APPENDICES
APPENDIX A
Methods for the Study of Argument Rhetorics

The textbooks study is undertaken in order to determine the common ways in which composition practice instructs on ethical argument and the models of argument thereby reflected. The methods for the textbooks study address some of the “disturbing practices” of composition textbooks research (to borrow a phrase from Libby Miles). Such practices include failing to define the kinds of textbooks and the terms significant to an investigation, not setting forth or following through on criteria for selection of textbooks, and not analyzing a sufficient number of textbooks (L. Miles).

The term “composition textbook” is defined as a textbook available and intended for use by instructors, typically in a first-year composition course (although not precluding its use in an upper-division writing course), that includes substantial explanatory material on how to write – is generally broader than others given in the literature. Composition textbooks often include exercises and writing assignments (Gilfus). They also may include some explanation regarding issues of grammar and usage, as well as reading materials borrowed from other sources and excerpted in full or part. When these features are central rather than auxiliary, however, the book is no longer a textbook but (respectively) a “handbook” (or “grammar guide”) or a “reader” (or “anthology”). The definition of “composition textbook” given here also excludes textbooks having to do with writing in particular fields of study or disciplines (e.g., literature), guides to writing that appear to be focused primarily on individuals as a target audience (rather than college or university courses), and “logic-based textbooks” –

---

84 One example is the definition of “rhetoric” given by Jonna Gilfus who helpfully contrasts rhetorics’ focus on writing with other textbooks’ focus on reading, but limits rhetorics to those focusing on rhetorical modes or other developmental sequences. In comparison, William Woods divides composition textbooks into those based on language, on rhetoric, and on logic. Of his three types of textbooks, his “rhetoric-based” textbook is closest to my “composition textbook,” although more narrowly characterized by discussions of invention, development and arrangement, adapting style, and focusing on “real” writing and process. Donald Stewart’s “rhetoric” is perhaps the narrowest of all, observed as building from words to sentences to paragraphs to themes, or based on forms of discourse ("Revisited").
focusing primarily on critical thinking or research rather than writing (Woods). The definition allows that these features might be part of a “composition textbook.”

This study focuses in particular on “argument rhetorics” – those composition textbooks that are organized around, focus heavily on, or speak significantly about argumentation. Although known by any number of names, this group of textbooks is a category widely operationalized in composition scholarship and by textbook publishers and writing programs as a means of identifying certain kinds of instructional materials. I use the term “argument rhetorics” rather than “argumentative writing textbooks” or “argumentative composition textbooks” to avoid implying that such textbooks are geared exclusively to upper-level or specifically argumentative writing courses, or that they are narrowly targeted for use in composition and rhetoric courses. Instead, the textbooks I examine may use argument as an organizing theme or have one or more significant sections on argument, but they are intended for more general composition courses, among other possible curricular uses. The use of “rhetorics” also follows certain usage in the composition textbooks research literature (e.g., Gilfus).

The argument rhetorics reviewed here were selected according to a multi-stage process. In order to compile a relatively comprehensive list of argument rhetorics, I reviewed relevant literature in composition scholarship. I also examined the online marketing materials of composition textbook publishers. Publisher mergers in recent decades have radically narrowed the number of textbook publishers, so that major publishers of composition textbooks are readily identifiable (Mortensen). At the time of textbook selection, these included: Bedford/St. Martin’s, Cengage, Longman, McGraw Prentice Hall, and W. W. Norton. I used publisher websites to determine those composition textbook titles characterized by publishers as about argument. In addition, I looked to a major online textbook distributor – Amazon. Amazon was chosen because, at the time of the study, it represented a significant part of the overall book and media

---

85 This literature includes summaries of approaches to composition pedagogy that mention textbook titles (Covino; Tate, Rupiper and Schick; R. Fulkerson). It also includes pertinent scholarship on composition textbooks, especially two pivotal articles by Larry Beason on argumentative textbooks (Welch; Beason "Textbooks"; Beason "Canon"; Gale and Gale; Tischio).

86 The publishers Bedford/St. Martin, Cengage, and McGraw Hill use “argument” as a search category on their webpages as a means of identifying certain kinds of composition textbooks. Where publishers did not categorize their textbooks as such, I examined textbook titles to try to separate out those books that appeared to focus significantly on argument.
market and the biggest online presence. It is estimated that Amazon was responsible for somewhere around one-sixth of the overall book sales market. In 2007, among the big three book distributors – Amazon, Barnes & Noble (also B. Dalton, BN.com), and Borders (also Waldenbooks) – Amazon captured about a third of the market for overall book and media sales (including music, DVDs, etc.) ($4.63 billion out of a total of $13.20 billion). And the big-three-total is about half of the overall book sales market, which includes Walmart and other non-bookseller retail outlets as well as a $5 billion primary and secondary textbook market. Of the major distributors, Amazon seemed the most likely source for students seeking textbooks (i.e., non-trade books). Also, Amazon captures and tracks sales in the used book market, which is significant for textbook sales. (It is estimated that one in three books sold on Amazon is via a third party (Rosenthal).)

In her review of scholarship in composition on textbooks, Miles finds that researchers sometimes choose textbooks that were never widely popular (L. Miles 763). Some choose textbooks based on their own use of the textbook, or its appearance on their bookshelf (e.g., Ohmann and Douglas; Rose "Sophisticated, Ineffective"; Kleine). Others are vague or altogether silent with respect to how textbooks are selected.87

Ideally, argument rhetorics would be chosen for study on the basis of actual use in college and university composition courses. Data on textbook use, however, is difficult to discover (e.g., Fraizer). As a proxy for use, this study relied on textbook sales data, as does Donald Stewart in his two influential textbook studies (Stewart "Assault"; Stewart "Revisited"). In those studies, Stewart contacts textbook publishers regarding sales. Here, I used online sales data as tracked by Amazon, and I contacted publishers in order to check results.88 An advantage of using such online textbook sales data is that it is

87 In her study of first-year writing students’ civic participation, for example, one researcher somehow chooses three “writing-about-issues texts” to examine (Ervin). Another analysis of “college writing textbooks” selects textbooks based on “authors’ reputation” (Tischio). Other studies of composition textbooks, some of them quite well known, do not speak to how the textbooks they examine are chosen (e.g., Coles; Guinn; Rose "Speculations"; Kail; Bryant; Bleich; McCormick).
88 Amazon book sales data is collected by Amazon Associates Web Services; it is compiled and made searchable at Aaron Shepard’s Sales Rank Express (SRE). As described on that site, SRE is a “sales rank checker” that gives a “snapshot” of a book’s sales performance on Amazon. By contrast, “sales rank trackers” – industry standard Monument Information Resources, or online TitleZ, Charteous, RankForest, RankTracer, and Books & Writers – yield historical data on a book’s sales and sometimes span several distributors. But they typically involve a fee or subscription, often substantial for more than a handful of books. The snapshot given is for U.S. sales only, and includes sales of new and used books as well as e-books (Shepard).
possible to compare sales nationally and across publishers, key functions when comparing publishers’ top sales, particularly where a handful of publishers dominates the market (as with composition textbooks). A limitation of Amazon’s sales rankings data is that it captures a snapshot of current sales trends rather than sales as they have occurred over time. I corrected for this limitation in the way I gathered and interpreted sales data, and by checking results against publishers’ reports of sales. In order to establish which textbooks in a long list of argument rhetorics were top-ranking, I reviewed Amazon sales ranks for at least two points – beginning of May and beginning of September. I assumed that, in marking beginnings of semesters (Summer, Fall), these two points might capture sales associated with writing courses in these semesters. I used the May data point to establish which textbooks had relatively high sales (i.e., were ranked above 50,000), and I used the September data point to confirm that sales remained strong and to establish a final ranking. Because I was initially checking on hundreds of textbooks, I limited my data points to two and relied on the second data point for ordering.  

The chosen method of selection of argument rhetorics holds for at least three reasons. Textbook sales, unlike other book sales, are likely to occur in intense clusters (at the beginning of semesters), rather than steadily over time. For this reason, sampling at these times should give a better picture of sales than would typically be the case for trade books. Also, a number of the selected argument rhetorics are familiar to me, and confirmed by my own and others’ experiences as instructors. Finally, the sales rankings for most of the argument rhetorics making the list were high enough that they would not be subject to substantial fluctuation. So, for example, the top three textbooks were ranked between 1,000 and 2,000. It is estimated that books ranked in the top 5,000 typically do not change rank more than 2,000. So, at their lowest sales point, these books would be ranked below 4,000. Most of the other books on the list are ranked higher than 20,000. These books don’t typically drop below 50,000, a ranking at which a book still sells an average of ten books per week (or 520 per year) (Rosenthal). Publishers were surveyed after compiling a list of such titles using the Amazon sales rank method. Of the sixteen titles identified by publishers, twelve (75%) had appeared on the list (which

---

89 I have since come to discover that a statistically more secure method is to check sales rankings twice a week for four weeks, add the results, and to divide the total by eight (Rosenthal). This is because sales rankings jump some, especially as sales go down (i.e., as the ranking number becomes larger).
initially included 29 titles in total). By using online textbook sales data and contacting
publishers to narrow the list of argument rhetorics for analysis, textbooks were chosen for
this study according to meaningful criteria, namely sales as representative of actual use.

For this study, I chose twelve argument rhetorics, each with a ranking higher than
25,000, translating to sales of at least thirty copies per week at the time I finalized
rankings (September 2008). (The twelve argument rhetorics analyzed are listed in Table
I (“Argument Rhetorics Analyzed”) in Chapter One. Twelve textbooks proved a large
enough number to encounter some diversity of approach while at the same time offering
meaningful patterns among the materials examined.

In order to make sense of how ethical argument and narrative are treated as a
point of instruction in the argument rhetorics, I worked from localized readings of
passages having to do with ethical argument and related terms and concepts (e.g., morals,
values, etc.) as they occurred in each argument rhetoric to a broader sense of the patterns
that recurred within and across the textbooks. The passages examined were drawn from
any number of textual apparatuses: prefaces (cf. Gilfus); writing instruction; readings
(including student-authored texts (cf. Rose "Sophisticated, Ineffective"; Gilfus) as well as
advice (cf. Perrin), commentary, and prompts for consideration); and exercises (such as
questions for discussion and writing assignments). Which passages were examined,
however, was driven not so much by where they appeared in a textbook as by an interest
in the extent and character of textbooks’ treatments of ethical argument. Especially
important were moments where “ethical argument” and related terms and concepts were
defined, and where instruction on ethical argument and the uses of narrative occurred,
whether directly (e.g., through advice giving) or indirectly (e.g., through examples or
commentary). Also noted were the issues or contemporary controversies textbooks
addressed as having to do with ethical argument (see Appendix B). Relying on what
turned out to be copious moments, this localized evidence was then examined in order to
seek the wider themes and issues by means of which the argument rhetorics address and
instruct on ethical argument.

The method of critical analysis used here borrows from a long tradition in
composition textbook scholarship of examining textbooks’ specific writing advice as well
as surveying textbooks for major trends and differences or general patterns. Composition
scholars have examined textbooks’ advice to writers on a variety of topics.\textsuperscript{90} And, as with this study, some scholars have analyzed trends, differences, and patterns across textbooks (Kail; Beason "Textbooks").\textsuperscript{91} What the critical approach in this study additionally does is to recognize the less direct ways in which instruction to writers occurs – for example, through readings and exercise. Furthermore, the approach bridges localized instances of direct and indirect instruction with patterns and trends occurring across textbooks.

\textsuperscript{90} Investigated textbooks’ topics vary widely (e.g., Ohmann and Douglas (argument, organization, audience, expression, usage); Connors "Current-Traditional Rhetoric" (invention, organization, outlining, paragraphs); Rose "Sophisticated, Ineffective" (invention, audience); Emig (invention, metaphors); Stewart "Revisited" (invention, organization, writing process, style, "good writing"); Fraizer (writing process); Tischio (revision); Gilfus (invention, plagiarism)).

\textsuperscript{91} There are, of course, other methods that have been used to analyze textbooks. Certain studies have looked in particular at historical textbooks (e.g., Connors "Current-Traditional Rhetoric"; Emig; Connors "Evolution"; Hawhee (including handbook author’s notes and research)). Other researchers instead have examined the institutional and material conditions of textbooks’ use and production (e.g., Tibbetts and Tibbetts (surveying college teachers and based on experience as members of purchasing committee); De Beaugrande (reviewers’ comments); Perrin (as an author); Winterowd (publishing contracts); Mortensen (publishing house mergers as shifting control from managers to shareholders); E. A. Miles (interviewing publishing employees reveals economic incentives and complicity of writing programs)).
APPENDIX B
Issues Most Frequently Discussed by Argument Rhetorics as Involving Ethical Arguments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>APPROACH TO ETHICAL ARGUMENT ILLUSTRATED</th>
<th>HOW ETHICAL ARGUMENT DISCUSSED (SELECTED EXAMPLES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Abortion (6/12 textbooks)</td>
<td>Classification – Stases</td>
<td>“Current issues” and related “enduring issues” include “human life issues.” Among these is whether to allow abortion, which is associated with human life as an absolute value as well as balancing persons’ interests against government control (Wood 16). Applies stases questions to abortion (Crowley and Hawhee 98-102). Describes definition questions on this issue as “requir[ing] rhetors to examine their moral positions” (99) and quality questions as “deeply involv[ing] community values” (100). Abortion debate demonstrates how parties to an argument can lack shared stasis; some argue that abortion is murder whereas others argue that women have the right to choose (81). “[M]oral grounds” associated with those who oppose abortion (80). “They [pro-life] frequently support their position by making reference to religious, moral, or natural laws” (82).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classification – Toulmin</td>
<td>Claims of Value described as including “moral, ethical, and aesthetic judgments” (Seyler 83). Example: “Abortion is wrong” (83). As an example of a warrant involving a parallel argument: Judith Thomson’s “A Defense of Abortion” where Thomson argues that pregnant woman has right to save her life even if it means killing her fetus, because people would recognize the morality of killing another person who was going to kill you by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In discussing the importance of stating assumptions, example given of abortion, in which pro-lifers refer to pro-choicers as murderers (assuming that fetus at any stage is a human life) (Chaffee 413) and pro-choicers call pro-lifers “moral fascists” (assuming they are interested in imposing narrow moral views on other) (414).

**Persons**

Students prompted to consider their own views and the sources of their views in response to this prompt, among others: “Is abortion wrong?” (Chaffee 50)

Judgments can conflict with what is approved or disapproved of, for example: “I think a woman should be able to have an abortion if she chooses to, although I don’t believe abortion is right” (147).

Especially respecting arguments based on moral values and beliefs (e.g., abortion), appeals are often made to authority and tradition (Goshgarian and Krueger 177-78). But these appeals will only be persuasive to those who share beliefs. Even so, authors point out that many people use scriptural law (e.g., “Thou shall not kill”) as a basis for arguing against legalized abortion (178).

**Principles & Values; Outcomes**

Value conflicts are reason “some very reasonable people shout that abortion is murder while other equally reasonable observers see abortion as humane” (Browne and Keeley 56). Position said to depend on how “sanctity of human life” valued (57).

**First Euthanasia (6/12 textbooks)**

**Classification – Genre**

Section on narrative includes Jerry Fensterman’s “I See Why Others Choose to Die,” in which Fensterman argues for availability of physician assisted suicide by relying on his own story of being diagnosed with kidney cancer (Goshgarian and Krueger 164-65).

**Classification – Stases**

“Current issues” and related “enduring issues” includes “human life issues.” Among these is “mercy killing,” which is associated with human life as an absolute value as well as balancing persons’ interests against government control (Wood 16).
Resemblance arguments by precedent described as comparisons between two things, one of which is “usually a past event where some sort of decision was reached, often moral, legal, or political decision” (Ramage et al. 276). In exercises for class discussion, scenario presented where students have been hired as lobbyists for (against) right to die legislation, with the responsibility of researching euthanasia in the Netherlands (278).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification – Toulmin</th>
<th>Following example given of “claims of value”: “Mercy killing is immoral” (Wood 167).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Being asked for an opinion about voluntary euthanasia is about “focus[ing] on moral and ethical questions: . . . Who should make so weighty a decision – the patient, the patient’s family, the attending physician, a health team?” (Goshgarian and Krueger 5) Thinking Activity asks students to explore their moral values by responding to some questions concerning euthanasia (Chaffee 310).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles &amp; Values</td>
<td>Position on voluntary euthanasia depends on how you value “sanctity of human life” (Browne and Keeley 57). Arguments regarding euthanasia are based on moral values and beliefs (Goshgarian and Krueger 177). When asked for an opinion about voluntary euthanasia, must “focus on moral and ethical questions: Is the quality of life more important than the duration of life? What, if any, circumstances justify the taking of a life?” (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Killing Others – Death Penalty (5/12 textbooks) Classification – Stases “Current issues” and related “enduring issues” includes “human life issues.” Among these is capital punishment, which is associated with human life as an absolute value as well as balancing person’s interests against government control (Wood 16). More general statements seem to highlight values and principles (Crowley and Hawhee 79). As an example: General: Should people convicted of murder be put to death? Specific: Should Timothy McVeigh have been put to death for blowing up the Murrah building in Oklahoma City on April 19, 1995, an act which resulted in the deaths of 168 people? (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Animal Rights (5/12 textbooks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification – Toulmin</td>
<td>As an example of a warrant, it is explained that both those for and against capital punishment share “a respect for and appreciation of the value of human life” (Goshgarian and Krueger 199).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles &amp; Values; Outcomes</td>
<td>Position on death penalty said to depend on how “sanctity of human life” valued (Browne and Keeley 57). Two people can agree on the fact that capital punishment deters, but disagree as to whether they support it or not (Ramage et al. 40). One person supports it on this basis; the other doesn’t because “the taking of a human life is always wrong in principle” (40). Writers can argue from principles and consequences, as long as approaches don’t contradict (300). Both approaches should be used to strengthen ethical arguments (306-07). Arguments are made on the basis of principles and consequences, both opposing and supporting the death penalty (299-300).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Especially respecting arguments based on moral values and beliefs (e.g., death penalty), appeals are often made to authority and tradition (Goshgarian and Krueger 177-78). But these appeals will only be persuasive to those who share beliefs. Persuasion is based on audience and arguing that the death penalty is immoral on Christian grounds would be appropriate for a religious publication but not Newsweek (85). Even so, many people use scriptural law (e.g., “Thou shall not kill”) as a basis for arguing against the death penalty (178).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification – Toulmin</td>
<td>One reason for vegetarianism is ethical – the killing animals is wrong (Goshgarian and Krueger 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Thinking Activity asks students to explore their moral values by responding to questions concerning eating meat and wearing animal skins and animal experimentation (Chaffee 310).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles &amp; Values; Outcomes</td>
<td>A book review by Peter Singer (“Animal Liberation”) calls for animal liberation on, as Singer puts it, purely moral grounds (Barnet and Bedau 210).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>Emotion used to build bridges and win over potentially skeptical audiences, as illustrated by Michael Pollan’s use of personal experience in introducing the “great moral struggle of our time” – animal rights (Lunsford et al. 52).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Free Speech – Pornography (4/12 textbooks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification – Toulmin</td>
<td>Having had the Toulmin method applied to it, Susan Jacoby’s (“A First Amendment Junkie”) approach is described as “absolute” in its interpretation of the First Amendment, that is, seeing any censorship as politically unwise and morally objectionable (Barnet and Bedau 332).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Thinking Activity asks students to explore their moral values by responding to some questions concerning pornography (Chaffee 310).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Third | Affirmative Action (4/12 textbooks) | Classification – Toulmin | As an example of the Toulmin method: 
Claim: Academic institutions should accept students only on academic merit.
Evidence: It is fair and right.
Assumptions: Fair and right are important values. AND: Academic institutions are only about academics (Seyler 76). |
<p>| Persons | Thinking Activity asks students to explore their moral values by responding to some questions concerning equal opportunity (Chaffee 310). |
| | Principles &amp; Values | Section on “Cultural Assumptions and Values” explains that “[s]ome of the assumptions in an argument will be based on shared values derived from culture and history” (Lunsford et al. 95). Examples include the “principles of fairness and equity” in the U.S. and how different positions on the affirmative action debate understand fairness differently (i.e., as correcting past inequities, as causing inequity today) (95-96). Controversy over affirmative action in employment described as involving value conflict between equality versus individualism (Browne and Keeley 60). |
| Third | Environment (4/12 textbooks) | Classification – Stases | Dispute between Makah tribe and environmentalists over meaning of killing a whale said to be about stasis of value (Corbett and Eberly 30). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification – Toulmin; Persons</th>
<th>An argument is ethical (rather than categorical) “[d]epending on how large a role ethical considerations play in the evaluation” (Ramage et al. 296). One example is buying a car, which is a categorical argument (decision) to the extent based on “cost, safety, comfort, stylishness, and so forth” and an ethical one if based on “the most fuel-efficient car” (296).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles &amp; Values</td>
<td>Section on “The Power of Audience-Based Reasons” stresses the importance of finding common ground with your audience’s values, beliefs, or assumptions about the world (Ramage et al. 102-04). One example warrants building of hydroelectric dam by environmentalists (puts environment least at risk among alternatives) versus business community or out-of-work laborers (supporting growth of industry) (102-03).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>After an article by George F. Will (“Being Green at Ben and Jerry’s”), Senator Barbara Boxer is described as opposing drilling in a federal wildlife reserve – as Boxer puts it “God’s gift to us” (Barnet and Bedau 111). The following question is asked: “Do we have a moral duty to preserve certain unspoiled areas?” (111) “For Class Discussion” includes an ethical argument about whether it is morally right or wrong to buy an SUV (Ramage et al. 301) and that it is morally right or wrong “for the government to pressure car companies into converting all their manufacturing to hybrids and fuel-efficient cars” (301).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Killing Others – War, Murder, Neonaticide (4/12 textbooks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classification – Toulmin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
analyzed according to the Toulmin method (Goshgarian and Krueger 200-04, 09-11). Response described as being about how Pinker “ignores the moral and ethical values of our society regarding the relationship between mothers and their children” (137).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Thinking Activity asks students to explore their moral values by responding to some questions concerning murder in self-defense (Chaffee 310).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles &amp; Values</td>
<td>Position on war depends on how you value “sanctity of human life” (Browne and Keeley 57).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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