p. 1

Name\_

## Completing Ch. 9 in Opening Doors, Ch. 9 in Vocabulary Connections, and Part-Time Indian

Due dates will be announced in class, but the entire packet needs to be turned in on the day of the final, which is when you will be quizzed on this material.

## Part I. Opening Doors Textbook & Online Homework

GOT our c in the DO t your As you	"Take Out the Trash, and Put It Where? on <b>p. 614-618</b> in <i>Opening Doors</i> .  Of the Online Learning Center (OLC) at http://highered.mcgraw-hill.com/sites/0073407135/student_view0/index.html or from class web site at http://www.marthabianco.com/RD115. Instead of answering the comprehension questions for the 3rd reading the chapter, go to the OLC and select Chapter 9.  The "Take Out the Trash" and the Chapter Review quizzes online. When you're finished, submit your answers and e-mail them to self (not to me!). Print out the 1st page only of each e-mail and staple them to your homework packet to turn in.  The page only of each e-mail and staple them to your homework packet to turn in.  The page only of each e-mail and staple them to your homework packet to turn in.  The page only of each e-mail and staple them to your homework packet to turn in.  The page only of each e-mail and staple them to your homework packet to turn in.  The page only of each e-mail and staple them to your homework packet to turn in.  The page only of each e-mail and staple them to your homework packet to turn in.  The page only of each e-mail and staple them to your homework packet to turn in.  The page only of each e-mail and staple them to your homework packet to turn in.
1a.	Is the first statement by Denis Hayes in ¶1, p. 614, a fact or an opinion?
1b.	Explain your answer.
2a.	On p. 616, what logical conclusions can you draw about whether landfills are safe?
2b.	Explain your answer.
3a.	On p. 617, what logical conclusions can you make about what New York will do with its garbage?
3b.	Explain your answer.
4a.	Is the statement by Allen Hershkowitz in ¶19, p. 617, a fact or an opinion?
4b.	Explain your answer.
→ Cond	duct a critical evaluation of the author's argument in this last reading selection:
1.	What is the <i>issue</i> this reading is about? To answer this, ask yourself: "What controversial topic is this
	<b>reading about?"</b> Generally, with this kind of material, the author is trying to <u>argue a point</u> . He or she has a <i>thesis</i> , a point he or she wants to <u>persuasively arque</u> . Examples of controversial topics about which authors (and readers) might try to argue are abortion, the death penalty, legalizing marijuana, protecting the spotted owl, etc.
2.	What is the author's argument? To answer this, ask yourself: "What is the author's point of view,
<b>.</b> .	position, and/or bias about the controversial topic?" Although an author may choose to take a neutral position and present just the facts, leaving readers to decide for themselves, often the author of a persuasive piece will take a position and try to persuade readers to agree with him or her. For example, an author might write a piece that is anti-abortion, pro death penalty, against the legalization of marijuana, opposed to protection of certain endangered species, etc. You need to be a detective to find out where the author is coming from.

3.	What are the author's assumptions? These are factors that the author takes for granted, that he or she assumes to be true – without offering specific evidence. Suppose an author argues that an advantage of the death penalty is that it serves as a deterrent to crime, that is, that potential criminals will not commit crimes that carry the death penalty because they would fear having that penalty themselves. A primary assumption here is that potential criminals pay attention to the enactment of the death penalty, that they know that it's a potential penalty for a crime they might commit, and that knowledge of the death penalty is enough to keep them from committing a crime – when in fact even if they know the death penalty could be imposed, they might not care and go ahead and commit the crime anyway. There is an assumption here that such criminals care in the first place about whether they live or die. And that may simply not be true.
4.	What types of support does the author offer for his or her position? Here, you need to look at the supporting details and ask what kinds of support they provide for the author's argument. So, if the author is arguing that the death penalty is a deterrent to crime, we might expect the author to provide statistics, expert opinion, interview results, and other facts and evidence that could bolster his or her case.
5.	Does the support relate directly to the author's argument? It's really important that the support an author offers is directly relevant to his or her argument. In the death penalty argument, if the author argued that victims' families felt safer, that argument – while perhaps true – doesn't really have anything to do with the author's argument that the death penalty is a deterrent to crime.
6.	Is the author's argument objective and complete? This means that the author's argument is based on facts not on opinion. It also means that the author hasn't left out any important information that might actually weaken his or her argument. If we found out that the author's sister was murdered by a felon who received a sentence of life without parole – but not an actual death penalty – this information begins to weaken the author's argument because it shows that he or she is probably not being objective. Furthermore, the author might actually know of studies that show that in fact there is a very weak connection between criminals' awareness of the death penalty and the likelihood that they will commit a serious crime – but the author doesn't mention any of those studies in his/her argument. That makes the argument incomplete.
7.	Is the argument valid and credible? The validity of an argument is based on how well the author reasoned it correctly and logically, based on the information and evidence. To figure this out, examine your answers to the questions about assumptions, types of support, whether the support relates directly to the argument, and whether it is objective and complete. If the answer to those four questions is "yes" or even "mostly yes," then the argument is probably valid and, therefore, logical. Whether the argument is credible means, simply, is it believable? If it's valid and logical, it probably is believable. But, you may come across points that are very well argued, but in the end just don't convince you. You might agree with most of the author's argument in support of the death penalty, finding it mostly objective and complete, and pretty logical – but in the end, you just aren't convinced that the death penalty will in fact result in fewer serious crimes. Usually, if an argument is very strong and valid, it will be credible, but if there are weaknesses and omissions here and there, it becomes harder to believe in the author's position. This is what critical thinking is all about!

Choose the answe		Explain the	reason for your answer in a brief sent	tence 🖟
	21			
	22.			
	23			
	24.			
	25.			
		Part II.	Vocabulary Connections	QUIZ ALERT!

WORD PART	MEANING	SAMPLE WORD 1	SAMPLE WORD 2	SAMPLE WORD 3	SAMPLE WORD 4
ali					
duc					
civ / cit					
mit / mis					
cent					



## Part III. The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian

- Read p. 179-230 from the book & answer the following questions.
   All of these questions will appear on the last quiz.
   You will choose any two to answer for regular credit and any two to answer for extra credit.
   Be especially careful to answer all parts of each question. Use a highlighter if you have to (and a pen for underlining) to make sure you see every question-within-a-question.
   You can bring these pages to the quiz, to use as a reference but beware that your answers should rock!
- 1. Referencing p. 180, explain why Junior/Arnold became a good basketball player "overnight." Give examples & details. Do you think you've become a better reader (and maybe even writer) "overnight" (over the course of this term)? Why?

2. On p. 183, the local news crew comes out to interview Arnold and asks, "So, Arnold, how does it feel to play against your former teammates?" When Arnold responded, "It's kind of weird," the newscaster said, "Listen. I know this is a difficult thing. You're young. But maybe you could get more specific about your feelings." What was Arnold finally able to say once he was able to find the words to be "more specific"? Looking back over this term, when I've been urging you over and over again to BE SPECIFIC and PROVIDE DETAIL in your essay responses, please respond specifically to this question: When you first started this class, you probably struggled to answer many of the questions about our readings; now, you're definitely reading at college level. How does that make you feel?

3. On p. 187, Coach tells the team, "I have to be honest, guys. We can't beat these guys with our talent. We just aren't good enough. But I think we have bigger hearts." As Junior/Arnold goes on to explain things over the next couple of pages, what do you think Coach meant by that – "have bigger hearts"? Thinking about how far you've come with your reading and writing ability in this class this term, do you think you're good enough, that you have heart, or maybe even both? Why? How can you use those four words (YOU CAN DO IT) to describe where you've come from and where you are going, as far as being a true college reader?

4. On p. 211, Rowdy tells Junior, "It's all your fault." What is it that Rowdy's accusing Junior of here? Considering everything that happened – not just in this chapter, but in the whole book, why do you think Junior tells us, "The next morning, I went to school. I didn't know what else to do"? What are other things he could have done (what were most of the other Indians doing?)? What do you think it means that he decided to go back to school? Did you have any crises happen to you this term? What do you think it is that made you decide to keep coming back to school?

5. On p. 217, Junior lists all the tribes he belongs to. Briefly explain what you think he means by any six of them (for example, what does he mean when he says he belongs to the tribe of American immigrants?). List the "tribes" you feel you belong to. Can you think of any "new" tribes that you might belong to, now that this class, this term, this academic year have all come to an end – compared with those you belonged to when you first started?



- Read **p. 572-575** about identifying propaganda devices (also called logical or rhetorical fallacies). Consult the following table to answer the questions on the next page. You may bring this table with you to the quiz.
- 1. **Appeal to authority**: assuming an expert in one field might be an expert in another
  - Three out of four dentists recommend Crestine toothpaste.
- 2. **Appeal to fear / Slippery slope**: arguing that one thing will lead to a cascade of unwanted events
  - If you let your kids play video games, they'll never pick up a book again!
- 3. **Appeal to sympathy:** trying to get readers to feel sorry for someone or something
  - Your \$20 donation could save this child's life a life that without your help could end before she's 10 years old.
- 4. **Appeal to tradition**: relying on tradition as an explanation
  - In this part of the country, we have always voted the conservative ticket – and nothing's going to change that.
- Appeal to vanity: arguing that readers should feel a certain way because they are special or superior to others
  - The few. The proud. The Marines.
- 6. **Ad hominem** (personal attack): using a personal attack, unrelated to the thesis, to explain it
  - My opponent lied about smoking pot during his high school years. Why should we believe him now when he says he can reduce taxes?
- 7. **Bandwagon argument**: justifying an argument because "everyone" thinks that way
  - Everyone wants to be in shape today. So join the millions who have bought the Home Exer-Gym.
- 8. **Circular reasoning / Begging the question**: assuming what first needs to be proved or answered before taking action
  - You could get a better grade if you worked harder.
     Good grades cause students to put more effort into their work.
- Dodging the issue (red herring): diverting attention from the real problem by highlighting something unrelated
  - The question is not whether we should have invaded Iraq. The question is whether we want a free Middle East.
- 10. **Either-or fallacy / False dilemma**: insisting that there are just two alternatives, when there may be many
  - Vote "yes" for tuition increases or say goodbye to productive career training.

- 11. **False analogy**: assuming that two things that are similar in one way are similar in other ways
  - Taking a shower with Spring Burst soap is as refreshing as a refreshing romp in the surf.
- 12. **False cause** (*post hoc, ergo propter hoc*): arguing that because two events are related in time, one *caused* the other
  - Joan was scratched by a cat while visiting her friend. Two days later she comes down with a fever and concluded it must be "cat scratch fever."
- 13. **Hasty generalizations**: "leaping to conclusions" generalizing based on very little evidence
  - If you care about animals, you'll send in a generous donation to the Animal Protection League today.
- 14. **Oversimplifying**: arguing for a very simple explanation to a very complex issue
  - Taxation is theft. Don't vote for higher taxes!
- 15. **Plain folks:** trying to convince readers to adopt an opinion like the author's because he's just a regular guy like they are
  - I'm just a simple man hoping to represent the common man's interests before Congress.
- 16. **Straw man:** first, misrepresenting what an opponent believes, and then attacking that belief
  - Senator Jones wants to kill all defense funding. Why would he want to leave us at the mercy of our enemies like that?
- 17. **Sweeping generalizations**: presenting a broad statement that goes far beyond the evidence; a form of stereotyping
  - Have you noticed how all old people are really bad drivers?
- 18. **Testimonial / Endorsement**: arguing that because some famous person believes something, the reader should, too.
  - The cast members of Lost eat Wheaties to help them find their way throughout the day. Shouldn't you, too?
- 19. **Transfer (bad) / Guilt by association**: unfairly criticizing/accusing someone because of their association with others
  - He may say he supports environmental reform, but his own brother drives an SUV!
- 20. **Transfer (good)**: transferring good qualities of a person or a thing to another, in order to get the reader to support it
  - Just like JFK, our candidate is a Catholic from Massachusetts.

- Use the table of propaganda devices/logical-rhetorical fallacies on the previous page to indicate which type of device each sentence below is using.
- 1. A successful politician has to be either a liar or just plain lucky.
- 2. The victims of the devastating tornado need more than your pity. They need you to roll up your sleeve and donate blood.
- 3. Bill Collins was an outstanding quarterback in college, and I believe he will make an outstanding senator today!
- 4. Ellen failed her first quiz; I'd say she's a poor student.
- 5. Gold Star Butter: It's not for just anyone.
- 6. Ever since our new school superintendent took office last January, crime has increased 14 percent.
- 7. Christmas wouldn't be Christmas without Creamy Smooth Eggnog! It's been America's No. 1 choice for more than half a century.
- 8. Fitz Holladay has a documented problem with alcohol from his college days; his is unfit to run for governor.
- 9. Each year more than one million Americans trust Nationwide Realty to sell their homes. Shouldn't you?
- 10. I'm not voting for Judge Barlow; she belongs to the same club as that lawyer who was recently disbarred.
- 11. Liz got wet and cold in the rain, so now she's got the flu!
- 12. Parents are justified in doing whatever it takes to keep themselves informed about their child if they think their child is doing something wrong. Dr. Laura says it's okay for parents to search their teenagers' rooms, read their diaries, and even take drug tests.
- 13. Many college students, faced with unbelievable external pressures, cheat on exams and homework; therefore, it makes sense to go ahead and do that once in a while.
- 14. The governor opposes legislation that mandates safety locks on guns. Obviously, he has no problem with innocent children being killed from playing with guns.
- 15. None of the children in my family drink coffee; obviously, children don't like coffee.
- 16. Since both the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times* endorsed the senator for reelection, she has my vote!
- 17. That merchant has been alleged to be a thief and a liar; his arguments against a sales tax are worthless.
- 18. The Olympic champion's face on that box of cereal guarantees it's great for you!
- 19. The current economic crisis is the result of poor decisions by the Bush administration.
- 20. The new mayor is not even the head of his own household, so how can we expect him to be the leader of a city?

- 21. This novel has been No. 1 on the best-seller list for weeks. You should read it!
- 22. We Americans have the right to pursue happiness, and we should want to do what is right. So let's make happiness our goal in life.
- 23. We can eliminate hunger by growing more food.
- 24. America will have better-educated citizens when fewer students drop out of school.
- 25. We have never allowed students without a high school diploma or GED to take college classes; therefore, we should not allow such students into our program.
- 26. We have two choices: to build more nuclear power plants or to be completely dependent on foreign oil.
- 27. We know this is a natural law because it feels natural.
- 28. We need to get rid of the liars and thieves in government!
- 29. Why worry about overcrowded schools when we ought to be trying to attract a professional hockey franchise?
- 30. Gun control and state-subsidized health care are the first steps toward a socialist government.

## ☐ Read the following paragraph and identify the logical fallacies you may find in it.

<sup>1</sup>As the Oscar-winning director, Scavan Kleck has argued, "Animal experimentation saves lives." <sup>2</sup>Isn't the life of a little girl more important than the life of a chimpanzee? <sup>3</sup>We have to choose: we can either experiment on animals to find cures for life-threatening diseases or we can stand by helplessly while thousands of children die. <sup>4</sup>Experimentation is necessary because research is important. <sup>5</sup>And why should we worry about what happens to animals in laboratories when the real problem is how people treat their pets? <sup>6</sup>Advocates of animal rights are a bunch of sentimental vegetarians who don't care what happens to children, and they will never be satisfied with banning painful experiments on animals. <sup>7</sup>If they succeed in getting legislation passed that restricts experimentation, it's only a question of time before the sale of meat is prohibited. <sup>8</sup>Just look at the trouble they've already caused. <sup>9</sup>The cost of research has soared since people started protesting against animal experimentation.