

Project 2: Pick a Rhetor

The Project: This project introduces you to a host of important rhetorical perspectives by making each student responsible for learning and understanding the work of a rhetor we do not read as a part of the regular course work. This project allows us to see the scope of rhetoric as well as find the places wherein we might fit in the conversation based upon our own interests. While there are a few “canonical” rhetors on this list, the majority of them speak from different minority spaces and/or address a variety of perspectives that apply to rhetoric in the 21st century. You will also notice that some of them address a more than one space in their scholarship which may feel very different than the majority of what we have read in class. This project is here to remind you about the spaces between the canonical rhetoric that we read and how we can work to fill and expand those spaces.

Parameters: Many of the rhetors listed have a host of scholarship. Some of it fits into the category of “rhetoric” while others are more composition based. Some have written books while others have been more prolific in publishing articles and essays. Because of the array of texts you will find as you search for your rhetors, I will require the following in terms of “how much you read:”

- 1) **Books:** If you choose to read a book by your rhetor it must a) not be a collected edited by them but the whole text is written by them and b) you would read one book—approximately 100-150 pages (give or take). Some books you may find are a collection of essays by that scholar (evident specifically with Haraway and Bakhtin).
- 2) **Articles:** If you opt to read a collection of articles/essays published by your rhetor then you will select 4-6 articles (this will also result in about 100-150 pages of reading). Academic article lengths you should shoot for range between 15-30 pages.
- 3) **A Hybrid:** Depending on the rhetor you select, you may read a very short book and scholarly articles as well. This should still result in 100-150 pages of reading.

The Proposal: When selecting what you plan to read, you will submit your proposal with the article/book titles you plan to read. I’d suggest providing more than the required options on the proposal so that I can help you narrow down to the texts that you would gain the most from as you read. You should submit as part of your proposal 4 potential books you could read and 7 articles (most of the people listed have that much work to pull from with the exception of a few who are very current prolific writers. From that proposal, I will respond with the narrower version of texts you should read for your project. As with all scholarly endeavors, you should always have a bank of reading that far exceeds the required amount so that you can replace something that ends up not serving you.

Components: You will produce two things for this project 1) a handout that highlights the important details about your rhetor, their work, and how it fits into the conversation of rhetoric as a whole and 2) a 5-7 page essay that establishes who the rhetor is, what work you read by them, and how you see it contributing to the field/opening conversations/providing foundations/challenging the canon...etc. As with your other project you will also compose a **Rhetorical Rationale** that is at least 750 words. Your handout will be presented to the class as well as “handed out;” I’d suggest writing the paper first and then pulling the most important parts from it to create the content of your handout—but hey, that’s just me. Do you. Every rhetor that is presented will be fair game for the second exam. Consider that as you are creating the handout.

The Rhetor Selection: After you submit Project 1, you will have a week to make an educated choice regarding the rhetor you want to study. Research them. Google them. Find three that you could spend some time with. You will then submit your top four rhetors to me via BB. There will not be any repeat rhetors. So everyone will end up with a different person. I will work toward each student receiving one of their top four choices. Below are the rhetors you may choose from:

Paula Gunn Allen	Rebecca Dingo	Katherine Hayles	Kristine Ratcliffe
Mikhail Bakhtin	Jay Dolmage	Susan Jaratt	Jeff Rice
Adam Banks	Stanley Fish	Bruno Latour	Adrienne Rich
Wayne Booth	Henry Louis Gates Jr.	Nancy Mairs	Jacqueline Jones Royster
Collin Gifford Brooke	Keith Gilyard	Ben McCorkle	Stuart Selber
Judith Butler	Cheryl Glenn	Keith Miller	Starhawk
Karlyn Kohrs Campbell	Carolyn Handa	Cherrie Moraga	Patricia Williams
Mary Daly	Donna Haraway	Walter Ong	Shirley Logan Wilson
Diane Davis	Debra Hawhee	Chaim Perelman	
Susan Delegrange	Gail Hawisher	Malea Powell	

Assessment:

1. **Stake your claim and support with evidence**—a clearly developed claim (your main point) with support from your rhetor. You might consider connecting to current issues/trends/conversations that would bolster your claim about your rhetor’s contribution to the field. Remember rhetoric does not occur in a vacuum.
2. **Sources and Analysis of Sources** —You need to reference in some way every piece you have read by your rhetor. Don’t forget to give us some background information—who they are, are they still alive, perhaps an acknowledgement of the work they have done that you didn't read, perhaps attention to the context within which they are writing? You must also follow

proper MLA or APA citation methods for this project. In your proposal you will also inform me of the citation method you will be following.

3. **Language and Genre Awareness**—Your attention to language of genre awareness is very important. You are producing both an academic paper as well as a handout (the handout should be accessible to an audience...even if they haven't really read "rhetoric"). Find a balance in your voice and adhere to the particular conventions of the spaces in which you write.
4. **Audience Awareness**—attention to audience is key in this project; consider their context, level of interest, age, gender, location and attention span. Remember, I am only one component of your audience... your peers are as well. Consider the ways in which your handout could work to help them perform on the exam (remember these rhetors and the information you provide may surface on the exam in some way).
5. **Surface Level/Design Details**—MLA/APA formatting, works cited page (don't forget about this), typos, grammatical mistakes, sentence structure, fluidity (from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence). Don't forget to do a final polish/edit—this also applies to your handout. Consider how you design your handout. How are you balancing images/visuals with text? Consider the ways in which your reader will expect to engage with the handout.
6. **Workshops and Due Date**—you came to the workshop prepared and ready to work. By missing a workshop this will affect your grade by 15 points; if your paper is late it will also drop your grade. Additionally, you will lost 15 points if you do not submit the proposal by the due date

- **Rhetor top 4 Due:** February 25
- **Rhetorical Rationale:** required
- **Rhetor "Proposal" Due:** March 16
- **Workshop:** April 1
- **Due date:** April 8

Twitter Component:

While working on the project itself, consider ways in which you could engage with the publics of Twitter to think about ways to reach your audience, the affordances of your project, your purpose, your content etc. For this project, you should tweet 10-12 times specifically about it in some way—THESE TWEETS COUNT TOWARD YOUR WEEKLY REQUIREMENT. Scholars are also present in this space, perhaps "tweet at" them to enter into the conversation regarding the rhetor you have chosen. Use our class hashtag, #FSURHET with these tweets.