**Strategies to look for in Oreskes’ “Climate Change: How do we know we’re not wrong?”**

**Metadiscourse –** Language about language. Metadiscourse announces what the writer is doing, helping you to recognize the author’s plan. (Example: In my paper . . .) Metadiscourse can be used both to announce the overall project or purpose of the paper and to announce its argument. Metadiscourse also provides signposts along the way, guiding the reader to what will come next and showing how that is connected to what has come before.

* What is Oreskes’ role in this paper? How does she enter in and guide the reader, through the text?
* What role does she adopt? What voice does she use?

**Prolepsis –** Anticipating the opposition’s best argument and addressing it in advance.

* Oreskes uses this strategy throughout her piece. How does this help construct ethos? How does this lead her audience to conclude that consensus can be trusted?

**Questions –**

**Rhetorical question –** A question designed to have one correct answer. The author leads you into a position rather than stating it explicitly.

**Transitional questions –** Leads the reader into a new subject area or area of argument.

* Oreskes fills this piece with questions. What role do these questions play? How do these questions lead the direction of her argument?

**Arrangement –** Refers to the way that a speaker or author organizes or arranges an argument. How does the speaker or author arrange the argument? Why does the speaker or author choose this arrangement?

* How does Oreskes’ organization of this chapter further her argument?

**Authorities or “big names” –** Refers to a speaker or author’s use of “big names” or well-known authorities on the topic being discussed. Closely related to *ethos* because speakers and author’s often try to build their own credibility or *ethos* by referring to big names or authorities on their topic.

* Oreskes cites many scientific organizations in this piece and includes excerpts from their publications.
* How does this appeal to authority build trust in her argument that the consensus can be trusted?
* How does this appeal tap into assumptions about scientific method

**Commonplaces –** Also known as hidden assumptions, hidden beliefs, and ideologies. Refers to the assumptions, many of them unconscious, that groups of people hold in common. What hidden assumptions or beliefs does the speaker have about the topic? How is the speaker or author appealing to the hidden assumptions of the audience?

* Who is the intended audience of this piece?
* What are some assumptions of this intended audience.

**Definition –** How is the speaker or author defining certain terms? How has the speaker or author chosen to define these terms for the audience?

* Oreskes defines several terms in this piece, including scientific method, induction, deduction, consilience, and falsification. How do her definitions help build her argument?

**Difference –** Examples of difference might include gender, race, class, ethnicity, or any other factor that people use to separate themselves into groups. How is the speaker or author portraying men, women, certain ethnic groups, certain social and economic classes of people, and so on? Why is the speaker or author portraying these people or groups in these ways?

* Oreskes works to build credibility for climate scientists at the same time she works to question the credibility of “contrarians,” who are well funded. How is she isolating these contrarians to show they different than reasonable people who rely on scientific consensus?
* She uses the term “contrarian” to refer to those who question consensus. What does this term do?

**Ethos –** Refers to the credibility, character or personality of the speaker or author or someone else connected to the argument. *Ethos* brings up questions of ethics and trust between the speaker or author and the audience. How is the speaker or author building credibility for the argument? How and why is the speaker or author trying to get the audience to trust her or him?

* How does Oreskes construct her ethos? How does this make her a reliable source of information?
* How does she build credibility for her sources?
* How does she construct credibility for her argument?

**Examples –** What examples is the speaker or author using to build the argument? Why?

* Oreskes uses examples to illustrate each defined term. How do these examples clarify her claims? How do they build her argument?

**History, context, background** –What historical background is the speaker or author providing on the topic being discussed? Why? How and why is the speaker or author building a context for analyzing the topic?

* In the first paragraph, Oreskes references 2004, the year that “global warming ‘got respect.’” How does this build significance and create context?
* Oreskes refers to past scientific discoveries in order to create historic precedence and to illustrate claims. How do these references to history strengthen her claims and build her argument?

**Identification –** This is Kenneth Burke’s term for the act of “identifying” with another person who shares your values or beliefs. Many speakers or authors try to identify with an audience or convince an audience to identify with them and their argument. Related to Burke’s term *scapegoat* (defined later).

* How does Oreskes build a connection between herself and the audience?

**Logos –** Loosely defined, *logos* refers to the use of logic, reason, facts, statistics, data, and numbers. Very often, *logos* seems tangible and touchable, so much more real and “true” than other rhetorical strategies that it does not seem like a persuasive strategy at all. How and why is the author or speaker using *logos?*

* Oreskes builds a very reasonable response to scientific consensus, so that it is real and “true.” How does she do this?

**Metaphors, analogies, similes** – Comparisons, usually between an idea or thing that is unknown and an idea or thing that is already familiar to the audience (e.g., “A strand of DNA is like a ladder.”) How and why is the speaker or author using these comparisons?

* What analogies or metaphors Oreskes does Oreskes use? How do these help build her argument? How do they appeal to her audience?

**Motive –** Why we should or shouldn’t trust someone’s argument –(ex. if the CEO of Krispy Kreme doughnuts argues against nutritional information on product packaging)

* Oreskes refers to “well-funded” contrarians. In what ways does she question motive?

**Distribution –** The author appears to clarify a position by dividing it into two or more categories. Look for alternative categories. How does this further the argument?

* How does Oreskes use this strategy to lead the reader into coming to the conclusion that the scientific consensus regarding climate change is reasonable and can be trusted?