

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindsor

OSSA Conference Archive

OSSA 4

May 17th, 9:00 AM - May 19th, 5:00 PM

Teaching Freshmen to Reason—And Live—Through Aristotle's Modes of Persuasion

Elza C. Tiner
Lynchburg College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive>



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

Tiner, Elza C., "Teaching Freshmen to Reason—And Live—Through Aristotle's Modes of Persuasion" (2001). *OSSA Conference Archive*. 110.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive/OSSA4/papersandcommentaries/110>

This Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences and Conference Proceedings at Scholarship at UWindsor. It has been accepted for inclusion in OSSA Conference Archive by an authorized conference organizer of Scholarship at UWindsor. For more information, please contact scholarship@uwindsor.ca.

Title: Teaching Freshmen to Reason—And Live—Through Aristotle's Modes of Persuasion

Author: Elza C. Tiner

Response to this paper by: Vance Mendenhall

© 2001 Elza C. Tiner

ABSTRACT. While the three Aristotelian modes of persuasion, *pathos*, *ethos*, and *logos*, are generally treated discretely in composition textbooks based on traditional rhetoric, in practice they are interdependent. This paper shows how interdependence among the modes becomes the basis for the second term of a first-year composition course. Students examine the modes of persuasion in texts related to the theme of Tyranny and Freedom from one of the volumes of the Lynchburg College Symposium Readings (LCSR) program, of which the course is a part. Overlaps among the modes of persuasion are explored in writing about the theme as applied to the self, family, friends, and national and international communities, to help students become aware of the powers of persuasion in their lives.

Illustrations of first-year student work include a website by Jon Hart, who also created a video showing fallacies of reasoning in Hitler's speeches during the Holocaust, followed by graphic evidence from the concentration camps, and web portfolios of essays prepared by April Davis and Stephanie Eagle, linking modes of persuasion to the central course theme.

I. Modes of Persuasion Defined

In testing various parts of classical theory in teaching writing while a visiting preceptor at Harvard University in 1993 and at Lynchburg College since 1989, I have found that the classical rhetoric provides a structured framework for students, without locking them into an excessively vague (for example, limited to free-flow, expressive approach to writing) or rigid system (for example, limited to the five-paragraph essay). While some students will find reading the primary source difficult, Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is especially useful for teachers, as it provides theory from which assignments can be developed to explore the interplay between speaker/writer and audience, or between the self and the rest of the world, a consciousness that first-year students do not always bring to their classes.

Aristotle defines the artistic or learned methods of persuasion thus, addressing a debate that still goes on among composition students: do we need this theory or can we just compose innately?

Of the *pisteis*, some are atechnic ["nonartistic"], some entechnic ["embodied in art, artistic"]. I call atechnic those that are not provided by "us" [the potential speaker] but are preexisting: for example, witnesses, testimony of slaves taken under torture, contracts, and such like; and artistic whatever can be prepared by method and by "us"; thus, one must *use* the former and *invent* the latter. Of the *pisteis* provided through speech there are three species: for some are in the character [*ethos*] of the speaker, and some in disposing the listener in some way, and some in the argument [*logos*] itself, by showing or seeming to show something. [*Rhet.* 1.2.2]

Following are Aristotle's definitions of the specific modes of persuasion:

Pathos

[There is persuasion] through the hearers when they are led to feel emotion [*pathos*] by the speech; for we do not give the same judgment when grieved and rejoicing or when being friendly and hostile. [*Rhet.* 1.2.5]

Ethos

[There is persuasion] through character whenever the speech is spoken in such a way as to make the speaker worthy of credence; for we believe fair-minded people to a greater extent and more quickly [than we do others] on all subjects in general and completely so in cases where there is not exact knowledge but room for doubt. [*Rhet.* 1.2.4]

Logos

Persuasion occurs through the arguments [*logoi*] when we show the truth or the apparent truth from whatever is persuasive in each case. [*Rhet.* 1.2.6]

Ryan (1984) identifies two elements in the development of Aristotle's analysis of enthymemes: 1) *topoi*, or the patterns of reasoning in which any topic can be set. I explain these to the class as frames or structures, such as cause-effect, possible/impossible, or past-fact/future fact, into which any material will fit; 2) premises constructed into valid syllogisms. In the composition class, a combination of both elements, *topoi* and recognition of valid reasoning, is needed. Application of the *topoi* helps students to shape their arguments, and recognition of fallacies of reasoning helps them to avoid being taken in by ethical and emotional appeal and to construct valid arguments of their own.

Perhaps the question as to whether or not the students need the theory or have it innately could be answered thus: while some of the class may not know or use the terms for the modes of persuasion, they learn the applications of the modes through interactions and discourse in their communities. One of those communities is the academic setting. Hence the instruction here is in part, learning of language, rhetorical terms and definitions, largely to provide a metalanguage for discussions about their work; and in part, using of language, or what the students have to say in their compositions.

II. Qualifications to Definitions

Kennedy (1991, Note 40, pp. 37-38) points out that *pathos* and *ethos* are, according to Aristotle, attributes of persons, not qualities of speech or the presentation of character in a discourse. Only *logos* is inherent in the argument or speech itself. The adaptation of these modes of persuasion to the character or persona of the speaker in the discourse is a later interpretation of Aristotle. The purpose of *pathos* is to lead the hearers to feel emotion; *ethos* inspires them through moral character of the speaker. Hence Aristotle is focused on the effects of these modes in people, not in language. This distinction in no way negates the process of teaching or studying the modes in oral and written discourse, as ways to understand the self and others in society, so that language becomes a means, not an end in itself. False or deceptive presentations of character in part depend on fallacious reasoning, or misuse of *logos*.

III. Interdependence of the Modes of Persuasion

While the study of these modes of persuasion may treat them as discrete parts, in practice they function together, in varying combinations and proportions. Aristotle was aware of the interdependence.

In Book 2, Chapter 12, which provides a transition to the section on character, Aristotle implies that it is necessary to understand the emotions, in order to analyze types of character: "Next let us go through the kinds of char[a]cter, considering what they are like in terms of emotions and habits and age of life and fortune [*tyche*]" (*Rhet.* 2.12.1), thus linking *ethos* and *pathos*. In Book 2, Chapter 18, Aristotle shows that he is aware of the interdependence of *ethos* and *logos* in all three types of rhetoric: deliberative, demonstrative, and judicial. Once a speaker understands the character and emotional state of his audience, in any speech he must devise persuasive proofs to convince that audience, i.e., use the principles of logical appeal. A discussion of the common topics of argument follows, clearly related to character: "Since there was a different end for each genus of speech, and opinions and premises have been collected for all of them, from which [speakers] derive *pisteis* when speaking in deliberation and in demonstrations and contention and from which, moreover, it is possible to make speeches appropriate to character, and since definitions have been given on these matters, it remains to describe the *koina*" (*Rhet.* 2.18.2), or forms of argument.

IV. Related Studies of Aristotle's Rhetoric

Studies of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* give varying degrees of importance to the modes of persuasion, as well as their interdependence. The problem of sincerity in artistic persuasion threads through many of the sources, as it did for the students in the composition class. The students often ask whether or not it is appropriate to manipulate an audience's emotions in a rational argument.

Garver (1994) devotes an entire study to this problem and the overlaps among the modes, suggesting that Aristotle's approach to rhetoric, as a civic art, is to treat it as an integration of reason and character, or *logos* and *ethos*, at its highest level of achievement, though it does not always meet that goal (p. 12). Similarly, emotions are treated as subordinate, within the governing context of character and rationality (Garver, 1994, pp. 104-138), but they can influence judgments, unite or divide an audience, and so a speaker must know how to use them. An audience that is aware of the tools of persuasion may also be prepared to make judgments about the value of the discourse. Tindale (1998) points out that, in Aristotle's concept of rhetorical argument, the audience is actively involved in the process of persuasion. This involvement depends on an integration of the modes, such that the audience is favorably disposed toward the speaker or writer of that argument and its content, and thus, ready to accept the conclusion.

Leighton (1996) also discusses Aristotle's presentation of emotions as a means to alter judgments; or move a person to make a judgment. Contrary to Hatch's (1999) mysterious view of the process by which emotion influences reason, "But when people are made to feel strongly about something, they will often act on those feelings--even when they're not sure why" (p. 38), Leighton (1996) comments that "One may well be aware of what one is doing in such cases. We

make certain judgments in public that are at odds with what we really believe" (p. 208). However, this kind of public insincerity, which may indeed have driven certain responses to Hitler and other speakers during the Holocaust, was not Aristotle's idea of the connection between the two modes. According to Aristotle, Leighton (1996) claims, emotions come with judgments, or when a person is in a certain frame of mind, emotionally, he or she is likely to make specific types of judgments influenced by that emotion.

In the same volume of essays, Cooper (1996) takes a slightly different tack. He stresses Aristotle's teachings about fifteen sample emotions as means for the orator to become a sort of actor, able to move his audience. The purpose of the selection is "to cover the range of emotions that an orator needs to know about in order to complete his public addresses with full effectiveness--whether by representing himself as motivated by them, or by finding means to arouse them in his audience and direct them suitably for the purposes of his discourse" (Cooper, 1996, p. 251). In so doing, orators need to present themselves as genuinely concerned for the well-being of the audience (*ethos*) and able to present a rational, plausible case (*logos*) (Cooper, 1996, p. 239). Again, however, a connection between emotion and judgment is made: "he needs to know how to engender in them the emotions that will cause them to judge the matter as he wishes them to" (Cooper, 1996, p. 239).

Likewise, a connection between emotional and ethical appeal is inherent in rational persuasion. Frede (1996), in her discussion of *pathos* as comprising "all the nonrational desires" (p. 266), shows that Aristotle does not make a separation between reason and emotion. *Ethos* is part of the driving force linking the two, in emotional responses, and judgments: "Aristotle does not claim that our rational desires must be unemotional. His contention is merely that our rational predilections are determined exclusively by our conviction that the thing in question is beneficial, either to ourselves or to humankind in general" (Frede, 1996, p. 266).

Ryan (1984) points out that the modes of persuasion are not "a master plan of rhetoric," but instead, levels of awareness that a speaker must have in preparing a sound argument (p. 173). Moreover, critical analysis of the argumentation can aid a speaker or audience in discerning the ethical and emotional aspects of persuasion, which can enhance the discourse. On the other hand, awareness of these dimensions, along with potential errors in reasoning, might also protect an audience from harmful persuasion.

Rorty (1996) sums up this interdependence clearly. After advising that the practitioner of rhetoric gain a knowledge of psychology, she observes that "Aristotle distinguishes three interconnected dimensions of persuasion (*pistis*): *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*" (1996, p. 8). Knowledge of psychology, which would include understanding of human emotion, would enable the speaker to give the presence of credibility, use persuasion effectively on the audience, and supply premises for arguments. She also points out that Aristotle was aware that a dazzling orator might well fool an audience for a time, because the citizens do not understand the grounds for well-being promised, until the effects of the policy or promises begin to reveal otherwise. In my teaching of Composition II, I have found that helping students to become expert in the detection of fallacies of reasoning is one good way to clear the smoke around an orator using emotional and ethical appeal deceptively.

V. Textbooks

The basic textbook for my course, Hatch, *Arguing in communities* (1999), provides an introduction to the modes of persuasion with sample essays. It is useful for an introductory course in composition. A more advanced text, which provides an overview of the classical theory, including that from the Ciceronian tradition, is Corbett and Connors, *Classical rhetoric for the modern student* (1999). However, like Aristotle, these texts do not address the overlaps or interdependence among the modes of persuasion at length. The student will discover them in practice. Corbett and Connors (1999) write:

Aristotle said that we persuade others by three means: 1) by the appeal to their reason (*logos*); 2) by the appeal to their emotions (*pathos*); 3) by the appeal of our personality or character (*ethos*). We may use one of these means exclusively or predominantly, or we may use all three. Which of these means we use will be partly determined by the nature of the thesis we are arguing, partly by current circumstances, partly (perhaps mainly) by the kind of audience we are addressing. (p. 32)

Hatch (1999) is similarly brief in the discussion of overlaps, but gives prime importance to *logos*. In the introduction to his chapter on *logos*, he defines all three types of persuasive strategies, "*Logos* is the predominant persuasive appeal in argumentation" (1999, p. 5). Later, at the beginning of Chapter 2 on *ethos* and *pathos*, he simply comments, "Although *logos* (the appeal to reason) is the primary persuasive strategy in arguing, arguments rely on other persuasive strategies as well" (1999, p. 33) and then proceeds to define *ethos*, which "is present in every act of communication" (1999, p. 34).

Pathos, defined as "the ability of language to evoke feelings in us," is presented as somewhat mysterious and independent of reason, "Whenever you act or accept an opinion based on your feelings, even without fully understanding why, you are acting on *pathos*" (Hatch, 1999, p. 37). Yet, emotional appeal is important for getting a response to a piece of persuasion. Logical appeal cannot function alone very effectively: "Although the emotional appeal can be manipulative, it is also essential for moving people to action. People can be convinced logically that they ought to do something and still not follow through. But when people are made to feel strongly about something, they will often act on those feelings--even when they're not sure why" (Hatch, 1999, p. 38). A connection between *ethos* and *pathos* is not made in this textbook, even though Aristotle stresses the importance of understanding emotional response in a speech based on appealing to character.

I have experimented with assigning sections from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* to first year students, with great resistance; the students most prepared to read the primary text were those in the Honors program. There, I was able to initiate a discussion of Aristotle's theory. However, even the Honors students had difficulty understanding Aristotle. Therefore, for average freshmen, I have explained the concepts from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and concentrated on the applications to texts. In general, I have found that there are two levels to teaching: one backstage, the theory that drives the pedagogy, and one onstage, the material that the students are ready to use. More advanced students are able to work deductively, from theory to examples, whereas most less advanced students need to proceed from examples to theory.

VI. Theory vs. Classroom Practice

In making the transition from theory to practice, it may be questioned whether or not applying a descriptive system of rhetoric to a classroom setting is a valid use of theory. However, there is justification for the transfer. Atwill (1998) points out that "Much of the history of Western rhetoric has been the story of attempts to transform the art into some form of either philosophy or ethics/politics" (pp. 162-163) without regard to its use as a productive art, where Aristotle would place it. It is a system for making or doing something for a specific end--communicating persuasively, not necessarily determining a path to virtue or the good life. Hence, as a system for how to do something, or persuade audiences, its value lies in the skills learned from it. Atwill (1998) specifically cautions against setting up a theory/practice binary opposition in the consideration of Aristotle's rhetoric, or what my students would recognize as an "either or fallacy." However, while the system is not necessarily responsible for the content, or the use to which it is put, the speaker--and the audience--are.

Contemporary educators are aware of the interdependence of the three modes, often related to the communication triangle of speaker, audience, and context/content of the speech or text. For example, Thompson (1998), author of a handbook of rhetorical theory for communication studies, points out that Aristotle's principles are still useful today in broadcasting and the media, where actors and journalists spend years learning the art of persuasion of audiences. In a brief definition of Aristotle's modes of 'artistic' (or learned) persuasion, he observes that the three modes form a triangle: "You can't succeed by applying one and not the other two principles. Being persuasive is really about speaking from your heart, your head and your soul" (1998, p. 8).

Similar to my own approach, Lee (1996) lists nine 75-minute seminars and workshops designed to teach students critical thinking. Session IV proceeds from "Utilizing *ethos* (personal proofs), *pathos* (emotional proofs), and *logos* (logical proofs)," to "Combining the three to create a 'good reason' to speak" (Lee, 1996, p. 6).

Adapting study of the modes to literary analysis in her literature and composition classes, Khawaja (1997) uses the communication triangle and the three modes of persuasion in a correlation of memory and imagination. She takes an Aristotelian approach to reader-response criticism, and uses combinations of the modes to create an interdependent and interactive reading and writing process: "The Aristotelian approach to reader-response requires that students integrate both emotions and reasoning in their reader-response" and "since the author and the audience, through the acts of reading and interpretive writing mutually share the *ethos* of a literary text, it becomes a practising ground for one's emotional intelligence" (1997, p. 6). In turn, the balance of emotions and reasoning relate to ethical choices made by author and reader in the response to the text (Khawaja, 1997, pp. 7-8)

In my LCSR composition classes at Lynchburg College, which are based on an integration of reading, writing and speaking, students are challenged to observe the modes in their reading and use them in their speaking and writing.

VII. Composition II at Lynchburg College

Lynchburg College is a four-year, comprehensive institution of about 1,900 students, located in Central Virginia. Composition is taught as part of the General Education Program, the

basic requirements students must take before concentrating on their major. Composition I and II are taught as a one-year course at Lynchburg College. It is required of all entering students, unless they have earned Advanced Placement (AP) credit during high school or transfer credit for composition taken at another institution. Each faculty member is required to accomplish the same general goals in the course, but the methods and readings used may vary, according to the professor's expertise.

The first semester, Composition I, concentrates on developing understanding and application of forms of writing, both creative and expository, as well as the basic principles of academic writing. In the second semester, Composition II is designed to teach students research skills, so that they learn to write from sources. The maximum enrollment in Composition I and II is 20, though some faculty members may have larger classes.

My sections of Composition are taught as part of the Lynchburg College Symposium Readings (LCSR) program. Initiated in 1989, this program is designed to introduce students to classical authors in preparation for their Senior Symposium course, required of all seniors. Faculty may propose courses to be included in the LCSR program at any level, including freshman courses. These courses include readings from the 10-volume set of anthologies used for Senior Symposium, as well as an integration of reading, writing, and speaking skills for students. For this particular term, I chose the LCSR volume *Tyranny and freedom* (Ed. Huston, 1993), for readings to be used in conjunction with Hatch (1999) for theory. Note however, that this approach to Aristotle's theory need not be restricted to composition, but can be applied to analysis of texts in a variety of disciplines and levels.

VII.1 Course Matrix

In teaching writing and research skills, this course is designed to challenge students to think beyond the self in discovering a definition of freedom, to take into account successively wider contexts for their view of the term and its applications: in short, to learn to live in a society with other people. Awareness of other people in society translates into audience awareness, needed for persuasive communication. Paper assignments are based on a) one of the LCSR readings, b) one or more of the Aristotelian modes of persuasion (one as primary, for study), and a "level" of perception, as shown in the table below. The first paper establishes the problem: definition. The remaining papers (see assignment instructions below) create a cascade of modes, in which students learn to use a combination of persuasive forms.

| Papers | Reading | Rhetorical Theory | Level |
|---------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| Paper 1 | | Definition | Self |
| Paper 2 | Rousseau | Pathos | Family |
| Paper 3 | Plato | Ethos | Friends |
| Paper 4 | Holocaust Documents | Logos Detecting Fallacies | Community |
| Paper 5 | Martin Luther King, Jr. | Combination | National/International |

Note that, as I mentioned earlier, the assignment of particular texts to particular modes of

persuasion is somewhat arbitrary, as all three operate together. Thus, a teacher could assign Rousseau's *Social Contract* to study *logos* (how Rousseau builds his argument) or *pathos* (what happens when the contract breaks down).

To begin, I ask the students to define the terms "tyranny" and "freedom" (or one of them). Most students seize on "freedom," and a majority begin by asserting that "freedom is the ability to do whatever you want." Next, they are asked to find exceptions or problems in their definitions, based on suggestions and questions from others in the class. For freshmen, used to memorization and push-button computer responses, as well as the sanctity of their own opinions, this first unit creates agony, complaints, and shock. What they discover is that doing whatever one wants may infringe on others' rights. Their definitions of freedom have to be modified. Revised definitions are submitted with the final version of Paper 1.

Next, the students test their revised definition of freedom on the readings, with additional examples drawn from the particular "level" of the essay. Research strategies are taught for the gathering of evidence, such as recall at the self level; observation at the family level, interview at the friends level, and reading/online searches for the community and national/international levels. For the unit including the Holocaust Documents, students are also required to refer to related events on campus, such as an exhibit on the life of Anne Frank at the college art gallery, March 16-April 16, 2000, or one or more of the public lectures at the college, for example that of Gerda Weissmann Klein, a Holocaust survivor, on March 16, 2000. Hence they learn to integrate other types of sources in their writing beyond print and online material.

Following is a list of the specific assignments, with argumentation techniques. Instructions for students are given in section VII. 3.

VII. 2 Overview of Assignments

Paper 1) Tyranny and freedom at the personal level, with website as source. Rhetorical strategies: definition of terms tyranny/freedom and components of argument, claim, reasons, and assumptions.

Paper 2) Tyranny and Freedom in the Family, with website, plus radio, CD, TV broadcast, video or DVD as source. Rhetorical strategy: emotional appeal. Reading: Hatch (1999), Ch. 2, "Ethos and pathos," section on *pathos* (pp. 37-40); Letterman, "Tiny fighters are victims of mothers' smoke," (Hatch, 1999, pp. 57-59), contemporary essay to illustrate emotional appeal; and Rousseau, *The social contract*, in *Tyranny and freedom* (Huston, 1993, pp. 27-46).

Paper 3) Tyranny and freedom among friends, with any of the above source types, plus conversations as sources. Rhetorical strategy: ethical appeal. Reading: Hatch (1999), Ch. 2, section on *ethos* (pp. 33-37); Duff, "Moral and ethical dilemmas in the special-care nursery" (Hatch, 1999, pp. 453-457), contemporary essay to illustrate ethical appeal; and Plato, *Apology of Socrates, Crito, Phaedo*, in *Tyranny and freedom* (Ed. Huston, 1993, pp. 195-211, 213-221, 223-225).

Paper 4) Tyranny and freedom in the greater community, with any of the above source types, plus documents in newspapers and magazines as sources. Rhetorical strategies: evaluating *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*; recognizing fallacies of reasoning. Reading: Hatch (1999),

Ch. 5, "Evaluating arguments" (pp. 163-75); "Holocaust Documents," in *Tyranny and freedom* (Ed. Huston, 1993, pp. 381-94).

Paper 5) Tyranny and freedom in the nation, with any of the above source types, plus books as sources. Rhetorical strategies: organizing arguments, awareness of the combination of *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*; replying to fallacies of reasoning. Reading: Hatch (1999), Ch. 6, "Joining the conversation," (pp. 209-227), with "Public statement by eight Alabama clergymen" (Ed. Huston, 1993, pp. 357-358, or Hatch, 1999, pp. 236-237) and "Letter from Birmingham Jail" (Ed. Huston, 1993, pp. 345-356, or Hatch, 1999, pp. 237-249).

For the final examination, students were asked to assemble their papers into a website portfolio and write an introductory essay showing how their definition of freedom would apply to each of the five papers. Most of the students also wrote overviews of the theory covered in the papers, together with the progression of the definition. Throughout the term, each student also gave a presentation of one paper to the class.

VII. 3 Instructions for Students

The instructions for the students illustrate the interrelation of modes in the five paper assignments. Each paper can be revised for two weeks after its initial submission deadline, for improved grades. Students may see the instructor for comments or send their papers electronically, using Norton *ConnectWeb* software.

Assignment: PAPER 1: Defining Freedom at the Personal Level

The purpose of this paper is to give the class an opportunity to explore the components of argument in establishing a definition of freedom, with one or more websites about Martin Luther King, Jr., as sources for information to illustrate the definition. Since freedom is a concept on which King based his life's work, and also a concept on which our country is founded, we need to understand exactly what this term means. Often, misunderstandings arise when people apply different definitions of the same term, one for the self and another one for others. Thus, by starting at the personal level, and then considering how a personal definition affects others, we begin to discover the process of getting along, sharing, and arguing rationally, in communities, or communication.

An argument (or any rational piece of communication) has the following components: a) claim or thesis, b) reasons or evidence to support the claim, and c) assumptions on which the claim and supporting evidence are based. Often the choice of supporting evidence is strongly governed by assumptions, as is the choice of language in the claim. It is a writer's responsibility to consider exceptions to the claim, to let the audience know that the framer of the definition has considered alternative viewpoints or problems that may arise in applying the definition. Also, to limit misunderstandings, writers should be aware of their own assumptions as well as those of others in defining terms and choosing evidence.

This paper should include:

- 1) Your personal definition of freedom. Please avoid the dictionary. Construct this definition from your own experience, so that it is based on your own thinking.

- 2) Supporting information based on your web research about Martin Luther King.
- 3) Possible exceptions to or problems with your definition.
- 4) Illustration of those exceptions.
- 5) A modified definition of freedom, explaining the limitations of this definition.
- 6) Problems or exceptions in the evidence gathered.
- 7) A list of works cited in MLA or APA format.
- 8) A printout of any web pages that you used.
- 9) A critique of the argumentation in what you have written. Answer the questions on p. 6 of Hatch.

Note that 1)-6) are not necessarily a sequence to follow, just the content of the paper. Organize your material with good reason.

Assignment: **PAPER 2: Defining Freedom at the Family Level**

The objective of this assignment is to give you an opportunity to develop your definition of freedom, as it relates to interactions within a family, and as it illustrates Rousseau's idea of the social contract applied to the family.

Content of Paper

Explain what Rousseau means by the idea of a social contract, relate this idea to family life, and show how the social contract relates to your definition of freedom, as established in Paper 1. Be sure to summarize or quote from Rousseau's text to explain his concept, as needed to illustrate the idea of the social contract in the family, using examples from your own life and from that of your sources. Your sources, in addition to personal observation, must include at least one audio, video, CD or DVD source, cited according to Modern Language Association or American Psychological Association guidelines. You may also use websites, as you learned from Paper 1, and Letterman's essay, "Tiny fighters are victims of mothers' smoke," printed in Hatch, *Arguing in Communities* (1999), pp. 57-59, for examples and ideas about freedom and the social contract in the family. The rhetorical strategy for this assignment should include persuasion through emotional appeal (Hatch, 1999, pp. 37-40).

Pathos: Emotional Appeal

Apply techniques of emotional appeal to the paper. Using descriptive details in the examples, make your point about the social contract, showing why it is necessary and what happens if it does not work properly in the family. Be careful not to tell your readers how to feel. They should be able to feel what you want them to experience through the details alone. Commentaries and moralizations give "the answer" and thus stop thought (yes, *logos*!) and distance the reader from the experience.

Logos: The Basics of Argument (claim, support, assumptions)

Assignments in this course are cumulative: you are expected to use techniques from the last assignment in this one, to reinforce skill in argumentation. Most essays are based on *logos*

to make a point, even if they also use emotional appeal. Similarly, most essays use emotional appeal to maintain interest in a rational argument.

Therefore, your paper should

- 1) Have a thesis statement or claim
- 2) Have support for that thesis statement
- 3) Question or challenge the original claim
- 4) Use examples to illustrate problems with the original claim
- 5) Develop a modification to the claim.

This carryover of *logos* does not mean that you should copy examples already written for Paper 1 here. Use the techniques again, with new examples.

Organization and Development

You are writing a research paper, though it may include techniques of creative writing. Thus, the more detailed research that you do in the examples, the better the paper. A hasty overview without much information is like “telling the reader what to feel”—it distances the reader from the text. Your paper should be coherent. Use transitions to explain the development of ideas. Examples should fit claims and the conclusion should relate to the introduction. Remember that you are responsible for finding and developing material: I cannot do it for you. This is ENGL 112.

Assignment: PAPER 3: Socrates' Apology: Tyranny and Freedom among Friends

The purpose of Paper 3 is to relate the concept of tyranny and freedom to examples of friends and to show your individual ethical appeal. You must be sure to identify the three criteria for ethical appeal; the problem of ethical appeal in Socrates' *Apology*; the three charges against Socrates, and why Socrates refuses to escape. Include a parallel between a contemporary problem with friends and the *Apology*.

For the contemporary parallel, use a personal experience or an experience of someone you know. The experience should be of how a person has believed in something so much that he or she argued with friends about it: an experience where your friends have shunned or turned away from you over it.

Or, you can write from a personal perspective. If you were on trial, being charged for something that you did not commit, how would you use your ethical appeal to the jury to get you off? You can be creative with the charges. You may even be your own lawyer if you please. Whatever the outcome of your trial, whether you are convicted or pardoned, tell how Socrates' situation relates to your own. You may use the three criteria for ethical appeal.

- 1) Be sure to define ethical appeal and explain the problem of ethical appeal in Socrates' *Apology*.

- 2) Relate your choice of experience to what Socrates went through, including the three charges: teaching incorrectly, not believing in the gods, and corrupting the youth.

Are the experiences similar or different?

3) What was the accused person's argument? Did it meet the criteria for ethical appeal? Why or why not? If so, did the person succeed in his or her ethical appeal?

4) Did the person have the chance to escape from the problem? If so, did he or she escape and why or why not?

5) Interview sources for gaining information and evidence to support your claim. Interview people who could have gone through a situation similar to that of Socrates.

6) Use the information you gained in 5) to back up your claims. Then relate your example and the evidence back to Socrates. At the end of the *Crito*, Socrates says that he would rather die than go against the laws of the state and God's will. Do your examples end the same way as Socrates?

7) Be sure to list the sources interviewed in the Works Cited section at the end of your paper. You may use other types of sources as well, but be sure to document them. As I mentioned in class, you may quote or discuss poetry from the Poetry Symposium or other poetry in your paper, if you wish, but be sure to give the source where you got it. See me if you need help with the works cited references. No copying of references please!

In writing your paper make sure you use *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*. Be sure to make it interesting: make this paper fun! Be creative! Good Luck!

Assignment: **PAPER 4: Tyranny and Freedom in the Community: The Holocaust**

The purpose of this paper is to give you an opportunity to design your own essay, to explore the problems of tyranny and freedom during the Holocaust. Before you begin, write the prompt for your paper, containing items a)-e) from the instructions given out in class. Put your prompt at the top of your paper. Below that, write your paper. Be sure to give your paper a title!

1) Does the paper have instructions that fit the existing paper?

2) If not, which do you suggest, changing the paper or the instructions or both?
How?

3) Does the paper have a thesis?

4) Check for the following in argumentation:

- Fallacies of reasoning named, according to Hatch
- Fallacies of reasoning in your sources, explained clearly
- Illustrations of fallacies of reasoning from the Holocaust
- Discussion of fallacies related to thesis of paper

5) Check for the following in use of sources:

- Sources given for all information

- Article(s) cited
- Reference to the Lynchburg College Daura Gallery exhibit on Anne Frank
- Works Cited list

Assignment: *PAPER 5: Tyranny and Freedom in the Nation: Analyzing Rhetorical Appeals in Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Letter from Birmingham Jail."*

Write an analysis of how Martin Luther King, Jr., uses one or more of a) emotional appeal (*pathos*), b) ethical appeal (*ethos*), and c) logical appeal (*logos*) in his "Letter from Birmingham Jail." You may focus on one or more of the strategies. Refer to assigned readings in Hatch on the syllabus and to your class notes for definitions of the terms. You may introduce a personal parallel if you like. Be sure to give a Works Cited reference to King's letter and to the statement by the Alabama clergy, if you refer to either of these texts in your paper.

Suggested Structure of Paper

- 1) Introduction, giving the strategy or strategies that you plan to discuss. Define all technical terms and give the sources for your definitions. Remember that you are writing to an audience not familiar with this class.
- 2) Summarize briefly the important points in the letter.
- 3) Provide illustration of one or more the rhetorical strategies (*pathos*, *ethos* and *logos*, as mentioned above) that make the letter persuasive. Feel free to critique the letter as well, if you find parts that are not persuasive. Keep the subtopics that you plan to discuss in the same order as they are mentioned in the introduction.
- 4) Discuss the significance of the letter with respect to the strategies of persuasion. What does it teach you?
- 5) Feel free to include a personal parallel, showing how you make a connection from the letter to your life. This personal parallel is optional.
- 6) Write a conclusion.
- 7) Provide a works cited reference.

Option: If you want to experiment creatively with this assignment

Feel free to alter the arrangement of 1)-5) if you need to do so. You may also tell a personal story and relate it to King's letter as you go, but don't forget the requirement to analyze your examples with respect to one or more of the rhetorical strategies.

Final Examination: Web Portfolio Instructions

By the end of the term, each student will create a web portfolio of their papers. This portfolio will serve as the final examination for the course. The goal of the assignment is to give

you an opportunity to connect what you have learned in the course, to show how the papers relate in some way, to document your development of ideas throughout the course. Grading is based on editing skills that each author displays in the following areas:

- Well-written introductory commentary connecting papers in a meaningful way
- Attention to arrangement or sequencing of papers to make a unified point
- about writing skills or the development of ideas
- Correction of old grammar and spelling errors in all papers (hello--I check!)
- Consistent, elegant formatting
- Precision in proofreading

Individual paper grades will not affect the portfolio grade (but lack of proofreading of papers will). The grade for this portfolio is based on the writing and editing to assemble the papers into a unified work.

Each student will make HTML files using Microsoft *Front Page* 2000, which is available in the lab computers. Students may include graphics or links to video, audio, or animation from the web, to produce a creative hypertext book of their papers! Note copyright rules: images may not be copied without citation of source and permission from original site. Web portfolios should include the following:

- A. Opening page introducing portfolio
 - Title of portfolio
 - Your name
 - Course name and number (ENGL 112J)
- B. Index page, listing papers
- C. Introductory essay
- D. HTML links from index page to papers

Optional:

- E. Links to other websites
- F. Graphics, audio, video, or animation

Format: Put your website on your P drive in your public directory. Make sure that the links work.

Web Portfolios

ENGL 112J & R

Student Name _____

Course Section _____

The purpose of this final examination is to give you an opportunity to connect what you have learned in the course, to show how the papers relate to the central theme of the course: tyranny and freedom. This website exercise also gives you an opportunity to learn how to make webpages, a composition skill of growing importance in every sector of the economy.

Grading is based on the editing skills that each author displays in the following areas:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1) All Required Parts completed | 10% |
| A. Opening Page (Title Page) | |
| B. Index Page with links to | |
| C. Introduction | |
| D. Paper Titles | |
| E. Works Cited List | |
| 2) Well-written introductory essay | 50% |
| 3) Sequencing of papers to make a unified point | 10% |
| 4) Consistent, elegant formatting of website | 10% |
| 5) Precision in proofreading | 20% |
-

Final Web Portfolio Illustrations

Website portfolio of **April Davis**

http://tiner-e.web.lynchburg.edu/public/OSSA/Davis_A/title.htm

Website portfolio of **Stephanie Eagle**

http://tiner-e.web.lynchburg.edu/public/OSSA/Eagle_S/title.htm

Website portfolio of **Jon Hart**

Web Portfolio: http://tiner-e.web.lynchburg.edu/public/OSSA/Hart_J/index.htm

Video: not available for distribution, due to copyright restrictions.

Results

These examples show how students connected the modes to the levels and ultimately discovered the overlaps among the modes. Emotional appeal depends on awareness of the thinking process of the audience, the “state of mind they bring to the discourse,” as well as the causes that lead to their responses. Emotional appeal in well-chosen examples can enhance the persuasion of a logical argument. Ethical appeal depends on “sound sense,” (*logos*), as well as concern for the audience (*pathos*). April Davis's introduction gives a good overview of the strategies used in the course, showing a student's perspective of the relevance of the pedagogy and rhetorical theory.

In her essay "There is no true freedom," Stephanie Eagle points out the problem with the initial assumptions about freedom, as the ability to do whatever one wants. She shows how she learned that her concept of freedom must take into account others around her. This definition became the basis for the introduction to her website, where she raises several important questions, including why, freedom is not given to all equally. This question leads to an exploration of the problem of tyranny, with examples of individuals who challenged limitations on human rights. In the course of writing the papers, which include a personal role-play, "The Apology of Stephanie," where she becomes "Socrates" on trial for violating the sanctions against premarital sex and develops the interconnection between law, personal ethics, and emotional reactions.

April Davis's essay on Rousseau, "*The Social Contract* in relation to the family," shows the ethical and emotional dilemmas that family members face in facing threats to survival of the self, and the family, in the larger context of society. By her last paper, "Brotherhood vs. bigotry," on Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Letter from Birmingham Jail," she demonstrates the ability to analyze his message and his mission from a variety of perspectives, to show how he uses all three modes of persuasion to challenge fallacies of reasoning used to justify segregation.

Using a website and video, Jon Hart also demonstrates the awareness of how, in the context of emotional and seeming ethical appeal, fallacies of reasoning can be discovered, subverting the persuasion intended. In turn, he creates a document that integrates emotional appeal, ethical appeal, and logical appeal, contrasting the arguments of Hitler, in which the fallacies of reasoning are carefully labeled and refuted by the footage of carnage in the concentration camps.

The evidence here shows that, with knowledge of the modes of persuasion and the interdependence among them, students can detect fallacies of reasoning and be on guard against arguments used for destructive purposes: the advantage of a few at the expense of many. Thus they—and others—may not only survive, but also truly live, in a society with freedom, one that must be founded on respect and concern for others globally.

Acknowledgements

Presentation of this paper at the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation Conference,

Windsor, Ontario, Canada, May 17-19, 2001, was made possible by a grant from the Lynchburg College Faculty Development fund and funds from the Geraldine Lyon Owen Professorship. Thanks go to Dr. Jacqueline Asbury, former Dean of the College; Dr. Vernon Miles, Dean of the College; Dr. Peggy Pittas, Assistant Dean for Faculty Development and Director of the Lynchburg College Symposium Readings (LCSR) Program; Dr. Daniel Lang, Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences; Prof. Thomas Allen, Chair, English Program; Dr. Howard Ramagli, Associate Vice President for Information Technology and Resources; Ms. Susan McBee, Software Support Manager; Mr. Paul Spaulding, Network Manager; Mr. Scott Twisdale, Operations Systems Support Technician; and Ariel Myers, Public Services Librarian, Lynchburg College, for their support throughout the course and preparation for the conference and publication.

References

- Anne Frank in the World: 1929-1945*. (2000, March 16-April 16). Exhibition at the Daura Gallery, Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, VA, USA.
- Aristotle. (1991). *Aristotle 'On Rhetoric': A theory of civic discourse*. Trans. G. A. Kennedy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Atwill, J. M. (1998). *Rhetoric reclaimed: Aristotle and the liberal arts tradition*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Cooper, J. M. (1996). "An Aristotelian theory of the emotions." In A. O. Rorty (Ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric* (pp. 238-257). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Corbett, E. P. J., & Connors, R. (1999). *Classical rhetoric for the modern student* (4th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Duff, R. S. (1999). "Moral and ethical dilemmas in the special-care nursery." In G. L. Hatch, *Arguing in communities* (pp. 453-457). Mountain View: Mayfield.
- Frede, D. (1996). "Mixed feelings in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*." In A. O. Rorty (Ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric* (pp. 258-285). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Garver, E. (1994). *Aristotle's rhetoric: An art of character*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hatch, G. L. (1999). *Arguing in communities* (2nd ed.). Mountain View: Mayfield.
- Holocaust Documents. (1993). In A. M. Huston (Ed.), *Tyranny and freedom. Lynchburg College symposium readings: Classical selections on great issues* (2nd ed.), (Vol. 1). (pp. 381-394). Lanham: University Press of America.
- Huston, A. M. (Ed.) (1993). *Tyranny and freedom. Lynchburg College symposium readings: Classical selections on great issues* (2nd ed.), (Vol. 1). Lanham: University Press of America.
- Khawaja, M. (1997). "Reconfiguring Aristotle's dialogics through reader-response." Paper presented at the 87th Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Detroit, MI, November 20-27. ERIC Document 420883.
- King, M. L., Jr. (1993). "Letter from Birmingham Jail." In A. M. Huston (Ed.), *Tyranny and freedom. Lynchburg College symposium readings: Classical selections on great issues* (2nd ed.), (Vol. 1). (pp. 345-356). Lanham: University Press of America.
- King, M. L., Jr. (1999). "Letter from Birmingham Jail." In G. L. Hatch, *Arguing in communities* (pp.

- 237-249). Mountain View: Mayfield.
- Klein, G. W. (2000, March 16). Public Lecture. John M. Turner Lectureship in the Humanities, Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, VA, USA.
- Lee, A. A. D. (1996). "Critical thinking for the new millennium: A pedagogical imperative." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Faculty Development Symposium, October 10-13. ERIC Document 429913.
- Leighton, S. R. (1996). "Aristotle and the emotions." In A. O. Rorty (Ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric* (pp. 206-237). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Letterman, G. (1999). "Tiny fighters are victims of mothers' smoke." In G. L. Hatch, *Arguing in communities* (pp. 57-59). Mountain View: Mayfield.
- Plato. (1993). *Apology of Socrates. Crito. Phaedo*. In A. M. Huston (Ed.), *Tyranny and freedom. Lynchburg College symposium readings: Classical selections on great issues* (2nd ed.), (Vol. 1). (pp. 195-225). Lanham: University Press of America.
- "Public statement by eight Alabama clergymen." (1993). In A. M. Huston (Ed.), *Tyranny and freedom. Lynchburg College symposium readings: Classical selections on great issues* (2nd ed.), (Vol. 1). (pp. 357-358). Lanham: University Press of America.
- "Public statement by eight Alabama clergymen." (1999). In G. L. Hatch, *Arguing in communities* (pp. 236-237). Mountain View: Mayfield.
- Rorty, A. O. (1996). "Structuring Rhetoric." In A. O. Rorty (Ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric* (pp. 1-33). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rousseau, J. J. (1993). *The social contract*. In A. M. Huston (Ed.), *Tyranny and freedom. Lynchburg College symposium readings: Classical selections on great issues* (2nd ed.), (Vol. 1). (pp. 27-46). Lanham: University Press of America.
- Ryan, E. E. (1984). *Aristotle's theory of rhetorical argumentation*. Montréal: Bellarmin. Thompson, P. (1998). *Persuading Aristotle: The timeless art of persuasion in business, negotiation and the media*. St. Leonards, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Tindale, C. (1998). "Introduction: The importance of rhetoric for argumentation." In H. V. Hansen, C. W. Tindale, and A. Coleman (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Second OSSA Conference, Argumentation & Rhetoric*, Brock University, May 15-17, 1997. St. Catharine's, Ontario: OSSA. CD ROM.