

Communication 772
Rhetorical Leadership and Ethics
Spring 2016

Merrill 248 - Fridays, 9:00-11:40 a.m. (1/25-5/10)

Professor:	Kathryn Olson	Office:	Johnston 225
Email:	kolson@uwm.edu	Phone:	414-229-4261 (Main office)
Office Hours:	F 1:45-2:45 p.m. & other times by appt.		414-229-6396 (My office)

Course Objectives

This course is designed to explore rhetorical perspectives and practices of leadership, critical followership, and ethics. By the course's end, you should be able to: 1) understand, analyze, and evaluate rhetoric's potential relationships to experiences and practices of contemporary leadership and 2) demonstrate fluency with a range of rhetorical choices for effectively exercising and critiquing ethical rhetorical leadership.

In keeping with its mission as the anchor course in the Rhetorical Leadership Certificate, the class focuses less on discovery and generating new research than on understanding and finding creative, practical uses for many rhetorical insights to which we have access. As Polanyi (1962) put it:

The mathematical theories of physics are formal systems which are applied to experience by symbolic operations. . . . [Re-casting a formal system into more manageable terms] adds to the beauty and power of the system without enlarging its theoretical scope; it can tell more fluently what it says about nature, but cannot say more than it could say before. So we can achieve greater economy and simplicity in our interpretive framework, and keenly enjoy this as the display of intellectual elegance, without saying anything substantially new. (p. 145)

When taken for graduate credit, this course contributes to the 15-credit post-baccalaureate **Rhetorical Leadership Certificate** (stand-alone credential) or **Concentration** (as part of a graduate degree). For details, please talk to Kathryn Olson or check the Department's website or visit <http://www4.uwm.edu/letsci/rhetlead/>

Required Readings

Single article and book chapter readings are available on our D2L site, or you can locate them yourself using the citations below. The one required book is:

Lakoff, George. *The All New Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing, 2014.

Time Investment

Students should expect to spend a minimum of 38 hours in class meetings, 40 hours reading and preparing for class, and 66 hours researching and preparing papers and oral assignments.

Course Standards and Policies

1. *Participation.* In a graduate seminar, full preparation and weekly participation are not only expected, but required. Attendance, including being ready on time and staying through the entire class period, is necessary but not at all sufficient for participation. It is assumed that you will not miss more than one week of class and that only for a pressing reason (like presenting a paper at a conference or being ill).

Asking questions of information or rhetorical questions or being able to summarize aspects of the reading are also necessary but not sufficient to participation. You must regularly take and defend--with good reasons and appropriate evidence--sustained, well-reasoned positions with respect to, but other than, those which are in the readings to test the ideas raised by, assumptions behind, implications of, and alternatives to the positions presented by those authors and other class participants. Thoughtful, detailed interaction with the readings and other students' comments, not just with the professor, is expected. You will be required on occasion to bring and analyze for the group an example that enriches and illustrates the operation of rhetorical concepts that we are learning.

2. *Provisional Portable Technology Policy.* Use of portable technology devices other than tablets or computers (e.g., phones, Blackberries) is prohibited any time that class is in session. All such devices are to be turned off and stowed away in a backpack, purse, etc.; they cannot be out on the desk or in your lap or hand during instructional time. Of course, you may check messages and make calls at breaks, but otherwise this 2 hours and 40 minutes is for interacting f2f and publicly with all other class members and only with them. If you have a condition that qualifies you for accommodation to use a particular device during classtime, please follow the steps outlined in 8 below.

Provisionally, we will begin the semester with the understanding that students may use tablets or laptop computers during class for note-taking, referring to electronic copies of 772 readings, and doing in-class activities IF they follow etiquette that keeps their use from distracting others (e.g., answering email, checking Facebook) and bring their computers with enough BATTERY CHARGE to last throughout class so that we can easily and efficiently move into groups because no one is tethered to a wall with a cord. If everyone cannot abide by these provisions, we will move to an electronics-free policy.

3. I am committed to having a supportive instructional climate. Achieving such a climate means that both students and professor:
 - attack arguments, not people
 - are individually responsible for the accuracy, quality, and complete citations of all evidence or reasons that they use to support oral or written claims
 - speak for themselves, not for others
 - support equality of access to opportunities in the course

- show respect for differences based on gender, culture, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and physical challenges

4. Assignments due to the D2L Dropbox must be submitted as Word documents and by the specified time to count for credit. All deadlines are published in this syllabus, so late assignments are unacceptable. If you have an emergency situation, you must provide acceptable documentation and contact the instructor immediately (preferably before you miss the deadline) to see if an exception can be made and to define the terms of any arrangement.

Please consistently and rigorously use either the 16th edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style* (which is available free and online via the Golda Meir Library website) or the 6th edition of *The Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* for your citations.

5. Academic dishonesty is strictly prohibited. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to: turning in as your own any individual graded work that you did not produce entirely on your own; looking at another's work during, or otherwise cheating on, an exam or quiz; turning in an assignment for which you have received or will receive credit in another course; failure to document references completely and properly (including appropriate use of quotation marks, presenting full citations, etc.). Any student who uses, without proper acknowledgment, all or part of another's work as if it was his or her own or who allows others to use his or her work as if it was their own will face severe penalties (e.g., grade reduction; course failure; being reported for college disciplinary action). Cheating on exams or plagiarism are violations of the academic honor code and carry severe sanctions such as failing a course, suspension, or dismissal from the University; see <http://www4.uwm.edu/osl/dean/conduct.cfm>
6. If you must be absent due to the call-up of reserves to active military duty, see the accommodations policy at http://www4.uwm.edu/current_students/military_call_up.cfm
7. If religious observances will prevent you from completing assigned work on scheduled dates, you are asked to discuss this with your professor WITHIN THE FIRST THREE WEEKS OF CLASS to make appropriate arrangements. UWM's religious observation accommodation policy is at <http://www4.uwm.edu/secu/docs/other/S1.5.htm>
8. If you have a health condition or disability that may interfere with your attendance or your ability to complete course requirements, you should take the following steps. First, if you have not done so already, you should contact the Student Accessibility Center (SAC) and arrange to meet with a SAC counselor who will help you determine whether your condition qualifies you for accommodations and to complete a VISA form describing the approved accommodations. Second, you should inform your instructor of your need for accommodation and provide the instructor with a copy of the completed VISA form. You are expected to complete these steps within the first three weeks of class or as soon as possible after learning of the need for accommodation, unless legitimate circumstances prevent you from doing so. If you have any questions about this process, please contact a SAC counselor. The accommodations policy is at <http://www4.uwm.edu/sac/>

9. Links to university policies on additional subjects (e.g., Incompletes, Discriminatory Conduct, Complaint Procedures, Grade Appeal Procedures) are available at:
http://www4.uwm.edu/secu/news_events/upload/Syllabus-Links.pdf
10. Information on departmental and university policies on topics including drop procedures, retaking courses, safety, graduate requirements, and certificate requirements are available in the Graduate Bulletin, the Communication Department's main office (Johnston 210), and on the university, the Graduate School, and the department's websites.
11. Bad weather? Check UWM's website or call 414-229-4444 to see if UWM has canceled classes.

Final Grading Scale

1000 - 925	A	824 - 795	B-	694 - 675	D+
924 - 895	A-	794 - 775	C+	674 - 625	D
894 - 875	B+	774 - 725	C	624 - 595	D-
874 - 825	B	724 - 695	C-	594 - 0	F

Assignment Weightings

First Position Paper	150 points
Participation Self-Analysis (or Analyses) - total	25 points
Second Position Paper	175 points
Graded Oral Assignment	75 points
Blind Peer Review of a Final Paper Draft	100 points
Final Project	325 points
Weekly Participation (see Course Standards 1 & 3)	150 points

1000 points

Grading Criteria

- Demonstrated ability to make and support an argument (see "Top Eleven Tips")
- Demonstrated attempts to understand and apply a range of course material
- Demonstrated ability to unite theory and practice
- Use and citation of appropriate evidence for your claims
- Clarity of expression and ability to develop and support an idea persuasively
- Degree of thoughtfulness and originality in using concepts
- Completeness of argument and assignment
- Ability to justify the importance of and defend your arguments orally
- Fulfilment of assignment instructions
- Proper and consistent use of Chicago, or APA style (*Hint: the citations below are NOT in a particular style, so don't just cut and paste them into your work; learn a citation style.*)

Assignments

Directions for the Oral Assignments, Position Papers, and Self-Analysis of Participation Appear below in the Course Schedule; Blind Peer Review and Final Project Instructions are:

Blind Peer Review of Final Paper Draft

Offering constructive feedback to help others do their best work is an important part of scholarship. Each student will do a thorough peer review of another student's draft of the final paper with the intent of helping the original author best meet the requirements for and potential of the project. This will be a single-blind review; the reviewer will know who the paper author is, but the paper author will not know the identity of the reviewer. Reviewers will be assigned and papers distributed after the April 22 class; blind peer reviews are due to the Dropbox by 9:00 a.m. on April 29.

Below is the assignment, with the key aspects highlighted that you, as a peer reviewer, should make sure are present and evaluate for quality (relative to the grading criteria above). Please use these to thoroughly assess and offer comments on your peer's paper. You should turn in to the Dropbox (without your name or other identifying information) two documents: 1) a marked up copy of the peer's paper with specific comments, corrections, ideas, locations of what should be where or what is missing, etc., and 2) a separate overall evaluation (1-2 single-spaced, typed pages) in which you address how well your peer's paper is performing on the highlighted key aspects of the assignment description below, in light of the grading criteria, and offer both compliments and suggestions for performing even better on the final draft.

There is a sample of the two documents from a blind peer review of a paper on D2L. It was done on a paper for a different graduate class, so please ignore the paper content and focus instead on how the reviewer approached her two-part task.

****To make your comment bubbles in Word (Review Tab, Track Changes) anonymous, you have to click the box for Track Changes Options, then click Change User Name in the user information, and remove or alter to "Critic 1" or something untraceable to you (no last name/first name/initials/nickname) BEFORE you make any comments on the paper.**

Final Project Information

Overview

Research and write a case analysis of an actual instance involving an unresolved rhetorical leadership problem. Your project should explain, define, and support with evidence the nature of a particular leader's rhetorical situation, as you see it. Then it should propose two good, complete strategies for successfully handling the challenge by securing shared action through rhetoric. Each of your two alternative solutions must be fully developed with specific action steps/sample discourse/speech outlines, etc., must rely on an analysis of the pros and cons and likely

developments if this route is followed, and must be defended as an effective, ethical route using the materials we have studied this semester. Finally, make a recommendation of which of your two rhetorical routes you think is preferable and why. Each graduate student will present and defend a 12- to 15-minute oral version of the essay's argument on May 6. The exact amount of initial presentation time that each person will have depends on the number of students enrolled in the class, so I can be more specific closer to the presentations. (15-18 pages, inclusive of everything due to the D2L Dropbox by 10:00 a.m. on *Thursday*, May 12)

Requirements

1. You may write with either the rhetor him/herself or an aide of the rhetor as *your* audience. You must have a SPECIFIC RHETOR or potential rhetor in mind IN A SPECIFIC TIME AND PLACE and take into account all the opportunities and constraints provided by that individual and his/her history/position. The situation may be from a time past, present, or pending now, but it must be "real" (in the sense of historical).

Since you are honorable and agreed to advise this rhetor, assume that you both desire the same audience action outcome already, so you don't have to defend the value of the campaign's final outcome to *your* audience (e.g., if your rhetor is using rhetoric to get people to participate in having cleaner air in Milwaukee, you don't have to defend the value of cleaner air but can just assume you both already agree that that is a worthy objective). Instead you are undertaking the task of orienting the rhetor to the focus of the rhetorical problem s/he faces in achieving that worthy ultimate objective, then offering and evaluating two good rhetorical courses to meet the situational demands and ethically and effectively move the rhetor's audience to action.

2. The goal within your case must be to advise the rhetor on how to move *his/her* rhetorical audience members to take part in some shared meaning that they do not currently embrace and to engage in some sort of shared action course as a result (so NOT just re-align their beliefs and impressions with the rhetor's, but follow a specific COURSE OF ACTION as a result of the rhetor's presentation; and NOT just do something individually for their OWN perceived benefit, like buy a product, but do something about an issue with PUBLIC OR SHARED STAKES BASED ON THE SHARED UNDERSTANDING ENCOURAGED BY YOUR RHETOR; and NOT just do something that will primarily benefit the rhetor, like image rehabilitation or election to office, but something with public consequences beyond leader selection or reinscription, which are only indirectly means to future public ends).

3. In analyzing the rhetor's rhetorical situation for him or her, defend with reasoning and evidence your interpretation of how the rhetor faces a PROBLEM THAT CAN LIKELY BE AMELIORATED OR SOLVED BY RHETORIC (i.e., a rhetorical exigence)—AND PARTICULARLY BY RHETORIC THAT IS ETHICAL AS WELL AS EFFECTIVE. (Whether the problem now faced was caused or aggravated by rhetoric in the first place, let alone by this rhetor's own rhetoric, is immaterial EXCEPT as a possible constraint on the rhetor's options now. Remember, you are looking forward and prescribing, like a doctor; knowing the history may help you realize how the patient got to this point and may point toward possible remedies, but it is only a tool and not the end point, as it might be with a forensic scientist examining a body. You want to elaborate on how we got to where we are now *only* to the extent that it helps you show how to make things better using rhetoric from this point forward.)

4. You must defend with evidence the existence of an ACTUAL RHETORICAL AUDIENCE (faced by the rhetor) that meets both criteria (i.e., capable of being influenced and able to act to significantly

ameliorate and solve the rhetorical exigence and so move us closer to the ultimate objective, e.g. cleaner air in Milwaukee).

5. Once you have concisely argued your interpretation of the rhetorical situation that your rhetor faces, use the main portion of the paper to propose and develop two *different* rhetorical courses and why each is ethical and likely to be effective in this situation; this request requires you to articulate your standards of judgment. You will need to use both theory and application to this situation to defend your two recommended rhetorical courses on likeliness of effectiveness and ethicality.

6. You need to offer two *good, self-contained* rhetorical courses for the rhetor to move from where we are now to the rhetorical audience acting to fix the situation. So, don't make one option a straw person argument to blow away in the conclusion, and make sure your two options are each *complete* plans of action, not just two isolated strategies that might get us part way to success. Each course of action may require multiple rhetorical strategies working together to succeed.

7. In the conclusion, recommend one of your two good courses of action as the *better* one and defend that relative recommendation, defining your criteria for that judgment in the process.

Suggestions for Success

1. Review "Top Eleven Tips for Writing a Focused Argumentative Essay," the Grading Criteria in the syllabus, the details in this assignment, and the sample final papers on D2L before you begin writing; revisit them often during the writing process.
2. Remember, you are NOT looking for a text to analyze, but for a public, rhetorical problem with defensible shared stakes that is *yet to be solved* by a rhetorical leader.
3. Avoid past successful cases. (Of course you can look at these for ideas on how to solve your problem; they just shouldn't be the focus of your project.)
4. Avoid cases where someone already tried what you are suggesting and it failed—unless you can use that episode to help you show how your redux is fundamentally different and how your change fixes what was substantially wrong with the first try *and* you can deal explicitly with how this rhetorical attempt being a second try might complicate or ease things with the particular audience.

Suggested Paper Layout

Introduction

The introduction doesn't need to be fancy as you are writing to someone whose goals you have already researched and with which you agree. So, briefly recap any needed historical context that connects you to the reader and orients us to your relationship and why you are "on the same page" with their goals (e.g., perhaps some uncontested, unproblematic, and shared concerns that bring you to writing this proposal for them). Review the goals at which you together aim and how the success of your suggestions can be judged incrementally, short of accomplishing the final goal.

Current Rhetorical Situation Analysis and Diagnosis

- Identify and establish with reasoning and evidence the rhetor's rhetorical exigence

- Not just a goal, but a problem marked by urgency that could be fixed through the right rhetoric moving other people cooperatively to take action
 - Systematically rule out alternative explanations or contingencies that make the problem NOT primarily rhetorical; if you find your rhetor’s problem is not able to be substantially ameliorated through the right public rhetoric, pick a different case
 - Identifiable and measurable indications of success need to be presented—how will we “know” if a rhetorical plan is on its way to success?
- Identify and establish with reasoning and evidence who the rhetorical audience is
 - Capable of being influenced by this rhetor’s rhetoric
 - Capable of taking action that ameliorates the rhetorical exigence featured
 - Identify and establish with reasoning and evidence any important constraints (possibly including past efforts/rhetoric directed at solving this exigence)
 - Be careful of confusing constraints and the exigence
 - Constraints may be positive or negative or ambiguous

In light of your rhetorical situation analysis, conclude with your pointed diagnosis of why the rhetor has not been able to overcome the exigence with rhetoric so far and what is essential to success now (i.e., these become your standards for the likely effectiveness of your recommendations in getting the rhetorical audience to act).

Two Alternative Recommendations for Rhetorical Routes that are Ethical and Effective

- Develop and justify with reasoning and evidence two different rhetorical strategy plans to get the rhetor from where s/he is now, in light of your rhetorical situation analysis, to successfully motivate the rhetorical audience to ameliorate the exigence.
- Be sure to defend why each strategy is likely to work in this rhetorical situation and why what you have proposed is sufficient or “enough in itself” (not just one necessary step among many that are not effected by your proposal) to get the rhetor to the goal of significantly ameliorating the exigence by motivating the rhetorical audience to act.

Conclusion/Preferred Choice between Your Two Good, Recommended Rhetorical Routes

- Develop and justify with reasoning and evidence your criteria for promoting one of your recommended routes over the other (e.g., likelihood of success, relative ethicality, viability of switching later, etc.)
- Develop and justify your recommendation of one of your proposals over the other in light of those criteria

COURSE SCHEDULE

Jan. 29 Foundations - Course Introduction

Cicero, *Ad Herennium*, Book I.i-ii (“Cicero on Studying Rhetoric”)

Cicero, *On the Orator*, Book I.xxxii.144-147 (“Cicero on Practice and Art”)

Loebs, Bruce. “Hitler’s Rhetorical Theory.” *Relevant Rhetoric*, 1(1) (Spring 2010).
<http://relevantrhetoric.com/wp-content/uploads/Hitlers-Rhetorical-Theory.pdf>

Churchill, Winston. “The Scaffolding of Rhetoric.” 1897.
<http://www-adm.pdx.edu/user/frinq/pluralst/churspk.htm>

Reis, Rick. “Truths About Leadership.” Excerpting Chapter 2 of Susan R. Komives, Nance Lucas, and Timothy R. McMahon, *Exploring Leadership: For College Students Who Want to Make a Difference*, 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2007, in *Tomorrow’s Professor*.

Vickrey, Jim. “Symbolic Leadership: The Symbolic Nature of Leadership.” In *Concepts for Air Force Leadership*, edited by Richard I. Lester, 315-318. Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Air University Press, 2008.

Feb. 5 Foundations - Rhetorical Ethics in Practice

***Participation Oral Assignment:** (4 minutes max) Bring to class an example to share from public discourse by a leader, and be prepared to analyze and evaluate it orally using ONE of the three ethical positions argued by Booth, Johnstone, or Brockriede. All of your evaluation evidence will be from the text itself. Remember ETHICALITY is not necessarily the same as EFFECTIVENESS with an audience or ELOQUENCE, though the three certainly may interact in the same text. *Your focus is strictly on recapping your interpretation of ONE (and only one) of the three ethics (either Booth’s or Johnstone’s or Brockriede’s) and then explaining how the rhetorical choices in your example text support your evaluation of that text’s ETHICALITY on your chosen ethic.*

Entire Syllabus

Olson, Kathryn. “Top Eleven Tips for Writing a Focused Argumentative Essay”

Hacker, Diana. “When to Cite a Source; Avoiding Plagiarism.” In her *A Pocket Style Manual*, 83-89. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin’s Press, 1993.

Natanson, Maurice. “The Claims of Immediacy.” In *Philosophy, Rhetoric, and Argumentation*, edited by Maurice Natanson and Henry W. Johnstone, Jr., 10-19. University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1965.

Booth, Wayne C. "The Rhetorical Stance." In *Contemporary Rhetoric: A Reader's Coursebook*, edited by Douglas Ehninger, 218-224. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1972. (Original work published 1963)

Johnstone, Jr., Henry W. "Toward an Ethics of Rhetoric." *Communication* 6 (1981): 305-314.

Brockriede, Wayne. "Arguers as Lovers." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 5 (1972): 1-11.

Feb. 12 Foundations – Interactions of Leadership and Rhetorical Pedagogy

***Position Paper 1 Due to D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.:**

What are **key similarities** in the rhetorical ethics proposed by Booth, Johnstone, and Brockriede? What are the **key differences among the three positions, and why are these important?** Based on your analytical comparisons, **propose and defend what you see as the best, most comprehensive standard** that you can formulate, grounded in these readings, for guiding or critiquing rhetorical leadership, *irrespective of issue content*. (3-5 pages, including APA or Chicago citations)

Gouran, Dennis S. "Problematic Constraints on the Successful Exercise of Leadership, Their Negative Impact, Palliative Measures, and Argument as a More Effective Remedy." In *Recovering Argument*, edited by Randall A. Lake. New York: Routledge, in press.

Roy, Jody M. "The Power of Outreach: Using Communication Research to Help At-Risk Youth." *Spectra*, March 2011, 2-6.

LaDuke, Winona. "Introduction." In *Grassroots: A Field Guide for Feminist Activism*, by Jennifer Baumgardner and Amy Richards, xi-xv. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.

Martin, Roger. "The Limits of the Scientific Method in Economics and the World." *Blogs.reuters.com*, November 10 and 11, 2011.
<http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2011/11/10/a-better-blueprint-for-economics/> and <http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2011/11/10/a-better-blueprint-for-economics/>

Zaleznik, Abraham. "Mangers and Leaders: Are They Different?" *Harvard Business Review*, May/June 1977, 67-78.

Morse, Suzanne W. "Making Leadership Personal and Universal." *Innovative Higher Education*, Fall 1992, 71-77.

Brummett, Barry. "Rhetorical Theory as Heuristic and Moral: A Pedagogical Justification." *Communication Education* 33 (April 1984): 97-107.

Olson, Kathryn M. "Educating Rhetorical Leaders." In *Engaging Argument*, edited by Patricia Riley, 532-538. Washington, D.C.: National Communication Association, 2006.

Feb. 19 Foundations – Rhetoric, “Public” Problems, and Policy Stock Issues

*** Self-Analysis of Class Participation to Date Due to D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.:**

Review Course Standards 1 and 3 and reflect on your class participation to date. Write a one-page essay in which you propose the grade you honestly deserve for class participation thus far and defend your proposed grade with evidence from the classroom. If you have trouble finding enough evidence to make a case for a good grade, acknowledge that and use your essay to describe instead the specific steps that you will take to improve. I will look at these essays and consider their persuasiveness and your follow-through in assessing your participation grade. We may repeat this exercise later in the semester, if that seems appropriate.

Aristotle, *The Art of Rhetoric*, Book I:i-iv.

Lasch, Christopher. "The Lost Art of Political Argument." *Utne Reader*, March/April 1991, 72. (Original work published in 1990)

Zarefsky, David. "Strategic Maneuvering in Political Argumentation," *Argumentation* 22 (2008): 317-330.

Goodnight, G. Thomas. "Public Discourse." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 4 (1987): 428-432.

McIntush, Holly G. "Defining Education: The Rhetorical Enactment of Ideology in *A Nation at Risk*." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 3 (2000): 419-443.

Olson, Kathryn M. "The Practical Importance of Inherency Analysis for Public Advocates: Rhetorical Leadership in Framing a Supportive Social Climate for Education Reforms." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 36 (2008): 219-241.

Feb. 26 Rhetorical Situations and Rhetorical Leadership

Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14.

Vatz, Richard E. "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 6 (1973): 154-161.

Smircich, Linda, and Gareth Morgan. "Leadership: The Management of Meaning." *Journal of Applied Behavior Science* 18 (1982): 257-273.

Nixon, Richard. "The 'Checkers' Speech." In *Contemporary American Voices: Significant Speeches in American History, 1945-Present*, edited by James R. Andrews and David Zarefsky, 241-48. White Plains, NY: Longman, 1992.

Obama, Barak. "Statement on the Sandy Hook Elementary School Shootings in Newtown, Connecticut, December 14, 2012." *AmericanRhetoric.com*
<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/PDFFiles/Barack%20Obama%20-%20Sandy%20Hook%20Elementary%20School.pdf>

Start locating a final project case where you can demonstrate the rhetorical situation of someone with an actual, unsolved rhetorical leadership problem that you want solved.

Mar. 4 Managing Meaning in Controversy – Rhetorically Defining and Redefining Situations

***Position Paper 2 Due to D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.:**

After Martin Luther King, Jr.'s assassination, many African-American communities reacted in grief, despair, and violence. Robert Kennedy, who was on a campaign visit to a predominantly black community, replaced his planned speech with the statement we are reading for today. It was the first that many in that Indianapolis audience heard of the assassination, and Indianapolis was the only major city in which civil unrest did not break out. First outline a coherent interpretation of Kennedy's rhetorical situation (the text includes an historical headnote with information for you to use in assessing and proving your interpretation of the 3 parts of the immediate RHETORICAL SITUATION that Kennedy faced), then analyze how Kennedy's particular textual choices may have productively managed meaning in that rhetorical situation for his immediate audience (i.e., do the follow-up textual criticism with evidence from the speech text). (4-6 pages including APA or Chicago citations)

Kennedy, Robert F. "Statement on the Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., Indianapolis, Indiana, April 4, 1968." In Stephen E. Lucas and Martin J. Medhurst, *Words of a Century: The Top 100 American Speeches 1900-1999*, 480-482. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

"The White Ministers' Law and Order Statement, January 16, 1963." In S. Jonathan Bass, *Blessed Are the Peacemakers: Martin Luther King Jr., Eight White Religious Leaders, and "Letter from Birmingham Jail,"* 233-234. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2001.

"The White Ministers' Good Friday Statement, April 12, 1963." In S. Jonathan Bass, *Blessed Are the Peacemakers: Martin Luther King Jr., Eight White Religious Leaders, and "Letter from Birmingham Jail,"* 235-236. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2001.

Hartwick Classic Leadership Cases. *Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Letter from*

Birmingham Jail,” 1-11. Oneonta, NY: Hartwick Humanities in Management Institute, 1994.

Fulkerson, Richard P. “The Public Letter as a Rhetorical Form: Structure, Logic, and Style in King’s ‘Letter from Birmingham Jail’.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 65 (1979): 121-136.

Mar. 11 Competing Value Hierarchies, *Loci*, and Rhetorical Leadership

***Participation Oral Assignment:** (3 minutes max) Be prepared to describe and justify the three parts of the rhetorical situation you will use for your final project: rhetorical exigence, rhetorical audience, and constraints.

Perelman, Ch., and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*, translated by John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver, 80-99. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

Cox, J. Robert. “The Die Is Cast: Topical and Ontological Dimensions of the *Locus* of the Irreparable.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68 (1982): 227-239.

Olson, Kathryn M. “Rethinking *Loci Communes* and Burkean Transcendence: Rhetorical Leadership While Contesting Change in the Takeover Struggle Between AirTran and Midwest Airlines.” *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 23 (2009): 28-60.

Olson, Kathryn M. “The Controversy over President Reagan’s Visit to Bitburg: Strategies of Definition and Redefinition.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 75 (1989): 129-151.

Mar. 18 Spring Break – No Class

Mar. 25 Practicing with *Loci* and Rhetorical Framing and Reframing I

***Graded Oral Assignment Due at 9:00 a.m.:** (4 minutes max) Bring to class and have uploaded to D2L Dropbox an example (with full citation) from public discourse of a leader urging a shared course of action using any of the six *loci* catalogued in last week’s Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca reading, and be prepared to analyze it orally and argue for why a particular locus is DOMINANT in this text. All your evidence will be from the text itself. Before class, please upload to the D2L Dropbox a copy of your speaking notes along with the copy of your text (with full citation) to help in evaluation. A good example of speaking notes is on D2L.

Remember, *loci* are just places to look for or standard ways of developing an argument. The same issue or course of action could be advocated with different *loci* as justification, either within the same text or in different texts that are all on

the same side of the issue. What you are looking for is a particularly good actual example of where a public leader developed an argument (thoroughly, hopefully) by *featuring* one of the six *loci* as s/he attempts to manage meaning for an audience.

Fairhurst, Gail T., and Robert A. Sarr. "Framing: Seizing Leadership Moments in Everyday Conversations." Chap. 1 in *The Art of Framing: Managing the Language of Leadership*, 1-22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Lakoff, George. *The All New Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing, 2014. (Reading selections from the book to be determined.)

Apr. 1 Rhetorical Framing and Reframing II – Comedy, Tragedy, and Melodrama

Brummett, Barry. "Burkean Comedy and Tragedy, Illustrated in Reactions to the Arrest of John Delorean." *Central States Speech Journal* 35 (1984): 217-227.

Carlson, A. Cheree. "Gandhi and the Comic Frame: 'Ad Bellum Purificandum.'" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 72 (1986): 446-455.

Olson, Kathryn M. "Rhetorical Leadership and Transferable Lessons for Successful Social Advocacy in Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth*." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 44 (2007): 90-109.

Schwarze, Steven. "Environmental Melodrama." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 92 (2006): 239-261. (If you are interested someday--these are not required readings for this class--, responses to Schwarze are available in the forum section of *Environmental Communication* 2 (2008): 78-109.)

Apr. 8 Rhetorical Framing and Reframing III – Strategic Ambiguity

Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969, 25.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969, xv-xxiii.

Eisenberg, Eric M. "Ambiguity as Strategy in Organizational Communication." *Communication Monographs* 51 (1984): 227-242.

Ceccarelli, Leah. "Polysemy: Multiple Meanings in Rhetorical Criticism." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84 (1998): 395-415.

Ivie, Robert L. "Obama at West Point: A Study in Ambiguity of Purpose." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 14 (2011): 727-760.

Apr. 15 **Central States Convention – no f2f class; use time to complete your final paper**

Apr. 22 **Challenges of Public Involvement**

***Full draft of Final Paper due to D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.**

Baumgardner, Jennifer, and Amy Richards. "Prologue." In their *Grassroots: A Field Guide for Feminist Activism*, xvi-xxv. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.

Putnam, Robert D. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy* 6 (1) (1995): 65-78.

Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. "Individualism and the Crisis of Civic Membership." *Christian Century* 113, 8 May 1996, 510-515. (Excerpt from the new introduction to a tenth-year anniversary edition of *Habits of the Heart* published by the University of California Press, 1996)

Eliasoph, Nina. *Avoiding Politics: How Americans Produce Apathy in Everyday Life*, 1-22, 230-268. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Hart, Roderick P., and E. Johanna Hartelius. "The Political Sins of Jon Stewart." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 24 (2007): 263-272.

Apr. 29 **Challenges of Generating Ethos and Guest Speaker**

***Blind Peer Review (2 documents) due to D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.**

Aristotle, *The Art of Rhetoric*, Book II.i.1-7 ("Aristotle on Ethos")

Merriam, Allen H. "Symbolic Action in India: Gandhi's Nonverbal Persuasion." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61 (1975): 290-306.

Hartnett, Stephen John. "Communication, Social Justice, and Joyful Commitment." *Western Journal of Communication* 74 (2010): 68-93.

Special Guest: Robert Kraig, Executive Director, Citizen Action of Wisconsin

Selected articles, introducing Dr. Kraig and his work

May 6 **Final Project Presentations**

May 12 **Written Final Projects Due to D2L Dropbox by 10:00 a.m. (no f2f meeting)**