I. INTRODUCTION

A. Present background for understanding this example of rhetoric and the theoretical underpinnings for your analysis.

1. Introduce the circumstances and contours of the incident(s).

2. What particular elements of the situation make it unique/ interesting.

3. What are the particular rhetorical elements at play?

B. Rationale for the report

1. In what way(s) is rhetoric significant?

2. In what way(s) are the meanings that were shaped significant?

C. Statement of your purpose (thesis) and preview of the main ideas to be covered in the paper.

II. BODY OF THE REPORT

A. Detail the incident(s)

1. What circumstances prompted it?

2. On what communication details does your analysis focus?

3. Detail relationships between the event(s), the speaker and the audience.

B. What was the message?

1. What was the major claim or idea it promoted?

2. What kind of support (logical, credibility, emotional?) was offered?

3. What was the strategy of presentation?

C. What aspects of rhetorical theory help explain the communication within the incident(s)?

1. Describe the theoretical perspective

2. Detail how the perspective was illustrated in the incident.

D. Methods

1. What serves as data/artifact/text?

Authentication (how can we be sure you have an accurate version?)

2. Unit of analysis? (how will you break up the data/artifact/text for analysis—how often will you code?)

3. Analytical steps: what will you DO to the data (essentially, how will

you code it/what questions will you ask of the data).

D. What standard of judgment will you apply to the rhetorical action?

1. describe it

2. justify why it’s the right one

F. Findings/results

[YOU ARE NOT EXPECTED TO HAVE COMPLETED THE ANALYSIS AT THE POINT OF THE OUTLINE. NO FINDINGS REQUIRED FOR THE OUTLINE. ROVIDE PLACEHOLDERS FOR HOW YOU’LL PRESENT FINDINGS/RESULTS]

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

[YOU ARE NOT EXPECTED TO HAVE COMPLETED THE ANALYSIS AT THE POINT OF THE OUTLINE. NO SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION REQUIRED FOR THE OUTLINE. PROVIDE PLACEHOLDERS FOR HOW YOU’LL PRESENT SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.]

1.What did examining rhetorical practice teach you about how communication shapes meanings in organizational contexts?

2. Evaluate the rhetorical action, given the analysis of data.

3. Evaluate the rhetorical action in light of the standard you selected.

4. Recommendations for alternative action (derived from this or other rhetorical theories from this period of study)?
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