

RHETORICS OF CONSTITUTING COMMUNITIES AND SOCIAL CONTROVERSY

Communication 872 - Spring, 2020

Wednesdays, 3:30 – 6:10 p.m., Merrill G48

Instructor: Kathryn Olson

Office Hours: M&W - 11:00-11:30 a.m.,

W – 2:15-2:45 p.m., and other times by appt.

Email: kolson@uwm.edu

Office: Johnston 225

My 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 their 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 Home or Discussion areas of our CANVAS 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 written 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 (e.g., presenting a scholarly paper at an academic 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 argued by the readings to test the ideas raised by, assumptions behind, implications and uses 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. Have full copies of the week's readings and student papers available in class.

2. *Provisional Personal Technology Policy.* Use of portable technological devices other than tablets or computers (e.g., **phones**, pagers) **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 these 2 hours and 30 minutes are 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 class time, please follow the steps outlined in 10 below.

Provisionally, we will begin the semester with the understanding that students may use tablets or laptop computers during class for note-taking and referring to electronic copies of 872 readings IF they follow etiquette that keeps their use from distracting others (e.g., answering email, checking Facebook or messages, surfing the Internet) **and IF they bring their computers with enough BATTERY CHARGE or a portable power source to last throughout class period so that we can easily and efficiently move into groups because no one is tethered to a wall by a cord or has to sit in a particular location because they need an outlet.** If everyone cannot abide by these provisions, we will move to a totally 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, and in a civil manner
 - 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 including but not limited to: gender, culture, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and physical challenges

4. *Late Work/Assignment Submission Policy.* Assignments due to the CANVAS Assignments must be submitted as Word documents, unless otherwise specified, and by the specified time to count for credit. CANVAS Assignments provides you with a receipt when something is successfully submitted, so look for and save those until your final grade is posted in PAWS. All deadlines are published in this syllabus, so late assignments or submissions via other avenues (e.g., email, paper) are unacceptable; there is only one specified exception to this “eligible/ineligible for any credit” rule related to position papers, which is described in that assignment’s directions. As specified in the assignment directions, position and response papers need to be in BOTH the proper Assignment folder and the proper Discussion area before the deadline to be considered on time. For pedagogical purposes, I may provide feedback on late submissions, even when they are not eligible for credit. If you have a health or family 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.

Build your work plan knowing that technology is inherently unreliable (frequently our computers malfunction, our Internet connection slows down or goes out, one’s preferred browser isn’t a good match for CANVAS, etc., and replacement technology or programs need to be sought to complete and submit something electronically, which takes time), so that is not an unforeseeable emergency. Therefore, don’t risk waiting until the night before or the day that the Assignments folder or Discussion closes to complete and upload your work because these technical difficulties do not excuse missing the deadline. The system publicizes planned CANVAS outages for routine maintenance so be alert to such announcements and plan your work accordingly. At the deadline, Assignments access closes automatically; Discussion postings are time-stamped and checkable. You having a slow Internet connection or starting to submit too close to the deadline is NOT a Canvas problem, but your problem.

****IF YOU ARE RUNNING LATE WITH COMPLETING YOUR ASSIGNMENT, A WISE STRATEGY IS TO UPLOAD YOUR PARTIALLY COMPLETED WORK TO CANVAS SO THAT THERE IS SOMETHING THERE FOR ME TO GRADE. THEN RE-SUBMIT WHEN YOU HAVE THE WHOLE ASSIGNMENT OR MORE OF IT COMPLETED UP TO THE TIME OF THE DEADLINE; YOU CAN MAKE UNLIMITED SUBMISSIONS UP UNTIL THE ASSIGNMENTS BOX CLOSSES, AND I**

WILL GRADE THE MOST RECENT SUBMISSION, UNLESS YOU DIRECT OTHERWISE, SO USE THIS STRATEGY IF YOU ARE IN A BIND.**

5. Please consistently and rigorously use the endnote style (not author-date or footnotes) from the 17th edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style* for all documentation; the most direct place to start is with the examples at 14.23 in the manual, and specific issues are searchable. The complete, easy-to-use version of the Chicago manual is available to you remotely, electronically, and free of charge via the UWM Libraries site under C in Databases A-Z. Please note that Chicago note reference formats differ from the bibliography entries in the Course Schedule (which may include some additional information to facilitate other documentation styles that you might use in the future but that you might not need for Chicago style). So do *not* just cut and paste from the syllabus when citing a class reading; verify all citation format details and use only what is minimally needed, according to Chicago style. It is a matter not only of accuracy and ethics, but of ethos as a scholar.
6. 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 is his or her own or who allows others to use his or her work as if it is 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://uwm.edu/academicaffairs/facultystaff/policies/academic-misconduct/>
7. REUSING WORK. All your work for this course should be original work and only turned in for this course. *You are not allowed to re-use work that you created, submitted, or presented for other classes.* If you are repeating the course, you must create new work. If you are “double dipping,” this will be treated as academic dishonesty
8. If you must be absent due to the call-up of reserves to active military duty, please see the policies at <http://uwm.edu/active-duty-military/>
9. If religious observances will prevent you from completing work on an assigned date(s), please discuss this with the instructor WITHIN THE FIRST THREE WEEKS OF CLASS to make arrangements. See the accommodations policy at <http://www4.uwm.edu/secu/docs/other/S1.5.htm>
10. 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 Accessibility Resource Center (ARC) to undertake the process of ARC determining whether your condition qualifies you for accommodations and what kind(s); if you are eligible, ARC will provide you with a

“Notification of Accommodation” document. Second, you should initiate by email a face-to-face meeting with the instructor, and attach that “Notification of Accommodation” document. At the meeting we will consult to develop acceptable accommodations for this course, collaborating with an ARC counselor if needed. To arrange for needed accommodations in a timely manner, students are expected to complete these steps within the first three weeks of class or as soon as possible after incurring or recognizing the need for accommodation, unless legitimate circumstances prevent one from doing so. If you have questions about this process or need to initiate an accommodations request, please contact an ARC counselor or initiate the accommodation request at <http://uwm.edu/arc/>

11. For university policies regarding issues such as incompletes, discriminatory conduct, complaint procedures, grade appeal procedures, visit <https://uwm.edu/secu/wp-content/uploads/sites/122/2016/12/Syllabus-Links.pdf>
12. Information on departmental, Graduate School, 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, and on the university, the Graduate School, and the department's websites.
13. Bad weather? Check 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

Completed Course Policies Agreement	10 points
Participation Self-Analysis (or Analyses) – total	10 points
Position Paper and Defense	250 points
Response Paper (2 at 125 points each)	250 points
Weekly Participation (see Course Standard 1)	90 points
Peer Review of a Final Paper Draft	90 points
Project Draft, Final Paper, and Presentation	300 points
Project Proposal and 1:1 Meeting – 25 points	
Completeness of Draft for Peer Review – 50 points	
Final Presentation and Defense– 50 points	
(see rubric below for presentation will be evaluated on)	
Final Written Paper – 175	

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 proper 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 and making arguments
- Completeness of arguments and assignment for the stage of the assignment
- Demonstrated ability to make well-chosen refinements based on seriously using the feedback provided you at each stage of the project
- Ability to justify the importance of and defend your arguments orally
- Fulfilment of assignment instructions
- Proper and consistent use of 17th ed. Chicago endnote style, according to the official manual

Assignment Directions

Completed Course Policies Agreement to CANVAS

Download the Course Policies Agreement from Basic Course Information on CANVAS, carefully review the syllabus and the agreement, complete the agreement, and upload the completed agreement to CANVAS Assignments.

Participation Self Analysis (may be done more than once in the semester)

Review Course Standards 1 and 3 and reflect on your class participation to date *focusing on* your participation in ways OTHER THAN when you are asked to present your small group’s findings to the class. 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 sessions. 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 comment on 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.

Position Paper and Response Papers (See samples of each paper type on CANVAS)

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 CANVAS Assignments *and* on the appropriate CANVAS Discussion ***before noon on the Thursday before they are due to be presented***. Two classmates will develop and present Response Papers to each Position Paper. An optional rewrite of your Position Paper, with any modifications prompted by these responses and the class discussion, is due for grading to a distinct CANVAS Assignments ***before noon on the Monday after they are presented in class***. **Please not that I will not be “grading” the paper prior to that, so I can “in conversation” with the argument on the paper when I read it prior to the session and hear you defend and will give you this annotated copy for your use in considering revision.** If a revised paper is not uploaded there by this deadline, I will re-visit and grade the original submission from the original CANVAS Assignments folder.

It is imperative that you meet the position paper's initial CANVAS submission deadline because two of your classmates cannot begin writing their graded papers for that week until yours is posted. Remember, 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 on CANVAS or 0 points are 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). HOWEVER, any rewrite must still be a developed argument original to you (not just a reprisal or comment on something we discussed/concluded during the class session and definitely not an argument presented by the week's other papers). FURTHERMORE, every rewrite must be systematically argued to support a central thesis, so the paper should not be a collection of small unrelated observations on various aspects.

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. **ALSO, YOU ARE NOT RESPONDING TO YOUR CHOICE OF EITHER POSITION PAPER OR TO BOTH OF THE POSITION PAPERS, IF TWO POSITION PAPERS ARE BEING PRESENTED THE**

SAME DAY; RESPOND EXCLUSIVELY TO THE ARGUMENT OF THE POSITION PAPER TO WHICH YOU ARE ASSIGNED AND LET OTHER PEOPLE DO THEIR TASKS.

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 appropriate CANVAS Discussion as well as to the appropriate CANVAS Assignments *before noon on the Monday 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 to advance meaningful discussion, but they do not substitute for you developing your own positions and comments on the readings and their issues.

Semester Project (Samples of project proposals and matching final papers on CANVAS)

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 foundational ones that later essays might draw on, respond to, or depart from, thus illustrating 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).

Project Proposal (See sample proposals and matching papers on CANVAS)

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. Completeness, depth of thought and research, and project justification are key at this stage (over knowing your conclusions yet). The paper should identify and justify the "text" that will be the basis of your analysis (whether you are doing a theory or criticism paper); do not choose a text to which you will not have constant access throughout the semester. While you will not have completed your research yet, 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. 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 one's Wave's deadline. I would also be happy to meet with you earlier in the semester to discuss your ideas, but this meeting is required.

By your wave's deadline, you must submit a draft of your *completed* paper (i.e., all references, notes, evidence, and conclusion in place) to the appropriate CANVAS Assignments. Incomplete submissions at this stage will negatively affect your final project grade by up to 50 points, even if the end result is good; a problematic argument is better than an incomplete one because your reviewer can help you. The papers will be redistributed so that every author has a single-blind peer reviewer. The peer reviewers will submit their reviews to the appropriate CANVAS Assignments by their Wave's deadline, and I will distribute them promptly to paper authors.

Project Final Paper and Presentation (See sample paper on CANVAS)

The final project (18-20 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. Sample final papers and their project proposals are CANVAS. 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, and well-chosen refinements based on seriously using the feedback provided you from these opportunities are considered in this grade.

During one of the final two class periods, each student will present a 12-14 minute rehearsed, polished oral version of their essay’s argument and defend it. 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. The schedule for presentations and final paper deadlines are by Wave and are in the Course Schedule. Your presentation must include the following, in whatever order you believe makes the most sense to your audience:

- ▶ Clear sense of *your* original argument/thesis/position (NOT just the topic area or text)
- ▶ Brief statement of your argument’s *relationship to the relevant scholarly literature* or conversation(s) and *to what larger specific question/puzzle* your project is an answer
- ▶ Development of your argument’s *importance to understanding rhetoric’s operation* more generally and beyond the case (Why is answering this problem or puzzle significant?)
- ▶ Body of your argument with carefully selected and justified support; include definitions of methodological concepts you are using as critical tools as needed (usually different from theoretical *puzzle*)
- ▶ Development of the *implications that flow directly from this study’s analysis in terms of our understanding of how rhetorics of constituting communities and social controversies operate* (NOT a statement of the general importance of studying this text or this theoretical area or this rhetor or exercising some known methodological concept again or the historical value of the text or studying it—remember Brummett’s argument, Basic Course Information, CANVAS). *Rhetorically*, what can we do now that we could not do before hearing your presentation?

Blind Peer Review of Completed Paper (Sample from another course on CANVAS)

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. See Course Schedule for your Wave’s deadlines.

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. 6) 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 CANVAS Assignments (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 CANVAS (since different programs have different steps) and the sample peer review documents on CANVAS.

"The final project (18-20 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. Sample final papers and their project proposals are on CANVAS."

Course Schedule

All students must have read in advance and have accessible during class (in paper or on tablet or laptop--*no phones out*--per the course's personal 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. Read all assigned readings PRIOR TO reading the week's position and response papers.

Jan. 22 Developing a Rhetorical Perspective (Identification/Division & Confrontation)

Entire Syllabus, "Basic Course Information," and sample student assignments on CANVAS; Review the Brummett article, which you likely have read

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.

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

Jan. 29 Developing a Rhetorical Perspective (Identification/Division & Textual 2nd, 3rd, or Null Personae)

**** Completed Course Policies Agreement Due to CANVAS Assignments before 3:30 p.m. today.** Download the Course Policies Agreement from Basic Course Information on CANVAS, carefully review the syllabus and the agreement, complete the agreement, and upload the completed version to CANVAS Assignments.

****Be prepared to select position paper and response paper slots and whether you will be Wave 1 or Wave 2 for the Final Project during class. Please review all materials and student samples of position and response papers (including "Top Eleven Tips for Writing a Focused Argumentative Essay") on CANVAS under "Basic Course Information." Carefully read Sample Position Paper AA and the two corresponding Response Papers.**

****Use the preparation questions on CANVAS for guidance as you do today's readings; you don't have to write out or turn in the answers, but you might want to make some notes or at least think about the issues raised.**

Edwin Black, "The Second Persona," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (1970): 109-19.

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.

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.

Discussion Text: Laura Bush, "Separating Children from Their Parents at the Border 'Breaks My Heart,'" Opinion piece, *Washington Post*, June 17, 2018, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/laura-bush-separating-children-from-their-parents-at-the-border-breaks-my-heart/2018/06/17/f2df517a-7287-11e8-9780-b1dd6a09b549_story.html?utm_term=.5cd58fec91d1

Feb. 5 Developing a Rhetorical Perspective (Constitutive Rhetoric & Community)

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

****Use the preparation questions on CANVAS for guidance as you do today's readings; you don't have to write out or turn in the answers, but you might want to make some notes or at least think about the issues raised.**

Michael Calvin McGee, "In Search of 'The People': A Rhetorical Alternative," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61 (1975): 235-49.

Maurice Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the People Quebecois," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987): 133-50.

Kenneth S. Zagacki, "Constitutive Rhetoric Reconsidered: Constitutive Paradoxes in G. W. Bush's Iraq War Speeches," *Western Journal of Communication* 71 (2007): 272-93.

Feb. 12 Traditional Social Movement Theories – Dramatistic and Instrumental

****Self-Analysis of Class Participation to Date Due to CANVAS Assignments by 3:30 p.m.:** Review Course Standards 1 and 3 and reflect on your class participation to date *focusing on* your participation in ways OTHER THAN when you are asked to present your small group’s findings to the class. 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 sessions. 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 comment on 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.

****Position Papers 1 and 2 and Two Response Papers Apiece**

Leland M. Griffin, “A Dramatistic Theory of the Rhetoric of Movements,” reprinted in *Landmark Essays on Kenneth Burke*, edited by Barry Brummett (Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1993), 199-219. (Original essay published 1969)

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

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.

Feb. 19 Qualifications/Objections/Exceptions to Traditional Movement Theories

****Position Papers 3 and 4 and Two Response Papers Apiece**

Robert S. Cathcart, “Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form,” *Southern Speech Communication Journal* 43 (1978): 233-47.

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

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

**Friday, Feb. 21 – Wave 1 Final Project Proposals Due to CANVAS before NOON –
Schedule required 1:1 meeting on final project promptly via email**

Feb. 26 Wavering Between Identification and Division, Community and Controversy

****Position Papers 5 and 6 and Two Response Papers Apiece**

Robert L. Ivie, “Democratic Dissent and the Trick of Rhetorical Critique,”
Critical Studies-Critical Methodologies 5 (2005): 276-93.

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.**

**Note: “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): 123-35.

**Friday, Feb. 28 – Wave 2 Final Project Proposals Due to CANVAS before NOON –
Schedule required 1:1 meeting on final project promptly via email**

Mar. 4 Rhetorically Performing Objections I

****Position Papers 7 and 8 and Two Response Papers Apiece**

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): 125-51.

Darrel Enck-Wanzer, “Trashing the System: Social Movement, Intersectional
Rhetoric, and Collective Agency in the Young Lords Organization’s
Garbage Offensive,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 92 (2006): 174-201.

**Mar. 11 Special Session on Relationships among New Media, Constituting
Communities, and Social Controversy**

***Position Paper 9 and Two Response Papers**

**Special Guests: Dr. Hilary Rasmussen, University of Wisconsin- Parkside
Dr. Tom Salek, Concordia University Chicago**

Sean Illing, “Why Conservatives Are Winning the Internet,” *Vox*, June 3, 2019,
[https://www.vox.com/policy-and-
politics/2019/6/3/18624687/conservatism-liberals-internet-activism-jen-
schradie](https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2019/6/3/18624687/conservatism-liberals-internet-activism-jen-schradie)

Benjamin W. Mann, “Rhetoric of Online Disability Activism: #CripTheVote and
Civic Participation,” *Communication Culture & Critique* 11 (2018): 604–
21.

K. J. Rawson, “Transgender Worldmaking in Cyberspace: Historical Activism on
the Internet,” *QED: A Journal in GLBTQ Worldmaking* 1, no. 2 (2014):
38-60.

Mar. 18 SPRING BREAK – NO CLASS MEETING

Mar. 25 Rhetorically Performing Objections II

****Position Papers 10 and 11 and Two Response Papers Apiece**

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): 277-92.

Phaedra C. Pezzullo, “Resisting ‘National Breast Cancer Awareness Month’: The
Rhetoric of Counterpublics and Their Cultural Performances,” *Quarterly
Journal of Speech* 89 (2003): 345-65.

Catherine H. Palczewski, “The 1919 Prison Special: Constituting White
Women’s Citizenship,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 102, no. 2 (2016):
107-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2016.1154185>

Apr. 1 Rhetorically Consummating, Deconstructing, and Reconstructing Identity

****Wave 1 Full Papers for Peer Review Due to CANVAS before NOON**

****Position Papers 12 and 13 and Two Response Papers Apiece**

Randall A. Lake, "Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 59 (1983): 127-42.

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

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

Apr. 8 **No Class Meeting – Replaced by 1:1 Paper Meetings Earlier in Semester**

****Peer Reviews for Wave 1 Full Papers Due to CANVAS before NOON**

****Wave 2 Full Papers for Peer Review Due to CANVAS before NOON**

Apr. 15 **Central States Communication Association Convention - Chicago**
No Class Meeting – Replaced by 1:1 Paper Meetings Earlier in Semester

****Peer Reviews for Wave 2 Full Papers Due to CANVAS before NOON**

Apr. 22 **Constituting and Re-constituting Communities**

****Use the preparation questions on CANVAS for guidance as you do today's readings; you don't have to write out or turn in the answers, but you might want to make some notes or at least think about the issues raised.**

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): 467-86.

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): 340-61.

Apr. 29 **Wave 1 Final Paper Presentations – 7**

May 6 **Wave 2 Final Paper Presentations – 6**

Wave 1 Final Papers Due to CANVAS **before NOON

May 13 **NO CLASS MEETING But**

Wave 2 Final Papers Due to CANVAS **before NOON