The process below can be used to ensure that the texts we write not only address the material we analyze in a meaningful way, but that the analysis makes larger connections to the human element. As you look over your peers’ texts (and, later, as you begin to dissect your own), be sure that you find that the writing achieves each of these steps.

1. **Significance → Text.** identify whether the quote is properly contextualized and analyzed, following our Literary Devices in Action pattern of Context, Concept, and Connection:
   a. **Context.** Does the quote’s introduction include some discussion of who (is speaking), what (is occurring/has just occurred), where/when (in the story this moment occurs) or why (this piece of narration or dialogue is supplied)?
   b. **Concept.** Does the analysis identify the literary device and explain its usage - ie, if it is a metaphor, does it explain that the quote offers a comparison of two indirect objects? (note that this information should be supplied fluidly within the analysis, not as a standalone definition.)
   c. **Connection.** Does the analysis explain how this moment from the text contributes to the work’s underlying message?
      i. Identify the message of the analyzed text, as you understand it from this author’s analysis.

2. **Significance → the “Human Condition”.** identify two Great Questions that the analysis addresses. If one is not addressed, identify one yourself that the quoted text and its analysis might contribute to answering. What does this analysis of the text contribute to that larger dialogue?
   a. in place of a specific Great Question, the analysis might instead address a broad concept - a topic that is so far-reaching that all people will have an idea of its meaning and impact on their lives, yet not so broad that the idea is too large for meaningful discussion. A good test for this kind of connection is whether your connection to a larger idea is a “step away” from those topics addressed directly by the text (Holden talks directly about loneliness in The Catcher in the Rye; but he never directly addresses how people are expected to treat one another when deprived of a universal moral center). If the connection you come up with is arguable, then you’re on the right track; if it’s something everyone would agree to without much thought, then it likely doesn’t need to be stated and is a poor basis for argument.