Unit One                  topical question: what makes home, home?

                                rhetorical focus: audience, project, writer/speaker

Week One   One    One    One    One

**pre-class prep**: to prepare for our first class-meeting, please watch the introductory episode of a television show that starred Grant Imihara:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6L68Xlics5c

Your first task is to notice Imihara's definition of home, regardless whether he states this definition or implies it.  Notice, too, if his definition assumes anything.  Invest thought, next, into figuring out whether any visuals in the video add to the definition of 'home' that GI offers in words, undercut what he offers in words, complicate what he offers in words, or alter what you had thought he meant.

Your second task is to post your replies to these questions at least 24 hours before we meet on Tuesday.  Aim for 100 to 200 words.  Then, reply to one of your classmates' posts, in about the same number of words.  Tip: you can take pressure off the second post by posting the first one by Saturday at 11:59 p.m.

**IN THIS ASSIGNMENT, AND ALL OTHER ToHo POSTS, IT IS EACH CLASSMATE'S RESPONSIBILITY TO ENSURE THAT EVERY CLASSMATE'S POST RECEIVES AT LEAST ONE REPLY. #community#engaged**

Tuesday   compare findings about the video that we'll call GI#1.  What sort of audience are we, as a group, for this word+ project?  For instance, do you see any of the vid's ideas, or claims, about 'what makes home, home' conflicting with your ideas, or claims?  Or, do you see any of your realities of home conflicting, or adding layers that the vid doesn't address?  Now, a different question: what sort of skills do we bring to this video of noticing how a word+ assemblage works?  For instance, in classmates' posts, did you see any #curious or #critical wondering about the vid's word-image or word-music or word-role interactions?

**pre-class prep**: please read Roozen, 'Writing is a social and rhetorical activity'.  If you have questions about his lesson, you should post so that everyone can learn.  This essay is part of a collection that targets students of writing like you: #curious.  You can find this essay via FindMore on the NUS Central LIbrary portal.  The collection information is:

Adler-Kassner, Linda and Elizabeth Wardle, *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies* (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2015)

After you consider Roozen's short piece, watch GI#1 again.  How do you notice this vid trying to reach an audience?  Not the whole world, then, just a section of it that you can identify with a few descriptive phrases or words.  Offer reason to accept your phrases or words: evidence from the vid.

This task completed, take another angle: check to see if you notice anything odd about GI#1.  Anything that you didn't expect, that you can't see the point of, that strikes you as intrusive, counter-productive or wrong for the audience that you've identified ... or something that you would have expected to see in the vid but that the vid doesn't include (#courage).  You may return to your Tuesday post or notice something new: your choice.  Explain your discoveries about audience, and oddities, to us: people who have watched the vid.  Then reply to one post.  You have ca. 150 words for the first post, and the same again for a reply-post to a classmate (plus 100 more, for the reply, if you like).   Due by 11:59 p.m. on Wednesday.

Thursday   today, we consider Roozen's lesson in terms of a way in which many crafted texts are set up (= planned).  Our model is bare-bones simple: an 'elevator pitch'.  If you don't know this phrase, you can google but we'll go over this approach in class too.  Put your prep time into Roozen, please, and the two posts.

**pre-class prep**: watch GI#2:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MktWujqmeMl

Develop something about either vid that you've noticed: a 'move' that you think odd, striking, hard to explain, counter-productive as you understand the vid-team's project and/or audience ... you're in charge (#courage).  Post what you've noticed but this time, write for readers who have not seen the vid.  You have to explain more, right?  Try an 'elevator pitch' approach, if you like.  But definitely, invest 200-350 words in helping a non-viewer understand what you find odd about one of the GI videos.  If you have enough words, explain why someone else should care about what you noticed: answer the question, ' so what?'  #community

     You know what comes next: reply to a classmate's post.  Use 200-400 words.  If you can offer a classmate a possible thesis, or answer to the question, 'so what?', feel free to do so.  First post due by 11:59 p.m. on Friday; second post due by 11:59 p.m. on Sunday.

Week Two    Two    Two     Two     Two:

                       component analysis is not meaning interpretation

**pre-class prep**: read Lunsford, 'Writing addresses, invokes, and/or creates audiences'.  This essay is another in *Naming What We Know*.

Tuesday   we'll analyze the GI vids.  Be ready to discuss your findings about how one GI vid was crafted, or intended, to 'work' in the way a car is engineered to 'go': how the vid is supposed to operate.  It will be ok to compare a component in one GI vid to the same component in the other.  Actually, though, study of one vid is enough if you tackle this question fully: how does the component function as part of a larger assemblage?  We want fine-grained analysis rather than blobby generalities.  Some folk call this sort of analysis 'close reading'.  If you strive for the tag #critical-curious, do kiv that criticism need not be negative: criticism can be appreciative too.

You may work with your post from last Friday, with input that you received later, or with another aspect of a vid that you've noticed.

**pre-class prep**: study Ng Hui Ren's 'close reading' project.  Identify this essay's motive and thesis, as well as its answer to the question, 'fine, you noticed such things; so what?'  You can google using this search term <USP folio> or try this link:

https://foliojournal.wordpress.com/2018/12/21/what-are-you-a-chimera-the-shirt-with-multiple-audiences-by-ng-hui-re/

If you'd like to see a 'close reading' from a previous ToHo, Khiam Wee's Unit One essay is #engaged-courageous-probing:

https://foliojournal.wordpress.com/2018/12/10/hierarchy-in-john-ruskins-ideals-of-women-by-goh-khiam-wee/

We don't use Ruskin's thoughts on home this sem.  But you can learn quite a lot by noticing how Khiam Wee looked out for an audience who hadn't read the Ruskin excerpt, how he structures his analysis (what he says, when), how trimly he stitches each paragraph to the next, and how he uses textual evidence from the Ruskin excerpt plus his own bright reasoning.

Thursday   we'll discuss Ng Hui Ren's 'close reading' of a shirt.  Be ready to point out the motive, thesis, and answer to a reader's valid question, 'so what?'  I'll ask you about the evidence that you consider vital to the analysis.  We can also ponder audience-contact tactics, as long we bear in mind that tactics don't always succeed.  This practice helps you strengthen your ability to approach a text by considering its rhetorical situation.

**CONFERENCE DRAFT due in the LumiNUS workbin by 11:59 p.m. on Saturday.  Once you've uploaded, send a copy to the person whose info sits above yours on our 'class & groups' list on LumiNUS (look for a link to the left of this screen).**

**follow-up** over the next five days, you review a classmate's draft; instructions tba

Week Three   Three    Three    Three    Three

**pre-class prep**: study the Jones article, please.  It is a work of journalism.  You may need to study it quite carefully since rhetorically, it may be more complex than a *Naming* essay, for instance.  Consider audience, project and writer, with an eye out for Jones's motive and thesis.  Try this link:

<https://gizmodo.com/roombas-next-big-step-is-selling-maps-of-your-home-to-t-1797187829>

Before Friday at 11:59 p.m., post ca. 300 words to tell us what you learned by peer-reviewing a classmate's conference draft.

Tuesday   what is the rhetorical situation, in your view, for Jones's article?  Do you find the evidence strong, weak or mixed?  Do you see him analyzing, arguing, or both?

**pre-class prep**: time to consider rigorous thoughts on 'home': Dekker helps.  You can find his article via FindMore on the NUS Central Library portal.  Here's the info:

Dekkers, Wim.  "Dwelling, house, and home: towards a home-led perspective on dementia care," *Medical Health Care and Philosophy* 14 (2011): 291-300.

Thursday   do any of the theories of 'home' that Dekker reviews, speak for your ideals and/or your experiences of home?  Do any of those theories puzzle you or raise your resistance?  Is anything missing from all of those theories, or is something taken for granted, in your opinion?  #courage-curious  #critical-engaged

**follow-up** when you upload your peer review for me, send a copy to the classmate too please.  Now, take a rest from ToHo assignments (but keep using your learning, to keep strengthening the skills).

Week Four   Four    Four    Four     Four         athletes do reps, writers revise

Tuesday   we won't meet for discussion today, due to conferencing.  You can sign up for one-to-ones with me on Monday, Tuesday and possibly Wednesday.

**pre-class prep**: post your learning in or from the conference within 36 hours of our talk.

For Thursday's meeting, please read Downs, 'Revision is central to developing writing' in *Naming What We Know*.

Thursday   let's work with Downs's lesson by sharing what you've learnt, to date.  We can chart developments in your ‘noticing’ ability since the pre-write.  We can consider peer review of conference drafts, too, as learning by doing (i.e., by reviewing) or by reading (thanks, reviewer!).  We may also be able to share your plans about how you plan to revise your conference draft.  #reflection

Saturday, by 11:59 p.m.: **upload for-now drafts** to the LumiNUS workbin.  Include a cover letter, of 200 to 400 words, that inventories your learning about *audience*, *evidence*, and *rhetorical situation*.  You may mention also learning from the Writing Centre, a classmate, or someone else: a pre-uni instructor for instance or someone in your family.  Definitely, though, upload the peer reviewed draft with the peer-reviewer's feedback.  Choose a handy hashtag, if you like to.

Unit Two                 topical question: does technology makes home, home?

                                rhetorical focus: using secondary sources, rhet-sit in view

Week Five   Five    Five    Five    Five

**pre-class prep**: read the first half of Kaika's researched argument: until the break on p 273.  You can find this article via FindMore on the NUS Central Library portal.  Here's the citation:

Kaika, Maria.  "Interrogating the Geographies of the Familiar: Domesticating Nature and Constructing the Autonomy of the Modern Home," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Studies* 28:2 (June 2004): 265-86.

Tuesday   we'll start by ensuring that we know what Kaika is saying: we will summarize what we've read.  Later, we'll read more of this article.  For now, you may like to notice whether you used any of our lessons to get a firmer grip on what she argues, or used other lessons that have come your way.   #engaged-reflection

Do get in touch with me, or post on LumiNUS, if you'd like to use Thursday's class-meeting to swop thoughts on research skills such as how to use Google Scholar and NUS's FindMore.

**pre-class prep for Thursday**: compare conference and final uploads from a recent ToHo.  Then, post one or two discoveries by 11:59 p.m. on Wednesday.  Read three classmates' posts before you post, to learn more.  #community-engaged

Thursday   we can swop thoughts on research skills, or compare conference and final drafts of a recent Unit Two project for ToHo.  We may be able to manage both tasks but if you have a preference, let us know that that we can prioritise.

Week Six   Six    Six    Six    Six    Six

**during this week, you can search for a primary source for your multi-source argument project.  You can look for COVID-home rhetoric in a *Straits Times* article or an MRT poster, choose an advertisement for a technology of home (even if the advertiser doesn't use that phrase), select an entertainment account of a toho, probe technology in a work of HDB-depicting art such as https://www.artsy.net/artwork/sarah-choo-jing-the-hidden-dimension-il ...  to name just a few possibilities.  If in doubt, post or get in touch with me.  You may select a word-only text or a word+ text as long as this project features materials on tech-reliant home-making**

**pre-class prep for Tuesday**: read Kaika's article from start to finish

Tuesday   Kaika's article is full of ideas.  We'll sort through her ideas to test, and clarify the sort of claims that you can draw on.  Some ToHo students have found this article thought-prodding well beyond WCT.  Can you see implications that go beyond our specific topic? #courageous-critical

**pre-class prep**: read Cevetello's reflective essay with an eye out for a motive (that may not look like the sort we've studied so far), a thesis (ditto) and use of at least one keyterm.  If in doubt about keyterms, check Harvey's 'Elements of the Essay'.  You can find Cevetello's essay in e-reserves; it's one that Sherry Turkle, at MIT, edited into a collection.  Use the 'Readings' pull-down on LumiNUS in 'Module Details'.

Thursday   you can notice 'writerly' decisions in Cevetello's essay that differ from Kaika's, Jones's and Dekkers's decisions.  We'll share thoughts on decisions of that kind after we figure out Cevetello's rhetorical situation.  You may have #courageous-curious insights, moreover, about how his argument transfers far from medical concerns: for instance, to your relationship with a technology of your home.

Recess    Recess    Recess    Recess    Recess

**pre-write** for multi-source argument: post by 11:59 p.m. on Wednessday the primary source for your project plus one syllabus source that you expect to draw on, and one of the secondary sources that you have found.

​​​        extra credit **option** #1:  by 11:59 p.m on Tuesday, post a ca. 200-word response to Bazerman & Tinberg, 'Text is an object outside of oneself ...' in *Naming What We* *Know*.

       extra credit **option** #2:  by 11:59 p.m. on Saturday, reply to at least two extra credit posts by bringing their thoughts together or noting divergence.  If only one classmate takes the first option, this second option evaporates.  Word limit: 300

You may take up either option or both.  The credit bulks up your 'participation' grade.

Week Seven   Seven   Seven   Seven    Seven

**pre-class prep**: read up on what plagiarism is, and how citation works.  Start here:

<https://integrity.mit.edu/handbook/what-plagiarism>

Be sure to read, also, what you find by clicking on 'cite sources'.   #curious

Tuesday   we'll work through the core concepts involved in citing sources, and give you a chance to be sure that you comprehend what plagiarism entails.   #engaged

Wednesday by 11:59 p.m. post the motive for your multi-source argument, as well as a reply to a classmate's post.  Word limits: up to you

Thursday   let's compare your current motives and in-development theses  #develop

**CONFERENCE DRAFTS** **are due on Saturday at 11:59 p.m.  We'll do peer-reviews differently this time.  Look ahead, please, to the instructions in the Week Nine part of this syllabus.**

Week Eight    Eight    Eight    Eight    Eight

**pre-class prep**: please watch two short videos that introduce warrants:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1vArfwlX04I>

and

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SrUaDcrntD0>

Tuesday   we'll study Toulmin's ideas about case-making #step-back

**pre-class prep**: read another reflective essay, Gleason's thoughts on a bunny.  You can find this short essay in our e-reserves, in the 'Readings' pull-down.

Thursday   do you see a 'motive' in Gleason's reflective essay?  How about a thesis?  Topically, do you see thoughts about what makes home, home?  How about thoughts on technology?  Rhetorically, do you spot any warrants or places where warrants could be added?

Week Nine    Nine    Nine    Nine    Nine

no class-meeting on Tuesday since we'll schedule draft conferences on Monday, Tuesday and possibly Wednesday #take-a-rest

**Use time this week to revise your conference draft but also to review a draft for a classmate.**  Drafters, let your reviewer know which plan you will follow so that they can plan their schedules: you want their feedback on your conference draft **or** on a draft that you have revised after conferring with me.  Your reviewer this time is the classmate whose info sits two lines above yours on our Class list.

Thursday   do you know how to put feedback to use?  #maximiselearning

Unit Three         topical question: what makes home, home for you, tech-user?

                         rhetorical focus: writing = revision (+ reflection)

Week Ten    Ten    Ten    Ten    Ten

presentations on Tuesday and Thursday   #rhetoricalsituations

**upload your for-now draft within four days of your presentation.  Thus, Tuesday's presenters will upload by 11:59 p.m. on Saturday.  In the cover letter for this upload, please mention how you worked with secondary sources, taking into account this project's rhetorical situation.**

​Week Eleven   Eleven    Eleven    Eleven

Tuesday   presentations              #rhetoricalsituations#engaged

Thursday   peer review takes varied forms.  Having you tried the gossipy method?

Week Twelve    Twelve     Twelve     Twelve

**pre-class prep**: read Yancey's thoughts on 'Learning to write effectively' in *Naming*

Tuesday   we'll compare learning experiences before WCT, and in it, to Yancey's thoughts.  A vital part of effective learning is this sort of pause to reflect, and stock-take. #develop

**pre-class prep**: post 200 words on your sense, now, of your reflection topic and sources

Thursday   [this class's contribution is left open to keep our work flexible]

      you may **upload the conference draft of your reflection project** to the workbin any time before Sunday, 8 November, at 11:59 p.m.  One upload per student.  I plan to start downloading as soon as drafts are uploaded, so you may like to plan in terms of conferencing sooner or later.

Week Thirteen   Thirteen   Thirteen   Thirteen

**pre-class prep**: one last *Naming* essay, Estrem's 'Writing is a knowledge-making activity'

Tuesday   wrap-up our sessions together.  Prepare thoughts on how you are inventorying your WCT lessons, what has changed in your sense of 'writing' and what has stayed the same, plus what you think of Estrem's input.

Thursday's time will be invested in draft conferences; no class-meeting

Reading Week       Reading Week       Reading Week

**upload a portfolio** comprised of a revised Unit One or Unit Two project for a final grade on that effort, a final version of your reflection project, and a 250- to 400-word cover letter that inventories your WCT learning.  I look forward to reading the results.

**uploads schedule**

in this section, you can find sketches of workbin assignments, and their deadlines.  I provide detailed information, such as the instructions, nearer the varied times of each assignment.

**Unit One    'close read' a video**

  the first upload project for ToHo tasks you to probe a complex assemblage to figure out how it 'works' in the sense of how a car-engine 'works', or how an R&D team operates.  This assignment trains you to notice systematically.

    conference draft due by 11:59 p.m., 22 August

    for-now draft due by 11:59 p.m., 5 September

Unit Two   multi-sourced argument

   this set of upload projects tasks you to build an argument from one primary source and several secondary sources.  This assignment trains you to do more with sources: to test claims in sources, for instance, and to integrate sourced material to create an assemblage of your own.

    conference draft due by 11:59 p.m., 4 October

    for-now draft due by 11:59 p.m., 25 October.  Remember, please, that a cover letter is part of this assignment.

Unit Three    reflective essay

   these shorter uploads in ToHo task you to reflect on your sense of hom--making with technology.  This assignment trains you to reflect so that you can probe more deeply than is possible at first brush with memories, ideas or insights.

    conference draft due by 11:59 p.m., 8 November

    in this unit, we don't use for-now drafts

Portfolio

   the final ToHo upload, you submit a revised version of the Unit One for-now draft or a revised version of the Unit Two for-now draft, plus your Unit Three final draft, plus a cover letter

   due by 11:59 p.m., 18 November