Assign 4: Whistleblowers, Resistance, and Moral Foundations:
1500-1800 words: 200 points

Required Readings:
- Haidt, Jonathan: “Ch 7: Righteous Minds” (PDF/HO)
- They Say I Say—all covered chapters
- Woods Chapter on Rogerian argument (PDF/HO)

Due Date:
This assignment’s final packet (hard copy and digital submission of final draft) is due on ____________.

Note: This assign 4 topic will be the topic you use to find sources for Assign 3, the Annotated Bibliography topic. Assign 3 will be due before this topic because the sources found for the annotated bib could be the sources you use for Assign 4.

Note: Assign 3 and 4 Related Library Orientations:
Classes will meet in Library 108 (by the elevators at the back of the first floor of the library) on the following days:

MW
- MW 9:00 meets in library during normal class time on Mon March 25
- MW 12:00 section meets in library during normal class time on March 25
- MW 1:30 section meets in library during normal class time on March 25

TT
- TT 10:30 section meets in library during normal class time on March 21
- TT 12:00 section meets in library during normal class time on March 21

Assign 4 Overview:
So far this semester, we’ve been exploring the rights, costs, and benefits of belonging to a civil society. For Assign 1 and 2, we looked specifically at the actions of civil disobedience—when, with what costs and benefits, and any limits that apply.

For assignment 3 and 4, we will explore the ethics of and motivations for a specific resistor's actions.

- The audience: a group of people that work or belong to the same community or organization as the resistor, but who remain uncertain about the ethics of the resistor's actions.
• In your essay, ethically address the audience’s concerns in a way that leads them towards adopting your enthymeme. Your enthymeme may support or criticize the resistor’s actions—it's up to you and your paper/research to set up your stance effectively.

• Use the ideas and templates from They Say I Say chapters to help you integrate your sources smoothly for a skeptical audience.

The Assignment:
For this assignment, the capstone assignment for the semester, use the moral foundations described in Haidt’s “Ch.7 Righteous Minds” handout to help build your readers’ (skeptical and currently incomplete) understanding of the actions, motives, decisions, and thinking of the specific resistor within their organization.

Ultimately, your goal will be to explain, using Haidt’s ideas and with a Rogerian tone, why the resistor may have decided to act and if those actions were “right” actions to take.

Your sources may, depending on how you decide to use them for your argument,
• support
• counter-argue
• and rebut your points.

This prompt is fairly open in scope, but it will need to be specific in time, person, and place for your essay to work well. Please take a look at the suggested topics at the end of this handout to help you see potential avenues of more focused argued research, each of which should be further focused in regards to person, place, and time.

Specifics:

Genre:
This essay falls within the Rogerian persuasive researched argument genre, so be sure you read carefully the Woods handout since that clearly defines, describes, and applies Rogerian approaches to an argument. The student essay in that handout clearly exemplifies an organizational plan that has worked for many students in past semesters.

Building on TSIS Ch 6 and 7, the Rogerian argument asks that you write invitingly and with an understanding tone to a potentially “hostile” audience, skeptical or at least undecided about the ethics and general “rightness” of your whistleblower’s actions.

Personal pronouns (I, me, my) are appropriate to use in this essay since you’re a colleague expert to many in your audience.
Sources:
Throughout your essay, you’ll use multiple related credible sources, that you find, integrated into your argument, to support and illustrate (and counter-argue, only to be rebutted) your points.

Since you’re writing in the discipline of English, genre and discipline expectations require that your paper follow MLA style in format and source integration (using parenthetical citations).

Again, I encourage you to use the templates and ideas from They Say I Say to help you integrate your sources to meet the needs of your audience.

Specifics:
Length: 1500-1800 words (double-spaced, typed, following MLA style throughout)

Sources: 7-8 sources total
- Must include substantial reference to the five moral foundations within Haidt’s article
- Includes 6-8 other related sources of your own choosing and research.

Genre-Specific Organizational Demands:
Since this paper is in a different genre than the Exploratory Paper, the organization of this paper will NOT follow the organization we used for the Exploratory Paper. (Basically, then, this paper will not follow the “one paragraph, one source” format of the Exploratory Essay format.)

Instead, you would organize this paper following your choice of the following:

a) the motorcycle essay in the Rogerian section attached to this assignment sheet OR

b) the example research paper in They Say I Say pp.145-159. That paper (“Family Guy and Freud”) organizes paragraphs around ideas, rather than sources. Our paper also may have a few sources in one paragraph, particularly if those sources help illustrate the main thrust of that paragraph.

Note the Rogerian tone of the “Family Guy” paper too.

Note: I do NOT expect images or tables or dialogue in this paper. Those attributes fit the paper in They Say I Say but will not necessarily be appropriate to your own paper.
Sample Assign 3 Whistleblower Problems:
Please review but also feel free to come up with your own topic. Please run it by me BEFORE you start writing or researching, so I can help you strengthen your idea:

a) Apply one specific moral foundation from Haidt's "Ch7 Righteous Mind" to a specific whistleblower's process to help build readers' understanding of the person's actions. Ultimately, use the moral foundation to help persuade your readers that the whistleblower's actions did or did not strengthen the organization involved.

b) Watch one of the Whistleblower movies, and analyze how that movie depicts ONE of Haidt's moral foundations as the primary motivation for the whistleblowers' actions. Ultimately, persuade your readers that the movie whistleblower's actions may or may not prove helpful in strengthening organizations.

c) Choose ONE psychological theory (such as in-group/out-group, bystanders, the experiments of Asch or Milgram, Zimbardo's Prison Experiment or TED speech), and apply it to helping you build an understanding of the specific whistleblower's decision to act. Ultimately, your goal is to persuade your readers why understanding the motives of whistleblowers may or may not prove helpful in strengthening organizations.

d) Manning and Snowden each inspire seemingly equal amounts of criticism ("they're traitors!") or admiration ("they're heroes!"). Look carefully at ONE of these whistleblowers' decision to release previously classified information and, using information from our readings and your own additional research, determine whether that person's actions were justified or not. You may find it helpful to apply a specific part of Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) to your analysis, but MFT is not a required part of this analysis. Ultimately, persuade your readers why understanding the motives of whistleblowers may or may not prove helpful in strengthening organizations.

e) Not everyone admires whistleblowers, even if the whistleblower's actions clearly led to solving a significant problem. Using your sources and Haidt's Moral Foundations Theory, explore and ultimately suggest explanations as to why many hold conflicted views about one particular whistleblower. Ultimately, choose the MAIN reason people hold conflicted views of this particular whistleblowers and determine if organizations should address this conflict to remain optimally functional.

f) Choose one specific whistleblower and determine whether (and why) one or two of the following philosophers (Thoreau, King, Rousseau) would support that person's decision to explore possible corruption. Include specific references to your chosen philosopher as well optional references, if
relevant, to Haidt’s moral foundations. Ultimately, persuade your readers why understanding the motives of whistleblowers may or may not prove helpful in strengthening organizations.

g) Looking at the five moral foundations within Moral Foundations Theory, consider which foundation(s) would most accurately help readers build an understanding of the arguments from (choose ONE) Thoreau OR King OR Rousseau. Ultimately, persuade your readers why understanding of your chosen philosopher may or may not prove helpful in understanding further your chosen philosopher’s ideas.