

ENGL 103

Rhetoric & Composition I



Northern Illinois
University

WP2: Value Analysis

Description

For WP2, you will explore the language and posting processes of a space. The space should be currently active, small enough to get to know in the time frame, and user controlled. You'll observe that space, specifically looking for the language and genre conventions used. Then, you'll analyze that content of the space to make an argument for what the users value in good content. You'll use evidence from your observations to make a point about what counts as a "good" post, image, response, comment, or other interaction within your space.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of this writing project, students will be able to:

- Recognize patterns of language use in a space.
- Recognize genre patterns in a space.
- Reflect on the ways that language is shaped by community practices.
- Evaluate systems of language use.
- Further build strategies for planning and revising writing.

Choosing an Appropriate Space

You can choose from one of the following spaces or select a similar space with the approval of your instructor. All spaces must be small enough to have a similar set of practices across the whole space. For example, you can't choose Instagram because too many different groups exist within the same space, but you could choose a local Facebook group where interactions are more limited.

If you choose a space other than those on the list below, **your space must be approved by your instructor in advance and cannot be changed without approval.**

Possible Spaces

- Medium-sized spaces on Reddit, such as:
 - [Dogs with Jobs](#)
 - [Happy](#)
 - [Illinois](#)
 - [Memes of Harry Potter](#)
 - [Sequel Memes \(Star Wars\)](#)
- Small Facebook Pages, such as:
 - [DeCarbon DeKalb](#)
 - [Harry Potter Memes](#)
 - [Star Wars Memes and Jokes](#)
 - [What's ACTUALLY Happening in DeKalb, IL](#)
 - [What's up Illinois?](#)
- Specific message boards, such as:
 - [Cat Forum](#)
 - [Chicago Fanatics](#)
 - [Chicago Fishing Forum](#)
 - [Harry Potter Fan Forum](#)
 - [Jedi Council Forums](#)

Requirements

Appropriate Space

You have chosen a space from above or had your space approved by your instructor.

Submission

Please submit your project through OneDrive. Please approve any alternative methods to submit your writing project with me in advance.

Naming Documents

Please name your files using the following convention:

course.section_your name_assignment.draft.

For example, a student in ENGL 103 section 08 named Malcolm Reynolds working on WP2 draft 1 would name their file:

103.08_MalcolmReynolds_wp2.1

Due Dates

- Completion drafts are due on **Friday, October 20th**
- Revision drafts are due on **Friday, October 27th**

Completion Drafts

Completion drafts are graded on demonstrating a basic understanding of the requirements. Grades for completion drafts aren't an indication of how well you'll do on the revision draft. To get full credit for the completion draft, you must do the following:

Choose an appropriate space

You have chosen a space from the list above, or your space has been approved by your instructor. You should have observed your space for a minimum of five hours by the time you write your draft.

Make a claim about values

Clearly choose at least one way in which the community values "good" content. What is a "good" post, comment, response, image, meme, etc. in the space, and how do you know?

Select and curate evidence

Select evidence from your observations that helps to support what your community values in good content. Be mindful to select appropriate observations that support your points well. Not all observations will be used in your drafts.

Reflect on your choices

Write a reflection that explains how you chose the main value to focus on and how you chose your evidence to support that claim. Explain your selection of any multimodal content, such as images, sounds, videos, links, and so on. Please remember that reflections are worth 50% of your completion draft.

Making a Claim

One note about making claims: Your claim doesn't have to cover every type of post in your space. Instead, it just has to be true and able to be proven with evidence from your observations. In fact, good claims won't cover every post as that would be too obvious. For example, in the subreddit [r/aww](#), it would be easy to say the community values pictures of cute animals. Try to dig further. Instead, a good claim might be good posts use the titles to make the animals in the pictures seem to have human-like attributes. I could back up this claim with evidence such as [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#).

Revision Drafts

Revision drafts are graded on the criteria below. Each criterion is evaluated as "exceptional," "met," or "not met." If all of the criteria are "exceptional," you will earn an A. If they are all "met," you will earn a C. One or more criteria in the "not met" column may result in an F.

Grading Criteria: Reflection	Exceptional	Met	Not Met
1. Reflecting on Your Claim	You have clearly explained why you have chosen your central claim and given reasons for why this was your best option.	You explain why you have chosen the central claim you make.	How the claim was chosen is not included or unclear.
2. Reflecting on Your Supporting Evidence	You have clearly explained why you have chosen the evidence to support your claim and given reasons for why this evidence is better than other parts of your observations.	You explain why you have chosen the evidence to support your claim.	How the evidence was chosen is not included or unclear.
3. Reflecting on Evidence Integration	You have clearly explained why you have placed evidence in certain places and how you've explained that evidence to your readers.	You explain how evidence could be understood by your readers.	How evidence was placed and/or explained is unclear.
4. Reflecting on Your Rhetorical Purpose	You have clearly explained the goal of WP2 and how you have met that goal.	You explain the goal of WP2.	The project goal is not mentioned or unclear.
5. Responding to Feedback	You have revised your reflection substantially and/or thoughtfully based on both your peers' and your instructor's feedback.	You have revised your reflection based on both your peers' and your instructor's feedback.	No revisions to the reflection have been made or only minor changes have been made that do not adequately respond to feedback.
6. Meeting Requirements	You have met or exceeded all of the requirements for the reflection.	You have met all of the requirements for the reflection.	One or more of the requirements for the reflection has not been met.

Grading Criteria: Analysis	Exceptional	Met	Not Met
1. Claim	You have a focused claim about what your community values in content, and the claim is unique to your space and not obvious.	You have a focused claim about what your community values in content.	No single claim is made or several unrelated claims are made.
2. Analysis	Your analysis focuses on demonstrating your claim is true through reasonable examples and other data.	Your analysis focuses on your claim and uses reasonable examples.	The analysis does not focus on the claim or does not provide adequate examples.
3. Supporting Evidence	You have selected several examples of your claim in action and clearly explained how those examples support your claim.	You have selected a minimum of three examples of your claim in action from your observations.	No examples of the claim are given, or examples do not match the claim.
4. Evidence Integration	You have integrated evidence into your document effectively. Quotes, images, links, and so on are used at appropriate times so that readers can follow easily.	You have integrated evidence into your document appropriately. It is possible to understand quotes, images, links, and so on.	Evidence is included at inappropriate times, and/or it is difficult for readers to understand the significance of the evidence.
5. Responding to Feedback	You have revised your analysis substantially and/or thoughtfully based on both your peers' and your instructor's feedback.	You have revised your analysis based on both your peers' and your instructor's feedback.	No revisions to the analysis have been made or only minor changes have been made that do not adequately respond to feedback.
6. Meeting Requirements	You have met or exceeded all of the requirements for the analysis.	You have met all of the requirements for the analysis.	One or more of the requirements for the analysis has not been met.