Instructor's Manual

to accompany

Bean/Chappell/Gillam

Reading Rhetorically

A Reader for Writers

Prepared by

Virginia A. Chappell

Marquette University

Alice M. Gillam

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Longman

New York Boston San Francisco
London Toronto Sydney Tokyo Singapore Madrid
Mexico City Munich Paris Cape Town Hong Kong Montreal

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

It may seem surprising to emphasize reading in a textbook on writing. However, we do so in the belief that reading is inseparable from writing, particularly the writing and inquiry students are asked to do in college courses. Put simply, most college writing assignments are based on reading, and if students are to meet the demands of these assignments, they must be able to read analytically.

By understanding the connections between reading and writing, students can use reading to write more effectively and use writing to read more effectively. *Reading Rhetorically*'s emphasis on reading in a writing course and aims-based organization is informed by the following three concepts:

- **Reading and writing are constructive, meaning-making processes.** While students may be familiar with the idea that writing is a process of making meaning, they are often less familiar with the idea that reading is also such a process. Students tend to think that texts have a stable meaning that readers are meant to extract. By connecting reading and writing as processes of constructing meaning, *Reading Rhetorically* helps students read with a writer's eye and write with readers in mind.

- **Reading and writing are rhetorical acts.** While it may seem obvious that writing is a rhetorical act, that is, an act in which a writer attempts to influence a reader's thinking or understanding, it may be less obvious that reading is also a rhetorical act. Readers draw on knowledge, experience, and purpose for reading to accept, resist, or modify their thinking and understanding in response to a text. *Reading Rhetorically* introduces the concept of rhetorical reading as attending to a writer's purposes within a rhetorical situation by examining both what the author says and how she or he says it. We organize the readings in the anthology by rhetorical aim so that students can see how particular purposes and situations affect writers' rhetorical choices. In turn, this rhetorical emphasis offers students insights and strategies they can apply to accomplish their own purposes as writers.

- **Reading and writing abilities continue to develop throughout life and can be advanced through explicit instruction and self-conscious practice.** A widespread misconception views both reading and writing as discrete skills that should be learned once and for all during the elementary and secondary years and thereafter simply deployed in all future reading and writing situations. Not only does our experience as teachers challenge this misconception, but our own experience also makes it clear that as we grow intellectually we continually learn to read and write in new ways about new subject matter for new audiences and purposes. Although most students bring excellent reading skills to their college courses, they continue to need explicit support and instruction to build upon and expand those skills, particularly when they are confronted with difficult texts about unfamiliar subject matter. *Reading Rhetorically* offers students rhetorical reading strategies that they can use to engage more effectively with difficult college texts and writing strategies that they can use to meet the challenges of reading-based writing assignments in college.

For further reading about the close connections between reading and writing, we offer a bibliography at the end of this preface.

Overview of Instructor's Manual

The purpose of this Instructor's Manual is to provide support for teaching *Reading Rhetorically: A Reader for Writers (RR)*. Whether you are a new or veteran teacher, the ideas and resources in this manual will assist you in designing a sequence of writing assignments, creating a syllabus, selecting reading assignments, and planning classroom activities. In short, we hope that you will use this manual to make *Reading Rhetorically* work for you—to achieve your course goals, to address the needs of your students, and to fit your institutional and programmatic context.

Course and Syllabus Design

This chapter suggests a number of ways you can combine *Reading Rhetorically's* instructional and anthology chapters to create syllabuses for courses of different lengths and with different emphases. It covers the following topics:

- Three different organizing principles for a *Reading Rhetorically* syllabus
- Rationale for *Reading Rhetorically*'s writing assignments, including the three strands of major writing assignments in the anthology chapters
- Introducing students to rhetorical reading
- Options for sequencing material from Parts One through Three to provide students with a solid grounding in rhetorical reading
- Syllabus templates for courses with different emphases

Parts One through Three: The Instructional Chapters

These three chapters of the manual are designed to support your teaching of *Reading Rhetorically's* instructional chapters, Chapters 1–8. Part One, "Helping Students Become Reflective Academic Readers," covers Chapters 1–3 of *Reading Rhetorically*; Part Two, "Helping Students Read and Respond to Texts Critically," covers Chapters 4 and 5; and Part Three, "Helping Students Write about Readings," covers Chapters 6–8 and the "Building a Citation" Appendix.

These chapters of the manual are organized around

- key concepts discussed in each chapter of the textbook
- activities and applications for teaching key these key chapter concepts, including the "For Writing and Discussion" activities and writing assignments presented in the text

Part Four: The Anthology Chapters

This section of the manual consists of eight chapters, one for each of the anthology chapters in *Reading Rhetorically.* This material is designed to help you choose and teach reading selections from the aims-based chapters in the anthology and to guide students through the writing assignments at the end of each of the anthology chapters.

Part Four begins with an overview that introduces you to the apparatus accompanying the readings in each chapter and offers teaching tips for the reading log prompts and "Thinking Critically" questions with each reading.

Each chapter in Part Four includes

- introductory list of learning outcomes
- "Helping Students Understand Texts that…" a discussion of important rhetorical features related to the chapter aim
- synopsis of each selection and a brief discussion of its key rhetorical features
- "Helping Students with the Writing Projects" ideas for coaching students on each of the three major writing assignments at the end of the chapter
- "Thematic Connections" suggestions for readings that might be analyzed together and for "extending the conversation" research related to the chapter selections

Acknowledgements

More people than we can count or adequately thank have helped us write and prepare both *Reading Rhetorically* and this Instructors Manual. First, of course, is our ever insightful and encouraging co-author, John Bean. On the editorial side we are grateful to our editor, Eben Ludlow, whose wisdom and generosity are endless, and to our supplements editor, Teresa Ward, who has enduring patience and enviable tact. We could not have done this without her! Finally, we want to salute our colleagues at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee and Marquette, from whom we learn every day, and to send special thanks to the many Marquette instructors who shared insights and teaching ideas in person and over email as they worked with the preliminary edition of *Reading Rhetorically*, especially Jennifer Heinert, Catherine Kalish, Dan Knauss, Ron Picard, Michelle Ruggaber, Heidi Sjostrom, and Doug VanBenthuysen.

Virginia Chappell and Alice Gillam

Selected Bibliography on Reading-Writing Connections

Adams, Marilyn Jager. "Theoretical Approaches to Reading Instruction." *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Ellen Cushman, et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 309-15.

Atkins, C. Douglas, and Michael L. Johnson. *Writing and Reading Differently*. Lawrence, KS: UP of Kansas, 1985.

Bartholomae, David, and Anthony Petrosky. *Facts, Artifacts, and Counterfacts: Theory and Method for a Reading and Writing Course*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1986.

Bean, John. "Helping Students Read Difficult Texts." *Engaging Ideas.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996. 133-148.

Brandt, Deborah. *Literacy as Involvement: The Acts of Writers, Readers, and Texts*. Carbondale, IL: S Illinois UP, 1990.

Brent, Doug. *Reading as Rhetorical Invention: Knowledge, Persuasion, and the Teaching of Research*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1992.

Cheuse, Alan. *Listening to the Page*. New York: Columbia UP, 2001.

Geisler, Cheryl. *Academic Literacy and the Nature of Expertise: Reading, Writing, and Knowing in Academic Philosophy*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1994.

Goodman, Kenneth S., and Olive S. Niles. *Reading Process and Program*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1970.

Haas, Christina. "Learning to Read Biology: One Student's Rhetorical Development in College." *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Ellen Cushman, et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 358-75.

Hass, Christina, and Linda Flower. "Rhetorical Reading Strategies and the Construction of Meaning." *College Composition and Communication* 39 (1988): 167-83.

Manguel, Alberto. *A History of Reading*. New York: Penguin, 1996.

McCormick, Kathleen. *The Culture of Reading and the Teaching of English*. Manchester, England: Manchester UP, 1994.

McCormick, Kathleen, Gary Waller, and Linda Flower. *Reading Texts: Reading, Responding, Writing*. Lexington, MA: Heath, 1987.

Quindlen, Anna. *How Reading Changed My Life*. New York: Ballentine, 1998.

Richards, I.A. "How to Read a Page." *Richards on Rhetoric*. Ed. Ann E. Berthoff. New York: Oxford UP, 1991. 62-83.

Smith, Frank. *Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read*. 4th ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1988.

COURSE AND SYLLABUS DESIGN

The in-depth discussion in the opening chapters about reading, responding to, and writing about texts at the college level combines with the anthology selections in *Reading Rhetorically* to offer instructors enormous flexibility for course design. Our discussion here of ways you can take advantage of this flexibility to construct a syllabus covers the following topics:

- organizing principles for a *Reading Rhetorically* syllabus
- the rationale behind *Reading Rhetorically*'s various writing assignments
- the concept of rhetorical reading
- three options for sequencing material from Parts One through Three to provide students with a solid grounding in rhetorical reading
- syllabus templates for courses with differing emphases and lengths

As the syllabus templates at the end of this chapter illustrate, we expect that most classes using *Reading Rhetorically* will move back and forth between the compendium of expert reading strategies in Chapters 1 through 8 (Parts One through Three) and various selections in the anthology. The strategies for both "writing to read" and "reading to write" presented in Parts One through Three can be applied to a wide variety of assignments, and the three strands of writing assignments that weave through the anthology can be adapted to fit just about any subject matter. These assignment strands, discussed in detail later in this chapter, invite students to engage with readings in three ways typical of what college professors expect:

Strand 1	Writing to practice the rhetorical methods modeled by a text
Strand 2	Writing to analyze and respond to a text's rhetorical strategies
Strand 3	Writing to "extend the conversation" by conducting inquiry and synthesizing multiple readings

ORGANIZING PRINCIPLES

In this section we lay out several overarching principles for sequencing assignments. These approaches can and inevitably will overlap. We do not mean to draw hard lines of distinction among them but rather to suggest primary concepts that can be used to guide decision-making for syllabus design.

From Personal to Public Writing

Reading Rhetorically's focus on writers' rhetorical engagement with readers offers a fresh take on the time-honored personal-to-public approach to first-year composition. The book's lineup of anthology chapters itself suggests such a sequence in the movement from the intimacy of Expression and Reflection to the public-spiritedness implicit in the common ground strategies of Rogerian argument. A single term course (semester or quarter) would typically cover four or five of these anthology chapters or four to five major writing projects that combine chapters. (A model sequence of assignments that combines aims is presented in the "Syllabus Template Emphasizing a Variety of Aims" later in this chapter.) In a two-term course, each of the eight chapters could be the focus of a distinct writing project.

Putting reading at the center of a personal to public writing sequence helps students think beyond subject matter choices ("What should I pick for my topic?") so that they can apply the dual perspective they gain from reading rhetorically critique by emulating the "what" and "how" of skillfully written texts. Such a syllabus might begin with assignments that invite students to practice the conventions of a particular type of text (Strand 1) and move toward "Extending the Conversation" assignments (Strand 3). Reflective assignments could be used as "bookends" at the beginning and end of the course, giving students the opportunity to deepen and complicate their understanding of belletristic techniques available to them as well as to gain perspective on changes in their evolving reading and writing processes.

Degrees of Change

An assignment sequence more explicitly focused on writers' engagement with readers could be based on the degrees of change writers seek to bring about in their readers' thinking, from the slight, welcome broadening of perspective that is frequently offered in narrative and exposition to the major reconstruction of a reader's image sought by those who engage in controversial argument.[1] In a two-term course, the frequently neglected middle of such a continuum, where writer's purposes mix and sometimes go under cover, could be examined in detail. Such a course might assign several informative/explanatory papers intended for audiences with contrasting expectations (e.g., welcoming v. resistant) along with analytic and interpretive assignments like those students will frequently encounter in college.

Such a course might begin by asking students to practice the relatively straightforward conventions of expressive or informative texts, then challenge students with "Examining" and "Extending" assignments that take on ambiguous subject matter or that stipulate rhetorical contexts where resistance or skepticism are assumed. We would recommend, for example, an interpretive paper based on a short story or an evaluative paper based on a cultural phenomenon similar to those scrutinized by the authors in Chapter 14, Evaluating and Judging. The course would build to a persuasive paper, where the writer explicitly seeks to reconstruct readers' image of the subject matter. In a two-term course, work on argument could include several papers culminating with an assignment from Chapter 16, Seeking Common Ground. In that connection, one might pose the following question: Which kind of change involves more extensive reconstruction of a preconceived image: persuading readers to join your side of a controversy, or persuading the parties to a controversy that they actually have much in common and will gain more through cooperation than opposition?

Spirals

A third method for syllabus development uses a spiral structure, which takes students through a pattern of learning experiences (in this case writing assignments) several times. Each experience after the first is grounded in an earlier one, but is now more complex and challenging. This principle is implicit in the syllabus design suggestions we present later, but in a spiral syllabus, it dominates, especially in a two-term course.

In contrast to a more segmented syllabus, where students might do source-based writing only during the second half or where the first term is about expository writing and the second about argument or literature, a spiral syllabus uses

---

[1]This analytical construct comes from the work of Richard Young, Alton Becker, and Kenneth Pike in *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change* (San Diego: Harcourt, 1970). For further discussion, see the introduction to Chapter 11 in *Reading Rhetorically*.

multiple types of assignments, then revisits them in more complex form. The type(s) of writing scrutinized and practiced in the first half of a course, the first of two terms, or even the first of two paired assignments is complicated in some way for a second look. The complexity might come from longer, more difficult readings with aims similar to those studied previously, from a focus on academic texts, or from an assumption that papers will now be based on outside research. Either single or multiple categories of texts can be drawn upon in a given project unit, but as the spiral turns, multiple tasks are required (interpretation grounded in analysis, for example), and rhetorical contexts deliberately made ambiguous. For example, an initial assignment to analyze rhetorical strategies in a single text might be reprised through analysis of competing arguments. A "take a stand" assignment might gain multiple facets as a proposal argument, complete with problem explication and evaluation of competing solutions.

WRITING ASSIGNMENTS IN *READING RHETORICALLY*

Since the writing you will ask students to do necessarily determines your decisions about syllabus design, in this section we explain the many types of writing assignments *Reading Rhetorically* offers and supports.

Short Assignments

For Writing and Discussion (FWD) Exercises. The opening instructional chapters of *Reading Rhetorically* contain numerous FWD exercises, which invite brief written responses to be used as a basis for discussion by the whole class or in small groups. Many also invite later written reflection. These short, informal assignments provide students with opportunities to practice the various methods that the text describes for using writing to deepen one's understanding of a text ("writing-to-read"). FWDs can also be used as invention activities that model "reading-to-write" strategies for developing academic papers. Students can do FWD work in reading logs or journals that you collect periodically for quick review. (See the descriptions of writing-to-learn activities on pp. 93–95 of *Reading Rhetorically*.)

Brief Writing Projects. Other assignments in Chapters 1 through 8 call for work that, although short, is likely to require several drafts. At the end of Chapter 1, the "Scenes of Reading" assignment can serve as both a warm-up exercise and an introductory writing sample. It is designed to tap observational, descriptive, and narrative skills in a short personalized sketch that connects with the subject of reading itself. In Chapter 4, the descriptive outline, summary, and rhetorical précis also call upon students' substantive composing skills. These can also serve as valuable invention activities; for example, a four-sentence rhetorical précis of a reading might become the foundation of a four-page analytical response. The brief writing project at the end of Chapter 4 suggests that students submit a portfolio demonstrating their use of all three types of "listening" treatments on a text. This assignment prompts scrutiny of both an assigned text and students' own writing and so taps the skills being developed as students work with *Reading Rhetorically*.

Anthology Apparatus. The introduction to each anthology chapter ends with a series of aim-specific questions designed to facilitate rhetorical reading through thoughtful examination of a text's rhetorical strategies. These variations on the generic "Questions that Rhetorical Readers Ask" in Chapter 2 (p. 20) are valuable prompts for both discussion and invention. The pre-reading questions, labeled "For Your Reading Log," and the "Thinking Critically About" discussion questions accompanying each of the readings in the anthology chapters offer numerous possibilities for invention activities as well as informal writing that will enhance students' understanding of rhetorical reading and composing processes. The responses called for range from reflection on personal experience to written application of the various listening and questioning techniques in Chapters 4 and 5.

Three Strands of Major Assignments

The writing assignments at the end of each anthology chapter are designed to reinforce the book's rhetorical approach to academic literacy by giving students practical experience with the three major ways that academic writers use other writers' texts: as models, as objects for analysis, and as voices to respond to. Since even a two-term syllabus does not afford time for students to tackle each type of assignment in every *Reading Rhetorically* chapter, your overall course goals will serve as a basis for choosing among the possibilities. We hope that you will come to think of the assignments in the strands as templates for developing your own prompts. All of the assignments are easily modified—broadened or narrowed—to fit particular assignment sequences and thematic goals.

Even when you will not assign any prompts at the end of a particular chapter, you might wish to draw attention to the pattern of assignments presented or to base a class discussion on hypothetical responses to them. Doing so can serve to deepen students' understanding of both the given rhetorical aim and the many varied situations in the academy and elsewhere in which they will be expected to apply their reading and writing skills. See "A Further Look at Writers' Purposes" in *Reading Rhetorically* Chapter 2 (pp. 21–26) for a definitive overview of the scheme the book uses for categorizing writers' aims. Based on the discussion and examples there, you might ask students to imagine analogous writing tasks that they can expect in their majors or in work and community situations.

Strand 1: Composing Texts with a Specific Aim. This series of assignments gives students the opportunity to practice the conventions common among texts with similar rhetorical purposes. Students are asked to apply in their own writing what they've learned about how texts within the category engage readers and project their writers' purposes. *Reading Rhetorically*'s presentations go beyond structural matters so that students can use the chapter's texts as models not merely of form but of rhetorical method. Outside research can enhance students' papers in this strand, but is not essential. (For additional discussion, see *Reading Rhetorically*, p. 96.)

These assignments can serve as the backbone of your course either by defining the major focus of students' graded work or by serving as the basis of more complex assignments that combine aims and/or call for outside sources to "extend the conversation" (Strand 3). *Reading Rhetorically* deliberately leaves subject matter open so that students can choose their own topics or instructors can broaden, narrow, or otherwise modify the book's prompt.

Strand 2: Examining Rhetorical Strategies. Rhetorical analysis is the obvious goal of the assignments in this strand. Building on the listening and questioning strategies presented in Chapters 4 and 5, these assignments help students learn how rhetorical strategies intersect with a range of issues that include but also extend beyond their personal response to a text. The aim-specific "Questions to Help You Read [the chapter's topics] Rhetorically" at the end of each chapter introduction are extremely useful invention prompts for these papers.

To help students avoid merely going through the motions of *reporting* on a text rather than *analyzing* it, analysis assignments such as these need to provide, or help students invoke, a rhetorical purpose and context—i.e., a reason for writing, an exigence. (See the advice to students about this matter on p. 100 of *Reading Rhetorically*.) You may want to specify a purpose—which could range beyond analysis to include explanation, persuasion, argument, etc.—or, as the term progresses, you may decide to have students choose, and specify, the purpose for their analysis. The scrutiny of textual and contextual features called for in these assignments prepares students for similar work with texts in the social sciences and humanities. (For additional discussion, see *Reading Rhetorically*, p. 97.)

These assignments provide especially valuable experience with gathering and organizing textual evidence to support an analysis. They can work well as major writing projects, or, narrowed in scope, they can be used as formal preparation for class discussion or as microthemes that build toward a major paper. Posing questions that highlight distinct features of the aim, they typically prompt re-examination of one or more readings. For example, in Chapter 9, Expressing and Reflecting, Strand 2 asks students not only to scrutinize what an author's rhetorical choices reveal about purpose but also to reflect on how the text has altered their understanding of the subject matter. In Chapter 11, Informing and Explaining, this assignment calls for comparative evaluation of two selections from the chapter, then asks students to consider whether these texts would have been more properly categorized in an argument chapter.

Strand Three: Extending the Conversation. The concept of reading as conversation governs these assignments. Designed to develop students' ability to write texts that synthesize their own perspective with perspectives they encounter in their reading, these assignments ask students to use texts as springboards for further discussion and, ideally, discovery. To respond successfully, students must usually incorporate material from several sources as well as practice the conventions of the rhetorical aim on which the chapter focuses. For example, the "extending" prompt for Chapter 10, Inquiring and Exploring (p. 253), invites students to do further research on a topic raised by one of the texts in the chapter; similarly, the Strand 3 prompt in Chapter 14, Evaluating and Judging (p. 489) invites students' own evaluation of one of the phenomena discussed in a chapter reading.

Assignments from this strand, like those in the others, can serve as the backbone of your course, either as they are presented in the text or as frameworks you modify into broader or narrower prompts. You might, for example, limit the options for explorations, evaluations, and so forth, according to thematic constraints. (See the Thematic Table of Contents and the "Thematic Connections" sections in Part Two of this manual for numerous possibilities for tying together the content of reading selections within and among anthology chapters.) On the other hand, in chapters where the "extending" prompt focuses on one particular reading (e.g., the "update" assignment regarding antioxidants in Chapter 11), you might wish to broaden the possibilities, perhaps finding subject matter in other chapters, an option that will give students an opportunity to examine how rhetorical features and conventions vary with writers' purposes. (For additional discussion, see *Reading Rhetorically,* p. 98.)

Modifying and Combining the Strands

All of these assignment prompts can be modified to suit specific pedagogical purposes or themes. See, for example, the evaluative paper assigned in the highly specific "Extending the Conversation" assignment in Chapter 7 (p. 111), to which Jenny's research paper at the end of Chapter 8 responds. Other possible modifications include the following:

- Prompts in the same strand can be combined across chapters for assignments that combine aims, either within a paper or in a sequence of papers on the same topic. For example, an exploratory or explanatory paper could lead to a proposal; an analysis of competing arguments could lead to a common ground argument.
- Discussion or freewriting in response to an "Examining Rhetorical Strategies" prompt might serve as pre-writing for another paper. Jenny's research paper, for example, grows out of her work on rhetorical analysis in Chapter 5.
- An evaluation argument could be based upon an examination of rhetorical strategies.
- A companion piece reflection assignment could ask students to (a) describe how their own rhetorical strategies in a given paper evolved and (b) consider how these would be different if they were writing with a different purpose; for example, if they were seeking primarily to persuade resisting readers rather than to inform receptive readers.
- Students could be asked to transform a text—their own or a selection from the book—into one with a different purpose; for example, to rewrite a strident argument into a coolly informative report.

INTRODUCING STUDENTS TO RHETORICAL READING

Whatever the writing assignments, rhetorical aims, and thematic content that shape your syllabus, one of your first objectives in an *Reading Rhetorically*-based course will be to help students understand what it means to read rhetorically. We sketch below three different options for sequencing assignments and activities in the opening weeks of a composition course, from a full unit on rhetorical reading to a brief overview.

Conceptual Foundation

The concept of rhetorical reading is defined at the beginning of Chapter 1 as attending "both to what authors say and to how they say it." Reading this way, *Reading Rhetorically* says, fosters analytical awareness that "enables [readers] to discern how well your purposes for reading match the author's purposes for writing" (p. 4). Chances are, this will be a new and at first puzzling proposition for most first-year college students, who tend to take their reading processes for granted and to think of texts as neutral conveyers of information from which readers "get" what they need. In high school, students use reading and writing to demonstrate that they have learned something. To be successful college students, however, they must learn to use reading and writing as activities through which they not only gather information and gain expertise but also make arguments, create new knowledge, and get things done in the world.

In many ways, then, introducing rhetorical reading in a first-year writing course is a matter not only of presenting expert strategies for critical reading but of leading students to reconceptualize the intellectual work involved in their literacy practices. Thus, your course design decisions must take into account the goal of helping students appreciate what rhetorical readers gain not only from weighing their purposes against an author's but from discerning and scrutinizing the larger conversation in which a given text seeks to participate. Effective rhetorical readers can **analyze** how a text works to fit itself into a context and can **judge** how well it accomplishes its purposes there. Effective rhetorical readers can also **respond** to a text constructively, perhaps resisting its argument, perhaps extending its argument to accommodate their own understanding of the subject. Furthermore, effective rhetorical readers can **incorporate** key elements of their reading into their own writing, writing that in turn **accomplishes their purposes** in school, on the job, or in the community.

Few first-year college students have considered this broad a context for their reading and writing activities. In our experience, few have thought about reading as a process of composing meaning, nor have many considered how they might manage their reading processes according to their purposes for reading. The learning objectives and activities we outline will help you introduce this new way of thinking to your students and help them learn about:

- Reading strategies used by expert academic readers
- Their tacit knowledge about how texts work
- Their tacit knowledge about how they themselves read
- Strategies for both "listening to" and questioning texts (reading with and against the grain)
- Managing their composing processes
- Using rhetorical reading as a research strategy
- Incorporating material from other texts into one's own writing

Option 1: Full Unit on Rhetorical Reading

The ideal introduction to rhetorical reading is a three- to four-week unit (twelve 50-minute classes) focused on the interconnections between reading and writing processes and the value of rhetorical reading for academic writing. Beginning a course this way permits early coverage of both listening and questioning strategies (Chapters 4 and 5) and gives students valuable multifaceted practice with the type of reading and writing assignments they will encounter across their college curriculum. At the end of the unit, students submit for evaluation a mini-portfolio of polished short pieces about texts they have read—e.g., a summary, rhetorical précis, response paper, and reflection. Peer response and revision activities can be included in the portfolio preparation process.

The substantial range of "writing-to-read" and "reading-to-write" activities that students might practice in this unit make it a particularly attractive way to begin a two-course sequence, a course requiring extensive source-based writing, or a course focused on academic writing. You can assign readings from different anthology chapters to highlight differences in writers' purposes or from within one category that will serve as a foundation for the rest of the term's work. Similarly, the practice with various "writing-to-read" strategies can focus on one text (like the samples from Jenny in *Reading Rhetorically*) or on a series of different texts.

Learning Objectives for an Introduction to Rhetorical Reading. The objectives here cover key learning outcomes for the first five chapters of *Reading Rhetorically* along with material on composing processes that is crucial for students' work on the short writings for the portfolio.

At the end of the unit, students will be able to:

1. Articulate in writing their own varying purposes for reading
2. Apply the generic "Questions that Rhetorical Readers Ask" (p. 20) to assigned readings and support their answers with textual evidence
3. Define and distinguish among rhetorical aims
4. Identify writers' apparent purposes (rhetorical aims) in published texts and supply textual evidence to support their view
5. Define the concept of rhetorical context and identify ways in which texts respond to it
7. Explain how reading can be understood as a composing process
8. Name and use selected strategies for preparing to read and for listening to and questioning texts. (Note: Strategies can be selected by students on the basis of self-assessment and their purpose for reading or assigned according to course goals and materials.)

9. Articulate in writing their own varying purposes and strategies for reading
10. Write an accurate and clear summary and rhetorical précis
11. Write an accurate, clear, and convincing rhetorical analysis and response to a text, including in it both with-the-grain and against-the-grain elements along with descriptions of the author's rhetorical strategies and evident purpose

Activities for a Full Unit on Rhetorical Reading. To help new instructors get started, we suggest specific activities for the first week or so of classes, then list possible activities for the rest of the unit.

Class 1

- Brief discussion of how purposes for reading may vary
- Chapter 1 assigned as reading for the next class; students are to write out their responses to the seven “On Your Own” questions in the “Taking Stock of Why You Read” exercise on p. 5

Class 2

- “With Your Classmates” discussion of responses to the Taking Stock questions
- In-class reflective writing at the end of the Taking Stock exercise (5–10 minutes)
- Concept of rhetorical reading introduced, in-class discussion of Burke’s conversation metaphor (if time)
- Chapter 2 and a relatively brief reading from the anthology assigned for the next class; students are to apply the “Questions that Rhetorical Readers Ask” (pp. 19–20) to the reading. Instructors may want to use a text representative of the aim(s) students will work with next. Useful short readings for this assignment include
  —Expressing and Reflecting: “Reflection as Knowledge” (p. 201)
  —Inquiring and Exploring: “Testing the Limits of Tolerance as Cultures Mix” (p. 221)
  —Informing and Explaining: “How Come” (pp. 259–261)
  —Analyzing and Interpreting: “I Shop, Ergo I Am: The Mall as Society’s Mirror” (p. 349) or “Toys” (p. 354)
  —Taking a Stand: “For Starters, We Can Require Trigger Locks” (p. 405)
  —Evaluating and Judging: “The Morality and Metaphysics of E-mail” (p. 467)

Class 3

- Discussion of assigned readings in light of the “Questions that Rhetorical Readers Ask”
- In-class discussion of Thomas Lux poem, “The Voice You Hear When You Read Silently” (p. 29)
- Concept of rhetorical context introduced (p. 31)
- Chapter 3 and two readings with similar subject matter but contrasting aims (e.g., explanation v. argument) assigned for the next class for continued practice with using the Questions that Rhetorical Readers Ask for analysis. Consult Thematic Table of Contents for likely pairings.

Class 4

- Discussion of the assigned readings
- Small-group work and class discussion of the introductions to articles about teenagers' sleep habits (pp. 32–34)
- Work with listening strategies in Chapter 4 assigned

The following activities complete the unit. Course calendars will vary according to instructors' desired pace and overall syllabus.

1. Students practice and reflect in writing on at least one "listening" technique at each of the three stages covered in Chapter 4: preparing to read, initial reading, and re-reading. Note that descriptive outlining (p. 58) is useful not only for preparing summaries but for critiquing and revising one's own drafts.
2. Students prepare and compare "trial" drafts of a summary and précis of text(s) previously analyzed in class discussion, leading to independent work on a summary and précis.
3. Students prepare written responses to "Taking Stock of How You Read" (p. 39) and compare them in class.
4. Students discuss in class the questioning strategies and examples presented in Chapter 5.
5. Class time is devoted to discussing and applying "Examining a Text's Ideology" (p. 78) and "The Believing and Doubting Game" (p. 81) to model techniques for responding to the assignment.
6. Instructor assigns and guides students in developing a rhetorical analysis paper parallel to the one at the end of Chapter 4, including class critique of Jenny's work.
7. Class time is devoted to discussion of drafting and revising strategies, including *at minimum*: "Asserting Your Authority as a Reader and Writer," pp. 98–99; "Seeing Writing as a Process of 'Putting in Your Oar,'" pp. 99–106; along with "Mapping the Idea Structure," p. 56, and/or "Descriptive Outlining," p. 58. These last two are excellent listening strategies for students to use when reviewing their own drafts.
8. Purpose of attributive tags is introduced (pp. 132–134) along with the citation method to be used in the mini-portfolio.
9. Class time is devoted to peer review and discussion of revision techniques (see pp. 103–106).

Option 2: Integrated Introduction to Rhetorical Reading

Instead of the broad experience with rhetorical reading skills afforded by the unit of short writing-to-read assignments, your calendar and course goals may call for an initial unit that moves directly to a major writing assignment. In that case, you will probably want to spend more time with the materials on composing processes and integrating reading into writing in Chapters 6 and 8 than is described above. A substantial, but shorter, introduction to rhetorical reading, perhaps focused primarily on listening strategies, might culminate with a summary and/or rhetorical précis assignment that feeds into the unit's primary writing project. Work with questioning strategies would then be integrated into the next unit. This option, which we use in the "Syllabus Emphasizing a Variety of Aims," has the advantage of providing more time for material in Part Three, "The Rhetorical Reader as Writer" (Chapters 4 through 6), and for study of anthology materials about specific rhetorical aims.

Option 3: Brief Overview of Rhetorical Reading

A third option is to spend only a few classes—perhaps just the three or four outlined above under Option 1—introducing rhetorical reading, then turning directly to an aims-based writing assignment. The topics covered in those four class outlines concentrate on the first five learning objectives above, leaving the others to be integrated with coursework related to major writing projects. If a formal writing sample is needed during the first week (perhaps for assessment purposes), the short "Scenes of Reading" project at the end of Chapter 1 (pp. 7–8) provides a good option. The sample readings presented with it, which are short enough to read aloud in class, can serve as productive prompts for the Taking Stock exercises in Chapters 1 and 3 (see pp. 5 and 39).

SYLLABUS TEMPLATE EMPHASIZING A VARIETY OF AIMS

This kind of syllabus will give students broad experience with texts that have different purposes and contexts. The template demonstrates not just an assignment sequence but a method for integrating material from Parts One through Three of *Reading Rhetorically* with work on specific writing projects.

Each unit involves analysis of multiple types of texts; for the writing projects students work with at least two different aims. Incorporation of outside sources is necessary for the Unit 2 exploratory paper and may be required for Unit 3. Students submit three major papers and two short ones for grading, with revision as policies permit. We assume 50-minute classes, approximately 40 in either a 10-week quarter or 14-week semester.

Unit 1 Introduction to Rhetorical Reading plus Reflecting & Analyzing
See Option 2, p.in this manual Approx. 15 classes
Materials: Chapters 1–5, readings in 9 and 12, parts of 6 and 8
Writing Projects: Brief project at end of Chapter 4 (p. 64) and analysis paper from Strand 2 in Chapter 9 or 12 (p. 206 or 389)
Reading Focus: Listening and questioning
Writing Focus: "Writing to Make Claims about a Text" (pp. 97–98) and Chapter 8's opening sections on incorporating reading into writing

Unit 2 Exploring and Informing 11–12 classes
Materials: Chapters 10 and 11, parts of 7 and 8
Writing Project: Paper from Strand 3 in Chapter 10 or 11 (p. 253 or 336)
Reading Focus: Choosing and evaluating sources, Chapter 7, with emphasis on question-based research (p. 111 ff.)
Writing Focus: Plagiarism and citation conventions in Chapter 8

Unit 3 Explaining versus Persuading 11–12 classes
Materials: Chapters 11 and 13, parts of 5 and 8
Writing Project: Explanatory paper based on Strand 2 assignment in Chapter 13, perhaps modified to focus on students' research regarding an issue related to reading(s) from *Reading Rhetorically*
Reading Focus: Examining credibility, reasoning, and ideology (pp. 70–74 and 78–80); argument structure (pp. 391–400)
Writing Focus: Material in Chapters 6–8 as needed

Unit 4 Reflection and Revision 1–2 classes

Materials: Review: Chapters 9 and 6

Writing Project: Short reflective piece on student's growth as reader and writer, with possible revision of previously submitted paper(s) and/or submission of course portfolio, according to course or program policies

Reading & Writing Focus: Using critical reading strategies to revise

SYLLABUS TEMPLATE EMPHASIZING PERSUASION AND WRITING IN THE PUBLIC SQUARE

In contrast to the broad eclecticism of the previous template, this syllabus narrows the rhetorical focus to persuasion and establishes a thematic focus on public issues. Based on the "Degrees of Change" conceptual framework described earlier, it can be adapted for other themes or a wider rhetorical focus. The syllabus begins with a brief overview of rhetorical reading, then moves directly to an "Exploring and Informing" unit that presents rhetorical reading as a method of inquiry and establishes a baseline against which the persuasive texts studied in the remaining units can be compared.

This syllabus might define the second term of a course that begins with the syllabus emphasizing a variety of aims; alternatively, units from this syllabus could supplement a sequence focusing on single chapters in the early part of the anthology.

Introduction Brief Overview of Rhetorical Reading (Option 3 above) 3 classes

Unit 1 Exploring and Informing 11–12 classes

Materials: Chapters 10 and 11, selected sections of Chapters 4–8

Writing Project: Paper from Strand 3 in Chapter 10 or 11 (p. 253 or 334) with focus on issues relevant to the local community or current events

Reading Focus: Listening and questioning strategies and question-based research. Summary and believing-doubting game writing, along with research logs, serve as invention exercises for the writing project.

Writing Focus: Reading-to-write, Chapter 4; writing strategies, Chapter 6; incorporating reading into writing, Chapter 8

Unit 2 Taking a Stand 9–10 classes

Materials: Chapter 13, selected sections of Chapters 5–8

Writing Project: Taking a Stand assignment (researched argument, Strand 2, p. 446) with short Strand 2 paper (on a text from Chapter 13 or a source from individual research) as invention exercise

Reading Focus: Examining credibility, reasoning, and ideology (pp. 70–74, 78–80), argument conventions (pp. 391–95)

Writing Focus: Material from Chapters 6 and 8 not previously covered, especially peer response, plagiarism, citation conventions

Unit 3 What's Really at Issue? 9 classes

Materials: Chapters 13–15, parts of Chapter 7 and 8

Writing Project: Researched evaluation or proposal argument from Strands 1 or 3, Chapters 14 or 15; rhetorical précis for invention

Reading Focus: "What's Really at Issue?" (pp. 396–400) and the conventions of evaluation and proposal arguments

Writing Focus: Using argument conventions, elaborate strategies from Chapters 6–8 as necessary

Unit 4 Common Ground 8–9 classes

Materials: Chapters 9 & 16

Writing Project: Strand 1 assignment in Chapter 16, p. 574 ("Moving Toward Common Ground"); individual topics should stem from informal reflection about composing the previous three papers.

Reading Focus: Elaborate listening and questioning strategies as needed

Writing Focus: Conventions for reflection, seeking common ground, and Rogerian argument; elaborate strategies from Chapters 6–8 as necessary

SYLLABUS TEMPLATE EMPHASIZING ACADEMIC WRITING

This syllabus asks students to read a wider range of aims than does the persuasion-focused sequence, but assigns mainly the explanatory and analytical writing projects of academic work. (For example, it uses Strand 2 from the common ground chapter, asking for analysis of texts, not advocacy of a position.) The sequence of necessitates increasingly more complex engagement with the materials students write about. As a second-term syllabus paired with either of the preceding models, it would take students through a spiral framework.

The course begins with the full unit on rhetorical reading described earlier in the chapter, then moves to an "Exploring and Informing" unit that, although similar to the ones in previous templates, is shorter because both listening and questioning strategies are covered in the opening unit. The difference in emphasis in Unit 1 comes from the academic readings students will work with and the writing project's combination of exploratory and informative purposes, intended to replicate much academic work across the curriculum. Each succeeding unit then focuses on a different type of academic writing and a different strand of writing assignments. These all presume students will be reading materials intended primarily for an academic audience, whether found in the anthology or through their own research. See Appendix B of this manual, "Texts Written for Academic Audiences," for a list of selections in *Reading Rhetorically* that were originally published in refereed journals (with bibliographies and/or notes) as well as three student papers with MLA style Works Cited lists.

Unit 1 Full Unit on Rhetorical Reading 12 classes

Materials: Chapters 4–6 and reading selections with scholarly focus
See Option 1 above for details

Writing Projects: Rhetorical analysis and response paper as described in objective 11 above together with a portfolio of short "listening" and "questioning" pieces based on assignments in Chapters 4 and 5

Reading Focus: Rhetorical contexts (pp. 31-34); listening and questioning strategies applied to longer, more challenging readings that will give students practice comparable to that illustrated in Chapters 4 and 5 in connection with the Weston passage

Writing Focus: Writing-to-read strategies

Unit 2 Exploring and Informing 9 classes

Materials: Chapters 7, 10 and 11, parts of 6–8

Writing Project: Exploratory paper (Strand 1, p. 253) based on a question that imitates that from the Extending the Conversation strand in Chapter 11, which asks, "What is the current thinking about antioxidants?" Students should formulate a parallel question related to their anticipated academic major.

Reading Focus: Choosing and evaluating sources, Chapter 7, emphasis on question-based research (p. 111 ff.)

Writing Focus: Material in Chapter 6 not covered in Unit 1, especially peer response; Chapter 8 on incorporating reading into writing

Unit 3 Analyzing and Interpreting 9 classes

Materials: Chapters 5 and 12, parts of 6 and 8

Writing Project: Analysis paper from Strand 2 (p. 389) *or* Interpretive paper examining an ambiguity in one of the short stories in the anthology. The

"Responding as a Writer" questions for Hribal's "Consent" (pp. 333–334) provide model prompts. See also the "Thinking Critically About" prompts for the other stories (pp. 363, 42, and 484).

Reading Focus: In-depth work with questioning strategies by applying techniques in Chapter 5 to readings in Chapter 12 and, as desired, short stories or creative nonfiction pieces in Chapters 9 and 10.

Writing Focus: Material in Chapters 6 and 8 not previously covered, especially peer response, plagiarism, and citation conventions

Unit 4 Common Ground — 9 classes

Materials: Chapters 13 and 16

Writing Project: Strand 3, Chapter 16, p. 577

Reading Focus: Argument structure and questions at issue from Chapter 13 and common ground concept from Chapter 16

Writing Focus: Elaborate strategies from Chapters 4–8 as necessary

Unit 5 Reflection and Revision — 1–2 classes

Materials: Chapter 9

Writing Project: Short reflective piece on growth as reader and writer, including possible revision of previously submitted paper(s) and/or submission of course portfolio, according to course or program policies

Reading & Writing Focus: Using critical reading strategies to revise one's own work

---

As you and your students explore the materials and insights that *Reading Rhetorically* offers, many other possibilities for assignment sequences will no doubt become apparent to you. the chapters that follow offer numerous teaching tips for working with Parts One through Three of *Reading Rhetorically* in ways that will bring multifaceted possibilities to life in your classroom and in your students' writing. Then, in Part Four of the manual, we offer specific guidance for teaching each of the anthology chapters.

PART ONE

CHAPTERS 1 THROUGH 3: HELPING STUDENTS BECOME REFLECTIVE ACADEMIC READERS

Part One of *Reading Rhetorically (RR),* Chapters 1-3, begins by asking students to consider why they read. Our aim is to encourage students to think of themselves as experienced readers. Just as many students do not think of themselves as "writers," so, too, many do not think of themselves as "readers." In their minds the reading that they do on a daily basis—school assignments, advertisements, the sports page, fashion magazines–doesn't count as real reading. Rather they think of readers as bookworms who love to read long "serious" novels. Before introducing students to new ways of reading, we believe it is important for them to recognize the many purposes reading already serves in their daily lives and the expertise they already have as readers. Thus, the trajectory of concepts in Part One moves from familiar reading purposes to the new academic reading purposes and from familiar reading habits to new rhetorical reading strategies that will enable them to meet the challenges of college reading and writing assignments.

CHAPTER 1 - YOUR LIFE AS A READER

Chapter 1 offers a brief overview of the book, introduces the concept of rhetorical reading, and asks students to consider the roles reading already plays in their lives.

Key Concepts

1. Reading is a purposeful activity.

Although it may seem self-evident to say that reading is a purposeful activity, students may not realize that they have many different purposes for reading. By drawing students' attention to *why* they already read, you will be preparing them to better understand this book's central concept: that purpose (*why*) is related to method (*how*) for both readers and writers.

2. Reading is a vital part of daily life and entails reading for a wide range of purposes.

Chapter 1 reminds students that they are already experienced readers and that they will continue to read for many differing purposes throughout their lives. It also attempts to expand their notion of reading to include the "invisible" types of reading that they do on a daily basis–billboards, bus signs, advertisements, and so on.

Activities and Applications

Taking Stock of Why You Read, page 5. This activity can be done as an in- or out-of-class assignment. Its aim is to make students aware of the many purposes reading already serves in their lives and to begin to make them consider the relationship between *why* they read and *how*. Since we assume you will want to assign this exercise early in the term, we suggest you collect it and then, at the end of the term, ask students to repeat it. You can return their original responses and ask them to compare the two sets of responses to see what changes, if any, have occurred in what and why they read.

A Brief Writing Project, page 7. The three options for writing invite students to extend their thinking about the roles that reading plays in their own lives and in the lives of others. Because this writing project is brief and has relatively low stakes, it makes for an engaging first writing assignment. Moreover, the first two options are likely to appeal to students since they typically enjoy writing about their memories and about their observations of others. The third option, however, might prove particularly instructive since students are likely to be surprised by the amount of reading required in their future profession. Each of the three sample essays illustrates one of the suggested options for writing and can easily be read aloud and discussed in class.

CHAPTER 2 - THE SPECIAL DEMANDS OF ACADEMIC READING

In this chapter, we use Burke's conversation metaphor to introduce the challenges presented by academic reading and to explain more fully our definition of rhetorical reading. The chapter concludes by discussing the range of writers' purposes represented by the readings in the anthology section of this book.

Key Concepts

1. Academic reading and writing are best understood as ongoing conversations.

As a teacher you are perhaps familiar with the use of *conversation* as a metaphor for reading and writing, but it is likely that your students are not. The *conversation* metaphor is helpful for introducing students to the purpose of academic reading and writing, which is to make disciplinary knowledge, not to consume or transmit a fixed, authoritative body of knowledge. In addition, it explains the connection between reading and writing in academic contexts. Just as writers interact with prior texts in order to challenge, modify, or extend what they have said, so, too, readers interact with texts to accept, modify, or resist their understanding of a subject. Finally, this metaphor helps students to understand why they have difficulty with their college reading assignments. These texts are part of an ongoing conversation of which they are not yet a part. Consequently, they are understandably confused when they encounter new terminology, allusions to ideas and texts they have not read, and references to concepts they do not yet understand. This does not mean they are poor readers; it simply means that they are newcomers to this particular disciplinary conversation. Our use of the everyday metaphor of *conversation* is meant to convince students that the challenges they encounter as college readers are to be expected and that they can learn to meet these challenges by learning to read rhetorically.

2. Reading rhetorically enables you to meet the special demands of academic reading.

The notion of *reading rhetorically* builds on the idea introduced in Chapter 1: reading purposes shape reading strategies. Since the purposes of academic reading are to learn both *conceptual knowledge* (the course's subject matter) and *procedural knowledge* (the discipline's ways of making knowledge), successful readers must attend to both *what* texts are saying and *how* they are saying it. Reading rhetorically means reading with this double focus. However, since most students are not accustomed to this way of reading, they need explicit instruction in how to do so. Specific strategies for comprehending what a text is saying and for analyzing what a text is doing are introduced in Chapters 4 and 5 respectively. In this chapter, we introduce and define the concept, offer examples, and suggest a set of questions that rhetorical readers ask. These questions not only offer starting points for examining how a text works but they also foreground the distinction between writers' purpose and a readers' purpose. Writers aim to change readers' views of a subject and thus shape their texts to have particular effects on particular readers. However, readers bring prior knowledge and attitudes as well as their own purposes for reading, all of which affect their assent, mixed response, or resistance to the view the writer is proposing. Reading rhetorically enables readers to identify the fit between the writer's purpose for writing and their purpose for reading and to take this into consideration as they weigh their response to a text.

Activities and Applications

For Writing and Discussion, Applying Burke's Parlor Metaphor, page 16. This exercise is designed to help students understand and apply Burke's parlor analogy to their own reading lives. It might be assigned as homework, perhaps as a reading log entry, or as an in-class activity in which pairs of students interview one another, taking turns asking questions and jotting down the other's responses. As the class discusses the results of this exercise, it is worth pointing out that neither oral conversations nor written scholarly conversations are free exchanges in which everyone has an equal voice and credibility is dependent only upon knowledge. Factors such as gender, race, class, sexual orientation, political or religious affiliation, and personal style can affect whose opinions are listened to and given credence and whose are not.

Additional Activities

Dramatizing Burke's Parlor. Dramatize Burke's parlor analogy by asking several class members to leave the room while the rest of the class launches a discussion of a hot political topic or local campus controversy. Then invite the class members outside the room to come back in after about 10 minutes and ask them to join in the conversation whenever they see fit. Allow the conversation to continue for another 10 minutes or so, and then ask the late arrivals to discuss the cues that enabled them to get the drift of the conversation and how and why they decided to join in at a particular point. The differences in the latecomers' responses will be interesting for the class to observe and discuss. Did their points of entry into the conversation vary according to their prior knowledge and opinions? According to their personalities and sense of authority? After the class has completed this activity, ask them to list the ways in which reading is like conversation and the ways in which it is unlike conversation.

Trying Out the Questions Rhetorical Readers Ask. To offer practice in using the questions on p. 20 and to introduce students to rhetorical analysis, ask them to apply the questions to the first two chapters of *Reading Rhetorically*. What seems to be the purpose of these two chapters? What questions do these chapters address? How would they describe the authors of the text? What kind of student reader do the authors seem to have in mind? And so on. Be sure to ask them to offer textual evidence for their answers. (Thanks to Ron Picard, an instructor at Marquette University, for this suggestion.)

CHAPTER 3 - STRATEGIES FOR READING RHETORICALLY

Chapter 3 explains two pieces of background knowledge that inform the concept of rhetorical reading: (1) reading is an act of composing, and (2) skilled writers make rhetorical choices based on context. We then show how these concepts inform the practices of experienced readers as they build a context for reading and match their strategies with the text's genre and their own purposes for reading.

Key Concepts

1. Reading, like writing, is an act of composing.

Like Chapter 2, this chapter uses an everyday metaphor—reading as an act of composing—as a way to explain the interactive nature of the reading process. This new way of thinking about reading sets the stage for the critical reading strategies introduced in Chapters 4 and 5. One challenge in teaching this concept is students' tendency to conclude that since reading is an act of interpretation or of composing meaning, everyone's interpretation is equally valid. That is, everyone has a right to his or her own interpretation. The discussion and FWD involving the Lux poem are designed to get at this frequent misunderstanding.

2. Rhetorical readers understand that authors base their choices about content, structure, and style on rhetorical context.

To illustrate this key piece of background knowledge, we use an extended example in which the results of a scientific study are reported in five different article excerpts. The differences in content (what's emphasized and what's not) as well as style reflect differences in each publication's rhetorical context–that is, its intended audience, purpose, and genre. The difference between the cautious reporting of scientific research results in scientific journals and the attention grabbing and sometimes misleading reporting of the same results in the popular press nicely illustrates how audience, purpose, and genre affect writers' rhetorical choices. In "Clinical Research: What Should the Public Believe?" (Chapter 15), Marcia Angell and Jerome Kassirer discuss this very issue and caution readers to be skeptical of popular reports of new scientific breakthroughs. You may wish to assign this essay along with this portion of Chapter 3. Or if you assign the Angell and Kassirer essay later in your course, be sure to remind students of its connection with the concepts learned in the sleep exercise. The point of this extended example and the accompanying FWD is this: by understanding how a writer's choices are influenced by contextual factors, readers can make more informed decisions about how to use the text for their own purposes.

3. **Experienced academic readers build a context for reading, match their reading strategies with the text's genre, and vary their reading process according to their purpose for reading.**

In the last part of this chapter, we demonstrate how experienced readers use their understanding of reading as a process of making meaning and of writing as shaped by purpose and context to read strategically. As Donald Murray says of his explanations of the writing process in A Writer Teaches Writing, we aim in this section of the chapter to take students behind the stage to show them how the magician (i.e., the expert academic reader) stuffs the rabbits up his or her sleeve.

Activities and Applications

For Writing and Discussion, Interpreting "The Voice You Hear," page 29. We have found this exercise to be a particularly engaging one for students and valuable in communicating the distinction between *private* interpretations and *publicly* defensible ones. In a sense the poem captures the paradox of silent reading, the voice that is simultaneously the reader's and the writer's. Alternatively, you might ask your class to consider how reading aloud affects meaning. As an experiment, read the poem aloud for your students dramatically emphasizing what you believe to be key words and phrases. Ask students if their response to the poem differed when they heard you read it aloud? Would they have read it aloud differently? How is oral reading an act of interpretation? In effect, an oral performance of a text adds a third voice–the voice of the oral reader is added to that of the poet's and the listener's. Since poems are often more strongly "voiced" than other kinds of texts, you might ask students to read other kinds of texts silently and then ask questions similar to the ones we ask about the Lux poem. By extending this exercise to include other types of texts, you would be making the point that this two-way interaction between the text's network of textual cues and the reader's prior knowledge, attitudes, and experiences is always at work as one makes meaning of any text.

For Writing and Discussion, Articles Based on Sleep Research, page 32. This exercise demonstrates to students how the same information is presented differently according to audience, purpose, genre, and publication venue. You might wish to have students do this exercise in pairs or in small groups. Also, you should instruct students to analyze each introduction using the questions on pp. 32-33 before trying to match the introductions with the periodicals. If they begin by trying to match the passage to the periodical, they tend to read less closely and notice fewer contextual clues. Note: In the excerpt of Article #5, we include only the first of the three reasons the article mentions in order to capture briefly the article's tone and style.

For Writing and Discussion, Using Textual Cues to Build a Context for Reading, page 36. Students are likely to find the Weston passage is particularly opaque and daunting, and that is really part of our point. By using the textual cues to build a context and make predictions, readers can begin to unpack even the most difficult texts. Of course you may decide that you'd rather choose a somewhat less intimidating text for this exercise or a text that deals with a less abstruse subject.

Taking Stock of How You Read, page 39. Like the "Taking Stock of Why You Read" exercise in the beginning of Part One, this exercise requires little explanation and is sure to be engaging for your students. Here, too, it might be interesting to collect their responses and then ask them to repeat the exercise at the end of the term and compare their responses. Of course, if they are writing their responses in a reading log, they will automatically have a record of their initial responses to use for comparison.

Additional Activities

The Demands of College Reading Assignments. To illustrate the special demands of college reading assignments, ask students to consult their syllabi for other classes and make a list of reading assignments they are being asked to complete in the first few weeks of class. Ask them to indicate the length of the assignment, type of text, and apparent purpose (to review previously learned concepts, to introduce new concepts, etc.). Then ask the class as a whole to generate a corporate list of assignments, comparing length of the assignments, types of texts, and purposes the reading might serve. The amount and variety of reading should make clear the need to develop new reading habits and strategies.

Modeling an Experienced Reader's Process. Demonstrate an experienced reader's processes by performing two reading protocols for the class, one of a difficult text that is in your field of expertise and one of a text that is not. Describe your initial predictions about each text, and then read each text aloud, stopping to comment on your evolving responses, questions, predictions, and so on as they occur to you. Alternatively, ask students to bring in a text that is familiar to them both in terms of subject and style; then ask them to work in pairs to read each text aloud to their partner, explaining how they are making meaning of that text as they read.

Myths About "Good Readers." Before students read Chapter 3, ask them to describe the behaviors of good readers. According to these descriptions, how would they rate themselves as readers? What do these descriptions suggest about how they might go about improving their reading skills? After they have read Chapter 3, you can then ask them to compare their previous conceptions of the practices of good readers with what they have learned in the chapter.

Matching Reading Process to Purpose and Genre. To help students understand the relationship between one's purpose for reading and one's reading processes, bring several short texts that you have read recently for various purposes: directions for operating a new VCR or answering machine, an excerpt from a scholarly article, or an OpEd piece. Give the students copies of these short texts and then divide them into groups in which each group discusses reasons why they might read this text and how their reasons for reading it would affect their method of reading it.

PART TWO

CHAPTERS 4 AND 5: HELPING STUDENTS READ AND RESPOND TO TEXTS CRITICALLY

In Part Two, we turn to practical strategies for reading rhetorically. Drawing on the "conversation" metaphor, we divide rhetorical reading strategies into two types: those that involve "listening" to a text and those that involve "questioning" it. Listening strategies focus on comprehending a text in its own terms while questioning strategies focus on analyzing and critiquing a text. Both kinds of strategies ask students to engage actively with a text by writing as they read. Such active engagement not only helps readers to **comprehend** what they read more deeply but also to **invent** ideas for their own writing. Undoubtedly, you will find yourself referring students back to these chapters as they work their way through the anthology chapters you choose to assign.

Chapters 4 and 5 prepare students not only to read rhetorically but also to write rhetorical analyses that apply their rhetorical reading abilities. At the conclusion of this section, we offer specific pedagogical strategies for teaching this key writing assignment.

CHAPTER 4 - LISTENING TO A TEXT

This chapter emphasizes the importance of reading carefully in order to understand a text in the way the author intended. To reinforce the importance of reading as a process, this chapter divides "listening" strategies into three sections: preparing strategies, initial reading strategies, and rereading strategies.

Key Concepts

1. It is crucial to understand a text in its own terms and give it a "fair hearing" before responding.

We have found that students not infrequently misread a text because they respond or react to something in the text and then proceed to interpret the text's meaning in light of that reaction. They rush to judgement, failing to attend carefully to textual cues and meaning. For example, we have found that students sometimes mistake the author's citation of an opposing point of view for the author's own view. Though we grant that texts do not have stable meanings when viewed through the lens of poststructuralism, we believe it is possible to represent a text's meaning in terms that will gain other readers' agreement and conversely that it is possible to read inaccurately. For expert academic readers, the "listening" and "questioning" stages of the reading process are probably indistinguishable. But we have found it useful to separate these stages for less expert academic readers and to insist on an accurate representation of a text's meaning as the groundwork for critical response.

2. Taking time to prepare to read results in a more productive initial reading.

The four preparatory activities outlined in Chapter 4 can be divided into two kinds of activities: those that focus on the reader and those that focus on the text. The first two strategies–"Identifying Your Purpose" and "Recalling Background Knowledge"–ask students to consider what they bring to the reading of this particular text. Attention to the student's purpose for reading encourages more attentive reading and reinforces the idea that **how** they read should be shaped by **why** they are reading. Further, asking them to consider what they know or don't know about the subject encourages them to read with more personal engagement. The next two strategies–"Reconstructing the Rhetorical Context" and "Spot Reading"–ask students to preview the text and make predictions based on a variety of textual cues. We bundle these four strategies together in order to emphasize the dialogic nature of the reading process in which what the reader brings to the text interacts with what the writer intends in terms of reader response.

3. Marking and annotating a text increases comprehension.

The following four activities—noting organizational signals, marking unfamiliar terms and annotating–aim to slow down students' first reading of a text and make them more attentive to textual cues. These strategies help students monitor their reading process and encourage them to construct actively a "first draft" reading of the text.

4. Composing a critical reading of a text is a multi-draft process.

Students need to understand that a deep, critical understanding of a text requires rereading, sometimes multiple rereadings. To make rereading more fruitful, they need not only to flesh out their understanding of a text's meaning but also to begin to analyze how a text works. Mapping a text's idea structure, descriptively outlining, composing a summary, and/or writing a rhetorical precis enables students to move from a representation of a text's meaning to a more complicated understanding of the relationship between its meaning and its strategies, in short, from comprehension to analysis.

Activities And Applications

For Writing and Discussion, Trying Out Preparatory Strategies, page 51: This activity asks students to try out the preparatory strategies in a relatively brief period of time in order to demonstrate their benefit. You can, of course, choose any reading you wish to use for this exercise, and you may wish to allow a longer period of time if the reading is longer. This activity can be nicely done during class, and to reinforce the value of preparatory strategies, you might give students two articles of similar length, genre, and difficulty, and then ask them to use the preparatory activities before reading one but not the other. Immediately following each reading, ask them to summarize briefly each article. Which summary was easier to write? Which one was more accurate?

For Writing and Discussion, Marking and Annotating MacFarquhar's Text, page 56: This exercise offers students practice in marking and annotating a text and thereby aims to demonstrate the value of these strategies. Here again, you may wish to use a different article from the one we suggest, one that is more related to your course's goals and themes. Although individual students may differ in the passages they mark as difficult or in the words and references they find unfamiliar, there should be some consensus about the main points. However, if there is not, we recommend that you use any disagreements about an article's main points as an opportunity to talk about reasons for disagreement. Is it due to ambiguities in the text? Or can the disagreement be resolved by using guidelines for distinguishing main points from supporting points, details, and examples?

For Writing and Discussion, Mapping Ideas and Descriptively Outlining, page 59: This exercise offers students an opportunity to see how these two strategies reveal the text's conceptual and rhetorical structure. You might wish to ask students to do one part of this activity in class. If you decide to do the idea mapping in class, we suggest dividing the class into small groups and asking each group to create an idea map. That way, the class can compare the similarities and differences in the maps created and can adjudicate, as a class, what constitutes major and minor points in the essay, what organizational cues are evident, and so on. If you choose to assign the descriptive outlining exercise as an in-class activity, you can divide the class into four groups, giving each group 3 of the 12 remaining paragraphs to outline. (We present Jenny's descriptive outline of the first three paragraphs as an example, and there are a total of 15 paragraphs.)

Brief Writing Project, page 64: Intended as a review of the listening strategies taught in Chapter 4, this sequence of short writing assignments can serve as an early, mini-portfolio that receives a single holistic grade or set of formative comments. Further, these three activities offer excellent preparation for writing a rhetorical analysis paper.

Additional Activity

Summarizing Activity: Students find accurate summarizing difficult and need repeated practice. Here is an additional activity that we borrow from Virginia Anderson of Towson State University. Ask students to read a text and write a summary of 150-200 words. Prepare a model summary of your own to duplicate and distribute in the class. For homework, ask students to compare the two summaries (their own and yours) and write a paragraph identifying the similarities and differences and commenting on what they have learned from the comparison.

CHAPTER 5 - QUESTIONING A TEXT

In many ways, this chapter is the heart of the book, for here we offer strategies for analyzing a text in rhetorical terms. While students may be accustomed to offering opinions about what they read, they are often not accustomed to offering interpretations or conclusions based on systematic analysis. Similarly, they are accustomed to reading for content but not for rhetorical method. Chapter 5 provides the scaffolding for systematic rhetorical analysis of a text.

This chapter is intentionally exercise-heavy because we believe it is important that students practice each of the questioning strategies in order to get a sense of its explanatory power. Not only does this chapter spell out the process of rhetorical reading but also it lays the groundwork for writing rhetorical analyses as we explain in more detail below.

Key Concepts

1. Writers construct an image of themselves in the text in order to gain readers' good will and trust.

A point that needs emphasis with regard to *ethos* is this: the image authors create of themselves in the text is not selfsame with who they are in "real life." Although there may be aspects of this image that square with writers' "real life" personality and credentials, writers emphasize or exaggerate aspects of themselves or even invent a persona in order to gain readers' assent about a particular topic. Consider, for example, the writer who uses humor to create an image of informality and likeableness. The writer may or may not be a humorous person in everyday life, but in a sense that doesn't matter. The use of humor is strategic, aimed at establishing a certain kind of relationship with readers for a particular rhetorical purpose.

2. Since writers intend for readers to follow and adopt their reasoning about a subject, they must appeal to readers' existing beliefs and assumptions.

In teaching the three classical appeals, we have found *logos* the most difficult for students to grasp. Because reasoning processes are abstract and difficult to grasp, students initially tend to focus on the most concrete aspects of logical appeals, specifically, on the existence or nonexistence of evidence (e.g. "The writer appeals to readers' logic by offering facts and statistics to support his claims"; or "The writer fails to appeal to readers' logic because he offers no facts or statistics to support his claims.") To understand the inter-relationship among claims, reasons, evidence, and assumptions, students need to be shown lots of everyday examples of the reasoning process, and they need lots of practice in identifying this process at work in texts. It is also sometimes difficult for students to see how writers use their intended readers' assumptions to shape their logical appeals. To illustrate this process, you might ask the class to brainstorm together two different lines of reasoning about a controversial subject to use with two different types of audiences. Our best advice about helping students to understand the concepts entailed in reasoning is to return to these key concepts and terms throughout the term, applying them to a wide range of types of discourse.

3. To be effective, writers must engage readers' attention, emotions, interests, imagination, and/or values. To do so, they create roles for readers to play in relation to the subject, the writer, and/or other readers.

In our presentation of *pathos*, we broaden its usual limited association with emotional appeals to include appeals to reader engagement generally. Further, we emphasize that texts invite readers to play various roles–concerned environmentalist, good citizen, hip rock music afficionado, etc. In other words, our aim is to get students to think of audience appeals in the widest possible sense. This broader definition inevitably connects audience appeals or *pathos* to the other two classical rhetorical appeals, particularly *ethos*. If the writer is to engage readers' in a particular way, she or he has to establish a certain kind of relationship with readers through the persona he or she creates in the text.

4. All of the rhetorical appeals are mediated through language and thus careful attention to specific aspects of language reveals a great deal about the writer's purpose and methods.

This often overlooked aspect of rhetorical appeals not only yields important insights but also can help you make the connection for students between grammar, style, and rhetoric. That is, the grammatical aspects of a text–its use of first or second person, its use of present or past tense, etc.–can be viewed as rhetorical choices not just as enactments of arhetorical grammatical rules and prescriptions. Martha Kolln's book *Rhetorical Grammar* is a useful guide in helping students understand grammar in rhetorical terms.

Attention to language also enables you to emphasize the relationship among the appeals–e.g. the ethical and emotional appeals of a particular metaphor. What we recommend in this section of the chapter is basically close reading, asking students to pay careful attention to how a writer's particular word choice, sentence patterns, punctuation, figures of speech, and so on, work rhetorically.

5. Underlying every text is an ideology or way of viewing the world.

Students may not share our belief that every text is interesting no matter how "objective" the text may appear to be. They find it difficult to see that the appearance of objectivity is itself a rhetorical strategy. The most important lesson here is that "ideology" is not a negative term. Everyone naturally has a point of view and set of values that are shaped by a myriad of factors. Therefore, it is crucial to identify and take into consideration the ideology underlying a text in order if one is to respond critically.

6. Rhetorical appeals always work together and overlap.

Although we present the above five rhetorical strategies separately, they obviously work in conjunction with one another and overlap. For example, an appeal to readers' interests is done through particular word choice and through reasoning based on intended readers' values. Although we mention this interconnection in Chapter 5, you will probably need to emphasize it and repeatedly ask students to make these connections by asking them, "How do these appeals work together?" "How does the author's image of herself work logically or work to engage readers?"

Activities and Applications

For Writing and Discussion, Analyzing Ethos, page 71: Describing in words or drawing one's sense of a writer's persona often provokes lively class discussion. And this exercise can be used with any text, including your syllabus and this textbook. As a variation, you might also ask them to try out this exercise on one another's papers. They might be surprised by the images they create of themselves in writing.

For Writing and Discussion, Analyzing Audience Appeals, page 74: This activity goes hand-in-hand with the previous one and nicely demonstrates how *ethos* works in tandem with *pathos* or audience appeals. To emphasize the broad range of ways in which writers attempt to engage their readers' interests and sympathies, try to prompt students to identify a number of different audience appeals in MacFarquhar's essay.

For Writing and Discussion, Analyzing the Rhetorical Effects of Language, page 76: One effective approach to this exercise is to ask students individually, in groups, or as a whole class to list "facts" about Barcott's language in "Blow-Up"–e.g. Barcott begins with a one-sentence paragraph that is an exclamation; he uses informal terms such as "jaw-dropper"; he specifically names a long list of rivers that have been dammed; he uses comparisons such as "high as 35 houses" and "second only to the Great Wall of China"; and so on. After they have created this list, ask them to consider the rhetorical effect of each of these specific language choices.

For Writing and Discussion, Analyzing a Text's Ideology, page 79: Because we believe identification of a text's ideology is important, we offer students many opportunities to try out this exercise in the anthology section of this book. To help students understand this activity initially, we suggest that you work through it as a whole class, constructing a two-column list of the binaries students find in the Barcott text. Undoubtedly, students will readily see the explicit binaries, such as "backed up" (negative term) vs. "run free" (positive term) and "continental arteries" (positive) vs. "still bathtubs" (negative). More challenging are the suggested binaries where only one term is offered explicitly and the other only implied. For example, in Barcott's text, the following words and phrases clearly have a negative connotation– "outsized," and "instruments of holy progress." Students will need to infer their opposites, perhaps coming up with such terms and phrases as "natural in scale" (as opposed to "outsized") and "naturally-created resources" (as opposed to "instruments of holy [human] progress"). The latter process involves interpretation and thus may involve debate. Obviously, there's no single right answer in terms of the wording of unstated terms; however, students should quite clearly see the values and worldview evident in the Barcott passage. The value in doing this as a whole class is to model the process, so students will be familiar with this activity and its purpose when they try it on their own or in small groups.

Exploring Your Responses to a Text, page 80: The three activities in this section require little further explanation and bear repeating as students read selections in the anthology portion of this text. These activities offer a valuable starting point for writing assignments such as the rhetorical analysis because they ask students to articulate and explore their personal reactions to a text— their points of identification, confusion, agreement, disagreement, etc. Since personal connection and investment are crucial to effective writing, it is important to help students discover and use such connections as springboards for writing.

For Writing and Discussion, Responding to Jenny's Rhetorical Analysis, page 87: Since most students are unfamiliar with rhetorical analysis papers, we recommend that you use this activity to examine Jenny's paper on pp. 84-87 closely. Particularly valuable in this exercise is the question that asks students how they might handle the same assignment. We suggest that you ask the class to work in groups or to brainstorm as a whole class in response to this prompt.

Additional Activity

Putting Together the Questioning Strategies: Choose one of the texts you have assigned for the class to read. Divide the class into five small groups and assign each group to examine one of the text's rhetorical strategies–author's credibility, audience appeals, reasoning, language choices, ideology. Suggest that they briefly review the appropriate section of Chapter 5 before they begin the activity. If it is a short text, each group should only need 5-10 minutes. Each group will present its analysis to the class, after which the rest of the class can ask questions, offer alternative evidence and interpretations, and so on. (Thanks to Jennifer Heinert, an instructor at Marquette University, for this exercise.)

TEACHING STUDENTS TO WRITE RHETORICAL ANALYSIS PAPERS

A rhetorical analysis paper demonstrates a writer's understanding of how a text works to influence readers. It is, in other words, the written counterpart of rhetorical reading. To write a rhetorical analysis, students must apply the rhetorical reading strategies they have been learning in Chapters 1-5. Put simply, we believe that **writing rhetorical analyses teaches the critical reading skills that are necessary for academic success across the curriculum.**

If your experience is like ours, you will probably find that many students initially struggle with this type of writing assignment because analytical writing generally and rhetorical analysis specifically are new to them. Below we offer a list suggestions for helping your students tackle this new and challenging writing assignment.

Preparing Students to Write a Rhetorical Analysis

- Before asking students to write a rhetorical analysis, assign a summary of the text so that students base their analysis on an accurate representation of the text's meaning.

- To introduce analysis as a writing aim, ask students to read the introduction to Chapter 12, which offers an in-depth discussion of writing to analyze and interpret.

- Assign students to write a descriptive outline in order to foreground the distinction as well as the relationship between what a text says and what a text does.

- Alternatively, or in conjunction with the descriptive outline, assign the rhetorical precis, which asks students to write a very condensed rhetorical analysis.

- To help students identify a strong personal response or significant effect a text had on them, ask them to do one of the three "Exploring Your Responses to a Text" activities. As we note above, these activities offer points of departure for writing a rhetorical analysis: What in the text created this response? Why is this response or effect important to examine?

GUIDING STUDENTS THROUGH THE PROCESS OF WRITING A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

We suggest the following process steps for your students to follow in writing a rhetorical analysis paper. Following each process step, we discuss how the sample paper by Jenny on pp. 84-87 illustrates this step.

Step 1 - Start by identifying a significant effect the text had on you as a reader–a strong positive or negative response, a tension or contradiction you found in the text, some aspect of the text that confused or surprised you. Use this effect to formulate a question–e.g. What makes the writer seem so believable (or not)? Why do I have such a strong negative response to this author's ideas? Why do I find the reasoning unconvincing? Why does the writer end the text as she does?

Example: Jenny's starting point is the mismatch between the expectations set up by the blurb–"The value of books is overstated"—following the title and the text's actual content. The question she develops is "What is [MacFarquhar's] opinion of reading?" That is, what reasons does she have for making this claim?

Step 2 - Reread the text carefully to select the rhetorical strategies and key terms that will help you answer this question. The rhetorical strategy(ies) or terms will serve as an analytical lens for examining the text.

Example: The key rhetorical strategy that Jenny examines in order to answer her question is MacFarquhar's reasoning or use of *logos* in this essay.

Step 3 - Reread the text yet again to find specific examples of the use of this strategy or strategies, taking notes on how this strategy contributes to the effect you have identified. You may find that you discover a different or more intriguing effect, or you may find that your view of the original effect changes as you reread and analyze the text. If so, that it is good. It means that your understanding of the text is deepening. Revise your question and re-examine the text with this new question in mind.

Example: Jenny discovers through her analysis that most of MacFarquhar's reasoning is used to support a different claim than that suggested by the subtitle. That is, most of MacFarquhar's reasoning supports the claim that "Americans still value books." Jenny identifies and evaluates the reasoning and evidence MacFarquhar uses to support this claim—statistics, comparisons, testimony, and so on. Additionally, Jenny identifies and evaluates the evidence offered in support of what at first appeared to be MacFarquhar's main claim that "the value of books is overstated."

Step 4 - Review your notes and compose a working thesis that offers a new perspective or insight on the text's meaning and methods or that offers your evaluation of the text's effectiveness based on your rhetorical analysis.

Example: Jenny's thesis is stated at the end of the introductory paragraph. Jenny seems to have two purposes in writing this analysis: (1) to clarify her initial confusion regarding MacFarquhar's main point; and (2) to evaluate MacFarquhar's argument that "the value of books is overstated." Jenny's analysis offers other readers who might be initially confused and troubled by MacFarquhar's bold but unsupported claim to better understand this text and how it works.

Step 5 - Write a draft that has the following elements:

- An introduction that includes (a) a brief summary of the text, (b) contextual information about the text's audience, purpose, genre, and so on, and (c) your thesis or conclusions about the text's significant rhetorical effect.

- A series of body paragraphs that develop the thesis by discussing specific rhetorical strategies that produce that rhetorical effect and by citing specific textual evidence to back up your analytical points.

- A conclusion that makes it clear why this effect is significant and why the insights gleaned from your analysis are significant to other readers. What new understanding results from your analysis? Why is this new understanding important? How does your analysis lead to a particular assessment of a text's effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

Example: The annotations of Jenny's paper point out all of the above elements.

Step 6 - Revise your draft after you have received peer feedback. Here are some questions that your peers can use as a guide in responding to your draft:

- Does the writer offer a brief, accurate, and fair summary of the text to be analyzed?

- Does the writer provide information about the text's context–that is, its apparent purpose, intended audience, genre, date and place of publication?

- Does the writer state a thesis drawn from her or his rhetorical analysis or pose a question that can be addressed through rhetorical analysis?

- Does the writer offer a clear purpose for her/his rhetorical analysis? That is, does she or he offer a reason why other readers should be interested in her/his analysis?

- Has the writer clearly identified the rhetorical strategies she/he is using as an analytical lens? Are these strategies appropriate to the writer's purpose? Is it clear that the writer understands these strategies and is applying them with insight?

- Does the writer use textual evidence to support her/his analytical points?

- Does the writer's rhetorical analysis offer a new perspective that enables readers to understand the text more deeply or differently?

PART THREE

CHAPTERS 6 THROUGH 8
& APPENDIX: BUILDING A CITATION
HELPING STUDENTS WRITE ABOUT READING

These three chapters show students how to apply the methods of rhetorical reading to the complex work of selecting relevant, reliable research sources and integrating ideas and material from those sources into their own papers. Shifting focus from reading strategies to writing techniques, all three chapters underscore the idea that rhetorical reading leads to rhetorically powerful writing. Chapter 6 discusses familiar material about composing processes in an academic context that emphasizes the idea of reading and writing as conversation. Chapter 7 describes how to use rhetorical reading as a research strategy. Chapter 8 offers sentence-level advice about incorporating reading into writing and explains the rhetorical functions of citation conventions.

CHAPTER 6 – WRITING ABOUT READING: THE SPECIAL DEMANDS OF ACADEMIC WRITING

This chapter focuses on composing processes, offering concise discussion of specific strategies for improving writing within the context of academic reading and writing assignments.

Key Concepts

1. Reading is the basis of writing assignments across the college curriculum.

Chapter 6 opens with a series of workplace and community scenarios that involve writing about reading, then describes typical college writing assignments that serve varying purposes for both writer and audience. Reading and class discussion about writing in the varying contexts described will help students conceptualize both reading and writing within a broadening framework of intellectual activity—the thinking and learning work of college classes.

The assignment descriptions can serve as a touchstone for different types of writing you ask students to do throughout the course, or they may become the focus of a class discussion that examines the different kinds of writing students expect to do in different courses during the current term or in the workplace. Regarding the opening scenarios, for example, you might ask students to consider how different the various "deliverable" documents will be from the source documents. Like the "Taking Stock" exercises in Chapters 1 and 3, such discussions can help students discover not only tacit knowledge about their literacy practices but subtleties they may have overlooked about varying contexts and expectations.

2. Strong writers design texts not only to say something but to *do something*: they seek to alter readers' views of their subject.

This section encourages students to take self-aware, active authorial roles. The presentation of this concept applies to students' role as *writers* the gist of Chapter 2's discussion about writers' and readers' varying purposes (pp. 20–26). The active authorial stance recommended will help prepare students for the research-related reading and writing discussed in Chapter 7 and 8, which revisit the admonitions here against passivity and the regurgitation of course material that we call "patch-writing." Note as well the echoes of the *does-says* analysis necessary for Chapter 4's descriptive outlining. Practice with descriptive outlining helps prepare students for decisions about how to evaluate and write about research materials. It is also a powerful technique for critiquing drafts to see if they *do* what is intended.

3. Composing processes for written work are analogous to engaging in spoken conversation ("putting in your oar") in both their recursiveness

and their grounding in social and rhetorical contexts.

Rhetorical purposes and contexts are at the forefront throughout *Reading Rhetorically*'s discussion of composing processes. The chapter presents strategies and tips for aspects of composing that range from getting started to final polishing. This detailed advice can be revisited throughout the course whenever appropriate. Note especially the detailed advice for peer review, which we have divided into two distinct categories: "Tips for Offering Feedback" and "Tips for Using Feedback." Because students too often think that peer review is only about receiving advice, they can miss the learning to be gained from listening to and responding to their classmates' work, and they can become confused about how to deal with responses and advice that others offer to them.

CHAPTER 7 – USING RHETORICAL READING TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

The chapter seeks to help students reconceptualize the role of a writer-researcher from that of information retriever to *question formulator, resource evaluator,* and *knowledge maker* (p. 111). Its motto might be thought of as "Know what you're looking for." Applying the concept of reading rhetorically to the conduct of research, the text stresses how important it is for student researchers to clarify their own purposes as preparation for scrutinizing the writers' purposes embedded in potential research sources.

Instruction in techniques for rhetorically active composing continues from Chapter 6 with guidelines for two key concepts or methods for effective research: *question analysis* (QA) and *evaluating sources*. These methods will help students become more efficient and thoughtful researchers as they sort through the deluge of materials now available electronically. The chapter's questions and guidelines, accompanied by excerpts from a sample research log, show how critical thinking and rhetorical reading strategies can focus a research problem and narrow the field of potential sources even before students begin to download, photocopy, or read sources themselves in detail.

Key Concepts

1. Question analysis: efficient and effective research begins with thoughtful definition of the scope of the research problem—both focused questions and criteria for good answers—before the retrieval process starts.

For many of your students, the recommendation for doing question analysis before running searches in a library database or on the Internet may represent a big change from their previous approach to research. Nevertheless, once they apply the specific "Prompts for Question Analysis" on pp. 113–114 to a question that interests them, they are likely to discover not only the usefulness of the process for focusing their research problem, but also how much they already know about the published conversation on the topic they intend to research.

2. Evaluating sources: the information available through electronic retrieval tools permits quick evaluation of a potential source's reliability and relevance to a given research project.

The generic questions for source evaluation laid out in the chapter, all typically answerable through scrutiny of bibliographic information, are grouped into four categories—(1) relevance, (2) currency and scope, (3) authors and experts, and (4) publishers and sponsors. The questions will help students weigh a potential source's pertinence to their research project, assess their own ability to catch the drift of the published conversation in which the source participates, and discern the author's evident purposes and thus to be alert for particular assumptions and biases if they decide to examine the full text of the material. Of course, some of these questions can only be answered definitively after a careful reading of the full text, but as the various examples in *Reading Rhetorically* illustrate, neophyte researchers can avoid many blind alleys, wasted photocopies, and naïve analyses if they pause to consider what a source's context of publication indicates about its readability and reliability.

Classroom Applications

Library Orientation. Since first-year writing students are typically very familiar with Internet searching but inexperienced with the nuances of searching for academically sound materials in periodicals, databases or library on-line catalogs, the ideal way to introduce the concepts of QA and Evaluating Sources would be through a hands-on orientation to your campus library's resources, either at the library or electronically from the classroom. (Instruction librarians are usually eager to help design such orientations.) Students prepare for this session by applying the QA prompts to a question that interests them, then during or after the session use the library tools they learn about to evaluate sources that seem potentially useful for answering their question. To focus student effort, we suggest a writing-to-learn activity based on a worksheet—a paper or electronic—where students write out responses to the QA prompts *before* they go to the library. For maximum flexibility, make it clear that their choice of question to explore for the exercise does not commit them to a topic for the next paper.

The library orientation itself would center on (a) example searches that show how to use several different retrieval tools and (b) demonstrations of how to apply the chapter's evaluation questions to the potential sources located. Daring instructors and librarians might try this live on the Web in real time; a more cautious—and wiser—approach would be to prepare selected examples in advance in PowerPoint or other presentation software.

After the orientation, a follow-up worksheet—again paper or electronic—would lead students to synthesize their QA and source evaluation work in a quick report (perhaps a simple chart) about the two or three most and least reliable sources they found. Ask students to note at least the following:

- bibliographic information needed for citing the source
- the retrieval tool and search terms that led them to the source
- an explanation of why each source does or does not appear to be reliable and relevant
- questions for evaluating the source further when they examine the full text
- next steps for further research

In addition to the QA prompts and evaluation questions themselves, material for class discussion preparing students for this kind of exercise is provided by :

- background points about print publication processes (pp. 115–117) and differences between library databases and search engines (pp. 117–118)

- the "cautionary tale" on page 112 about inept research, which ties to the exercise on page 117 asking students to come up with alternative approaches to the same topic
- excerpts from Jenny's research log (pp. 114–115 and 121–122)

CHAPTER 8 – MAKING KNOWLEDGE: INCORPORATING READING INTO WRITING

Asserting that successful academic writing will frequently depend upon a student's ability to integrate sources into a paper, this chapter focuses on highly practical, "how to" aspects of using ideas and excerpts from source readings clearly, purposefully, and ethically. As in Chapters 6 and 7, the advice about each topic—from incorporating summaries to formatting in-text citations—is framed by *Reading Rhetorically*'s emphasis on the importance of students taking purposeful, active authorial roles in their research-based papers. The subject matter frequently concerns formal detail (e.g., effective use of quotations or attributive tags), but the discussion consistently focuses on the rhetorical impact of these details.

The chapter's various sections can be assigned separately across several course units or all at once as preparation for a particular assignment. Since examples throughout the chapter are drawn from Jenny's "Extending the Conversation" paper on pages 140-144, students should be assigned to read it in connection with their first assignment in the chapter.

Key Concepts

1. Effective use of sources enables a writer to position her or his own ideas in a larger conversation in a way that establishes the writer's own credibility.

The discussion in the first part of the chapter about using summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation treats each as a valuable rhetorical strategy. This purposeful rhetorical approach is particularly important for working with students who may have developed a "cut and paste" approach to research papers. They sometimes have to be convinced that skillful attribution of material to a source enhances rather than detracts from their own authority. Bulleted lists of guidelines and a closing paragraph with "words of caution" relevant to each method offer specific advice for both drafting and revising. These materials, illustrated by excerpts from the research paper at the end of the chapter, can be used as the focus of class discussion and as reference materials for students to use independently.

2. **Ethical use of sources requires scrupulous attention to detail and accuracy so that credit is always appropriately given to other writers' words and ideas.**

The discussion of plagiarism and how to avoid it offers practical methods for keeping accurate track of information and wording borrowed from sources. Examples of acceptable and unacceptable paraphrases of a source passage are compared. These guidelines here can be covered as part of preparation for drafting a paper, and should be revisited frequently as part of informal work that asks students to summarize, paraphrase, and quote directly from sources.

3. **Smooth, clear use of attributive tags in connection with outside material will enhance both readability and credibility.**

Attributive tags explicitly announce the source of an idea or passage, e.g.: "According to commentator Bill Moyers…." They not only help provide transitions within a discussion but also, by highlighting the writer's knowledge about the experts participating in the larger conversation on a topic, they enhance his or her credibility. Tags help student writers position their source materials in relation to their own points and signal their confidence about how these points fit with those of the experts. A lack of attributive tags can be symptomatic of the passive writing described in Chapter 6, writing in which students patch together sources and let them speak instead of themselves. This section discusses in detail the value and function of these tags, offers a list of elements that can be included in a tag, and provides a list of guidelines for using tags effectively. Like the other sections in this practice-oriented chapter, this section can serve as the focus of a lesson and be revisited frequently in connection with analyzing various texts.

4. **Careful, accurate use of citation conventions not only gives credit where credit is due but enhances a writer's credibility by presenting him or her as knowledgeable and responsible.**

The final section of Chapter 8 explains how citation conventions function and provides detailed guidelines about how to format MLA style in-text citations and what to include in them. Formats for the full citations to be used on works cited sheets are presented in the "Building a Citation" appendix. The book's discussion of citation formats or conventions emphasizes that they are, indeed, conventions; that is, they are agreed upon methods for presenting particular types of material in particular ways. Conventional formats enhance a citation's informative value because readers can quickly glean the information they need when their expectations are met about where to find what.

In keeping with the chapter's overall approach, our discussion of MLA in-text citations puts rhetorical function at the forefront by emphasizing a citation's two important functions:

- to refer readers to an alphabetized works cited list at the end of the paper
- to inform readers about the quality of the source being cited

The fact that citations follow conventions, not some undisputed physical reality, also means that they will vary from discipline to discipline. Anticipating that *Reading Rhetorically* will be used almost exclusively within English and writing departments, we present MLA format in detail. However, you may want to draw your students' attention to our mention on page 135 of other citation formats used in several anthology selections that were originally published in scholarly journals. In addition, the footnote on that page lists citation systems students might be expected to use in other disciplines. Our discussion also notes other variations in format and style that students may notice in the anthology, especially in selections from newspapers because of contrasts between MLA and Associated Press punctuation conventions (pp. 135–136), a point you may want to revisit in connection with specific selections.

Activities and Applications

For Writing and Discussion, page 129. This exercise asking students to analyze Jenny's use of direct quotation in the paper at the end of the chapter can serve as a prototype for any number of activities asking students to examine and evaluate how other writers have applied the principles and techniques explained in the chapter. The underlying purpose is for students to recognize and evaluate options that writers use and thus to become aware of (a) how those choices reveal writers' purposes and (b) what choices are available to them as writers.

Examining What Citations Do. This exercise is designed to help students understand how attributive tags and in-text citations function rhetorically to position texts within a larger published conversation. Small groups examine how MLA in-text citations are used in one or more sample texts. Either a student paper or a published article can be used, or you may wish to work with both, perhaps a student paper and a text it uses as a major source. (See p. 136 of *Reading Rhetorically* for a list of student papers with MLA style citations.)

For small groups:

- Students work together to highlight in-text citations, determine why a citation was needed at each spot, and note how the citations and quoted material fit into sentence syntax, especially in regard to any attributive tags. (Separate groups might analyze different sections of the text, especially if a scholarly article is used.)
- Students prepare answers to these questions to report to the whole class:

1. Which citations work primarily to support the author's points?
2. Which primarily position the text within a larger conversation?

For large group discussion:

- How do the citations enhance the author's credibility?
- If some are more effective than others, why is that?
- How do the citations serve the author's evident purpose (rhetorical aim)?
- If papers are compared, do students detect a context-based distinction between the ways the student and published authors use citations?

It will be valuable to explore differences in perceptions among students' readings of the citations. Be sure to leave time for student questions about formatting.

Comparing Citation Systems. If you are aware that a significant number of your students are expected to use a citation system other than MLA in another class, it could be valuable to spend class time comparing the formats and rhetorical impact of the two systems in two sample papers. Doing so would dispel some of the mystery and frustration that surround citation systems at the same time that it underscores the purposes of citations. Ambitious instructors might prepare sample pages of the same text using two different systems. Or students could be asked to revise a portion of a text prepared in one style—e.g., Chicago Manual footnotes—so that it uses MLA in-text citations instead. For maximum understanding of the rhetorical impact of citations, focus discussion less on format details and more on readers experience of the text.

A further variation on this activity could focus on determining where in-text citations would be needed if journalistic texts such as Crossette's *New York Times* piece on cultural differences or Gordon's Associated Press article on credit cards were written for an academic audience.

APPENDIX: BUILDING A CITATION

The model MLA style citations in the appendix largely speak for themselves, but the following points may help you guide students in their use of the material.

- Overall guidelines for compiling MLA style works cited lists are presented on pages 579–580, including advice about the importance of gathering full bibliographic information from the beginning.
- Model citations are presented in four major categories: (1) books, (2) articles in periodicals, (3) World Wide Web (WWW) sources, and (4) “other materials and media,” which includes government publications, biblical citations, and various oral and visual media students often use.
- The appendix’s “building a citation” approach, which follows the *MLA Style Manual* closely, lists at the beginning of each category the information elements needed to assemble or build a basic citation, then provides a series of models for variations on that basic format.
- Many of the elements listed for WWW citations may not apply to or be available for a given source. It is essential to include elements indicating sponsorship/authorship, date, and the URL.
- It will be valuable to draw students’ attention to the contrasting features of the three basic models for periodical articles presented on page 585.
    1. The format for material retrieved from paper publication is familiar and requires page numbers.
    2. The format for print articles retrieved as full text through an electronic database will be new to many. It consists of the citation for original print publication, *including page numbers for the print article*, followed by database information. The convention signals that a reader wishing to consult the material has the option of retrieving either print or electronic copy. As noted in Chapter 8 (p. 137), when students work with electronically retrieved text, they may not be able to cite specific page numbers for quotes and paraphrases.
    3. The model for a print article retrieved through a periodical’s Web site (increasingly available), similarly presents the print publication information first, again including page numbers, then the date of access and the URL for the periodical site. Specific page numbers for locating quotes and paraphrases again may not be available.
        - Citations for material published or promulgated only or primarily on the Web, including articles from online periodicals or news articles that appear only on the Web, should follow the WWW formats.

PART FOUR

USING THE ANTHOLOGY

OVERVIEW

The chapters in Part Four of this manual are designed to help you choose and teach reading selections from each of the aims-based chapters in the anthology section of *Reading Rhetorically*. The sequence of readings within the anthology chapters does not necessitate that some be read first, so you may assign texts according to particular course goals and interests without concern that students may "miss" an important instructional component in texts not assigned.

We have placed readings into the various chapters according to what seems to us to be each text's dominant aim; however, it may be that you and your students will disagree with us about these decisions. Nearly every selection involves more than one aim; in some texts the dominant aim is clearer than in others. When disagreements about an author's evident aim surface, we suggest you treat the occasion as an opportunity for discussion about the complexity of rhetorical purposes, which may be interwoven and are, finally, matters of interpretation.

Each chapter in this part of the manual includes these sections:

Helping Students Understand the Aim
Identifies important concepts related to a particular aim

Chapter Selections
Offers a synopsis of each text and brief discussion of its special rhetorical features

Helping Students with the Writing Projects
Provides tips for helping students deal with the particular challenges posed by the writing projects at the end of each chapter

Thematic Connections

Suggests complementary readings, including selections from other chapters, and offers starting points for further inquiry

APPARATUS ACCOMPANYING THE READINGS

Students read with greater engagement and critical understanding when they write about what they read. Each chapter has six types of materials to enhance student learning with a variety of reading, writing, and discussion activities.

1. ***Chapter Introduction.*** These discuss rhetorical characteristics typical of the given aim, such as vivid detail and figurative language (in "Expressing and Reflecting") or argument structure and *stasis* categories (in "Taking a Stand"). Whether you use *Reading Rhetorically* as a stand-alone text or with a "rhetoric" that provides additional writing instruction, the introductions will enhance students' understanding of the chapter's focus and provide a valuable basis for class discussion.

2. ***Generic "Questions to Help You Read Rhetorically."*** These questions at the end of each chapter introduction expand upon the "Questions that Rhetorical Readers Ask" in Chapter 2 (page 20) to help students focus on formal and rhetorical elements common among texts in the chapter.

3. ***Contextualizing Headnotes.*** This information about authors and the text's original publication will deepen students' understanding of each selection's rhetorical context.

4. ***Reading Log Prompts.*** These informal questions help students prepare to read by asking them to consider their existing knowledge and attitudes about its subject matter. They provide specific application of the various "Preparing to Read" strategies discussed in Chapter 4 of *Reading Rhetorically.*

5. ***Thinking Critically Questions.*** These questions, which follow each reading, are divided into two types:

- **Responding as a Reader,** designed to help students reflect on their experience of reading the text and help them analyze its rhetorical strategies.
- **Responding as a Writer,** designed to help students identify strategies they might use in their own writing. Material from either category can provide a starting point for class discussion or a student essay.

6. ***Three Strands of Writing Assignments.*** These assignments for formal papers invite students to engage with the chapter's readings in ways that writers typically use readings in academic settings: as models, as objects for analysis, and as voices in a conversation. In this section of the manual we offer tips for helping students with the specific assignments in each anthology chapter. For a discussion of overall pedagogical goals for the assignments, see the Syllabus Design chapter at the front of this manual.

TEACHING TIPS FOR THE READING LOG PROMPTS

1. Require students to make regular entries in their reading logs.
2. Demonstrate the importance and value of reading logs by using them in class in some way. Here are some possibilities:
   a. To start discussion, ask a few individuals to read an entry aloud.
   b. Have students read entries aloud in small groups, write a summary of the ideas or key questions that emerged, and report these to the whole class.
   c. Collect the reading log entries, read them through, and report at the next class on the ideas, questions, and themes that emerged. Better yet, students themselves can take turns collecting a set of reading log entries and reporting on them the next day.
3. Establish clear expectations for reading log entries—minimum length, number required, and so on.
4. Ask students to number and date each entry. This will encourage them to keep up with their reading log work, and it will make it easier for you to assess the completeness of the logs when you collect them periodically.
5. Be sure that the reading logs "count" towards the final grade.
6. Collect the reading logs two or three times during the term and comment on them in terms of substance and depth of engagement, not grammatical and mechanical correctness. Aim for interactive, conversational comments rather than evaluative ones. To allow yourself more time for substantive comments, ask students to asterisk a certain number of entries for you to read and comment on.

7. At the end of the semester, ask students to read through their reading logs and write a self-assessment as their last entry. You may wish to develop your own set of evaluative prompts for students to use, but here are a few suggestions. You might ask students to:
    a. Identify their three or four strongest entries and explain their choice
    b. Identify the most difficult entries to write and explain why
    c. Discuss what they learned about rhetorical reading from keeping the log and use specific entries to support their comments

TEACHING TIPS FOR THE THINKING CRITICALLY QUESTIONS

1. Require students to respond in writing to questions about specific reading assignments on a regular basis either as part of their reading log or to be collected in a separate folder.
2. The advice above about Reading Logs pertains equally to these questions: use students' response in class to demonstrate the purpose and importance of the assignment; have responses count as part of the course grade; establish clear expectations regarding length, depth, and so on.
3. Collect these responses frequently. Reproduce substantive responses to distribute to the class or show them on an overhead as discussion starters and as examples of your expectations.
4. Ask students to include their strongest responses in a final portfolio of their work for the semester, writing a self-evaluation such as these:
    a. Identify your most thorough analytical responses.
    b. Discuss a rhetorical strategy you learned from writing these responses and illustrate what you learned with reference to your use of this strategy in your own writing.
    c. Assess your ability to make connections among readings, between a reading and your own experience, between a reading and larger themes or issues.

CHAPTER 9

Reading and Writing Texts that Express and Reflect

Chapter 9 offers a lively place to begin or conclude your course. Expressive and reflective texts appeal to students' enjoyment of personal narratives and spark interest in writing their own. The pedagogical value of expressive and reflective texts, however, lies in the fact they are much more than simply stories. They invite readers to engage imaginatively with another's experience and thus to broaden their understanding of a subject, and this kind of reading enables writers to understand their own experiences in more complicated terms.

By reading and writing expressive and reflective texts, your students will be encouraged to:

- think dialectically by putting differing perspectives, experiences, ideas, and texts in conversation with one another
- develop self-reflective skills that are important to academic and professional success
- understand the power of language to recreate experience, trigger emotions, enable identification, and provoke new insights

HELPING STUDENTS UNDERSTAND EXPRESSION AND REFLECTION

Given their familiarity with narrative texts, students may think of expressive and reflective texts as relatively easy to read and write. This apparent ease of understanding and producing such texts is deceptive, however. Well-written expressive and reflective texts involve subtle and sophisticated rhetorical moves—e.g., careful selection of detail to render experience, engagement of reader interest through construction of a credible and appealing persona, and the communication of a new insight or perspective without didacticism. To help students understand these matters, we suggest that you draw attention to the following three rhetorical aspects of reflective and expressive writing:

1. Writer's Ethos and Relationship with Readers

Most writers of expressive and reflective essays create a distinctive and engaging *ethos* and establish an informal, personal relationship with readers. To help students understand that the image of the writer in the text is a purposeful construction and not selfsame with the writer, we suggest that you introduce terms such as *ethos* (*Reading Rhetorically*, page 70), *persona*, and *speaker* for referring to the "I" found in the text. The class can then explore how the author of a given selection creates a particular image through strategies such as word choice, humor, tone, and style. Closely connected with *ethos* is the relationship the *persona* establishes with readers. Indeed, in expressive and reflective texts *ethos* and *pathos* (*Reading Rhetorically*, page 74) are inseparable. If readers are to identify imaginatively with writers' experiences and take seriously their reflections, writers must create images of themselves that are credible and trustworthy. For example, Kingsolver uses humor to create a warm, likeable *persona* with whom readers readily identify. In contrast, hooks creates an earnest, highly principled *persona* whom readers can respect even if they cannot always identify with her experiences or agree with what she says.

2. Presentation of Experience

Some of the writers in this chapter (e.g., Updike) concentrate on a single experience while others (e.g., Slater and Mori) include a series of related experiences or anecdotes. With a series of experiences, the writer's challenge is to connect these episodes narratively and/or thematically. To make their stories come alive for readers, reflective writers must recreate their experiences vividly through carefully selected details, dialogue, and/or figurative language. Like the writer's *persona*, these accounts of experience are purposeful constructions, not factual reports of what happened. Each detail in the narrative is selected to anticipate or enable the reflection. You will undoubtedly also wish to draw students' attention to writers' narrative strategies such as verb tense and the exposition that sets up an incident or moves the story along. For example, Slater (paragraphs 1–3) and Updike (paragraphs 8–20) use present tense strategically, giving key events in their narratives dramatic immediacy. Both also use exposition to set up these central incidents (Slater, paragraphs 4–5; Updike, paragraphs 1–7). Kingsolver, in contrast, narrates her experiences in the past tense, illustrating that memory is selective and emotionally charged. The key questions to ask are these: What effect do the narrative strategies have on readers? How do these strategies serve the writer's apparent purpose?

3. Reflection on Experience

A final challenge in expressive and reflective texts is the balance between personal narrative and reflective commentary. In some of the essays in this chapter, personal narrative dominates (e.g., Updike), in others, reflective commentary (e.g., hooks), and in still others, there is a balance (Slater and Mori). In each case, the writer's decision has to do with overall purpose. Writers have a range of options available for reflecting on experience: presentation of multiple perspectives, either within the narrator or between the narrator and others; direct commentary on the meaning of the experience; use of comparison/contrast; inclusion of subject-related information; or citation of authorities. The essays in this chapter illustrate each of these techniques. For example, Kingsolver uses the speaker's past and present perspective on her hometown and adolescence to reflect on memories of growing up; hooks comments directly on what she believes to be the effects of education on class identification; Mori compares Japanese and Midwestern American English practices to make various points about language; and Slater includes medical information about OCD to develop her reflections on this illness. At times, the reflections on experience are suggested rather than directly stated, as in Updike's essay. In each piece, these strategies are important to analyze and discuss for both what they reveal about the writer's purposes and what they offer as possible options for students to use in developing their own reflections.

CHAPTER SELECTIONS

To help you select and teach the readings in this chapter, we provide a synopsis of each essay and some notes on its special rhetorical features.

Barbara Kingsolver, "In Case You Ever Want to Go Home Again"

Synopsis. Kingsolver uses the occasion of her triumphal return to her rural Kentucky hometown for a book signing to speculate about the nature of memory and of writing. She describes her memories of small town life and of being a high school outcast, reflecting on differences between her past and present attitudes toward both. Interspersed with this narrative is an account of the writing and publication of her first novel. A central theme is the imaginative transformation of experience through memory and the act of writing.

Writer's Ethos and Relationship with Readers. To begin a discussion of Kingsolver's *ethos* and the intimacy it establishes with readers, ask students to select favorite passages and read them aloud in class. How would they describe the voice in each passage? What features of language contribute to this voice? How would they describe the role that the speaker invites the reader to play?

Presentation of Experience. Several aspects of Kingsolver's presentation offer fruitful topics for discussion—her ability to create verbal pictures (e.g., paragraphs 1 & 2), her careful selection of details and examples (e.g., paragraphs 3 & 12) and her use of metaphor (e.g., paragraph 4) and analogy (e.g., paragraph 7). Additionally, this essay challenges readers to make connections between the "story" of the speaker's trip back to her hometown and the "story" of her writing life. Here is a possible way to think of the connection: it is the speaker's writing success that takes her back home, and it is the trip home that evokes her memories and insights about the similarity between memory and writing. Like memory, writing imaginatively transforms "reality" and aims for emotional rather than literal truth. To enable students' understanding of this link, ask them to reread the essay, identify where and how Kingsolver connects these two story lines, and then speculate about the meaning she intends through these connections. For example, the metaphor in paragraph 29 of the old-fashioned party line telephone links her hometown memories with the experience of writing: both are simultaneously private and public.

Reflection on Experience. This essay explores the speaker's experiences through a number of contrasting points of view, between her adult and adolescent perspectives and between her perspectives and those of others. Ask students to find passages or pairs of passages that illustrate two or more perspectives, or direct their attention to specific passages. For example, paragraph 11 contrasts the speaker's adolescent self who "yearned for the slick and the new" with her adult self who is "suspicious" of the same. Paragraphs 19 and 22 contrast her childhood "dread" of the game called "Cooties" with her adult self, who can joke about being "cootie-free." Also worth discussing is the contrast between the speaker's anticipation of others' reactions and their actual reaction (see, for example, passages such as paragraphs 9, 12, and 27, or paragraphs 23 and 33).

Kyoko Mori, "Language"

Synopsis. Mori meditates on being a woman caught between two languages—that of her native Japan and that of her adopted home, the American Midwest. She uses comparison and contrast to reveal particular cultural messages encoded in each language and reflects specifically on the silencing and fear that her native language produces in her. More generally, this essay offers insight into the ways language shapes perception, identity, and human relationships.

Writer's Ethos and Relationship with Readers. To get at the various aspects of the *persona* Mori creates in this essay, ask students to describe and compare the different voices in paragraphs 1, 27, and 36, then to discuss the role each voice plays in creating their own image of and feelings toward the speaker. Also important to note are the pains the speaker takes to make sure that readers unfamiliar with Japanese will understand her reflections on her home language. Ask students to consider how Mori's various techniques—example (e.g., paragraphs 5–6 & 8), metaphor (e.g., paragraph 9), and comparison (e.g., paragraph 10)—contribute to her credibility and her relationship to readers.

Presentation of Experience. The narrative passages in this essay include childhood anecdotes (paragraphs 1, 4), anecdotes of airplane trips to Japan as an adult (paragraphs 2, 4–7, 45–46), and anecdotes involving language (paragraphs 14–22). Ask students to identify the techniques used in these passages—choice of details, use of dialogue or figurative language—and then to discuss how these techniques communicate the speaker's experiences and anticipate her reflections on language. Another important topic for discussion is Mori's strategies for connecting her stories of language to her stories of travel. One way to get at these links is to ask students to reread the opening and closing paragraphs (1–3 and 45–46) and consider how the first passage connects thematically to the final one. What insights has the intervening essay contributed to their understanding of the speaker's fear of visiting her homeland and her contradictory attraction and resistance to its physical beauty?

Reflection on experience. For the most part, the speaker's reflections on language are direct. To foster class discussion of these reflections, you might assign small groups to read carefully one of the following passages: paragraphs 5–9, 10–13, 23–24, 26–29, or 37–44. After group members have read and discussed their passage, they should collaborate in answering the following questions: What generalization is the speaker making about a particular language practice? How does she support these generalizations? What is your group's response to these generalizations? What similarities or differences do group members see between her experiences with language and their own?

Lauren Slater, "Black Swans"

Synopsis. Opening with a childhood memory of early obsessive tendencies, the essay narrates the onset of Slater's obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), her experiences with various treatments, and her unfolding attitude toward her disease. Without reducing the pain and disability caused by her illness, Slater ultimately suggests there is potential “dignity” in illness and in learning to live with it.

Writer’s Ethos and Relationship with Readers. Slater creates multiple personae in this essay—her childhood self experiencing an early obsessive impulse (paragraphs 1–2), her young adult self experiencing the onset of OCD (paragraphs 5–20), her 31-year-old self reporting and reflecting on these experiences (paragraphs 3–4, 78–79), and her knowledgeable self offering authoritative information and opinion about her disease (paragraphs 3, 5, & 35). Ask your students how they would describe each persona and the kind of relationship each establishes with readers. How does each contribute to the speaker’s credibility and their willingness as readers to trust her insights?

Presentation of Experience. At times, Slater’s speaker recounts her experiences in great detail, slowing down to describe the setting, reveal the protagonist’s thoughts, and/or recreate dialogue (paragraphs 1–2, 5–17, 21–34, 43–55, 88–97). At other times, she offers exposition or plot summary to move the story along (paragraphs 4, 18–19). Ask students to examine closely these narrative techniques. How does she go about bringing her experience alive for readers? Why does she choose to slow down the narrative at certain points? What aspects of the narrative enable them to identify with her experiences? How do particular details anticipate later reflections about her disease?

Reflection on Experience. Among the strategies Slater uses to reflect on her experience are the following: (1) the speaker’s changing perspectives, (2) the incorporation of medical information and expert opinion, and (3) the use of figurative language. To get at the insights provided by the first of these strategies, ask students to track the changes in the speaker’s attitudes toward taking Prozac, from her initial euphoria (paragraphs 65–72) to her first recognition of its downside (paragraphs 74–76), her questions about its effects on her sense of self (paragraphs 78–79), and her feelings when it ultimately fails her (paragraphs 90–104). To get at the insights provided by her use of medical information and expert opinion (e.g., paragraphs 5, 35, 73, & 83), ask students to consider how it contributes to Slater’s overall reflections on OCD, Prozac, or mental illness generally. Finally, we suggest that you draw students’ attention to Slater’s most indirect strategy for reflection, the use of images—angels (paragraphs 1–3, 58, & 116), black swans, and other animals (paragraphs 78, 110 & 114). How do these figurative techniques extend her reflections thematically? What insights or perspectives do these images suggest?

bell hooks, "keeping close to home: class and education"

Synopsis. The essay describes hooks's struggles to maintain loyalty to her poor, black, rural family and culture as she moved literally and figuratively away to college and then to pursue an academic career. In particular, she reflects on the ways in which her education challenged the values of her home culture and on her attempts to stay "close to home" through her use of language.

Writer's Ethos and Relationship with Readers. Some students may have difficulty identifying with the speaker in this essay. They may feel that they are not part of her primary audience or even that she is critical of them and their values. Ask students to identify passages where they feel they are part of her intended audience and passages where they feel they are not. Then ask them to discuss these passages with a partner to consider what accounts for their sense of being included or excluded. Is it their identity in terms of race or class? Their political ideology? The language of the text? How would they describe the speaker in terms of her moral character? What passages contribute to this image? How does this *ethos* contribute to her credibility? What kind of a relationship does this *ethos* create with readers? (See particularly paragraphs 6, 10, & 13.)

Presentation of Experience. Except for the three opening paragraphs, hooks reports most of her experiences discursively rather than through a narrative re-creation. Ask students to consider their response to the opening narrative. What is its effect on the reflections that follow? How does it anticipate and set up various themes? What details do they find particularly vivid and telling?

Reflection on Experience. Hooks refers to two other texts to extend her reflections—Carol Stack's *All Our Kin* (paragraph 7) and Richard Rodriguez's *Hunger of Memory* (paragraph 19). How does she use each of these references? What relation does each have to her own ideas? Does it offer support or a contrasting perspective? She also offers brief anecdotes in which her perspective on a particular subject or event contrasts with someone else's (paragraphs 6, 11, & 13). How does this approach develop her ideas or themes? Finally, you might ask students to reread paragraphs 1–3 along with paragraph 23. How does the latter comment on the former? To what extent do gaps in understanding they have experienced with their own parents help them they identify with hooks?

David Updike, "A Word With the Boy"

Synopsis. Updike recounts an incident that occurred the first day he and his eight-year-old son arrived in London to visit his wife, who was there attending a seminar. Having spent a year in London as a child, he hopes to further a growing bond with his son by showing him some of his own “childhood haunts.” Instead, they are confronted by police officers who suspect Updike is a child molester because, to them, he and his mixed-race son do not appear to be related. The experience of this “difference” leaves Updike plagued with self-doubt about how he handled the situation, and his son sad and longing for home.

Writer’s Ethos and Relationship with Readers. You might ask students these questions about the *persona* created in this essay: What kind of image does Updike create of himself as a father? What does the speaker say or do that contributes to this image? As readers, how do they feel about him? Is he someone they would trust? Why or why not?

Presentation of Experience. Several aspects of Updike’s narrative are worth class discussion. Paragraphs 1–7 recount the start of the visit in the past tense, but the central incident which begins in paragraph 8 is told in the present tense. What is the effect of this shift? Ask students to reread paragraphs 1–7 after they have completed the essay and to discuss how the author’s selection of details and information anticipates the central incident and shapes their understanding of its impact. Another narrative technique to highlight is the use of visual details to portray the setting and mood leading up to the encounter with the policemen (paragraphs 8–10). What techniques does Updike use to narrate the key incident itself? Its aftermath?

Reflection on Experience. Although Updike’s essay is primarily narrative, his contrasts between the London of his childhood and present London (paragraphs 6–7) and his introspective reflections following the incident (paragraphs 15 & 28) comment indirectly on the incident and the larger subject of racism. Ask students to examine these passages and consider the questions or insights suggested in them.

Heidi Steenburg, “Reflection as Knowledge”

Synopsis. Steenburg writes about her attempts to articulate what she learned during her week-long volunteer experience at a shelter for homeless women and children, reflecting on both the week itself and the experience of writing about it for different purposes.

Writer’s Ethos and Relationship with Readers. Ask students to consider the following questions: What does the speaker reveal directly and indirectly about her age, personality, socio-economic background, and values? What details, word choices, or other stylistic features contribute to your image of the writer? How do these impressions affect your willingness to grant her credibility? Can you identify with this speaker? Why or why not?

Presentation of Experience. Most of this essay focuses on Steenburg's experience of trying to come to terms with her time at Casa Maria by writing about it. Some possible questions for discussion: Does Steenburg present enough details and anecdotes about her stay at the shelter for you to understand why it had such a powerful effect on her? What details or anecdotes do you find most compelling? What else would you like to know about her experience? If you could interview her, what questions might you ask? If you could interview the residents of Casa Maria, what might you ask them?

Reflection on Experience. Steenburg explores her experience almost entirely through direct commentary. Throughout her essay, she seems to be searching for new understanding and clarity. A good topic for class discussion might be this: At what new understanding does Steenburg arrive through her reflections? How would you put this new understanding or knowledge into your own words? If you were to recommend strategies for making the reflective part of her essay stronger, what might you recommend?

HELPING STUDENTS WITH THE WRITING PROJECTS

Reflecting on Experience

Four challenges face students as they write in response to the assignment on page 206: (1) selecting an experience or set of experiences that will lead to fresh perspectives, (2) presenting the experience vividly, in a way that helps readers anticipate the reflection, (3) developing the reflection without preaching, and (4) maintaining thematic coherence.

1. The instructions prompt students to begin by thinking about significant experiences. Alternatively, students might start their search for a suitable topic by identifying significant or controversial subjects about which they have personal experience. How might their experiences shed new light on the subject?

2. The most important question they need to ask themselves regarding their presentation of experience is "What does the reader need to know in order to anticipate my reflections on this experience?" Other decisions include whether to focus on a single narrative or a series of anecdotes.

Since students' will tend to "tell" rather than "show," you will need to direct their attention back to the essays in Chapter 9 as models for strategic selection of detail.

3. While there are a number of options for developing a reflection, an effective reflection offers readers more than one perspective on the subject. The readings in this chapter model a variety of strategies of achieving multiple perspectives. Encourage students to try more than one strategy to see which works best to provide fresh, provocative insights.

4. Because good reflective essays offer multiple perspectives, creating thematic coherence can be a challenge. If students have carefully constructed their narrative to anticipate their reflections, a large part of this challenge is addressed. Other decisions regarding coherence have to do with arrangement. Do they wish to begin with experience then reflect on it? Alternatively, they might begin with subject-related information or questions then turn to experience and further reflection. Either way, they will need to decide whether to connect the segments with explicit transitions or indirect thematic references.

Writing a Rhetorical Analysis of Expression and Reflection

The major challenges here are (1) discovering an exigence or reason for writing, and (2) selecting an analytical framework.

1. To help students discover an exigence for their rhetorical analysis, ask them to select a reading to which they had a strong positive or negative response or one that changed their attitude or understanding of a particular subject. After they have made their selection, ask them to explore their responses to this essay by writing a before/after reflection (See page 81 and the advice about getting started on page 100.)

2. To help students determine the analytical framework they'll use, the assignment offers a number of questions as starting points. The key is to select a rhetorical concept or set of related concepts that the student can use to point out and explain insights about how the chosen text works.

Extending the Conversation

This assignment asks students to write to extend a conversation begun by one or more of the chapter's essays about a particular subject—language, race, class, or mental illness. Instructors may either stipulate or let students decide whether they will use the book's prompts (1) to "talk back" to the chapter essay(s) on the basis of their own experiences or (2) to combine their reflections on personal experience with additional reading and research on the subject.

Whenever students write to engage in conversation with published texts, choosing appropriate texts and source material can present a major challenge. For readings and resources to offer students as starting points, see the materials listed below under "Related Readings and Starting Points for Research." The task of engaging with other texts in relation to one's own experience and understanding presents the additional challenges of (1) maintaining one's own authority and perspective and (2) creating coherence among multiple perspectives.

1. Regardless of whether students will incorporate additional research materials, we suggest that you have them begin by writing out reflections on their own experience, seeking a fresh perspective, new insight, or question that can serve as a starting point for the paper. This initial work should help them maintain their authority as they place their own experiences and reflections in conversation with other texts. Specifically, ask students to get started by describing and then reflecting on their experience with a subject addressed by one of the authors in this chapter. Then ask them to compare their stories and reflections with the *Reading Rhetorically* essay(s) on the subject. What are the points of similarity? The points of difference? What accounts for these similarities and differences? What further insights does this comparison yield? This new perspective can then serve as the thesis or central question for their own essay.

2. Creating thematic coherence among multiple perspectives is a challenge here as it is on the Strand 1 reflection assignment, complicated in this case by the need to incorporate perspectives beyond students' personal experience and reflections. To help students do this, suggest that they think of the various segments of their essay—personal experience(s), others' experiences, authoritative information or opinion on the subject, their own reflections, others' reflections—as distinct elements that build toward a new insight or question. Then this final insight or question can retrospectively guide their arrangement of the segments of their essay. This approach to organization is usually best achieved during revision, after the writer has discovered the key insight/question through drafting. Once this end point is identified, the student can work backward to arrange the parts of the essay so that they lead up to it, using explicit

transitions and/or thematic references as signposts for the reader. Alternatively, students may wish to experiment with a collage structure in which segments are connected more indirectly through juxtaposition, thematic references, or repeated key words or images.

Thematic Connections

This list suggests readings from this chapter and others and that might be discussed together and offers some starting points for further student research.

- On reflections on home, pair Kingsolver, Mori, and hooks.

- On language, culture, and identity, pair Mori and hooks.

To develop additional material, students might use their own experiences and Mori's essay as starting points to conduct some firsthand research on language and gender, observing and taking notes on conversations between males and females in a particular social setting such as a college party or their workplace.

- On illness, pair Slater's essay with Mairs's in Chapter 11.

For additional sources, students might look for articles and Web sites on OCD, examine medication ads in newspapers and magazines, or consider portrayals of the disease in popular media, then consider how particular representations of this illness extend or differ from Slater's.

- On the intersection of race, class, and education, pair hooks's essay with Bambara's story in Chapter 12.

- On homelessness, pair Steenburg with Marin in Chapter 11.

- On education and class, pair hooks with Irgang in Chapter 11.

CHAPTER 10

Reading and Writing Texts that Inquire and Explore

Exploratory texts begin by asserting uncertainty then trace an author's efforts to resolve that uncertainty, frequently reaching only tentative and sometimes multiple conclusions. The value of reading such texts lies in the complex, even contradictory, intellectual experiences they present. Likewise, asking students to read and write such texts helps them learn to resist their inclinations toward premature closure and instead to do as John Ramage and John Bean advise: "wallow in complexity."[2] As writer and reader scrutinize a subject from multiple angles, the process reveals ideas that might otherwise remain hidden or unexamined in a rush to certainty. Practice with this kind of critical thinking is important for traditional-aged, first-year college students (17–19 year olds), whose intellectual development is typically at what William Perry terms "dualist" and Patricia King and Karen Kitchener describe as "pre-reflective" stages.[3]

By reading and writing exploratory texts, your students will gain experience with:

- the fundamental academic enterprise of posing a question, looking for answers, summarizing findings, and commenting on those findings
- open form, thesis-seeking prose that resists closure
- observing and articulating the thinking processes involved in examining an issue or question from multiple angles

HELPING STUDENTS UNDERSTAND INQUIRY AND EXPLORATION

---

[2] John Ramage and John C. Bean, *Allyn and Bacon Guide to Writing*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000) 23.

[3] William G. Perry, *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years* (Troy, MO: Holt, 1970); Patricia M. King and Karen Strohm Kitchener, *Developing Reflective Judgment* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1994).

It is not unusual for first-year college students to be uncomfortable with the lack of closure typical of exploratory texts. Their schooling has taught them the value of “right” answers, and they have had little experience with literary nonfiction or magazine journalism, where exploratory forms flourish. Thus, they typically resist such ambiguity. Having learned that a thesis statement is an essential component of serious texts, they are likely to have difficulty analyzing, writing, or even taking seriously texts that do not assert a fixed position. Yet one of the major, if implicit, goals of first-year composition is to move students away from certainty and into complexity. Furthermore, as the introduction to Chapter 10 notes, asking questions that may not have clear-cut answers is essential to the academic enterprise of building new knowledge. Discussing and writing about the selections in Chapter 10 will help your students discover that texts without an explicit thesis statement can nevertheless articulate significant questions, engage readers, and accomplish important purposes.

Anecdotes and personal narrative are an important feature in this chapter’s selections, but in contrast to Chapter 9’s reflective/expressive texts, these texts use stories as frames and examples, not as the primary subject matter. Both texts engage readers in the writer’s experience of searching for answers or meaning, but texts we categorize as exploratory typically pay less attention to the explorer, more to the subject explored. Furthermore, that subject is typically larger than and partially external to the writer’s immediate experience.

To deepen students’ rhetorical reading of texts that inquire and explore, plan to base discussions on the “Questions to Help You Read Explorations Rhetorically” (pp. 210–211) and the “Thinking Critically About” questions that follow each reading. We especially recommend comparisons of how two or more writers in the chapter handle parallel rhetorical problems. In the material that follows, we discuss three primary rhetorical problems that authors of exploratory texts must solve, then for each chapter selection provide a synopsis and specific notes regarding these major rhetorical issues. Examining how these aspects of a text shape readers’ experience of it (a) help your students formulate exploratory questions that are open to complexity and (b) prepare them to tackle the writing assignments at the end of the chapter.

1. Assertion of Exploratory Stance

If we take it as a given that writers have designs on readers, that writers write because they want to influence how their readers think about something, it is important for rhetorical readers to examine a writer's grounds—explicit or implicit—for asserting an exploratory aim. Some writers take a stance that assumes readers will share their engagement with an inquiry process and simply move forward. Others begin by asserting multiple questions and answers that seem designed to grab attention and disrupt readers' complacency. Ask students

- to determine the point at which the author's exploratory purpose becomes evident in a given text. Would they have recognized this purpose if they had read the text in its original context?
- to consider how the exploratory approach reveals and/or forwards an author's purposes. Here it is important to examine not just the author's questions but her or his commentary on the information discovered. How does the information presented and explained deepen or complicate the students' own understanding of the subject?
- to note how a writer justifies the exploratory approach. Does that rationale hold up through the entire piece? What do the author's questions—explicit and implicit—reveal about his or her commitment to genuine inquiry? Does the form appear to be contrived to make a point? (Such contrivances are not necessarily flaws.)

Some writers take up an exploratory aim because their true subject is the story of their own need to understand (e.g., Dillard and McColough) or because even expert knowledge and experience about the subject matter are still at a formative stage (e.g., Crossette). For others, exploration may primarily be an organizational technique. A gradual unfolding of information can enhance readers' understanding of a difficult subject. If a writer seeks to expand readers' views of something that is controversial or difficult to delineate, an exploratory text may have a better chance of earning acceptance than would a direct explanation or argument. If reader resistance seems likely, a thesis, whether implicit or explicit, may be more acceptable if it is delayed, or left implicit. If subject matter is potentially offensive, an exploratory stance can provide a buffer between the text and audience sensitivities, or even between the subject and the author's own emotions (e.g., McGuire, Gross, and Naylor).

2. Strategy for Exploration

Essential to a reader's acceptance of an author's authority in an exploratory text is a clear understanding of the relevance and reliability of the questions posed and sources consulted. Because beginning college writers are used to taking narratives at face value, they are sometimes reluctant to consider how authors have constructed their experience in a text—as Dillard does in "Singing with the Fundamentalists," for example—or that a given textual construction of experience needs to be critiqued as a basis of authority just as a series of library sources or interviews with an expert would be. Guide students to consider not only *what an author explores*, but *how the author uses what is found.*

3. Form

The exploratory purpose of these selections leads to open form organization, which is quite unlike the hierarchical points-to-particulars patterns customary in academic writing. As with the previous two features, students will likely need guidance in considering the implications and effects of authors' choices about form. Are expectations fulfilled or thwarted? Do multiple viewpoints suggest convergence or divergence? How much does the author guide readers' understanding? Do gaps create places where readers must make sense of shifts in subject, point of view, or even genre?

In keeping with the curiosity and uncertainty that motivate their creation, exploratory texts frequently use collages and narrative to follow or recreate an inquiry. Since these choices about form are influenced by rhetorical context, it will be important to draw students' attention to the contrasts in genre between journalistic pieces such as Crossette's and McGuire's and more literary pieces such as Dillard's and Gross's. Remember that many students will need to adjust their inclination to accept narratives at face value so that they can consider the implications and impact of sequence and juxtaposition of detail within a narrative or collage. A valuable tool for helping students track organization strategies in exploratory texts is the descriptive outlining procedure described in Chapter 4 (p. 58). Formulating *does* and *says* statements for major sections of an exploratory text, especially the collage pieces by Dillard, McGuire, and Gross, will help students distinguish between direct assertions and implications so that they can examine what each reveals about the author's purpose and credibility.

CHAPTER SELECTIONS

Annie Dillard, “Singing with the Fundamentalists”

Synopsis. Dillard explores her fascination with a group of Christian students who gather in the middle of campus every morning to sing hymns. Hearing the music outside her window, she decides to join them, in part because she enjoys singing and in part because she is drawn to the “very absurdity” of their indifference to what others may think of them (paragraph 3). Filled with narrative and descriptive detail, this collage essay chronicles Dillard’s reactions to these young people as she sings with them daily over the ensuing weeks. She puzzles over their sometimes intense, sometimes vapid lyrics, notes the distance they seem to keep from each other, and considers the many ways in which they do and do not fit stereotypes of fundamentalists. Through a mixture of narration, introspective comments, and snippets of lyrics, the essay relates Dillard’s not entirely comfortable experiences with the group. In two expository sections Dillard relates what she has learned about the beliefs and politics of fundamentalists she has met in her classes (paragraphs 16–17) and draws together numerous secondhand images of fundamentalists (paragraphs 18–21).

Assertion of Exploratory Stance. The essay’s exploratory stance is evident from its opening paragraphs, where the in-progress but unclear music draws Dillard outside asking, “What are they singing?” (paragraph 3). That question will recur nearly as often as her wonder about why they are singing, this way, in this public place. She portrays herself as at least figuratively on the group’s fringes, trying to catch the beat, figure out lyrics, decipher emotions and motivations. Her eventual articulation of her own reasons for singing with the fundamentalists emerges only in the context of a tentative formulation of why the others also show up each morning (paragraph 15).

Strategy for Exploration. Since Dillard’s primary method in this highly personal essay consists of relating and reflecting upon details of her own experiences, you may find it useful to review the rhetorical features typical of expressive and reflective texts listed in the previous chapter: writer’s ethos and relationship to readers, techniques for presenting experience, and methods for reflecting on it. The panoply of detail in the singing scenes demonstrates Dillard’s keen eye—and ear—from perspectives both inside and outside the group. One element useful to track in class is her varying references to the singers as “them” and “us” (see, for example, paragraphs 7 and 45). What is happening at points where the pronouns change? Another analytical focus, as suggested in the first “Responding as a Reader” question (p. 220), is the role explicit and implicit questions play in the essay’s development. What is the effect of some being answered and others not? Finally, ask students to analyze how Dillard's uses external sources (paragraphs 16–21). Though these sections are relatively short, they add crucial information to the overall portrait of the singers, and they provide valuable illustration of the type of materials one might consult to flesh out a similar exploration.

Form. This essay provides an easily apprehended and analyzed example of collage organization. White space signals breaks between major narrative sections, which proceed chronologically, as well as between the narrative and the commentary sections in which Dillard attempts to set her growing understanding of fundamentalist students within a national political context.

Barbara Crossette, "Testing the Limits of Tolerance as Cultures Mix"

Synopsis. Crossette's *New York Times* article details a number of somewhat shocking, or as she puts it, "repellent" customs that give rise to the question of where the limits of tolerance may lie in a pluralistic democracy. The author's examples of cultural practices likely to make most Americans uncomfortable are interspersed with commentary from experts who ponder the phenomena of changing and clashing cultural values. Some worry about relativism and the possible loss of a "core American culture." Because Crossette does not assert a position regarding these practices, and because the experts' comments suggest still further complications and contradictions, her exploration supports her assertion at the end of the second paragraph that "balancing cultural variety with mainstream values is becoming more and more tricky" (paragraph 2). The sentence may be considered a thesis statement, but an unusual one, for its explicitly uncertain point establishes a need for the exploration presented in the article, not an answer to the question that precedes it.

Assertion of Exploratory Stance. This piece, the only one in this chapter lacking the author's personal "I," appeared in the Arts and Ideas section of the *New York Times,* where readers expect provocative content from authoritative writers. You may need to help students see how the conventions of this original context invoke both readers' expectations and the author's authority. In the feature sections of a newspaper, especially this newspaper, the introductory anecdotes about conflicting views implicitly combine with the second paragraph's question and answer commentary on them lead seamlessly into the sequence of consultations that Crossette presents. She does here what journalists so often do: report on a search for answers.

Strategy for Exploration. Crossette's specific strategy about which experts to consult and what to quote, paraphrase, or summarize from them remains implicit. In this situation, unlike that of an academic paper, readers do not expect to hear how or why the writer consulted these people. We grant her the authority to decide as long as she tells us their credentials. Class discussion of "Responding as a Reader" question #1 and "Responding as a Writer" question #2 (p. 224) should help students discover and understand these rhetorical effects.

Form. Newspaper conventions also govern the article's basic form of anecdote, discussion, and commentary quoted from interviews. Within this pattern, however, an author's decisions about sequencing and linking examples can be scrutinized for evidence of underlying logic and purpose. Crossette quotes an anthropologist from the University of Chicago, a law professor at Harvard, a Swede who directs UNICEF in sub-Saharan Africa, an author who has written about underdevelopment, and finally an international lawyer who is an advocate for women. Ask students to track the credentials and primary concerns of these experts and to note, as in a descriptive outline, what the inclusion of each perspective *does* to develop the article. ("Responding as a Writer" question #2 asks students to consider how Crossette's formal integration of these expert opinions would have to be modified for an academic paper.)

Robert McGuire, "Witness to Rage"

Synopsis. McGuire announces his subject as the lasting effect of domestic violence on children who have witnessed it. The article is grounded in startling revelations from very the first line, "I boil inside." We learn almost immediately that McGuire has beaten the odds and not become the batterer his father was. But as the text unfolds, we also learn that the violence he saw inflicted upon his mother has nevertheless affected his life in many ways. This collage essay/article intersperses personal narrative—some of it relating violent scenes from his childhood, some offering retrospective from the relative calm of his adult life—with references to published materials, interviews with leaders of community agencies, reports of his own volunteer work with children at shelters, and summative commentary. McGuire's unflinching tone at times addresses the reader directly. For example, toward the end, after a painful disclosure, he asks, "So what?…Why should you care?" (paragraphs 73–74). As the final section begins, he admits, "I'm not sure how to end this story—half-empty or half-full." He leaves it to the reader.

Assertion of Exploratory Stance. McGuire's exploration is highly personal. His initial self-disclosures become the basis for turning in paragraph 12 to the question that generates the rest of his piece: "I've been wondering lately what happens when children witness domestic violence…." He develops this initially personal inquiry into a matter of community concern that he hopes will engage more than readers' curiosity. It should be useful to ask students to compare their readerly engagement with McGuire's personal story and his presentation of these broader social issues.

Strategy for Exploration. The gaps between the pieces of McGuire's collage leave unstated his reasons for consulting a given source or including particular material at a particular point. Students scrutinizing the structure of this text will discover that its fragmented organization mirrors the author's uncertainty, which in turn seems to account for his multi-faceted invocations of authority—both personal experience and the broader perspectives of experts and statistics. The overall effect might be seen as an uncertain piecing together of memories.

Form. This selection is the most formally complex in the chapter. The collage approach not only juxtaposes expert commentary with chronologically separate and disrupted narrative, but also interweaves memories of childhood terror with calm self-disclosure. To help students explore how McGuire's form affected their reading experience, see the first two "Responding as a Writer" questions (pp. 234-235).

Beverly Gross, "Bitch"

Synopsis. Gross uses dictionaries and anecdote to explore varying meanings and uses of the word *bitch*.[4] An English professor, she begins by relating a classroom discussion about Mary McCarthy's purported "bitchiness" that culminates with speculation about what the male equivalent of *bitch* would be. The incident prompts the inquiry that shapes the essay, first with reports on the word's lexical history, from Samuel Johnson to a contemporary thesaurus of slang, then with a pastiche of anecdotes about women using and being abused by the term, from Hemingway's Lady Ashley to Madonna. Though Gross's inquiry is cool on the surface, it gathers an undercurrent of intensity as she accumulates evidence of *bitch* not just as insult but as weapon in gender-based power struggles (paragraph 17). Finally, having demonstrated that the word is—or has been—"'the most offensive appellation' the English language provides to hurl at a woman" (paragraph 4), Gross suggests that Madonna might change that. (Note: Gross's discoveries about *bitch* in African American slang tie to Naylor's points about *nigger*. See paragraph 31.)

Assertion of Exploratory Stance. Like the Dillard and McGuire pieces in this chapter, Gross's exploration arises from personal experience, in this case, in her own classroom, a fact that leads naturally to her scholarly inquiries about *bitch*. The differences in the way each of these authors asserts and responds to controlling questions can prove a fruitful focus of discussion about organizational strategies, rhetorical techniques, and stylistic devices.

Strategy for Exploration. Having begun with a classroom anecdote, Gross builds her essay upon a foundation of reference sources, Her strategy of working chronologically through a series of important dictionaries shifts once she reaches the 20th century and turns to a number of formal and informal sources, including a chain of definitions from slang dictionaries. After paragraph 17, she shifts away from systematic investigation and turns instead to a collage of anecdotes.

[4] In our discussion of Gross and Naylor we are following the MLA and *Chicago Manual* convention of italicizing a word that is being discussed as a word. In contrast, the texts in *Reading Rhetorically* follow the original styles, which used no punctuation or quotation marks. Students should follow the MLA style, which in academic papers entails underlining as a signal for italics. (See p. 580 in the *Reading Rhetorically* appendix.)

Form. The mixture of forms and organizational strategies in this essay will be evident to students, but interpretations of the mix will probably be controversial. Examining Gross's choice and sequence of anecdotes in the second part of the essay is bound to generate lively class discussion. What logic is implicit in the sequence? Is Gross still exploring for answers in the later part of the essay? Has the essay become an argument? These are not mutually exclusive possibilities.

Gloria Naylor, "Mommy, What Does 'Nigger' Mean?"

Synopsis. Drawing upon childhood memories to explore the meanings and uses of *nigger*, Naylor frames her essay with the story of the first time she heard the word—that is, the first time someone used it to insult her. When she got home, she asked "the inevitable question that every black parent must face" (paragraphs 3 and 15). As the headnote says, this was originally published as a *New York Times* "Hers" column, a feature comparable to an op-ed opinion piece, but running with other articles written for a female audience. Naylor begins by announcing that language is her subject and asserts her preference for the spoken word over the written. She never settles on a definition of *nigger*. Instead, her exploration, which also examines the word *girl*, implicitly illustrates her claim at the end of the second paragraph: "Words themselves are innocuous; it is the consensus that gives them true power."

Assertion of Exploratory Stance. That Naylor's exploration will not be definitive becomes apparent at the start of paragraph 4. There she complicates the possibility of finding a clear answer by noting that before she herself was insulted by it, she must have heard the word many times, but with quite different uses. Her reflective question, "And what exactly did it mean?" generates the main body of the essay.

Strategy for Exploration. In keeping with her point that social use is what gives words their power, Naylor focuses on her personal experience. In contrast to the other selections in this chapter, this author is the only expert speaking in this piece. We do not even hear her mother's response, which surely was framed in much more intimate language than Naylor uses to make her points about how language works. (For a glimpse of Naylor's relationship with her mother, see her brief personal narrative at the end of Chapter 1, "The Writing Life.")

Form. Discussion of this essay's form and purpose will help students see not only how these two rhetorical features can become intertwined but also how a single short piece might have multiple rhetorical aims. Since the essay is largely personal narrative based on re-examination of childhood experiences, the question naturally arises as to whether it might more properly be categorized as reflection than exploration. Furthermore, certain paragraphs within it have explicitly explanatory and persuasive purposes (e.g., paragraphs 1–2 and 14). From our perspective, it belongs in the "Inquiring and Exploring" chapter because exploration is the primary rhetorical strategy Naylor uses to engage her readers. Was our decision appropriate? This question might be taken up in class in connection with the "Responding as a Reader" questions as well as "Responding as a Writer" question #2 about the title's effectiveness. To prompt full discussion, ask students to consider how alternative formal structures might affect readers' engagement with Naylor's subject.

Joshua D. McColough, "Seeking Answers to the Question of Divorce"

Synopsis. Trying to come to terms with the news that a much-loved aunt and uncle seem about to end their marriage, McColough undertakes a collage essay that contextualizes his family's experience within larger social trends and indirectly ponders his own chances for a lasting marriage. Although the "question of divorce" that concerns him remains implicit, he seems to be asking why divorces happen, why marriages don't last. The essay opens with a series of platitudes that shrug off the increasing frequency of divorce, but McColough finds them inadequate and asks in the first full paragraph, "How do we make sense of all this?" He combines anecdote, questions, and commentary to look for evidence that might counter the idea that divorce has become the norm. Writing as an undergraduate for an undergraduate audience, he describes himself in the final paragraph as "caught somewhere between the fear of marriage and the loathing of divorce," stuck "in a barren no man's land."

Assertion of Exploratory Stance. As the title, epigraph, and initial platitudes suggest, the impetus for McColough's exploration is his personal distress. Worth discussing is what exactly distresses him and what question he seeks to answer.

Strategy for Exploration. McColough's essay differs from others in the chapter in that it does not articulate, even implicitly, a strategy for exploration. He draws primarily upon internal resources—his experiences and worries. Do students, who are likely to share his vantage point and concerns, find this effective? Ask them to compare this specific aspect of McColough's essay to those of other texts assigned in the chapter and then to decide when and why explicit statements of a strategy are desirable.

Form. Is this essay a genuine exploration or a lament shaped as an exploration? How and why does that question matter? As the second "Responding as a Writer" question indicates(p. 252), form was a particular concern of McColough's. Comparison of his form with that of others in the chapter can provide a productive focus for a peer critique of the piece and highlight as well those aspects of exploratory writing that you want students to focus on as they develop their own texts.

HELPING STUDENTS WITH THE WRITING PROJECTS

Analysis and discussion (written or spoken) of the three rhetorical features outlined above will prepare students well to undertake any of the chapter's writing assignments or to use exploratory writing as a preliminary exercise for a paper with a different aim.

Exploring a Puzzling Question

This assignment asks students to use the chapter selections as models for a paper that inquires and explores; it may be combined with the Extending the Conversation project on the same page. Work on the project will probably entail three major activities: question formulation, research, and shaping the essay. Since Chapters 7 and 8 of *Reading Rhetorically,* together with the earlier chapter in this manual on teaching Part Three ("Helping Students Write About Reading") offer considerable guidance for the research process, we concentrate here on the challenges students face in formulating questions and shaping their essay.

Formulating Questions. Articulating a good question to guide research can be challenging. Although the assignment warns against "fake" questions that set up a soapbox for an already determined position, some writers will inevitably ignore or misunderstand this. To forestall the problem and help students refine their questions, provide considerable in-class practice on composing open-ended questions, questions that use "how" or "what" or "why" instead of binary "should" or "is it" phrasing. In addition, help students see that it is OK to revise their question as they explore. Doing so can be a sign of strength, and interesting to readers.

To illustrate the impracticality and detrimental simplicity of yes-no questions for this assignment, you might ask students to freewrite on a binary question you pose. Choose something you suspect most will readily take a position on but that will become complicated once they read the assigned material. After they freewrite in class, assign the reading. At the next class, ask them to review their first freewrite and add to it a brief paragraph assessing their initial response.

Class discussion can examine shifts in students' thinking, then turn to revision of the initial question so that it more fully anticipates complexity. As illustration, consider this question paraphrased from Crossette's article: "Should the government have the authority to intervene in intimate details of family life?" (from paragraph 3 on p. 221). We predict that students will mostly reject this possibility and/or insist upon clearer delineation of "intimate details." But as they read Crossette—no doubt recognizing the source of your question—they will discover that clashing cultural values can make this matter difficult to resolve and that the question itself is too simple an entrée for a multifaceted phenomenon.

Shaping Essays. To help students develop their papers, ask them to freewrite and discuss with their peers ideas about how they will solve the three rhetorical problems discussed above.

- How will they assert the importance of their question and engage their readers in the exploration?
- How will they explain their exploration strategy? How will they account for their choice of sources? How much information will they need to include about and from each?
- In what sequence will they present the answers they find? Chronological order may suffice—"I looked here, then here, then here"—especially if the inquiry itself follows a logic such as Gross's look at dictionaries. But the subject matter may suggest other options, as McGuire's and McColough's do.
- What form will they use? Will they use a collage of different materials, with white space instead of transitions? This may look easy, but unless readers can sense good reasons for the gaps, they will be confused. The best results will stem from careful thought.
- Finally, the additional issue of closure must be considered. The assignment's wording leaves it up to the individual. However, to underscore the nature of the exploratory task, you may wish to stipulate that the matter be left open at the end of the paper and ask instead for a closing paragraph the summarizes the difficulty of finding conclusive answers.

WRITING A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF INQUIRY AND EXPLORATION

As we discussed in connection with the previous chapter's Strand 1 assignment, a good rhetorical analysis must lay out a rhetorical exigence or reason for writing and must make clear an analytical framework. The Strand 2 assignment for

Chapter 10 (p. 253) helps students with these two challenges by specifying a purpose (to explain "the extent to which the author succeeded in deepening your thinking about the topic") and by suggesting what to analyze (the role that the author's exploratory stance asks readers to play and the strategy for exploration). The assignment urges students to support their points with evidence from both the text and what they can find out about its original context, and it suggests that students begin developing ideas by outlining what distinct sections *do* and *say*. (For additional suggestions about rhetorical analysis assignments, see the extended discussion at the end of our chapter about teaching *Reading Rhetorically* Part Two.)

Extending the Conversation

This chapter's Strand 3 assignment (pp. 253-254) is similar to Strand 1, but focuses on formulating and researching questions prompted by the selections published in the chapter. An excellent basis for this kind of project is an ungraded reflective writing that responds directly to the essay and then begins to pose questions about it. Encourage students to include in this preliminary text a few sentences about why these questions are important and difficult to answer: What will be gained by asking this? How will their exploration go beyond the original author's in important ways? Why is the answer not obvious? At this point, expressing ideas in academic language is less important than simply making them visible on paper. This early writing can serve as a touchstone as students develop their ideas and will help prevent those ideas from being overtaken by the expert information they encounter as they explore. (See *Reading Rhetorically* 98-99 and discussion of Chapter 9's Strand 3 assignment in the Instructors Manual chapter that precedes this one.)

Next, if students are to write an exploratory paper, use the suggestions for the first assignment above to help them develop and plan their essay. This assignment may also serve as a taking off spot for work on an explanatory or persuasive paper; see the relevant chapters in this manual for further ideas and activities related to developing those papers.

Thematic Connections

The list below suggests readings from this and other chapters that might be discussed together and offers some starting points for further student research.

- On tolerance, cultural variety, and mainstream values, pair Crossette

with Dillard. Yet another perspective on cultural transgression is offered by Muwakkil in Chapter 16.
To contrast aims, read these selections with Sullivan or Tisdale in Chapter 13, and/or Callahan in Chapter 16.

- To update and extend Crossette's exploration of the limits of tolerance, students will find a wealth of information and debate concerning America's efforts to come to terms with the September 11, 2001, attack on the World Trade Center and Pentagon.
  For another perspective, they might search the Web and periodicals databases for material related to the April 1999 conference at Harvard on the relationship between culture and progress (paragraph 18).

- On language, assign Gross and Naylor together.
  For another take on language and power, have students tead Muwakkil's portrait of "Aaron the 'Wiggah'" in Chapter 16.
  To contrast aims, consider including Mori or hooks in Chapter 9.
  For exploration that extends the conversation, students can look for up-to-date commentaries about potentially offensive language in music lyrics, or take an historical look at efforts to label albums and disks for certain age groups.

- To extend McGuire's conversation about family violence, a team of students could gather material for a report to the class on what shelters and other resources are available in their college community for people seeking relief from abusive situations.

- To extend McColough's search for answers to "the question of divorce," one student or, better yet, a collaborative team could brainstorm a list of community, library, and Internet resources with potential answers, and undertake a multi-faceted research project. Have them begin by reflecting in writing about personal and public issues raised by the essay (see the last question on p. 252). Urge students to explore not just questions about divorce, but questions about marriage rates (in 2000-2001 rumored to be increasing) and resources for couples who need help staying together or deciding whether they should marry in the first place.

CHAPTER 11

Reading and Writing Texts that Inform and Explain

Effective expository texts must do more than present information. They must show readers that the information presented is valuable and reliable. The rhetorical challenge for the writer increases in situations where readers might resist the information—perhaps because it is difficult to understand, markedly different from previously understood ideas, or just plain “bad news” (e.g., evidence of global warming). Indeed, the line between explanatory and persuasive purposes is sometimes difficult to discern. A given text’s location on one side or the other of this line is typically a function of an author’s assumptions about readers’ existing knowledge and attitudes. (Note that the Strand Two rhetorical analysis assignment on p. 335 invites students to consider whether the texts by Irgang, Mairs, and Marin properly belong in this chapter on “Informing and Explaining.”)

Reading, analyzing, and writing expository texts will help your students:

- understand how texts convey authority
- discern texts’ assumptions about audience interest and knowledge level
- recognize how texts are constrained by context
- deepen their understanding of how to *read rhetorically*
- develop their ability to do rhetorical analysis
- consider the importance of word choice, syntax, and paragraphing in effective informative and explanatory texts
- learn techniques for developing and organizing such texts

HELPING STUDENTS UNDERSTAND EXPOSITION

Students often think of informative texts as transparent, mere conduits of content from author to reader, and as a result find it difficult to recognize the implicitly persuasive agenda of such texts. To demonstrate the inherently rhetorical nature of exposition, Chapter 11 presents a range of explanatory and informative texts written for a wide variety of audiences, contexts, and purposes.

Regarding audience, these texts range from Kathy Wollard's short, upbeat science features for family-oriented newspaper readers to Amy Wolfson and Mary Carskadon's scholarly article addressing the interdisciplinary academic audience of *Child Development*. Wollard's texts are readily understood and seem designed to be read aloud. Our apparatus accompanying the scholarly article seeks to demonstrate that at least its essential findings and implications are also comprehensible if readers understand the conventions of academic articles and apply techniques for "listening" to difficult texts as described in Chapter 4.

Regarding context—which frequently conveys information about an author's credibility—the chapter includes material written for the wide readership of daily newspapers, for the smaller audiences of specialized periodicals such as the *Wellness Letter*, and for the experts who read academic journals. For further discussion of context, see the "Texts and Their Rhetorical Contexts" section of Chapter 3, which includes the exercise in which students match the opening paragraphs of articles about sleep research with the periodical in which they appeared.

Regarding purpose, the chapter's selections range from the fairly direct presentation of information in articles from newspapers and Paul Roepshe's student essay on pizza to the more pedagogical aims of the UC Berkeley *Wellness Letter* article and Paul Irgang's personalized column about the status of physical plant employees on college campuses. The pieces by Nancy Mairs on life in a wheelchair and Peter Marin on causes of and responses to homelessness offer emotionally complex meditations on their subject matter. Finally, to both explicate and complicate notions of explanation (and interpretation) even further, the chapter ends with a short story in which the protagonist "can guess" his own explanation for a young boy's drowning. Although this text's aim is not to provide new information but to engage readers' imaginations, we include it in this chapter because its plot and main character are primarily concerned with information and explanation.

Although more typically associated with argumentative writing, the three points of the classical rhetorical triangle—pathos, ethos, and logos—serve well as an organizing system for analysis of this chapter's texts. These concepts highlight the crucial rhetorical elements of effective exposition, drawing attention to its inherent persuasive function even as they help distinguish the explanatory aim of these texts from the explicitly persuasive aim of argumentative texts. Analysis of these three features will make a rhetorical reading of a given text possible and help students discern how that text sets out to change their mind, even a little, about its subject matter. For additional suggestions of discussion points and brief writing assignments, see the "Questions to Help You Read Informative and Explanatory Texts Rhetorically" (p. 258), the various reading log prompts, and the "Thinking Critically" questions with each selection.

1. Pathos

With expository texts, analysis of pathos—the ways that a text appeals to an audience's interests and emotions—should include examination of both (a) the text's techniques for drawing in readers and (b) its evident assumptions about readers' existing understanding of the subject matter. To be effective, texts that inform and explain must demonstrate early on the value and relevance of the information they offer. Readers should be able to discern quickly what they are to gain if they continue reading. New facts? New insights? New ways of doing something?

2. Ethos

The crucial issue for analysis of ethos in an informative or explanatory text is the author's credibility, that is, the implicit or explicit grounds on which he or she (a) claims to know more than the reader about the subject matter and (b) asserts the significance of the information presented in the text. Authors who seek to inform and explain write not from opinion but from what they consider to be and assert as certain knowledge on the basis of their own experience, expertise, or research, or their consultation with experts and experts' writing. Assertion of authority through an explicit first person point of view, although acceptable, is not the norm. At times, the context of publication may provide the strongest evidence of authority. An author's name may not be well known, but a publication's reputation can implicitly convey authority. In scholarly journals, credibility is further assured by the process of editorial review and conveyed through extensive bibliographic citations. In contrast, student papers, because they lack the reassuring context of a reputable publication, must rely upon bibliographic citations and the clarity of their writing to convey a credible ethos. (For further discussion of ethos, see pp. 70-71 of *Reading Rhetorically*. For additional discussion of discerning an author's reliability from context, see pp. 119–121.)

3. Logos

Logos typically refers to the network of reasoning in an explicit argument—claims, reasons, and assumptions (pp. 71–74 and 393–395 of *Reading Rhetorically*). Expository essays assume not the clashing theses and disagreements of argument but premises and interests that are shared with the reader. Thus, the reasoning to be examined encompasses major points, supporting evidence, illustrative examples, and, very importantly, clearly articulated connections among all these. This articulation of how the various elements connect with each other is the heart of an explanatory text. Yet, for beginning college writers, explaining these crucial connections can be the most difficult aspect of explanatory writing. Students often find it challenging to decide when information can "speak for itself," without explanatory connections, and when those connections need to be made explicit. To help students learn ways to resolve such difficulties, ask them to identify and discuss how the authors they read make such connections explicit through, for example, definitions of terms, introductory generalizations for sections and paragraphs, illustrative examples, transitions, organizational sequences, and syntax that balances "old" and "new" information within sentences. (For more on old-new, or topic-comment, syntax strategies, see the most recent edition of Joseph M. Williams, *Style: 10 Lessons in Clarity and Grace* [NY: Longman].)

CHAPTER SELECTIONS

Kathy Wollard, "Mirage Isn't a Figment of Your Imagination" and "That Funny and Embarrassing Hiccup May Actually Be Helpful to Your Body"

Synopsis. Analysis of these short science features, ideally in comparison with treatments of the same subjects in traditional reference works, will help your students recognize the rhetorical elements of even seemingly simple and direct explanations. Written for young people and their families, these articles have a light-hearted tone, but Wollard's explanations take readers' questions seriously. The question opening the mirage piece asks why patches of water appear on the road ahead but then disappear when one gets closer. Wollard's response first connects the apparent water patches to oasis-in-the-desert mirages and atmospheric effects that make the sky blue. Combining these concepts, she explains that what we really see is light from the sky passing through air heated by the hot asphalt road. The second article starts with a question about what makes us hiccup. After admitting that no one knows the cause for sure, Wollard describes the phenomenon in detailed anatomical terms, explains that hiccups probably protect us from sucking food particles into our lungs, and closes with recommended cures. (For columns on other questions and examples of the cartoon-like illustrations that accompany her newspaper pieces, visit her Website, "How Come? Science Discoveries for the Whole Family," at <http://www.greenapple.com/~words1/howcome.html>.)

Pathos. The feature's title—"How Come?"—and the full sentence headlines on each article reflect Wollard's direct conversational style. Students will no doubt enjoy examining her language (see p. 75 of *Reading Rhetorically)* and analyzing her strategies for communicating with a multi-aged audience. The second "Responding as a Reader" question (p. 261) calls for textual evidence of Wollard's assumptions about audience; finding that evidence will involve analysis not just of her explanation in paragraphs 12–16 but also of how she builds to it. Ask students to imagine encountering these articles while browsing through a newspaper. How likely would they be to read either of the pieces? To extend students' thinking about Wollard's relation to audience, use the third "Responding as a Writer" question, which asks them to compare her approach with treatments of these subjects in standard reference works. For productive comparisons, you might ask different students to report on different sources. Be sure to encourage at least one person to consult a children's encyclopedia. Have them examine what roles the different texts give readers to play. What do the texts seem to assume about their readers' purposes? (See additional suggestions for this exercise below under *logos*.)

Ethos. The opening sentences of each piece implicitly assert the significance of their content: someone wants to know something. The authority from which Wollard answers is also largely implied, via context, tone, and clarity. The feature's popularity suggests that thousands, maybe millions, take her seriously, and probably enjoy doing so. Discussion of such responses will help students understand how contexts of publication convey authority.

***Logos*.** Wollard's columns address basic questions and convey information about how the natural world "works." Her decidedly nonacademic approach builds slowly to the technical aspects of each explanation. Note in particular her use of contradictions and implicit surprises. By comparing her approach with more conventional reference sources, students can examine how examples and explanatory connections differ according to context and purpose as well as subject matter. Ask students to examine how two different types of text present specific information about the same subject. As part of connecting these differences to context, you could extend the conversation to examine economic and social factors that influence how, when, where, and by whom encyclopedias and newspapers are read. (Understanding of economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information is Standard #5 of the Association of College and Research Libraries' "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education." See <http://www.ala.org/acrl/ilstandardlo.html>.)

Marcy Gordon, "Once a Novelty, Now-Essential Credit Card Turns 50"

Synopsis. This lively Associated Press feature article uses anecdotes and interviews to provide considerable factual information about the origin and development of credit cards. Working with it will help students understand differences between journalistic and academic conventions for presenting information. The first half of the article treats the cards as an essential convenience, as indicated in the title, but at paragraph 23 Gordon shifts without much fanfare to the negative side of credit cards, covering a long list of problems and concerns, from mounting debt for college students (paragraph 24) to personal bankruptcies (paragraph 26). Deviating from the usual pyramid structure of news articles, the piece ends with an essay-like move, a few paragraphs that again celebrate credit cards.

Pathos. The evocative scene in the opening paragraph invites readers into an entertaining story, an invitation reinforced by the lengthy narrative headlines and subheads that ran with it in many newspapers.[5] However, once Gordon has covered the card's history, the second half of the article paints a different, and problematic picture of credit problems forecast briefly in paragraph 4. Students may vary in their response to this shift and their sense of whether the headlines are misleading.

Ethos. The conventions of newspaper reading mean that this story's mere appearance with an Associated Press byline, probably in a prominent position, would lead readers to grant the author credibility, whether or not they recognize her as someone who writes frequently about credit and personal finance. In the text, Gordon provides detailed credentials for the experts she paraphrases and quotes but never refers to herself. Students may find it useful to consider the quite different conventions that govern how they should assert credibility for their papers and for the experts they consult and cite in academic papers.

Logos. The two distinct halves of the article are crucial to analysis of the logic behind its overall presentation of information. Journalistic conventions permit such juxtaposition, but this kind of organization and opening would probably not be accepted in an academic paper. Ask students to examine the two sections to note differences not just in content, but also in sources, organization, and style, and to consider differences between academic and journalistic conventions for presenting information. The key difference, almost certainly, is that academic readers expect a clearly articulated central focus, even if that focus must wrestle with contradictions. Indeed, subject matter with inherent contradictions tends to be prized in many college classes. To guide students in exploring techniques for explaining complex, even contradictory phenomena, ask small groups to rewrite paragraphs 2–5 so that they forecast and explain more effectively what the overall story will present. Have some groups use the short paragraphs favored by newspapers and others create a single paragraph for an academic essay.

---

[5] The title in *Reading Rhetorically* is from the AP headline that accompanied the story when it was sent to newspapers. For a sampling of headlines newspapers used, see p. 267 of ***Reading Rhetorically.*** Only one of these forecasts the negatives in the article's second half. Note: the subheads from Milwaukee and Los Angeles tell contradictory stories about Frank McNamara's wallet.

***UC Berkeley Wellness Letter*, “Why Do Those #&*?@! ‘Experts’ Keep Changing Their Minds?”**

Synopsis. The various graphic and discursive techniques in this piece address readers’ presumed information needs from multiple angles. Intended as a lesson for non-experts on how to read and understand press reports about health research, the material focuses initially on the difficulty lay people have making personal health decisions in light of often conflicting research findings about the benefits and/or risks of antioxidants. The piece, originally a two-page spread in an 8.5-11 inch newsletter, includes two shaded boxes, one with a glossary (p. 271) and one with a list of “commonsense pointers” about what to look for when reading about health research (p. 273). The article itself unfolds this way:

Paragraphs 1–2: conversational, sympathetic recap of how difficult it is to figure out the implications of studies about dietary supplements

Paragraphs 3–4: explanation that experts don’t actually change their minds as often as headline writers make it appear and that “science is a process” of slowly accumulating evidence

Paragraphs 5–6: list of factors that complicate “the search for truth in a democracy” and an admonition to “keep your wits about you”; the rest of the article advises how to do that

Paragraph 7 (a bulleted list treated as one paragraph): description of three types of studies that can provide useful information for consumers

Paragraphs 8–11: reasons that reports about scientific studies must be read with skepticism, from the nature of the studies to the pragmatics of publicity and journalism

Paragraphs 13–15: why “the bottom line is pretty good”

Pathos. The clever, colloquial title immediately constructs a role for the reader as an exasperated consumer. How well does the title convey the content of the overall article? Comparisons to academic conventions are again apt. “Responding as a Reader” #2 asks students to evaluate an alternative opening. Question #3 asks students to consider what assumptions the various lists and boxes convey about the audience’s informational needs. What part of the article do they think would draw readers’ most careful attention?

Ethos. No author is listed for this piece; given its varying approaches to content, it may be that different people wrote different sections. What gives its content credibility? Publication context is one obvious answer, but productive discussion is likely to result from consideration of what its content and stance toward the audience contribute to credibility. How does the title, which might be considered smart-alecky, influence one's sense of the subject's significance and the article's credibility?

Logos. As a function of its authors' underlying assumptions about readers' interests, concerns, and knowledge levels, this article explains several different kinds of points (e.g., types of studies, how to read health reports, the impact of media competition). The "Thinking Critically About" questions suggest ways to help students recognize methods in the article that they can adapt for academic writing. Because the summary assignment (#2 on p. 274) underscores the multiple angles and uses of the article, it would be helpful to ask students to write summaries for different purposes, then to compare results and discuss the principles that guided their writing. In addition, paragraph 5's list of factors that complicate the ways health research is reported can lead to insights about how students must use their rhetorical reading skills to evaluate the reliability of materials they encounter during their own research.

Amy R. Wolfson and Mary A. Carskadon, "Sleep Schedules and Daytime Functioning in Adolescents"

Synopsis. This is the study from *Child Development* upon which the articles excerpted in Chapter 3 are based. Along with other studies by Carskadon in particular, this work has led to advocacy for later high school start times across the United States. The article is long and perhaps daunting—which is precisely why working with it is useful practice for reading difficult material. Learning about the conventions of scholarly articles like this one will help students glean information from refereed journal articles they are encounter when they do library research in many different classes. The headnote, extended reading log prompts, and "Thinking Critically About" questions will help you guide students to develop appropriate strategies for understanding the article's main points and the authors' assertion of their study's significance.

Reading and analyzing this article will help your students:

- develop skills for tackling difficult readings
- learn to read complicated material for specific purposes
- understand how to work with the conventional sections of a scientific study (e.g., abstract, literature review, methods, results, discussion, implications—exact titles will vary in different fields and journals)
- recognize the rhetorical elements of a literature review, i.e., paragraphs 1–14, labeled "introduction" in this article (See "Responding as a Writer" #1 and #2 on pp. 296–297.)
- recognize the function of statistical presentations within research reports

(See “Responding as a Writer” #3 on pp. 297–298.)

To prepare students to tackle this article, we recommend assigning the sections in Chapter 3 about “Texts and Their Rhetorical Context” (the article excerpts about the sleep research begin on p. 31) and about “Learning from the Practices of Experienced Readers” (pp. 34–39). Especially pertinent is the discussion about how physicists read scientific articles (p. 37). In addition, work with the *Wellness Letter* article immediately preceding this one will help students recognize why Wolfson and Carskadon must offer caveats that acknowledge limitations of their research (e.g., paragraphs 41 and 42). As the *Wellness Letter* article explains for its lay audience: “Science is a process” (paragraph 4, p. 269).

Wolfson and Carskadon’s purpose, principal findings, and recommendations are not difficult to understand. They wanted to examine the relationship between sleep habits and daytime functioning, so they asked several thousand high school students in Rhode Island to fill out a Sleep Habits Survey about how much they sleep, what they do and feel during the day, and how well they do in school. The abstract’s statement of their findings is easy to understand, and probably easy for your students to identify with: “most of the adolescents surveyed do not get enough sleep, and their sleep loss interferes with daytime functioning” (p. 276). Also clear are the implications of these findings laid out in paragraphs 36 and 43: early school start times are problematic, research is needed from additional disciplinary perspectives, and professionals must work together to promote the well-being of adolescents.

More difficult to understand, of course, are the details in the full description of those results (pp. 282–287), yet those details, and the discussion based upon them (pp. 287–293), are what have made the study important and publishable in this prestigious journal. To help students fit together the pieces that support the authors’ powerful assertions in this scholarly context, help them recognize what the major sections of a conventional scientific research report *do* (as opposed to *say*). This kind of work will help them apply what they have learned when they encounter other difficult articles so that they can discern, as the physicists discussed in Chapter 3 do, which parts of a given article will address their reasons for reading.

Pathos. It may seem irrelevant to analyze *pathos* in a scientific report, which by its nature focuses on subject matter and would seem to leave little flexibility for readers’ roles. However, if we recognize that the concept encompasses the many ways that texts work to engage readers (*Reading Rhetorically*, p. 74), it becomes clear that careful adherence to professional conventions and even the cool, dispassionate presentation of research statistics are part of what draws readers into a text. Students need to understand that in refereed journals the readers who must first be persuaded of authors' credibility and reasoning are peer reviewers, who have a gatekeeping function. Wolfson and Carkskadon's understated but direct assertions of the importance of their findings' significant policy implications for high schools suggest a secondary audience of educators. For Responding as a Reader" question #3, which asks students to identify places where the authors (a) connect with readers' everyday lives and (b) assert the significance of the subject matter, we suggest drawing attention to paragraphs 32–36, 38, 40, 43, and 44.

Ethos. The fact that Wolfson and Carskadon's results and statements of implications were published in a peer-reviewed journal enabled various news and magazine writers to take them seriously. At least three factors contribute to the impact of ethos here. First, as above, careful design and presentation of the study earned approval for publication. Second, the literature review (labeled "introduction" here) makes the study's broad significance clear. Third, within the cool dignity of this research journal, additional impact comes from the everyday language the authors use to describe the effects of sleep loss and their clear, direct assertions of their findings' importance.

Logos. The conventional sections of a research report necessarily dictate its pattern of reasoning. Of all the articles in the chapter, this one probably has the most minutely articulated statements of connections and significance, which students can track as they work through the article on a second reading, perhaps following the structural pattern suggested in the synopsis above or taking a more personal approach based on the preliminary questions suggested in the second reading log prompt. Another activity for helping students recognize the logos inherent in research reports would be to ask students to imagine that they had been participants in the study. What would they have wanted to know before they decided to participate? What would they want to know as they read the article? It seems likely that their brainstorming would generate question categories similar to the study's main parts: (a) What is already known about the subject? (b) What do the researchers want to find out? (c) How will they go about finding out? (d) What did they find out? (e) Why is that important? (f) What's next?

Paul Irgang, "When a Wet Vac Counts More Than a Ph.D."

Synopsis. In this short, wry piece, Irgang, a "building-maintenance worker II" at the University of Miami in Florida, asserts the value of his skills and work ethic against those of "any Ph.D. in theoretical physics" (paragraph 9).

It offers students a skillful example of an author bringing an uncomfortable point to his readers' attention in an entertaining way.

Pathos. The intended audience, readers of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, consists primarily of university administrators and faculty. Irgang's techniques for hooking them and keeping them reading despite their almost certain discomfort at times include jokes, irony, and literary references. The "Responding as a Reader" questions encourage students to analyze his techniques and to examine on the contrast and congruence between *what* he says and *how* he says it.

Ethos. Irgang writes from personal experience and illustrates the importance of his work with both common (keeping keys, changing light bulbs) and unusual (saving 10,000-year-old ice core samples) examples. His humor undoubtedly adds to his credibility, yet the double-edge of irony keeps asserting the seriousness of his subject matter.

Logos. This is the first of the three pieces in the chapter that perhaps edge closer to explicit persuasion than exposition, an issue raised in the Strand 2 writing assignment on page 335. The surface network of reasoning here is not complex: the writer uses examples to describe his job and its importance. But, as is frequently the case in informative writing, Irgang's explanation of his work and its importance is complicated by its undergirding of implicit assumptions about values, values that he cannot be certain are shared by his intended audience. His early reference to the "unofficial, yet undeniable caste system" (paragraph 2) suggests that he may be challenging some readers' assumptions, not just expanding their image of building maintenance workers. The third "Responding as a Writer" question (p. 301) invites students to use freewriting and discussion to reflect upon the values implied and assumed in the essay as well as its overall effect upon them.

Nancy Mairs, "Body in Trouble"

Synopsis. The complex mixture of personal revelation and social commentary in this piece make it an excellent focal point for the rhetorical analysis project at the end of Chapter 5. Describing disability as "at once a metaphorical and a material state" (paragraph 5), Mairs decries linguistic and cultural assumptions that rob wheelchair-bound people like her of dignity. Her prose, while at times delightfully witty, is uncomfortably defiant and poignant at other points. She asks, "is a woman for whom any action at all is nearly impossible capable of right action, or am I just being morally cocky here?"

(paragraph 9). At the essay's end she asserts her capacity for moral action through writing, for which she uses the sharp instrument of her tongue and a waist high keyboard. As the population ages, she says, others will join her in disability, and her job is to conceptualize "a habitable world: a world that wants me in it" (paragraph 14).

Pathos. Mairs writes for a fairly educated audience, readers who can take her direct, often irreverent observations, who will enjoy her examination of dead metaphors that equate physical vigor with moral quality, and who will appreciate her feminist stance and allusions. Some students may find the subject difficult to read about, but others will find her frankness engaging. Discussion comparing points in the text that raise distinct responses will undoubtedly lead to examination of her language, literal and figurative.

Ethos and Logos. Mairs' assertion of character is so intertwined with this text's reasoning that it is difficult to discuss ethos and logos separately. Her project, in the essay and in the book in which it appeared, is very much a presentation of her worldview, both her ideological take on the world and her literal view of it from wheelchair level. She writes in response to both. Her personal experience, indeed, her own suffering, serves not only as the basis of her credibility but of her reasoning. The complexity of her engagement with the world despite the raw simplicity of her difficulties in negotiating through it energizes her prose. Her last paragraph reminds readers that they, too, are likely to experience disability, a point that might serve as an implicit argument for paying attention to what she has to say if it came early in the piece rather than late. Instead, it serves to bolster the value of her commitment to mapping her world by naming what she sees.

Peter Marin, "Helping and Hating the Homeless"

Synopsis. Marin states his purpose clearly in paragraph 6: "to try to illuminate some of the darker corners of homelessness." The result is an extensive examination of the causes of homelessness and of the middle class's fearful responses to it. The author draws upon academic sources as well as his own experiences with homeless people, including not only positive interactions (e.g., paragraphs 1, 24, and 52–54) but also feeling threatened when strangers sleep in the park near his house (paragraphs 35–36). Analysis of Marin's content and technique will give students experience grappling with complex, multi-faceted rhetorical strategies as well as with sometimes uncomfortable subject matter.

A descriptive outline assignment (*does-says* analysis) will help students discern the article's structure. After the six-paragraph introduction, it divides into four parts: two sections of personal narrative and commentary frame two relatively academic sections that consider first, changes in the American landscape since the 1960s that have narrowed options for the poor, and second, the eighteenth century European roots of contemporary attitudes toward the poor.

Marin's primary points are three: (a) that homeless people fall into two groups, those who are "hapless victims" and those who are "voluntary exiles" (paragraph 16); (b) that middle class efforts to help the poor are driven more by fear and a desire for control than by compassion (paragraphs 36, 43–47); (c) that American society needs those who voluntarily marginalize themselves—"When margins vanish, society becomes too rigid, too oppressive by far" (paragraph 58). His final reflective section asks, "What does a society owe to its members in trouble, and *how* is that debt to be paid?" (paragraph 48). Our response, he concludes, will "determine…something crucial…about our own souls."

Pathos. Marin's complex reader-focused strategies and evident assumptions about audience are worth examining because the fears and avoidances of his presumably middle-class readers are one of his major concerns. For example, his frequent use of "you" and "we" implicates readers in even his most complex intellectual analysis, and metacomments such as "the point is" or "let me put it as simply as I can" (paragraphs 5 and 61) insist that readers pay attention. The "Responding as a Reader" questions on page 320 offer both text-based and reflective ways to analyze how (and if) Marin avoids offending readers, earns acceptance of his sometimes discomfiting points, and builds to his closing existential appeal.

Ethos. The personal frames the analytical in this essay, and thus dominates it. Marin begins on an intimate note by revealing his childhood fantasy of a solitary old age amidst used bookstores; he ends with a homily. His strong authorial voice almost revels in contradictions: homeless strangers in his neighborhood annoy and frighten him (paragraphs 35–36), yet he values the world of homeless people "as a place to hide or rest" (paragraph 58). Theirs is a world where he has roots, and his sympathies remain with the voluntarily homeless. It is from this identification that both his credibility and sense of urgency grow.

Logos. This article exemplifies a mixture of multiple rhetorical aims within a nevertheless unified and serious text. Personal narration and reflection mix with expository paragraphs that follow a traditional form of point-support-comment. He illustrates his analytic points with his own experience, anecdotes from students, and evidence from historical research. Throughout, he works with a logic of contradiction and struggle. In the end, he draws together the dichotomies of his discussion by describing two types of drama visible on city streets—the struggle of those who want to regain their place in society and the struggle of those who want to survive outside of society. The resolution, he says, depends on a third drama "at the heart of the culture" between our generosity and our darker impulses of fear and "love of order and control" (paragraph 62).

Thomas Roepsch, "America's Love Affair with Pizza: A Guilty Pleasure No More"

Synopsis. This short student paper asserting the health benefits of eating pizza provides a model of a straightforward research-based paper. Assigned to explain "surprising good news" about something commonly misunderstood or considered problematic, Roepsch uses material from general circulation health magazines to point out that fatty ingredients are not essential to good pizza and to report that tomato sauce has newly discovered health benefits, benefits that may be enhanced when the sauce is combined with certain kinds of fat.

Pathos. Roepsch's text assumes readers share his enthusiasm for pizza and are interested in healthy eating. His colloquial title and opening paragraph underscore this connection via a wry tone and vivid phrases such as "devouring a greasy pizza straight out of the box." His opening establishes tension between common views that pizza is unhealthy and the welcome news that nutritionists have recently changed their view of pizza, even to the point of saying that it might save lives. What pizza lover wouldn't keep reading?

Ethos. Assigned to write a research-based informative paper, Roepsch follows convention by not referring to himself, much less to his stake as a restaurateur in promoting the eating of pizza. He asserts credibility by referring to experts and nutritionists and using parenthetical citations to credit the sources listed on his Works Cited page.

Logos. The straightforward logic of Roepsch's paper is basic to exposition. His well-explained connections between the evidence and his points assume that published reports from experts will foster acceptance of information that, although surprising, will enhance enjoyment of a favorite food. However, the paper ignores complexities that critical readers should probably recognize as inherent to research about nutrition and health (see the *Wellness Letter* article, pp. 268-273). Indeed, your students may find fault with Roepsch's treatment of the contradictory information about fat content in paragraph 7; they may even question the reliability of sources that do not bring up limitations on the research they report. (Suggestions for improving the paper might include using more qualified language, using attributive tags to signal the sources of information, going back to his sources to look for caveats he omits, and, finally, glancing at *Magazines for Libraries* to check the reputation of the popular magazines he cites. Perhaps there are more reliable, and nevertheless readable, sources to be consulted.

C.J. Hribal, "Consent" (Fiction)

Synopsis. A child has drowned at Atwood Acres. As real estate developer Porter Atwood arrives at the scene, he reflects that the incident will confirm the existence of his subdivision as a distinct place, Atwood Acres, and vainly hopes that the incident happened in a swimming pool, not the picturesque creek he considers a selling point. In this disturbing story about character and class, a third person narrator relates in detail Atwood's silent guess about what happened among the group of boys playing with boats in the creek. Organizing discussion of the story around this chapter's key rhetorical concepts will enhance students' understanding of those concepts as well as the "truth" of literary texts.

Pathos. Porter's explanation of what happened is constructed to engage readers, not other characters. Ask students to examine carefully the way that they are drawn into the world of the story (see "Responding as a Reader #2), then to scrutinize the parallel process of being drawn into the story within the story, Porter's "guess" about what happened. What clicks for them? Where do they resist? What elements of character, setting, and narrative background are most important to their acceptance or rejection of Porter's version of events?

Ethos. Porter Atwood's worldview and personality are essential factors in readers' ability to find his character realistic and his version of the drowning credible. How believable do students find Atwood on either score? What details add to or detract from their understanding of either element of the story? Although the narrator gives us the story through Porter's eyes, Hribal has left distance between them. (See "Responding as a Reader #3.) Ask students to try to delineate this distinction, then to decide how it affects their experience of the story. What is the effect of the narrator typically calling him "Porter," for example, not "Atwood"? Finally, how important is it that we take Porter's version of events to be true? Why?

Logos. In fiction, *logos* can be understood as the network of reasoning that drives the plot, which in turn establishes the believability of events, motivation, character, and so forth. This believability is of course inextricably tied to readers' engagement with the story and the credibility of the narrator and main characters. Examining these factors from the perspective of plot events can often lead to new insights. Ask students to consider, for example, the type of evidence the story provides to support its characterizations of Porter, the drowning victim Danny, and the other boys at the ravine. Does the text provide enough discursive explanation of how the story's various elements connect to each other? Too much? Does it provide a credible counter to Porter's views of the people of Atwood Acres and the story's events?

HELPING STUDENTS WITH THE WRITING PROJECTS

Analysis of the chapter's selections in light of *pathos, ethos,* and *logos* will help students compose informative and explanatory texts that persuade readers of their significance and reliability.

Explaining What You Know

Cast in terms of the chapter's concept of exposition as changing readers' view of subject matter, the generic informing/explaining assignment used for Strand 1 (p. 335) leaves as many subject matter and rhetorical variables as open as possible so that individual instructors or students can define them. As part of invention, it recommends a written analysis of the rhetorical task writers set for themselves. This analysis can serve as a checklist for evaluating an initial draft in light of *pathos, ethos,* and *logos*. Experience shows that students' biggest challenges with assignments like this one involve (a) avoiding values-based arguments that treat readers' current views as *wrong* rather than incomplete or inaccurate, (b) providing sufficient supporting evidence, and (c) explaining connections that link specific evidence and illustrations to the paper's overall explanatory purpose.

Avoiding Argument. For a powerful invention activity that will keep students focused on an informative purpose, have them use a two-column grid for brainstorming, with one column labeled, "Readers' Current View," and the second labeled, "How I Want Readers' View to Change." The ideas and details they list in the two columns should be based on facts, not opinions or values. For help distinguishing factual points from values points, students should review "A Further Look at Writers' Purposes" in Chapter 2 (pp. 21-26).

Sufficient Support. Many writers new to a field find it difficult to judge how much needs to be said about something, in general or in specific. First-year college students who write about topics that require research in unfamiliar fields are likely to think that material speaks for itself and to thus err on the side of brevity. A checklist like the following can help students avoid this problem.
Does your paper contain enough evidence to *show* readers the truth of your main points, not just *tell* them? To put it another way, do your paragraphs contain enough specifics to *do* what they *say*—to enlarge the reader's view of your subject matter?

Have you included evidence from several reliable sources, avoiding the mistake of relying too much on a single source?
Will readers recognize the credibility of the information sources you use and cite?

Clear Connections. Omitted or insufficient explanatory material represents the flip side of the previous problem, but the cause is often similar: assuming that material speaks for itself. Here are more possible checklist questions.
Do your paragraphs make clear the *point* you want your specifics to get across?
Have you avoided the mistake of letting specific details speak for themselves?
Have you explained to readers how the points in individual paragraphs tie together to accomplish your overall purpose of enlarging their view of your subject matter?

Examining Rhetorical Strategies

As we noted at the beginning of this chapter, the line between explanation and persuasion is sometimes difficult to discern. This chapter's Strand 2 assignment (pp. 335–336) provides an opportunity for students to explore both sides of the line by doing a comparative rhetorical analysis. The assignment asks them to examine the persuasive and explanatory elements in two of the three chapter selections where explanations implicitly challenge readers' attitudes and present sometimes uncomfortable ideas: Irgang, Mairs, and Marin. (You may, of course, wish to simplify the assignment by having students analyze only one of the texts.) All three of these authors are implicitly advocating a new view of people on the margins, a term used by Mairs and Marin and implicit in Irgang. Like the Strand 2 prompt in the previous chapter, this assignment suggests both an exigence (evaluating the textbook authors' categories) and an analytical structure, in this case purpose and reader-focused strategies. (For additional suggestions for coaching students on rhetorical analysis assignments, see the extended discussion at the end of our chapter about teaching *Reading Rhetorically* Part Two.)

Extending the Conversation

By stipulating informing and explaining as the purpose, this chapter's Strand 3 assignment (p. 336), like the previous chapter's, provides a variation on its Strand 1 assignment. Here, the third assignment calls for a researched update on the subject that motivated the *Wellness Letter* article: the appropriate role for antioxidants in human nutrition. Similar updating projects that could result in expository papers are suggested in the third “Responding as a Writer” questions with the Gordon article on credit cards (p. 267) and the Marin article on homelessness (p. 321). Another updating project would seek recent information about research on teens’ sleep habits and further developments regarding changes in high school starting times. A place to begin this research would be the Website of the National Sleep Foundation (NSF). Carskadon co-chaired the NSF’s National Sleep and Teens Task Force, which issued a major report on “Adolescent Sleep Needs and Patterns” in April 2000. See <http://www.sleepfoundation.org/publications/teensleep.html>.

All of these research activities lend themselves to collaborative research efforts by teams working on behalf of the class at large and can be undertaken as the basis of oral reports rather than formal papers.

Thematic Connections

Here we list suggestions for assigning Chapter 11 texts with others that have similar subject matter but perhaps different rhetorical aims, or readings in other chapters that include sections with expository aims.

_ The need for skillful rhetorical reading of material about scientific and medical research ties together the articles by the *UC Berkeley Wellness Letter*, Wolfson and Carskadon, and the student paper by Roepsch.

_ To contrast the explanatory purpose of the *Wellness Letter* article with an argumentative one, you might pair it with the *NEJM* editorial in Chapter 15, which is written for a quite different audience, medical experts and journalists, and proposes a set of guidelines for journalists so that the limitations of research findings are made clearer to the public.

_ The selections by Savage and Boxer in Chapter 12, “Analyzing and Interpreting,” explain particular ways of approaching certain phenomena. (The other pieces in this chapter are less concerned with informing and explaining and more with forwarding a particular analysis.)

_ In Chapter 16, “Seeking Common Ground,” the selection by Michlowski explains processes for resolving conflict and the article by Ginsburg reports on how adversaries in a controversy found common ground.

CHAPTER 12

Reading and Writing Texts That Analyze and Interpret

Since writing assignments that ask students to analyze and interpret phenomena are common across the curriculum, your students will should find this chapter useful in preparing for assignments they are likely to receive in a variety of courses. Moreover, our experience suggests that students have difficulty with this type of assignment and therefore benefit from explicit instruction in how to go about analysis and interpretation. In Part Two of this manual, we discuss rhetorical analysis, a particularly powerful type of analytical method that can be used to interpret both written and media texts. Here we discuss analysis and interpretation more generally and suggest additional approaches.

By reading and writing analyses and interpretations, your students will learn:

how analysis leads to interpretation
how to read texts that analyze and interpret critically
how to identify formal, structural, and conceptual methods of analysis
how to recognize the values and beliefs behind a writer's analysis and interpretation

HELPING STUDENTS UNDERSTAND ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

When asked to analyze, students often evaluate. That is, they respond in terms of what they like or don't like about a text's ideas or in terms of what they agree or don't agree with about the text's claims. We have found that very few students have had experience in reading and writing analytically, or if they have had such experience, it is not sufficient to meet the expectations of college teachers. To introduce this relatively unfamiliar way of reading and writing, you will probably wish to devote class time to discussion of pp. 337–339 of *Reading Rhetorically* and to the "Thinking Critically About" questions that follow each reading.

In this chapter, students learn about analysis by examining how expert writers go about analyzing and interpreting complex phenomena. Because analysis and interpretation are central to academic inquiry, it is important that students understand the purpose and process of analysis. The purpose of analysis, as we explain in the introduction to *Reading Rhetorically's* Chapter 12, is to understand a puzzling phenomenon–a text, an event, a natural occurrence, and so on. The writer's question or puzzlement leads to an analysis in which the writer uses methods that he or she believes can lead to new insight or understanding. Analysis involves examining the phenomenon systematically which result in conclusions, interpretations, and/or new questions. To help students understand analysis and interpretation, we suggest that you draw their attention to the following aspects of analysis and interpretation:

1. Purpose of the Analysis

Writers analyze phenomena in order to answer various kinds of questions: How does this phenomenon work? Why is it as it is? What does it mean? However, the writer's questions or reasons for perplexity are not always made explicit. Identifying the question or questions behind the analysis is important because these questions not only suggest the writer's purpose but also explain why the writer chooses a particular method of analysis. For example, Roland Barthes in "Toys" implicitly asks, "What is the meaning of French toys?" His purpose is to expose what they reveal about French culture, and his method is to discuss both their form and their function. We recommend that you begin discussion of analytical texts by asking students to identify or infer the questions or puzzlement that prompted the text. As the class proceeds to discuss the text, they can refer to these questions to confirm or revise their initial identification and to connect these questions to the writer's analytical strategies and rhetorical choices.

2. Method(s) of Analysis as Terministic Screens

The question that prompts the analysis determines the writer's method of analysis, which, in turn, becomes what Kenneth Burke calls a "terministic screen," a way of seeing the phenomenon. Since there are always many different ways of seeing or analyzing a phenomenon, the writer's choice of a method reveals particular values and concerns. That is, the method—the terms, concepts, or structural components used to "take apart" the phenomenon—is tied to the writer's interests and world view, and the method shapes the conclusions or interpretations that result from the analysis. In the reading selections in this chapter, for example, Geoffrey Miller analyzes various behaviors using terms and assumptions drawn from evolutionary psychology. These terms form a terministic screen that shape his conclusions. Natalie Angier analyzes some of the same behaviors from a feminist perspective or terministic screen and her conclusions are quite different from Miller's. They interpret similar phenomena differently because their methods of analysis are drawn from quite contrary terministic screens.

Generally, writers have three kinds of analytical methods available to them for systematically taking apart a phenomenon: (1) formal techniques such as comparison/contrast, cause/effect, form/function, division/classification, etc.; (2) preconceived structural categories—e.g., the classical parts of a tragedy—exposition, rising action, climax, and denouement; or (3) conceptual categories that come from someone's theory or interpretation of similar phenomenon–e.g., Freud's terminology for interpreting dreams or Keynes's terminology for interpreting economic trends. Often, writers combine these methods. For example, Kirk Savage combines formal techniques, specifically comparison/contrast, with conceptual categories, specifically, differing "logics of commemoration" in his analysis of the meaning of memorials. A useful way to think about a writer's method of analysis is as a demonstration of her or his **reasoning**.

By drawing students' attention to authors' analytical methods, you offer them models to apply in writing their own analyses. Important questions to discuss in relation to analytical methods are these: Is the method of analysis appropriate to the question being asked? Does the writer use evidence to back up his or her analytical points? How does this method serve as a terministic screen or way of seeing? What other methods of analysis might have been used to examine this phenomenon?

3. Relationship Between the Analysis and Interpretation

The outcome of the writer's analysis is usually an interpretation or a conclusion that offers a new understanding of the subject. Sometimes the outcome is a new set of questions, and sometimes the interpretation may be implied rather than directly stated. You might ask students to examine the relationship between the analysis and interpretation by asking the following questions: Does the method of analysis support the interpretation offered or should the author have used other methods of analysis in order to support this interpretation convincingly? Does the author provide evidence to support the analytical claims that she or he makes? Do these analytical claims add up to or warrant the interpretation offered? Does the author mention other possible interpretations? If so, does the author treat these interpretations fairly but at the same time show why his or her interpretation is more plausible? Of what significance is this new perspective or interpretation?

CHAPTER SELECTIONS

To help you select and teach texts from this chapter, we provide a synopsis of each selection and notes on its special rhetorical features.

Kirk Savage's "The Past in the Present: The Life of Memorials"

Synopsis: Savage contrasts two views of public memorials or monuments–(1) as fixed in meaning, offering a closed interpretation of the past or (2) as open in meaning, provoking continual reinterpretation of the past in light of the present. Although Savage discusses both of these viewpoints, he clearly argues for the latter view. To support his argument, Savage compares the Emancipation Monument in Washington, which attempted "to purify the past of any continuing conflict" with various monuments to the Civil Rights movement that make it clear that the meaning of memorials is never fixed or closed but always contested and subject to change.

Purpose of the Analysis: Savage states the exigence for his analysis in paragraph 4: "Today, as we are experiencing an explosion of interest in erecting public monuments, it is useful to explore whether this anxiety [about whether monuments are ways of remembering or forgetting] is still–or was ever–justified." Later, in paragraph 5, he formulates this exigence as a question: "Why lavish time and money on monuments, especially if 'true' memory indeed resides elsewhere?" (paragraph 5). As the essay unfolds, he implicitly asks other related questions: Does a public monument fix the meaning of an historical figure or event or are monuments continually open to interpretation? Do public monuments enable people to better understand the present in terms of the past? Can monuments "design" or "engineer" memory? It becomes clear that Savage's chief interest is in how public monuments can help us "define the problems and opportunities we face in the present" (paragraph 8).

To link his purpose with his method of analysis and objects of study, ask students why they think he chose to compare Civil War and Civil Rights movement monuments.

Method(s) of Analysis as Terministic Screens: To address these questions, Savage uses the formal technique of comparison/contrast to analyze two differing "logics of commemoration" and monuments that represent these logics. Before students can understand Savage's analysis, they need to understand what he means by an "older logic of commemoration." According to Savage, the "older logic of commemoration" aims to "celebrate and cement [a] progressive narrative of national history" (paragraph 5). He critiques this logic as "shrivel[ing] history" and trying "to purify the past of any continuing conflict" (paragraph). He proceeds to illustrate this "older logic" through his discussion of the "so-called" Emancipation Monument in Washington (paragraph 7) and the Lee Monument in Richmond, Virginia (paragraph 9). Although he never labels it as such, the newer "logic of commemoration" that Savage supports understands that "the world around a monument is never fixed. . . . The history of monuments themselves is no more closed than the history they commemorate" (paragraph 8). This newer logic is illustrated by the later addition of the Ashe Monument to Monument Avenue in Richmond and by various monuments to the Civil Rights movement such as Maya Lin's memorial at the Southern Poverty Law Center in Montgomery (paragraph 13), James Drake's monuments in Kelly Ingram Park in Birmingham (paragraph 13), and the as-yet unbuilt monument in Wilmington, North Carolina.

In order to help students arrive at this understanding of the two "logics of commemoration," without your directly telling them, ask them to make two columns, with one labeled "old logic of commemoration" and the other "new logic of commemoration." Under each column, ask them to place specific monuments that they believe represent this logic. Then, using the specific monuments as references, ask them to define the two logics of commemoration in a paragraph. Savage's method of analysis or terministic screen is, of course, only one of the possible ways in which one might analyze monuments. Ask students to consider other bases or methods for analyzing monuments–for example, on the basis of aesthetics, cost, geographic placement, etc.

Relationship Between Analysis and Interpretation: Savage's analysis of various civil rights memorials clearly supports his conclusion that while "the design of public monuments is obviously important . . . the design cannot claim to engineer memory. The inner memories of a culture profoundly shape how its monuments are experienced and lived. The fate of the civil rights memorials will ultimately depend upon how the movement itself is remembered and reinterpreted in the complex reality of the present" (paragraph 16). Perhaps the most dramatic illustration of how memorials change in meaning and significance is the history of the memorials on Monument Avenue in Richmond, Virginia, that began with a monument of Robert E. Lee and concluded with a monument of Arthur Ashe (paragraph 9). Ask students if they can think of other memorials that also demonstrate Savage's conclusion that the meaning of memorials is never fixed but always shifting according to present issues. Can they think of memorials that have been controversial in the making or that have later become controversial?

Sarah Boxer's "I Shop, Ergo I Am: The Mall as Society's Mirror"

Synopsis: Sarah Boxer reports on various analyses and interpretations of shopping by cultural studies' scholars. After offering a brief history of the term "shopping," she proceeds to discuss interpretations of shopping's social significance through the ages–as creating a "counter-public" sphere for women in 18^{th} and 19^{th} centuries, as offering an opportunity for civil action in the 19^{th} and 20^{th} centuries, and as signaling new constraints on civil liberties in the 21^{st} century. For most of the article, Boxer keeps a journalistic distance from the interpretations she is reporting. However, in the last paragraph, she suggests that she, too, feels some alarm about the social implications of shopping in the new superstores.

Purpose of Analysis: Since Boxer is reporting on others' analyses of shopping rather than offering her own analysis, it would be interesting to ask students how they would define her purpose in writing this article? What is her attitude toward the analyses she presents? Her apparent underlying purpose is suggested in paragraphs 20-22, where she indirectly and directly poses two questions: What might the experience of shopping at superstores tell us "about the dangers lurking in society at large?" and "What does one man's shopping experience at Best Buy tell us about the dangers of modern life in America?"

Method(s) of Analysis and Terministic Screens: The general method of analysis used by all of the scholars Boxer cites is a cultural studies approach. Briefly (and overly simply), a cultural studies approach views ordinary activities as having social significance. More specifically, Boxer presents three conceptual lenses or terministic screens for understanding the significance of shopping in particular eras: shopping as a social occasion, shopping as civil action, and shopping as "'an activity that makes the impact of economic institutions on everyday life critically intelligible'" (paragraph 20). To demonstrate cultural studies methods of analysis, ask students to consider other possible ways of analyzing or interpreting shopping. Or ask them to choose another ordinary activity to analyze for its possible cultural meanings.

Relationship Between Analysis and Interpretation: In the final paragraphs, Boxer appears to agree with the interpretations of other cultural critics. Specifically, she suggests that superstores no longer offer customers opportunities for socializing nor for "exercising their minimal rights" as citizen-shoppers. Rather, they are places that reveal how deeply we are socialized by consumer culture, and they are places where our every move is monitored by security guards. Since so much of her essay depends on others' analyses rather than on her own, ask students how they respond to her conclusions in paragraphs

21 and 22. Are her conclusions credible? Also, ask them to consider whether or not they think the single example of the Kahlow case warrants this conclusion? What other kinds of analysis and evidence might she marshal to support this conclusion? Do their experiences in superstores support this conclusion or do their experiences call this conclusion into question?

Roland Barthes's "Toys"

Synopsis: Barthes's *Mythologies* was originally published in France in 1957; its English translation was published in 1972. Barthes's cultural criticism of wide range of everyday French cultural objects anticipates the work of contemporary cultural studies scholars. In "Toys" Barthes analyzes the cultural meaning of French toys of the 1950s and concludes that they function to socialize children into adult roles and to stunt children's creativity through their representational and unaesthetic forms.

Purpose of Analysis: In this essay Barthes implicitly asks, "What is the meaning of French toys?" His purpose is to expose what they reveal about French culture. To enable students to make the connection between purpose and method of analysis, ask students to predict his method of analysis based on his implicit question. Alternatively, ask your students to brainstorm a list of contemporary everyday objects, including toys, and then ask students what methods of analysis they might use to investigate the social significance of these objects.

Method(s) of Analysis as Terministic Screens: Barthes uses three structural terms to analyze French toys: in paragraph 3, he analyzes their **form** and **function**; and in paragraph 4, he analyzes their **substances**. A less obvious aspect of his analysis turns on the conceptual term **bourgeois**, which signals a negative set of values for Barthes. Since toys are classified by Barthes as "bourgeois" in "status," they are not surprisingly interpreted disparagingly as "graceless, products of chemistry, not of nature." To demonstrate how key terms work together to produce a terministic screen, ask students to combine these three structural terms (form, function, substance) with a positive rather than a negative term and then describe these same types of toys—dolls that wet, military toys, cars, etc.

Relationship Between Analysis and Interpretation: Noteworthy in Barthes's concise four-paragraph analysis is his arrangement. He begins in paragraphs 1 and 2 with his conclusions or interpretations, then uses paragraphs 3 and 4 to present the analysis upon which these conclusions are based. To evaluate the effect of this arrangement, ask students to read the essay beginning with paragraphs 3 and 4 and concluding with paragraphs 1 and 2. Is there any difference in effect? Alternatively, ask them to write a paragraph in which they analyze a cultural object, first by stating their conclusion in the paragraph topic statement and then supporting that conclusion through their analysis, and second by reversing the order. What difference do they experience in the effect, particularly the authoritativeness, of their analysis? Can they think of rhetorical situations in which one arrangement would work better than the other?

Toni Cade Bambara's "The Lesson"

Synopsis: Told from the point of view of the street-smart, tough-talking Sylvia, "The Lesson" is a story about a group of African American children's "field trip" to F.A.O. Schwartz. The trip is organized by Miss Moore, a college-educated woman "with nappy hair and proper speech," who has moved into a poor New York City neighborhood and taken on the "responsibility for the young ones' education" (paragraph 1). As the story progresses, the lesson for this particular day becomes clearer and clearer. What is less clear is Sylvia's interpretation and response to this lesson.

Purpose of Analysis: It is always risky to attribute a particular purpose to a literary author. To do so risks what literary theorists call an "intentional fallacy." Yet it seems clear that analysis and interpretation are at the center of this story. You might suggest to the class that they talk about the analysis and interpretation in this story in two ways: (1) the analysis and interpretation evident on the part of the characters in the story; and (2) the analysis and interpretation the story prompts in us as readers. Miss Moore's lesson for this day is about money (paragraph 2). To teach the children about money, or more specifically about this country's economic inequities, Miss Moore takes them to F.A.O. Schwartz toy store on 5th Avenue. Miss Moore hopes that the children will learn through observation and induction about the unfairness of a society in which "some people can spend on a toy what it would cost to feed a family of six or seven" (paragraph 50). As the story concludes, it is clear that some of the children, particularly Sylvia and her friend Sugar "get" the point of the lesson (paragraph 49). Miss Moore's question to them, and to perhaps us as readers, is "And? . . . What do you think?" (paragraph 49-50).

Method(s) of Analysis as Terministic Screens: As just suggested, Miss Moore's teaching method involves analysis by inductive comparison. Her "lesson plan" anticipates the children's fascination with the toys at F.A.O. Schwartz, their shock at their exorbitant cost, and their comparison of these costs with the money available to their own families. She counts on their asking questions like the one asked by Sylvia: “Who’d pay all that when you can buy a sailboat set for a quarter at Pop’s, a tube of glue for a dime, and a ball of string for eight cents?” asks Sylvia (Paragraph 27). Miss Moore intends for these comparisons to lead children to conclude that if the rich can afford to spend extravagantly on toys when their families have trouble paying the rent and putting food on the table, then our economic system is unjust. As the title, this is the story of a lesson, and the lesson’s method is analysis and interpretation.

But what, you may wish to ask your students, is the lesson we’re supposed to learn as readers? That is, how are we to analyze and interpret this story’s various lessons? Are we supposed to learn the same lesson as the children? Are we supposed to learn additional lessons? What is the significance of making Sylvia the narrator? Ask your students to trace Sylvia’s evolving response to the lesson. Initially, she is dismissive–“And Miss Moore asking us do we know what money is, like we a bunch of retards” (paragraph 2)–and hostile–“And then she gets to the part about we all poor and live in the slums, which I don’t feature” (paragraph 3). Eventually, however, Sylvia is drawn in and participates in the lesson despite her resistance. What are we to make of these changes in Sylvia’s perspective? Of the relationship between the older Sylvia as narrator and her portrayal of her younger self? What are we to make of the last line? Did she interpret the lesson Miss Moore intended? How might the story itself be thought of as a terministic screen that is intended to enable readers to see differently certain socio-economic realities?

Relationship Between Analysis and Interpretation: Miss Moore attempts to guide the children inductively through a series of particular observations (e.g. the microscope costs $480, the sailboat $1,195, the clown $35) to a conclusion or interpretation: “Must be rich people shop here” (paragraph 37). You might ask students to consider whether or not they think the “analysis” or lesson laid out for the children inevitably leads to Miss Moore’s conclusion. Some of the children draw other conclusions: “White folks crazy” and “I’d like to go there again when I get my birthday money” (paragraphs 45–46). What is the significance of these children’s conclusions? How might we as readers analyze and interpret the significance of various details of the story–for example, the particular toys noted and discussed? Are there other possible conclusions that might be drawn from Miss Moore’s lesson? On what basis? Through what kind of terministic screen?

Geoffrey Miller’s “Waste is Good”

Synopsis: Geoffrey Miller uses theories drawn from evolutionary psychology (a field that combines insights from natural and social sciences) to interpret a variety of sexual signaling behaviors. He begins by arguing that conspicuous consumption might be interpreted as a form of sexual signaling and concludes by arguing that human consciousness "may have evolved as pure display, like a peacock's tail" (paragraph 39). In the process, he weighs the benefits and problems created by the wastefulness that is "a necessary feature of sexual courtship" (paragraph 10).

Purpose of Analysis: Miller aims to explain a number of perplexing phenomena, and he introduces the ideas he is attempting to explain through a series of questions. The first appears in paragraph 1: "Why would evolution produce a species of anthropoid ape that feels it simply must have the Sennheisers, when the Vivancos would stimulate the ears just as well?" He continues to ask other questions throughout this essay that act as springboards for explaining various interpretations. For example, he asks "What is the link between biological fitness and monetary wealth?"(paragraph 16); "Must we follow his [Veblen's] moral crusade against waste?" (paragraph 23); and "Where does this leave those of us who value the life of the mind?" (paragraph 39). As Miller proceeds to address these questions, it becomes clear that his purpose is to challenge conventional ways of thinking about conspicuous consumption, consumerism, waste, and so on. See, for example, his bold suggestion that "religion, philosophy, and literature" are "varieties of sexual waste" (paragraph 36).

Because this is a complex essay, you might wish to select three or four of these questions, and assign small groups to investigate his analysis and conclusion regarding a particular question.

Method(s) of Analysis as Terministic Screens: Miller's primary method of analysis is to bring together theories from evolutionary biology (such as "sexual selection theory") and social psychology (such as "conspicuous consumption" and "handicap theory") to interpret contemporary behaviors, primarily what he calls sexual signaling. The key word he uses to stand for the combination of these theories is "waste." In addition, he uses comparison and contrast to analyze and explain various behaviors: e.g. like a male peacock's large colorful tail, human males' buying of a Porsche functions as sexual signaling (paragraph 14); however, the former has social benefits that the latter does not (paragraph 28).

To help students understand how terministic screens shape a writer's interpretations, ask them to select one of Miller's interpretations, say, his interpretation of the relationship between "wasteful signaling" and birth rate (paragraphs 31-33). What other terministic screens might one use to interpret this relationship and its effects on cultural progress?

Relationship Between Analysis and Interpretation: Among Miller's most provocative conclusions or interpretations are the following: "[Gullible people] may spend more time displaying virtual signals (advertised products) than real, biologically validated signals (wit, creativity, kindness)" (paragraph 15); "[A]lmost everything in nature which we find beautiful or impressive has been shaped for wasteful display, not for pragmatic efficiency" (paragraph 25); and "[T]hose human achievements and insights we most value would never have been produced without our sexual instincts for waste" (paragraph 42).

Students may be more persuaded by some of these conclusions than they are by others. To what extent has Miller made a case for these conclusions through analysis? Ask them to choose one of his conclusions and play the "Believing and Doubting Game" (*RR*, Chapter 5), using both his analysis and their own experiences, opinions, and knowledge as the basis for both believing and doubting.

Natalie Angier's "Men, Women, Sex, and Darwin"

Synopsis: Feminist Natalie Angier takes to task "hard-core" evolutionary psychologists who have been disseminating their views about the essential nature of male/female relationships to the general public. According to Angier, these views represent a narrow, "overwhelming masculinist" point of view (paragraph 2), which is not only wrongheaded but also harmful. Her disdain for these ideas is revealed in her frequently sarcastic tone. To challenge these views, Angier addresses their "cardinal premises" one by one, holding each "to the fire of alternative interpretation" (paragraph 16).

Purpose of Analysis: Her purpose is plainly stated in paragraph 2, where she writes, "I'm only proposing here that the hard-core evolutionary psychologists have got a lot about women wrong . . . and that women want more and deserve better than the cartoon Olive Oyl handed down for popular consumption." Although she is convinced that these views are wrong, she aims to show others the flaws in their argument through her analysis. The implicit questions that her analysis addresses are these: What makes the conclusions of evolutionary psychologists mistaken? Why is it important to challenge these misconceptions? What alternate explanations are there for the behaviors they purport to explain?

Here is a question that you might pose to students for class discussion: If analyses and interpretations are intended to reach a new understanding about a puzzling subject or to arrive at fresh conclusions, to what extent can Angier's essay be considered an analysis and interpretation? Although she clearly begins her analysis with a bias (as do all writers whether they acknowledge it or not), is there any evidence in the essay that she comes to a new understanding or modifies her interpretations in the course of her analysis?

Method(s) of Analysis as Terministic Screens: It is clear that a key terministic screen shaping Angier's analysis is her feminist belief in the role culture plays in shaping gendered behavior. At the same time, she gives some credence to biological difference and evolutionary influence (paragraph 26). Her analysis is organized by the formal method of division; specifically, she divides evolutionary psychologists' key ideas regarding men and women into five "cardinal premises" (paragraph 5) and then proceeds to analyze each of these claims for its logic consistency and evidentiary basis though not necessarily in the order in which she lists them.

One of the best ways to engage your students in understanding her analytical methods is to assign "Responding as a Reader," Activity #1 (*RR*, p. 384). An in-class variation of this assignment might be to assign five small groups to each analyze her critique of one "cardinal premise." They will discover that she not only offers alternate explanations for the same phenomena but that she also points out contradictions in their positions and uses scientific data to dispute their supposedly scientifically-based conclusions.

Relationship Between Analysis and Interpretation: Since Angier's main purpose is to challenge evolutionary psychologists' ideas, to what extent does she forward her own interpretations? Ask students to identify and evaluate the interpretations she offers. Does she offer sufficient analysis and evidence to back up these interpretations? How might a "hard-core" evolutionary psychologist respond to her analysis and alternate interpretations of male/female behavior?

Heather Wendtland's "Rebellion Through Music"

Synopsis: In this essay, Heather Wendtland recalls her experiences as a member of the Vanilla Nation, a group of high school girlfriends. She describes their love for rap and hip hop music even though the lyrics often degraded women and minorities and analyzes the causes for this attraction.

Purpose of Analysis: Wendtland states the question behind her analysis directly: "Why did we love entertainers and songs we knew we should hate?" (paragraph 2). Before your students read this essay, read paragraph 1 and the first sentence in paragraph 2 aloud to them, and ask them to predict what her answers will be to the question she poses. Ask them if they have ever reflected on past behaviors and through that process come to a new understanding of these behaviors.

Method(s) of Analysis as Terministic Screens: In paragraph 2, Wendtland sets up her causal analysis by asking a question that calls for an explanation. She then offers the conclusions she has come to as her thesis statement. In the body of the paper, Wendtland shows how she has come to these conclusions by using Gaitskill and Morgan's explanations of their experiences as points of comparison and as conceptual lenses for analyzing and interpreting her own experiences. That is, she "tries on" the ideas offered by Gaitskill and Morgan to see if they fit and thus explain her experiences.

To enable students to see how the ideas of others can work as a critical lens for interpreting a phenomena (in this case the author's own experiences and feelings), ask students to come up with some of the key words or phrases from Gaitskill and Morgan that Wendtland finds most useful in explaining her feelings and experiences. This list will undoubtedly include such terms and phrases as "aggressive feelings," "empowerment," "unacceptable" female behavior. You might ask them if they can think of alternative words or concepts that might explain Wendtland's feelings and behaviors? How might a different set of terms change the interpretation or conclusions drawn?

Relationship Between Analysis and Interpretation: Ask students to consider whether or not they think Wendtland's explanations of her experience are warranted by her analysis and the evidence she provides? How persuasive was her use of Gaitskill and Morgan as an analytical lens? Would her explanation have been more or less convincing if she had not used the ideas of these two authors?

HELPING STUDENTS WITH THE WRITING PROJECTS

Offering an Interpretation

Students should enjoy the Strand 1 assignment suggested in *Reading Rhetorically* (p. 389) because it offers them an opportunity to think about everyday or ordinary cultural objects and practices in an extraordinary way. It asks them to de-familiarize the familiar for themselves and readers. Or, alternatively, it invites them to explain to others a new and puzzling cultural practice with which they are familiar. The instructions make the purpose of this assignment clear: "to use analysis and interpretation to challenge and extend your readers' understanding." However, achieving this fresh perspective will be a challenge, and the key to doing so successfully is careful selection of an analytical lens or method. To help them select a method that can cast a new light on a familiar object or practice, suggest that they try some of these invention activities:

> Compose a series of similes that compare the cultural object or practice to dissimilar phenomena–e.g. the ubiquity of people in hazmat suits is like . . ., Lean Cuisine meals are like . . . , the show *Survivor* is like . . ..
>
> Find at least two articles that discuss this object or practice either in print or on the Internet. What key terms or concepts do these articles use to interpret the meaning or significance of the phenomena? Do these two sources differ in way they interpret this object or practice? What values or ideology underlie these articles' treatment of the subject? Can you use these terms or concepts as a springboard for your own analysis of the phenomena? (The idea is not to simply reproduce someone else's analysis or interpretation.)
>
> Try to divide the object or phenomena into constituent parts or to see it as a process. Does this division into parts or translation into a process cast any new perspectives on the phenomena and enable any new understanding of it?

WRITING A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATIONS

We realize it sounds a bit redundant or tautological to ask students to analyze an analysis. The challenges students will face in composing this Strand 2 assignment are similar to those students face in writing any rhetorical analysis. We suggest you refer them to the detailed explanation of this process provided in Part Two of the *IM*. Perhaps the most important thing for them to understand is that their selection of an analytical method is already delimited by the nature of the assignment. That is, the terms for analysis will be rhetorical ones, and as with any rhetorical analysis they need to select terms that will accomplish their purpose. Here are some questions that might guide their initial planning:

> What is most striking about this author's method of analysis and conclusions? Is the method of analysis an appropriate one? Does the analysis lead logically to the interpretation or conclusion offered? What kind of values underlie the author's terministic screen or method of analysis?
>
> What other rhetorical factors, such as author credibility or audience appeals, are work in this text? To what effect?
>
> What's my purpose in analyzing this text? To understand the author's method and conclusion and discuss their implications? To question or evaluate an author's method and conclusion? To propose alternative methods and interpretations of the phenomena under scrutiny? In short, what new insight will your analysis of this text offer readers and why is this new insight significant?

Extending the Conversation

This chapter's Strand 3 assignment (*RR*, p. 39) may at first appear constraining. However, since most memorials engender controversies about their meaning, appropriateness, aesthetics, and so on, it should not be difficult for your students to find a topic that interests them. An example of a national monument that has provoked many differing interpretations and assessments is the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC. A local example comes from our hometown, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and concerns a controversial sculpture that was commissioned for construction at the airport. The image that the sculptor came up with was a large plexiglass blue shirt. Many in the community were outraged, arguing that "Blue Shirt" wasn't aesthetically pleasing and that it mocked our city's blue collar identity. Others argued in favor of the sculpture either because they liked its self-reflexive humor or because they saw the objections as censoring artistic expression.

Once students have selected a memorial to investigate, they will need to formulate questions about this memorial and the controversies surrounding it to guide their research and to help them evaluate and select sources. Yet another challenge posed by this assignment is the selection of an appropriate method or methods of analysis. What analytical approach will best yield a new understanding of this memorial and its controversies? Do they wish to draw on the ideas and terms found in their sources to analyze this memorial and its controversies? Is there another memorial or controversy with which their subject can be compared or contrasted? Can this controversy or the issues related to this memorial be divided into parts?

If your students are having difficulty coming up with a topic, here are a few suggestions:

> A statue of a conquistador has created much controversy between Hispanics and Indians. A starting place for research on this topic is James Brooke's "Conquistador Statue Stirs Hispanic Pride and Indian Rage," *New York Times* 9 Feb. 1998: A11.
>
> A series of articles in the *Washington Post* debate Disney's representation of history: Michelle Singletary's "Disney Sees Challenge in Honest and Entertaining Past" (*Washington Post* 13 November, 1993, B1+) and "The Imagineers' Craft a Past: With Robots and Rides, Disney's Plans Take Shape for Virginia Park" (*Washington Post*, 20 November 1994); and Richard R. Willich's "Let Disney Tell the Story" (*Washington Post*, 15 February, 1994: A17).
>
> Finally, and most timely as I write this *IM* chapter in late October 2001, you might ask students to consider what a fitting memorial might be to the victims of the September 11th bombing of the World Trade Center. Two recent articles raise provocative questions: Bill Keller's "Remembering and Forgetting" (*The New York Times*, 22 September 2001: A25) and Dinitia Smith's "Hallowed Ground Zero: Competing Plans Hope to Shape a Trade Center Memorial" (*The New York Times*, 25 October 2001, E1). Both of these articles echo Savage in very interesting ways and both refer to the Oklahoma City memorial to the bombing of the federal building, which might be yet another interesting topic for investigation. And surely by the time you assign this topic to your students, there will be even more information and debate on a World Trade Center memorial.

Thematic Connections

The list below suggests connections between the readings in this chapter as well as connections between the readings in this chapter and those in other chapters. These connections offer starting points for research and other writing projects.

> To compare strategies for interpreting cultural objects, pair Barthes with Cisneros and/or Lord in Chapter 14. To compare strategies for interpreting consumer practices, pair Boxer with Bambara and/or

Queenan (Chapter 14).

An interesting pair of texts to compare for their interpretations of conspicuous consumption are Miller and Bambara.

To compare interpretations of identity formation, pair Wendtland with Muwakill (Chapter 16).

Miller's claims about how conspicuous consumption functions as sexual signaling rest on the assumption that "women are naturally attracted to high-status men with resources" (Angier, paragraph 4). By pairing these essays, you could ask students to consider or to write about how Angier's essay calls into question many of Miller's interpretations or, conversely, how Miller's analysis and interpretations challenge Angier's interpretations.

CHAPTER 13

Reading and Writing Texts that Take a Stand

With this chapter, *Reading Rhetorically* turns to explicitly persuasive writing. This “take a stand” chapter is the first and most general of the four chapters focusing on different subcategories of argument. Texts that take a stand address a question that is clearly in dispute; they seek to persuade readers to see the issue as the author does and adopt the author’s position, to stand with the author. The success of these persuasive texts depends on how well they (a) support claims with reasons and evidence, (b) build from assumptions shared with readers, and (c) anticipate and counter opposing views without alienating readers.

Reading, analyzing, and writing the argument texts in this chapter will help your students:

- analyze the basic structure of arguments: claims, reasons, evidence, and assumptions
- distinguish genuinely arguable issues
- understand that arguments arise from questions and thus can serve a knowledge-seeking function in public life
- recognize the type of question at issue (*stasis category)* in an argument
- learn to read arguments critically, with a watchful eye for what is *not* said, but assumed
- make intelligent decisions about whether they will agree with a given argument text

Helping Students Understand Argument

The introduction to Chapter 13 of *Reading Rhetorically* provides in-depth discussion of the role of persuasive texts in public discourse, the components of argument structure, and categories of argument types (or *stases*) according to the question at issue. Our discussion here in the manual will focus on three rhetorical features that are important for helping first-year composition students write arguments as well as analyze and evaluate them: (1) argument type or stasis category, (2) argument frame, and (3) handling of opposing views. Since the first two features provide a summary of the selection, instead of the synopses provided in other manual chapters, we begin discussion of individual selections with a brief "Context for Study" section.

1. Argument Type or Stasis Category

The shape of an argument depends upon how the question at issue is defined; indeed, if the parties to an argument have markedly different views about what is at issue—e.g., civil liberties or national security—agreement will be very difficult to find. To help students identify the question(s) at the heart of an argument, Table 13.1 on pages 397–398, "What Kind of Question Is at Issue," uses generic questions and sample applications to illustrate six stasis categories. These categories and examples provide an invention tool students can use not only to analyze the effectiveness of arguments they read but also to identify their options for articulating questions and for shaping arguments they write.

2. Argument Frame

The chapter introduction discusses in detail the four major components of an argument—claims, reasons, evidence, and assumptions—which together constitute its logos or logical power. Tracking explicit statements of the first three elements will help rhetorical readers discern the frequently unstated values and beliefs that link evidence to claims and claims to audiences.

3. Handling of Opposing Views

This third rhetorical element serves as an especially valuable discussion focus that will assist students in developing their own arguments. First, analysis of a text's treatment of opposing views opens up analysis of its handling of *ethos* and *pathos*. Second, traditional aged first-year college writers frequently have difficulty anticipating, rebutting, or otherwise integrating counterarguments into their papers. Giving voice to an opposing view is risky, after all, and an organizational challenge as well. For many college students, the difficulty is probably connected to intellectual development processes. As we pointed out regarding exploratory writing, late adolescents are frequently inclined toward binary thinking.[6] John Ramage and John Bean describe people's growth as arguers as a progression from seeing argument as an exchange of personal opinions to seeing it as a truth-seeking process linked to the values and beliefs of an intended audience.[7] Paying attention to the expert handling of opposition by this chapter's authors will help students progress along this continuum.

The "Responding as a Reader" questions with each selection are designed to help students determine whether they will assent to the author's argument, and why. The "Responding as a Writer" questions promote analysis of argument structures as a means of identifying techniques students can use in their own writing. For additional help with components of argument, see the analytical questions on page 394. Additional touchstones for classroom discussion are suggested in the "Questions to Help You Read Arguments Rhetorically" on page 400 and the reading log prompts.

CHAPTER SELECTIONS

Web Pages for the Million Mom March and Second Amendment Sisters Rally, May 2000

Context for Study. The screen captures from Million Mom March (MMM) and Second Amendment Sisters (SAS) Websites invite students to read and analyze visual images and layout in addition to verbal text, skills that can transfer to analysis of many types of advertising. Because so much of the argument on each page remains implicit in evocative imagery, students should enjoy comparing the pages and their responses to them.

Although neither of these pages is still accessible, a Web search will readily lead to materials about both organizations. To see color samples of the pastels and imagery on the MMM page, try the Website of the designer, Abstract Edge, at

---

[6] As discussed at the start of Chapter 10 above, Patricia M. King and Karen Strohm Kitchener describe this stage of intellectual development as "pre-reflective" (*Developing Reflective Judgment* (San Franciso: Jossey Bass, 1994).

[7] See *Allyn and Bacon Guide to Writing*, 2nd ed. (Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon), pp. 319–320.

<http://www.abstractedge.com/flash.html>, which features the MMM Web campaign as a case study of the firm's branding expertise. Similarly, a Web search for the SAS page's photographer, Oleg Volk, will lead to displays of his photographs and materials that support his advocacy of the right to keep and bear arms. Volk's quiz about attitudes toward guns at <http://www.a-human-right.com> offers not only an opportunity to explore the case against gun control but to analyze how patterns of questions and answers can be used to persuade.

Argument Type or Stasis Category. The immediate argument of each page, "Join us!" is clearly a call to action that fits in the stasis of policy and procedures. The issues around which each group is mobilizing also constitute policy arguments for and against gun control legislation. Both screens have brief implicit arguments about the consequences of gun control, and the names of both invoke a values argument regarding the Second Amendment and motherhood.

Argument Frame. The main point of each page is, of course, the rallying cry to join the demonstrations. (The small print on the MMM poster at the top left reads, "Mobilize for Commonsense Gun Laws.") Complex details about gun control legislation are left off stage; instead, the pages center their case for participation on largely implicit values claims. Ironically, the MMM site, which relies more extensively on text, is less explicit about connections among claim, reasons, evidence, and assumptions. The SAS page makes explicit the need for readers to come to Washington: to protect their rights and thus their ability to protect themselves they must "let Congress know that these women do not speak for all mothers!" On the MMM site, reasons to join the march are detailed further down the page and through links, but are not available for a visitor's first glance. Of course, an emotional rationale for attending the march is implicit in the very idea of rallying "moms" to march for "commonsense gun laws": protect children.

Handling of Opposing Case. On the most immediate level, the opposing case for each text is a decision *not* to go to Washington to demonstrate. This undesirable outcome remains implicit in both presentations. Advocates on both side do have opponents—any members of the public and Congress who oppose their position on gun legislation. The SAS text refers directly to the MMM as opposition prepared to "take away, or severely infringe" upon "your" (the reader's) rights, a stance in keeping with the intensity of the photograph, color, and layout of the page, and very much in contrast with the softer visual and verbal presentations on the MMM page.

Kathleen Parker, "For Starters We Can Require Trigger Locks" and "Revisiting the Issue of Trigger Locks"

Context for Study. Juxtaposition of these two op-ed pieces gives students the unusual opportunity to scrutinize the bones of opposing arguments that are expressed in the same distinctive voice and to analyze as well appeals to ethos and pathos that, in effect, embellish the argument.

Argument Type or Stasis Category. These pieces, which respond to the fatal shooting of a six-year-old girl at school by a six-year-old boy with a gun he found at home, offer another example of stands taken in the stasis of proposal or procedure. At a fundamental level, both articles address the question of what can be done to protect children from being shot by other children. More practically, they address the question of whether trigger laws should be mandated by law. Parker's two responses, the second contradicting the first, hinge on quite different questions in the stasis of consequences, one about the effects of trigger locks and the other about law enforcement.

Argument Frame. Parker begins the first column by asking where the blame for this incident lies and articulates her primary claim in the final paragraph: "we" (she and her readers together) must "immediately insist on trigger locks for all firearms" (paragraph 15). Why? Because they are "precautions against tragedy" (paragraph 5). Unsupported by evidence, this reason operates as an assumption. Parker turns her attention in most of the piece to denouncing the irresponsibility of the shooter's caretakers and all irresponsible parents. She calls for unspecified punitive action against parents.

The second column denounces her as unenforceable previous advocacy of mandated trigger locks and advocates that "adults pay for crimes committed by children" (paragraph 12). She still subscribes to the claim/assumption that supported her initial proposal: trigger locks will save lives. However, she has been convinced that another set of consequences is more pertinent: a trigger lock law is not enforceable. She assumes that readers will share this view—she has apparently heard from many who do—so instead of offering empirical evidence to support it, she draws analogies to what would be foolish efforts to regulate aspects of personal behavior such as showering. In an interesting twist in the final paragraph, she equates the effectiveness of trigger lock laws with that of laws "insisting that people not steal or use drugs" or "a law requiring them to be good parents." Students may wish to decipher the implicit and perhaps contradictory implications of this statement, especially in light of her more explicit call in this column for punishing parents (paragraphs 7 and 12). (Note: it will be interesting to see if students agree with her statement in paragraph 3 that the first column put primary focus on "tough consequences for adults.")

Handling of Opposing Case. Parker minces no words in her sometimes sweeping denunciation of opposing views, even of a view she herself published just days before. In the first argument she says that anyone who disagrees with her call for a trigger locks law is "irresponsible," guilty of "a crime against common sense for which we all share blame"—presumably the shooting death that has already happened and future deaths that may occur for lack of trigger locks. The second argument features colorful denunciations of her own advocacy of a trigger lock law and, by implication, of anyone else's advocacy of such measures. The first and second "Responding as a Writer" questions on page 408 invite students to analyze Parker's style. You might extend this discussion to consider contexts where approaches such as Parker's are and are not appropriate.

Arnold Wolfendale and Seth Shostak, "Is There Other Intelligent Life in the Universe? An Exchange of Letters"

Context for Study. This exchange of letters provides an unusual opportunity for analyzing the text of direct, friendly opposing positions in a factual dispute. Working with the texts, which were written for general readers, will also introduce students to the kinds of reasoning and evidence that scientists use. As follow up on the second reading log question, you might poll the class to see which argument students found more convincing and whether anyone's initial views have changed, then compare these responses to the SETI Institute's informal poll at: <http://www.seti-inst.edu/general/poll-1/Welcome.html>. When you discuss the poll's results, be sure to note factors relevant to evaluating the reliability of such surveys (what population was polled?) and examine the report's visual displays of data. Note: this exchange between an Englishman and an American was published in Britain and follows British spelling conventions.

Although your students probably have opinions about the likelihood of extraterrestrial intelligence (ETI), many may feel daunted by the unfamiliar subject matter and the density of detail in these texts. In fact, the well-organized paragraphs make it fairly easy to track the main points of debate through the six letters, especially if students collaborate on an idea map as suggested in the first "Responding as a Reader" question on page 415 or a descriptive outline as described in Chapter 4. Groups of students could compare maps or outlines of the whole, or specific groups could work with different letters or track the give-and-take around specific points, e.g., Wolfendale's initial statement of the "life is unique" argument.

Argument Type or Stasis Category. The title of the article defines the argument type as factual: Does X exist? Unlike many "take a stand" arguments, this clash of views does not concern disagreement about what should be done. Both writers want the search for radio signals to continue even though they have different views of the likely outcome.

Argument Frame. Since there is no direct evidence addressing the factual question at issue, the supporting reasons concern probability. Wolfendale and Shostak's exchange thus focuses on the reliability and relevance of the evidence, or lack of evidence, for each case supported by claims in the stasis of interpretation and analogy (e.g., paragraphs 8 and 13–14). In effect, they conclude by agreeing to disagree.

Handling of Opposing Case. This exchange is all about opposing views, but it is unlikely that either scientist thought he might change the other's mind. Thus, we might think of this as a "display argument," designed so that readers can examine representative arguments about ETI. As above, it will be valuable to track how Wolfendale and Shostak handle specific points of disagreement, e.g., the play of the "Where are they?" argument through paragraphs 7, 13–14, 18, and 19, or the ripostes in paragraphs 9 and 16. These and other brief glimpses of personality draw attention to elements of ethos and pathos in the letters. Both men make good-natured digs at the other with some friendly name-calling (e.g., paragraph 16) or analogies (e.g., paragraphs 9 and 14). Shostak frequently argues from analogy, Wolfendale from probability. What effect do these indications of character have on students' understanding of the text or of the writers' credibility? Do they read these as indications of ethos or of pathos, and if pathos, as directed toward engaging the writer's opponent or the readers of *Prospect*?

Statement by Alabama Clergy and
Martin Luther King, Jr., "Letter from Birmingham Jail."

Context for Study. Your students are probably familiar with the content of King's famous letter, especially lines such as "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere" (paragraph 4). This familiarity will enrich their analysis of the argument's structure in light of the rhetorical concepts in Chapter 13. We include the brief statement from the Alabama clergy because it dramatizes and adds immediacy to the political and textual contexts of King's letter.

Argument Type or Stasis Category. Both sides see this controversy as a matter of policy, but the goals of each are defined differently. For the clergy, the question at issue is how to bring about "a better Birmingham." For King, the question is how racial justice should be pursued. Students may be surprised to discover that the clergy's call to "unite locally in working peacefully for a better Birmingham" (paragraph 7) does not immediately seem inappropriate. King's counterargument changes everything, however, by marshaling new facts, alternative definitions, and a radically different perspective on causes and consequences. The values on which his rationale for nonviolence is based—values that he posits as shared between the white clergy and the demonstrators—redefine "common sense" and overshadow the clergy's appeal to law and order.

Argument Frame. King's argument, one of history's great rationales for nonviolent direct action, is framed entirely as a response to the clergy's plea for an end to demonstrations. It falls into 11 main sections which do the following:

Paragraph 1: Announces King's purpose of answering the clergy's statement in "patient and reasonable terms."

Paragraphs 2–4: Counters the label of "outsider" by explaining he is in Birmingham for three reasons: (a) because he was invited through his ties there, (b) because injustice is there and, like Paul, he must respond to a call for aid, and (c) because "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

Paragraphs 5–11: Sets forth facts of events leading to the demonstrations and explains the rationale and process of nonviolent direct action. This section culminates in King's declaration that he concurs with the clergy's call for negotiation.

Paragraphs 12–14: Answers the charge that the demonstrations are untimely by (a) contending that progress in civil rights results only from pressure, (b) asserting that to his people, "wait" means "never," and (c) providing vivid details of the injustices he has suffered.

Paragraphs 15–20: Responds to the clergy's "legitimate" anxiety about law breaking by examining the difference between just and unjust laws, and contending that the laws the parading demonstrators break are unjust because they were designed to maintain segregation.

Paragraphs 21–22: Argues that precedent legitimizes civil disobedience.

Paragraphs 23–32: Describes his disappointment with "the white moderate," i.e., people who argue as the clergy do for order, not justice.

Paragraphs 33–44: Describes his disappointment with the white church's failure to call for justice in the struggle for civil rights.

Paragraphs 45–46: Objects to the clergy's commendation of police behavior and provides an alternative account, detailing brutality.

Paragraph 47: Calls for recognition of demonstrators as heroes.

Paragraphs 48–50: Closes with apologies for the length of the letter, confidence in the truth of his claims, and hope for love and brotherhood.

Handling of Opposing Case. One of the most remarkable aspects of King's text is its respectful address of the opposition and its repeated assertion of shared values with those leaders. Despite its framing as a direct counterargument to the clergy statement and its lengthy expression of disappointment with white moderates and church leaders (i.e., King's addressees), the letter is built on assumptions of values that if they are not shared by King and the religious leaders, ought to be, as well as appeals to authorities who are respected by the opposition, such as Paul, Socrates, and St. Augustine (ethos). From his opening explanation of purpose to his closing good wishes, including intense sections of detailed brutality where use of the second person refuses to let readers off the hook (cf. paragraphs 14 and 45 especially), the letter is genuinely grounded in an effort to change the minds of the people King addresses.

Andrew Sullivan, "Let Gays Marry"

Context for Study. Sullivan's brief argument for a *Newsweek* audience is addressed to the public but pays special attention to the concerns of readers who may be opposed to gay marriage. It surprises many students because it asserts the issue of gay marriage as a conservative cause. The article provides a succinct, carefully crafted argument that reflects understanding of opposition concerns and explicitly seeks to address opponents' fears.

Argument Type or Stasis Category. Another argument about public policy, this piece advocates for gay marriage by asserting the superiority of claims based on precedent and analogy over claims based on definition.

Argument Frame. Sullivan begins by celebrating the Supreme Court's assertion of equal protection for gay men and lesbians, an idea which he will echo in every paragraph. He says gay people seek simply "to be a full and equal part of America" (paragraph 2); the right to marry is central to that. In paragraph 5 he argues from precedent that the definition of marriage as necessarily between a man and a woman can change, just as the definition of marriage as a contract making a wife legal property has changed. In paragraph 6 he uses analogy to point out that marriage is permitted between childless couples and to assert that same-sex marriage is more like traditional marriage than it is like polygamy. He concludes with a definition argument that gay marriage is a "deeply conservative cause." To oppose it, he says, is to make gays "strangers in their own country," an echo that underscores the Supreme Court ruling with which he began.

Handling of Opposing Case. Sullivan focuses on the concerns of his opponents and emphasizes similarities between his cause and the values of conservatives, who are frequently vocal opponents of gay marriage. His theme of reassurance carefully limits what he wants. There's no need for the institution of heterosexual marriage to change, only for civil law to expand to include people currently on the margin. Before suggesting how definitions can shift, as they have before, to permit this, he spends his longest paragraph carefully separating his goal from a central concern of opponents: religious doctrine. That is best debated within a faith, he says; what he seeks is the right to a civil marriage license, "like anybody else" (paragraph 4). Similarly, in the final paragraph, he supports his definition of gay marriage as a conservative cause by asserting its connection with family values.

Sallie Tisdale, "Should a Boy Be Expelled for Thought Crimes?"

Context for Study. Although Tisdale uses a question for a title, her article is not an exploration but a firm answer that no, he should not. The least rigorously argued piece in the chapter, Tisdale's article will give students experience with critiquing the chatty, almost flip, argument style common in popular media. (This was published months before the Columbine shootings.)

Argument Type or Stasis Category. Although the title suggests a policy argument, Tisdale argues not about what ought to be done in the future, but about what has already been done, wrongly. She argues from definition that James LaVine should not have been expelled from high school because he is guilty of "nothing more—or less—important than expressing a frightening thought" (paragraph 10). By agreeing with LaVine's lawyer that the expulsion set a disturbing precedent (paragraphs 16–17), she implies a values argument but does not articulate it beyond her contention that what happened to LaVine is bad.

Argument Frame. Tisdale devotes most of the article to her contention that the behavior for which LaVine was punished is normal, the school's response to it abnormal. Evidence consists of analogy to her own childish short story about murder, LaVine's otherwise normal behavior, and her sharp-edged narrative of the events. She brings up Kip Kinkel's shooting rampage in Oregon earlier that year (paragraph 9) not to suggest why the authorities might have been especially cautious but to contrast their actions with Oregon officials' poor judgment on the opposite side of caution—they did not act on the danger Kinkel posed.

Handling of Opposing Case. Beyond her narrative of events, presumably learned from LaVine and his lawyer, Tisdale devotes no attention to the concerns or claims of the school officials that expelled LaVine other than to note that the school superintendent would not see her.

George Orwell, "A Hanging" (Fiction)

Context for Study. This story provides an excellent example of advocacy expressed through narrative detail, something students will perhaps need to recognize more often than they will use it. Although critics disagree about the extent to which the story is fictionalized, we label it as fiction because we read it as a crafted blend of fiction and reportage stemming from Orwell's experience in Burma.[8]

Argument Type or Stasis Category. The story makes an indirect values argument opposed to capital punishment. "Responding as a Reader" question #1 offers students the opportunity to evaluate whether the argument comes through strongly enough to justify including the story in this "Take a Stand" chapter.

Argument Frame. Orwell's first-person narrator, a colonial official, is part of a group accompanying a prisoner to the gallows. We are told nothing about the prisoner's crime and very little about the narrator's thoughts. When the prisoner steps aside to avoid a puddle, the narrator is suddenly struck by "the unspeakable wrongness of cutting life short when it is in full tide" (paragraph 10). Support for this values claim lies implicit in the narrator's detailed contemplation of the prisoner's bodily life. Except for this one introspective revelation, the argument against execution is indirect, left for the reader to compose from details such as the dog's exuberance, the prisoner's humanity, the group's nearly panicked eagerness for the execution to be accomplished (paragraph 13), and the men's despicable—or perhaps merely uncomfortable—laughter at the end.

Handling of Opposing Case. The opposing case shapes the narrative, and thus speaks for itself. Within the frame of the story, the narrator's point of view reveals what is wrong. Within the text and the reader's experience of it, that accumulating sense of wrong expresses the text's purpose.

Sofia Collins, "Good Intentions in the Anti-Sweatshop Movement"

---

[8] See "George Orwell," Concise Dictionary of British Literary Biography, Volume 7: Writers After World War II, 1945-1960 (Gale: 1991), Biography Resource Center, Gale, Memorial Lib., Marquette Univ., 9 Oct. 2001 <http://www.galenet.com/servlet/BioRC/>.

Context for Study. This short student-written piece offers a good example of a counterargument that establishes shared concerns with the opposition. Highly sympathetic to the anti-sweatshop movement, Collins presents a surprising view of protest demonstrations and suggests alternative tactics. Intended for submission to a campus newspaper, the piece provides a model for the "Extending the Conversation" assignment to write an op-ed column or letter to the editor (p. 447). Note that the first "Responding as a Writer" question for this reading (p. 445) invites students to shorten and sharpen the piece to enhance its chances of being chosen for publication.

Argument Type or Stasis Category. Collins mounts arguments answering questions about consequences (paragraphs 3–4) and definition (paragraph 5), and then concludes with a policy argument (paragraph 6).

Argument Frame. Collins's answer to the question of what will most help overseas apparel industry workers leads her to argue from consequences that less attention be paid to hourly pay rates and more attention to working conditions and formation of unions. In her view, demonstrations at department stores, aimed at consumers, result from misdirected good intentions. She defines such demonstrations as well intentioned but paternalistic, as based on a "protectorate mentality" (paragraph 5). In the final paragraph, she argues for a policy that will empower workers "to assert their own human rights" (paragraph 6).

Handling of Opposing Case. Before she brings up her objections to the demonstrators' tactics and goals, Collins attempts to build good will by devoting most of the first two paragraphs to positive descriptions of the protestors' efforts and sympathetic restatements of their concerns and goals.

HELPING STUDENTS WITH THE WRITING PROJECTS

The chapter's writing assignments give students the opportunity to apply in their own writing what they've learned from the readings about argument structure and how to make credible appeals to different kinds of audiences.

Taking A Stand Of Your Own

This chapter's Strand 1 assignment (p. 446) is designed to focus students' attention on the ways they engage with their audience. A second major pedagogical goal of this assignment is to help students juggle multiple viewpoints, something that is particularly difficult when those views oppose one's own.

Planning and Invention. The assignment specifies important choices students must make as they plan and draft their papers. A checklist from you focusing attention on these decisions will help keep these matters at the forefront of attention. We suggest including items such as these:

- Are you writing primarily for someone opposed to your position or someone undecided about the issue?
- How much background will your intended audience need?
- What assumptions do you share with your audience?
- To move your readers closer to your position, what is the most significant point you need to change in their view of the matter?
- What kind of evidence will be most persuasive for this audience?
- Where do you predict your readers will most resist your points?

Addressing Counterarguments. Instructors and students alike report that first-year writers often hesitate to bring up an opposing view for fear that it will undermine their own points, or that they don't know how to bring it up without condemning it. The emphasis on rhetorical dynamics in *Reading Rhetorically* should help students with this challenge. For in-class work on this matter we recommend these activities:

- Considerable discussion of how various writers refer to opposing views, anticipate objections, and mount counterarguments
- Discussion of the Callahan reading in Chapter 16. Students can use her "rules" to plan and evaluate drafts.
- An exercise in which students outline the argument of a representative opposition statement so that they understand how it works. (See Callahan's "Rule Number 3" on p. 539.)
- An oral or written exercise in which students consider within the give and take of a conversation how someone might object to their position. (This will help with organization as well.)
- Discussion of examples that will help students recognize that if they come on too strong or dismiss their opposition, they lose credibility

Support and Connections. Students may encounter difficulties with aspects of their arguments similar challenges we mentioned for explanatory writing: providing sufficient supporting evidence and explaining how that evidence connects to the argument's overall pattern of reasoning. Difficulties with both of these is a function of the issue we pointed out regarding Chapter 11's Strand 1 assignment—recognizing when material can and cannot “speak for itself.” Since many teachers assign explanatory papers before argument papers, it is likely you will already know which of the items from the Chapter 11 checklists presented challenges for your students and can include them on a new checklist for evaluating arguments drafts.

Examining Rhetorical Strategies

The Strand 2 assignment calls not for an argument paper, but for an analysis and explanation of the argument strategies and style of a published author—a political, entertainment, or sports columnist, ideally someone with whom the student is already familiar. This assignment could be used for a major writing project, a warm up to either of Chapter 13’s other assignments, or in-class discussion. Preliminary practice with questions to ask and evidence to find is provided in the “Responding as a Writer” questions that accompany the selections by Parker and Tisdale (pp. 408 and 437). Although the assignment assumes individual students will choose the writer they will analyze, either of these two writers could, of course, be used. Examples of their work are readily available on the Web and through periodicals databases.

The challenges for this assignment are similar to those of other Strand 2 assignments: (a) analyzing evidence to find a major point and exigence for writing, and (b) articulating an analytical structure. The assignment in the text suggests three focal points: framing of issues, reasoning, and style. You may wish to limit the assignment to one of these or, to emphasize rhetorical issues above argument structure, to focus the analysis specifically on matters of ethos and pathos. (For additional guidance on working with rhetorical analysis assignments, see the end of our Part Two chapter above.)

Extending the Conversation

This assignment presents a challenging version of Strand 1: an op-ed piece or letter to the editor. A successful paper must be short, appeal to a multi-faceted audience, and, for a special twist, comment specifically on the content and strategy of a recently published piece of the same genre. As students will discover when they examine sample letters to the editor, many successful, i.e., printed, letters include such comments. Sofia Collins’s op-ed piece (p. 443) provides a model for both the assignment and, in paragraph 2, the type of commenting called for.

Students typically enjoy the challenge of preparing something to submit for publication. (You may want to offer extra credit or a grade boost for papers that are actually published.) In addition to work with the chapter's selections, many of which were first published as op-ed articles, class discussion analyzing sample op-ed or letters to the editor pages will help them recognize rhetorical strategies to employ, as will checklists similar to those suggested above for Strand 1.

Thematic Connections

The argument strategies used by this chapter's authors are ripe for comparison with each other. Besides contrasting the direct arguments-counterarguments in the first four selections, you might pair any of the readings for useful comparison of how various authors marshal support for their claims, handle opposing claims, appeal to readers, and so forth. For an extreme example, consider the marked contrast between Parker's impassioned advocacy and the implicit argument in Orwell's story. Readings in this chapter can also be paired with selections in Chapter 16 that advocate careful treatment of opposing views. For example:

- Callahan's "Fight Fierce but Fair: And Practice at Home" (Chapter 16) can be used as a benchmark for evaluating how any of Chapter 13's arguments handle opposing views. Particularly pertinent are the ways that Sullivan and Collins refer to views they oppose.

- For comparison of both content and argument strategies, pair Sullivan and/or King with Mel White's letter to Jerry Falwell (Chapter 16).

- Collins's opinion column can be analyzed in light of the Singer and Oates selections about poverty and third world development issues (Chapter 15).

Finally, students might tie analysis of readings to current discussions in periodicals and on the Web about gun legislation, the status of efforts to legalize gay marriage, or recent developments in the anti-sweatshop movement.

CHAPTER 14

Reading and Writing Texts That Evaluate and Judge

Because evaluating and judging are quotidian activities, it is easy for students to misunderstand the requirements of these activities in an academic context. As William G. Perry discovered in his study of the intellectual growth of college students, it is common for students to move from the "dualistic stage," where they believe there is a right and wrong answer to everything, to a "multiplistic" one, where they believe that since "everyone has a right to her or his own opinion," all evaluative claims are equal, just a matter of opinion.[9] In their study of women's intellectual development, Mary Field Belenky and her colleagues refer to this stage of intellectual development as "subjectivism" or "subjective knowing." [10] Since many college assignments involve reading and writing evaluative texts, it is important for students to understand that such texts are forms of argument that require careful reasoning, selection of appropriate criteria, and use of relevant evidence.

By reading and writing texts that evaluate and judge, your students will learn that

- evaluations and judgments are forms of argument
- convincing evaluative arguments are based not on subjective opinion but rather on values and standards that are shared by others
- effective evaluative arguments demonstrate sound reasoning through selection of appropriate criteria and use of supporting evidence

---

9 William G. Perry, *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years* (Troy, MO: Holt, 1970).

10 Belenky, Mary Field, et al., *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind* (New York: Basic Books, 1986) 54.

HELPING STUDENTS UNDERSTAND EVALUATION AND JUDGMENT

A good place to begin helping students understand evaluation and judgment is to ask them to reflect on these processes in their everyday lives. You might ask them, for example, what kinds of evaluations and judgments they have made in the past week and the basis on which they have made these judgments. The discussion might then turn to the differences between evaluations and judgments made in one's private life to those made in a public or academic forum. What might be the difference, for example, between evaluating a movie in a conversation with a friend and writing a review of that same movie for publication? This discussion can set the stage for introducing this chapter's central concept–that evaluations and judgments are arguments that must be well reasoned to be convincing to an academic or public audience.

Following these introductory activities, we suggest that you assign the introduction to Chapter 12 (*RR*, pp. 449–453) and allow sufficient class time to discuss its key terms and ideas. To help students deepen their understanding of evaluation and judgment through the readings in this chapter, we suggest that you draw their attention to the following aspects of these reading selections:

1. Question(s) of Value at Issue

Evaluative texts always entail questions of value. At issue are such questions as these: Is something beneficial or harmful? Is it good, better, or best? As we explain in Chapter 13 of *Reading Rhetorically*, questions of value are one of the stasis questions developed by ancient rhetoricians. We recommend a review of the stasis questions of value to help students understand this important aspect of evaluative texts. Identifying the questions of value at issue is an important step in critically assessing a text's argument. Sometimes the questions of value at issue are clearly stated while at other times they are only implied. For example, the questions of value addressed in Laurence Zuckerman's article on PowerPoint clearly concern the benefits and drawbacks of this new form of communication. By contrast, the question of value entailed in Joe Queenan's evaluation of Web sites "dedicated to simplicity" must be inferred.

2. Author Credibility and Stance

If writers are to persuade readers that their judgments are sound and trustworthy, they must create an image of themselves as knowledgeable about the subject and fair-minded. It is important to note that fair-mindedness does not necessarily mean pointing out the positive as well as the negative aspects of the subject. At times, writers of evaluative texts focus on either a subject's positive or negative qualities. However, if such an evaluation is to be persuasive, the writer must persuade readers that this one-sided assessment is justified. To evaluate a writer's credibility and stance, rhetorical readers ask questions such as the following: Is the writer well informed about this subject? On what does the writer base his or her authority for making judgments? What's the writer's attitude toward the subject? Is this attitude justified? What about the writer's attitude toward readers? What roles does the writer invite the reader to play in relation to the subject? As students will discover in reading the selections in this chapter, sometimes the writer's stance toward the subject is so even-handed, it is difficult to tell what his or her opinion is regarding the subject. This is especially true of journalistic articles such as Laurence Zuckerman's *New York Times* article on PowerPoint.

3. Criteria Selected and Supporting Evidence

The effectiveness of an evaluative argument depends largely on the soundness of the reasoning displayed. Writers of evaluative arguments demonstrate their reasoning by (1) selecting appropriate criteria and (2) presenting evidence that supports and matches those criteria. The criteria used by writers of evaluative arguments are usually drawn from commonly established standards for judging a particular kind of phenomena. However, there are times when a writer must establish new criteria either because there are not existing standards for judging this kind of phenomena or because the standards commonly used are somehow inadequate or inappropriate. In these situations, writers must argue for the criteria they are using as well as for the judgments they are making about the subject. The second aspect of evaluative reasoning is the use of evidence. To be persuasive the evidence must match the criteria. So, for example, if one were to judge the quality of a team's pitching staff, he or she would cite the ERA statistics for each pitcher but not the batting records of each. In "En Garde, Princess," M.G. Lord evaluates the quality of a new line, Get Real Dolls, using the criterion of "hairplay," a feature that research has found to be important for doll sales. To support her positive evaluative of these dolls, Lord describes their hair as "abundant," a feature that enables "hairplay." Thus, her evidence matches her criterion. A feature like natural-looking hair color would not fit this particular criterion because it has nothing directly to do with "hairplay."

The type of criteria selected also depends upon the situation. Are the criteria appropriate to the situation at hand? Does the situation call for absolute or relative standards? If, for example, a writer were evaluating the coach of a little league baseball team, she would use quite different criteria than she would if she were evaluating the coach of a major league baseball team. In the former case, she might base her evaluation on such criteria as the ability to encourage sportsmanlike behavior or to treat all players with respect despite their ability. If she were evaluating the coach of a major league team, she would obviously use quite different criteria like the coach's win/lose record, knowledge of the game, and so on. Further, some situations call for the application of absolute standards–that is, selection of the "best"–but more often, they call for the application of relative standards–x is "better" than y.

CHAPTER SELECTIONS

To help you select and teach readings from this chapter, we provide a synopsis of each selection and commentary on its special rhetorical features.

Jared Diamond's "Invention Is The Mother Of Necessity"

Synopsis: Jared Diamond's title suggests that his subject is the best invention of the millennium, but early in the essay he makes it clear that his real topic is the millennium's best example of the invention process, or, as he puts it "the millennium's best window into how inventions actually unfold" (paragraph 3). He selects Gutenberg's printing press on both counts. He then proceeds to focus most of his essay on the complex history that finally resulted in Gutenberg's invention. In the concluding paragraphs, he suggests that an important purpose in writing this essay was to argue for increased funding of basic research (paragraph 13). Cast as an enthymeme his reasoning is this: since many important inventions in the past occurred by chance or accident through the tinkering of curious scientists who were not necessarily trying to solve a particular problem, increased funding of the these tinkerers' work, that is, basic research, is likely to yield important inventions that can improve our lives in the future.

Question(s) of Value at Issue: In Diamond's essay, questions of value are closely tied to and dependent on questions of definition. He begins with conventional definitions of an invention–a discovery that has significant consequences for society–and an inventor–a lonely, heroic experimenter who is solely responsible for a given invention. However, he quickly challenges these definitions and devotes the rest of his essay to defining the process of invention and the much less heroic contributions of the individual inventor (paragraph

10–11). Although he never offers an explicit definition of the process of invention, his discussion suggests that they are the result of prior inventions, good timing, and chance. This shift in definition also produces a shift in question of value. The question of value at issue in judging the best invention is what unparalleled positive contributions did this invention make to humankind. The question of value at issue in judging the best example of the invention process is what of value can we learn from this process in order to foster it?

Undoubtedly students will find this aspect of the article difficult to grasp on first reading, so we suggest that you assign "Responding as a Reader," Activity #1, and offer guidance in mapping out the questions of definition and value entailed in this article.

Author Credibility and Stance: Diamond demonstrates his vast knowledge of the history of scientific discovery in his lecture-like discussion of the development of printing and the printing press. Ask students to describe his attitude toward his subject and his style of presentation. Does he successfully communicate his fascination for the subject? If so, how? In his lecture-like presentation he uses surprise and reversal of expectation to keep the reader's interest. For example, after modifying Gutenberg's achievement in paragraph 4 to the invention "printing with movable type" not the invention of "printing," he asks "Have we now got the story right?" (paragraph 5). And he proceeds to explain that we have not and that even movable type was invented prior to Gutenberg's printing press. Ask students if they think they would enjoy having Diamond as a professor? Why or why not?

Criteria Selected and Supporting Evidence: Based on its contributions to human progress or, as Diamond puts it, "its enormous consequences for modern societies," Diamond judges Gutenberg's printing press to be the millennium's best invention (paragraph 1). He supports this evaluative claim with a brief list of significant consequences: Martin Luthers' 95 These, the Declaration of Independence, and so on. Why does he devote so little time to discussing this evidence? In judging Gutenberg's printing press the millennium's best example of the inventive process, Diamond uses a different criterion: its representativeness. What aspects of this invention make it representative in Diamond's view? That is, what are the representative features of the invention process? This question might be used for a general class discussion or posed to small groups who can then compare answers. Undoubtedly, they will come up with such criteria as the existence of prior related inventions (paragraphs 3-7), its dependence on other scientific advances like the development of "paper, an alphabet, improved inks, metals, and presses (paragraph 7), its timeliness in terms of society's "capacity to utilize the invention" (paragraph 8), and its dependence on chance occurrence such as the olive presses that served as the prototype for Gutenberg's printing press (paragraph 9). For each of these criteria, Diamond provides detailed historical examples. Why does he provide so much detail here when he provides so little detail in relation to his earlier evaluative claim about the printing press's being the millennium's best invention?

Alison Lurie's "A Perfect Set of Teeth"

Synopsis: Lurie argues that the "zipper" is the best fashion of the millennium because it made undressing so easy. To explain this advancement in fashion, she contrasts the zipper with older clothes fasteners that made clothing dangerously time consuming to shed. She begins and concludes her assessment by referring to the ways in which zippers have "changed relations between the sexes" (paragraph 1).

Question(s) of Value at Issue: A formulation of the underlying question Lurie addresses might go something like this: What fashion development had the most significant impact on daily life? Ask students to consider the following questions: Are there other fashions that have also had important effects on daily life? Based on this value are there other competitors for the title "best fashion"? What about other values that might be used to assess "best fashion" of the millennium?

Author Credibility and Stance: Neither the headnote nor the text itself offers any evidence of Lurie's special credentials as a judge of fashion. Like many of the authors of these short "best of the millennium" essays, she was chosen because she is a famous writer, not an expert on this particular subject. Thus, her credibility comes from her literary achievements and not from her expertise regarding fashion. How does this kind of credibility affect her choice of fashion to evaluate? What seems to be her attitude toward her subject–both the specific subject of the zipper and the larger subject of the millennial best fashion? Be sure to ask students to back up their answers with references to the text.

Criteria Selected and Supporting Evidence: The general criteria Lurie selects follow from her question of value: the practical benefits of the zipper in daily life. The specific criteria on which she focuses is the speed with which it enables people to undress, a value in daily life in terms of not only convenience but also in terms of health and even survival. To support her evaluation with evidence, she uses historical and contemporary examples to illustrate that the zipper is a benefit in love and war. Specifically, she contrasts earlier clothes fasteners which were time-consuming to undo, thereby dampening the ardor of lovers and threatening the lives of knights in armor, with the zipper which is easy to undo, thereby enabling quick sex and easy donning and shedding of military garb. She also suggests that the zipper has become a symbol of sexiness because it enables speedy removal of one's own or another's clothes (paragraphs 5-7). Why do you think she emphasizes this aspect of its impact on daily life, that is, its encouragement of quick sexual encounters?

Since this essay seems largely intended to entertain, we suggest that you ask students to write their own "best fashion" of say, the 80s, 90s, or the 21st century, using their freewriting and "Responding as a Writer," Activity #3 (p. 460).

Laurence Zuckerman's "Words Go Right to the Brain, but Can They Stir the Heart?"

Synopsis: Zuckerman evaluates the advantages and disadvantages of PowerPoint[11] for both speakers and listeners. Although his assessment of this presentation form is generally balanced, he suggests that the disadvantages are more consequential than the advantages. He concludes by suggesting that presentations using the Web offer many of the advantages of PowerPoint while avoiding some of its disadvantages.

Question(s) of Value at Issue: As already mentioned, Zuckerman is interested in the benefits and drawbacks of PowerPoint, specifically in whether or not the disadvantages outweigh the advantages. In his evaluation, he considers the practical as well as the rhetorical value of PowerPoint. You might ask students to consider why Zuckerman believes this is an important question. What does he suggest is at stake? Although the photograph of Martin Luther King delivering his "I Have a Dream" speech and its presentation in PowerPoint format may well have been an editorial decision and not Zuckerman's, what does this accompanying graphic suggest about the significance of this question of value?

---

[11]PowerPoint is the patented trade name for Microsoft's presentation program, but it is fast becoming a general term for a particular kind of presentation just as xerox, which was originally a patented trade name, became the general term for both the process of duplication and the text produced. In the article, Zuckerman spells the term *Powerpoint* rather than *PowerPoint* because he is following the *The New York Times* style guide.

Author Credibility and Stance: Author credibility is established mainly through the text although it sometimes comes from readers' knowledge of the author's reputation outside the text. In this case, students learn in the headnote that Zuckerman frequently writes about technology and culture, so this biographical fact suggests that he brings some background knowledge to his evaluation of PowerPoint. But what about the credibility established in the text? How does he demonstrate his familiarity with PowerPoint and with the debates surrounding its positive and negative effects? Perhaps a more important issue to discuss with students is his stance toward his subject. Is his evaluation fair and balanced? Does he judge the disadvantages to outweigh the advantages or vice versa? As we have suggested in our synopsis, we think he makes the former judgement, and we base this conclusion on several factors–the somewhat mocking tone set by the opening anecdote, the greater significance of the disadvantages (its homogenizing effect, its emphasis on form over content, its potential for oversimplification and deception, etc.) relative to the significance of the advantages (its organizational clarity, its conciseness, its visual appeal, etc.). But there is an argument to be made that he remains neutral. Be sure to ask students to support their position about his stance with evidence from the text.

Criteria Selected and Supporting Evidence: Although Zuckerman's criteria are fairly explicit, students will have to read this article closely to tease them out. You might ask them to divide the criteria into those related to speakers or presenters and those related to the audience. Then ask them to list the advantages and disadvantages related to the speakers/presenters and those related to the audience. What kind of criteria are the advantages and disadvantages based on? They will quickly discover that Zuckerman uses competing criteria so that an advantage in terms of one criteria may be a disadvantage in terms of another. For example, an advantage to speakers/presenters is the ease of use (an important criteria in judging the usefulness of any communicative tool) but ease of use also results in formulaic, homogenous presentations which are a disadvantage in terms of rhetorical effectiveness. To support his evaluative claims, he uses examples and the testimony of various experts–business leaders, psychologists, communication scholars, and so on. You might ask students to assess his use of evidence. Does he provide sufficient evidence to back up his evaluations? Is there other evidence that he might have cited?

Michael Kinsley's "The Morality and Metaphysics of Email"

Synopsis: In this brief article, Michael Kinsley argues that e-mail is "an almost entirely positive development" (paragraph 4). Although he acknowledges some disadvantages, most of the article is devoted to praising the virtues of e-mail which include the re-establishment of written record-keeping and thus the preservation of history.

Question(s) of Value at Issue: At issue for Kinsley are both practical questions of value and social questions of value. While most readers would agree that these two categories of value are appropriate, they might not agree with Kinsley's representation of the practical and social values entailed in e-mail. Ask students to consider other ways of representing the practical and social questions of value related to e-mail.

Author Credibility and Stance: In the first few paragraph Kinsley makes clear his authority–he is, after all, an executive at Microsoft and therefore presumably knowledgeable about the Internet–yet he downplays that authority by representing himself as an ordinary e-mail user: "The way the new technology has affected my working life most directly has nothing in particular to do with what I am producing. . . . [T]his particular innovation would be just as transforming if my business were manufacturing paper clips" (paragraph 1). You might ask your students to consider why he takes pains to represent himself in this way. How does this effect his credibility? How does this change his stance or relationship to his subject, e-mail? Although he expresses nearly unbridled enthusiasm for e-mail, does his mention of its disadvantages (paragraphs 7 & 8), enhance his credibility?

Criteria Selected and Supporting Evidence: The criteria selected are related to the practical and social questions of value raised. Specific criteria selected to argue for its practical value include convenience and enhancement of business communication. The criteria he selects to argue for its social value include its egalitarianism and creation of a written record. His evidence for its convenience and communicative effectiveness is drawn mostly from his personal work experiences, and his evidence for its egalitarianism and contributions to history are mostly hypothetical or speculative. Ask students to evaluate the persuasiveness of this evidence. Are there other kinds of evidence that might be used to argue for either the advantages or disadvantages of e-mail based on the criteria Kinsley uses? Does he adequately address the disadvantages of e-mail? That is, is his evidence too one-sided to be persuasive? In the concluding paragraph, Kinsley compares e-mail to the telephone in terms of their effects on historical documentation. Ask your class to try to think of other comparisons they might make in order to argue for either the cultural effects of e-mail.

Joe Queenan's "Websites Dedicated to Being Simple Without Giving Up

Affluence"

Synopsis: Queenan offers a biting satire of Web sites that offer advice to the affluent about how to simplify their lives. In his view, these sites peddle silly or obvious ideas to people whose lives are made complicated by the drive to acquire and maintain wealth. Since these people have no intention of giving up their privileged, materialistic lifestyle, a key cause of their hectic lives, he sees the whole simplicity enterprise as laughably shallow and self-serving.

Question(s) of Value at Issue: Implicitly, Queenan asks whether or not these sites actually promote the value they profess to: a simpler lifestyle. This implied question, of course, begs the question of definition. What would it really mean to simplify one's life? Queenan answers this question by suggesting what it does not mean–made-up family rituals instead of old-fashioned obvious ones like eating dinner together. He also indirectly suggests that it might mean giving up some of the material privileges of an affluent lifestyle and attending to the decidedly not simple responsibilities of raising one's children. His judgment of the worth of these Web sites is stated, not surprisingly, in ironic terms: "None of the foregoing is meant to suggest that simplicity sites are useless, trendy, or foolish" (paragraph 5). But, of course, that's exactly what the foregoing is meant to suggest.

Author's Credibility and Stance: Well known for his social satire, Queenan's credentials are those of a social commentator who has spent some time browsing these Web sites. Of interest here is his stance toward his subject and the role he invites his readers to play in relationship to this subject. He seems less interested in trying to convince readers of the absurdity of these Web sites than he is in inviting readers to join him in mocking these sites and, perhaps indirectly, those that take them seriously. An interesting topic of discussion might be the role of the satirist in society. The role of the satirist is to expose human folly. Inevitably, then, the satirist is a moralist. To what extent, do they find Queenan's ridicule and critique moralistic? And if they find it so, how does this affect his credibility and their response to his critique?

Criteria Selected and Supporting Evidence: Queenan suggests his criteria in negative terms. That is, by judging these sites "useless, trendy, and foolish," Queenan implies the positive criteria of usefulness, time-testedness, and seriousness. The particular examples he cites all fail to live up to these positive criteria. For example, advice about "buying surveillance equipment" to keep tabs on the nanny is hardly a "useful" way to simplify one's life, and sixty-two tips for planning a New Year's Eve Party is hardly serious in its life-changing consequences. Ask the class to consider what kinds of changes might fit his criteria. Then ask students to visit one of the sites he mentions and evaluate it in terms of Queenans' criteria or according to other criteria that the class develops for judging serious recommendations for simplifying one's life.

Joyce Millman's "The Addictive Spectacle of Maternal Reality"

Synopsis: In her review of the reality TV show *A Baby Story,* Joyce Millman begins by comparing it to the childbirth film she saw in her Lamaze class. Despite her mixed feelings toward both the show and the film, she finds herself in tears at the end of each. The essay proceeds to speculate about the reasons for the show's popularity among women viewers as well as her own reactions to it. She concludes that the show is "hopelessly addictive" for many reasons–for its "voyeuristic tingle," its predictability, its presentation of childbirth "under the best, most hopeful circumstances," and its opportunity to relive one's own childbirth experiences.

Question(s) of Value at Issue: Implicitly, Millman asks two closely intertwined questions: why is this show so popular and why do viewers value it? Ask students to consider why she chooses the latter question of value over other questions she might has asked about the show's quality–it's filming techniques, composition, and so on. What question of value does she seem to be posing for herself?

Author Credibility and Stance: A good place to start discussing this feature of the article is with "Responding as a Reader," Activity #1. Additionally, you might ask them to describe her attitude toward the show? If they see her attitude as mixed, ask them to identify places where these differing attitudes are evident in the text. Do her mixed feelings add or detract from her credibility as an evaluator?

Criteria Selected and Supporting Evidence: Millman seems to use competing criteria to evaluate the show. Judged in artistic terms, it is hokey, predictable and sentimental, and its "stars" are unprofessional. But judged in human terms, it has many positive qualities. It is moving, and it treats its subjects with "dignity" (paragraph 9). How, she seems to ask, can such a sentimental, blatantly manipulate show touch such deep emotions in a sophisticated viewer like me? Her own response, in other words, is the most compelling evidence she offers for the show's value.

M. G. Lord's "En Garde, Princess!"

Synopsis: M.G. Lord, who has written a book about Barbie's longstanding corner on the doll market, evaluates the potential of a new doll line, the Get Real Girls, for giving Barbie some real competition. She compares both the two doll lines and their chief promoters, Jill Barad of Mattel and Jules Chavez, the creator of Get Real Girls. She tentatively suggests that the Get Real Girls are the first dolls to come along in a long time that actually have a chance of cutting into Barbie's market. However, she is hesitant to make any conclusive predictions because as a longtime Barbie watcher, Lord is quite aware of her formidable staying power.

Question(s) of Values at Issue: Lord suggests that the two doll lines appeal to competing values held by differing audiences. Young girls are drawn to Barbie's glamor and value the fantasy play she inspires. Mothers, by contrast, are drawn to dolls like Get Real Girls that offer a more wholesome role model. So perhaps the underlying question is what values are communicated through each two doll lines. Lord also describes the different values held by the doll promoters. Barad is characterized as a "juggernaut of a CEO" who is not likely to have looked into Mattel's labor practices (paragraphs 3 & 24). Chavez, by contrast, is characterized as a much more low key entrepreneur, who is quite concerned that her company engage in fair labor practices. Why are the values of the doll promoters important to Lord? Do you think such issues are relevant to an evaluation of the dolls' qualities? You might also ask students their opinions about Barbie dolls and the social values they communicate. What role do toys play in shaping children's values, self-concept, and so on?

Author Credibility and Stance: Even if the headnote did not reveal Lord's background knowledge of the doll industry generally and the Barbie industry particularly, the essay itself reveals that she is an authority on the subject. What effect does her knowledge of Barbie and her competitors throughout the years have on her credibility for judging the competitiveness of this new doll line? How might her attitude toward Barbie and Barad be described? Her attitude toward Get Real Girls and Chavez? Who is she rooting for? How do you know?

Criteria Selected and Supporting Evidence: We suggest that you ask your students to generate a list of criteria she uses to evaluate and compare the two doll lines. Then ask them to fill out a "score card" individually or in groups in which they list evidence under each criteria that one or the other doll line wins in that particular category. They will undoubtedly come up with such criteria as product quality, attention to detail, currency of ethos, marketing through Web sites, etc. Who do they think is the likely winner? Why?

Sandra Cisneros's "Barbie-Q"

Synopsis: Narrated from the point of view of a child, this very short story tells of two little girls, each making do with her one Barbie with the one worn-out outfit ("not including the sock dress"), until a fire sale in the neighborhood makes new, if slightly damaged, Barbies available cheap.

Question(s) of Value at Issue: Through the exuberant voice of the innocent child narrator, readers glimpse two competing value systems: one that can delight in and create imaginative play even with old, beat-up dolls, and another that reflects the larger cultural values that teach children to believe that new, fancy toys are better and more desirable. "Responding as a Writer" Activities #2 and #3 aim to engage students in a discussion of these competing values. Ask students to try to imagine this as an essay by Cisneros. What point do they think she might try to make? What might be the different effect between an essay with an explicit point and this short story?

Author Credibility and Stance: As suggested in "Responding as a Writer" Activity #1, there are two voices in this story: the voice of the child and the occasional voice of the narrator's older self recalling this incident. What details of language make the voice credible as a child's voice? Why is it important to render much of this story in the child narrator's voice? In particular, how does this contribute to the implied evaluations of the older and newer toys? At what points does the older narrator's voice emerge and what is the role of this perspective?

Criteria Selected and Supporting Evidence: The two competing value systems mentioned earlier–one that values children's natural ability to invent play, the other that values the latest commercially-made toy—entail two differing sets of criteria for determining value. Ask students to generate two lists of criteria for these sets of values and then to list the details in the story that support each of these sets of criteria. A criterion related to the first value system, for example, is improvisation, and evidence of this criterion is found in paragraph 2 and the last sentence of paragraph 6. Criteria related to the second value system are newness and variety. The fire-sale Barbies are deemed more valuable because they include an array of new outfits, accessories, and bendable legs (paragraphs 3, 4, & 6). You might ask students what they think about the abundance of toys available to American children. What effects do these toys have on children's development and values?

Rhonda Downey's "Through the Looking Glass"

Synopsis: Despite the African American actors in lead roles and the African American story lines, Downey judges two 1990s sitcoms, *Family Matters* and *Martin,* as more negative than positive in their representations of African Americans. While she recognizes their positive aspects, she finds that a closer analysis reveals the perpetuation of stereotypes. A turning point in her view of *Martin*, a show she had particularly enjoyed, came when she observed her white college dorm mates' response to this show.

Question(s) of Value at Issue: The question of value that is of immediate concern in this essay is stated directly: "They [these shows] challenge racial stereotypes and create a positive image of African Americans, don't they? (paragraph 1). Her larger concern is the positive or negative effects media images have on people's attitudes toward African Americans. Do these shows and the media generally "promote ethnic peace and harmony"? (paragraph 7). Some students will no doubt wish to protest that things have changed since the 1990s, and perhaps they have. However, they must be prepared to offer concrete evidence if they wish to make this argument.

Author Credibility and Stance: Ask students to discuss the follow questions: What makes Downey credible as a critic of these shows? How, for example, does her admission that she was initially a fan of both shows add to her credibility? How would you describe the tone of this essay? What does her tone communicate about her attitude toward these shows?

Criteria Selected and Supporting Evidence: The main two criteria by which Downey judges these two shows are realism and positive representation of the African American characters. She actually finds some evidence that each show meets these criteria, but more evidence that they do not. Does Downey provide enough to support her judgment of these two shows? What about her concern that stereotyped media images influence peoples' attitudes toward African Americans? Does she provide sufficient and compelling evidence that these images do have a damaging effect?

We can think of several thought-provoking discussion topics that might follow from a reading of Downey's essay: Isn't it possible that these two criteria might sometimes compete? That is, any realistic representation of a group of people might sometimes portray them negatively. Is it the media's responsibility to challenge existing prejudices and change social attitudes?

HELPING STUDENTS WITH THE WRITING PROJECTS

Making an Evaluation

The three rhetorical features discussed in relation to the readings can also be used to guide students in their selection of a topic and the writing of an evaluative essay. Options A and B under this strand are meant to offer students a choice between making a judgment of absolute value (x is best) and making a relative judgment (x is better in some way than y). However, the sentence under Option B which reads, "For example, you might evaluate a restaurant in the category of best ethnic restaurant . . .," blurs this distinction. Actually, that example should appear under Option A.

Here are some suggestions for helping your students with Strand 1 assignments:

- **Establishing author credibility**. Whether students choose Option A or B, it is best if they select a topic that they know something about both in terms of experience and background information. If they are avid mountain bikers, for example, they probably not only have firsthand experience with bikes, equipment, and locations for mountain biking but they also probably have factual knowledge about the bikes, equipment, and political debates with environmentalists about the impact of mountain biking from reading online or print publications for mountain bikers. Ask students to brainstorm a list of topics about which they have some expertise and then interview one another about the topics. What topic might be most interesting to others? You might even want to encourage students to identify a particular audience and publication venue for this essay and then send this essay off for possible publication.

- **Considering the question(s) of value at issue**. In the early stages of this writing project, you might ask them to freewrite about who values this phenomenon and why. What types of values are related to this phenomenon? For example, restaurants are valued as sources of entertainment as well as sources of eating pleasure. Sometimes, as we discussed in relation to some readings, competing values are entailed, or differing groups may value the same phenomenon for different reasons. Fleshing out these questions of value should generate ideas for how to evaluate their subject as well as help them articulate possible purposes and audiences.

- **Selecting criteria and providing sufficient evidence**. The criteria selected follow from the question or questions of value at issue. So if a student is arguing that x is the best Mexican restaurant in town based primarily on its culinary superiority, she would select such criteria as variety, quality, uniqueness, and/or presentation of the food. If she were arguing that it was the best Mexican restaurant in providing an overall entertaining evening, she would include service, entertainment, decor, and atmosphere. In planning this essay and selecting criteria, students should consider not only the relevance of the criteria but also their ability to marshal convincing evidence that match this criteria. If they have chosen a topic about which they have some personal knowledge, they should be able to use personal experience as one kind of evidence. A final note: as mentioned earlier, the question of value entailed in Option A is an absolute question of value while the question of value entailed in Option B is a relative one. What this means is that the burden of proof is greater for the writer of Option A than it is for the writer of Option B. The former must be absolutely precise in defining his or her criteria and able to marshal convincing comparative evidence. While both kinds of evaluations will undoubtedly involve comparison, the writer of Option A will have to make categorical comparisons which, in turn, requires a thorough knowledge of the category. To argue that bike x is the best mountain bike available for the money requires a comprehensive knowledge of the category and the presentation of conclusive proof. By contrast, one can focus on a more limited set of facts if she is arguing that bike x is better than y for the money.

Examining Rhetorical Strategies

Strand 2 invites students to evaluate an evaluation. That is, it asks them to analyze and judge the effectiveness of a particular evaluation. The prompts suggested for this assignment on p. 489 of *Reading Rhetorically* offer criteria for students to use in making their evaluation. However, the assignment does not suggest a purpose beyond judging the persuasiveness of the evaluation. Therefore, it is crucial to discuss possible purposes with your students. Why is it important to evaluate this particular text? Are there consequences that might follow from this text's evaluation of a topic that might cause concern? Is there unfairness or bias in the evaluation that needs to be exposed? Are there other ways to evaluate this topic that should not be ignored? Is the value or importance of this topic underestimated?

Extending the Conversation

Strand 3 extends the preceding assignment by asking students explicitly to "talk back" to one of the evaluative essays in this chapter. That is, this assignment asks students to offer a different evaluation or assessment of the same topic. They may, of course, partially agree with the original author's assessment but they must extend the evaluation to add some new evaluative perspective. The chief way in which they will do this is by analyzing and evaluating the subject for themselves–viewing *A Baby Story* (if it's still running) or another reality TV show; taking notes on their experiences with PowerPoint or e-mail; visiting one of the simplicity Web sites or examining some issues of *Real Simple* magazine; going to a toy store to evaluate the new Get Real Dolls or visiting their Web site; and so on. Their essays will inevitably involve comparing and contrasting their evaluations with the authors. Students should enjoy doing this firsthand research for this assignment and should be able to collect evidence for their position readily.

Thematic Connections

The list below suggests readings from this and other chapters that might be discussed together.

- On the topic of toys and the values they communicate to children, pair Barthes's "Toys" (Chapter 12) with the Lord essay and Cisneros short story in this chapter. These three readings provide a rich context for discussion and also a context for writing. Students can also draw on their personal experiences to discuss these issues. All three texts mention gender socialization directly or indirectly, so this, too, is a fruitful topic for discussion or writing.

- On the topic of technology and its impact on our lives, pair Zuckerman with Kinsley and perhaps even Queenan, who suggests that technology has complicated our lives. This topic for discussion and writing also draws on students' experiences. Since each of these articles was written, there have been many developments in each of these technologies as well as in the creation of new technologies which students can discuss, compare, and evaluate.

- On the topic of media and its impact on our lives, pair Downey and Millman. To this topic as well most students bring extensive personal experience.

- On the intersections of race and class, pair hooks (Chapter 9), Bambara (Chapter 12), Cisneros, and Downey.

CHAPTER 15

Reading and Writing Texts that Propose Solutions

Texts that propose solutions are common in public, professional, and academic life. As forms of argument, they aim to convince readers that a particular solution to a problem is feasible and justifiable. More importantly, they aim to persuade readers to take some action or to become aware of the need for action. In short, understanding how to read and write proposal arguments is vital to students' academic, civic and professional lives.

By reading and writing texts that propose solutions, your students will learn to

- read critically a form of discourse that is common in public, professional, and academic life
- identify the rhetorical features of effective proposal arguments
- try out these features in their own writing

HELPING STUDENTS UNDERSTAND TEXTS THAT PROPOSE SOLUTIONS

To introduce this unit, we suggest that you bring in a variety of short proposals from newspapers, business or technical journals, popular magazines, and so on. For example, you might include proposals from fashion magazines for women and men about how to solve relationship problems. Divide students into small groups and ask them to read an example or two and answer the following questions: How is the problem defined? What solution is proposed? What kind of reasons or evidence is given in support of this solution? What seems to be the intent of the article–to change attitudes or to get readers to act?

Next ask students to read the Introduction to Chapter 15 in *Reading Rhetorically* and reconsider the examples they have been discussing in light of the terms and concepts introduced.

To help students understand the features of effective proposals, we suggest that you draw their attention to the following:

1. Goal of Proposal and Audience Appeals

Since writers of proposal arguments have specific designs on readers, it is important to identify the kind of action intended. Is it the proposal's goal to move the audience to concrete, specific action? Acceptance, rejection, or modification of a policy? A change in outlook or values? Some combination of the above? Once the goal or goals are identified, the rhetorical reader can begin to examine the strategies the writer uses to elicit the intended response. What kind of a relationship does the writer try to establish with readers? What kind of roles does the writer invite the audience to play in relation to the subject? The writers in this chapter use differing strategies to persuade their readers to respond in particular ways. In order to provoke readers to action, Peter Singer appeals to readers' sense of moral responsibility. Janet Radcliffe-Richards and her colleagues attempt to neutralize their readers' repugnance toward their subject by engaging readers' reasoning.

2. Presentation of the Problem

Whether or not the writer needs to devote much attention to presentation of the problem depends upon how familiar intended readers are with the problem. In some cases, writers may just briefly present the problem and move on to their solutions while in other cases they may take up most of the essay trying to convince readers that there is a problem. So the approach to problem presentation is entirely situational. For writers who need to inform readers about the problem, the challenge is to present it in compelling terms, to give it *presence*. Techniques for making a problem present to readers include vivid anecdotes or examples, surprising facts, quotes from authorities, and so on. The authors of the selections in this chapter demonstrate a wide range of strategies–from Weston's dramatic descriptions of the consequences of our "trashing" the environment to Kathryn Sipiorski's opening anecdote that indicates our need to "study peace."

2. Justification of Solution

While making a problem present to readers often involves appeals to readers' emotions, values, and self interest, justifying a solution appeals to readers' reason as well as to their values. Generally, writers use three kinds of logical appeals to justify their solutions: (1) appeals based on principle; (2) appeals based on consequence; and (3) appeals based on analogy. Most proposal arguments draw on all three kinds of justification as is illustrated in the example from Radcliffe-

Richards et al. discussed in the Introduction (*RR*, p. 493).

CHAPTER SELECTIONS

To help you select and teach texts from this chapter, we provide a synopsis of each selection and notes on its special rhetorical features.

Anthony Weston's "The Need for Environmental Ethics"

Synopsis: Anthony Weston issues an urgent call for radical change in our way of thinking and living. In his view, the consequences of our failure to treat the environment with respect are already catastrophic and continued exploitation will lead to even more dire consequences for our children's children. For Weston, short-term solutions are no solutions at all, but long-term solutions will take resolve and sacrifice and that requires a profound change in our relationship to the natural world.

Goal of Proposal and Audience Appeals: Weston's goal is not a specific action or policy proposal but a change of heart and mind. Ultimately, of course, his goals include radical changes in lifestyle and environmental policy, but he knows that this will only happen if there is a profound changes in values. Therefore, his task is to impress upon readers the gravity of the problem and to appeal to their sense of moral responsibility to future generations. However, to achieve this goal, he has to dramatize the enormity of the problem and that risks overwhelming readers and causing them to despair. Ask your students to consider their emotional reaction to his essay. How do they feel after reading this essay? Does he succeed in convincing them that this is a grave problem and that they are responsible to do something about it? What kind of lifestyle sacrifices would they be willing to make to protect the environment? (See also "Responding as a Writer," Activity #2 on p. 498, which deals with audience strategies.)

Presentation of Problem: Given Weston's goal, the success of his argument rests on his ability to make this problem present to readers. He does this in two ways: by describing the current consequences (paragraph 1) and by describing the future consequences (paragraphs 4–6). "Responding as a Reader," Activity #1 offers a place to begin discussion of this aspect of Weston's argument. One of the problems he mentions but fails to develop in detail is people's alienation or disconnection from nature (paragraph 1). Why is this an important problem to Weston? Do your students feel this is an important problem? What are its consequences?

Justification of Solution: To justify his long-term solution–radical changes in thinking and lifestyle—Weston dramatizes the "disproportion" between the short-term gain and the long-term loss (paragraph 7). In other words, he uses arguments from consequence to make an argument from principle. What does it say about values, he asks rhetorically, that we are willing to mortgage our children's and their children's future for the sake of "a cheaper hamburger"? If one accepts Weston's reasoning from consequence and principle, she or he cannot fail to reach his conclusions. So the question to ask students is do they accept his reasoning here.

John Oates's "Why a Prime Model for Saving Rain Forests Is a Failure"

Synopsis: Oates argues that conservationists' current policy of integrating "sustainable development" with conservation isn't working either to protect the environment nor to achieve sustainable economic development for people (paragraph 8). One consequence is "many animal species in the tropics face extinction" (paragraph 11). Oates urges his academic audience to take actions that include speaking out against current conservation policies and teaching children and young people greater respect for nature (paragraphs 12–19).

Goal of Proposal and Audience Appeals: Oates's goal is concrete action coupled with changes in current policies. He relies mainly on logical rather than on emotional appeals to his audience of fellow academics. He seems to believe that if he rationally explains why the current policy isn't working, his audience will be persuaded to act. Ask your students whether they think this strategy works? Why or why not?

Presentation of Problem: Oates presents the problem as a policy problem with dire consequences to the environment. Yet he doesn't attempt to make these consequences present to readers; he merely asserts that these policies aren't working and that they are endangering many species. Perhaps he assumes that his academic colleagues will take his word for it without requiring him to prove his assertions with evidence. Here's a brief exercise you might try with your students. Assume that Oates was asked to rewrite this article for a different audience, say, for a children's magazine like *Weekly Reader*. What advice would they offer him about presenting the problem to this audience?

Justification of Solution: Since Oates's chief goal is a change in policy, he argues mainly from the consequence, specifically claiming that the current policy of coupling conservation with development is a failure (paragraphs 8–11). Underlying his argument, of course, is a principle that places higher value on environmental protection than on economic development. "Responding as a Writer," Activities #2 and #3 ask students to examine this aspect of Oates's article.

Peter Singer's "The Singer Solution to World Poverty"

Synopsis: Philosopher Peter Singer challenges readers to take concrete action to end world hunger, specifically to donate significant amounts of their income to hunger relief organizations. Anticipating his readers' many objections, he raises them himself and tries to answer them. But, finally, as he admits, what he is asking of readers requires significant personal sacrifice and radical change in lifestyle: "If that [giving away significant amounts of our income] makes living a morally decent life extremely arduous, well, then that is the way things are" (paragraph 23).

Goal of Proposal and Audience Appeals: Because the concrete action he is proposing is so bold, Singer faces daunting challenges in terms of audience appeal. Like Weston, he is faced with the difficulty of implicitly criticizing readers' current behavior and values while trying to win them over to his proposal that they change. Further, he wants readers to feel guilty if they refuse to act on his proposal but he doesn't want to alienate them from even considering his proposal. (See "Responding as a Reader," Activity # 2, p. 509.) One way in which he tries to finesse these contrary appeals to his audience is through the ways in which he refers to readers and invites them to play various roles. Compare, for example, the pronouns he uses to refer to readers in paragraphs 14 and 15. His move here is to invite readers to identify themselves against those readers who do not act on his proposal. Does it work?

Presentation of Problem: Singer devotes almost no time to making the problem of world poverty present for readers. Ask students to speculate about why he doesn't. Was this decision a mistake? Why or why not?

Justification of Solution: Most of Singer's essay is devoted to justifying his solution through reasoning, specifically the kind of reasoning used by utilitarian philosophers. As he explains in paragraph 5, for utilitarian philosophers moral principles are inseparable from actions because actions have moral consequences. The only way people can demonstrate their principles is through their actions. Although he also argues from analogy, this is only to illustrate the inseparability of principle from consequence. If a reader accepts

Singer's line of reasoning, he or she cannot help but assent to his solution, and that, of course, is his aim. Paragraph 10, for example, offers a particularly clear example of the everyday deductive reasoning (rhetoricians call this kind of logical sequence an *enthymeme*). Singer's essay lends itself nicely to a brief lesson in everyday reasoning and logic. To resist the conclusion Singer insists upon in paragraph 10, for example, the reader would have to challenge the premises on which he bases this conclusion, particularly the unspoken premise that Bob's action is analogous to a refusal to send money to relief organizations.

Marcia Angell and Jerome Kassirer's "Clinical Research–What Should the Public Believe?"

Synopsis: In this *NEJM* editorial, Angell and Kassirer discuss the problem of distorted media reporting of medical research. Such reporting causes confusion and even resentment on part of the public who believe they are being given contradictory advice. Angell and Kassirer offer two solutions, each aimed at a different audience: (1) more cautious and careful reporting by the media; and (2) more critical, well informed consumption of these reports by the public.

Goal of Proposal and Audience Appeals: This proposal aims to change the behaviors or practices of two groups of people, the media who report on medical research and the public who read these reports. Why, then, your students may wonder, is this proposal published in a journal whose primary audience is medical professionals? Presumably, this audience does not need the kind of schooling in the nature of scientific research offered in paragraph 5. The real audience, then, appears to be the media reporters who read *NEJM* to glean stories about medical research and secondarily the general public who may read this editorial if it is picked up by major newspapers. A useful topic of discussion is the distinction between "primary" or "immediate" audiences and "subsidiary" or "mediated" ones.[12] The point is that many texts address multiple audiences simultaneously, and sometimes the ostensible or immediate audience may not be the main audience targeted.

Presentation of the Problem: Angell and Kassirer devote little attention to problem presentation on the assumption that both their immediate and subsidiary audiences are already aware of the problem on some level. However, they do offer a series of vivid and familiar examples of the problem of

[12] William A. Covino and David A. Jolliffe discuss these distinctions in *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1995), pp. 12-13.

contradictory advice in paragraph 2.

Justification of Solution: Angell and Kassirer spend little time justifying their solution but a great deal of time spelling out their solution in almost teacher-like fashion. In paragraph 5, as mentioned, they offer a lesson in the scientific method for the benefit of the media and the general public, and in paragraph 7, they offer a numbered list of recommendations for improving reporting practices by the media. Their only justification is the argument from consequence, and it is only mentioned in passing (see paragraph 10) on the assumption that their various audiences will readily assent that this solution will ameliorate the problem. (See "Responding as a Reader," Activities #2 and #3, p. 515.)

Janet Radcliffe-Richards et al.'s "The Case for Allowing Kidney Sales"

Synopsis: Radcliffe-Richards and her co-authors argue that the case for allowing kidney sales by live donors ought to be re-opened. Their reason for proposing this reconsideration is that they believe the consequences of prohibition are more harmful than the negative consequences that prompted the prohibition in the first place. Moreover, they believe that the arguments used to justify the prohibition do not hold up when carefully scrutinized.

Goal of Proposal and Audience Appeals: The stated goal of this proposal is to reopen debate about the policy against kidney sales by live donors, and it is directed toward medical professionals who are the ones, presumably, who are in a position to call for renewed debate. However, near the end of the essay there emerges a second proposal which modifies the first: "we claim that the burden of proof remains against the defenders of prohibition, and that until good arguments appear, the presumption must be that the trade should be regulated rather than banned altogether" (paragraph 20). Since Radcliffe-Richards and her colleagues have already reopened the debate with this article, this latter claim suggests that their real intention all along was to argue for a change in policy. Ask your students what they think of these somewhat competing proposals. Why did the authors begin as they did and reveal their "second" proposal only near the end of the essay? What does this suggest about their intended readers' attitudes toward this subject? Does this seem like an effective audience strategy?

Presentation of Problem: There two kinds of problems the authors present. The first is the material problem of the shortage of kidneys for transplantation, and the authors only give this problem brief mention (paragraph

2) because their audience need not be convinced that this is a problem. The second, and thornier problem, is the feelings and beliefs that have produced the policy prohibiting kidney sales, and it is this problem that is the main focus of the essay.

Justification of Solution: As suggested above, there are really two solutions proposed: (1) reopen discussion and (2) change the policy to one that regulates rather than bans kidney sales unless a more compelling case can be made for its continued prohibition. Nearly the entirety of the article is devoted to challenging the justifications that prompted the current policy. Their justification for reopening the debate and possibly reversing the policy rests mainly on argument from consequence (paragraph 2), but they engage in arguments from principle and analogy in order to show the weaknesses in their opponents' arguments. For example, they argue that their opponents' argument from the principle of "autonomous choice" involves two separate arguments each of which is flawed (paragraphs 7–13). We suggest that you spend some time analyzing the reasoning in this essay. The appeal to *logos* seems the most difficult for students to grasp, so essays that lay out their reasoning in this detail are useful in helping them to understand how arguments based on reasoning work.

Kenneth Bruffee's "Binge Drinking as a Substitute for a 'Community of Learning'"

Synopsis: Bruffee addresses the problem of binge drinking on campuses. In Bruffee's view, membership in fraternities and sororities contributes to this problem, and the reasons first-year students join fraternities and sororities is to belong and to mask insecurity. Therefore, his proposed solution is to make collaborative learning available to first-year students, so they will have no need to seek friendship and community through joining fraternities and sororities .

Goal of Proposal and Audience Appeals: It is not until the last few paragraphs that Bruffee makes his goal clear. His goal is action on the part of his academic readers, specifically implementation of collaborative learning initiatives. Since he imagines his readers to be familiar with collaborative learning, he offers no specific or detailed recommendations for enacting his proposal. Throughout the article, he adopts a collegial attitude toward his readers, assuming they will accord him credibility not only as a fellow academic but also as a well know expert on collaborative learning.

Presentation of Problem: Bruffee states the problem and summarizes its consequences briefly in paragraph 1. He assumes the problem is already quite present to his audience of fellow academics. (See "Responding as a Reader," Activity #1 on p. 524–525.)

Justification of Solution: To persuade his readers of the logic of his solution, he offers the following line of reasoning: first-year students feel insecure and alone, so they join fraternities and sororities which afford them community but also contribute to the possibility that they will engage in binge drinking. Therefore, if this kind of social belonging could be provided in first-year classrooms, first-years students would be less likely to join fraternities and sororities and therefore less likely to be exposed to binge drinking. To justify, his solution to his audience of other academics he argues from consequence (paragraph 1 and 12) and shared principles such as the goals of a liberal education (paragraph 11). It is likely that your students will be less persuaded by Bruffee's reasoning and argument from principle than are his audience of academics. Ask them to respond and evaluate his claims about the "sharp distinction" between the academic and social for students (paragraph 10) and to respond to his entirely negative characterization of fraternities and sororities (paragraph 14).

Kathryn Sipiorski's "Consider the Study of Peace"

Synopsis: Using a report of another shooting death at an inner-city high school as her point of departure, Sipiorski argues that our society would be less violent if the school curriculum included peace studies. Specifically, she proposes that her university "consider the study of peace" by adding such courses to the curriculum.

Goal of Proposal and Audience Appeals: Sipiorski has two goals in mind: (1) expansion of the curriculum to "expand peace education" (paragraph 7); and (2) personal commitment to a "new mentality" that fosters "the ability to nurture, harvest, and distribute the fruits of nonviolence" (paragraph 8). Ask your students to describe the relationship she tries to establish with her readers. How does she model the kind of nonconfrontational approach she is calling for? What kind of audience appeal is at work in paragraph 6? Which of her two proposals seems most likely to be successful?

Presentation of Problem: She is really addressing two types of problems that she suggests are causally linked. In the first four paragraphs, she describes the first problem, widespread violence, concluding that a key cause of this problem is the absence of alternative models of behavior. The second problem, then, is this absence of models (paragraph 5). To support this assertion, she compares the number of courses dealing with the theme of violence at her university as opposed to those dealing with nonviolence. Ask your students if they know whether or not there are peace studies courses on your campus. Also, ask them how the attitudes toward violence and nonviolence might have changed for many since September 11th.

Justification of Solution: The plausibility of Sipiorski's solution–more courses on nonviolence and more personal commitment to work for nonviolence in our everyday lives–depends upon whether or not the reader accepts her argument from consequence. Does the prevalence of violent behavior and paucity of models of nonviolent behavior contribute to violence? And if so, can education help solve this problem? (See "Responding as a Writer," Activity #1, pp. 527–528). In the last few paragraphs, Sipiorski argues from principle: personal commitment to nonviolent thinking and action is the responsibility of everyone if we are to work toward a peaceful community (paragraph 8). Ask students what they think of this proposal. What might this mean in new and more dangerous times?

HELPING STUDENTS WITH THE WRITING PROJECTS

Proposing a Solution

This Strand 1 assignment (*RR*, p. 529) offers students an opportunity to write for audiences outside the classroom and to consider submitting their work for possible publication. We recommend that you urge or even require your students to do this. A benefit of requiring submission for publication is the deeper understanding of audience your students will acquire.

In addition to the questions that are provided to guide students' planning, we offer these additional teaching suggestions:

- To help students choose a topic, ask them to brainstorm about problems that concern them, particularly local ones about which they have some knowledge. Perhaps the class can fill the board with topic ideas, so that those who are struggling to find a topic can see the range of possible topics.

- As a class, select a sample topic and brainstorm together about all of the people who are concerned about this problem or have some stake in its solution. After this list has been generated, consider as a class whether what is at issue differs for various groups concerned about the problem. For example, in our hometown, student performance in inner city public schools is a serious problem. Those concerned include parents, students, teachers, school administrators, state legislators, the school board, and local taxpayers. Clearly, each constituency defines the problem somewhat differently and those differences lead to differing approaches to solving the problem. In preparation for this activity, ask students to review the discussion of stasis questions in Chapter 13.

- After students have chosen their individual topics and begun work on their essays, have them pair up and interview one another about feasibility or justifications of the solution the author is proposing. You might encourage interview partners to take turns playing the devil's advocate with respect to his or her partner's solution.

WRITING A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF TEXTS THAT PROPOSE SOLUTIONS

If students have worked through the "Thinking Critically" questions that accompany each reading, they should be well prepared for writing this essay. As we explain in the Strand 2 prompt on *Reading Rhetorically*, p. 529, they should think of this as an evaluative argument in which they use the features of effective proposals as the criteria for judging a particular text. A useful way to think about their purpose in this essay might be to think of it as a letter to the editor of the magazine or journal in which the proposal was published. What do they want to say back to the writer of this proposal? How will their analysis enable their readers to see the original proposal differently? (For additional tips on helping students write rhetorical analyses, see Part Two of this manual.)

Extending the Conversation

Strand 3 combines the tasks in Strands 1 and 2 and asks students to add new "voices" to the conversation about a particular school problem. Like the Strand 1 assignment, this might be an opportunity for students to address audiences outside the classroom with their writing. A valuable part of this assignment will be the primary research your students conduct in reviewing campus materials and interviewing members of the campus community. To prepare students for conducting interviews, you should spend class time discussing the features of a good interview: carefully designed questions prepared in advance, the protocol for requesting and conducting the interview, the pros and cons of using a tape recorder, the role of the interviewer, and so on.

Thematic Connections

- On critiques of Americans' materialistic values, pair Weston and Singer from this chapter with Queenan (Chapter 12), Bambara (Chapter 12), or perhaps Hribal (Chapter 10).

- On moral decision-making, couple a showing of the movie *Central Station* (or excerpts from it) with either Singer or with Radcliffe-Richards et al. Or, alternatively, pair Weston and Singer.

- On environmental issues, pair Weston and Oates.

  To extend the conversation about environmental policies, ask students to conduct research about local environmental issues.

- On the need for improved science education, pair Oates and Angell and Kassirer.

  To extend the conversation about science education, interview public school science teachers, presenting Oates and Angell and Kassirer's proposals and asking them their opinions of these proposals.

CHAPTER 16

Reading and Writing Texts that Seek Common Ground

Unlike previous chapters, this one includes texts with a variety of rhetorical aims—some argue, others explain or analyze. Nevertheless, they are linked thematically to a rhetorical idea, an idea about using rhetoric for the common good. This common idea is a commitment to civil discourse that works to overcome if not resolve differences. The authors of these texts are interested in how argument can be a productive activity, not an unpleasant shouting match. Their texts discuss and demonstrate ways of resolving conflicts. They demonstrate ways of finding commonality in the midst of difference.

Reading and analyzing these texts that describe and practice common ground techniques will help your students:

- take a constructive, ethical approach to working with disagreements and differences
- learn to examine controversies to find the disagreements at their core
- learn to examine controversies to find shared concerns and points of agreement within them
- learn to adopt argument strategies that reduce threat

HELPING STUDENTS UNDERSTAND COMMON GROUND

As the introduction to Chapter 16 explains, we have built *Reading Rhetorically*'s final chapter around the popular catch phrase *common ground* because we want to demonstrate the ways in which reading and writing *rhetorically* can yield new insights about difficult controversies and conflicts. The concept of common ground does not necessarily mean compromise or the end of disagreement. It means learning enough about people who differ from and with us so that together we can find commonality upon which something good can be built. It is an approach to human discourse that can be enhanced by the careful listening of rhetorical reading and the careful work of writing with rhetorical insight.

The selections in this chapter were written from a wide variety of disciplinary perspectives. Each offers a different perspective on the common ground idea. The chapter introduction puts special emphasis on the approach to writing arguments known as Rogerian rhetoric (p. 532), which entails reducing threat by conveying understanding and emphasizing points of agreement between opposing views.

The first four readings suggest the need for and describe common ground methods. The last four then embody common ground techniques and ideas. The chapter's first selection, Deborah Tannen's "Triumph of the Yell," lays out the problem that our common ground theme is meant to address: she describes what's wrong with agonistic public discourse and recommends that we move beyond opposition. Sidney Callahan suggests how we might make opposition more productive and offers some rules for "fighting" fairly at home and in public. Next, educator Aida Michlowski, a trained mediator, provides a primer on concepts and methods for conflict resolution in the classroom, and anthropologist Faye Ginsburg reports on how the Common Ground Network for Life and Choice helped opponents in the abortion controversy work together on the public policy issues about which they did agree.

The chapter's second set of four readings begins with political scientists Michael X. Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter's scholarly common ground argument for the value of service learning in the teaching of political science. Next, Mel White's highly personal letter to Jerry Falwell about homosexuality demonstrates an open-armed Rogerian approach to persuasion. It is followed by Salim Muwakkil's analytic narrative of a young white student asserting common ground with African Americans through hip-hop music. Finally, student Jenny Trinitapoli's researched academic paper looks for common ground in opposing positions in the controversy about requiring content filters on public Internet terminals.

As even these brief descriptions illustrate, these texts are more similar in theme than aim or genre; as a result, we present our commentary on their rhetorical features under the synthetic heading "Possibilities for Common Ground" instead of the distinct parallel categories of features used in previous chapters.

CHAPTER SELECTIONS

Deborah Tannen, "The Triumph of the Yell"

Synopsis. In this short "take a stand" style argument, Tannen criticizes contemporary tendencies to treat public discourse as a fight, arguing from consequences that the resulting "culture of critique" is counterproductive, that "opposition is not the path to truth" (paragraph 9). She illustrates her claim with anecdotes where antagonistic interactions squelched expression or incited vicious verbal attacks: "the result of demonizing those with whom we disagree can be truly demonic," she says (paragraph 16). She closes by recommending that we move beyond opposition as a primary means of inquiry and thus "move closer to the truth."

Possibilities for Common Ground. Ironically, Tannen's piece gives little indication of reaching out to the opponents whom she criticizes. The problem she describes, which she elaborates upon in *The Argument Culture*, gave impetus to calls for "civility" and "common ground." Her central point contends that if we can move beyond artificial notions of "two-sides to everything," we have a better chance of understanding, indeed, appreciating, complexity and finding commonality amidst difference. Tannen says, "it is a myth that opposition leads to truth when truth does not reside on one side or the other but is rather a crystal of many sides" (paragraph 7).

Sidney Callahan, "Fight Fierce but Fair: And Practice at Home"

Synopsis. In contrast to Tannen, Callahan has faith in the value of opposition, if it's civilized. This selection explains what she calls the "Callahan guidelines for conducting civilized debate" (paragraph 6), four rules she and her husband have long followed to keep peace between them, for they disagree strongly on a number of religious and ethical issues, abortion probably the best known of them. In paragraph 12 she describes Americans' attitude toward dilemmas quite differently from the way Tannen does, remarking that "we hate sustained argument and hard-focused thinking." Training at home with the Callahans' rules should help overcome this, she suggests, and "produce people able to persevere in arguments" (paragraph 13). It should be interesting to see if students find Tannen and Callahan to be in disagreement or looking at matters from different perspectives. (As the headnotes indicate, their articles were published within a month of each other in early 1994.)

Possibilities for Common Ground. While Callahan is celebrating the value of argument, her four "rules" suggest excellent means for reducing strife and rancor. Perhaps the most important of these for finding commonality with an opponent is Rule Number 3, an admonition to avoid extremes (here she's in agreement with Tannen) and argue against the best representative of the opposition's points. "If you can't state the opposing side's arguments better than they can, and then show why the position is unsatisfactory, you haven't done your homework" (paragraph 10). Emphasizing this advice should help students who find it difficult to refer to or challenge opposing views when they write arguments. Callahan's points underscore the idea that "common ground" represents not the end of disagreement, but a commitment to plumb opposing viewpoints for possibilities. We see her optimism again in the closing paragraph, where she remarks, "Who knows? By attentive, polite listening to all sides of conflicted encounters…you can learn new things."

Aida A. Michlowski, "From Conflict to Congruence"

Synopsis. Michlowski's informative text is not so much making a point as providing a compendium of terms and references that will help readers understand and study classroom-based conflict resolution programs. The article, which is accompanied by extensive bibliographic citations, has four major sections: (1) methods of resolution, which describes negotiation, peer mediation, and arbitration; (2) objectives and outcomes, which gives nutshell summaries of research data; (3) curriculum approaches, which describes different types of conflict resolution programs in schools; (4) teaching strategies, which summarizes published reports of strategies used in a variety of programs.

Possibilities for Common Ground. The taxonomy of terms and program descriptions in this text offers readers a template for analyzing conflicts. As the chapter introduction suggests (p. 532), rhetorical readers might use these methods for conflict resolution to supplement more traditional rhetorical analysis to discover what is at stake in opposing arguments and where parties to a controversy might find points of amicability if not agreement.

Faye Ginsburg, "The Anthropology of Abortion Activism"

Synopsis. A mix of exposition and advocacy, Ginsburg's essay describes some of her anthropological research on abortion activism and calls for scholarly research on contemporary social movements. Writing for a broad academic audience at a time when violent clashes in front of abortion clinics and even murders of doctors and clinic workers were frequently in the news, Ginsburg argues that possibilities for solving or even easing controversies as difficult as the abortion debate can emerge only if "a rounded, complex sense of who the activists are" (paragraph 6) is more generally known. To illustrate and support her points, she describes the efforts of grassroots abortion activists to move beyond confrontational tactics and instead join with opponents to promote dialog and educational programs. Paragraphs 10–15 provide specific details about activities of the Pro-Dialogue group in North Dakota during the mid-1980s and of the Common Ground Network for Life and Choice in the 1990s.

Possibilities for Common Ground. This selection connects with the chapter's common ground theme in two ways: (1) through its larger argument for academic research that counters extremist stereotypes, and (2) through its depiction of specific common ground efforts. The listening and "say back" methods of the Common Ground Network, described further on pages 532-533 of the chapter introduction, suggest a model useful not just for opponents seeking common ground for productive work but for students—whether anthropology scholars or first-year writers—who read or listen to opposed positions so that they can understand them more fully and perhaps then, as Ginsburg says, suggest ways to "help expand and reframe the public discourse on controversial issues" (paragraph 18). This kind of work, she says, "can help to illuminate new political possibilities that offer a brave counterpoint to the atmosphere of increasing violence" (paragraph 9).

Michael X. Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter, "What Should Be Learned Through Service Learning?"

Synopsis. In this article addressed to a broad spectrum of political science faculty, these two political scientists use a common ground approach to make their case that service learning is a valuable teaching method for their discipline. They begin by acknowledging that service learning provides both opportunities and challenges for "the teaching and practice of democratic politics" (paragraph 1). Unlike readers of *PS*, the specialized journal where this was published, English students and instructors may not immediately recognize that this pairing of "teaching" and "practice" represents a longstanding tension between educational and civic goals for political science teaching. By the fourth paragraph, however, we can gather that the intended audience includes professors with "sometimes competing" pedagogical goals. After providing a brief map of the article's structure (third sentence), the authors announce their intention of identifying common ground between these goals. At the end of the first paragraph, they assert that the competing pedagogical models have common ground "in the learning of factual knowledge about politics."

Devoting much of its attention to sympathetic restatement of positions that might oppose the author's points, the article proceeds very much like the Rogerian arguments described in the chapter introduction (p. 532). After defining the goals of service learning and showing their similarity to the overall goals of policitcal science itself (paragraphs 2–3), the authors acknowledge the value of pedagogy that has the primary goal of transmitting knowledge, not experience (paragraphs 4–5), then suggest that service learning can fill this role, too (paragraph 5). Interested in a less stark set of choices, however, they move on to suggest what might be called a "both/and" set of questions to replace the "either/or" tension with which they began, then refocus on their common ground claim about factual knowledge (paragraph 6). In the next two paragraphs they again acknowledge opposing views before asserting reasons and evidence for their own views. They stretch out into their rationale for service learning pedagogy, provided it is well-designed, only in paragraphs 9–12, and then conclude in classic social science form by specifying questions for further research.

Possibilities for Common Ground. As the synopsis shows, this scholarly article exemplifies a common ground or Rogerian approach to persuasion. Because Delli Carpini and Keeter approach their argument through common ground, their persuasive goal can be described better as seeking to enlarge and clarify rather than to restructure their readers' views of the pedagogy that they are recommending. Recognizing how they do this is crucial. Although the main points are not difficult to understand, a descriptive, *does-says*, outline could be very helpful for tracking how key points are positioned amidst the authors' acknowledgements of competing viewpoints.

Reading and analyzing this article will demonstrate the basic principles of rhetorical reading. Recognizing *how* the text works as well as *what* it says allows a rhetorical reader who is not part of the intended audience to see that although this article advocates a particular position, its circumscribed presentation of reasons and evidence makes it come across almost like an informative article would. Indeed, it is valuable for the information it conveys, not only answering its title question but providing nonexperts with an overview of a significant pedagogical issue in political science.

Mel White, "Open Letter from Mel White to Jerry Falwell"

Synopsis. In this values argument, the first of a series of letters from White to Falwell, White tries to persuade Falwell to change his view of homosexuality as Falwell once changed his segregationist thinking. White's approach exemplifies the Rogerian concept of reducing threat. He spends his first nine paragraphs reminding Falwell what he himself has told White (author of Falwell's autobiography) about the events and reasoning that led him to forsake his segregationist views. White's intention of eventually drawing an analogy between Falwell's previous segregationist views and his current condemnation of homosexuality—unquestionably clear to Falwell and other readers from the start—becomes explicit only at paragraph 10. In the ensuing paragraphs, White draws close parallels between Falwell's previous acknowledgement of error to the change White is now requesting. He emphasizes in particular Falwell's misuse of the Bible and tragic consequences for condemned individuals and their families. White quotes Falwell's personal statements about his previous failure to understand how scripture speaks to racial equality, and then begs him to see the applicability of these points to homosexuality. Concluding on an intensely personal note, he reminds Falwell that not data but "knowing [segregation's] victims and their suffering" changed his mind previously (paragraph 18). Thus, he asks Falwell to consider the humanity of lesbians and gays he probably doesn't even realize he knows, to reread his own autobiography, and so to "stop long enough to hear God's voice again" (paragraph 20).

Possibilities for Common Ground. Although it deals with a much more personal and controversial issue than the text about service learning that precedes it, White's letter also exemplifies clear-cut example of Rogerian strategies for reducing threat. Personal appeals to both ethos and pathos figure largely here. White's tone throughout expresses sympathy for failure and inadequacy even as he implores Falwell to reverse things he has said about homosexuals, "terrible things with tragic consequences" (paragraph 12). More personal, too, than Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Letter from Birmingham Jail," White's text is similar in its appeal to his audience through scripture, a humble ethos (see especially the second sentence of paragraph 17), and, of course, his intent to mobilize nonviolent direct action "in the spirit of Gandhi and King" (paragraph 17).

Salim Muwakkil, "Aaron the 'Wiggah'"

Synopsis. In this short text, Muwakkil relates and reflects upon the story of a student who transgressed racial and cultural boundaries on the presumption that his good intentions were sufficient to establish common ground. Aaron of the title, a white hip-hop enthusiast, mistakenly presumed that he could refer to a fellow student, an African American, with the hip-hop term "my niggah." His transgression resulted in a difficult quarrel between the two. Muwakkil, leader of the seminar in which they were enrolled, begins his reflections on the incident by explaining that the extent to which hip-hop's embrace of the "n-word" has stripped away its connotations of racial subordination is a matter of great debate in the African American community (paragraphs 3–4). To Aaron, the word had been denuded of its painful implications. However, Aaron was an outsider. As the seminar members come to understand, appreciation of a minority culture by someone from a privileged culture is not always welcomed, for that appreciation can be accompanied by condescension and can threaten appropriation (paragraphs 8–9). The pattern of white supremacy that marked cultural exchanges between whites and enslaved Africans for most of America's formative years, Muwakkil says, "is deeply etched" (paragraph 9). Nevertheless, he reports that by the end of the semester students in the seminar came to appreciate African Americans' anxieties about cultural appropriation as well as Aaron's enthusiasm for "boundary jumping." He ends by telling us, "The wiggah and 'his niggah' became the best of friends, and they remain close today."

Possibilities for Common Ground. This story about an adventure in asserting common ground reminds us that the process is complex and always multi-faceted. Multicultural exploration is rewarding, but difficult. Muwakkil's essay brings to attention the limits of a majority culture's presumptions: historical inequality has painful repercussions even when contemporary intentions are good. Muwakkil doesn't by any means condemn Aaron; indeed, he admires him for his willingness to live the example of a "wiggah," a group frequently derided, as he says, "from both sides of the racial divide" (paragraph 5). Given the lessons learned and insights gained by the seminar participants, Muwakkil suggests that "wiggahs may turn out to be lead scouts in our multicultural future" (paragraph 11). Yet this story reminds us that common ground will not be found simply through enthusiasm for the other. Finding common ground necessitates awareness of and sensitivity to others' perspectives on whatever matter is at hand, including, in this case, recognition of Aaron's unclaimed position of privilege. It is a matter for careful listening and rhetorical reading.

Jenny Trinitapoli, "Public Libraries and Internet Filters: Protection Versus Access"

***Synopsis*.** This researched student paper exemplifies a common ground approach to analyzing controversies from a neutral position. It responds to the Strand 3 assignment at the end of the chapter (p. 577), which asks students to look for and assert common ground by analyzing a controversy and suggesting where possibilities for agreement might lie. Trinitapoli begins by providing background on Congressional efforts to protect children from Internet pornography and then focuses specifically on the difficult situation of librarians, who, as she puts it, are "torn between conflicting allegiances to their communities [where many people call for filters on public Internet terminals] and their profession" [which commits them to intellectual freedom] (paragraph 1). Her analysis of competing positions finds values arguments about decency and freedom at the heart of the controversy, but the issue is further complicated by the practical matter of "who or what is actually *capable* of keeping kids safe on the Internet" (paragraph 8). Filtering software filters out many nonpornographic sites and can be disabled readily. In her final three paragraphs, Trinitapoli focuses on the Fall 2000 report of the commission established by the 1998 Child Online Protection Act (COPA), a measure that was otherwise found to be unconstitutional. The COPA Commission recommended against federally mandated filtering largely because existing technology is inadequate to filter selectively enough to pass constitutional muster (paragraph 10). Trinitapoli joins the conversation largely in sympathy with the Commission's report, noting that its "most lasting contribution may come from the common ground implicit in its validation of concerns on both sides of the controversy" (paragraph 11). As for local libraries, she says they should be the center of continuing public conversations between librarians and concerned parents about Internet safety, the practical limitations of technology, and shared as well as conflicting core values.

Possibilities for Common Ground. Trinitapoli's paper exemplifies the careful rhetorical reading/listening and research necessary for discovering possibilities for common ground. Though dense with information, the paper is well organized, thanks in part to her research, which led to the COPA Commission report. It had received very little press coverage, was rarely mentioned in advocates' arguments, and generally had little impact—Congress ignored it in the December 2000 filtering law. Yet, not only did the report help her sort out the issues but it also acknowledged values conflicts in a way that suggests possibilities for productive community discussions. Her work on the paper stands as a model for productive analysis and research; furthermore, the points she makes indicate the importance of rhetorical reading not just in school, but in community life.

HELPING STUDENTS WITH THE WRITING PROJECTS

The chapter's writing assignments provide three different ways in which students can use common ground principles in their own writing. We envision these challenging assignments as culminating a term's work on rhetorical reading and writing by drawing upon multiple analytic and composing skills discussed in *Reading Rhetorically*.

MOVING TOWARD COMMON GROUND

The Strand 1 assignment (p. 576) outlines steps for developing a paper that uses strategies for reducing threat that are recommended and exemplified in the chapter. In addition to guidelines and examples provided in the readings (as discussed above) students will also find techniques for sympathetic outreach to an opposing audience exemplified in the selections by King, Sullivan, and Collins in Chapter 13.

Because of the difficulty students may have in stepping away from strong advocacy of their own position, the writing assignment includes a fairly detailed list of invention and shaping suggestions. Extensive invention work on opposition perspectives can help students meet what is frequently their greatest challenge on this kind of assignment: feeling insincere, or worse, manipulative, as they try to restate sympathetically the opposition's position and concerns. Note: It is not unusual for students to develop doubts about or even reverse their positions while working on papers like this one (sometimes late in the process of composing), so you will want to have in mind a procedure for accommodating such developments.

Examining Rhetorical Strategies

The opening phrase of this Strand 2 assignment—"without taking sides"—makes it the most challenging rhetorical analysis assignment in the textbook. Students who are used to thinking of writing as the expression of opinion, not the explanation of analysis, sometimes complain that this injunction means that they cannot include their own thinking in the paper. This, of course, is not true. This assignment definitely calls for texts that convey students' own thinking—about how the representative arguments make their cases, *not* their own thinking on one side of controversy or the other. Remind students that *their* rhetorical purpose is to help readers understand the controversy. Once the nature of the task is clear, it will seem much more doable.

Workplace Analogies. Discussion of workplace and community scenarios that might call for this kind of analysis and explanation will make the value of the exercise clearer still. Many entry level professionals—interns and recent college graduates—are assigned to research a situation and report the pros and cons back to a work team or supervisor without making a recommendation. Analysis from a neutral standpoint such as this paper requires will be valuable practice for such assignments. Another useful workplace concept regarding this paper is the idea of "value added." The information that the students and their readers need is "out there," in publications and on Websites. The student writer/researcher is gathering it, selecting representative samples, analyzing them, and then explaining the core issues. In other words, she or he is adding value to the raw data for the benefit of readers. From stock brokerages to social service agencies, many people make very good money doing this kind of writing.

Getting Started. The following three keys to students' success on this assignment cannot be overstressed:

- choosing a topic on a public controversy (so that they can find published arguments to analyze) that represents a genuinely arguable issue not simply a rehearsal of well-known but intractable values arguments (so that they have something to discover and write about)
- choosing a controversial topic about which they do not already have strong feelings (so that they, again, have something to discover and can write about it fairly)
- choosing arguments to analyze that represent opposing positions well

The temptation to take shortcuts on these matters is great and needs to be militated against by considerable class discussion and preliminary writing. You might find it useful to ask for a one-paragraph paper proposal as a way of checking topics so that you can redirect students as necessary. Also valuable is early submission of a working bibliography in which students make the case for their representative arguments as reliably representative and authoritative. To help them in their research, point out the usefulness of finding overview discussions, such as Trinitapoli's discovery of the COPA Commission report. If they find a text asserting commonalities with opponents or using Rogerian techniques for reducing threat, they will have still more to write about.

Analyzing and Shaping. The questions listed in the assignment provide a rough guide for analysis, and the list of goals for the Strand 3 assignment suggests strategies for organizing a paper for this assignment, too. (The primary difference between the two assignments is that for Strand 2, the writer should stop before making a recommendation.) Students might formulate a thesis statement around their answers to questions 1 and 2, identifying the central issue in the controversy, or their answer to question 5, identifying common ground. Regarding the first two questions, point out to students that people on different sides of a controversy may define the issue differently. Discerning those differences and explaining them can make for a particularly interesting paper.

Extending the Conversation

The chapter's Strand 3 assignment invites students to go a step beyond the rhetorical analysis in Strand 2 and recommend some steps toward common ground. It is otherwise nearly the same assignment, although, of course, the writer's stance in relation to the material will be somewhat different throughout. That is, Strand 3 papers will not be Strand 2 papers plus a few paragraphs. However, Strand 2's detailed advice about guiding students through the assignment is directly relevant to this Strand as well. The numbered questions in Strand 2 need only a shift of emphasis to serve as a heuristic for this paper.

This assignment does, in effect, invite writers to take a stand, not on the issue about which they are writing, but on how the parties involved with that issue might move toward resolution or at least act upon commonalities in their position. The difference between the advocacy invited in this assignment and that invited in the Strand 1 assignment is that in this paper, the writer stands outside the controversy, neutrally observing and recommending.

As in the Strand 1 assignment, the chapter's selections will suggest techniques for analyzing conflicting viewpoints and provide models for what the writer might suggest for lowering tension. (A simple recommendation to listen more carefully and argue more fairly might cap an excellent paper—if the representative arguments are chosen carefully, not just easily critiqued "straw" arguments.)

Additional Writing Possibilities

Reflection. All three of these assignments make complex intellectual demands on student writers. To help them manage the complexity and recognize what they have learned from their efforts, consider adding to any of these assignments a reflective piece like the self-evaluative reflections described on page 149 of *Reading Rhetorically.* If students keep a research log or journal, they could use it as a basis for reflecting on their research and analysis processes. Alternatively, if you assign Strand 2 or 3, before students hand in their papers, ask them to reflect on what they have come to believe about which party in their controversy makes the better case. Promise not to read it until after you've graded the paper, or have students hold them until you return papers. Students might write about what they couldn't say in their papers:

- How did your position change as you read different points of view?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the main positions?
- Where do your sympathies lie?
- How likely do you think a resolution is?
- What do you expect to happen in the meantime?

Thematic Connections

At the end of Chapter 13 above we made a number of suggestions for pairing selections from this chapter with the arguments in the "Take a Stand" chapter that need not be repeated here. For a unit focused primarily on common ground techniques, the best sequence of reading assignments would cover as many selections in the chapter as possible, contrasting their techniques and noting their commonalities. For example:

- Tannen and Callahan are rather different in the way they present their own ethos and the way they endeavor to engage readers.

- The three examples of published writing for academic audiences—Michlowski, Ginsburg, and Delli Carpini and Keeter—can be compared in terms of audience, purpose, and use.

- Reading the service learning article and Mel White's letter together could lead to interesting discoveries of similarities despite surface differences, and readings from Chapter 13 suggested as potential models for the Strand 1 assignment—King, Sullivan, and Collins—will be useful as further variations on the Rogerian model. Would Sullivan's handling of pathos, for example, justify its placement in Chapter 16 instead of Chapter 13? You see how we decided that question, of course, but students may have good reasons for disagreeing.

APPENDIX A

USING *READING RHETORICALLY* TO ACCOMPLISH WPA OUTCOMES FOR FIRST -YEAR WRITING

Developed over four years by a diverse group of college writing teachers, *The WPA Outcomes Statement*[13] describes the knowledge and skills that first-year writing courses aim to teach. Thus, these goals represent the accumulated wisdom of college teachers from across the country and grow out of their expertise as scholars and teachers. By intention, these outcomes are not meant to be used as a set of standards but rather as descriptions of the types of learning that first-year writing teachers hope to see at the end of the first-year writing sequence. Application of these outcomes in terms of curricula and assessment are decisions to be made by local programs and institutions.

The outcomes are organized into four categories: (1) Rhetorical Knowledge; (2) Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing; (3) Processes; and (4) Knowledge of Conventions. *Reading Rhetorically* (*RR*) supports the teaching and learning of each of these outcomes in clear and specific ways. In this Appendix, we explain briefly the ways in which *Reading Rhetorically* supports outcomes-based teaching.

1. Rhetorical Knowledge

---

[13] A full text of the Statement can be found in "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition," *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 23.1/2 (Fall/Winter 1999): 59-70. It is also available online at http://www.wpacouncil.org.

A chief aim of *Reading Rhetorically* is to teach students rhetorical terms and concepts that they can then use as an analytical framework for reading and writing, not only in their college course work but also in their civic and professional lives. The following chapters introduce students to rhetorical terms and concepts as well as to rhetorically-based reading and writing practices:

> Chapter 2 introduces the concept of **rhetorical reading** and defines it as an academic strategy. It also introduces students to **questions rhetorical readers** ask.
>
> Chapter 3 explains the practices of expert academic readers as rhetorical acts and introduces three important concepts: **rhetorical context, purpose, and genre**.
>
> Chapters 4 and 5 explain the process of rhetorical reading and offer specific strategies for enacting this process. Key terms such as ***ethos, pathos, logos*** are explained in detail and illustrated. Additionally, students are offered guided practice in applying these terms as a critical lens for analyzing what they read.
>
> Chapters 6–8 turn to writing, using the rhetorical framework established in Chapters 2–5 to explain the writing process of writing, particularly the process of writing about reading. For example, activities such as paraphrase and summary are presented as **rhetorical choices**.
>
> Chapters 9-16 present an anthology of readings organized by **rhetorical aim**. Each chapter introduction discusses the special rhetorical features of texts with that aim. Chapter 13, "Readings that Take a Stand," offers a detailed discussion of key rhetorical concepts related to argument: **claims, reasons, evidence, warrants**. Further, this chapter presents a thorough discussion of **stasis questions**.

2. Critical Thinking, Reading, And Writing

The connections among these three activities are explicitly linked in *Reading Rhetorically* and mutually reinforce one another in ways that should be clear to students. Here are some examples of how this book helps students to understand the links among these processes:

> Chapter 2 characterizes reading as joining an ongoing intellectual

conversation, a metaphor taken from Burke to emphasize the attentive "listening" and "talking back" that are entailed in reading as an act of making meaning.

Chapter 3 explains how reading and writing are both **acts of composing**.

Chapters 4 and 5 present reading as a process of actively **listening** to what a text says and systematically **questioning** what a text does. Together they represent critical reading as inseparable from critical thinking.

Chapter 6 discusses what might be called **writing-to-read** strategies, that is, writing activities that are intended to help students understand what they read more fully.

Chapter 7 discusses what might be called **reading-to-write** strategies, that is, reading strategies that are intended to help students use reading for **inquiry** and **writing**. This process involves **question formulation and analysis** and **evaluation of sources**.

Chapter 8 presents techniques for **incorporating reading into writing** as a way of **extending the conversation** or making new knowledge.

3. Processes

A process approach to teaching reading and writing offers specific strategies for undertaking these activities recursively. *Reading Rhetorically* differs from other rhetorics in that it not only treats writing as a process but also reading and inquiry. *Reading Rhetorically* supports process teaching in the following ways:

Chapter 2 emphasizes the **social** or **collaborative nature of the reading process**.

Chapter 3 presents **reading as a process of composing meaning**.

Chapters 4 and 5 discuss **reading as a multi-draft process** in which readers read initially to get the gist of a text, reread to deepen their understanding, and reread yet again to question and talk back to a text.

Chapter 6 presents **writing as a social process** in which one adds her or his voice to an ongoing conversation about a topic. Additionally, Chapter 6 offers strategies for **getting started**, **generating ideas**, **drafting**, **revising**, and **editing**.

Chapters 7 and 8 guide students through the processes of **reading to conduct research** and **incorporating reading into their own writing**.

4. Knowledge Of Conventions

Reading Rhetorically presents genre conventions as tied to rhetorical situation. Further, it illustrates this point by including texts that represent a range of rhetorical situations and that employ a range of genre conventions. Specific discussions of genre conventions can be found in the following chapters:

Chapter 2 introduces and defines the term **genre** and explains that part of learning disciplinary knowledge is learning a discipline's characteristic styles and formats for presenting research.

Chapter 3 extends the discussion of **genre conventions** by offering an extended example (the articles about teenagers' sleep habits) that illustrates how differing rhetorical situations result in texts that differ in format, style, and even the information reported. Further, this chapter explicitly presents **knowledge of genre conventions as a rhetorical reading strategy**.

Chapter 6 discusses writing assignments that offer students **practice of the conventions of a particular type of text**.

Chapter 8 and Appendix A: Building a Citation discusses **citation conventions as linked to rhetorical situation and genre**.

Chapters 9–16 include **texts from a variety of genres**–social scientific research reports, editorials in medical journals, literary nonfiction, articles from popular newspapers, and so on.

APPENDIX B

SHORT TEXTS IN *READING RHETORICALLY*

We list here short essays, articles, opinion pieces, and a story suitable for reading silently or aloud in-class. Selections are presented in their order of appearance in the book. For page numbers, please consult the Index or Table of Contents in *Reading Rhetorically*.

Gloria Naylor, The Writing Life
Virginia Chappell, Reading on the Fourth of July
Melissa Martinie, A Lawyer and His Reading
Gloria Naylor, "Mommy, What Does 'Nigger' Mean?"
Kathy Wollard, Mirage Isn't a Figment of Your Imagination
Kathy Wollard, That Funny and Embarrassing Hiccup May Actually Be Helpful for Your Body
Paul Irgang, When a Wet Vac Counts More Than a Ph.D.
Thomas Roepsch (Student), America's Love Affair with Pizza, a Guilty Pleasure No More
Roland Barthes, Toys
Heather Wendtland (Student), Rebellion Through Music
Kathleen Parker, For Starters, We Can Require Trigger Locks
Kathleen Parker, Revisiting the Issue of Trigger Locks
Andrew Sullivan, Let Gays Marry
Sallie Tisdale, Should a Boy Be Expelled for Thought Crimes?
Sofia Collins (Student), Good Intentions in the Anti-Sweatshop Movement
Alison Lurie, A Perfect Set of Teeth
Michael Kinsley, The Morality and Metaphysics of Email
Joe Queenan, Websites Dedicated to Being Simple Without Giving Up Affluence
Sandra Cisneros, Barbie-Q (Fiction)
Rhonda Downey (Student), Through the Looking Glass

Kenneth Bruffee, Binge Drinking as a Substitute for a "Community of Learning"
Kathryn Sipiorski (Student), Consider the Study of Peace
Deborah Tannen, The Triumph of the Yell
Sidney Callahan, Fight Fierce but Fair: And Practice at Home
Salim Muwakkil, Aaron the "Wiggah"

APPENDIX C

SELECTIONS IN *READING RHETORICALLY* ACCOMPANIED BY BIBLIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

From Scholarly Journals

The following selections originally appeared in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and include notes or bibliographies. For information on the bibliographic styles used, see the head notes. Selections are presented in their order of appearance in the book. For page numbers, please consult the Index or Table of Contents in *Reading Rhetorically*.

Amy R. Wolfson and Mary A. Carskadon, Sleep Schedules and Daytime Functioning in Adolescents
Kirk Savage, The Past in the Present: The Life of Memorials
Marcia Angell and Jerome P. Kassirer, Clinical Research—What Should the Public Believe?
J. Radcliffe-Richards, et. al., The Case for Allowing Kidney Sales
Aida A. Michlowski, From Conflict to Congruence
Michael X. Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter, What Should Be Learned Through Service Learning?

Student Papers

These papers written by students have MLA style Works Cited lists.

Jenny, Who Cares If the Value of Books Is Overstated?

Jenny, Romance Fiction: Brain Candy or Culturally Nutritious?
Thomas Roepsch, America's Love Affair with Pizza, a Guilty Pleasure No More
Heather Wendtland, Rebellion Through Music
Jenny Trinitapoli, Public Libraries and Internet Filters: Protection Versus Access