Lesson 4.23. Analyzing and Evaluating an Argument (2)

The debate over whether Hawai‘i should legalize gambling heated up again in 2011, when the economy took another downturn.

Assignment 4.23: Analyzing and Evaluating an Argument (2) Souki

Participation/Response Sheet for Assignment 2.11

Click here to download to your desktop the response sheet to participate in the assignments in this Lesson: _2.11.doc_.

Due Nov. 1, Thursday, at 12 noon, at Assignments.

Click on, download, and read the following two argument for legalizing gambling in Hawai‘i:

“**Well-run operation will enhance state’s image as visitor destination**” (2011 Feb. 14), by Joseph Souki, state representative from Maui.

“**Gambling is not the quick fix Hawaii legislators are looking for**” (2011 Feb. 14), by David McClain, professor of Business and former President of the University of
Then analyze the components of Souki's argument and evaluate the argument? Has he persuaded you that gambling is a good idea for Hawai'i?

1. Analysis

1. In a sentence or two, state the thesis (the main point).
2. Identify the reasons and evidence the writer give to persuade you to agree with his thesis.
3. Identify concessions, counterarguments and evidence the writer give, if any, to persuade you that those who take the opposite position are wrong. (To concede a point is different from counter arguing against a point. In counter argument, you argue that your opponent’s point is wrong or invalid; on the other hand, when you concede a point, you say that your opponent is right about that one point, even if you disagree with him or her overall.)
4. Identify the emotional appeals that the writers use. What emotions does each appeal to? (Identify specific emotions, such as fear, hope, pride, shame, guilt, anger.)
5. Describe the qualifications, expertise and ethics of each writer (that is, his character appeal).

2. Evaluation

Based on your analysis of the components of each of the two arguments, which one did you find more persuasive?

Base your answer on the analysis and comparison of the two writers on the following:

1. Which writer provided betters reasons and evidence for his positions?
2. Which writer made better counter arguments?
3. Which write made better emotional appeals?
4. Which writer was more qualified and knowledgeable about the issue? How can you tell? What kinds of values do they express (ethics)? Do you share their values?

Your evaluation may be complex: it could be that you felt the writers were equally good in providing reasons and evidence, or equally bad. Your judgment of one writer being more persuasive than the other mya be based on one, two, three or all four components of their arguments.