

COMM 322: Argumentation & Advocacy 4 Units

Spring 2020 – Mon/Weds –
10:00-11:50am, 12:00-1:50pm, 2:00-3:20pm
Sections: 20511R, 20512R, 20513R
Location: ANN 305

Instructor: Carlos Godoy PhD, Esq.
Office: ASC 333
Office Hours: Mon/Weds 3:30-5:30 & by Appt.
Contact Info: cgodoy@usc.edu
Telephone: 909-576-1884

Course Description

Basic argumentation theory including analysis. Research and evidence, case construction, refutation; discursive and visual argument; diverse fields of advocacy including law, politics, organizations, interpersonal relations. Argumentation is a process of give-and-take. While the process of arguing involves disagreement, it need not—and should not—be disagreeable. Being a good arguer is not synonymous with being argumentative or quarrelsome. On the contrary, an effective arguer is open-minded, a good listener, respectful of the opinions of others, and able to fashion arguments in a way that others will find reasonable. Thus, it is very important that you be present and prepared to participate appropriately in each class not only as an advocate but also as an audience. The best policy is to always **T.H.I.N.K.** before you speak by ensuring that your comment is: **Thoughtful, Helpful, Interesting, Necessary, Kind.**

Debate Topic:

This semester, we will be researching and debating a current hot issue:

“Resolved: That the Federal Government should significantly strengthen control of firearms and/or ammunition in the United States.”

Student Learning Outcomes

- To understand the history and evolution of argumentation theories
- To develop your ability to critically analyze and evaluate the arguments of others
- To develop your ability to construct and present sound arguments
- To understand the nature, functions, forms and contexts of argumentation as a communication event

Course Notes

There is a course website at blackboard.usc.edu. All students enrolled in this course have access to the website through their USC username and password. This website is an official place for posting information relevant to the class, such as announcements, assignments, grades, lecture materials, and so on.

Description and Assessment of Assignments:

1 Minute Speech Assignment: Present your best argument on climate change (Pro or Con) using the TOULMIN MODEL. This means that you make a clear claim/s, support the claim/s with high quality evidence and reasons; have a warrant or warrants that link the grounds (evidence reasons) to the claim/s, provide backing for the warrant, identify the most significant exceptions (rebuttal) to your claim/s, and assign a qualifier to your claim with justification. Main Criteria for Evaluation: How well you incorporate the Toulmin Model into your argument & your accuracy in labeling the elements of the Toulmin Model. You will read your speech and hand in the speech with each element of the Toulmin method identified (e.g. labeled). Time Limit: 1 minute (45 second leeway without penalty).

Presidential Debate Analysis: This past election season, there were three Presidential debates and one Vice-Presidential debate. Type your answers to the following questions about one of the two presidential debates you watched and turn it in on the day of the Midterm. 1. Describe the format of the debate you watched. (Role of moderator, time limits, rebuttal, setting, topics, etc.) [5 points] 2. List one question that you found most relevant to the election. [5 points] Summarize each candidate's response. [10pts] 3. Critique each candidate's debating skills, as displayed during this debate. Make note of tone, gestures, other para-verbals, etc. that the candidate displays throughout the debate. [30 points] 4. If you were a debate coach what would you recommend each candidate do to improve their performance on the next round? [30 points] 5. In your opinion, who won the debate? Why? [20 points]

Midterm Exam: Comprehensive format/Matching/Multiple Choice/Fill-In/Short Answer/Short Essay

In-Class Debates: You will debate Pro against one team and then you will have second debate where you will debate Con. Teams consist of pairs of two students. This is a competitive format and evaluations are based on multiple criteria that the entire class fills out per round. Your standing is based on these real-world evaluations. I give medals to the top 3 scoring teams. Your individual grades are based both on your overall ranking and on my assessment of your improvement from round to round.

Final Exam: Because you are an expert in the field of Communication you have been hired as a consultant for a major political party. The candidate's team wants advice on how to coach their candidate to be more appealing both in terms of his/her personal presentation skills and with regard to the content of his/her campaign rhetoric.

You have been sent the following clips: The first shows the candidate debating. The second shows the candidate giving a speech

- 1) You should critique the candidate's debating skills, as displayed during the debate. Make note of tone, statements, gestures, other non-verbals, etc... that the candidate displays. What would you recommend the candidate do to improve for the next debate? (50% of grade)
- 2) Critique the candidate's speech. How would you describe the candidate's rhetorical strategy (e.g., Dramatism, Narrative Paradigm, Aristotelian)? Is this strategy effective for the audience it is intended for? Why or why not? Is the content of the speech effective? What would you recommend the candidate add or take out to make the speech more persuasive? (50% of grade)

You have 48 hours to complete the exam. The exam must be a minimum of 3 pages double spaced 12pt font and a maximum of 6 pages. You will be graded on how well you synthesize and apply the information you learned throughout the semester in Argumentation & Advocacy.

Grading

Participation 5%

One Minute Speech Assignment 5%

Presidential Debate Analysis 5%

Midterm Exam 35%

Two In-Class Debates 15%

Final Exam 35%

All assignments must be the original work of the student and cannot have been used previously or concurrently in any other course.

Grading Scale

95% to 100%: A	80% to 83%: B-	67% to 69%: D+
90% to 94%: A-	77% to 79%: C+	64% to 66%: D
87% to 89%: B+	74% to 76%: C	60% to 63%: D-
84% to 86%: B	70% to 73%: C-	0% to 59%: F

Assignments will be graded and posted within 2 weeks. All assignments are due on the dates specified. Assignments may be submitted in hard copy or via email.

Required Readings and Supplementary Materials

Readings:

Thomas A. Hollihan and Kevin T. Baaske, *Arguments and Arguing: The Products and Process of Human Decision Making*. (3rd ed.; Waveland Press, 2016) [REQUIRED]

[Los Angeles Times](#), daily [RECOMMENDED]

Other readings as assigned

Readings are assigned to enhance our understanding of argumentation theory and practice as well as to stimulate class discussion. All readings are **required** unless indicated otherwise. Readings will come primarily from the textbook. In some cases supplementary readings will be distributed via Blackboard or in class as handouts. Readings should be completed *before class* on the day assigned, and I expect you to bring your book and/or article(s) to *every* class session. Lectures will not cover all portions of the assigned readings and may cover additional materials not in the assigned readings; nonetheless, you are responsible for *all* materials, both in the readings and from lectures.

Laptop Policy

All undergraduate and graduate Annenberg majors and minors are required to have a PC or Apple laptop that can be used in Annenberg classes. Please refer to the **Annenberg Digital Lounge** for more information. To connect to USC's Secure Wireless network, please visit USC's **Information Technology Services** website.

Add/Drop Dates for Session 001 (15 weeks: 1/13/20 – 5/1/20)

Friday, January 31: Last day to register and add classes for Session 001

Friday, January 31: Last day to drop a class without a mark of "W," except for Monday-only classes, and receive a refund for Session 001

Tuesday, February 4: Last day to drop a Monday-only class without a mark of "W" and receive a refund for Session 001

Friday, February 28: Last day to drop a course without a mark of "W" on the transcript for Session 001. [Please drop any course by the end of week three (or the 20 percent mark of the session) to avoid tuition charges.]

Friday, February 28: Last day to change pass/no pass to letter grade for Session 001. [All major and minor courses must be taken for a letter grade.]

Friday, April 3: Last day to drop a class with a mark of "W" for Session 001

Course Schedule: Weekly Breakdown

Jan 13: Introductions: Course, Instructor, and Students. Communication as a tool to persuade and prevent conflict. The Nature of Human Nature, Desert Survival Group Cooperation Exercise, Rokeach Value Survey: Why values matter

Jan 15: Rhetorical Approaches: Aristotle (E.M. Griffin, Chapter 21 Blackboard Reading; Hollihan, Chapter 1) MLK I Have a Dream Speech Analysis -Aristotle

Jan 20: No Class -University Holiday Martin Luther King Day

Jan 22: Rhetorical Approaches: Burke (E.M. Griffin, Chapter 22 Blackboard Reading; Hollihan, Chapter 4) Malcolm X Bullet or the Ballot speech analysis -Burke

Jan 27: Rhetorical Approaches: Fisher's The Narrative Paradigm (E.M. Griffin, Chapter 23 Blackboard Reading; Hollihan Chapter 2) Three Little Pigs

Jan 29: Advocacy: Obama/Putin Syrian Intervention speech analysis from the perspective of Fisher, Aristotle, & Burke, Republican Presidential Primary Debate Analysis: The Trump Factor

Jan 24: Interpersonal Debate Exercises: Hot Air Balloon Debates, If I Ruled the World, and I Couldn't Disagree More

Jan 29: How best to persuade someone (Cialdini-Influence Blackboard Readings)

Feb 3: Persuasive Message Construction and Presentation Strategies continued....

Feb 5: Toulmin Method & Types of Argument (Hollihan, Chapter 3, Chapter 6) (Toulmin Exercise Handout) The Grounds of Argument. READ: **Chapter 7**; VIEW: “**An Inconvenient Truth**” *Global warming Speech Assignment (data collection/warrants/claims/grounds) Building an argument. One Minute Global Warming Speech Assignment*

Feb 10: Inconvenient Truth & Cool-IT Film continued

Feb 12: Persuasion How best to persuade someone (Cialdini-Influence Blackboard Reading)

Feb 17: No Class University Holiday President’s Day

Feb 19: Persuasion continued. One Minute Speeches read aloud in class

Feb 24: State of the Union Analysis -Obama, State of the Union Analysis -Trump, persuasion strategies. First Presidential Debate Analysis –Clinton vs. Trump

Feb 26: Second Presidential Debate Analysis-Clinton, Wayne La Pierre & President Obama Speech Analysis

Mar 2: Introducing Gun Control Ted Nugent & Piers Morgan Debate Analysis

Mar 4: *Midterm Review & Study Guide Handout*

Mar 9: **Midterm & Presidential Debate reaction paper evaluations of the candidate performances due**

Mar 11: Third & Final Presidential Debate Analysis; Political & Public Policy Argumentation (Hollihan, Chapter 5 & Chapter 10)

March 15-22 Spring Recess

Mar 23: John Oliver Guns in America; Review of Mass Shootings in America

Mar 25: The Great Debaters Film

Mar 30: The Great Debaters Film Continued/Team Assignment/Scheduling

Apr 1: Affirmative Brief Construction

Apr 6: Negative Brief Construction

Apr 8: Affirmative/Negative Brief Construction Meetings

Apr 13: Affirmative/Negative Brief Construction Meetings & 3 Minute Policy Debate Speech due and rehearsed. Your choice-either Pro-Gun Control or Anti-Gun Control Speech rehearsed.

Apr 15: Debates

Apr 20: Debates

Apr 22: Debates

Apr 27: Debates

Apr 29: Debate Final Championship Rounds and *Last day of class*;
Teammate Assessments Due; Final Debate Policy Briefs Due

Study Days -May 2nd through May 5th

Final Exam Schedule:

Class Section 10AM Mon/Weds – Final Exam May 11th 8-10am

Class Section 12PM Mon/Weds – Final Exam May 8th 11-1pm

Class Section 2PM Mon/Weds – Final Exam May 11th 2-4pm

Communication

If you cannot come to office hours, please email or call me to let me know if you are having any issues or need clarification on anything. I am very understanding, helpful and kind.

Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems

a. Academic Conduct

Plagiarism

Plagiarism – presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in *SCampus* in Part B, Section 11, “Behavior Violating University Standards” policy.usc.edu/scampus-part-b. Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in *SCampus* and university policies on scientific misconduct, policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct.

b. Support Systems

Counseling and Mental Health - (213) 740-9355 – 24/7 on call

studenthealth.usc.edu/counseling

Free and confidential mental health treatment for students, including short-term psychotherapy, group counseling, stress fitness workshops, and crisis intervention.

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline - 1 (800) 273-8255 – 24/7 on call

suicidepreventionlifeline.org

Free and confidential emotional support to people in suicidal crisis or emotional distress 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

*Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention and Services (RSVP) - (213) 740-9355(WELL),
press “0” after hours – 24/7 on call*

studenthealth.usc.edu/sexual-assault

Free and confidential therapy services, workshops, and training for situations related to gender-based harm.

Office of Equity and Diversity (OED)- (213) 740-5086 / Title IX – (213) 821-8298
equity.usc.edu, titleix.usc.edu

Information about how to get help or help someone affected by harassment or discrimination, rights of protected classes, reporting options, and additional resources for students, faculty, staff, visitors, and applicants. The university prohibits discrimination or harassment based on the following *protected characteristics*: race, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, age, physical disability, medical condition, mental disability, marital status, pregnancy, veteran status, genetic information, and any other characteristic which may be specified in applicable laws and governmental regulations. The university also prohibits sexual assault, non-consensual sexual contact, sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, stalking, malicious dissuasion, retaliation, and violation of interim measures.

Reporting Incidents of Bias or Harassment - (213) 740-5086 or (213) 821-8298
usc-advocate.symplicity.com/care_report

Avenue to report incidents of bias, hate crimes, and microaggressions to the Office of Equity and Diversity | Title IX for appropriate investigation, supportive measures, and response.

The Office of Disability Services and Programs - (213) 740-0776
dsp.usc.edu

Support and accommodations for students with disabilities. Services include assistance in providing readers/notetakers/interpreters, special accommodations for test taking needs, assistance with architectural barriers, assistive technology, and support for individual needs.

USC Support and Advocacy - (213) 821-4710
uscsa.usc.edu

Assists students and families in resolving complex personal, financial, and academic issues adversely affecting their success as a student.

Diversity at USC - (213) 740-2101
diversity.usc.edu

Information on events, programs and training, the Provost's Diversity and Inclusion Council, Diversity Liaisons for each academic school, chronology, participation, and various resources for students.

USC Emergency - UPC: (213) 740-4321, HSC: (323) 442-1000 – 24/7 on call
dps.usc.edu, emergency.usc.edu

Emergency assistance and avenue to report a crime. Latest updates regarding safety, including ways in which instruction will be continued if an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible.

USC Department of Public Safety - UPC: (213) 740-6000, HSC: (323) 442-120 – 24/7 on call

dps.usc.edu

Non-emergency assistance or information.

Annenberg Student Success Fund

<https://annenbergs.usc.edu/current-students/resources/annenbergs-scholarships-and-awards>

The Annenberg Student Success Fund is a donor-funded financial aid account available to USC Annenberg undergraduate and graduate students for non-tuition expenses related to extra- and co-curricular programs and opportunities.

Breaking Bread Program [undergraduate students only]

<https://undergrad.usc.edu/faculty/bread/>

The Breaking Bread Program is designed to provide individual undergraduate students with an opportunity to meet and have scholarly discussions with faculty members outside of the normal classroom setting. Through this program, students and faculty enjoy good company and great conversation by literally “breaking bread” over a meal together and USC will pick up the tab! Your meal event can take place anywhere outside of the normal classroom setting. Your venue can be a restaurant or eatery on or off-campus.

About Your Instructor: Carlos Godoy earned his J.D. from UC Berkeley in 1998 and his Ph.D. from USC Annenberg in 2007. His primary research focuses on the role that virtual environments may play in diagnosing and changing real-life decision-making and behavior. He has served as a public policy consultant for the Institute of Medicine assessing the state of science on the health status of LGBT populations. Specifically, Professor Godoy examined the impact of the internet on the health of LGBT people; the opportunities that new technology provides to conduct innovative research with LGBT populations, including hard to reach subgroups; the utilization of electronic health records to assure that health systems can track outcomes for populations at risk for unequal treatment; and the use of internet technology for primary, secondary and tertiary prevention and management of chronic disease among LGBT populations. Prior to joining USC Annenberg he worked as an assistant professor of communication at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and as a civil litigation attorney.

Publications

Lynn C. Miller, Sonia Jawaid Shaikh, David C. Jeong, Liyuan Wang, Traci K. Gillig, Carlos G. Godoy, Paul R. Appleby, Charisse L. Corsbie-Massay, Stacy Marsella, John L. Christensen & Stephen J. Read (2019) Causal Inference in Generalizable Environments: Systematic Representative Design, *Psychological Inquiry*, 30:4, 173-202, DOI: [10.1080/1047840X.2019.1693866](https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2019.1693866)

Smith, B.J., Xue, F., Droutman, V., Barkley-Levenson, E., Melrose, A.J., Miller, L. C., Monterosso, J.R., Bechara, A., Appleby, P.R., Christensen, J.L., Godoy, C. G., Read, S.J. (2018) Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience. Virtually ‘in the heat of the moment’: Insula activation in safe sex negotiation among risky men. Volume 13, Issue 1, 1 January 2018, Pages 80–91, <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsx137>

Corsbie Massay, C., Miller, L.C., Appleby, P.R., Christensen, J.L., Godoy, C.G., & Read, S.J. *Identity and Sexual Risk for Black and Latino YMWM*. (2016) *AIDS and Behavior*.

Miller, L.C., Christensen, J.L., Appleby, P.R., Read, S.J., Marsella, S., Corsbie-Massay, C., Godoy, C.G., Anderson, J., Jeong, D., Park, M. (2014) *Socially Optimized Learning in Virtual Environments (SOLVE): Developing, Evaluating, and Disseminating A Game HIV Prevention Intervention Nationally Over the Web*. Journal of Mobile Technology in Medicine. 3:1S:4.

Godoy, C.G., Miller, L.C., Corsbie-Massay, C., Christensen, J.L., , & Read, S.J., Si, M. (2013). *Virtual Validity, mHealth simulation games, diagnostic indicators and behavior change*. Journal of Mobile Technology in Medicine. 2:4S:17.

Godoy, C.G., Miller, L.C., Christensen, J.L., Appleby, P.R., Corsbie-Massay, C., & Read, S.J. (2013). *Results of an online HIV prevention randomized control*. Annals of Behavioral Medicine Volume 39, Issue 2.

Christensen, J.L., Miller, L.C., Appleby, P.R., Corsbie-Massay, C., Godoy, C.G., Marsella, S.C., Read, S.J. (2013). *Reducing shame in a game that predicts HIV risk reduction for young adult men who have sex with men: a randomized trial delivered nationally over the web*. Journal of the International AIDS Society. Vol. 16. Issue 3.

Miller, L.C., Appleby, R. P., Christensen, J.L., Godoy, C., Corsbie-Massay, C., Read, S. J., Marsella, S., & Si, M.. (2011) *Virtual agents and virtual sexual decision-making: Interventions for on-line applications that change real-life risky sexual choices*. In S. Noar & Harrington, N. (Eds.) Interactive Health Communication Technologies: Promising Strategies for Health Behavior Change. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates)

Godoy, C.G. (2010) *Using Virtual Environments to Unobtrusively Measure Risk-Taking: Findings and Implications for Health Communication Interventions*. VDM Verlag Muller.

Miller, L.C., Christenson, J.L., Godoy, C.G., Appleby, P.R., Corsbie-Massay, C., & Read, S.J. (2009). *Reducing Risky Decision-Making in the Virtual and in the Real World: Serious Games, Intelligent Agents, and a SOLVE approach*. In U. Ritterfield, M. Cody, P. Vorderer (Eds.) Serious Games: Mechanisms and Effects. Routledge/LEA Press.

Godoy, C.G., Christensen, J.L., Miller, L.C., Appleby, P.R., Corsbie-Massay, C., & Read, S.J. (2008). *Guilty Pleasures: Using Virtual Environments to Reduce Risk-Taking*. Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 35, s63.

Godoy, C.G., Appleby, P.R., Miller, L.C., Christenson, J.L., Read, S.J., & Corsbie-Massay, C. (2008). *Been There, Done That: Virtual Risk-Taking and the Theory of Planned Behavior*. Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 35, s63.

Appleby, P.R., Godoy, C., Miller, L.C., & Read, S. J. (2007). *Increasing healthy behavior through the use of interactive video technology*. In T. Edgar, S. M. Noar, V.S. Freimuth (Eds.). Communication perspectives for HIV/AIDS in the 21st century. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

WELCOME TO THE CLASS!