

Rhetorical Rationale: Project 2 (200 points)

**** Remember:** rhetorical rationales are your opportunity to articulate your rhetorical choices and, more importantly, to defend and justify them in order to illustrate how the creation of your text was intentional and rhetorically informed. **

1. Rhetorical Objective (100 points)

- Which rhetorician did you cover and why?
- Did you cover and explain your rhetorician in-depth for your novice audience? More specifically, did you:
 - provide a biography and some historical context for the rhetorician?
 - explain the context for the conversation the rhetorician is involved in; that is, did you explain the rhetorician's influences and to whom and what the rhetorician is responding?
 - articulate the rhetorician's overarching epistemology and the way it shapes his/her understanding and characterization of rhetoric? Put another way, how does this rhetorician understand the relationship between knowledge and rhetoric?
 - cover important theories, ideas, and concepts associated with the rhetorician?
 - share an example or set of examples that will resonate with your audience and illustrate the importance of this rhetorician and his/her work for not only contemporary society but also your audience in particular?
 - Defend the extent to which you addressed these areas and the effectiveness of your coverage, especially given your audience.
- What content from our readings and discussions (if any) did you choose to include and why? What did you exclude and why? Defend your selection process.
- What additional research did you conduct and how much of it did you include and why? Defend your research methods and your incorporation of your research.
- Justify the extent to which your text satisfies your rhetorical objective: to explain a particular rhetorician for the audience of *novice* EWM majors.

2. Audience Awareness (30 points)

- What type of voice did you adopt and why? How (if at all) was this choice rhetorically appropriate considering your rhetorical objective and audience?
 - Put another way, how did you tailor your prose style in a way that aligns with your rhetorical objective and is appropriate for your genre and your audience? Defend your stylistic choices in light of your audience.

- What other ways (if any and in addition to prose style) did you identify and address your audience? Defend the way you attended to your audience.
- How did you demonstrate (if at all) the purpose and value of your text; that is, how did you go about convincing your audience that this text is important to them and worth reading? What incentive did you provide for them to continue reading? Defend the extent to which you made this text meaningful and purposeful for your audience.
- How (if at all) did you work to cultivate a credible ethos for yourself as the author of this text?

3. Genre (30 points)

- What genre (text-type) did you work in and why? How (if at all) was your selection of genre rhetorically based and appropriate considering your objective and audience? Were there other genres you considered composing in? If so, what were they, and why did you ultimately go in a different direction? Defend the selection and appropriateness of your genre.
- What type of identity did you adopt while composing in this genre and how (if at all) was it different from the one(s) you assume while composing in other genres?
- How did you attend to typography (font style, size, color, etc.)? Defend the rhetorical effectiveness and appropriateness of your use of typography.
- How did you utilize the available white space and why? How (if at all) was such use rhetorically effective and appropriate? Defend your use of white space.
- What medium (print, screen, audio) did you use to deliver this genre to your audience and why?
 - If screen (or digital audio), what platform(s) (e.g., YouTube, Wix, Tumblr, Facebook, WordPress, Prezi, iTunes, etc.) did you use to house and deliver your text and why?
- Overall, how significant of a role did genre play in the creation of this text and why?

4. Arrangement (30 points)

- What overarching organizational scheme did you use and why? How (if at all) does this scheme provide coherence in ways that align with your rhetorical objective and that are appropriate for your audience? Defend your organization.
- How did you arrange individual elements (e.g., titles, subtitles, written text, images, videos, etc.) within different pages/content areas/frames to foster an ideal reading experience? Said another way, how (if at all) did you ensure the arrangement of the different content elements provided an effective way to read/consume the text? Defend your arrangement of different content elements.
- Did you forecast your organizational scheme for your audience? If so, why and how? If not, why? Defend the extent to which you did or didn't preview this text for your audience.

5. Citation (10 points)

- Did you make sure to cite sources both in the text and in a separate Works Cited/References page?
- Did you make sure to cite all of your sources, including visuals?
- What (if anything) was difficult about the citation process?

6. Reflection

- Sometimes instructors forget to ask this: what did *you* learn from doing this project (about the rhetorician, about composing, about epistemology, about rhetoric in general, about using a particular genre, about appealing to an audience, etc.)?
- If you had more time and/or could re-do this project, what might you revise, change, and do differently?
- In what ways was this project similar to a traditional academic essay that would have asked you to explain the rhetorician? In what ways was it different? Which do you prefer composing and why?

7. Additional

- Did you run into any complications/limitations/problems with this project that you want me to know about?
- Is there anything else you would like to tell me/explain to me about your project?