

Heat, Voice, Purpose

Compare how three public texts shape a city heat response.

ELA.12.R.3.4 "Evaluate rhetorical choices across multiple texts."

NAME _____

DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK

Read it twice

YOUR JOB In each text, underline one phrase that shows the writer's purpose and circle one rhetorical choice, such as evidence, repetition, an anecdote, or a qualification. Then number the texts from 1, most urgent in tone, to 3, most cautious in tone.

Three Voices on City Heat

- ① Text 1, testimony to the City Council by Dr. Lena Ortiz, public health director: In July 2023, Phoenix had 31 consecutive days with highs of at least 110°F, and heat is not merely uncomfortable. It can be deadly. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention warns that extreme heat can cause serious illness and death. In neighborhoods with sparse tree cover, pavement absorbs sunlight and releases it after sunset, leaving residents little relief at night. I urge the council to fund shade structures, cooling centers, and tree planting. These measures address exposure before an emergency call is needed. They also reduce the burden on hospitals during prolonged hot spells.
- ② Text 2, op-ed by resident Malik Jones: Last August, my apartment felt like an oven long after dark. My daughter slept beside a fan because our window unit could not keep up. Across town, streets lined with mature trees seemed cooler, quieter, and more livable. We need shade for the walk to school. We need shade at bus stops. We need shade where older neighbors wait for rides. Critics may call tree planting a luxury, but a city that plans for extreme heat is planning for people. Council members, choose a budget that lets every neighborhood breathe easier.
- ③ Text 3, City Parks Department notice: Beginning this fall, the city will test a heat-ready route near three public libraries. The pilot will add shade canopies at selected bus stops, drinking-water stations, and 150 young trees. Crews will track tree survival and maintenance costs for two years before officials consider expanding the program. Residents can view the route map online and submit comments by October 4. This notice does not promise immediate results. Instead, it explains a limited plan, identifies what will be measured, and invites public input before the next budget decision.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE _____ Use the passage

1 Compare the likely audiences of Text 1 and Text 2. What rhetorical choices show how each writer addresses that audience?

2 How does Text 1 use evidence and cause-and-effect reasoning to support its request for funding?

3 What is the effect of repeating “We need shade” in Text 2? How does this approach differ from Text 3's approach?

4 Which text most carefully limits its claim? Identify a phrase or detail that creates this cautious tone and explain its effect.

3 YOUR TURN _____ Your own words

Write 80 to 100 words for the city communications director. Recommend whether a future heat campaign should borrow most from Text 1, Text 2, or Text 3. Name one rhetorical choice from two texts, evaluate each choice for a stated audience, and explain your recommendation.

PART 1 • READ AND MARK

In each text, underline one phrase that shows the writer's purpose and circle one rhetorical choice, such as evidence, repetition, an anecdote, or a qualification. Then number the texts from 1, most urgent in tone, to 3, most cautious in tone. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 • ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	Compare the likely audiences of Text 1 and Text 2. What rhetorical choices show how each writer addresses that audience?	Text 1 addresses council members through public-health evidence and a direct funding recommendation. Text 2 addresses council members and the public through a personal story, repeated demands for shade, and direct address to council members.
2	How does Text 1 use evidence and cause-and-effect reasoning to support its request for funding?	It cites Phoenix's 31 consecutive days of extreme heat and explains that pavement releases heat after sunset. This evidence makes shade, cooling centers, and trees seem necessary to reduce exposure before emergencies occur.
3	What is the effect of repeating "We need shade" in Text 2? How does this approach differ from Text 3's approach?	The repetition makes the need for shade sound urgent and personal. Text 3 uses measured, procedural language about a pilot, tracking results, and public comments rather than an emotional call for action.
4	Which text most carefully limits its claim? Identify a phrase or detail that creates this cautious tone and explain its effect.	Text 3. Its statement that the notice "does not promise immediate results," along with its description of a limited pilot and two years of tracking, signals transparency and makes the plan seem credible.

PART 3 • YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

To the city communications director, I recommend that a campaign borrow most from Text 1, while pairing its evidence with Text 2's human voice. For council members, Text 1's temperature and health information makes funding seem necessary, not optional. For residents who may not read a report, Text 2's apartment anecdote and repeated call for shade make heat feel immediate. Text 3 is credible because it admits that the pilot cannot promise quick results. A campaign should lead with evidence, then show whom the policy protects.

Accept supported comparisons that identify a rhetorical choice and explain its effect on an audience or purpose. For the open response, accept another defensible recommendation if it evaluates choices from two texts, names audiences, and stays within 80 to 100 words.