AP 11 Language and Composition Summer Reading Journals 2021-22

Purpose of Summer Reading Journals:

* To introduce you to rhetorical concepts we will explore this year.
* To gather evidence on your strengths and needs as a writer, reader, and thinker.
* To evaluate how well you can respond to the free response prompts.
* To familiarize you with the drafting, feedback, and self-reflection process in this class, the format for Socratic Seminars, and the type of texts we will read this year.
* To pre-assess and begin working on the standards in our first unit.
  + RHS-1: Individuals write within a particular situation and make strategic writing choices based on that situation.
  + CLE-1: Writers make claims about subjects, rely on evidence that supports the reasoning that justifies the claim, and often acknowledge or respond to other, possibly opposing, arguments.

Steps and Directions:

* Required: Read the six short nonfiction passages included in the summer reading packet.
* Required: Respond to the TWO journal prompts with a page-long paragraph (you can select two prompts from the three options).
* Required: You are not allowed to go over more than a sentence or two onto a second page. I am looking for your ability to convey complex ideas precisely.
* Required: Use MLA format and print the journals for class when they are due.
* Optional: Complete the working notes to prepare you for the journals and socratic seminar.

The full-length journals should follow the directions provided:

* Single paragraph analysis of about 250 words (double spaced, 1 full page in length, but no more than a sentence or two onto the next page).
* First sentence (topic sentence) should clearly introduce a narrow, defensible claim about the subject that responds to the prompt and provides the paragraph with a purpose and direction.
* Aptly support your topic sentence with a minimum of two direct quotations or references to the text, appropriately embedded to justify your claim. You should try to connect and transition between the evidence and cite it appropriately.
* Include, as best you can, short quotations or paraphrases so that you can provide more evidence and transition smoothly between your writing and the author’s words. Your audience does not need long quotations because they have read the same texts you have.
* Avoid summary of the passages. Your audience has read the same passages you have and does not need a summary, but are instead interested in your interpretation and argument in response to the passage.
* Include, as best you can, reasoning to explain the relationship between the evidence and claim and evidence and events, people, or arguments outside of the passage to frame it in a broader context.
* Include a concluding sentence which provides closure to your argument.

Working Notes

Your working notes for this text will differ in complexity. They have no point value attached to them; however, they will help you draft the journals and participate in the Socratic Seminar in class. The questions provided in the working notes section should be used to guide you through the text and understand the complexities of the rhetorical situation. To help you organize your notes, I would write the title of the passage at the top that you selected to read, a topic or prompt you are focusing on in your reading, a bulleted list of details that support that topic, and your reactions to those details. I would suggest providing page numbers so you can keep track of your evidence. You do not need to answer all of these questions for each passage; it is up to you depending on what you feel like you need.

Working Notes Questions

1. What is the author’s main claim in the excerpt?
2. What type, quantity, or quality of evidence does the author use to support the claim?
3. What words or phrases did you not understand that you think are significant to the text that you should look up?
4. What comprehension strategies can you use to help you understand the passages? (like context clues, breaking sentences into smaller sections, noting transitions and connections between ideas, looking at headings and chapter titles, connecting it to what you already know about the topic, noting organizational patterns like compare and contrast, or writing short summary sentences of the topic of individual paragraphs).

Passage Options: Click here to go to the passages at the end of the document.

[Passage #1: Excerpt from *The Enigma of Reason* by Hugo Mercier and Dan Sperber pages 5 to 8](#_gr2gaib43uw)

[Passage #2: Excerpt from *Winning Arguments* by Stanley Fish pages 159 to 164](#_ay3lpxa2hruj)

[Passage #3: Excerpt from *Understanding Rhetoric: A Guide to Critical Reading and Argumentation* by Eamon M. Cunningham pages 218 to 219](#_i91u001ohycg)

[Passage #4: Excerpt from *The Art of Logic in an Illogical World* by Eugenia Cheng pages 81 to 83](#_y9kgd0oxy3dl)

[Passage #5: Except from *Make It Stick: The Science of Successful Learning* by Peter Brown, Henry Roediger, and Mark McDaniel pages 201 to 202](#_chg6t5xb9fdp)

[Passage #6: Excerpt from *Word by Word* by Kory Stamper pages 94 to 9](#_d90y7ce0fbtr)5

### Full Length Journal Prompts

\*You may use personal experience and knowledge/background from other subject areas in response to the journal prompts in addition to the textual evidence. However, you may not use any hypothetical scenarios or general evidence. For example, you cannot do the following: “if you were shopping at the grocery store and the line at the check-out was really long and you were frustrated by having to wait, that would be an example of not having patience.” This example is a hypothetical scenario as evidence and is not a good support of a claim.

**Prompt Option #1 Synthesis:** Develop your position by defending, challenging, or qualifying **one** of the following below. Required: You are required to use at least TWO of the passages for this journal as evidence, but can use all six if you want.

* the most important factor(s) a writer should consider when formulating and defending a claim to persuade an audience. *\*You may not use ethos, logos, or pathos in your answer or synonyms for these words.*
* on the relationship between language and argument.
* on the claim that many people generate conclusions or arguments based on misconceptions, faulty logic, or problematic evidence.
* on the value of studying rhetoric (the art of persuasion) for personal, social, political, **OR** academic reasons.

**Prompt Option #2 Rhetorical Analysis:** Analyze how the author(s) makes strategic choices to convey his/her message to the audience and achieve his/her purpose. Required: You must select one passage for this analysis and use two direct quotations to analyze. Your evidence and commentary should go beyond summary since your audience has read these passages. *\*You may not use ethos, logos, or pathos in your answer or synonyms for these words.*

**Prompt Option #3 Argumentation:** Select a single significant claim in any of the six passages and defend, challenge, or qualify that claim by providing evidence you generated from your observations, readings, knowledge, or experiences. Required: You are not allowed to use more than one passage for this prompt and should only select a *single* sentence to use as a quotation to argue about. All of your additional evidence and commentary should stem from your knowledge.

### Rubric for Both Journals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 point- Attempting | \_\_\_\_\_EVIDENCE: Provides evidence that is mostly general.  \_\_\_\_\_Tends to focus on summary or description of a passage rather than specific details.  \_\_\_\_\_Identifies a statement that is not a claim.  \_\_\_\_\_Identifies statements that are not supporting, relevant, or significant evidence.  \_\_\_\_\_ Does not blend quotations or cite them.  \_\_\_\_\_Provides little to no explanation of the relationship between the evidence to the claim or substitutes the task with summary. |
| 2 point- Approaching | \_\_\_\_\_EVIDENCE: Provides some (meaning 1, not 2) specific, relevant, supporting pieces of evidence.  \_\_\_\_\_Consists of a mix of specific evidence and broad generalities.  \_\_\_\_\_May make one point well but does not adequately support the claim.  \_\_\_\_\_Does not organize the claim and supporting evidence into a line of reasoning.  \_\_\_\_\_Does not provide logical transitions between the claims and evidence.  \_\_\_\_\_Does not blend the evidence or introduce it before directly quoting or paraphrasing or might provide quotations too long for the purpose of the journal.  \_\_\_\_\_Does not cite the evidence.  \_\_\_\_\_Identifies a statement that is not a claim or evidence by confusing the two.  \_\_\_\_\_Attempts to provide an explanation of the relationship between the evidence to the claim, but does not develop it for long enough or substitutes the task with summary. |
| 3 point- Meeting either evidence or claim, but not both. | \_\_\_\_\_EVIDENCE: Provides specific, supporting, relevant evidence to support all claims in a line of reasoning.  \_\_\_\_\_Uniformly offer evidence to support the claim.  \_\_\_\_\_Focus on the importance of specific words and details from the passage to build an argument.  \_\_\_\_\_Organizes an argument as a line of reasoning composed of multiple supporting pieces of evidence, providing logical transitions when necessary.  \_\_\_\_\_Writing that suffers from grammatical or mechanics errors cannot earn the full point for evidence and claim.  \_\_\_\_\_Might miss one of the following elements: quotation blending, organization, or not provide 2 pieces of supporting evidence.  \_\_\_\_\_Blends evidence using full sentence or clause quotations built into the sentence for the audience to logically connect ideas.  \_\_\_\_\_Cites evidence but has typos or errors in the citation.  \_\_\_\_\_ Has 1 to 2 sentences of commentary, but does not provide much depth and includes unnecessary summary where analysis should be. |
| 4 points- Mastering Claim to Evidence | \_\_\_\_\_EVIDENCE: Provides specific, supporting, and relevant evidence to the whole claim.  \_\_\_\_\_Uniformly offers evidence to support the claim (2 pieces of evidence to support 1 claim).  \_\_\_\_\_Focuses on the importance of specific words and details from the passage to build an argument.  \_\_\_\_\_Organizes and supports an argument as a line of reasoning composed of multiple supporting pieces of evidence, with transitions to connect pieces of evidence when necessary.  \_\_\_\_\_ Writing contains little to no grammatical or mechanics errors.  \_\_\_\_\_Aptly blends evidence using short quotations built into the sentence seamlessly for the audience to logically connect ideas.  \_\_\_\_\_Cites evidence correctly.  \_\_\_\_\_Has 3 to 4 sentences of commentary, providing depth and no summary, so the audience gains additional insight into the text not directly stated to the reader. |

### Draft for Journal #1

Copy and paste the prompt you decided to answer from the three options.

### Draft for Journal #2

Copy and paste the prompt you decided to answer from the three options.

\*The end of pages as they appear in the original text are inserted throughout the document in italicized parenthesis.

### **Passage #1: Excerpt from *The Enigma of Reason in the* “Introduction: Where We Are Going” by Hugo Mercier and Dan Sperber pages 5 to 6:**

There have been more than two thousand years of philosophical work on reason, and more than fifty years of intense experimental work on reasoning. Some of the greatest thinkers of all time have contributed to this work. It would be beyond presumptuous to claim that most of this thinking has been on the wrong track, if it were not for the fact that both the philosophical and psychological tradition have been vigorously contested from within.

How good is reason at guiding humans toward true knowledge and good decisions? How good are humans at using reason? We won’t attempt to tell the convoluted story of these old debates that in recent times, with psychologists joining the fray, have intensified to the point of being called “rationality wars.” What we will do instead in Part I of this book, “Shaking Dogma,” is single out clashes that reveal how serious are the problems posted by standard approaches to reason, and how wanting the solutions. We will suggest that parties to these heated debates have managed to weaken one another to the point that the best course may well be to collect from the battlefield whatever may still be of use and to seek new adventures on more promising ground.

We are less interested anyhow in debunking shaky ideas than in developing a new scientific understanding of reason, one that solves the double enigma. Reason, we will show, far from being a strange cognitive add-on, a superpower gifted to humans by some improbable evolutionary quirk, fits quite naturally among other human cognitive capacities and, despite apparent evidence to the contrary, is well adapted to its true function.

To understand how reason could have evolved and how it works, one should pay attention not only to what makes it special but also how it fits among other psychological capacities and how much it has in common with them. There are mechanisms involved in drawing inferences. Reason is only one of them. In Part II, “Understanding Inference,” we situate reason in relation to other inferential mechanisms.

Animals make inferences all the time: They use what they already know to draw conclusions about what they don’t know— for instance, to anticipate what may happen next, and to act accordingly. Do they do this by means of some general inferential ability? Definitely not. Rather, animals use many different inferential mechanisms, each dealing with a distinct type of problem: What to eat? Whom to mate with? When to attack? When to flee? And so on (*End of page 5)*.

Humans are like other animals: instead of one general inferential ability, they use a wide variety of specialized mechanisms. In humans, however, many of these mechanisms are not “instincts” but are acquired through interaction with other people during the child’s development. Still, most of these acquired mechanisms have an instinctual basis: Speaking Wolof, or English, or Tagalog, for instance, is not instinctive, but paying special attention to the sounds of speech and going through steps necessary to acquire the language of one’s community has an instinctual basis.

As far as one can tell, other animals perform all their inferences without being conscious of doing so. Humans also perform a great variety of inferences automatically and unconsciously; for instance, in acquiring their mother tongue. However, there are many inferences of which means are partly conscious. We are talking here about intuitions. When you have an intuition— for example, the intuition that your friend Molly is upset even though she didn’t say so and might even deny it— this intuition pops up fully formed in your consciousness; at the same time, however, you recognize it as something that came from within, as a conclusion somehow drawn inside your mind (*End of page 6)*. Intuitions are like mental icebergs: we may only see the tip but we know that, below the surface, there is much more to them, which we don’t see.

Much recent thinking about thinking (for instance Daniel Kahneman’s famous *Thinking, Fast and Slow*) revolves around a contrast between intuition and reasoning as if these were two quite different forms of inference. We will maintain, on the contrary, that reasoning is itself a kind of intuitive inference.

Actually, between intuition in general and reasoning in particular, there is an intermediate category. We humans are capable of representing now only things and events in our environment but also our very representations of these things and events. We have intuitions about what other people think about abstract ideas. These intuitions about representations play a major role in our ability to understand one another, to communicate, to share opinions and values. Reason, we will argue, is a mechanism for intuitive inferences about one kind of representations, namely, reasons.

### **Passage #2: Excerpt from *Winning Arguments* from “Chapter 5: Academic Arguments: I Said That First: Being Original” by Stanley Fish pages 159 to 164**

If you want to make an argument in the academy, either as a professor or a student, you will be no less constrained than you are in court. The difference is that in the bounded space of legal argument the constraints are written down, while in the bounded space of academic argument they typically are not.

We can open a window into the world of academic argument by considering the idea of plagiarism, usually defined as signing your name to, and thereby claiming as your own, the words, images, or ideas of another. In 1976 an essay of mine (“Interpreting the Variorum,” *Critical Inquiry*) was published in which I coined the term “interpretive community” (*End of page 159).*

An interpretive community is not made up of persons who, because they share some of the same ideas and aims, get together and form a club, as *Star Trek* fans do. Rather, an interpretive community is made up of those who, by virtue of training, experience, and practice, have internalized the norms of some purposive enterprise— law, education, politics, plumbing— to the point where they see with its eyes and walk in its ways without having to think about it. Interpretive community members are not independent agents who self-consciously choose to think and act in a certain way; if they are deeply embedded in the community they have no choice; the world just appears to them already organized by the emphases and urgencies that are the community’s content.

When, for example, my students and I enter the classroom, we don’t have to ask ourselves about the significance of the arrangement of the room, about the seats facing forward in the direction of a podium, about the behaviors we can and cannot indulge in while the class is meeting, or about a thousand other things. Situated as we are in the interpretive community called “higher education in America”— a community located not in a particular physical space but in a set of practices— knowledge of what everything in the scene of instruction means and is for just comes with the territory (we don’t have to reach for it) or, rather, comes with having become a native of the territory. It is the kind of knowledge often referred to as “know-how” or “horse sense.”

In a short time the interpretive community idea caught on and was applied to different problems in different disciplines. After a while many people forgot where the term originated and used it without attributing it to me (*End of page 160)*. In effect, I was being plagiarized all the time, and it isn’t getting any better as more and more scholars drop the words “interpretive community” in their essays and books without any acknowledgement. (Wikipedia, at least, gives me proper credit.)

Why am I distressed at the casual appropriation by many of a two-word phrase? After all, isn’t it an honor to have one’s ideas become so much a feature of the disciplinary landscape that they belong to everyone? The answer has to do with the system of currency in the academy. In that system big ideas count for more than small points made in the course of an argument, and as it has turned out, “interpretive community” is a big idea (with an obvious resemblance to Thomas Kuhn’s “paradigm,” Pierre Bourdieu’s “habitus” and Michael Polanyi’s category of “tacit knowledge”). If you are known as the originator, and therefore the proprietor, of a big idea, your academic stock is to some extent secure; for that identification goes along with you even if you have not touched or developed the idea in years, much as the winner of an Academy Award is introduced as one long after he or she has made any well-received films, and much as an ex-senator is still addressed as Senator even though it’s been decades since he or she was in office. So if there is a conference on the big idea or a journal issue devoted to it, you will likely be invited to contribute, and even if you are not, you can still count on your name being mentioned (not always in praise, but that doesn’t matter) many times.

All of this (and much else) follows from the fact that what is valued in the academy is originality. Both plagiarism as a all , the idea of a single author whose willed intention produces a text or an image that can be identified as “his” or “hers” has been attacked by philosophers, art historians, historians of science, theorists of the Internet, literary critics, and a host of others often influenced by essays such as Roland Barthes’s “The Death of an Author” and Michel Foucault’s “What is an Author?” (*End of page 161).* The basic ideas in these essays is that language, rather than being an instrument available for us by individuals who choose what to say and mean, is “ready-made dictionary” (the phrase is Barthes’s), a system of differences or binaries that precedes, enables, and constrains the production of intelligible speech acts. The individual who would speak must go through that system in order to form assertions; he can’t step “outside” the system in a gesture of freedom; he must attach himself to its prefabricated meanings, meaning that speak through him as opposed to doing his bidding. Rather than being the master of language, he centriloquizes it; rather than engaging in the act of self-expression, he is the vehicle of language’s expression of itself. In Barthes’s words, “it is language that speaks, not the author,” who is merely its local and temporary habitation.

It follows that originality is not a claim one can make, given that one can say only what the system allows one to say; one can say only what has been said already. When John Milton begins his pastoral elegy “Lycidas” with the words “Yet once more,” he acknowledges his status as a mere relay or node traversed by texts and meanings he cannot sign his name to as an “only begetter.” “Yet once more” means “Here again (even if it is the first time for me) singing the themes and notes given to me by the tradition that takes me over, the tradition I now voice not as a willed choice but as a necessity that befalls every singer who would strom the pastoral lyre” (*End of page 163).* Mikhail Bakhtin drives the point home: “language is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker’s intentions; it is populated, overpopulated, with the intentions of others” (*Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, 1986). You can’t be a freestanding self in charge of intentions that belong exclusively to you.

If the independent, meaning-originating self is a myth, so necessarily is the unique textual object that supposedly stands as the fixed and visible guarantor of the meaning the self has supposedly originated. Texts are not bounded, self-enclosed entities waiting to be claimed. All texts are collages of previous texts— you can’t start from scratch— and no text has the fixity and stability— the sameness of shape and significance through time-- that would be required for it to be an own-able entity, only when it is seen in relation to the innumerable texts can came before it or sit alongside it. A single page of an annotated edition of “Lycidas” might display two lines of text surrounded by thirty-three lines of sources and analogues. A text’s identity is relational, not frontal; it is what it is (or isn’t) because it is like and unlike other texts, which are in turn like and unlike other texts, and on and on; it has no self-identify. As Jean Baudrillard puts it, “A truly unique, absolute object such that it has no antecedents and is no way dispersed in some series or other-- such an object is unthinkable” (*The System of Objects*, 2005). (*End of page 164).*

### **Passage #3: Excerpt from *Understanding Rhetoric: A Guide to Critical Reading and Argumentation* from the chapter titled “Chapter Eight: A Brief History of Argumentation” by Eamon M. Cunningham pages 218 to 219**

Arguments are a simple fact of life. Whether we are aware of it or not, we informally engage in the argument process every day. Sometimes, our arguments are trivial: “I think you should wear the blue t-shirt instead of the orange one,” “I like the weather better today than I did yesterday.” Others are more somber: free internet access ought to be a public right,” “unionized labor supports the public good.” Whether lighthearted or more serious, all these arguments make a claim, direct that claim to an audience, and will presumably support that claim with further reasons and evidence. A good argument, one that can alter attitudes and shape minds, is deeply connected to a writer’s rhetorical knowledge, and this unit will be the natural scaffold from the first. Think of the relationship between rhetoric and argument to that of a metaphor and simile: not all metaphors are similes, but all similes are metaphors. Not all rhetoric is argumentative, but all argument is rhetorical. And just like rhetoric, a good aruer must know what the persuasive strategies are so as to argue well and not be taken in by the speech of others. Consider the following two arguments and see if you can identify the difference:

“Joe is a bachelor because he is an unmarried man.”

“Go to bed because it is past your bedtime.”

These arguments do share a set of surface similarities. Each is ten words. Each essentially contains the same grammatical structure: an assertion linked to evidence by subordinating conjunction “because.” But if your gut is telling you that there is something which makes the arguments different, you’re right. The first is what’s known as an “enthymeme,” a type of short-hand version of the classical syllogism, a form of deductive logic which we’ll discuss throughout the chapter *(End of page 218)*. Part of what makes this argument so good is that it’s logically bulletproof; if a bachelor is an unmarried man, and if Joe is unmarried, he is indeed a bachelor. In syllogisms, the claim is the necessary conclusion derived from the two premises: the definition of a bachelor and Joe’s marital status. Its negated form is just as logically solid: “Joe is *not* a bachelor because he is a *married* man.” Enthymemes operate on deductive logic and it is this pattern of thought that carries argumentation through the first two thousand years of its history.

Though it’s easy to recognize the logical merit of an enthymeme, day-to-day situations rarely present themselves in ways that can be settled in deductive proofs. The world is messier than that. “Go to your room because it is past your bed time” is not categorically true like our enthymeme, but is it a good argument? Well, there is a claim (“go to bed”), supported by reasons (“it is past your bed time”), but the assent of the audience— whether or not they will accept the conclusion— is much more uncertain since the underlying assumption of the argument is subject to interpretation. Perhaps the audience understands that “a good night sleep is of the utmost importance.” Perhaps the audience disagrees that bucking bed time is a “violation of a direct order is an intolerable act of insubordination.” Perhaps the audience feels that the parents “ought not to be irritated after a certain hour in the night.” Assessing the validity of these assumptions— “warrants” as they are known in modern argument theory— makes all the difference in an audience’s acceptance of an argument’s validity. Every day argumentation is forced to play off a number of variables that formal logic does not have to contend with: inference, probability, circumstances, politics, social norms, cultural values, personal feelings, and so on. Here is where rhetoric, the ability of language to achieve a particular purpose or goal, can be spliced into study of argument’s everyday use. And with that, let’s turn to Ancient Greece to see how argument and rhetoric have been together from the start.

### **Passage #4: Excerpt from *The Art of Logic in an Illogical World* “Chapter 5 Blame and Responsibility: How Everyone and Everything is Logically Connected” by Eugenia Cheng pages 81 to 82**

On April 9 2017 United Express Flight 3411 was overbooked. The airline bumped a particular passenger off the flight, but he didn’t go voluntarily and was dragged off by security officers, sustaining injuries along the way. There was an uproar and opinion was characteristically divided about whose fault it was. The two main opposing viewpoints were:

1. It was United’s fault for their unreasonable use of force.
2. It was the passenger’s fault for refusing to leave his seat when asked.

But there were very many contributing factors. Is a contributing factor the same as “fault”? Let’s face it, everything in life is caused by more than one factor. It’s just humans who are prone to trying to point the finger of blame at one factor, often one person.

If a student doesn’t do well in an exam, is it because they didn’t work hard enough, or because they were not taught well enough? Probably it is both of those things to some extent: a really excellent teacher will inspire students to work hard, but this sounds like placing blame on the teacher; a really good student will work hard even if they have an uninspiring teacher, but this sounds like blaming the student for being taught badly. There’s a cartoon that goes around periodically in which the “good old days” (whenever those were) are compared with today. In the panel for the good old days, a parent and child are in a teacher’s office, and the teacher is scolding the student for their bad grades. In the panel for today, the image is the same except now it’s the parents scolding the teacher for the student’s bad grades (*End of page 81)*. There is, alas, some truth to this. The question of blame is wrapped up with the question of responsibility, and the counterargument is often that if we don’t blame any individuals, does that mean that nobody should ever take responsibility for anything?

Another more universal case is when relationships break down. Sometimes it’s mutual and both partners agree that it wasn’t really anyone’s fault, but alas this happens far too infrequently. Usually someone— or indeed both people— get very hurt and each blames the other person. But in many cases (except in cases of abuse) there are contributing factors from both sides, and the key to understanding the breakdown is to understand the way in which the people were relating to one another, and the way their individual contributions were woven together to lead to the collapse.

**Interconnectedness**

Going back to the example of the failing student, we can try to find the logic of the situation. The point is that the student’s contribution and the teacher’s contribution combine to cause the outcome:

The student didn’t work hard enough And The teacher didn’t teach well enough = The student failed the exam. Someone might argue, “Well, if the student had worked harder, they’d have passed, so it’s the student’s fault.” Someone else might argue “Well, the student did the best they could but they were so badly taught they didn’t have a chance, so it’s the teacher’s fault” *(End of page 82)*. A former Oxford student recently sued Oxford University for lost income on the grounds that he was taught so badly it was Oxford’s fault he didn’t get a first-class degree, and that this caused him to lose income in his years since graduation. It’s unadvisable to comment on such cases without all the information, but I would hope that there are better remedies for poor teaching than a lawsuit years later.

The crucial point is that when two factors combine to cause a result, either one of them being different could cause the result to be different. But that doesn’t mean that one of them is individually to blame for the result: it is the combination of the two that caused the result. The logic of this situation is the logic of connectives.

Logical connectives are the way that logical statements are connected to form bigger, more complex statements. It is a general principle in mathematics that a good way to understand something complex is to break it down into simple constituent parts. Then you have to understand simple building blocks together with the ways of sticking them together. Logical connectives are the way of sticking together simple logical statements into complex wholes.

For example, “The student didn’t work hard enough and the teacher didn’t teach well enough.” The connecting word here is “and”. How could the student have passed? Perhaps if “The student worked harder or the teacher taught better.” The connecting word here is “or”. These two words are two basic connectives in logic.

“And” and “or” are innocuous little words, and yet they cause logical mistakes all over the place, especially when combined with implication and negation.

### **Passage #5: Except from *Make It Stick: The Science of Successful Learning*, the section titled “Practice Retrieving New Learning From Memory” by Peter Brown, Henry Roediger, and Mark McDaniel pages 201 to 202**

*What does this mean?* “Retrieval practice” means self-quizzing. Retrieving knowledge and skill from memory should become your primary study strategy in place of rereading.

*How to use retrieval practice as a study strategy:*  When you read a text or study lecture notes, pause periodically to ask yourself questions like these, without looking in the text: What are the key ideas? What terms or ideas are new to me? (*End of page 201)* How would I define them? How do the ideas relate to what I already know?

Many textbooks have study questions at the ends of the chapters, and these are good fodder for

quizzing. Generating questions for yourself and writing down the answers is also a good way to study.

Set aside a little time every week throughout the semester to quiz yourself on the material in a course, both the current week’s work and material covered in prior weeks.

When you quiz yourself, check your answers to make sure that your judgements of what you know and don’t know are accurate.

Using quizzing to identify areas of weak mastery, and focus your studying to make them strong.

The harder it is for you to recall new learning from memory, the greater the benefit of doing so. Making errors will not set you back, so long as you check your answers and correct your mistakes.

*What your intuition tells you do to:* Most studiers focus on underlining and highlighting text and lecture notes and slides. They dedicate their time to rereading these, becoming fluent in the text and terminology, because this feels like learning.

*Why retrieval practice is better:* After one or two reviews of a text, self-quizzing is far more potent for learning than additional rereading. Why might this be so? This is explained more fully in chapter 2, but there are some of the high points.

The familiarity with a text that is gained from rereading creates illusions of knowing, but these are not reliable indicators of mastery of the material. Fluency with a text has two strikes against it: it is a misleading indicator of what you have learned, and it creates a false impression that you will remember the material.

By contrast, quizzing yourself on the main ideas and meanings behind the terms helps you to focus on the central precepts rather than on the peripheral material or on a professor’s turn of phrase *(End of page 202).* Quizzing provides a reliable measure of what you’ve learned and what you haven’t yet mastered. Moreover, quizzing arrests forgetting. Forgetting is human nature, but practice at recalling new learning secures it in memory and helps you recall it in the future.

Periodically practicing new knowledge and skills through self-quizzing strengthens your learning of it and your ability to connect it to prior knowledge.

A habit of regular retrieval practice throughout the duration of a course puts an end to cramming and all-nighters. You will need little studying time at exam time. Reviewing the material the night before is much easier than learning it.

*How it feels:* Compared to rereading, self-quizzing can feel awkward and frustrating, especially when the new learning is hard to recall. It does not feel as productive as rereading your class notes and highlighting the passages of text feels. But what you don’t sense when you’re struggling to retrieve new learning is the fact that every time you work hard to recall a memory, you actually strengthen it. If you restudy something after failing to recall it, you can actually learn it better than if you had not tried to recall it. The effort of retrieving knowledge or skills strengthens its staying power and your ability to recall it in the future.

### **Passage #6: Excerpt from *Word by Word* from the chapter titled “Surfboard: On Defining” by Kory Stamper pages 94 to 95**

Back in the stuffy editorial conference room, Gil leans back in his chair and sucks his teeth. He seems to do this whenever he’s about to embark on a long explanation that he knowledge will whistle clear over our heads but will contain important information we will need if we get on with this lexicography shtick.

He sucked his teeth a lot that first year.

Today, he announces, we will start talking about definitions— specifically, the kinds of definitions we will be writing and the kind we won’t be writing. “We’ll begin,” he says,” with real defining.”

My fellow new hires and I give each other surreptitious looks side-eye. We were under the impression that writing definitions for the oldest dictionary maker in America would, you know, constitute real defining. As it turns out, there are several kinds of defining in the world, but the two big ones that lexicographers must wrestle with are real defining and lexical defining. Real defining is the stuff of philosophy and theology: it is the attempt to describe the essential nature of something. Real defining answers questions like “What is truth?” “What is love?” “Do sounds exist if no one is around to hear them?” and “Is a hot dog a sandwich?” This is the sort of defining that many budding lexicographers imagine doing: sitting at a leather-topped desk in an office made of warm wood, being erudite, and getting your philosophy on. You’d get to stare into the middle distance and palm books of wisdom and decide whether love is an action, a feeling, a myth. From somewhere outside— a passing car perhaps— you’d hear the strains of music. Rhythms would thump while the KLF asked, “What time is love?” and you would smile, because you are a lexicographer, and only you can tell the KLF exactly what time love is (*End of page 94*).

This is a happy fiction (it was my happy fiction, in fact). Lexicographers don’t do real defining. In fact, the hallmark of bad lexicography is the attempt to do real defining. Lexicographers only get to do lexical defining, which is the attempt to describe how a word is used and what it is used to mean in a particular setting. The questions we answer are, “What does ‘beauty’ mean in the sentence ‘She’s a real beauty’?” or “What does ‘love’ mean when someone says the love pizza, and is that the same use of ‘love’ as when they say they love their mom?”

But when people go to the dictionary and look up “love,” they expect to see us explain what it is. You can tell by the comments that people leave at the entry online that they don’t care about all his highfalutin faff (“strong affection for another arising out of kinship or personal ties,” or “affection based on admiration, benevolence, or common interests”):

* Long Overcoming Values Effect~love?
* What is Love?? God is Love! “For God so LOVED THE WORLD, that he gave his only begotten son!”
* Love is the desire for something to live to the fullest of its ability.
* Strong magic feeling, which is expressed each another people and it’s need to all.
* I think love is a big con and like religion or so called metaphysics can be moulded into anything people want the word to mean.
* Love is so much more than that.
* The meaning of love in your dictionary is the Jonas Brothers *(End of page 95).*

The distinction between real defining and lexical defining often sounds like some ass-covering hairsplitting. Lexicographers aren’t saying that the essential nature of love is affection; we’re saying that’s how the word is used. But the speaking, writing public chooses to use the word “love” over “affection'' because love signifies something more than affection, doesn’t it? Love has to be different from mere affection.

Lexicographers wobble across this tightrope constantly. Yes, it’s true, the thing *love* is different from the thing *affection*, but the word “love” has a bunch of different uses that overlap some of the uses of the word “affection.” If you are a philosopher, that answer is unsatisfying, but it’s the best one that a lexicographer can give.