writers solicit responses from a writing instructor and others in the WriteCheck online social media community who are clearly part of the audience for the larger discussion of plagiarism.

5. Sites like Wikipedia and other open sources of information can be a problem because they provide quick and convenient access to large amounts of information on any subject. But that information may be superficial, poorly researched, a step removed from secondary sources, or otherwise unsuitable for academic papers. These sites can provide tempting opportunities to plagiarize. Moreover, students may not investigate primary and secondary sources on their own.

6. This is not an argumentative essay or post. The writers are trying to inform their readers and give them ways of thinking about plagiarism — and the best ways to avoid it.


Popular “essay mills” like echeat.com and myessayhouse.com are notorious for selling academic papers to students. So curious psychology professor and author Dan Ariely and his lab manager provide a writing prompt to four of these companies and order four essays to see “exactly what they provide” (para. 3). He discovers that the papers are terribly written, sourced, and formatted, concluding: “It’s comforting in a way that the technological revolution has not yet solved students’ problems” (para. 17). But the very existence of these enterprises still bothers him.

At Issue: Sources for Understanding Plagiarism, p. 407

1. “Coarse” has several meanings and connotations: rough and scratchy in texture, but also rude, vulgar, and boorish. In this context, the writing in the paper was rough and scratchy “gibberish,” while the entire experience with the essay mill (e.g., its refusal to refund Ariely, its threat to call the dean) suggests rudeness and vulgarity.

2. A “mill” is a building equipped with machinery for grinding grain into flour, like a factory. In the context of “essay mills,” the term connotes a factory that mindlessly grinds out anonymous, poorly written essays for money.

3. He investigates because he knows that they exist and tries to take them into consideration when he assigns essays. He is curious to find out what kind of papers these mills write: “Professors in general are concerned about essay mills and their effect on learning, but not knowing exactly what they provide, I wasn’t sure how concerned to be. So together with my lab manager Aline
Grüneisen, I decided to check the services out” (para. 3). He is successful, in
that he gets a sense of the kind of work that essay mills do.

4. He concludes that the mills provide terribly written, poorly sourced, ineptly
formatted, and often plagiarized “gibberish” (para. 7). He provides specific
examples of terrible writing to support this general claim, although it is
from a limited sample of essays. He also concludes that students cannot
“rely on [these] services to get good grades” (para. 7) and that “the tech-
nological revolution has not yet solved students’ problems” (para. 7). To
support the last two conclusions, he would likely need more evidence — for
example, evidence that professors are actually providing poor grades for
this work.

5. Students might respond by discussing the practices of — and pressures on —
college students to complete their academic assignments. Even if most students
who use essay mills only rely on them once, that may be enough to keep them
in business. Moreover, there is essentially an endless supply of new students
under pressure to meet deadlines.

6. The one-sentence final paragraph does not summarize all his ideas. But it does
reinforce the notion that essay mills are unscrupulous, both financially and
intellectually.

Summary of Term Papers for Sale
Advertisement, p. 409

This Web site advertises for services that provide custom term papers for students.
You might ask students how prevalent their use is, and about the ethics of buying
such essays.

At Issue: Sources for Understanding Plagiarism, p. 409

1. The site is designed to get students to buy essays. Its argument seems to be
based on delivery of a quality product on time, with a “money-back guarantee.”

2. The site appeals primarily to ethos. For example, money-back guarantee
(p. 409) suggests that those behind the site stand by their product. The “100%
satisfaction guarantee” claim implies that the audience views these aca-
demic essays like any other consumer product. It is unclear what the “guar-
antee” actually means in the long run, however. The ad does not indicate
that unsatisfied customers will have their grade changed. Additionally, the
“Why Us?” portion of the site explains that the site has “been known for
honest, reliable and professional operating at the academic writings market
for 12 years.” Clearly grammar is not the strong suit of TermPaperWriter.
org, so their ethical claim is suspect. Logical claims include the state-
ments that papers will satisfy the student’s requirements. Appeals to pathos
include the images of the happy, graduating students, as discussed in the
response to question 3.
3. The stock photos show pleased and successful students. The ad uses an image of two people graduating, which implies success is the ultimate goal for students seeking to buy papers.

4. Students will no doubt find spelling errors, odd capitalizations, misused punctuation, and missing articles, as well as strange syntax and wording. The ads are trying to create an image of professionalism, academic quality, and good writing, but the errors and non-standard English undermine that image.

5. Because plagiarism is by definition the appropriation of intellectual content without attribution, a guarantee of a plagiarism-free paper for sale is logically fallacious. Of course, the entire transaction is dishonest if students buy papers and submit them to professors as their own work.

Template for Writing an Argument about Plagiarism, p. 410
This exercise asks students to compose a one-paragraph argument in which they take a position on where to draw the line with plagiarism. Students should fill in the given paragraph structure with their own words. Here is a sample response with the given text in boldface.

To many people, plagiarism is theft; to others, however, it is not that simple. For example, some define plagiarism as merely borrowing; others see it as copying another’s words or ideas. Another thing to consider is whether the person who plagiarized did so deceptively and with the intent of defrauding readers. In addition, we must realize that borrowing and copying are common in other areas of society. They are common in music, movies, or even literary plots. Despite these differences of opinion, plagiarism is often dealt with harshly and can ruin careers and reputations. All things considered, it is important to note who was involved and what the circumstances were surrounding any incident of plagiarism, and the label of “plagiarism” should be reserved for willful cases of fraud.

Exercise 11.4, p. 410
This exercise asks students to discuss the issue of plagiarism in small groups. The goal is to have them think about how they’d define plagiarism and to consider who is involved in plagiarism—who commits plagiarism (who doesn’t) and who are its victims. Finally, students should draft a paragraph that summarizes the key points of their discussion.

Teaching tip: In this discussion, have students think back to the readings. Do students think that there is a difference between copying a plotline for a movie and quoting paragraphs of research in a paper without documentation? How is a person’s intent a factor?

Exercise 11.5, p. 410
Finally, in this exercise, students are directed to draft an argumentative essay “Where Should We Draw the Line with Plagiarism?” By narrowing their focus to a specific group, the students will be able to more effectively address the often-unwieldy topic of plagiarism. Students should also address whether plagiarism always has a negative effect. In their essays, they should refer to At Issue readings and be sure to document their sources.
Exercise 11.6, p. 410
This exercise asks students to think foundationally about the arguments they wrote for Exercise 11.5 by now reviewing the four pillars of argument discussed in Chapter 1. Students should establish whether their own argument includes these pillars, add anything that is missing, and then label the essay by identifying these parts.

Writing Assignments: Using Sources Responsibly, p. 411
This section allows you to take the concept of plagiarism a bit further by having your students draft either a causal argument (see Chapter 13) or an argument by definition (see Chapter 12). Each of these suggestions has students engage with the At Issue essays while considering both their opinions on the plagiarism issue and the ways they can present these opinions through different styles of argumentation.