**MWA #2 – Rhetorically Analyzing an Argument**
**Framing the "Bad Guy"**
(due by 11:59 pm on Sunday, 11/7)

1. You'll be selecting either a **video** (from YouTube) or an **online article** that makes an argument.

- Tip: This assignment will likely be easier if you pick an argument you don't agree with or that at least contains *some* components that you don't fully agree with.
- The scope is wide for what's allowed. This doesn't need to be a formal argument, but it can be. If you go the video route, it can be one that was made specifically for YouTube, or it can be from another venue (like a TEDTalk, etc.). It can be a clip from a movie where a character argues for a claim, like the Chaplin video we watched. It could even be an advertisement. If it's an online article, it can be from a formal source (like *The New York Times*, etc.) or it can be an informal "article," like a post on social media. The text you select simply needs to contain an argument for a claim. That is, there's something the "author" wants you (the audience) to believe or do, and they've constructed their video/article to persuade you about it.
- Pick a text that you believe provides you with enough content to do this project's two main tasks: rhetorically analyze the argument and respond to it.
- If you select a video, there's no time limit. I encourage you to pick one that's under 20 minutes though. If you pick one that's longer than that, please focus your analysis and response on no more than 20 minutes. (That can be a continuous 20 minutes or a total of 20 minutes when combining the different segments you discuss.)
- Use timestamps in your essay/project whenever you reference specific parts of the video even when you're not directly quoting.

- Do not pick a text that advocates for hate views. That would be things like sexism, racism, etc.
- I had mentioned in class that you can't pick a text about abortion. That's the typical policy in the English Dept. for our First-Year Writing classes. The rationale is that people generally get too emotional when discussing that topic (on both sides of the issue), and that harms their ability to write a strong essay. However, I've decided that if you want to, you may choose that topic. Judge wisely, though: Will your emotions about the topic harm your ability to compose a strong analysis and response? Don't choose the topic if they will.

2. For MWA #2, you'll identify the text's **claim**. What does it want the audience to believe or do? [That's the argument's purpose. That's why the "author" even bothered making their argument in the first place.]

3. **Rhetorically analyze** the "composition choices" the text used to achieve its purpose. (The *Rhetorical Analysis Guide* in Week 9's journal assignment will assist you with this.)

4. **Respond**. These are some guiding questions for your response: What relevant ideas and info did the text not discuss? Whose perspective did it ignore or not represent well? What flaws in reasoning did it commit? Did it overemphasize logic, feelings, or credibility/shared values while neglecting other parts? Did it assume the importance of certain values without arguing for why those values matter the most? Did it ignore other important values that compete with their argument and should be considered? [While considering what the argument "left outside its frame," you can discuss if you agree *or* disagree with the argument's claim, if you both agree *and* disagree, or if you're undecided. Explain why.]

5. The updated prompt with more details (word count, number of images required, etc.) will be posted soon.