

Hello everyone! Today, we will be talking about rhetorical appeals, the three most popular of which being logos, pathos, and ethos. We'll start by looking at the definitions of these three before diving into each of them in more depth before reviewing the lesser-known rhetorical appeal, then seeing how everything comes together. Now, these are just the definitions of the three most popular rhetorical appeals. I really just wanted to show my work here. You can find the extended definitions at literarydevices.net. Let's start with logos. An appeal to logos is an appeal to logic. We can do this through the use of images such as graphs and infographics. These are a great way to help your audience visualize the data that you've presented. We can also incorporate logos in our text by stating the facts that back up your argument. Next, we'll look at pathos, which is an appeal to emotion. We can do this by showing an image that will elicit an emotional response or by writing something that will elicit an emotional response. Both of these will encourage your audience to actually care about your argument. Next, let's jump into ethos. Ethos is widely misunderstood to just be an appeal to ethics, but, in modern-day rhetoric, an appeal to ethos is more so an appeal to credibility. While someone's ethics might lend to their credibility, it does not define their credibility, which is why we focus more on ethos being an appeal to credibility. We can do this visually by showing a logo such as this ASU logo or by citing an expert in the field that your argument lies in. Unfortunately, the idea of credibility has become more and more vague over time, so let's talk about what is credible to use as a source today. Since most research today is done online, the quickest way to determine if a website is credible is by looking at the website suffix such as .com, .net, and .org. The best suffix you can use is the .gov suffix, followed by the .edu suffix, followed by everything else. .gov sites come directly from the government and .edu sites come directly from colleges and universities, meaning they are frequently peer-reviewed. The idea behind peer review is that outside sources are constantly fact-checking these sources. If a .gov website had incorrect information published on it, someone would immediately call it out and have it fixed. The same can be said, although less so, for .edu sites. If a university published inaccurate information and someone called them out, their reputation would be extremely hurt. The next argument for credibility comes from the idea of primary vs. secondary vs. tertiary sources. Primary sources come from videos, images, and direct accounts from people who attended the events you could be citing. Secondary sources would be analyses of these primary sources. Tertiary sources would be analyses of primary and secondary sources. Most people will claim that, the less distance a source has from its original event, the more credible it becomes because it's not as subject to analytical bias. However, it is my personal belief that secondary sources can be just as credible as primary sources because they could provide necessary context by providing other primary sources. For example, take a look at this primary source. This little girl is smiling, and that's generally considered a good thing. However, a secondary source might provide us with the context that this little girl is smiling because she just committed arson, which would be a bad thing. I believe primary and secondary sources hold equal credibility. Next, we have to consider the recency of your source because science is constantly improving and facts are constantly being updated because of fact-checkers and peer reviewers. The more recent a claim is, the more likely it is to be true. Finally, let's talk about Wikipedia. Wikipedia is perhaps the epitome of peer-reviewed sources. However, because it is constantly subject to analytical bias, it doesn't make for the best academic source. If you read through this article, though, you'll notice little numbers at the ends of claims. If a specific claim is relevant to your argument, you can click on its number and find its citation below. From here, you can research Piero's and Taruskin's "Music in the Western World: A History in Documents" and use it as a source in your text. In this way, Wikipedia acts as a wonderful annotated bibliography. Now that we're done looking at credibility, let's talk about

self ethos. Up until now, we've been talking about sources of external ethos. There's been this new concept that every writer has a sense of ethos. You can check out this [jstor article](#) if you want to learn more about it. To summarize, just by writing about something, you have a sense of ethos. The idea is that the piece you are currently working on, when published, will give you ethos in that field. Therefore, you have a sense of self ethos in the piece you are currently writing. But this is a small amount of ethos considering that anyone could write anything and publishing is becoming ever easier. Ways to build your self ethos include earning degrees and distinctions by educating yourself and by doing research. Next, there's Kairos, the lesser-known fourth rhetorical appeal. An appeal to Kairos is an appeal to timing. Take a look at this [article header](#). You'll notice that the date is October 31st, which is Halloween, the perfect time to be talking about Halloween candy. Then, notice the year, 2019, the year before a presidential election, which is the perfect time to be talking about presidential candidates. An example of effective Kairos can actually be seen in this [lecture](#). Here's some food for thought: Is it more useful to watch this video before or after you write? Finally, let's see how everything comes together. An appeal to logos shows your audience that you have proof of your argument. An appeal to pathos tells your audience why they should care about your argument. An appeal to ethos tells your audience how they can trust you or your sources. Now, let's see how we can put these together. Logos acts as the backbone of your argument, holding everything else together. Pathos acts as the arms and hands of your argument, giving it agency, giving your audience a call to action. Ethos acts as the legs of your argument, giving everything else a baseline to stand on. With these three rhetorical appeals combined, we can create a solid argument. I hope you enjoyed this lecture and maybe even learned something new about the rhetorical appeals. If you have any questions or suggestions for me, feel free to leave them in the comments below. Happy writing!