Re-Inventing Digital Delivery for Multimodal Composing: A Theory and Heuristic for Composition Pedagogy[☆]

Chanon Adsanatham [a,*,1], Bre Garrett [b,1], Aurora Matzke [c,1]

[a] *Miami University, Oxford, OH*
[b] *University of West Florida, Pensacola, FL*
[c] *Biola University, La Mirada, CA*

Abstract

This essay recasts James E. Porter's *topoi* for digital delivery theory as a pedagogical heuristic that guides students to reconsider delivery throughout the process of composing a multimodal video in first-year writing. The article showcases students' engagement with the fifth canon. It reports the findings from a pilot classroom study examining the affordances and limitations of the heuristic by three teacher-researchers, offers pedagogical implications, and presents a re-modification of Porter's *topoi* for different situated uses. Through examining students' uses of the digital delivery heuristic for video composing, four interrelated finding strands were discovered: interdependency of the *topoi* and rhetorical canons, rhetorical and ethical use of multimedia resources, identification across differences and commonalities, and reinscription and norming. The article makes explicit the dynamic, interactive, and recursive nature of delivery in multimodal writing and resituates digital delivery as a composition theory and pedagogy for teaching multimedia composition.
© 2013 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Delivery; The fifth canon; Body/identity; Multimodal video composing; Digital delivery theory; Heuristic; Composition pedagogy

"Having never done any kind of digital writing before, I don't really know what needs to be taken into consideration. There are things that we don't have to do and think about when writing [an essay], something I'm used to doing in school, but this new media stuff is different from anything I've done," related Mary[2] in response to composing her first multimodal video. Her candid reflection identifies the complexity of composing and teaching digital composition: both the excitements and challenges that students and teachers encounter. For many writing instructors, as well as for students like Mary, "this new media stuff" requires unique pedagogical scaffolding and modeling process. As teachers, we can highlight the rhetorical options—showing how multimodal composing enables more varied means to deliver, to invent, and to construct and communicate knowledge. Although we are often users/viewers/readers of digital multimodal texts, we are not always producers and teachers of such textual designs. Composing with words,

---

sounds, images, and motion using a video camera and audio editing software call forth different composing actions and processes from writers.

In this collaborative teacher-research study, we draw upon James E. Porter's (2009) theory of digital delivery and develop a heuristic that guides composers to invent a particular delivery process for multimodal video composing. We modify Porter's theory as a pedagogical tool and call for more situated uses of his framework. By foregrounding delivery, the fifth canon, as a rhetorical process and heuristic that informs multimodal composing, we aim to make more explicit the dynamic, interactive, and recursive nature of delivery in digital multimodal composition and writing pedagogy.

In "Recovering Delivery for Digital Rhetoric," winner of the Ellen Nold Award for best *Computers and Composition* article in 2009, Porter capaciously re-theorized the canon of delivery for digital writing. He presented a framework comprised of the following five *topoi*:

- *Body/Identity*–representations of the body, gestures, voice, dress, image, identity, race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and ethnicity in digital spaces
- *Distribution/Circulation*–technological publishing options for reproducing, distributing, and circulating digital information
- *Access/Accessibility*–audience's ability and competence for accessing and using digital hardware and software
- *Interaction/Interactivity*–the range and types of engagement (between people and information) encouraged or allowed by digital designs
- *Economics*–copyright, ownership, control of information, fair use, authorship, and the politics of information policy

Each *topos* holds significance in composition and rhetoric scholarship about delivery (Ridolfo & DeVoss, 2009; DeVoss & Porter, 2006; Banks, 2005; Rhodes, 2004; Yancey, 2004; Selfe, 1999; Hawisher and Sullivan, 1999). Porter grouped the terms collectively as *topoi*, a classical concept that retains implications of invention. He stressed that these topics extend beyond "abstract theories, or technical proficiencies," and they function as "categories that operate heuristically and productively across multiple situations to prompt rhetorical decisions regarding production" (p. 208). Production entails a dual process of invention and delivery. The fifth canon is, hence, significant throughout the stages of digital multimodal composing.

In this article, we first situate the canon of delivery within a larger historical realm of rhetoric and composition. We then outline the course background, pedagogical context, and scaffolding process involved in our pilot study. Afterward, we detail a heuristic of digital delivery adapted from Porter's *topoi* and provide the results garnered from our classroom research in which we explore: What do student composers fairly new to video composing gain by working with the *topoi* of delivery; what are some limitations and challenges of using the *topoi* as a heuristic; and what pedagogical modifications might be needed as a result?

To investigate these questions, we conducted an IRB approved pilot study in a first-year writing course that Chanon taught. Bre and Aurora distributed and collected the consent forms, attended the classes for observation and pedagogical assistance, and interviewed students who agreed to participate in the study.[3] To maintain confidentiality, Chanon was not informed regarding participation until final course grades were submitted. All students in the course granted us permission to observe, report, and analyze their classroom participation and all of the work they developed in relation to the digital delivery heuristic. Our data consists of interviews, class observation notes, students' projects, responses to the digital delivery heuristic, and weekly written composing process reflections. Throughout the writing of this article, we hope to provide a contextualized response concerning what rhetorical choices and negotiations composers made when working with a digital delivery theory.

A caveat before we proceed: The versatility and affordances of digital composing spaces can feel at times too vast for a single theory or heuristic. Heuristics and theories must bend and fold with situated, embodied practice,[4] so while we work to expand Porter's *topoi* in our work, we initiated our study by narrowing his originally intended scope from

---

[3] The questions followed three strands and were woven together with four questions a piece: feelings and attitudes, multimodal composing with the heuristic, and ideas of digital invention and delivery.

[4] Practices are immensely complex and varied. Yet, as teachers and as composers we must develop some guides, some tools for helping students. As guides, heuristics do not impart guarantees, and of course, practices will always elude our efforts to predict or manage them.

the ever-expansive domain of "internet-based communication" to the situated classroom praxis of multimodal video composing. Even though Porter's much needed re-theorization accounts for a pluralistic and wide range of available means inclusive of different composing technologies and spaces, we offer here a point of consideration for fellow composition teachers who seek to integrate multimodal video authoring into their classroom—one we learned through studying students' video composing practices and their engagement with digital delivery theory.

1. The fifth canon in composition studies

Porter titled the first digital delivery *topos* as body/identity and rightly so, considering that delivery is inexorably connected to physical bodies. In the Greco-Roman rhetorical tradition, an interrelationship existed among delivery, bodies, and speaker ethos from the beginning. Spoken, oral delivery essentially transpired from the physical, corporeal body. In *Delivering College Composition*, Kathleen Blake Yancey (2006) argued that in classical times, "the only available technology of delivery was the body" (p. 9). Delivery encompassed physical capabilities that speakers learned and cultivated through rehearsal and repetitious training in multimodal actions, involving attention to vocality, bodily posture and movement, and appearance.

The body as a signifier of cultural identity was the very marker of why not all individuals were granted equal opportunity to a rhetorical education (Glenn, 1997; Royster, 2000; Buchanan, 2005). Most commonly, only able-bodied male citizens were trained in and had the most direct access to spoken, public delivery (Kirsch & Royster, 2010). As Porter and a number of scholars of rhetoric history and composition theory demonstrated (Connors, 1983; Welch, 1990; 1999; Reynolds, 1996; McCorkle, 2005; Yancey, 2006; Selfe, 2009), the cultural and material shift from orality to print literacies re-composed new socio-cultural scripts for delivery. In print culture, delivery implicates printing processes, typography, binding, and publishing; however, how one crafts and distributes a production to an audience, and in turn, how audiences receive it drastically differs across modality and medium.

The prevalence of digital technology and composing warrant a re-theorization of delivery for writing in electronic contexts. *Electric communication*, a concept that Kathleen Welch (1999) ushered into composition vernacular, replenished an interconnection between orality and the visual as a means of taking in and delivering information. *Internet-based communication*, Porter's phrase, takes the computer and its capacity for multimodal electronic production and adds the affordances of a digitally connected, networked environment—textual spaces that enable combinations of sounds, images, motions, and words for varied means of web publication, such as blogs, email, wikis, and social networking sites. Internet-based communication imparts considerable transformations to not only the myriad material means by which one composes, but equally so to the literal available material means by which an audience receives and interacts with communication.

During her 2004 Conference on College Composition and Communication Chair's address, Yancey advocated for scholars to carve rhetorical space into our theories and practices by re-assessing the place and function of the canons in a digital age. Two years later, in response to her own call, she published a collection that reconceptualized delivery as a pedagogical concept. In our classroom praxis, we work with what Yancey (2006) termed "composition-as-delivery" (p. 199). Through our study, we push delivery to the foreground of our students' video composing practice. In doing so, we realign the fifth canon as a central rhetorical concern that warrants sustained, recursive consideration in digital composition and pedagogy.

2. Adapting Porter's theory as a heuristic: Pedagogical context and scaffolding

Chanon modified Porter's digital delivery theory and employed it as a heuristic to teach multimodal video composing in English 112. English 112 is a first-year writing course designed to help students develop the ability to read, write and think critically and rhetorically about various forms "texts" they encounter in daily life—texts broadly defined as alphabetic, visual, sonic, and material artifacts. Through four overlapping units called inquiries, students learned methods of close, critical reading and composing of "texts" and engaging in sustained reflection about their rhetorical skills and literacy practices. All of the inquiries take a multiliteracies approach to teaching writing (Kress, 2009; Takayoshi and Selfe, 2007; Selber, 2004; New London Group, 1996).

For the third inquiry, Creative Production, students composed a six to eight minute research-based video with alphabetic text, visuals, voiceovers, sound effects, and video clips to explore a set of self-chosen inquiry questions. Chanon selected multimodal video composing because it captures the "multiple and materially textured" composing

environment that Yancey (2006) characterized as the common scene of many US college students (p. 199). Composing with/for video opens production to a wide-range of potential modalities and offers an amalgamation of multimedia elements. It requires access to certain technologies and composing materials. In order to create footage, for instance, a composer needs a video or digital camera, a computer with movie editing software, and an audio recorder.[5] Combining spoken voice, music, effects, and even silence alongside displayed alphabetic text, images, and animation, video composing demands a great deal of rhetorical consideration and invention.

Keeping track of multiple moves and textual layers as they occur can help composers make more informed decisions before delivering their finished video project. In multimodal video composing, delivery holds a twofold impact on textual content: influencing what actually gets produced (and in what formats), and its effects upon the audience (via distribution and circulation). In order to help students complete their videos, Chanon created several scaffolding exercises[6] and recontextualized Porter's 5 *topoi* into a heuristic in order to invest the students' composing practices with recursive attention to delivery. He modified and expanded the ideas behind each of Porter's *topoi* into a set of heuristic questions meant to help students rhetorically and critically invent and reflect upon their work throughout the composing process.[7] See Appendix A. Students responded to the questions via blogging, shared their write-ups with the class, and commented on each other's written reflections. Doing so enabled them to generate ideas and content for their video.[8] As a whole, the heuristic questions that Chanon developed from Porter's theory highlight the rhetorical, ethical, and critical components of delivery for composers. Through outside of class reflection and in-class reinforcement of the heuristic, writers engaged in critical rhetorical invention and planning grounded in digital delivery theory.

3. Pilot study results

Our goals for researching the digital delivery theory heuristic were threefold: 1) to better understand how/if the heuristic aided students' video composing and reflection processes, 2) to use the insights gained to improve future invention practices and reflection-based pedagogy, and 3) to contribute to the field's ongoing conversation about digital delivery theory by investigating students' video composing process and situated learning. Our preliminary findings are divided into four internetworked strands: interdependency of the *topoi* and rhetorical canons, rhetorical and ethical use of multimedia resources, identification across differences and commonalities, and reinscription and norming. Below, each section of the results opens with parallel remarks from students and theorists in composition studies in order to highlight the braided nature of the *topoi* and the findings.

3.1. Thread I: Interdependency of the topoi and rhetorical canons

"I just kind of did it all-at-once." Tatum, Interview
"The pedagogical challenge is to help students take advantage of allatonceness."

Ann E. Berthoff, *The Sense of Learning*

In working with the heuristic across the composing process, we discovered that the *topoi* functioned as interconnected components, making explicit the multiplicity of concerns stemming from delivery in any one writing situation. Addressing the function of delivery in internet-communication, Porter stated that composers must engage the five *topoi*

---

[5] Several other technologies also make available video composing such as smartphone and iPad capabilities.

[6] While refining their research question, students were asked to watch and analyze sample videos on YouTube to become acquainted with the multimodal video genre. Students evaluated how and why the videos were rhetorically effective through a set of analytical questions. Once students developed a focused topic, they submitted a project prospectus outlining the research question, rhetorical situation, detailed tentative rhetorical moves, and possible resources. They also drafted and exchanged storyboards with their classmates for feedback.

[7] The digital delivery heuristic that Chanon developed and modified from Porter was done while he was taking a summer graduate seminar, Theory and Practice of Teaching Composition. Bre and Aurora co-taught that course and served as assistant directors of college composition during the research that coincided with Chanon's teacher-training.

[8] However, because Porter's *topoi* was originally meant to be a general theory for digital rhetoric and not meant to be medium specific, some modification is needed for them to be relevant to the course objectives and assignment. Interaction/interactivity was one such *topos*. According to Porter, interaction/interactivity concerns "how users engage interfaces and each other in digital environments," as well as "the range [continuum] and types of engagement (between people, between people and information) encouraged or allowed by digital designs" (p. 217, 208). Since the media, genre, and broadcast outlet for the assignment were predetermined for students, Chanon re-framed the interaction/interactivity *topos* to focus on the affordances/limitations of YouTube and other places where students might distribute their video.

in "dynamic interaction" in order "to maximize their generative or productive power" (p. 220). From our study, we learned that in students' multimodal video composing, focus on the *topoi* directed attention to delivery's interplay with invention and arrangement. Delivery occurred more as a series of micro-processes; delivery moments surfaced at various, pivotal times, and each occurrence raised questions about different components of Porter's *topoi*. Like Porter intended, the *topoi* often functioned collectively, engaging one another throughout the students' video composing process.

Reflecting on his video project about the contributions of women pilots during World War II, Mitch offered the most explicit discussion of how working with the *topoi* encouraged him to see the connections among audience, interaction/interactivity, memory, and delivery. He detailed how thinking about interaction, whether to allow viewers to leave comments and rate his video on YouTube,[9] an option that the website provides, led him to re-reflect about the other components of Porter's theory and the canons:

> My only fear is negative comments written on my YouTube posting. I've seen how mean and negative people can be in their comments of other YouTube videos, so *half of me wanted to disable the comments wall* under my video. The mask of anonymity of the user on YouTube compels people to leave comments that they would never express to the author of a video in person. But then *I* thought back to the 5 components of digital delivery and how *audience interaction* was imperative. If the audience can interact and give input on the digital text, then it *creates meaningful dialogue* on my issue that attracts public attention. I enabled the comment wall *when I posted* my video and hope for positive, honest responses from my audience. (emphasis ours)

Mitch, here, had a recursive and interconnected moment in the actual act of "delivering." While uploading his video, he had to make a decision about whether or not he would allow other users of YouTube to comment on the effectiveness and material of his work. His memory of other YouTube comments he read, as well as the audience he presumed would view his project, first compelled him to "deliver" his video in such a way that would limit audience response (interaction), in order to prevent negative commentary. Yet, his ideas regarding audience interaction, a component of Porter's *topoi*, led him to realize the significance of dialogue. Thus, he changed his mind. Mitch's initial doubts did not dissipate. Rather, he "hopes" his audience will be "positive" and "honest." Mitch, through his blended understanding of the *topoi* and canons, chose to take up a vulnerable position in order to propel interaction/interactivity.

Another student, Lulu, whose video focused on the fashion trends on campus, also observed the interconnectedness of the *topoi* and canons. She characterized her video composing process as recursive, explaining in her written reflection: "With having the 5 components of delivery theory, I could sometimes stop and look back to think more about why I used a specific picture, or why I chose that music. What effects does it have? How might I make it more interesting so people will *access* my video and help me *circulate* it? [All] those are important things, and they made me think of different ideas because if I did something without a goal, it would ruin my entire video" (emphasis ours). Lulu's action to "stop and look back," a recurrent process she engaged throughout the completion of her project, prompted continual revision, or reinvention, of her work—actions initiated by focused attention on delivery.

Similarly, reflecting upon her video composing processes in an interview conducted after the project completion, Tatum commented on the interconnectedness of the *topoi* and, as a side-story, narrated her personal feelings about the assignment. She expressed feeling, at first, afraid of the video project (she explored what faith means to college students and why some of them choose to devote their lives to God.) Feeling "anxious" about how to use new technologies, Tatum claimed that overall, she felt "uncomfortable" about video composing, feeling "quite uneasy about using the computer for something other than writing papers, searching online, and listening to music." "I am just very good at writing papers, writing essays, and that's what I expected in my first year writing classes," she expressed. As a video composer, Tatum encountered a high-stakes composing situation, a classroom assignment in which she identified as a novice, an inexperienced beginner.

Looking back at her video composing process, Tatum revealed: "I was inventing as I was going." She described her invention process as emerging from "playing with" new composing spaces such as Windows Movie Maker, the movie editing program available on PCs. Working in the movie making program, Tatum complied and arranged images, video clips, sounds, and alphabetic texts together as a way to "think through" her project. "I just put everything together to help me get going and get my message across," she recollected, "I think putting pictures, sounds and things together

---

[9] The course assignment required students to deliver their work on YouTube, but they had the option to reveal or disclose their name.

[arrangement] helped me realize what I wanted to say, what my main message is. I just kind-of did it all-at-once, and that helped me think through the video." Tatum's recollection echoes Ann Berthoff's (1990) phrase about writing as an "allatonceness" phenomenon, a moment of composing action in which distinction among different parts and "sub-skills" fade (p. 79-80). In composing a multimodal video, Tatum and other students not only had to strategize the standard "allatonceness" of working with ideas, representing and naming one's own meanings, but they also had to negotiate the affordances of the video camera and digital video production: composing with an amalgamation of words, sounds, visuals, and motion.

In her interview, Tatum explained that during the video composing process, she gave much consideration to body/identity and how it influenced the rhetorical choices she made about visual and audio selections. Tatum recalled worrying about her own body, whether and to what extent her own body/identity would be visible and audible on screen. She was concerned about how these audible and visual components would impact how people might perceive her message and work. Ultimately, she decided to remove her body from her video, neither recording her audible voice nor displaying her physical body. Tatum clarified her decision: "I think mostly in my video, I want to make it so I am not present at all. I wanted to make it so that the interviews could send the message alone. Their words should have the authority. . .I want it to be them [interviewers] strictly giving their ideas. I like the idea of quick responses, contrasted with long explanations, and I think in order to achieve this, my voice/body should not be present." That is, she wanted to rely on the ethos of her interviewers instead. Perhaps Tatum felt less exposed, as an author, by communicating in written alphabetic text, rather than through video or audio recording herself. In terms of the author's body, video composing invites what may seem to some as a hyper-embodiment—opening possibilities for making bodies visible and audible and locating ways of capturing kinesthetic, moving bodies in time and space. In some cases, renewed attention to how bodies exist, how bodies look, sound and take up space, and how bodies communicate may invite unsolicited attention to bodies, something that teachers must consider when assigning multimodal video projects.[10] We believe these considerations engage critical, rhetorical knowledges that emerge from an explicit study of the body/identity *topos*.

Tatum further explained how other *topoi*, distribution/circulation and access/accessibility, led her to think about audience and the clarity of her own multimodal arguments. Contemplating where she might distribute her video to reach target viewers helped her develop a better sense of audience: "I think it could be helpful with more private circulation, such as with [certain] clubs [on campus], and thinking about who belong in these clubs made me realize what my audience is like, who they are, what they might like to see." This comment indicates that thinking about delivery, specifically distribution/circulation, helped Tatum engage in audience analysis, a crucial step for crafting an effective composition. Additionally, considering access/accessibility led her to think about the clarity and overall effectiveness of her work, as well as what type of media to include. She related that the *topos* motivated her to plan how she should gather and package her materials in terms of file types and how she might save sound, image, and video files for later combining, editing and arranging in Movie Maker. Throughout this process, she also thought about how the audience might react to her work and whether her overall message was clear. We want to point out that this type of reflection on the part of the composer is not an expressive moment of self reflection for the sake of self expression. Rather, attention to one's own embodied positionality as a writer and examination of how this positionality shifts in different composing situations characterizes a rhetorical evaluation of one's own work. Attention to the *topoi* during invention and play stages of the project helped Tatum link together purpose, audience, and delivery as important concerns in video composing.

The above account from Tatum provided a nuanced understanding for us as teachers, showing us a close-up of how one composer, new to video production, worked through a multimodal video composing process with the digital delivery theory. We learned from Tatum, or rather her experience reminded us about the importance of patience when composing new forms and types of texts. In her multimedia webtext, "A Bookling Monument," Anne Frances Wysocki (2002) urged readers to enter new media texts with patience, because such texts often ask readers to engage with compositions that are atypical. Multimodal texts, made in modes besides words, require different writing and reading practices, Wysocki argued. As Tatum's experience exemplified, multimodal composers must, at times, immerse themselves within the "allatonceness" composing process, resting in particular moments, but nonetheless moving forward.

---

[10] See Heidi McKee's (2008) "Ethical and Legal Issues for Writing Researchers in an Age of Media Convergence" for further discussion about the ethics of bodily representations in onine environments and digital writing research.

3.2. Thread II: Rhetorical and ethical use of multimedia resources

"There are [rhetorical and ethical] implications that I never even thought about." Mitch, Post-Project Reflection

"[The] five components are more than merely subject area domains, abstracted topics, or technical proficiencies. Rather, think of these as the common topics (*koinoi topoi*) of delivery—i.e., categories that operate heuristically and productively across multiple situations to prompt rhetorical [and ethical] decisions regarding production." James Porter, "Recovering Delivery for Digital Rhetoric"

Thinking about delivery in the more dynamic way that Porter's *topoi* encourages also led students to become more discerning about rhetorical usage of multimedia elements. Sally reported that blogging about digital delivery, particularly analyzing the interaction/interactivity *topos*, encouraged her to be strategic about the incorporation of sounds and colors in her video. One of the blog prompts about interaction/interactivity asked: "Based on what you know about the interactivity of the interface in which you will broadcast your video content, what considerations or modifications might you need to do to make your project work?" Blogging a response to this question led Sally to contemplate viewers' potential reactions to her project and consider how she might appeal to them. She explained: "If I hadn't looked at those guidelines [in the interaction *topos*], I never would have thought about how some of the things in my video would affect or not affect certain people." Further, she added: "I intend to promote a happy tone in my video, so I used bright and fun colors to show the happy mood. I want to include upbeat songs that promote happiness to my audience. I think overall it [the *topos*] helped to have to think deeper about this project." Sally's remarks suggest that the heuristic prompted her to consider the audience's reactions more carefully, and this, in turn, led her to become more rhetorical regarding the inclusion of images, colors, and sounds.

Mitch, a classmate of Sally, shared that the economics *topos* helped him become more knowledgeable about copyright laws and ethical usage of media—things he had not considered before but are crucial in the "age of file sharing" (DeVoss & Porter, 2006; McKee, 2008; Lessig, 2008). Mitch's new understanding of "digital ethics" (DeVoss & Porter, 2006) guided his music, image and video selection process. He elaborated:

The component [of digital delivery theory] that was most helpful to me during this inquiry was by far economics. It made me think about the copyright implications and taught me about fair use and educational multimedia guidelines. There are implications that I never even thought about when I published my rhetorical remix video [last semester]. It [the *topos*] guided me throughout the process because I was conscious not to include more than 5 pictures from any one collection, for example.[11] I used Freeplaymusic.com to get music that is [from] creative commons. I included a credits page at the end acknowledging the Library of Congress because I pulled a lot of content off of their website.

Thus, economics taught Mitch about copyright laws and fair use, and he learned to recognize the importance of source attribution and ethical file sharing (DeVoss & Porter, 2006). Put differently, he acknowledged and respected other people's work and labor. His digital composing practice aligned with Danielle DeVoss and James Porter's (2006) call for writing teachers and students to teach and practice "digital ethics" that "run counter to the usual expectation that has governed the sharing and use of print texts" (p. 179). From our teaching experience, addressing the complexities of copyright and fair use regulations with students is difficult, and many of them wish to solely incorporate commercialized music and other forms of copyrighted media in their work. But, Mitch's story serves as a reminder that despite some students' initial resistance and concerns, there are viable, exciting, and legal alternative media resources that can help students grapple with these issues. Digital ethics must remain an important consideration and component of writing pedagogy, and the economics *topos* provides impetus for that.

3.3. Thread III: Identification across differences and commonalities

"I should have paid more attention to the race aspect of sororities." Sally, Interview

---

[11] According to the University of Maryland University College's copyright and fair use guidelines that Mitch read, it is permissible to incorporate up to five images from a visual artist in multimedia work. See http://www.umuc.edu/library/copy.shtml#amount for details.

"Rhetorical listening may be employed to hear peoples' intersecting identifications with gender and race (including whiteness), the purpose being to negotiate troubled identifications." Krista Ratcliffe, *Rhetorical Listening*

In working with the body/identity *topos*, during the invention and reflection stages of the video-making process—both before and after the final delivery of the finished project—students frequently noted occasions where certain aspects of their videos only spoke to or communicated with particular identities. Some students, such as Greta, chose to build their videos around difference and were highly conscientious of the commonalities and differences they held with their audiences and the subjects of their videos. Yet, most students had difficulty unpacking how their rhetorical choices identified certain groups problematically, or only noticed that they had enacted exclusive practices after they had published their videos. In most cases, students only successfully identified and targeted audience groups similar to themselves.

In *Rhetorical Listening*, Krista Ratcliffe (2006) argued that many conversations about rhetorical identification turn to Kenneth Burke's theory based on "consubstantial common ground" (p. 47). Yet, she contended that Burke's theory washes over differences in order to emphasize moments of shared, common interests. With the goal of persuasion in mind, the Burkean concept of identification does hold merit as a way of reaching across difference to appeal to individuals who may in fact live quite differently from a speaker/writer. However, as Ratcliffe cautioned, the term has not offered much credence or practicality to "cross-cultural communication" (p. 48). In our study, we found most students verbalized a desire to cross-culturally communicate with and through their projects but struggled to do so in concrete ways. In addition, this communication covered a wide spectrum, from focusing on differences and commonalities to almost ignoring them entirely.

For example, Greta, whose video examined how diversity is marketed in university publications, was highly contentious about the use and display of gender, race, and ethnicity in her work. She reflected, referencing the body/identity *topos*, "By considering the body/identity [topic], I was able to determine the overall structure of my video. It also allowed me to think about the gestures, voice, race, and text that I wanted to include in my video." Since Greta's project looked at perceptions of diversity on campus, the reader can see that the issue of body/identity was especially important to her work. In her blog about body/identity, she wrote:

> I am going to be using my voice (white, female) for rhetoric reasons. I want the audience to know that this video was made from a white, female point of view on race. I think that this is important because opinions may change if it were done by someone of another sex, gender, or race. The body will also include voices/interviews of people of different genders and races, to enforce the overall diversity in the video. I want to include diverse people in my video so that I am not contradicting my argument.

Reflecting on the body/identity *topos* not only helped Greta think about the diverse identities she needed to include in her video to make it rhetorically effective, but it also led her to situate herself—to think about her own ethos and subject position. Greta demonstrated Ratcliffe's complex attention to cross-cultural identification through her use of images, voice work, and gender that are both similar to and different from her own.

The opposing points of student engagement with the body/identity *topos* were demonstrated by Caleb, whose video explored why students on campus might want to participate in "A Day Without Shoes" campaign (where participants go barefoot to draw attention to the plight of children without shoes), and Sally, whose project investigated why students join sororities. Both projects were influenced by, but did not explicitly address, cross-cultural communication from author to audience. When Caleb related why he chose to display different types of people in his video about the TOMS Shoes company, he explained, "I wanted everyone to be able to relate with the video and to be able to participate in the movement of TOMS. I incorporated pictures of older gentleman in business as well as young men and women going barefoot and changing the world to create the idea that anyone can participate in the TOMS movement and help change the world." Here, the reader can see Caleb's ideas of audience were fairly generic. His call for "everyone" was articulated through "older gentlemen in business suits" and "young men and women." And while his video was aesthetically sophisticated and enjoyed some of the higher distribution rates (garnering several hits on YouTube, as well as press from TOMS Shoes), the reification of the white male business men, as well as the only feet of color present in the video being associated with poor and needy communities, showed the watcher clear racial and gender norming that Caleb left largely unexplored throughout his reflections. Caleb engaged with the Burkean conception of identification as it works through sameness, through an intercultural communication that may reify problematic discourses of race and gender.

Another student participant in the study, Sally, noted her own discomfort regarding racialized norming she saw present in her own work. Through her video, Sally hoped to encourage international students to take up greater participation in sororities, yet her video almost exclusively showed pictures of large, smiling groups of white women as they participated in "sisterhoods." In response to her own work, Sally felt she "should have paid more attention to the race aspect of sororities." Through the interview conversation, it became clear that while Sally identified with her subject matter (sororities on campus), she did not identify with her audience (international students). Her ability to be reflexive regarding the commonalities and differences in her own viewpoint and that of those she was trying to reach came only after her delivery of her video. Sally had a moment that Yancey (1998) would describe as "reflection in presentation" (p. 69). Only through sharing her work with others did Sally then note the discrepancies in her goals with her product. Consequently, her enactment of Burke's "consubstantiation" may have stifled her ability to incorporate Ratcliffe's "cross-cultural communication."

Greta, Caleb, and Sally demonstrated the wide range of identification that occurred through the student videos. The students' abilities to note differences and commonalities, and to respond in productive ways during the learning processes to these moments of identification, varied widely. Overall, the writers fell into Caleb's side of the spectrum more readily than either Greta's or Sally's perspectives. So, while our results suggest that most students were grappling with body/identity in at least surface ways through their understanding of the body/identity *topos*, the *topoi* do not address explicitly enough for students how identification through difference and commonalities are enacted in multimodal projects.

3.4. Thread IV: Reinscription and norming

> "A female voice would not be as strong—as authoritative—and a male voice would seem more historical." Tatum, In-Class Comment

> "What happens when rhetorical purpose reinforces norming and exclusion?" Chanon, Teaching Reflection

When working in-class on the body/identity *topos*, we spent a class session, one hour and fifteen minutes, discussing rhetorical moves that increase author credibility and thus more directly grab and maintain audience attention. In essence, how can multimodal video authors, through small moves and measures, construct ethos? In raising this central question, what we did not anticipate was the overwhelming number of students who, in aiming to be as persuasive as possible, unintentionally reinscribed socially constructed stereotypes about what bodies and what identities signify authority. We also discovered that body/identity, as a *topos* for digital delivery, impacts the author and audience aspects of the rhetorical situation, becomes a subject matter— a topic dressed in particular cultural discourses that circulates via, in this context, multimodal videos published to three different public audiences (as required by the assignment).

During class discussion, Tatum articulated that she was contemplating having a male voice narrate her video because "a female voice would not be as strong. . .and a male voice would seem more historical [and hence, authoritative]." Tatum's response points to a problematic understanding of rhetorical authority embodied in/through spoken male voice. Her view and implementation of a masculine ethos reinscribed patriarchal ideology about what bodies, what gendered identities, signify authority. Tatum was not alone in her reliance on patriarchal scripts to assert rhetorical authority. As the discussion progressed through the class, another female student, Beth, concurred. Beth claimed that historical authority was commonly attributed to male voices. She said, "a deep, sturdy, and monotone voice." Tatum's and Beth's attribution of historical authority to male voices was born out in the nods and agreement by several of their classmates. After class, as the teacher of the course, Chanon articulated concern over how to intervene in these moments of cultural norming. Prompted by the class period, Chanon questioned: "What happens when rhetorical purpose reinforces norming and exclusion?"

In popular culture, lower registered voices are associated with males. Advertising and voice-over work in video composing often do make use of deep, masculine voices as markers of power, knowledge, and credibility. Students might, therefore, imitate cultural practices in order to be "rhetorically savvy" for their audience(s), adopting common practices without critical reflection. As teachers and researchers, we were troubled by the potential for reinscription occasioned by these practices. Consequently, how do we both negotiate the current standards and call into question composing practices that, while marketable, do not fall in line with the inclusive and critical goals of the course?

Another way to approach this question is to ask: What can we do as teachers to help students make rhetorically savvy choices without further excluding already marginalized groups? One possibility might be to further probe a question

that we posed concerning the body/identity *topos* in Porter's heuristic: "What kind of stereotypes and problematic sociocultural assumptions might you need to be aware of, and how might you circumvent them from being reinforced in your work?" Students must practice how to critically reflect upon such questions that interrogate, in some cases, their own beliefs. Moreover, teachers can guide students to think about the cultural/political consequences of how one reads body/identity, as a subject within a text, by pushing composers to consider additional issues: What are the implications and results of holding such views about a particular identity group? How do we come to hold such opinions? From where do these views stem? What concerns, if any, might these beliefs raise? In analyzing the body/identity *topos*, we must also consider the moments in which bodies and identities become the subject matter: the message and representation circulating through each subsequent video viewing. At times, discourses about bodies and particular identities are so hegemonic that composers do not critically pause to scrutinize them.

A close look at one student's project on Asperger's Syndrome shows how easily discourses about the body and about particular identities slip into unintentional norming. Nathan, who self-discloses as having Asperger's Syndrome, composed a video entitled "Asperger's Syndrome: Functioning in Society," in which he explored, "Can students with Asperger's Syndrome succeed in the classroom?" He stated in his project plan that his work aims "to help educate people about Asperger's Syndrome," to challenge "the negative stigma" often placed on Asperger's Syndrome as a diagnosis, and to persuade society to respond with more tolerance to individuals with Asperger's.

In April 2010, Nathan posted his final video to YouTube, and as of today, it has received over 3,000 views. He also sent it to the Office of Disability Resources on campus, who decided to display his work on its website. We mention this delivery/audience context in order to show that Nathan's video reached a specific public audience and was sponsored by a university office. Consequently, Nathan's message appears to reinforce and extend views deemed acceptable by a higher education institution. His video is made up of a series of interviews with three people he identified as "respected in the area of Asperger's Syndrome," individuals socio-culturally deemed as "authorities" based on their schooling and/or career experience: the director of disability resources, a psychology professor who specializes in developmental disorders, and a senior psychology major who worked as a tutor in the university learning assistance center. All three interviewees specified "difference" as a way of approaching disability.[12]

But ever so often in the video, speakers couch Asperger's Syndrome in medical and scientific rhetoric that positions "different learners" in relation to "normal learners," discourses that situate disability and difference within a fix-it or, to repeat the term actually used by the tutor in Nathan's video, a "mend" approach—treatment aims to modify behavior and blend differences. In one particular moment in the video, in response to Nathan's question about whether students with Asperger's Syndrome can succeed in academia, an interviewee explained, "Yes, students with Asperger's can succeed just like any other student." They learn and communicate differently, she stressed, and then almost automatically, she ended the sentence with, "in relation to norm"; she paused for a split moment before adding, "[like] other learners." The interviewee changed her terminology from normal learners to other learners on the spot, and it happened so quickly that the initial inclination of saying "normal" may escape some listeners. The interviewee seemed to recognize instantly a need to revise her diction. As a psychology student and as a tutor, the interviewee was still learning how to enter dominant discourses and how to challenge the most readily available social scripts. Her trip over language choice and then her sudden action to change her words demonstrates the struggle that communicators encounter when naming and representing identities.

Besides interviews, Nathan used secondary source materials to build his credibility and persuasiveness. He incorporated research from secondary source materials that described Asperger's according to medical and psychological discourses. In several voice-over sections, Nathan read from written notes and relied on scientific source materials as authorities, to define and culturally situate Asperger's Syndrome. For example, introducing the video, Nathan provided a quick listing of characteristics that mark one as having Asperger's. Because he has selected evidence from psychology, referencing Tony Attwood's (2008) *The Complete Guide to Asperger's Syndrome*, the narrative blocks between the interview sections focus on discourses that present Asperger's as a disorder, as something to observe in order to recognize deviance. Nathan's work reminded us that some topics more explicitly highlight body/identity as

---

[12] The director of Disability Resources stressed accommodation as a model for working with students who learn and communicate in different ways and through different means. Indeed the Office of Disability Resources defines student success and retention as one of its missions, and it seeks to work with faculty to devise learning plans that will help students attain academic success. The emphasis is not on disability but on learning success—a shift that redirects attention from a given person and from identifying a person or a particular body by a disability to emphasizing learning interaction and ways to make student success more accessible.

a subject that composers place in circulation. When disability becomes the topic of discussion, societal and cultural commonplaces can often cast difference as an "aberration," a description that Nathan used, citing a secondary source, to describe behaviors associated with Asperger's Syndrome. Nathan, of course, did not intend to reinscribe these things. We believe he did not even realize this occurred. Similar to Tatum, he adopted popular social scripts in an attempt to establish credibility and to be rhetorically effective and never once presumed he may have, however unintentionally, sent out a message that subtly speaks against his purpose. Melanie Yergeau's (2012) recent work on autism rhetorics explained how cultural codes and public discourses often package mental disability like autism as an "epidemic." As Yergeau might contend, the public has enough psychological and medical perspectives about what is autism; what is Asperger's; however, we are lacking narratives about "what it's like for an autistic to be an autistic" (Yergeau, 2012). Rather than offering a first-hand account of Asperger's Syndrome, Nathan buried his own voice beneath secondary source materials. Figures and sources of authority, not Nathan, performed the role of expert, speaking for and knowing best.

To address issues of disability and normalcy, Margaret Price (2008) urged writing instructors to incorporate disability studies (DS) discourses into their pedagogy. Exploring DS in first-year writing, she maintained, is pivotal to bring forward "the interplay of writing, ideology, and material life in fundamental and vivid ways" (p. 57). For Price, the writing classroom

> is not simply a place to improve writing "skills" but a place to *think critically*. . .about the play of ideologies, language, and subject positions. Learning to write with more self-awareness—becoming more able to identify, consider, and change the ideologies that are enacted in our writing—is a key goal. (p. 57, our emphasis)

We concur. Explicit pedagogical interventions to help students examine hegemonic normative assumptions about body/identity issues in their own multimodal composition and public discourse are vital.

One way educators can enter into discussions of reinscription and norming in digital multimodal composing is to provide time for writers to receive feedback about potential reinscription present in their own videos. Give them time to pause and critically interrogate hidden assumptions in their work and then to revise accordingly. When asking students to deliver videos to a broader public audience, as educators, we have a responsibility to address the ways discourse works to define subjects in ways not anticipated by the composer. We need to challenge students to examine what normative/hegemonic assumptions and depictions about body/identity are evident in society, and how things may come to influence the way we compose, speak, think, and "read" other bodies/identities. Cynthia Lewiecki-Wilson and Brenda Jo Bruggemann's (2008) *Disability and the Teaching of Writing* provides resources on how teachers can explore and problematize discourses about normalcy in the writing classroom. Building upon Lewiecki-Wilson and Bruggemann's call for teachers to acknowledge difference as productive, in light of our study findings, we believe that attention to discourses about norming and reinscription belong as an additional consideration and extension of the body/identity *topos*. These issues must be brought to light and explicitly addressed in multimodal composing and students' analyses of their own work, as well as the works of others. Through such practice, students can come to develop the critical thinking (Price, 2008) and critical literacy (Selber, 2004) necessary for creating a more reflexive, inclusive and progressive social future.

4. Conclusion: Digital delivery as pedagogy & composition theory

As a heuristic, the *topoi* of digital delivery can help students think more deeply about various rhetorical, ethical and critical issues involved in video production via sustained back-and-forth reflections. Teaching and doing multimodal video composing, as Mary pointed out at the beginning of this essay, involves a variety of considerations that are discrete from essayistic writing, which include, but are not limited to representations of body/identity, copyright, interactivity, accessibility, and rhetorical velocity (Ridolfo & DeVoss, 2009). These issues can be foreign to and overwhelming for instructors, especially a novice working with and teaching digital media for the first time. At the time of this study, Chanon was new to teaching multimedia video composing, but Porter's theory provided a roadmap for building course content, pedagogy, and assignment scaffolding. The *topoi* that Chanon modified from Porter helped him plan the unit. Class activities and exercises were sequenced and made to match the *topos* to which students were studying each week. Porter's digital delivery theory became a pedagogical framework that guided instruction.

While Porter intended for his theory to be used as a vehicle to "highlight the importance of technical knowledge as a legitimate form of humanistic thought" and "to emphasize how rhetoric theory and critical humanistic thinking contribute value to web-based production and design" (p. 208), through our classroom research and teaching, we have expanded it to have pedagogical relevance. Thus, Porter's theory is no longer just a heuristic for theorizing, inventing, planning, and composing digital projects. *It is likewise a composition and pedagogical theory*, blurring the divide between composition and rhetoric theory, it is a praxis. Digital delivery theory, in this case, becomes a "situated practice" or "heuristic for action" (Ede, 2004, p. 127). According to Porter, the point of reviving delivery is not to "demonstrate the enduring truth of classical categories," but rather to "raise significant questions and encourage productive thinking" (p. 221). He asked: "How can this theory aid productive action? How can it prompt the critical thinking of writers/designers and help them produce better online communications" (p. 221)? We believe our pedagogy and study results provide some answers to these compelling questions, but as always, we have more work to do.

First, as noted in the results section, students' responses to the body/identity *topos* varied widely. These findings suggest that we must do more to teach about norming and exclusion that stem from students' attempts to be rhetorical, which can elide critical consideration about hegemonic perceptions of gender, disability, and authority. Awareness of audience and author differences and commonalities, norming, and exclusion must be addressed with greater clarity. When reviewing the *topoi* categories Porter put in place, identification of both self and other seems too sandwiched among the *topoi*, and the body/identity *topos* does not explicitly address issues pertaining to norming and exclusion. Perhaps separating body and identity into different, yet of course interrelated, categories might be more efficacious. Clearly, these categories are linked but are not synonymous. We have now revised the digital delivery heuristic to consist of six categories: body, identity, distribution/circulation, access/accessibility, interaction/interactivity, and economics (See Appendix B). We hope that separating body and identity into two categories will force students to think more critically about the rhetorical and cultural/political implications of bodily and identity representations in their own work—as well as in the works of others. Critical questioning of race, gender, sexual orientation, physical ability, class and ethnicity is complex and warrants careful unpacking and analysis. We think splitting body and identity into two separate categories is a way to help unpack these complicated topics and to force students to heed their significance in further detail. Divided into two *topoi*, the body *topos* asks students to think critically and responsibly about the rhetorical effects of bodies, gestures, voices, dress, races, sexual orientations, ethnicities and genders in their own work and to be aware of the kind of stereotypes that exist, so that they can circumvent them from being reinforced in their multimodal compositions. The identity *topos*, in turn, requires students to go further and interrogate political and ideological consequences from the way they depict, position, or cast a particular bodily identity in their work; to heed how their representation and rhetorical choices will shape how others come to perceive that identity; to consider who is included and left out (intentionally or unintentionally) in the video and why; and most importantly, to acknowledge the sociohistorical/political occurrences that shape how an identity comes to be understood and (mis)represented. This revision of the body and identity *topoi*, we hope, will complicate students' understandings about ethos, video production, and culture at large.

Second, given the reinscription of hegemonic norms in class discussions and students' projects engaging the body and identity *topoi*, instructors must work to build critical discussion and analysis about normativity in which students are pressed to question and re-think cultural "commonplaces." What is common in society is often riddled with ideological assumptions that reinscribe domination and alienation, so the rhetorical use of commonplaces warrants close scrutiny and reconceptualization. Thinking that the male voice is more authoritative or that disability is abnormal, for instance, reifies stereotypes and discrimination that privilege the strong, able body at the expense of other subjectivities. To lead students to problematize this ideology, before students engage in multimodal video composing, instructors might ask students to first analyze cultural "texts": to observe how certain bodies, races, genders and sexualities are depicted and to then consider the consequences—the cost—of such depictions, an issue we now posit for consideration under the identity *topos*. Among some of the questions the instructor might raise include: Who gets privilege here and at whose expense? What beliefs are being reinforced here? How do these beliefs and depictions color our perceptions and attitudes about the subject? These questions must also be raised on students' own projects. We encourage writers to continuously reflect upon them *throughout* their composing process. In addition, as a creative exercise, we might ask students to "play": Create alternative depictions that will challenge or re-signify hegemonic representations and understandings of bodily norms in their own work. Doing so may enable students to engage in a sustained reflection and critical thinking that will, we hope, lead them to become a more critical audience/author/citizen.

Third, given the, at times, allatonceness of video composing (or any composing process), students should be encouraged to revisit the *topoi* recursively. Although the *topoi* are now separated into six categories with specific questions allocated to each, students should re-reflect on each *topos* as they theorize the next in their written blog reflections. They must think back as they go forward. On their blog responses, we might ask them to re-examine how thinking about access/accessibility might require a reconceptualization of body/identity, and how this might, in turn, necessitate re-thinking distribution/circulation choices. Delivery can come to aid revision. Engaging in recursive reflections of the *topoi* encourage writers to make connections that reinforce the interdependency of Porter's categories.

Fourth, from Sally's and Lulu's reflections, we learned that actual distribution/circulation of the video should be included as a component of the multimodal video composing assignment. Actual distribution provides students the opportunity to compose on a topic or cause that has significance to them for a real audience, and this, we suspect, motivated Sally and Lulu to become more rhetorical in their usage of multimodal elements. Most significantly, compositionists such as Diane Penrod (2005), Christian Weisser (2002) and Susan Wells (1996) have long argued for instructors to teach public writing, compositions that "will enter some form of public space": to engage students in "public discursive forms [that] share an orientation to action [and] require a reconfiguration of the writer, and of agency, beyond the figure of the isolated modernist scribe" (Wells, p. 336). The rise of networked technology makes distribution to public audiences more readily available, and through this affordance, students' projects may potentially impact change at some level. According to Daniel Anderson (2008), multimedia composing not only provides "many opportunities for personal transformations based on engagement that result in new literacies," it can also link "reading and writing to another level of literacy: critical, civic participation and agency" (p. 45). In short, encouraging students to distribute/circulate their video projects can lead to exciting potentials beyond writing assignments that will only be seen by the teacher and perhaps other students in the class.[13]

In this article, we have modified Porter's theory of digital delivery into a heuristic for multimodal video composing and reported the preliminary results of our collaborative classroom study that examined what student composers fairly new to multimodal video composing gain by working with the heuristic. As our research progresses from this pilot study, we seek to garner a greater collection of student projects and responses to help us better understand how Porter's theory—which we have modified into six *topoi*—can help students develop greater rhetorical and critical consciousness in digital multimodal composing, from thinking about normative reinscription and exclusion, identification across differences and commonalities to rhetorical and ethical usage of multimedia resources in digital writing. We are repeating our study in Chanon's English 112 course in spring 2012, using the re-modified heuristic. In the meantime, our research has raised several questions for further investigations: 1) How might the modified heuristic with six *topoi* aid critical thinking (Price, 2008), as well as raise critical consciousness/awareness about bodily and identity representations in students' multimodal composition and culture at large? 2) Although we have recast and used digital delivery theory as a framework for video composing, how might it be adopted as a heuristic for doing rhetorical analysis and critical reading of digital texts online? 3) As access/accessibility and interaction/interactivity are two major *topoi* in Porter's theory, how might we further theorize these concepts and use them to develop effective multimodal digital pedagogy that fosters accessibility and interactive learning? How might these *topoi* help us rethink the way we deliver our pedagogy, how we teach digital rhetoric and writing?

By continuing to foreground delivery as a heuristic *and* composition theory/pedagogy, we aim to highlight the significance of the dynamic and recursive nature of the fifth canon in digital multimodal composition and as a means to motivate rhetorical and critical decision-making in our students, who are the designers of social futures. Becoming a competent reader, writer and informed citizen in the 21st century demands functional, critical, and rhetorical literacies (Selber, 2004) in multiple modalities and technologies. We hope the findings from our pedagogical approach and future research on digital delivery theory will not only help generate new possibilities for teaching writing in the age of media convergence but that they will help sharpen and complicate how students read, compose, listen, view, and think about the available means of persuasion and semiotic resources in our ever increasingly globally interconnected, networked world.

---

[13] Abby Dubisar and Jason Palmeri (2010) made a similar call and observation in "Palin/Pathos/Peter Griffin: Political Video Remix and Composition Pedagogy."

Appendix A. Porter's Five *Topoi* of Digital Delivery Modified for Multimodal Video Composing

Body/Identity
Think rhetorically, critically, and responsibly about embodied representations in multimodal work:

- When applicable, what kinds of bodies, gestures, voices, dress, races, sexual orientations, ethnicities and genders will you include? Why?
- What rhetorical effects might your body/identity selections have?
- What kind of stereotypes and problematic sociocultural assumptions might you need to be aware of, and how might you circumvent them from being reinforced in your work?

Distribution/Circulation
Analyze the rhetorical situation, anticipate rhetorical velocity (*Ridolfo & DeVoss, 2009*), *and promote viewership*:

- What is your rhetorical purpose, and who is your audience?
- Based on your purpose and audience, where else might you publish your work? How?
- Once the video is published, how might it be used and re-used in digital space without your plan or intervention? Think about various possibilities.
- How might you limit or control circulation? What kind of disclaimer might you need to include to manage (expand or limit) circulation/usage?

Interaction/Interactivity
Consider the affordances and limitations for interactivity that different websites provide:

- What kind of interactivity does YouTube and the places where you might circulate your video allow?
- How does it invite or limit people's engagement and interaction with your work?
- What are the affordances and limitations of the site's interface?
- Knowing this, what might you need to do, if you desire more interactivity?
- Based on what you know about the interactivity of the interface where you will broadcast your project? What considerations or modifications might you need to make to your video content? Revisit this question in the revision stage after you have all of your "broadcasting sites" determined.

Access/Accessibility
Examine assumptions about audience ability and access to "distribution" outlets:

- What skills, technical knowledge, or physicality must your audience possess to access your work?
- What technology and equipment are required from your audience to view your work?
- What do you know about your audience's technical skills, equipment, knowledge, and physical ability?
- What assumptions are you making about your audience's ability, values, class, and background?
- How does your distribution decision (see category 3 above) impact access/accessibility?
- What modifications, if any, might be needed to enhance accessibility?

Economics
Pay attention to ethics, legality, source attribution, and fair use:

- What information and material sources might you need to build your video?
- Are they copyrighted?
- What and whom do you need to acknowledge to use them?
- How do you ethically and fairly use information?
- What credits might you need to include in your video? Where and how?

Appendix B. The Six *Topoi* of Digital Delivery for Multimodal Video Composing, Re-Modified from James Porter's Theory

Body
Think rhetorically, critically, and responsibly about embodied representations in multimodal work:

- When applicable, what kinds of bodies, gestures, voices, dress, races, sexual orientations, ethnicities and genders will you include? Why?
- What rhetorical effects might your body/identity selections have?
- What kind of stereotypes and problematic sociocultural assumptions might you need to be aware of, and how might you circumvent them from being reinforced in your work?

Identity
Think critically about the kind of identity representations that your work create and the political and social implications that could come about as a result:

- How does your work position and depict a particular identity group? For what purpose?
- How might the bodily selection and depiction choices you make affect how a particular identity group might come across and be perceived? What ethical responsibility might you have as the author?
- How is this identity generally understood or perceived in our cultural milieu, and what is your understanding and perception of this identity group?
- What historical, political, or cultural issues might you need to take into consideration about this identity group to avoid marginalizing its members?
- What identity group do you include and who is left out of your work? Why?

Distribution/Circulation
Analyze the rhetorical situation, anticipate rhetorical velocity (*Ridolfo & DeVoss, 2009*), *and promote viewership*:

- What is your rhetorical purpose, and who is your audience?
- Based on your purpose and audience, where else might you publish your work? How?
- Once the video is published, how might it be used and re-used in digital spaces without your plan or intervention? Think about various possibilities.
- How might you limit or control circulation? What kind of disclaimer might you need to include to manage (expand or limit) circulation/usage?

Interaction/Interactivity
Consider the affordances and limitations for interactivity that different websites provide:

- What kind of interactivity does YouTube and the places where you might circulate your video allow?
- How does it invite or limit audience engagement and interaction with your work?
- What are the affordances and limitations of the site's interface?
- Knowing this, what might you need to do, if you desire more interactivity?
- Based on what you know about the interactivity of the interface where you will broadcast your project, what considerations or modifications might you need to make to your video content? Revisit this question in the revision stage after you have all of your "broadcasting sites" determined.

Access/Accessibility

Examine assumptions about audience ability and access to "distribution" outlets:

- What skills, technical knowledge, or physicality must your audience possess to access your work?
- What technology and equipment are required from your audience to view your work?
- What do you know about your audience's technical skills, equipment, knowledge, and physical ability?
- What assumptions are you making about your audience's ability, values, class, and background?
- How does your distribution decision (see category 3 above) impact access/accessibility?
- What modifications, if any, might be needed to enhance accessibility?

Economics

Pay attention to ethics, legality, source attribution, and fair use:

- What information and material sources might you need to build your video?
- Are they copyrighted?
- What and whom do you need to acknowledge to use them?
- How do you ethically and fairly use information?
- What credits might you need to include in your video? Where and how?

Chanon Adsanatham, doctoral candidate in composition and rhetoric at Miami University, researches comparative rhetoric, multimodality, and digital writing pedagogy. Approaching composition and rhetoric as a global, multimodal art, he uses cross-cultural rhetorical perspectives and multimodality as complementary approaches to expand how we theorize, practice, and teach the art of rhetoric in the 21st century. His research on the assessment of multimodal composition has appeared in *Computers and Composition*.

Bre Garrett is an Assistant Professor of English at University of West Florida where she directs the Composition Program. Bre's research interests include embodied rhetorics, multimodal teaching and composing, and accessibility and curricular design. She is currently working on two different articles on Writing Studio pedagogy and a book project entitled *Corporeal Rhetorics: Embodied Composing and the Teaching of Writing*.

Aurora Matzke's ongoing research interests include folksonomy and the rhetorics of community, studio and feminist pedagogies, and writing program administration. Aurora serves as an Assistant Professor of English and Writing Program Co-Director at Biola University. Presently, she is writing articles on both feminist, wise crowd theories and writing studio pedagogy.

References

Anderson, Daniel. (2008). The low bridge to high benefits: Entry-level multimedia literacies, and otivation. *Computers and Composition*, *25*, 40–60.
Attwood, Tony. (2008). *The complete guide to Asperger's Syndrome*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
Banks, Adam J. (2005). *Race, rhetoric and technology: Searching for higher ground*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Berthoff, Ann. (1990). *The sense of learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
Buchanan, Linda. (2005). *Regendering delivery: the fifth canon and Antebellum women rhetors*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
Connors, Robert. (1983). *Actio*: A rhetoric of manuscripts. *Rhetoric Review*, *2*, 64–73.
DeVoss, Dánielle, & Porter, James E. (2006). Why Napster matters to writing: Filesharing as a new ethic of digital delivery. *Computers and Composition*, *23*(2), 178–210.
Dubisar, Abby, & Palmeri, Jason. (2010). Palin/Pathos/Peter Griffin: Political video remix and composition pedagogy. *Computers and Composition*, *27*, 77–93.
Ede, Lisa. (2004). *Situating composition*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
Glenn, Cheryl. (1997). *Rhetoric retold: Regendering the tradition from Antiquity through the Renaissance*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
Hawisher, Gail, & Sullivan, Patricia A. (1999). Fleeting images: Women visually writing the web. In Gail Hawisher, & Cynthia Selfe (Eds.), *Passions, pedagogies, and 21st-century technologies* (pp. 268–291). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
Kirsch, Gesa, & Royster, Jacqueline. (2010). Feminist rhetorical practices: In search of excellence. *College Composition and Communication*, *61*(4), 640–672.
Kress, Gunther. (2009). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. London: Routledge.
Lessig, Lawrence. (2008). *Remix*. New York: Penguin.
Lewiecki-Wilson, Cynthia, & Bruggemann, Brenda Jo. (2008). *Disability and the teaching of writing: A critical sourcebook*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.
McCorkle, Ben. (2005). Harbingers of the printed page: Nineteenth century theories of delivery as remediation. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, *35*(4), 25–49.
McKee, Heidi. (2008). Ethical and legal issues for writing researches in the age of media convergence. *Computers and Composition*, *25*, 104–122.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard.* Educational Review, 66, 60—92.

Penrod, Diane. (2005). *Composition in convergence: The impact of new media on writing assessment.* New York: Routledge.

Porter, James E. (2009). Recovering delivery for digital rhetoric. *Computers and Composition*, *26*, 207–224.

Price, Margaret. (2008). Writing from normal: Critical thinking and disability in the composition classroom. In Cynthia Lewiecki-Wilson, & Brenda Jo Bruggemann (Eds.), *Disability and the teaching of writing: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 56–73). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Ratcliffe, Krista. (2006). *Rhetorical listening.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP.

Reynolds, John Frederick. (1996). Delivery. In Theresa Enos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of rhetoric and composition: Communication from ancient times to the information age* (pp. 172–173). New York: Routledge.

Rhodes, Jacqueline (Ed.). (2004). Sexualities, technologies and literacies: metonymy and material online (Special issue). *Computers and Composition Online*. Retrieved from http://www.bgsu.edu/cconline/rhodes/ccointro.htm

Ridolfo, Jim, & DeVoss, Danielle. (2009). Composing for recomposition: Rhetorical velocity and delivery. *Kairos*, *13*(2)

Royster, Jacqueline. (2000). *Traces of a stream: Literacy and social change among African American women*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Selber, Stuart. (2004). *Multiliteracies for a digital age*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois: UP.

Selfe, Cynthia. (2009). The movement of air, the breath of meaning: Aurality and multimodal composing. *College Composition and Communication*, *60*(4), 616–663.

Takayoshi, Pamela, & Selfe, Cynthia. (2007). Thinking about multimodality. In Cynthia Selfe (Ed.), *Multimodal composing: Resources for teachers* (pp. 1–12). New York: Hampton.

Weisser, Christian. (2002). *Moving beyond academic discourse: Composition studies and the public sphere*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Welch, Kathleen E. (1990). Electrifying classical rhetoric: Ancient media, modern technology, and contemporary composition. *Journal of Advanced Composition*, *10*(1), 22–38.

Welch, Kathleen E. (1999). *Electric rhetoric: Classical rhetoric, oralism and a new literacy*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Wells, Susan. (1996). Rogue cops and health care: What do we want from public writing? *College Composition and Communication*, *47*(3), 324–341.

Wysocki, Anne F. (2002). A bookling monument. *Kairos, 7*(3). Retrieved from http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/7.3/coverweb/wysocki/

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. (2006). *Delivering college composition: the fifth canon. Portsmouth*. NH: Boynton/Cook.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. (2004). Made not only in words: Composition in a new key. *College Composition and Communication*, *56*(2), 297–328.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. (1998). *Reflection in the writing classroom*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Yergeau, Melanie. (2012, Feb. 2). "Empathize with this." Autism and empathy: Dispelling myths and breaking stereotypes. [Web log]. Retrieved from http://www.autismandempathy.com/?p=1027