

UNIT 6: Synthesizing Perspectives and Refining Arguments, pp. 299–378

UNIT 6 OVERVIEW, pp. 300–310

Student open responses will vary. Sample responses are provided.

Analyzing the Visual, p. 301

Students may suggest that the image conveys the struggles Puerto Rico has gone through and the way those struggles have threatened to break the people of Puerto Rico.

Composing on Your Own p. 308

After each professional anchor text, students will have an opportunity to write freely in response to it. Although subsequent “Composing on Your Own” activities direct students to specific writing tasks based on what they are learning, students are also free to follow their own inquiries in these compositions that develop over a unit. *See pages 223–228 for Inquiry Activities for Writing Rhetorically.*

What Do You Know? pp. 309–310

Note: This recurring feature uses the practice of “effortful recall” to help students’ learning “stick.” Chances are that over their previous years of schooling, students have encountered these ideas, if not necessarily the terminology. Having to work hard to retrieve what they already know will help students form stronger connections to the new knowledge they acquire. These questions are not meant to be scored. They will serve as a guide to what your students may or may not already know about the unit’s content.

Close Reading

1. She anticipates others’ reactions by recognizing the limitations of her evidence. For instance, she says things such as, “Yet not all circumstances are quite so cut-and-dried,” or she seems, especially in the beginning, to speak directly to her audience when admitting that we all lie. Anticipating that her readers may accuse her of passing judgment, the author provides multiple examples showing that she herself lies. Finally, she concedes that lying may be unavoidable, such as when she says that sometimes we have to lie in order to pacify children.
2. Although the author initially states, “Sure I lie, but it doesn’t hurt anything,” she quickly contradicts this statement by saying, “But if I justify lying, what makes me any different from slick politicians or the corporate robbers who raided the S&L industry?” In much of the essay, the author answers this question by providing a variety of evidence to reveal the negative aspects of lying.
3. She moves from contemplating hypothetical situations at the beginning of the essay to examining specific types of lies. Her line of reasoning shifts as she provides more evidence to support her argument that we all lie. It shifts again when she acknowledges the limitations of her evidence, such as when she says she realizes not all examples are “cut-and-dried.”
4. In much of the essay, Ericsson’s tone is informal and conversational, but it never detracts from her position about the different types of lies. The author likely establishes this tone to make herself seem accessible, down-to-earth, and nonjudgmental.
5. “Yet not all circumstances are quite so cut-and-dried.” (reconsideration, refinement)
“But there is a world of difference between telling functional lies and living a lie.” (qualification to her argument)

Evaluating Writing

1. One source views the dilemma from an ethical perspective shaped by his study of philosophy and the other views it from a behavioral perspective shaped by her study of psychology.
2. The philosopher objects on ethical grounds and states that encouraging children to believe in fantastical characters discourages critical thinking. The psychologist thinks it’s okay to let children believe in them but that parents should tell the truth when children begin to doubt the existence of these characters.
3. This piece is an example of neutral diction.
4. The overall tone is fairly formal and impersonal.
5. The tone largely remains the same throughout.

Analyzing the Visual, p. 310

The image conveys the idea that Santa is real because he and his reindeer can be detected on radar, a scientific instrument. It contributes the idea that adults go out of their way to support children’s belief in fictitious characters.

PART 1 SYNTHESIZING PERSPECTIVES, pp. 311–321

PART 1.1 Evaluating and Synthesizing Source Material | CLE-1.P CLE-1.Q

For a reproducible of writing choices that increase credibility on page 318 of the student text, see page 272.

1.1 Checkpoint, pp. 318–320

Item Number	Answer	Enduring Understanding	Skill	Essential Knowledge	Text Pages
Close Reading					
1	See below.	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.Q: reliability of sources	312–316
2	A	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.P: source material	312–318
3	C	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.P: source material	312–318
4	C	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.P: source material	312–318
Evaluating Writing					
1	See page 106.	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.P: source material	312–318
2	See page 106.	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.P: source material	312–318
3	C	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.Q: reliability of sources	312–316

Close Reading: Open Response Questions/Activities

1. Ericsson’s evidence ranges from common everyday occurrences to examples from history, psychology, and sociology. She usually provides more than one example for each type of lie, which has the effect of making her argument relatable to a more diverse audience. Many of the lies for which she does not provide a personal example, such as the historical example of the U.S. Navy denial of imminent attack, are things that many people have heard about, but perhaps have not considered to be forms of lying. The fact that she does not focus on specific details or facts does not detract from her credibility.

Evaluating Writing: Open Response Questions/Activities

1. The writer uses information from two professors with contrasting perspectives about what is best for children.
2. The writer uses information from two professors with contrasting perspectives about what is best for children. One is a professor of philosophy who thinks that these lies discourage critical thinking. The other is a professor of psychology who thinks that adults can wait until children begin to question these fictional characters before they break the spell by providing honest answers.

Composing on Your Own, page 320

Students should explore various sources to help them decide on a subject. Remind students that the process of research will help them develop a central claim that they can defend in writing. Students may have opinions or experience concerning a particular area of interest, but the research process should refine—and possibly change—their ideas about their subject matter. When conducting research, students should keep their rhetorical situation in mind, including the exigence, audience, and purpose.

PART 1.2 Position Versus Perspective | CLE-1.R

1.2 Checkpoint, pp. 322–324

Item Number	Answer	Enduring Understanding	Skill	Essential Knowledge	Text Pages
Close Reading					
1	See below.	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.R: position and perspective	321–322
2	See below.	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.R: position and perspective	321–322
3	A	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.R: position and perspective	321–322
4	D	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.R: position and perspective	321–322
5	C	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.R: position and perspective	321–322
Evaluating Writing					
1	See page 107.	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.R: position and perspective	321–322
2	See page 107.	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.R: position and perspective	321–322
3	See page 107.	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.R: position and perspective	321–322
4	See page 107.	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.R: position and perspective	321–322
5	A	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.R: position and perspective	321–322

Close Reading: Open Response Questions/Activities

1. Ericsson acknowledges that we all lie, but she suggests that little lies can have big consequences, some of which we may not be aware of at the time the lie is told. Although Ericsson initially states—somewhat dismissively—that “we all lie,” she quickly reevaluates this statement, saying “But if I justify lying, what makes me any different from slick politicians or the corporate robbers who raided the S&L industry?”
2. Ericsson’s perspective changes when she discusses unintentional lies, such as the time she was confronted by a truck driver who questioned her assertion that she had “a mouth like a truck driver.” Ericsson realized that she needed to change her perspective, because her perspective was based on a stereotype, and that a stereotype was a type of lie.

Evaluating Writing: Open Response Questions/Activities

1. The last sentence reveals the writer’s position: whether or not to believe in fictional holiday characters is a personal choice, but it is important that families have their own traditions.
2. The writer discusses two different perspectives in the essay (one that questions promoting fictional holiday characters and one that suggests possible benefits), and these perspectives are reflected in the writer’s conclusion, which states that parents can “either enhance or replaces the traditions...connected to fictional characters.”
3. The writer does not simply agree or disagree with either source but synthesizes the information to inform his or her own position.
4. The audience for the student draft is primarily fellow students; the student essay is being written in reaction to a cheating scandal that has been uncovered. Many students may have fond memories of holidays, but others may consider believing in fictional holiday characters to be somewhat childish and outdated. In addition, because the essay is being published in the wake of a cheating scandal, many students may consider any type of lying to be a serious offense, so the author needs to carefully weigh whether or not any type of lying can have value.

Composing on Your Own, p. 324

Students should write a thesis statement establishing an argument that can be logically defended with evidence from reliable sources. When reviewing their source materials, students should pay careful attention to the positions and perspective of the writers. Remind students that a writer’s position reflects his or her beliefs, while writer’s perspective reflects his or her unique viewpoint and background. Before refining their thoughts into a thesis, students should consider the rhetorical situation, including the context, audience, and purpose of their writing. As students begin to craft their writing, remind them that a thesis that states clear position is more compelling than a bland generalization or repeating something that is factually well-known.

**PART 1.3 Recognizing and Acknowledging Biases in Source Material, pp. 325–330 | CLE-1.S
CLE-1.T**

1.3 Checkpoint, pp. 328–329

Item Number	Answer	Enduring Understanding	Skill	Essential Knowledge	Text Pages
Close Reading					
1	See page 108.	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.S, CLE-1.T: bias and limitations of arguments	325–327
2	See page 108.	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.S, CLE-1.T: bias and limitations of arguments	325–327
3	D	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.S, CLE-1.T: bias and limitations of arguments	325–327
4	D	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.S, CLE-1.T: bias and limitations of arguments	325–327
5	E	CLE-1	3.A	CLE-1.S, CLE-1.T: bias and limitations of arguments	325–327
Evaluating Writing					
1	See page 108.	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.S, CLE-1.T: bias and limitations of arguments	325–327
2	B	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.S, CLE-1.T: bias and limitations of arguments	325–327

Close Reading: Open Response Questions/Activities

- Ericsson acknowledges the limitations of her evidence when she says things like, “Yet not all circumstances are quite so cut-and-dried” or when she speaks directly to her audience when admitting that we all lie. She anticipates that her readers may accuse her of passing judgment. There are also other places where she concedes that lying happens and sometimes needs to happen—such as when she recognizes that we may have to lie in order to pacify children.
- Ericsson admits that she is biased, since she can accept her own lies but not those of others. In addition, some students may suggest that Ericsson displays a liberal bias, such as her negative views of the Clarence Thomas hearing, or her view that removing the character of Lilith from the Bible was a form of “spiritual robbery.”

Evaluating Writing: Open Response Questions/Activities

- There does not appear to be evidence of bias. Each of the sources appears to be an area expert who is examining this dilemma objectively: one employs an ethical perspective shaped by the study of philosophy, and the other with a behavioral perspective shaped by the study of psychology.

Composing on Your Own, p. 330

Students should make sure they are using information from reliable sources. Remind students to review the table of sources to ensure that they use evidence that is reliable. When reviewing sources, students should look out for exaggerated language that may reveal writer bias. Students should also keep the rhetorical situation in mind. Finally, students can start drafting their essay, integrating their source material to defend the main claim they have developed.

Part 1 Apply What You Have Learned, p. 330

- Students may point to any of the following: the competing nature of deception and deception detection in evolutionary biology; the reliance of lying on theory of mind and executive processes and their complementary relationship; lack of relationship between lying and lie detection; good liars make good lie detectors.
- Students will note that Riddle uses what appears to be reliable, academic, research-based sources, such as articles and studies generated by area experts.
- Limitations: first, participants were explicitly instructed when to lie; second, the study cited is a correlational study that doesn’t explain why the connection between liars and lie detectors exists.

Reflect on the Essential Questions, p. 333

Readers need to pay close attention to the way information is presented in the sources they consult. Some sources are more reliable or credible than others. Some sources may be less credible because they exhibit bias or less reliable because of other serious limitations. Often, the degree to which a source does or does not consider other positions reflects the degree to which it is biased. Writers should synthesize evidence from multiple sources that may share the writer’s same position on the subject while coming from different perspectives based on their background, interests, and expertise. When incorporating evidence or sources into an argument, writers need to recognize and acknowledge the biases and limitations of the material and account for those limitations in their reasoning.

PART 2 CONSIDERING AND ACCOUNTING FOR NEW EVIDENCE, pp. 334–355

PART 2.1 Consideration and Use of New Evidence, 335–340 | CLE-1.U

2.1 Checkpoint, pp. 338–339

Item Number	Answer	Enduring Understanding	Skill	Essential Knowledge	Text Pages
Close Reading					
1	See below.	CLE-1	3.B	CLE-1.U: revising based on new evidence	335–337
2	See below.	CLE-1	3.B	CLE-1.U: revising based on new evidence	335–337
3	See below.	CLE-1	3.B	CLE-1.U: revising based on new evidence	335–337
4	E	CLE-1	3.B	CLE-1.U: revising based on new evidence	335–337
5	C	CLE-1	3.B	CLE-1.U: revising based on new evidence	335–337
Evaluating Writing					
1	See below.	CLE-1	4.B	CLE-1.U: revising based on new evidence	335–337
2	See page 110.	CLE-1	4.B	CLE-1.U: revising based on new evidence	335–337
3	A	CLE-1	4.B	CLE-1.U: revising based on new evidence	335–337

Close Reading: Open Response Questions/Activities

- The author might investigate her line of reasoning by asking the following questions. *Does the fact that it is illegal make the sergeant’s lie worse? Does it show that the sergeant felt so strongly that he was willing to risk his own military benefits (such as his pension, the possibility of promotion, etc.) if his lie came to light? Does the legality of a lie indicate whether or not it is a serious offense?*
- Some students might suggest that Ericsson’s heavy reliance on anecdotal evidence may undermine her argument because such evidence is based solely on her personal experience, while including more examples from scientific studies could give the essay an objective credibility. In addition, Ericsson could bolster her argument by citing additional examples of the harmfulness of lying in contemporary politics.
- More details might conflict with her informal style. She is trying to not sound overly academic or as if she is a moral elitist, and involving too many details (rather than just selecting the most apt information to include) might complicate her message and turn off some readers. She is also trying to pull general understandings from specific instances.

Evaluating Writing: Open Response Questions/Activities

- The beginning of the argument discusses the emotional underpinnings of the holiday season, and also contrasts the roles of parent and child, but doesn’t explicitly provide an absolute claim. Then, in the third and fourth paragraphs, the writer provides two professional positions—one from a philosophical perspective and one from

a psychological perspective—before synthesizing these two positions in the final paragraph. In the final paragraph, the writer argues that choosing whether to tell children that fictional holiday characters are real or fake is a personal decision for adults; there is no one right answer, and families need to consider what traditions mean and how they want to celebrate together.

- Answers might include: blogs by parents in which they share their experiences, both good and bad; articles by people who regret that Santa Clause and the Easter Bunny secularize holidays that were originally religious celebrations; and articles about how learning the truth about these fictional characters led children to reject religion as well.

Composing on Your Own, p. 339

Students should review their draft and decide, based on reviewing their sources, whether or not to rethink or refine their subject matter. Remind students that evidence often causes a writer to reassess his or her claim. When reviewing their work, students should keep the rhetorical situation in mind.

Part 2 Apply What You Have Learned, pp. 339–340

- No. It only elaborates on an aspect of lying but does not challenge any other positions.
- It would fit best in paragraph 6 where the author discusses response times.

Reflect on the Essential Question, p. 340

The thesis statement identifies the trajectory of the argument, helping the reader identify any ideas that are not aligned with the claim set forth in the thesis; this can render the argument specious. New evidence—whether it agrees with the writer’s position or not— should influence the line of reasoning, if not the thesis. Sometimes a writer may not completely change his or her claim or position, but does need to account for the new evidence, pointing out the limitations or biases in it and then explain why this evidence does not necessitate a change in information, perspective, and argument.

PART 3 STRATEGIC USE OF TONE, pp. 334–355

PART 3.1 Tone, pp. 342–351 | STL-1.D STL-1.E

For a reproducible of the elements of style on pages 347 and 348 of the student text, see page 273.

3.1 Checkpoint, pp. 349–351

Item Number	Answer	Enduring Understanding	Skill	Essential Knowledge	Text Pages
Close Reading					
1	See page 111.	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.D: tone; writer’s attitude STL-1.E: inferring tone from word choice	342–348
2	See page 111.	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.D: tone; writer’s attitude STL-1.E: inferring tone from word choice	342–348
3	B	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.D: tone; writer’s attitude STL-1.E: inferring tone from word choice	342–348

4	B	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.D: tone; writer’s attitude STL-1.E: inferring tone from word choice	342–348
5	D	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.D: tone; writer’s attitude STL-1.E: inferring tone from word choice	342–348
6	C	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.D: tone; writer’s attitude STL-1.E: inferring tone from word choice	342–348
Evaluating Writing					
1	See below.	STL-1	8.A	STL-1.D: tone; writer’s attitude STL-1.E: inferring tone from word choice	342–348
2	See below.	STL-1	8.A	STL-1.D: tone; writer’s attitude STL-1.E: inferring tone from word choice	342–348
3	E	STL-1	8.A	STL-1.D: tone; writer’s attitude STL-1.E: inferring tone from word choice	342–348

Close Reading: Open Response Questions/Activities

- For a blank reproducible of the table below, see page 274.

Describe the author’s tone.	Identify strategic word choices to help set the tone.	Identify at least three characteristics of the author’s style.
Informal, down to earth	Synonyms for lying, colloquialism, slang	Rhetorical questions, dashes with follow-up questions

- Her tone is largely informal and conversational, which doesn’t detract from her position about the different types of lies, because it makes her seem accessible, down-to-earth, and nonjudgmental. A more formal tone might not appeal to a general readership and prevent some people from reading the writer’s essay. When discussing certain subjects, the author sometimes subtly varies the language, integrating words that are more formal with the informal language that makes up most of her essay. She also questions “establishment” ideas about truth, appealing to the ideals of social change that are held by many of the magazine’s readers.

Evaluating Writing: Open Response Questions/Activities

- The tone is fairly formal throughout. It remains impersonal even when the writer describes memories of childhood holiday magic, which appear to be hypothetical.
- Being detached and impersonal about the subject allows for the introduction of two different perspectives and a position that uses information from both perspectives. It also appears more credible to use an objective approach to a subject that may have emotional associations for many readers. The author is writing in response to a cheating scandal and is addressing students, parents, and teachers, so the tone remains objective and formal, which highlights the seriousness of the subject matter and is likely to appeal to a broad audience.

Composing on Your Own, p. 351

While keeping the rhetorical situation in mind, students should carefully consider each point in the bulleted checklist. Students should attempt to keep a consistent tone, and any variations in the tone should serve a specific purpose within the argument. Students should consider the language that will most effectively connect with their chosen audience. The language should also reflect the purpose and context of the writing. Remind students that emotional language will have a different effect than formal, studious language. Finally, students should review their spelling, sentence structure, and grammar to make sure their writing is free of editorial errors.

PART 3.2 Shifts in Tone, pp. 351–355 | STL-1F

For a reproducible of the template for describing tone shift on page 353 of the student text, see page 275.

3.2 Checkpoint, pp. 353–354

Item Number	Answer	Enduring Understanding	Skill	Essential Knowledge	Text Pages
Close Reading					
1	See below.	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.F: shifts in tone	351–353
2	See below.	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.F: shifts in tone	351–353
3	B	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.F: shifts in tone	351–353
Evaluating Writing					
1	See page 113.	STL-1	8.A	STL-1.F: shifts in tone	351–353
2	B	STL-1	8.A	STL-1.F: shifts in tone	351–353

Close Reading: Open Response Questions/Activities

1. In “The Ways We Lie”, Stephanie Ericsson’s tone shifts from one of flippant observation when describing the multitude of lies that she tells in a given day to a tone of grave reflection when describing the effect that lies can have. This shift highlights the writer’s realization that lies, no matter how small, are far more intricate and meaningful than one might assume.
2. While the author generally uses a similar tone throughout the essay, she does sometimes subtly shift the tone. Often, she uses the word “but” to signal a change in tone or perspective. For instance, when she begins to question her initial assertion that everyone lies, she states, “But if I justify lying, what makes me any different from slick politicians or the corporate robbers who raided the S&L industry?” In addition, when she questions the social facades that everyone uses—including herself—she states, “But facades can be destructive because they are used to seduce others into an illusion.” Similarly, when she questions everyone’s tendency to lie by omission, she states, “But what about omission of information that could make a difference in how a person lives his or her life?”

Evaluating Writing: Open Response Questions/Activities

1. In the last paragraph, the writer could qualify his or her position in a variety of ways. For instance, the author could note that holidays are not important because of the material gifts we receive or the fables we tell our children; instead, holidays allow us to step out of our day-to-day routines, to mark the passage of time, and to reflect on and celebrate the important things in life, including friendship and family.

Composing on Your Own, p. 354

Students should first review their work to ensure that it has a consistent tone. If the tone varies, students should ask themselves whether or not this variation is justified by shift in the argument or the rhetorical situation. When introducing an opposing viewpoint or a different perspective, students may want to shift the tone by changing the language. When students are satisfied that the essay handles tone effectively and addresses the rhetorical situation, they should carefully work through the “Checklist for Composing” to revise their essays into final form.

Part 3 Apply What You Have Learned, p. 355

Students will likely note that both essays discuss the results of telling lies, and both authors suggest that lying is an integral part of day-to-day life, but Ericsson’s essay uses many more personal anecdotes to draw her reader in, while Riddle’s essay largely uses scientific evidence, including examples from nature and a particular scientific study. Ericsson’s essay only examines the human aspects of lying, but Riddle shows that lying—or “deception” as he calls it—is a prevalent mode of survival in the animal kingdom. In addition, Riddle focuses on a scientific study to examine whether people who are good liars are better at detecting a lie than people who are unconvincing liars. Riddle is not only interested in examining lying, but is also concerned with examining the ability to uncover lies; unlike Ericsson, Riddle seems unconcerned by the moral aspects of lying, but is more concerned with exploring his thesis: “Good liars... should also make for good lie detectors.”

The tone in most of Riddle’s article is formal and somewhat academic, although the introductory paragraph, which focuses on an example of how deception is used when playing poker, incorporates more informal, colloquial language—such as “poker chops” and “bad shape”—to interest the reader in the subject matter. The author repeatedly uses the word “deception” instead of “lie.” Although “deception” usually has a negative connotation (and a largely negative denotation), the author isn’t interested in passing judgment; in fact, he shows that deception is part of survival for animals, and he’s primarily interested in the process of detecting deception.

Riddle compares how deception and detecting deception is used within poker to the deceptions practiced by frogs; in both cases, deception and deception detection are related skills. In his concluding paragraph, Riddle suggests that lying and detecting lying are both decisive factors in whether people succeed or not, but he never judges whether lying is good or bad.

Reflect on the Essential Question, p. 355

A writer’s word choices should fit his or her purpose and intended audience. Formal diction and a serious tone are appropriate for an academic paper. Neutral diction has a more conversational tone, while informal diction is the most personal of all, the language of everyday speech. The writer’s choice of words should fit the tone he or she wishes to convey, which means that he or she must consider not just their neutral denotations but also their connotations. Using words with the wrong connotation can undermine a writer’s purpose. A shift in tone may indicate a shift in attitude or a shift in the writer’s line of reasoning. A writer may start out by making a claim, but upon considering evidence from a variety of sources may alter or refine his or her original opinion of the subject.

Revised Student Draft Passage from pages 312–313. Revised sentences and sections appear in *italics*. New sentences added to this draft have not been numbered.

(1) Many of our most cherished memories are of holiday celebrations. (2) *[First half of original sentence has been deleted]* Children approach this time of year with joy and wonder. (3) Undoubtedly, some of the most memorable life experiences—for both adult and child—stem from imagining Santa coming down the chimney to deposit gifts under the tree, or the baskets of candy left by the Easter Bunny. (4) While both child and adult recall these times of magic and consumerism with warm nostalgia, it is up to the adults to maintain these fanciful images for children.

(5) *Unfortunately*, parents everywhere are plagued by the ethics of lying to children in order to foster a childhood full of magic. (6) Should adults, from parents and grandparents to schoolteachers and religious leaders, continue to perpetuate lies about Santa Claus, the Easter Bunny, and the Tooth Fairy in order to instill magic into these holidays and, ultimately, childhood? *After all, children will, eventually, discover the truth about their favorite childhood holiday characters, and the resulting distrust they feel toward their parents can alter the integrity of that relationship.*

(7) David Johnson, a professor of philosophy, has an ethical objection to parents promoting literal belief in Santa Claus, believing that it discourages critical thinking. (8) When kids begin to ask questions, many adults pull out “proof.” (9) This promotes credulous thinking, since it teaches kids to believe something in spite of the evidence against it, and sets a dangerous precedent. (10) And, since children trust their parents to tell them the truth, this lie is a betrayal of their trust.

(11) Conversely, Cyndy Scheibe, a professor of psychology, recalls the look on children’s faces when they start to question their belief in Santa. (12) That shift comes at a stage of cognitive development when their thinking grows more organized. (13) Scheibe qualifies her belief that children should be allowed to believe in these holiday characters by saying that when children start questioning how Santa can get down every chimney or how reindeer can fly, it is time for adults to answer honestly.

While Johnson explores the ethics of maintaining a false narrative in order to create magic during holidays, Scheibe relies on the psychological perspective to inform her position that nurturing these beliefs can be appropriate, depending on the cognitive development of the child. Although both perspectives are well-researched and credible, they fail to consider factors such as family dynamics, cultural customs, or religious traditions and therefore each family needs to make its own decisions about what is best. (14) Ultimately, parents and other adults in children’s lives need to instill their own traditions and ways of celebrating that can either enhance or replace the traditions and celebrations connected to fictional characters.

UNIT 6 REVIEW

Section I: Multiple Choice, pp. 356–363

Item Number	Answer	Enduring Understanding	Skill	Essential Knowledge	Text Pages
Reading					
1	D	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.D, E: tone, word choice	342–348
2	A	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.D: tone	342–348
3	D	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.D: writing style	342–348
4	C	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.F: shifts in tone	351–353
5	E	STL-1	7.A	STL-1.F: qualification, refinement, or reconsideration	351–353
6	E	RHS-1	1.A	RHS-1.A: exigence	9–10
7	A	REO-1	5.A	REO-1.E: sequencing	142–143
8	A	REO-1	5.B	REO-1.O: repetition	267

Item Number	Answer	Enduring Understanding	Skill	Essential Knowledge	Text Pages
Writing					
9	E	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.P: source material	312–314
10	C	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.R: position and perspective	321–322
11	E	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.P: source material	312–314
12	B	STL-1	8.A	STL-1.D: tone; writer’s attitude STL-1.E: inferring tone from word choice	342–348
13	D	CLE-1	4.A	CLE-1.R positions	321–322
14	B	CLE-1	4.B	CLE-1.U: changing the line of reasoning	335–338

Join the Conversation, pp. 354–373

For reproducibles of the organizers on pages 371 and 372–372 of the student text, see pages 276 and 277–278.

Justice and Race To reinforce the skills of synthesis and engage in a conversation on justice and race, you may wish to use the activity on page 238.

Section II: Free Response, pp. 374–378

Synthesis Rubric: Snowflakes

Row B in the following rubric has been modified to suit the requirements for the somewhat simplified synthesis prompt in *Join the Conversation* on pages 364–373. See page 175 for the College Board® version of the rubric used to score the synthesis prompt on the AP® exam.

Row A: Thesis (0-1 points), Scoring Criteria [4.B]	
<p>0 points For any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no defensible thesis. The intended thesis only restates the prompt. The intended thesis provides a summary of the issue with no apparent or coherent claim. There is a thesis, but it does not respond to the prompt. 	<p>1 point Responds to the prompt with a thesis that presents a defensible position.</p>
<p>Responses that do not earn this point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only restate the prompt. Do not take a position, or the position must be inferred or is vague. Equivocate or summarize other's arguments but not the student's (e.g., some people say it's good, some people say it's bad). State an obvious fact rather than making a claim that requires a defense. 	<p>Responses that do earn this point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respond to the prompt by developing a position on the role of free speech on campus, rather than restate or rephrase the prompt. Clearly take a position rather than just stating there are pros/cons.
<p>Examples that do not earn this point: Restate the prompt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Some people argue that offensive speech should be banned from campus." <p>Address the topic of the prompt, but do not take a position</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Some people argue that triggering speech should be banned, but others feel that all students should be able to speak freely." "Some types of speech are hurtful to certain people, although some people feel this speech is not a problem." <p>Address the topic of the prompt but state an obvious fact as a claim</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Universities are places of learning for adults, not day cares for coddling children." 	<p>Examples that earn this point: Present a defensible position that responds to the prompt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Colleges are places where young people engage new and sometimes uncomfortable ideas. As a result, people need to feel free to openly discuss a wide range of ideas without worrying about offending sensitive groups. Too much concern about possibly offending someone will lead to censoring people and limiting the free exchange of information." "While 'safe spaces' have been derided as places where ideas are censored, the truest meaning of 'safe space' is a designated place where people can freely and openly discuss ideas without fear of ridicule. What makes these spaces safe is not that ideas and viewpoints are limited, but that participants can feel safe to express themselves."
<p>Additional Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The thesis may be more than one sentence, provided the sentences are in close proximity. The thesis may be anywhere within the response. For a thesis to be defensible, the sources must include at least minimal evidence that <i>could</i> be used to support that thesis; however, the student need not cite that evidence to earn the thesis point. The thesis <i>may</i> establish a line of reasoning that structures the essay, but it needn't do so to earn the thesis point. A thesis that meets the criteria can be awarded the point whether or not the rest of the response successfully supports that line of reasoning. 	

Row B: Evidence AND Commentary (0-4 points), Scoring Criteria [2.A, 4.A, 6.A, 6.B, 6.C]

<p>0 points Simply restates thesis (if present), or references no sources.</p>	<p>1 point EVIDENCE: Provides evidence from or references one of the provided sources. AND COMMENTARY: Summarizes the evidence but does not explain how the evidence supports the argument.</p>	<p>2 points EVIDENCE: Provides evidence from or reference at least one of the provided sources. AND COMMENTARY: Explains how some of the evidence relates to the student's argument, but no line of reasoning is established, or the line of reasoning is faulty.</p>	<p>3 points EVIDENCE: Provides specific evidence from both of the provided sources to support all claims in a line of reasoning. AND COMMENTARY: Explains how some of the evidence supports a line of reasoning.</p>	<p>4 points EVIDENCE: Provides specific evidence from at both of the provided sources to support all claims in a line of reasoning. AND COMMENTARY: Consistently explains how the evidence supports a line of reasoning.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Decision Rules and Scoring Notes | Typical responses that earn . . .

<p>0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are incoherent or do not address the prompt. May be just opinion with no textual references or references that are irrelevant. 	<p>1 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tend to focus on summary or description of sources rather than specific details or techniques. 	<p>2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consist of a mix of specific evidence and broad generalities. May contain some simplistic, inaccurate, or repetitive explanations that don't strengthen the argument. May make one point well, but either do not make multiple supporting claims or do not adequately support more than one claim. Do not explain the connections or progression between the student's claims, so a line of reasoning is not clearly established. 	<p>3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uniformly offer evidence to support claims. Focus on the importance of specific details from the sources to build an argument. Organize an argument as a line of reasoning composed of multiple supporting claims. Commentary may fail to integrate some evidence or fail to support a key claim. 	<p>4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uniformly offer evidence to support claims. Focus on the importance of specific details from the sources to build an argument. Organize and support an argument as a line of reasoning composed of multiple supporting claims, each with adequate evidence that is clearly explained.
---	---	--	--	---

Additional Notes:

- Writing that suffers from grammatical and/or mechanical errors that interfere with communication cannot earn the fourth point in this row.

Row C: Sophistication (0-1 points), Scoring Criteria [2.A, 4.C, 6.B, 8.A, 8.B, 8.C]

<p>0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.</p>	<p>1 point Demonstrates sophistication of thought and/or develops a complex understanding of the rhetorical situation.</p>
<p>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</p>	
<p>Responses that do not earn this point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attempt to contextualize their argument, but such attempts consist predominantly of sweeping generalizations (“All colleges seek to educate people . . .” OR “Throughout history, people have always discussed important ideas . . .”). ▪ Only hint at or suggest other argument (“I’ve heard some college students say . . .” OR “While some college students may argue that . . .”) ▪ Use complicated or complex sentences or language that is ineffective because it does not enhance the argument 	<p>Responses that earn this point may demonstrate sophistication of thought and/or a complex understanding of the rhetorical situation by doing any of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Crafting a nuanced argument by consistently identifying and exploring complexities or tensions across the sources. 2. Articulating the implications or limitations of an argument (either the student’s argument or an argument related to the prompt) by situating it within a broader context. 3. Making effective rhetorical choices that consistently strengthen the force and impact of the student’s argument. 4. Employing a style that is consistently vivid and persuasive.
<p>Additional Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This point should be awarded only if the sophistication of thought or complex understanding is part of the student’s argument, not merely a phrase or reference. 	

Rhetorical Analysis Rubric: “Nine-Year-Olds, Meet Monet,” p. 378

Row B of the following rubric has been slightly modified to address tone and tonal shift.

Row A: Thesis (0-1 points), Scoring Criteria [1.A, 4.B]

<p>0 points For any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no defensible thesis. ▪ The intended thesis only restates the prompt. ▪ The intended thesis provides a summary of the issue with no apparent or coherent claim. ▪ There is a thesis, but it does not respond to the prompt. 	<p>1 point Responds to the prompt with a defensible thesis that analyzes the writer’s rhetorical choices.</p>
<p>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</p>	
<p>Responses that do not earn this point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only restate the prompt. ▪ Fail to address the rhetorical choices the writer of the passage makes. ▪ Describe or repeat the passage rather than making a claim that requires a defense. 	<p>Responses that earn this point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Respond to the prompt rather than restate or rephrase the prompt and clearly articulate a defensible thesis about the rhetorical choices Goodman makes to convey her message.
<p>Examples that do not earn this point:</p> <p>Restate the prompt “Goodman reveals that she views the trip to the art museum from different perspectives.” “Goodman uses the rhetorical situation to develop an essay about children attending a field trip at a museum.”</p> <p>Make a claim, but do not address the writer’s rhetorical choices “. . . Goodman shows that Monet was an individualist who valued his art.”</p> <p>Repeat provided information from the passage “In the essay, Goodman shows that the children are expected to fill out worksheets and reveals that the children enjoy their visit to the museum.”</p>	<p>Example that earns this point:</p> <p>Presents a defensible thesis that analyzes the writer’s rhetorical choices “Rather than using extensive examples and evidence, Goodman situates her audience in a common childhood experience: a field trip. Knowing that such trips attempt to expose children to real-world experiences, Goodman uses her impressions of the trip to explore how exposing children to Monet reveals the contradictory lessons we teach young people about self, individuality, and conformity.”</p>
<p>Additional Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The thesis may be more than one sentence, provided the sentences are in close proximity. ▪ The thesis may be anywhere within the response. ▪ For a thesis to be defensible, the passage must include at least minimal evidence that <i>could</i> be used to support that thesis; however, the student need not cite that evidence to earn the thesis point. ▪ The thesis <i>may</i> establish a line of reasoning that structures the essay, but it needn’t do so to earn the thesis point. ▪ A thesis that meets the criteria can be awarded the point whether or not the rest of the response successfully supports that line of reasoning. 	

Row B: Evidence AND Commentary (0-4 points), Scoring Criteria [1.A, 2.A, 4.A, 6.A-6.C]

<p>0 points Simply restates thesis (if present), repeats provided information, or offers information irrelevant to the prompt.</p>	<p>1 point EVIDENCE: Provides evidence that is mostly general. AND COMMENTARY: Summarizes the evidence but does not explain how the evidence supports the argument.</p>	<p>2 points EVIDENCE: Provides some specific relevant evidence. AND COMMENTARY: Explains how some of the evidence relates to the student's argument, but no line of reasoning is established, or the line of reasoning is faulty.</p>	<p>3 points EVIDENCE: Provides specific evidence to support all claims in a line of reasoning. AND COMMENTARY: Explains how some of the evidence supports a line of reasoning. AND Explains how at least one rhetorical choice contributes to the writer's argument, purpose, or message.</p>	<p>4 points EVIDENCE: Provides specific evidence to support all claims in a line of reasoning. AND COMMENTARY: Consistently explains how the evidence supports a line of reasoning. AND Explains how multiple rhetorical choices in the passage contribute to the writer's argument, purpose or message.</p>
---	---	---	--	---

Decision Rules and Scoring Notes | Typical responses that earn ...

<p>0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are incoherent or do not address the prompt. May be just opinion with no textual references or references that are irrelevant. 	<p>1 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tend to focus on summary or description of a passage rather than specific details or techniques. Mention rhetorical choices with little or no explanation. 	<p>2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consist of a mix of specific evidence and broad generalities. May contain some simplistic, inaccurate, or repetitive explanations that don't strengthen the argument. May make one point well, but either do not make multiple supporting claims or do not adequately support more than one claim. Do not explain the connections or progression between the student's claims, so a line of reasoning is not clearly established. 	<p>3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uniformly offer evidence to support claims. Focus on the importance of specific words and tone in the passage to build an argument. Organize an argument as a line of reasoning composed of multiple supporting claims. Commentary may fail to integrate some evidence or fail to support a key claim. 	<p>4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uniformly offer evidence to support claims. Focus on the importance of specific words and identify tonal shifts in the passage to build an argument. Organize and support an argument as a line of reasoning composed of multiple supporting claims, each with adequate evidence that is clearly explained.
---	--	--	---	---

Additional Notes:

- Writing that suffers from grammatical and/or mechanical errors that interfere with communication cannot earn the fourth point in this row. To earn the fourth point in this row, the response may observe multiple instances of the same rhetorical choice if each instance further contributes to the argument, purpose, or message of the passage.

Row C: Sophistication (0-1 points), Scoring Criteria [2.A, 4.C, 6.B, 8.A, 8.B, 8.C]

<p>0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.</p>	<p>1 point Demonstrates sophistication of thought and/or develops a complex understanding of the rhetorical situation.</p>
--	---

Decision Rules and Scoring Notes

<p>Responses that do not earn this point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempt to contextualize the text, but such attempts consist predominantly of sweeping generalizations (<i>"Most people appreciate Impressionism . . ."</i> OR <i>"Since people began painting . . ."</i>). Only hint at or suggest other argument (<i>"I once heard about an artist who . . ."</i> OR <i>"While a few people may argue . . ."</i>). Examine individual rhetorical choices but do not examine the relationships among different choices throughout the text. Oversimplify complexities in the text. Use complicated or complex sentences or language that are ineffective because they do not enhance the argument. 	<p>Responses that earn this point may demonstrate sophistication of thought and/or a complex understanding of the rhetorical situation by doing any of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Explaining the significance or relevance of the writer's rhetorical choices (given the rhetorical situation). Explaining a purpose or function of the passage's complexities or tensions. Employing a style that is consistently vivid and persuasive.
--	---

Additional Notes:

- This point should be awarded only if the sophistication of thought or complex understanding is part of the student's argument, not merely a phrase or reference.

Row A: Thesis (0-1 points), Scoring Criteria [4.B]	
<p>0 points For any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no defensible thesis. The intended thesis only restates the prompt. The intended thesis provides a summary of the issue with no apparent or coherent claim. There is a thesis, but it does not respond to the prompt. 	<p>1 point Responds to the prompt with a thesis that presents a defensible position.</p>
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
<p>Responses that do not earn this point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only restate the prompt. Do not take a position, or the position is vague or must be inferred. State an obvious fact rather than making a claim that requires a defense 	<p>Responses that do earn this point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respond to the prompt rather than restate or rephrase the prompt. Clearly take a position on Hynkel's declaration about brotherhood and kindness.
<p>Examples that do not earn this point: Do not take a position</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Hynkel's statement tells people to place importance on humanity and feelings." <p>Address the topic of the prompt but are not defensible—it is an obvious fact stated as a claim</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Charlie Chaplin created an interesting character in his movie <i>The Great Dictator</i>." 	<p>Examples that earn this point: Present a defensible position that responds to the prompt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Although Chaplin's character states that 'More than machinery we need humanity,' he made this statement years before the advent of the personal computer. Now, more than ever, humanity depends on the machinery of technology to interact and communicate—in other words, machinery is now part of our humanity." "Chaplin's plea for people to express a basic humanity, to focus on personal relationships rather than machinery, is more apt than ever. Our technology, which is supposed to help us communicate, has largely led to misinformation and people sequestering themselves in information silos." "Chaplin may have pleaded for people to place humanity over machinery, but he was also a savvy user and beneficiary of the highest form of technology during his days: movies. Chaplin's speech reveals a contradiction we all must face: we want to treat other with humanity and respect, but all too often we knowingly act against our stated ideals."
<p>Additional Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The thesis may be more than one sentence, provided the sentences are in close proximity. The thesis may be anywhere within the response. The thesis <i>may</i> establish a line of reasoning that structures the essay, but it needn't do so to earn the thesis point. A thesis that meets the criteria can be awarded the point whether or not the rest of the response successfully supports that line of reasoning. 	

Row B: Evidence AND Commentary (0-4 points), Scoring Criteria [2.A, 4.A, 6.A, 6.B, 6.C]				
<p>0 points Simply restates thesis (if present), repeats provided information, or offers information irrelevant to the prompt.</p>	<p>1 point EVIDENCE: Provides evidence that is mostly general. AND COMMENTARY: Summarizes the evidence but does not explain how the evidence supports the argument.</p>	<p>2 points EVIDENCE: Provides some specific relevant evidence. AND COMMENTARY: Explains how some of the evidence relates to the student's argument, but no line of reasoning is established, or the line of reasoning is faulty.</p>	<p>3 points EVIDENCE: Provides specific evidence to support all claims in a line of reasoning. AND COMMENTARY: Explains how some of the evidence supports a line of reasoning.</p>	<p>4 points EVIDENCE: Provides specific evidence to support all claims in a line of reasoning. AND COMMENTARY: Consistently explains how the evidence supports a line of reasoning.</p>
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes				
<p>0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are incoherent or do not address the prompt. May be just opinion with no evidence or evidence that is irrelevant. 	<p>1 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tend to focus on summary of evidence rather than specific details. 	<p>2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consist of a mix of specific evidence and broad generalities. May contain some simplistic, inaccurate, or repetitive explanations that don't strengthen the argument. May make one point well, but either do not make multiple supporting claims or do not adequately support more than one claim. Do not explain the connections or progression between the student's claims so a line of reasoning is not clearly established. 	<p>3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uniformly offer evidence to support claims. Focus on the importance of specific details to build an argument. Organize an argument as a line of reasoning composed of multiple supporting claims. Commentary may fail to integrate some evidence or fail to support a key claim. 	<p>4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on the importance of specific details to build an argument. Organize and support an argument as a line of reasoning composed of multiple supporting claims, each with adequate evidence that is clearly explained.
<p>Additional Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing that suffers from grammatical and/or mechanical errors that interfere with communication cannot earn the fourth point in this row. 				

Row C: Sophistication (0-1 points), Scoring Criteria [2.A, 4.C, 6.B, 8.A, 8.B, 8.C]

0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Demonstrates sophistication of thought and/or develops a complex understanding of the rhetorical situation.
--	---

Decision Rules and Scoring Notes

<p>Responses that do not earn this point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempt to contextualize their argument, but such attempts consist predominantly of sweeping generalizations (“We should all be kind to each other . . .” OR “Since people evolved, we have tried to get along . . .”). • Only hint at or suggest other argument (“Back in the olden days...” OR “There are many different arguments that I’ve heard . . .”). • Use complicated or complex sentences or language that are ineffective because they do not enhance the argument. 	<p>Responses that earn this point may demonstrate sophistication of thought and/or a complex understanding of the rhetorical situation by doing any of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Crafting a nuanced argument by consistently identifying and exploring complexities or tensions. 2. Articulating the implications or limitations of an argument (either the student’s argument or an argument related to the prompt) by acknowledging counterarguments. 3. Making effective rhetorical choices that consistently strengthen the force and impact of the student’s argument. 4. Employing a style that is consistently vivid and persuasive.
--	---

Additional Notes:

- This point should be awarded only if the sophistication of thought or complex understanding is part of the student’s argument, not merely a phrase or reference.

UNIT 7:

Style as Substance, pp. 379–460

UNIT 7 OVERVIEW, pp. 380–389

Student open responses will vary. Sample responses are provided throughout this resource.

Composing on Your Own p. 386

After each professional anchor text, students will have an opportunity to write freely in response to it. Although subsequent “Composing on Your Own” activities direct students to specific writing tasks based on what they are learning, students are also free to follow their own inquiries in these compositions that develop over a unit. *See pages 223–228 for Inquiry Activities for Writing Rhetorically.*

What Do You Know? p. 388

Note: This recurring feature uses the practice of “effortful recall” to help students’ learning “stick.” Chances are that over their previous years of schooling, students have encountered these ideas, if not necessarily the terminology. Having to work hard to retrieve what they already know will help students form stronger connections to the new knowledge they acquire. These questions are not meant to be scored. They will serve as a guide to what your students may or may not already know about the unit’s content.

Close Reading

1. Cho orients the reader by providing anecdotal evidence that reveals how changing phone technology has affected her own life; in showing how the rise of cell phone technology has negatively affected her own family, Cho both contextualizes the subject-matter and raises the reader’s interest.
2. Cho largely argues that cell phone technology, which has resulted in the loss of the landline, has had a negative impact on families, because it eliminates the shared quality of receiving phone calls.
3. Cho is showing the connection between the two sentences: both show how cell phones isolate people. The first sentence shows how this applies within a family, while the second shows how this applies to a larger category of people.
4. Cho uses dashes to interject thoughts and asides that add information but are not central to her argument. She also uses dashes to create a more conversational style that helps emphasize certain concepts.

Evaluating Writing

1. There are a number of places where the author could modify the language to more specifically qualify the argument. For instance, in paragraph 1, sentence 4, the author could modify the word “desperate” to “important” or “ongoing” in order to soften the tone and make the language less one-dimensional. In addition, the author could combine sentences 5 and 6 to avoid expressing the argument in absolute terms: “Amish communities often ask themselves a key question: how might this new thing affect our relationships with one another?”
2. The author suggests that we carefully consider how our use of technology impacts our relationships with one another.
3. *Possible rearranged paragraph, with original sentence numbering and sentence 1 deleted:* [2] Today, most people think of the Amish as people in horse drawn buggies who wear plain clothes and refuse use of any modern technology. [3] They reject most technology that they feel will separate family or community members from one another. [5] Amish communities ask themselves one question. [6] How will this new thing affect our relationships with one another? [4] The Amish reflect a desperate need that many other Americans have today—the need to explore how technology affects our relationships with people.