

Communication 3629:  
**Language and Social Interaction**

The Ohio State University  
School of Communication  
Spring 2018

Dr. Susan L. Kline  
Associate Professor  
Office: 3106 Derby Hall  
Office Phone: 614-292-0464  
Office Hours: Wed. 8:30-10:30 or by appt.  
[kline.48@osu.edu](mailto:kline.48@osu.edu)

Class: Monday and Wednesday  
11:10-12:30 pm.  
Room: 136 Baker Systems

This course explores the question as to how we use language to communicate in every day contexts. One function of language use is to discuss and debate issues that are important to us in our families, at work, and our communities. This term we will explore the role of language in two types of social interaction: dialogue and argumentation. The civil exchange of opposing perspectives is a cornerstone of democracy. Furthermore, surveys consistently show that employers desire those with strong communication and critical thinking skills. In this course we will explore what it means to conduct a dialogue and make good arguments. We will examine cross-cultural models of dialogue. We will also engage in activities to help you develop insights about dialogue and argument, and construct argumentative cases that are eloquent, evidenced-based and ethical.

### **COURSE OBJECTIVES**

By the end of this course students should be able to:

1. To know the differences between dialogue and debate as communicative events.
1. To understand the role of language in dialogue, argumentation and debate.
2. To develop our critical thinking abilities to analyze and evaluate the arguments of others
3. To develop our abilities to construct and present sound arguments in a debate with others.
4. To develop our ability to use language to conduct a dialogue with others.

**Catalog Description:** Examination of perspectives on and ways to analyze language use in everyday contexts, discourse in society, and implications for communication theory, practice, and competencies.

### **Course Texts**

Readings are drawn from a variety of sources on language and dialogue, argumentation, and debate, and will be posted on Carmen.

## Course Activities

Examinations. All students will take two examinations over the content of the course. These examinations will consist of multiple choice and essay items, and will each count 13% toward the final grade in the course. Make-up exams will only be offered for medical or other similar, legitimate reasons.

In-class activities and homework: Class time will be spent learning the language of dialogue and argument. We will engage in various exercises, such as sharing research (which will be assigned as homework), and learning about dialogue practices as well as debate strategies; worth 6%.

Participation in class and attendance will count 10%.

Dialogue and debate. Some graded work in the class will take the form of one dialogue facilitation and at least two debates (detailed explanations of each assignment is forthcoming):

- a. Dialogue facilitation: This speech will be 4-5 minutes plus Q&A. The focus of this speech is to develop skill in using language to present arguments for or against some position that incorporates the views of opposing perspectives. 8%
- b. Debate: At least two four-person debates will occur. One team will take the position of the “government” while the other plays the “opposition.” The assignment will incorporate thorough background research prior to the debate and have improvisation during the debate. Since the experience of debating is substantially different for the government and opposition teams, each student will debate twice: once as “GOV” and once as “OPP.” 24%

Written language use in dialogue and argument: Students will also compose written examples of dialogue and argument.

- a. Dialogue design. Students will explore, using a dialogue interview, how others think about a polarizing topic. 10%
- b. Letter to the editor; argument analysis. Students will analyze and write arguments that are eloquent and persuasive. 8%
- c. Briefs. Students will develop both an affirmative and negative brief, or summary of the arguments for his/her debate topic. 8%

## GRADING

Your grade in this course is a function of the following:

Exams: 26%  
Speech and Debates: 32%  
Dialogue paper: 10%  
Debate briefs: 8%  
Argument essays: 8%  
Homework: 6%  
Participation and attendance: 10%

A	93% – 100%
A–	90% – 92%
B+	87% – 89%

B	83% – 86%
B–	80% – 82%
C+	77% – 79%
C	73% – 76%
C–	70% – 72%
D+	67% – 69%
D	60% – 66%
E	Less than 60%

**To help you master the reading and class discussion material:**

1. Study guide questions for each reading will be available on our course website.
2. There will be in-class application exercises for you to develop your skill at analyzing and designing dialogue and argumentation.
3. Power-point outlines of lectures will be available on Carmen.

**Course Policies**

Participation. Students are responsible for attending class and participating in class discussion. Students with excessive absences (>4) will be evaluated under the class participation portion of the grade.

Scholarly integrity. Students are expected to demonstrate their knowledge with honor and credibility. It is imperative that all work you submit be your own. When you use someone else’s ideas, you must give proper credit to the original author(s). Please adhere to the latest edition of the APA manual of style when citing others’ work.

According to the Committee on Academic Misconduct, “Academic misconduct is defined as any activity which tends to compromise the academic integrity of the institution, or subvert the educational process,” (<http://oaa.osu.edu/procedures/1.0.html>). Further, the term “academic misconduct” includes all forms of student academic misconduct wherever committed and is illustrated by, but not limited to, cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices in connection with examinations. Instructors shall report all instances of alleged academic misconduct to the committee (Faculty Rule 3335- 5-487). It is the responsibility of the Committee of Academic Misconduct to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct. For additional information, see the Code of Student Conduct ([http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource\\_csc.asp](http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource_csc.asp)). Plagiarism of any kind on examinations or written assignments will not be tolerated. If you are caught plagiarizing, you will be prosecuted through appropriate University channels.

Diversity. The School of Communication at The Ohio State University embraces and maintains an environment that respects diverse traditions, heritages, experiences, and people. Our commitment to diversity moves beyond mere tolerance to recognizing, understanding, and welcoming the contributions of diverse groups and the value group members possess as individuals. In our School, the faculty, students, and staff are dedicated to building a tradition of diversity with principles of equal opportunity, personal respect, and the intellectual interests of those who comprise diverse cultures.

Title IX. Title IX makes it clear that violence and harassment based on sex and gender are Civil Rights offenses subject to the same kinds of accountability and the same kinds of support applied to offenses against other protected categories (e.g., race). If you or someone you know has been sexually harassed or assaulted, you may find the appropriate resources at <http://titleix.osu.edu> or by contacting the Ohio State Title IX Coordinator, Kellie Brennan, at [titleix@osu.edu](mailto:titleix@osu.edu)

### **Accessibility accommodations for students with disabilities**

**Students with disabilities that have been certified by the Office for Disability Services will be appropriately accommodated and should inform the instructor as soon as possible of their needs. Please review the following for more details: <http://ada.osu.edu/resources/Links.htm> The Office for Disability Services is located in 098 Baker Hall, 113 W. 12th Avenue; telephone 292-3307, TDD 292-0901; [slds@osu.edu](mailto:slds@osu.edu); <http://slds.osu.edu>**

## SCHEDULE

Day	Date	Lecture	Topic and Reading
Week 1: <u>The problem: The lack of civility and dialogue in American discourse</u>			
M	1/8	1	Course Introduction: A call for dialogue and argument in discourse
W	1/10	2	What is dialogue? What is argument? <i>Lunsford, A.A., Ruzs̄kiewicz, J.J., &amp; Walters, K. (2013). Everything's An argument, with readings. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins. Chapter 1. Everything Is an argument.</i>
Weeks 2-3: <u>Engaging in the language of dialogue: Cross-cultural models</u>			
M	1/15		Martin Luther King Holiday-no formal class
W	1/17	3	Features and types of dialogue, I. <b>Read two, your choice.</b> Carbaugh, D. (1999). "Just listen": "Listening" and landscape among the blackfeet, <i>Western Journal of Communication</i> , 63, 250-270, doi: 10.1080/10570319909374641  <b>Fish Philosophy:</b> <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CXbYQPa9OVY">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CXbYQPa9OVY</a>  Tracy, K. & Robles, J.S. (2013). <i>Everyday Talk: Building and reflecting identities</i> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Guilford Press. Ch. 10. Narrative.  Stewart, J. U&M: <i>Communicating in moments that matter</i> . Chagrin Falls, OH: Taos Institute publication. Chapters 1, 3
M	1/22	4	Features and types of dialogue, II. <b>Read two, your choice.</b> <i>Cooperrider &amp; Whitney, Appreciative inquiry. Read 15 pages, your choice.</i> <i>Walton, D. Types of dialogue handout.</i> Bohmann, J. (2000). <i>Public deliberation: Pluralism, complexity, and democracy</i> . Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press. Chapter 1. What is public deliberation: A dialogical account. pp. 53-66. Pearce, B. & Pearce, K. <i>Community building with dialogue reading</i> .
Weeks 3-6: <u>The language of argument</u>			
W	1/24	5	Facilitating Dialogue/Structuring arguments <i>A guide for training public dialogue facilitators: Everyday democracy.</i> Read 15 pages, your choice (e.g., Chapter 5).  <i>Lunsford, A.A., Ruzs̄kiewicz, J.J., &amp; Walters, K. (2013). Everything's An argument, with readings. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins. Chapter 7. Structuring argument.</i>  <i>Hill, B., &amp; Leeman, R.W. (1997). The art and practice of argumentation and</i>

*Debate*. London: Mayfield Publishing. Preparing evidence: Pp. 67-75.

- M 1/29 6 Evidence and building arguments  
*Inch, E.S., & Warnick, B. (1998). Critical thinking and communication: The use of reason in argument. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. Chapter 7. Evidence: The Foundation of Argument.*
- Inch, E.S., & Warnick, B. (1998). Critical thinking and communication: The use of reason in argument. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. Chapter 6. Read 137-142. Types of claims and propositions. OR*
- Holliban, T.A., & Baaske, K.T. (2005). Arguments and arguing: The products and process of human decision making, 2nd Ed. New York: Waveland Press. Chapter 8.*
- W 1/31 7 Reasoning; argument analysis  
Read *Inch, E.S., & Warnick, B. (1998). Critical thinking and communication: The use of reason in argument. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. Chapter 8. Reasoning: Making Inferences OR*  
*Holliban, T.A., & Baaske, K.T. (2005). Arguments and arguing: The products and process of human decision making, 2nd Ed. New York: Waveland Press. Chapter 6.*
- M 2/5 8 Dialogue speeches
- W 2/7 9 Dialogue speeches
- M 2/12 10 Dialogue speeches/Review
- W 2/14 Exam #1

Weeks 8-10: The language of debate

- M 2/19 11 Analysis of stock issues, flowing, debate roles  
*Holliban, T.A., & Baaske, K.T. (2005). Arguments and arguing: The products and process of human decision making, 2nd Ed. New York: Waveland Press. Chapter 11. Impromptu debates*
- W 2/21 12 Affirmative case construction and briefing  
*Ziegelmueller, G.W., & Kay, J. (1996). Argumentation: Inquiry and advocacy, 3rd edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. Chapters 11, 18.*
- M 2/26 13 Negative case construction and briefing  
*Ziegelmueller, G.W., & Kay, J. (1996). Argumentation: Inquiry and advocacy, 3rd edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. Chapter 19.*
- W 2/28 14 The Great Debaters film
- M 3/6 15 The Great Debaters discussion/Language in argument
- W 3/8 16 Dialogue and argument in politics
- M 3/12 Spring Break
- W 3/14 Spring Break

Weeks 12-17: Engaging in Refutation and debate

M	3/19	16	Refutation <i>Holliban, T.A., &amp; Baaske, K.T. (2005). Arguments and arguing: The products and process of human decision making, 2nd Ed. New York: Waveland Press. Chapter 9.</i>
W	3/21	17	Debate workshop office hours
M	3/26	18	Debate #1
W	3/28	19	Debate #1
M	4/2	18	Debate #1
W	4/4	19	Final debate format; disadvantages <i>Ziegelmueller, G.W., &amp; Kay, J. (1996). Argumentation: Inquiry and advocacy, 3rd edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. Chapter 19. (pp. 339-343)</i>
M	4/19	22	Handling Disadvantages: Answering disadvantages on the affirmative. Responding to affirmative answers to disadvantages
W	4/11		Debate #2
M	4/16		Debate #2
W	4/18		Debate #2
M	4/23		Debate #2/Review for Exam #2
W	4/30		<b>Exam #2</b>

There may be updates or changes in order to make the class a better experience for everyone. Any changes will be posted to Carmen and announced in class.