

Avani Agrawal

Elizabeth Dieterich

Interpretation and Argument - At Home (76-101)

2 February 2025

CGA Rough Draft

Immigration has been a pressing issue on the news in recent years, especially the ill-treatment of immigrant workers in their careers. Alex Tizon's article, "My Family's Slave" published on June 2017 in *The Atlantic* and Maria da Conceição Figueiredo, Fátima Suleman, Mariado Carmo Botelho's article "Workplace Abuse and Harassment: The Vulnerability of Informal and Migrant Domestic Workers in Portugal" both focus on the exploitation many immigrant workers face, often being isolated and subjected to abusive conditions. However, each article holds its own way of communicating these issues to appeal to their respective audiences. Tizon's article is directed towards a non-expert audience, and thus takes a narrative approach to increase attention and allow for better understanding of a difficult issue. On the other hand, Figueiredo et al. is written for an expert audience, so it utilizes a more scholarly approach by including more analysis and details. While both texts explore similar topics regarding forced domestic labor and its impact on the household, the audience that each paper is written for—an expert-oriented academic paper versus a non-expert-oriented news article—plays a great role in determining the tone of the text, more specifically in terms of formal and colloquial language, objectivity and subjectivity, and the overall rhetorical situation of the texts.

The intended audience contributes heavily to the tone of the two articles, the academic article being more formal and the news article being more colloquial. Alex Tizon's "My Family's Slave" boasts an extremely emotional tone throughout the entire piece in order to engage the

general public rather than inform. Storytelling plays a huge role in the article to provide a more human outlook to the issue of immigration and domestic labor. Thus, Tizon uses the story of his “servant/slave” to evoke an emotional response from the readers to ensure that they understand the emotions behind domestic labor. This allows the issue of forced labor more understandable and compelling to a wide range of readers. In contrast, Figueiredo et al. maintains a formal tone as the goal is to inform rather than evoke emotion from the readers. The language is technical and concise in order to provide a detailed analysis of the systemic issues surrounding domestic labor in Portugal. It is clear that the intended audience is scholars and practitioners in the field as they use nuanced vocabulary. Whereas Tizon’s article invites readers to emotionally invest in the story and the issue as a whole, Figueiredo et al.’s paper is created to educate and thus distances the reader from the personal emotional aspect.

Another difference that arises due to the different intended audiences between both articles is the objectivity vs. subjectivity. Tizon’s article is heavily subjective as he uses the personal stories of his “servant/slave”, which provides an emotional perspective into the issue surrounding domestic workers. While the story is an actual real-life story, the article does not contain facts regarding domestic labor as a whole. Tizon’s story is designed to evoke emotion from the readers making them feel saddened due to the circumstances faced by Lola. Thus, using a subjective approach creates emotional connection rather than just facts. In comparison, Figueiredo et al. prioritize objectivity, by including facts and in general having an academic format for their expert audience. Even when discussing the exploitation that many immigrants face, the article’s tone and structure does not contain any emotion to solely provide facts and no bias. This objectivity is due to writing for an academic audience they would expect pure facts and not a biased perspective.

The last difference due to different audiences is the rhetorical situation of each article while communicating the issue of forced domestic labor. Tizon's article appears to be for raising awareness and building emotion regarding the unfair treatment seen in domestic labor. He writes in a way that an audience that has little to no information on the topic can still understand and perhaps gain a new perspective on it. By using Lola's life story, he creates emotional engagement and connection that makes it easier for people to wish to support others in similar situations. In comparison, Figueiredo et al.'s article is more directed towards providing critical analysis on research, rather than creating emotion. By using nuanced vocabulary and detailed facts, they focus more on educated and perhaps stimulating debate about domestic labor rather than gaining support for the cause. Also, the author provides an extensive list of sources that would allow the readers to delve deeper into the topic and develop their own opinion, rather than having a biased perspective handed to them.

Thus, because both of the articles have differing audiences that they are trying to write for, experts versus non-experts, the tones, the difference in objectivity versus subjectivity, and the rhetorical situation vary drastically. The news article has a rather colloquial tone, leans towards subjectivity, and has the main purpose of informing and building context. In comparison, the academic article is extremely formal with an academic register, prefers objectivity, and has the purpose of providing facts and analyzing these facts so that an expert audience can understand.