



COMM-636, American Public Communication, Fall, 2017

Instructor: Dr. Christopher M. Duerringer

Phone: (562) 985-1647

Office Hours: Th 8:30-9:15am

Course: COMM-636

Class Days/Times: Th, 9:30-12:15pm

Office: AS-363

Email: Christopher.Duerringer@csulb.edu

Prerequisites: COMM-541

Term: Fall, 2017

Class Location: LA2-107

Course Description

The idea of “the public sphere” figures centrally in most modern formulations of democratic society. Conceptualized as a discursive space (constructed by and for discourse), the public sphere represents the modernist impulse in political science and rhetoric: in the ideal public sphere, the better argument prevails and, per force, drives public institutions. Actual discourse practices in deliberative democracies, however, fund biting critiques of this model. The public sphere is also challenged by geopolitical, economic, and theoretical exigencies. Our class together this semester, *The Public Sphere, Rhetoric, and Dissent*, will explore the history of the public sphere and its relationships with other spheres of human action. We will consider the complicated births, lives, deaths, and rebirths of publics. We will also examine the publics and the public sphere in relation to a number of other related lines of theoretical inquiry from queer theory, feminist theory, globalization theory, counterpublic theory, and critical/cultural studies.

Course Goals/Student Learning Objectives

- To master foundational theories of the public, the public sphere, and counterpublics
 - Demonstrated by in-class dialogue, activities, final exam, and end-of-year paper presentation
- To recognize the relationships among the public sphere, social movements, and rhetoric
 - Measured by response papers, the semester-long project, and the final exam
- To produce a conference-ready piece of scholarship
 - Measured by the quality and coherence of the final project and its presentation

Required Texts/Readings

Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. New York: Holt.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger & F. Lawrence, trans.). Boston, MA: MIT Press.

All other readings will be posted to BeachBoard. You are responsible for printing and reading these essays in advance of each class.

Computer Access

Two open access computer labs are available for current CSULB students. Both the Horn Center (located in lower campus) and the Spidell Technology Center (located in Library) are a great resource for students needing to use a computer. Visit the [Open Access Computing Facilities - http://www.csulb.edu/library/guide/computing.html](http://www.csulb.edu/library/guide/computing.html) website for an extensive list of all available software installed in both computer labs.

BeachBoard Access

There is an online component to this course. It is your responsibility to know how to access and interact with the BeachBoard site. Check the BeachBoard site often! This is where course material, weekly readings, and course updates will be posted. You will also submit your essays through the TurnItIn system on BeachBoard. I will not accept any assignments via email. To access this course on [BeachBoard - https://bbcsulb.desire2learn.com/](https://bbcsulb.desire2learn.com/) you will need access to the Internet and a supported Web browser



(Firefox is the recommended browser). You log in to [BeachBoard - https://bbcsulb.desire2learn.com/](https://bbcsulb.desire2learn.com/) with your CSULB Campus ID and BeachID password. Bookmark this link for future use, or you can always access it by going to [CSULB - http://www.csulb.edu/](http://www.csulb.edu/)'s homepage and clicking on the BeachBoard link at the top of the page.

Once logged in to BeachBoard, you will see the course listed in the My Courses widget on the right; click on the title to enter the course.

Course Schedule

08/31: Welcome, Orientation, and Overview

Chambers, S. (2009). Rhetoric and the public sphere: Has deliberative democracy abandoned mass democracy? *Political Theory*, 37(3), 323-350.

Warner, M. (2002). Public and private. In *Publics and Counterpublics* (pp. 21-63). New York: Zone Books.

09/7: The Public and Its Problems

Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. New York: Holt. (read pp. 1-74)

09/14: The Public and Its Problems (cont'd)

Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. New York: Holt. (read pp. 110-184, 217-219)

09/21: The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger & F. Lawrence, trans.). Boston, MA: MIT Press. (read pp. xii-140)

09/28: The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere (cont'd)

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger & F. Lawrence, trans.). Boston, MA: MIT Press. (read pp. 141-250)

10/5: Dewey's Impact in Rhetorical Studies

Asen, R. (2003). The multiple Mr. Dewey: Multiple publics and permeable borders in John Dewey's theory of the public, *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 39, 174-188.

Greene, R. W. (2003). John Dewey's eloquent citizen: Communication, judgment, and postmodern capitalism. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 39, 189-200.

Stob, P. (2005). Kenneth Burke, John Dewey, and the pursuit of the public. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 38(3), 226-247.

Clark, L. (2012). The public and its affective problems. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 45(4), 376-405.

10/12: The Emergence and Development of Public Sphere Theory in Rhetorical Studies

Hauser, G. A., & Blair, C. (1982). Rhetorical antecedents to the public. *Pre/Text*, 3, 139-167.

Goodnight, G. T. (1982). The personal, technical, and public spheres of argument: A speculative inquiry into the art of public deliberation. *Journal of the American Forensics Association*, 18, 214-227.

Phillips, K. R. (1996). The spaces of dissension: Reconsidering the public sphere. *Communication Monographs*, 64, 270-275.

Haas, T. (2004). The public sphere as a sphere of publics: Rethinking Habermas's Theory of the Public Sphere. *Journal of Communication*, 54(1), 179-184.

10/19: Critiques of the Public Sphere

Squires, C. R. (2002). Rethinking the black public sphere: An alternative vocabulary for multiple public spheres. *Communication Theory*, 12, 446-468.

DeLuca, K. M., & Peebles, J. (2002). From public sphere to public screen: Democracy, activism, and the "violence" of Seattle. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 19(2), 125-151.

Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2003). Mobile transformations of 'public' and 'private' life. *Theory, Culture, and Society*, 20, 107-125.

Finnegan, C. A., & Kang, J. (2004). "Sighting" the public: Iconoclasm and public sphere theory. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 90, 377-402.



COMM-636, American Public Communication, Fall, 2017

10/26: Theorizing Counterpublics

- Fraser, N. (1992). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Habermas and the public sphere* (pp. 109-142). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Asen, R. (2000). Seeking the counter in counterpublics. *Communication Theory*, 10, 424-446.
- Brouwer, D. C. (2006). Communication as counterpublic. In G. J. Shepherd, J. St. John, & T. Striphas (Eds.), *Communication as...: Perspectives on theory* (pp. 195-208). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

11/2: Case Studies of Publics

- Brouwer, D. C. (2005). Counterpublicity and corporeality in HIV/AIDS zines. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 22, 351-371.
- Squires, C. (2001). The black press and the state. In R. Asen & D. C. Brouwer (Eds.), *Counterpublics and the state* (pp. 111-136). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Katriel, T. (1994). Sites of memory: Discourses of the past in Israeli and pioneering settlement museums. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 80, 1-20.
- Dunn, T. R. (2011). Remembering "a great fag.": Visualizing public memory and the construction of queer space. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 97(4), 435-460.

11/09: Case Studies of Publics (cont'd)

- Martin, F. (2000). From citizenship to queer counterpublic: Reading Tai Pei's New Park. *Communal/Plural*, 8, 81-94.
- Hoexter, M. (2002). The waqf and the public sphere. In M. Hoexter, S. N. Eisenstadt, & N. Levtzion (Eds.), *The public sphere in Muslim societies* (pp. 119-138). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Duerringer, C. M. (2013). The "war on Christianity": Counterpublicity or hegemonic containment? *Southern Communication Journal*, 78(4), 311-325.
- Kelsey Kearl, M. (2015). "Is gay the new black?": An intersectional perspective on social movement rhetoric in California's Proposition 8 debate. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 12(1), 63-82.

11/16: No Class Meeting: National Communication Association Convention in Dallas, TX

11/23: No Class Meeting: Thanksgiving Holiday

11/30: Emerging Economic, Technological, and Theoretical Challenges

- Fraser, N. (2007). Transnationalizing the public sphere: On the legitimacy and efficacy of public opinion in a post-Westphalian world. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 24, 7-30.
- Brouwer, D. C., & Asen, R. (2010). Public modalities, or the metaphors we theorize by. In *Public modalities: Rhetoric, culture, media, and the shape of public life* (pp. 1-27). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2015). Affective publics and structures of storytelling: Sentiment, events, and mediality. *Information, Communication, & Society*, 19(3), 307-324.
- Cavalcante, A. (2016). "I did it all online.": Transgender identity and the management of everyday life. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 33(1), 109-122.

12/7: Final Projects Due / Final Project Presentations

12/19: Take Home Final Due (10:15am-12:15pm)

Course Policies and Requirements

Reading Policy

Almost every professor will tell you that reading is strongly correlated with success in the classroom. This is especially the case in rhetoric. If you are to pass this class, you **must** devote yourself to carefully reading all the assigned material before each class; arrive prepared to actively discuss all readings and examples in class; and be able to write academically about your analysis of readings, discussions, and ongoing controversies. You can expect that I will come to each class prepared and ready to engage you in discussion, that I will encourage you express your ideas, and that I will provide a fun, safe, and positive learning environment.



Writing Policy

All written work for this course must be typed, on white paper, using 12 pt font, Times New Roman, properly cited (APA), and stapled (binder clips are fine, but please no paper clips). All written assignments must be turned in on time: NO LATE WORK WILL BE ACCEPTED without a University approved excuse (religious observance, illness, University-sponsored activity, or compelling circumstances beyond the student's control).

Evaluation Method

Assignment	Points	Weight
Reading Responses (11 @ 5pts each)	55	14.47%
Detailed Outlines (2 @ 25pts each)	50	13.16%
Discussion Leading (2 @ 25pts each)	50	13.16%
Project Proposal	25	6.58%
Semester Project	125	32.89%
Take-Home Final Exam	75	19.74%

Course Grading Scale

Percent Range	Letter Grade
90 - 100%	A
89 - 80%	B
79 - 70%	C
69 - 65%	D
Below 64%	F

Grade Descriptions

- A: Highest Level of Performance! Exceptional work with superior organizational and presentational abilities. Clear understanding and application of complex concepts, audience adaptation, and consistent quality of work.
- B: High Level of Performance! Student clearly understands the material and has met all and often exceeded some of the requirements.
- C: Adequate Performance. All assigned work completed. This is the bare minimum required. It has everything required and little else. If it were a job, you would not be disciplined, but not promoted either.
- D: Less Than Adequate Performance. Came up short. Did not complete all work. Clearly made some attempt, but failed to satisfy some of the requirements.
- F: Failure. Did a minimal amount of work. Final work product is ineffective.

If you would like above-average grades, you must do more than the bare minimum requirements.

Grade Dispute Policy

If you have a warranted disagreement and argument against my grading on a specific assignment, you may approach me to discuss it, following these standards. First, please wait 24 hours before approaching me. Second, please approach me within seven days of receiving your grade. Third, I will ask that you have a written list of reasons supported with evidence warranting a grade change. This list should be clear and concise, and should focus on the work, not issues relating to your personal life, your effort, etc. I will



review your written argument in relation to the assignment, and I will consider your case accordingly.

Communication Policy

The fastest way to reach me is via email (Christopher.Duerringer@csulb.edu). Of course, you are always welcome to come to office hours or to make an appointment if those hours don't work for you.

Late work/Make-up Policy

Generally speaking, I will not accept late work. However, the university recognizes religious holidays, government obligation (jury duty), or university sponsored events as excused absences. If you will be absent due to one of these reasons, you must inform me in writing prior to your absence in order to make up any missed work.

Plagiarism/Academic Integrity Policy

Academic dishonesty includes plagiarizing (using someone else's words or ideas without citation), cheating, and inappropriate collaboration on coursework. Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated. Students who plagiarize or cheat may receive an F on an assignment, an F in the entire course, or face further penalty at the instructor's discretion. If you have any doubt about this policy, please ask. Additionally, the instructor will report each and every case to the Academic Integrity Committee. The Committee may, in turn, choose to enforce its own sanctions, such as expulsion from the University.

Work that you submit is assumed to be original unless your source material is documented appropriately, such as a Works Cited page in correct APA format. Using the ideas or words of another person, even a peer, or a web site, as if it were your own, is plagiarism. Students should read the section on [cheating and plagiarism in the CSULB catalog](#) - http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/catalog/current/academic_information/cheating_plagiarism.html.

University Withdrawal Policy

Class withdrawals during the final 3 weeks of instruction are not permitted except for a very serious and compelling reason such as accident or serious injury that is clearly beyond the student's control and the assignment of an Incomplete grade is inappropriate (see [Grades](#) - http://www.csulb.edu/depts/enrollment/student_academic_records/grading.html). Application for withdrawal from CSULB or from a class must be officially filed by the student with Enrollment Services whether the student has ever attended the class or not; otherwise, the student will receive a grade of "WU" (unauthorized withdrawal) in the course. Please refer to the [CSULB Course Catalog](#) - http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/catalog/current/academic_regulations/withdrawal_policy.html to get familiar with the policy.

Attendance Policy

At the graduate level, unswerving attendance and passionate participation is simply expected. If you wish to succeed in this course, you must attend class diligently. I understand that circumstances may require that you miss a class meeting. If this is the case, it is your responsibility to arrange for a classmate to take notes for you. Please refer to and get familiar with the [CSULB Attendance Policy](#) - http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/catalog/current/academic_information/class_attendance.html.

Technical Assistance

If you need technical assistance at any time during the course or need to report a problem with BeachBoard, please contact the Technology Help Desk using their [online form](#) - http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/academic_technology/thd/contact/ or by phone at (562) 985-4959 or visit them on campus in the Academic Service (AS) building, room 120.



Inform Me of Any Accommodations Needed

Students with disabilities who need reasonable modifications, special assistance, or accommodations in this course should promptly direct their request to the course instructor. If a student with a disability feels that modifications, special assistance, or accommodations offered are inappropriate or insufficient, they should seek the assistance of the Director of the CSULB Disabled Student Services, please see their [website - http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/students/dss/](http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/students/dss/) or contact them via email at dss@csulb.edu or by phone at (562) 985-4635.

Classroom Respect

I request that you maintain respect for instructors, guests, and one another in the class regardless of different opinions, values or other group differences. While studying rhetoric that circulates in our popular culture and politics, it is not uncommon for very different opinions and beliefs to emerge. Our goal is to create a supportive and cooperative learning environment in which these differences can be expressed and explored. Students should give one another equal opportunity for discussion, and practice good speaking and listening skills.

Laptops & Personal Electronic Devices

A growing body of research shows that focus, comprehension, and information processing are all harmed by the use of electronic devices in classroom settings. If I see you using a cell phone in any way, I will ask that you turn the offending appliance off and stow it. If a second offense occurs, you will be asked to leave the room. You will be considered absent for any activity you miss after leaving the room. For each offense beyond the second, your final grade will be lowered by ten percent (10%). This policy applies equally to iPods, tablets, laptops, and all other forms of electronic communication and entertainment.

Worth a read:

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/reading-paper-screens/>

<http://www.newyorker.com/tech/elements/the-case-for-banning-laptops-in-the-classroom>

http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/03/science/whats-lost-as-handwriting-fades.html?_r=0

Class Material Disclaimer

Because this is a discussion-oriented course that involves discussion of culture, identity, and inherently political issues, it is possible that we may cover contentious and potentially inflammatory material. I am stating this up front so that you are aware of the possibility, and so that your continued enrollment in this course, following the reading of the syllabus, indicates that you are aware of this material and you have chosen to stay in this particular section of the class. I do not anticipate any problems, but it is important you are aware of this disclaimer from the beginning. Please talk to me if you have any questions or concerns.

Assignment Descriptions

Response Papers

Each Thursday, beginning on September 7 and continuing through November 30, our class will read important works that exemplify significant areas of theory and application in public and counterpublic sphere theory. On these days, you will be expected to come to class with a response paper, which summarizes your thoughts about the assigned readings for that day. What did you find thought-provoking or useful about them? What did you find most confusing, challenging, or disagreeable? Include direct quotes where appropriate. These brief 2-3 page responses are due on BeachBoard by 9am each Thursday.



Discussion Leading

Twice this semester, you will serve as discussion leader. On these days, you will be expected to read and outline one of our scheduled readings. You will arrive to class with copies of your typed outline (please provide one for each member of the class) that delineates the main points of the reading, and 3-5 discussion questions that draw our attention to the most significant innovations, implications, or issues that arise from the reading. During the course of the conversation, you will be expected to offer smart responses and help foster thoughtful discussion.

Final Project

Because I recognize that not all of our graduate students intend to become published authors or earn a Ph.D., students will have some flexibility in satisfying the requirements for a final project in this course.

After considering their desired future careers, students may choose to craft any of the following:

- A 12-15 page critical essay suitable for a conference, academic journal, or application to doctoral program
- A 12-15 page thorough and reflective review of literature on a growing area of inquiry suitable for submission to Review of Communication
- A pair of smartly written smaller papers (including a 2000-word G.I.F.T. **and** a 3000-5000 word think-piece suitable for The American Prospect, Vox, Slate, The Atlantic, etc.) employing public sphere or counterpublic sphere theory

Final Project Proposal

In this brief (2-3 pages, not including references) paper, you will describe the project you intend to complete. If you will write a critical essay or a review of literature, summarize the central claim(s) you hope to make, articulate a rationale for the worthiness of such a project, and furnish a list of at least 15 scholarly sources you expect to employ. If you will write a GIFT and think-piece, summarize the point of the exercise and the venue and major argument you hope to make for your think-piece.

Critical Essay

Your task in this term paper is to summarize, apply, extend, and/or critique concepts and issues related to our engagement with rhetorical theory and criticism this semester. Your complete draft should be 12-15 pages, not including references; and contain a minimum of 25 sources, 20 scholarly.

Basic Components of a Typical Critical Essay in Rhetorical Studies

1. Introduction
 - a. Intriguing hook or set-up
 - b. Specification of topic/research questions
 - c. Justification for study (why is this worth doing?)
 - d. Preview of theses/claims
 - e. Preview of subsequent essay sections
2. Body
 - a. Literature Review(s)
 - i. Informed selection of scholarly sources
 - ii. Description of key concepts and disputes
 - iii. Clear statement of your position with regards to such issues



- b. Elaboration of “method” or approach—how will you do your analysis? What procedures will you follow?
 - c. “Thick Description” (rich, detailed explanation) of context(s)
 - i. Socio-economic and cultural factors and influences
 - ii. Historical factors or influences
 - iii. Political factors or influences
 - d. “Thick Description” of text(s)
 - e. Analysis of text(s)
3. Conclusion
- a. Review of theses/claims
 - b. Clarification of your contributions—what did your project show us about this artifact, about theory, about rhetoric generally?
 - c. Acknowledgements of specific limitations of your study
 - d. Suggestions for future research

Review of Literature

Your task in this term paper is to summarize, synthesize, and evaluate a growing body of literature dealing with a given concept, theory, phenomena. Your complete draft should be 12-15 pages, not including references; and contain a minimum of 25 sources, 20 scholarly.

Literature reviews attempt to provide a service to the reader—they organize and explain the research around a given topic. In our field, *Review of Communication* is the primary venue for the publication of such reviews. Your paper should succeed in doing three things: providing a clear organization of the research; properly and succinctly summarizing the major claims/implications of the research; and critically evaluating the merits and limitations of the research.

GIFT & Think-Piece

This project is intended to provide a more useful exercise for students who have no intent to pursue research or a doctoral degree.

GIFT

A Great Idea for Teaching (GIFT) is a brief description of a teaching activity, designed to be shared with others in the discipline at conferences and in NCA’s pedagogy journal *Communication Teacher*. These brief (2000 word maximum) papers should contain the following components: (1) a brief title; (2) the course(s) for which the activity is intended; (3) the objective(s) for the activity; (4) a brief theoretical rationale for conducting the activity; (5) a description/explanation of the activity, including any preparation/preliminary steps and materials needed; (6) a debriefing paragraph, including typical results; (7) an appraisal of the activity, including any limitations or variations; and (8) references.

Students should refer to published GIFTS to get a sense of how these papers ought to be constructed.

Think-Piece

Sometimes, although not often enough, scholars attempt to make their work helpful to the public by translating research into the language of the public sphere. We might look to the good works of Neil De Grasse Tyson, Noam Chomsky, Carl Sagan, and Marshall McLuhan as examples of the value of public



intellectualism. Your job in this think-piece is to craft an essay, which could be published by a serious mainstream venue (Slate, Vox, American Prospect, Politico, The Hill, etc.). Your 3000-5000 word think-piece should provide a scholarly, rhetorical perspective on some matter pertaining to the public sphere, deliberative democracy, or dissent.

To get a sense of how such an essay might work, consider the following works published by rhetoric scholars in mainstream media:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/george-lakoff/understanding-trump_b_11144938.html

https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2016/03/09/how-donald-trump-gets-away-with-saying-things-other-candidates-cant/?utm_term=.dc87d3301a5b

<https://www.thenation.com/article/killing-commons/>

<http://washingtonmonthly.com/2016/03/31/why-trumps-promises-of-disaster-might-be-part-of-his-appeal/>

Final Exam

Prior to the final exam period, you will be provided three short-answer question prompts. These comp-like questions are intended to guide you to synthesize and critically reflect upon the material we have covered this semester. As this is a take-home test, you are expected to take advantage of your access to scholarship, and cite sources accordingly.

Useful Sources of Information for Rhetorical Studies

- CRTNET – The Communication, Research, and Theory Network is a free email listserv that distributes, on a daily basis, information about upcoming conferences and presentations, scholarships, graduate programs, academic job positions, and wide-ranging theoretical and pedagogical discussions among communication scholars. If you hope to have a job in academia one day, you ought to subscribe.
- Academia.edu – A new-ish web platform designed to help make scholars and their research more accessible. In some sense, it is like Facebook for researchers—you can build a profile, post links to your scholarly work, and follow others whose research you value. It is an excellent place to locate CVs and publications that are hard to find elsewhere.
- Google Scholar – Once you tell Google Scholar to search within CSULB's library, it becomes the most useful search engine for scholarly research, spanning multiple databases.
- Selective Lists of Published Resources:
 - Scholarly Journals Publishing Excellent Work in Rhetorical Theory & Criticism:
 - The Quarterly Journal of Speech (QJS)
 - Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies (CCCS)
 - Critical Studies in Media Communication (CSMC)
 - The Journal of Communication Inquiry
 - Argumentation & Advocacy
 - Philosophy & Rhetoric



COMM-636, American Public Communication, Fall, 2017

- Rhetoric & Public Affairs (RPA)
- The Western Journal of Communication
- Communication Theory
- Communication Monographs
- The Southern Communication Journal
- Excellent Readers/Anthologies in Rhetoric, Critical Theory, and Cultural Studies
 - Bizzell, P. & Herzberg, B. (Eds.) (2001). *The rhetorical tradition: Readings from classical times to present* (2nd ed.). New York: Bedford.
 - Burgchardt, C. (Ed.) (2010). *Readings in rhetorical criticism* (4th ed.). State College, PA: Strata Publishing.
 - During, S. (2007). *The cultural studies reader* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
 - Lucaites, J. L., Condit, C. M., & Caudill, S. (Eds.) (1993). *Contemporary rhetorical theory: A reader*. New York: Guilford Press.
 - Olson, L. C., Finnegan, C. A., & Hope, D. S. (Eds.) (2008). *Visual rhetoric: A reader in communication and American culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
 - Richter, D. H. (2006). *The critical tradition: Classic texts and contemporary trends* (3rd ed.). Boston: Bedford/St.Martins.
 - Storey, J. (2013). *Cultural theory and popular culture: A reader* (4th ed.) New York: Routledge.
- Useful Textbooks for Those Just Getting Their Feet Wet (**NB: These are excellent places to begin or augment your education in rhetoric, but—because they oversimplify for the purpose of teaching novices—they are not the sort of thing you should cite in a serious paper for a graduate seminar, conference, or publication.**)
 - Borchers, T. (2006). *Rhetorical theory: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Waveland Press.
 - Foss, S. K. (2008). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Waveland Press.
 - Kuypers, J. A. (2009). *Rhetorical criticism: Perspectives in action*. Lanham, MA: Lexington Books.
 - Stoner, M. & Perkins, S. J. (2004). *Making sense of messages: A critical apprenticeship in rhetorical criticism*. London: Routledge.
 - Tyson, L. (2014). *Critical theory today: A user-friendly guide* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.