GENERAL 1101 DESCRIPTION
The goal of English 1101 at Georgia Tech is to improve students' written and oral communication skills through a rhetorical focus on argument. In this course students explore a variety of non-fiction arguments within the discipline of science, technology and culture studies. Students learn how to read critically and write effectively as they examine how arguments develop within social, political and historical contexts. To enhance their understanding of a variety of communication modes, students learn how to expand and support their written work with oral presentations, and they explore visual as well as textual arguments. Additionally students learn how to improve their writing through their engagement with a variety of educational technologies. Working independently and collaboratively, students improve their composition skills while gaining a deeper understanding of audience and the contexts that inform effective communication.

SECTION DESCRIPTION
With a consistent focus on the argumentative strategies at work in our readings, this specific section will work toward the goals of 1101 by examining a series of texts with different (and sometimes competing) views of how specific discourses of science and technology have functioned within the British Empire, and of what interests those discourses have served.

We will begin with Perry Curtis's study of the Irish in Victorian cartoons, which examines how anthropology and racial "pseudo-sciences" like phrenology both reflected and shaped British attitudes towards Ireland and the Irish. Your first essay will be in response to these readings. Our second main unit will build on these readings by looking in detail at the specific case of Bridget Cleary, a woman who was burned alive by her family in 1895, and whose story is the subject of Angela Bourke’s anthropological and historical study *The Burning of Bridget Cleary*. Bourke suggests that folklore is a kind of "database: a pre-modern culture’s way of storing and retrieving information and knowledge of every kind." Though dismissed as "superstition" because it was a “system of reasoning which was alien to those in power,” this “database,” Bourke argues, constitutes a series of “arguments about reality.” While Cleary’s family drew on this "database" to argue that they had been attempting to save her from the fairies, the legal and political authorities in Ireland and Britain used a series of then-new scientific and legal discourses to argue that Cleary’s family had simply committed criminal, degenerate acts. Your second essay will offer your own argument about how these discourses functioned in Cleary’s case. In the final weeks of the semester, we will look at several sections from another book on Cleary to compare the effectiveness of the argumentative
strategies that the two books use, before concluding with a series of short readings – some of which you will choose – that examine these issues in more recent contexts.

REQUIRED TEXTS
2) Curtis, Apes and Angels: The Irishman in Victorian Caricature (Smithsonian, ISBN 1560987332)
3) Faigley and Selzer, Good Reasons (Longman, ISBN 0321105311)

RECOMMENDED TEXT
5) Hoff and Yeates, The Cooper's Wife is Missing (Basic, ISBN 0465030882)

These are all available in the campus bookstore and Engineer's Bookstore (the campus store has more copies of The Cooper's Wife, but Engineer's has copies of the Curtis book, which has not yet arrived at the campus store, as well as used copies of both Bourke and The Cooper's Wife). We will be reading some selections from The Cooper's Wife, which will also be on e-reserves.

Along with the writing handbook for the semester, we will use different resources on the web, including the website associated with the handbook (http://www.ablongman.com/littlebrown) and sites like Emory University’s Writing Center (www.emory.edu/ENGLISH/WC/).

E-RESERVES
The Alvarez reading and the sections from The Cooper's Wife will be available in pdf form from the library's electronic reserves.

COURSEWORK
Your work for the course will consist of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Due Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Presentation:</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9/15-9/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Website:</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper #1:</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Rough draft due 9/8, final draft due 9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper #2:</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Rough draft due 10/27, final draft due 11/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebX portfolio:</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation:</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>(includes assessment essays, discussion, peer reviews, and other group work)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUP PRESENTATION
Each group will give a 20-minute oral presentation on the different argumentative strategies discussed in Ch. 5-9 of Good Reasons. You will, of course, offer some summary of the book’s views, but you will also need to provide your own critical analysis and draw on your own examples, from the essays we will have read and from other sources. Finally, you will use some form of visual aid to help you lead your classmates through your material.

GROUP WEBSITE
Over the course of the semester, we will spend several days discussing the feedback your essays have received, from your peers and from me. After you get your second paper back, you will begin to draw up specific examples of the problems you have encountered and offer solutions to those problems. Each group will condense these examples into a set
of 15 that the group members have encountered. You will then develop this material into a website that would be useful for students like yourself.

**PAPERS**

2 formal papers (each 4-5 pages/1200-1500 words) make up the largest component of the required writing for this course. The first paper will be on the readings from the Curtis book. Your rough draft for this paper will be due on September 8, and your final draft on September 12. The second paper will be on the Bourke book. Your rough draft for this paper will be due on October 27, and your final draft on November 3.

As detailed on the schedule below, the process for each paper assignment will begin when you e-mail me your draft thesis statement. We will then discuss these as a group, asking what they do well and what they need to improve. Next, you will exchange a full draft of the paper with your peer reviewers and do in-class peer reviews, after which you will revise your draft before turning it in. When you turn it in, you will include the original draft as well as a 1-page typed summary of the peer reviews it received and of how you chose to address those comments. Your second paper will go through this process twice, each time with a different group. We will discuss the details of this process more fully in class as the first due date approaches. We will also discuss possible topics in class, but you will be strongly encouraged to develop your own topics.

All essays must be computer printed and double-spaced in a reasonable font (such as Times or Palatino). *I will not accept late papers – any assignments turned in late will receive 0%.*

**JOURNALS**

The questions and journals that you post on WebX will serve a number of purposes:

1) They will give you a concrete basis from which you can begin your essays. In this sense, these journals are a key part of the process of writing, one that emphasizes both the function of revision and the ability to read consciously and actively. Instead of posting a comment and moving on, you will build your papers from your postings.

2) Because you are *required* to use the second, longer posting to respond to your classmates, these postings will not be a series of isolated posts. Instead, they will take the form of a threaded discussion community that will at once enrich our discussions and extend them beyond our limited class time.

3) They will keep you writing on a regular basis and they will help everyone focus on the discussion for the day.

With some exceptions, noted on the schedule below, your responses will have two stages, both of which must be clear, concise, on topic, and on time:

1) *Questions*. By 10 p.m. on the assigned dates (usually a Sunday – see the schedule below), you will post 2 specific, detailed questions of your own about the reading, along with two passages from the text (including quotations and page numbers) that inspired your questions. These should help you start to think about the reading before we begin discussing it in class. More specifically, they should be real questions you have that you think our discussion should address (as often as possible, I draw on your
questions during our discussion).

2) Journals. By 10 p.m. on the assigned dates (usually a Thursday – see the schedule below), you will make a short post (300 words). These posts must respond directly to your classmates’ questions, to their comments during class discussion, or to their short posts, and they must clearly identify the specific comments or students to which they are responding. Like the questions, these posts should help you prepare for discussion, but they should also extend our discussion beyond the class time, and you should see them as an opportunity to try out some ideas that you can later develop for your essay.

At the end of the semester, you will gather a 2-part portfolio of your class postings. 50% of the grade for your journals will come from this portfolio:

1) An explanation (500 words) of what you see as the qualities that make for a good, productive post. In defining and discussing those qualities, you must refer to examples drawn from your classmates’ posts. This portion will be graded as a formal piece of writing.

2) 5 postings that you choose to represent your best journal work for the semester. These should also reflect the criteria you define in part 1. Because these are journals rather than essays, they will be graded primarily for content, clarity, and evidence of consistent engagement with the material and with your classmates (i.e., they must do more than paraphrase my comments or those of your classmates).

The remaining 50% of your journal grade will reflect the completion of all of your journals. For every posting that is missing, late, or does not meet the basic criteria for a posting, I will deduct proportionate points from this 50%.

PARTICIPATION
This class runs as a seminar which will require both careful reading and regular participation in the discussion. Throughout the semester you will engage in several peer editing exercises, where you will exchange your work with other students. You will also participate in group presentations and workshops. All of these activities – discussion, peer-reviews, and group work – are part of the collaborative community that this class requires: the more everyone participates, the more everyone learns. In this sense, your consistent participation in these activities is an obligation to the classroom community. The most prominent part of your participation grade will be active, regular participation in class discussions. To do well on this part of your grade you will have to contribute consistently and visibly to our discussions. Because these discussions are meant to develop everyone's understanding of the material, they rely on your willingness to ask questions, and you should not feel that you have to understand the text completely before you can participate. Rather than simply a way to prove you've done your homework, this is a requirement that you take part in working out ideas as a class. Participation in this sense is not simply talking a lot -- it also means listening attentively and politely to the discussion. Consequently, habits such as being late, sleeping, or talking to your neighbors while others are talking will lower your participation grade.

QUizzES
There will be no quizzes or exams in this class, unless it becomes apparent from the lack of substantive discussion that you have not been doing the reading.

ATTENDANCE
You are expected to attend all classes – participation counts heavily, and you can hardly participate without attending. After three absences you will lose 3% from your final course grade for each further absence. If I do not hear anything from you about an absence, I will assume it is unexcused, so it is in your best interest to contact me as soon as possible if extraordinary circumstances arise.

OFFICE HOURS
My office hours are Monday and Wednesday from 1-2, but I am also available to meet by appointment, and I will make time to meet with you. I strongly encourage you to come by my office or to ask in class if you are unsure about how to address the comments on your papers. If you contact me by e-mail, I will respond as soon as possible.

I will use e-mail as the primary means of contacting you, individually or as a group, about syllabi changes or anything else related to the class. I make every effort to respond to your e-mails promptly, and I expect you to do the same. Not having checked your e-mail will not be an excuse for missing a deadline.

GRADING
The grade descriptions here are not formulas: because every essay is different, every grade reflects the balance of strong and weak elements in a particular essay. One B paper may have a good argument weakened by awkward or unclear writing, while another may have very engaging writing but a weak argument, and a third might have a slightly less challenging argument but fewer formal problems. The argument in a C+ paper may have more potential than that in a B- paper, but the C+ paper may also have other more serious problems. A grammatically flawless but essentially empty essay will not get an A, nor will a brilliant argument obscured by weak grammar. The argument won’t be clear without the correct grammar, and the grammar serves no real purpose if it doesn’t help communicate anything. Finally, isolated mistakes usually won’t detract from your grade as much as the general appearance of carelessness will. You should be able to spell every word you use independently of any machine, but spelling errors in the age of the spell-checker are simply rude.

A: This essay is excellent. The argument is substantive, effectively and efficiently made, subtle, and original. The writing is clear, engaging, and direct. This essay has no significant grammatical, typographical, or spelling errors.

B: This essay has some relatively minor problems, but no major structural weaknesses. The argument is characterized by all of the same things that characterize an A argument, but to a lesser extent, or perhaps with one element weaker than the others. The writing is clear and engaging, with minor exceptions, but may not flow as well or may have passages of summary and description that do not contribute directly to the argument. There are scattered grammatical, typographical, or spelling errors that detract from the argument.

C: This essay has more serious problems, perhaps even at a structural level. The
argument may be inconsistent and, despite some stronger sections, too often vague, unclear, simplistic, or disorganized. The writing may be clear, effective, or engaging in passages, but it is not consistently so. This, in turn, is probably due to an excessive number of errors or other problems.

**D**: This essay has extensive problems, at both surface and structural levels. The argument is unclear and ineffective to an extent that overwhelms any strong points. The writing is vague and even confusing. There may be enough serious errors that they obscure other elements of the essay, making the argument and the writing hard to evaluate.

**F**: This essay may have potential, but it has too many serious problems to be acceptable. The argument is unclear or weak enough that it may be hard to make out. The writing is unclear and confusing. It has serious and frequent grammatical, typographical, and spelling errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90-92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80-82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70-72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>60-62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLAGIARISM**

All of the work that you submit for this class must be entirely your own, and must not be work that you have submitted or are going to submit for another class. All quotations, references, and sources must be fully and clearly cited according to MLA guidelines (see pages 426-432 and 441-485 in *Little, Brown*). We will discuss plagiarism and citation in detail before you submit any written work for this course. As part of a departmental policy, all written assignments for this course will be turned in through the anti-plagiarism program “Turn It In” (www.turnitin.com).

This course will follow the definition of plagiarism in the Georgia Tech Honor Code (www.honor.gatech.edu). The "Student Conduct Code of the Rules and Regulations" (Georgia Institute of Technology General Catalog, Section XIX) states, “Academic misconduct is an act that does or could improperly distort student grades or other student academic records” and offers the following descriptive list:

- Possessing, using, or exchanging improperly acquired written or verbal information in the preparation of any essay, laboratory report, examination, or other assignment included in an academic course;
- Substitution for, or unauthorized collaboration with, a student in the commission of academic requirements;
- Submission of material that is wholly or substantially identical to that created or published by another person or persons, without adequate credit notations indicating authorship (plagiarism);
- False claims of performance or work that has been submitted by the claimant;
- Alteration or insertion of any academic grade or rating so as to obtain unearned academic credit;
- Forgery, alteration, or misuse of any institute document relating to the
academic status of the student.

The Code continues, “While these acts constitute assured instances of academic misconduct, other acts of academic misconduct may be defined by the professor.” Consult the Honor Code online or in the General Catalog to remember your primary commitment to academic honesty. Students who engage in academic dishonesty may receive a 0.0 on the assignment or fail the course. In addition, the instance will be reported to the Dean of Students who may take further action.

COMPUTING RESOURCES AND REQUIREMENTS
We will meet regularly in a multimedia computer lab, and we will make use frequent use of Internet applications in the lab and from remote locations (i.e. your home or dorm room). Because this course assumes that all students will meet the technology requirements for incoming freshmen at Georgia Tech, you must have access to your own computer with Internet capabilities to complete the work in this class. We will use e-mail applications, Web browsers, and online conferencing applications (including Web Crossing) both in- and out-of-class. For your group websites, we will also use Macromedia Dreamweaver, which is installed on all lab and library computers at Georgia Tech, and we will devote a class to giving you basic training in the program. During the first few weeks, we will meet in the computer lab for a session to introduce you to the central applications for the course. Previous experience with Internet research, e-mail, and conferencing software is not a prerequisite for this course, but it will be a significant advantage. If you have doubts about your ability to work with these programs, let me know as soon as possible.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
Any student who feels that he or she may need an accommodation for any sort of disability should make an appointment to see me during office hours. Students with disabilities should also contact Access Disabled Assistance Program for Tech Students (ADAPTS) to discuss reasonable accommodations. For an appointment with a counselor call (404) 894-2564 (voice) / (404) 894-1664 (voice/TDD) or visit Suite 210 in the Smithgall Student Services Building. For more information, see adapts.gatech.edu.

SCHEDULE
(We will meet in our classroom, with the exception of days for group presentations and website workshops, when we will meet in one of the computer labs. On workshop days for the group websites, we will use the department’s wireless-equipped laptop carts in our classroom.)

*GR = Good Reasons*

*LBH = Little, Brown Handbook*

**Week 1 (8/18-8/22)**

**Monday 8/18:** Syllabus, introduction, e-mail

**Tuesday 8/19:** post WebX #1: use the methods outlined in Wednesday's *GR* and *LBH* readings to identify 2 key points in Attis's argument, then, as in the usual format for your WebX questions, give your own two questions about the reading.
Wednesday 8/20: Assessment essay. Read Attis, "Science, Culture, and the Economy: From the Famine to the Celtic Tiger" (57-65, handout). On critical reading: GR Ch. 1 (13-20), LBH Ch. 2g –2h (16-17) and 7 (69-80).

Thursday 8/21: post WebX journal (WebX #2)

Friday 8/22: Curtis, Apes and Angels (ix-xxxiv). On finding topics: LBH Ch. 1b (4-6).

Week 2 (8/25-8/29)

Sunday 8/24: WebX questions (WebX #3)

Monday 8/25: Curtis, Ch. 1 ("Physiognomy: Ancient and Modern) and Ch. 2 ("The Ethnology of Irish Celts") (1-22). On evaluating and strengthening arguments: GR Ch. 2 (35-48).

Wednesday 8/27: Curtis, Ch. 8 ("The Cartoonists' Context") (94-108) and Ch. 4 ("Simianizing the Irish Celt") (29-57).

Thursday 8/28: WebX Journal (WebX #4)

Friday 8/29: Curtis, Ch. 9 ("Historical Revisionism and Constructions of Paddy and Pat") (109-147). On drafting a thesis statement: LBH Ch. 2c-2d (12-14) and 3a (18-21), GR Ch. 4 (100-102). Assign presentation groups for Week 5.

Week 3 (9/1-9/5)

Monday 9/1: No Class (Labor Day)

Tuesday 9/2: e-mail me your draft thesis statement. Consider using the GR chapter on which you're presenting to help you formulate your argument. As a group, the class will go over each thesis statement in detail, and respond to it in our own terms as well as in the terms provided by GR and LBH.

Wednesday 9/3: Thesis Exercise. GR Ch. 16 (MLA format, plagiarism). On conclusions: GR Ch. 4 (92-93), LBH Ch. 6d (63-67).

Friday 9/5: Finish Thesis Exercise. On drafting: GR Ch. 2 (54-55), LBH Ch. 3b (21-26) and 4a-4b (27-29).

Week 4 (9/8-9/12)

Monday 9/8: turn in peer review draft of Paper #1. Discuss presentation requirements and workshop group presentations. On revision and editing: LBH Ch. 5f (42-44), 6b #6 (53-55), 13 (147-150), and 17 (177-183).

Wednesday 9/10: peer reviews in class. On revision: GR Ch. 4 (101-102, #8) and 11 (211-222), LBH Ch. 5a (30-33) and 5c-5d (36-39).


Week 5 (9/15-9/19)

Monday 9/15: Group Presentations 1 (GR Ch. 5) and 2 (GR Ch. 6)

Wednesday 9/17: Group Presentations 3 (GR Ch. 7) and 4 (GR Ch. 8)

Friday 9/19: Group Presentations 5 (GR Ch. 9)

NB: for all presentations, see LBH Ch. 6c for other examples

Week 6 (9/22-9/26)

Sunday 9/21: post WebX questions (WebX #5)
Monday 9/22: Bourke, *The Burning of Bridget Cleary* Ch. 1 (1-26)
Wednesday 9/24: Bourke, *The Burning of Bridget Cleary* Ch. 2-3 (27-61)
   Thursday: post WebX journal (WebX #6)
Friday 9/26: Bourke, *The Burning of Bridget Cleary* Ch. 4-5 (62-99)
last day to withdraw with a “W”

Week 7 (9/29-10/3)
   Sunday 9/28: post WebX questions (WebX #7)
   Monday 9/29: Bourke, *The Burning of Bridget Cleary* Ch. 6 (100-129)
   Wednesday 10/1: Bourke, *The Burning of Bridget Cleary* Ch. 7 (130-147)
   Thursday 10/2: post WebX journal (WebX #8)
   Friday 10/3: Bourke, *The Burning of Bridget Cleary* Ch. 8 (148-175)

Week 8 (10/6-10/10)
   Sunday 10/5: post WebX questions (WebX #9)
   Monday 10/6: Bourke, *The Burning of Bridget Cleary* Ch. 9 (176-205)
   Wednesday 10/8: Bourke, *The Burning of Bridget Cleary* Ch. 10 (206-231)
   Thursday 10/9: post WebX journal (WebX #10)
   Friday 10/10: Bourke, *The Burning of Bridget Cleary* Conclusion (232-239)

Week 9 (10/13-10/17)
   Monday 10/13: No Class (Fall Break)
   Tuesday 10/14: post samples of 4 different problems from your first paper on WebX (WebX #11), each with a reference to LBH and each with a possible correction or improvement.
   Wednesday 10/15: discuss problems with first paper
   Friday 10/17: discuss problems with first paper; assign Web project groups (possibly keep these groups the same as your peer review groups)

Week 10 (10/20-10/24)
   Sunday 10/19: e-mail me draft thesis statement for Paper #2
   Monday 10/20: Thesis Exercise for Paper #2
   Wednesday 10/22: Thesis Exercise for Paper #2
   Friday 10/24: TBD

Week 11 (10/27-10/31)
   Monday 10/27: exchange peer review drafts for paper #2. Because you will be doing 2 different sets of peer reviews this time, each with a different group, we will take time for you to tell both sets of your reviewers exactly what you have questions about and what you want to improve, in terms of both this paper and the feedback on your first paper.
   Wednesday 10/29: peer reviews, first set
   Friday 10/31: peer reviews, second set

Week 12 (11/3-11/7)

Tuesday 11/4: post WebX questions (WebX #12)

Wednesday 11/5: readings from Hoff and Yeates, Cooper's Wife (e-reserves/handout)

Thursday 11/6: post WebX journal (WebX #13)

Friday 11/7: read Hoff and Yeates, Cooper's Wife "Afterword"; small group discussions: how does Hoff's argument about Bridget Cleary compare to Bourke’s argument? In what ways is it more or less successful?

Week 13 (11/10-11/14)
We will spend this week on readings that look at contemporary versions of the questions we have been discussing with Curtis and Bourke.

Sunday 11/9: post WebX questions (WebX #14)

Monday 11/10: Alvares, "Science, Colonialism, and Violence: A Luddite View" (68-112) (e-reserves)

Tuesday 11/11: post 1 contemporary source on these issues (WebX #15)

Wednesday 11/12: contemporary readings on technology and globalization, cont.

Thursday 11/13: post WebX journal (WebX #16)

Friday 11/14: contemporary readings on technology and globalization, cont.

Week 14 (11/17-11/21)

Monday 11/17: Dreamweaver follow-up; initial Web group workshops with laptop cart

Tuesday 11/18: post samples of 4 different problems from your second paper on WebX (WebX #17), each with a reference to LBH and each with a possible correction or improvement.

Wednesday 11/19: discuss common problems with second paper

Friday 11/21: discuss common problems with second paper

Week 15 (11/24-11/28)

Sunday 11/23: e-mail (to me and to your group) a list of 10 sample problems drawn from your first 2 papers, each with a reference to Little, Brown Handbook and each with a possible correction or improvement.

Monday 11/24: workshop “common problems” group websites with laptop cart

Wednesday 11/26: finish workshops for websites with laptop cart, make final division of group responsibilities

Friday 11/28: No Class (Thanksgiving)

Week 16 (12/1-12/5)

Monday 12/1: exit assessment essay; discuss websites and WebX portfolios

Wednesday 12/3: course evaluations

Friday 12/5: WebX portfolio due; wrap-up discussion

Sunday 12/7: websites posted by midnight