

# Course Design

## ENGL 1102: Literature and Composition: Handwriting and Typography

*Aaron Kashtan, Georgia Institute of Technology*

I taught three sections of ENGL 1102, the second course in a mandatory first-year writing sequence with a heavy multimodal focus, during my first semester as a Marion L. Brittain Postdoctoral Fellow in the Department of Literature, Media and Communication at Georgia Tech. The specific subject matter for these sections was handwriting and typography. Assignments and readings required students to develop sensitivity to the rhetorical potential of font choice and typographic design and to produce multimodal texts that made significant use of typographic rhetoric. For example, the second essay asked students to compose a handwritten essay that analyzed their own handwriting. In keeping with this special issue's focus on comics, this course design explains how my lifelong interest in comics provided the theoretical rationale for this course, even though comics was not its explicit subject.

### Institutional Context

The Brittain Fellowship is a teaching fellowship through which instructors teach a course in the mandatory first-year writing sequence, ENGL 1101 and 1102, or technical communication. When the Brittain Fellowship was created in the late 1980s, its primary focus was on written communication. During Jay Bolter's tenure as Brittain Fellowship coordinator and writing program director from 2000 to 2007, the program increased its focus on digital pedagogy. On being hired as the Director of the Writing and Communication Program (WCP) in 2007, Rebecca Burnett implemented the current WOVEN model ("The Brittain Fellowship"). Under this model, each ENGL 1101 and 1102 course must incorporate assignments covering five specific rhetorical modes: written, oral, visual, electronic, and nonverbal (summarized by the acronym WOVEN). In lieu of a final exam, each ENGL 1101 and 1102 course culminates in a reflective portfolio, for which students select artifacts published over the course of the semester that fit into each of the WOVEN categories and write reflective essays that analyze the process of composing each of these artifacts. So long as they meet these and other requirements, Brittain Fellows are encouraged to teach their ENGL 1101 and 1102 classes on any topic within their area of expertise. The GT WCP's emphasis on multimodality is further indicated in the program's common rubric, which "emphasizes *rhetorical awareness, stance and support, organization,*

*conventions*, and *design*, categories that shape multimodal communication” (Burnett et al.). In particular, the rubric recognizes that one of the important tasks facing students as they engage in multimodal communication is to “design in ways that increase engagement, comprehensibility, and usability” (Burnett et al.). When I entered the program, the Design for Medium component of the rubric was as follows:

Table 1: Georgia Tech Writing and Communication rubric, section on Design for Medium (as of 2011-2012)

<b>Scale</b>	<b>Design for Medium</b> Features that use affordances of the genre to enhance factors such as usability and comprehensibility
<b>Basic</b>	Lacks features necessary or significant for the genre; uses features that conflict with or ignore the argument
<b>Beginning</b>	Omits some important features; distracting inconsistencies in features; uses features that don't support argument
<b>Developing</b>	Uses features that support the argument, but some match imprecisely with content; involves minor omissions or inconsistencies
<b>Competent</b>	Supports the argument with features that are generally suited to genre and content
<b>Mature</b>	Promotes engagement and supports the argument with features that efficiently use affordances
<b>Exemplary</b>	Persuades with careful, seamless integration of features and content and with innovative use of affordances

Thus, ENGL 1102 instructors are encouraged to teach writing not merely as a semiotic process, but also as a process of careful integration of form and content, in which the visual and material form of a written document are crucial tools for shaping its rhetorical appeal. Moreover, this view of writing applies not only to nonprint texts like videos or blogs but also to traditional text-based essays.

The WCP's emphasis on multimodality is appropriate given the multimodal focus of the department, which has evolved over the past three decades to focus heavily on science, technology, and media studies rather than traditional literary studies. Reflecting this shift in focus, the department name was changed from "Literature, Communication, and Culture" to "Literature, Media, and Communication" during my time there. Moreover, a multimodal focus was appropriate given the nature of Georgia Tech's students. As an engineering school, Georgia Tech's most popular majors include engineering (58%) and business administration (14%; "Georgia Institute of Technology"). Georgia Tech's students tend to be extremely technologically savvy and interested in visual media such as film and video games, which makes topics like comics and gaming particularly appropriate for 1102 courses. Thus, a multimodal approach to first-year writing was both more relevant to this student body and more useful to their future professional lives than was an approach that emphasized traditional written communication. According to former Writing & Communication Assistant Director L. Andrew Cooper, "the GT WCP serves a student body in particular need of preparation for communication in dynamic environments that involve information in multiple modes and media synchronously and asynchronously" (n.p.).

I came to the Brittain Fellowship in 2011 having just completed a PhD thesis focusing on comics and media studies, yet my previous teaching experience had given me only modest preparation to teach within a multimodal and digital framework. While teaching composition as an adjunct during graduate school, I had typically assigned only traditional written projects. (This was not an uncommon experience among new Brittain Fellows; Rebecca Weaver, for example, refers to the "steep tech learning curve of the Brittain program.") Therefore, this essay explores how I drew upon an intuitive understanding of multimodality that I had acquired through a lifetime of reading and studying comics in order to teach a course with a heavy focus on multimodality.

### **Theoretical Rationale**

I chose handwriting and typography as the subject matter for this course because I wanted students to understand multimodal composition as a process of conscious design. I wanted students to understand texts not as abstract vehicles for meaning but as material and visual artifacts, whose form helps to shape the reader's perception of their content, and whose meaning would change if any visual element were altered. I arrived at this understanding of multimodality through comics theory, and I would suggest that the process of document design, as theorized by rhetoricians in professional writing, bears surprising similarities to the process of making comics.

My favorite definition of comics comes not from a standard source like Scott McCloud or Thierry Groensteen, but rather from Dylan Horrocks's graphic novel *Hicksville*. In this book, a character named after the author interviews a fictional cartoonist named Emil Kopen:

HORROCKS: Okay, how are *piktorii* [comics] like maps?

KOPEN: They are the same thing: using *all* of language—not only words or pictures.

HORROCKS: But some *piktorii* have *no* words.

KOPEN: And some have no pictures. When we speak, we do not always use our whole vocabulary. . . .

[. . .]

HORROCKS: So it's still a comic even with no pictures?

KOPEN: Perhaps. It is still a map. Why not? I have seen maps made entirely of text.

Whereas standard definitions of comics emphasize the primacy of the image,<sup>1</sup> Horrocks's radical insight is that *everything* is a comic, from a painting to an unillustrated novel. According to Horrocks's definition, making comics is not a specific and clearly definable craft, but a way of thinking, a mentality that recognizes words and images on a continuum. For Horrocks<sup>2</sup>, images can be semiotic and words can be visual, as well as vice versa. Even when we compose a text that seems not to include pictures, for example, pictures are still part of the vocabulary we draw upon. And composing such a text is a visual activity, in the same way that painting is a semiotic activity.

What might a comic (or map) “made entirely of text” look like? It might simply be a written composition in which the visual and other sensory properties of text serve as means of generating meaning and in which any change in the visual arrangement of text produces a corresponding change in meaning (see fig. 1). In that sense, *any* text that employs document design—any text at all, in other words—can be viewed as a comic, whether or not it uses pictures. Comics, in the narrow sense, are different from other types of texts, such as prose texts, only insofar as their use of document design is more visible and deliberate. Reading and making comics is a process of what Horrocks calls “using our whole vocabulary,” where “whole” is understood in the same sense as in Kathleen Blake Yancey's phrase “a composition made whole.”



This understanding of comics bears a surprising resemblance to current theories of document design. The latter may be defined as a process of careful selection and arrangement of the visual elements of a text so as to achieve a desired rhetorical effect. In the introduction to her textbook *Dynamics in Document Design: Creating Texts for Readers*, Karen Schriver observes,

Books on desktop publishing and professional communication have tended to treat design as mere formatting. This way of thinking relegates the designer to a support role—the one who squeezes content into girdles, who pours messages into templates for smoothing and shaping. This view wrongly separates form and content. (6)

Instead, successful document design is about thoughtful matching of form to content: “Document design is the field concerned with creating texts (broadly defined) that integrate words and pictures in ways that help people to achieve their specific goals for using texts at home, school or work” (10). Similarly, in the introduction to their textbook *Designing Visual Language: Strategies for Professional Communicators*, Charles Kostelnick and David Roberts write, “In each communication you design, you’ll try to shape its visual language so that it fits the rhetorical situation—audience, purpose and context” (5).

The current importance of document design in the fields of professional communication and rhetoric and composition is partly attributable to technological changes:

The reintroduction of design thinking to composition studies at least since 2002 has been driven by growing use of computers in first-year writing, an introduction of technology that has expanded understanding of first-year writing as document production requiring of students the integration of (minimally) textual and visual representations. (Marback 264)

Technological change has expanded the scope of design options available to communicators, while also giving individual writers responsibility for design choices, such as font choice, that were previously the purview of professional designers (Handa 225). Document design, however, is not specific to visual rhetoric but applies equally well even to alphabetic writing. As Stephen A. Bernhardt wrote in 1986, “The physical fact of the text, with its spatial appearance on the page, requires visual apprehension: a text can be seen, must be seen, in a process which is essentially different from the perception of speech” (66). Moreover, “outside the classroom visually informative prose is pervasive, and not just in scientific or technical fields” (67). Although the current emphasis on document design is at least partly attributable to the rise of

digital technology, document design is not exclusive to digital or even to predominantly visual texts. And although document design is primarily taught in technical communication courses, it applies equally well to the kinds of texts students write in first-year composition courses—just as the thought processes involved in making comics also apply when making primarily verbal texts.

Based on my experience with comics, therefore, I want students to think about the design inherent in *everything* they write. For me, document design is about seeing texts not simply as abstract vehicles for meaning, but as material and visual artifacts whose form helps to shape the reader's perception of their content, and whose meaning would change if any visual element were altered. In other words, for me, document design is about seeing texts as comics in Horrocks's broad sense. In the course under discussion here, I sought to implement this theory not by having students make their own comics (though I did do that later in my time as a Brittain Fellow), but by having them create projects that required students to engage in the design-thinking characteristic of comics.

We began the semester by reading Tamara Plakins Thornton's *Handwriting in America: A Cultural History*, which analyzes handwriting as "one of the places where the self happened" (xiii), examining how changes in popular opinions about handwriting reflected changes in the prevalent understanding of selfhood. One of the topics Thornton covers is the pseudoscience of graphology, popular in the early twentieth century, which was based on the premise that handwriting is an index of the writer's personality. Graphologists claimed to be able to infer a writer's character traits from the graphic properties of their handwriting, such as size and slant (see fig. 2). While graphology itself has been discredited, the basic notion behind it—that handwriting has a more intimate connection to personality and selfhood than other writing technologies—is still central to the way handwriting is understood in twenty-first-century America. To show students the connections between handwriting and the self, we read Alison Bechdel's *Fun Home*. As I have argued elsewhere, *Fun Home* uses handwriting as a central metaphor for selfhood (Kashtan), and it graphically demonstrates the link between handwriting and selfhood through its accentuation of the idiosyncratic features of Bechdel's style of handwriting and drawing (see Chute for a similar argument). As a further demonstration of the rhetorical effects of document design, we read Jonathan Safran Foer's *Extremely Loud & Incredibly Close*. Though Foer's book is a prose novel, it arguably has more in common with comics than with most prose fiction in terms of its design because it violates the crystal-goblet principle and uses images and expressive typography as key components for creating meaning.



Fig. 2. Graphological analysis of Lady Gaga's handwriting. Copyright Sheila Kurtz.

All these readings, as well as the writing projects I am about to describe, introduced students to the notion that design features such as typography can serve as tools for creating meaning. For example, one of the early informal writing projects for this class asked students to do the following:

1. Write a story about yourself. It can be any story at all, but it should be about something that actually happened to you, and it should reveal something about you.
2. Prepare two versions of this story: a handwritten version and a typewritten or word-processed version. These versions do not necessarily have to be the same, but if they are different, then be prepared to explain why.

This assignment asked students to consider the rhetorical importance of design: would a typewritten essay have the same rhetorical effect as a handwritten version of the same essay?

The second formal assignment for this course asked students to confront the question of the relationship between design and content even more directly. In this assignment, I asked students to test graphological theories by discussing what, if anything, their handwriting revealed about them. Specifically, I asked

students to write an essay analyzing their own handwriting and I specified that this essay had to be *handwritten*. This assignment required students to apply the understanding of design rhetoric that they drew from Thornton, Bechdel and Foer. It required them to think about writing as both semiotic process and visual and haptic process. Even more radically, this assignment required students to think about the semiotic and design components of their writing as integrated rather than separate. The arguments that students made about their handwriting had to be delivered through the visual appearance of the handwritten text itself. My goal in this assignment, in other words, was to create a feedback loop between document design and content. My hope was that as students wrote about their handwriting *in* handwriting, they would realize things about their handwriting that they might not have noticed otherwise and that they could then draw upon these insights as they continued to work on the essay. Like the informal writing project just described, this assignment asked students to produce an essay that primarily used the written mode of rhetoric, the “W” in WOVEN; students were not required to include other modes like images or videos (and thus, in a sense, this assignment exemplifies Shipka’s claim that multimodality is not exclusive to digital composition). Yet the most successful essays produced in response to these assignments used document design in highly visible ways that enhanced meaning, and any changes in the design of these essays would have noticeably altered the rhetorical experience of reading the text.

Finally, in the last major assignment for this class, students chose a digital communication technology and explained its effects: “When you use your chosen communication technology, to what extent does it reveal, and to what extent does it conceal, your “self,” “personality” or “identity”? Why is that? . . . When you use your chosen communication technology, how does it *change* the sort of person you are or appear to be? Are you (or do you appear to be) the *same* person when you use this technology, as when you use nondigital communications technologies?” This assignment challenged students to apply the design-thinking characteristic of comics to media that were produced by nonchirographic means. Furthermore, this assignment was motivated by my belief that despite common claims for handwriting and hand-drawing as uniquely personal and embodied technologies (see Kemp-Jackson for an example of such claims), the self-expression and attention to detail characteristic of handwriting are present, at least to some degree, in any writing technology. Neither comics-making nor document design, in other words, is medium-specific.

## Critical Reflection

The assignments described above produced some spectacular results. For example, one student, Lauren “Rook” Jarrett<sup>3</sup>, responded to the first informal assignment by producing an essay that detailed a Pokémon card game she had played in third grade (see fig. 3). This essay took full advantage of the affordances of handwriting, using multiple scripts and colors of ink for dramatic effect. In addition, the essay incorporated marginal illustrations depicting scenes from the story. Simply by looking at an essay like this, one can clearly see its resemblance to comics. Like the lettering in comics, the handwriting in this essay functions visually as well as semiotically; what it looks like matters as much as what it says. Like a comic, this essay uses document design as a tool for creating meaning, and if any graphic element of this essay were changed, it would offer an entirely different reading experience. Indeed, Rook Jarrett’s typewritten version of this essay, while containing the same textual content, is comparatively visually impoverished, lacking the color or visual richness of the handwritten version (see fig. 4). (This should not be taken to imply that handwriting is superior to typewriting in terms of its visual richness. Students could also have responded to this assignment by producing a handwritten essay written in sober and boring handwriting, or a typed essay that used expressive typography and nonstandard font choices.)

Similarly, the same student’s response to the second assignment is notable not only for the attractiveness of its handwriting but also for the ways in which her writing actually illustrates the argument of the text, visually documenting the changes that have occurred in her handwriting over time (see fig. 5). In terms of its deliberate, thoughtful use of design rhetoric, an essay like this has more in common with a comic book than with the 12-point, double-spaced papers in Times New Roman that we typically ask students to produce. Indeed, an essay like this one can be viewed as a comic “made entirely of text.”



DMC one kid tripped and ran into the wall, my point is the neighbor's yard, then, well, home.

After many volleys of snowballs, I had eyes on my target, in that phrase, I remembered his chance against me. It was later for Jordan— well, the biggest snow I could deal, short of that— to be served. I saw someone aim for him, and took aim, he was my target. The kid who challenged my reputation went down, then, happened to spill on some other victim. Jordan saw my action and grinned at me in shame.

That was his name— Jordan Laycock, Naboo's older brother. I now had a perfect opportunity, he thought I was on his side. In a quick decision, I scooped up a huge amount of snow and formed it into a large ball. I darted behind him as he took down another child, and called his name. As he turned, I plummeted the snow cannonball down his coat and was rewarded with an unmanly chuck. Triumph in my eyes, I yelled.

"That's for cheating me out of my awesomest cards, you big dumb jerk!"

Yes, the call for my retribution was caused by unfair dealings in Pokémon cards. Tricked and humiliated in one horrible trade, where I had lost my holographic Machop and holographic Gyarados, I was only partially soothed by the glorious snow. While it may be difficult to understand the need for revenge over something as trivial as a few cards, consider the fact that, to third graders, Pokémon cards had more value than actual currency.

Of course, my victory was short lived, as Jordan called to his friends and I was assaulted to my doorstep. However, I felt triumph, and as I later drank sweet hot chocolate, I did not think about the sweetness of revenge in reference to hot chocolate, as that would have been extremely cliché.

Fig. 4. Rook Jarrett's typed response to the informal assignment described above.

... my 's' came from eighth grade. My 'm's and 'n's are from ninth. My 'y's I developed junior year. The rest of my handwriting followed suit:

This handwriting is from eighth.)  
This handwriting is from ninth.)  
This handwriting is from tenth.)  
This writing is from eleventh.)

Not all of them

My handwriting is the same as from senior year. If handwriting really showed someone's personality, I'd have become a different person about seven times, which is not the case. Handwriting isn't locked in like one's natural facial features - it can be changed.

Graphological theory says that a person can be read by their handwriting, and I guess that's somewhat correct by my handwriting. Though the prints are often hit or miss, there are some hits (even if they're not more than luck or general). I've seen that other people's writing does go with graphological theory, so there is some degree of validity

Fig. 5. Rook Jarrett's response to the second formal assignment.

With the third assignment, students' essays moved far away from what one would normally think of as comics, yet continued to show careful attention to design and integration of form and content. Students took the third assignment and ran with it, producing essays that were formatted as Tumblr feeds, Facebook pages, text message conversations, or even more exotic objects of digital self-expression. For example, a computer science major chose to write about the way he expressed himself in comments on code. His final paper was submitted as a Java program that produced the text of the paper; however, he also included the source code of the Java program, which included commentary on his paper.

Despite my initial lack of experience with multimodal composition, I ended the semester feeling that this was one of the most successful composition courses I had taught, and tried to incorporate insights from this class into my future courses. I would speculate, however, that because I was teaching at an engineering school whose students tended to be extremely digitally savvy and competent with coding, they tended to be more willing to engage with the creative possibilities of multimodal design than other students may have been. At my current institutional home, a liberal arts university, I initially assumed a similar level of multimodal competency from my students and was surprised when some of them had trouble understanding what multimodality meant.

An additional benefit of teaching a course like this is personal, in that I was able to use my interest in comics to bridge the gap between my existing teaching experience and the multimodal approach that Georgia Tech demanded from me. The quality of the work I received from my students encouraged me to try to use similar practices in my own scholarly work. As I continued to assign projects like the ones described above, I felt increasingly embarrassed by the fact that my scholarly work tended to look exactly like my drafts of this essay—a series of gray pages of double-spaced 12-point font, with occasional images. When I accepted Roger Whitson's invitation to submit an article in comics form for his and Anastasia Salter's special issue of *Digital Humanities Quarterly* on the theme "Comics as Scholarship," I was initially terrified because of my lack of confidence in my own drawing and coding abilities. Without the experience of having had my students engage in similar projects, I might never have been willing to start that project at all.

Overall, the assignments discussed here suggest ways in which an understanding of comics can inform the way we teach not only multimodal assignments but also traditional alphabetic writing. My experience with comics informs everything I do when I teach composition, because I see comics not as a particular category of texts, but as a mode of design thinking that can potentially apply to any genre of texts. For Horrocks's fictional character Emil Kopen, the difference between comics and prose is a matter of degree

rather than of kind: comics are simply texts that “use our whole vocabulary,” including words and pictures. Thus, the design processes involved in comics are applicable to all texts, even texts in which we use only part of our vocabulary.

## Notes

1. Familiar examples include McCloud’s “juxtaposed pictorial and other images in deliberate sequence” (9) or Groensteen’s “relational play of a plurality of independent images (128).

2. This definition is of course provided by the fictional character Emil Kopen, not by Horrocks the author. However, in his essay “Inventing Comics,” Horrocks critiques McCloud’s definition of comics in terms similar to those he places in Kopen’s mouth.

3. Name used with permission.

## Works Cited

Bechdel, Alison. *Fun Home: A Family Tragicomic*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006. Print.

Bernhardt, Stephen A. “Seeing the Text.” *CCC* 37.1 (1986): 66–78. Print.

“The Brittain Fellowship: An Introduction.” *DevLab*. Georgia Institute of Technology, n.d. Web. 31 Oct. 2014. <[http://devlab.lmc.gatech.edu/wiki/index.php/The\\_Brittain\\_Fellowship:\\_An\\_Introduction](http://devlab.lmc.gatech.edu/wiki/index.php/The_Brittain_Fellowship:_An_Introduction)>.

Burnett, Rebecca E. Sample syllabus for ENGL 1102, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA. August 2011.

Burnett, Rebecca E., Andy Frazee, Kathleen Hanggi, and Amanda Madden. “A Programmatic Ecology of Assessment: Using a Common Rubric to Evaluate Multimodal Processes and Artifacts.” *Computers and Composition* 31 (2014): 53–66. Print.

Chute, Hillary. *Graphic Women: Life Narrative and Contemporary Comics*. New York: Columbia UP, 2010. Print.

Cooper, L. Andrew. “If you think about...” Facebook. 30 Oct. 2014. Web. 15 Jan. 2015.

Foer, Jonathan Safran. *Extremely Loud & Incredibly Close*. Boston: Mariner, 2005. Print.

“Georgia Institute of Technology.” *U.S. News & World Report*. U.S. News & World Report, n.d. Web. 31 Oct. 2014. <<http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/georgia-tech-1569>>.

Groensteen, Thierry. *The System of Comics*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2009. Print.

Handa, Carolyn. *Visual Rhetoric in a Digital World: A Critical Sourcebook*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2004. Print.

Horrocks, Dylan. *Hicksville*. Montreal: Drawn & Quarterly, 2001. Print.

---. “Inventing Comics.” *The Comics Journal* 234 (2001): 29–39. Print.

Kashtan, Aaron. “My Mother Was a Typewriter: *Fun Home* and the Importance of Materiality in Comics Studies.” *Journal of Graphic Novels and Comics* 4.1 (2013): 92–116. Print.

- Kemp-Jackson, Samantha. "We Should All Mourn the Death of Cursive Writing." *Huffpost Living*. The Huffington Post. 6 Aug. 2013. Web. 15 Jan. 2015. <[http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/samantha-kempjackson/cursive-writing-in-schools\\_b\\_3707794.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/samantha-kempjackson/cursive-writing-in-schools_b_3707794.html)>.
- Kostelnick, Charles, and David D. Roberts. *Designing Visual Language: Strategies for Professional Communicators*. Boston: Longman, 2011. Print.
- Marback, Richard. "Embracing Wicked Problems: The Turn to Design in Composition Studies." *CCC* 61.2 (2009): 397–419. Print.
- McCloud, Scott. *Understanding Comics*. Northampton: Kitchen Sink, 1993. Print.
- Schraver, Karen. *Dynamics in Document Design: Creating Texts for Readers*. New York: John Wiley, 1997. Print.
- Shipka, Jody. *Toward a Composition Made Whole*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2011. Print.
- Thornton, Tamara Plakins. *Handwriting in America: A Cultural History*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1996. Print.
- Weaver, Rebecca. "Tech, No to Tech, Yes: How a Former Technophobe Becomes a Digital Teaching Fellow." *TECHstyle*. Georgia Institute of Technology, 13 Sept. 2012. Web. 31 Oct. 2014. <<http://techstyle.lmc.gatech.edu/tech-no-to-tech-yes-how-a-former-technophobe-becomes-a-digital-teaching-fellow/>>.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "Looking for Sources of Coherence in a Fragmented World: Notes Toward a New Assessment Design." *Computers and Composition* 21.1 (2004): 89–102. Print.

# Syllabus

## ENGL 1102

### Course Description

We usually think of words and letters as simple containers or channels for communication. Yet words and letters, including the words and letters you are looking at now, are also things. Whether handwritten, printed, or electronically generated, words and letters are material and visual, and the material and visual properties of words can have a substantial impact on the way in which words and letters are understood by readers. In other words, the *look* of what we write influences the *content* of what we write. At a time when writing technology is changing rapidly and individual users have access to an unprecedented repertory of options for manipulating the appearance of their writing, sensitivity to the material and visual aspects of writing is more important than ever. In this class, you will examine works in various media that make use of the expressive potential of handwriting and typography; using these works as guidelines, you will create works of your own that take advantage of this same potential.

### Textbooks

Bechdel, Alison. *Fun Home: A Family Tragicomic*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006. Print.

Foer, Jonathan Safran. *Extremely Loud & Incredibly Close*. Boston: Mariner, 2005. Print.

Hayles, Katherine. *Writing Machines*. Cambridge: MIT, 2002. Print.

Lupton, Ellen. *Thinking with Type: A Critical Guide for Designers, Writers, Editors, & Students*. New York: Princeton Architectural, 2004. Print.

Thornton, Tamara Plakins. *Handwriting in America: A Cultural History*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1996. Print.

In addition, you will be required to purchase *WOVENtext*, Georgia Tech's custom e-book for ENGL 1101 and 1102. Readings will also include various articles and handouts as specified on the syllabus.

### Teaching philosophy

- My method in teaching is to train you to think nontransparently. That is, I want you to examine your own expectations and look critically at things you typically take for granted. In reading and writing about texts, I want you to be able to step outside the world of the text and examine the unstated assumptions and ideas behind the text.

- In grading student texts, I value creativity and innovation. I will be more impressed if you attempt something difficult, even if you do it less successfully, than if you try something easy.
- This class will be participatory in nature. I prefer to conduct discussions and ask leading questions, rather than lecturing. I feel that you will learn more effectively if you figure things out for yourself than if I tell you things.

## Assignments

- *Rhetorical Analysis #1*: Choose a text of your choice and analyze its use of typography. Explain how the text communicates by means of its choice of typefaces, its arrangement of letters, and its distribution of letters relative to pictures. (10%)
- *Graphology*: Perform an informal graphological analysis of yourself. Explain why your handwriting looks the way it does, why you write the way you do, and what your handwriting reveals and/or conceals about you. This assignment must be handwritten. (20%)
- *Typographic History*: As a group, select a particular font or electronic typeface. Research the origin, history, uses, and associations of this typeface, and provide at least one example and analysis of a particularly effective use of it. Present this information to your classmates in the form of a group presentation with accompanying Prezi. (15%)
- *Rhetorical Analysis #2*: Select one of the pieces included in the Electronic Literature Collection. Prepare an oral presentation with accompanying Prezi in which you describe the way in which this piece makes use of typography, and assess whether its use of typography could be replicated in print or handwriting. (15%)
- *Electronic Graphology*: Perform a digital graphological analysis of yourself. Explain what your electronic writing looks like and why, and what it reveals or conceals about you. This assignment must incorporate features specific to digital writing. (20%)
- *Portfolio*: Select one assignment that fulfills each of the five WOVEN components (Written, Oral, Visual, Electronic, Nonverbal). For each assignment, write a short reflection essay. Prepare an attractively formatted and typeset document that incorporates each of the five assignments and the reflection essays. (10%)
- *Participation* (10%).

**Grading:** Essays will be graded on a rubric consisting of five components:

- Rhetorical Awareness (usually 25%)

- Stance and Support (25%)
- Organization (25%)
- Design for Medium (15%)
- Conventions (10%)

## CLASS SCHEDULE

### WEEK 1: Why letters matter

Day 1

- Course introduction
- Lecture: The crystal goblet theory of typography

Day 2

- In-class viewing of *Helvetica* (Gary Hustwit, 2007)

Day 3

- Finish in-class viewing of *Helvetica*
- Homework: Type design exercise; read Shaikh, A. Dawn, Barbara S. Chaparro, and Doug Fox, “Perception of Fonts: Perceived Personality Traits and Uses,” *Usability News* 8.1 (2006): 1-6.

### WEEK 2: How letters create meaning

Day 1

- Discussion: How does the design of letters affect meaning?
- Reading: Poems by Apollinaire and Marinetti to be announced

Day 2

- Discussion: How does the arrangement of text affect meaning?
- Homework: Read selected poems by Heaney, Blake and Keats
- Supplemental reading: WOVENText 21, “Exploring, Planning, and Drafting”

Day 3

- Discuss Heaney, Blake and Keats poems
- Homework: Rhetorical Analysis, first draft

### WEEK 3: Handwriting and the self

Day 1: NO CLASS—LABOR DAY HOLIDAY

Day 2

- Rhetorical Analysis first draft due
- Workshop: Rhetorical Analysis
- Homework: Begin *Fun Home*

Day 3

- Discuss *Fun Home*
- Homework: Continue *Fun Home*

#### **WEEK 4: Cross-cultural theories of handwriting**

Day 1

- Discuss *Fun Home*
- Homework: Read *Handwriting in America*, chapters 1-2

Day 2

- Discuss East Asian calligraphy
- Homework: Read *Handwriting in America*, chapters 3-4
- Rhetorical Analysis first draft will be returned

Day 3

- Discuss Thornton
- Homework: Read *Handwriting in America*, chapter 5 and epilogue

#### **WEEK 5: Histories of handwriting**

Day 1

- Rhetorical Analysis second draft due
- Homework: Read *Handwriting in America*

Day 2

- Discuss *Handwriting in America*
- Homework: Read Shmuel Yosef Agnon, "The Tale of the Scribe," *A Book That Was Lost and Other Stories*, eds. Alan L. Mintz, and Anne Golomb Hoffman (New York: Schocken, 1995), 167-183.

Day 3

- Discuss *Handwriting in America*
- Homework: Supplemental reading on East Asian calligraphy

#### **WEEK 6: Rhetoric of typography**

Day 1

- Discuss East Asian calligraphy
- Homework: Read *Thinking with Type*

Day 2

- Discuss *Thinking with Type*
- Homework: Read *Thinking with Type*

Day 3

- Discuss *Thinking with Type*
- Homework: Finish *Thinking with Type*

#### **WEEK 7: Typography as expression**

Day 1

- Discuss *Thinking with Type*
- Homework: Begin *Extremely Loud & Incredibly Close*
- Graphology first draft due

Day 2

- Discuss *Extremely Loud & Incredibly Close*
- Homework: Continue *Extremely Loud & Incredibly Close*

Day 3

- Discuss *Extremely Loud & Incredibly Close*
- Homework: Continue *Extremely Loud & Incredibly Close*

### **WEEK 8: Presentations**

Day 1

- Homework: Finish *Extremely Loud & Incredibly Close*
- Supplemental reading: WOVENtext 83-84

Day 2

- Workshop: Oral/Nonverbal Presentations

Day 3

- Workshop: Oral/Nonverbal Presentations
- Supplemental reading: WOVENtext 80-82

## **UNIT III. LETTERING AND TECHNOLOGY**

### **WEEK 9: Presentations**

Day 1

- NO CLASS—FALL RECESS

Day 2

- Oral/Nonverbal Presentations

Day 3

- Oral/Nonverbal Presentations
- Homework: Begin *Writing Machines*

### **WEEK 10: Text as technology**

Day 1

- Discuss *Writing Machines*
- Homework: Continue *Writing Machines*

Day 2

- Discuss *Writing Machines*
- Homework: Continue *Writing Machines*

Day 3

- Discuss *Writing Machines*
- Homework: Continue *Writing Machines*

### **WEEK 11**

Day 1

- Discuss *Writing Machines*
- Homework: Begin reading Electronic Literature Collection

Day 2

- Discuss electronic literature
- Workshop: Rhetorical Analysis #2
- Supplemental reading: WOVENtext 106

Day 3

- Workshop: Rhetorical Analysis #2
- Supplemental reading: WOVENtext 97-99 and 101

## **WEEK 12: Presentations**

Day 1

- Rhetorical Analysis #2 presentations

Day 2

- Rhetorical Analysis #2 presentations

Day 3

- Rhetorical Analysis #2 presentations
- Homework: Read Jessica Helfand, “Electronic Typography: The New Visual Language,” *Print*, 48.3 (1994): 98-101.

## **WEEK 13: Electronic typography and the memory of handwriting**

Day 1

- Discuss Helfand

Day 2

- In-class viewing: *Up*

Day 3

- In-class viewing: *Up*
- Discuss *Up*

## **WEEK 14**

Day 1

- Discuss *Up*
- Electronic Graphology first draft due
- Homework: Read excerpts from Heller, Steven. *The Education of a Typographer*. New York: Allworth, 2004. Print.

Day 2

- Discuss Heller

Day 3

- NO CLASS—THANKSGIVING HOLIDAY

## **WEEK 15**

Day 1

- Electronic Graphology first draft will be returned
- Peer review and conferences: Electronic Graphology

Day 2

- Peer review and conferences: Electronic Graphology

Day 3

- Peer review and conferences: Electronic Graphology and Portfolio

### **WEEK 16: Week Preceding Final Exams**

Day 1

- In-class portfolio workshop
- Electronic Graphology final draft due

Day 2

- In-class portfolio workshop

Day 3

- In-class portfolio workshop
- Portfolios due at end of class