Stu Dent
Engineering 110-04
Prof. Suzan Last
Oct 30, 2018

Use of Rhetorical Strategies in an Editorial Versus in a Scholarly Article

Since there are multiple ways of convincing an audience to agree with a stance on an issue, it is crucial to choose the most effective strategies to suit the expectations and needs of your specific audience. In a newspaper article, such as Lucy Madison's editorial "Wheels of Misfortune", published in the *New York Times* [1], emotional arguments can be used effectively to get the readers interested, to care about the issue, and agree with her argument that cycling laws need to be more heavily regulated. In contrast, a scholarly article such as "Pedestrian injuries due to collision with bicycles in New York and California" [2], will usually rely on logical evidence and credibility to convey their purpose and convince the specific scholarly audience likely to read this paper. In this academic article, Tuckel, Milczarski, and Maisel show that pedestrian-bicycle collisions are on the decline due to improved cycling infrastructure using statistical analysis that proves effective in communicating to the article's intended audience of traffic safety researchers. Authors must carefully select the rhetorical strategies that will most appeal to their target audience. **In these two articles, the authors have done just that:** Madison relies mostly on emotional arguments, while adding some logic and personal credibility to appeal to her general newspaper readers, while Tuckel, Milszarksi, and Maisel rely mostly on logical evidence and scholarly credibility to appeal to their academic audience.

Both articles make use of logical evidence such as statistics and data, but this strategy is much more widely used in "Pedestrian injuries due to collisions with bicycles in New York and California" than in Madison's "Wheels of Misfortune." To reinforces their findings, the authors of the scholarly article quote statistics multiple times throughout their paper, such as "In New York City, the rate climbs from 4.26 in 2004 to 7.54 in 2008 and thereafter falls to 6.06 in 2011" [2]. This

information supports their conclusion that improving cycling infrastructure decreases collisions. Similarly, Madison states that "The number of collisions between pedestrians and cyclists rose more than 40 percent from 2012, when there were 243 crashes that injured 244 pedestrians, to 2015, when there were 349 than injured 361 pedestrians" [1], which backs up her stance that cyclists flouting the law is a growing concern. Madison's scant use of statistics is appropriate for her general audience who appreciate a bit of data, but would likely lose interest if she relied solely on this strategy. The opposite is true of the academic audience, who would reject the article as unsuitable if it contained insufficient data.

While both articles make appeals to credibility, Madison's is more personal, while the scholars rely more on extrinsic *ethos*. Madison shows that she has first-hand experience with cyclists who should be considered dangerous, because "I live in Prospect Heights in Brooklyn, where cyclists seem to be everywhere…. I'm struck by the number of cyclists with no regard for the traffic laws" [1]. She demonstrates that her calls for more law enforcement against cyclists is justified, as she is someone who is directly affected by this issue, and who has lost a loved one because of it. The scholarly authors, however, seek to obtain their credibility by drawing their data from other credible academic sources. They explain that "The data for New York [comes] from the Statewide Planning and Research Cooperative System", which "collects patient level detail charges for every hospital discharge, ambulatory surgery patient, and emergency department admission in New York State" [2]. Their use of credible sources to support each point they make shows that their arguments are well supported and can be trusted by the audience. Where Madison builds trust by sharing her personal experiences with readers in her community, the scholars build trust by conforming to academic conventions of citing credible research sources.

One rhetorical strategy prevalent in Madison's article but absent in the article by Tuckel *et al* is an appeal to emotion. In the hook of her article, Madison tells the story of how her mother was struck and killed by a cyclist. To enhance the emotional response felt by the readers, she uses

dramatic phrasing such as "a cyclist plowed into my mother" and "Those were among her final conscious moments" [2]. Her goal in these sentences was to invoke an emotional response in the reader, such as sadness or outrage, in order to get them to care about the issue. She aimed for her audience to be either sorrowful or angry, so that they would be more receptive to her main point, namely that laws should be more heavily enforced against cyclists. In contrast, the scholarly article uses no overt emotional appeals, as these would likely reduce their credibility for the scholarly audience, who would see them as emotional manipulation.

For any given rhetorical situation, the strategic use of rhetorical appeals can result in vastly different results. A text intended for the layperson is more likely to contain emotional appeals, and one for researchers more likely to exclusively rely on logic and credibility. Using the wrong strategies for you audience can result in them losing interest or even losing confidence in your professional abilities. These two articles demonstrate excellent practice in using right approach for the chosen audience.

(881 words)

References

[1]   L. Madison, "Wheels of Misfortune," 11 Aug. 2017. *New York Times* [online]. Available: https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/11/opinion/traffic-bike-laws.html

[2]   P. Tuckel, W. Milczarski, and R. Maisel, "Pedestrian injuries due to collisions with bicycles in New York and California, *Journal of Safety Research*, vol. 51. pp. 7-13, 2014.

Format	A range: Excellent	B range: Good to Great work	C/D range: Ok - Solid to Marginal work	F: Insufficient achievement
Adheres to Style Sheet formatting Requirements Includes properly formatted IEEE References list				

Introduction

	A range	B range	C/D range	F
Develops a clear overall **purpose**, highlighting its importance and offering needed context for analyzing the two sources	✔			
Identifies each of the two articles by **author, title,** and **genre** (*type* of source) and intended audience. Gives concise summary of each.	✔			
Ends with a **focused Thesis Statement** that presents an analytical claim about the articles' use of rhetorical strategies. Identifies **2-3 rhetorical strategies** for discussion/analysis.	✔			

Development (Body Paragraphs)

	A range	B range	C/D range	F
Begins each paragraph with a clear **Topic Sentence** based on **ONE criteria** for comparative analysis related to thesis.				
Each paragraph is **unified (one topic)** and well developed, and helps to achieve the essay's **main purpose or goal**				
Uses **effective transitions** to show logical connections between ideas within and between paragraphs				
Makes **close, detailed reference** to each source to support and substantiate *each and every* claim about the articles				
Uses at least **4 short quotations**, as evidence; integrates quotations effectively into surrounding sentences/ideas. Cites properly	✔			

Conclusion

	A range	B range	C/D range	F
The Conclusion reflects the Introduction, echoing **the Thesis** and **reiterating key points or findings**				
Provides a final insight that offers some broader **statement of significance**: a "bigger picture". Does not simply repeat.				

Documentation

	A range	B range	C/D range	F
Cites and documents sources correctly in IEEE style (in-text citations and References list at the end).				

Style

	A range	B range	C/D range	F
Style is formal, "objective," avoiding slang, contractions, and awkward *you* and *one* pronouns		*Use of "you" is appropriate and effective here*		
The essay uses **present tense** to refer to its sources, reserving past tense to discuss historical events				
Uses **clear, concise, complete sentences**, avoiding awkward, unclear, or convoluted sentence structure				
Uses **concrete, specific, precise diction**—rather than broad, generalized terms. Uses strong action verbs and rhetorically effective signal phrases.				
Uses **commas, colons,** and **semi-colons** correctly; typos have been caught, showing careful attention to detail and accuracy				
Overall -- Content demonstrates a sound grasp of **basic principles of rhetoric and argumentation**: rhetorical features are correctly identified, essay is effectively developed and organized *Outstanding work!*	All Objectives fully met and some exceeded. ✔ A+	Good or very good work; some revision needed.	C/D range: significant revision needed	F Less than minimal achievement