**Question 1:** Much of the scholarship on rhetoric and technology addresses shifting notions of literacy and what it means to be literate. Drawing upon 4-5 scholars from the course, focus your discussion on two of the following.  
o   How we teach  
o   How we communicate

Advancements and changes in technology change the way we communicate, and our approach to teaching. This results in a shift of our views of literacy/literacies and approaches to both the understanding literacy and of rhetorical strategies needed to teach, and use these new literacies. The purpose of this paper is to analyze the ways in which technology shifts how the concept of literacy based on how we communicate, and how these shifts change how we teach through the work of Hawisher and Selfe (1991), Kathleen Blake Yancey (2004), Stuart Selber (2004), and Sarah Arroyo (2013) add Pigg or whoever here!

An early observation of how technology can impact how we teach is examined in Hawisher and Selfe’s (1991) article “The Rhetoric of Technology and the Electronic Writing Class.” Hawisher and Selfe bring to our attention the idea that the technology (computer) used in a classroom “reinforces those traditional notions of education” in which “teachers talk, students listen; teachers' contributions are privileged; students respond in predictable, teacher-pleasing ways” (p. 55). This is problematic because the implementation of a technology has created boundaries as opposed to promoting freedom for students to explore and work with the computer in a way that encourages their development of multiliteracies. Hawisher and Selfe warn that instructors need to be aware of the “negative effects of using new technology” (p. 59), because of the danger of using computers “to deliver drill-and-practice exercises to students” (p. 59), as opposed to using technology to enhance the experience of the student, and not replace previous approaches to teaching. The way to circumvent this type of use of the computer requires instructors to “plan carefully and develop the necessary critical perspectives to help us avoid using computers to advance or promote mediocrity in writing instruction” (p.59). This requires instructors to think beyond using technology for the sake of including it in their classroom, because it is new, exciting and seemingly helpful or beneficial to the student. Doing so without thinking critically about the impact, both positive and negative, of implementing the technology in the classroom may result in ???. In 1991 for Hawisher and Selfe it was \_\_\_\_ Therefore when instructors begin to make use of technology they must use a “balanced and increasingly critical perspective is a starting point: by viewing our classes as sites of both paradox and promise” in an effort to “construct a mature view of how the use of electronic technology can abet our teaching” (p. 62). This approach is beneficial for the student and the instructor because it calls on them to be critical of the technology used. Despite the age of the Hawisher and Selfe (1991) piece, it continues to resonate in rhetorical and technology because we cannot, as instructors, simply respond to shifts by blindly or gullibly implementing technology without looking beyond affordances. This is important when responding to calls regarding the shift in how we think about literacy, and how we teach. BETTER TRANSITION. TRANSITION BETWEEN IDEAS.

Yancey (2004) in “Made not only in words: Composition in a new key” addressed the importance of moving away from alphabetic text only. Yancey declares that “we are digital already,” (p. 307), which means that continued conversation surrounding the “literacy associated with screen” and how such a literacy “leads us to question what we know” is vital (p. 304). While the influence and use of technology is vital to this discussion, it must also be noted that this address is just as equally rooted in the changes in how we communicate, and write. When “members of the writing public have learned—in this case, to write, to think together, to organize, to act within these forums—largely without instruction” and more importantly “without our instruction” (p. 301), then the way we, students and instructors, communicate and write has shifted to a point in which we can no longer ignore. Such an observation, and appeal seems obvious now, but in 2004 this important in understanding that the public possesses “a rhetorical situation, a purpose, a potentially worldwide audience, a choice of technology and medium,” and that the writing of students is social then we should pay closer attention to the ways in which the public and academic writing of students converge (p. 301). How we communicate, and the changes in how we write forces us to rethink literacy, and what we teach when we incorporate literacy of the screen. Yancey urged that this could not be written off as “something technical, and outside the parameters governing composing,” and that we could either be part of the moment, or not (p. 320). To be part of it, however, does not require us to simply embrace literacy of the screen, and include more than alphabetic text. As Hawisher and Selfe

2004 proved to be an important year for rhetoric and composition and scholarship on its relationship between rhetoric and technology. Stuart Selber (2004) in *Multiliteracies for a Digital Age* urges scholars to help students develop multiliteracies by changing their approach to using and integrating technology in the classroom. Selber provides a theoretical framework for how to include technology in curriculum, and move these multiliteracies beyond a functional level. If what and how we teach remains at a functional level, then it would limit the student, and make their use of the computer more “proceduralist,” which reinforce the “systematic power” of using such a technology (p. 43, p. 46). Instead, he argues that how and what we teach should be at a critical and rhetorical level. At the critical level “students might be encouraged to recognize and question the politics of computers” (p. 75). This critical awareness of computers, and technology in general, is as necessary in 2004 as it is now. Due to the use of various types of technology in the daily lives of students it is important to question the impact of technology beyond the practical uses. When a student develops a rhetorical awareness of technology the user/student possess the ability to “effect change in technological systems” (p. 182). They become a “reflective producer of technology” (p. 182). The theoretical framework Selber provides helped to establish that students should be questioners of technology (critical literacy), and rhetorical in the way that they understand the implications of technology. 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” (p. 234). This comprehensive education must be different than what is taught with the alphabetic text essay. Therefore what we teach must change, and it should not be continue to shift along with the demands of the changing notions of literacy. The learning objectives, and elements taught must be different, or else the student only learns how to transfer an essay to a different genre, or format. Selber’s main argument is to develop a curriculum that goes beyond the functional level because how we think about technology, and how we communicate using technology in our daily lives influences how we communicate with our students. When we incorporate technology, and do so in a way that aims to help students develop multiliteraces at a critical and rhetorical level it will change what we teach.

Moving forward the field responded to the calls of Yancey and Selber. This is evident in the work of Sarah Arroyo. In Arroyo’s (2013) book *Participatory Composition: Video Culture, Writing, and Electracy* shediscusses participatory composition, and the connectedness of students that alters composition classes. Here again we see that as technology continues to evolve, and with it the ways we use it, so does how we communicate. In 2004 Yancey understood that writing was becoming increasingly social in the online world, and Arroyo sees this as increasingly prominent as a result of video culture. Arroyo uses Ulmer’s concept of electracy as the theoretical framework for her work. Electracy for her is a concept that “can be compared to digital literacy but encompasses much more: a worldview for civic engagement, community building, and participation” (Kindle Locations 30-31). Arroyo’s book addresses other issues, including her belief that not all participation is positive, but the concept of electracy is central to her work and as such it is discussed here more than other areas. For Arroyo electracy incorporates more participation and civic engagement on the part of the user/student. Despite the attempt to separate electracy from digital literacy there are still elements of the type of engagement Selber discusses in his book, which is altogether not uncommon in rhetoric and composition classrooms. Therefore, it is clear that while technology changes how we communicate, and that change will indubitably alter how we teach because of what we teach in the wake of technological advancements, the core principles of a composition class remain.
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