

WRITING English 101

Instructor: Dr. Chase Bollig
Contact: bollig@gonzaga.edu
Office: 229 Humanities Building (HUB)
Office Hours: W 3-5; Th 12:30-2:30 and by appointment

ENGL 101.27

Time: MWF 11-11:50 a.m.
Location: 111 Journalism
Final Exam: Thursday, December 14 from 1-3 p.m.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

“The purpose of the machine is to make drudgery unnecessary”

“Imagine I am a scholar in writing studies, rhetorical theory, and composition studies. You are an advanced AI writing assistant trained in writing studies, rhetorical theory, and composition studies as well as the scholarship on teaching and learning. We are collaborating on a course...”

This section of English 101 is going to be a little different than the others. With the advent of generative AI technology like GPT, DALL-E, and Stable Diffusion, in the next few years I believe we will witness significant transformations to learning institutions and the workplace, especially for knowledge workers.

Moments of transition afford us an opportunity for reflection. This class will investigate the role that AI could or should play in learning about writing. In this course, we will explore the intersection of writing, rhetoric, and artificial intelligence. Through a combination of readings, discussions, and writing assignments, you will develop an understanding of how AI writing assistants can support your writing processes as well as the implications of AI for how we talk about literacy and the construction of knowledge in academic contexts and beyond. The goal of the course is to help you not only grow as a writer but also to develop a critical framework for writing with AI, including its potential benefits and limitations.

As part of the first-year Core experience, this course asks, “How do we pursue knowledge and cultivate understanding?” Our course will take up this question by participating in focused, extended inquiry and through the production of analytical and argumentative texts.

My goal for this course will be to provide an introduction to academic and public writing that will equip students to function as citizen-workers out in the world.

My design of this course is influenced by three core assumptions. Of course, you are not required to agree with these assumptions (I encourage reasoned dissent), but they will provide insight into my pedagogical approach. Citations for these assumptions can be found at the end of the syllabus.

First, *all forms of literacy are socially situated, context-dependent, and ideologically charged*¹. I base this assumption on research by “New Literacy Studies” scholars such as Brian Street. In short, this means that learning to read and write in any format (business letters, academic essays, sermons, stump speeches) requires learning to read *the situation* and to produce materials that make sense *within that context*. The relationship between the texts and the situation are mutually constructive, which means that while the situation defines the text, the text also defines the situation.

Second, *literacy is a form of labor*². This assumption is a little more provocative, because this positions writing as an economic act (or at least, as potentially economic). One of the reasons that literacy is ideologically charged is because, as a resource or a form of labor, it is valuable to someone, somewhere. Recognizing our writing as labor means looking for the ways that writing is valued (by whom), and trying to get a better sense of why some kinds of writing are valued differently, or some people’s writing is valued differently.

Third, *our roles as citizens and our roles as workers are intertwined but often obscured*³. We’ve all heard the phrases “vote with your dollar” and “corporate sell-out,” and we’re increasingly engaged with the legal construct that corporations are people. In this course (and in life), I want to speak back to these situations by thinking about how our choices as workers are political choices, or the possibility that our civic/political identities have some relationship with our economic identities.

Because of these assumptions, I cannot ethically design a writing course that sticks to “templates.” Rather, I have designed a course that looks to engage everyone in the class as citizen-workers. In order for this course design to work, I need to hear from a range of voices, including dissent or skepticism. Some have argued⁴ that our media environments have produced polarized echo chambers, and I want this course to resist that tendency.

Now, and this is something I haven’t asked before Spring 2023, the question is whether AI writing challenges or changes any of these assumptions.

CORE LEARNING OUTCOMES

English 101, as your Core Curriculum Writing course, aims to prepare students for the demands of college-level writing. As such, at the completion of this course, students will be able to

1. write for different audiences to achieve distinct purposes and desired effects.
2. employ a variety of processes and habits for writing and reading.
3. demonstrate information literacy.
4. write effective arguments appropriate to a range of potential rhetorical situations.

Additionally, English 101’s status as a Writing Enriched core course means that at the completion of this course, students will be able to

1. demonstrate competency in formal and informal writing specific to the discipline in which the writing occurs.
2. integrate appropriate primary and secondary research in their writing by the means customarily used in the discipline.
3. incorporate feedback received during an intensive revision process.

Writing-enriched (WE) courses are designed to promote the humanistic and Jesuit pedagogical ideal of clear, effective communication. Courses with this designation provide students with opportunities to

expand their understanding of writing and its various purposes. As one component of WE, faculty reinforce how writing can be employed as a tool for clarifying thinking. Another component concerns the ways in which writing serves to communicate knowledge, propose ideas, and stimulate intellectual exchange.

Faculty in WE courses dedicate time and space for teaching students skills necessary for effective writing. Students demonstrate their competencies by completing required formal and informal writing of multiple, various types in specific disciplinary and professional contexts. Students will receive instruction in finding, evaluating and incorporating primary and secondary sources; will be introduced to processes for producing effective writing; and will receive substantial feedback. For example, students may be required to submit multiple drafts of at least one assignment in order to help them to improve their writing style and clarity.

In WE courses, thinking about, learning about, and practicing writing are practices that occur in class and in assignments. As appropriate, faculty consider these practices in formative and summative assessment of student performance. In other words, for all WE courses, the quality as well as the content of student writing will be assessed, and the writing will figure significantly into the final course grade.

REQUIRED MATERIALS

Required for Purchase:

No textbook required
3x5 lined index cards (100-count)

Highly recommended:

2 GB min. flash drive or external hard drive
2 GB min. cloud storage of your choice

All reading materials have been posted to Canvas.

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING CONTRACT

In this course, rather than assessing each assignment qualitatively to determine your final grade, your work will be evaluated on a contract basis: for timely submission of good faith, complete assignments, you will receive a **“B” in the course**. Late work or assignments that do not meet expectations will result in a lower grade. Consistently providing evidence of extraordinary engagement will result in an “A.”

See below for the standards for “good faith, complete” work and “extraordinary engagement.” Upon completion, each submission will be assigned a point value of 0-4:

Grade and Point Value	Submission:	Submit no later than:
B (4)	Good faith, complete submission	within 48 hours of printed deadline
C (3)	Good faith, complete late submission	within one week of printed deadline
D (2)	Good faith, complete very late submission	within two weeks of printed deadline
F (1)	Does not meet “good faith” standard <i>(e.g., gross errors, failure to follow directions, very low quality)</i>	within two weeks of printed deadline
I (0)	Non-submission of assignment	--

Additionally, throughout the semester, you will be given opportunities to demonstrate your **extraordinary engagement** with assignments or the course for additional points.

Your course grade will be based on the total point value of the work you complete this semester:

- A: 32 points, no assignments lower than “C”
- B: 25 points, no assignment lower than “C”
- C: 18 points
- D: 12 points
- F: < 12 points, or more than 2 “incomplete” assignments

This chart is a little difficult to read. Check out “**How do I get an A in this class?**” on Canvas for tips on designing your learning experience in this class. Assignment prompts on Canvas detail assignment expectations and due dates.

Here is an overview of the eight assignments you will be expected to complete this semester:

Assignment	Standard Expectations (“B” in the course)	Submission Due:
Engagement and Intellectual Community (collaborative project)	<p>consistent engagement with readings/discussion attend and contribute to class regularly prepare readings for discussion contribute meaningfully to group efforts</p> <p>reading responses regularly post responses to reading prompts</p> <p>prep for in-class activities timely submission of short writing activities</p>	<p>assessed throughout the semester</p> <p><i>no late work accepted</i></p>
Protocol Analysis	<p>analytical essay about peers’ use of ChatGPT 750+ word analytical essay</p>	Week 4
Research Proposal and Annotated Bibliography	<p>research proposal about technology and writing 750+ word research proposal five (5) 250-word annotations</p>	Week 6
Research Process Reflection #1	<p>reflection on research and writing process 750+ word reflection</p>	Week 6
Research Process Reflection #2	<p>reflection on research and writing process 750+ word reflection</p>	Week 13
Rhetorical Ecology Impact Statement (group project)	<p>well-researched, persuasive technical report contributes to University discussion of AI assistants in undergraduate coursework grounds argument in research in related fields</p>	Week 14
Final Course Reflection	<p>reflection on experiences and insights 750+ word reflection connecting learning experience to research, course texts</p>	Finals Week

This grading schema is very different from qualitative grading (where I would determine the extent to which each submission meets or exceeds expectations). Plan to meet with me during office hours or via email for clarifications or an explanation of my motivations for this approach.

Good Faith and Complete Work

In order for this grading system to succeed, student submissions need to reflect earnest and thoughtful engagement with the tasks of each assignment. While I seek to accommodate a range of abilities, experiences, and backgrounds, I want to balance this accommodation against the university’s and my personal standards for rigorous learning environments. Incomplete submissions, half-hearted or rushed work, or low-effort contributions should not be weighted equally alongside another student’s commitments of time, effort, and thought.

To distinguish between satisfactory work and low-effort contributions, I will use the standard of “good faith and complete work.” We will clarify this standard as a community with the first assignment. Assignment prompts also identify the minimum expectations for good faith, complete work.

At minimum, **good faith and complete work** must:

- follow all directions, meeting requirements for length and number of texts.
- exhibit few prose and information design errors; errors do not inhibit clarity/readability
- provide evidence of effort, including but not limited to:
 - thoughtful engagement with assignment prompt, course discussions, and readings
 - satisfactory critical thinking, reasoning, argumentation for senior-level students
 - appropriate documentation of works cited and consulted, as appropriate
 - reader-centered document design, organization, and clarity

Submissions that fail to meet the standard for “good faith and complete work” will be assigned an “*unsatisfactory*” grade (D for borderline work; F for low-quality work). If you receive an “unsatisfactory” grade, you may petition to revise and resubmit for a “C” on that assignment.

Revisions following instructor feedback (required for some assignments to be assessed as an “A”) must also meet the standard for “good faith and complete work.” They must evidence substantive revision or transformation of the original work to be considered for an improved grade. Additional requirements (revision rationale, responding to instructor feedback) may be imposed based on the assignment or individual circumstances.

Evidence of Extraordinary Engagement

The standard grade for each assignment (and for the course) is a “B.” In order to attain an “A” assessment on assignments, you will need to provide evidence of extraordinary engagement, proof that your work goes above and beyond the standard expectations for the course. Some assignments will identify explicitly what constitutes evidence of extraordinary engagement; to get an A on those assignments may require a timely revision following instructor feedback or an additional research component.

For assignments that do not explicitly identify the standards for “A” level work, you will need to provide additional documentation that may serve as evidence for how your work exceeds the effort or depth of engagement for the standard grade. Depending on the assignment, this may include documentation of engagement with a task over time, an additional social or intellectual component, a process reflection and self-evaluation, etc. I am available to work with students individually prior to deadlines to determine what constitutes extraordinary engagement.

Evidence of extraordinary effort is due by the printed deadline for the assignment unless otherwise noted (e.g., revisions are due within two weeks of instructor feedback). If submitting supplemental materials, please submit in a single “attempt” on Blackboard.

Submitting documentation as evidence of extraordinary effort *does not guarantee an “A”* on an assignment. This material will be assessed qualitatively, as an argument about your work, and if that argument is lacking, the assignment grade will be a “B” (for timely, good faith submission).


COURSE POLICIES

Notice to students with disabilities/medical conditions: The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability/medical condition requiring an accommodation, please call or visit the [Disability Access Office](#) in (room 208 Foley Library).

Regarding harassment, discrimination and sexual misconduct: Consistent with its mission, Gonzaga seeks to assure all community members learn and work in a welcoming and inclusive environment. Title VII, Title IX and Gonzaga's policy prohibit gender-based harassment, discrimination and sexual misconduct. Gonzaga encourages anyone experiencing gender-based harassment, discrimination or sexual misconduct to talk to someone from the Campus and Local Resources list found in the [Gonzaga's Harassment and Non-Discrimination Policy](#).

It may be helpful to talk about what happened in order to get the support needed and for Gonzaga to respond appropriately. There are options for support and resolution, namely confidential support resources, and campus reporting and support options available. Gonzaga will respond to all reports of sexual misconduct in order to stop the harassment, discrimination, or misconduct, prevent its reoccurrence and address its effects. Responses may vary from support service referrals to formal investigations.

As a faculty member, I want get you connected to the resources here on campus specially trained in and experienced in assisting in such complaints, and therefore **I will report all incidents of gender-based harassment, discrimination and sexual misconduct to Title IX**. A representative from that office will reach out to you via phone and/or email to explore options for support, safety measures and reporting. I will provide our Title IX Director with all relevant details, including names and identifying information, of the information reported. For more information about policies and resources or reporting options, please visit the following websites: [Equity and Inclusion](#) and [Title IX](#). If you would like to directly make a report of harassment, discrimination or sexual misconduct directly, you may contact the Title IX Director by phone, email or in person by contacting:

Title IX Director 	Or by filling out an online form	Sexual Misconduct Report Form
--	----------------------------------	---

Religious Accommodations for Students: In compliance with Washington State law (RCW 28.10.039), it is the policy of Gonzaga University to reasonably accommodate students who, due to the observance of religious holidays, expect to be absent or endure a significant hardship during certain days of their academic course or program. [The Policy on Religious Accommodations for Students](#) describes procedures for students requesting a Religious Accommodation and for faculty responding to such a request

Attendance is essential to the success of this class and to your ability to understand class materials. Your presence in class is one part of the assessment of Engagement and Intellectual Community

(Participation). A pattern of incidental absences (e.g., resulting from poor time management, a lack of engagement, etc.) will affect assessment of your Participation.

However, you are encouraged to *not* attend class if you are sick and contagious. If you anticipate prolonged absence, you may individually negotiate terms for making up lost class time. Due to the nature of the discussion-based, processed-based course, some materials may not be eligible for make-up work. A pattern of excessive absences without timely communication or prior accommodation may result in a “V”, which has the same effect as “F” (Fail) and is counted in the GPA.



Participation in class activities and discussions makes class attendance meaningful. Your participation in class will be evaluated holistically according to the rubric posted on the course website. If you have difficulty participating in class discussions due to medical or other reasons, please let me know as soon as possible.

As part of your participation grade, you will be expected to behave in a professional manner toward your peers and the instructor in the classroom. We will undoubtedly engage with controversial topics this semester, and although disagreement and debate are encouraged, harassment or bigotry will not be tolerated.

Final Exam Schedules are set by the University. All classes are required to meet during their scheduled final exam time. **Accommodations for travel are not available.** You can find your final date and time for this course at the end of the Daily Schedule.

Copyright and plagiarism: All members of the Gonzaga community are expected to adhere to principles of honesty and integrity in their academic endeavors, and I will abide strictly by procedures and guidelines of the [University’s Academic Integrity Policy](#). Students and faculty are governed by this policy, and I encourage you to familiarize yourself with its scope and procedures. Ignorance of the policy will not serve as a defense against any violations.

Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism (including self-plagiarism), and theft. Any student found guilty of academic dishonesty is subject to disciplinary action, which may include, but is not limited to, (1) an “incomplete” or failing grade for the assignment in question, (2) a failing grade for the course, or (3) a recommendation for dismissal from the University.

AI writing technologies are fast-developing and proliferating. Research-based policies for best practices in using AI assistance lag behind these developments and public access. As such, the use of AI assistance in writing assignments has been clearly delineated on each assignment. Unless otherwise noted, use of AI is prohibited on assignments with a  but are allowed for assignments marked with a . We’ll revisit our shared expectations and assumptions as they develop through research this semester.

Late Work: Student work must be completed and submitted on time. All assignments should be turned by the time and date indicated on the assignment prompts. Late submissions will result in grade penalties (detailed in the assignment contract), and submissions more than two weeks overdue will not be accepted and will be recorded as a 0. Planned travel, absences, illness, or technological misfortunes do not excuse failure to meet a deadline.

The contract policy already accounts for the high likelihood of disruption. That said, extraordinary individual circumstances may warrant ad hoc revisions to deadlines and late policy on a case-by-case basis. Timely communication and prior accommodation are key.

Class Cancellation Policy: In the unlikely event of class cancellation due to emergency, I will contact you via email, and a note will be placed on our class door. In addition, I will contact you as soon as possible following the cancellation to let you know what will be expected of you for our next class meeting.

Technology policy – back it up! *Note that technological disasters or fried hard drives will not be an acceptable excuse for failure to submit assignments on time.* Regularly backing up your work (in no fewer than two places) is an essential habit of successful college students and professionals working in digital environments. Gonzaga provides free cloud storage through Microsoft OneDrive, and you may also be aware of free cloud storage services such as Google Drive and Dropbox.

Course Evaluations: At Gonzaga, we take teaching seriously, and we ask our students to evaluate their courses and instructors so that we can provide the best possible learning experience. In that spirit, we ask students to give us feedback on their classroom experience near the end of the semester. I will ask you to take a few minutes then to carry out course/instructor evaluation on-line. Please know that I appreciate your participation in this process. This is a vital part of our efforts at Gonzaga to improve continually our teaching, our academic programs, and our entire educational effort.

ITINERARY

Informal writing and participation assignments will be announced in class.

Check Lesson Plans on Blackboard for daily homework.

“(pp.)” used to indicate length of readings. Assigned readings do not constitute endorsement.

Date	Topics	Reading and Writing Due
UNIT I: EXPLORING AI IN COLLEGE WRITING Week 1-6		
<i>Week 1</i>		
M 8/28	<i>No Class... Yet</i>	
W 8/30	Intro Course	No Reading Due
F 9/1	Attention Engineering	Kelly. “Filtering,” from <i>The Inevitable</i> . [28 pp.] Writing Guide: Reading Analytically Writing Due: Message, Purpose, and Audience
<i>Week 2</i>		
M 9/4	No Class – Labor Day Holiday	
F 9/6	Literacy is a Resource	Brandt. <i>Literacy in American Lives</i> excerpt. [23 pp.] Bad Ideas: “You Can Learn to Write in General” [3 pp.] Bad Ideas: “America is Facing a Literacy Crisis” [4 pp.] Writing Due: Message, Purpose, and Audience
W 9/8	Rhetorical Ecology	Rivers & Weber. “Ecological, Pedagogical, Public Rhetoric” excerpt, p. 191-195 [5 pp.] Writing Due: Message, Purpose, and Audience

<p><i>Week 3</i></p> <p>M 9/11</p>	<p>Perspectives on Technology</p>	<p><i>Pick 1 Techno-Optimist:</i> Kelly. "Limitless Creativity." [12 pp.] Smith. "Techno-Optimism for 2023" [14 pp.] Kurzweil. "The Coming Merging of Mind and Machine." [6 pp.]</p> <p><i>Pick 1 Techno-Pessimist:</i> Lanier. "You are Not a Gadget" [5 pp.] Turkle. "The Flight From Conversation." [2 pp.] and "Alone Together" [4 pp.] Carr. "Is Google Making Us Stupid?" [14 pp.]</p> <p>Writing Due: Message, Purpose, and Audience</p>
<p>W 9/13</p>	<p>Perspectives on AI Assistants</p>	<p>Lee & Qiufan. "Twin Sparrows" and "Analysis." excerpt from <i>AI 2041</i> [40 pp.]</p> <p>Writing Due: Message, Purpose, and Audience</p>
<p>F 9/15</p>	<p>Perspectives on AI Writing</p>	<p><i>Meet in the library.</i></p> <p>Foley Library Tutorials</p> <p>Writing Due: Think-Aloud Protocol Activity</p>
<p><i>Week 4</i></p> <p>M 9/18</p>	<p>Research in Writing Studies</p>	<p>Clary-Lemon et al. "What are Research Methods?" [18 pp.] Bad Ideas: "Research Starts with Answers" [4 pp.]</p>
<p>W 9/20</p>	<p>The Field of Writing Studies</p>	<p>browse selection of journals in writing studies CARS model handout [2 pp.]</p> <p>Writing Due: Research Questions for Writing Studies</p>
<p>F 9/22</p>	<p>AI Writing and Literate Identity</p>	<p>Review 5 peers' Think-Aloud submissions</p> <p>Writing Due: Protocol Analysis Paper [750+ words]</p>
<p><i>Week 5</i></p> <p>M 9/25</p>	<p>Research Workflow</p>	<p>Zotero Tutorial "Using BEAM Sources"</p> <p>Writing Due: Revised Research Question for Writing Studies + Source Annotation</p>
<p>W 9/27</p>	<p>Annotating Sources</p>	<p>BYO: research source on technical writing (or technical and professional communication)</p>
<p>F 9/29</p>	<p>Writing a Research Proposal</p>	<p>"Developing a Research Proposal" from <i>Try This</i> [2 pp.] CARS model handout [2 pp.]</p> <p>Writing Due: Research Proposal Outline</p>

Week 6 M 10/2	Writing with AI Workshop	Cummings. The Anatomy of a Prompt Balkhi. How NOT to use AI for Writing Mollick & Mollick. Seven Approaches for Assigning AI (pick one)
W 10/4	Writing Workshop	No Reading Due
F 10/6	Research Showcase	No Reading Due Writing Due: Research Proposal with Annotated Bibliography
UNIT II: IMPLICATIONS OF AI IN COLLEGE WRITING Week 7-15		
Week 7 M 10/9	AI and Academic Integrity	Gonzaga Academic Integrity Policy - plus - <i>Pick 1:</i> Jamieson & Howard. “Rethinking the relationship between plagiarism and academic integrity” [17 pp.] Price. Beyond “Gotcha!”: Situating Plagiarism in Policy and Pedagogy [29 pp.]
W 10/11	AI and the Future of Work	Roose. Leave Handprints, from <i>Futureproof</i> Writing Due: Message, Purpose, and Audience
F 10/13	AI and the Future of Work	McKinsey. Defining the skills citizens will need in the future world of work [12 pp.] The Uncertain Hour. My Boss is an App. Writing Due: Research Process Reflection
Week 8 M 10/16	Environmental Impact Report as Genre	Sample Environmental Impact Reports
W 10/18	Stakeholders and Audiences	Gross et al. “Audience Analysis,” from <i>Technical Writing</i> [9 pp.] <i>Discussion: Campus Stakeholders and Audiences</i>
F 10/20	Brainstorming Rhetorical Ecology Impact Report	No Reading Due
Week 9 M 10/23	No Class – Founder’s Day Holiday	
W 10/25	Close Reading Environmental Impact Reports	Sample Environmental Impact Report
F 10/27	Research Process + AI Writing	No Reading Due

Week 10 M 10/30	Team Effectiveness	Google. Understanding Team Effectiveness [10 pp.] Writing Due at the end of class: Task Analysis Worksheet (Group Submission)
W 11/1	AI Conversations	AI Conversations (<i>pick 2 from list</i>) [15-20 pp.]
F 11/3	AI Conversations	BYO: AI Conversations Writing Due: Message, Purpose, and Audience for your BYO
Week 11 M 11/6	AI Writing in Context	Knight. "The Dark Secret at the Heart of AI" [8 pp.] Dzieza. "Inside the AI Factory" [14 pp.] Writing Due: Message, Purpose, and Audience <i>required library consultation in groups</i>
W 11/8	AI Writing in Context	BYO: AI in Context Writing Due: Message, Purpose, and Audience for your BYO <i>required library consultation in groups</i>
F 11/10	Town Hall on AI and Writing	meet in the Writing Center today (starting at 12, if available) <i>required library consultation in groups</i>
Week 12 M 11/13	Effective Reflections	No Reading Due <i>required library consultation in groups</i>
W 11/15	Writing Workshop	No Reading Due <i>required library consultation in groups</i>
F 11/17	Writing Workshop	No Reading Due Writing Due: REIS draft for peer review <i>required library consultation in groups</i>
Week 13 M 11/20	Understanding AI Writing	No Reading Due Writing Due: Research Process Reflection #2
W 11/22	No Class – Thanksgiving Holiday	
F 11/24	No Class – Thanksgiving Holiday	
Week 14 M 11/27	Writing Workshop	No Reading Due Writing Due: Agenda Setting Exercise for in-class activity (group submission)
W 11/29	Writing Workshop	No Reading Due
F 12/1	Writing Workshop	No Reading Due Writing Due: AI Rhetorical Ecology Impact Statement

<i>Week 15</i>		
M 12/4	Final Reflection	Selections on AI Futures
W 12/6	Final Reflection	Selections on AI Futures
F 12/8	Course Reflection	No Reading Due Writing Due: Draft Final Reflection
FINALS WEEK		
ENGL 101.27: Thursday, December 14 from 1-3 p.m.		
Writing Due: Revised Final Course Reflection		
Writing Due: Revisions / Extraordinary Engagement		

¹ Duffy, J. (2007). *Writing from These Roots: Literacy in a Hmong-American Community*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Street, B. (2003). What's "New" in New Literacy Studies? *Critical Approaches to Literacy in Theory and Practice*. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 5(2), 77–91.

² Chaput, C. (2008). *Inside the teaching machine: rhetoric and the globalization of the U.S. public research university*. Tuscaloosa, Ala: University of Alabama Press.

Scott, T. (2009). *Dangerous writing: Understanding the political economy of composition*. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.

Villanueva, V. (2005). *Toward a Political Economy of Rhetoric (or a Rhetoric of Political Economy)*. In L. Gray-Rosendale & S. Rosendale (Eds.), *Radical relevance: toward a scholarship of the whole left* (pp. 57–66). Albany: State University of New York Press.

³ Berlin, J. A. (1996). *English Studies, Work, and Politics in the New Economy*. In L. Z. Bloom, D. A. Daiker, & E. M. White (Eds.), *Composition in the twenty-first century: crisis and change* (pp. 215–225). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

⁴ Crowley, S. (2006). *Toward a civil discourse rhetoric and fundamentalism*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Leeper, T. J. (January 01, 2014). *The informational basis for mass polarization*. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 78, 1, 27-46.