

Substitute Guide: Analyzing Argument and Rhetoric

Course: English I (Grades 9–12) **Subject:** English Language Arts & Reading **Time:** ~50-min period or ~90-min block RLA

5-minute guide (plain language)

Students read an original argumentative essay, "Keep the Doors Open," about whether a high school should close its campus at lunch. They find the writer's **claim**, label the three **rhetorical appeals** (ethos = credibility, pathos = emotion, logos = logic/facts), tell apart **strong and weak evidence**, locate the **counterargument and rebuttal**, and then write a short **analytical response** judging how effective the argument is. On a block period, they also revise the weakest paragraph. **You do not need an English background to run this.** Everything students need — including the whole essay and the definitions of every term — is printed in their packet, and every question can be answered directly from that essay. Hand out the packet, read the opening script, let students work independently in pencil, help by reading aloud and pointing to paragraph numbers (never by giving answers), and collect every packet at the end. The answer key is a separate file for the teacher only.

Standards alignment

Framework: 19 TAC §110.36 (English I).

- **Rhetorical analysis:** analyze how rhetorical appeals (ethos, pathos, logos) and the author's choices develop the argument.
- **Evaluating argument & evidence:** evaluate whether the evidence supporting a claim is relevant, sufficient, and credible, and identify counterargument and rebuttal.
- **Revision:** revise a draft to strengthen support, reasoning, and focus.

Provisional — pending educator verification against the current official TAC source.

(Standards are paraphrased here, not quoted. Please confirm codes and wording against your official source.)

Setup Before class (5 min)

- Count and hand out one **student packet** per student.
- Confirm each student has a **pencil**. No devices or other materials are needed.
- Write the date on the board and remind students to fill in the name line.
- Keep the **answer key** with you — it is a separate file and is **not** in the student packet.
- Check the plan: is this a **standard ~50-minute period** or a **~90-minute block**? (Pacing for both is below.)

Materials What's needed

- Printed student packet (5–6 pages) per student.
- Pencil per student.
- This guide and the separate answer key (teacher only).
- No technology, no calculator, no special materials.

Timing Standard period vs. block

On a ~**50-minute period**, do Q1–Q9 and ACE (skip Q10). On a ~**90-minute block**, add Q10 (revise the weakest paragraph) and allow deeper work on Q5–Q9.

Segment	~50-min period	~90-min block	What students do
Start — Predict & warm up	5 min	7 min	Q1–Q2 (predict position + appeal match)
Build — Read the argument	12 min	15 min	Read the essay, word bank; Q3
Apply — Analyze the argument	18 min	28 min	Q4–Q8 (claim, appeals, evidence quality, counterargument/rebuttal, best-evidence choice)
Explain — Evaluate effectiveness	10 min	18 min	Q9 analytical response (C-E-R)
Explain (block) — Revise	—	10 min	Q10 rewrite the weakest paragraph
Close — ACE	5 min	7 min	Articulate / Connect / Extend
Continue — early finishers	optional	optional	Write a rebuttal paragraph

Script Read aloud to start

"Today's assignment is a reading and analysis activity called *Analyzing Argument and Rhetoric*. You will work by yourself with just a pencil — no computers. First read the short argumentative essay called *Keep the Doors Open*, which argues that a high school should not close its campus at lunch. Your job is to find the writer's main point, label how they try to persuade you — by credibility (ethos), by emotion (pathos), and by logic and facts (logos) — decide which of their support is strong and which is weak, and then judge how well the whole argument works. Every question can be answered from the essay, so if you're unsure, go back and reread. Answer the questions in order; if one is tricky, skip it and come back. Write in complete sentences where it asks you to explain, and always name the paragraph you're using. You may quietly read the essay aloud to yourself. Put your name, class period, and date at the top now. [On a block: You'll also revise the weakest paragraph in Question 10.] Raise your hand if you need a word read to you or explained."

Support When students ask for help

- **You may read any part aloud** — the essay or any question — to a student or the class.
- If they are stuck, point them to the **paragraph numbers** [1]–[7]; every answer is in the essay.
- Remind them: a **claim** is the writer's main position; **ethos** = credibility, **pathos** = emotion, **logos** = logic/facts (all defined in the packet word bank).
- For "strong vs. weak," prompt: "Is that a *fact* from a reliable source, or just an opinion or an 'everyone knows'? Does it actually connect to the campus question?"
- For Q9, remind them to **analyze, not summarize** — judge how well the support works, don't just retell it. Encourage the printed **sentence stems**.
- Do **not** give answers; prompt with "Which paragraph shows that?" or "Is the writer appealing to credibility, emotion, or logic there?"
- It is fine if a student cannot finish the optional early-finisher task, or Q10 on a short period.

Access Accommodations & language support

- **Read-aloud** of the essay or any question is allowed for all students.
- Point students to the **sentence stems** and the **word bank** (definitions provided for all seven terms).

- Extended time is fine; the core can stop after Q9 if time runs short.
- Students may answer in phrases if writing full sentences is a barrier, as long as the idea is clear and cites a paragraph.
- The packet is grayscale-safe — it prints and reads clearly in black and white.

Tools Allowed & not allowed

Allowed: pencil, the printed packet, quiet self-read-aloud. **Not needed / not allowed:** phones, computers, outside sources (everything is in the essay).

Collect at the end: Collect every packet, whether finished or not, with names on them. Stack them for the teacher. Note on a sticky how far most students got, whether it was a period or a block, and any questions that caused confusion.

Answer key: The **answer key is a separate file** (answerkey.html) and is for the teacher only. Please do not hand it to students.

Teacher follow-up (for the returning teacher)

Watch for two common patterns: students *summarizing instead of analyzing* on Q9 (retelling paragraphs rather than judging how well the support works) and *appeal mix-ups* (labeling the nurse's testimony as logos, or the survey data as pathos). A quick next-day mini-lesson contrasting a summary sentence with an analytical one, and sorting sample sentences into ethos / pathos / logos, would reinforce this well. Q5 and Q6 show who can identify and judge appeals and evidence; Q7 shows who can trace a counterargument to its rebuttal; the Q9 response — and the Q10 revision on block days — show who can evaluate an argument's effectiveness and strengthen a weak one with well-chosen support.

HS_ENG1_ArgumentRhetoric_01 — Analyzing Argument and Rhetoric Substitute Guide

Analyzing Argument and Rhetoric

Course: English I (Grades 9–12) **Subject:** English Language Arts & Reading **Time:** ~50-min period, or a ~90-min block (adds deeper analysis + revision) **Work mode:** Independent · pencil only RLA

Start Here

This is a **reading and analysis task**. You will read an original argumentative essay, then analyze how the writer builds a case — the **claim**, the **evidence**, and the **rhetorical appeals** (ethos, pathos, logos) — and judge how well it all works. You will work with a pencil only; you do **not** need a computer or any device. Every question about the essay can be answered **from the essay itself** — the evidence is on the page. Write in complete sentences where you are asked to explain, and always name the **paragraph** you are drawing from. If a question is hard, skip it, keep going, and come back. Reading the essay quietly aloud to yourself is allowed and encouraged.

Start Predict & Warm Up 5 min

Look only at the title and the first sentence of the essay before you read the rest.

1The essay is titled "**Keep the Doors Open: Why Lincoln High Should Not Close Its Campus at Lunch.**" From the title alone, **predict the author's position** — what does the writer want, and which side of the debate are they on?

2**Rhetorical-term warm-up.** Match each appeal to the kind of support it makes. Write the letter (A, B, or C) on each blank.

A. ethos — appeal to credibility, character, or trustworthiness · **B. pathos** — appeal to emotion · **C. logos** — appeal to logic, facts, and reasoning

___ "A 2019 district survey found that 61% of students skipped lunch on closed-campus days."

___ "As a nurse who works with teenagers, I have seen what a skipped meal does to a young person."

___ "Imagine your own child sitting hungry through fifth period, unable to focus."

Build Read the Argument 12 min

Words to know (for analyzing argument and rhetoric)

claim

the main position the writer is trying to prove.

evidence

facts, data, examples, or expert statements used to back up a claim.

ethos

a rhetorical appeal to the speaker's credibility, character, or authority.

pathos

a rhetorical appeal to the audience's emotions.

logos

a rhetorical appeal to logic — facts, data, and reasoning.

counterargument

a point from the opposing side that the writer raises.

rebuttal

the writer's response to a counterargument, explaining why their position still stands.

"Keep the Doors Open: Why Lincoln High Should Not Close Its Campus at Lunch" — an original argument

[1] Next month, the Lincoln High School board will vote on whether to close our campus during the lunch period, meaning students could no longer walk to the diner, the taquería, or their own kitchens for the thirty-five minutes we have to eat. Supporters of the closed-campus plan say it is about safety. I understand that concern, and safety must come first. But closing the campus at lunch is the wrong tool for the job: it would harm student health and trust while doing little to make anyone safer. Lincoln High should keep an open campus at lunch.

[2] The strongest reason is what an open campus does for students who cannot eat the food served here. Last spring, our own student council surveyed 480 students. In that survey, 61% of students said they skip lunch entirely on the days they cannot leave — many because of allergies, religious dietary rules, or simply because the cafeteria runs out of food before the last lunch period is served. A student who does not eat at noon is a student who is running on empty through the whole afternoon. When more than half of us are going hungry, the schedule is the problem, not the students.

[3] The health cost of that hunger is not just an opinion. According to Dr. Alvarez, the school nurse who has worked with teenagers for fifteen years, skipping a midday meal leaves students with lower concentration, headaches, and irritability by the afternoon. "I see the same faces in my office every closed-campus day," she told our newspaper. When the person who treats these students every day tells us that hunger is hurting them, we should listen. Her years of firsthand experience carry more weight than a rule written by people who never see the nurse's office at 1:00 p.m.

[4] Now picture your own younger brother or sister sitting through fifth period with an empty stomach and a pounding head, watching the clock, unable to hear a word the teacher says. That is not a rare student; on our campus it is hundreds of them, every single closed-campus day. We should not build a policy that leaves so many young people hungry and unable to learn.

[5] Supporters of the closed-campus plan raise a fair point: they worry that students who leave for lunch are more likely to be late, skip class, or get hurt crossing the busy street outside. That concern deserves a real answer, not a shrug. But the answer is not to lock everyone in. A neighboring district kept its campus open and cut tardies by adding a crossing guard and a clear sign-out system; their after-lunch attendance actually improved. We can protect students who leave without punishing the hundreds who simply want to eat.

[6] Some will say that an open campus has always caused a few problems, and that is true — every policy does. But everyone knows that closing the doors is what responsible schools do, and no one who really cares about students would vote to keep them open. Besides, my cousin at another school says their closed campus is "totally fine," so ours would be too.

[7] Closing the campus would trade real, measurable harm to student health for a safety benefit no one has actually shown. Keep the doors open, fix the real problems with guards and sign-outs, and trust students to feed themselves. A school that feeds its students' bodies is a school that can finally reach their minds.

3In paragraph [2], what specific finding from the student-council survey does the author use to support keeping the campus open? Answer using details from the essay.

Apply Analyze the Argument 20 min

Every answer in this section is in the essay. Point to the paragraph in your head before you write.

4Identify the claim. In one sentence, state the author's main **claim** — the position the whole essay is trying to prove. (paragraph [1])

5Label the three appeals. The essay uses each of the three rhetorical appeals at least once. For each appeal below, **copy one sentence** (or a close phrase) from the essay that shows it, and name the paragraph.

Ethos (credibility) — sentence + paragraph #

Pathos (emotion) — sentence + paragraph #

Logos (logic/facts) — sentence + paragraph #

6Evaluate evidence quality. Paragraph [2] and paragraph [6] each try to support the claim. One relies on **strong** evidence and one on **weak** evidence. Decide which is which and explain **why** — consider whether the support is factual, relevant, and reliable, or whether it leans on unproven assumptions.

Paragraph [2] — strong or weak? Why?

Paragraph [6] — strong or weak? Why?

7Find the counterargument and the rebuttal. In paragraph [5], the author raises a point from the opposing side (a **counterargument**) and then responds to it (a **rebuttal**). State the counterargument in your own words, then explain how the author answers it.

Counterargument (the opposing point)

Rebuttal (how the author responds)

8Which evidence best supports the claim? The claim is that Lincoln High should keep an open campus at lunch. Which piece of evidence from the essay **best** supports that claim? Fill in the circle for ONE choice.

- "My cousin at another school says their closed campus is 'totally fine,' so ours would be too."
- "Everyone knows that closing the doors is what responsible schools do."
- "A student-council survey of 480 students found that 61% skip lunch entirely on days they cannot leave."
- "An open campus has always caused a few problems."

8b. In one sentence, explain why the evidence you chose is stronger than the others.

Explain Evaluate the Argument's Effectiveness 10–15 min

Question 9. Write an **analytical response** that judges **how effective** this argument is. Do not summarize the essay — **analyze** it. Take a position on whether the argument is convincing overall, and support that position by discussing **two** specific appeals or pieces of evidence from the essay, **judging the quality of each** (strong or weak, and why). Use the C-E-R frame below and name the paragraph for each piece you cite.

Sentence stems you may use: "Overall, this argument is (convincing / partly convincing / weak) because..." · "One appeal the author uses is ____ in paragraph ____, which is effective/ineffective because..." · "A second piece of support is ____ (paragraph ____); its quality is strong/weak because it is factual / from a credible source / merely opinion / an unproven assumption..."

Claim (your judgment of the argument's effectiveness)

Evidence (two appeals/pieces from the essay, with paragraph #)

Reasoning (why each is strong or weak, and how it affects the argument)

Block period only (~90-min class): Revise the weakest paragraph.

Question 10. Paragraph [6] is the weakest part of the essay — it leans on the bandwagon "everyone knows," an insult to anyone who disagrees, and one cousin's opinion. **Rewrite paragraph [6]** so it strengthens the argument instead: replace the weak reasoning with **real evidence or an appeal already used elsewhere in the essay** (for

example, the survey data in [2], the nurse's testimony in [3], or the neighboring district in [5]). Write your improved paragraph on the lines below.

Close ACE Wrap-Up 5 min

Articulate

Say the author's **claim** in your **own words**, in one sentence, as if telling a friend the point of the essay.

Connect

Name the **one appeal** (ethos, pathos, or logos) you think does the **most** to make this argument convincing, and point to the paragraph.

Extend

Name **one weak spot** in the argument and, in a sentence, tell what the author could add to make it stronger.

Continue Early Finisher optional

If you finish early (no new materials needed):

Write a rebuttal paragraph. On the back of this page, take the **opposite** side: argue that Lincoln High **should** close its campus at lunch. Include one counterargument that the "Keep the Doors Open" author might raise, and write a **rebuttal** that answers it. Use at least one rhetorical appeal (ethos, pathos, or logos) on purpose, and label which one you used.

Turn in: Hand in this whole packet with your name, class period, and date filled in. Make sure questions 1–9 and the ACE box are answered. Question 10 (revision) is for block periods; the early-finisher rebuttal is optional — turn either in if you did it.

HS_ENG1_ArgumentRhetoric_01 — Analyzing Argument and Rhetoric Student Packet



TEACHER ANSWER KEY FOLLOWS

Do not copy the pages after this divider for students.

Answer Key: Analyzing Argument and Rhetoric

Course: English I (Grades 9–12) **Subject:** English Language Arts & Reading **For teacher use only** RLA

How to use this key

Answers are grouped by section and question number. Many items are open-ended; accept any response that shows correct reasoning and cites the essay, even if the wording differs. Notes flag where more than one answer is defensible and list common misconceptions to watch for. Paragraph numbers below refer to the bracketed markers [1]–[7] in the essay. Estimated grading time: ~6–8 min per packet.

Start Predict & Warm Up grade for effort · ~2 min

1 Predict the author's position from the title.

The author is **against closing the campus** — they want Lincoln High to **keep an open campus at lunch**. Full credit for any prediction that names the pro-open-campus / anti-closure position. Accept close wording ("wants students to be able to leave for lunch," "opposes the closed-campus plan").

2 Rhetorical-term warm-up (match the appeal).

"A 2019 district survey found that 61% of students skipped lunch..." → **C (logos)** — data/reasoning.

"As a nurse who works with teenagers, I have seen..." → **A (ethos)** — appeal to the speaker's credibility/experience.

"Imagine your own child sitting hungry through fifth period..." → **B (pathos)** — appeal to emotion.

All three correct = full credit; grade for reasonable effort on this warm-up.

Build Read the Argument ~1 min

3 Survey finding used in paragraph [2].

From **paragraph [2]**: the student council surveyed **480 students**, and **61% said they skip lunch entirely** on days they cannot leave campus (because of allergies, religious dietary rules, or the cafeteria running out of food). Accept any answer citing the 61% figure or the "more than half skip lunch" finding.

Apply Analyze the Argument ~3 min

4 Identify the claim. (paragraph [1])

Lincoln High should keep an open campus at lunch (the board should not close the campus during lunch).

Accept any accurate restatement of that position. Reject a supporting reason offered as the claim (e.g., "students are hungry" is a reason, not the claim itself).

5 Label the three appeals with a sentence from the essay.

Accept any correct sentence for each appeal. Best examples:

Ethos (paragraph [3]): "According to Dr. Alvarez, the school nurse who has worked with teenagers for fifteen

years..." / "Her years of firsthand experience carry more weight..." — appeal to the credibility and experience of an expert.

Pathos (paragraph [4]): "Now picture your own younger brother or sister sitting through fifth period with an empty stomach and a pounding head..." — appeal to emotion.

Logos (paragraph [2], also [5]): "our student council surveyed 480 students... 61% of students said they skip lunch entirely" — appeal to data and reasoning. (Paragraph [5]'s neighboring-district attendance result also counts as logos.)

Full credit if the student pairs each appeal with a genuinely matching sentence and a correct paragraph number. Watch for appeal mix-ups (see misconceptions).

6 Evaluate evidence quality — paragraph [2] vs [6].

Paragraph [2] = STRONG. It cites specific, verifiable data from a named source (a student-council survey of 480 students; 61% skip lunch) and gives concrete reasons (allergies, dietary rules, cafeteria running out). The evidence is factual, quantified, and *directly relevant* to whether the campus should stay open.

Paragraph [6] = WEAK. It relies on a bandwagon claim ("everyone knows..."), an insult/loading assertion that no one who "really cares" would disagree, and a single anecdote ("my cousin... says it's 'totally fine'"). None of it is factual, sourced, or relevant proof.

Full credit if the student labels [2] strong and [6] weak **and** gives a valid reason for each (factual/relevant/sourced vs. bandwagon/anecdote/unproven assumption).

7 Counterargument + rebuttal in paragraph [5].

Counterargument: supporters of closing the campus worry that students who leave for lunch are more likely to be **late, skip class, or get hurt crossing the busy street**.

Rebuttal: the author agrees the concern is fair but argues the answer is not to "lock everyone in." Instead, a **neighboring district kept its campus open and cut tardies** by adding a **crossing guard and a sign-out system**, and its after-lunch attendance improved — so the real problems can be solved *without* closing the campus.

Full credit for stating the opposing safety/tardiness concern **and** explaining that the author answers it with a workable alternative (guard + sign-out) rather than dismissing it.

8 Which evidence best supports the claim?

8a — C. "A student-council survey of 480 students found that 61% skip lunch entirely on days they cannot leave." This is specific, quantified, sourced, and directly relevant to keeping the campus open.

Why the others are weaker: **A** (a cousin's opinion) is an anecdote; **B** ("everyone knows...") is a bandwagon claim; **D** ("has always caused a few problems") is vague and actually cuts *against* the author.

8b: Accept any sentence explaining that C is stronger because it is concrete, sourced data directly tied to the claim, while the others are opinion, bandwagon, or vague.

Explain Evaluate Effectiveness (Q9) ~2–3 min

9 Analytical response — judge effectiveness, cite two appeals/pieces, judge quality.

This is **analysis, not summary**. A strong response takes a position on how convincing the argument is and defends it by examining **two** specific appeals or pieces of evidence. **Model response:**

"Overall, this argument is mostly convincing because its central support is strong, though a few weak spots undercut it. Its most effective move is the **logos** in paragraph [2]: the survey showing 61% of 480 students skip lunch is concrete, sourced, and directly tied to the claim, so it makes the harm feel real rather than assumed. The **ethos** in paragraph [3] adds to this — the nurse's fifteen years of experience make her testimony credible, and the author uses it to turn hunger from an opinion into a health problem. The argument weakens only in paragraph [6], where bandwagon claims and a cousin's anecdote replace evidence; if the author had cut that paragraph, the case would be stronger. Because the strongest paragraphs rely on relevant data and credible testimony, the

argument is more persuasive than not."

Full credit for: (a) a clear **judgment** of effectiveness (the Claim), (b) **two** specific appeals or pieces of evidence with paragraph numbers, and (c) **reasoning that evaluates quality** (why each is strong or weak) — not just naming them. A response that only retells what each paragraph says has *summarized, not analyzed*; score it low on reasoning.

10 (**Block period only**) Revise the weakest paragraph [6].

The revision should **remove** the bandwagon ("everyone knows"), the insult ("no one who really cares..."), and the cousin anecdote, and **replace** them with real evidence or an appeal used elsewhere. **Model revision:** "Some will say an open campus has always caused a few problems, and that is true — every policy does. But the solution is to fix those problems, not to punish the majority. The neighboring district in paragraph [5] shows this works: with a crossing guard and a sign-out system, it kept its campus open *and* improved attendance. Pairing that fix with the survey data — 61% of students going hungry on closed days — makes the case that an open campus, managed well, protects both safety and health."

Full credit for a rewritten paragraph that (a) eliminates the weak reasoning and (b) substitutes accurate, relevant support drawn from the essay ([2], [3], or [5]).

Response scoring rubric (3 points, Q9)

Score	Claim (judgment of effectiveness)	Evidence (two appeals/pieces)	Reasoning & quality judgment
3	Clear, defensible judgment of how convincing the argument is.	Two specific appeals or pieces of evidence, each tied to the correct paragraph.	Analyzes <i>why</i> each is strong or weak and how it affects the argument — true analysis.
2	Judgment present but vague or barely defended.	One solid piece, or two with a minor error or vague location.	Some quality judgment, but partly slips into summary.
1	No real judgment; mostly restates the essay.	Evidence vague, off-topic, or not from the essay.	Summary only; no evaluation of quality.
0	No claim / off-task.	No evidence.	No reasoning.

Close ACE ~1 min

ACE Articulate / Connect / Extend.

Articulate: accept any accurate one-sentence restatement of the claim ("Lincoln High should keep an open campus at lunch / should not close the campus").

Connect: accept any of the three appeals with a valid reason — most students will name the **logos** of the survey (paragraph [2]) or the **ethos** of the nurse (paragraph [3]); the **pathos** in [4] is defensible if the student explains its effect. What matters is that the appeal is correctly identified and justified.

Extend: accept any reasonable weak spot + fix — e.g., "paragraph [6] uses bandwagon and an anecdote; replace it with data," or "the pathos in [4] has no source; pair it with the survey." More than one answer is defensible.

Watch Common misconceptions

- **Summary vs. analysis.** On Q9, students often *retell* each paragraph instead of *evaluating* it. Analysis judges how well the support works and why; summary just says what the essay says. Push for a stated judgment plus reasoning about quality.
- **Appeal mix-ups.** Students confuse the appeals — labeling the nurse's testimony (ethos) as logos because it mentions health, or calling the survey data (logos) pathos because hunger is emotional. Anchor them: ethos = *who is speaking / credibility*; pathos = *feelings*; logos = *facts and reasoning*.
- **Evidence quantity vs. quality.** Paragraph [6] piles up several statements but none are real evidence; paragraph [2] has one figure that outweighs them all. More sentences of "support" does not mean stronger

support — weigh credibility and relevance, not count.

- **Claim vs. reason.** The claim is the overall position (keep the campus open), not a supporting reason ("students are hungry"). Watch for students naming a reason as the claim on Q4.
- **Missing the rebuttal.** On Q7, some students find the counterargument but stop; credit requires showing how the author *answers* it (the guard/sign-out alternative), not just that a concern exists.

Teacher follow-up based on likely errors

If many students summarize instead of analyze on Q9, run a 5-minute mini-lesson contrasting a summary sentence ("The author says students are hungry") with an analytical one ("The hunger claim is convincing because it rests on sourced survey data, not opinion"). If the appeal labels in Q5 are shaky, sort a few sample sentences aloud into ethos / pathos / logos. The Q5, Q6, and Q8 items quickly reveal who can identify and judge appeals and evidence; the Q9 response — and, on block days, the Q10 revision — show who can evaluate effectiveness and strengthen a weak argument with well-chosen support.

HS_ENG1_ArgumentRhetoric_01 — Analyzing Argument and Rhetoric Teacher Answer Key