**Slide 1**

* Always been interested in the digital assignment, whether it be a visual argument, documentary, website, etc. as part of the first-year comp curriculum because of my own limited experience and interest in building websites, editing videos, etc.
* The whole issue of technology in the classroom, specifically building upon a pre-existing skillset of students, or developing skills with specific programs, etc. is an on-going topic in rhetoric and composition
* Studied it here at UTEP in comp studies, rhet & technology, computers and writing,

**Slide 2**

* The numerous appeals cover a wide range of topics. Starting with students using computers in writing classes, or these classes taking place in a computer lab, to the push towards multimodal composition/composing not only in alphabetic text
* There are works that exist that address pedagogy, or bridging that gap between theory and application. Meaning what we talk about should be happening, and actually making it happen.
* They aren’t always specific. Or the assumption is the author/professor is able to do this in their class, but how would someone else replicate that?
* Essentially these assignments aim to incorporate elements of digital rhetoric, procedural rhetoric, and electracy, developing multiliteracies

**Slide 3**

* Each incorporation or approach has its benefits.
* But if assignments included based on specific theories and definitions 🡪 are we missing something?
* Danger of approaching these 3 much like the approach to literacy Wysocki and Johnson-Iola warn about
* And this is really what I’m after here. I am well aware that many first-year comp curriculums include some kind of “digital assignment”
* I’m aware of the reasoning behind the inclusion of this type of composition
* But what I want to know is which theories/definitions are included/used when implementing these assignments? I realize it will be vary from school to school, but if something is left out I want to know why. If something is included I want to know why. Because there are a lot of appeals/ a lot of Comp should do this. Some still think comp should be the fix all for students. We should “fix” their writing. Then we have technology. And what comp should do there. Teach it? Is it about effectively using software? Critically thinking about technology and its role in our daily lives? (I think yes, but do others? Do they need to?)
* I see a lot of these as intersecting. They are related, in some way, and often at numerous points, but is that reflected in curriculum?

**Research Questions**

* Leads me to my research questions. How are these theories/understandings implemented? Why these over others?
* How do they influence? Do they at all?
* What works? What are instructors using? Why? How?
* Rationale 🡪 These questions, I think will allow me to continually research the how and why. If something is done how is it done. Why was it done?
* I admit, that on that end this approach may be simple, but there are several factors/or parts to this, as with any complex or complicated issue. The how and why of it all, allows me to keep it simple, while still researching/investigating. I could, essentially ask how and why at every point.

**Digital Rhetoric**

* Current scholarship provides a large amount of attention to defining digital rhetoric, understanding what it means, and developing theories based on these definitions and understandings.
* In the prospectus I wrote a brief Lit Review. In it I begin with Selber. In *Multiliteracies for a Digital Age*. He argues, “if students are to become agents of positive change, they will need an education that is comprehensive and truly relevant to a digital age” (p. 234).
* What is relevant to a digital age? Especially when things move so quickly.
* In trying to define digital rhetoric I noticed that there is no agreed upon definition. Different scholars take on different approaches. Obviously, no one is wrong here, and personally I don’t know that we truly need or can ever achieve a generally agreed upon definition. If digital rhetoric is so closely tied to technology, an understanding of it may change once the next big thing comes out.
* What I attempted to do in this section of the LR is capture some of the definitions so that I can begin to build my own understanding of it that reflects where it (digital rhetoric) has been, and possible where it is going.
* **Lanham 🡪** He introduces the concept of a computer as a “rhetorical device as well as a logical one” in use. He notes that the computer is seen as logical, but not rhetorical. He views the electronic word as a means to electronic expression and as such it fits within the Western Arts & Letters. Lanham attempts not only to legitimize the electronic word, and electronic expressions, but also creates the space for the work that follows under his term of digital rhetoric. He focuses more on the manipulation of text and the results of moving text to the screen from the page, which is understandable given that this piece first appeared in 1992, and again in 1993.
* **Zappen 🡪** Zappen addresses the difficulty of applying traditional rhetoric to digital media. He situates his understanding of digital rhetoric within the digital space the writing and communication take place. This definition thus occupies itself more in the realm of the technology used to write and communicate than the strategies used. There is the suggestion that the strategies may be used differently in a digital space.
* **Losh 🡪** 4 part definition, more extensive, see view shifts about what is/can be digital rhetoric
* **Eyman 🡪** Eyman’s definition of digital rhetoric also accounts for the performance of composing and distributing, using a method of delivery that is not only based on speaking or writing.

This approach continues to incorporate and promote interdisciplinarity. Relevant not only because of his contribution of another definition/view of digital rhetoric, but because efforts to define it are on-going.

**Procedural Rhetoric**

* **Bogost 🡪** separate from digital rhetoric, deals more with \_\_\_\_\_ and video games, applied/seen by more as also an attempt at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* This definition is closely linked to the procedural computational practices. Bogost views these practices equally as persuasive as verbal and visual forms of communication. However, rather than the persuasion done in alphabetic text or multiple modes with a knowledge of language and images it is achieved as a result of the procedural nature of computer code. The code may appear to us in forms we know, but it is essentially the result of code. Therefore, to compose media within a computer is “the art of using processes persuasively” (p. 3).
* Process here procedure, the steps, not the process often talked about in composition theory
* **And why?** Bogost specifically applies procedural rhetoric to video games, but the concept of persuasion through software, and procedural processes ought be included under the umbrella of digital rhetoric, and as a potential theory to inform pedagogical practices in composition.

**Electracy**

* **Ulmer 🡪** The concept of electracy is tricky. As I understand it, and as Ulmer explains it, electracy is “to digital media what literacy is to alphabetic writing: an apparatus, or social machine, partly technological, partly institutional.” In this sense it is everything related to media, and by extension communicating using whatever is available in digital media
* **Arroyo 🡪** Arroyo uses it as a theoretical framework of participatory composition. She uses electracy because for her the concept of electracy goes beyond digital literacy. The inclusion of
* Here we see a continued desire to create scholarship that reflects current writing practices.
* **which is the result of current online culture that includes what Arroyo labels “video culture,” (p. 1) but the concept of electracy is not limited to it, or other forms of communication.**
* **the “notion changes from a theory into a practice to a practicing theory as it is emerging” (p. 104).**
* Electracy is important because it attempts to include composition practices as they happen and are needed in real time. This includes, but is not limited to writing outside of the classroom on multiple platforms.

So in what started out as defining digital rhetoric, in the early drafts of this prospectus/project, I found offshoots. Procedural rhetoric. Then electracy, which is different, but I think related to some of the goals/outcomes of digital rhetoric.

That was all from 92 – 2014. During the same time period here is what else is going in regards to rhetoric, technology, and the comp. class/curriculum.

**Rhetoric & Technology in the Classroom**

* **H&S 🡪** Electronic classroom. Computer lab to us. Warn of over reliance on technology, and even in 92 they recognize the need to “plan carefully and develop the necessary critical perspectives to help us avoid using computers to advance or promote mediocrity in writing instruction” (p. 62). Overall their view of computers in writing classrooms is positive, but they clearly point to a lack of critical awareness of the ways in which computers in the writing classroom may change pedagogical practices

**NLG 🡪** for a “new approach to literacy that they call literacies” (p. 60). The social environment they recognize as changing the result of the rise of globalized societies. They push for literacy pedagogy to include the “burgeoning variety of text forms associated with information and multimedia technologies” (p. 61). To do this the New London Group argues that students must understand and control “representational forms” in communications, and therefore instructors must embrace multiliteracies over traditional approaches to literacy because multiliteracies “focuses on modes of representation much broader than language” (p. 64).

* Johnson-Wysocki 🡪 discussed earlier
* Yancey 🡪 Compose not only alphabetic text. More attention given to multimodal composition, etc.
* **Selber 🡪 multiliteracies. Three levels. Functional. Critical. Rhetorical.**
* **Clarke 🡪** presents digital rhetoric as another literacy students must develop/enhance. She uses Lanham’s *The Electric Word* to support the shift towards images and words in writing. She points to web 2.0 technologies as a means to access and allow for exploring new ways to encourage authorial control of writing (p. 28). Assignments such as the E-Portfolio are highlighted as a means for “discussions of ownership of digital material” (p. 29). This interpretation of the E-Portfolio incorporates elements of Selber’s critical literacy. Clarke goes so far as to describe the composition classroom as an “emerging space for digital rhetoric” and views this as one way to develop students’ literacy in digital rhetoric.
* **So, between early 90s to mid 2000s, and a few years ago, 2010s? 🡪 continued work in tech in classroom, digital rhetoric, how to implement it in classroom, other approaches, multiliteracies, etc. I believe these are closely related. They don’t often mean the same thing, but the role of technology as both creator of a composition, user of devices and software, etc. seem to be in some way addressed. This may be the result of tech advances and developments. More of our daily lives incorporate certain things, the smart phone, internet, etc.**
* **I sometimes think of these as lanes on a freeway. All headed, at the moment, in the same place, but in slightly different areas or ways.**

**Methodology**

* **Type of study, process and rationale**
* **Collection of data**
* Scholarship will include works in pedagogy, multimodal composition, electracy, procedural rhetoric, and digital rhetoric. This lens will allow me to analyze the syllabus, assignment guidelines, rubrics, and interview responses in an effort to determine which theories are turned into practice in the form of assignments.
* **Limitations**

**Next Steps**