

## Exercise 26: Smoking at home kills (p. 64)

i. The author attacks parents' intelligence and questions their knowledge. Mr Treeton implies that parents are ignorant and do not heed the warnings. They seem unaware of the fact that if they smoke in the presence of their young children they will harm their health.

ii. The author attacks parents' moral compass. Mr Treeton infers that they do not take sufficient care of their children's health and should be ashamed of themselves.

iii. Mr Treeton also makes harmful remarks about their character such as their selfishness and double standards. He questions their motives and suggests that they prioritise their own interests above their children's. They pretend that they do not know that they are harming their family's health. They also become a burden on the health system and waste taxpayers' funds.

2. Ms Fit attacks the police (and hence the Government) by trivialising the issue and stating that it is simply a matter of individual liberties. She believes that the Government just wants to interfere unnecessarily in people's lifestyles.

3. Tone: accusatory; flabbergasted; outraged and sarcastic: "Have the police got so much free time ..."

Appeal to civil liberties and individual freedoms

Extension exercise for Mr Treeton: What evidence does the author rely on? How does it link to the author's views? What point does it prove? What is its impact?

Techniques and purpose:

- ◆ Appeal to moral values: Mr Treeton characterises the parents as selfish and/or ignorant in order to shame them.
- ◆ Appeal to the common good and public safety/ duty of care and responsibility: Parents should be more responsible in the home. The government should set appropriate standards.
- ◆ Mr Treeton makes an analogy with other rules and regulations relating to domestic affairs to show that there is a precedence. This anticipates Ms Fit's attack (and seeks to overturn the preconceived notion) that the government should not interfere in the home.
- ◆ He uses a real-life example referring to Sabina and her asthmatic condition to prove that parents are ignorant of the damage they are causing to their children.
- ◆ His argument also relies on statistics to show that there are a lot of children who are suffering unnecessarily from passive smoke. This enhances the author's authority as well as the degree of trust among his target audience –parents who smoke.
- ◆ Repetition (parallel rhetorical questions): "Don't they read... Don't they see...?" to question their degree of ignorance and selfishness.

### Sample paragraph:

View and topic sentence: Mr Treeton maintains that parents should not smoke in the home because they are jeopardising / compromising their family's health. The author refers to the anecdotal evidence regarding two year old Sabina's ill-health to prove that controls are needed to stop parents smoking in the home. This is because smoking has a detrimental effect on children's health and many are unaware of the dangers.

Mr Treeton also refers to the expert opinion of Professor Simon Chapman, who is a trustworthy and credible source. He believes that we need greater regulations in the home in order to protect the



# Student responses

## Parents should not use electronic tags to track children

8 years ago in Praia da Luz, Portugal, Kate and Gerry McCann went to a restaurant to have dinner without their daughter, whom they kept in the hotel room. Upon return, they were distraught to discover that Madeleine, their daughter, had disappeared from her bed. To this day, she still has not been found. Many people believe that a tracking tag would have helped in this situation. I am sceptical of this idea. Why would we use a tracking tag if it makes us rely more on technology, makes us shirk our responsibility, and psychologically impacts us in a negative way?

Technology is becoming more and more advanced as scientists create better and more complex devices. These days, we are relying too much on technology to help us in our everyday life, and the child tracking device is an example of this. The new technology used to track the tag is making us rely less on our own ability. This can be disastrous if the tag stops working or gets thrown out by the kidnapper; the tag would be useless. In addition, hackers are a huge problem in our society. Earlier this year, a group of hackers stole over \$1 billion from more than 100 banks in 30 different countries by breaking into the banks' computer security. This shows how easy it would be for someone to hack into the network of tracker tags, and how they could exploit it to bring harm to children. This is ironic; the tag is supposed to keep the child safe and protected, but instead it is being used as a tool for kidnappers. It is also no use if the kidnapper finds and disposes of it.

All parents must be responsible for their child by managing their health, education and wellbeing. The child tracker tag may at first seem to assist parents in being more responsible by helping them know where their children are, but that is just the tip of the iceberg. Below the surface, the tracker tag makes parents think that "My child can go anywhere he/she wants because the tag will keep them safe." It can also affect the child's mindset to make them think that they can do whatever they want. Parents should scrap the idea of a tracker tag and be more responsible, not waiting for a notification on their phone to say that "Your child has gone outside of the restricted area."

How would you feel if you know you are being tracked by somebody all the time? Safe? Children would become anxious and more self-conscious that someone knows where they are and might bring harm to them. Fear and dread would also build up in them, preventing them from trying and exploring new things. The tag gives them a sense of suspicion and it tells others that "This child is dangerous." Sometimes a child may even exploit these tags to attract attention, which is known as the "cry wolf" syndrome.

In conclusion, this child tracking tag is the worst idea someone could have ever thought of. It makes us rely more on technology, could have ironic consequences, shirks our responsibility and psychologically impacts us in a negative way. Parents must be actively responsible in looking after their children by relying less on technology.