

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/loaded 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