HU4625 Risk Communication

Room: 108 Walker
Time: 9:05-9:55 MWF
Semester: Spring 2007
Instructor: Associate Professor Craig Waddell
Office: Room 302 Walker
Office Hours: 10-11 a.m. MW; other times by appointment
Phone: 487-2016 (office); 482-1636 (home)
E-mail: cwaddell@mtu.edu
Class List: risk-l@mtu.edu (Responses to messages to this list are posted only to the message originator.)

(Risk Communication is included on the General Education Program’s “Institutions” Distribution Courses List.)

Required Texts


If you prefer to order a hardcopy of this chapter for $4, go to http://www.hesperian.org/mm5/merchant.mvc?Screen=PROD&Store_Code=HB&Product_Code=P220&Category_Code=ENG

I will also provide you with four case studies.

General Course Description
Almost all of us are or will be involved in risk communication—as either producers or consumers—in two broad capacities: as professionals (scientists, engineers, technical communicators, business managers, foresters, etc.) and as citizens.

Historian James Souther claims that since World War II, the need to communicate technical information to the public has been dramatically increased by (1) environmental legislation, (2) the consumer movement, and (3) the advent of the personal computer. In all three of these contexts—but especially in the first two—risk communication plays a key role. In fact, communicating information about the risks associated with (among other things) natural hazards, environmental issues, health, safety, occupational hazards, consumer products, and financial investments is an increasingly important part of the work of both technical experts and professional communicators. This course examines various models of risk communication, the diverse roles assumed by the public under each of these models, and means of ensuring that risks are communicated both effectively and ethically.

As a profession and a subject of scholarly discussion, risk communication is a fairly new field. Nevertheless, the communication about hazards is ancient, diverse, and ubiquitous, including everything from fairy tales to road signs. You have all been subjected to hazard communication from birth (e.g., “Don’t touch that stove!”); hence, you are each already hazard communication experts of a sort. What we will try to do this semester is to (1) pool your expertise (through shared discourse); (2) conceptualize your expertise (that is, abstract from your experience principles of effective and ethical risk communication); (3) inform your expertise (through our readings); and (4) practice your expertise (through your projects).

In class, we’ll consider a variety of case studies of health, safety, and environmental risk communication. Our readings will focus on communicating public health risks in general and on communicating risks associated with HIV/AIDS in particular, with added emphasis on communicating risks in diverse cultures. Over the semester, you’ll develop individual or group projects on a risk-communication topic of your choice by—among other things—adapting what we learn about risk communication from the case studies and readings.

A Few Key Definitions

The National Research Council defines hazard and risk as follows:

**Hazard:** An act or phenomenon posing potential harm to some person(s) or thing(s); the magnitude of the hazard is the amount of harm that might result, including the seriousness and the number of people exposed.

**Risk:** Adds to the hazard and its magnitude the probability that the potential harm or undesirable consequence will [occur].
Public Participation in a Democratic Culture

A central concern in discussions about risk communication has been the role of the public in shaping policies designed to respond to various risks (environmental risks, health risks, etc.). James Petersen contends that “citizen participation [in policy formation] is nearly synonymous with democracy.” To work effectively with the public, risk communicators must understand the various ways in which public participation in risk disputes influences risk policy.

In an 1820 letter to William Jarvis, Thomas Jefferson said “I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education.” In a technologically advanced democracy, the people risk becoming disenfranchised on an increasing number of issues that entail complex technical information. As Frederick Antczak says in Thought and Character: The Rhetoric of Democratic Education:

In democracy, the people rule—that is, they rule insofar as they make their own decisions. But those decisions grow more complex, more intellectually demanding every day. The average citizen... is called to deliberate on an increasingly formidable variety of issues, each demanding a different way of knowing. Decisions must be made on, among other things, problems of toxic waste disposal,... the reliability of nuclear power plant construction and operation,... the proper limits and accountability of recombinant DNA research,...

Life in an increasingly technologized society imposes increasing intellectual demands on society’s decision makers. If in such an era democracy’s decisions are to be made intelligently and effectively, the public must somehow be reconstituted intellectually.

Public participation in public policy formation is not only a fundamental principal of democracy, it is also an essential means to better-informed policy decisions since—among other things—it encompasses a wide variety of perspectives that might not otherwise be considered.

This course examines public participation in public-policy deliberations in a scientifically and technologically advanced democracy. Through some—but not all—of the case studies described below, we will examine means by which non-experts do and can become informed participants in such deliberations, and we will discuss warrants, models, and strategies for such participation. As Jefferson suggests, if decisions about such issues are to be made wisely and yet are not to become the province of technical experts, we must find more and better ways to inform public deliberative processes.
In his *Rhetoric*, Aristotle says that a speaker's character (or ethos), "may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion he possesses" (1356a.12). A key issue in our discussions will be trust in the expert testimony that informs much of our decision making.

## General Models for Public Participation

One of many possibilities for taxonomizing various models of public-policy formation is by grouping models in terms of the diverse roles played by experts and the (presumably) nonexpert general public.

1. **The Technocratic Model:** This model assumes that technical decisions should be left to "experts" in science, engineering, industry, and government and allows no role for public participation or oversight.

2. **The One-Way Jeffersonian Model:** In 1820, Thomas Jefferson wrote "I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education." One implication of this Jeffersonian vision of democracy is that the public has a right to participate in decisions that affect its well-being, but that it should be empowered to do so, simply and unproblematically, through a one-way transfer of expert knowledge.

3. **The Interactive Jeffersonian Model:** This model might be considered a more charitable interpretation of the Jeffersonian vision of democracy. Under this model, technical experts communicate their expertise to the public, and the public communicates its values, beliefs, and emotions to technical experts. Thus, while the public adjusts to expert knowledge, experts adjust to public sentiments.

4. **The Social Constructionist Model:** This model expands upon the Interactive Jeffersonian Model by acknowledging that the values, beliefs, and emotions of experts also play a role in risk communication and environmental-policy formation. Furthermore, technical information also flows in both directions; thus, the distinction between "expert" and "public" begins to blur. The Social Constructionist Model views risk communication as an interactive exchange of information during which *all participants* also communicate, appeal to, and engage values, beliefs, and emotions.
The Underdetermination Thesis

An underlying assumption of this course is an extension to the realm of policy formation of what Mary Hesse and others have called the "underdetermination" thesis. Hess argues that scientific theories are "underdetermined" (that is, only partly determined) by scientific data in that they are also partly determined by the assumptions, biases, and presuppositions that one holds when evaluating that data: "Theories are logically constrained by facts, but are underdetermined by them: that is, while, to be acceptable, theories should be more or less plausibly coherent with facts, they can be neither conclusively refuted nor uniquely derived from statements of fact."
alone.” Hence, theory formation (for example, about the causes of global warming) is not a strictly inductive process, and different scientists can derive different conclusions or theories from the same data.

This perspective places scientific theories closer to the realm of deliberative rhetoric than to that of objectively revealed truths. It also suggests that we need to closely examine the assumptions, biases, and presuppositions that shape not only our perception of the data, but also our very construction of data (for example, our construction of what data is needed for informed decision making and our construction of what counts as valid data). We need to make such biases explicit and question their social, political, and ethical implications. And we need to acknowledge that experts as well as nonexperts are subject to such biases.

**Basic Discussion Questions**

The course addresses questions such as the following:

1. Why should the non-expert public have a voice in policy decisions that involve complex scientific and technological issues and evidence?

2. If the public is to participate in such deliberations and decisions, how might it do so effectively and ethically?

3. What factors shape the public reception of complex scientific arguments? and how might awareness of these factors be used to construct more effective appeals?

4. When it is unfeasible to include the full public in the deliberative process, how might representative segments of that public be involved in such deliberations?

5. In a diverse culture, how might one present arguments so as to respect diversity, win adherents based on diverse warrants, and challenge members of the community to consider the issue in new ways?

6. Does public testimony — sometimes required by law — merely provide a means of catharsis? or does it genuinely influence the decision-making process?

7. What are the problems with and what are the alternatives to the old technocratic model of decision making?

8. Is the prevailing model of communicating risks to the public primarily a means of understating those risks? If so, can this model be modified such that it might be used to **heighten** public awareness of and concerns about genuine risks?

9. Ultimately, what changes will be needed in formal education, the media, and public advocacy in order to ensure that the people both remain the “depository of the ultimate powers of the society” and are “enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion”?
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Summary of Case Studies

1. Sandman’s Model of Risk Communication

In his 1993 book *Responding to Community Outrage: Strategies for Effective Risk Communication*, Peter M. Sandman is described as “the preeminent risk communication speaker and consultant in the United States today.” In fact, Dr. Sandman is much cited, much sought after (the consulting list in his c.v. reads like a list of the Fortune 500), and his model is arguably the dominant model of risk communication. However, his approach has been criticized as manipulative (see, for example, chapter 5 of *Trust Us, We’re Experts!* by Sheldon Rampton and John Stauber).

We will examine how Sandman defines risk (risk = hazard + outrage), break this definition down into six components, and examine which of these six components Sandman’s approach addressed and which it does not address and why. We will then consider how, by this definition and method, Sandman can claim to have reduced the risk when he has only reduced outrage.

Finally, we will examine how Sandman’s method—which he suggests is applicable only to reducing public outrage (“the critical question of how to pierce public apathy is not discussed here,” p. iv)—might be adapted to increasing public outrage; thereby making this model of risk communication equally accessible to both sides in any given case.

2. Great Lakes Water Quality

Some studies of public participation have suggested that at times it may appear that the public has considerable influence on policy recommendations when, in fact, it has little; this chapter suggests that at other times it may appear that the public has little influence on policy recommendations when, in fact, it has considerable.

This case study of the International Joint Commission’s Biennial Meetings on Great Lakes Water Quality suggests that at least some of the IJC’s recommendations emerge from an interactive process that includes the five following stages:

1. Folk epidemiology—possibly in conjunction with some preliminary scientific findings—alarms the public about a potential problem.

2. Public testimony on this problem is offered before the IJC.

3. The commissioners refer compelling issues to their various scientific advisory boards for investigation.
4. The scientific advisory boards confirm some of the public's concerns, leading the commissioners to be convinced (prepared to accept an idea intellectually), but not necessarily persuaded (committed to act on the basis of that idea).

5. On hearing further emotional appeals from the public on this issue, the commissioners become persuaded, but contend that public testimony only confirms what they already believe based on scientific evidence.

In at least some cases, the commissioners pursued an issue on the basis of public testimony, sought the support of their scientific advisory boards before committing themselves, and then, having received such support, genuinely perceived subsequent comments on this issue from the public as simply confirming their scientifically based beliefs. Thus, although the commissioners have found it politically expedient to cite public support when presenting their recommendations to legislators, they have found it politically inexpedient to suggest that their recommendations derive from public (as opposed to scientific) testimony. These conclusions are based on participant observation at three IJC Biennial Meetings, on in-depth interviews with five of the six IJC commissioners, on interviews with public participants at the meetings, and on analysis of related texts.

3. Recombinant DNA Experimentation

For at least 2,500 years, philosophers and rhetoricians have argued over the role of logic and emotion in deliberative processes. However, this case suggests that key to a successful appeal is not whether it is logical or emotional, but whether it is judged to be appropriate by the audience. An appropriate appeal is one that balances appeals to reason (logos), to emotion (pathos), and the character of the speaker or writer (ethos).

It is in part, at least, our ability to incorporate emotional and ethical appeals into a reasonable decision that separates human decision making from artificial intelligence. Hence, in order to further understand and enhance human decision making, we must determine what makes some emotional and ethical appeals appropriate and others inappropriate in a given context. This case describes how one audience—the Cambridge Experimentation Review Board (CERB)—made such determinations when considering arguments for and against conducting recombinant DNA research in Cambridge, Massachusetts in 1976-77. These conclusions are based on research in the MIT Archives collection on this case and on extensive interviews with the principal participants, including all of the CERB members.

This case also suggests that when public policy decisions or recommendations must be delegated to a subset of the population at risk (such as to the Cambridge Experimentation Review Board), that subset should be

1. Representative of the community at risk.
2. Disinterested in the exclusive benefits in question (i.e., benefits not shared by the general population, such as immediate financial rewards and prestige).
It would be convenient to believe that one factor—such as appeal to Cold War apocalyptic concerns—explains the strong public response to Rachel Carson’s 1962 classic *Silent Spring*. However—as with most other complex issues—the public response to *Silent Spring* was overdetermined, a process that Raymond Williams defines as “determination by multiple factors.” Some of these factors, however, are more easily emulated than others. One such factor is Carson’s ability to ally her concerns with the prevailing spirit of the times, which happened to be apocalyptic. Hence, those who would learn from Carson’s success are well advised to ally their concerns with the contemporary spirit of the times rather than (as has often been done) to simply generate additional apocalyptic appeals. These conclusions are based on my research with the Rachel Carson Papers at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.

**Communication Ethics**

In the West, theories of public communication can be traced back at least to the conceptualization (that is, the development of teachable principles) of the art of rhetoric in fifth century B.C. Greece. We’ll draw upon this ancient body of rhetorical theory as we study risk communication this term. Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) defined rhetoric as “the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion.” A key concern in philosophical discussions of rhetoric has been the extent to which an emphasis on persuasion licenses deceit and manipulation. Plato (427-347 B.C.) and (through him) Socrates (469-399 B.C.) criticized rhetoric for “making the worse appear the better case.” Many rhetoricians, however, have been deeply concerned with the ethics of rhetoric. For example, in his *Institutio Oratoria*, Quintilian (A.D. 35-99) wrote

> Too much insistence cannot be laid upon the point that no one can be said to speak appropriately who has not considered not merely what it is expedient, but also what it is becoming to say. . . . these two considerations generally go hand in hand. . . . Sometimes, however, the two are at variance. Now, whenever this occurs, expedience must yield to the demands of what is becoming. . . . the end which the orator must keep in view is not persuasion, but speaking well, since there are occasions when to persuade would be a blot upon his honour. (XI.I.8-11)

Good risk communication addresses both what is expedient (persuasive/ effective) and what is becoming (ethical).

**Reading and Class Discussion**

> “We don’t understand anything until we’ve discussed it.”
> 
> Russian Proverb

This course is based on common readings, on class discussion of those readings, and on the research projects described below. Hence, you should keep up with the reading and participate.
in class discussion on a regular basis; such discussion provides practice in public deliberation that is fundamental to the goals of this course.

As outlined in the below schedule of assignments and class activities, rather than requiring additional texts, we’ll view and discuss a number of videos and case studies. For example, we’ll view a video based on Peter Sandman’s *Responding to Community Outrage: Strategies for Effective Risk Communication*. Sandman provides a perspective on risk communication reflective of industrial priorities. He claims that there are two different genres of risk communication: (1) arousing people whom one believes to be inadequately concerned about risks; and (2) calming down people whom one believes to be overly concerned about risks. He says that his book is relevant only to the second genre of risk communication; we’ll examine and challenge that claim.

**Research Projects**

“Tell me, and I forget. Show me, and I remember. Involve me, and I understand.”

In addition to our common readings, you’ll work on an individual or a collaborative research project on risk communication in which you do one of the following:

1. Communicate risks to an audience—through a single product (brochure, Web page, videotape, etc.) or through a more ambitious campaign/combination of products—with the goal of reducing those risks and provide a brief (2-3 page) analysis of your work (see the Final Analysis section below for details). One way to do this would be by finding a client who needs such work done.

2. Analyze existing risk communication (either a single product or a whole campaign) with the goal of improving that communication, submitting where possible copies of what you’ve analyzed.

3. Examine and analyze an issue (pedestrian safety, STD’s, winter driving) instead of a risk communication product. In this case, you’ll create a report (which might itself be considered an example of risk communication) rather than a brochure, Web page, videotape, etc. What risks are involved with this issue? How might they be communicated effectively and ethically to target audiences. This may or may not include analysis of existing risk communication.

4. Analyze a risk-communication process (such as risk communication preceding the launch decision for the Space Shuttle Challenger) rather than a risk communication product.

Recent projects have addressed topics as diverse as cardiovascular disease, volcanic hazards, pharmaceutical waste, anti-smoking campaigns, carbon nanotubes, tsunamis, Ford Pinto production decision, cell phones, woodworking machinery, Space Shuttle Challenger launch decision, biomedical laboratory safety, sexually transmitted diseases, U.S. military anthrax

HU4625 Risk Communication
vaccine program, human papilloma virus, genetic testing, communication between health-care providers and their clients, and viral diseases. You might want to examine a case that is of regional interest; or you might examine a case—current or historical—that has gained the attention of the national media.

Given that 4000-level courses can be taken by both graduate and undergraduate students, I’ve tried to keep diverse audiences in mind when selecting texts and designing the project assignment. If you’re a graduate student, you might want to consider selecting option 2, 3, or 4 (above) and using this project as a draft of a master’s project, a pilot study for or draft chapter of your dissertation, or a draft conference or journal paper.

The ability to work collaboratively is becoming increasingly important in academic, industrial, political, and other contexts. People in all of these contexts need to pool both their time and their diverse skills in order to solve complex problems and to complete complex tasks effectively. Hence, I encourage you to use this opportunity to work in a collaborative group (consisting of 2-4 people), and I strongly encourage you to form interdisciplinary groups in order to take maximum advantage of one another’s strengths. If you do join a collaborative group, remember that the others in your group will be depending on you, and your grade (as well as theirs) will in part be determined by your ability to work effectively with them.

Your project will include at least the following six stages or components:

A. Brainstorming: Meet with me to discuss project ideas.

B. Proposal: Your proposal should be approximately 500-1000 words (two to four double-spaced pages) and should identify (1) the members of your group (if you’re working collaboratively), (2) what each of you will contribute to your study, (3) the issue or case you plan to study (topic), (4) how you plan to study it (methods), (5) why you’ve chosen this particular issue or case, (6) what your final product(s) will be, (7) what you hope to learn from this study, (8) what problems you anticipate, and (9) how you plan to resolve those problems.

C. Progress Report: Your progress report should be approximately 750 words (three double-spaced pages) and should describe progress to date, work left to be done, problems encountered, how you’re resolved or attempted to resolve those problems, and results (or preliminary results) of user-testing (where appropriate). Your report should include a draft of all or of a substantial part of your final project.

D. Final Product: Your final brochure, videotape, etc.

E. Oral Presentation: A 12-15-minute oral presentation (including Q&A) on your project. Three formats have worked well in the past: (1) present your project as if the class is the intended audience for your risk communication; (2) describe your project in a way similar to the method defined in the “Final Analysis” section above; (3) some combination of 1 & 2. Remember that the oral presentation is about your project; it is not your project itself.
F. Final Analysis: In either providing a brief analysis of your own work or producing a scholarly analysis of someone else’s work, you might consider, among other things, (1) the intended audience(s) of the communication; (2) the purpose(s) of the communication; (3) the effectiveness of the communication; (4) the ethics of the communication; and (5) how what you’ve produced or analyzed fits into—or might fit into—a larger, more comprehensive program of risk communication on this issue.

If you’ve chosen option 1 above, your final analysis should be a brief (2-3 page) analysis of your own risk-communication product or campaign.

If you’ve chosen option 2, 3, or 4 above, your final project should be approximately 2500-3000 words (10-12 double-spaced pages) and should describe what you studied and why (topic and purpose), how it relates to other reading you’ve done (literature review), how you studied it (methods), a description of the case (narrative), what you found (results/thesis and evidence to support your thesis), and what insights you draw from your results (conclusions); for example, what is the cause of what you’ve found? what is its significance? what should we do about it? what further studies might be warranted? You should also include a list of works cited and, if appropriate, appendices. In producing a research-based, scholarly analysis, be sure to support your claims with evidence: This is not a newspaper article or an op-ed piece.

Both in your project and in your analysis, you should apply concepts introduced in the course, such as the following:

1. Appropriate adaptation of Sandman’s 20 components of outrage.

2. Three basic forms of risk communication (consensus, care, and crisis).


4. Principles of Uncertainty (such as lack of data, data mining, failure of invariance, expert disagreement, underdetermination, complexity/chaos).

5. Principles for Making Reasonable Decisions under Conditions of Uncertainty (such as weight of evidence, burden of proof, Pascal’s Wager).

6. Rhetorical Principles (such as ethos, logos, and pathos; kairos; stasis, topoi; and the rhetorical situation).

Internet Resources

As with most other topics these days, there is a vast amount of information about risk and risk communication available on the Internet. For example, the SAREC (Science of Anticipation Recognition Evaluation and Control of Health Risks) Web site
http://www.sarec.ca/books/index.htm includes an extensive bibliography of books on risk assessment and communication. Here are a few others you might want to try:


Coalition for Health Communication http://www.healthcommunication.net/


The Journal of Health Communication http://www.gwu.edu/~cjh/journal/


University of Cincinnati, Department of Communication, Center for Health and Environmental Research http://asweb.arisci.uc.edu/communication/scheer/resources/index.html

International Institute for Facilitation and Consensus, Latin American Center for Outcome Mapping http://iifac.org/projects_facom-en.html (“The Center coordinates the training of trainers, development of Spanish-language training materials, scheduling of workshops, and other activities related to making Outcome Mapping available in Latin America. … Outcome Mapping is a participatory method for planning, monitoring and evaluation. First introduced by IDRC in 2000, Outcome Mapping (OM) has been used in projects, programs and organizations in Latin America, Africa, Asia and Europe.”)


The Peter Sandman Risk Communication Web Site http://www.psandman.com/

Risk Communication in Print and on the Web http://www.fz-juelich.de/mut/rc/inhalt.html
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Institute for Risk Analysis and Risk Communication, University of Washington
http://depts.washington.edu/irarc/

Risk World’s Risk Communication Web Sites
http://www.riskworld.com/websites/webfiles/ws5a014.htm

Center for Risk Communication http://www.centerforriskcommunication.com/home.htm

Society for Risk Analysis, Risk Communication Group http://www.sra.org/rcsg/rcsgsources.html

Risk Communication in the Context of Consumer Perceptions of Risks
http://www.consumersunion.org/food/riskcomny598.htm

The Environmental Communication Resource Center http://www.nau.edu/soc/ecrc/

Center for Environmental Communication Studies
http://asweb.artsci.uc.edu/communication/ches/about/index.html

The Risk Assessment & Policy Association http://www.fplc.edu/risk/profrisk.htm

Evaluation

Your final grade will be determined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance (40 classes at 5 points each)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and discussion quizzes (100 points for each of 3 quizzes)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming meeting</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research proposal</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final research project/project analysis</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extra credit:
Bring to class during the first three weeks of the semester the required textbooks with your name permanently marked on the inside front cover 25 points

A: 930-1000 points
AB: 880-929 points
B: 830-879 points
BC: 780-829 points
C: 730-779 points
CD: 680-729 points
D: 600-679 points
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F: 599 or fewer points

Late Assignments

I won’t accept any assignment that’s more than two days late. There’s no penalty for one late paper (as long as it’s not more than two days late); subsequent late papers, however, will be lowered by one part of a letter grade (e.g., from a BC to a C).

Attendance Policy

“Eighty percent of success is just showing up.” Woody Allen

Excused absences include (but are not limited to) a medical excuse signed by your physician or a personal emergency authorized in writing by the Dean of Students. For a more detailed description of what constitutes an excused absence, see the Michigan Tech Student Handbook http://www.adm.mtu.edu/protect/studenthandbook/policies.html#integrity

I keep a record of attendance for two reasons:

1. Because if you’re doing poorly in class, these records can help me to determine if poor attendance is part of the problem.

2. Every professor at Michigan Tech is required to submit attendance-verification rosters. These rosters are used for two purposes:

   a. To identify before it’s too late to make the appropriate corrections students who

      • think they are registered for a course, attend all semester and complete the work, but receive
        no grade at the end of the semester because they were never registered;

      • have never attended a class because they mistakenly think they have dropped the course and, hence, wind up receiving a failing grade at the end of the semester;

      • attend an incorrect section of a course and receive a failing grade at the end of the semester
        from the section for which they are registered but which they never attended.

   b. To comply with federal law that stipulates that universities must verify that students who receive

      Title IV financial aid are attending the classes in which they are enrolled. (Title IV of the Higher
      Education Act of 1965 as amended in 1998 establishes general rules that apply to student financial
      assistance programs, including Pell Grants, Academic Competitive Grants, National SMART
      Grants, Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, Federal Direct Loans, Federal
      Perkins Loans, and Federal PLUS Loans. Approximately 85% of Michigan Tech students receive
      some form of financial aid.)
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Michigan Tech's Academic Integrity Policy

"Academic integrity and honesty are central components of a student’s education, and the ethical conduct maintained in an academic context will be taken eventually into a student’s professional career. Academic honesty is essential in a community of scholars searching and learning to search for truth. Anything less than total commitment to honesty undermines the efforts of the entire academic community. Both students and faculty are responsible for ensuring the academic integrity of the university.

This policy applies to the academic conduct of all persons at Michigan Technological University who have ever matriculated at the University, whether or not the person is enrolled at the time an allegation of academic dishonesty is made.

This policy addresses academic dishonesty in course work. Allegations of dishonesty in research or publication are addressed under the Scientific Misconduct Policy.

Procedures to ensure fairness and due process for all parties involved in any apparent violation of the Academic Integrity Policy will be developed, and periodically reviewed, by the Dean of Students Office in consultation with the members of the Academic Integrity Committee appointed by the University Senate."

Definition of Academic Dishonesty

A Plagiarism: Knowingly copying another's work or ideas and calling them one’s own or not giving proper credit or citation. This includes but is not limited to reading or hearing another’s work or ideas and using them as one’s own; quoting, paraphrasing, or condensing another’s work without giving proper credit; purchasing or receiving another’s work and using, handling, or submitting it as one’s own work.

B Cheating: Intentional, unauthorized use of any study aids, equipment, or another’s work during an academic exercise. This includes but is not limited to unauthorized use of notes, study aids, electronic or other equipment during an examination; copying or looking at another individual’s examination; taking or passing information to another individual during an examination; taking an examination for another individual; allowing another individual to take one’s examination; stealing examinations. All graded academic exercises are expected to be performed on an individual basis unless otherwise stated by the instructor. An academic exercise may not be submitted by a student for course credit in more than one course without the permission of all instructors.

C Fabrication: Intentional and/or unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation during an academic exercise. This includes but is not limited to changing or adding an answer on an examination and resubmitting it to change the grade; inventing data for a laboratory exercise or report.
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Facilitating Academic Dishonesty: Knowingly or recklessly allowing or helping another individual to plagiarize, cheat, or fabricate information.

Sanctions for academic dishonesty range from warnings to expulsion from Michigan Tech. For more information, visit http://www.studentaffairs.mtu.edu/dean/judicial/policies/academic_integrity.html

The Americans with Disabilities Act

MTU complies with all federal and state laws and regulations regarding discrimination, including the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). If you have a disability and need a reasonable accommodation for equal access to education or services at MTU, please call Dr. Gloria Melton, Dean of Students (7-2212). For other concerns about discrimination, you may contact your advisor, your department head, or the Affirmative Action Office (7-3310).

Schedule of Assignments and Class Activities

Dates indicate when reading and writing assignments are due, not when they are given. I’ve used the following abbreviations for our texts: RC = Risk Communication and Public Health; TU = Trust Us, We’re Experts; MM = Mountains beyond Mountains; SC = Sanitation and Cleanliness for a Healthy Environment.

Week 1: Read TU Preface and Ch. 1
Monday: Martin Luther King, Jr. Day: No Class

Wednesday: Overview of course and syllabus; examples of risk communication


Week 2: Read TU Ch. 2-5
Monday: Informal rhetorical analysis of “Plan to Get Out Alive”; self-introductions and brainstorm for project ideas


Friday: Part of video: Peter Sandman’s “Risk = Hazard + Outrage”; Case Study 1: Critique of Peter Sandman’s model of risk communication; Sandman’s four strategies for dealing with diverse publics
Week 3: Read TU Ch. 6-8; Meet this week to brainstorm for projects
Monday: Class discussion topics: care, consensus, and crisis communication; the dilemma of democracy and technology; the underdetermination thesis and lightning strikes; Pascal’s Wager; schedule conferences to brainstorm for projects

Wednesday: Class discussion topics: risk comparisons; data mining/dredging (cherry picking)

Friday:

Week 4: Read TU Ch. 9-11
Monday: Project proposal due; class discussion topics: seven approached to risk, risk and chaos, ethical communication, cost-benefit analysis (Ford Pinto, tipping ranges); video: “Stove and Stepstool Instability.” (Roger Boisjoly, 2002. 6 min.)

Wednesday: Class discussion topics: eight stages to forgiveness

Friday, February 11: Winter Carnival, NO CLASS

Week 5: Read RC Ch. 1-6
Monday: Review for Quiz 1

Wednesday: Quiz 1

Friday:

Week 6: Read RC Ch. 7-13

Wednesday: Discuss Case Study 2: Great Lakes Water Quality


Week 7: Read RC Ch. 14-20

Wednesday: Counter examples to PR: Ad Busters and Culture Jammers

HU4625 Risk Communication

Week 8: Read MM Parts I & II

Wednesday: Video: An Enemy of the People

Friday: Video: An Enemy of the People

March 10 - March 18: Spring Break

Week 9: Read MM Part III

Wednesday: Case Study 3: Recombinant DNA Experimentation; review for Quiz 2

Friday: Quiz 2

Week 10: Read MM Parts IV & V
Monday:

Wednesday:

Friday: Progress reports due; sign up to discuss progress reports

Week 11: Read SC; Meet this week to discuss progress reports
Monday: Progress reports due; sign up to discuss progress reports; sign up for oral presentation times; Video: “Paul Ehrlich and the Population Bomb” (Prod. Sam Hurst. Narr. David Suzuki. KQED, San Francisco, 1996.) (60 min.)


Friday: Read Waddell, “The Reception of Silent Spring.” Chapter 1 in And No Birds Sing: Rhetorical Analyses of Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2000. 1-16);

HU4625 Risk Communication

**Week 12**
Monday: Conclude video: “Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring”;
Case Study 5: The Public Reception of Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring; **review for quiz 3**

Wednesday: **Quiz 3**

Friday: Oral presentations on projects

**Week 13**
Monday: Oral presentations on projects

Wednesday: Oral presentations on projects

Friday: Oral presentations on projects

**Week 14**
Monday: Oral presentations on projects

Wednesday: Oral presentations on projects

Friday: Oral presentations on projects; course evaluations; **projects due**