The intersection of literacy and technology represents a vast expanse of study where many scholars address, and critique areas of concern in digital rhetoric and how these issues may or may not impact writing. Much like rhetoric, digital rhetoric has no clear and generally agreed upon definition. With many different definitions there are various similar and conflicting approaches to digital rhetoric studies. 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. The abundance of theories has led to a limited and limiting number of scholarly work in application. There exist numerous appeals to scholars to critically address and think about the role of technology in the classroom, its social use and the implications of both in our daily lives and writing. Digital rhetoric can no longer to afford to primarily focus on theory, and/or build upon preexisting theories. As a subfield of Rhetoric & Composition it must (\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_)

This paper aims to identify the various definitions of digital rhetoric and the pedagogical practices linked to them by categorizing them into three separate epistemologies. The categories will then be linked to current pedagogical practices commonly associated with them.

Continuing work that focuses on theory and not application can lead to what Wysocki, and Johnson-Eilola, J. refer to as an attempt to use literacy to “give others some basic, neutral, context-less set of skills whose acquisition will bring the bearer economic and social goods and privileges” (p. 352). In their article “Blinded by the Letter: Why Are We Using Literacy as a Metaphor for Everything Else?” they criticize the approach to literacy as a skill that equals the playing field for all. Doing so does not address systemic issues, as it is an assumption that to be literate in any area is to have a set of skills that are both desirable and beneficial. Without applying digital rhetoric theories, or devoting more scholarship to the application of these theories there is a high likelihood that curriculum in composition will approach digital rhetoric as an area for students to become literate in working in digital spaces without exploring the relationship between the user and the technology.

**Research Questions**

1. How do the various definitions of digital rhetoric affect composition pedagogy and approach to digital literacies in the field of rhetoric?
2. What theories in digital rhetoric need to be applied and incorporated in assignments?
3. What types of assignments, and platforms allow for an attempt to bridge the gap between theory and application?

4. How do we make all this work? (Fancy it up)

**Lit Review**

Richard Lanham coined the term digital rhetoric in his *The Electronic Word: Democracy, Technology, and the Arts.* While he does not supply a specific definition 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 create 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. It is important to include Lanham’s work because he coined digital rhetoric. Lanham’s contribution goes beyond coining the term digital rhetoric.

Equally as important was his view of the computer as a rhetorical device, which allowed for scholarship to be done in digital rhetoric. The scholarship done in the field of digital rhetoric varies, and as such several different approaches to the study of digital rhetoric exist resulting in several different working definitions and understandings of digital rhetoric.

Zappen (2005) in “Digital rhetoric: Toward an integrated theory” attempts to differentiate between traditional and digital rhetoric. He defines digital rhetoric as “traditional rhetorical strategies function in digital spaces and suggest how these strategies are reconfigured within these spaces” (p. 319). 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.

Ian Bogost, prefers to view digital rhetoric as procedural rhetoric. In his 2009 book Bogost defines procedural rhetoric as “the art of persuasion through rule-based representations and interactions, rather than the spoken word, writing, images, or moving pictures” (p. ). This definition is closely linked to the procedural computational practices of using a computer. Bogost views these practices as 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.). His work in procedural rhetoric pushes scholars to move beyond the view that the technologies we use are simply tools available to us. He puts procedural rhetoric under the umbrella of digital rhetoric because of the “practice of using processes persuasively,” due to the nature of the digital spaces we compose in, and inhabit, it is impossible to separate any understanding of digital rhetoric from the processes we engage in to accomplish communication.

In Elizabeth Losh’s 2009 book *Virtualpolitik : An electronic history of government*

*media-making in a time of war, scandal, disaster, miscommunication, and mistakes* she

provides a comprehensive four-part definition of digital rhetoric:

1. The conventions of new digital genres that are used for everyday discourse, as we as for special occasions, in average people’s lives.
2. Public rhetoric, often in the form of political messages from government institutions, which is represented or recorded through digital technology and disseminated via electronic distributed networks.
3. The emerging scholarly discipline concerned with the rhetorical interpretation of computer-generated media as objects of study.
4. Mathematical theories of communication from the field of information science, many of which attempt to quantify the amount of uncertainty in a given linguistic exchange or the likely paths through which messages travel. (p. 47 - 48)

This definition encompasses several aspects of scholarship within digital rhetoric. It touches on digital genres as a means of discourse, public rhetoric/political messages distributed through networks, the computer generated media becoming objects of study in their own right, and the use of mathematical theories of communication within information science to gauge linguistic exchanges. The importance of this comprehensive definition is that it details the difference in approach and understanding of what digital rhetoric is, what it can do, and ultimately how it is interdisciplinary.

Carolyn Handa’s book *The Multimediated Rhetoric of the Internet: Digital Fusion* defines digital rhetoric as:

“simply (or maybe not so simply) traditional rhetoric applied visually as well as textually. It is not another form of rhetoric. We do not switch from digital to traditional rhetoric. All of the components we are accustomed to discussing in traditional rhetoric, especially having to do with style and arrangement for the purposes of conducting logical, discursive, persuasive arguments, are elements that can occur visually” (p. 18).

This definition attempts to link traditional rhetorical practices to those in digital spaces. Doing so tends to give more attention to the elements of persuasion due to the fact that this definition keeps in line with Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric.

Doug Eyman in Chapter 1 of *Digital Rhetoric: Theory, Method, Practice* (2015) makes a connection between digital rhetoric and visual rhetoric, based on “the sense that a focus outside of the tradition of written and spoken argument broadens the available opportunities to apply rhetorical theory to new objects of study.” Eyman continues by linking visual and digital rhetoric by writing that “visual rhetoric also draws on theory from art and graphic design as well as psychology (gestalt theory), bringing rhetoric into these spheres even as they contribute to the overall rhetorical methods,” and that since digital rhetoric includes visuals “it can align itself with these fields, as well as other technical fields—such as computer science, game design, and Internet research—that don’t usually take up rhetorical theory.” This approach continues to incorporate and promote interdisciplinarity. 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, The implications of digital spaces suggests a reliance on the visuals used and perceived, that also find themselves closely related to methods of delivery.

As scholars in digital rhetoric worked to define the term, and create a space within the field of rhetoric other scholars, not necessarily concerned with the field of digital rhetoric address issues of technology and literacy. During this same time period of the early 1990s to the 2000s similar concerns over technology, its use in composition classes, and calls to action based on new or different writing practices as a result of developments and

In “The Rhetoric of Technology and the Electronic Writing Class” Hawisher and Selfe (1991) express concern over the “new electronic classrooms” (p.55) and its impact on how writing instructors teach writing. They warn of over reliance on technology, and integration of technology in the classroom. They advice to writing instructors is to be aware of the positive and negative influences computers may have on the writing classroom. They note that leading up to the time of their publication there was an overwhelmingly positive depiction of the role of the computer, and technology, in these so-called electronic classrooms. Based on their observations they were surprised by the amount of writing taking place in the classrooms with computers. However, the amount of writing according to them limited the time students and no “careful two-way discussions of the writing problems students were encountering” (p. 60) as a result of the overreliance on the implemented technology in the classroom. Their observations of the approaches of instructors teaching in these electronic classrooms leads to a call 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.

This specific outlook of technology integration is not uncommon, nor is it only associated with the integration of technology in a classroom. The appeal of a new technology, and/or new approach to a preexisting theory. My point is we also do this in other areas. There is the shiny new object and we jump to it, and in some cases without creating a critical eye as to what its impact may be.

Wysocki and Johnson call attention to the general understanding and approach to literacy. This is dependent upon the notion that “if we acquire the basic skills of reading and writing—if we are literate—we have, or will have, all the goods the stories bundle together” (p. 352), which ultimately leads to what Glenda Hull writes in “TITLE HERE” as an “intellectual equivalent of all-purpose flour,” by assuming that “once mastered, these skills can and will be used in any context for any purpose” (34). This view of literacy as a basic skill that leads to meaningful use in any context is not unlike Hawisher and Selfe’s view of the computers in writing classrooms. The skills acquired in using them are necessary, but that does not equate to transferability to any and all situations and contexts. Wysocki and Johnson write that this also happens with “technological literacy” or “computer literacy” in the way that “we wish to give others some basic, neutral, context-less set of skills whose acquisition will bring the bearer economic and social goods and privileges” (p.352). One of the dangers of this view of literacy as a skill does not account for the socioeconomic status/stuff.

**LITERACY**

**Wysco & Friend**

**Selber Multilteracies!**

Baron (1982), in “Pencils to Pixels” establishes the link between technology and the classroom when he states that the computer “promises, or threatens to change literacy practices, for better or worse, depending on your point of view” (p.7). Developments in technology account for new literacies to be learned, but agreeing upon how to do that is tricky at best. Yancey (2004) in “Made not only in words: Composition in a new key” declared the field to be in a most important moment, and urges the field to move away from only composing and teaching composition that consists of alphabetic text. Yancey states “the screen is the language of the vernacular” (305), and despite this not being a new assessment in 2004, she proclaimed that “we are digital already.”

Around the same time Stuart Selber also addresses where curriculum should go in *Multiliteracies for a Digital Age*. Selber 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” (234). This comprehensive education differs from the traditional approaches associated with alphabetic text. It is no coincidence that following these strong statements in support of moving away from alphabetic text, and relying upon interfaces and digital spaces for communication that some in digital rhetoric focus more on the technology than the persuasive practices.