

Dr. Stapleton W233 Documentation evaluation

Please read the following passage and take this multiple-choice quiz. For informational purposes only! Relax. But submit your answers via email to me by 9 a.m. tomorrow (15 May):

stapletm@pfw.edu

4

The time would come for her to speak into the winds of history, but, as much as she knew Iowa wasn't the place, she also knew that

5

her moment hadn't yet come. She'd been off the political battlefield for seven years. As secretary of state, she'd worked to win concessions in diplomatic back rooms across the world, but she didn't have to worry about securing millions of votes. Barack Obama had been elected president and the Tea Party had risen in the time since she'd last been on the campaign trail as a candidate. The nation's political bearings had shifted. And, if her 2014 book tour had taught her anything, it was that she was rusty as hell. Talking to voters, she hoped, would help her sharpen her political skills and develop her vision for the country's future.

Obama had been relentlessly superb at telling voters why he was running for president and giving them a window into how he would govern. He was confident, cocky even, about his vision. Hillary, a modest, midwestern Methodist with a love of minutiae, was unshakably focused on the trees rather than the forest. This campaign would test the A student's ability to adapt—to subordinate her nature to her need to win.

In preparing to campaign again, she studied Obama's February 2007 launch speech in Springfield, the one he delivered on the steps of the Old State Capitol—the one that connected him with fellow Illinois state legislator Abraham Lincoln, who had freed the slaves in an act that set the first stone on Obama's improbable path to the presidency. "She kept harkening back to Obama in Springfield," said one of Hillary's top advisers. "She had gone back to read that speech and how important it was for people as a marker of what he would do in the presidency. She viewed it as an important kind of road map for her governing principles and her actual plans to be president."

MLA entry

Allen, Jonathan, and Amie Parnes. *Shattered: Inside Hillary Clinton's Doomed Campaign*. New York: Crown, 2017.

APA entry

Allen, J., and Parnes, A. (2017). *Shattered: Inside Hillary Clinton's doomed campaign*. New York: Crown, 2017.

1. Which of the following are plagiaristic?

- a. Mrs. Clinton would speak into the winds of history (Allen and Parnes 4).
- b. As a candidate, Obama was obviously more at ease than Mrs. Clinton
- c. Mrs. Clinton “studied” Obama’s techniques, which meant that she had to test her ability to adapt, like the A student she had always been (Allen and Parnes 4).
- d. a, b, and c.
- e. none of the above.
- f. b and c

2. Which of the following are not plagiaristic?

- a. Mrs. Clinton would speak into the winds of history (Allen and Parnes 4).
- b. As a candidate, Obama was obviously more at ease than Mrs. Clinton.
- c. Mrs. Clinton “studied” Obama’s techniques, which meant that she had to test her ability to adapt, like the A student she had always been (Allen and Parnes 4).
- d. a, b, and c.
- e. none of the above.
- f. b and c

3. Which of these sentences or phrases would be worth saving to quote verbatim in a future paper?

- a. “The time would come for her to speak into the winds of history.”
- b. “a modest, midwestern Methodist with a love of minutae.”
- c. “she was rusty as hell.”
- d. a, b, and c
- e. none of the above

4. Which of these would comprise an accurate summary of most or all of the entire passage?

- a. Mrs. Clinton was intelligent enough to understand that she needed to retrain herself as a campaigner for office.
- b. Allen and Parnes credit Mrs. Clinton with the instinct to adapt herself to new methods of campaigning, and her method was studying President Obama's previous success as a presidential candidate (4-5).
- c. The dichotomy "worked to win concessions in diplomatic back rooms across the world" and "didn't have to worry about securing millions of votes" epitomizes the view of Allen and Parnes about how out of touch Mrs. Clinton was as a candidate for president (4-5).
- d. all of the above
- e. none of the above.

5. Which of these summary comments would accurately reflect the perspective of the authors or represent their opinion of their subject?

- a. Allen and Parnes are biased, sexist, and condescending in their evaluation of Mrs. Clinton (2017, pp. 4-5).
- b. *Shattered* in its first chapter is obviously liberally biased concerning Mrs. Clinton's tendency to steal other people's ideas.
- c. You can tell from reading the early passage in *Shattered* comparing Clinton and Obama that the authors favor the latter over the former (Allen and Parnes 2017, pp. 4-5).
- d. The authors of *Shattered* seem neutral about Mrs. Clinton, non-judgmental about her lack of campaign experience, with the exception of their comment, "rusty as hell" (Allen and Parnes, 5).
- e. all of the above.