Evaluative Logic
What I am trying to do?

- As much a way of thinking as a way of writing
- A *structure of the parts that make up a critical claim*.
- Identify the elements that shape critical judgment.
Patterns of Evaluative Logic

General Pattern of Evaluative Logic

Evaluative Claim

Justifies

Speech

Applied to

Criteria

Description using vocabulary of theory

Supported in theory of good communicative practice
Intrinsic Criticism

Criteria

Description

Evaluative Conclusions

Developed empirically from the speech

Supported empirically from the speech

Argument in Criticism


- Seeking definition of significant insight
  - More the critic infers beyond direct experience, the better
- Key to this is argument. Dimensions of argument:
  1. Inferential Leap
  2. Perceived rationale to justify leap
  3. Choice among competing claims
  4. Regulation of uncertainty
  5. Willingness to risk
Then judges some characteristic types of criticism

- **Evaluation**
  - Identify criteria & philosophic or theoretical foundations
  - Offer data on applications
  - Note our general model

- **Descriptive**
  - Not acceptable Criticism

- **Classification**
  - Unacceptable if it only applies categories

- **Explanation or Interpretive Criticism**
  - Use of more general category system yields insight
  - Pick category system for explanatory power (eclectic)
  - Sets up interaction between act and criteria
Critical Modes: Formal Criticism

- Evaluates speeches against a normative standard
- Used much more in teaching than in our published research
Critical Modes: “How it works”

- Usually, mechanistic in Pepper’s terms
  - Deals with effectiveness
  - Seeks to explain how something works
  - Analytic in character: divides into parts and sets in motion
  - Applies theories of “how rhetoric works”
- Theory using/Theory building
- Typically, based on persuasion model: rhetors use language to influence others
- Most common in our research
Critical Modes: Synthetic

- Contextualist or Organic in Pepper’s terms
  - Constructs communication as interpretive power humans use to shape action, generally socially
  - Text/context relationship key
  - Quality/texture dialectic key to critic
  - Stranding
- “Theory” contextually located; taken less seriously; specific to case
- Important Variations: ideological, cultural
  - Strands rhetoric back into history, ideology, culture, etc.
- Criticism “thickens” experience of the criticism
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Criticism</th>
<th>Neo-Aristotelian Criticism</th>
<th>Contextualist Criticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Roots</strong></td>
<td>Formism</td>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td>Contextualism or Organicism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluative . . .</strong></td>
<td>Based in performance theories</td>
<td>If so, basis is effectiveness</td>
<td>Based on pragmatic impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretive</strong></td>
<td>Only which form (norm or genre) applies</td>
<td>May be primarily interpretive/ explanatory</td>
<td>With which strands from context does text construct meaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fundamental inquiry</strong></td>
<td>How well is speech performed</td>
<td>How persuasive is message</td>
<td>How is meaning (including action) performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory of truth</strong></td>
<td>Does it meet norm?</td>
<td>Does theory map practice? Does rhetoric produce effect?</td>
<td>What is impact of strategy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wrangean “Criticism”

- Constructs rhetoric as the process in which society develops, works out, evolves ideas
  - Speakers contribute to the complex of ideas
- Fundamentally contextualist history
  - Human interpretation is a force in history
  - We should study ideas in their rhetorical/historical process