

Schedule

For good measure, press cmd+shift+r (Mac) or ctrl+chift+r (PC) to refresh the page.

Since no class dynamic is the same, I sometimes must make adjustments to the schedule. If this is the case, I will announce such changes in advance to help you adjust accordingly.

WEEK 1 – STARTING POINTS

Tuesday – 01/16: Class Review

Readings

- Syllabus

Thursday – 01/18: Extending Rhetoric: Language and Technology

Readings

- Burke (1950/1969). Traditional principles of rhetoric. Chapter 2 in A rhetoric of motives (pp. 49-65). University of California Press.
- Haas, C. (1996). Chapters 1 & 2 in Writing technology: Studies on the materiality of literacy (pp. 1-47). New York, NY: Routledge.
- ~~Clark, D. (2010). Shaped and Shaping Tools: The rhetorical nature of technical communication technologies. Spilka, Ed., Digital literacy for Technical communication, (pp. 85-102). New York, NY: Routledge.~~

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive

WEEK 2 - THEORIES OF MEDIATION & MATERIALITY

Tuesday – 01/23: What is Language?

Readings

- Harris, R. (2000). Rethinking writing. New York, NY: Continuum. Chp. 3, "Writing off the page," (pp. 64-90). (Paired with handout summarizing Aristotle's and Saussure's respective semiological theories of language.)
- Chapter in Vee, A. (2017). Coding literacy. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press: Chapter 2, "Sociomaterialities of Programming and Writing," pp. 95-138.

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive

Thursday – 01/25: Language & Material Infrastructure

Readings

- Lamp, K. (2011). 'A city of brick': Visual rhetoric in Roman rhetorical theory and practice. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 44, pp. 171-193.
- Mattern, S. (2017). Code + clay ... Data + dirt: Five-thousand years of urban media. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, Chp. 4, Speaking stones, (pp. 114-135).
- Gillespie, T. (2017, August 25). Is "platform" the right metaphor for the technology companies that dominate digital media? Nieman Lab. Retrieved January 22, 2018, from <http://www.niemanlab.org/2017/08/is-platform-the-right-metaphor-for-the-technology-companies-that-dominate-digital-media/>.
- Watch the video at Kim, K., Jackson, B., Karamouzas, I., Adeagbo, I., Guy, S. J., Graff, R., and Keefe, D. F. (2015). Bema: A multimodal interface for expert experiential analysis of political assemblies at the pnyx in Ancient Greece. University of Minnesota: Interactive Visualization Lab. Retrieved 22 Jan. 2018 from, <http://ivlab.cs.umn.edu/generated/pub-Kim-2015-Bema.php>.

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive. No need to annotate the video about the Pynx simulation research, but it will help us frame the importance of *speaking stones*, so to speak.

WEEK 3 – ALGORITHMS & PROCEDURES

Tuesday – 01/30: Hospitality, Circulation, & Place

Readings

- Brown, Jr., J. (2015). Processing power: Procedural rhetoric and protocol. Chapter in *Ethical programs: Hospitality and the rhetorics of software*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. Available at <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/d/dh/13474172.0001.001/1:6/--ethical-programs-hospitality-and-the-rhetorics-of-software?g=dculture;rgn=div1;view=fulltext;xc=1>.
- Edwards, D. (2017). On circulatory encounters: The case for tactical rhetorics. *Enculturation*, Issue 25. Retrieved 11 Dec. 2017 from http://enculturation.net/circulatory_encounters.
- Yam, S. (2017). Instagramming the Starbucks *Bing Sutt*: Nostalgia memory kitsch and the construction of cosmopolitan consumer subjects. *Enculturation*, Issue 25. Retrieved 11 Dec. 2017 from http://enculturation.net/instagramming_the_starbucks_bing_sutt.

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive

Thursday – 02/01: Data Infrastructure

Readings

- Frith, J. (2017). Big data, technical communication, and the smart city. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 31, pp. 168-187.
- Lum, K., & Isaac, W. (2016). To predict and serve? *Significance*, 13(5), 14-19.
- Johnson, S. (2018, Jan. 16). Beyond the Bitcoin Bubble. *The New York Times*. Retrieved 17 Jan. 2018 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/16/magazine/beyond-the-bitcoin-bubble.html>.

- Tufekci, Z. (2014). Engineering the public: Big data, surveillance and computational politics. *First Monday*, 19(7). Retrieved 2 Dec. 2017 from <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/4901>.
- --. (2018, Jan. 16). It's the (Democracy-poisoning) Golden Age of free speech. *WIRED.com*. Retrieved 17 Jan. 2018 from <https://www.wired.com/story/free-speech-issue-tech-turmoil-new-censorship/>.

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive

WEEK 4 - RACE & RACISM, AND ACTIVISM

Tuesday – 02/06: Race and Racism

Readings

- Chapter 5 in Banks, A. (2006). *Race, rhetoric, and technology: Searching for higher ground*. LEA and NCTE.
- Daniels, J. (2012). Race and racism in Internet Studies: A review and critique. *New Media & Society*, 15, pp. 695–719.
- Chapter in Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York, NY: NYU Press: Chapter 2, Searching for black girls, Kindle locations 1174-1791.
- Wilson III, E.J. & Costanza Chock, S. (2012). New voices on the net: The digital journalism divide and the costs of network exclusion. In L. Nakamura & P.A. Chow White (Eds.), *Race After the Internet* (pp. 246–268). New York, NY: Routledge.

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive

Thursday – 02/08: Activism

Readings

- Freelon, Deen and McIlwain, Charlton D. and Clark, Meredith D, Beyond the Hashtags: #Ferguson, #Blacklivesmatter, and the Online Struggle for Offline Justice (February 29, 2016). Center for Media & Social Impact, American University, Forthcoming. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2747066>.
- Poe-Alexander, K. and Hahner, L. A. (2017). The intimate screen: Revisualizing understandings of down syndrome through digital activism on Instagram. In D. M. Walls & S. Vie, (Eds.) *Social Writing/Social Media: Publics, Presentations, and Pedagogies* (pp. 225-244). Perspectives on Writing. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse and UP of Colorado. Retrieved Jan. 6, 2018 from <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/social/>.

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive

WEEK 5 - QUEER & FEMINISMS

Tuesday – 02/13: Queer & Feminist Concepts, Bodies, Minds, & Technologies

Readings

- Blas, Z. and Cárdenas, M. (2013). Imaginary computational systems: queer technologies and transreal aesthetics. *AI & Society*, 28, pp. 559–566.
- Keyword articles from inaugural issues of *Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 1(1-2): Bio/Logics, pp. 33-35; Biometrics, pp. 35-38; Biopolitics, pp. 38-42; Microaggressions, pp. 129-134; Performativity, pp. 148-150. *Note: I included the entire 2 issues in the Google Drive folder, because it is just so wonderful to have on hand.*
- Chapter from yergeau, m. (2018). *Authoring Autism: on rhetoric and neurological queerness*. Durham, NC: Duke UP: Chp. 1, Intervention, pp. 35-88.

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive: Choose at least 2 keywords to summarize from TSQ.

Thursday – 02/15: Rhetoric and embodied practices + Gender & Programming Values

Readings

- Chapters from Hawhee, D. (2004). *Bodily arts: Rhetoric and athletics in ancient Greece*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. Introduction, pp. 15-22; Chapter 3 - Kairotic bodies, pp. 65-85.
- Dadas, C. (2017). Hashtag activism: The promise and risk of "attention." In D. M. Walls & S. Vie, (Eds.) *Social Writing/Social Media: Publics, Presentations, and Pedagogies* (pp. 17-36). Perspectives on Writing. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse and UP of Colorado. Retrieved Jan. 6, 2018 from <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/social/>.
- Bivens, R. (27 Jan. 2016). Programming violence under a progressive surface: Facebook's software misgenders users. The Society Pages. Retrieved 06 Feb. 2016 from <https://thesocietypages.org/cyborgology/2016/01/27/programming-violence-under-a-progressive-surface-facebooks-software-misgenders-users/>.
- wilkie & Bieda, L. (2012). Reuleaux selectors. wilkie writes a thing [personal blog]. Retrieved 06 Feb. 2016 from <https://wilkie.how/posts/reuleaux-selectors>. (PDF also available on Drive.) Be sure to check out their prototype here: <https://wilkie.github.io/reuleaux-selectors/>.

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive

WEEK 6 - RHETORICAL ACTIVITY IN THE SCIENCES

Tuesday – 02/20: Rhetoric, Science & Technology

Readings

- Hartzog, M. (2017). Inventing mosquitoes: Tracing the topology of vectors for disease. In C. Boyle & L. Walsh, (Eds.), *Topologies as Techniques for a Post-Critical Rhetoric*, (pp. 75-98). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Star, S. L. (1990). Power, technology and the phenomenology of conventions: On being allergic to onions. *The Sociological Review*, 38(1), 26–56.

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive

Thursday – 02/22: Visuals, Language, and Simulations in the Sciences

Readings

- Chapters 1-2 (pp. 1-18), & 4 (pp. 39-66) from Roundtree, A. K. (2013). *Computer simulation, rhetoric, and the scientific imagination*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Wickman, C. (2013). Observing inscriptions at work: Visualization and text production in experimental physics research. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 22, pp. 150-171.

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive

WEEK 7 – RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES & METHOD

Tuesday – 02/27: Critical Approaches to Studying a Digital Infrastructure

Readings

- Sano-Franchini, J. (2017). Feminist rhetorics and interaction design: Facilitating socially responsible design. L. Potts and M. Salvo, (Eds.), In *Rhetoric and Experience Architecture* (pp. 84-89). Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.
- Seaver, N. (2017). Algorithms as culture: Some tactics for the ethnography of algorithmic systems. *Big Data & Society*, 4(2), pp. 1-12.
- ~~Chps. 1 & 2 in Spinuzzi, C. (2003). *Tracing genres through organizations: A sociocultural approach to information design*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.~~
- Star, S. L. (1999). The ethnography of infrastructure. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(3), pp. 377-391.
- Takayoshi, P., Tomlinson, E., and Castillo, J. (2010). The construction of research problems and methods. In K. Powell and P. Takayoshi, (Eds.), *Practicing Research in Writing Studies* (pp. 97-121). New York, NY: Hampton Press.

Due

- Instead of the usual use-annotations, you will reflect on these 3 scholarly calls to study technological systems through the prompts provided at the end of Takayoshi *et al.* In addition to the research problem itself, what type of contexts will you reflect on and/or observe over time? What kinds of data might help you refine this research problem?

Other Information

- Announcement to come, regarding classtime, since I will be away at a conference.

Thursday – 03/01: Types of Autoethnographies**Readings**

- Proposal project page.
- Ellis, C., Adams, T.E., & A.P. Bochner. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1). Retrieved 14 Jan. 2016 from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095>.
- Pace, S. (Apr. 2012). Writing the self into research: Using grounded theory analytic strategies in autoethnography. *TEXT*, 16(1). Retrieved 14 Jan. 2016 from <http://www.textjournal.com.au/speciss/issue13/Pace.pdf>.

Due

- Instead of the use-annotation, please revise your earlier ideas in lieu of the new readings about autoethnographies and the feedback that you received on Tuesday. Please write a wholly new document by responding to the following prompts:
 1. What type of autoethnography you will conduct and write up;
 2. How and why that type will serve your research problem best;
 3. What concepts you will synthesize to help you refine your problem and guide your data collection, production, and analysis; and
 4. Discuss what data you will indeed collect/produce.

With each of these prompts, go back to our readings and make your case by drawing on past scholars to back up your decisions.

**WEEK 8 –
SPRING BREAK**

Tuesday – 03/06: Spring Break - No Class

Thursday – 03/08: Spring Break - No Class

WEEK 9 – INVENTING OUR PROJECTS

Tuesday – 03/13: On writing fieldnotes

Readings

- Wolfinger, N. H. (2002). On writing fieldnotes: Collection strategies and background expectancies. *Qualitative Research*, 2(1), pp. 85-93.
- Sanjek, R. (Apr. 2012). A vocabulary for fieldnotes. In R. Sanjek (Ed.), *Fieldnotes: The makings of anthropology* (pp. 92-121). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive. Use these annotations as a means to critically consider what kinds of fieldnotes you will write up and what they might be about. Of course, back up your choices with specific ideas/claims made by Sanjek and Wolfinger as a means to develop content for you proposal due on Thursday.
-

Thursday – 03/15: Proposals Due + Doc Reviews

Readings

- None.

Due

- Proposal due in Google Drive. Please share the full version in the class folder. Additionally, provide 2 comments that solicit guided feedback for all of us to consider in class. We will use the comments features to supply suggestions.

WEEK 10 – REFINING METHODOLOGIES

Tuesday – 03/20: Methodology-Making

Readings

- Two articles/chapters that pertain to the construction of your methodology, or specific scholarship with which your work converses.

Due

- Use-annotations in Google Drive. If the scholarship helps with your epistemology, your use-annotation should reflect that goal. If the scholarship helps you with narrowing your conversation, try to explain why you think that is the case. Both will provide you with the means to examine your own tacit assumptions about their work and your own analysis.
- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.

Thursday – 03/22: Fieldnote Work

Readings

- As needed: artifacts, fieldwork, etc.

Due

- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.
- In class, we will coordinate a fieldnote analysis day. To facilitate the process, I want you to provide a *methodological guide* for your peers. Accordingly, prepare a short document that articulates your research problem, questions, and a 4-5 sentence blurb about your methodology.

In other words, those 4-5 sentences explain how and why you know what to write about in your fieldnotes, and by what epistemology guides your interpretation of such fieldnotes. In so doing, it should prove interesting to garner other readings of your fieldnotes.

WEEK 11 – REFINING METHODOLOGIES, CONTINUED

Tuesday – 03/27: Upon Reflection: Revisiting Prior Works

Readings

- Reread 1-2 pieces central to your methodology. Specifically the readings from the first phase of the course.

Due

- For this last use-annotation, please rewrite your summary without relying on your old summary. Write your summary paragraph knowing exactly which aspects of the piece are most integral to your project. Then, in the second paragraph, provide a more detailed explanation about how this work has already proven important for understanding how to make choices about what artifacts to collect/create + how to understand them as part of rhetorical activity.
- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.

Thursday – 03/29: Fieldnote Work

Readings

- As needed: artifacts, fieldwork, etc.

Due

- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.
- In class, we will conduct lightning review rounds. Accordingly, each of you will present your re-readings of prior work from the course, articulating 1) how you are putting it into scholarly action, and 2) what implications you think this has for understanding rhetoric. I would like each of you to use Google Slides to facilitate a quick rendering of the 2 aforementioned subjects, 1

slide per prompt. It is a challenge, because you have roughly 4 minutes to explain and 3 minutes for Q&A. Peers, be prepared to quickly ask questions and provide generous support and feedback about their aims and direction.

WEEK 12 - HISTORICIZING & ARTIFACTS

Tuesday – 04/03: How to historicize the rhetorically mediated experiences in question

Readings

- As needed: artifacts, fieldwork, etc.
- TBA

Due

- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.
 - TBA
-

Thursday – 04/05: Historicizing work, continued

Readings

- As needed: artifacts, fieldwork, etc.

Due

- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.
 - TBA
-

WEEK 13 - PROGRESS REPORTS

Tuesday – 04/10: Progress Presentations -- Day 1

Readings

- As needed: artifacts, fieldwork, etc.
- TBA

Due

- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.
- TBA

Thursday – 04/12: Progress Presentations -- Day 2

Readings

- As needed: artifacts, fieldwork, etc.

Due

- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.
 - TBA
-

WEEK 14 - INSIGHT MAPPING & AUTOETHNOGRAPHY EXAMPLES

Tuesday – 04/17: Mapping Insights**Readings**

- As needed: artifacts, fieldwork, etc.
- TBA

Due

- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.
- TBA

Thursday – 04/19: Learning from AE examples: On writing up your work**Readings**

- As needed: artifacts, fieldwork, etc.

Due

- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.
- TBA

**WEEK 15 –
DRAFT
WORKSHOPS****Tuesday – 04/24: Workshop on Introduction + Methodology****Readings**

- As needed: artifacts, fieldwork, etc.
- TBA

Due

- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.
- TBA

Thursday – 04/26: Workshop on Findings/Analysis

Readings

- As needed: artifacts, fieldwork, etc.

Due

- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.
- TBA

WEEK 16 – CONCLUDING THOUGHTS & TRAJECTORIES

Tuesday – 05/01: Concluding Activity: Networked Trajectories

Readings

- As needed: artifacts, fieldwork, etc.
- TBA

Due

- At least 2 fieldnotes + at least 1-2 memos.
 - TBA
-
-