

2017

# We [Still] Have a Moment: Multimodal Values and Curricular Practices in a First-Year Writing Program

Kelly L. Wheeler

*University of South Carolina*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Wheeler, K. L. (2017). *We [Still] Have a Moment: Multimodal Values and Curricular Practices in a First-Year Writing Program*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/4167>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu).

We [Still] Have a Moment: Multimodal Values and Curricular Practices in a First-Year  
Writing Program

by

Kelly L. Wheeler

Bachelor of Arts  
The University of Puget Sound, 1993

Master of Arts in Teaching  
The University of Puget Sound, 1994

---

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts in

English

College of Arts and Sciences

University of South Carolina

2017

Accepted by:

Hannah J. Rule, Director of Thesis

Kevin Brock, Reader

Cheryl L. Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

© Copyright by Kelly L. Wheeler, 2017  
All Rights Reserved.

## DEDICATION

For my mom, Sarah Anne Wheeler, you have always been and will be the wind beneath my wings. For Mustafa Nathaniel Isaiah Tunkara, may the world be embrace you and allow you to flourish; your Aunt Kee loves you more than anything.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Hannah J. Rule for her assistance through this process and serving as my thesis director. When I thought I would never make it through all the iterations of this project on top of applying to schools for my PhD, she grounded me and kept me sane with her encouragement. Thank you too to Dr. Kevin Brock, whose class began this project and whose assistance helped complete it. To my friends and family who supported me in this adventure, I am who I am because of your love and support. For that I am deeply indebted and forever thankful.

## ABSTRACT

Students today get much of their news and information about the world through their handheld devices. Their phones flash or vibrate with a new message or post, and they are sucked into a conversation or moment beyond the physical space they occupy. In this way, their phone feeds blur the lines between places as politics enters the bathroom, a walk in the forest, or their most private spaces. With opportunities for rhetors to act upon audiences in every imagined physical space, our practices within the classroom should reflect these changes in space, delivery, and ubiquity of multimodality in digital platforms. This study makes transparent the processes that FYW at The University of South Carolina, Columbia goes through in composing both their ENGL102 syllabus and the accompanying textbook *The Carolina Rhetoric* as they relate to multimodal practices within the classroom and link the classroom and the world-at-large. The findings of this study provide FYW programs a jumping off point for discussing modification and implementation of multimodal curriculum and in doing so allow programs to examine the relationship between their own programs' philosophies and practices: where philosophy and practice might line up, where they might miss the mark, or where there is progress being made toward alignment. Through examination and reflection, Composition can then move closer toward creating the kinds of gateway classrooms Kathleen Blake Yancey advocated in her 2004 CCCC's address.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2 THE CHALLENGES OF MULTIMODAL PRACTICE .....	8
CHAPTER 3 BACKGROUND AND PARTICIPANTS.....	16
CHAPTER 4 METHODS .....	22
CHAPTER 5 FINDINGS.....	28
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSIONS/IMPLICATIONS.....	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	49
APPENDIX A – INTERVIEW LETTER AND QUESTIONS .....	52
APPENDIX B – SYLLABUS AND ASSIGNMENTS .....	55
APPENDIX C – <i>THE CAROLINA RHETORIC</i> TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	70
APPENDIX D – ANALYSIS OF <i>THE CAROLINA RHETORIC</i> .....	73
APPENDIX E – ANALYSIS OF ENGL102 SYLLABUS .....	76

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1 Text Response Type Occurrence .....	32
Table 5.2 Percentage of Multimodal versus the Total Questions .....	34
Table 5.3 Multimodal Texts by Unit.....	36

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Students today get much of their news and information about the world through their handheld devices. Their phones flash or vibrate with new messages or posts, and they are sucked into a conversation or moment beyond the physical space they occupy. In this way, their phone feeds blur the lines between places as politics enters the bathroom, a walk in the forest, or their most private spaces. With opportunities for rhetors to act upon audiences in every imagined physical space, our practices within the classroom should reflect these changes in space, delivery, and ubiquity of multimodality in digital platforms. Because multimodality with its use of multiple modes in conjunction with one another to present information functions intimately in students' lives through digital technology and media use, compositionists must re-examine their practices within first-year writing courses and question their emphasis on monomodal focus and practice. While, of course, multimodality is not new nor is it necessarily fundamentally different from older traditional methods of delivery, how multimodality enters the lives of rhetors and audiences is. As such we have now reached a point where we cannot ignore the ubiquity of multimodal expression and must address it within our classrooms.

Composition has wrestled with a multimodal call to action for some years. In 2004, for example, Kathleen Blake Yancey shaped the trajectory of composition studies with her 2004 CCCCs address. In it she argues that “we have a moment” where students compose an inordinate amount of work willingly but that, as compositionists, we have

not harnessed this energy as we continue to implement classroom practices focused on the traditional academic essay. She argues that “basically writing is interfacing” and technology has played a role in reading and writing publics as its accessibility blurs the public and pedagogical spaces (299). Compositionists have yet to fully capitalize on this blurring of spaces as a teachable moment for our students, one in which transfer is fully realized and practiced. Writing occurs outside of school because it “operate[s] in an economy driven by use value” (301). This economy understands the rhetorical situation, purpose and audience potential, but still warrants critical analysis and pedagogical vocabulary and practices within the classroom to deal with this blurred space. That is, for example, students know how to create posts and tweets, but do they understand how these rhetorical practices act upon audiences? For this reason, Yancey echoes Elizabeth Daley when she says First-Year Composition can be conceived no longer as a gate-keeper but rather as a gateway “that prepare[s] students to become members of the writing public and to negotiate life” (305). Tradition and practices of the past prevent this gateway from being fully realized as a pass-through between public and pedagogical spaces. This in turn affects and limits how we see our future practices and how we actually practice within classrooms. Yancey argues that our Composition classrooms should, therefore, focus on the circulation of composition, the canons of rhetoric, and the deicity of technology (312). Her call to action asks us to re-envision our classrooms, their structures and our practices, to include not just the linguistic text but other forms of text, which also have rhetorical power dependent upon circulation and context. The emphasis in Composition classrooms then moves from a focus on process, which leads to a specific product and emphasizes invention, arrangement, and delivery as separate, to an emphasis

on design, which forces the canons to be blurred together as they negotiate and flow into each other rather than hold their rigid distinctive shapes, and demands from Composition a reorientation to multimodal choices and how those choices in design impact argument. Because handheld technology allows information to be situated in a variety of places from your car to the privacy of your bathroom, design choices in the canon of delivery warrant attention and practice within the classroom both in analyzation and creation. Yancey could not have conceived 13 years ago how even more engrained digital texts would be in our students' lives, and now more than ever, her call to capitalize on student composition seems more pertinent as we have still maintained that gate-keeper mentality and have yet to fully realize the ways in which Composition should be a gateway for students to negotiate their world and their place within it.

Since instructors are always called upon to prepare students for a future that extends beyond the school setting, we must continually reflect upon our practices within the classroom and question the effectiveness of said practices as they evolve over time. A pedagogy of multimodality would meet the challenges of our digital world, incorporating multimodality at every turn and allowing students to become discerning viewers and designers of multimodal information. And yet, thirteen years after Yancey's address, has Composition reflected a significant shift in pedagogical philosophy to be one more inclusive of a variety of texts, and has it started re-imagining what it means to compose as spaces continue to blur between school, social, and private lives?

The WPA Outcomes Statement (OS) 3.0., published in 2014, highlights multimodality and design choices among Composition's educational outcomes and frameworks for success. Carrie S. Leverenz, in her recent examination of this statement

in the *WPA Journal*, claims that the recent revisions include specific mentions of digital technologies and that these small modifications create an “opportunity to shift our focus from teaching the standards of academic writing to preparing students for a future of writing characterized by multiplicity and change” inherent in multimodal composing (Leverenz 33). Agreeing that the WPA OS is merely a floor and not a ceiling, Leverenz focuses upon design as the New London Group describes it to change the role of students within classrooms. Rather than *writing* and a *process*, students are asked to *compose* using a variety of *processes*. She believes this “signals an expansion in both the kinds of texts students may produce and their means of producing them” (39-40)., This albeit small move in the wording of the WPA OS represents a significant shift toward broadening the definition of composition; one which echoes the NLG and which has “opened the door to a conception of writing instruction as preparation for just such a messy and complex future of writing, one which will call on all of us to be designers capable of transforming the past into something new” (Leverenz 45). My research connects to her view of multimodality as being an opportunity for students to compose in a variety of ways and encourages multiplicity and change; Composition then becomes a gateway for students and a means of engagement in the world as critical citizens.

Again, the handheld nature of digital devices and multimodality of digital texts forces Composition yet again to examine practices to incorporate critical analysis and creation of multimodal texts. Leverenz writes, “we must give students the freedom and the tools to choose for themselves how to create texts that can affect the problems they care about. We need to teach them the importance of listening to difference, to realize that when it comes to responding to complex problems, difference in perspective is not

only expected but necessary and productive” (46). This sentiment reverberates with Yancey’s claim about circulation and how spaces blur as technology impacts and is impacted by composition. The variety of modal combinations demonstrates rhetorical choices in delivery and design as they impact the argument of the rhetor but also create a modification or new way for technology to be used by future rhetors. The practices and expectations outlined in the learning outcomes and the pedagogical artifacts for First-Year Writing (FYW) programs should allow students to practice and master those skills. Because of its placement within every university, leaders of FYW have great power to impact practice as they control the curricular artifacts, which dictate to some extent the classroom practices. While it seems Composition values and theorizes multimodality, it is harder to know what happens in practice in our FYW programs. As such, I aim, through a qualitative analysis of the processes involved in the curricular development of a FYW program at a large state university, to better understand how multimodal values and beliefs are reflected in the artifacts it creates, which then by extension become classroom values and practices.

The possible misalignment between multimodal theory and classroom practice leads me to focus this study upon what a FYW program believes its goals to be in regard to multimodality and the outcomes of Composition curriculum. I wonder how those goals are translated into curriculum design and instruction. To discover some preliminary answers, I focus upon one school, The University of South Carolina (USC), to allow me to see the creation process of a curricular template, the syllabus, which is the direct tool used for instruction, as well as the amassing of the texts within a textbook, *The Carolina Rhetoric*, for implementation of this template within the classroom as a practice (See

Appendices B and C). In doing so, one can view the multimodal conversation tangentially, at least within USC, as it pertains to the value of multimodality by looking at the curriculum and instruction focus as well as the presence and weight it has within the syllabus. The yearly overhaul of the ENGL102 syllabus and *The Carolina Rhetoric* provide the opportunity to look at a program's practices as it develops new curriculum to meet the needs of students, the university, and other various curricular, social, and economic goals. This annual curricular change would suggest a fluidity and constant movement for ENGL102 toward goals to comprehensively include multimodality as a reflection of our society's emphasis on multimodal communication.

By looking at the two most powerful artifacts in terms of execution of curricular change across a program, the syllabus and the textbook, I will examine what we are teaching and whether our practices prepare our students for the world they find beyond our classrooms. The specific aims of this research study are two-fold. First I want to understand how multimodality is valued by FYW Program leaders at USC and how this value is reflected in the production processes of the course ENGL102 syllabus and the accompanying curriculum textbook, *The Carolina Rhetoric*. Secondly, this study makes transparent the processes of production of these two artifacts. Locally, the findings of this study will be of use to USC's FYW Program as a means to critically examine the relationship between these texts and the purpose the program leaders envision them to serve as they tie to multimodality. More broadly, however, this study provides FYW programs at large a framework for discussing their own modification and implementation of curriculum change tied to multimodality. In this way, reflecting on classroom practices and expectations helps illuminate the relationship between a program's philosophy and

its practices. Programs can see: where philosophy and practice might line up, where they might miss the mark, or where there is progress being made toward alignment. Only through careful examination and reflection can Composition change its practices to better meet the needs of students as technology becomes even more integrated in their lives and affects how they perceive and interact with the world.

To explore multimodal values and curriculum decisions, I first look at the challenges of multimodal practice within the classroom by reviewing Diana George, Kathleen Blake Yancey, and Jody Shipka, who have all argued for multimodal pedagogy but have faced opposition within the field. In examining their values and classroom practices, I then take up the charge of Yancey that there is a gap between theory and practice as Composition instructors acknowledge multimodality's influence within and without the classroom but have not fully incorporated repeated practices in Composition classrooms to reflect that influence. Taking up Carrie S. Leverenz's claim that the WPA Outcomes Statement formalizes the recognition and inclusivity of multimodality, I charge that this recognition and inclusivity is but a small step toward full incorporation of multimodal texts within Composition classrooms.

With a Cultural Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) framework, I use interview and text analysis methods to examine USC's process in creating the standard course syllabus and the course textbook to determine how the values of multimodality held by the program leaders are reflected in the curriculum and practices. This study seeks to probe the disparity between multimodal philosophy and practice and examine just how inclusive and diverse the practices are within a particular FYW curriculum.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE CHALLENGES OF MULTIMODAL PRACTICE

Multimodal composition has been less emphasized within some Composition circles, and as a result, it has not been fully embraced within Composition classrooms on the whole because of perceived issues with implementation. Charles Hill, for example, in his essay “Reading the Visual in College Writing Classes,” notices how the “subfields of composition in particular have largely ignored visual types of expression, especially in the classroom” (108). Instruction on written texts require an inordinate amount of time, and to add another mode could overwhelm students and teachers alike. In this section I discuss the challenges of multimodal pedagogies in relation to three compositionists, Diana George, Kathleen Blake Yancey, and Jody Shipka. Their incorporation of multimodality within classroom practices has faced opposition from some within the Composition community in one way or another, which reveals the limitations that persist when trying to create a multimodal composition classroom. Carrie S. Leverenz’s argument concerning moves within the 2014 revised WPA Outcomes Statement to incorporate multimodality shows a move by the Composition community to broaden the definition of composition and in doing so, inherently incorporates a value of difference, which creates opportunities for critical analysis by students and can better engage Handheld technology has transformed how students interact with and in the world as it blurs rhetorical spaces. Therefore, Composition instructors should incorporate multimodal practice within the classroom, especially if they are to harness the energy

students already use to produce and create in the digital realm. By doing so, we enable students to practice skills, which will benefit them in the future, and thus we help create the analytical citizens necessary for a healthy functioning democracy.

Diana George argues that compositionists' discussions concerning literacy and writing have limited what might be imagined in Composition classrooms. In her essay "From Analysis to Design: Visual Communication in the Teaching of Writing" George pushes against the notion that students need to be producers of only linguistic texts. She prioritizes visual text, which has often been viewed as not being anything "much more than attendant to the verbal" (George 213). She believes practices in the teaching of writing have limited possible composition assignments with their focus on linguistic text and that students actually have "a much richer imagination for how the visual might enter composition than our journals" (George 225). Through the exploration of her own visual argument assignment, George demonstrates how Composition can incorporate and wield visuals to create arguments. But even with her successful implementation within her own classroom, her practices were often still met with suspicion and questioned as she says visual argument has been limited to analysis only (George 228). When she told staff about her students creating visual arguments, "many were more than skeptical. They wanted to know if such a genre exists and, if it does, how can it be taught, and for what reason I might use it—except, perhaps to keep students doing 'interesting projects'" (George 225). The pushback concerning her classroom practices reflects the reticence of some composition instructors to give up a strict focus on monomodal, linguistic text. George ends saying, "For students who have grown up in a technology-saturated and image-rich culture, questions of communication and composition absolutely will include

the visual, not as attendant to the verbal but as complex communication intricately related to the world around them” (George 228). Even more so now our students live in a different world than we did while going to school, and these different forces act upon them in ways that seem natural to them but perhaps unnatural for us as instructors. Students understand that multimodality acts upon them in ways they may not be able to articulate, but they will, however, willingly experiment with various modes to convey an argument. George’s essay displays that it is the reticence of the instructors that prevents the move to multimodal instruction not the students or their skill level. Perhaps this reticence to teach multimodality comes from not perceiving the visual as being a complex form of composition worth of study or that instructors feel they must be an expert in an area in order to deliver instruction on it in class.

Yancey addresses the reticence of instructors by pointing out that we are at a pivotal and important moment in composition studies where we can harness the energy students use to produce a variety of texts outside of school in their everyday functioning in the world. In harnessing that energy we can apply it to the teaching of critical analysis and reflection and therefore, blur the lines between social and scholastic spaces thus creating a transfer of skills. She advocates for compositionists to create “a new curriculum for the 21<sup>st</sup> century; a curriculum that carries forward the best of what we have created to date, that brings together the writing outside of school and that inside school” (308). She says, “Our model of teaching composition, ... (still) embodies the narrow and singular in its emphasis on a primary and single human relationship; the writer in relation to the teacher” (309). This is not how the world works, and with a shift to social writing, how something circulates becomes a concern as it operates in the world.

Design choices based upon media and audience must be considered by the author, and what is gained or lost with those choices make them more conscious members of the writing public (311). It will be a new pedagogy of multimodality that takes into consideration, circulation of composition, canons of rhetoric, and deicity of technology keeping in mind that these categories bleed into and affect one another. While the aim of her address was not to offer specific classroom practices, she does want instructors to think big and boldly about what composition entails and how to blur the lines between school and social spaces in a way that best fits an instructor's classroom practices but also meets the needs of students as they move beyond the classroom. How innovative have instructors been in creating those new practices and turning them into replicable best practices on a larger scale across classrooms and universities? USC represents but one state school in the nation, but by examining its ENGL102 textbook and syllabus, I feel we can see how one university attempts to make inroads concerning multimodality and addresses the three considerations Yancey asks FYW to make. The move to multimodal incorporation is fraught with challenge, but Yancey offers us a way to overcome these challenges. She suggests that Composition move toward using design as a way to discuss composition. The subtle shift in focus to design, which is applicable to all sorts of modalities, could help harness student interest and energy in a way that enables the kind of gateway classrooms Yancey envisions.

Jody Shipka, in her book *Toward a Composition Made Whole*, also approaches composition from a design perspective, focusing upon it as a decision-making process and not a final product. Like Yancey, Shipka too believes that Composition must bridge “the gap between the numerous and varied communicative practices in which students

routinely engage outside of school versus the comparatively narrow repertoire of practices typically associated with the writing classroom” (5). She seeks a composition made whole, meaning that all means and modes possible can and should be used to compose the best argument possible for an intended audience. In so doing, she challenges what it means to compose by focusing upon design and design choices and re-focusing our attention on the fifth cannon of rhetoric. Metacognitive writing and description accompany design choices as her students attempt to place their work in circulation in the world. An example of this in practice is a project created by a student in her class who wrote her researched-based essay on a pair of ballet shoes (Shipka 2). Rather than looking at the product, the ballet shoes and evaluating that, Shipka focused on the composing process and the choices her student made as she composed her argument. In this way, Shipka echoes not only a more post-process approach to pedagogy, but she broadens what it means to compose using multiple modes. Her book allows us a way to envision text design and creation differently within composition classrooms. In this re-envisioning of text production, though, Shipka also faced pushback from instructors as they questioned her the legitimacy of her classroom practices. One instructor from the history department challenged the assignment and “[d]espite being phrased as a question, his tone, facial expression, and body language suggested this was not a genuine question or attempt at a clever pun so much as a way of signaling his discomfort with the kinds of texts I was proposing students might produce” (Shipka 2). His cutting remark reveals his belief that multimodal arguments are not academic nor can they be taken seriously, whereas Shipka sets her classroom up to reflect the seriousness and academic nature of multimodal composition.

George, Yancey, and Shipka's innovative classroom practices incorporating multimodality reflect what happens when a classroom values multimodality. They all allowed their students the freedom to be innovative with multimodality, and in doing so provide concrete examples of classroom practices that allow for discussion and analysis of multimodal texts to better meet the challenges of current society's information interface. When theory lines up with practice within the classroom, students feel more comfortable to create and design multimodal texts. This begs the question, what is the significant stumbling block to implementation of a multimodal pedagogy? It appears to be instructors and changing how they view and value multimodality as being as academically serious.

So how do we make multimodality more important in Composition classrooms and nudge those reluctant instructors? A national guiding document like the WPA Outcomes Statement (OS) 3.0 of 2014 can facilitate this move as, in it, expectations about multimodality are outlined more explicitly, and values are implicit in the language used. Because it is a national organization, those recommendations may move some instructors to modify their classroom practices. Changes to the WPA OS in this recent iteration begin to broaden the definition of what composition means and legitimize digital and non-linguistic texts through direct mention and reference. In doing so this statement reminds instructors to re-examine their practices within the classroom. Changes such as section titles moving from "Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing" to "Critical Thinking, Reading, and Composing" emphasize the power of the student to negotiate multiplicity (Leverenz 40). Language in the WPA OS moves toward *exploration*, which is not definitive or looking for an *appropriate correct* answer. Students are asked to

*negotiate* “purpose, audience, context, and conventions as they compose a variety of texts for different situations” and “*develop facility* in responding to a variety of situations and contexts calling for purposeful shifts in voice, tone, level of formality, *design*, medium and/or structure” (WPA 145, emphases mine). The word choice changes the focus of the class and therefore the practices of both the instructors and students. Students become, as George, Yancey and Shipka each differently emphasize, *designers* who must negotiate a variety of rhetorical situations and create rhetoric specific for that situation. This means that students cannot compose in the same mode every time they are asked to perform the act of composition and that instructors must afford them the opportunity to compose in different modes. In this way the WPA OS is a formal challenge to instructors to modify their practices within their classrooms to incorporate multimodality, which has become even more necessary recently as multimodal arguments leave students vulnerable to manipulation because they are not trained to look for rhetorical moves within them. Critical awareness can help confront the cognitive dissonance so prevalent within digital media as the blurring of the spaces affects people anywhere at any time. Practicing the design and delivery of multimodal texts creates awareness and allows for audiences to be more critical and thus less easily manipulated.

Leverenz draws upon the New London Group’s definition of available design and the idea of inhabiting our world as designers. If we inhabit the world as a designer, it “changes how we engage with the world” (39). We are no longer experts searching for the one answer but the creators who draw upon the available designs of others to generate and thus create another available design for future iteration. This demonstrates the blurring of definitive spaces between student and citizen. With handheld devices,

students inhabit both spheres simultaneously and interact with both spheres fluidly, perhaps too fluidly, if we are to be truthful. Taking the stance that students are designers, or creative participants in the world around them, changes their own view of how they work within the world and how it works upon them. The combination of modes for rhetorical effect with the element of design creates a space for discussion about the roles of our students, but it still does not give us practices in how students learn and produce using a variety of modes, which operate differently in their various combinations.

Taken together George, Yancey, Shipka and Leverenz expose how the field values multimodality. Despite clear exigence and a charge to compose in a variety of modes, multimodality stumbles in practice because of lack of comfort of instructors, time constraints, and the emphasis upon linguistic texts. The tension between values and programmatic practice forms the focus of my study, as I attempt to figure out how those values translate into classroom artifacts and practices and thus modify student behavior such that they become more savvy with analysis and creation of multimodal texts within the classroom. The First-Year Writing Program at USC, the focus of the study that follows, has made moves to include multimodality and therefore gives compositionists an example of a writing program in the midst of making the connection between valuing multimodality and putting those value into actual practice.

## CHAPTER 3

### BACKGROUND AND PARTICIPANTS

The University of South Carolina, a large, research-intensive state school, serves 30,603 undergrad and graduate students on its main campus in Columbia, SC. The FYW Program is directed by the FYW Director, in this study named Andrew C. and the FYW Associate Director Cassidy D. along with the support of four student Assistant Directors and a full-time office assistant. The entire First-Year English curriculum includes two three-credit, one-semester courses, with ENGL 101 focusing on critical reading and the ENGL 102 focusing on argumentation and rhetoric. Instructors for ENGL102 range from second-year MA students in Composition and Rhetoric, Linguistics, or MFAs in poetry, fiction, or non-fiction to PhD students to tenured faculty. With 100 sections of the course per semester and varied experiences of the instructors, the FYW Program designs a common syllabus and textbook each year to assist new instructors to Composition and to create continuity between the sections.

ENGL102 fulfills one of USC's general education requirements, which are classes deemed to "support subsequent study in the program major and in beyond-the-classroom learning activities" ("Carolina Core"). Areas of focus include "communication, analytical reasoning and problem solving, scientific literacy, information literacy and the arts" ("Carolina Core"). ENGL102 satisfies the "Effective, Engaged, and Persuasive Communication: Written" requirement within the Carolina Core, or general education, requirements. In order to fulfill this Core requirement,

ENGL102 focuses on an extended research project that ties to the Information Literacies outcomes established by USC. Students in this class learn about the rhetorical aspects of writing and various texts and are asked to create an academically researched argument on a topic of their choosing. From these texts, students are asked then to remediate their argument into another form and present these “new” remediations to their peers, which often results in multimodal projects like pamphlets, informational videos, or multimodal presentations.

My study focuses on the four individuals directly responsible for creating the ENGL102 syllabus and its accompanying textbook *The Carolina Rhetoric*. I interviewed the First-Year English Director, the First-Year Assistant English Director, and two student Assistant Directors (ADs) about their perceptions of the roles of FYE, ENGL102, and the textbook, as well as how they viewed multimodality as a component of those roles. Because the program’s Director and Associate Director have worked for the past several years together, they share some similar views on the purpose of ENGL102 and how it serves the goals of the university and society at large. Both feel the goal is to “prepare students for the work they will do in their academic areas and then beyond into their professional lives” (Andrew C.) and that there is a heightened value in “evaluating source material from a variety of places or locations” (Cassidy D. ). The FYW Director is a tenured professor in the department of English Language and Literature with a specialization in Rhetoric and has served two terms as the FYW Director. The FYW Associate Director has been in the position for the last nine years and has a PhD in Literature.

Student Assistant Directors (ADs) can be PhD students in either Literature or Composition and Rhetoric and are in charge of the textbook and the syllabus for FYW under the direction of the Director of FYW and the Associate Director of FYW. This year both ADs in charge of the FYW textbook and syllabus were male PhD students in Composition and Rhetoric. Both had teaching experience in their previous MA programs at other universities as well as their first years in their PhD program at USC. At the time of this study, both ADs, Sean L. and Isodore B. had finished coursework for the USC PhD Composition and Rhetoric program, were working on their dissertations, and were fulfilling their student Assistant Director roles in FYW. Neither earned undergraduate degrees in Composition and Rhetoric but did study Communication before coming to USC, and both had interests beyond the classroom in multimodality.

*The Carolina Rhetoric* textbook is organized into two parts. Part One focuses on “rhetorical terms that should be useful to [students] both as [they] analyze texts and as [they] engage in [their] own research and writing” (Harley vii). The terms, definitions, questions, and exercises were all written by Composition faculty or graduate students, and Isodore B. organized them according in accordance with the five canons of rhetoric. These canons are divided unevenly into subcategories. For instance, Invention contains eight sub categories, Arrangement six, Style two, Memory none, and Delivery two. Each subcategory has three exercises attached to it. After Part One, which contains what the FYW Director calls the “encyclopedia of rhetoric” portion of the textbook, Part Two comprises “professional essays that [students] can analyze for rhetorical devices, cite in [their] Researched Argumentative Essay, or use as models for [their] own work” (Harley vii). These readings are used as exemplars and discussion points for students as they

explore the rhetorical choices made by rhetors. Forty texts make up Part One and are divided evenly among four units: Media and Technology, Gender and Sexuality, Food, and Race, Ethnicity and Heritage.

The process of creating the textbook involved the Sean L. and Isodore B., along with other graduate instructional assistants (GIAs) within Composition and Rhetoric, discussing possible ways to organize the textbook. Isodore B. then took the lead and proposed the conceptual organization of it to the FYW Director and Associate Director. Creating the entire textbook was a first at USC. In past instantiations, the FYW Program used handbooks from established publishers and made them work along with the readings supplied by the textbooks, or, in more recent years, the FYW Program created a reader to accompany the publisher's handbook. This undertaking marks a shift in USC's practices, one that may impact many years to come depending on how often or if the book's set up is altered in Part One.

On the other hand, the readings for Part Two underwent a similar process as past years where the FYW Associate Director enlisted feedback from last year's instructors and secured permissions for pieces to be used as exemplars in the second half of the book while meeting budget constraints. This does not mean that Part Two will never change; it is also modified each year to account for readings that become dated, obsolete, or unavailable because of permissions or budget constraints. For instance Jacques Derrida's "Panopticon" went from a reasonable amount of less than \$50 for permission to use it to \$500 in one year (Cassidy D.). Paying this much money for one permission drives the cost of the textbook up, and the FYW Program at USC seeks to meet the needs of their students within the classroom while also keeping the costs of textbooks low (Cassidy D.).

I feel it is important to note this activity of textbook creation as being different and in some ways innovative so that other schools may follow such a process. This modification of activity significantly changed how the texts were generated and functioned as a whole in FYW classrooms. Because of the adjustment to an in-house production, the textbook created by USC can be said to reflect the values and beliefs of FYW more directly. The adjustment to an in-house production also shows how a textbook can modify curriculum drastically if warranted in response to student needs or perceived student needs as well as budget constraints.

Traditionally, the syllabus and textbook are updated by the same person, but this year, Isodore B. took charge of the textbook, and Sean L. took charge of the syllabus. USC provides a common syllabus tied directly to the required textbook for all ENGL102 instructors to use. The common syllabus seeks to create a unified experience for freshman and was made available to all instructors of ENGL102 by the student AD in charge Sean L. How and if the syllabus is used is up to each individual instructor, but the Information Literacy Projects (ILPs) and the Major Writing Assignments (MWAs) must be done to fulfill the requirement of the Carolina Core set up by USC. Many instructors, the majority of whom are grad students, use this syllabus to organize their classroom instruction because this is their first experience teaching ENGL102. For that reason, looking at the common syllabus gives us an idea of what many students will experience in ENGL102 within a given year.

The process for creating the syllabus involved Sean L. looking at the textbook and its arrangement. He then took the previous year's syllabus and used it as a "skeleton" for his own (Sean L.) For instance, he kept the course description and learning outcomes the

same since they come from the department and FYW website. Course Policies were a “conglomeration” of policies used by him or other GIAs with whom he talks about classroom management (Sean L.). After he established the policies, he moved to the creation of the assignments and schedule of activities. He proposed ten readings from the possible 40 within the textbook. These readings were interspersed with the required ILPs and the MWAs. After creating the syllabus, Sean L. submitted it to the Director of FYW for comments and suggestions. With minimal edits, Sean L. modified the syllabus, and it was sent to those teaching ENGL102. This year’s process involved more collaboration between the student ADs because the separation of duties and Isodore B. being more intimately familiar with the new textbook created by FYW.

## CHAPTER 4

### METHODS

To understand the creation processes and values informing the production of the ENGL102 syllabus and *The Carolina Reader*, I draw upon Cultural Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) as the theoretical framework for this study. CHAT involves looking at activity as “historically, culturally, and socially situated action in which people are engaged towards a shared objective” (Barrett-Tatum 4); in this case, the activity to be considered is the production of writing program’s syllabus and textbook . I draw most upon Engeström’s third-generation of CHAT, which “blends Bakhtin’s ideas about language as being inseparable from social and history factors and Leont’ev’s concept of activity” (Barrett-Tatum 4). In other words, language functions as a material object created in a particular context for a particular purpose. In this instance, the material artifacts that encapsulate the objects of language, the syllabus and the textbook, do not just exist; they too interact with those they encounter and also influence behavior. At USC, these two artifacts impact up to 1,000 students spring semester. Because the syllabus and textbook are created and then are placed into situations where they are used, CHAT allows to us to map out a rhizome of interactions from their creation to implementation as they interact with those they encounter.

Third-generation CHAT “provides for the joining, or intersecting, of two systems working towards individual and collective goals” (Barrett-Tatum 5). In this case, the overlap of the four individuals working together to create the two ENGL102 artifacts and

the activities surrounding those artifacts allows us to see the ideology behind their creation. For those who wish to look at the inclusion and construction of multimodality, the syllabus and textbook allow observers the ability to triangulate the values and beliefs behind FYW, specifically ENGL102 at USC. These artifacts are material manifestations of those values in action and become important to examine since they in turn impact the ideas and beliefs of both instructors and students who use them within the university. If we are concerned with classroom practices, it is important to understand what lies behind that ideology, which dictates practices, and if those practices in turn do what they are intended to do.

A set of studies that focus on curriculum development and use CHAT-informed methods inform my study's design. Chris Campbell, Seonaigh MacPherson, and Tanis Sawkins conducted a CHAT study, called "Preparing Students for Education, Work, and Community: Cultural Historical Activity Theory in Task-Based Curriculum Design," which looked at the designing of The ESL Pathways Project and examined how curriculum modification allowed students to practice and carry out real-world skills. This study ties to my examination of how controlling documents and philosophies at an institution or program-level impact classroom practices. In a somewhat similar curricular vein, Cynthia Shanahan, Michael J. Bolz, Gayle Cribb, Susan R. Goldman, Johanna Hoppeler, and Michael Manderino, in their study "Deepening What it Means to Read (and Write) Like a Historian: Progressions of Instruction Across a School Year in an Eleventh Grade U.S. History Class," used CHAT to look at Project Reading, Evidence, and Argumentation in Disciplinary Instruction (READI) and to study the successful execution of text choice to meet expected goals. This study is similar to mine in that it

sought to examine curriculum innovation and how it impacts best practices within the classroom, which ties to what FYW is tasked with doing when they create and develop *The Carolina Rhetoric* and its accompanying syllabus.

Jennifer Barrett-Tatum's analysis of Common Core State Standards implementation within two classrooms in her article "Examining English Language Arts Common Cores State Standards Instruction through Cultural Historical Cultural Historical Activity Theory" provides the most significant influence on my study design. Her case study "examined the day-to-day instruction of two primary grade teachers running their first year of full [Common Core State Standards] CCSS implementation" (1). She uses the third generation of CHAT methodology to look at how two classroom teachers implemented Common Core while attempting to achieve the same curricular goal (5). For my study not only was I able to look at how those who created the ENGL102 syllabus and *The Carolina Rhetoric* participated in these creation activities, I was also able to look at the artifacts themselves as being reflective of the philosophies of each participant as they pertained to multimodality in classroom practices. Barrett-Tatum's approach to looking at the activities of teachers as they implemented CCSS models a framework to look at how activities within FYW at USC reflect the philosophy and goals of FYW and ENGL102. Instead of looking at literacy activities as Barrett-Tatum did, however, I looked at multimodality activity and exposure within these two artifacts. Her concept that a learning objective is a separate entity (or object) that is an extension of where activities overlap also becomes useful as I look at the two artifacts created by FYW (the ENGL102 syllabus and *The Carolina Rhetoric*) to determine if they reflect the values outlined by participants (4). What she found was that there influences

outside of the classroom that impacted the literacy learning activities within the classroom. Nothing is created in a vacuum, and the activities that occur within a writing program are impacted by other parts of the university or entities or systems outside the university. In her case, it was not just the teacher's view and philosophy that impacted instruction, but outside sources such as "CCSS documents, State DOE guidelines for implementation and assessment, County guidelines and assessments, school-level supports such as the literacy instructional coach, grade level lesson plans, and classroom communities" (15). In exploring how USC's FYW Program creates the two artifacts, outside influences also directly impacted how the activities were carried out as well as impacted the artifacts themselves directly. Permissions and the cost of producing a textbook would fall into this category. In this way Barrett-Tatum provides a direct model of how an curricular system implements change and what impacts that change as it makes its way to the classroom practices. Her use of semi-structured interviews and coding system provides a lens through which one can see how the beliefs of the those involved in the creation of these artifacts individually and together potentially impact classroom practice.

My study contributes to an understanding of the activity behind syllabus and textbook creation at a large state university in the South. The common syllabus and textbook provide examples of material items in action that attempt to unify classroom practices. The syllabus acts as a controlling or guiding document of information and therefore those values of the institution. CHAT allows us to see how individuals and activities tied to the creation of the syllabus and textbook influence an entire campus not only that year but in the years to come as both undergo modifications both large and

small. What institutions and the creators of the curriculum value translates into class requirements and activities, which demonstrate to students what is deemed important by the institution (Thomson-Bunn). For this reason, we must examine the creation of these guiding documents of practice and those who create them. CHAT formalizes this examination and allows for a more objective observation and reflection upon the activities to determine if the activities that create these artifacts are viable and useful for the future.

To understand how philosophy, players, and artifacts interact in the creative process of the ENGL102 syllabus and *The Carolina Rhetoric*, I had to determine the process of creation, interview the players, and examine the artifacts for content. The book and syllabus are modified a year in advance of implementation due to permissions and general moves the FYW Program chooses to make as they fine tune their curriculum to meet the needs of all their constituents. My study focuses on the six months before the final edits of the book are prepared because that is when the most decisions are made and implemented within the two artifacts. I conducted one 30-minute semi-structured interview with the FYW Director, the FYW Associate Director, the FYW student Assistant Director in charge of developing the ENGL102 syllabus and the FYW Student Assistant in charge of *The Carolina Rhetoric*. The interviews contained questions pertaining to FYW, ENGL102, and multimodality as well as asked interviewees to reflect upon the strengths and weaknesses of FYW, ENGL102, and *The Carolina Rhetoric* and the processes they underwent to create the syllabus and textbook (See Appendix A). I allowed interviewees to read this paper before submission for accuracy.

In addition to the interviews, I conducted text analysis on how multimodality appeared in *The Carolina Rhetoric* and the ENGL102 syllabus (See Appendix D). Using the Table of Contents as my guide, I coded two different parts present within *The Carolina Rhetoric* differently. Coding for “Exercises” within Part One proved necessary because some of these questions not only referred to non-linguistic texts but also asked students to respond in modes other than linguistic text. I wanted to see where students were being asked to respond in a mode different than a written linguistic one, or if they were asked to respond in a multimodal form. In Part Two, some academic arguments used more than one mode to convey their argument or referred to a multimodal text as the basis of their argument. To be able to look at whether the texts referred to a multimodal form of communication as well as look at what modes were used by the authors in their own creation of the texts, I coded when multiple modes were used and made note of those academic arguments that used multimodal texts as the crux of their argument. This data would provide information as to whether students were seeing multimodality analyzed or used by rhetors in their own texts.

I used the coding mentioned above for Parts One and Two of the *Carolina Reader* to code the syllabus activities. I also coded the larger assignments called Information Literacy Projects (ILPs) and Major Writing Assignments (MWAs). These assignments are required by FYW, so I noted whether they referenced a mode other than linguistic text or required multiple modes in their creation because I wanted to see whether other modes were referenced or used in creation of the assignments. Coding the syllabus this way also allowed me to see how the textbook was utilized within the classroom as it helped dictate classroom practices.

## CHAPTER 5

### FINDINGS

In examining the interviews of the four participants involved in creating the textbook and the syllabus, I found that they held similar beliefs about the goals of FYW, ENGL102 and *The Carolina Rhetoric*. According to Andrew C., FYW functions as a place to “prepare students for the work they’ll do in the rest of their academic careers and then beyond into their professional life.” The preparation of students for future work was foremost in the minds of each of the participants as they all discussed the importance of FYW. Interviewees echoed this academic focus time and time again, saying that FYW was a “space to get their feet wet in the genre of academic writing” (Sean L.) and where students “learn to read texts critically and responsibly and then how they take those skills to do research and generate their own independent arguments” (Isodore B.). Repeated among participants was the idea that students need to be aware of the rhetorical situation in which they compose and that they “construct texts toward maximizing their persuasiveness or affects, or at least with some attention to how the text is received” (Andrew C.). The specific language used by all interviewees focused on *academic* writing as being the first priority and the emphasis of FYW.

When asked about how FYW functions beyond the university, all interviewees reached beyond the classroom to current events to point out that Composition has become more pertinent and the skills taught and practiced in the classroom have more weight and

value as a result of the social, cultural, and political climate of the nation. Isodore B. says, “I think that the cultural moment has done this [brought about the critical analysis of research] more than anything we could put in a textbook.” Now more than ever, USC is placing “an emphasis on Humanities education” with the President of USC and the Dean celebrating “diversity and being good citizens” (Cassidy D.). Sean L. believes the skills and practices students learn in FYW transcend the classroom and that the class has students “reflect on what argument is and what it does in everyday kinds of situations.” Sean L. provides an example of this practice in the syllabus he created. As he described the process, his syllabus layout “maximizes the readability and clarity of it” with “a column for the day, a column for class content, and a column for assignments.” This example and these statements all indicate that those involved in FYW understand and can see the applicability of FYW beyond the classroom, and while not the primary objective, transfer of skills beyond academics is most certainly a close and strong second. Moving beyond the academic classroom with skills learned within the classroom echoes Yancey’s call for blurring the lines of Composition. Skills are not to be taught in isolation but in connection to the world at large. For USC, this secondary focus appeared to be a natural extension philosophically for those in charge of curriculum, but this philosophical extension tends to end up competing with academic goals within the USC FYW classroom as instructors struggle to prepare students for what is expected within the classroom as well as what lies beyond the focus of the classroom.

To give students experience in composition with multimodality on a larger scale, FYW created the Public Turn assignment “Multimodality was kind of tacked on a few years ago” and “was something that he had never touched before,” said Sean L. It came

about after both Isodore B. and Sean L. took a graduate school course on multimodality. With that class and the Director of FYW's awareness of the "burgeoning movement for multimodality," the idea of multimodality "kind of seeped in" (Sean L.). The Director of FYW describes how the public turn was kind of a "left turn" and how he "had reservations when this attention to visual and multimodality came on the scene." This reservation came from how to balance curriculum to give adequate coverage to multimodality instruction but still achieve curricular goals, which still lean heavily on linguistic production as the primary mode of composition. Leaning on linguistic production circles back to USC's expectation that FYW fulfil the Carolina Core literacy requirement of "Effective, Engaged, and Persuasive Communication: Written." FYW must also factor in training. As the Director of FYW, Andrew C. puts it, "There is so much to talk about with the written, print texts, that can we afford to give less time to something in a way that we are ill-equipped to do at least as we are trained now, which is analyzing visual texts." His "conversion narrative," as he calls it, and his rationalization of the inclusion of multimodality in FYW came after working on html JavaScript as a hobby. He realized,

Oh, okay now I get it. When elements of visual design are part of the equation, it influences the ways that I compose, so I think that there is that rationale for including multimodality and the visual in the classroom. The other is the one that we were talking about before; that this is the way [students] get a lot of their information is through visual texts. I think there is a "greater expectation" even within the academy that they are going to be communicating their research or

their findings through texts that incorporate visual element, so it is important that we include multimodality in the classroom.

Despite realizing the relevance of multimodality, the FYW Program Directors still struggle “to figure out exactly how to handle it” and incorporate it more smoothly into composition (Harley). Andrew C. says, “We still have a long way to go in terms of training our instructors to teach multimodality effectively,” and the lack of training is perhaps one of the stumbling blocks for many FYW programs across the nation and ties back to practice. Teachers instruct in the way they have been instructed and learned, and possibly without practice themselves, they may be unsure of how to instruct and assess multimodal compositions. Classroom practices, therefore, often lag behind current social practices, and we see this most evidently displayed with multimodality, as technology has moved exponentially into our lives.

What drives a curriculum, aside from the skills that an instructor wishes his or her student to practice and achieve, are the materials used to impart these skills and model these practices. It makes sense then to begin with the textbook as the first artifact of examination in this study. Isodore B. designed Part One “to help students generate arguments” and give “them some terms just to give them a way to talk about things they might have intuited otherwise about languages and then give them models.” The goal of this section, according to Isodore B., is “to get [a rhetorical term], be able to talk about it, and move.” Part One does reflect this approach and comprises only 74 pages of a 515 page textbook.

For this portion of the book, I noted what students were being asked to do and the kinds of practice that was being asked of them as they studied the canons of rhetoric.

Having graduate students and English faculty contribute to the textbook strengthens *The Carolina Rhetoric* because “they know our students” and can therefore better write for USC students whereas “other publisher and authors have a disconnect” (Cassidy D.). Since the textbook was created from scratch, including all the exercises, this artifact can be said to better reflect the values of the FYW program as it is created by those who are in charge and those who teach it. As the Assistant FYW Director puts it, the student AD is “an experienced TA, who has their finger on the pulse of what their cohorts want to see” and therefore can give voice to the kinds of changes desired by instructors as curriculum moves forward within FYW.

A close examination of the textbook demonstrates the types of modes in which students are asked to work and to which they are exposed. When we look at the breakdown of the modes in which students were asked to respond in Part One exercises, linguistic response made up the super majority with 50 of the 57, or 87.7%, of questions requiring some form of written linguistic response either alone or in conjunction with another mode (See Table 5.1). The remaining seven required a verbal linguistic response either TABLE 5.1

**Text Response Type Occurrence**

<b>Text Response Type</b>	<b># of Questions</b>	<b>% of Occurrence</b>
Audio (A)	3	8.8%
Linguistic written (L)	50	87.7%
Linguistic verbal (Lb)	10	17.5%
Spatial (S)	2	3.0%
Visual (V)	12	21.1%
Requires use/viewing of non-linguistic	5	8.8%
Note: Questions can require more than one mode of response		

alone (4 of 7, or 57%) or in conjunction with another mode (3 of 7, or 43%). Of those written linguistic responses, three required a visual component used to illustrate a point; otherwise the question required discussion with others or with the class as a whole. For visual composition options, like the re-envisioning and creation of a new Monopoly game in the Design exercises, a written or verbal explanation of reasoning for choices made was turned in or shared with the class. In fact, if the composition required a spatial or audio composition, a written explanation was required in all instances. The fact that 87.7% of responses require only a linguistic written composition, 21.1 % could require a visual composition, 17.5% could require a spoken composition, 8,8% could require an audio composition, and 3.5% could require a three dimensional composition displays a reliance upon linguistic texts to teach composition skills and reinforce composition practices. This heavy preference for written compositions does make sense considering the primary focus of ENGL102 is still “the argumentative essay, or the argumentative genre of academic essays” and the goal is “to prepare our students to not only use rhetorical concepts to analyze texts but also use rhetorical concepts to produce texts” (Sean L.). However, the move to incorporate production beyond the linguistic bears noting. A modest variety of modes are displayed within the textbook but not with the frequency one would expect, say over 50%, if multimodality were a significant value within the curriculum and its practices.

While the book largely demands written linguistic modes of response, the most diversity in mode occurs in the sections devoted to canons of Memory and Delivery (See Table 5.2). Invention, Arrangement, and Style account for the majority of the questions at 48 of 57, or 84%, with exercises that require a written linguistic text alone accounting for 33

of those questions, or 68.8%. Memory and Delivery exercises that require written linguistic texts alone only account for 8 of 15, or 53.3%. Also within Memory and Delivery, we see the most variety available in exercise responses; five of the 15 exercises allow students to compose visually, spatially, or in an audio format in contrast to just a verbal response.

TABLE 5.2

**Percentage of Multimodal versus the Total Questions per Canon**

Mode	Lowest%				Highest%
Audio (A)	Invention 0% (0/24Q)	Delivery 0% (0/6Q)	Arrangement 5.6% (1/18Q)	Style 16.7% (1/6Q)	Memory 33.3% (1/3Q)
Linguistic Written (L) ALONE	Memory 33.3% (1/3Q)	Delivery 50% (3/6Q)	Arrangement 66.7% (12/18Q)	Style 66.7% (4/6Q)	Invention 70.8% (17/24Q)
Linguistic Verbal (Lb)	Style 0% (0/6Q)	Invention 16.7% (4/24Q)	Delivery 16.7% (1/6Q)	Arrangement 22.2% (4/18Q)	Memory 33.3% (1/3Q)
Spatial (S)	Invention 0% (0/24Q)	Arrangement 0% (0/18Q)	Memory 0% (0/3Q)	Style 16.7% (1/6Q)	Delivery 16.7% (1/6Q)
Visual (V)	Arrangement 16.7% (5/18Q)	Invention 20.8% (5/24Q)	Style 30% (2/6Q)	Delivery 30% (2/6Q)	Memory 33.3% (1/3Q)

Isodore B. recognizes the dilemma of any book and multimodality, “How do you get a video into a book?” so he purposefully sends students to listen to debates or podcasts or has them compose in a social media format to try and incorporate more multimodal ties and move beyond the constraints of a textbook. For instance, within the subcategory of stasis in Invention, one of the questions asks students to go listen to a debate at <http://www.intelligencesquaredus.org/debates/free-speech-threatened-campus>. With this debate, Isodore B. wants students to answer “What does these two people being in conversation with each other add? Also, what does you watching through the screen add?” Including texts for students to listen to or view demonstrates one move made by Isodore B. to incorporate multimodality beyond the textbook. Other examples of

instructions to examine other modes include a podcast about Monopoly in the Design section and social media examination in the Delivery section.

Part Two contains exemplar texts, which enact the rhetorical terms students are studying and composing with and displays them as models of argument. These are texts that students read and respond to and they often serve as models or resources for classroom discussion or practice. My coding scheme reveals clearly that these texts are overwhelmingly linguistic (See Appendix D). Of the 40 texts, 32, or 80%, were single mode, linguistic texts. Of those 32, however, four did require students to have an understanding of a movie or video in order to fully embrace the authors' arguments. For example, in "Post-Process Models of Gender: The New Man in Disney/Pixar" by Ken Gillam and Shannon R. Wooden, students were expected to have some passing knowledge of the movies *Cars*, *Toy Story*, and *The Incredibles* in order to fully understand the argument that the idea of what it means to be a man is changing. As the FYW Associate Director puts it, most exemplar texts "reflect an essay format but reference videos or things that go viral. Students are encouraged to use the book as a map to go on and find this stuff" as it ties to their own research and interests (Cassidy D.). As such, students need or are assumed to have to have digital or cultural awareness tied to media and current events in the media and in doing asks students to purposefully blur the lines between the classroom and beyond. The eight texts that utilized more than one mode relied upon the visual. Of the visuals used in these texts, two were used to illustrate movement in time or of an activity, two were drawn images to add an illustrative example to the argument, one used a diagram to illustrate a concept, and the remaining five used charts or graphs to define or explain vocabulary or display data. The inclusion of

something other than written text in the exemplar essays varied in the 10 texts from unit to unit: 30% in Media and Technology, 20% in Gender and Sexuality, 0% in Food, and 30% in Race, Ethnicity, and Heritage (See Table 5.3). While not evenly dispersed, 20% of the total texts having multiple modes present indicates Isodore B., as editor, along with the FYW Associate Director, as managing editor, consciously sought to “find pieces that included graphs and charts,” which are consistent with how multimodal components are encountered in academic texts, but “*The Carolina Rhetoric* does better than other texts because there is a diverse array of genres and a diverse array of modes” (Isodore B.).

TABLE 5.3

**Multimodal Texts by Unit**

<b>Unit Name</b>	<b># of Multimodal Questions</b>	<b>% of Occurrence</b>
Media and Technology	3	30%
Gender and Sexuality	2	20%
Food	0	0%
Race, Ethnicity, and Heritage	3	30%
<b>Total Texts</b>	8 of 40 texts	20% of total texts

Part Two of the textbook reflects a concerted effort to include ties to multimodality yet displays the limitations of a textbook, which cannot include videos and sound. For example, in the introduction to the article “Why the Calorie is Broken” by Nicola Twilley and Cynthia Graber, students are directed to listen to the podcast *Gastropod* at <http://mosaicscience.com/story/why-calorie-broken> because Isodore B wants students to conceptualize how an academic argument changes for different contexts and purposes when it is turned into a multimodal argument. By sending them to the argument in a different form, students can see how different modes can make the same argument. Isodore B. also made sure that some academic texts used multiple modes,

so students could see them in practice. He says, “When I think about multimodality, I don’t think just digital or don’t think just performance. When you look at the different genres of writing, they are also functioning different modally. Science articles, the use of graphs, the use of images, the use of photographs. We tried to find pieces that included graphs and charts” to expose students to a diverse array of genres and modes but also make reference to sources outside the text to which students can turn to see how an argument changes when it changes modes. Isodore B’s philosophical nod to incorporate audio and visual texts to supplement the textbook gives students models, which they could then use to structure their own multimodal arguments.

The exercises in Part One of *The Carolina Rhetoric* also provide some exposure for students in the practice of composing in more than one mode. For instance, within the subtopic Genre Conventions, students are asked to “take a piece that [they’ve] read for this course and pretend [they’re] going to ‘translate’ it into another genre” (Harley 51). This gives students the opportunity to re-envision an argument and practice placing it into another genre and mode. All this analysis of the textbook shows that there is a direct correlation between the values and beliefs of FYW at USC concerning multimodality and the contents of the textbook.

The contents of the textbook are overwhelming to do in one semester-long class, so Sean L. boiled 40 possibilities down 10. Examining the syllabus reveals how Sean L. marked time in the classroom and where and how multimodality is incorporated. Aside from outlining readings to be discussed, the syllabus marks deadlines for the Information Literacy Projects (ILPs) and Major Writing Assignments (MWAs) as well as displays the days focused on the production of students’ own writing as they prepared their MWAs or

worked on aspects that would enable them to better complete their ILPs (See Appendix 2 and 3 for the MWAs and ILPs). Class time focused on the textbook specifically 18 of 43 days (41.9%) with some of those days focusing on more than one canon. Five of those 18 days were selections from Part One paired with a reading from Part Two. Here Sean L. “leaned on Isodore B.” who had developed the textbook to help him pair the readings: “We had a meeting before I wrote the syllabus and talked, and I asked, ‘What kinds of pairings would you like to see?’” From here, Sean L. chose concepts he felt could be completed within a given week and then broke them down further into specific days with activities and readings. The readings again demonstrate a linguistic preference. In the five pairings, all readings from Part Two were linguistic.

Of note, however, is when Sean L. turns from the book and creates two days dedicated to examining digital texts not tied to the textbook at all because he understands the limitations of *The Carolina Rhetoric*. He says, “So in the textbook, there’s very limited amounts of tools that we can use in order to kind of express or unfurl the full possibilities of what multimodality can be. A part of this is that we are limited by the format of the textbook.” This necessitates a turn away from the book to incorporate the multimodal, and Sean L. did just that. But only two days of the course have students engaging with multimodal texts directly. These days fall at the end of the semester, when students begin creating their Public Turn assignment. Sean L. uses three multimodal sources from outside the text to bring the total number of days where multimodal texts were engaged by students to be 5 of 18. Comparing the number of days multimodal texts were engaged directly in the readings in Part Two or possibly through exercises in Part One versus the total number of days students were engaged with the textbook directly,

the total rises to 14/18 (77.8%). This breaks down to 14/43 (32.6%) days where students had the possibility to create or view multimodal texts or 18/43 (41.9%) days if viewing class presentations for the Public Turn assignment are counted. The number of days that students are engaged with multimodal texts relates to Sean L.'s comment about the limitations of a textbook. He said, "it's kind of trying to fit a square peg into a round hole sometimes, especially with multimodality, because it's kind of this amorphous thing," and this makes capturing multimodality in a textbook especially problematic. By looking beyond the text, Sean L. attempts to make that square peg a bit more round in practices within the classroom by supplying current multimodal examples for students to see and examine.

The weighting of the assignments and the amount of time spent on a practice or skill connote a value in the curriculum. The number of days between assignments is almost symmetrical even though the weight of the assignments is heavier in the second half of the semester. Nine days work up to the Exploratory Analysis worth 10% of the total grade. Another nine days pass and leads to the Project Proposal and Annotated Bibliography worth 15% of the total grade. Nine more days lead to the Researched Argument worth 20% of the total grade. The Researched Argument is supposed to be the assignment the two previous heavy hitters aim for, so it make sense that the value and weight build up. Up until this point in the semester, the focus of these assignments and much of the class practices revolve around linguistic texts. As the syllabus progresses, the textbook is used less because of the turn toward revision of assignments to be included in the final portfolio. The turning away from the book also happens with the use of outside sources as examples of multimodal arguments and leads up to the Public Turn

assignment, “which requires a re-envisioning their argument in another form such as a Prezi, poster, song, poetry, or pamphlet” (Cassidy D.). Those twelve days that move from the submission of the Researched Argument to the Public Turn assignment worth 15% of the total grade do focus on multimodality and the re-envisioning of their argument, but they also simultaneously heavily emphasize the revision of the entire portfolio for final submission at the end of the semester. That is, during the multimodal assignment, students are still also engaging with linguistic texts.

Weighing the Public Turn and the Project Proposal and Annotated Bibliography equally, however, does show value of the Public Turn assignment. This move in the curriculum to, as Cassidy D. puts it, “step up our game” aims to treat the Public Turn as more than just an add-on as it has been in the past and creates a weighted significance that expresses those in FYW’s value of multimodality. Students are expected to speak in the Public Turn assignment to an audience beyond the classroom and in doing so blur the lines between scholastic and social spheres. It also possibly sets up students to recognize that they are participants, no matter where they are, in rhetorical acts, so they should be aware and critical of design choice.

The Public Turn assignment represents one move by USC’s FYW Program to bridge the gap between classroom and real-world practices and blur those spaces. Essential to this assignment is a turn to the “public.” Students must imagine their new audience outside the classroom and make changes in the design of their argument to better reach that new audience and achieve their persuasive goal within the public realm. However, because the emphasis on multimodal production falls in the last month of the semester and involves an imagined public audience, it is a bit problematic. As a result, I

am not sure that the move to value multimodality by making it an official assignment worth 15% of a student's grade is as successful as FYW would wish it to be. Students must practice multimodality and its analysis throughout the semester in order set them up to be successful.

The multimodal assignment occurring last, despite it holding significant weight in the grade for the course, contributes to the idea that it is an “add-on.” Students view the Public Turn assignment in the words of Isodore B. as a “one off” despite the move to value it more, and it is not hard to see why. If the entire semester works toward creating an argument, students view the re-mediation of the completed argument as just another hoop to jump as they wrap up their semester instead of looking at it as a way to re-envision an argument. Leverenz would argue that they have not gained an appreciation of difference in how arguments are made. How the syllabus is organized reinforces the “add-on” mentality and sets the Public Turn assignment up is as a “next move” in the formation of an argument rather than a “different but natural” way of creating arguments. Had the respect of difference in how we argue through a variety of ways been incorporated and practiced throughout the semester, this would not feel like a “next move” but instead a “different move,” or just another way to argue. One way to solve this issue is by simply moving the Public Turn assignment to occur before the Researched Argument. This move enables students to play with design as Yancey advocates before they formally design their written pieces, which are the goal for FYW. Playing around with design would allow for students to make their arguments more concrete in their minds and would allow them to see the different ways of arguing that Leverenz advocates. Another side benefit to reordering the MWAs might be the incorporation of

multimodal aspects into the academic essay. Rather than the monolinguistic essays we traditionally get students might see how adding a visual could help convey their argument more clearly and would consider and value it as an academic move. This minor shift of the MWA could contribute to a larger shift in the valuing of multimodality at USC.

In examining the materials and conducting the interviews, I believe we can see a direct correlation between the values of those creating the curricular artifacts and the artifacts themselves. While the relationship between the two is not a startling revelation, I do feel that FYW at USC has made progress in their incorporation of multimodality. Where George, Yancey, and Shipka faced opposition from other instructors in taking multimodality seriously and as being academic, the syllabus and the Public Turn assignment demonstrate that USC instructors are willing to teach and assess multimodal assignments and do feel it a serious practice. This is progress.

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSIONS/IMPLICATIONS

With our world becoming ever-increasingly digital, multimodal arguments constantly enter the lives of our students through their hand-held devices and blur the line between academic and social spaces. Because of its worldwide potential for distribution, technology affords us the opportunity to communicate differently than we have done in the past and allows for a democratization not yet seen to this degree before. We instantly enter into a conversation and therefore circulation each and every time we post, tweet, blog, or publish electronically, and as such, voices echo in the space of the digital realm. Our students are inundated with those voices no matter the physical location, and we must help them be critical of these voices that vie for their eyes and as they act upon them multimodally. Quoting D.J. Leu, C. K. Kinzer, J. Coiro, and D. Cammack, Yancey writes ““technological change happens so rapidly that the changes to literacy are limited not by technology but rather by our ability to adapt and acquire the new literacies that emerge”” (318). Therein lies the age-old proverbial rub that as writing educators we are always a step behind trying to hit a moving target some place out in the future, a target with which we may not be comfortable ourselves. Our lack of comfort impacts our classroom and can hinder or weaken our classroom practices as literacies change with each new advancement in technology.

Cynthia Selfe exposes this weakness when she says that “a single-minded focus on print in composition classrooms ignores the importance of aurality and other

composing modalities for making meaning and understanding the world” (Selfe 114). Students have the right “to identify their own communicative needs and to represent their own identities, to select the right tools for the communicative contexts within which they operate, and to think critically and carefully about the meaning that they and others compose” (Selfe 115). By disallowing, or not encouraging, students to express themselves in their own “bandwidths,” we limit them to ours (Selfe 115). Selfe’s comments suggests a constant movement forward in education that is in constant friction with past practices. Students have likely encountered technology their entire lives and in many ways it is an extension of their own bodies, while their instructors may or may not have had the same experiences. That being said, practices must push all the more against restrictions from previous generations as instructors find themselves in the moment of which Yancey speaks. Instructors should think those big and bold thoughts when it comes to classroom practices and should push themselves to be Composition instructors whose classrooms act as gateways to, not gatekeepers of, knowledge.

From this study, I can draw several tentative conclusions and suggestions for the USC’s FYW program, and FYW programs more broadly, that address the moment Yancey speaks of concerning multimodality. First, despite the willingness of instructors at USC to teach and assess multimodality, it does not mean they all feel comfortable with the move. Fear is warranted whenever new curricular moves are made, but we, as instructors, must not remain stagnant in our own growth. Practice makes perfect is the adage, but I would qualify that practice only makes better as long as the practice is reflected upon by the participants. Put simply, if we inserted more instances of multimodality in the secondary and post-secondary levels of Composition for both

students to practice and the instructors to assess, future instructors of Composition would feel more comfortable instructing and assessing such practices, and current instructors could begin to feel more comfortable assessing. The belief that one must be an *expert* in multimodality to be able to talk about it and teach it seems counter productive, and holding on to that belief is not only unrealistic but prevents us from moving any further along in talking about and including multimodal practices within the classroom. Until instructors get a better footing and students get more practice composing in multimodal forms, we may need to lean on students to help us create classroom practices that better prepare them for the world and in doing so, perhaps, if only for a moment blur the lines between student and teacher. We provide the theory, and they provide the real-life example and practice. In this way, we each have something to give the other, so as our students evolve, our own growth as teachers also evolves.

Secondly, multimodal practice cannot be a “one and done” approach. Classroom practices need to regularly and consistently reflect analysis and design of multimodal texts, if we are to be faithful to the call of the WPA OS and shift our students from being writers to our students being designers and critical viewers of a variety of texts. As demonstrated by the interviews and my examination of the curricular artifacts at USC, the academic essay reigns supreme and using multimodality is only examined, if at all, within the confines of such essays. Digital media and its multimodal complexity within Composition is still a bit of an add-on at the end of the semester in the remediation for the Public Turn assignment. Analysis cannot occur mainly at the end of the year, if we are to shift the perspective of our students. Students must experience and design multimodal assignments throughout the course of the class. By doing so, students will begin to see

the academically serious nature of multimodal arguments and also better conceive of themselves of creators of such arguments.

Third, while total transfer and blurring of social and scholastic spaces will never be reached within Composition classrooms, we must continue in developing authentic practices that allow for transfer as society and digital media change. By this I mean that FYW Program leaders at USC shared the value of multimodal in academia, and therefore it appears within the syllabus in academic instantiations. They understand the value of composition within the university setting and practice this as such, but where there is a breakdown still is the practice that takes composition beyond the academic uses. USC's Public Turn assignment in FYW seeks to reach out and grab onto the idea of multimodality in this discourse. Through circulation and timeliness, this assignment creates the opportunity for students to blur the spaces between school and society at large in redesigning and re-envisioning their written argument. When asked to change mediums for delivery, students must "consider what they move forward, what they leave out, what they add" and with the Public Turn at SC, students must think about "how the medium itself shapes what they create" (Yancey 314). They remediate their own work and design a new iteration based upon the medium with which they choose to work. Even with the move to the Public Turn assignment or other such assignments, which try to capitalize upon student interest or "real-world" simulation. The assignment does not require that the Public Turn to actually become public beyond the classroom, however, and as such students may perceive it as a contrived exercise that maintains the delineated spaces of school and the world at large. An example of creating a successful authentic experience, however, might involve service learning or community writing approaches

that have students go out to communities to which they belong and solicit ways they could assist this community with a text creation for a specific purpose. This would take a “simulation” and make it a real-world activity in that students are vested in the topic and have a desire to assist their community toward a specific goal. If students never scrutinize and practice multimodality in authentic ways, those actions become merely activities that students complete to get a grade without critical examination of those actions.

Finally, in order to do all of the aforementioned changes, the process to enact change must be timely and current in its approach. By this, I mean that it is responsive and can change from year to year to evolve to meet the needs of students in a more natural and fluid way. The activity that USC undergoes to create *The Carolina Rhetoric* and the syllabus tied to it demonstrates the kind of timely and current approach to conceiving and making curricular change I advocate. Some universities are locked into a textbook year after year, which makes curricular changes via a shared syllabus more difficult. Because the activity surrounding the textbook at USC allows for change in a more timely fashion to reflect student needs, the syllabus also experiences that same flexibility. This flexibility could be used to make changes like the one I suggest in this study. Moving the Public Turn assignment to occur before the Researched Argument might seem small, but its move may prove more beneficial to creating classroom practices that allow for students to re-envision themselves as designers, for instructors to capitalize on students’ interest and experiences as digitally savvy individuals, and for curriculums to impact student lives beyond classroom walls. USC is fortunate to be able to have the flexibility to modify curriculum yearly, if needed, and at the same time, with this flexibility comes the possibility of backward movement. A student AD or FYW

Director or Associate Director could come in with an agenda that does not include multimodality. Fortunately, however, the FYW Director and FYW Associate Director have voiced a commitment to multimodality, so the likelihood of backtracking is unlikely at USC. We can rest assured at USC that not only will there be a continued evolution of the textbook and syllabus but also instructor practices as the two former influence the latter.

USC, like many universities, has made great strides in answering Yancey's call with nods to circulation of composition, the canons of rhetoric, and the deicity of technology, but deicity of technology still troubles the classroom. We have not, as yet found a true balance between the academic essay and multimodal analysis and creation. Due to the reticence of instructors for various reasons, full integration does not exist yet for many schools, yet this reticence fails to prepare our students in the best way possible for lives beyond academia. Education in general has struggled with transfer beyond the classroom walls, but Composition, in particular, still begs to move beyond those walls. Only when we blur the lines between classroom and the world, students realize composition exists not in a vacuum but as a skill to be practiced and analyzed daily. Multimodal practice creates the kind of citizens we wish to have in a fully functioning democratic society, ones who are not easily lead but are critical of those wishing to control how and what they think. When Composition classrooms have created those kinds of citizens, they will have moved beyond Yancey's moment to create yet another moment.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barrett-Tatum, Jennifer. "Examining English Language Arts Common Cores State Standards Instruction through Cultural Historical Cultural Historical Activity Theory." *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. (2015) 23:63 pp 1-30.
- Bazerman, Charles and David. R. Russell. "Introduction." *Writing Selves/Writing Societies*. Authors and Editors, February 1, 2003.  
[http://wac.colostate.edu/book/selves\\_societies/](http://wac.colostate.edu/book/selves_societies/)
- Beaufort, Anne. "College Writing and Beyond: Five Years Later." *Composition Forum*. Vol. 26, Fall 2012, pp. 1-11.
- Bezemer, Jeff and Gunther Kress. "Writing in Multimodal Texts: A Social Semiotic Account of Designs for Learning." *Written Communication*. vol. 25, no. 2, April 2008. pp. 166-195.
- Campbell, Chris and Seonaigh MacPherson and Tanis Sawkins. "Preparing Students for Education, Work, and Community: Cultural Historical Activity Theory in Task-Based Curriculum Design." *TESL Canada Journal Review*. (2014) 13:8 pp 68-92.
- "Carolina Core." *sc.edu*, 10 April 2017,  
[.sc.edu/about/office\\_and\\_division/provost/academic\\_priorities/undergradstudies/carolinacore/intex.php](http://sc.edu/about/office_and_division/provost/academic_priorities/undergradstudies/carolinacore/intex.php).
- Ceraso, Steph. "(Re)Educating the Senses: Multimodal Listening, Bodily Learning, and the Composition of Sonic Experiences." *College English*. vol. 77, no. 2, Nov. 2014, pp. 102-123.
- Clark, "Constructing Syllabus Materials." *Departmental Syllabus: Experience in Writing*. Pp. 103-131.
- Dively, Ronda Leathers. "Standardizing English 101 at Southern Illinois University Carbondale: Reflections on the Promise of Improved GTA Preparation and More Effective Writing Instruction." *Composition Forum*. Vol 22, Summer 2010.
- Elbow, Peter. "Review Essay: What is Real College Writing? Let the Disagreement Never End." *WPA*. Vol. 34, no. 2, Spring 2011, pp. 153-161.
- Emig, Janet. *The Web of Meaning: Essays on Writing, Teaching, Learning and Thinking*. Edited by Dixie Goswami and Maureen Butler. Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc., 1983.

- Ericsson, Patricia, et al. "Composition at Washington State University: Building a Multimodal Bricolage." *Composition Forum*. Vol. 33, Spring 2016.
- "Frameworks for Success in Postsecondary Writing." CWPA, NCTE, and NWP. January 2011.
- George, Diana. "From Analysis to Design: Visual Communication." *Multimodal Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Edited by Claire Lutkewitte. Bedford/St. Martin's, 2014, pp. 211-232.
- Hawhee, Debra. "Bodily Pedagogies: Rhetoric, Athletics, and the Sophists' Three Rs." *College English*. Vol. 65, no. 2, Nov. 2002, pp. 142-16
- Hill, Charles A. "Reading the Visual in College Writing Classes." *Visual Rhetoric in a Digital World: A Critical Sourcebook*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins 2004. 107-130.
- Hill, Charles A. and Marguerite Helmers, editors. *Defining Visual Rhetorics*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 2004.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. U of Chicago P, 1980.
- Leverenz, Carrie. "Remediating Writing Program Administration." *WPA*. Vol. 32, no. 1, Fall/Winter 2008, pp. 37-56.
- Lutkewitte, Claire, editor. *Multimodal Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Bedford/St. Martin's, 2014.
- Lunsford, Andrea A. "Writing, technologies, and the fifth cannon." *Computers and Composition*. Vol. 23, 2006, pp. 169-177.
- Maid, Barry M. and Barbara J. D'Angelo. "Is Rhetorical Knowledge the Uber-Outcome?" Parlor Press, 2012, pp. 257-270.
- Neaderhiser, Stephen E. "Hidden in Plain Sight: Occlusion in Pedagogical Genres." *Composition Forum*. Vol. 33, Spring 2016.
- Oddo, John and Jamie Parmelee. "Competing Interpretations of 'Textual Objects' in an Activity System: A Study of the Requirements Document in the \_\_\_\_\_ Writing Program." *WPA*. Vol. 31, no. 3, Spring 2008, pp. 63-88.
- Palmeri, Jason. *Remixing Composition: A History of Multimodal Writing Pedagogy*. Southern Illinois UP, 2012.
- Shanahan, Cynthia, et al. "Deepening What it Means to Read (and Write) Like a Historian: Progressions of Instruction Across a School Year in an Eleventh Grade U.S. History Class." *The History Teacher*. (2016) 49:2 pp.241-270.
- Shipka, Jody. *Toward a Composition Made Whole*. U of Pittsburg P, 2011.

Stuckey, Mary E. "On Rhetorical Circulation." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*. vol. 15, no. 4, 2012, pp. 609-612.

Thomson-Bunn, Heather. "Are They Empowered Yet?: Opening up Definitions of Critical Pedagogy." *Composition Forum*. Vol. 29, Spring 2014.

"WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition v3.0." WPA. 17 July 2014.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "Re-designing Graduate Education in Composition and Rhetoric: The Used of Remix as Concept, Material, and Method." *Computers and Composition*. Vol. 26, 2009, pp. 4-12.

## APPENDIX A – INTERVIEW LETTER AND QUESTIONS

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

My name is Kelly Wheeler. I am a graduate student in the English Department at the University of South Carolina. I am conducting a research study as part of the requirements of my degree in Composition and Rhetoric, and I would like to invite you to participate.

I am using a Cultural Historical Activity Theory approach to investigate the development of the ENGL102 Syllabus and *The Carolina Rhetoric*. I am interested in particular in how multimodal composing is valued and constructed in these texts.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to participate in one interview about multimodality and the creation of the FYW syllabus and *The Carolina Reader*. In particular, we will discuss the future of Composition and Rhetoric and multimodality as well as the goals for FYW concerning multimodality and the creation process of the 102 syllabus and *The Carolina Rhetoric*. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to. The meeting will take place at your discretion or a mutually agreed upon time and place and should last about 30 minutes. The interview will be audio taped and transcribed so that I can accurately reflect on what is discussed. The tape will only be reviewed by the researcher and mentor who will transcribe and analyze them. They will then be destroyed.

Study information will be kept in a secure location at the University of South Carolina. The results of the study may be published or presented at professional meetings, but your identity will not be revealed. While pseudonyms will be used, it is possible that participants' words represented in the study write-up could be linked to their identities. Though all efforts to preserve anonymity will be taken, full confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

Taking part in the study is your decision. You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to. You may also quit being in the study at any time or decide not to answer any question you are not comfortable answering. Participation, non-participation or withdrawal will not affect job in any way.

I will be happy to answer any questions you have about the study. You may contact me at 206.920.4764 or [wheelek@email.sc.edu](mailto:wheelek@email.sc.edu) or my faculty advisor, Dr. Hannah J. Rule [ruleh@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:ruleh@mailbox.sc.edu) if you have study related questions or problems. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Office of Research Compliance at the University of South Carolina at 803-777-709

Thank you for your consideration. If you would like to participate, please contact me at the number listed below to discuss participating.

With kind regards,

Kelly L. Wheeler

301 Waccamaw Ave, Columbia, SC 29205

206.920.4764

[wheelek@email.sc.edu](mailto:wheelek@email.sc.edu)

### Questions

Name:

Date/Time:

Role:

1. What do you perceive as being the goal/s of FYE?
2. What do you perceive as being the goal/s of ENGL102?
3. What do you perceive as being the goal/s or *The Carolina Rhetoric*?
4. How and where do you see the goals referenced above reflected or enacted at The University of South Carolina (SC)?
5. How do you see multimodality as it pertains to or in relation to FYW here at SC?
6. How do you see multimodality as it pertains to or in relation to ENGL102 here at SC?
7. How do you see multimodality as it pertains to or in relation to *The Carolina Rhetoric* here at SC?
8. What are some of the strengths, in your opinion, of FYW here at SC?

9. What are some of the strengths, in your opinion, of ENGL102 here at SC?
10. What are some of the strengths, in your opinion, of *The Carolina Rhetoric* here at SC?
11. What are some of the weaknesses, in your opinion, of FYW here at SC?
12. What are some of the weaknesses, in your opinion, of ENGL102 here at SC?
13. What are some of the weaknesses, in your opinion, of *The Carolina Rhetoric* here at SC?
14. What is the process that FYW goes through in creating the ENGL102 syllabus?
15. What is the process that FYW goes through in creating the *The Carolina Rhetoric*?
16. How do you feel about your role within FYE?

## APPENDIX B – SYLLABUS AND ASSIGNMENTS

### Major Assignment 1: Exploratory Analysis

#### **Requirements:**

Assignment length: 750 words minimum

Style guidelines: MLA 8

Due: XX/XX

#### **Instructions:**

For this assignment you will investigate a conversation or debate by finding and analyzing sources and reflecting on how they can be used to generate arguments. This assignment will also help you choose and develop a particular direction for your future research in the class. Rather than think of your project in vague terms of “topics” or “ideas,” this assignment will have you develop a “research question” that directs your investigation and provides the initial “problem” that your thesis will later address.

#### **Developing a Research Question (200 words minimum):**

Before you create a research question, you should ask “how” and “why,” while avoiding “yes” or “no” questions:

- Avoid asking questions like, “Is drinking 8 cups of water a day good for you?”
- Instead, ask questions like, “Why do we think that drinking 8 cups of water a day is good for you?” or “How do physicians know how much water people should drink in a given day?”

Additionally, before you come up with a research question, you should consider scope, difficulty, and controversy in developing this question:

- **Scope:** Will research on drinking 8 cups of water a day be enough to sustain an 8-10-page essay? Should I instead focus more broadly on hydration, so that I don’t run out of things to say?
- **Difficulty:** Will I be able to understand research on drinking water and staying hydrated? How much background knowledge do I need in order to do a good job on this topic?
- **Controversy:** Do people really believe that you should drink 8 cups of water a day? Is this something that people care about?

Once you have selected a good research question, explain why you want to pursue this research in **at least 200 words**. You might consider the following questions:

- Why are you interested in this research question?
- How does this research question affect you and your values, or does it not?
- Who might care about this research?

You will need to find (3) sources pertaining to your research question, and for each:

1. Summarize the central claim and major evidence of the article (50 words per source – 150 words overall).
  - Ex., Explain the major claims of the article and elaborate on how the author(s) support those claims.
2. Identify the major values and interests at stake for the article (50 words per source – 150 words overall).
  - Ex., Discuss which types of readers would agree or disagree with the article and why.
3. Analyze the credibility and bias of the author and source (50 words per source – 150 words overall).
  - Ex., Look carefully at the website that the source is located on, and elaborate on any obvious biases or positions. Be on the lookout for polarizing or extreme language. Search for other works by the author or seek out biographical information on the author and discuss. Explain the commitments or affiliations that the authors or sources have.

**Feasibility of Research Question (100 words minimum):**

Finally, you should reflect on the feasibility of the research question (100 words):

- How is the research question arguable, and why?
- What are some agreements and disagreements among the sources you have found?
- How do the different perspectives of the sources affect your own?
- How do you need to revise your research question?

## **Major Assignment 2: Project Proposal and Annotated Bibliography**

### **Requirements:**

Project proposal length: 350 words minimum

Annotated bibliography sources (Draft): 6

Annotated bibliography sources (Final): 10

Style guidelines: MLA

Due: XX/XX

### **Instructions:**

This assignment requires you to explore and evaluate current research related to your research question. You will survey and analyze the variety of sources you have found developing your research question and completing the previous ILPs. As you conduct more research throughout the semester, you will add additional bibliographic entries to this assignment. The first draft of the annotated bibliography must include at least 6 sources, while your final draft must have 10 sources total. MLA format requires your citations to be in alphabetical order, by the first word in the citation.

### **Annotated Bibliography:**

Your sources should include:

- At least three (3) scholarly, peer-reviewed articles.
- At least two (2) contemporary periodicals (credible newspapers/websites)
- At least one (1) non-text-based source, such as a Ted Talk, YouTube video, Podcast, etc.

Selecting good sources is important for this assignment. In order to select good sources, you will need to read through more than 6 periodicals and articles. Do not simply take the first few articles you can find. Remember, you are trying to select sources that can address your research question, not merely sources that are related to your “topic.” Putting the time into finding good sources now will save you effort later on in the semester.

For each source, write a proper MLA citation and an annotation that:

1. Summarizes the central claim and major evidence of the source (1-2 sentences).
2. Assesses the credibility, relevance, timing, and bias of the source (1-2 sentences).
3. Reflects on the suitability, utility, or applicability of the source for your project (1 sentence) (If you have a difficult time answering this, you should find a new source).

### **Project Proposal (350 words minimum):**

After you have completed gathering your initial 6 sources, you will write a project proposal that explains your research project. Using all of the sources you have annotated, you will outline the positions and conversations surrounding your argument, and develop a detailed thesis as a preliminary answer to your research question. You should not merely “parrot” or “mirror” the conclusion of a single source. Instead, you should address how you plan on using each of your sources together to put forward an initial answer to your research question. You do not need to revise the project proposal for your final draft; you are only required to add 4 additional annotations to your bibliography. These additions should adhere to the requirements listed above.

## **Major Assignment 3: Researched Argumentative Essay**

### **Requirements:**

Essay length: 2500 words minimum

Sources from annotated bibliography needed: 8

Style guidelines: MLA

Due: XX/XX

### **Instructions:**

For this assignment, you will write sustained argument stemming from your research this semester. This assignment will be developed from the annotated bibliography and other assignments you have already completed for class. This essay will represent a sustained critical argument drawing from your research to examine and interpret a given situation, event, or subject persuasively. In other words, you are answering your research question as completely as possible. Your essay must be 2500 words minimum, and must make use of at least eight sources from your annotated bibliography assignment. Your paper should adhere to the latest MLA style guidelines for research papers. A successful paper will do the following:

- Articulate a thesis as an answer to your research question, and support it with a reasonable argument and authoritative evidence.
- Develop the argument with well-written prose, effective organization, accurate grammar & usage, and appropriate academic language.
- Provide an adequate background and context for the argument you wish to make, and explain why your research question and thesis are important for this background and context.
- Properly utilizing researched evidence by effectively integrating each source using both prose signposts and MLA citation to indicate another's work while maintain coherence and readability.
- Reasonably account for opposition to your argument or differences surrounding it. Do not simply reject your "opponents" but account for their critiques within the development of your own argument.
- Argue the significance of your argument: Where does it get us? How does it address the problems you outlined? What should we do now? Where can changes be made? Your argument should have a point, a "Who cares?" that grounds it in your research and experience.
- Include a works cited with correct MLA citations for each of your 8 sources (do not include annotations, only citations).

## Major Assignment 4: Public Turn

### **Requirements:**

Goal setting and reflection length: 300-500 words minimum

Style guidelines (if applicable): MLA 8

Length (if applicable): 5-6 minutes

Due: XX/XX

### **Instructions:**

In our current information society, the vast majority of arguments are not located in academic essays. Arguments also appear in videos, images, sounds, and even smells. This assignment asks you to reconfigure the central argument and main points of evidence from your research project into a new medium and/or genre using multiple modes of expression (e.g., video, audio, etc.). This can take the form of a presentation, blog, song, poetry, short story, film, podcast, dance, food, painting, or other medium. Please discuss what format your reconfiguration will take with me before you begin this assignment. While this assignment does not have to be a presentation/video/audio *per se*, I must be able to assess your project in 5-6 minutes (i.e., keep audio, video, and presentation length to 5-6 minutes).

### **Part 1: Goal Setting (150-250 words minimum):**

Prior to creating a new medium for your argument, describe 2-3 major goals that you would like to accomplish with your public turn and how your chosen medium will achieve those goals. For example, if you have a technical topic or argument, one of your goals might be to make your research more understandable to an audience who lacks the technical know-how that you do. Using video with diagrams and illustrations might be one way to accomplish this. Alternatively, if your topic is deeply personal or emotional, one of your goals might be to capture those feelings in a more visually or orally expressive medium. A dance, song, or poem might be a suitable way to accomplish this goal. You should select goals that are achievable and appropriate for your topic. Additionally, consider how realistically your new medium can achieve the goals you have set for yourself.

### **Part 2: Reflection (150-250 words minimum):**

After you have completed presenting your work, you should look back at the goals set in the pre-remediation portion of the assignment and reflect on how successful you were in achieving these goals. In particular, address any successes, failures, or complications that occurred during the process of remediation. Additionally, elaborate on which elements you would have done differently if you were to complete the assignment again. Be as specific and detailed as possible as you reflect on your work for this assignment.

## Information Literacy Project 1: Introduction to Research Due: XX/XX

Name:  
Date:  
Section:

<b>Instructions</b>
---------------------

**Part 1:** Find and read two articles on the same subject published in the last five years. These articles should have listed authors and comprehensive content. You may need to search through many articles before you find sources that fit these criteria; do not simply use the first sources you find. Use your *Everyday Writer* to cite your selected articles in MLA 8 in the space provided. In your own words, summarize the main ideas for both articles in the space provided.

**Part 2:** Complete each category in the space provided.

- **Authority:** How does the author assure the reader that the information presented is accurate and complete? Click through links, look up citations, or verify important facts in the article through a web search. Are the links, citations, or facts presented accurate and relevant? Look up other articles written by the same author or biographical information about the author. What are their credentials?
- **Bias:** Explain the commitments of the author. What do they stand to gain from writing this article? Who is their audience and how can you tell? What kinds of organizations, ideas, or beliefs do they associate themselves with? How do you know? Are multiple viewpoints presented and addressed, or only the viewpoints of the author?
- **Context:** Examine the website, journal, or other context in which the article is written. Is this context credible? How does this context assure the reader that the content it publishes is accurate and well-researched? What sort of sources does content in this context generally use (i.e., [scholarly journals](#), [popular press](#), twitter, etc.)? How do these factors shape your view of this context?
- **Date:** What is the date in which your article was published, and how much does this matter for your subject? Explain your reasoning.

**Part 3:** Answer each research reflection section in complete sentences in the space provided

<b>Part 1: Citation &amp; Summary</b>	
Citation 1:	
Citation 2:	
Summary 1 (100 words max.):	
Summary 2 (100 words max.):	

<b>Part 2: Source Analysis (400 words max.)</b>	
<b>Authority:</b>	Source 1:  Source 2:
<b>Bias:</b>	Source 1:

	Source 2:
<b>Context:</b>	Source 1:
	Source 2:
<b>Date:</b>	Source 1:
	Source 2:

<b>Part 3: Research Reflection (300 words max.)</b>	
1. What steps did you go through to locate your articles? What kind of sources are they (i.e., more informative or opinionated)? What databases or search engines did you use? How long did it take you to find your sources (be honest)?	
Response:	
2. What knowledge or views did you already have regarding this topic, and how did this research change them? After reading these articles, will your research project change? How and why?	
Response:	
3. How can you use these sources in your project? Which parts of each article are most useful for your project and why?	
Response:	

## Information Literacy Project 2: Paraphrasing Arguments

### Due: XX/XX

Name:  
Date:  
Section:

**Instructions**

**Part 1:**

Find and read one [popular press article](#) on your topic that makes a clear and distinct argument. Use your *Everyday Writer* to cite your article in MLA 8 in the space provided. Paraphrase (do not quote) the central argument and the evidence used to support that argument in the space provided.

**Part 2:**

Complete each category in the space provided.

- **Authority:** How does the author assure the reader that the information presented is accurate and complete? Click through links, look up citations, or verify important facts in the article through a web search. Are the links, citations, or facts presented accurate and relevant? Look up other articles written by the same author or biographical information about the author. What are their credentials?
- **Bias:** Explain the commitments of the author. What do they stand to gain from writing this article? Who is their audience and how can you tell? What kinds of organizations, ideas, or beliefs do they associate themselves with? How do you know? Are multiple viewpoints presented and addressed, or only the viewpoints of the author?
- **Context:** Examine the website, journal, or other context in which the article is written. Is this context credible? How does this context assure the reader that the content it publishes is accurate and well-researched? What sort of sources does this context generally use (i.e., scholarly journals, popular press, twitter, etc.)? How do these factors shape your view of this context?
- **Date:** What is the date in which your article was published, and how much does this matter for your subject? Explain your reasoning.

**Part 3:**

Answer each research reflection section in complete sentences in the space provided. You will need to look at your ILP 1 in order to answer some questions.

Part 1: Citation & Summary	
Citation:	
Summary (100 words min.):	

Part 2: Source Analysis (200 words max.)	
<i>Authority:</i>	
<i>Bias:</i>	

<b>Context:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	

<b>Part 3: Research Reflection (300 words max.)</b>	
4. What steps did you go through to locate your article? What kind of source is it (i.e., more informative or opinionated)? What databases or search engines did you use? Was searching for this source easier or more difficult than locating sources for ILP 1? Explain.	
Response:	
5. What knowledge have you gained from reading sources from this ILP and ILP 1, and has this knowledge affected your beliefs? Explain.	
Response:	
6. How can you use this source in your project? Which parts of the article are most useful for your project and why? How does this source relate to the sources you found in ILP 1?	
Response:	

## Information Literacy Project 3: Integrating Quotations

**Due: XX/XX**

Name:  
Date:  
Section:

<b>Instructions</b>
---------------------

**Part 1:**

Go to the library and physically borrow or [check out an electronic book](#) relevant to your research project. Read the introduction, conclusion, and at least one chapter from the book. Using your *Everyday Writer*, cite the book in MLA 8 in the space provided. Select three sections of text from your reading that accurately, thoroughly, and ethically represent the argument of the source. Using these sections of text, create several quotations and write a 250-word paragraph explaining the book’s argument. Make sure to properly use and [integrate your quotes](#) into the 250-word paragraph.

**Part 2:**

Complete each category in the space provided.

- **Authority:** How does the author assure the reader that the information presented is accurate and complete? Click through links, look up citations, or verify important facts in the book through a web search. Are the links, citations, or facts presented accurate and relevant? Look up other sources written by the same author or biographical information about the author. What are their credentials?
- **Bias:** Explain the commitments of the author. What do they stand to gain from writing this source? Who is their audience, and how can you tell? What kinds of organizations, ideas, or beliefs do they associate themselves with? How do you know? Are multiple viewpoints presented and addressed, or only the viewpoints of the author?
- **Context:** Examine the website, journal, or other context in which the article is written. Is this context credible? How does this context assure the reader that the content it publishes is accurate and well-researched? What sort of sources does this context generally use (i.e., [scholarly journals](#), [popular press](#), twitter, etc.)? How do these factors shape your view of this context?
- **Date:** What is the date in which the book was published, and how much does this matter for your subject? Explain your reasoning.

**Part 3:**

Answer each reflection section in complete sentences in the space provided. You will need to look at your ILP 1 and 2 in order to answer some questions.

<b>Part 1: Citation &amp; Summary</b>
Citation:
Summary (250 words max. including quotations):

<b>Part 2: Source Analysis (200 words max.)</b>	
<b>Authority:</b>	

<b><i>Bias:</i></b>	
<b><i>Context:</i></b>	
<b><i>Date:</i></b>	

<b>Part 3: Research Reflection (300 words max.)</b>	
1. What steps did you go through to locate this book? What kind of source is it (i.e., more informative or opinionated)? What databases or search engines did you use? Was searching for this source easier or more difficult than locating sources for ILP 1 & 2? Explain.	
Response:	
2. What knowledge have you gained from reading this source compared to the sources you looked at in ILP 1 & 2, and has this knowledge affected your beliefs? Explain.	
Response:	
3. How can you use this source in your project? Which parts of the source are most useful for your project and why? How does this source relate to the sources you found in ILP 1 & 2?	
Response:	

# Information Literacy Project 4: Source Mining

## Due: XX/XX

Name:  
Date:  
Section:

### Instructions

#### Part 1:

Find and read one [scholarly article](#) relevant to your research project. Find a central claim or piece of information in the article that uses a citation and is relevant to your research question. Locate this source in the bibliography of the article, [and using the library](#), find and read it. Using your *Everyday Writer*, cite both the original source and the source you selected from the original source in MLA 8. In 250 words or less, explain how these two articles are related.

#### Part 2:

Complete each category in the space provided for your original source only.

- **Authority:** How does the author assure the reader that the information presented is accurate and complete? Click through links, look up citations, or verify important facts in the article through a web search. Are the links, citations, or facts presented accurate and relevant? Look up other articles written by the same author or biographical information about the author. What are their credentials?
- **Bias:** Explain the commitments of the author. What do they stand to gain from writing this article? Who is their audience, and how can you tell? What kinds of organizations, ideas, or beliefs do they associate themselves with? How do you know? Are multiple viewpoints presented and addressed, or only the viewpoints of the author?
- **Context:** Examine the website, journal, or other context in which the article is written. Is this context credible? How does this context assure the reader that the content it publishes is accurate and well-researched? What sort of sources does this context generally use (i.e., [scholarly journals](#), [popular press](#), twitter, etc.)? How do these factors shape your view of this context?
- **Date:** What is the date in which your article was published, and how much does this matter for your subject? Explain your reasoning.

#### Part 3:

Answer each reflection section in complete sentences in the space provided. You will need to look at your ILP 1, 2, & 3 in order to answer some questions.

Citation & Summary
Original source citation:
Source's source citation:
Relationship between sources (250 words max.):

Source Analysis (200 words max.)	
<b>Authority:</b>	

<b><i>Bias:</i></b>	
<b><i>Content:</i></b>	
<b><i>Date:</i></b>	

<b>Part 3: Research Reflection (300 words max.)</b>	
4.	What steps did you go through to locate both articles? What kind of source is your original (i.e., more informative or argumentative)? What databases or search engines did you use? Was searching for this source easier or more difficult than locating sources for ILP 1, 2, and 3? Explain.
	Response:
5.	What knowledge have you gained from reading these sources compared to the sources you looked at in ILP 1, 2 and 3? Has this knowledge affected your beliefs? Explain.
	Response:
6.	How can you use either source in your project? Which parts of this source are most useful for your project and why? How does this source relate to the sources you found in ILP 1, 2, & 3?
	Response:

## Information Literacy Project 5: Addressing Counterarguments Due: XX/XX

Name:  
Date:  
Section:

<b>Instructions</b>
---------------------

**Part 1:**

Find one sophisticated source that argues against your research project's thesis, opposes your evidence or reasoning, or otherwise complicates your argument. Using your *Everyday Writer*, cite your source in MLA 8 in the space provided. Finally, in the space provided thoroughly summarize the sections of this source that contradict your research, and explain how you would counter these claims.

**Part 2:**

Complete each category in the space provided for your selected source.

- **Authority:** How does the author assure the reader that the information presented is accurate and complete? Click through links, look up citations, or verify important facts in the article through a web search. Are the links, citations, or facts presented accurate and relevant? Look up other articles written by the same author or biographical information about the author. What are their credentials?
- **Bias:** Explain the commitments of the author. What do they stand to gain from writing this article? Who is their audience, and how can you tell? What kinds of organizations, ideas, or beliefs do they associate themselves with? How do you know? Are multiple viewpoints presented and addressed, or only the viewpoints of the author?
- **Context:** Examine the website, journal, or other context in which the article is written. Is this context credible? How does this context assure the reader that the content it publishes is accurate and well-researched? What sort of sources does this context generally use (i.e., [scholarly journals](#), [popular press](#), twitter, etc.)? How do these factors shape your view of this context?
- **Date:** What is the date in which your article was published, and how much does this matter for your subject? Explain your reasoning.

**Part 3:**

Answer each reflection section in complete sentences in the space provided. You will need to look at your ILP 1, 2, 3, and 4 in order to answer some questions.

<b>Citation &amp; Summary</b>	
Citation:	
Summary (200 words max.):	

<b>Source Analysis (200 words max.)</b>	
<i>Authority:</i>	
<i>Bias:</i>	

<b>Content:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	

<b>Part 3: Research Reflection (300 words max.)</b>	
7.	What steps did you go through to locate this article? What kind of source is your original (i.e., more informative or argumentative)? What databases or search engines did you use? Looking at ILP 1, 2, 3, and 4, how has your research strategy changed throughout this semester? Explain.
	Response:
8.	What knowledge have you gained from reading this source compared to the sources you looked at in ILP 1, 2, 3 and 4? Has this knowledge affected your beliefs? Explain.
	Response:
9.	How can you use either source in your project? Which parts of this source are most useful for your project and why? How does this source relate to the sources you found in ILP 1, 2, 3, and 4?
	Response:

APPENDIX C – *THE CAROLINA RHETORIC* TABLE OF CONTENTS

**The Carolina Rhetoric Table of Contents**

**Part One—Rhetorical Concepts**

**Unit One—Invention**.....3

The Rhetorical Situation.....5

Exigence.....7

Topoi.....9

Stasis.....13

The Appeals.....17

Audience.....22

Stakeholders.....25

Kairos.....27

**Unit Two—Arrangement**.....31

Inductive Reasoning.....33

Deductive Reasoning.....36

The Toulmin Model.....39

Classical Arrangement.....43

Rogierian Argument.....46

Poetics.....49

**Unit Three—Style**.....53

Genre Conventions.....56

Voice.....58

Unit Four—Memory.....61

Unit Five—Delivery.....65

Opportunities and Constraints.....6

Design.....	70
-------------	----

## **Part Two—Professional Essays**

### **Unit One—Media and Technology**

Joni Adamson “Indigenous Literatures, Multinaturalism, and Avatar: The Emergence of Indigenous Cosmopolitics” .....	77
Roxane Gay “Daniel Tosh and Rape Jokes: Still Not Funny” .....	87
Ken Gillam and Shannon R. Wooden “Post-Princess Models of Gender: The New Man in Disney/Pixar” .....	90
Jane McGonigal “Becoming Part of Something Bigger than Ourselves” .....	101
Eric Schmidt and Jared Cohen “Our Future Selves” .....	114
Susan Schneider “Mindscan: Transcending and Enhancing the Human Brain” .....	129
Akiba Solomon “Thugs. Students. Rioters. Fans: Media’s Subtle Racism in Unrest Coverage” .....	144
Constance Steinkuehler and Sean Duncan “Scientific Habits of Mind in Virtual Worlds” .....	147
Margaret Talbot “Brain Gain: The Underground World of ‘Neuroenhancing’ Drugs” .....	169
Taylor M. Wells and Alan R. Dennis “To Email or not to Email: The Impact of Media on Psychophysiological Responses and Emotional .....	177

### **Unit Two—Gender and Sexuality**

Petra Doan “The Tyranny of Gendered Spaces: Reflections from Beyond the Gender Dichotomy” .....	197
Cordelia Fine “The ‘Seductive Allure’ of Neuroscience” .....	209
Katrina Karkazis “Taxonomies of Intersexuality to the 1950s” .....	215
Michael Kimmel “‘Bros Before Hos’: The Guy Code” .....	229
Ariel Levy “Either/Or: Sports, Sex, and the Case of Caster Semenya” .....	238
Ruth Padawer “When Women Become Men at Wellesley” .....	258
Jesse J. Prinz “Gender and Geometry” .....	273
Pepper Schwartz “The Social Construction of Heterosexuality” .....	288
Christina Hoff Sommers “The Boys at the Back” .....	303
Bryan Wuest “Stories Like Mine: Coming Out Videos and Queer Identities on YouTube.” .....	307

### **Unit Three—Food**

Donald L Barlett and James D. Steele “Monsanto’s Harvest of Fear” .....	319
---	-----

Jennifer Cockrall-King “Chicago: The Vertical Farm” .....	336
Blake Hurst “The Omnivore’s Delusion: Against the Agri-intellecutals” .....	349
Michael Idov “When did Young People Start Spending 25% of Their Paychecks on Pickled Lamb’s Tongues?” .....	357
Barbara Kingslover “You Can’t Run Away on Harvest Day” .....	363
Bill MicKibben “The Only Way to have a Cow” .....	372
Marion Nestle “Eating Made Simple” .....	375
Robert Paarlberg “Attention Whole Foods Shoppers” .....	382
HRH the Prince of Wales “On the Future of Food” .....	389
Nicola Twilley and Cynthia Graber “Why the Calorie is Broken” .....	397
<b>Unit Four—Race, Ethnicity, and Heritage</b>	
Mahzarin R. Banaji and Anthony G. Greenwald “On Stereotypes” .....	407
Naomi Gerstel and Natalia Sarkisian “The Color of Family Ties: Race, Class, Gender, and Extended Family Involvement” .....	419
Diane Goldstein “I’m a Cop and I Support Black Lives Matter: How Can We Heal These Wounds?” .....	426
Linda Holtzman and Leon Sharpe “Theories and Constructs of Race” .....	429
Haiming Lui and Lianlian Lin “Food, Culinary Identity, and Transnational Culture: Chinese Restaurant Business in Southern California” .....	443
Matthew Salesses “Different Racism: On Jeremy Lin and How The Rules of Racism are Different for Asian Americans” .....	464
S. Sayyid “A Measure of Islamophobia” .....	471
Marcel M. Suárez-Orozco and Carola Suárez-Orozco “How Immigrants Become ‘Other’” .....	489
David Treuer from <i>Rez Life: An Indian’s Journey Through Reservation Life</i> .....	498
George Yancy “Dear White America” .....	510

APPENDIX D – ANALYSIS OF *THE CAROLINA RHETORIC*

**Part One--Rhetorical Concepts**

<b>Invention</b>	Q 1	Q2	Q3
The Rhetorical Situation	L	VL	VL
Exigence	L	L	L
Topoi	L	L	L
Stasis	L	VL	L
The Appeals	L	Lb	VLb
Audience	L	L	L
Stakeholders	VLb	L	L
Kairos	L	Lb	L
<b>Arrangement</b>			
Inductive Reasoning	L	VLb	L
Deductive Reasoning	*Lb	L	L
The Toulmin Model	VL	L	L
Classical Arrangement	*L	L	L
Rogerian Argument	L	LLb	LLb
Poetics	*L	L	VLA
<b>Style</b>			
Genre Conventions	L	VLAS	L
Voice	L	L	VL
<b>Memory</b>	Lb	L	VLA
<b>Delivery</b>			
Opportunities and Constraints	*VL	L	LLb
Design	*VLS	L	L
Text Response Type Key			
<b>Audio (A)</b>			
Linguistic written (L)			
<b>Linguistic verbal (Lb)</b>			
<b>Spatial (S)</b>			
<b>Visual (V)</b>			
Requires use/viewing of something non-linguistic (*)			

## Part Two--Professional Essays

<i>Unit One--Media and Technology</i>			
<i>Author</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Text Type</i>	<i>No. of Txts</i>
Adamson, Joni	<b>movie</b>	linguistic	single
Gay, Roxane	verbal	linguistic	single
Gillam, Ken and Shannon R. Wooden	<b>movie</b>	linguistic	single
McGonigal, Jane	<b>video game</b>	linguistic	single
Schmidt, Eric and Jared Cohen	technology	linguistic	single
Schneider, Susan	<b>AI</b>	linguistic, <b>visual</b>	<b>multiple</b>
Solomon, Akiba	protest	linguistic	single
Steinkuehler, Constance and Sean Duncan	<b>video game</b>	linguistic, <b>visual</b>	<b>multiple</b>
Talbot, Margaret	drugs	linguistic	single
Well, Taylor M. and Alan R. Dennis	<b>media</b>	linguistic, <b>visual</b>	<b>multiple</b>
<i>Unit Two--Gender and Sexuality</i>			
Doan, Petra	gendered spaces	linguistic	single
Fine, Cordelia	neuroscience	linguistic	single
Karkazis, Katrina	intersexuality	linguistic	single
Kimmel, Michael	<b>masculinity</b>	linguistic, <b>visual</b>	<b>multiple</b>
Levy, Ariel	gendered sports	linguistic	single
Padawer, Ruth	gender and school	linguistic	single
Prinz, Jesse J.	<b>gender and socialization</b>	linguistic, <b>visual</b>	<b>multiple</b>
Schwartz, Pepper	heterosexuality and society	linguistic	single
Sommers, Christina Hoff	gendered school structures	linguistic	single
Wuest, Bryan	<b>YouTube and sexuality</b>	linguistic	single
<i>Unit Three--Food</i>			
Bartlett, Donald L. and James B. Steele	Monasanto	linguistic	single
Cockrall-King, Jennifer	alternative farming methods	linguistic	single
Hurst, Blake	"industrial" farming	linguistic	single
Idov, Michael	foodies	linguistic	single
Kingsolver, Barbara	homestead farming	linguistic	single
McKibben, Bill	ecosystem of a cow	linguistic	single
Nestle, Marion	nutrition	linguistic	single
Paarlberg, Robert	poor countries and food	linguistic	single
Prince of Wales, HRH	industrialization of food	linguistic	single

Twilley, Nicola and Cynthia Graber	nutrition	linguistic	single
<b><i>Unit Four--Race, Ethnicity, and Heritage</i></b>			
Bnaji, Mahzarin R. and Anthony G. Greenwald	<b>stereotypes</b>	linguistic, <b>visual</b>	<b>multiple</b>
Gerstel, Naomi and Natalia SADRkisian	<b>families</b>	linguistic, <b>visual</b>	<b>multiple</b>
Goldstein, Diane	Black Lives Matter	linguistic	single
Holtzman, Linda and Leon Sharpe	race	linguistic	single
Lui, Haiming and Lianlian Lin	<b>food and ethnicity</b>	linguistic, <b>visual</b>	<b>multiple</b>
Salesse, Matthew	racism	linguistic	single
Sayyid, S.	islamophobia	linguistic	single
Suarez-Orozco, Marcelo M. and Carola Suarez-Orozco	immigration	linguistic	single
Treuer, David	Native American life	linguistic	single
Yancy, George	racism	linguistic	Single
<b>BOLD denote texts whose focus is multimodal or uses multimodal arguments.</b>			

## APPENDIX E – ANALYSIS OF THE SYLLABUS

### Syllabus Text Breakdown by Day

Date	CR P1	CR P2	ILP MWA
<b>M 1/9</b>			
<b>W 1/11</b>	<b>Invention</b> ; The Rhetorical Situation; Exigence	Talbot	
	<b>X</b> ; L, <b>VL</b> , <b>VL</b> ; L, L, L	linguistic	
<b>F 1/13</b>			ILP #1 Due single
<b>M 1/16</b>			
<b>W 1/18</b>	Topoi	Sommers	
	L, L, L	linguistic	
<b>F 1/20</b>			ILP #2 Due single
<b>M 1/23</b>	Stasis	Schmidt and Cohen	
	L, <b>VL</b> , L	linguistic	
<b>W 1/25</b>			
<b>F 1/27</b>			Exploratory Analysis Due single
<b>M 1/30</b>	The Appeals		
	L, <b>Lb</b> , <b>VLb</b>		
<b>W 2/1</b>		<b>Banaji and Greenwald</b>	
		linguistic, <b>visual</b>	
<b>F 2/3</b>			ILP #3 Due single
<b>M 2/6</b>	<b>Arrangement</b> ; Inductive Reasoning; Deductive Reasoning		
	<b>X</b> ; L, <b>VLb</b> , L; * <b>Lb</b> , L, L		
<b>W 2/8</b>	Audience; Stakeholders	Bartlett and Steele	
	L, L, L; <b>VLb</b> , L, L	linguistic	
<b>F 2/10</b>			ILP #4 Due single
<b>M 2/13</b>	Kairos	Yancy	
	L, <b>Lb</b> , L	linguistic	
<b>W 2/15</b>			
			Project Prop. and Annot. Bib. Due <b>*req. a non-written text source be included.</b>
<b>F 2/17</b>	Poetics		

	*L, L, <b>VLA</b>		
<b>M 2/20</b>	<b>Style</b> ; Genre Conventions		
	<b>X</b> ; L, <b>VLAS</b> , L		
<b>W 2/22</b>	<b>Gillam and Wooden</b>		
	linguistic		
<b>F 2/24</b>			
<b>M 2/27</b>	<b>Arrangement</b> ; Classical Arrangement; Rogerian Argument; Toulmin Model		
	<b>X</b> ; *L, L, L; L, <b>Lb, LLb</b> ; <b>VL</b> , L, L		
<b>W 3/1</b>	<b>Kimmel</b>		
	linguistic, <b>visual</b>		
<b>F 3/3</b>			ILP #5 Due single* could be <b>multiple</b>
<b>3/5-3/12</b>			
<b>M 3/13</b>			
<b>W 3/15</b>			
<b>F 3/17</b>			Researched Argument Due single
<b>M 3/20</b>	Voice; <b>Memory</b>		
	<b>Lb</b> , L, <b>VLA</b> ; <b>X</b>		
<b>W 3/22</b>	<b>Kingsolver; McKibben</b>		
	linguistic; linguistic		
<b>F 3/24</b>			
<b>M 3/27</b>			
<b>W 3/29</b>			
<b>F 3/31</b>			
<b>M 4/3</b>			
<b>W 4/5</b>			
<b>F 4/7</b>			Public Turn Goals Due <b>multiple</b>
<b>M 4/10</b>	<b>Delivery</b> ; Opportunities and Constraints; Design	<b>Branch</b>	
	<b>X</b> ; *VL, L, <b>LLb</b> ; *VLS, L, L	linguistic, <b>visual, audio</b>	
<b>W 4/12</b>		Hruby and Ciardiello; Shuping	
		linguistic, <b>visual</b> ; linguistic, <b>visual, audio</b>	
<b>F 4/14</b>		Grace; McCarter	
		<b>visual, audio</b> ; <b>visual, audio</b>	
<b>M 4/17</b>			Public Turn Presentation Day <b>multiple</b>
<b>W 4/19</b>			Public Turn Presentation Day <b>multiple</b>
<b>F 4/21</b>			Public Turn Presentation Day <b>multiple</b>
<b>M 4/24</b>			Public Turn Presentation Day

	<b>multiple</b>
4/26-5/3	Final Portfolio Due <b>Multiple</b>
<b>BOLD indicates a text from the textbook whose focus is multimodal or uses multimodal arguments.</b>	