Respectfully refutes Rushdie’s point consequently. His disagreement with Rushdie in principle could have been marked by a condescending and imposing tone — however through his choice of phrases. Sanders tone is informal, yet respectful of Rushdie’s point of view. He connects himself with the reader and Rushdie by using such words as “I,” “our,” and “we.” He places himself on our level as well as Rushdie’s; he is conversational and informal. Yet he is still respectful towards Rushdie and admits that even though he disagrees completely with him, Rushdie articulated his views “as eloquently as anyone.” He is respectful of the man whose ideas he is refuting — there is not even a hint of ad hominem argument in this essay, for Sanders never attacks Rushdie himself. This tone develops his point as one that is accessible and easy to understand for all people, as one that we should hold as a fundamental belief of society.

Sanders does not develop his point of view with vicious verbal slander or disrespectful destruction of Rushdie’s well-thought out argument. Rather, he uses a respectful as well as informal tone, direct quotes, and acknowledgement and sometimes agreement with his opponent’s argument.

Scoring Rationale: This essay offers no elaborate introduction. It doesn’t need to: the analysis question calls for an examination answer, not a discursive essay, and this student follows an instinct to get right to work on the analysis. The essay first examines Sanders’s use of material directly quoted from the Rushdie essay, showing how Sanders uses the Rushdie material as a springboard for developing his own beliefs. The student notes the effect of Sanders’s direct quoting: “In quoting Rushdie directly and repeating his words and syntax, Sanders not only assures the reader of his careful thoughtfulness on the issue, but also states his own belief that moving does nothing to rid us of the unfortunate aspects of humanity of which we all wish to be free.” The student next examines how Sanders moves from legitimately and honestly examining Rushdie’s argument to offer his own counterargument. The response offers a succinct evaluation of this organizational strategy. “This gradual movement from agreement to complete disagreement reinforces Sanders’s point and respectfully refutes Rushdie’s point consequently.” Finally, the writer analyzes Sanders’s “conversational and informal” tone. In summary, this paper analyzes the logic, organization, and tone of Sanders’s essay quite fully and fluently.

Score: 6

In his passage Staying Put: Making a Home in a Restless World, Scott Russell Sanders employs a veritable plethora of rhetorical strategies in order to create a skeptical, critical, and even at times mocking tone towards incessant migration. As this idea is exemplified by Salman Rushdie, Sanders systematically attacks the philosophy that “movement is inherently good [and that] staying put is bad.”

Sanders begins his criticism by outlining opposition. His color diction depicts America as a land of “heroes,” and he implements zeugma in order to equate “explorers” and “cowboys” with “rainbow-chasers,” seeming to embrace such an idealistic view. He also addresses the audience using the first person plural pronoun “We” and the possessive “our” which immediately unifies the perspective of the author and the reader. However,
beginning with the short and grim sentence in the first paragraph, Sanders skepticism begins to shine through as he qualifies the statement “stand still... and you die” with his own editorial “we are [].” All of a sudden the author begins to question this idealism, asking how Americans “could hear such a proposal without hooting.”

In the second paragraph Sanders addresses Rushdie’s direct points, and only adds to his credibility as an authority by making the admission that because of the diversity created by migration “we are stronger.” Still, Sanders attacks Rushdie’s assertion that “to be a migrant is the only species of human being free of the shackles of nationalism,” even mocking his syntactical structure by using parenthesis to offer his analysis on the state of which social problems have (or have not) been resolved. In the third paragraph, Sanders bolsters his argument by citing historical examples to lend ethos to his opinions, and concludes the paragraph by metaphorically exposing the ridiculous notion that the world was meant to accept heterogeneous practices suited for and specialized in one region in all locales.

Ultimately Rushdie believed in a world based on ideas because he himself was a consummate romantic, but as a pragmatist, Sanders does not overlook how “By settling in, we have a chance of making a durable home for ourselves, our fellow creatures, and our descendants.”

_Scoring Rationale:_ This essay focuses on a broad assessment of Sanders’s “veritable plethora” of devices and then focuses on what the student sees as a “skeptical, critical, and even at times mocking tone.” The essay praises Sanders’s “colorful diction” even mentioning the use of zeugma (but without clearly pointing out where it is in the original text). The student recognizes Sanders’s use of first-person plural pronouns, but then senses a shift towards skepticism in Sanders’s diction. Throughout this opening section of the essay, the student does a good job of explaining how diction and style support Sanders’s evolving ideas. The next move, though, keep the essay in the adequate, rather than effective, range by arguing that Sanders attacks Rushdie, “even mocking his syntactical structure.” It is difficult to substantiate such overstated claims. The student’s subsequent attempts to show how Sanders’s use of historical examples both “bolster his argument” and “lends ethos to his opinions” is quite acceptable, however. The essay concludes with a quite nice, if brief, comparison between Rushdie as a “consummate romantic” and Sanders as a “pragmatist.” In short, this essay shows all the hallmarks of a first draft, which, if the student could return to it, temper its overstatement, and flesh out its points with examples, would be effective.

Score: 4

In Staying Put: Making a Home in a Restless World, Scott Russell Sanders’ position on moving continuously is obvious right from the start. He begins with examples of the people we look at as heroes and what they did. His point begins there because all of those people were ones who moved around quite often. People like sailors, explorers, and cowboys were always traveling. He makes a very interesting statement in the essay that “Our Promised

Land has always been over the next ridge or at the end of the trail, never under our own feet.” This abstractly says that our strive for happiness is likely to go on forever. It is as if we are running in place trying to get to the Promised Land. He uses examples of situations where people feel like they need to move to a new location and those examples provide imagery for the reader. Sanders states that “if we fish out a stream or wear out a field or if the smoke from the neighbor’s chimney begins to c— the sky, why move?” People seem to be under the impression that happiness will be achieved without a struggle, and that’s not the case.

Sanders also uses a lot of parallel structure in his examples of the things Americans do in general that involve moving. He says that “Americans have built the most roads and airports, dug the most canals, and laid the most rails out of any other nation. It’s like we are fascinated with new surroundings. Sanders really starts to unleash a kind of ignorance of the American in the middle of his essay. Moving is not always the solution. He states that some people feel like moving will “make a new imaginative relationship with the world.” Some people will just carry bad habits for the rest of their lives.

Sanders also alludes to many historic events that involved the idea of moving for benefit. It alludes to the Spaniards, Central and South America, Colonists and North America and the Dust Bowl of 1930; it’s obvious that this way of thinking has been going on for hundreds of years. He uses a simile comparing the mind of people and the land of the world to dough and cookie cutters. “The habit of our industry and commerce has been to force identical schemes onto differing locales.”

I definitely would say that his concluding paragraph was most effective because of its diction. It really just tops off his argument that people who don’t move don’t have a stable life. It just makes the reader think. He says “People who root themselves in places are likelier to know and care for those places are people who root themselves in ideas.” He also says that when we decide to stop moving everytime something bad happens, we can learn to respect where we are currently. “By settling in we have a chance of making a durable home for our fellow creatures and our descendants.” It appeals to ethos and makes him sound very credible.

_Scoring Rationale:_ This essay is an inadequate response to the task. It is disjointed. It identifies discrete features without ever clearly explaining how the features connect to, and support, Sanders’s purpose and evolving ideas. The essay beings with a gloss on the content and relies on summary heavily throughout. It observes that Sanders supports his points with historical examples and even notes that some of these examples evoke imagery. The student remarks that “Sander also uses a lot of parallel structure” and offers a brief analysis of the effect of that syntactic strategy. The student then refers to Sanders’s use of historical examples an points out a simile, quoting one of Sanders’s conclusions. The essay concludes by attempting to praise the diction of the final paragraph, but the student seems incapable of offering examples, saying merely “It just makes the reader thing.” The student seems to know what analysis is but inadequately performs the task, falling back on the strategies of paraphrasing content and pointing out stylistic features yet not connecting the two.