

COM 402.01: SEMINAR IN RHETORICAL COMMUNICATION RESEARCH METHODS

Fell Hall 116, Thursdays 6:30-9:20

Instructor: Dr. Zompetti

Ofc Hours: MTWF 1:15-1:55 & by appointment

Email: zompetti@ilstu.edu

Office: Fell 413

Office phone: 438-7876

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

We will focus on the process, or method, of rhetorical criticism. The aim of this course is to provide students with the skills to engage in rhetorical criticism. To borrow from Ashley Mack, “it is a practice where critics (you) approach objects (texts, artifacts, etc...) with certain orientations (theories, practices, etc...) in order to unpack not only what the object is saying, but also perhaps what it reveals about strategies, interests, and power dynamics at work in public culture” (Mack, nd). We will begin by exploring the philosophy behind criticism, the purpose of criticism, and the meaning of criticism. We will next move to learning different methods of rhetorical criticism and how those can be applied to interpreting different rhetorical texts. Students will gain experience in the different methods by analyzing texts of their choosing.

As such, here are the main questions that will frame the course:

1. What is rhetoric? What is the point of doing rhetorical criticism?
2. What are the different types of rhetorical criticism?
3. How can we employ rhetorical criticism to interpret different texts?

[Mack, Ashley Noel (nd). Rhetorical Criticism Syllabus (Graduate Seminar). The University of Southern Mississippi. Available: https://www.academia.edu/20413763/Rhetorical_Criticism_Syllabus_Graduate_Seminar]

Required Books:

Brummett, Barry (2019). *Techniques of Close Reading* (2nd edition). Los Angeles: Sage. ISBN: 978-1-5443-0525-7.

Keith, William M. and Lundberg, Christian O. (2008). *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's. ISBN: 978-0-312-47239-9

Kuypers, Jim A. (Ed.) (2009). *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action*. Lanham, MD: Lexington. ISBN: 978-0-7391-2774-2.

Other Texts:

There will also be articles for our reading pleasure. I am listing them in the tentative schedule so you can know in advance what is expected. While I will attempt to post all of these readings on ReggieNet, in case I overlook one, these can be retrieved through Milner's electronic database system (try using the “communication and mass media” database, but other databases may be used as well). Others can be found online. A bibliographical listing of all of the additional readings is listed toward the end of this syllabus.

Course Objectives

1. You should be familiar with the literature concerning rhetoric and rhetorical criticism. You should have a working knowledge about the authors, their theories, and their arguments. You should be able to speak intelligently about the work we read and study, including understanding and using the vocabulary associated with this body of knowledge.
2. You will examine a variety of different methodological and critical approaches analyzing rhetorical texts. You should be able to apply these approaches to your own investigation of rhetoric.
3. You should remember your position as a scholar, student, citizen and activist. You should be mindful of respecting other's ideas, while being self-reflexive of your own.

4. You should be able to recognize the different types of rhetorics that exist around us. You should be sensitive to our need to interrogate them. You should, by the end of the course, have an ability to critically question such rhetorics and analyze them into a meaningful argument.
5. You should be able to see common themes among your different criticisms. As such, we may wish to propose your work as a panel to a conference.
6. In short, by the end of the course, students should be able to:
 1. recognize and describe the philosophical nature of rhetorical criticism
 2. understand and apply rhetorical criticism to different texts
 3. demonstrate their understanding of rhetorical criticism in various assignments that employ criticism.

Course Overview

The course is intended for students with no background in rhetoric as well as rhetorical veterans. For students not well-versed in rhetoric, we will begin the course with a brief introduction of rhetoric. For the student with previous rhetorical experience, we will highlight key primary and secondary texts of rhetorical criticism for advanced study.

Ideally, students should be taking graduate courses for more than just a grade – they should identify and attempt to accomplish their own “learning outcomes.” But, to help students in their pursuit for higher learning, a conference/publication-quality paper and a comprehensive, take-home exam will be assigned.

Special Needs/Concerns:

Any student needing to arrange a reasonable accommodation for a documented disability and/or medical/mental health condition should contact Student Access and Accommodation Services at 350 Fell Hall, (309) 438-5853, or visit the StudentAccess.IllinoisState.edu. Any and all accommodation concerns must be discussed with this office before any arrangements can be made with the instructor.

My Approach to Seminars

1. We all learn from each other – you from me, I from you. As such, I do not have a monopoly on truth. I will help guide and facilitate discussion. I will help you in ways that I am able. I will answer your questions to the best of my ability. And, I will speak on subjects that I have some experience. Nevertheless, we will all obtain more from this course if we remember that we can learn from each other (and not just from me).
2. I will provide (hopefully meaningful) comments on the material we discuss in class. However, a seminar is not a "lecture" course, nor is it like the typical undergraduate course. Given that we will be discussing a multiplicity of themes involving rhetoric, you will become the experts on some of these issues, and I will expect you to take charge of some of the discussions. I expect all of you to take an active role in your participation in this course. If you do not come to class prepared to speak (meaningfully and intelligently) about the material for that evening's class, you will be failing me, the rest of the class, and yourself. At this point in your academic careers, I shouldn't have to take attendance, or fill-in if you didn't read the material. You will not receive an A or perhaps a B in the course if you are consistently absent, late, or unprepared (that last two are tantamount to skipping).
3. We will discuss a great deal about theory in this course. You should remind yourselves about the importance of theory for its use in interrogations and investigations. After all, we will be learning how to conduct rhetorical criticism.
4. I am more interested in ***how*** you think, rather than what you think. Please don't be afraid to share your thoughts and ideas in class, and don't presume that you know how I will respond if you introduce a concept in class. It is more important that you are reflecting on the material and thinking critically about its relationship to your ideas and interests.
5. Let me be blunt: This is a graduate course in one of the top Master's programs in the country. Don't take shortcuts, don't sell yourself short, don't be lazy. Instead, ***do*** additional readings, ***do*** discussions outside of class, ***do*** have confidence in your abilities to think about and process information.
6. A seminar is more than just a time for FYIs and descriptive ramblings. You must think reflectively and critically about the material. Don't accept it on face-value. You should be able to explain the “why” and “how” of ideas. In short, you need to be able to APPLY what you read, not just regurgitate it back to me and the class. Additionally, it is important that we cover the material we read, as

much of it will be necessary to understand other readings. I don't want to stifle discussion, but at times it may be necessary to move on to avoid becoming derailed.

7. **You should avoid coming to class saying you didn't understand the material.** I don't have much patience for such positions. If you are in graduate school, you can comprehend what you read. If you have some difficulty given your unfamiliarity with the topic or concepts, then you should spend additional time reading the material. Consult additional sources. Form a reading group with other members of the class. Some of the readings will use complex theoretical language. If you're still having trouble, you should come see me during office hours.

8. You should come to class always already prepared to discuss the material which is scheduled for that evening. You should also be flexible – in other words, LISTEN to what others say in the class and build your thoughts about the material on what they say. Don't be afraid to debate in class with others, provided that the debate is professional and respectful. Similarly, don't get discouraged if others disagree with your take on the readings – this is graduate school, so we need to take suggestions and criticisms and then rethink our positions.

9. **Bring all reading materials to class when we discuss them**

10. If you need help, come to me! Seriously – we should chat in my office. If you are struggling with grad school in general, I'm also happy to help.

Course Expectations

1. Complete all of the readings as they are assigned. Think about them as you read. Re-read if necessary. I strongly suggest that you complete each reading in a single sitting, rather than breaking it into segments, if possible. This will allow to reflect more accurately on the intricacies of the material. Minimize distractions while you read (like put your phone on silent and away, mute your computer sound, etc.) so that you may concentrate on the readings.

2. Attend class. Missing seminars is unacceptable behavior for a graduate student in the absence of illness, university sponsored activities, or family emergency. If you find that for some reason you need to miss class –please notify me in advance. I will not deduct points for attendance, but your participation points will most likely suffer, and so too will your ability to grasp the material for the following week.

3. Attend class on time (within a couple of minutes). It is disrespectful to show up late.

4. Complete all assignments, on time. Late work will be penalized one grade per day of lateness (the next day begins as soon as class is over). I won't write many comments/explanations for the grades I give to late work. Failure to complete all assignments results in failure in the course. Failure to complete the major paper and/or the final exam may also result in a "C" or worse for this course. If you are experiencing difficulties or have unforeseen circumstances emerge, send me a quick email out of courtesy, and it is possible we can strike an agreement or compromise about your late work.

5. Do not take another person's work as your own. This is plagiarism and will result in failure for the particular assignment. All words in a paper must be your words, unless they are enclosed in quotation marks. Use direct quotes sparingly and use them to illustrate ideas, never to present or explain an idea. Even when you paraphrase material, it should be adequately cited. You **must** cite all work each time you use it. When in doubt, cite the material. Students assume the ultimate responsibility for their work. This liability includes (but not limited to) Academic Honesty. Please note the following excerpt from the University Catalog:

Plagiarism: The Modern Language Association's MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers defines plagiarism as follows: Repeating another's sentence as your own. Adopting a particularly apt phrase as your own. Presenting someone else's line of thinking in development of a thesis [ideas] as though it were your own. In short, to plagiarize is to give the impression that you have written or thought something that you have borrowed from another. Writers may use other persons' words and thoughts but must acknowledge them.

6. When you have questions about the course, assignments, etc., see me or email me. Don't talk to someone else in class and assume it is accurate. If you ask someone else, and they are wrong, then your performance may suffer.

7. Out of courtesy for all participating in the learning experience, all cell phones must be turned off before entering the classroom, and should not be turned on until class is over. This means, of course, that there should be no text messaging occurring during class. Laptops & tablets may be used, but please out of courtesy for others, do not use them for any other means except for taking notes and issues related to class (i.e., no Facebook or email reading).

8. Any student needing to arrange a reasonable accommodation for a documented disability and/or medical/mental health condition should contact Student Access and Accommodation Services at 350 Fell Hall, (309) 438-5853, or visit the StudentAccess.IllinoisState.edu.

Course Assignments

1. **POSITION PAPER ON RHETORIC**. This is due the second night of class (August 29). In approximately 5-7 pages (remember, quality is more important than quantity), you need to write about the nature of rhetoric, what it means to you, and why you think it is important to know how to effectively evaluate rhetoric. You may use the readings due for that night of class and/or you may use additional sources. **However**, this paper is about **your** position – not the summarizing or regurgitating of others' views on the subject. I expect you to defend and justify your position. This is a broad assignment – you can discuss anything you'd like as it relates to rhetoric, so long as you support your position. The purposes of this assignment are to encourage you to think about rhetoric and why it should be criticized, to help you summarize and prioritize your thoughts on the subject, to orient you to the topic of this course, and to provide you some feedback on your writing early in the semester. **In addition**, to orient you to writing succinctly, you need to write a précis at the very end of your position paper. The précis should concern the Keith & Lundberg book (all of it), and your précis should not exceed 150 words. You can check out an example of a précis here: http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/phl201/modules/rhetorical-precis/sample/peirce_sample_precis_click.html.

2. **CLASS DISCUSSIONS**: Virtually every class has a good deal of reading due before the class begins. I expect that you will do the reading before class begins. This is imperative for us to have meaningful and productive discussions. It will also be important for you so that you don't fall behind in the course. We will go through all of the readings (time permitting). Your participation grade will be derived solely from the quality of your discussion participation. Part of each class period will be spent on your reactions to the readings, so you will not be able to dodge questions or "hide" in class. I will then provide my "take" on the readings after you and your peers provide your input.

3. **CRITICISM PAPER ASSIGNMENTS**: (8 papers, but I will drop your lowest grade; each are worth 50 points). As you will notice from the tentative schedule, you will be responsible for a criticism paper that employs each of the major forms of criticism that we will examine in this course (except semiotics).

This will seem like a great deal of work for many of you, and it is. However, each paper (not including references) **must be 5 pages or less**. This will substantially reduce the work burden for you, but it will also challenge you to be succinct (hence the early exercise on précis writing).

Each paper will require you to locate a text/artifact of your choosing. You will then analyze the text/artifact using the criticism for that particular week. For example, if you are intrigued by a billboard that you believe can be understood by employing "ideology criticism," then you would use that text for your ideology criticism assignment. In addition to our assigned readings, you may want to quickly examine the works of other scholars who use the particular method we will be discussing/using. You can also peruse the bibliographies of different types of rhetorical criticisms located at the Wake Forest University website:

<http://users.wfu.edu/zulick/454/454sources.html>

Given the length of these papers, no literature review is necessary, unless you want to mention previous examinations of your text/artifact in passing (or via footnote/endnote). Thus, the basic components of each paper (although not necessarily in this order, nor am I prescribing a formula) should include: an introduction (brief!), context/situation/description of the text/artifact, **brief** description of the method, analysis, conclusion. Obviously, the analysis section is very important.

Here is a bit more explanation for each component:

1. Introduction. Tell me what your topic is and why it is worthy of study
2. Context/situation/description of the text/artifact. Here is where you describe the context (*kairos*). You will also describe the text/artifact here and why it is important to examine.
3. Method. Describe the type of criticism you will be using. This should be thorough, yet **very brief**. You need to explain why the method is useful, why you're using this method as opposed to another, for what will you be looking to discover in the text, etc.
4. Analysis. As I mentioned above, this should constitute the bulk of your paper. You should be thorough in analyzing your text. You should incorporate samples of the text you're investigating, but remember the majority of this section should be your analysis – not lengthy block quotes from some other scholar or the primary text under investigation.
5. The conclusion. This is perhaps the most important part of the paper. Answer the **“so what”** question. In other words, why does your study matter? Why is it important? How does it advance knowledge in general and to the field of rhetoric in particular? What important insights should we have learned about the rhetorical implications by reading your paper? What areas of future research are there? Etc.
7. The references page. Don't forget this. Reference list should either use APA 6th edition, the latest Chicago style format, or the latest MLA format (but I'm not a real stickler when it comes to the particular edition). The references will not count toward your 5 page limit.

Grading

Criticism Papers (6 x 50)	300 points
Position Paper on rhetoric	25 points
<u>Participation</u>	<u>25 points</u>
Total	350 points

Note: Failure to turn in any of the course requirements may result in failure of the overall course. For all assignments, work that meets the minimum expectations and is “average” work will earn the grade of “C.” Work that exceeds the minimum expectations and shows initiative, support and is considered “very good quality” will earn the grade of “B.” Work that exceeds “B” level work by being exceptional and outstanding in all areas (high degree of initiative, excellent support, superior quality, etc.) will earn the grade of “A.” Work that has promise but falls below the minimum expectations will earn a “D,” and work that is well below the minimum expectations, needs serious re-crafting and/or is not graduate-level material will earn the grade of “F.” The Grading Scale is an A (4) = 90-100, B (3) = 80-89, C (2) = 70-79, D (1) = 60-69, F (0) = 0-59.

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS:

All papers and written assignments must be typed, double-spaced, and in paragraph form. The quality of your written work (grammar, punctuation, format, spelling, etc.) will be included in grading evaluations. The content of your work is necessarily implicated and impacted by the mechanics of the paper. Make sure you proofread all of your work and that it is photocopied or saved on a jumpdrive. If you forget to proofread or if you misplace your work, do not expect me to be sympathetic. I will not accept e-mailed copies of your written work. I reserve the right to choose whether or not to accept any late work. Any accepted late work will be automatically reduced one-letter grade for every class period that it is late. If you foresee problems, make sure you discuss them with me BEFORE the assignment is due. Accepting any late work is strictly at the instructor's discretion. In addition, make an argument!!!! Don't simply provide opinion. Support your reasons with sufficient evidence (including quotes, references, examples, etc.) that demonstrate, justify or prove your over-arching argument. All the written work asks you to analyze the rhetorical implications of something. The paper should also demonstrate your working vocabulary of the ideas expressed in the literature indicative of rhetoric and social movements or activist campaigns. **You should research your area thoroughly.** ANY AND ALL ARGUMENTS, IDEAS, WORDS, CONCEPTS, MATERIAL THAT IS NOT YOUR OWN MUST BE APPROPRIATELY FOOTNOTED AND CITED IN A BIBLIOGRAPHY PAGE. *Your research should avoid being conducted from the Internet, unless in special circumstances, where you need to obtain instructor approval.* Citations: Any and all work or ideas taken from another person or entity must be appropriately cited. This means that **material MUST be cited EACH time it is used** in your written work (not a simple reference at the end of a paragraph or end of your paper), AND it must have an appropriate full reference in a footnote or works cited page. You should also avoid doing whatever is minimally necessary to meet the assignment. If you set your sights that low, the best you will receive will be a C for your work; after all, a C is average and reflects minimal work. To receive a high B or an A, you should go well beyond what is expected of you – surprise and impress me. **All writings should be in Times New Roman, 12-point font.**

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

- WEEK 1:
R, 8/22 **Understanding rhetoric** [read: Baskerville (1977); Benson (1989); Keith & Lundberg, *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*; Kuypers & King (2009) in *RC* chp 1; Ott & Dickinson (2013); Scott (1967); Zhao (1991)]
- WEEK 2:
R, 8/29 **Basics of criticism** [read: Campbell (1974); Dow (2001); Foss (1996), chapters 1-2; Kuypers (2009) in *RC* chp 2; Palczewski (2003); Warnick (1992)]; **Position Paper due.**
- WEEK 3:
R, 9/5 **What makes “good” rhetorical scholarship?** [Brummett (2006); Darsey (1994); Hart (1994); Hunt (2003); Jordan et al. (2003); Hart (1994)]
- WEEK 4:
R, 9/12 **What is a text? And the “rhetorical situation?” And *kairos*?** [read: Bitzer (1968); Campbell (1996); Farrell & Young (2009) in *RC* chp 4; Kinneavy, (2002); Larson (1970); Leff & Sachs (1990); Sillars & Gronbeck (2000); Sipiorea, (2002); Vatz (1973)]
- WEEK 5:
R, 9/19 **Close Textual Analysis and Neo-Aristotelian/Traditional criticism** [read Best & Marcus (2009); Biane (2011); Brockriede (1974); Browne (2009) in *RC* chp 6; Brummett (2019), chapters 1-2; Fürsich (2009); Gatta (2010); Hill (2009) in *RC* chp 5; Leff (1986); Zarefsky (2008)]
- WEEK 6:
R, 9/26 NICD conference, work on papers
- WEEK 7:
R, 10/3 **Ideology/Marxism** [read Bost & Greene (2011); Brummett (2019), chapter 4; Charland (1987); Cloud (1994); Cloud (2006); Foss (1996); Greene (1998); Greene (2004); Grossberg (1979); Lee (2009) in *RC* chp 16; McGee (1980); Wood & Cox (1993); Zompetti (2012)]; **Traditional criticism paper due**
- WEEK 8:
R, 10/10 **Ideology/Marxism, part II.** We will continue our discussion from the previous week. All readings assigned for 10/4 should be read by 10/4, but they will also be our topic of discussion for 10/11.
- WEEK 9:
R, 10/17 Detroit Fulbright conference, work on papers
- WEEK 10:
R, 10/24 **Critical/Cultural Studies** [read: Grossberg (2015); Lucaites & Condit (1990); McKerrow (1989); McKerrow & St. John (2009) in *RC* chp 17; Ono & Sloop (1992); Ono & Sloop (1995); Zompetti (1997)]; **Ideology paper due**

WEEK 11:

R, 10/31

Feminism [read Dow & Tonn (1993); Dubriwny (2013); Foss & Griffin (1992); Foss, Foss & Griffin (2004); Lazar (2007); Nudd & Whalen (2009) in **RC** chp 15; Sowards & Renegar (2006)]; **Critical/Cultural Studies paper due**

WEEK 12:

R, 11/7

Race, Ethnicity & Identity Politics [read Enck-Wanzer (2011); Flores (1996); Flores et al. (2006); hooks (1992); Kelly (2011); Shome (2013); Shome & Hegde (2002); Watts (2001)]; **Feminism paper due**

WEEK 13:

R, 11/14

Narrative criticism [read Brummett (2019), chapter 3; Fisher (1984); Foss (1996), pp. 307-319; Rowland (2009) in **RC** chp 9; Warnick (1987)]; **Race, Ethnicity & Identity paper due**

WEEK 14:

R, 11/22

Burke and the Pentad [read Anderson et al. (2009) in **RC** chp 10; Burke (2013); Foss (1996), pp. 355-371; King (2009) in **RC** chp 11]; **narrative paper due**

WEEK 15:

R, 11/28

Thanksgiving Break

WEEK 16:

R, 12/5

So What?: Rhetorical Criticism, Activism, and the Public Intellectual [read: Black (2009) in **RC** chp 3; Crick (2006); Hartnett (2010); Klumpp & Hollihan (1989); Wander & Jenkins (1972)]; **Burke paper due**

FULL BIBLIOGRAPHICAL LISTING OF COURSE READINGS

Scans (listed under “resources & materials” in ReggieNet):

- Baskerville, Barnet (1977). Must We All Be “Rhetorical Critics”? *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 63(2), 107-117.
- Benson, Thomas W. (1989). Rhetoric as a Way of Being. In Thomas W. Benson (Ed.), *American Rhetoric: Context and Criticism*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Best, Stephen & Sharon Marcus (2009). Surface Reading. *Representations*, 108, 1-21.
- Biane, Amanda Rene (2011). *The Timeless Speech: A Close Textual Analysis of John Fitzgerald Kennedy’s Inaugural*. Senior Project at California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo.
- Bitzer, Lloyd F. (1968). The Rhetorical Situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 1(1), 1-14.
- Bost, Matthew, & Ronald Walter Greene (2011). Affirming Rhetorical Materialism: Enfolding the Virtual and the Actual. *Western Journal of Communication*, 75(4), 440-444.
- Brockriede, Wayne (1974). Rhetorical criticism as argument. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 60(2), 165-74.
- Browne, Stephen Howard (2009). Close Textual Analysis: Approaches and Applications. In Jim A. Kuypers (Ed.), *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action* (pp. 63-76). Lanham, MD: Lexington.
- Brummett, Barry (2006). *Rhetoric in Popular Culture* (2nd Ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Burke, Kenneth (2013). “Literature as Equipment for Living.” In Brian L. Ott & Greg Dickinson (Eds.), *The Routledge Reader in Rhetorical Criticism* (pp. 259-263). New York: Routledge.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs (1974). Criticism: Ephemeral and Enduring. *The Speech Teacher*, 23(1), 9-15.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs (1996). *The Rhetorical Act* (2nd Ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Charland, Maurice (1987). Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the People Québécois. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 133-150.
- Cloud, Dana L. (1994). The Materiality of Discourse as Oxymoron: A Challenge to Critical Rhetoric. *Western Journal of Communication*, 58(3), 141-163.
- Cloud, Dana L. (2006). Change Happens: Materialist Dialectics and Communication Studies. In Lee Artz, Steve Macek, & Dana L. Cloud (Eds.), *Marxism and Communication Studies: The Point Is to Change It* (pp. 53-70). New York: Peter Lang.
- Crick, Nathan (2006). Rhetoric, Philosophy, and the Public Intellectual. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 39(2), 127-139.
- Darsey, James (1994). Must We All Be Rhetorical Theorists? An Anti-Democratic Inquiry. *Western Journal of Communication*, 58(3), 164-181.

Dow, Bonnie J. & Mari Boor Tonn (1993). "Feminine Style" and Political Judgment in the Rhetoric of Ann Richards. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 79, 286-302.

Dow, Bonnie J. (2001). Criticism and Authority in the Artistic Mode. *Western Journal of Communication*, 65(3), 336-348.

Dubriwny, Tasha N. (2013). Feminist for President: Hillary Clinton, Feminism, and the 2008 Presidential Primaries. *Women & Language*, 36(2), 35-56.

Enck-Wanzer, Darrel (2011). Barack Obama, the Tea Party, and the Threat of Race: On Racial Neoliberalism and Born Again Racism. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 4, 23-30.

Fisher, Walter R. (1984). Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument. *Communication Monographs*, 51, 1-22.

Flores, Lisa (1996). Creating Discursive Space through a Rhetoric of Difference: Chicana Feminists Craft a Homeland. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 82, 142-156.

Flores, Lisa A., Dreama G. Moon & Thomas K. Nakayama (2006). Dynamic Rhetorics of Race: California's Racial Privacy Initiative and the Shifting Grounds of Racial Politics. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 3(3), 181-201.

Foss, Sonja K. (1996). *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice* (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Foss, Sonja K. (2009). *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice* (4th ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland. ISBN: 978-1-57766-586-1

Foss, Sonja K., & Cindy L. Griffin (1992). A Feminist Perspective on Rhetorical Theory: Toward a Clarification of Boundaries. *Western Journal of Communication*, 56, 330-349.

Foss, Karen A., Sonja K. Foss, & Cindy L. Griffin (2004). *Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Fürsich, Elfriede (2009). In Defense of Textual Analysis: Restoring a Challenged Method for Journalism and Media Studies. *Journalism Studies*, 10(2), 238-252.

Gatta, Thomas Michael (2010). *Uniting a Nation: A Close Textual Analysis of Barack Obama's Inaugural Address*. Senior Project at California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo.

Greene, Ronald Walter (1998). Another Materialist Rhetoric. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 15(1), 21-41.

Greene, Ronald Walter (2004). Rhetoric and capitalism: Rhetorical agency as communicative labor. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 37(3), 188-206.

Grossberg, Lawrence (1979). Marxist dialectics and rhetorical criticism. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 65(3), 235-249.

Grossberg, Lawrence (2015). The Long and Winding Road of Co-Existence. *Cultural Studies*, 29(1), 19-22.

- Hart, Roderick P. (1994). Doing Criticism My Way: A Reply to Darsey. *Western Journal of Communication*, 58(4), 308-312.
- Hartnett, Stephen John (2010). Communication, Social Justice, and Joyful Commitment. *Western Journal of Communication*, 74(1), 68-93.
- hooks, bell (1992). Selling Hot Pussy: Representations of Black Female Sexuality in the Cultural Marketplace. In bell hooks, *Black Looks: Race and Representation* (pp. 61-77). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Hunt, Steven B. (2003). An Essay on Publishing Standards for Rhetorical Criticism. *Communication Studies*, 54(3), 378-384.
- Jordan, John W., Kathryn M. Olson & Steven R. Goldzwig (2003). Continuing the Conversation on "What Constitutes Publishable Rhetorical Criticism?": A Response. *Communication Studies*, 54(3), 392-402.
- Kelly, Casey Ryan (2011). Blood-Speak: Ward Churchill and the Racialization of American Indian Identity. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 8(3), 240-265.
- Kinneavy, James L. (2002). *Kairos* in Classical and Modern Rhetorical Theory. In Phillip Sipiora & James S. Baumlin (Eds.), *Rhetoric and Kairos: Essays in History, Theory, and Praxis* (pp. 58-76). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Klumpp, James F., and Hollihan, Thomas A. (1989). Rhetorical Criticism as Moral Action. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 75(1), 84-97.
- Larson, Richard L. (1970). Lloyd Bitzer's "Rhetorical Situation" and the Classification of Discourse: Problems and Implications. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 3(3), 165-168.
- Lazar, Michelle M. (2007). Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Articulating a Feminist Discourse Praxis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 4(2), 141-164.
- Leff, Michael (1986). Textual Criticism: The Legacy of G. P. Mohrmann. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 72, 377-389.
- Leff, Michael, & Andrew Sachs (1990). Words the Most Like Things: Iconicity and the Rhetorical Text. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 54(3), 252-273.
- Lucaites, John Louis & Celeste Michelle Condit (1990). Reconstructing <Equality>: Culturetypal and Counter-Cultural Rhetorics in the Martyred Black Vision. *Communication Monographs*, 57, 5-24.
- McGee, Michael Calvin (1980). The "Ideograph": A Link between Rhetoric and Ideology. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 66(1), 1-16.
- McKerrow, Raymie E. (1989). Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis. *Communication Monographs*, 56(2), 91-111.
- Ono, Kent A. & John M. Sloop (1992). Commitment to Telos – A Sustained Critical Rhetoric. *Communication Monographs*, 59(1), 48-60.

- Ono, Kent A. & John M. Sloop (1995). The Critique of Vernacular Discourse. *Communication Monographs*, 62(1), 19-46.
- Ott, Brian L., & Greg Dickinson (2013). "Entering the Unending Conversation: An Introduction to Rhetorical Criticism." In Brian L. Ott & Greg Dickinson (Eds.), *The Routledge Reader in Rhetorical Criticism* (pp. 1-13). New York: Routledge.
- Palczewski, Catherine Helen (2003). What is Good Criticism?: A Conversation in Progress. *Communication Studies*, 54(3), 385-391.
- Scott, Robert L. (1967). On Viewing Rhetoric as Epistemic. *Central States Speech Journal*, 18(1), 9-16.
- Shome, Raka (2013). The Obligation of Critical (Rhetorical) Studies to Build Theory. *Western Journal of Communication*, 77(5), 514-517.
- Shome, Raka & Radha S. Hegde (2002). Postcolonial Approaches to Communication: Charting the Terrain, Engaging the Intersections. *Communication Theory*, 12(3), 249-270.
- Sillars, Malcolm & Bruce Gronbeck (2000). *Communication Criticism: Rhetoric, Social Codes, Cultural Studies*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Sipiora, Phillip (2002). Introduction: The Ancient Concept of Kairos. In Phillip Sipiora & James S. Baumlin (Eds.), *Rhetoric and Kairos: Essays in History, Theory, and Praxis* (pp. 1-22). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Sowards, Stacey K., & Valerie R. Renegar (2006). Reconceptualizing Rhetorical Activism in Contemporary Feminist Contexts. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 17, 57-74.
- Vatz, Richard E. (1973). The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 6(3), 154-161.
- Wander, Philip, & Steven Jenkins (1972). Rhetoric, Society, and the Critical Response. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58(4), 441-451.
- Warnick, Barbara (1987). The Narrative Paradigm: Another Story. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 172-182.
- Warnick, Barbara (1992). Leff in Context: What is the Critic's Role? *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 78(2), 232-237.
- Watts, Eric King (2001). "Voice" and "Voicelessness" in Rhetorical Studies. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 87(2), 179-196.
- Wood, Julia T., & Robert Cox (1993). Rethinking Critical Voice: Materiality and Situated Knowledges. *Western Journal of Communication*, 57(2), 278-287.
- Zarefsky, David (2008). Knowledge Claims in Rhetorical Criticism. *Journal of Communication*, 58(4), 629-640.
- Zhao, Shanyang (1991). Rhetoric as Praxis: An Alternative to the Epistemic Approach. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 24(3), 255-266.

Zompetti, Joseph P. (1997). Toward a Gramscian Critical Rhetoric. *Western Journal of Communication*, 61(1), 66-86.

Zompetti, Joseph P. (2012). The Cultural and Communicative Dynamics of Capital: Gramsci and the Impetus for Social Action. *Culture, Theory and Critique*, 53(3), 365-382.

Optional Articles:

Birdsell, D. S. (1987). Ronald Reagan on Lebanon and Grenada: Flexibility and interpretation in the application of Kenneth Burke's pentad. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73(3), 267.

Bormann, Ernest G. (1972). Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58(4), 396-408.

Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument. *Communication Monographs*, 51(1), 1-22.

Gunn, Joshua (2004). Refitting Fantasy: Psychoanalysis, Subjectivity, and Talking to the Dead. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 90(1), 1-23.

Harrell, Jackson, & Wil Linkugel (1978). On rhetorical genre: An organizing perspective. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 11(4), 262-281.

Lundberg, Christian (2004). The Royal Road Not Taken: Joshua Gunn's "Refitting Fantasy: Psychoanalysis, Subjectivity and Talking to the Dead" and Lacan's Symbolic Order. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 90(4), 495-500.

Miller, Carolyn R. (1984). Genre as Social Action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70(2), 151-167.

Rushing, Janice Hocker (1983). The Rhetoric of the American Western Myth. *Communication Monographs*, 50(1), 14-33.

William, Charles E. (1987). Fantasy Theme Analysis: Theory vs. Practice. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 17(1), 11-20.

Young, Cory (2005). Contemporary Native American Rhetoric: A Narrative Criticism of the Cherokee Rally. *Texas Speech Communication Journal*, 29(2), 131-141.

DR. Z's WRITING TIPS

How to use this guide: **Read this guide carefully.** Read it now, and read it before you turn-in your work. When you receive my feedback on your writing, I may use acronyms for certain principles in this guide – those acronyms are listed by the tips (e.g., tip #3 below has “EWP” at the end, meaning “ending with a preposition”.)

1. Spend more time on your writing. Proofread, proofread, proofread. Follow my tips. Have someone you trust (and who can be brutally honest) proofread your work as well.
2. Use a Thesaurus. Seriously!
3. Avoid ending sentences and clauses with a preposition (e.g., don't say, “those are the people I will be speaking with.” Instead, say “those are the people to whom I will speak.”) [EWP]
4. Use precise language – avoid vague language.
5. Avoid using conversational jargon, trite phrases, and informal writing. Do not write like you speak. You should write in a formal way and with a formal tone. Avoid using language like “going to,” something is “so” difficult, “whatever,” etc. The best way to do this is to read as much as you can, especially non-fiction (i.e., peer-reviewed journals, books on academic disciplines, etc.). [AWLPS – avoid writing like people speak]
6. Cite material EACH TIME you use it. [cite]
7. Cite evidence when you need to support a position or argument. [cite]
8. Vary your sentence structures.
9. Vary your word choice – don't repeat the same words (or variants of words) over and over again. [WC]
10. As you write, always ask “how” and “why.” If your writing doesn't answer these questions, you need more support (and/or evidence). Also, you should be sure to answer the “so what” and “who cares” questions to accentuate the significance and importance of your topic and your writing.
11. Avoid unclear pronouns. Instead of saying “it comes from pork,” be careful with the word “it” and say “bacon comes from pork.” Other pronouns to watch are: they, he/she/it, people, this, that, these, things, etc. Here's a good rule to follow: Imagine you are walking up to someone on the quad. If you just said, “it comes from pork,” they will have no idea what you mean. If, instead, you go up to them and say, “bacon comes from pork,” they will still think you're a whacko for coming up to them and saying that, but at least they will know what you mean! [UP]
12. Avoid saying "today's society" or phrases like it, such as "the world today." This is one of my ultimate pet-peeves. It is filler, clutter, and simply just junk writing. Be more specific and clear in your writing. If you are referencing a particular era, date, or period of history, say so. If you are talking about the present condition of things, chances are you have already described that or the reader will understand it. [YUK]
13. Be aware of there vs. their vs. they're.
14. Don't use contractions! Seriously, contractions detract from formal writing.
15. Also be aware of it's vs. its. "It's" is the **contraction** not the **possessive**. So, if you are referring to the stain on the book, you would say "its stain." You should **never** use "it's" because you should not use contractions in formal writing.
16. Be careful with dates. Often folks confuse 1970s vs. 1970's. More often than not, you will want to just use 1970s. The only time you use an apostrophe is if you want to show possession. E.g., "The 1970's economy was terrible."
17. Avoid run-ons. These are sentences that require commas to separate two full sentences, but have no commas. For example: "I detest papers that are written poorly and I love chocolate." The sentence should have a comma before the "and" to read: ""I detest papers that are written poorly, and I love chocolate." [RO]
18. Avoid sentence fragments (such as this). Sentence fragments are phrases or clauses (often complex) that are not full sentences.

Be sure all of your "sentences" have subjects and verbs! [FRAG]

19. Be careful with indented quotations. These are the lengthy quotes you may have in your paper that are distinct from the shorter quotations. Every line of indented quotations should be indented (hence their name) and they do not use quotation marks!!! Lengthy quotes that take 4 or 5 sentences should be indented – 1) the entire quote should be indented, 2) it should be single-spaced, and 3) it doesn't use quotation marks. [BQ]

20. Use proper citations. If you don't know how to cite material, you need to purchase an MLA or APA guide. You can always ask me or someone else for help. For in-text citations, you should have the author's last name and year. If it is a direct quotation, you should also include a page number, unless it is from a webpage. If there is no author (which is rare!!!), then you should cite the first couple of words of the title. NEVER put URL addresses in an in-text citation. For Bibliography/Reference citations, make sure that the citation is complete and accurate – this includes the author's name, the date, the title of the article/chapter, the title of the periodical/book, volume number (if a journal article), and if from a web source, include the full URL. The URL should be from a websource – if you are using material from a Milner database, DO NOT include the Milner URL – just cite the source as if it were a hard copy. You do not need to include DOI numbers for written work submitted to me.

21. Use adequate citations. **ANY** material that is not your own, that you quote, that you paraphrase, that you allude to, etc., **MUST BE CITED**. Failure to do so is plagiarism and is unacceptable. Proper citation – you should cite a source EACH time you use it, not at the end of a paragraph.

22. Avoid using the second person "you." Another big pet peeve of mine. This is sloppy writing. At times you may use the first person (e.g., "I"), but never use "you" unless you're quoting someone else. [2P]

23. Avoid writing like you talk. Some common examples are "doing this will be huge" or "like, this is important." Writing is fundamentally different than speaking, and you must be able to know the difference. [AWLPS]

24. Use dashes, not hyphens (-- vs. -). For example, if I say that good writing is important – it helps you get a better job, makes you appear more intelligent, etc., that is different than saying that you're a well-liked person (notice in the beginning the use of dashes, and the hyphen is used only for hyphenated language).

25. Be mindful of proper and appropriate paragraph development. This means that a paragraph should stick to one central point, but it should also be developed – meaning more than 2 or 3 sentences in length. Paragraphs should focus on a single concept or argument. So, while a paragraph should be long enough to develop a single, coherent argument, it should also not be too long – it should not include more than a single argument or unit of thought. Generally speaking, a paragraph should not exceed half or $\frac{3}{4}$ of a page. [¶]

26. Underline or italicize titles of books, periodicals, movies, TV shows, and musical albums. Use quotations for titles of TV show episodes, titles of articles in periodicals, and individual songs.

27. In general, follow the suggestions for composition in any widely-used manual of style. Pay special attention to the form for footnotes and bibliography entries. You may use whatever style you desire, as long as you use it consistently.

28. Papers should be expository or argumentative in nature. Avoid descriptive material unless it is brief and necessary to your overall argument. Narrative material on how you discovered the topic is neither necessary nor appropriate. Stay away from informal tones. Write your paper with the assumption that the readers are academics and/or scholars.

29. A paper is more than a receptacle for quotations from others. Do not produce a string of quotations held together only by transitions. Also, do not deposit quotations in the paper without preparing the reader with appropriate contextual material which elaborates on the quotation in an appropriate and useful manner. Finally, you should unpack and explain the significance of the quotation immediately after the quote. [SQ]

30. Please **double space**. Do not use 1-1/2 space. Leave ample margins at sides, top, and bottom so that comments may be made on the paper without great difficulty. I prefer Times New Roman, 12-point font.

31. Do not place papers in booklet covers or binders. Use staples to keep your paper together. Please do not dog-ear the pages.

32. Do not leave papers until the last minute. Please have consideration for your reader as well as pride of authorship, and allow enough time to prepare the paper so that your ideas may be expressed in clear, succinct, and stylistically appropriate ways. Poor writing due to last minute preparation will greatly damage the grade.

33. UMSL – "use more sophisticated language." Formal writing should use sophisticated language, not words such as "get" or "a lot"

or “got” or “x is so important.” **Use a thesaurus.**

34. Avoid referencing the class. Don’t say “as we’ve discussed in class” or some other form of referencing. It detracts from the formal nature of your writing.

35. Avoid generalizations – Avoid generalizations when it comes to descriptions of people (e.g., “all college students drink”), but also avoid generalizations when it comes to describing issues (e.g., “the media always criticize Bush”)

36. “Media” and “data” – these words are **plural!!!** This means you must be mindful of correct subject/verb agreement. For example, these are incorrect:

The media **has** discussed the election.

The data **is** informative.

These are correct:

The media **have** discussed the election.

The data **are** informative.

37. * in your paper indicates that a quotation needs a transition to introduce it.

38. URL addresses – First, don’t cite the URL address in the paper. Instead, cite the author or the first couple of words of the title. The full URL is stated in your bibliography page (or footnote). Second, change the color of the URL address to black and underline it. In other words, make it match the destination of the rest of your writing. [URL]

39. Webpaged material – although you should avoid using the Internet for your material, some of you will inevitably do so anyway. If you do, and you cut/paste it directly from the Internet, make sure the font matches the font you’re using for your paper.

40. Support your claims – if you make an argument, back it up with evidence. If you use statistics or complicated explanations for ideas that the average person probably wouldn’t know, back it up. For each claim that needs support, you should find at least TWO sources to support it.

41. If you emphasize a word or phrase in your paper and you feel it should be emphasized even more, do NOT italicize it or underline or put it in apostrophes. Special words should be important simply by reading them. If, however, you are coining a word or drawing attention to a word or phrase used in the literature, place it in quotation marks.

42. Any foreign words used in your writing should be italicized.

43. When citing web-based material, do **NOT** put the URL address in your paper. It should be cited by author or title. The URL address should be in the bibliography page only.

44. Citing material within your paper: Use embedded textual references or footnotes/endnotes – just be consistent with appropriate stylistic conventions. **DO NOT** place the entire title of a book or article in the text of your paper; there is no need for this, it just takes up space, it disrupts the flow of reading, and the full titles should appear in the bibliography/references page. All you need to cite in the text of the paper is the author’s (authors’) name, date and page number. If there is no page number, simply use “n.p.”

45. Citing material at the end of your paper: You must have an appropriate bibliography/references page. It should be listed alphabetically first, then if you have material from the same author, they should be listed by date in ascending order (i.e., the oldest date occurs first). If you have more than one source from the same author in the same year, indicate this by the use of letters at the end of the date (e.g., Zompetti 2010a, Zompetti 2010b, Zompetti 2010c, etc.).

46. Avoid putting titles of books and articles in your paper. They are unnecessary and take up too much space. They will appear in your Works Cited/Bibliography pages, so they do not need to be in the text of your paper.

47. Punctuation – Avoid doing these:

a. “Smith argues that writing is fun,” (Smith, 2010). [no comma before the quotation mark]

b. “Smith argues that writing is fun.” (Smith, 2010). [only use one period – should be after the parentheses]

c. “Smith argues that writing is fun.” (Smith, 2010) [only use one period – should be after the parentheses]

48. All papers must have a thesis statement, and then the subsequent paragraphs of your paper should support that thesis statement. A thesis statement is a one-sentence, declarative contention of yours about the position you will be advocating.

49. Please note that titles of books, journals, albums, TV shows, and anything that is a “stand-alone” product should be *italicized* or underlined (you may use either, but don’t use both – be consistent and only use italics or underlining). If you are citing a chapter of a book, an article in a journal or magazine, a specific song, or an episode of a TV series, then those should be placed in “quotation marks.”

50. Embedded references in the paper itself – The punctuation of the sentence should occur after the reference, and there should not be any punctuation before it. For example:

Incorrect: writing is fun. (Zompetti, 2009). [there should not be a period before the embedded reference]

Incorrect: writing is fun, (Zompetti, 2009). [there should not be a comma before the embedded reference]

Correct: Is writing fun (Zompetti, 2009)?

Correct: writing is fun (Zompetti, 2009), but it can be challenging.

51. Introductory prepositional phrases should be offset with a comma. For example, “Although the course was challenging, I still learned a great deal” or “In the United States, apple pie is yummy.” Notice the comma after the phrases.

52. Generally, you should avoid “so” in your writing. For example, avoid saying things like “I was so hungry.” Instead, simply say, “I was hungry,” or “I was very hungry.”

53. Items in a series use parallel structure. Example:

A. Incorrect: The student argued that they were busy, people said they were poor, and became ill after eating Avanti’s.

B. Correct: The student argued that they were busy, poor, and ill from eating Avanti’s.

54. Adverbs generally end in –ly and answer the question “how.” Thus:

A. Incorrect: I felt bad.

B. Correct: I felt badly. [I felt how? I felt badly.]

55. WMF – write more formally. This is similar to UMSL, but simply put, it means to write in a more formal way, as opposed to a journalistic or creative writing style.

56. Hyphenation – when two words (typically adjectives) function together to modify or describe a preceding noun, then the two words should be hyphenated. For example:

A. Hyphenate: A well-read student knows the difference between philosophy and religion.

B. Don’t hyphenate: A yellow, high post designates the height of the bridge. [“yellow” and “high” do not function together to create a single modifier – they are two separate adjectives]

57. Capitalize proper nouns – if a word also functions as the name or official label of an entity or group, it should be capitalized. For example, the words Republican and Democrat should be capitalized. However, the word democrat – a person who believes in democracy – is not capitalized because it refers to a general belief, not a particular political party.

58. Internet -- capitalize the “I” so that the word is spelled “Internet.”

59. All written work should be in Times New Roman, 12 point font.

60. Avoid words the end with “wise,” like “economy wise” or “culture wise” or “business wise.” This type of writing falls under AWLPS.

61. Avoid using the word “being” (as in “being that such and such...”) and “having” (as in “having to do something”). You can avoid these typically very easily. Instead of using “being,” use the word “since.” Instead of “having,” use the verb that follows it (e.g., “having to drive to the store,” could simply be “driving to the store”).

62. Punctuation when there are quotation marks.

A. [incorrect]: “The cat was black”, and I loved it.

B. [correct]: “The cat was black,” and I loved it.

63. Web citations when there is no author:

A. In the text of your paper, you should cite the source by its title if there is no author, such as this (Glenn Beck Biography, 2016, np).

B. Then, in the References Page, you should cite it like this:

Glenn Beck Biography (2016). Available: <http://www.biography.com/people/glenn-beck-522294> (accessed 4/22/16).

64. What constitutes a “scholarly source”?

A. From Dr. Darby Ray at Millsaps College:

In general, a **"scholarly" source is one that is written or edited by a "scholar"** – that is, a person who has earned a graduate degree in the field they are writing about. Having such a degree (usually a Ph.D.; synonym: a doctorate) means the person has had to prove that they have studied the field extensively and have mastered it well enough to be considered an expert in it. This doesn't mean that the person's interpretation of their field is beyond question or debate; rather, it means that they at least know enough about the field to have an INFORMED interpretation (in other words, one that others ought at least to consider).

People who are **professors at a college or university** may safely be considered "scholars" because they have usually earned a graduate degree in their field of knowledge.

People who publish books can usually be considered "scholars" because most publishers only publish books that have been reviewed by two or more experts in a field, which means that at least a couple of experts have agreed that the author of the book is well enough informed about their chosen subject matter to be considered a scholar. Hence, a book may usually be considered a "scholarly" source.

Articles in a journal published by a college or university can be considered "scholarly" because "scholars" have approved those articles.

Articles in a journal published by a scholarly group such as the American Medical Association or the American Bar Association or the Modern Language Association can be considered "scholarly" because, once again, such articles have been reviewed by experts in the field.

If you aren't sure whether or not the group that publishes a journal is "scholarly" or not (for instance, maybe you've never heard of the Modern Language Association and so don't know that it is the association of college and university English professors), you can look at the section in the journal where the list of editors is given. Scholarly journals usually list not only the editors' names but also their academic credentials (what degrees they have earned, or where they are a professor). If a journal offers no such list, then chances are it is NOT a scholarly journal because if it were, it would list the names and credentials of its scholars. You can find this information by looking at a hard copy of the journal or by visiting the journal's webpage and searching for its list of editors.

If you run across a random article on the Internet, you need to ask at least two questions:

- Who wrote the article, and is that writer a "scholar" (see definition of scholar above)? If no credentials of the author are listed, then he or she is probably NOT a scholar. If no author is listed, then the source is definitely NOT a scholarly source.
- Is the article sponsored by a scholarly organization (such as a university or college or scholarly journal)? If so, it can usually be assumed to be a scholarly source.

Magazines like *Time* and *Newsweek* often have good information in them, but because they usually do not document how they got that information (whether it came from reliable, well-informed sources or not), and because the authors of their articles are not usually "scholars" (refer to definition above), they are not usually considered scholarly sources.

(http://www.millsaps.edu/academics/heritage_how_to_identify_scholarly_sources.php)

B. From Michael Engle, Cornell University: **"Scholarly or peer-reviewed journal articles** are written by scholars or professionals who are experts in their fields. In the sciences and social sciences, they often publish research results.
(<http://guides.library.cornell.edu/scholarlyjournals>)

65. **Each** word should have purpose. Think carefully about the words you choose – is there a better word? Can you say what you mean more succinctly? Have you checked a thesaurus to review synonyms?

66. Review multiple drafts. Do not just print off your work as soon as you finish it. Go over it. Then, go over it again. Ask someone else to proofread it as well. Be sure to review my writing tips to double-check easy-to-fix problems (e.g., do a “search” of your document for words such as “you” or “get” or “getting,” etc. Those are easy to find and replace).

67. Use multiple examples from multiple sources!

A. If I try to convince you to vote in the election (assuming you haven't decided yet), are you just going to take my word for it? Or, if I just say, “hey, you have a civic duty,” is that reason alone sufficient to convince most people? Of course not! I should also say things like this election is super important, by not voting you may be jeopardizing something you care about, voting requires that you become educated about the candidates and issues which are important to be engaged in your community, etc. The more reasons I

use, the more likely I'll persuade with one or more of them.

B. We all know that some sources are just bad. Recall the examples I placed on ReggieNet that appear to be from ABC News but are actually bogus. Or, what if you were writing a report on climate change and you only found one source to support your claims – and that source happens to be a climate change denier?!? Your entire position would be based on just one source, and that source would be disputed by over 1700 of the world's leading experts! If you research multiple sources, you avoid this problem.

68. Avoid “filler” words that are vacuous in meaning, such as “true,” “truly,” “do,” and “does.” This can also occur with the word “had.” For example:

- A. Avoid: “In order to develop a true understanding of politics, I read the newspaper.”
- B. Correct: “In order to develop an understanding of politics, I read the newspaper.”
- C. Avoid: “I do believe that climate change is happening.”
- D. Correct: “I believe that climate change is happening.”
- E. Avoid: “I had discovered that politics is interesting.”
- F. Correct: “I discovered that politics is interesting.”

69. Avoid the word “amongst.” This is a word commonly seen in British English, and many Americans incorrectly assume it is a formal word. Instead, we should simply say “among,” which is still considered formal in American English.

70. Similarly, we should avoid the word “judgement.” This is the British way of spelling the word. In American English, we simply spell it as “judgment.”

71. Avoid the word “towards.” In American English, we just spell the word as “toward,” without the “s.”

72. Avoid the problem of “apart” vs. “a part.” When discussing division or separation, we use the word “apart,” as in “politics is splitting us apart.” When discussing groups or categories, we use “a part,” such as “we all like to be a part of something bigger, which is why I am a Republican.”

74. If you have questions, ask ME, not someone else who may not know about my grammar tips or who may not be knowledgeable about writing mechanics.

****Note:** You may think that grammatical conventions such as these are restrictive, perhaps even colonizing. You might be correct. However, they are also perceived as being important, particularly among scholars and potential employers. Therefore, it is in your best interest to master these NOW!!!