

RHETORICS OF CONSTITUTING COMMUNITIES AND SOCIAL CONTROVERSY – Spring, 2017

Communication 872
Fridays, 9:00 - 11:40 a.m., Merrill G48

Professor: Kathryn M. Olson
Office Hours: F 1:45-2:45 (occasionally changes, with
notice, to F noon–1:00 plus other times by appt.)
Email: kolson@uwm.edu

Office: Johnston 225
Office: (414) 229-6396
Main Office: (414) 229-4261

Course Overview

“Community” and “controversy” are held in peculiar regard by our society. We often value and seek out community and disdain and avoid controversy. Our culture frequently assumes that community and controversy are antithetical, that is, that community and controversy work antagonistically to dispel each other. If there is community, then controversy threatens to dissolve it. By the same token, if there is a controversy, we often hear claims that it will be resolved once we find common ground. These maxims are helpful, but perhaps not wholly accurate. We might instead suggest reasons to see community and controversy as mutually and complexly entwined, symbiotic rather than opposing forces. In this view, the greatest test of community is not how it operates during times of harmony, but how it emerges in and engages controversy and subsequently is redefined. Conversely, controversy can be examined for its ability to promote and redefine, not just challenge and destroy community.

Our primary lens for critically viewing the phenomena of community and controversy will be rhetoric, which draws our attention to how communities and controversies are defined, contested, advocated, and made sensible to people via symbolic arrangements. As part of our endeavors, we will explore various rhetorical tools for analyzing communities and controversies, ultimately using these tools in our own investigations and analyses of a community/controversy phenomenon. By the end of the semester, we should be able to discuss eloquently the stakes of and options for community and controversy in our society, with each student evidencing his or her claims in a specific case project developed over the course of the semester.

This course fulfills a requirement for the 15-credit **Rhetorical Leadership Graduate Certificate** (stand-alone credential) or **Concentration** (part of a graduate degree). For details, please talk to RL Director Kathryn Olson or go to <http://uwm.edu/rhetorical-leadership/>.

Required Readings

Unless otherwise noted, all readings listed on the syllabus are required. Full citations are provided for readings so that you may locate them. Most readings are published essays or student submissions available on the Content or Discussion areas of our D2L site. The book that you might want to rent or own (it is also on reserve at the library), but minimally need to read the assigned sections of, is:

John W. Bowers, Donovan J. Ochs, Richard J. Jensen, and David P. Schulz, *The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control*, 3rd ed. (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 2010).

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 readings 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 may 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, so this relates to good participation. 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 872 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 (e.g., don't take more than your share of class "air" time; don't insist on your opinion; pause and really listen to others)
 - show respect for differences based on gender, culture, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and physical challenges
4. Assignments due to the D2L Dropbox or Discussion area must be submitted as Word documents and by the specified time to count for credit, though I may give feedback on a late assignment. 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 determine the terms, if any alternative arrangement is deemed warranted.

In each written assignment, please consistently and rigorously use either the 16th edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style* (preferable both because it is the style used by most major rhetoric journals and book series and because it is available free, online, and in full via the Golda Meir Library website) or the 6th edition of *The Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* for your citations. Please note that the citations in the syllabus are purposely NOT in either of these citation styles, so do not just cut and paste them; learn the style(s).

Papers must be typed, double-spaced, *including the references or notes*. Focus your thoughts to abide by the stated page limit for each assignment. Do not include a cover page. Papers must be accurate in spelling and grammar; proofread carefully (don't just Spellcheck) prior to every submission. These are minimal expectations of professionalism. On D2L, see and abide by Hacker and "Top Eleven Tips for Writing Argumentative Papers" (assigned for Day 1) and Brummett, Zarefsky, and Jordan, Olson, and Goldzwig (assigned for Day 1 and Day 5) on expectations for good rhetorical scholarship (reproduced under "Basic Course Information"). I have also added there two resources on some rhetorical terms used when analyzing how style is working in a text that might be useful.

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 websites.
11. Bad weather? Check UWM's website or 414-229-4444 to see if UWM 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

Participation Self-Analysis (or Analyses) - total	10 points
Position Paper	250 points
Response Paper (2 at 100 points each)	200 points
Weekly Participation (see Course Standard 1)	115 points
Peer Review of a Final Paper Draft	100 points
Project Proposal and 1:1 Meeting with Professor	25 points
Project Final Paper and Presentation	300 points

	1000 points

Grading Criteria

- Demonstrated attempts to understand and apply a range of course material
- Demonstrated ability to unite theory and practice
- Use and citation of appropriate evidence and quality of research
- Clarity of expression and ability to develop and support an idea persuasively
- Degree of thoughtfulness and originality shown
- Completeness and insightfulness of the argument
- Fulfilment of assignment instructions
- Ability to defend your arguments orally

Assignment Descriptions

Position Paper and Response Papers (See samples of each paper type on our D2L site)

A *position paper* is a focused 4-6 page argumentative paper that takes an original position on some significant aspect of the readings assigned for that week. Initially, the paper should fairly and fully summarize the aspect of the reading with which it takes issue (perhaps 1-2 pages). Then the paper should clearly state, develop, and support a position with respect to that aspect, including explicitly explaining and illustrating the importance of the issue and the stakes of deciding whether to side with the position paper. Please remember that these readings are assigned NOT because they offer all the answers but because they raise interesting questions or problems concerning rhetorics of constituting community and social controversy; so, you should do something other than just endorse, reinforce, or further illustrate what they have already said. Please also remember that your position paper does not need to reject the readings wholesale; indeed sometimes you might decide they do not go far enough in the direction they start or that there are necessary, but unexamined implications of a reading's position.

Position papers must be posted *both* in the D2L Dropbox *and* on the appropriate D2L Discussion Board ***before noon on the Monday before they are due to be presented***. Two classmates will develop and present Response Papers to each Position Paper. A final version of your Position Paper, with any modifications prompted by these responses and the class discussion, is due for grading to the same D2L Dropbox folder where you submitted the original ***before noon on the Monday after they are presented in class***. If a revised paper is not uploaded there by this deadline, I will grade the original submission. **It is imperative that you meet the position paper's initial D2L submission deadline and present at class the argument that you submitted in advance because two of your classmates cannot begin writing their graded papers for that week until yours is posted and they are responding to *that* position. You have a rewrite window after the class, and they do not. Furthermore, all class members need time to read and reflect on these papers, and they have planned their work schedules around the announced timetable. Because of these relationships, a position paper posted after the initial noon deadline will be penalized 20% of the assignment value (i.e., 50 points) for each 12-hour period or portion thereof that passes after the deadline until the paper is posted in both places on D2L or 0 points is reached.**

Parameters for rewritten position papers. Your rewritten paper should take into account the feedback that you received during class discussion and any feedback the instructor provided regarding your initial submission. You may take a substantially different position on the readings, if you are no longer convinced of the position you originally argued and do not see trying to gerrymander a qualification as the best way to go. The rewrite may retrench and strengthen your original position or may take a substantially different position on the readings you addressed or may be on a totally different aspect of the day's readings (if you are willing to go with a first-run paper on a new issue). Any rewrite must, however, still be something original to you (not just a reprisal or comment on something we did/discussed/concluded during that class), and every rewrite must be systematically argued to support a central thesis, so it should not be a collection of small unrelated observations on various things.

A *response paper* is a 3-4 page argumentative paper that responds to a position paper. It is NOT just a shorter parallel position paper on the same readings; instead your job is to analyze and respond to *the position paper's argument* with respect to those readings. The response paper must have a clearly stated thesis that responds to the position paper; that argument should be carefully developed and supported, and the implications and stakes of its thesis explicitly explained. Response papers must be posted on the D2L Discussion Board as well as to the Dropbox *before noon on the Wednesday before they are due to be presented* so that all class members can read and reflect on them before our class discussion. **There are no rewrite possibilities for this assignment.**

All class participants must read and be ready to discuss in class the week's position and response papers; they will form an important basis of discussion, but they do not substitute for you developing your own positions and comments on the readings and their issues.

Semester Project (See samples of project proposals and final papers on our D2L site)

This course's focus on constituting community through rhetoric and social controversy, which is something more than "disagreement" over an issue or policy because it also rhetorically contests or challenges the very ways that decision-making, participation, voice, what counts as evidence, whose interests count and how, where the lines of inclusion in community are currently drawn, etc. are currently structured. The 872 paper is to approach a problem of constituting community and/or social controversy from a rhetorical perspective. Whether it emphasizes rhetorical theory or rhetorical criticism, it must use a case to demonstrate its claims/insights and why they matter. Whether the emphasis is a criticism or theory building, the paper needs to speak to rhetorical problems that extend or through which we can learn something about rhetoric of constituting communities and social controversies beyond that particular case.

You must have a rhetorical problem and approach that together guide your paper's argument. The academic readings we cover in class offer some ideas for setting up rhetorical problems and ways to approach them, but you are certainly not limited to those approaches, and every week layers on new possibilities; we start with some of the most foundational ones that later essays respond to or depart from, showing how rhetorical scholarship "grows". I have provisionally named each week in the syllabus to give some indication of rhetorical approaches illustrated in that session, so you might want to look ahead in the syllabus and see if there are some coming up

that interest you and skim those readings before deciding on a project. It is also possible to change your topic after the initial choice/oral defense, if it doesn't seem to be working.

You must have an actual text or texts that you are analyzing in pursuit of answering your rhetorical problem and showing how your argument has traction. As for a text, people have chosen lots of different things successfully and, of course, text choice interacts intimately with your problem and perspective choices--so if you favor a certain perspective for your project, then you need to find a text that meets the expectations that perspective has for a text (e.g., single speech or essay with a clear call to action for some, a representative anecdote of a whole swath of community or movement rhetoric that you can defend as encompassing all the signature elements of that community or movement although just a single text, a group or stream of text that unfolds in a controversy or community, the back-and-forth texts of a movement and an establishment).

Oral Proposal and Justification of Project

You will have an early (March 3), ungraded (though mandatory) opportunity to orally present and justify your project to the class and receive feedback. The presentation should essentially cover all the issues called for in the written project proposal that is described next (the key parts are highlighted in the paper assignment); please read that description and the highlighting in the main final project paper assignment carefully and organize your succinct 3-minute oral presentation to cover all the issues it raises. The more developed your proposal is at this stage, the more help we can be to you.

Project Proposal (See sample proposals and matching papers on our D2L site)

In this short (3-page) paper, you will propose a general thesis (NOT just a topic area) for your semester project and justify that thesis's relationship and importance to rhetorical issues of constituting communities and social controversy. The paper should identify and justify the "text" that will be the basis of your analysis; do not choose a text to which you will not have constant access throughout the semester. It is not expected that you will have done a great deal of research yet, but you nevertheless must be able to indicate why the project is worth your and your readers' time; the project is not only for self-enlightenment or to prove that you are smart but must also engage and provide illumination that others will find significant and that will make them smarter with respect to how rhetoric works in constituting communities and social controversy. So, don't go with a whim, but interrogate what your project can and should do and why and then develop the best case. **Monday, March 27, 9:00 a.m. is the final deadline for submitting proposals and scheduling a subsequent 1:1 meeting, but there is an earlier optional proposal submission deadline of March 10, 9:00 a.m. for students who want to schedule their meeting on completed, well-developed proposals prior to Central and Spring break.** Each student is responsible to schedule the face-to-face meeting with the professor for a mutually feasible time soon after the proposal is submitted and in time to allow oneself enough time to develop a complete paper for April 14. I would also be happy to meet with you earlier in the semester to discuss your ideas, but this meeting is required.

By 9:00 a.m. on Friday, April 14, you must submit a draft of your *completed* paper (i.e., all references, notes, evidence, and conclusion in place) to the D2L Dropbox. Incomplete submissions will affect your final project grade. The papers will be redistributed so that every

author has a single-blind peer reviewer. The peer reviewers will submit their reviews to the D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m. on Friday, April 21, and I will distribute them to paper authors.

Project Final Paper and Presentation (See sample paper on our D2L site)

The final project (18-22 pages, exclusive of notes and references) must approach a problem of constituting communities and/or social controversy from a rhetorical perspective. Whether its emphasis is theory-building or criticism, it should analyze a particular case in a way that advances our understanding of rhetoric's role in constituting communities and social controversy more generally; in other words, we definitely will learn more about your case, but from your original argument we must also learn something that stems from that analysis that is portable to other cases and that helps answer a more general rhetorical problem related to our seminar's theme and readings. The final paper's argument should present a **clear thesis** and its **importance beyond this case**, **introduce any text and justify its selection**, **situate the thesis and text theoretically and contextually**, **offer a thorough and directed rhetorical analysis of the significant aspects of the text**, **facilitate the readers' understanding of your argument and its stakes**, and **point to some future possibilities for better understanding rhetorics of constituting communities and social controversy in light of this analysis**. How you accomplish these goals is up to you, but the assigned readings offer a range of strong examples from various perspectives as models. See "Top Eleven Tips" and the Jordan, Olson, and Goldzwig essay for general guidelines on good rhetorical arguments. Good sample final papers and their project proposals are on our D2L site.

During the final class period on May 5 (and, depending on the number of students enrolled, possibly a few on April 28), each student will present a 10-12 minute rehearsed, polished oral version of the essay's argument and defend it; a more specific time range may be provided closer to the time, depending on the number of class participants. Slides are discouraged, unless your texts are images that must be projected for the argumentative analysis to make sense to your audience. The idea is to provide the audience with a clear sense of your argument, its significance and implications, and how you proved it using key aspects of selected support, not to share all the details. Final papers are due to the Dropbox no later than 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, May 11. Your written paper, presentation, and defense of your position at the presentation, the completeness of the draft that you provided for your blind peer reviewer to work with on April 14 (even though the argument will certainly have developed and improved since then), and well-chosen refinements based on seriously using the feedback provided you from these opportunities are considered in this grade.

Blind Peer Review of Final Paper Draft (*See sample from another course on our D2L site*)

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 over the weekend after paper drafts are submitted on Friday, April 14; peer reviews are due to the Dropbox by 9:00 a.m. on Friday, April 21 and will be distributed shortly thereafter.

Peer Reviewers,

Below is the assignment, with key aspects that you, as a peer reviewer, must verify are present and adequately developed and evaluate for quality (relative to the grading criteria in this syllabus, p. 5) highlighted. Please use these key aspects together with the grading criteria in this syllabus to thoroughly assess and offer comments on your peer's paper. You should turn in to the Dropbox (without your name or any 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. Be sure to comment on EACH highlighted item as well as making overall general comments or suggestions.

To make your comment bubbles in Word (Review Tab, Track Changes) anonymous, you have to click the box for Track Changes, 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. See help documents for some versions or Google the directions for your specific word processing software if it is not among those on D2L (since different programs have different steps) and the sample peer review documents on our D2L Content area.

"The final project (18-22 pages, exclusive of notes or references) must approach a problem of constituting communities and/or social controversy from a rhetorical perspective. Whether its emphasis is theory-building or criticism, it should analyze a particular case in a way that advances our understanding of rhetoric's role in constituting communities and social controversy more generally; in other words, we definitely will learn more about your case, but from your original argument we must also learn something that stems from that analysis that is portable to other cases and that helps answer a more general rhetorical problem related to our seminar's theme and readings. The final paper's argument should present a **clear thesis** and its **importance beyond this case**, **introduce any text and justify its selection**, **situate the thesis and text theoretically and contextually**, **offer a thorough and directed rhetorical analysis of the significant aspects of the text**, **facilitate the readers' understanding of your argument and its stakes**, and **point to some future possibilities for better understanding rhetorics of constituting communities and social controversy in light of this analysis**. How you accomplish these goals is up to you, but the assigned readings offer a range of strong examples from various perspectives. See 'Top Eleven Tips' and the Jordan, Olson, and Goldzwig essay for general guidelines on good rhetorical arguments. Good sample final papers and their project proposals are on our D2L site."

Course Schedule

All students must have read in advance and have accessible during class (in paper or via only technology that is consistent with the course's portable technology policy) the week's position and response papers as well as the week's assigned readings. Students' position and response papers will form an important basis of discussion, but they do not substitute for you developing your own analysis of and position on the readings.

Jan. 27 Developing a Rhetorical Perspective (Identification/Division & Confrontation)

Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), 3-46.

Robert L. Scott and Donald K. Smith, "The Rhetoric of Confrontation," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 55 (1969): 1-8.

G. Thomas Goodnight, "Controversy," in *Argument in Controversy*, edited by Donn W. Parson (Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1991), 1-13.

David Zarefsky, "Knowledge Claims in Rhetorical Criticism," *Journal of Communication*, 58 (2008): 629-640.

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

Discussion Text: "Pray the Devil Back to Hell" (we'll watch this video during class)

Feb. 3 Developing a Rhetorical Perspective (Textual Personae)

****Be prepared to select position paper and response slots during class**

Entire Syllabus – continued enrollment in this class assumes a student's knowledge and acceptance of all syllabus provisions

Diana Hacker, Excerpt from *A Pocket Style Manual* (Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1993), 83-89.

"Top Eleven Tips for Writing a Focused Argumentative Essay"

Sample Position and Response Papers on D2L Content Area under "Basic Course Information"

Edwin Black, "The Second Persona," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (1970): 109-119.

Philip Wander, "The Third Persona: An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory," *Central States Speech Journal* 35 (1984): 197-216.

Dana L. Cloud, "The Null Persona," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 2 (1999): 177-209.

Charles E. Morris III, "Pink Herring & The Fourth Persona: J. Edgar Hoover's Sex Crime Panic," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88 (2002): 228-244.

Don J. Waisanen and Amy B. Becker, "The Problem with Being Joe Biden: Political Comedy and Circulating Personae," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 32 (2015): 256-271.

Discussion Text: John Fitzgerald Kennedy, "Speech to Greater Houston Ministerial Association," reprinted in *Contemporary American Public Discourse*, 3rd ed., edited by Halford Ross Ryan (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1992), 174-176.

Feb. 10 Developing a Rhetorical Perspective (Constitutive Rhetoric)

***Position Paper 1 and Two Response Papers**

Michael Calvin McGee, "In Search of 'The People': A Rhetorical Alternative," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61 (1975): 235-249.

Maurice Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the People Quebecois," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987): 133-150.

Kenneth S. Zagacki, "Constitutive Rhetoric Reconsidered: Constitutive Paradoxes in G. W. Bush's Iraq War Speeches," *Western Journal of Communication* 71 (2007): 272-293.

Angela G. Ray and Cindy Koenig Richards, "Inventing Citizens, Imagining Gender Justice: The Suffrage Rhetoric of Virginia and Francis Minor," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 93 (2007): 375-402.

Randall A. Lake and Beth L. Boser, "'Enduring' Incivility: Sarah Palin and the Tucson Tragedy," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 17 (2014): 619-652.

After doing these readings, read all position and response papers for the week.

Feb. 17 Developing a Rhetorical Perspective (Traditional Social Movement Theories)

****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.

Robert S. Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," *Southern Speech Communication Journal* 43 (1978): 233-247.

John W. Bowers, Donovan J. Ochs, Richard J. Jensen, and David P. Schulz, *The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control*, 3rd ed. (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 2010), Ch. 1, 2, 3, 4, & 9.

Herbert W. Simons, "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (1970): 1-11.

Richard B. Gregg, "The Ego Function of the Rhetoric of Protest," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 4 (1971): 71-91.

Sherry Lowrance, "Was the Revolution Tweeted? Social Media and the Jasmine Revolution in Tunisia," *Digest of Middle East Studies* 25 (2016): 155-176.

Discussion Texts: Malcolm Gladwell, "Why the Revolution Will Not Be Tweeted," *New Yorker*, October 4, 2010.

Christian Christensen, "Introduction: Twitter Revolutions? Addressing Social Media and Dissent," *The Communication Review* 14 (2011): 155-157.

Feb. 24 Between Identification and Division, Communities and Controversies

***Position Paper 2 and Two Response Papers** (not on Jordan, Olson, Goldzwig)

John W. Jordan, Kathryn M. Olson, and Steven R. Goldzwig, "Continuing the Conversation on 'What Constitutes Publishable Rhetorical Criticism?': A Response," *Communication Studies* 54 (2003): 392-402.

Sample Project Proposals and Sample Final Papers on D2L Content Area under "Basic Course Information" – closely read the Sample A proposal.

Robert L. Ivie, "Democratic Dissent and the Trick of Rhetorical Critique," *Critical Studies-Critical Methodologies* 5 (2005): 276-293.

Robert L. Ivie, "Enabling Democratic Dissent," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 101 (2015): 46-59.

Kathryn M. Olson and G. Thomas Goodnight, "Speaking in Community and *Ingenium*: The Case of the Prince William County Zoning Hearings on Disney's America," in *New Approaches to Rhetoric*, edited by Patricia Sullivan and Stephen R. Goldzwig (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004), 31-59.**

**Heads up: "Ingenium" and "Community" are not the same and are definitely not always on the same side of a struggle, and ingenium could operate on all sides of one.

Robert L. Scott, "The Conservative Voice in Radical Rhetoric: A Common Response to Division," *Speech Monographs* 40 (1973): 123-135.

After doing these readings, read all position and response papers for the week.

Mar. 3 Rhetorically Performing Objections I

****Orally Propose and Justify a Case Study for Your Final Project at Class**

***Position Paper 3 and Two Response Papers**

Review Sample A 3-page proposal

Kathryn M. Olson and G. Thomas Goodnight, "Entanglements of Consumption, Cruelty, Privacy, and Fashion: The Social Controversy over Fur," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994): 277-292.

Phaedra C. Pezzullo, "Resisting 'National Breast Cancer Awareness Month': The Rhetoric of Counterpublics and Their Cultural Performances," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89 (2003): 345-365.

Angela G. Ray, "The Rhetorical Ritual of Citizenship: Women's Voting as Public Performance, 1868-1875," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 93 (2007): 1-26.

Leo Groarke, Catherine H. Palczewski, and David Godden, "Navigating the Visual Turn in Argument," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 52 (2016): 217-235.

After doing these readings, read all position and response papers for the week.

Mar. 10 Rhetorically Performing Objections II

***Position Paper 4 and Two Response Papers**

****OPTIONAL Early Deadline (9:00 a.m. today) for Project Proposals (IF YOU WANT YOUR REQUIRED MEETING EARLY NEXT WEEK *PRIOR* TO CSCA AND SPRING BREAK, USE IT.)**

Kevin Michael DeLuca, "Unruly Arguments: The Body Rhetoric of Earth First!, Act Up, and Queer Nation," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 36 (1999): 9-21.

Kevin Michael DeLuca and Jennifer Peeples, "From Public Sphere to Public Screen: Democracy, Activism, and the 'Violence' of Seattle," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19 (2002): 125-151.

Jules Boykoff, "Framing Dissent: Mass-Media Coverage of the Global Justice Movement," *New Political Science* 28 (2006): 201-228. [not a rhetoric article]

Mark Porrovecchio, "Lost in the WTO Shuffle: Publics, Counterpublics, and the Individual," *Western Journal of Communication* 71 (2007): 235-256.

OPTIONAL: For your own enlightenment, you might want to compare to Bowers, Ochs, Jensen, and Schulz, Chapter 7 for their take on WTO Protests and the Battle in Seattle.

After doing these readings, read all position and response papers for the week.

Mar. 17 Central States Communication Association Convention, Minneapolis

****No f2f class; our required individual paper appointments substitute**

Mar. 24 Spring Break – no class

Mon., Mar. 27 **Project Proposals Due to D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m. (FINAL DEADLINE); Schedule an individual meeting with the instructor to discuss your proposal.

Mar. 31 Rhetorically Performing Objections III

***Position Paper 5 and Two Response Papers**

Billie Murray, "The Sphere, the Screen, and the Square: 'Locating' Occupy in the

Public Sphere,” *Communication Theory* 26 (2016): 450-468.

Gary Tang, “Mobilization by Images: TV Screen and Mediated Instant Grievances in the Umbrella Movement,” *Chinese Journal of Communication* 8 (2015): 338-355. [not a rhetoric article]

Elizabeth A. Brunner and Kevin Michael DeLuca, “The Argumentative Force of Image Networks: Greenpeace’s Panmediated Global Detox Campaign,” *Argumentation and Advocacy* 52 (2016): 281-299.

Theodore Otto Windt, Jr., “The Diatribe: Last Resort for Protest,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 58 (1972): 1-14.

After doing these readings, read all position and response papers for the week.

Apr. 7

Promoting Controversial Change as an Extension of Community or Tradition and Co-opting Change Rhetoric

***Position Paper 6 and Two Response Papers**

Sample Project Blind Peer Reviews (2 documents each) on D2L Content Area under “Basic Course Information”

David Zarefsky, “President Johnson’s War on Poverty: The Rhetoric of Three ‘Establishment’ Movements,” *Communication Monographs* 44 (1977): 352-373.

John M. Murphy, “Domesticating Dissent: The Kennedys and the Freedom Rides,” *Communication Monographs* 59 (1992): 61-78.

John M. Murphy, “Inventing Authority: Bill Clinton, Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Orchestration of Rhetorical Traditions,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 71-89.

Michael J. Lee, “The Populist Chameleon: The People’s Party, Huey Long, George Wallace, and the Populist Argument Frame,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 92 (2006): 355-378.

Michael Serazio, “Encoding the Paranoid Style in American Politics: ‘Anti-establishment’ Discourse and Power in Contemporary Spin,” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 33 (2016): 181-194.

After doing these readings, read all position and response papers for the week.

Apr. 14 Special Guest – Dr. Steve Goldzwig, Marquette University****Full Draft of Final Paper Due to Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.**

Stephen R. Goldzwig and Patricia A. Sullivan, “Contesting the So-Called ‘Post-Racial’ Landscape of Presidential Politics: Obama, African-Americans, and a Shifting Electorate,” in Clarke Rountree (ed.) *Venomous Speech: Problems with American Political Discourse on the Right and Left*. (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2013), 75-92.

Three convention papers plus the response from a panel entitled “Rhetorical Approaches to Barack Obama's Eulogy for the Honorable Reverend Clementa Pinckney, Charleston, South Carolina, June 26, 2015,” Public Address Division, NCA, Philadelphia, PA, November, 2016. (All on D2L)

Apr. 21 Consummating, Deconstructing, and Reconstructing Identity through Rhetoric****Blind Peer Reviews Due to Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.*****Position Paper 7 and Two Response Papers**

Randall A. Lake, “Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 59 (1983): 127-142.

Danielle Endres, “American Indian Activism and Audience: Rhetorical Analysis of Leonard Peltier’s Response to Denial of Clemency,” *Communication Reports* 24 (2011): 1-11.

Bonnie J. Dow, “AIDS, Perspective by Incongruity, and Gay Identity in Larry Kramer’s ‘1,112 and Counting’,” *Communication Studies* 43 (1994): 225-240.

Mari Boor Tonn, “Militant Motherhood: Labor’s Mary Harris ‘Mother’ Jones,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 82 (1996): 1-21.

Jason Edward Black, “Extending the Rights of Personhood, Voice, and Life to Sensate Others: A Homology of Right to Life and Animal Rights Rhetoric,” *Communication Quarterly* 51 (2003): 312-331.

After doing these readings, read all position and response papers for the week.

Apr. 28 Constituting and Re-constituting Communities

James Jasinski, “Constituting Citizenship Through Public Argument: The

Case of the Constitutional Ratification Debate, 1787-1788,” in *Argument in Controversy*, edited by Donn W. Parson (Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1991), 80-85.

James Jasinski, “(Re)constituting Community through Narrative Argument: ‘Eros’ and ‘Philia’ in ‘The Big Chill,’” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 79 (1993): 467-486.

Denise M. Bostdorff, “The Internet Rhetoric of the Ku Klux Klan: A Case Study in Web Site Community Building Run Amok,” *Communication Studies* 55 (2004): 340-361.

Samuel P. Perry and Jerry Mark Long, “‘Why Would Anyone Sell Paradise?’: The Islamic State in Iraq and the Making of a Martyr,” *Southern Communication Journal* 81 (2016): 1-17.

(Depending on the number of students enrolled, we may need to do a few final paper presentations this session.)

May 5 Final Paper Presentations

(Depending on the number of students, we may need to do a few final paper presentations the week before this session, April 28.)

Thurs. May 11 **All final papers are due to the D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.; no face-to-face

May 17 Final Exam Period (no face-to-face meeting)