**Essay 1—Rhetorical Analysis**

**Peer Review Date:** July 3

**First Complete Draft Due:** July 4

**Final Draft Due:** July 10

**Length:** 5-7 pages, double spaced with standard font and margins.

**Instructions:** From the two lists of readings provided on page 2, select two that seem to work together. At least one of these must be from the list of Additional Readings that we did not discuss in class. The other may be from either list. In a 5-7 page rhetorical analysis, compare and contrast the argumentative strategies that each author uses. The thesis of your paper may run something like this:

 “A’s argument is more effective than B’s because he does X, Y, and Z.”

“A makes a more effective use of pathos, but B’s argument makes a better use of logos and ethos as shown in X, Y, and Z.”

“A is more likely to appeal to a broad audience than B because of X, Y, and Z, though B’s argument is will likely entice people who are already predisposed to agree with her.”

Through examples, direct quotations, and judicious paraphrasing, you will develop your reasons—X, Y, and Z. Remember that this isn’t a cataloguing exercise. Your body paragraphs shouldn’t read like a list of the author’s use of pathos. You must intersperse examples of pathos in the argument with your own commentary that discusses the impact of those examples on the audience, its relationship to the context of the piece, and that ties your two texts together. Always observe correct citation form, including in text citations as well as a Works Cited page.

While you will inevitably make a statement about which argument is more effective, your task is not to make your argument about affirmative action or intellectual diversity. Your own opinion is, for the moment, beside the point. As such, avoid making unqualified claims about the logic of an argument that can be reduced to “This is an example of logos because I say so” or “because I like this argument.” Similarly, make sure you aren’t labeling as logical fallacy all the claims that you do not like. One way to get around bias is to try to see through the eyes of another reader. How might a member of this author’s audience who does not hold your particular assumptions and beliefs view this argument?

**Minimum Requirements (for a C):**

* Serviceable thesis that draws a comparison or a contrast between your two chosen texts and that identifies the most important rhetorical strategies.
* Addresses all parts of the rhetorical triangle
* A minimum of 5 pages in length. No fudging on the margins!!!
* Correct in-text citations, for paraphrase as well as direct quotations.
* A Works Cited page.
* Relatively few grammatical errors and a crisp, readable (jargon free) style.

**Draft Progression:** The peer review session held on July 3 is **mandatory**, and coming to class late is vehemently discouraged. Groups will form at approximately 10:05 and latecomers may not be able to participate. Please bring two clean copies of your draft to class. You will submit both your peer reviewed draft and the worksheet(s) from the peer review session with Essay 1.1.

Essay 1.1 is not a rough draft. It is a complete, well-edited draft that will be graded to the same minimum requirements as the final draft. Because this is our first “full-length” paper, Essay 1.1 will receive an advisory grade only. However, since 2.1 and 3.1 will receive “real” grades, you’re advised to take it seriously. The advisory grade will be something of an indicator as to how much work you need to do for 1.2.

Essay 1.1 will be handed back with comments during individual paper conferences to be held July 7-8 and then resubmitted with all previous drafts as a revised final draft, Essay 1.2. Revision is part of the assignment for Essay 1.2 and may include (depending on the paper) changes to the thesis, rearrangement of paragraphs, rewriting of individual sentences and whole paragraphs, additions where clarification or elaboration is needed, or removals where something is redundant or irrelevant. If my comments on 1.1 are ignored, your grade on 1.2 will probably be lower. Lexical revisions (corrections to spelling, punctuation, etc.) are not sufficient.

**Texts:** Choose one from each list or two from the list of Additional Readings.

**Class Readings:**

Sarah Karnasiewicz, “The Campus Crusade for Guys” (textbook)

Walter Benn Michaels, “Diversity’s False Solace” (textbook)

Michael May, “The Cream of Every Crop” (Blackboard-external link)

David Horowitz, “In Defense of Intellectual Diversity” (text book)

Michael Berube, Chapter One of *What’s Liberal About the Liberal Arts?* (handout)

**Additional Readings:**

Any of the articles reproduced in Chapter 27 of *Everything’s an Argument*, including Stanley Fish’s “‘Intellectual Diversity’: The Trojan Horse of a Dark Design” (listed under recommended readings).

Tienda, Alon, and Niu, “Affirmative Action and the Texas Top 10% Law: Balancing Equity and Access to Higher Education” (Blackboard-external link)

David Horowitz, “The Two Universities” (Blackboard-external link)

Daniel Drezner, “All the Words!” (Blackboard-external link)

Caryl Rivers and Rosaline Barnett, “The Myth of the Boy Crisis” (Blackboard-external link)