

# [Artifact analysis assignment](https://assignbuster.com/artifact-analysis-assignment/)

The goal here is to help your classmates revise their writing. So be serious, detailed and thorough-? but also constructive and respectful-? in your criticisms as you can be. Use additional sheets as necessary. 1 . Identify the author’s critical thesis or main idea. Is It clearly worded? Is it early In the paper? Does it gulled the analysis throughout the paper? Suggest ways of revising to make It better, clearer, more Interesting – even If you think the mall argument Is “ good enough. ; In this essay, I will use a generic criticism of political hip hop and angers rap music to argue that as a rhetorical hybrid, GUM Is in a unique position to self reflexively deconstruct several of the tropes ingrained in rap music. -The thesis is somewhat clearly worded, but made me a little confused when it mentions GUM being In a “ unique position” as to what the author meant. -The thesis is In a good place not too early In the essay and not too far In. -It does gulled the analysis throughout the paper -? One way that I think the author can revise the thesis Is to clarify how GUM is in a unique place, but that is just my opinion. . How well organized is the essay? Are the points clear, previewed early in the paper, and do they support the thesis? Suggest alternative ways of organizing this paper, if necessary. -The essay is well organized from beginning to end. -From the beginning the author makes the point clear as to what they were writing and what they were going to write later on. The author’s claims support his thesis as mentioned early on in the essay. I honestly don’t have an alternative way of organizing this essay except make it a little more clear when jumping from one topic to another. 3.

Does the author provide enough credible evidence about the historical and rhetorical situation of the speech and/or about the appropriate genre? What were you left wondering or wanting to know? Suggest other resources. The author gives much evidence about the historical and rhetorical situation of the speech. The author gave convincing evidence about both gangster rap and political hip hop to say that the MAD Is a hybrid of the two genres and how it is in a unique position. The author makes couple of points about the subtlety of the lyrics both incorporating gangster rap and political IP hop was very well explained and thought-out.

The only thing that I might add is that the author put in many supposedly credible sources, but I had no idea who those sources were which left me wondering how credible the sources were. 4. Was there enough detailed analysis of the speech Itself? Were there enough examples (excerpts from the speech) to prove the point for a reader unfamiliar with the speech? Does the claim the author is making about the speech seem to be a fair or accurate description of the text’s strategies? Be sure to read the speech under consideration in the course packet when making this evaluation.

The author gave many examples throughout his whole analysis of the album which was great- One thing the author might want to fix is maybe make better connection of the examples about homosexuality and hyper sexuality where I couldn’t make a connection between the author points and the examples given in the essay. -Besides making a connection between the examples and the context the author did a pretty good Job making a inductive analysis of the album. 5. Assess the quality and clarity of the author’s writing. Do you understand what the paper is saying? Are the sentences structured clearly?

Are the right words chosen to express the author’s ideas? How is the grammar and punctuation? YOU MUST mark the author’s draft and attach it to your assignment. -It was a little difficult for me to understand what the author was saying at times do to the choice of words the author made, which made the essay harder for me to read. It felt as if the author was trying to use complicated words at times to make the easy sound more intellectual. Also, Because some examples weren’t conceptualized like I said earlier there were parts of the essay that I couldn’t understand very well