

Rhetorical Analysis: Elements of Argument

<p>Claim</p>	<p>The position of the argument, either stated or implied.</p> <p>Claims of facts: Argues that something is true (factual).</p> <p>Claims of value: Argues that something is ethical, moral, or desirable for society.</p> <p>Claims of policy: Argues that something should be enacted</p>
<p>Aristotelian argument</p>	<p>A syllogistic pattern of deduction or induction in which logical conclusions are reached based on truthful premises.</p>
<p>Deduction</p>	<p>An argument that reaches conclusions of logical necessity. The classical formula is:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">If A = B and B = C then A must = C.</p> <p>For example, Socrates is a man; all men are mortal; therefore, Socrates is mortal.</p>
<p>Induction</p>	<p>An argument that reaches conclusions of probability. The higher the probability, the more sound the argument. Truthful premises are presented and a conclusion follows.</p> <p>For example, the sun has risen every day of recorded history; therefore, the sun will rise tomorrow. (Deductively argued: The sun rises every day, therefore, it will rise tomorrow.)</p>
<p>Soundness</p>	<p>An argument is said to be sound if its conclusion (claim) is based on truthful premises and is reached by valid (logical) reasoning.</p>
<p>Valid logic</p>	<p>Valid logic is absent of logical fallacies and is not based on pathos.</p>
<p>Logical fallacies</p>	<p>Inconsistencies in logic; conclusions that do not follow reasoning.</p> <p>For example, correlation is mistaken for causation. Or a comparison (analogy) is not comparable. Or only two choices are presented when other choices are available. Or a person rather than an idea is attacked.</p>

<p>Truthful premises</p>	<p>The truth—factual validity—of the premises of an argument must be established by verified sources of information and data in order to reach sound conclusions.</p> <p>In examining the soundness of an argument, claims of fact are examined for truthfulness by confirming source and factual reliability.</p>
<p>Appeal</p>	<p>The primary and secondary approaches an argument makes to an audience to be persuasive to a particular audience. The most persuasive arguments use all three appeals.</p> <p>The three branches are: pathos (emotional); logos (reasoning); ethos (trust—values and credibility).</p>
<p>Toulmin argument</p>	<p>A method of argument analysis that recognizes, or relies on, the presence of embedded or stated "warrants"—assumptions, beliefs, values—in an argument and/or in the audience and addresses these. As a method of argument, a Toulmin argument includes warrants—values and assumptions of the audience, either stating them or embedding them in the argument. (named after Stephen Toulmin)</p>
<p>Rogierian argument</p>	<p>Also called a "common ground" argument, this type of argument seeks to reconcile opposing positions by finding values and valid points in common and proposing a way forward that incorporates these aspects of both positions.</p>
<p>Rhetorical Analysis</p>	<p>Examining the content of an argument—the claims and support—and the strategies and methods used in an argument, whether a visual, oral, or written text. Rhetorical analysis looks at how an argument is made in order to reach conclusions about the argument's soundness and effectiveness.</p>
<p>Examining written arguments</p>	<p>An examination (an analysis) of an argument involves looking at all its parts: the title, the content, the context, the publisher, the author, the audience, the appeal, the structure, the language, the style and tone, the embedded assumptions and values, the word choices, the logic, and the methods of persuasion.</p>
<p>Effective arguments</p>	<p>To be effective, an argument must be convincing (claims of facts or value) or persuasive (claims of policy). The audience is an essential part of the equation comprising author, content, and audience. A sound argument may not always be effective; likewise, an effective argument may not always be sound.</p>