**Strategies that Appeal to Logos**

**Cause and Effect Analysis**: This strategy analyzes why something happened and describes the consequences of a string of events. Where in the text does the author describe events through cause and effect? What is the cause? What is the effect? Why would the author want to demonstrate a causal relationship between two events? Why would the audience be concerned with the consequences the author describes? How does this strategy further the author’s claim?

**Comparison and Contrast**: This strategy discusses similarities and differences. Where in the text does the author discuss two related subjects? What are the similarities? What are the differences? Why would the author need to establish these distinctions? Why would these similarities and differences matter to the audience? How does this strategy further the author’s claim?

**Process Analysis**: This strategy explains how to do something or how something happens. Where in the text does the author explain how a series of steps achieve a specific outcome? What are these steps? What is the outcome? Why would the author need to explain these steps? Why would this process matter to the audience? How does this strategy further the author’s claim?

**Analogy**: This strategy compares between two things, typically on the basis of their structure and for the purpose of explanation or clarification. Where in the text does the author compare one thing in relation to another? What are the two things? How does the author demonstrate their similarity? Why would the author need to compare these two things? How would this comparison clarify the something for the audience? How does this strategy further the author’s claim?

**Example Topic Sentence**: Carr appeals to logos through the strategy of cause and effect analysis.

**Strategies that Appeal to Ethos**

**Authoritative Quotation**: This strategy is often a quotation from a famous person, well-known authority, specialized expert, or exemplary individual. Why would the author quote this person? What does it reveal about who the author is? What does it reveal about who the audience is? Why would quoting this person be effective for this audience? What in the actual quote would the audience find authoritative? How does this strategy further the author’s claim?

**Prolepsis**: This strategy is the anticipation and answering of possible objections. What is the possible objection? Why would the author need to address it? What is the answer that the author provides? How well does the author answer it? What does this answer reveal about the author’s character? Why might a skeptical audience be or not be persuaded by this answer? How does this strategy further the author’s claim?

**Example Topic Sentence**: Carr develops his ethos through the strategy of prolepsis.

**Strategies that Appeal to Pathos**

**Motive**: This strategy accuses someone or something of having a hidden agenda for doing something; it creates an “us” and “them.” The motive the author accuses this other party of having is usually negative and harmful (although it could be positive and altruistic). Where in the text does the author suggest that someone or something has a hidden or harmful motivation? What is this motive? Why is it harmful? Why would the audience be concerned about this motive? How does fear play a role in the audience’s acceptance of a claim provided by the author?

**Description and Narration**: This is a strategy that provides a detailed sensory description or recounting of a person, place, experience, or event. This strategy usually creates a feeling of connection between the audience and the thing described or recounted. What does the author vividly describe or recount? Why would the author use this strategy? What in the description or narration would the audience connect with? How would this connection help the author advance a claim?

**Metaphor and Simile**: This strategy is a short comparison between two things that relies on the audience to fill in the connection between the two things. (In an analogy, the author makes the connections more apparent.) This strategy usually reframes the relationship in order to provoke a response in the audience. Where in the text does the author use a metaphor or simile? What two things are being compared? What in this comparison provokes an emotion in the audience? How does this comparison frame the audience’s understanding of the argument? How does this metaphor or simile further a claim made by the author?

**Example Topic Sentence**: Carr appeals to pathos through the strategy of motive.

**Strategies that Appeal to both Ethos and Pathos**

**Commonplaces (values of the audience)**: This strategy is works on an assumption, an unsupported claim, based on the values, ideals, fears, or prejudices of the audience. These typically take the form of an evaluative claim with little supporting evidence that connects to the audience’s hidden beliefs and ideologies. Where in the text does the author make a claim about values and beliefs? What is the ideal or prejudice embedded in this claim? What does this value or belief reveal about the author? What does it reveal about the audience? Why would claims about beliefs need less supporting evidence?

**Identification**: This strategy associates and connects the author with the audience, in which the author attempts to demonstrate that he or she shares common values, experiences, beliefs, fears, or aspirations with the audience. It can also connect the audience with someone or thing else other than the author. Where in the text does the author build a connection with the audience? What values, experiences, or beliefs is this connection based on? Why would the audience have a connection to these beliefs or experiences? Does the author use any personal pronouns that would make the audience feel this connection? How does this connection help the author’s claim seem more persuasive?

**Metadiscourse**: This strategy signals the author’s role in relation to the argument and to the audience. As an appeal to ethos, metadiscourse can create the voice of the author and reveal who he or she is. In what ways is the author explicit about his or her purpose and position? What values does it reveal? How does help the audience understand and connect with specific claims? As a pathos appeal, metadiscourse can make the audience feel more or less connected to the author. Does the author create connections with the audience through the use of personal pronouns, or the description of common values and experiences? What emotions might this elicit from the audience. How would this further the author’s claim?

**Sample Student Paragraph**

*A notable strategy that reoccurs in Carr’s text is the use of analogies and figurative language such as metaphors and similes. The use of short story excerpts and phrases creates a sense of relatability as well as demonstrates his intricate claims in a simplistic way.*

*The most apparent analogy that Carr uses in his text is the very first section in which he compares a supercomputer known as HAL being disconnected and terminated from Stanley Kubrick’s A Space Odyssey to the deconstruction of the mind due to the internet. The use of this “weirdly poignant scene” indicates the adverse changes in people’s ability to perform caused by the internet (56).*

*Apparently, the internet is preventing people from reaching their full potential in their ability to read, think, and memorize information. The question is, why is this analogy significant at all or why is it needed?*

*Carr uses it for a number of reasons all of which tie into his main argument. The analogy acts as an attention getter for the reader and forms an interesting, yet mysterious and thought provoking introduction to the text. Whether or not his readers have seen the film, they imagine the scene in their minds, which piques their curiosity and creates interest in Carr’s text.*

*However, this analogy also functions as an exaggerated form of the argument that Carr is trying to make. Carr appeals to logos by creating a logical association between the supercomputer HAL having its internal core dismantled piece by piece and the internet causing people’s minds to become deconstructed. By making this connection, Carr suggest that the internet essentially results in the brain death of its users.*

*His use of exaggeration or extremity also appeals to pathos because it establishes a sense of caution and danger for the public and opens people’s eyes to understanding the severity of the argument he is trying to make. After reading the analogy, Carr’s readers are meant to have made a logical connection between Kubrick’s haunting scene and what the internet is doing to our minds, and that connection is scary and worrying.*

**Steps to Crafting a Body Paragraph Focused on Analysis**

1. **Topic Sentence** that asserts a claim (names strategy and its role)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ uses \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

 (author/speaker) (strategy) (function)

2. Set-up and show strategy in action with “quote/s”

3. Explain in depth **HOW** this strategy works

* in service of one or more Aristotelian appeals
* to impact/affect the audience (how author intends it to “move” the audience)
* persuasiveness (how convincing, credible, compelling)

4. **Evaluate use** of the rhetorical strategy

* assess strength (quality, poor/excellent choice because…)
* audience’s actual reaction (yourself and intended audiences)
* function (role it plays in the argument, fulfills writer’s purpose)
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