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ABSTRACT

Digital media and informational/instructional technologies are profoundly affecting teaching, learning, and literacy and have consequently become a necessary part of our jobs as scholars and teachers. We send and receive email about departmental meetings and fellowship opportunities. We use library databases to search for scholarly work on topics relating to our research and have come to expect projectors and Internet connections at conference presentations. Many of us ask students to critically reflect upon visual/digital culture and use online discussion boards and chat rooms to facilitate class discussion. Some of us also teach sound and video editing in our writing classes and create multimedia productions showcasing scholarly work that can only be mediated digitally. But many questions exist—how to assess non-traditional assignments, strike the proper balance between traditional writing and digital media projects, train GTAs to incorporate technology into their teaching, provide ongoing support for pedagogical integration of digital media, and evaluate electronic scholarship. In “I'm Really Not a Technology Person,” I explore the digital literacy practices of graduate students and tenure track faculty members at three institutions with varying levels of support for pedagogical applications of technology and research in/with digital media. It is one of the first projects to address the relationship between institutional culture and digital media use.
As digital technologies become a greater presence in our classrooms and institutions, it is important to understand how our attitudes toward technology influence our academic practices: teaching, doing research, evaluating work for tenure and promotion purposes, training GTAs, and sufficiently supporting and providing access to the technologies that enhance our work. Understanding the relationships among technology, scholarship, pedagogy, and institutional culture allows us to reflect critically upon our praxis and clarify how technology influences the way we think about the humanities, the relationships among its many fields, the interdisciplinary nature of much of what we do, and the direction the discipline must go in the 21st century. English and Communication teachers play a pivotal role in introducing students to the technologies they will encounter in their academic and professional careers. My project is valuable to these fields because they train future teachers and faculty members who will need to be comfortable teaching with technology in order to prepare their students for courses and workspaces that require writing and communicating in digital environments. Successful training depends upon creating environments that effectively support the kinds of technologies that enhance our pedagogical, institutional, and disciplinary goals.

Through a methodology that blends ethnography, case study, and survey research, I have collected a variety of data—interviews with assistant professors, Ph.D. students, and key administrators at three major universities; field notes from class observations; promotion and tenure documents; and survey responses. My analytical strategy is likewise interdisciplinary, blending ethnography’s focus on literacy and community with rhetorical studies of purpose and appeals.
Click on the “Attachments” tab (to your left) to view my multimedia dedication (it requires Macromedia’s Flash Player)
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CHAPTER 1

AN INTRODUCTION

Around the time I was preparing for my candidacy exams and exploring dissertation topics, the graduate school at my university announced that theses and dissertations were moving online. They would no longer be bound and made available in the library; instead, they would be submitted as PDF documents and would be available online through the state’s library and information network, a consortium of 84 of the state’s college and university libraries. Any patron using any library in the consortium would be able to download a copy of any dissertation prepared at any of the colleges or universities in the consortium. The announcement sent shock waves throughout my department, the Department of English. Graduate students in particular responded emotionally to the idea of electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs).

One mid-October afternoon in 2002, after the policy had been implemented, I attended a town-hall style meeting convened by the department’s director of graduate studies, to which graduate school representatives responsible for ETDs were invited. The dark, worn “commons room” was packed with faculty and graduate students, many of whom expressed dismay, concern, and anger about the new policy. Some worried that
such easy access to dissertations would lead to plagiarism of their work. One lecturer (and former graduate student in the department) said that a portion of his dissertation had indeed been stolen and used, without a link to the original or permission, on an e-zine. Others worried that they would lose rights to their work because the university, the “publisher,” might retain the copyright or the intellectual property rights, making it more difficult to publish portions of the dissertation in other venues later on. The biggest concern, however, was that publishing the dissertation electronically would prevent a university press from later publishing a revised version of the work as a book or a journal from publishing one of the chapters as an article, thereby undermining the ability of the young scholar to gain tenure.

My department was (and is), in some ways, forward thinking about the use of digital media in the classroom. It maintains several computer classrooms in which both writing and literature classes are regularly offered; it maintains a space—The Digital Media Project—employing graduate students (which at one time included me) who give professional development workshops on integrating technology into different kinds of classes and provide support, both pedagogically and technically, to teachers in the networked classrooms. All of the graduate student techno-pedagogy consultants regularly teach in the networked classrooms and experiment with digital media assignments in their classes, particularly their writing classes. At that time, I was one of only two techno-pedagogy consultants whose field was composition and whose research area was digital media. We were not, however, the only consultants interested in the changing nature of
writing, new forms of writing, or writing in digital environments. In fact, all the consultants often talked about composition of new media or multimodal texts as writing.

This idea that the form and nature of writing is changing has its roots in arguments that literacy (reading and writing) is changing as the mediation of texts changes. The natural conclusion of these arguments is that literacy education needs to change to take into account the changing contexts of communication. Robert Yagelski, for instance, argues in *Literacy Matters* that literacy is often taught without regard to the contexts of students’ lives, making it tedious, if not meaningless, to them. He suggests that literacy needs to be taught in the context of students’ lives and the texts they are familiar with so that they can participate in the discourse that shapes their lives, a discourse that is increasingly dependent upon multi-media. Many others have argued that the contexts and rhetorical situations of writing are changing and that what is taught in college writing classes needs to change as a result. Anne Frances Wysocki, Johndan Johnson-Eilola, Cynthia L. Selfe, and Geoffrey Sirc take these assumptions as a jumping off point in their recent book *Writing New Media: Theory and Applications for Expanding the Teaching of Composition*. In the introductory chapter, Wysocki argues that writing teachers are the best choice for teaching analysis and composition of new media texts—which don’t have to be digital—because they understand the social, political, and material practices in which writing and reading are always embedded, regardless of what form or medium is used. Therefore, she argues that production of new

---

1 For discussions of the changing nature of literacy see Kress; Tyner; Selfe; Hawisher and Selfe; Selfe and Hilligoss; Kist. For discussions of the changing nature of mediation see Kress and VanLeeuwin; Bolter.
media texts in writing classrooms is needed in addition to more attention to the materiality of all texts. Throughout the book, the materiality of print and its limitations for the arguments contained in the book is constantly emphasized through the use of layout, font choices, boldface, and highlighting.

Because of our conversations, it surprised me when some of the techno-pedagogy consultants I worked with came out against electronic theses and dissertations. Not only did they incorporate new ways of composing into their classes, but they also used electronic resources for their own research and appreciated online clearinghouses because of the easy access to texts they provide. I didn’t understand why ETDs were an exception. Their motivations started to become clear to me while I was conducting interviews and surveys for this dissertation.

**Studying Digital Media and Professional Identity**

This dissertation is a study of digital media and professional identity; it is shaped by the following six research questions:

1. How do departmental and disciplinary contexts influence PhD students’ and assistant professors’ uses of digital media for research and teaching?
2. How do PhD students and assistant professors define their professional identities in relation to digital media and what role do departmental and disciplinary contexts play in those negotiations?
3. How do these contexts constrain the materiality of texts that are assigned for students to read, texts that are read for research/scholarly purposes, texts that
students are asked to create, texts that are created for research/scholarly purposes, and so on?

4. How do PhD students and assistant professors learn to use digital media and incorporate/integrate them into their professional activities?

5. What role do departmental evaluation criteria for promotion and tenure play in shaping assistant professors’ uses of digital media for research and teaching?

6. What role do departmental evaluation criteria for promotion and tenure play in shaping assistant professors’ negotiations of their professional identities in departmental and disciplinary contexts?

Because I was interested in local contingencies affecting digital media uses, I chose a mixed-methods approach combining semi-ethnographic case studies, key-administrator interviews, and a paper-based survey, allowing for an exploration of local contexts and comparisons among several different local contexts.

I visited three departments, all in different universities, and interviewed key administrators: the department chair, chair of the committee on promotion and tenure, and technology advisor (if such a position existed). In digitally recorded, semi-structured interviews, I asked key administrators to describe trends in digital media usage by faculty

2 Ethnography is a method that involves a researcher’s spending time in “the field,” observing a community or culture, and gathering artifacts and interviews in order to understand how the community or culture understands itself. I say my approach is semi-ethnographic because, although I spent time observing individuals’ classes and interviewing them, I did not observe faculty and graduate students in the departments I visited interacting with each other. My main goal, however, was to understand these departments as communities/cultures and to understand how members of these departments understand the inner-workings of their departments.
and graduate students, how access to networked classrooms is determined, how work with computers figures in tenure decisions, and the culture of support for digital media use. I also conducted semi-ethnographic case studies in order to paint a rich portrait of participants’ uses of digital media in their writing classes and to investigate the effects of departmental culture on pedagogical and scholarly uses of new media. Case study participants were PhD students and tenure-track assistant professors who were using digital media writing (writing of web pages or hypertexts; use of chat, listserv, or discussion boards; innovative uses of word processors during class, such as paperless peer response, collaborative writing, etc; use of multimedia presentations or assignments; or incorporation of multimodal composition) in courses they were teaching, or whose scholarship incorporates or focuses on new media. In digitally recorded, semi-structured interviews, I asked participants to describe their uses of digital media for teaching, research, and other professional activities; the support available to them when using digital media; the ways they have learned and continue to learn to use digital media; the barriers/constraints that stand in the way of their using digital media; the big questions they face regarding digital media; the emotions or feelings they have in connection with its use; and the impact they perceive that their uses of digital media have had on their academic work and the evaluation of that work. I also conducted class observations, making detailed field notes. In addition, I collected course materials—such as syllabi, writing prompts, discussion board transcripts, etc.—for analysis and to use as the basis for discourse-based interviews, also recorded digitally and coded using digital qualitative
analysis software. During discourse-based interviews, I asked participants to reflect upon the class session that I observed. All interviews were completed between March and December, 2004.

In addition to semi-ethnographic case studies and key-administrator interviews, I also conducted a paper-based survey of all PhD students and assistant professors (tenure-track as well as non-tenure track) in the three departments. The survey asked participants to rate their attitudes toward digital media and to describe their pedagogical philosophies regarding digital media, their uses of new media (to teach, for research/scholarship, for administrative tasks), and available support for pedagogical and scholarly uses of new media. The survey was conducted between January and June, 2004. A total of 105 individuals responded to the survey: 78 PhD students and 27 assistant professors (see Table 1.1 for a detailed breakdown by department). All data—survey, interview, observational, textual—was digitally coded using qualitative data analysis software and analyzed for emergent themes relating to my research questions. In my analyses, I use the survey to provide additional descriptive information about each of the research sites in order to better describe interview participants’ positions in their departments (e.g., if their work with digital media is common or unusual in the department). Given my multimodal research design, the survey data became descriptive rather than inferential.

---

3 See Appendix A for survey instruments.
Table 1.1: Survey Participation. This table shows the number of survey participants solicited in each department in each category (assistant professor and PhD student) and the number that actually responded to the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Faculty Solicited</th>
<th>Faculty Responding</th>
<th>PhDs Solicited</th>
<th>PhDs Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print Literacy Department</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>41 (38.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Literacies Department</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15 (51.7%)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35 (53.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Literacies Department</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9 (26.5%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27 (36.0%)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>78 (43.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Solicited: 253            | Total Responding: 105 (41.5%) |

The three institutions I visited, though in different states, have much in common. They are all major research universities in the Midwest; all are public institutions. Each enrolls 35,000-40,000 undergraduates and at least 10,000 graduate students. The departments, however, are very different, and each department is positioned somewhat differently regarding other departments in its institution. The department I will refer to as the Print Literacy Department is situated within a college of arts and sciences. The department offers the PhD in English, MFA in creative writing, MA in English, and BA in English. The department I will refer to as the Parallel Literacies Department is situated within a college of humanities, which is itself situated within a larger managerial entity, a federation of colleges of arts and sciences. The department offers the PhD in English, MFA in creative writing, MA in English, BA in English, and coursework contributing to several university interdisciplinary minors and focus areas. The department I will refer to as the Integrated Literacies Department is situated within a college of arts and letters and
offers undergraduate majors in professional writing and American studies. The
department does not have a graduate program; however, the college has an
interdisciplinary graduate program that employs faculty from the Integrated Literacies
Department, and the department employs graduate students from the interdisciplinary
graduate program to teach some of its writing classes. The interdisciplinary graduate
program offers an MA in rhetoric and professional writing and a PhD in rhetoric and
writing with several different concentrations.

The pseudonyms for the departments grew out of my analysis and represent the
different ways that these departments position themselves toward the various media of
literacy, most notably print and digital media. While members of all departments use
digital media, the Print Literacy Department is heavily invested in print and the literacies
associated with it. The Parallel Literacies Department also sees print literacy as its
business, yet has invested tremendous resources in digital media and the teaching of
literacies associated with technology; in spite of such investment, digital media has not
been integrated into the curriculum. The Integrated Literacies Department, however, does
have an integrated curriculum and does not require its members to “take sides” in what is
often constructed as a battle between print and digital forms. These distinctions between
the departments will be fully explicated in the following chapters.

Each of these three departments has a mixture of scholars in fields traditionally
concerned with the printed text—such as literature, composition, and/or creative
writing—and in fields concerned with alternative texts and literacies—such as folklore,
literacy studies, rhetoric, and/or cultural studies. Each of these three departments
administers its university’s first-year writing course, a required “gateway” course at each institution (a gateway not only to the academy but also, often, a gateway course to the department and, as a result, to the discipline). Each of these departments has at least one composition scholar working in the area of “computers and writing,” a field currently exploring, challenging, and extending the boundaries of the definition of writing and incorporating digital media into writing classes. Consequently, the role of digital media in teaching and research, from both disciplinary and departmental perspectives, is a question that members of these departments are currently grappling with. Because of their different makeup, local contexts, and local constraints, these departments influence faculty members’ and graduate students’ navigation of their professional identities in relation to digital media in markedly different ways.

I deliberately chose departments in three different universities because I wanted to examine the affordances and constraints of local culture and make comparisons in order to better understand some of the ways that local contexts influence digital media use and, consequently, begin to understand the possibilities for intervention at the local level. I chose three departments in research-intensive universities because I wanted to understand not only the influence of digital media on teaching/pedagogy but also on research/scholarship. Research-intensive institutions are disciplinary leaders; they set the scholarly/research agenda for members of their disciplines. Because they educate students at the graduate level, they also shape the future of disciplines by teaching graduate students what scholarship is in the discipline and by teaching graduate students how to teach. In short, they have a profound influence on the professional identities of
future faculty in the discipline, as well as on the collective identity of the discipline itself. It is the combination of these particular commonalities—focus on research, focus on graduate education, administration of writing programs, interest in traditional/print as well as non-traditional/non-print literacies and texts—and particular differences—departmental makeup, local contexts, and local constraints—that make these three particular departments well-suited for my investigation.

“Discipline” is a fluid term, and departmental structure does not necessarily determine disciplinary identifications. Consequently, all individuals in a department might not identify with the same discipline. For instance, the area of rhetoric and composition often, but not always, resides in an English department. Is the area of rhetoric and composition, then, a sub-field of the discipline known as “English Studies” or is it a separate discipline? Though scholars in the Print Literacy Department and Parallel Literacies Department work in English departments and thus identify with the term “English Studies,” recognizing their varied fields as included in the discipline referred to by that term, many scholars in the Integrated Literacies Department do not identify with that term. Their department is not a department of English, and they define themselves in relation to the English department that does exist in their university (which focuses primarily on the study of British and American literature). However, it is the common concerns articulated above, particularly the focus on analysis of discourse (and especially, though not exclusively, printed texts) and the teaching of writing, that binds together scholars in these departments. What is a discipline, after all, but a collection of people across institutions working on similar problems and creating similar types and
forms of scholarship? I am calling these “ties that bind” English Studies, though I recognize that not all of my participants are comfortable with that label. I also recognize that individuals in this study orient themselves very differently to this discipline because of their local contexts, and I attempt to account for those differences in my analyses.

Disciplinary Identification and its Influence on Digital Media in Scholarship & Teaching

When I speak with “Chester,” a PhD candidate in Victorian literature in the Parallel Literacies Department, he is preparing to go on the job market and is participating in a program that matches PhD students with mentors at liberal arts colleges in the area to help students understand the particular issues they might face working at such institutions. Chester’s mentor and visiting lecturers in his own department have told him that he is setting himself up nicely for the job market because of his work with technology. But he is skeptical:

I think there’s a lot of interest in [technology] but not a lot of knowledge about what it actually can do. When I asked my mentor at [the small liberal arts college] about what they had in terms of technology on their campus, it was basically ‘well, now that we have a new building we have digital projectors, VCR/DVD, and either computer hookups or computer stations,’ but there didn’t seem to be, ‘oh, we have computer classrooms’ or real specifics about what they were doing in terms of either creating content or using already created content on the web to enrich their classes or change the way that they think about teaching literature.

He said that his mentor mentioned that she likes to use a digital archive for her classes, but he notes that, because the same information is available on microfilm, the digital archive, while more convenient for her and her students, is just a different delivery
system. “I don’t really consider that a use of technology,” he says. “It’s just a shifting of the actual delivery method. It makes searching and pulling it up a lot easier, but it’s not an actual use of technology.”

Chester separates using technology as a tool for doing the same old things faster and more easily from asking students to use digital media to help them interpret literature. The former would include shifting delivery of texts, for instance, so that students access them online, but would have students reading and writing about them in more traditional ways. The latter, on the other hand, might have students creating multimedia texts that interpret literary works in forms very different from the analytical essay, using video, animation, sound, and/or still images, in addition to or instead of written words. This distinction continues in Chester’s discussions of scholarship in the field. He sees most people using technology as a tool rather than as a means of “rethinking the way we teach writing or rethinking the way we teach literature or even approaches to those disciplines.”

He ties this pattern of uses to fear, saying, “As much as the English department can be progressive, it’s also very scared by technology, very much in the same way that the recording industry is, about what’s going to happen to issues of copyright, intellectual property, plagiarism.” Some of these fears were articulated by members of my department during the town-hall meeting about ETDs: fears of easy plagiarism, changes in copyright or intellectual property conventions, effects of electronic publication on future tenure cases. It is because of this fear, he says, that “we haven’t really approached it and dealt with it in an in-depth way as a discipline. There are some sub-disciplines that
have, but they’re people who tend to be, I don’t want to say marginalized, but they tend to be in their own little off-shoot…and not being fully integrated, beyond using electronic databases to search and that sort of stuff.” Chester locates the motivator of individuals’ uses of digital media at the disciplinary level, tying those uses to professional identity: the discipline marginalizes those professionals in certain sub-disciplines or “off-shoots” who are using digital media in potentially transformational ways. If you are part of the discipline, then, you use digital media for instrumental or managerial purposes, as a tool; if you use technology in other ways—to challenge central questions and texts of the discipline or to challenge traditional disciplinary constructions of teaching goals and/or the purposes and central questions of scholarship—then you are only marginally part of the discipline.

Because Chester is talking about technology’s influence on the discipline—on scholarship in the discipline as well as teaching in the discipline—his comments need to be considered in relation to arguments of scholars like Sven Birkerts, who sees technology as threatening print culture and, by extension, English as a discipline, and Cynthia L. Selfe, who argues that as English teachers, we need to pay attention to technology and involve ourselves with it so that it suits the needs of and reshapes English as a discipline. In The Gutenberg Elegies, Birkerts argues that new communication and writing technologies, such as hypertext, fundamentally change the nature of reading and writing, leading to a focus on breadth at the expense of depth. He argues that this focus on “lateral range” sacrifices literary culture to mass mediated culture, self-reflection and
wisdom to functional manipulations of data/information, quality to quantity. He consistently uses war metaphors:

- various forces “threaten” reading (4)
- “all of the old assumptions [about reading, writing, and publishing] are under siege” (5)
- we are in the midst of an “epic battle that will transform everything about reading, writing, and publishing” (154).

He would not agree with Chester’s assessment of digital archives for accessing information; he argues that the medium of delivery changes meaning, that texts migrated online “mean differently” than they did when they were printed (139).

When Birkerts writes, “For more than any other development in recent memory, these interactive technologies throw into relief the fundamental questions about knowledge and learning. Not only what are its ends, but what are its means? And how might the means be changing the ends?” (135), he seems to be struggling with a set of questions similar to those Chester is struggling with regarding the role of digital media in English Studies. However, his conclusions are very different. Birkerts claims, “Apart from giving me ideas, books have forced me to create a space for reflection; they have made certain kinds of thinking inevitable” (106), whereas “If the print medium exalts the word, fixing into permanence, the electronic counterpart reduces it to a signal, a means to an end” (123). He sees no possibility that thinking people could have just as reflective and intellectual a relationship with the texts mediated through digital technologies as those mediated through print, nor that students could practice interpreting literature
through digital media production. Consequently, to Birkerts, “the idea of the literary intellectual threatens to become altogether implausible” (168). He would thus fall into the group of people Chester labels as “scared” of technology in English departments, though “nervous” might be a better characterization—they feel threatened to the core of their disciplinary values by these new media and their remediation of print. Their identity as scholars in the discipline, as “scholar” is defined by the discipline, is challenged.

Others, however, see grave consequences in not attending to technology and not allowing it to affect the discipline. For instance, in *Technology and Literacy in the Twenty-First Century: The Importance of Paying Attention*, Selfe stresses that humanists need to pay critical attention to technology, rather than merely embracing or shunning it. By embracing it uncritically, we view it as a tool that we can either use or not depending on our goals, we perpetuate the historical split of humanities and science, and we participate in “the violence of literacy” by submitting to an officially sanctioned definition that we haven’t critically scrutinized and that has more to do with boosting the U.S. economy by establishing a strong link between literacy and technology than actually boosting the level of literacy in America.

Because of the broad cultural link between technology and literacy and public discourse that views technological literacy as progress, Selfe argues that computers are becoming invisible (22). In other words, teachers are users of but not thinkers about technology. This has resulted in the failure of the technology agenda to live up to its promises. Among the difficulties educators face, Selfe notes the ways in which computers sustain inequities rather than remedying them, a lack of critical attention to computers in
teacher training that results in teachers using the available skills and drills software (because they have not been taught to analyze software for its pedagogical usefulness), and lack of teacher training in using computers. Because of the promises of technological literacy, funding for computers has been relatively easy to secure (although programs in art, music, and physical education are often dropped or cut back in favor of computers in English classrooms), and the relationship between technology and literacy has been officially inscribed in state benchmarks, leading to its becoming invisible, naturalized, “common sense.”

Ultimately, Selfe argues that we need to turn to critical technological literacy, which involves “reflective awareness” of “social and cultural phenomena” that affect definitions of literacy (148). In other words, we need to think beyond whether technology is either good or bad and instead:

1. resist one narrow definition or official version of literacy (and, by extension, one narrow definition of reading or writing, a trap into which Birkerts falls),
2. value multiple literacies (multiple ways of reading, writing, and thinking),
3. recognize that technology and critical technological literacy are part of our work as humanists,
4. do more research on technology and literacy,
5. teach critical thinking about technology,
6. help train TAs in technology use and critical technological literacy,
(7) work for low-cost access in public places such as libraries and community centers, and

(8) examine assumptions together with teachers of all levels and from all countries.

Gunther Kress takes Selfe’s argument one step further, suggesting that English curricula need to move from critique to design, where writers are re-makers rather than simply users/readers of technology and/or texts and create “complex orchestrations” in multimedia rather than traditional papers. He argues that the current visual and electronic nature of mediation necessitates such a re-thinking of English curricula, a re-thinking Chester mentions when he discusses the potential for digital media to help teachers re-think their approaches to teaching literature. Kress would appear to agree with Birkerts that new forms of reading and writing are emerging because of digital media, but he sees that as an argument for re-shaping English curricula to focus on the future and the skills that students will need for participation in society, which he argues are skills with visual and digital texts. In re-defining curricular goals for the fields that teach the literate skills of reading, writing, and critical thinking and arguing for the incorporation of digital media, Selfe and Kress implicitly challenge the identity of “teacher,” that is, how the discipline defines what is involved in teaching those literate skills.

What Chester’s comments reveal, and what these authors don’t specifically address (though Selfe hints at it), is the unique position and experience of graduate students and tenure track faculty, who are caught in a bind between pushing their fields to new places with digital media and remaining squarely in the center of the discipline so
they can gain either jobs or tenure. Graduate students and new faculty members working with digital media are defined by their liminality—they occupy a position between tradition and innovation, between the past and the future. Understanding their struggles as they live and work in this space of tension will help us understand where the discipline has been, where it is going, the path it should take to get there, and why there is such resistance to certain digital-literacy practices and not others in these three departments.

The circumstances surrounding concerns over ETDs in my department raised many questions for me about digital media and the discipline of English Studies, some of which are echoed by Chester’s stories: How do disciplinary definitions of “scholar” and “teacher” shape work with digital media? How are pedagogical and scholarly practices vis-à-vis digital media influenced by and reflected in disciplinary identities and alignments? To what extent must scholarship and teaching change as composing practices and media of publication change? Is such a change even possible, or would it destroy who we think we are as teachers and scholars?

**Departmental Cultures of Support: Learning to Integrate Digital Media and Professional Identities**

What I found to be the most interesting aspect of the town-hall meeting about ETDs, however, was what was *not* discussed: the potential for new forms and methods of scholarship, new ways of demonstrating ability/mastery of rhetorical and analytical skills, new ways of going about dissertations and candidacy exams brought about by the ability to include multiple media in PDF documents, the limitations of print for some projects
(particularly ethnographic and historical projects, as well as projects studying pedagogies of multiple media). The English department attendees focused on “saving” print and saving themselves come tenure time, while the invited graduate school representatives (2 deans) focused on ETDs as a means of disseminating ideas into the public sphere more quickly so as to benefit society. The one example the deans kept repeating had to do with cancer research. What if somebody found the cure for cancer? Shouldn’t that be disseminated as widely and as quickly as possible? That’s what ETDs do, disseminate widely and quickly. The audience did not find that example particularly relevant to their own scholarly pursuits, and it did not become more relevant as the hour progressed, no matter how many times the deans repeated it.

After the meeting, I overheard a member of my cohort talking to a member of her committee about the PDF format itself. During the meeting, several people had expressed concern about the accessibility of PDFs to persons with disabilities. But nobody questioned the PDF in its ability to represent their (linear, primarily textual) work as it should be represented. My classmate, however, had been hoping to create the first hypertext dissertation in the department but was worried that the PDF format, which was required, would not allow her to do exactly what she wanted to do. Certainly, PDFs allow writers to embed multimedia and even create links, but the interface is much different for readers than other formats would be. And while she saw limitations, she also saw potential: at least the electronic format would enable new possibilities that the print format hindered. But she did not bring up this subject to the group as a whole; she saved it for her committee member directly after the meeting. It was clear that the group wanted
ETDs to simply go away, and anybody who wanted to discuss the potential benefits of the form—such as the deans from the graduate school, who did mention the potential for inclusion of multimedia elements as a benefit—was in the minority, to be quickly shot down. Her reluctance to speak up calls attention to the role of departments in the formation of professional (scholarly as well as teacherly) identity. Her scholarly interest in digital media, particularly in new forms of composing scholarship, marginalizes her within the department, and she recognizes it.

As I worked on a first draft of this chapter, another of my classmates was preparing her dissertation for electronic submission. The formatting guidelines for the PDF version are just as stringent as the guidelines were for printed versions: particular margin widths, spacing and arrangement requirements, font and type size requirements. The guidelines require formatting that is best suited for print, even though the document will be electronic. They assume that form is unrelated, or only marginally related, to content, thereby making innovation in form extremely difficult. They are not, in Wysocki’s terms, “generous”:

If we do want something new to come out of new media—if we want to achieve abilities to see and hear voices that we traditionally haven’t, and to open composition even more to those whose ways with words and pictures don’t look like what we know and expect—then generous approaches to texts that look different, and practice in making texts that look different and that therefore position us differently, seem to me worth exploring (23).

Though she focuses her discussion on undergraduates, Wysocki’s argument could and should be extended to the graduate level and to scholarly publication in general. ETDs provide one way to do that, if the institutional guidelines for them become more flexible.
“Cosmo” suggests another way. Like Chester, Cosmo is a PhD student in the Parallel Literacies Department. He has just finished his candidacy exams in Rhetoric and Composition when we speak. He explains the limitations of the required form on the arguments he wanted to make and the way in which he wanted to make them:

I recently did a candidacy exam, and I was reading all about this multimodal composition stuff, and to jar with that, I switched fonts at several points and played around with page design to call attention to the real limitations of the form. But what I really wanted to do was create a map of my field and have rollover audio discussions and what-not because I have all these great notes on my iPod—I forgot, that’s how I use technology, I take notes on my iPod and walk around and listen to them for my candidacy exam. So I’d done this sort of great multimodal kind of studying, but, you know, I couldn’t do it there.

Because his focus area is multimodal composition, it makes sense for Cosmo to compose a multimodal exam, i.e., to use the form of the exam to make arguments about the content of the exam. However, he was constrained by local guidelines regarding candidacy exams, the same type of guidelines constraining submission of electronic dissertations. Cosmo’s desire to do something unconventional brings these guidelines to the forefront and exposes them as conventions, raising questions about the nature and future of scholarship and graduate education. What is the purpose of a candidacy exam? To write? To show mastery of a body of knowledge? To show that mastery through writing? If we take Wysocki’s and others’ arguments to heart, isn’t what Cosmo is doing also writing? His story highlights the role of departmental culture in interpreting and shaping what it means to be a scholar in the discipline by controlling the ways that scholars-in-training (graduate students) demonstrate their mastery of “core” concepts in their fields of study.

Cosmo’s comments ought to also be considered in a broader context, what Selfe and Hawisher might call a cultural ecology. In their recent book, *Literate Lives in the*
Information Age, Selfe & Hawisher present case studies of individuals’ lifetime experiences with literacy and technology to trace digital literacy’s emergence in the U.S. over the last few decades. They “situate the participants’ life-history accounts in the cultural ecology of the time, tracing major political, economic, social, and educational events, factors, and trends that may have influenced, and been influenced by, literacy practices and values” (25). They focus on making connections between the stories of people who lived through the same era but experienced very different local constraints. In Cosmo’s story, they might focus on the particular gateways that he found into digital literacy—such as his mentors in the Parallel Literacies Department—as well as the local constraints he faced—such as the requirements for candidacy exams in his department. Though departmental and disciplinary contexts would certainly be part of the cultural ecology, Selfe & Hawisher would probably not focus exclusively on those contexts but would contextualize the gateways and constraints Cosmo found in broader contexts, such as educational trends of the time and political trends that influence funding and matriculation.

Stuart A. Selber writes about the different contexts that influence digital literacy curricula towards the end of his book, Multiliteracies for A Digital Age. Throughout the book, Selber argues for a tripartite curriculum for computer literacy—functional, critical, and rhetorical—that recognizes technology as embedded in social and rhetorical contexts. In addition to a functional literacy in which students become effective users of technology, he adds a critical literacy in which students become informed questioners of technology and a rhetorical literacy in which students become reflective producers of
technology. In chapter 5, “Systemic Requirements for Change,” he lays out a framework of contexts in which change needs to occur in order for a computer multiliteracies curriculum to be adopted. The framework includes five nested contexts (technical, pedagogical, curricular, departmental, institutional) and “situates technology in contexts that are ever more social in nature” (184). Selber’s framework is important because it recognizes that instituting a curriculum that teaches digital literacy is complex and requires systemic change.

What his framework does not allow for is a discussion of the identity-negotiation of individuals working with digital media in educational contexts, and I am positing an alternative framework of contexts that influence (and are influenced by) work in/with digital media—learning space/writing space, department, institution, discipline, and culture (see Figure 1.1). Curricular, pedagogical, and technical concerns are not contexts in the same way that institutions and departments are contexts. The latter are collections of individuals that make decisions about the former. Those decisions then influence or guide future individuals in institutional and departmental contexts. My set of nested contexts are parallel to each other in the sense that they all refer to collections of people. Curricular, technical, and pedagogical concerns, as well as theoretical and scholarly concerns exist in a give-and-take relationship with individuals in each of these contexts. The technical may be addressed in any of these contexts, for example. Likewise, all of these contexts influence curricular and pedagogical decisions, though those curricular decisions are played out primarily at the institutional and departmental levels, and those pedagogical decisions are played out primarily in the spaces in which we teach and our
students learn and write. My framework, unlike Selber’s, allows for a discussion of the multiple identities faculty and graduate students negotiate in these contexts with regard to digital media: teacher, student, scholar, administrator, etc.

![Diagram of nested contexts]  
Selber’s “nested contexts in a computer multiliteracies program” (185).

Figure 1.1: Nested Contexts for Considering Digital Literacy. A comparison of Selber’s nested contexts for discussing a digital multiliteracies curriculum and my nested contexts for considering the digital literacy practices of faculty and graduate students.

Chester and Cosmo occupy the departmental, institutional, and disciplinary contexts that tend not to be studied. Selfe & Hawisher look at individuals in those contexts and attend to those contexts, but, ultimately, their project’s purpose is to focus on the broad cultural contexts of digital literacy—they thus trace the history of literacy broadly, in national contexts. Likewise, other scholars focus on broad cultural contexts of
digital literacy, focusing on the teaching of literate skills from a global or national perspective\(^4\) or focusing on theoretical concerns such as technology’s affect on the nature of literacy itself\(^5\). In both cases, implications for pedagogy are discussed, but the disciplinary, institutional, and departmental contexts are often de-emphasized in favor of attending to the cultural contexts that affect pedagogy and theory. Others study learning/writing spaces\(^6\). These projects often address larger cultural concerns (like race or gender) in the context of a particular class, so the classroom context is foregrounded and, as a result, the learning and/or writing spaces of undergraduate students. The learning/writing spaces of faculty are rarely, if ever, discussed. Consequently, there is little concentrated focus on the “middle” contexts. There is an emerging body of work focusing on the institutional context and providing institutional critique\(^7\). However, there has been little research that focuses on the role of these “middle” contexts in shaping graduate students’ and tenure-track faculty members’ professional identities vis-à-vis digital media.

\[^4\text{Amato; Barry; Cooper; Faigley; Kaplan; Laurel; Maeroff; Neill; Reddy}\]

\[^5\text{Baron; Bolter; Charney; Gee; Gurak; Handa; Johnson; Kress; Killoran; Lanham; Lemke; Stroupe; Taylor & Ward; Tyner; Ulmer; Welch}\]

\[^6\text{Anson; Bender; Blythe; Condon; Craig, DeWitt; DeWitt & Dickson; Eldred; Ellertson; Enos & Borrowman; Gay; Gillani; Gruber (2003); Handa; Harris & Smith; Hawisher/Selfe; Johnson-Eilola; Joyce; Kist; Kitalong et al.; Landow; Lauzon et al.; Mayers & Swafford; Mauriello, & Pagnucci; Monforton; Moran & Herrington; Navarro; Paris; Palloff & Pratt; Robinson; Rouzie; Sanchez; Takayoshi & Huot; Taylor; Wysocki, Johnson-Eilola, Selfe & Sirc; Yancey}\]

\[^7\text{DeVoss, et al.; Grabil; Porter, et al.}\]
This study thus provides a new perspective on digital media by focusing exclusively on the departmental and disciplinary contexts and comparing cases within those contexts. In Selfe and Hawisher’s project, each story means on its own but also takes on new meaning when juxtaposed with stories of people in very different contexts. The stories in this dissertation, likewise, mean on their own but also take on additional meaning when juxtaposed with stories of people in contexts that are on the surface very similar—graduate programs in English and Composition—but nonetheless exhibit very different local gateways and constraints. These gateways and constraints frame individuals’ experiences of learning how to integrate digital media into their teaching and scholarship, and these gateways and constraints are shaped, in part, by departments’ stances toward the role of digital media in the curriculum and in the discipline.

**Evaluation: Where Disciplinary, Departmental, and Professional Identities Accumulate**

Chester notes that although people have told him he is positioning himself well for the job market by learning about digital media, he does not see much disciplinary reward for the type of digital media work that he would consider “an actual use of technology,” such as producing new forms of scholarship in multimedia or developing a multimedia pedagogy for literature classes. He recently attended a department-sponsored lecture by “a big name” at another university who “talked about how…he and a few other people had to fight to get tenure for somebody who had primarily digital and electronic type of publications and editorial work” that the university was not recognizing. Chester
says, “And my response is, I don’t want to be a guinea pig. The job market’s really bad. I don’t want to have to trust that my senior colleagues at some future point in time are going to fight for me because they believe—It’s just too risky.” This comment is evidence of the influence of evaluation conventions on Chester’s decisions about who he wants to be as a scholar and teacher—not a “guinea pig”—and, consequently, on how he chooses to incorporate digital media into his work.

Rebecca Rickly discusses this issue in her 2000 article in CCC, “The Tenure of the Oppressed: Ambivalent Reflections from a Critical Optimist,” noting a discrepancy between what graduate students are told about technology and what is expected once they land tenure-track positions:

Most of us, as graduate students, were encouraged to learn about, experiment with, and use technology as long as it didn’t inhibit our progress towards a degree. In fact, I’ll wager that many of us got interviews and, subsequently, positions based on our work with technology. But once we’ve been hired, then what? Do we continue to spend as much time with technology? Should we continue to include it in our teaching, our scholarship, and our service? (21)

Like Chester, Rickly frames the issue in terms of evaluation, questioning whether work with digital media will be valued at the department level and, consequently, whether it is “worth” doing, whether it is worth being a “guinea pig.”

Most work with digital media threatens identities at the disciplinary and departmental levels and threatens evaluation conventions because it makes explicit and challenges our constructions of who we are as teachers and scholars both in disciplinary and departmental contexts. These two contexts—and the identities that faculty and graduate students negotiate in those contexts—intersect at these moments of evaluation. For PhD students, the major moment of evaluation, when disciplinary and departmental
identities meet, is during the academic job search. One of my mentors, Kitty O. Locker, used to say, “the dissertation is who you are on the job market.” It represents a young scholar’s professional identity and is judged in relationship to the discipline (e.g., is it publishable?) and the department (e.g., will it complement the work of others in the department?). The professional identity of the job candidate is thus in negotiation with the identity of the discipline (as the hiring department sees the discipline) and the identity of the department.

If the dissertation represents a PhD student’s professional identity, then the tenure dossier represents an assistant professor’s professional identity; the tenure dossier is “who you are” as a professional come tenure and promotion time, the moment of evaluation for faculty when disciplinary and departmental identities meet. The tenure and promotion guidelines represent “who the department is,” and the extent to which digital media are addressed in those guidelines sets up expectations about the role digital media should play in scholarship and teaching in the department. Likewise, the Modern Language Association’s (MLA) and Conference on College Composition and Communication’s (CCCC) guidelines about electronic scholarship set up expectations about the role digital media should play in scholarship and teaching in the discipline. Just as a job candidate’s identity is in negotiation with departmental and disciplinary identities during the job search, the faculty member’s professional identity is in negotiation with the identities that the department and discipline expect (as laid out in their guidelines for tenure). Digital media are becoming a part of these negotiations as more and more individuals incorporate them into scholarship and teaching; consequently, the tensions
faculty face when they attempt to fit their work in with these guidelines and the tensions tenure and promotion committees face when they evaluate faculty, particularly when faculty have done “non-traditional” work (often in digital media), need to be examined.

Navigating the Terrain of Professional Identity in the Age of Digital Media

The stories I have told in this chapter focus on graduate students and highlight their liminal position regarding disciplinary and departmental expectations about work in the profession and raise questions about the influence of those contexts on graduate students’ uses of digital media. The stories also implicate untenured faculty, who, although they have more influence to make change in these contexts than graduate students, are nonetheless limited in their potential activism by their status as non-tenured. This dissertation is about what they do with digital media in the face of these constraints, the ways their disciplinary and departmental contexts shape what they do, and the ways their disciplines and departments help them navigate their professional identities in the age of digital media.

Data analysis in chapters two through four highlights three ways that local departments shape individual graduate students’ and assistant professors’ negotiations of professional identity in regards to digital media. Chapter two explores the role of departmental leadership in shaping individuals’ negotiations of their disciplinary identities, analyzing participants’ perceived relationships between digital media and their own disciplines. Chapter three explores the role of departmental culture in shaping individuals’ access to digital media, their opportunities to learn about digital media, their
opportunities to integrate digital media into their sense of what it means to be a professional in their disciplines, and their negotiations of the relationship between their work with digital media and their place (central/marginal) in their departments. Chapter four explores the role of departments in structuring professional evaluation so as to accommodate (or not) work with digital media, and thus focuses on the critical moment (for faculty) when these two identities (disciplinary and departmental) are evaluated: the moment of review for tenure and promotion. Chapter five synthesizes the analyses from chapters two through four and discusses implications for institutional change, implications for teacher-training programs, and questions for future research.
CHAPTER 2

DISCIPLINARY IDENTIFICATION AND DIGITAL MEDIA

1. “Really, I’m just not interested in digital media at all. Also, I am (at least to an extent) old-school, and I believe that English Departments are some of the last places where BOOKS are valued over technology, and I guess I’d like to see it remain that way.”

2. “I’m stuck in a culture of human face-to-face interaction & I believe that is how teaching must be done.”

3. “Technology is becoming an important part of my department, which has recently changed its name to reflect this new emphasis. Although I am sure technology helps us be better teachers, I am concerned that the priority of teaching coherent writing is being undermined.”

4. “I’d like to use technology to create an environment that is fully accessible to students with disabilities and different learn[ing] styles. Also, I’d like to use digital media to challenge students to build on their traditional writing skills.”

5. “Everything I do is mediated by the Web, Adobe Photoshop, MS Word and Corel WordPerfect, PowerPoint, etc. Everything.”

The quotations that open this chapter are responses to open-ended questions on a survey about digital media and technology in English Studies. The survey asked respondents to describe how they used digital media/technology for teaching and in their academic research/writing/publishing processes and what barriers, if any, prevent them
from integrating digital media/technology more than they do into their teaching and/or professional activities. The five quotations above are representative of those surveyed—some respondents are enthusiastic about technology, some are concerned or ambivalent, and some are opposed. Such a distribution of attitudes makes sense if we accept Jay David Bolter’s argument that we live in the late age of print, a time characterized by tension between print and digital forms of writing. According to Bolter, during the late age of print we will see a “transformation of our social and cultural attitudes toward and uses of” the technology of print (3). As that transformation occurs, it will also bring a transformation of attitudes toward writing, rhetoric, pedagogy, and scholarship.

The quotations, at first glance, illustrate individuals’ taking sides in the opposition of print and digital media. The first three side with print and worry that digital media will change the processes of teaching and scholarship, objects of study, and central goals/questions of their profession. The last two side with digital media and use it to enable processes of teaching and scholarship, to study different objects, and to achieve new goals/answer new questions, exactly what the first three express concern about. Numbers 1 and 5 represent the extremes of this binary opposition yet also indicate an awareness of the binary and an attempt to navigate their professional identities in relation to it. #1, for instance, identifies as “old-school,” yet is keenly aware of the presence of digital media in the discipline. If digital media were not an oppositional force and did not threaten this person’s professional identity, she would not have emphasized the word “books” by capitalizing it. Digital media threatens the object of study central to her professional identity as teacher and scholar; therefore, she navigates the binary opposition
by emphasizing the book and distancing herself, as much as possible, from digital media. 
#5, the polar opposite of #1, expresses a professional identity that is completely saturated 
with digital media. This person focuses on the ubiquity of digital, rather than print, 
mediation in her professional life. Her insistence that *everything* she does is mediated 
digitally seems to be an intentional overstatement. She identifies herself in this way with 
one extreme of the digital/print binary, just as #1 identifies herself with the other extreme.

The other three quotations reveal more complex stories about the tension between 
print and digital media in the professional lives of these individuals and remap the binary 
terms in interesting ways. #2, for instance, feels “stuck” in a face-to-face culture, yet 
believes teaching must be done face-to-face. Digital media threatens this person’s sense 
of what it means to teach—to communicate face-to-face with students—yet also makes 
the person feel stuck, indicating an awareness that digital media open up new 
opportunities but an unwillingness or, perhaps, fear of re-identifying as a teacher in order 
to take advantage of those opportunities. The binary terms here are remapped onto 
pedagogical methods: face-to-face interaction/online interaction. There is a tradition in 
the humanities, in addition to valuing the printed word as an object of study, of valuing 
oral performance and interaction in the classroom. Digital media, in #2’s view of 
teaching, disable that process, suggesting that individuals also need to make choices 
about the methods that define their teaching (and, by extension, the methods/processes 
that define their research) and the ways that different media enable or hinder those 
methods.
For #3 and #4, the issue at stake is the question of shifting pedagogical goals. #3 frames the print/digital binary as teaching writing/teaching technology, whereas #4 does not see the terms existing in a binary opposition at all. #4 constructs a continuum—students will write traditionally and use digital media to build upon traditional writing skills, perhaps by producing non-traditional, digital texts. For #3, however, writing should be mediated by print, and teaching students to create other types of texts mediated digitally undermines the teaching of writing. Though they frame this tension as it affects their teaching, this is also a question that affects scholarly production. “What form should student texts take and in what media should they be produced?” and “What form should scholarly texts take and in what media should they be produced and disseminated?” are two related questions whose “answers” rely upon the disciplinary identities individuals forge and the disciplinary stances departments take.

#3’s struggle—the certainty that “technology helps us be better teachers” even as our central pedagogical goal of “teaching coherent writing is being undermined”—indicates the complexity of the issues at stake. Digital media, for most of the people in this study, is a mixed bag. As another survey respondent wrote, “The web is a fabulous—& dangerous—resource.” Digital media is alternately constructed by the participants in this study as both fabulous and dangerous, representing a struggle to navigate the tensions of the late age of print. These five quotations illustrate broad disciplinary tensions about digital media and its ability to enable and hinder central methods and processes of teaching and research, provide new or alternative objects of study for ourselves and our students, and transform the central goals of teaching and central research questions of the
discipline. The quotations only hint at the role individuals’ disciplinary identities play in the decision-making process as they navigate these tensions. This chapter will examine the influence participants’ disciplinary identifications have on their navigation of these tensions as they use digital media for teaching and research in their local contexts.

Departmental Stances on Digital Media: Making Possible Disciplinary Identities

Roxie, a PhD student in the Parallel Literacies Department, in describing her first experiences with the Internet as an undergraduate, remembers feeling a lack of entitlement to use it because of her field of study, English literature:

I have such a weird background with technology. And this is probably why I feel that ‘omigod, I’m not a technological kind of person.’ I had a lot of friends in college who worked a lot with computers, who were programmers…a guy who was getting a PhD in computer animation. One of my friends built, I don’t even know how to describe this, he used computers to build models of artificial intelligence that then predicted stock market activity. These people were just way beyond me, and I thought, well, I don’t do that so I’m not a tech person. The Internet became, at some point during my undergrad career, so pervasive that I had to force myself to use it even though I didn’t consider myself as entitled in some way to use it.

This is an interesting manifestation of the idea Cynthia Selfe discusses in Technology and Literacy in the Twenty-First Century: The Importance of Paying Attention—that some English scholars think technology is not their job. Roxie expresses a slightly more complicated version of this argument—that technology is not something she can “do” because it is not a major force in her discipline of English as it is in other disciplines (namely, computer science), so if she can’t use it in sophisticated ways then she shouldn’t be using it at all.
The Director of the Center for Digital Media Studies (CDMS), the Parallel Literacies Department’s resource center for digital teaching and research, addresses this seeming mismatch of “English Studies” and digital media. He says, “I think that there are lots of things that digital media is doing in this department right now. One is that it’s catching people’s attention who would normally think of English Studies in very traditional terms.” He notes that this attention-catching ability has benefits for the department: “Digital media obviously has buzzword status right now, and it also has become one of the key initiatives at the university, to improve education through technology and through technological literacy. And so the fact that it’s happening in the English department is a way of keeping us competitive.” Furthermore, the department chair says, “People think of the department of English as a center for the study of printed texts, and of course we will always have printed texts, but we’re living in an age where we need to also be proficient with other kinds of texts, texts that involve imaging, video, sound and animation.” Her comment that the digital is equally important as the printed, coupled with the department’s investment in a resource and teaching center specifically focused on digital media, makes a statement about the importance of digital media to the department and, consequently, the department’s relationship to the discipline at large: this department sees digital media as an important part of its future and an important part of the discipline.

The CDMS Director’s comments provide a new context for considering the role of disciplinary identity. The department’s official position on digital media creates a departmental stance towards the discipline that shapes the range of available choices for
faculty and graduate students regarding their uses of digital media and the disciplinary identities they feel comfortable claiming. For instance, as a member of this department (which is increasing its investment in digital media), survey respondent #1 must name her disciplinary identity as “old-school,” even though in a different department that identity might be more mainstream. Her lack of interest in digital media goes against her department’s disciplinary stance. The department’s stance does not completely influence her disciplinary identity, however. She still rejects digital media, but she labels herself in a way that is clearly influenced not only by her own conception of the discipline, but by her department’s stance, as well.

The Print Literacy Department chair addresses the separation of English and technology in his department, tying the separation to funding issues related to disciplinarity. He says that his department is very different from English departments in other, similar universities because “this department never really wanted to invest very much in professional and technical communication until very, very recently.” He adds, “When I first arrived here twenty years ago, there were sixty-five faculty, only two or three of whom were actively involved in rhetoric and composition, let alone professional communication. It was not an investment this department, nor the college, wanted to make.” He claims that this is changing because they have three specialists in rhetoric and composition and are hoping to hire a fourth, but three (possibly four) scholars in rhetoric and composition is not much of a change from the “two or three” that were there twenty years ago. This department chair ties technology to a specific field within English Studies—rhetoric and composition—as well as to a specific sub-field within rhetoric and
composition—professional communication, identifying a disciplinary home for technology that is extremely limited. That technology should be linked with professional communication is not surprising, given that it is often seen as a “service” course to train students for professional and often technical writing in business and industry. Neither is it surprising that technology should be linked so closely with rhetoric and composition, as a field, given that the technologies of writing and conditions of access to those technologies have long been central to discussions in that field.

The Print Literacy Department chair also ties technology to technical disciplines, indicating that the divorce of technology and English has quite a history at his university. He explains that, historically, other universities in the state system have developed technical programs like engineering and medical sciences, “so the onus on this department for generations was not to interface very well or very copiously with technology and with technical disciplines…That was not our job.” He adds, “it’s a very slow process of trying to develop curricula, faculty, and classroom space and technologies for that kind of environment.” Writing can’t be taught in networked computer classrooms because they don’t have the facilities. Another university in the state, he says, has “several really beautiful wired classrooms on the same floor as the English department where writing is taught in that computerized environment. We have nothing that even vaguely resembles that right now.” Though, he says, “I think we will, but it really has been a very different kind of department in that regard.” The Print Literacy Department seems to be facing the same constraint, institutionally, that the Parallel Literacies Department is facing—the perceived mismatch of English and
technology. However, the Print Literacy Department does not have the funding priorities nor the facilities that the Parallel Literacies Department has. Therefore, its disciplinary stance is much different: digital media is something for rhetoric and composition to contend with, and even then, its usefulness is limited to the teaching of writing.

The Integrated Literacies Department is not an English department, like the other two departments, but a department combining rhetoric and composition with cultural studies, two areas of study included in the larger Print and Parallel Literacies Departments. The Integrated Literacies Department’s graduate director says that even though “this is not an English department,” it nonetheless “has some of the technology attitudes that you would find in English.” He says, “I don’t find the hostility here that I’ve found and experienced in English departments, where there was explicit, ‘technology is the devil; we should avoid it’ kind of arguments.” However, “there’s technical reluctance. It’s not even technophobia. It’s a techno-anxiety—‘oh, you know, I’m not that good with technology; I could never use it in my classes.’ That’s a little different kind of problem.”

It is not a problem unique to the Integrated Literacies Department, however; Roxie shares a similar anxiety about technology. It is also a disciplinary issue. Even though conversations about the technologies of writing happen in rhetoric and composition circles, technology/digital media studies has been a sub-field: digital rhetoric is important, but rhetoric itself has not yet become digital; computers are important to writing and digital media production is acceptable in writing classes, but writing has not yet become multimedia production. The Integrated Literacies Department is actively working to change this. The graduate director wants the department to view technology
and writing as merged, to view rhetoric and digital as merged; he and others in the field are pushing for that merger because he says that’s the way the field has to go to because of the changing nature of communication in American culture.

However, it is a top-down philosophy, and there are still individuals in the department who show reluctance, a lack of functional skill, and anxiety about integrating digital media into teaching and research. Survey respondent #3 represents this struggle. Her local context influences her stance that it “helps us be better teachers.” But her disciplinary identity, primarily shaped outside of the department (as she has only taught there a few years), influences her concern that “the priority of teaching coherent writing is being undermined,” a concern that the graduate director does not share.

Administrative structure and allocation of resources are two ways that a department establishes a disciplinary stance, often implicit and unstated, towards digital media. As individuals in the department exercise the options made available by the department and make choices about digital media uses based upon their professional identities, the department’s disciplinary stance towards digital media is further shaped to represent the interests of those in the department. Such shaping occurs as individuals use digital media for different purposes—to enable processes central to teaching and research, as objects of analysis, and to transform the goals of teaching and research (thereby reshaping the discipline).
Three Modes: Management, Analysis, & Production

This chapter is organized around these three categories, or modes, of usage of digital media: management, analysis and production. The management mode focuses on the processes that are enabled and disabled by digital media. It describes uses of digital media that involve management of professional activities, but do not necessarily change, fundamentally, the tasks being performed. Some examples are using a word processor for writing papers/articles, using online databases to search for primary or secondary texts, using the web to post course updates for students, using an online discussion board to facilitate class discussion of texts. Though they don’t necessarily require altering the fundamental nature of research, writing, or teaching, they can; moreover, these uses raise concerns about disciplinary identity for some of the study participants. The analysis mode of using digital media describes uses of digital media that involve the analysis of alternative texts—including visual images, films, web sites, other digital texts—as well as the analysis of technologies as cultural artifacts and/or analysis of the uses of those technologies in various contexts (classroom, workplace, personal, etc.). It can describe the texts that faculty and/or graduate students analyze as part of their scholarly research agendas or the texts they ask their students to analyze. For some study participants, these uses raise questions about disciplinary identity because they often challenge central questions and texts of the discipline. The production mode of using digital media describes uses of digital media involving the production of alternative texts, such as web sites, digital videos, visual arguments, and the like. It can describe the texts that faculty and/or graduate students create as part of their scholarly activities or the texts they ask
their students to create. This mode is fundamentally concerned with uses of digital media that challenge traditional disciplinary constructions of teaching goals and/or the purposes and central questions of scholarship.

These three modes are similar in structure to the three computer literacies that Stuart Selber lays out. In *Multiliteracies for A Digital Age*, Selber argues for a tripartite curriculum for computer literacy: functional, critical, and rhetorical. In addition to a functional literacy in which students become effective users of technology, he adds a critical literacy in which students become informed questioners of technology and a rhetorical literacy in which students become reflective producers of technology. Selber’s construction is primarily pedagogical; he defines three relationships students should be taught to forge with digital media: the ability to use it to manage their digital lives, the ability to question and critique it in order to understand it in broader social and political contexts, and the ability to reshape it through the design of interfaces. The management, analysis, and production modes, on the other hand, describe the ways in which faculty and graduate students integrate digital media into their teaching and research activities.

Each mode can involve all three of Selber’s literacies, though it need not necessarily. For instance, Roxie, a GTA, says she began to incorporate digital media into her teaching to “streamline not only the process of composing my courses but also of administering them.” To do this, she uses a course management program (like WebCT or Blackboard) to disseminate texts to students and as a dropbox for their assignments, email to communicate with students, and PowerPoint to make “lectures more interesting for the students.” In using digital media in these ways, Roxie’s goal is management—of
her class materials, of her class time, and of her students’ work. However, in order to accomplish this management, she must employ functional, critical, and rhetorical computer literacies. She has to know how to use the course management tool and how to use PowerPoint in order for her digital management strategy to be effective; she also needs to understand the social and rhetorical contexts (particularly academic contexts) in which those tools are embedded in order to use them to most effectively reach her goals (functional digital literacy). Although she does not need to question and critique the media she uses in order to use them as she does, the following chapter demonstrates that she does question and critique their role in her pedagogy and in her discipline and this questioning influences her uses of digital media (critical digital literacy). She needs to be able to understand the course management system rhetorically, as an interface, in order to reshape that interface to best guide her students through the course materials contained in the site (rhetorical digital literacy). However, her actual teaching of students might not encourage them to develop all three literacies, even though she draws upon all three to manage the course.

Management: Enabling (and Hindering) New and Old Processes

Roxie laughs as she explains what led her to begin using the Internet: “Everybody was doing it!” Roxie is a first-year PhD student in the Parallel Literacies Department studying 19th century American literature and works as a consultant in the Center for Digital Media Studies, the department’s resource center for digital teaching and research. Her joking tone belies her suggestion that some uses of technology are simply taken for
granted. When talking about his uses of new media for teaching and research, as almost an aside, Alan says, “And of course I use email all the time.” Alan is a first-year PhD student in the interdisciplinary graduate program associated with the Integrated Literacies Department. His concentration is digital rhetoric and professional writing. For Roxie and Alan, communication and informational tools—email, listservs, online databases, etc.—are essential and “normal,” just the way things are done. Although these uses have become pervasive, they nonetheless cause inner conflict for some.

*Management Mode & Teaching*

Benjamin is a PhD student in the Print Literacy Department. His field is rhetoric and composition, and he has recently passed his candidacy exams. His point of view on digital media use illustrates a common approach to digital media that undergirds the management mode. He says, “I’m a big believer in not using any technology that isn’t necessary. If a blackboard, a pencil, a handout will do, do so. Why not? I don’t like the use of technology for the sake of the use of technology.” His attitude is that digital media should be used to enable processes that cannot be done with other media/technologies or to make processes that can be done with other media/technologies easier, faster, more efficient, or more effective.

Benjamin’s use of course web sites for each of his classes illustrates this approach in action. He says he posts “syllabus, handouts, assignment sheets, links to potential research, links to all kinds of useful sites” and maintains that “quite religiously.” In addition, he says, “I always encourage, indeed require, my students to use that web site
because I’m not photocopying things for them. They’re fully capable of going to a web site, downloading, printing, reading.” He notes the benefits of this approach: “Saves them money. Saves me money. Saves both of us time. …They’re not losing their assignment sheets. It takes care of a lot of potential miscommunication and protest, ‘you said that was due on such and such. No I didn’t, here it is clearly.’ And so I rely on the web site wholly to keep them up to date.” As a rhetorician, he wants to use the best resources (media/technologies) for the situation at hand, to achieve his goals. And since technology hasn’t changed his goals as a teacher, it needn’t change his methods, unless there is a payoff.

The payoff, for him, is a perceived increase in reliability and efficiency in getting information to students. This use of the web also illustrates the influence of the assumptions of a model of print literacy. His web syllabus space, for instance, is essentially unchanging, like a printed syllabus. The changes that are made are of a specific sort: additions—updates to due dates, addition of links, addition of texts to read or links to visit. Students can refer to the web syllabus as they would to a printed syllabus with unchanging information about the class. Web updates replace printed handouts; the unchanging and original information remains. Just as his department takes the stance that digital media is of limited usefulness to the discipline as a whole, Benjamin uses digital media in a way that is consistent with that stance.

In some ways, this use of the web resembles that of Chester’s mentor, who uses a digital archive for her classes. Chester criticizes this, saying, “It’s just a shifting of the actual delivery method. It makes searching and pulling it up a lot easier, but it’s not an
actual use of technology.” Chester distinguishes between uses of digital media that “simply” make traditional processes easier, faster, and more efficient and uses that change teaching goals.

Chester is a PhD student in the Parallel Literacies Department, studying 19th century British literature and preparing for the job market. He uses digital discussion boards to supplement class discussion; he also teaches in a networked classroom, so students have access to the online discussions during class. He says, “I have students post their reading journals onto a web based discussion board and then I respond to them, usually privately…especially early on, so it’s not like I’m calling them out. And sometimes I’ll respond publicly, if it’s a question I think everybody else should be aware of.” He also has “students read and respond to each other’s responses. And I vary that…sometimes it’s respond to three other people, sometimes it’s five, depending on the level of the course.” Chester has several goals for his students’ digital discussion postings. One is to get people talking to each other: “My hope is to get students engaged in reading each other’s work and responding and saying, ‘hey, I agree with you,’ or ‘no, I don’t think this character is this way, I think it’s this way.’” At first glance, this use seems to be, in Chester’s terms, not an “actual use” of technology because it is a use that simply improves a process that does not necessarily necessitate digital mediation.

Chester addresses this issue when he describes the digital discussion board’s role in his overall pedagogical philosophy. He says, “I also pitch it as a way of, if you’re not sure what’s going on in the reading, you’re confused, take some responsibility for your own education and, maybe, not taking these as authoritative or definitive accounts, but
reading your peers’ work might help you understand what’s going on.” He says, “I think reading and writing about and responding to what other people write about literature is a great way to learn about literature” because “it’s a great way to articulate what we think, and sometimes we say things and someone reads it slightly differently…and it gets students going.” In addition, he says “having access to more ways of reading the text than just the teacher’s” is a capability of the postings in that “it decentralizes the classroom a little bit more and leads to fuller class discussion just because they’ve had a chance to respond and they maybe even as they’re responding have seen how other students have responded and have started to think, ‘oh, I didn’t think about that,’ and they come to class a little bit more prepared.”

For Chester, the digital discussion boards are more than just another delivery system. They actually have changed his goals as a teacher. Even though it would be possible to have students respond to each other’s informal writing without digital media, Chester did not. In fact, he says, “I used to have my students write reading journals, and I would collect them, and I would read them, and I would pass them back. And it was a very solitary experience because nobody else got to read them and I had to lug around all the papers.” But the digital discussion board makes sharing student writing easy, and this affordance has allowed Chester to envision new goals for students, thus changing his teaching methods and shifting his identity as a teacher from the “knowledgeable one at the front of the room” to another participant in the interpretation of the literary texts of the class. Although the medium has changed Chester’s goals, his use of the digital discussion board does not reshape his understanding of the discipline because it does not
change the central questions or ways of interpreting literature. In fact, his activity encourages his students to talk to each other the way scholars in the field might (at a conference, for instance).

Though Chester’s goals have changed because of digital media, the goals of others in the department have not. Emily is an assistant professor focusing on 19th century American literature and culture. She is completing her 5th year of the tenure track in the Parallel Literacies Department. She uses her university’s course management system “as a place to put up supplementary materials” for both undergraduate and graduate courses. She describes the various materials she posted for her students who took an undergraduate course she just finished teaching on American realism—photographs, links to information about temperance organizations to supplement one of the course readings, links to online clearinghouses of information relating to the theme of the course, PDF versions of old magazine articles from the time period being discussed in class—as contextual written resources. She adds, “when I give graduate seminars I also use the [course management] site as a place where the graduate students can get access to secondary essays. So I would put them on electronic reserve, but then I would also download them as PDF files so that they could have more easy access to them.”

Roxie, similarly, uses the course management system “as a discussion board, as a place for them to sort of start to work out ideas before class discussion. And also as a way for me to tell that they’re reading,” as well as a space to post her syllabus and assignments. She says, “In fact, I have everything posted before class begins…I encourage them in the first week to look through those assignments and become familiar
with them. I also have a section called recommended writing advice, which is really just a
list of my pet peeves, form, content, and style. I link to the MLA page.” In addition, she
uses email with her students to comment on drafts of papers: “I ask them to send me
Word attachments, and then I download them and comment in caps in brackets and then
send them back as attachments.” She also adds, “I use PowerPoint to disseminate
information.”

As teachers, Emily and Roxie are clearly influenced by a model of print literacy. For Emily, digital materials are a supplement to traditional printed sources that are the
main texts of the class. She provides photos, scanned magazine articles, and other
materials not as texts to be analyzed on their own but rather to contextualize the primary
literary texts of the course. This is not a pedagogical innovation, but the electronic tools
make it easy and efficient. Likewise, while Roxie uses electronic tools to help her
comment on student papers, she still asks students to write traditional papers and makes
traditional-style comments; instead of writing in the margins, however, she uses Word’s
comment feature. For both, the underlying pedagogy doesn’t change. They still lecture
and disseminate information to students, but the means of dissemination are now, in part,
digital. They still expect traditional printed products in response to assignments, but
many of the resources to help students complete the assignments are now digital.

Though Emily says she began using technology in her teaching because of “the
proliferation of wonderful materials that are out there and you sort of feel like you want
to make them available to the students,” she also notes that this is an idealized situation
because “there’s tons of amazing stuff out there, and then of course there’s lots of dross.
Right? That’s always the problem.” She adds, “Ideally, I’m showing them [undergraduates] what are acceptable and interesting sites and places so that they don’t go to the dross. Although, I’m not sure that that in fact works.”

Interestingly, easy access is both an affordance and a constraint of the medium for Emily. It is also interesting that she views as part of her role as a teacher to show students the “acceptable and interesting” materials and steer them away from the “dross.” As a literature teacher, she draws the line between acceptable and unacceptable materials that is reminiscent of canonicity: some texts are worthy of study, some are not. And although she blurs traditional canonical lines by making available alternative texts via the course management system—including photographs and magazine articles—these are not the core texts of the course, and those core literary texts are not natively digital or made available digitally. In a way, this example illustrates the department chair’s statement that though digital texts are important, the study of English will always involve printed texts. Which printed texts, though, continues to be a central debate in Emily’s discipline. She frames her discussion of online texts in similar terms: some are worthy of inclusion in her digital canon, some are not.

Roxie, unlike Emily, is teaching composition in a networked classroom. Her concerns, consequently, focus less on the texts of her class and more on the physical classroom itself and its affects on the behavior of students. She says:

Sometimes my students are on the Internet when they should be listening to me. Especially in a [networked classroom], well I guess only in a [networked classroom], they have a hard time, apparently, distinguishing appropriate use of the machines, and that makes me angry. I don’t think that they would consider it equivalent to flip through a magazine while a professor’s lecturing, but somehow they think it’s OK to check their email.
When asked how she deals with that, she laughs and says, “I yell. I do, I get really upset, and I say, ‘when I tell you to turn to the computers, you can turn to the computers, but until that point, your eyes should be on me, your ears should be on me.’”

Roxie’s experience points to a problem with importing a more traditional pedagogy into a networked classroom—namely, the mismatch between student expectations for learning in a networked environment and the primarily print-mediated methods of traditional composition pedagogies. One explanation for this mismatch might be that students, when entering a networked classroom expect hands-on use of the technology, so when they don’t get it, they “act out.” This acting out does take some traditional forms but is mediated differently—in instead of passing notes, students check email; instead of whispering to each other, they instant-message each other. Roxie’s story illustrates that, perhaps, students feel the pedagogical disconnect as much as Roxie does in a networked classroom. Tension and conflict arise, conceivably, because the students’ assumptions about computers and learning are different than what they encounter and because Roxie is still figuring out the role that digital media will play in her pedagogy.

Her concerns, however, go beyond the strictly pedagogical, beyond the specific effects of computers in her composition classroom. Roxie says:

I don’t know. I guess my fear with technology and pedagogy is, one of my fears is that it does seem to in some ways erode the boundary between university and society, or, social time. You know, to me classroom time is sacred, and I prepare extensively for my classes, and it’s very frustrating for me to be imparting information that I think is essential for the continuation of our work, and they’re checking their email. I don’t think that that’s only the fault of technology, but I am afraid that technology kind of feeds into that. You know, ‘oh, I’m in a room with a computer, it’s just like my dorm room that has a computer, therefore the activities that I do in my dorm room are appropriate in this room.’
Roxie frames her concern as the students’ blurring the boundary between social time and learning time in her classroom when they check their email rather than paying attention. But the effect of digital media on the teaching profession in general also involves a blurring of boundaries: the boundary between teachers’ own social, or off-duty (not teaching) time and their on-duty time. One by-product of the pervasiveness of email that teachers grapple with is that their students often expect them to be constantly accessible and to respond to email messages with immediacy. This expectation can feel like a burden to teachers like Roxie, whose disciplines and departments construct digital media use as extra.

One way that Roxie’s department implicitly constructs digital media as “extra” to normal teaching duties is by the questions they use on the standard student evaluation form for composition classes. One of the questions asks whether the instructor kept regular office hours. Cosmo, a PhD student in the Parallel Literacies Department, says that one quarter he asked his students to let him know ahead of time whether they would be coming to his office hours because he didn’t want to sit there waiting and wondering if anybody would show up. But he also gave his students his instant messaging address and was available to them at any time he was at his computer. Consequently, although he rarely met with students in his office at a time convenient for him, he regularly “met” with students via instant messaging at times convenient to them. When he got his student evaluations back, one of the students had written “N/A” as a response to the office hours question, reminding Cosmo that he is an experimenter in a traditional department. The story also indicates, however, the role of departments in constructing definitions of
disciplinarity for their members. The evaluation form defines “office hours” as a teaching
duty but not instant messaging; hence, work with digital media is constructed as “extra”
and is not rewarded, nor is it expected as an integral part of a teacher’s identity.
Consequently, Roxie struggles with the blurring of the boundary between on-duty and
off-duty time, whereas Cosmo recognizes that his identity as a teacher is out of the
mainstream.

Management Mode & Research

Besides her concerns about the blurring boundary between social and class time,
Roxie also voices concerns about the influence of digital media on the central methods of
research in her discipline. She says, “I remember doing archival research in periodicals
and having to be so careful when I turned the pages so that they didn’t fall apart. And that
really imparted to me as an undergrad a sense of historicity, a sense of being a part of
something, and I’m afraid that that’s something that most of my students are missing out
on.” Although she says it is “easier for me to direct students to resources” and they are
“more likely to type in a URL than they are to visit the library,” she has mixed feelings
about it. She says, “In some ways, yeah, that’s positive, and in other ways, I’m sad that
they’re missing the experience of actually entering the stacks and perusing those titles…
But, you know, you can’t beat the efficiency and the convenience. That concerns me.
Should scholarly research be about convenience and efficiency?” Roxie wants to see
herself as part of a legacy, part of the history of literary studies. The printed text is, of
course, an integral part of that legacy. But spending time in a library, surrounded by and immersed in those texts, is equally important to her vision of the legacy she wants to inherit and continue.

And yet, Roxie says that she began to use digital media in her research because of “convenience, primarily. And I guess still the sense that it’s unavoidable. That’s where a lot of the things that I need to know are. So that’s where I go to find them.” Besides convenience, she also notes pleasure as a reason for using digital media for her research:

I love that I can be reading Thoreau and run across a strange phrase and plug it into Google and find that it’s Biblical. That’s great. And, you know, I’ve been in academia long enough that I remember when I would have to call professors, not email but call professors to ask them, ‘do you know where this comes from? Oh, the Bible?’ and then thumb through the Bible’s index trying to find it or call my mom and say, ‘do you know what book this is from? Mark? OK’ and read all of Mark. So it saves me time, and I like that a lot. That’s something none of us have very much of.

Roxie is clearly struggling to come to terms with the role of digital media in her discipline. On the one hand, it saves her time; but on the other hand, it separates her from the material of her research: printed texts. That separation is, in some ways, unavoidable, but it is also convenient. That convenience raises a red flag for her because she sees it as lowering scholarly standards for research in her field; but at the same time, the only way she can access many of the texts she needs to do her research is by going online.

Adele, on the other hand, frames the discussion in terms of the physical constraints of different media. Adele is completing her first year in the interdisciplinary PhD program associated with the Integrated Literacies Department, concentrating on critical and community literacies. She is interested in cultural studies, the culture of technology, postcolonial rhetorics, and creative writing and literary nonfiction. She has
been working on a project that attempts to dissolve the barrier between creative and critical writing by exploring their similarities. She says technology is “important and critical,” but quickly qualifies, “I still trust white paper over a computer. Paper is something that I have physically in front of me that doesn’t crash and I don’t have to worry about losing it as I do with technology.”

Adele’s trust in paper, an older form of mediation, not only derives from some of the material constraints of her department (to be analyzed in chapter 3), but it is also an example of the ways in which individuals become acclimated to the media that saturate their environments and comfortable with their vulnerabilities while remaining somewhat skeptical of different media that attempt to saturate their environments. English and composition have traditionally relied on print; these departments were print-saturated before digital media became commonplace. Adele is, not surprisingly, more comfortable with print. The fact that her department is becoming saturated with digital media and encouraging the philosophy that everybody needs to be comfortable and savvy with digital media likely contribute to her saying that it is “important and critical” to her work. Yet her status as a graduate student and her conditions of access likely contribute to her greater comfort with print. In addition, she is speaking as a researcher who, like Roxie, uses technology to enable a process: getting the materials of her research (texts). The technology doesn’t change her goals or questions or objects of study. So, even though it is important and critical to her work, she still trusts paper above all.

Ava, who positions herself differently as a scholar, sees only plusses. Ava is an assistant professor in the Integrated Literacies Department. Her teaching focuses “on the
impact of the Internet and the Web on North American Culture,” and her research is interdisciplinary but “anchored by a focus on feminist research practices and an interest in digital writing environments.” She is completing her third year at the university but is going through early tenure review. She passed the department- and college-level reviews and is waiting to hear the final word from the university committee.

When Ava wrote a manuscript about women’s porn sites, for example, she had two of the women read it and says, “we got into some really interesting conversations…about the label ‘pornography’” because “they didn’t see themselves as fitting into that mold, that category, that social construction of pornography.” She speaks with enthusiasm about the ability to communicate and converse with the women whose sites she is writing about: “To be able to email the women that are running these sites and talk to them and have conversations with them in an initially less obtrusive way than showing up at their homes, calling them on the phone. There’s just so much freedom and availability of information that for my research I don’t see there being any significant problems or hindrances.” In addition to touting communication tools such as email, Ava speaks with enthusiasm about the ability to access texts online: “But to be able to jump on a database or jump into Lexis-Nexis and pull up court cases, to search. That’s another thing, I don’t understand how we survived as a culture before these tools. I grew up before you could buy food with credit cards. I grew up before ATMs…” Ava sees the convenience of informational tools as an affordance. They allow her easy and fast access to the texts and tools she needs to do her work, thus enabling processes that are central to her identity as a scholar who studies technology uses and mediation in people’s lives.
For all three, digital media enable processes that are part of their researcher identities: finding and getting access to primary and secondary texts; communicating with people about their work; communicating with research subjects. Those whose researcher identity is more traditional—Roxie and Adele—feel more conflicted about or less comfortable with using digital media. For Ava, whose researcher identity depends upon digital media, there is no conflict.

Roxie was joking when she said “everybody was doing it,” but survey responses show, in fact, that pretty much everybody is doing it: using digital media to manage processes central to their work as teachers and scholars. 78.1% (82) of survey participants responded to an open-ended prompt asking them to describe how they use digital media/technology for their teaching. Of those who responded to the prompt, 98.8% describe uses of digital media for teaching that classify in the management mode—such as having a web syllabus, communicating with students via email, and teaching students how to find articles for research papers through online databases. A similar prompt asked participants to describe how they use digital media for research, to which 84.8% (89) of all survey participants responded. Of those responses, 97.8% describe uses of digital media for research that classify in the management mode—such as using databases to find journal articles, typing dissertations in word processors, and subscribing to academic listservs. Many use phrases such as “of course” and “obviously” when listing these uses, and several qualify the listing of these uses with phrases such as, “I only…” or “Not
much…” These findings indicate that using digital media in the management mode is widespread, and that some uses—communicating via email, doing research online, disseminating texts to students electronically—have become naturalized.

Even so, the management mode of digital media use still raises tensions relating to professional identity and processes of the discipline. These uses cause some people to wrestle with questions about the processes that are central to teaching in the discipline and the methods that are central to research in the discipline. Even as they use digital media to enable these processes, they nonetheless see digital media as changing those processes, as well, and in the process, changing what it means to be a teacher and/or researcher in the discipline.

**Analysis: Providing Alternative Objects of Study**

“All of my research is technologically mediated,” Ava says, “and most of my research is technologically focused.” She succinctly states the difference between the management mode and the analysis mode: the management mode describes the various ways that individuals participate in the mediation of texts and information, and the analysis mode describes the various texts that individuals analyze and ask students to analyze. The analysis mode parallels more closely Selber’s critical digital literacy. In Selber’s critical literacy, computers are taken as cultural artifacts, which he defines as “a generative metaphor of identity that foregrounds critically both contexts of production and use” and specifically recognizes the politics of technology (75). However, while Selber’s critical literacy focuses on the machine as text, the analysis mode focuses on
both the machine as text as well as on texts created by those machines. In other words, the analysis mode describes the ways in which faculty and graduate students analyze and incorporate into their classes analysis of non-traditional, non-printed, and/or non-alphabetic texts. It also describes the ways in which faculty and graduate students analyze or incorporate into their classes analysis of technologies themselves as cultural artifacts and/or individuals’ uses of technologies.

**Analysis Mode & Teaching**

Toby, one of Benjamin’s mentors, is an assistant professor in the Print Literacy Department and completing his second year as an assistant professor. His teaching and research is “heavily invested in bringing the rhetorical tradition(s) to bear on contemporary issues of selfhood, identity, and agency.” In addition, he is “the coordinator for professional writing, and my research in this area focuses on visual literacy and document design.” He is teaching a class called Rhetorics of Technology about new forms of communication. “It’s been a lot of reading about technology,” he explains. Some of the texts students read are “You and the Atomic Bomb” by George Orwell, *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley, and “Can Technology Replace Social Engineering?” by Alvin M. Weinberg. He also teaches a class “on rhetoric and democracy. We listen to Lee Greenwood lyrics and look at old *Schoolhouse Rocks* about the American melting pot. I do a lot of that just ‘cause I like the plurality of media representation to see what that does to both the rhetorical intent of a text and the way it’s assembled, the design of it.”
His interest in comparative media studies carries over to the writing assignments in Rhetorics of Technology; in addition to reading about technology, the students are also asked to write analytically and rhetorically about technology. For instance, the first paper requires students to analyze *A.I.: Artificial Intelligence* “in order to articulate its representation of technology.” Furthermore, as the assignment sheet explains, students must “use [their] analysis as the basis for some rhetorical speculation about this representation—that is, some speculation as to what the filmmaker (Steven Speilberg) might be trying to accomplish in representing technology in this way.” The second paper requires students to compare and contrast the representations of technology in *Brave New World* and a written or filmic text they choose. The final paper assignment requires students to develop a rhetorical analysis of a text’s representation of technology, using outside sources to help them support their arguments about the rhetorical intent of the text. These assignments ask students to consider the ways in which technology is represented, culturally and rhetorically, in a variety of texts. These assignments also ask students to consider the ways in which media affect the rhetoric of texts by asking students to read, view, and listen to texts and, in one of their papers, to compare texts composed in different media.

In this class, taught in a non-networked classroom without computers, Toby uses online discussion boards as an out-of-class supplement because “it seems really appropriate that a class on technology would have some sort of technologically mediated form of communication. That process itself is of interest to me, and we talk about that.” In addition, he says it is “more opportunity to pursue more questions” and “another
opportunity to get people talking.” He requires students to post a 500-word analytical response to a course reading twice during the semester and a 250-word analytical response “to any kind of post that’s up there” twice during the semester. This use of the discussion board is heavily influenced by a model of print literacy—namely, asking students to produce written analytical responses to articles they have read. But Toby also uses the postings to spark face-to-face discussion in class. He says, “When we start to have a discussion about a text, we usually use the responses of people who had to offer their commentaries for that day as the jumping off point.” Even though Toby uses this online form of communication, it is still a supplement to traditional face-to-face pedagogy. In fact, it enables traditional face-to-face pedagogy by preparing students for class time and attempting to ensure that they actually talk during class discussions. Most of the actual communication and discussion happens in class, face-to-face, not on the discussion board. The discussion board is more like a container that holds their analytical responses to readings, which everybody, not just Toby the teacher, can access, read, and respond to.

In these discussions, he says he tries “to ask questions about what we’re reading as a way of getting them, for one, to read the thing a little more closely, question their own readings of it, number two, just to find ways to get them interested in any kind of question that can feed a writing project that they’ll participate in.” This sort of questioning and encouraging students to read texts closely supports the model of traditional academic literacy that the Print Literacy Department heavily values. But it also allows Toby to connect the texts students are reading to the texts they are writing for the
class. This approach to the discussion board thus allows Toby to concentrate on teaching writing. It is a common strategy; teachers that incorporate creative production with digital media also use models to teach students the rhetorical skills they need to compose in the given medium. Although Toby uses digital discussion boards to spark discussion and as a container for students’ analytical writing, ultimately the digital form has little effect or input on the form/media in which he asks his students to write. They write as if writing for print, even when posting the writing online, and he says his role in the discussion forum “first and foremost, is to be a writing teacher.”

The kind of writing he teaches is the analytical, academic essay. This definition of writing and his assignments (formal, analytical writing, even when posted on the discussion board) is consistent with the department’s stance toward digital media as a supplement to support traditional writing and analytical activities. This definition of writing is also consistent with his primary professional identity as rhetoric and composition specialist. Traditionally, the field of rhetoric and composition has valued academic writing. More recently, visual rhetoric (the analysis of visual texts) has surged in popularity, and Toby has his students analyze films; the writing that is encouraged, however, is traditional academic analyses with visual texts as the object of analysis. There is a small niche within rhetoric and composition arguing for the valuation of alternative types of writing, particularly digital media productions. This niche follows in a tradition of scholars who have argued for valuing other non-academic forms of writing and other literacies in composition classes. In Toby’s department, however, the standard is the academic, analytical essay.
Though she does not focus her classes on technology as Toby does, Roxie does incorporate comparative media studies into her writing class. She says:

I have students compose PowerPoint presentations and then write a paper on that same topic, so that the PowerPoint serves as a kind of template for their paper writing. And then they write a self-reflexive piece on what the different rhetorical choices were that they had to make in paper writing versus the sort of visual presentation: organizational choices, format, that kind of thing.

Like Toby, Roxie asks students to do comparative analysis. Instead of comparing two texts’ representations of technology, however, they compare their own processes of writing for two different media. Rhetorical features are central to this analysis, as in Toby’s assignments.

She also asks her students to analyze digitally mediated visual texts, such as web sites. She says her students seem to be more comfortable analyzing these visual texts than traditional alphabetic texts. She says a benefit of this comfort is a certain kind of authority:

I think it empowers them. It gives them a sense of authority, especially because of my area. I’m asking them always to look at texts that they feel very alienated from. 19th century language can be very off-putting, and the themes are often very sentimental. It’s unclear to them, to students, what kind of a relationship they can forge with these texts. Whereas with the websites I think they feel much more in a position of authority, mastery.

Having students analyze visual texts, however, makes her “itchy,” she says, and has negatively affected her teaching:

It makes me really sad! It does, it makes me very sad. Has it changed the way I approach teaching? Yeah, it has, and, begrudgingly, honestly. Because I do a little bit with visual culture. I don’t do a whole lot with it. It’s a secondary interest of mine. My primary interests are textual. So, I find it frustrating that in order to produce what I would consider even passable analyses, I have to turn to visual texts that I’m not necessarily as interested in.
Roxie does not professionally identify, as Toby does, with alternative objects of study. As a literary scholar, she values traditional literary objects of study. As a composition teacher, she incorporates these alternative objects of study to keep her students interested and help them learn analytical writing, but on a certain level, she views the analysis of these texts as a cop-out.

Roxie frames the problem as her own lack of interest in visual culture and the students’ lack of interest in written texts, but her comment indicates her own negotiation of her professional identity as an English teacher. Are these texts appropriate to study in an English department? Why should they make her “itchy” unless there is something inappropriate about analyzing them in an English class? Her discomfort stems, possibly, from the feeling that asking her students to analyze non-literary or non-alphabetic texts goes against a core aspect of her discipline.

Toby does not face this issue because—although he is in an English department—his field is rhetoric and composition, which has not formed a canon in the same way that literary studies has. Although Toby and Roxie are both composition teachers, they approach the teaching of composition from different scholarly standpoints: Toby is a scholar of rhetoric and composition, whereas Roxie is a scholar of 19th century literature. They both value the teaching of analytical writing, but their ideas of appropriate texts for students to read and write about are different because of their different scholarly interests and their different disciplinary identities. Because Roxie comes from a field that values the analysis of alphabetic texts, she believes that those are the texts her students need to analyze; so, feeling forced to turn to visual texts unsettles her because she is not being
true to her disciplinary identity. Because a secondary interest of Toby’s is media representation, he feels much more comfortable asking his students to engage in comparative media analysis; he is not “betraying” his sense of the core texts of his discipline.

Analysis Mode & Research

Much of Ava’s research analyzes the ways in which technology affects people’s lived experiences, namely, women’s lived experiences, and thus focuses on the material effects of technology use in women’s lives. One chapter of her dissertation, for instance, analyzed women’s representations of self in bulletin board systems, and another chapter focused on cyborg bodies. Her current projects also focus on online discourse. One of the projects she is working on right now is a study of women’s office folklore, in which she is finding “that women are using the technology in their workplaces to create cartoons and quips and distribute cartoons and quips.” She is also finding that “there are these huge webrings and email rings of women who share this stuff after they’ve scanned it or they’ve faxed it to each other. So they’re using the technology in ways that are disruptive and rebellious but not in the ways that I expected.” Interestingly, in analyzing technology use, Ava finds that women in the workplace are working in the production mode when she expected them to be working more in the management mode. Thus, she explores how these women produce digital media texts rather than just consume them.

Another of her projects analyzes women’s porn sites, “looking at and looking through the types of communities that are forming online and the communication
processes that are emerging and evolving in digital spaces.” She describes the sites as “wonderful” and “hilarious”:

And you hit these web sites: ‘Hi. Welcome to my site. I live in Ohio, and I have a husband and three kids, and Thanksgiving’s my favorite holiday. Click here to see pictures of our new puppy. Click here to see naked pictures of me for $4.95 a month.’ It’s so wonderful because it’s so outside of our boundaries and our genres and everything. There is a place for porn in our culture and it’s, you know, the brown-paper-wrapped-magazine, although that’s changing. But it’s the guy alone downloading porn in the middle of the night, you know, it’s the VHS and DV tapes bought that come in the concealed box. And here are these women just like, ‘Yeah, these are my boobs, whooo!’ It’s hilarious…

Like the women’s office folklore project, this project studies the materiality of digital media texts in women’s lives and their creation of those texts. However, this project also analyzes what the texts these women create mean to their creators and how those meanings differ from traditional cultural meanings of pornography. Thus, she explores how the technology enables not only the creation of the texts but also complicates genres.

Ava is also collaborating with a colleague on a project about “the Star Wars kid,” a high-school boy who filmed himself in his high school’s media center pretending to fight with a light saber; he forgot to erase it, and it ended up on Kazaa, an off-shore server that allows peer-to-peer sharing of files. Soon, people began to download the video and create their own movies starring the Star Wars kid. “But what’s really interesting is an entire community and culture has come about due to this video…It’s unbelievable,” Ava says as she shows me one of the videos. The videos take the original and splice it with owned intellectual property, such as movie trailers, to create what Ava calls “multimedia pastiche.” Their creations, she says, “force us to think about so many different [things]…we’re talking about copyright, we’re talking about privacy, we’re talking about intellectual property, we’re talking about ethics, we’re talking about rich
processes of scripting and composing and *creating* that people will put the time and energy into these videos. Some of them are really stunning.” Again, she studies the use of technology in the production mode and analyzes the digital media creations. Her research is completely enmeshed in the analytical mode and relies upon the management mode for the mediation of the texts she analyzes and for communication with some of the people producing those texts.

In each of these scholarly projects, Ava is studying subjects that are often the topic of popular discussions about technology in American life: bulletin board systems, cyborgs, technology cartoons, Internet pornography, and peer-to-peer file-sharing. In addition, she is entering into scholarly conversations about the cultural and material positions of technology in our lives by drawing upon feminist critiques of technology in her work as well as using critical and cultural theory to analyze her findings. Finally, she has published her research/criticism in a variety of forums. These published works have the potential to re-shape the popular and scholarly discussions of technology, creating new questions and new topics of discussion that could lead to new lines of inquiry and critique and, later, new research projects. Her research, by turning a critical eye on technology itself and its uses, broadens popular understanding of technology’s role in and effect on our lives and encourages critical technological literacy.

Ava expresses concern, though, about how her audience—the larger academic community—will react to her research. She says, “I couldn’t do any of that without this space. I hope that this is, I think it is, but I hope the larger community finds this productive, useful research. If we don’t know what’s going on in Kazaa, if we don’t
know that things like the Star Wars kid are happening, you know, if we’re not aware of the ways, both inspiring and creative and interesting and dangerous and potentially devastating, that the different media are being used, then, how can we talk about them?” Her concern that a larger community find her research productive and useful points to a tension surrounding the analysis of digital media texts—are they an appropriate object of study? This is the same question causing tension for Roxie in her teaching. Although Ava finds her research useful and important and her department values the research she does, she worries that the larger academic community does not.

The chair of the Print Literacy Department says that digital media use “also begs the question…are web representations of reality objects of study appropriate to English departments? To what extent is visual culture…embraceable under the broadest definition of the discipline of English?” Analysis of these different texts pushes on disciplinary boundaries, he says. Roxie struggles with this question when she has students analyze visual culture. Although Ava is not in an English department, she still wonders if the academic community will find her research productive because it is focused on technology. This concern indicates that, regardless of departmental connections, disciplines that have traditionally valued the study of printed texts and/or literate practices related to print are struggling in the face of digital media to (re)define their discipline’s methods and matter.

One of Alan’s research projects provides an example of analysis of digital texts that also upsets traditional methods of research because it also requires the creation of digital media tools to perform that analysis. He is working on a collaborative project
exploring citation practices of both print and online publications to understand whether, where, and how much online sources are cited. This involves “developing methodologies for seeing where these things were when they were originally cited.” Besides using the Way Back Machine (http://www.waybackmachine.org), an Internet archive enabling users to see archived versions of web sites that might no longer exist “live” on the Web, he and his colleagues have also “developed a database to put the data into and then get information out of it based on the queries we give it.” He has thus been creating “the web interface of the database, structuring the database and getting that to work, which is kind of new stuff for me but interesting. Could be really functional in a lot of different ways for research.” This project pushes at disciplinary boundaries. In addition to analyzing digital texts, Alan also is creating a new methodology that does not resemble traditional methods in his field of rhetoric and composition. Furthermore, this new methodology requires the creation of digital tools to perform the analysis. Whereas many individuals surveyed and interviewed certainly use digital tools to acquire the texts they will analyze, few actually use digital tools to perform part of that analysis. Moreover, nobody else in this study has created their own digital applications. Alan’s project is thus unique in this study for its production of digital media for research purposes.

As previously mentioned, 78.1% of survey participants responded to an open-ended prompt asking them to describe how they use digital media/technology for their teaching, and 84.8% of survey participants responded to a similar prompt asking them to describe how they use digital media for research. Of those who responded to the prompts,
34.1% describe uses of digital media for teaching that classify in the analysis mode—such as asking students to analyze images, films, and digital texts instead of or in addition to traditional printed/literary texts—and 10.1% describe uses of digital media for research that classify in the analysis mode—such as publishing film analyses, analyzing the role of technology in society, or studying uses of digital media in the composition classroom. One third of those responding to the prompt indicate that they ask students to analyze otherly-mediated texts—whether those texts are printed and consist of images rather than text or whether those texts are digitally mediated and consist of multiple media. This indicates that there is a trend toward analysis of visual and digital culture. Although the majority of survey respondents do not mention asking students to analyze otherly-mediated texts, the “visual turn” in English Studies that Kress describes seems to be an accurate representation.

Just as the management mode, the analysis mode of digital media use also raises tensions relating to professional identity and processes of the discipline. These uses cause some people to wrestle with questions about the central texts of the discipline—which texts are appropriate to ask students to analyze and which texts are appropriate for scholarly analysis. Even as they analyze alternative texts, some nonetheless view analysis of these non-traditional texts as a threat to the discipline, changing what it means to be a teacher and/or scholar in the discipline.
Production: Transforming Goals and Products of Teaching

Alan, in addition to valuing digital media production in his research, also values it in his teaching. When he was a master’s student (at another university), he taught in a networked classroom and set up a centralized, shared folder, “so that students could put their work into it and look at each other’s work.” Eventually, he put Netscape on the computers and taught the students to “take their essays, turn them into web pages, so that they could all view them, from that shared folder, and then link between them, and then write about why they linked between each other’s work.” The Director of Composition was concerned that he “was teaching too much technology and not enough writing.” Because of this concern, Alan says, “I wasn’t able to or I felt compelled at that time to not integrate technology and the writing to the level that I should have, [so] the whole project of doing the web site linking failed miserably.” Even so, he says, “I think it was a good learning experience, and the students did learn how to do the basics of web design, which really excited them.” He will be teaching developmental writing in the fall, and one of his ideas is to have students do mini-ethnographies “where they can go do some observations and bring that in and create web texts based on that and link to each other, go back to the thing I did in my master’s that didn’t work. Now I know how to make it work. I think that would be very useful.”

The Director of Composition at Alan’s former university expressed concern that he was teaching too much technology and not enough writing, a fear that one of the survey respondents in the Integrated Literacies Department reiterates: “Although I am sure technology helps us be better teachers, I am concerned that the priority of teaching
coherent writing is being undermined.” Both set up an opposition between “writing” and “technology” that fails to recognize the ways in which writing necessitates and is mediated by technology. However, this constructed opposition is parallel to a tension in the field of rhetoric and composition: print literacy versus “new” literacy. The tension is not so much over how to define literacy; I think most in the field would agree that the proliferation of new communication technologies and different means of composing texts that are available in American society changes the nature of reading and writing, of literacy, and changes the kinds of literacy skills that students bring with them to class and will need once they leave college. However, the tension arises in applying the theory to teaching, in other words, deciding what to do in writing classes—what types of projects should be assigned, what media/modes should students master, how can it all fit into one course/one term?

The participants in this study indicate that there is a spectrum of attitudes toward this tension. On one end of the spectrum are those who see multimedia projects as a threat to academic literacy, even as they use digital media in the management and/or analysis modes. On the other end of the spectrum are those who insist that multimedia production is writing, in that multimedia assignments teach the same rhetorical skills as traditional writing assignments. Most are in between; they see value either in incorporating visual rhetoric—asking students to analyze and write about multimedia texts—or incorporating new media production along with more traditional writing assignments—replacing one assignment, perhaps, with a web site or PowerPoint assignment—but are hesitant to redefine writing.
The Center for Digital Media Studies’s Director, for instance, notes that, in the Parallel Literacies Department, although “there are a lot of people who are using digital media for demonstration purposes in teaching, and so we have a lot of people who are talking about historical artifacts, they’re talking about theoretical concepts, and they’re using technology as a way of demonstrating those ideas to their students. It’s very much used in that presentational mode,” there is “a smaller segment of the department that’s actually using it as a way to teach, to improve the learning of students, and that’s primarily happening in our computer classrooms.” The department has five computer classrooms, in which writing and literature courses are taught and he says that in those classes, “digital media is used in both the idea of presenting information to students but also as a way of having students involved in production of digital media. Production of digital media is also a way of getting students to learn in deeper ways about the subject matter of the class.” The spectrum of uses in the Parallel Literacies Department is heavier at the management end (the end suspicious of multimedia production) and lightest at the end of spectrum that embraces digital media production as writing.

This trend is expressed across the board in all three departments in an overwhelming acceptance of digital media in the management mode and relative lack of use of digital media in the production mode. The relative lack of use is possibly related to evident skepticism or (in rarer cases) hostility toward digital media in the production mode. Such skepticism is repeated over and over in open-ended responses to survey prompts, such as the ones quoted earlier. In addition, survey statistics show a lack of use of digital media in the production mode. Of the 105 total survey participants, 82 (78.1%)
responded to an open-ended prompt asking them to describe how they use digital media/technology for their teaching and 89 (84.8%) responded to a similar prompt asking them to describe how they use digital media for research. Only 12 (14.6% of respondents to the prompt; 11.4% of all survey respondents) indicated that they incorporate digital media production into their teaching, compared with 81 (98.8% of respondents to the prompt; 77.1% of all survey respondents) incorporating the management mode and 28 (34.1% of respondents to the prompt; 26.7% of entire survey respondents) incorporating analysis of alternative texts. Only 3 (3.4% of respondents to the prompt; 2.9% of all survey respondents) indicated that they incorporate digital media production into their research, compared with 87 (97.8% of respondents to the prompt; 82.9% of all survey respondents) incorporating the management mode and 9 (10.1% of respondents to the prompt; 8.6% of all survey respondents) incorporating analysis of alternative texts (Figure 2.1).

This lack of digital media production, of course, can be interpreted several ways. Because digital media production as a teaching method is so new and many of the applications used for it time-consuming to master, only the early adopters are incorporating it into teaching and research. Many survey respondents mentioned the lack of time to learn new media as a barrier to their integration of it into teaching and research, so that is another explanation. But in combination with comments to open-ended prompts on the survey and the tensions that arise in the management and analysis modes, it is likely that these statistics are yet more evidence of the tension between digital media production and traditional writing across these departments.
Figure 2.1: Management/Analysis/Production in Teaching & Research. Out of 105 total survey respondents and 82 responding to the open-ended question about uses of digital media for teaching, 81 employ the management mode for teaching, 28 employ the analysis mode for teaching, and 12 employ the production mode for teaching. Out of 105 total survey respondents and 89 responding to the open-ended question about uses of digital media for research, 87 employ the management mode for research, 9 employ the analysis mode for research, and 3 employ the production mode for research.

Critical Framing of Creative Tools

Ava employs the production mode in her teaching of visual rhetoric. When I meet Ava in her office two hours before her class begins, she gives me some materials relating to the class I will observe: a point sheet she uses to give feedback to students about their progress in the course, explanations of two modules the students have completed in Photoshop, and copies of the readings.
“Last week’s module was pretty basic,” she explains, “cause it’s such a huge application—getting comfortable with the interface; working with different layers, different images at once; working with text; it was really the basics.” On the other hand, the second assignment on Photoshop, due today, “pushed them a little harder, and they had to link to ideas in the readings. So that first activity is really interesting. We had been reading some pieces about postmodern identity/postmodern design. So we were reading about punk rock design and cheapskate design, clutter as a design strategy, and they had to start with a headshot of themselves and work with it to create either a sense of their unified or fragmented sense of identity. It’s really interesting.”

The classroom in which Ava teaches is the only computer classroom that the department maintains. Ten PCs running Windows XP and ten Macintosh G5s running OSX line three walls of the room. Jutting out from the fourth wall are the instructor’s station (which includes a PC, a Mac, and a media center) and four tables for group or non-computer work. In the center of the room there is another PC connected to a scanner. A projector hangs from the ceiling in the middle of the room and projects onto a screen that hangs over the wall of Macs.

“The focus of the class is a two-fold focus,” Ava explains. “The first and foremost and most important purpose is developing a vocabulary, an ability to speak in rich ways about writing and design and the intersections of form and content. So we do a lot of analysis.” An activity that helps students develop a critical vocabulary through analysis is something Ava calls the Visual Example Presentation. She asks each student to bring in an object and deliver a brief analysis of it; the class then responds with questions and
discussion of the object. In the class I observe, one student brings a perfume bottle. The
student gives an analysis of the bottle that focuses on its color scheme and packaging, and
the class, led by Ava’s questions, discusses the significance of those choices—why color
matters, how packaging is related to the economics of shelf space, and how design
decisions are related to society’s constructions of gender.

The course of Ava’s that I observe is Visual Rhetoric for Professional Writers, one of 4 core courses for the undergraduate professional writing program. Ava has
organized the course around modules that help the students learn software applications
and put into practice design theories. For instance, one module is on document design and
typography. The students read and discuss articles on document design and typography.
In class, they analyze documents’ designs; in the module, they are asked to experiment
with design principles they have read about and discussed by using Word to design song
lyrics or a poem. Each module also asks students to reflect upon their work. For example,
in the document design and typography module, students are asked to write a brief
statement explaining their interpretation of the song or poem and how their design
complements that meaning or to reflect upon their design process—why they chose
certain features and fonts, what effects they think it will have on an audience, etc.

Ava explains that she wants students to understand not only the mechanics of
design but also the cultures of production that influence design choices, so the students
work with software programs (which she calls “tools”). However, she stresses, “The
critical and analytical always frames the use of the tools. It is like my nightmare to be
stuck teaching Dreamweaver MX for fifteen weeks or a class on Adobe Photoshop, because that is just meaningless and uninteresting to me. Because the tools, I mean, they’re nothing unless they’re framed.”

Critical and cultural theory and discussions of cultures and histories frame the tools in Ava’s visual rhetoric class. The module exercise that asks students to design a poem or song lyrics in Word is an example of this critical framing. This assignment is coupled with a reading about the font face Hitler decided would be the defining marker of the Nazi party. According to Ava, “he’s talking about how we can design hate, that designs come to us, in some sense, as a blank slate and we embed them with this cultural and historical and social meaning…I hope that they never look at font faces the same again, that they have to kind of push and wonder why that was the way it is.”

In order to explore the critical and analytical frameworks, Ava says, “We use some pretty conventional tools but I try to push at the margins of them.” This comment seems to contradict her earlier comment about critical framing of technology. If you have to “push at the margins” of tools, they are not “nothing.” Instead, Ava’s pushing at the margins of software programs represents her resistance to the programs’ conventional uses, which are steeped in particular cultural frameworks. In her feminist analysis of technology, Billie J. Wahlstrom argues that multimedia technologies have implicit frames, built into them by their manufacturers/designers, that we can choose to simply accept or teach our students to recognize and reflect upon. Others have argued that

---

technological applications have implicit, often uncritically accepted, political perspectives built into them that encourage us to work in particular ways rather than others or, in other words, that frame our work in particular ways and not others (e.g., Howard; Selber; Selfe; Selfe and Selfe). The framework that is typically associated with software packages in classrooms, and which Ava is resisting, is a particular functional approach to computer literacy—simply teaching students how to use the tools in conventional and uncritical ways—which Selber critiques in *Multiliteracies for A Digital Age*, redefining a functional approach to computer literacy that understands technology as embedded in social and rhetorical contexts.

Selber’s tripartite digital literacy framework applies to Ava’s assignments. She employs an approach to digital media “tools” that suggests the type of functional approach Selber advocates: she frames the tools as a method of inquiry and argumentation rather than as an end in and of themselves as she teaches the students how to learn to use the tools to complete the assignments. Her analytical framework requires students to adopt a critical stance toward designs and the contexts in which they are created and consumed, which fulfils the requirements of the critical literacy component of Selber’s computer multiliteracies curriculum. In addition, she promotes rhetorical literacy by using critical and rhetorical concepts to frame not only the learning of functional skills but also critical thinking about the ways in which design and persuasion (and, by extension, writing in/for various media) work in real contexts. Furthermore, she has students produce assignments with digital media, creating their own designs, rather than just writing about digital media texts. She does not ask students to create new
interfaces, as Selber does with hypertext assignments in which students become re-
designers of media/reading/writing interfaces; however, the reflective writing that she
assigns encourages students to think about how the application and the medium influence
their design choices, thereby encouraging students to understand the applications
themselves as designed.

This rhetorical, rather than functional, approach to teaching in digitally mediated
environments—production of digital media texts, reflection, critical/analytical framing of
technological tools, and pushing the boundaries of traditional/mainstream software
packages—impacts the way the chair of the Integrated Literacies Department talks
about the role of technology in the department. He sees the department as very focused
on technology and encourages faculty to “use technology, writing technologies, and
involve students in digital media projects” at all levels and in all types of writing classes.
He also describes “vision documents that we’ve developed recently to really push the
emphasis in first-year writing to give the students much more experience with utilizing
digital media and constructing web pages and doing work in electronic space and
interacting with the instructor and the other students in all kinds of formats.” He stresses
the creative aspect of digital media production:

We want people to take the tools and to reshape them and to redesign them and to
bundle them and use them and also encourage the same thing in our students. You
know, that there’s real creativity, there’s real imagination, there’s real opportunity
here to use these for your own purposes, for your own needs, to your own vision,
and to experiment with them and to do creative, exciting things with them. And,
you know, you use them and maybe even make significant adaptations and
changes in them and you incorporate them into your own system of instruction
and your own idea of a research model and everything they want to do and
collaborating with other people on projects and so forth.
He stresses Selber’s rhetorical literacy—reshaping the tools/interfaces to better meet individual needs. It is not a surprise that Ava—an assistant professor in this department—does this.

When describing her uses of PowerPoint, for instance, Ava says, “I don’t use transitions or sounds, PowerPoint sounds, cause I think they’re cheesy. But I’ll embed my own sounds or create my own transitions. And because I know how to, I can do all my own designs. So I create all my own PowerPoint templates.” In addition, if a tool in the university’s course management program doesn’t work for her, she can use something else—“[our course management tool’s] chat interface sucks so bad. But, again, I have access to a couple of different MOOs, and I just create accounts and we go dork around in the MOO. So, I don’t have to use that interface.”—or change it—“I know enough about [our course management system] I can go in and tweak and revise areas so that it fits my needs. Obviously, not that many people can do that.” That she has the functional skill to do this only partially explains why she does it. It is also important that her department values this kind of work with technology, and the chair asserts that the department does. Her professional identity as a technology specialist also influences her reshaping of writing technologies to fit her needs; her field values this kind of technical expertise.

The Integrated Literacies Department chair also stresses the department’s emphasis on technology as a cultural phenomenon, rather than simply an application of a skill set:

The other element in this program is, in terms of technology, is that it is not, in no way is it a skills course, technology is not skills. It involves skill, and it’s used by
skillful people and by skilled people, but our emphasis is always on studying it as part of culture and its impact on culture and in fact the way the technology itself is determined by the culture and mediated by the culture and maybe even in some cases trying to be controlled by the culture or directed in some way.

Here, he stresses Selber’s critical literacy. The role of digital media in the department is, in part, to be studied by faculty and graduate students as a cultural artifact. In addition, faculty and graduate students should encourage the students in their classes to think about technology as a cultural artifact, the ways it designs their communication/reading/writing experiences, and how different tools/audiences/media design those experiences differently.

Alan’s uses of digital media for teaching correspond to this philosophy. He says, “Most of the goals that I have include the production of texts—and I’m using ‘texts’ very broadly here—of compositions, and the technologies required in order to do the production.” To achieve these goals, he says it is important to “structure the assignment such that the technology is an integral part of it…you can’t say, ‘make a digital video’ without learning some digital video technology. You can’t say, ‘make a web site’ without, I mean, you could. You could tell your students to just go make a web site. But I think that’s ineffective and possibly unethical.” Consequently, combining teaching of the technology with teaching of rhetorical skills necessary to create effective texts is key to him because “when you address the technology directly, you can also get students to see technology as a process. You can get them to see it, not just as a tool, but as particular frameworks for what they do.” Getting students to see technology in this way requires teaching them critical computer literacy—studying technology as a cultural artifact, designed by people, that frames their composing.
The Integrated Literacies Department’s official position on technology use in writing classes is that it is more than merely a-contextually teaching skills, i.e., how to use a particular software program. Instead, it is a method of critical inquiry, allowing students, through production with the tools, to explore the relationships between texts of all kinds, the cultures that produce them, the technologies used to create them, and the technologies that mediate them. Because it is a means of inquiry, as well as a tool (Selber 35) and an artifact (86), it is easily diffused, or integrated, into all areas of instruction. Ava’s font face assignment, described previously, is an example of this vision in practice.

The department chair plays an important role in defining the disciplinary sea in which the faculty and graduate students must swim. He defines digital media as part of the environment in such a way that functional, critical, and rhetorical approaches to digital literacy are integrated. His approach stresses functional knowledge in that technology “involves skill, and it’s used by skillful people,” but he also emphasizes the critical—technology is “determined by the culture and mediated by the culture”—and rhetorical—faculty and students as designers, reshaping the tools made available to them. Moreover, there is not a separation between digital media activities and other activities. In other words, digital media is integrated; it is like salt in the sea rather than a ship on the sea.

However, department members’ uses of digital media for teaching and research shape, as much as they are shaped by, the department’s position on the role of digital media in teaching and research. Alan, an active member of the computers and writing community before becoming a student in the Integrated Literacies Department, chose the
department, in part, because of its commitment to digital media. Yet, the work he does while a graduate student in the department also furthers their investment in digital media by bringing them notice for their commitment to digital media. Similarly, Ava’s work and the graduate director’s work with digital media (both their research projects that are published and their teaching of graduate students) also advance the department’s investment in digital media as much as the department’s philosophy about digital media influences their teaching and research.

Another crucial part of the department’s philosophy is that digital media are seen as part and parcel of the academic enterprise of the department rather than as an add-on or something outside the purview of most members of the department or something only a few scholars really need to think about. According to the graduate director, “You just have to do it. It may not be your research focus, and it may not be your principal identity, but there’s sort of a certain level of competency and skill and ability that you have to have. And that includes teaching in computer-based environments.” So though digital media may not be specifically tied up in the individual professional identities of each of the members of the department, it is part of the professional identity of the department as a whole.

Although Ava and others in the department participate in scholarly communities that focus their research and teaching agendas on technology—Computers and Writing being the primary community—and could (and, indeed, should) therefore be seen as (functional) specialists in digital media, they define their scholarly work in ways that resist traditionally functional or technical emphases, stressing instead the ways in which
Digital media force us to rethink traditional categories: rhetoric, literacy, pedagogy, various theoretical approaches to texts, the nature of text itself. Indeed, the graduate director stresses to me that he sees rhetoric as simply becoming digital rhetoric:

Not as it being a concentration in the field but just the way the field operates. I see the merger as being fairly sort of a saturated merger so eventually the new curriculum will simply come into the old. So...when we do our methodology course, it will just be methodology of computer-based writing as a course; that’s what writing is. Or, if we do a composition pedagogy course, it will be just teaching in computer classrooms because of course you teach writing in computer classrooms. So I see that merger as sort of happening, as being where the field has to go. Not as sort of an add-on or a special topic or a specialization in the field.

The department chair reinforces the graduate director’s comments when he explains that digital media is becoming an integral part of the curriculum: “Almost all of the courses are built around various aspects of that...And we’re also, part of our new thrust for undergraduate writing is to move to a much greater degree in terms of making writing technology or writing with technologies as part of the undergraduate instruction.” Digital media are thus beginning to saturate the department at all levels—theoretically, programmatically, curricularly; in other words, digital media are becoming integrated into the fabric of academic professionalism for Ava, Alan, and Adele in the Integrated Literacies department.

*Digital Production as Means to a Rhetorical End*

Cosmo is one of the instructors in the Parallel Literacies Department involving students in creating or producing digital media texts; however, his assignments and the media he uses are somewhat different than Ava’s. Specifically, he asks students to create short Flash movies attempting to persuade an audience to support some kind of social
change. These production projects, he says, give him “a great way to teach rhetorical analysis.” He has assigned production projects—from collaborative web sites to Flash movies—in both a required composition class and a business communication class. He always includes reflective writing as part of production assignments: “Whenever I’ve done a production project, I’ve always had a strong reflective component, where students actually had to write about all their rhetorical choices, analyze their rhetorical situation.” This reflective component allows Cosmo to teach rhetorical analysis by bringing a critical component to the production projects. Students do not just learn how to make Flash movies. They also learn how to craft a persuasive message that displays their understanding of rhetorical concepts. And the reflective essay also provides an opportunity for them to think about how the medium of composition influences and constrains their creativity, how a different medium might influence them in different ways, and who might be the “ideal user” of the medium. Although they don’t design a new tool or new interface, as Selber’s students do, but rather a persuasive message, the written component of the project gives them a chance to reflect on their rhetorical choices, those that are dependent upon the medium and those that are not.

The production mode thus parallels Selber’s rhetorical digital literacy in its focus on production in the undergraduate classroom, describing the ways that students are able to author “texts that in some measure defy the established purview of English departments” (139). Selber argues that “students who are rhetorically literate will recognize the persuasive dimensions of human-computer interfaces and the deliberative and reflective aspects of interface design, all of which is not a purely technical endeavor
but a form of social action” (140). In addition, Selber argues that rhetorical literacy mediates the dualism between functional and critical literacies “because rhetorical literacy insists upon praxis—the thoughtful integration of functional and critical abilities in the design and evaluation of computer interfaces” (145). Here is where Selber’s construction of rhetorical literacy and my construction of the production mode diverge, if only slightly. Rhetorical literacy depends upon blending functional and critical abilities through design, a process that the production mode recognizes and describes; however, rhetorical literacy limits production to the design and evaluation of computer interfaces, encouraging students to understand the rhetorical nature of computers and redesign computer/web interfaces based upon that rhetorical understanding of the ways in which a person in a particular context with particular needs will use a particular interface. The production mode does not limit the definition of rhetorical design in this fashion; it certainly includes the design of hypertextual interfaces, but it also includes the design of texts that, like traditional essays, require an understanding of rhetorical principles to effectively persuade an audience—such as Cosmo’s Flash movie assignment used to teach rhetorical analysis.

A second year PhD student in the Parallel Literacies Department, Cosmo is studying rhetoric and composition and focusing on the connections between marketing, design, and rhetoric. He is also a staff member in the Center for Digital Media Studies. He recently taught a second-year writing class on the role of marketing in American life,

9 The university requires all undergraduate students to complete two writing courses—a first-year writing class and a second-year writing class. The first-year writing
in which students read texts by marketers and texts critical of marketing. The class focused on “marketing in the broader sense as it affects all aspects of our culture” and asked students to think about “how we understand our subjectivities, looking at the broader material conditions underneath that.” He began the class with critical academic analysis, looking at digital texts, such as web sites and Flash movies like “The Meatrix,” an animated activist Flash movie available online that exposes factory beef- and pork-farming techniques, as examples and “talked about their persuasive effects and how they were connected to broader marketing campaigns.” Students then wrote about new media texts in traditional academic prose.

For their final projects, students created “digital marketing campaigns.” Cosmo required, however, that “it couldn’t be for a product. It had to be an idea, a concept, some kind of social change, the kind was up to them. And so they really got to put into place this notion of making change through persuasive multimodal texts.” For instance, one group of students made a movie “trying to advocate that people use alternative forms of energy or use energy-saving models.” The goal for the campaign assignment was two-fold, to persuade an audience and to “consider the material effects of what it is they were attempting to do.” The alternative energy movie attempted to persuade the audience using classical rhetorical appeals to logos—including statistics about “electricity, how it may
not be so good for you”—to pathos—“with continued voice-over about the problems of it…a very haunting classical music soundtrack and…images of pollution and destruction”—and an enthymeme: Cosmo says, “And then they turned to some happy family image in front of the wind-powered home, and then some information on more ways that people could be involved with alternative energy. And then they ended on an American flag and a patriotic appeal.”

Cosmo says that the students employed these rhetorical appeals consciously because of their focus on trying to persuade a particular audience, their class members:

And the students, and this is what made this group great, they were very conscious of the rhetorical manipulation of this. Like, they ended on the American flag, but they were ending on it partially because they really saw the rest of the class as their audience, people who probably didn’t really care much about this. And they were trying to, we talked a lot about enthymemes, and they were looking around for enthymemes to associate this with. And so when they ended with a normative vision of the family and a normative vision of the flag, they were conscious of this as a kind of rhetorical manipulation, which I thought was very powerful.

Additionally, the students’ movie showed an understanding of marketing as tied to broader material conditions. Cosmo says, “So in this case it wasn’t just sort of, there are some ways in which that [appealing to family values and patriotism] might be, kind of, reinforcing certain norms I wouldn’t necessarily want to reinforce, but that they really understood that as a core manipulation and used it in a pretty savvy way.”

The project thus seems to have met Cosmo’s goals. This group, in particular, demonstrates an understanding of persuasion through multimodal texts. In fact, Cosmo says that “They actually did have some elements that actually were black letters on a white page, except in a flash movie” and “This piece had four or five different [moments of transition] in it, and each moment had multiple ways of that transition happening. It
happened through image, it happened through voice, it happened through what it visually looked like.” In addition, the group demonstrates an understanding of classical rhetorical strategies of persuasion and employs them effectively, given their medium of composition and their audience. Finally, the group demonstrates an understanding of the broader material contexts in which persuasion and composition happen. They understood that in order to make their argument palatable, they had to connect it to normative images of family and nation. Further, they demonstrate, through conversations with Cosmo and reflective writing, an understanding of those images as constructions with particular material effects, which they used to their persuasive advantage.

As a scholar, Cosmo participates in the “Computers and Writing” community, and so he is familiar with much of the most recent scholarship on digital media production and composition. The way he incorporates digital media production and discussions of the materiality of texts is consistent with Wysocki’s argument that “new media needs to be informed by what writing teachers know, precisely because writing teachers focus specifically on texts and how situated people (learn how to) use them to make things happen” (5). He focuses specifically on the materiality of texts—the fact that they can persuade people to change their behavior—as well as on the particular material effects that the particular production students were planning would have on a particular audience, their classmates, who were situated in a particular context and a particular time. This materiality was a constant theme throughout Cosmo’s class, not only with this
assignment but also with the more traditional writing assignments in which students analyzed multimedia texts, like “The Meatrix,” for their persuasive effects and their connections to broader marketing campaigns.

The classroom in which Cosmo taught, the CDMS’s newest and most powerful lab, enabled a student-centered, studio pedagogy that allowed him to incorporate digital media production into his class in the way he did. The classroom has 16 student stations with G5 Macintosh computers and four iBooks available for use (when not used they were stored in a locked cabinet). The 16 workstations are set up in pairs, with five empty desks strategically placed around the perimeter and two circular tables near the center of the room. This set up works especially well for group projects because students have the option to work individually on machines, together on one machine, or individually or together without a machine. The class spent two days learning Photoshop and Flash and then spent five days of studio time working on projects. Most people chose to work in groups, he says, although a couple of people worked alone. During studio time, students were free to do what they felt was most pressing. He says, “One group would be writing the script, another group would be working with images, another group would be thinking about sound…I spent a lot of time running from group to group asking a lot of questions about their rhetorical intent, solving the technology crises as they happened.” Cosmo and his students blend functional and rhetorical digital literacies in this setting because working in the medium is so intertwined with rhetorical skill—as the students are thinking about sound or images or the script, they also have to think about how all the elements will work together rhetorically. In order to guide them, so does Cosmo.
The production mode describes the ways in which faculty and graduate students integrate production into their teaching and research. Using digital media in the production mode requires all three of Selber’s digital literacies. In order to teach students to make a Flash movie, Cosmo needs to understand Flash. He needs to analyze and compare Flash to other similar applications to make sure it is the best choice for his purposes and for his students. In order to teach his students to understand digital texts as embedded in larger social and political contexts, he needs to employ critical literacy to critique and question those texts and the technologies that produce and disseminate them. In order to teach his students to employ rhetorical concepts in their digital texts, he needs to understand not only rhetorical principles but also the affordances and constraints of the medium. He needs to be able to articulate how the medium can best produce those rhetorical principles in order to help students with their projects.

Cosmo says, “What I noticed was very different in this course is that the students all really wanted to see each other’s work.” Because of this engagement and their willingness to talk about each other’s texts and give constructive feedback, the next time he teaches he wants to start with the digital media project rather than end with it: “I think the students were so engaged in thinking about the rhetorical consequences of this digital work because they really saw it as a kind of text audiences they know really would read. I’d rather have them start with that. If it were a course where I had to teach print, I would actually want them to transfer their thinking from the digital text to print.” The trend across the departments, based on the numbers of people incorporating digital media in the three modes, seems to be to start with management, add in analysis later, and add
production later still. This does not indicate the order in which they assign projects, but it is not a surprising finding given the attitude of some that it is OK to analyze new media texts but not produce them.

Benjamin exemplifies this position: “And while I see multimedia presentations as texts, certainly, I'm not interested in my students producing them for a course; instead, I like to use them as texts for analysis.” Similarly, although Cosmo notes that there is a strong component of visual rhetoric built into the writing curricula in the Parallel Literacies Department, it typically involves “teaching students to critically analyze and read visual texts and other kinds of digital multimodal texts” yet “still asking them to write about them in very traditional, academic print ways” rather than asking them to author digital texts. Cosmo, though, sees a disconnect for students when they are asked to write academic prose about visual texts because “even though the texts we’re studying may be close to their lives, a lot of the academic print discourse conventions may not be.” But digital production, he says, helps students, for instance, “to understand the rhetoric of how digital texts are manipulated.” He adds, “you don’t tend to believe in the reality of the image after which time as you’ve selected a bunch of images, manipulated them, put them together, and combined them with music and text in other ways to make a persuasive point.” Consequently, he says, “I found once my students had engaged in that kind of production work, they were much more able to be critical of the rhetorical work of design.”

Although Cosmo and Benjamin are both composition teachers, they define their job as teachers very differently. For Benjamin, the core skill he is to teach is analytical
writing. Thus, he uses multimedia texts for analysis, but does not ask students to create them. And if students have trouble with academic print discourse conventions, then that is what they need to produce. For Cosmo, the core skill he is to teach is critical/rhetorical thinking; the products by which students express their critical/rhetorical analyses are less of a concern to him. Cosmo combines analysis and design, whereas Benjamin constructs them as opposed. Cosmo teaches critical thinking through design and makes rhetoric the centerpiece, whereas Benjamin constructs writing and design as opposed. Cosmo uses rhetoric as the bridge between multimodal composing and traditional writing, suggesting that he would have students transfer their thinking about digital media to writing to help them write better, whereas Benjamin sees traditional writing and multimedia as opposed.

It is important to note that Benjamin does not have a problem with digital media production in general, but he does not feel it is appropriate for a writing class:

I will say, however, that at the C&W conference in Indy (2003?), there was much debate about “giving up” the traditional essay in favor of multimedia presentations. Great—but I don’t think the place for that is necessarily in the composition (that is, writing) classroom (perhaps as a side project, perhaps as a project for which students then write an analysis, but not as a class focus)…Many students are already quite savvy with multimedia invention (Web, PowerPoint, etc.) whether we have them produce such projects for classes or not. Analytical writing is where they need the education.

Cosmo, on the other hand, views students’ experience with digital media differently. He says that while students have a great deal of experience reading new media texts, “often they don’t have experience with digital production in any great way.” Cosmo and Benjamin define production very differently. Benjamin conflates invention and production and opposes them both to analytical writing. Cosmo, on the other hand,
defines production as analytical in nature. He sees analytical writing and analytical digital media production as similar intellectual tasks, just as invention for a paper is similar to invention for a digital media project.

Besides comfort and experience with some digital media tools, Cosmo suggests another reason that some students engage with digital media production more than they might with traditional writing assignments:

Even though they may never actually make an activist Flash movie, I can show them a bunch of these movies on the ‘net, some of which they’ve already seen and circulated among themselves, and they can imagine themselves as the kind of citizen who might get enraged about something and might post a flash movie on the ‘net, much more-so than they can imagine themselves as the kind of citizen that would write a letter to the editor. And I’m not going to say that’s good or bad. As far as I’m concerned, that is. And my philosophy as a teacher has always been, you gotta start where the students are and build from that. And where my students are, by and large, is digital.

Cosmo, a rhetorician/compositionist, defines two of the central concerns of his field as rhetorical theory and civic participation; these are the skills and values he tries to teach his students with the digital marketing campaign assignment. His department values print literacy but creates a space for digital media production and experimental pedagogy, allowing him to experiment with digital media in his pedagogy. Both of these decisions require re-imagining what it means to teach writing and answering the question “what business are we in?” differently than it might have been answered in the past.

Though it certainly pushes the envelope of definitions of writing, Cosmo’s class provides an example of using creative digital media production in a required writing class to teach rhetorical principles and analytical thinking. However, though his students certainly engage in writing in the traditional sense, digital media production also replaces traditional writing to a certain extent. In Cosmo’s class, for instance, the students do one
analytical paper and one digital project, whereas in a more traditional class they might do three formal papers in a 10-week term. It is this replacement that worries those who stand at the other end of the writing/multimedia spectrum, such as Benjamin. He says, “If we (and I mean compositionists, teachers of writing) start doing too much multimedia production in our praxis, then who is going to teach writing? Writing, I’d argue vehemently, is still a useful skill to have and process to explore. Unless, of course, the technology gets to the point that we must redefine (as opposed to complicate or extend) what a writing project is.” He adds, “I am a strong believer in the analytical essay—a printed text composed of words. If a student wants to put images/figures into a paper, so be it, but I still teach writing.” For him, placing images or figures into a paper might accomplish that complicating or extending move: to include other means of expression in a paper complicates what a paper is, thereby complicating what writing is. However, elevating those other means of expression above words (creating a Flash movie, for instance, that uses words marginally—printed words not at all—and makes its main argument through audio and video) redefines writing and goes too far.

Walking the middle-ground position on writing and multimedia that Benjamin hints at, Toby envisions “the day where something like Microsoft Publisher takes over for Microsoft Word” because writing pedagogies are trying to respond to the visual and digital culture in which students now grow up. He continues:

I think it’s only a matter of time, and not a whole lot of time either, before a program with word processing abilities but with an explicit design component will become the gold standard for what the students write their papers in. It may not be Illustrator, but it might be Publisher, where it’s just built into it. You try to explain to students how to do a text box in Word and…Word was not meant to be
that kind of desktop publisher. And a lot of the same features are there that Publisher has, but in Publisher they’re a lot more direct, a lot more accessible.

This type of writing technology would support multimodal composing and different kinds of writing tasks. So it does complicate what a writing project is by allowing for multiple means of expression, not just words. Yet, it still assumes a printed product; Toby even says it will be the “gold standard for what the students write their papers in” [my emphasis]. So it doesn’t completely redefine writing to allow for multiple means of expression and multiple means of delivery, though it does incorporate a design element.

Toby, Benjamin, and Cosmo all come from the same field, and thus have certain disciplinary assumptions in common. One of these assumptions is that rhetorical skill and critical/analytical thinking are important skills to teach students. They differ on one crucial point: the form and media in which students must be able to demonstrate those rhetorical and critical/analytical thinking skills. As a field, rhetoric and composition is similarly conflicted, and it comes then to departments to provide guidance.

In Cosmo’s department, the focus is on creating a place for the digital alongside the traditional, or peaceful coexistence, and the CDMS provides a place for experimentation with digital media. Whereas the Integrated Literacies Department is saturated, positioning themselves to redefine writing and rhetoric, the Parallel Literacies Department is niche saturated—those who choose to integrate digital media into teaching and research are supported; those who choose not to don’t have to. The support is centralized in the Center for Digital Media Studies, and according to the CDMS’s director, “the current administration is funneling a great deal of funding to this program, as a way of making sure that there’s a resource center with high end equipment for
everybody involved.” The CDMS receives this funding because “currently our administration has a philosophy that they would like to centrally locate higher end technology rather than spread mediocre level technology widely.”

This funding strategy supports a niche of users, including Cosmo, who value multimodal composition and experimental pedagogies. Cosmo, for instance, is able to experiment with digital media production in his classes because of the CDMS: the CDMS supports the lab in which he teaches, offers professional development workshops on digital media and pedagogy, provides access to other material resources like video cameras and audio equipment, and fosters informal conversations among graduate students and faculty about their teaching strategies. Whereas Adele, a PhD student in the Integrated Literacies Department, has been enculturated by her department and graduate seminars to value new media pedagogy but has not had the opportunity to put those ideas into practice because there is only one lab in the department, Cosmo has the space to experiment with his pedagogy but has had to develop his philosophies about new media in informal conversations in the CDMS and by actively seeking out such scholarly conversations at conferences and online. He thus feels comfortable re-defining not only what it means to be a writing teacher but also what it means to write.

Just as his involvement with the CDMS has influenced Cosmo’s pedagogical applications of digital media, it has also introduced him to the field of computers and writing. Furthermore, though the CDMS certainly shapes his uses of digital media, as a staff member there, he also shapes the CDMS’s philosophy. And the CDMS’s philosophy, by extension, shapes the department’s philosophy on digital media. The
department chair names the CDMS as an important center for the department’s relationship to digital media. Consequently, she looks to the CDMS to set technology goals for the department and shape the technology agenda for the department.

The Print Literacy Department is also a traditional department. Like the Parallel Literacies Department, its position on digital media also privileges the printed word but welcomes other media to a certain extent—primarily the management and analysis modes. However, unlike the Parallel Literacies Department, the Print Literacy Department has few resources for digital experimentation. At least partially because of this lack of resources, digital media plays an “ancillary role to pedagogy,” according to Toby. He says that currently in the department digital media is “understood to be of importance” and “instructors in areas well beyond rhetoric and composition are making use of, at the very least, DVD presentations and web sites to some extent.” He foresees that “soon it will be understood to be formative” and “as its own productive site of inquiry” though it isn’t understood that way right now.

Benjamin, a rhetorician/compositionist, defines his field’s central concern as teaching traditional academic (analytical) writing; these are the skills and values he tries to teach his students. His department values print literacy, and print literacy practices shape his uses of digital media, particularly his embracing of the management and analysis modes and his skepticism of the production mode. Toby, a rhetorician/compositionist in the same department, appears to define his field’s central concern as rhetorical skill and traditional academic writing; he also is concerned with helping to shape his field’s relationship to technology, though he is not as active in that
area of scholarship as Ava, Alan, or Cosmo. He won a grant to help support the teaching of a new visual literacy class, and he is scheduled to teach document design in a networked environment, both perks of being a faculty member. Because of his rank, he has more access than Benjamin to resources, and consequently more opportunities to incorporate production into his classes. While the document design class will involve production, his writing classes do not.

At this point in time, the department’s traditional philosophies, coupled with Benjamin and Toby’s more traditional disciplinary identifications, seem to shape their uses of digital media more than their uses shape department philosophy about digital media. The department values digital media in the management mode, above all, and accepts digital media in the analysis mode. However, when it comes to production, analytical writing is privileged above all. Neither Benjamin nor Toby push that envelope, though Toby hints that he might in the future, perhaps after tenure or after production becomes more widespread and accepted across the board.

Because each department takes a different stance on the role of digital media in the discipline, Benjamin and Cosmo have different options available to them regarding how they identify as teachers and what they see as the central goal of their teaching. Whereas most of the classes offered in the Integrated Literacies department’s networked classroom focus on writing or rhetoric, the CDMS director says that in their five labs, “I think there’s huge diversity in what we teach. We have somebody who teaches I believe 18th century, or Renaissance would be a better description of his field, I guess. We have two of us in Composition, we have somebody in business writing.” Even though the
department maintains five networked classrooms, offering 40 sections of computer-enhanced classes per quarter, there is only a small niche of individuals that regularly teach in the labs and consistently incorporate digital media into their classes. He also stresses the experimental bent of the people who teach regularly in the classrooms: “I think we’re all experimental. And what I mean by that is…when we go into a class, we’re not completely locked in to a rigid curriculum, that we have an idea of what that class is going to do but we pay attention to the possibilities of the technology and the opportunities that the technology affords us.” Cosmo’s uses of digital media are certainly consistent with this experimental philosophy. He pushes the envelope of definitions of writing with his digital marketing campaign assignment, experimenting with the texts he asks students to produce; and he speculates about doing it differently the next time he teaches, which he thinks will take better advantage of the possibilities the assignment affords.

Roxie, a 19th century Americanist in the same department as Cosmo, understands her field of study as valuing the study of printed, alphabetic texts. She positions herself squarely in her field, yet says she sees her research and teaching interests as cutting-edge within that field. Yet, she says that technology makes her “feel very traditional and very old fogey” because “it reveals to me how old fashioned some of my beliefs really are, and that makes me uncomfortable. I’m not accustomed to thinking of myself as an old fashioned person. I always think I’m sort of radical and on the cutting edge, but technology makes it very clear to me, ‘no, you’re not that radical.’” Because she works in the CDMS, Roxie’s experience exemplifies the clashing of the two communities in the
Parallel Literacies Department—the traditional majority that values print literacy and the experimental minority that values digital media production. She is trying to come to terms with occupying that space, as she confronts her own disciplinary identity in the face of digital media.

Benjamin and Cosmo are also in a process of negotiation, but their struggle is slightly different than Roxie’s. They make disciplinary arguments that are influenced by their disciplinary identities. Benjamin argues on the side of tradition in his field, and Cosmo argues on the side of experimentation and radical change of definitions of writing. Their arguments about what the discipline should be and should value play out in the ways they use digital media in their teaching. The same can be said of other participants in the study, particularly Ava and Alan. Furthermore, the extent to which multimedia composing is incorporated into teaching depends, in part, on departmental culture and disciplinary identifications.

Likewise, the extent to which multimedia composing is incorporated into scholarship depends upon departmental culture and disciplinary identifications. Most in the study frame the question of production as a teaching issue, focusing on the forms and media of student “writing.” Yet, digital media also raise this issue as it relates to scholarly production, calling into question traditional media of expression and dissemination and challenging traditional goals and purposes of scholarly publication. Although constructions of disciplinary identity and local resources certainly influence individuals’ attitudes toward new media, forms, and venues for scholarly production, the way the tenure system is structured, both within local institutional contexts and at the
disciplinary level, plays an even bigger role in determining whether, when, and how individuals incorporate digital media into scholarly production. That issue will be explored in chapter four.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined disciplinary contexts that influence digital media use in three departments and has found that digital media is alternately constructed by the participants in this study as fabulous and dangerous, representing a struggle to navigate the tensions of the late age of print within their local departmental contexts. Participants’ understandings of their disciplines shape their choices regarding digital media, and departmental stances toward the role of digital media in the discipline shape the available range of choices. As they incorporate digital media into their professional activities, participants face tensions and questions about digital media’s ability to enable and hinder methods and processes central to teaching and research, provide new or alternative objects of study for themselves and their students, and transform the central goals of teaching and central research questions of the discipline. These tensions map onto three different modes of using digital media: management, analysis, and production. Individuals’ disciplinary identities play an important role in the decision-making process as they navigate these tensions and decide how to use digital media, particularly as methods of teaching and research are changing and the definition of writing is being questioned and challenged.
That’s a good question, and it’s framed by the fact that this is such a weird department... We teach hundreds of sections of first-year writing. We never talk about teaching. Never... So there are pockets of us who are hungry to talk about methods and approaches, and things are changing so dramatically now with grad students... and so we’re having more conversations about teaching, but not as much as I would like, and not as much on what you asked about, the teaching with technology or teaching about technology. [Ava, Integrated Literacies Department]

Unless they’ve been specifically trained or if they’ve had lots of experience, most people don’t know how to operate in a computer classroom. And so they tend to be very lecture-discussion-seminar based in their pedagogy. They’re not really sure what to do in a computer classroom... They’re inching into using technology, but in the end technology hasn’t really forced them to change the way they operate in the class. It’s being used just as a supplement to what they already do. And I think to their credit, if they’ve gotten a course web site through WebCT or one that they’ve designed on their own, that really does mirror how they operate in the classroom, that kind of very presentational kind of mode. And, to their credit, when I see people who are using those kinds of discussion boards, it shows that they’re also very interested in bringing what they know about class discussion to the technology and trying to figure out how it can be used in those ways. And so I don’t want to paint a gloom and despair picture of it, but I think it tends to mirror the way they operate in the classroom already. [CDMS Director, Parallel Literacies Department]
The quotations that open this chapter highlight an important aspect of digital media usage in departments: the culture that supports teachers’ professional pedagogical development. Ava indicates that informal “talk” about teaching methods would help her develop as a teacher, especially a teacher who incorporates digital media into the classroom. Likewise, the CDMS Director’s comment that people don’t know how to integrate digital media and thus use it primarily in the management mode because it mirrors closely their traditional pedagogies suggests that departments need to provide some kind of learning opportunities for teachers in order to encourage and support their development of digital media pedagogies. Though neither specifically mentions research, it follows that departments also need to provide professional development opportunities in order for individuals to learn how to integrate digital media into their research/scholarship.

The last chapter examined the influence participants’ disciplinary identifications have on their navigation of disciplinary tensions as they use digital media for teaching and research in their local contexts. It illustrated broad disciplinary tensions about digital media and its ability to enable and hinder central methods and processes of teaching and research, provide new or alternative objects of study, and transform the central goals of teaching and central research questions of the discipline. It also outlined an analytic useful for discussing the ways that digital media can be used: the modes of management, analysis, and production. This chapter will examine the influence departmental stances toward digital media have on the opportunities that are provided for individuals to learn
about incorporating digital media into their teaching and their research, paying particular attention to the influence these stances have on individuals’ choices to work in particular modes and not others.

**Three Cultures of Support for Digital Media Teaching and Scholarship**

Key administrators in each department articulate a departmental stance toward the role of digital media in the department’s curriculum that is separate from (though related to) its stance toward the role of digital media in the discipline. Each department has a different historical relationship to digital media defined by faculty research and teaching interests, institutional missions, and departmental funding priorities, and the stances grow out of these histories. Consequently, these stances emphasize different methods of providing learning opportunities surrounding digital media and different levels of integration of digital media with departmental curricula, which in turn influence graduate students’ integration of digital media into their professional identities.

*The Print Literacy Department*

As argued in the last chapter, the chair of the Print Literacy Department identifies a disciplinary home for technology that is extremely limited and links technology to technical disciplines, indicating that the divorce of technology and English has a long history at this university and in this department. Consequently, new technologies and digital environments for writing and learning are not integrated into the department, and most people who use digital media do so in the management and analysis modes. Few
have digital media as a primary scholarly interest. The department’s stance toward
supporting digital media teaching and scholarship in the department runs parallel to its
stance toward the role of digital media in the discipline.

There is no departmental mechanism for providing individuals opportunities to
learn about and explore pedagogical and research applications of digital media. Benjamin
says, “There is nothing that I know of that is English department sponsored that is
specifically geared to teaching instructors to use technology in the classroom.” Although
the university offers technical training and 24-hour technical support, there is no
structured pedagogical training to teach graduate students or faculty how to effectively
integrate technology into their courses or their research. The department thus relies upon
the university to provide interested individuals with learning opportunities, and those
learning opportunities are purely technical, not pedagogically or methodologically
oriented (i.e., they offer “how to make a web site” rather than “how and why to integrate
web building into writing classes”).

This dependence on the university makes sense given the department’s stance
toward digital media in the discipline: digital media studies is a small, non-traditional
pocket within Rhetoric and Composition, not a force affecting the texts and/or research
methods of the discipline at large. Furthermore, the acceptance of technical training
instead of pedagogically focused training reinforces the widespread use of digital media
in the management mode and the department’s overall position that new technologies and
digital environments for writing and learning are primarily tools for the management of professional activities that do not necessarily change, fundamentally, the tasks being performed or the central questions or methods of the discipline.

“Support” in the department is defined primarily as technical support and physical access to equipment. Toby, for instance, calls the university “tech-friendly” and notes, “there’s as much support there as I could want, really. Certainly, the university makes it very easy. I feel like no matter what tech question I have, there’s someplace on campus where there are people that are at the phone to answer that, or at email.” He defines support as a help-desk, technical matter that is the university’s job; he does not include opportunities for learning about integrating digital media into pedagogy and/or research. Along similar lines, the department chair defines support as primarily the job of entities outside of the department. He lists, for instance, “a variety of sources on campus,” as well as “a variety of [university] classrooms that are fully usable and fully wired.” These classrooms are “fully wired” for the instructor only. There is a podium with a variety of equipment including a computer with Internet access and VHS and DVD players connected to a projector. However, networked classrooms in which students are able to engage in production work do not exist, although the department has purchased a “portable wireless laboratory, in which twenty to twenty-five or thirty laptops will be on a cart that we can provide to students.”

Within the department, the chair says that “graduate students have an area called the workroom, “which has a half a dozen computers in it so they can do their email and those sorts of things” and “we do have a departmental web designer that, if you want to
put something up, you can put it up on the web.” Though he does recognize and comment on the importance of proper facilities (both spaces and equipment) for supporting digital media teaching and research, his comments indicate that those aspects of support need to be shared by the department and university, with most of the burden shouldered by the university. Furthermore, he stresses support for the management mode above other modes—“email and those sorts of things”—for which a half a dozen computers is considered sufficient to serve more than 100 PhD students. Pedagogical support—workshops to help faculty and graduate students bring digital media into the classroom, for instance—are not a part of his definition of support. There is no sustainable community of support for those who choose to teach with and/or do research about digital media, though there is a culture of individualized (self-selected) mentoring.

Benjamin says that there is a teacher-training seminar and, within it, there are consultants (more advanced graduate students), “many of [whom] are interested in technology and would be available to help people integrate it.” However, he notes that “it’s on an individual basis, so there’s no real structure in place.” Only 19.5% of PhD students in the department responding to the survey indicated that they spent zero hours in the past 12 months informally talking with others about integrating digital media/technology into their teaching. Nearly half, 48.8% responded that they spend 1-5 hours talking informally with others on this topic (see Figure 3.1). The survey did not ask to whom they spent this time talking, but given Benjamin’s comments, it is likely that they are talking to each other, even if only a small amount.
Figure 3.1: Time PhD students in the Print Literacy Department reported spending over the previous 12 months talking informally about integrating digital media/technology into their teaching.

Benjamin notes that “in terms of the department, it’s difficult, in terms of using technology in the classroom, there’s no real support, but there’s not a lack of support either. It’s a tool that we can use.” Digital media (all technologies, in fact) are nothing more than tools used for purely instrumental purposes. There is little encouragement to think of work in/with digital media as valuable processes (similar to writing) that might serve to transform pedagogy, methodology, disciplinarity, or professional identity. In this department, the culture is marked by a definition of “support” as mainly technical and handled by the university (or other outside entities). A by-product of this approach is that issues involving digital media that might be thought of in another department as
pedagogical or methodological questions that could generate new knowledge and practices are treated as technical problems to be solved by university technical support.

*The Integrated Literacies Department*

The Integrated Literacies Department provides opportunities for individuals to learn about integrating digital media into academic work, and the department attempts to integrate these opportunities throughout the graduate program. In addition, the department provides some basic technical support. According to the department chair, the department has a technical coordinator, a tenured faculty member with a course release, who, in addition to teaching and doing research in his field, is “the first line of the department’s emphasis on the importance of technology and responding to problems that faculty are having with their technology or upgrading their systems.” Although in some cases faculty members still must rely upon the college to provide technical support, the fact that the department invests in a faculty technology coordinator indicates a programmatic commitment to department-provided support for digital media teaching and research. The investment in a faculty technology coordinator whose tenure home is in the department, rather than a technology coordinator who is a technical specialist rather than a teacher and scholar, also indicates an awareness of the role that disciplinary knowledge plays in providing support in academic environments. Adele has first-hand experience of the importance of such disciplinary knowledge to her own digital media work. She says, “Going to another department where people aren’t necessarily familiar with what we do in Rhetoric and Composition can be tough. I had that situation at
[another University], ‘cause they don’t understand what we want on our web pages, why we would want something structured a certain way, that kind of thing.” Further evidence of the department’s commitment to sustained programmatic support for digital media work includes (1) an invited speaker series, which provides opportunities to explore the potentials of teaching and research with digital media, and (2) a series of workshops on topics such as the university’s online grading system, Photoshop, and teaching writing with technology, which provides opportunities to learn technical skills as well as pedagogical strategies.

Such a commitment to digital media comes out of the history and context of the programs associated with this department, particularly the graduate program. At the time of my interviews, the interdisciplinary graduate program was brand new, ending its first year of graduate course offerings. There were five students enrolled in the doctoral program, and most of the participating faculty were from the Integrated Literacies Department. From the beginning, conversations of the graduate program included digital media, combining it with the fields of rhetoric and writing, with the intent of re-shaping those fields, particularly research and teaching in those fields, with the integration of digital media. Consequently, digital media is at the heart of the graduate program.

On the topic of graduate students’ using digital media, the graduate director of the Integrated Literacies Departments says, “They have to do it. That’s the message that I’m preaching. Digital media is not an option,” he chuckles. “You just have to do it. It may not be your research focus, and it may not be your principal identity, but there’s sort of a certain level of competency and skill and ability that you have to have. And that includes
teaching in computer-based environments.” The graduate director focuses on the importance of the management mode and basic digital literacy: everybody has to reach a certain competency level, technically. However, he also stresses that digital media pedagogy is important. Even if graduate students do not produce digital media research, they all still have to have basic digital literacy and learn how to teach in a digital environment. Digital media is the business of the program and curricula are being set up to sustain and support that. Consequently, as part of the degree requirements, the curriculum for graduate students provides opportunities to learn about teaching and doing research with digital media and to put that learning into practice.

The Parallel Literacies Department

In the Parallel Literacies Department, opportunities for exploring digital media exist primarily through the Center for Digital Media Studies (CDMS), which provides learning opportunities—such as professional development workshops and one-on-one consultations—to those that seek them out. In this department, digital media work is another thing individuals are able to do and sometimes encouraged to do, but rarely (if ever) required to do. According to the director of the CDMS, “There’s a real commitment among the current administration to make sure that there are different types of technologies available to faculty and graduate students.” In addition to making sure that faculty and graduate students have access to computers in their offices, the current administration, he says, “has a philosophy that they would like to centrally locate higher end technology rather than spread mediocre level technology widely. So, we have what’s
called the [Center for Digital Media Studies], which is a teaching and research resource center in the department, and the current administration is funneling a great deal of funding to this program, as a way of making sure that there’s a resource center with high end equipment for everybody involved.” In addition, the CDMS has relationships with two university-level offices that provide technical support for the CDMS’s networked classrooms and faculty and staff office computers. The funding of the CDMS indicates a departmental commitment to providing both faculty and graduate students opportunities to learn about digital media work and integrate it into their professional activities.

That departmental commitment has, in fact, been increasing. According to the department chair, “I would like to think that it has been playing an increasingly greater role in the department, and of course one of the symbols of that shift is the change of the name from [a name involving the word “computers”] to [a name involving the phrase “digital media”].” She claims that this name shift is “very important” because it signifies the department’s desire to take the study of digital media to “a more complex level.” It is also an important shift because it recognizes digital media pedagogy and research as a field of study and places it on par with other fields of study in the department. So the shift was partially disciplinary, recognizing the changing shape of English studies. However, the shift was partially motivated by university forces, too. According to the CDMS Director, “digital media obviously has buzzword status right now, and it also has become one of the key initiatives at the university, to improve education through technology and through technological literacy. And so the fact that it’s happening in the English
department is a way of keeping us competitive.” The department, however, has not simply jumped on the technology bandwagon. It has been invested in exploring the relationship of technology and English studies for two decades.

According to historical program documents, the “Center for Digital Media Studies”10 (which has changed its name twice since its inception) “began in 1986 when Apple Computer’s Higher Education Donation Program sought innovative proposals involving the use of computers in university settings.” The Parallel Literacies Department “applied for and received a grant to equip three classroom labs to be used for teaching first-year writing.” In the two decades that followed, the program received multiple grants from different university and outside sources that allowed them to add two new labs and repeatedly upgrade the labs. Gradually, classes other than first-year writing were added to the schedule, although writing classes still form the backbone of courses that are offered in the five networked classrooms maintained by the CDMS. According to the CDMS Director, the CDMS offers “40 sections of computer supported writing, literature, folklore, whatever the subject matter is, each quarter” that “are full at 20 students,” so they serve “approximately 800 students per quarter in these classrooms.” Most of these courses are taught by graduate students, so “for the most part, if graduate students choose to teach them, they get to teach them, and they’re rarely booted out of there.” Faculty actually have a more difficult time getting scheduled to teach in the networked classrooms because most of the courses that faculty teach are capped at 40, so it becomes a budgetary issue, and faculty have to get special permission to lower the enrollment cap.

10 This is a pseudonym for the center’s current actual name.
However, the CDMS Director says that the administration is “more than supportive of that, and if faculty members make that request, they seriously consider the request in terms of its pedagogical value, in terms of its PR value for the department, and also in terms of its budgetary weight…and make the decision based on that.” Consequently, because the CDMS was originally funded as a teaching lab and a place for experimental pedagogy, it has developed a strong mission for pedagogical professional development, particularly for graduate students, though faculty have also been involved and invited to participate.

Since its inception, the CDMS has placed a high value on pedagogical experimentation with digital media and classroom-based research investigating those pedagogical experimentations, beginning in 1986 with word processing and continuing today with digital media production in programs like Flash and iMovie, among many others. The CDMS Director notes that he thinks everybody involved with the CDMS is experimental because “we’re not completely locked in to a rigid curriculum” and “we have an idea of what that class is going to do but we pay attention to the possibilities of the technology and the opportunities that the technology affords us.” Furthermore, he says, “I think we all pay attention to our students so that when we have something going on in class and a student says, ‘well, look at how you could do it with this technology,’ we pay attention to that and we’re willing to experiment a little bit with that.” This experimental attitude is fostered by the CDMS Director and his view of the CDMS as “as much a teaching lab as anything else.” The model of teaching in the CDMS, however, is not a training model but rather a model of community sharing and mentoring.
Such community-building begins by educating incoming graduate students about the CDMS and its services. Although the CDMS Director has worked with the first-year writing program to provide some training for graduate students in the pre-quarter pedagogy workshop, that training is becoming increasingly less formal. Under previous directors, the CDMS’s training tended to be very formal. There were rules about who could request a networked class, as well as a formal orientation, in which people learned to use specific software packages and talked about networked classroom pedagogy. However, the current CDMS Director says that the year he came on board, they decided to incorporate that training throughout the first-year writing program’s new GTA pedagogy course, but it failed because it was not well integrated and they were teaching software rather than pedagogy. He describes the new approach that has developed in response to the feedback from GTAs, which is still a part of the new GTA training course but is focused less on formal skills training:

This last year, then, what we’ve tried to do is keep the integration much more pedagogically focused and much more theoretically focused. We didn’t teach many software applications at all in that workshop. What we’ve done is then provided that support for anyone to come down to the [CDMS] who would like to teach a [networked] class. And I think that we’ve had two or three people who wanted to teach a [networked] class right away. And most people will want to get comfortable with the curriculum first and then they’ll ask if they can teach a [networked] class.

Rather than formalizing training, the CDMS is trying to cultivate a community of teachers who mentor each other in more informal ways. The Director says:

I try to give as many spiels as I can. New graduate student orientation, I attend those kinds of things. I try to get more new graduate students involved in becoming part of the staff in the [CDMS]. And I think that we were pretty successful this year. We have five staff members. I would say of those five, two are really pretty technically oriented, and the other three were a little surprised that I hired them. I knew that they didn’t have a lot of technology background, but
they do now, just in working here. And I think that they will become great advocates in talking to the other graduate students about the potentials for technology.

Instead of putting together a list of people who are “trained” to teach in a networked class because they attended a certain number of workshops, the CDMS Director instead spends some time talking with the new GTAs about the networked classrooms and about networked classroom pedagogy and invites them down to the CDMS to learn more, to talk to him and the staff, to learn specific applications they are interested in, and to experiment. The CDMS staff provides continuity and a support structure for this type of community—including informal “brown bag” discussions, more formal workshops, individual consultations, and peer mentoring—as well as some technical support.

That community culture is also being promoted by the department chair, who makes a point of using digital media when she gives presentations. She says, “I think that doing these public presentations have helped more of our faculty get on board because one of the things that I’ve done, whenever we’ve done a big public presentation, I’ve taken that same presentation and shown it at a faculty meeting, so that the faculty can see that, well, we all are making use of technology.” The fact that she has to stress to the faculty that “we all” use technology indicates the fact that not all in the department use technology or value its use in pedagogy or as a research subject, reinforcing its “niche” status, but nonetheless illustrates her commitment to the development of a strong foothold for digital media studies in the department.¹¹

¹¹ In fact, since my interviews were conducted, the Parallel Literacies Department has hired four faculty members with research interests in digital media studies, three as Assistant Professors and one as Professor. These hires will no doubt change the extent of
These profiles of the departments, demonstrating their stances toward digital media, indicate that these three departments:

- locate responsibility for digital media differently (curricular; university technical support; departmental center),
- place different levels of importance on different aspects of digital media work, and
- have faculty and graduate students whose work with digital media evidences different combinations of the management, analysis, and production modes.

These three themes of location, importance, and character of work are important for understanding departments’ choices regarding the learning opportunities focused on digital media that they offer to faculty and graduate students. The kinds of learning opportunities provided for learning to incorporate digital media into teaching, for instance, are influenced by the location of and level of importance placed on digital media in the department. Furthermore, the kinds of digital media teaching faculty and graduate students are able to engage in depends upon the location and importance of digital media in a department. Similarly, the extent to which individuals are encouraged to learn how to integrate digital media into their research/scholarship is influenced by the location and importance of digital media, and the kinds of digital scholarship they are able to create depends upon the location and importance of digital media in a department.

Where departments locate digital media and the level of importance they place on it arise

mentoring in digital research, the role of the CDMS in the department, the profile of the graduate student body, and the national reputation of the department within the field of digital media studies.
out of the department’s stances toward digital media; these material and philosophical negotiations determine the choices available to faculty and graduate students and, ultimately, have a profound influence on the work they do.

**Becoming Teachers: Learning & Practicing Digital Media Pedagogies**

This section will explore the extent to which individuals are encouraged to learn how to integrate digital media into their teaching. Specifically, it will examine the role of informal mentoring and formalized programmatic structures in providing learning opportunities focused on digital media and pedagogy.

**Mentoring/Being Mentored in Digital Media Pedagogy: Cosmo’s Story**

Before enrolling in graduate school in the Parallel Literacies Department, Cosmo had little experience composing with new media: “Before I arrived here, I really was kind of a luddite. I was on the web, I did my email, I surfed around to web sites, but I didn’t really do much.” He was introduced to web site composing and online discussions in the introduction to teaching course he took. The final assignment was an electronic portfolio, which he “got really into” because he had “never built a web site before.” Although he was proud of the site at the time, he says, “I’m glad I didn’t permit [the professor] to put it up on her site because on some level I knew then that I was proud of it but I would not be proud of it soon, and that well is the case.” However, although his early attempt at web
composing does not stand the test of time, he found the task “really interesting and engaging. I also used WebCT there in discussions, and I also found that to be quite interesting, too.”

Because of his experiences with that assignment and the online discussions, the first time he requested and was assigned a composition class that met in a networked classroom (called a C-class in this department), he decided to incorporate both of those activities. He says, “so…when I got into teaching and was signed up for a C-class, I thought, I’m gonna have my students do a web project and I’m gonna do WebCT discussions.” Just as Cosmo had enjoyed the tasks in his seminar, likewise, he says, “the web project towards the end got a really great response from the students. I got some pretty interesting materials.” He adds, “And really I think that’s what drove me very strongly was the fact that I’d done it myself and then tried it with my students and got a great level of engagement, in that case for a cultural critique of advertising, turning that in to a web-based format.” What the professor did in the pedagogy class with technology served to introduce Cosmo not only to different technologies as composing tools, but it also modeled for him how he might incorporate those technologies into his own courses. Although she didn’t mentor him personally, her modeling served as a guide to his own pedagogical experimentation. Because it was a TA training seminar, pedagogy was foregrounded, and the use of digital media as a pedagogical tool was modeled in the design and implementation of the class.

The next “major moment” in Cosmo’s work with digital media involved another mentor, the director of the Center for Digital Media Studies. Cosmo took two classes with
the CDMS Director: Teaching College English, a mentorship class, and a graduate seminar on composition pedagogy and theory that focused on digital media. He says that Teaching College English helped extend his thinking about digital media and pedagogy because he got to see an “upper level English studio course on documentary and Flash production in action and got to learn the technologies along with the students and help them out a little bit.” He served as an apprentice, of sorts, to the CDMS Director in an upper-level undergraduate seminar focused on digital media and English studies. In that class, Cosmo says, “I kind of stayed a week ahead of where [the students] were. Hah! Occasionally a week behind.” He was able, therefore, not only to learn to compose in a new medium, but also to think about creating digital media assignments for students and scaffolding them through the composing process, grading those assignments, and helping students see the rhetorical connections between composing in digital media and composing in print. As was the case with the TA training seminar, this class was a required, pedagogically focused course. Its purpose is to help the TAs learn to teach sophomore-level classes; although the professor teaches the bulk of the class, the TA is expected to share in the planning and execution of the course and reflect upon the experience. Technology integration is not a programmatic requirement for the course, but Cosmo sought it out because of personal interest.

The composition seminar Cosmo took with the CDMS Director also helped him because “we continued that kind of work at the grad level and filled in some of the more theoretical background.” The seminar focused on a “paradigm shift” in writing studies that is rewriting the field of “computers and composition” as “digital media studies.” In
addition to discussing what this change means to teaching and research in the field of composition, students also composed in digital media (Dreamweaver, Photoshop, and Flash), creating “digital media self-, teaching-, and research-portraits.” After those two experiences, Cosmo remembers, “And so I said, oh, well, now I know how to do Flash movies. This seems pretty cool, so now I’m going to do a Flash project. And I kind of ran off and did a Flash project.” Again, observing another teacher and learning new composing technologies spurred Cosmo on to experiment more with his multimodal pedagogy and create new kinds of composing assignments for students in his writing classes. Mentoring has clearly been a touchstone for Cosmo’s integration of digital media into his teaching. However, this mentoring is self-selected on both ends: Cosmo sought it out and was lucky enough to find faculty who integrated it into their seminars and were willing to mentor him in digital media pedagogy.

When we speak, Cosmo is a technology-pedagogy consultant in the CDMS and says, “I’m actually not teaching this year, but I’m working a lot with teachers, and I’m learning some new technologies, and I’m sure whatever I do next year is going to look different for that.” He says what got him started with teaching with digital media was “basically a combination of experiences, opportunities I’ve been given as a graduate student to use technologies and to talk about them in relation to pedagogy and then throw them into class and see what happens and run.” The community of teachers Cosmo has found in the CDMS are helping to shape his pedagogy at least as much as the more formalized learning experiences he has had in coursework. In addition, the ability to
actually experiment with technology during class has contributed to the types of activities he includes in his classes, such as Flash movies, web sites, and similar digital media production activities.

Survey responses reinforce the importance of informal mentoring to the development of a digital media pedagogy that integrates production. Of 35 PhD students from the Parallel Literacies Department responding to surveys, 30 responded to an open-ended prompt asking them to describe how they use digital media/technology for teaching. Responses were coded for management, analysis, and production modes. All responses indicated uses of digital media in the management mode. 6.7 percent of the responses indicated uses of digital media in the analysis mode in addition to management, 13.3 percent of the responses indicated uses of the production mode in addition to management, and 23.3 percent of the responses indicated uses of all three modes in combination. These coded responses were cross-analyzed with responses to the following prompts about formal training and mentoring:

1. About how many hours of formal basic technology skills training (e.g., word processing, web-building, course management tools) did you receive within the past 12 months?
2. About how many hours in the past 12 months did you spend on your own teaching yourself new technology skills?
3. About how many hours of formal training did you receive on integrating digital media/technology into your teaching?
4. About how many hours in the past 12 months did you spend informally talking with others about integrating digital media/technology into your teaching?

Individuals who described using digital media in the management mode only in their teaching reported the most amount of formal training and the least amount of informal talk with others. On the other hand, individuals who described using digital media in the production mode in their teaching reported the least amount of formal training, the most amount of self-teaching of technology, and the most amount of informal talk with others (see Table 3.1). These findings reinforce the importance of the CDMS to individuals interested in experimenting with digital media production in their classes because of the space and opportunity for self-teaching and informal interactions among graduate students and faculty that it provides through centralized facilities and equipment, as well as staff members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Management Mode only (n=17)</th>
<th>Management + Production Mode (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No formal training</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 hours formal training</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 hours formal training</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours formal training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 hours formal training</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No informal talk</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 hours informal talk</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 hours informal talk</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours informal talk</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 hours informal talk</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No self-teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 hours self-teaching</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 hours self-teaching</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours self-teaching</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 hours self-teaching</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Formal Training vs. Informal Talk Among PhD Students in the Parallel Literacies Department. This table compares two groups—those using the management mode only in their teaching and those using the management and production modes in their teaching (some individuals in this group also use the analysis mode).

Cosmo’s learning of pedagogical practices that incorporate digital media has been facilitated by the facilities the department has made available to him and by other graduate students—in other words, by spaces, people, available technologies, and a culture of sharing. These facilities enable Cosmo’s learning through informal talking and experimentation. Cosmo is in a department that values print. The current administration values digital media and invests in it. But curricularly, digital media represents the fringe, not the center, of the department’s interests. Physically, there is an investment in spaces
and resources that provide learning opportunities (particularly experimental teaching in networked classrooms) and facilitate a community of teacher-learners that provide ongoing support to each other. But that community is fringe/niche, not central, to the department’s ideas of what constitutes good teaching. Although the first-year writing program incorporates formal training into its pedagogy seminar, since Cosmo went through training things have changed and the focus is no longer on website production (which combined all three modes: management, analysis, and production) but on how to teach online research skills. Thus, while digital media is discussed as an important part of teaching, discussions of technology-enhanced pedagogy in the required, introductory course are limited to management mode activities. As a result, the full range of digital media pedagogy is not promoted in official programmatic channels, and graduate students are fed an impoverished version of digital media pedagogy. The gateway graduate course is not the only place in which this inattention to technology occurs. According to Emily, a tenure-track assistant professor in the Parallel Literacies Department, her uses of digital media “never come up” in her annual evaluations. So although everybody in the department is encouraged to view digital media use as important, they are not encouraged to explore the full range of digital media use. Those few that do wish to explore, do have the opportunity, however. The CDMS is well-funded and provides a great deal of opportunities for individuals to learn about and experiment with digital media pedagogy on their own time and their own terms. Cosmo
Curricular Identity and Digital Media Pedagogy: Adele’s Story

Cosmo talks about himself as a sort of renegade, an experimenter. He and Adele are clearly learners and relatively new to digital media composing and teaching with digital media. But Adele talks about herself as a learner and not experienced enough (i.e., behind the learning curve) with technologies to be able to incorporate them into her teaching. Adele began learning about pedagogical applications of digital media during her master’s program at another university. She “worked with a lot of English Education faculty who were using it in the classes” she was taking and “teaching us about how important it was.” In those classes, she developed collaboratively composed web sites compiling information on books, including “a page or two pages on the author and the book, resources, and assignment ideas for teachers, that kind of thing.” Through these activities, she “saw that [web composing] was useful and productive for me and wanted my students to experience the same thing. And I want them to, when they get on the job market or upper level courses maybe where that’s an option or is required, that they have some familiarity with that.”

In the Integrated Literacies Department, she says, “the majority of classes that I’ve taken have involved some type of electronic component. From working on an online course management program, or creating a web site, or submitting things electronically.”

thus has a safe space in which to experiment in the CDMS. He can, in his own words, “hide out” and do his own thing without getting a lot of attention from the policy-makers, few (if any) of whom have a professional investment in digital media studies.
The graduate director notes that there are “digital expectations” in all of the seminars, especially regarding course management tools. He says all of the graduate faculty use the course management tool “for file distribution, for email, and for discussion boards, and so on. So that’s just built in to, I think, all the courses.” Additionally, there are often digital assignments: “students have to do a homepage in the research colloquium,” a course required of all PhD students. With an MA in digital rhetoric and a PhD concentration in digital rhetoric, digital media is the business of the program, and curricula are being set up to sustain and support that. Adele adds, “I think we’re encouraged as instructors, too, to have our students be doing web page portfolios, web essays, that kind of thing, and not just having them work from print media all the time.” Because of the programmatic focus on integration of digital media throughout the curriculum, every graduate student, regardless of research focus, gets some formalized instruction in digital media pedagogy—such instruction includes online discussion and submission of assignments through the course management tool as well as web page composing. Thus, these activities are modeled in seminars, and Adele interprets this modeling as encouragement to use them in her own teaching.

The curriculum for graduate students provides opportunities to learn about teaching and doing research with digital media and to put that learning into practice by working with digital media in seminars, and Adele positions herself as a newcomer to digital media, a learner. She says, “I think the longer I have been at [this university], the more I see that it is something really necessary, but it can be frustrating too, ’cause you have the learning curve for people like me. I’m not an html code writer or a web site
designer, so I have to learn how to use these software programs and things.” It is interesting that Adele says that working with digital media can be tough for “people like me.” Though digital rhetoric is at the center of the MA program, it is one of three possible concentrations in the PhD program in Rhetoric and Writing, so not all PhD students place digital media at the center of their work. For instance, Adele’s research focuses on community literacy, whereas Alan’s focuses on digital media. Although Adele had experience with web composing before she entered the PhD program, Alan came to the program with significantly more experience with digital media pedagogy, allowing him to experiment more and develop his digital media pedagogy alongside his digital media research.

This difference between Alan and Adele points to a subtle difference in the department between those who came to the department already knowing about digital media and teaching with it—Ava, Alan, the graduate director, graduate students whose interests are centered on digital media, some professors in writing studies—and those who didn’t—Adele, some other graduate students whose interests are not centered on digital media, many of the visiting assistant professors, some professors in cultural studies. The former are intensely involved with digital media in all of their professional activities and express enthusiasm as well as excitement for the program and department, naming few, if any, departmental barriers to their work. The latter temper that enthusiasm with concerns that they are not receiving the amount of support and direction that they need in order to successfully and confidently incorporate digital media into their pedagogies.
When I interview Adele, the PhD program is small—5 students, 2 of whom are focused on digital media. In addition to taking classes with these students, Adele also is in classes with MA students who are all focused on digital rhetoric. Being surrounded by so many others with more experience with and interest in digital media likely contributes to Adele’s identifying herself as someone at the bottom of the digital media learning curve, thus leading her to emphasize her lack of skills rather than what she does know and can do with digital media. Because of this self-identification, she has not begun incorporating many composing technologies into her classes. One example is the university’s course management system, which she has had experience with as a student. She says, “I don’t feel that I know that program well enough to orchestrate that in my class. Over the summer I hope to take some kind of workshop on it and learn a little bit more about it and how I can use it as a course management tool.” Although she has experience using the program as a student, she claims to not be able to use the tool from a teacher’s standpoint and thus incorporate it into her teaching; she also feels the need to take a formal workshop in order to learn how to use the program, rather than informally asking one of her colleagues for help.

This need for formalized training could be related to the program’s focus on integrating learning about digital media into formal coursework by encouraging students to expect formal training. However, Adele says that, for graduate students, learning to integrate digital media into their teaching is “generally something that’s above and beyond what we’re already doing, or something that we have to seek out outside of our coursework, and for a lot of us, we just don’t have the time to do it…the people who have
really engaged with that are the people who were actually in the area before they got here.” It makes sense that a department trying to distinguish itself in digital media studies would attract students with interests in that area and that those students might already have experience teaching in a digital environment. But Adele’s comments suggest that the department overestimates graduate students’ knowledge and experience with digital pedagogy at the same time as they cultivate interest. To combat this problem and help students who are interested in teaching with technology but don’t have a background in it, she recommends, “I think it would be useful to offer workshops and things maybe in the summer or that would be for credit that would work to help not only with professional development using technology but also pedagogically, how to do more of that in your classrooms.” Her request for formal training is consistent with the department’s stance that digital media is integrated into the curriculum and students should begin learning about the potentials of digital media in their courses.

Her request for a pedagogy workshop is interesting, however, because it reveals that training in digital media pedagogy is not part of the teacher training workshop required of all entering graduate students, whereas digital media is integrated into the required research colloquium. According to the graduate director, TAs take a training workshop concurrently with teaching their first course “that consists of maybe 20 hours of workshopping the week before the semester begins and then a 2-hour session every week of the semester. And that’s focused on giving the students the parameters for the first year curriculum and then helping them develop their own versions of the curriculum for their courses.” Digital media is “not formally required as part of the training but
several of the students chose to do their courses in computer classrooms.” In every case, the graduate students who chose to do their courses in networked classrooms had previous experience doing so. Although “it isn’t formally part of the training,” he adds, “we did do a faculty-graduate student workshop last summer…[Ava] did a workshop on teaching faculty to use technology in writing classes. And we’d like to offer that again but we don’t have any plans to do that right now.” This creates something of an imbalance: there are more structured learning opportunities focused on digital media research than digital media pedagogy. Adding to the imbalance, there is no ongoing conversation about digital media and teaching. In fact, Ava says, “we never talk about teaching.” Of 11 survey respondents in the department (both faculty and graduate students) 9 said they received no formal training on integrating digital media/technology into their teaching; 1 said 1-5 hours; 1 said >20 hours. Two said they spent no hours informally talking with others about integrating digital media/technology into their teaching, but 4 said 1-4 hours, 1 said 6-10 hours, 2 said 11-20 hours, and 2 said >20 hours (Table 3.2). So while there are small numbers who are talking to each other informally, there is no facility (like the CDMS) that exists to nurture such informal interactions. As a result, the department stance on formalized learning of technology creates categories of learners and teachers. It also raises questions about the framing of digital media work in classes. Digital media pedagogy was modeled for Cosmo in pedagogy seminars, which led to his professional pedagogical development; Adele, while she has taken seminars that incorporate digital media, does not interpret that as pedagogical modeling, perhaps because the classes were not focused on discussions of
pedagogy but discussions of research. So the framing of digital media in seminar work seems to be an important issue when it comes to the pedagogical development of graduate students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n=11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About how many hours of formal training did you receive on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrating digital media/technology into your teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None 1 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About how many hours in the past 12 months did you spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informally talking with others about integrating digital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>media/technology into your teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 4 1 2 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Informal Talk About Teaching with Digital Media. This table shows the time faculty and graduate students in the Integrated Literacies Department spent in formal training sessions and talking informally with others about integrating digital media/technology into their teaching.

Although she positions herself as an inexperienced learner of digital media and is not able to teach regularly in a computer classroom, Adele makes analysis of technology and critical framing of the Internet a regular part of her class. For instance, she recently began using a “code exercise,” which teaches students to analyze the positioning of web sites by finding out “who sponsors the site, what servers the site uses, how long it’s been established, who runs it.” Her goal is to help students “develop a sense of the placement of the web site, that it does indeed have a name and a space and a sponsoring organization somewhere; it doesn’t just exist somewhere autonomously on the web.” In
addition, she wants “to get [students] looking at texts as having power.” Though this activity is not the same type of activity that Ava has students do—it isn’t production work—it does incorporate some of the philosophies that Adele has learned in graduate seminars about digital media pedagogy and digital rhetoric. For instance, it invites students to consider the materialities of digital texts by considering who wrote something, how and why they posted it, what technologies they had access to in order to create the text, who reads the text, what technologies are needed in order to read the text, and how the text affects those who read it.

Adele teaches the university’s introductory writing course. She says that the course director arranged for all of the graduate students’ sections of the course to meet at the same time and for a computer lab to be available throughout the semester at that time. So, although her course meets in a traditional classroom, they get some time in a computer lab “usually once maybe every other week.” They do web searches and word-processing, as well as collaborative writing that they submit online, “so they can be composing it together as a group in the class and then send it to me electronically.” She has also given students the option of doing either a traditional research essay or a web folio as their final project. She says many of the students are interested in the web folio because they “think it’s cool and fun and it’s different than typing a five-page research essay,” but “it’s something that, I think if I do that again, it needs to be more at the center of the curriculum, where part of their assignment is learning how to compose web documents.” Consequently, a visit to the university’s writing center—housed in the same college as the department in which Adele teaches and the interdisciplinary graduate
program in which she is enrolled—is necessary. The students are on their own to learn web designing, but the writing center offers help for them. In addition, the writing center offers help for teachers. “That’s the cool thing about the writing center,” she says. “They do have workshops you can do on document design and on web page design too.”

Even though Adele is incorporating some digital applications into her class, she has trouble fully integrating multimodal composing with digital media into her introductory writing course because it is difficult for her to schedule lab time. The class meets in a classroom that is in a dormitory, and the students “balk” at having to go anywhere else for class (such as the library or a computer lab) because most of them (about 80%) live in the dorm where the class meets. Space is at a premium at the university, affecting the department’s ability to provide digitally equipped classroom spaces to its students. According to Ava, the college is considering wireless access as an alternative; with laptops, then, any classroom could become digitally mediated. “Then once we get there [to the lab],” Adele says, “there’s 18 machines and I have 27 students. So they usually have to double up or I have them do group work on the computers. And it’s hot in there, and some of the machines are older.” Furthermore, the computers don’t all always work, and there aren’t enough chairs: “It’s those logistics, you know, the uses of space which really affect people’s willingness to be there in the first place.” Her graduate student identity and her identity as “not digital” influence these difficulties because she is not at the top of the list for a networked classroom. The department only owns one networked classroom. Because digital media is at the center of the master’s program, those classes have access, as well as undergraduate upper-level writing classes
that focus on digital rhetoric. First-year writing is not specifically and programmatically linked with digital media, even though the master’s and PhD students (whose programs are linked with digital media) teach first-year writing. So there is a tension: graduate students are expected to learn how to integrate digital media into their teaching; but because of the programmatic focus on digital media, there are more classes that need networked classrooms than there are networked classrooms to go around. So graduate students end up having few opportunities to actually teach in networked environments, even though they are encouraged to think about developing digital media pedagogies and encouraged to think about digital media in transformative terms.

Adele says her pedagogy would change if she were in a computer classroom because she would “do a lot more on PowerPoint and have a lot more activities like WebQuest where I’d prepare a list of sites for them to go through and look at all those and do an activity surrounding that.” Because of the current logistics—having “to finish the work out of class,” requesting “a technology cart to be dropped off” in her regular classroom, finding “a laptop with an Ethernet connection”—Adele says that digital media pedagogy right now for her “just gets to be cumbersome. I still work a lot from paper when I’m not in the computer classroom.” This reflection about how her pedagogy would change in a computer classroom shows that she is thinking about her pedagogy in regards to digital media and networked classroom teaching even though her opportunities to actually teach in that kind of space is limited. It also shows that she is integrating digital media into her pedagogy theoretically, as her seminars have encouraged her to do and as the stance of the department (that rhetoric is becoming digital rhetoric) has encouraged
her to do, even though she can’t fully put it into practice yet. Furthermore, it shows that the material conditions of access affect Adele’s pedagogy as much as the philosophies of digital rhetoric she has internalized from the seminars she has taken.

Interestingly, Adele finds it necessary to justify her continuing use of print media in courses, and she does this not by refuting the relevance or importance of digital rhetoric but by blaming the logistical realities, further showing her internalization of the program’s stance on digital rhetoric. Despite the logistical difficulties, she nonetheless sees the potential for a digital media-saturated pedagogy. She says,

“I also think that it’s really useful and eye opening to have [students] be able to compose something on the web and it be something that’s used by real audiences. If we were to create a course web site on a novel that we’re reading or something where other teachers or other students who might read that same book and go to that site and look at things that they’ve done, that’s really useful. It makes them feel like what they’re doing isn’t for naught and they’re just writing for one audience of the teacher. But I feel like I want to be more knowledgeable and savvy than I am with composing software and whatnot to be able to teach that.

Adele is clearly trying to cultivate in her students a critical and rhetorical stance toward technology, as her graduate training has encouraged her to do. She is also teaching her students about the materiality of texts, encouraging students to view all texts, digital or not, as material objects and encouraging students to understand the material power that texts have in the lives of people who use them. Yet her self-identification as a teacher who is not knowledgeable enough about digital media holds her back.

That self-identification is cultivated, in some ways, by the department. Her learning is facilitated by seminar work/theoretical work on pedagogy with digital media and digital rhetoric in her seminars. Adele is in a department that values digital media and places it at the center of the curriculum. The Integrated Literacies Department expects
teaching with digital media and expects people to learn, to a certain extent, on their own. That’s just part of being a professional (like keeping up with research in the field); individuals have to know how to use course management, at the least, and other applications are strongly encouraged. Individuals should know how to teach with it; they should have basic digital literacy. For graduate students, the department expects that the seminar work is enough to get them started. But for Adele, this formalization of learning about digital media coupled with a lack of informal talk about teaching, a lack of formal pedagogical training with digital media, and a lack of sufficient access to networked classrooms contributes to her identification as learner and leads to reluctance to incorporate web composing and course management tools into her teaching.

*Location, Importance, & Character of Digital Media Pedagogy*

The preceding analysis of learning opportunities for digital media pedagogy indicates that the curricular importance placed on digital media pedagogy leads to departments’ locating it differently and supporting different types of digital media usage in classes (i.e., management, analysis, and/or production modes). In the Print Literacy Department, for example, digital media pedagogy is not highly valued, and consequently, the location of digital media pedagogy is “underground.” Digital media is not the business of the Print Literacy Department, so Benjamin and Toby are unique for what they know and what they do in the classroom. But they don’t have the community that Cosmo has, so it’s harder for them to feel that others value what they do in the department. The discussions that do take place about digital media pedagogy are not
recognized (either officially or unofficially) by the department’s administration (most specifically, the department chair), leading to use of digital media in primarily the management mode, with a few using it in the analysis mode. In the Parallel Literacies Department, on the other hand, digital media is explicitly linked with pedagogy and given a home in the CDMS. However, while some graduate students and faculty embrace the experimental spirit of the CDMS and incorporate production work into their courses, most who use digital media do so in the management and analysis modes as an extension of what they already do in the classroom, as Chapter 2 demonstrated. In the Integrated Literacies Department, where digital media is highly valued, the learning of digital media pedagogy is struggling to find a curricular expression; because of the available facilities, digital media pedagogy is difficult to get into unless individuals already have knowledge from previous experiences. Still, nearly everybody uses digital media in the management and analysis modes, while a few incorporate the production mode, as well. It seems that the location of digital media pedagogy in a department depends not only on the department’s stance toward digital media but also the facilities that are able to support that stance. Furthermore, it seems that the management and analysis modes need little departmental infrastructure for them to thrive; the production mode, on the other hand, needs specific support—including disciplinary knowledge, proper facilities, formal training, and informal mentoring—in order for individuals to feel comfortable attempting it in the classes they teach.
Becoming Researchers: Learning & Practicing Digital Media Research Strategies

This section will explore the extent to which individuals are encouraged to learn how to integrate digital media into their research/scholarship. Specifically, it will examine the role of programmatic structures and informal mentoring in providing learning opportunities focused on digital media and/in research/scholarship.

Programmatic, Formalized Learning

When the Graduate Director in the Integrated Literacies Department was negotiating support for the graduate program, he argued that in order “to create a really top-notch graduate program, you’ve got to have a research center affiliated with it.” He says he “was not interested in doing the typical humanities type of program that didn’t have research centers. And I kind of made it a point of negotiation that we had to have one.” He lists several reasons that he fought so strongly for a research center:

- One reason is revenue-generation: “Graduate programs can’t rely on the largess of the institution’s general fund or the state legislature’s willingness to support education.”
- Another reason is respect and support across the university: “It’s a mark of distinction. It is amazing what having the center does in terms of people’s willingness to talk to us and listen to us in terms of what we have to say...In the sciences and some of the social sciences areas...you’re just not worth talking to if you’re not coming out of a research center. And that shouldn’t be the case but it is the case. So it’s given us a lot of entry into discussions that we didn’t have
before…The medical school’s virtual practice group has just invited us to join them, and that’s because we have a research center. Pure and simple. It’s not cause we’re nice people or because we know rhetoric and writing or science writing or anything like that. It’s because, ‘oh, they have a research center, then they’re worth talking to.’”

- Another reason is the opportunity for graduate student involvement with research projects: “They’re heavily involved” in “digital development work” such as building a server and serving as go-to digital technology persons for faculty projects.

- The final reason is to provide funding for faculty to work on digital projects. That funding includes but is not limited to course release, summer money, or paying the faculty member to work in the center.

The Graduate Director is also co-director of the research center, in its first of three years of funding by “a private foundation affiliated with the university.” It’s purpose “is to support research on writing in digital environments.” According to the Graduate Director, the center is funding two types of faculty projects:

One is building innovative digital products related to teaching writing or doing writing online. And that could be software, CDs. We’ve got several different kinds of projects now, and people are basically building products that we think will either be innovative and interesting and attract attention that way or they’ll generate intellectual property. Preferably both…And then the other sort of work is corporate and community work. We would like to do digital projects for companies and for community organizations…We don’t want to do just contract or consulting work. We want to do work that could generate models or products that could be replicable elsewhere, that we could take on the road and use as models. So we’re basically looking for digital products, digital models that solve issues, questions, problems that people have with digital writing. But it is primarily a research center, and faculty research.
This research center is evidence of the department’s stance of integrating digital media into the department and curriculum, particularly into the research agenda of the department. It is a programmatic center to support faculty research projects having to do with digital media and, as such, is integrated into the program, further cementing the centrality of digital media in the program. The center supports faculty member’s digital projects and considers those projects under the umbrella of research, even though those projects are digital productions (research in the production mode) rather than print productions analyzing digital texts (more traditionally-styled research in the analytical mode). Though the research center does not directly support graduate students by funding their projects, the center’s existence benefits graduate students by supporting faculty projects that deal with writing in digital environments; such projects are likely, eventually, to influence graduate students’ professional development when they take courses or teach a course utilizing a digital project developed with support from the research center. Furthermore, the center’s existence and support of faculty projects is likely to draw top scholars in digital media fields to the department and, as a result, attract graduate students interested in working with those faculty and doing similar types of projects.

Although the center does not fund graduate student projects, PhD students are still offered opportunities to learn about incorporating digital media into their research as well as into their professional identities as scholars. These opportunities come in the form of coursework. According to the Graduate Director, “it’s tied in with the digital rhetoric MA program. Half their courses are in computer classrooms. It’s the sea they swim in; it’s
what they have to do. In the PhD program it’s strongly encouraged. A lot of those
students are doing the digital rhetoric courses.” In the required research colloquium,
students are required to create a web site. Additionally, PhD students face a portfolio
requirement, which can be fulfilled digitally. Adele, for instance, says, “I maintain an
electronic folder on [the university’s course management system] that has all of my
research so far for this year contained in it, which is for the research colloquium course
that we’re taking. And then we also respond electronically through threaded discussion to
one another’s work.”

This portfolio requirement is interesting because students are allowed to fulfill it
with any medium. Cosmo, in the Parallel Literacies Department, says, “I’d like to see a
valuing of digital composition as a way of doing a candidacy exam or as a way of doing a
program of study, doing a dissertation.” In other words, he wishes his department would
recognize and value digital media as a way of approaching and completing major degree
requirements, and this department does: it recognizes digitally produced work as a
possible alternative to a printed portfolio. Though Adele uses it more as a container and
thus more in the management mode, the potential exists for the production mode to be
used to fulfill that requirement. Additionally, Adele says, “Most of the audience forum
analysis that I’ve done for situating my research in the field is all done on PowerPoint.
I’m always creating maps and images and things like that to infuse into text in Microsoft
Word. I’m always on the computer. It doesn’t seem like I can really get away from that.”
This use of digital media represents her blending of the analysis and production modes,
or, more accurately, her use of the production mode to facilitate the analysis mode. The
“maps and images and things like that” she creates help her during the invention stage to complete her scholarly analysis; they then become “infused into” her final, primarily alphabetic, text.

Besides the departmental stance that digital media must be integrated into faculty and graduate students’ researcher identities, the department also seeks to integrate digital media into the study of rhetoric. Not surprisingly, then, an important criterion the Graduate Director mentions for evaluating colloquium students’ web sites is “just a general rhetorical one”:

Is the site or is the document, is the discourse appropriate for its intended audience and purpose, whatever that is? We talk about that in our class, too. You’re not going on the job market yet, so why would you have a web site? That’s two or three years down the road. So what’s the point of a web site now? Well, there’s a couple of good answers to that. One is that we have a portfolio requirement in the program. So, the web site is in a sense an ongoing portfolio. So they use it in a sense as an archive for their own work and as a way to distribute their work to their committee members for reviewing it. And then the second one is sort of field networking. People in the field find out who you are by checking your web site, and people establish research connections.

The Graduate Director links basic rhetorical principles of composition to professional identity: the web site (or any kind of scholarly discourse) represents the graduate student as a professional and is a valuable job market resource. In addition, he stresses the connection between the management and production modes: the digital productions the students create (in this case, web sites) have the potential to be read and used in the management mode by other scholars. The Graduate Director and Adele thus demonstrate that digital media in this department are seen as an integral part of scholarly identity as
well as scholarly work. That vision is enacted, in part, through formal programmatic means: a funded research center focused solely on digital projects and digital coursework requirements.

Integrating digital media into his scholarly professional identity has been a trickier enterprise for Cosmo, a PhD student in the Parallel Literacies Department. The department generously funds the Center for Digital Media Studies. Though it is a teaching and research center, it has been viewed (and used) more as a resource center for digital teaching than for digital research projects. Cosmo notes that this perception is beginning to change, as the CDMS Director and the department chair are beginning to promote the CDMS differently; however, the CDMS’s role as a center for support of digital teaching is still stressed above all. Though the CDMS has the potential to function as a research center for the Parallel Literacies Department, at the time of my interviews it had not yet begun to reach for that potential. Cosmo also discusses the lack of seminars in which digital media is central. He says he would like to see “graduate courses taught in computer labs, well, taught in computer labs where the computers are actually used.” He adds, “Even the [pedagogy class] that got me started wasn’t really taught in a computer lab all the time because of its great size that year. So I really only had one class that was taught intensively in a computer lab environment where production was sort of central.” This reality—that no graduate seminar is required to include a digital component—is evidence of the department’s stance toward digital media in the program/curriculum:
those professors who want to include digital media are certainly supported, but their courses are not a requirement in the way that the Integrated Literacies Department’s research colloquium with its focus on web site production is a requirement.

Cosmo also touches on another, related, issue: the projects that are required in classes that don’t necessarily focus on analyzing technology. He says he has had professors who have been open to students doing alternative, digital projects in place of a final research paper, “but in some ways it’s a project that is just in place of a print project and not integrated into the course. I’ve done that once or twice but it’s not nearly as powerful as taking a class that really centrally used the computers.” He notes, in addition, that graduate course work is the perfect place “to build scholarly work that is maybe just a draft and just an experiment,” which he sees as part of the goal of graduate coursework, “which is where you’re supposed to create fake scholarly work, for the purposes of learning rather than for publication.” Furthermore, he says that he doesn’t have many models for this kind of scholarly work in digital media: “I mean, I definitely read Kairos, so I have some models, but I think that just within the department and how I’ve been trained, I’ve just been trained very much to think of the print article, and it’s a challenge to move beyond that. I want to, and I think I will, but I think I’m still in the moment of figuring that out.”

Cosmo’s graduate work has, not surprisingly, focused almost exclusively on the analysis mode. Analysis of digital media from a variety of perspectives is supported and encouraged in the department. But the production of scholarship—even scholarship focused on digital media—is expected to be alphabetic and printed. The requirements for
candidacy exams, dissertations, and the like discussed earlier reinforce this tension between the analysis and production modes. This tension is played out not only in terms of research but also in teaching. The last chapter, for instance, described this tension in the field of Composition and in the context of Cosmo’s and Benjamin’s uses of digital media in their courses. In the Parallel Literacies Department, teaching in the production mode is encouraged (and undergraduates are encouraged to create digital products that present critical analysis in alternative forms), and the CDMS supports teachers choosing to do it. It is likely, in the future, that such encouragement will ultimately extend to graduate research in the production mode, and it is likely that the department’s recent hires have the potential to increase graduate course offerings in digital media studies.

This tension between the analysis and production modes is deeply entrenched in both scholarly and programmatic conversations, which tend to subordinate production to analysis. In scholarship in Cosmo’s field, the analysis mode typically has printed products as its outcome, and the management mode also typically supports the production of traditional products. Adele notes that, often, digital media is seen as an enhancement: “I think most people who have mentored me have pointed to the necessity of having that be one of the components of what I do and using it to enhance the things that I do.” This attitude indicates that the management and analysis modes often support production in print, rather than leading to work in the production mode. Another example of work in the analysis mode that is presented in traditional forms is Benjamin’s. While Benjamin feels neither encouraged nor discouraged to use technology in the classes he teaches, he feels very encouraged to study new technologies. He says his PhD committee pushed him
in the direction of his dissertation, which is about computer gaming environments as writing spaces and their potential for community-building and collaboration among students. “Originally I was working in academic discourse,” he says, “more traditional. Now, I’m working on tech stuff. They were very interested and extremely supportive.” His work with digital media does not lead to a digital product but rather a printed product analyzing digital media. In fact, few attempt to do research in the production mode at any of the three sites. Cosmo and Alan are prime examples of these few.

Alan, a PhD student in the Integrated Literacies Department, is doing unique work that blends digital media work in all three modes in his scholarship. One project he is working on involves research on how online citations are being used in print publications. For that project, he says that he and his co-researchers are “looking at developing methodologies for seeing where these things were when they were originally cited. So I’m using a lot of the Way-Back Machine and a lot of stuff on the web to do that, that kind of technology.” This involves the management mode, using online tools to trace the evolution of web-based publications and the length of time they remain live on the web before disappearing. It also involves the analysis mode, studying digital citation, publication, and archiving patterns. In addition, he says, “We’ve developed a database to put the data into and then get information out of it based on the queries we give it. So I’ve been working a lot on developing…the web interface of the database, structuring the database and getting that to work, which is kind of new stuff for me but interesting. Could be really functional in a lot of different ways for research.” This database
development involves the production mode because Alan is doing production work to
design and code a database that enacts some of the analytical and managerial tasks and
might eventually be useful to other researchers.

There are several support structures that encourage Alan’s work. First and
foremost, the faculty, whom he calls “fabulous” and “totally supportive.” He says, “They
are very good at…giving feedback and just encouraging me to do work in the areas that I
want to do work in.” In addition, he says, “the resources that have been made available to
me are stunning. I mean I’m not even teaching this semester, and, look, I’ve got an office
with a brand spankin’ new computer. When I got here they said, ‘what kind of computer
do you want? We’ll order it.’ And I had looked at a lot of grad schools…It’s a nice set
up.” Although he imagines that the reason he has such resources at his disposal is
“because there are only five students right now,” he hopes “that they’ll be able to
continue that kind of level of support.” Even without the stellar resources at his personal
disposal in his office, however, the department’s other resources help support Alan’s
work. As a graduate student employed as an assistant by the research center, he notes,
“having access to the stuff we’re doing at the [research] center is” also helpful because “I
can have servers and do really interesting work in interesting ways.” As previously
mentioned, although the research center does not fund graduate student projects, its
existence encourages digital media production and thus helps to create a culture of
support for digital media production; in other words, digital media production has a place
in the department, and that attitude allows Alan to feel comfortable building real digital
media scholarship that he will share with the discipline rather than only creating
“practice” digital media scholarship in his seminars. The fact that graduate students are encouraged and sometimes required to practice digital media production as scholarship in seminars also contributes to this culture of support.

Mentoring

Part of the reason for the lack of formal programmatic integration in the Parallel Literacies Department is the lack of faculty who integrate digital media into their own professional identities, which also influences informal mentoring in the department. According to the CDMS Director, the support for digital media is in place. However, he adds, “We are unfortunately a little short-handed in terms of being able to mentor.” He ties this to the larger departmental culture, saying, “I think it’s a bigger-picture issue. We’re a traditional department. Our reputation is that we’re a traditional department.” Because of the fact that the department has a reputation as being traditional, he says that the graduate students who apply and enroll do so “because they know of that traditional focus of the department.” Consequently, “we’re not getting many applicants, necessarily, who are interested in doing digital media studies.” But the graduate student culture is directly related to the faculty culture. According to the CDMS Director, of nearly 100 faculty members in the department, only two are invested in digital media research, “and one of those now is an administrator and isn’t in the department very much at all and very difficult to find time to work with.” As a result:

You’ve got this bigger picture, where the department is very committed yet only has one faculty member doing research in digital media. That sends a message to the graduate students, then, who want to do work in digital media, [making them] probably a little apprehensive to want to come [here] to do that. So there are lots
of opportunities to do that kind of work, but it can be difficult just because the size of the program right now is pretty small.

This state of affairs indicates the importance of informal mentoring from faculty to the professional development of PhDs, particularly when it comes to incorporating digital media into their professional identities.

Although the department is “short-handed” when it comes to faculty mentors interested in digital media, the CDMS is set up so that graduate students become mentors for their peers as well as for their professors. The pedagogical mentoring that the CDMS has set up was demonstrated previously in the section on pedagogical mentoring. Chester, Cosmo, and Roxie have all worked in the CDMS, and they all attest to its importance in their pedagogical development. They don’t locate scholarly mentoring there; however, Cosmo notes that his appointment in the CDMS “has definitely provided me a space to do even more multimodal composition that approaches something like research.” While the CDMS has ventured into research—they have provided support and facilities for a summer colloquium for scholars in digital media studies, helped other programs in the department develop digital research materials, and hosted a panel presentation of research done by CDMS staff members—their reputation in the department is primarily that of a center for pedagogical support. Programmatic and informal mentoring are two sides of the same coin in the department when it comes to pedagogical professional development. And for students working in traditional areas and producing printed texts as scholarship, the department provides programmatic training through coursework and fellowship competitions as well as traditional mentoring structures such as exam and dissertation committees to encourage scholarly professional development. However, for students
interested in producing digital media texts as scholarship, the department is still struggling to provide both programmatic and informal mentoring in digital media scholarship. The CDMS provides a structure in which both formal programmatic training and informal mentoring in digital media scholarship might be located and flourish, based upon the model of pedagogical training and mentoring that currently thrives there.

Cosmo is in a field—rhetoric and composition—in which pedagogical mentoring, with digital media or without, is a given and teaching methods and philosophies are a constant subject of conversation. It is not surprising that two composition professors—one whose research area is digital media and one whose research area is not digital media—were his pedagogical mentors. Because he works in the same field of study as the CDMS Director and has had the experience of working in the CDMS, he also has received mentoring for doing digital media research in a way that is unlike most of the graduate students in the department. The CDMS Director explains that “a lot of our graduate students come here to engage in some very traditional academic study programs,” and if they don’t see their mentors, “those faculty members they obviously came here to work with,” being “really engaged in technology, it’s not that nobody’s necessarily discouraging them, but nobody’s also encouraging them at the same time.” He tries to encourage them as much as he can to come to the CDMS and find out about the potential for digital media in pedagogy and research, but it can be difficult for some students to overcome the barrier of having few role models in their scholarly areas who do much work with digital media in the production mode.
Related to the centralization of peer mentors in the CDMS is the centralization of physical resources there, as well. The CDMS Director notes that graduate students do not have access to good equipment in their offices and consequently are not encouraged enough to do innovative work with digital media:

Unfortunately, the graduate students, in their offices, are provided with some of our most outdated technology. So, right off the bat they’re being sent a signal that I’m not really comfortable with and that is that because they’re teaching freshman composition or second year writing and because they’re graduate students, then they are not worthy of good computer equipment, which certainly sets their attitude about why they should want to use technology in their research right now. Again, I think it’s one of those issues that in this department, they’re not seeing a lot of people who are doing that work in research with technology, and so they’re just not aware of what the possibilities are at this point.

The centralization of computer equipment in the CDMS, then, while it encourages a community of teachers and scholars interested in digital media, it also maintains the digital media community as a niche, located in a particular place. And although the CDMS community argues that digital media is transformative, because the CDMS is something of an add-on to the department, graduate students as a whole are encouraged to see digital media as, ultimately, an add-on or a tool that they can choose to use or not and the CDMS as a place they can choose to visit or not.

Location, Importance, & Character of Digital Media Research

The preceding analysis of learning opportunities for digital media research indicates that the curricular importance placed on digital media research leads to departments’ locating it differently and supporting different types of digital media research (i.e., management, analysis, and/or production modes). In the Print Literacy Department, for example, digital media research is only valued in the management and
analysis modes; consequently, there is no formal location for digital media research, and although most individuals do use digital media in the management mode for research (e.g., using online databases to find journal articles), only a very few (including Benjamin) do research about digital media, and nobody works in the production mode. In the Parallel Literacies Department, on the other hand, digital media is given a home in the CDMS; but it is primarily linked with pedagogy, and so the CDMS does not function as a research center as much as it does as a teaching center. Digital media research is not valued as highly as digital media pedagogy, although nearly everybody recognizes the importance of the management mode to their research and uses digital media in the management mode for research. A smaller number of individuals work in the analysis mode, analyzing digital media from various perspectives, and that work is valued by the department. Only a small few, however, express a desire to work in the production mode and create alternative forms of research in digital media. This work is less explicitly valued by the department, but because the CDMS exists, the few who choose to work in the production mode are supported. In the Integrated Literacies Department, where digital media is highly valued, learning about digital media research is built into the curriculum and required of all graduate students. Consequently, all three modes—management, analysis, and production—are encouraged, and competence in the management mode is simply expected. It seems that the location of digital media research in a department depends primarily on the department’s stance toward digital media and the availability of individual mentoring. Furthermore, it seems that the management mode needs little departmental infrastructure it it to thrive, while the analysis mode needs a core of faculty
also doing that type of work in order for graduate students to attempt it. The production mode, on the other hand, needs specific support—including informal mentoring, some formal training, and a community supportive of digital media production—in order for individuals to feel comfortable incorporating digital media production into their research agendas.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has explored the ways that these departments emphasize different methods of providing learning opportunities for digital media pedagogy and research and how those methods stem from different levels of integration of digital media with departmental curricula. The chapter has also examined the ways in which these levels of integration and methods of providing opportunities to learn about digital media influence graduate students’ integration of digital media into their teaching and research. The analyses have highlighted three different ways of locating and placing importance upon digital media pedagogy and research, which lead to the departments’ encouraging and supporting each of the three different modes of digital media usage—management, analysis, and production—to varying degrees and with different results. In examining the departmental contexts that influence digital media use, this chapter has found that specific support structures—including proper facilities, informal mentoring, formal training, pedagogical modeling, and a community supportive of digital media production—influence individuals’ willingness and ability to incorporate digital media into their teaching and research.
CHAPTER 4

DIGITAL MEDIA AND DISCOURSES OF PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION

[Faculty members who focus their work on technology are often charged with staying abreast of changing technology and exploring new forms of digital composition, literacy, texts, and professional involvement. As a result, they may value various forms of scholarship, teaching, and service work that are unfamiliar to other department members and to the university as a whole (Selfe, Hanson, Hawisher, Villanueva, & Yancey).

Let’s also acknowledge that scholarship often finds expression in other ways as well. Preparing quality computer software, for example, is increasingly a function of serious scholars, and even videocassette and television offer opportunity for communicating ideas to nonspecialists in creative new ways (Boyer 36).

We proceed with the conviction that if the nation’s higher learning institutions are to meet today’s urgent academic and social mandates, their missions must be carefully redefined and the meaning of scholarship creatively reconsidered (Boyer 13).

In their book Remediation: Understanding New Media, Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin argue that new media present “themselves as refashioned and improved versions of other media” (15). “Remediation” is thus defined as this act of refashioning, which depends, they argue, on the twin concepts of immediacy and hypermediacy. Media seek “to achieve immediacy by ignoring or denying the presence of the medium and the act of mediation” (11); at the same time, hypermedia call attention to the process of
mediation and ask the audience “to take pleasure in the act of mediation” (14). This “double logic of remediation” means that “our culture wants both to multiply its media and to erase all traces of mediation: ideally, it wants to erase its media in the very act of multiplying them” (5). All media, they argue, remediate older media in an attempt to get the audience closer to the actual thing represented. So Bolter and Grusin examine digital media and “the particular ways in which they refashion older media and the ways in which older media refashion themselves to answer the challenges of new media” (15).

The first quotation above is about scholars who study remediation and its effects on composition instruction and literacy practices. Because of their valuing of new forms of scholarship, they are in a unique position to remediate traditional scholarly forms. Selfe, et al. acknowledge, however, that those remediations are likely to be unfamiliar to other scholars at both the department and university levels and possibly raise questions at times of evaluation, particularly evaluation for tenure and promotion. Such unfamiliarity is likely to cause problems for scholars who focus their work on digital media because of the lack of precedent in evaluating such work. The second quotation above addresses this lack of precedent by arguing that scholarship can find expression in many media; Boyer specifically argues for the recognition of remediated scholarly work, that is, scholarly work that refashions itself for media other than print. In the third quotation above, Boyer argues that the definition of scholarship needs to be “creatively considered.” The subtext of these remarks is that remediated forms of scholarship complicate our understanding of
what scholarship is and have the potential to redefine academic work. If that is to happen, we need to consider tenure policy and the extent to which it makes room for such remediated forms.

The previous two chapters discuss two layers of an individual’s professional identity: disciplinary and departmental. These two layers intersect during moments of evaluation, particularly promotion and tenure evaluation (for faculty) and educational rites of passage like candidacy exams (for graduate students). This chapter explores the role of departments in structuring these moments of evaluation so as to accommodate (or not) remediated forms of academic work.

**Remediating Academic Work: Three Digital Projects**

Cosmo has experimented with digital media in his classroom and invented innovative pedagogical applications of multimedia; he has also experimented with multimodality in his own research, though he says, “I’m conscious of the fact that there’s limits to what I can do.” He explains:

I recently did a candidacy exam, and I was reading all about this multimodal composition stuff, and to jar with that...I switched fonts at several points and played around with page design to call attention to the real limitations of the form. But what I really wanted to do was create a map of my field and have...rollover audio discussions and what not, because I have all these great notes on my iPod— I forgot, that’s how I use technology, I take notes on my iPod and walk around and listen to them for my candidacy exam. So I’d done this sort of great multimodal kind of studying, but, I couldn’t do it there [in the exam].
As described in chapter three, Cosmo is something of a trailblazer in the Parallel Literacies Department. His desire to employ theories of multimodality in his teaching positions him on the cutting edge of his field. Yet he is constrained by departmental policy.

Though the CDMS supports Cosmo and others like him by providing the physical resources necessary for his digital media work (lab space, server space, computer software, video camera, sound equipment, etc.), the department also holds him back at times. There is very little institutional reward for teaching in general and no mechanism for rewarding innovative digital media pedagogy—though he does see potential reward on the horizon:

Recently I’ve actually spent time…looking at other programs that are out there, looking at the job list. And so I do actually see that developing skills in digital media production is going to be useful for my career. And that’s part of the reason why I’ve sought out the ability to actually do some more professional web design work so that I can potentially become prepared to teach courses that would train people to be web designers and to do some of this kind of work.

---

12 This is an issue facing academia in general and research institutions in particular. Colloquy Live, a regular online feature of The Chronicle of Higher Education, has held two discussions of technology and tenure. On both occasions, the devaluing of teaching in general has been cited as a problem. Christine Maitland, for instance, states that “good teaching gets shortchanged in the current methods of evaluation.” Compounding this problem is the fact that technology-enhanced teaching is not widely understood or valued. Maitland continues, “The technology is being used before systems of evaluation have caught up with it. So we have a disconnect right now between the people who are using the new technology and those who are charged with evaluating the use of it.” [see also: Boyer, Maid]
Cosmo is clearly motivated by potential reward as much as by personal interest, and he makes it clear he will go where the work he wants to do is valued. It is notable, though, that he focuses on teaching in this comment. His rationale for learning web design is preparedness for teaching, not for creating new forms of research.

Though there may be tangible reward and thus incentive for Cosmo to incorporate digital media into his pedagogy, there is still little incentive for him to innovate with digital media in his research. This lack of incentive for innovative digital production in research and publication seems to be built into the discipline at its foundation. For example, it is difficult to incorporate multimodal composing practices into candidacy exams and dissertations. Furthermore, the time spent learning the technologies necessary for complex digital media production is not supported. Though graduate students in the Parallel Literacies Department can apply for fellowships to visit archives or do field work, they are expected to learn technology in their free time, of which they have very little, as Cosmo observes:

All of the major hoops I’m asked to jump through are all hoops based on print. I think that, in general, people are relatively supportive of the idea that technology has a place in teaching. But I am very conscious of the fact that all the time I spent learning cascading style sheets or learning Flash or learning iMovie, that that kind of gaining functional computer literacy time is not really valued, here, in any great measure. I think it may be valued, depending on where I end up, jobwise, that I can append a nice long list of technical skills that I didn’t used to have. But...I have often got the sense that that’s considered icing on the cake by the department and so that’s not nearly as centrally valued as traditional forms of research. And so I’ve really had to be very internally motivated to bother to do that. And the fact that I came in with fellowship funding has definitely enabled me to do that. I’ve had a little bit more free time along the way.

Because Cosmo was awarded a fellowship based on his traditional work, he was able to take time to develop skills with digital media. However, no formal mechanism exists to
support such professional development that parallels the opportunity to get time off for
traditional data collection or spending time in an archive. While remediating teaching is
accepted and even encouraged, remediating institutional rites of passage, such as
candidacy exams or dissertations, is another story.

Like Cosmo, Roxie has been working on a project that disrupts the traditional
methods and format of scholarship. Her field is 19th Century American Literature, and
she explains the benefits of hypertext for rethinking her approach to literary analysis:

I’ve been working on one story for probably four years now and have a really
hard time trying to analyze and interpret this story in a scholarly essay because
there’s so much going on in it. So for me to scan that text, do hypertext and link is
a much easier way and in some ways I think does more justice to the ambiguities
and complexities of that story, rather than writing a traditional essay about it. So,
yeah, [the Internet has] made me rethink the way I approach literature in some
cases.

Roxie envisions a classic remediation of scholarly literary analysis that attempts to erase
the fact of mediation, bringing the audience closer to the ambiguities and complexities of
the story, through the process of hypermediation of the analysis itself.

When asked if she sees rewards for doing that type of work, Roxie indicates that
while she sees the opportunity for reward “out there,” she says, “I don’t think they exist
very much within [this] department.” She continues:

Again, largely because it seems to me that [this] department is very divided. I
think that there are a small group of professors who would go, ‘oh wow, that’s
great!’ but the majority would be a little uninterested, like, ‘that’s great, maybe
you should submit an article about it to this journal and be published,’ that that
online work isn’t enough, it has to be authenticated by appearing in a print
journal.

Though in many ways, Roxie’s project maintains many of the traditional hallmarks of
literary analysis, particularly close reading of a text, the very fact that it is hypermediated
raises red flags. Furthermore, Roxie indicates that many professors in her department set up a binary opposition between printed scholarship and hypertextual or digitally-mediated scholarship, considering only the former truly “published.”

Though it is a fascinating, innovative project that could potentially diversify the methods and media of literary analysis, Roxie imagines the project not as a research project that she would publish and share with other scholars but rather as primarily a teaching strategy: “This is actually not a project that I myself have been working on, but I have been thinking about requiring it at some point from my students. (Which means, in effect, that I would do the project first so that I could better guide them.) But no, I haven't done it yet.” Though, like Cosmo, she teaches in the Parallel Literacies Department’s networked classrooms, has worked in the CDMS, and has role models for teaching composition with digital media, she doesn’t have role models for digital research, which Cosmo finds not only in the Composition faculty in the department but also in his field, through conferences and listservs. It is no surprise, then, that Cosmo pushes the boundaries in his work—for instance, by critiquing the formal requirements of the candidacy exam through experimenting with the formal aspects of his written exam—while Roxie only speculates about the value of a hypertextual approach to literary analysis.

At first glance, Roxie and Cosmo have a lot in common—they are first-year PhD students in the same department, they are both self-described recovering luddites, they have both worked in the CDMS and have taught composition in networked classrooms. The main difference is their field of study. Like many departments of English, the
Parallel Literacies Department encompasses not only literary studies but also Rhetoric & Composition, film, folklore, creative writing, and a number of other areas of study. Roxie’s area is literature and Cosmo’s area is Rhetoric & Composition. In their department, technology is more frequently coupled with composition than literature—more composition classes than anything else are offered in the networked classrooms, for instance.

This association of composition and technology is probably true in many English departments. The Print Literacy Department chair, for instance, explicitly links technology to professional writing, saying, “Engineering isn’t here, it’s at [another university in the state]. Medical Sciences aren’t here but at [another campus in the state system]. And so the onus on this department for generations was not to interface very well or very copiously with technology and with technical disciplines…That was not our job.” His construction of technology as the domain of professional writing, specifically, and composition, more generally, but not literature, is just one example of a larger trend in English departments. This linking makes it more acceptable for Compositionists to do technology-centered work than literary specialists.

Cosmo’s and Roxie’s projects challenge not only the media of presentation but also the traditional methods of research; Toby, Assistant Professor in the Print Literacy Department, is working on a project that challenges the very definition of “research” as it has been traditionally and institutionally conceptualized. Toby is building a web site for the training of first-time professional writing instructors and wants this to count, not as service or teaching, but as a kind of research. He says, “It is departmental service because
it grows out of my responsibility to train these instructors, but it’s a certain kind of research and creative work that requires a kind of expertise that I don’t think a whole bunch of other colleagues in the department would be able to put forward.” He also says that working on the project has given him a better perspective on how technology inflects his pedagogical aims. Toby’s project is remediating not only teaching but also teacher-training, academic service, and research; his project is also attempting to break out of the mutual exclusivity of the categories of teaching/research/service used for evaluating academic work for tenure and promotion. He is concerned about the reception of such a project and whether others will accept his argument that it should “count” as research.

These three projects are examples of how digital media are changing the work of the discipline. They are also examples of a tension in English Studies: how to evaluate work in multiple media. In Toby’s case, the most prominent issue is the inadequacies of tenure and promotion evaluation criteria. In Roxie’s case, the most prominent issue is the lack of a culture of support for digital methods of literary criticism. In Cosmo’s case, the most prominent issue is the rigidity of departmental protocol (i.e., “hoops”) for entering candidacy.

**Remediating Academic Work: Trouble with a Capital T(enure)**

Other projects like these have been written about in the *Chronicle for Higher Education* and other similar newsletters. Edward L. Ayers, for instance, describes the development of his Valley of the Shadow Project—an online database that archives primary Civil War materials such as newspapers, letters, diaries, and account books—and other similar Web-based scholarship in “Doing Scholarship on the Web: 10 Years of
Triumphs and a Disappointment.” Another project, RiverWeb, is described in the Chronicle as a site that “uses primary sources to place the geography of the Mississippi River and its chief flood plain in the context of the region’s cultural history” (Read A37). It is similar to the Valley of the Shadow Project in that it involves “small-scale digitization” and database archiving to make historical documents broadly available as well as to contextualize them within a historical (and academic) framework. A Tufts e-news article, “Digital Scholarship,” reports an interview with Gregory Crane, who heads the Perseus Digital Library, “the world’s largest on line database of Latin and Greek texts and archeological finds.” The mission of the Perseus Digital Library is not to analyze or contextualize a small set of primary materials but “is to increase accessibility of primary and secondary source-texts, and bring a wide range of materials to a larger audience.” The Valley of the Shadow Project and RiverWeb provide pedagogical frameworks to scaffold the materials, while Perseus does not; but according to Crane, digitization “add[s] value to publicly accessible material” and democratizes information by blurring “traditional lines regarding who can contribute to history, and who can access it.” Besides blurring these lines, digital archives are “revolutionizing what constitutes research, who contributes to history and the number of people who can access information” (“Digital Scholarship”).

The accounts of these projects all note a similar problem, however: they raise questions for tenure committees. Ayers, for instance, writes that his one major disappointment is that “relatively few scholars have undertaken projects the size and scope of the Valley of the Shadow. Libraries are carrying on remarkable undertakings in
digitization and tool building, but it is hard for individual scholars to conceive of large
digital projects.” He ties this to the fact that “few granting agencies offer funds for efforts
that do not fit into existing categories…Not many institutions, despite encouragement
from the Modern Language Association and the American Historical Association, have
aggressively broadened tenure and promotion procedures to encourage the risk taking on
digital projects. How should these projects be evaluated? As teaching? Scholarship?
Service?” These projects cross the categories of non-peer reviewed research and teaching.
They require a great deal of research. However, because of the lack of peer review, they
aren’t given much value as published research at tenure time. They also are sophisticated
teaching tools and learning experiences for students. However, because they don’t fit the
model of teaching activities defined by institutions, they aren’t given much value in the
teaching category at tenure time, either. People doing this work are referred to as “digital
hobbyists” in the Chronicle of Higher Education (Read A37, my emphasis), not digital
scholars. Ayers notes that “colleges and universities are willing to invest in laboratories
and workshops to build teaching materials—but not to build original scholarship” (at
least in the Humanities). He adds that “until we build scholarship that can hold its own
with the best work done on paper, tenure and promotion will not follow.”

Comments such as Ayers’ raise further questions: How can digital scholarship
“hold its own with the best work done on paper” when evaluation criteria are written with
printed scholarship in mind? What will such scholarship look like? These are two
questions that need to be addressed by entities like the Integrated Literacies Department’s
research center and the Parallel Literacies Department’s CDMS. The former is an actual
case of a university investing in a “laboratory…to build original [digital] scholarship.”

These centers play an important role in encouraging and supporting the invention of new forms of scholarship and the fostering of individual projects that can set precedents for the evaluation of remediated academic work.

Part of the problem, however, that these centers will need to address is the fact that digital projects, like the ones described above, that might represent new forms of scholarship are not seen as scholarship; they are then evaluated as either teaching or service, which can be problematic. Computers and Writing specialists, for instance, have noted that there is a disconnect between much of the service and administrative work that so-called techno-rhetoricians (techrhets) do and the criteria that are used to evaluate that work. A 1997 *Kairos* CoverWeb explores the issue of evaluating online academic work. Janet Cross and Kristian Fuglevik suggest a new model for evaluation that recognizes the interconnections of research, teaching, and service (Figure 4.1). In this model, research, teaching, and service are interconnected in a matrix rather than separated into pieces of a pie.
Figure 4.1: Cross and Fuglevik suggest a new model for evaluation of academic work that recognizes the interconnections of research, teaching, and service (their graphics).

Seth R. Katz tells the story of how his department revised their tenure policy to take digital work into account. In telling the story, he points out two issues that constrained the committees discussions: much digital work doesn’t fit traditional categories (as Cross & Fuglevik argue) and the language used to talk about academic work doesn’t represent digital work well because the processes and products of digital work change so quickly. Thus, he describes the committee as caught in between traditional and radical definitions of scholarship, trying to balance the two forces.

But as Janice Walker argues in another section of the CoverWeb, talking about digital work in traditional terms (that is, terms provided by print culture) is not necessarily desirable because doing so privileges print culture and does not encourage real institutional change. Such privileging of print does not do justice to digital work because the language of print culture is inadequate to describe and evaluate digital work. Thus, she offers three choices: “first, make our electronic work somehow ‘fit’ into existing guidelines and be able to justify it along traditional lines; second, do what we're
doing now and not have it count for purposes of tenure and promotion; or, third, change
the definitions of what is ‘valued’ to fit what we're doing.” She argues for the third choice
but cautions that when we change those definitions we should be careful not to “lock
ourselves into definitions that do not allow for [the] play and exploration” that is integral
to much innovative digital work; creating new definitions of value that are as limiting as
the old “will only insulate us from the cyberworld as it continues to evolve with or
without us.” Creating policies that are flexible enough to reward a variety of forms of
scholarship teaching, and service, even as new forms evolve, might seem like a daunting
task.

In fact, there are many examples of digital work that made important
collections to the field or a specific university that were not valued by tenure
Committees. Barry Maid writes, “Although I do know it’s possible for technorhetoricians
to get tenure—as many have already done—I am also aware of cases where fine people
did not get tenure” (9). Maid doesn’t give any specific examples, but Jeffrey R. Young
tells the stories of three faculty members who were denied tenure and one who was twice
denied promotion to full professor because their work with technology was just not
counted as “academic.” In addition, Michael Day tells the story of an anonymous
colleague who did not gain tenure:

My colleague had built the online composition program at this university from the
ground up, and she had every reason to be proud of it. But because she had
limited publications (her CD ROM distance learning strategies was not considered
a publication because it was not picked up by a publisher), for tenure she had to
be rated as “excellent” in teaching, and a ninety minute meeting was scheduled to
discuss that teaching. As part of her tenure dossier, she had included both
printouts and URLs of her class web pages for evaluators to review. These were
the course web sites for all of her distance learning classes, classes taught entirely
on line. However, before meeting to discuss her teaching, a few members of the committee did some investigating of her other online class materials until they found examples of student work which they felt was substandard, not up to the quality expected of students at that school. These they printed and distributed to the whole committee as evidence of lack of involved teaching, even though these were just drafts of student papers, a record of process, not product. They also looked at the times (and intervals between these times) that the teacher had logged on, and assumed that she had not participated enough in the class. They then used this combined evidence to sway the committee to conclude that her teaching was capable plus, but not excellent. On this basis, she was denied tenure, but offered a chance to regroup and apply again.

Day uses this as an example of the problem of panopticism when online teaching is evaluated—and it is most always evaluated using a print paradigm, which finds online teaching lacking in some way rather than recognizing that the process of teaching is now made visible by the technology. The story is also an example, however, of the inflexibility of tenure policy when it comes to forms of scholarship. Her CD ROM was not considered a publication because it wasn’t picked up by a traditional publisher, but that’s not to say that it didn’t have the same (or even greater) impact on others teaching distance education courses as a textbook or monograph on the subject; in fact, a project of this sort might have even more impact on actual practice because of its format. But most tenure policies (especially in humanities-based disciplines) are not flexible enough to account for such radically alternative “publications.” This lack of reward stifles interesting projects like Roxie’s and Toby’s that could flourish and have greater impact if properly supported and rewarded.

Walker argues that although the purpose of the tenure system is “defending controversial and often radical ideas,” it has not defended the radical practices of digital work; consequently, because “tenure protects conservative ideas just as much as radical ones” many scholars in traditional disciplines, in order “to get academic credit (“value”)
for online work” are “simply emulating the more traditional off-line work and putting it online.” Perhaps they suspect that their more radical and innovative work will not be valued come tenure time, as Toby worries about his project. Consequently, some simply choose not to pursue the kind of work that pushes the boundaries of disciplinarity, textuality, writing, or traditional teaching and research methods. When I was conceptualizing this project and working on my prospectus, I corresponded briefly with a literary studies scholar who had done some work on hypertext. He had drifted away from that work, partially because of the tenure issue, saying that a “stack” of articles in his literary field would serve him better than a similar “stack” on “computer topics.” It is notable that he conceptualizes techno-scholarship as “a stack of papers” written about technology, rather than digitally-based projects.

This recognition that tenure committees expect written, published-in-print evidence of scholarship cuts to the heart of this chapter—and helps to explain why so many academics shy away from digital work or, like Roxie, think about doing digital work and imagine the possibilities but never actually get around to doing it. Others—like Cosmo and Toby—pursue their digital work anyway, hoping it will push the field to change, but often feeling burdened by having to do that work on top of traditional work and concerned that their evaluators will not see the value in their work. This is a pressing problem because digital media are influencing and, at times, transforming, how scholarship is conducted and conceptualized—from the methods by which departments prepare graduate students for entrance into academic candidacy (as illustrated by
Cosmo’s project) to the remediating of traditional research methods and venues (as illustrated by Roxie’s project) to the combining of traditional categories (or genres) of academic scholarship (as illustrated by Toby’s project).

In his book *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Ernest Boyer reconceptualizes scholarship as consisting of four separate, yet overlapping, functions—discovery, integration, application, and teaching—and argues that this broader definition of scholarship “brings legitimacy to the full scope of academic work” (16). Though he doesn’t specifically integrate multiple media into his redefinition of scholarship, his argument for recognizing a diversity of scholarly functions can be easily extended to include a diversity of forms, genres, and media, as well. The new forms and venues for academic work that digital media gives rise to offer an opportunity to rethink definitions of scholarship at the level of institutional reward. As the previous chapters demonstrate, academic work is becoming more diversified because of digital media. But as the rest of this chapter demonstrates, tenure and promotion policies are not written in language that values this diversity. New ways of going about scholarship are developing, and tenure policies need to better recognize and value the multiplicities of academic work.

**Recognizing Work: Defining Scholarship**

When asked how his TA-training web site would affect his professional evaluation, Toby, an assistant professor in the Print Literacy Department, responded that he is concerned about this issue because he is “always looking to figure out what kinds of technological involvement are valued and why.” In addition to explaining the ways in
which the project crosses the traditional categories of teaching, research, and service,

Toby explains his reasons for creating the training web site himself and the time and

effort involved in the endeavor:

I’m doing it [instead of having the teaching with technologies lab do it] because I
have greater control over it. I have a vision about it I don’t want to have to
translate to somebody else. And I want to be the person who maintains the site
and has that kind of access to it. But to pay for that I have to invest all this
time…I’ve gotta go to three workshops on more advanced features of
Dreamweaver and Image Ready so my files aren’t too large. I think that ought to
be valued. There ought to be some sort of currency that that’s given as an effort to
be up to speed pedagogically with the options that the university gives us and as a
kind of research because now I have a much better perspective on how technology
inflects certain pedagogical aims of mine. I think it’s valuable, should be valued; I
just don’t know how.

Toby recognizes that how the discipline values creative applications of technology
depends on how the discipline defines them. Is his project service? Is it teaching? Is it
research on teaching? Realistically, it is all three of these. And it is valuable because it is
all three—teaching, research, and service. However, traditional tenure constraints dictate
that this counts for him as service. And service doesn’t count much at the research-
intensive institution where Toby works. His story highlights the “problem” with work
that exists “in the margins” between the traditional categories of scholarship, teaching,
and service. It is not so much a problem with the work itself as it is with the criteria used
to evaluate that work for tenure purposes. As Roxie says, much work with digital media
just isn’t enough; “it has to be authenticated by appearing in a print journal” in order to
count as research.

The Modern Language Association (MLA) and the Conference on College
Composition and Communication (CCCC) have each developed reports outlining
guidelines for evaluating work with digital media for promotion and tenure purposes.
Both MLA and CCCC reports note that much digital media work blurs traditional categories or could “count” in more than one category. The MLA report, for instance, encourages departments to recognize that “some traditional notions of scholarship, teaching, and service are being redefined.” CCCC guidelines state that “work with technology is often described as administrative or placed under the category of service. However, often technology-related work has additional dimensions which are more appropriately reviewed under the categories of teaching or research, as well.” To ensure the fairest evaluation, the CCCC report suggests considering “a candidate’s work with technology in as many categories as possible.” Likewise, the MLA report suggests giving candidates “proportionate credit in more than one relevant area for their intellectual work.”

The Integrated Literacies Department’s tenure policy applies this guideline. After laying out the three categories in which work will be evaluated and before specific criteria for work in those categories is laid out, the policy states, “It is often difficult to identify a scholarly activity as belonging solely to one of the main functional areas of instruction, research and creative activities, and service. Faculty work should be evaluated where it is most appropriate, be that instruction, research and creative activities, or service and outreach within the academic and broader community.” In addition, the policy allows for a section of the dossier to include evidence of integration of scholarship across categories: “While the faculty member’s accomplishments may be reported under any of the functional areas or on the additional reporting page, this space provides an opportunity for special comments where the faculty member’s work shows
integration across the functions or has had a particular focus.” The Parallel Literacies Department’s policy, on the other hand, does not formally recognize this guideline, though the P&T chair notes that the boundaries between categories can be blurry: “I’ve never seen anything like that [Flash-based article in *Kairos*¹³] before, at 4th or 6th year review. But that’s not to say that it wouldn’t be welcome as yet more evidence of either teaching or research, and I think that this is an area, sometimes like the border between service and teaching, that is a little more difficult to define as one or the other.”

Even though these two departments recognize, to greater or lesser degrees, that work sometimes cuts across the boundaries of the three traditional categories of teaching, research, and service, they nonetheless view such work as anomalous. The formal guidelines establish that most work (and, consequently, the most valuable or valued work) fits into one of the categories and not the others. But why must this be the case? State legislatures are scrutinizing state universities and finding their teaching not up to par; universities are consequently focusing more attention on teaching and finding ways to encourage faculty to become better teachers. Academics are thus under pressure to direct their work at new audiences and to show how their research and service activities influence and improve their teaching. I expect that most scholars in the humanities do see connections between their research and teaching, even if those connections are not built into a project’s foundations (as they are with Toby’s project). It might be more

---

¹³ He is referring to Ellertson’s Flash-based article in *Kairos* that consists primarily of text, but also utilizes several images, moving text, side-by-side text blocks, pop-out windows, a video of the author speaking part of his analysis, and a graphical, interactive interface that allows the user to navigate multiple paths through the text.
appropriate, then, come tenure time, rather than ask faculty to list their accomplishments in three categories, to instead ask them to show how their work integrates scholarship, teaching, and research, or, more rhetorically, to ask them to show the impact their work has had on various audiences—students, the department, university, community, discipline. Non-traditional projects—like Toby’s—that cross boundaries to combine teaching, research, and service are now even more valuable, not only to universities but also to students. So why are these projects constructed by tenure policy as “different”? Why do projects have to be categorized at all? Why can’t the categories be shattered altogether? As Walker argues, the language of the tradition doesn’t do justice to digital work. So why can’t the language of tenure policy be changed? If we change the tenure and promotion policies so that academic work is valued differently, would that change the work that gets done? Would “traditional” work suddenly be less valued? Would standards necessarily “decline”? Could it simply open the doors for a valuing of multiple types of scholarship, multiple methodologies, multiple venues of publication, multiple notions of what publication is, and, ultimately, multiple styles of learning, teaching, and working within academia? Shouldn’t encouraging these multiplicities be the role of the tenure system and the responsibility of universities?

These questions are really about which digital work counts and how. Cosmo comments on these questions from the standpoint of the academic job market. From looking at advertisements for jobs in his field, he has concluded that developing skills in digital media production will be good for his career because eventually he will be able to teach web design in a professional writing program. However, while he thinks that being
a specialist in digital media and being able to write about technology is valued, he doesn’t see digital scholarship being valued. He says, for instance, “I’m not sure if I published a piece in Kairos versus in Computers and Composition, if publishing a piece in Kairos would necessarily be considered better. I think it would be because I would think you’d want your technology specialist to be publishing innovative digital work. But there are times when I’m not sure that it would be.” Cosmo’s comments complicate the idea of technology work. He separates certain kinds of work with technology—specifically, teaching applications, theorizing it, writing about it (work in the analysis mode)—from other kinds of work—specifically, creating with it, presenting our research in new forms and media (work in the production mode). It is this work in the production mode that seems to be most often misunderstood or dismissed. These two modes are very much in tension with each other; at the same time, the modes have porous boundaries, and production work often engages in serious analysis.

As Toby’s project demonstrates, digital media work causes research to blend with other categories. This porousness can be disconcerting and lead to dismissal of digital work as non-scholarly because it doesn’t fit into the traditional categories; moreover, production value of some digital projects often upstages the analytical work that is accomplished. Cosmo’s comments also suggest, however, that even work that might fit neatly into one of the traditional categories—a multimodal research report published in Kairos, for instance—might not be evaluated fairly or might even be dismissed altogether because it doesn’t “look like” traditional work in that category—that is, it doesn’t utilize traditional media of expression or dissemination. Four of the six graduate students I
interviewed make a point of mentioning this dismissive attitude toward creative work with technology. When I asked what one thing he would change about the culture of support for technology, either in the local department or the discipline at large, Chester, a PhD student in the Parallel Literacies Department, says, “It would be more respect for people who use technology, in the sense that, that it is important and it’s not just a nice thing to do if you have the time or the interest but that it’s something that gets rewarded on an institutional level.” And Benjamin, a PhD student in the Print Literacy Department, says he would make online journals more respected. It is this perceived lack of respect and lack of institutional reward that many graduate students are worried about. Tenure-track faculty also are concerned. Toby’s concerns about his project were quoted earlier. Additionally, Ava, Assistant Professor in the Integrated Literacies Department, expresses concerns about the durability, respect, and peer review processes of online journals, which causes them to not be valued as highly as print journals when it comes to tenure review.

Ava complicates this story of dismissal, however, when she discusses her experience of being evaluated during the tenure process (which she has just been through when we talk):

What’s really interesting is getting assessed by people who don’t do tech work, because you’re instantly labeled either as the geek or the technology guru… In some ways, though, people who aren’t ready to take the technology seriously don’t see it as meaningful. You’re kind of the geeky nerd who knows computer stuff but they might not see the intellectual value in it. But I really think that’s such a tiny point. It’s the way that you represent yourself and your work as a professional. I mean, we’re rhetoricians. That’s what we do well. You know, talking about how what we do counts and what it means and why and in what ways it’s significant.
Ava’s comments highlight an interesting point, namely, the importance of representing digital work rhetorically and educating those who might not take that work seriously. She also addresses another point that is often overlooked: many digital media scholars do digital work because that is what they were hired to do; it’s difficult to be a leader in the field of digital media studies and not do digital media production work. The fact that such scholars are then expected to fulfill traditional tenure requirements (often, though not always, a book) is problematic. Although, Ava’s comment indicates that many tenure policies might be flexible enough to reward digital work, as long as a scholar is able to demonstrate how his/her work meets the traditional requirements (perhaps even arguing for a redefinition of “the book”).

The P&T Chair of the Parallel Literacies Department reinforces the importance of this kind of education: “the provisionary faculty member has an opportunity to teach us how to evaluate what’s being presented to us through a number of documents, the research document, the teaching document, as well as the service document. So they could tell us, you know, if we’re not smart enough to figure it out ourselves, what’s important about how they’re doing what they’re doing.” This is the tack that several authors take in a 2000 issue of *Computers and Composition* devoted to the issue of tenure. Barry Maid and Rebecca Rickly argue that candidates should assess their rhetorical situations and use the language their departments value to describe their work with technology. Sibylle Gruber analyzes the contradictory subject positions that techrhets occupy, which she argues leads to a sense of fragmentation and lack of ability (on the part of tenure committees and administrators) to categorize work with technology;
she ultimately argues that tenure committees need to be educated of these multiple roles and their different purposes so they can better evaluate technology work. She, like Maid and Rickly, places the burden on the candidate to explain the work in traditional terms rather than arguing for a restructuring of tenure policy. However, she does anticipate transformation, but only if an environment is created that “opens dialogue, accepts difference, and promotes new and transformative ideas. Thus, instead of working against those who do not fit our ideological framework, we can work with them and create a differential movement—a movement that validates diversity and that looks at opposition as an enabling force” (53). This diversity, I argue, can only happen if tenure policy is radically restructured, and that restructuring will only happen if tenure policy is challenged by individual projects.

Multiple Media and Scholarly Expectations

When I interviewed the T&P chair of the Parallel Literacies Department, I showed him some examples of non-traditional publications, including Anthony Ellertson’s “Some Notes on Simulacra Machines, Flash in FYC & Tactics in Spaces of Interruption” published in *Kairos*. It was created using Macromedia Flash to organize its elements—it consists primarily of text, but also utilizes several images, moving text, side-by-side text blocks, pop-out windows, a video of the author speaking part of his analysis, and a graphical, interactive interface that allows the user to navigate multiple paths through the text. Even though the piece is composed primarily of words, because of
its multimedia elements, it seemed quite foreign to the T&P chair. When asked how something like that would be evaluated, he responded:

Well, presuming that there are people on the senior faculty who understand the matter, I think that um, I mean, I’m gathering that there’s a professional protocol for this kind of thing, I’m gathering that there’s now a group of scholars who are in a position to tell us what’s a good presentation and what isn’t a good presentation, one that’s taking full advantage of the resources peculiar to the technology. I’ve never seen anything like that before, at 4th or 6th year review. But that’s not to say that it wouldn’t be welcome as yet more evidence of either teaching or research, and I think that this is an area, sometimes like the border between service and teaching, that is a little more difficult to define as one or the other.

In addition to placing the burden of proof on the candidate to explain how the non-traditional project fits the traditional value system, this P&T chair also places some burden on scholars in the field. He assumes that there is a group of scholars that can educate those outside of their field about digital research, and that recognition indicates an openness to learn about digital media research and the potential to accept it on its own terms.

This comment also, however, points to the ways in which digital media are undervalued by traditional evaluation criteria. The Parallel Literacies Department is part of a research-intensive university, where research is valued most highly, followed by teaching. The multimedia piece I showed to the P&T chair utilizes traditional composition methodology and represents as much work as an ethnography presented in print and published in a journal; in fact, Kairos, the online journal that published the piece has a very good reputation for publishing quality scholarship. The difference is that the piece uses multimedia to present the research findings; it is not in print, and it is not linear. Thus, this T&P chair, though he claims it would be accepted as evidence of work,
says it would be evidence of EITHER teaching OR research, suggesting that this project is not clearly research. If it were printed, even with its focus on the classroom and ethnographic methodology, there would be no question; it would count as published research. This department has Composition and Folklore programs, and several faculty in those areas do ethnographic research. So there is a history of faculty educating their peers about ethnography; the use of the methodology is established in the department. But because of the “article’s” multimedia elements, all of a sudden the focus on the classroom and the medium of presentation become more apparent and suddenly it might not classify as research. It is also telling that this T&P chair does not say that the multimedia piece would be evidence of teaching AND research, but teaching OR research, reifying those categories as separate. Even though he admits the border is “difficult to define,” a border still exists.

It all comes down to the valuing of print culture over everything else and the elevation of print as the medium of research. Even the rules for the presentation of the dossier reflect the importance of print culture standards for evaluating research. The T&P chair describes the procedure for evaluating a candidate’s dossier in the Parallel Literacies Department:

At the appropriate points…the candidate is obliged to present us with a research package. And, if a part of that is online publication, we need to have hard copy. And those are evaluated, in the case of 4th year, by all senior faculty, they read them, and in the case of 6th year, they’re sent to at least six external reviewers, as hard copy, and part of the package. So, as always, we say, what we try to evaluate is the quality and not necessarily the venue. Though, I will tell you, the venue is sometimes important. Getting the right piece in the right place can be a feather in somebody’s cap, but it’s not, it seems to me, the decisive factor.
He says they look at the quality not the venue. But if the venue is not print how can a piece be evaluated in print without calling the venue into question? The question of the designer becomes important when addressing this question. If a piece was designed by the author for a particular medium, if the medium played an important part in the creative or analytical process, then printing out the piece poses serious problems. If the author did not design the piece specifically for digital presentation but it happened to appear in a digital venue (a traditional, linear article that is published in an online journal but does not make particular use of hypertextuality or multimedia, for instance), then printing out the piece does not seem particularly problematic. The T&P chair does not make this distinction, however, in his comments, indicating, at best, an unawareness of the kind of work digital media scholars might present.

It seems that the medium of dossier presentation must be print; the term “hard copy,” for instance, is used twice. But that doesn’t necessarily eliminate CD or other fixed media, which could easily be considered “hard copy.” The connotation, however, is that “hard copy” means printed. Other aspects of dossier presentation further support its being understood as a printed document. Written evaluations and letters are stressed by both policies, for instance. And it can thus be difficult, as Sabrina Mehra writes, “for committees to identify the applicability of technological efforts in the humanities when professors are prevented from making an accurate presentation” (9). Mehra interviewed Jane Lasarenko, who said, “Where I am now, they require you to submit a three-ring binder no larger than three inches for promotion and tenure applications, and you’re free to include any supplemental material you want, but they don’t have to look at it, and
there’s not even a computer in the room where they review the applications” (9).

Likewise, Anthony Carpi, a participant in the Chronicle.com’s 2002 Colloquy discussion “Working With Technology and Winning Tenure,” wrote:

From my own experience, I have created an online resource (http://www.visionlearning.com) that has been shown to improve science education and recently received funding from the National Science Foundation. Yet during a recent promotion review, I had to print these materials out and include a copy on CD for the committee only to be told that the physical width of the package was thin compared to a textbook.

What if a candidate’s work can’t be presented in print? What if a candidate’s research reports all utilized multimedia and were published in online venues like Kairos? When I asked the T&P chair in the Parallel Literacies Department how a piece like Ellertson’s would become a part of the dossier, he responded, “I have no idea. Nobody’s ever presented anything like this, thus far. That’s not to say it won’t happen. If it does happen, we’ll have to use CDs or something, I’m not sure. But I think that would be welcome as well.” He adds that the real challenge to probationary faculty is “not having enough senior faculty in his or her field.”

Certainly, this is a challenge. A senior faculty member who understands the candidate’s work and can explain it to the committee and advocate on the candidate’s behalf is surely an asset. However, is this really the biggest challenge? Perhaps the real challenge is a limited definition of scholarship that artificially separates intellectual work into categories that really aren’t so separate after all and limits the modes and media of expression and dissemination of academic work by invoking an understanding of disciplinarity that is similarly limiting.
How Does Medium Count?

After a pause, Ava adds to her previous comment that gaining tenure requires basic rhetorical skill in explaining your work’s value to others, “But—you know—I would probably be thinking differently about this if all my publications were online publications—or software. I have a lot of print publications. So that makes me feel more secure in a fairly traditional environment.” This comment highlights the conservative nature of definitions of publication—specifically, the valuing of print over other forms—but also the lack of reward for certain kinds of innovation. Toby’s project innovates by blending traditional scholarly genres and thus, in the evaluation of his project, the category of evaluation is at issue—research, service, or teaching. Furthermore, Ava’s comments reinforce the notion that even work that is easily classified as “research” raises questions if it isn’t published in the traditional medium of print or if it isn’t expressed primarily in words.

In fact, the medium of publication is already a central concern in tenure decisions. For instance, when asked how much medium counts in tenure decisions, the department chair of the Print Literacies Department says:

I think it counts a lot. At least right now…Let’s put it this way. If a person, if scholar X publishes his or her articles at well-known presses or in well-known journals, at least those of us who know the discipline reasonably well, ask no questions, we know what those are. Whereas if that same person’s publishing in electronic journals, unless they’re extremely well-known, nobody knows what they are. Now, let’s hope that the next generation of scholars will know. But I think for right now, it prompts questions that are not raised if scholarship is published in traditional venues. I assume that’s gonna change in the next ten years.

But how will the next generation know about online venues? If those venues are not valued now, rising scholars are not likely to publish in them. If rising scholars don’t
publish in them, they will never gain a reputation and nobody will ever know about them. This suggests that it is not enough to simply re-imagine the categories of evaluation of intellectual work. If the medium of publication matters so much, then defining the media of scholarship is crucial. In other words, the discipline needs to re-think the concept of publication by unpacking the definition of medium and recognizing how biases toward particular media are written into tenure policies and thus influence the kind of work that does and does not get done, not to mention where it does and does not appear.

**Recognizing Work: Revising Policy**

The MLA guidelines for evaluating work with digital media instructs departmental tenure and promotion committees to be aware of the unique issues associated with scholarly work in digital media and to revise their written policies when necessary: “Institutions and, when appropriate, departments should develop their own written guidelines so that faculty members engaged in research and teaching with digital media can be adequately and fairly evaluated and rewarded.” The report lists several guidelines (which are echoed by the CCCC report): departments should (1) recognize collaborative work, (2) recognize the blurring of traditional categories that digital media often entail, (3) seek qualified (often external) reviewers and/or interdisciplinary advice to assist in evaluating digital work, (4) review work in the medium for which it was developed and (by extension) recognize new venues for the development and dissemination of scholarly work, and (5) make explicit reference to medium in tenure and
promotion policies. Two of these suggestions have specific implications for this discussion—(1) reviewing work in the appropriate medium/recognizing new venues and (2) explicitly referencing medium.

*Review in Appropriate Medium & Recognize New Venues*

Recognizing new venues involves recognizing that an author likely chooses a medium of expression as well as a medium of dissemination and thus a venue based on the particular or unique characteristics of that medium and/or venue. In order for those characteristics to be fully appreciated and the work fully understood and evaluated, the MLA and CCCC reports state that any text must be reviewed in the medium for which it was intended.

The Integrated Literacies Department’s policy applies this guideline to teaching materials and scholarly work when listing examples of materials used to determine the quality of instruction: “Evidence of instructional materials and activities particular to online or distance education; such materials should be viewed in the media for which they were intended.” The policy also applies this guideline to scholarly work when listing examples of materials used to determine the quality of research and creative activity: “Other scholarly contributions such as editing a scholarly book, an edition of letters, or editing an anthology or reader. Multi-media production, computer software, websites or other technological contributions. Such contributions should be read in the media for which they were intended.”
On the other hand, the Parallel Literacies Department’s policy does not apply this guideline. As discussed earlier, the P&T chair says that candidates for tenure must present printed copies of published research for the dossier. Not only does this department not have a formal mechanism for dealing with non-printed publications, but it seems to informally discourage submitting non-printed materials for consideration. In addition, when shown a Flash-based article published in *Kairos* and asked how something like that would be submitted, the P&T chair responded that he had no idea how it would be dealt with because it has never been done before. His response, along with Cosmo’s not being able to do a multimodal exam, suggests that this department (like many others, to be sure) isn’t prepared to evaluate digital work, despite a growing number of faculty and PhD students who list digital media studies, digital literacy, or computers and writing as a teaching or research interest.

The Integrated Literacies Department has been through the process of evaluating non-traditional scholarship and has consequently built some flexibility into its policy so that all work is viewed/read in the medium in which it was published. The Parallel Literacies Department, however, is so steeped in print culture that, while adding technology into teaching or using the Web to access texts and communicate with others is accepted and even encouraged, scholarship and publishing are still unquestionably seen as print-based. Furthermore, the process of evaluation is a print-based one, clearly privileging print publications and publications that might appear online but are styled as if for print, making it more difficult for work that is not disseminated in print and not styled in such a way as to be easily printed out to be evaluated fairly, if at all.
Explicit Reference to Medium: Additive vs. Transformative Models

Both the CCCC and MLA guidelines recommend that tenure and promotion policies should specifically reference how work in digital media will be evaluated, though neither of the documents specifies exactly how to reference medium. The Integrated Literacies and Parallel Literacies Departments’ policy documents reference medium by adding it into lists of examples.

When laying out guidelines for the evaluation of scholarship, both the Integrated Literacies and Parallel Literacies Departments’ policies make explicit reference to medium. For instance, the Parallel Literacies Department’s policy states:

Beyond the quantitative standards for promotion to each rank (see below), the Department values especially the quality of a candidate’s scholarship—its originality, lucidity, and intellectual depth. Evidence of scholarship should consist of published writing, singly or collaboratively authored, or, where appropriate, recordings, videotapes, films, and works in electronic or other media, singly or collaboratively produced…Candidates must also demonstrate evidence of having made significant, high-quality contributions to important conversations in their field. This evidence typically takes the form of a published book as well as essays in major refereed journals or edited volumes, conference papers at national meetings of scholarly organizations, and book reviews and review essays. Where appropriate, evidence of scholarship may also include textbooks and journal articles on pedagogy, recordings, videotapes, films, and works in electronic or other media, singly or collaboratively produced. These forms of scholarship will be evaluated by the same process and according to the same criteria (see B above) as all other forms of scholarship.

Likewise, the Integrated Literacies Department’s policy also gives “examples of materials or activities by which research and creative activity may be evaluated” which “should be viewed as most valued in descending order of importance.” The first four in the list are:

A scholarly, belletristic, or textbook of substantial quality.
Articles, book chapters, short stories, or poetry.

Other scholarly contributions such as editing a scholarly book, an edition of letters, or editing an anthology or reader.

**Multi-media production, computer software, websites or other technological contributions.** Such contributions should be read in the media for which they were intended.

The definition of “scholarship” in these statements is explicitly tied to medium of production: in both, published writing (especially the book) is listed as the most important or typical contribution to scholarship. When other media are listed (highlighted portions), their “scholarly-ness” is not taken for granted as is the scholarly-ness of printed writing. This is especially true in the Parallel Literacies Department’s policy, in which forms other than the book “may” be considered evidence of scholarship “when appropriate.” Remediations of academic work are thus only *sometimes* scholarly and appropriate, and it is not clear the conditions that dictate when they would be considered so. The Integrated Literacies Department’s policy does not fall so blatantly into this pattern. However, both policies explicitly value the book over other forms of scholarly work.

The P&T Chair of the Parallel Literacies Department admits that “The department does have a fetish for the old-fashioned, single-authored volume, book.” But he also says that articles are important and that a traditionally styled online article would be treated the same as a printed article “as long as it’s refereed. It’s got to be refereed. That’s the key issue.” So it would seem that as long as the publication is rigorously peer reviewed and judged to be of high quality, then medium doesn’t matter. However, when asked whether it would matter if a person had only online publications and no print
publications, this P&T chair said, “I can’t tell you that it wouldn’t matter….What’s most
important is the book. And by that I mean a thing like this,” he holds up a bound book
and says, “not in cyberspace.” He later adds, “Now, we’ve had debates about what a book
is. I think we’re very broad-minded about what constitutes a book. As long as it’s doing
the sorts of work that important scholarship does, then I think it satisfies the senior
members of the department.” But what work does important scholarship do? A book in
cyberspace, or an e-book, arguably does (or has the potential to do) much the same
scholarly work as a printed book. A collection of photographs making a visual argument
or a documentary film chronicling an ethnographic research project or a software
program that allows classes to write poetry collaboratively or even a teaching module for
new professional writing TAs also has the potential to do much the same intellectual
work as a book full of words. Yet, this T&P chair specifically points to a bound, printed
book, and specifically says “not in cyberspace.” This indicates that the conversation in
the department about what constitutes a book has been focused on other issues, not the
medium of dissemination.

I mentioned earlier that four of the six graduate students I interviewed perceive a
dismissive attitude toward creative work with technology. Two of the six do not perceive
this as a problem. Both of these individuals are Ph.D. students in the Integrated Literacies
Department. This department has made it part of their mission to integrate technology
throughout the curriculum and to lead the field in the rhetoric and pedagogy of
technology. They are also revising their tenure and promotion policy to take
 technological work into account. The Integrated Literacies Department Chair says that
the new policy represents a new model for scholarship that takes technology into account by evaluating digital work as a major contribution to the field, giving it parity with other kinds of published scholarship, recognizing that it can be creative as well as scholarly, rewarding new kinds of innovation, and recognizing that “there are much [sic] more venues in which one’s work can be demonstrated.”

This department chair recognizes the transformative potential for digital media. He also realizes the need for a transformation of tenure policy based upon a new model of scholarship. The department’s policy lists four criteria for judging the quality of work:

Scholarship: to what extent is the effort consistent with the methods and goals of the field and shaped by knowledge, understanding, and insight that is current or appropriate to the topic? To what extent does the effort generate, apply, and utilize knowledge?

Significance: to what extent does the effort address issues that are important to the scholarly community, specific constituents, or the public?

Impact: to what extent does the effort benefit or affect fields of scholarly inquiry, external issues, communities, or individuals? To what extent does the effort inform and foster further activity in instruction, research and creative activities, or service?

Attention to Context: to what extent is the effort consistent with the University Mission Statement, issues within the scholarly community, the constituents’ needs, and available resources?

Echoing Ava’s earlier comments, innovation is not valued, even though the department chair mentions innovation as being important. Though the department’s four criteria could be applied to work in any media, the language of the examples given and the order of importance specified—first books, then articles, then “other” contributions, then multimedia contributions—still privileges print and sets up the same binary categorization (print/other) as the Parallel Literacies Department’s policy. In addition, it
represents an additive model of technological work, in which technology is added into what is already being done rather than being allowed to transform the work that gets done. Now, the Integrated Literacies department chair is talking in transformative terms, but the wording of the policy isn’t clearly expressing that vision yet.

Likewise, the Parallel Literacies Department’s policy names “originality, lucidity, and intellectual depth” as well as “evidence of having made significant, high-quality contributions to important conversations in their field” as the criteria for judging the quality of a candidate’s scholarship. Neither of these sets of criteria is specifically exclusive of any scholarship based on medium or genre. In fact, all of these criteria could be applied equally and fairly to scholarship of any genre appearing in any medium. However, the policy also states, “Typically, a candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure will be expected to present to reviewers a book published (or at least a finished manuscript under final, board-approved contract and in production) by a scholarly press with a strong reputation.” Though some presses publish e-imprints, the connotation of the word “press” is still “print.” What makes a strong reputation? Partially, the amount of time the press has been in existence and whether it is a university or commercial press; this privileges print again. The policy further states that candidates need to demonstrate significant contributions to their fields, and evidence of this typically appears in print (books, essays in refereed journals, etc.), though it adds that work in other media may also count when “appropriate.” Throughout the policy, scholarship is limited and defined based upon medium. Print is consistently listed as the typical medium of publication, and any other form is subsumed in the “other” category. I would argue
that a “book” or “essay” (or, indeed any other genre mentioned by the policy) could be presented in any medium; there are, in fact, traditional presses that also publish e-books. However, separating out “multi-media production” and delineating that “evidence of scholarship may also include…works in electronic or other media” sets up an opposition between “book” and “electronic or other media” that is mutually exclusive. Where, then, would an e-book fit? Is it a book or a “work in electronic or other media?” Can it be both? According to this policy, an e-book is “other” than a book seemingly only because of the absence of paper, though it could arguably still be considered a book in terms of some genre expectations other than medium of dissemination.

Genre and medium are conflated throughout the Integrated Literacies and Parallel Literacies Departments’ policies. I don’t want to argue that genre and medium are completely independent. Of course, every work that conforms to the conventions of a genre also has a medium of expression. And digital media are giving rise to new genres and transforming older ones. But the Parallel Literacies Department’s policy treats all online works as belonging to the same genre—the genre of online publication, which is not incredibly precise. Furthermore, it treats all non-printed works in the same category, constructing non-print as a single genre, rather than recognizing that most genres can find expression in a variety of media.

The Print/Digital Binary

It appears that these departments are beginning to take some of the MLA’s guidelines to heart and to recognize that high quality scholarly work appears in digital
venues as well as in print. However, print is still clearly the premier medium, and though the same standards might be applied to evaluate work in digital media, the fact that appropriate media have to be listed, coupled with the stories and comments from scholars in the preceding sections, suggests that work in digital media is not valued as equal to work in print. The medium of dissemination is enough to raise suspicions about the quality of work. Moreover, the guidelines that are meant to remedy this situation might actually be reinforcing the binary between print scholarship and scholarship not in print, where only the former is considered “published.”

The CCCC statement sets up a binary between print and digital publication early in the document:

In preparing these guidelines, we have tried to address the fact that at this moment in our profession, the pace of technological change in unprecedented computer-mediated communication (CMC) is reconfiguring the ways in which scholarly knowledge is produced and disseminated. New forms of scholarship are beginning to emerge in electronic environments. Electronic scholarship mimics print scholarship in some important ways, but it also differs from print scholarship in important ways. Several sources which speak to the evaluation of work for which there is a print counterpart already exist...It is the intention of this document to provide guidance for departments in evaluating work with technology for which there is not a convenient print analog. Thus, we offer general principles for evaluating such work, bearing in mind that the rapid pace of technological change means that each case will need to be decided on its own merits, and each case is in a sense precedent-setting.

In this paragraph, digital media scholarship is defined as either mimicking print media or not, which sets up print as the standard and defines digital texts in relation to printed ones—the main characteristic of digital media publications is that they are not print; therefore, different evaluation criteria are needed. The CCCC Position Statement on Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Writing in Digital Environments—written by a committee chaired by Kathleen Yancey and including Andrea Lunsford, James
McDonald, Charles Moran, Michael Neal, Chet Pryor, Duane Roen, and Cindy Selfe—sets up a similar binary when it states that “the curriculum of composition is widening to include not one but two literacies: a literacy of print and a literacy of the screen.”

The MLA report, on the other hand, focuses less on the products or specific technologies of scholarship as on the nature of scholarly production in the digital age:

Digital media have created new opportunities for scholarship, teaching, and service, as well as new venues for research, communication, and academic community. Information technology is an integral part of the intellectual environment for a growing number of humanities faculty members. Moreover, digital media have expanded the scope of textual representation and analysis to include, for example, image and sound. These innovations have considerably broadened the notion of “text” and “textual studies,” the traditional purview of modern language departments.

The MLA document avoids the explicit binarization of print/digital because it argues that digital media “innovations have considerably broadened the notion of ‘text’ and ‘textual studies,’ the traditional purview of modern language departments.” The MLA document, therefore, is attempting to open up for consideration the opportunity for publication in a range of media, including print and digital media but perhaps also other media left out of the print/digital binary, for instance, film, video, analog audio, etc.

Though the MLA report resists setting up this binary, the manner in which the guidelines have been adopted by the Integrated Literacies and Parallel Literacies Departments seems to follow the lead of the CCCC statement in maintaining a separation between types of scholarship based upon medium, which ends up privileging print over non-print publications. Furthermore, questions of medium in these departments’ policies are treated not as issues of medium as much as issues of genre, effectively masking (to a certain extent) the focus on medium by treating the digital medium as another genre as
opposed to recognizing that traditional genres can cut across media. When the CCCC Position Statement on Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Writing in Digital Environments discusses the relationship between digital texts and their print analogs, it is trying to make the distinction between medium and genre, recognizing that the “print analog” for a digital text is one that falls in the same genre but is merely published in a different medium. However, this fine distinction is not explicitly addressed and therefore not maintained in the promotion and tenure policy documents analyzed here. Because of this attention to medium, which MLA and CCCC suggest, tenure and promotion criteria are not applied in the same way to digital media because digital media publication is considered a “special case” and will remain so as long as the medium is specified with examples of work that counts and as long as genre is conflated with medium and as long as fear prevents scholars from presenting such work in their tenure and promotion dossiers.

**Conclusion**

Remediated forms of scholarship clearly complicate our understanding of what scholarship is and are redefining academic work. However, the system of institutional reward is not keeping up with these changes and is, in fact, set up in such a way that it does not accommodate digital projects very well. That tenure policy and other institutional rites of passage are constructed in a way that tends to privilege some forms above others is not surprising, given the conflicted nature of disciplinary and departmental identity that undergirds decisions about digital media work. However,
organizations like the Integrated Literacies Department’s research center and the Parallel Literacies Department’s CDMS are well positioned to encourage and support the invention of new forms of scholarship and foster individual projects that can set precedents for the evaluation of remediated academic work. In order for policy to change, it must be challenged by courageous digital scholars who believe in their work and can set precedents for how it is to be read and evaluated.
Peer review and other academic processes, such as promotion and tenure reviews, increasingly do not reflect the ways scholarship actually is conducted. In a climate in which the established methods of peer review are grounded in print-based publications, acknowledging and verifying scholarly contributions in unusual formats can be quite difficult. Where standards are not clearly defined, it is a challenge indeed to estimate the academic significance of digital works. This affects tenure, promotion, selection of new faculty, and other academic processes, as well (2006 Horizon Report).

The 2006 Horizon Report, a collaboration between The New Media Consortium and the EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative, was published, quite serendipitously, as I began writing the conclusion to this dissertation. It “describes the continuing work of the NMC’s Horizon Project, a research oriented effort that seeks to identify and describe emerging technologies likely to have a large impact on teaching, learning, or creative expression within higher education” (3). In addition to describing the technological trends that will affect colleges and universities (e.g., social computing and personal broadcasting), the report also “for the first time this year…explicitly identified and considered many challenges facing higher education” over the next five years (4). The
quotation opening this chapter is the first of five challenges listed in “rank order” (e.g., teaching information literacy, intellectual property concerns) (4). The report does not specifically describe how the emerging technologies they list might impact peer review and other academic processes but instead focuses on their “relevance for teaching, learning, and creative expression,” speculating about the potential applications of each technology in the classroom and in research/scholarship.

The fact that the report does not consider the specific impact on promotion and tenure or hiring processes is not surprising because those academic processes are so dependent, as the preceding chapters have demonstrated, upon local context. Furthermore, as the preceding chapters have argued, those processes are complicated by individuals’ departmental and disciplinary locations, identifications, and affiliations. In addition to professional identifications and affiliations, part of the difficulty affecting the evaluation of digital media work is finding models of what that work looks like and how that work could be evaluated. As the *Horizon Report* notes, standards are often not clearly defined; however, it is difficult to define new standards in the absence of a test case. It is these two questions—What might new models of scholarship look like? Who is doing such work now?—that can help the discipline understand the implications for revising tenure and promotion policy, training teachers to use digital media in their classes, and generally supporting all kinds of digital media work.
Digital Media Scholarship

The kinds of digital media scholarship that participants in this study are doing can be classified into two general types: scholarship that studies the role of digital media in people’s lives and scholarship that uses digital media to present its arguments in non-traditional ways. The former is work in the analysis mode, whereas the latter is work in the production mode. Ava’s scholarship falls in to the first category of digital cultural studies. Her study of women’s office folklore, for instance, analyzes people’s uses of technology to create digital texts and communicate with each other. Much current work in Rhetoric and Composition also falls into this category; discussions of teaching writing with computers (e.g., Monforton, Rouzie, Samuels, Stroupe) and the analysis of digital rhetoric (e.g., Howard, Welch) are commonplace.

There is a rift, however, between digital work in the analysis mode and digital work in the production mode. As the previous chapters have demonstrated, scholarship in the analysis mode—that is, scholarship analyzing digital media—does not raise eyebrows or cause concerns. In fact, all of the participants in this study have some analytical interest in the effects of digital media on various cultures, whether it is the classroom culture or cultures outside of the academy. None of them, however, uses digital media to create scholarship that presents its arguments in non-traditional ways. Their reasons are diverse: for some, like Roxie, the issue is one of accepted methodology in her discipline; for others, like Cosmo, the issue is one of accepted forms of composing in his department. For all, however, their decisions about using digital media are complicated by their disciplinary and departmental identifications and affiliations.
My own affiliations profoundly influenced this project. Early on in the process of writing this dissertation, I was talking with two tenured professors in my department (neither of whom works in the field of digital media studies) who asked me about potential venues for my work. I listed a couple of journals, and they asked why I wasn’t considering digital publications. The question truly took me by surprise, and I mumbled something I don’t remember. It got me thinking, though, about how strongly my program had trained me to value the printed product even though the focus of my research was digital media, the methods of my research lent themselves to digital production, and the focus of my teaching had been (and continues to be) digital composing. Although I used digital media to code and analyze my interviews (which had been recorded digitally), I had never thought about producing anything other than a printed document. I didn’t think my department or university would accept my dissertation in any other form, and it didn’t occur to me to challenge that convention with the format of my own analysis. Even now, when I think about how I might present this work digitally, I imagine a linear text with audio components: recordings of the participants speaking their own words rather than transcription of their words. It is difficult for me to imagine a radically different presentation.

Although nobody participating in this study (including me) has yet to do digital scholarship in the production mode, several of them are thinking about the possibilities and imagining new forms. Cosmo, for instance, envisions creating a non-linear, interactive text that maps his field and utilizes multimedia elements like rollover graphics and audio discussions to further an argument about his field. Roxie, likewise, envisions
creating a non-linear, interactive hypertext that furthers an argument about a literary text. Both of these projects imagine scholarly arguments that are expressed in non-traditional formats and media. Several digital media scholars have published non-traditional texts in *Kairos* that are non-linear and interactive and further scholarly arguments. Ellen Cushman’s “Composing New Media: Cultivating Landscapes of the Mind,” for example, is an interactive text that looks and feels like a poem but argues that new media composers “reform the practices and roles of academic readers and writers and scholarship.” She deliberately creates a sense of dissonance for the reader to make her point that we need to rethink the definition of writing/composing in this age of digital media and re-imagine both reading and writing as performative.

In chapter two, I argued that Alan’s research combined the analysis and production modes because his project exploring citation practices requires the creation of digital media tools to perform that analysis. This is an example of a project that does not fit neatly into either category of digital scholarship I’ve named in this section. His resulting analysis of citation practices clearly fits into the model of digital cultural studies: analysis of the culture of academic citation. But what about the database he and his colleagues have created that stores and categorizes the data and is able to retrieve data based upon user queries? It is not exactly scholarship that uses digital media to present its arguments in non-traditional ways because it doesn’t have an “argument” in the same way that Roxie’s imagined project does. But the way the data is coded and the way it is
programmed to interpret queries does constitute a kind of argument about the data, a way of seeing and organizing the data, that influences the kinds of queries that are acceptable and the data that will be retrieved for each query.

Alan’s project demonstrates that the analysis and production modes are not mutually exclusive. Work in the analysis mode typically produces some kind of product (printed document, oral presentation, etc.), much scholarly work in the production mode is highly analytical, and work in the production mode need not focus on analyzing digital media. The important distinction between the analysis and production modes as I discuss them is that the assumed product of work in the analysis mode is a printed, primarily alphabetic text, whereas the assumed product in the production mode is digital and primarily not composed of alphabetic text but rather audio, video, visuals, and the like; in addition, while analysis is certainly a component of much work in the production mode, what we accept as analysis in the production mode might be very different from the traditional definition of analysis exemplified by the analysis mode. Separating them, as I have done, reveals the underlying assumptions governing how we define, conduct, and evaluate scholarship.

So how should we consider Alan’s database? How should it count? For some tenure and promotion committees, it might not count at all. At best, it might count as service to the field because it provides other scholars a tool for doing more research. But might it count as scholarship? Might the creation of the database be considered research
and the database itself be considered the “final product,” analogous to a research report or an edited collection of letters or the like? Might it represent a new direction in scholarly production?

**Tenure & Promotion: Revising Policy**

Projects like the one Cosmo and Roxie imagine are raising questions right now for tenure committees. When shown an article in *Kairos* that utilizes strategies similar to those Cosmo imagines, the tenure and promotion committee chair in the Parallel Literacies Department was stymied; he had never seen anything like it. It is not a stretch to imagine that an argument that something like Alan’s database should be considered a scholarly product would be met with skepticism, if not outright opposition. Part of the problem is the issue of peer review that the *Horizon Report* notes. Peer review practices for the Parallel Literacies Department (as well as many other departments, to be sure) are print-dependent. A related problem is that standards for evaluating work also assume primarily printed products. The report argues that estimating the academic significance of digital work is challenging because standards for evaluating such work are not clearly defined. However, how are standards to be defined when digital work pushes at the boundaries of what is considered scholarly?

How can tenure and promotion committees define new standards when they have never seen the kind of work they are defining new standards for? A factor contributing to the problem is that nobody wants to be a “guinea pig,” as Chester so aptly put it in chapter one. It’s the same old story of which comes first, the chicken or the egg: nobody
will do digital media production work (or, more precisely, nobody will present any digital media production work as part of their dossier; they’ll do it “on the side,” “on top of” their traditional work) because of fears that it won’t count for tenure, but there’s no real exigency for tenure policy to change or for departments to know what changes to make until a test case comes through the channels. The kinds of cases that are coming through are, by and large, examples of traditional scholarship disseminated in a different medium than print: primarily alphabetic texts published in an online journal, for instance. The medium of dissemination must be considered separately from the medium of expression; typically, as the tenure policies reviewed in the last chapter reveal, these two ways of thinking about medium are conflated.

Given that so much of the scholarship disseminated digitally is not expressed in digital media but in static alphabetic text, it makes some sense that tenure and promotion committees (particularly those in this study) are so focused on defining appropriate media of scholarly presentation and adding specific types of digital media publications to their lists of examples of scholarly work. However, what happens when something that is completely different shows up? How do our mindsets have to change in order to recognize such projects as work with scholarly value? What will it take for departments like the Print Literacy Department or Parallel Literacies Department to drop the across-the-board requirement of “a book and a stack” for tenure, to understand that replicating traditional structures in new media is not really change, and to recognize that—while the production of books and journal articles might be the most appropriate form of
scholarship for some fields—it is just as important for some digital media scholars to do
digital media production work as it is to produce books and journal articles analyzing
digital media?

The case studies in this dissertation, while they certainly don’t provide definitive answers, do shed some light on these issues. The Integrated Literacies Department, for instance, was in the process of revising their tenure and promotion policy when I conducted my interviews. The impetus for the revision, according to the Department Chair, was the case of a person under review for tenure who had some non-traditional, online publications. He said that the discussion was more involved because the old policy (the policy in place at the time of the review) did not provide appropriate guidelines for considering digital scholarship. He added that it was lucky there were people on the committee who were in the field and could provide context for the other members of the committee because if they had not been on the committee, the person’s digital work might have been undervalued. The problems they had with reviewing this person’s case were the impetus for the department to revise its policy. Furthermore, although the Department Chair did not go into details, he said that the individual had a few online articles and a lot of service work relating to technology, which led me to believe that this person’s digital work was rather traditional in its form but published in non-print venues and that there was not significant digital production work. The new policy, analyzed in chapter four, attends primarily to these more traditional types of digital work that happen to be published in online venues and to the question or “problem” of technology-based service work. Although the department does provide evaluation criteria that are flexible,
the traditional hierarchy of media remains written into the policy, and the policy focuses attention on adding appropriate media of dissemination to the list of examples of acceptable scholarly work. The policy also addresses service and administrative work with technology that might cross into other categories (teaching, research), and much of the new language of the policy deals with this idea of work “counting” in more than one category.

The way that this policy was revised reveals the importance of precedent-setting cases. Somebody has got to be first to spark reform. At the same time, it reveals the importance of flexibility. Having a group of people in a department engaging in diverse scholarly and creative activities is what makes departments strong and vibrant; it’s what makes the discipline strong and vibrant. Yet in order to gain tenure, individual faculty members must demonstrate, paradoxically, that their work is in some ways like everybody else’s. I’m not arguing against standards. But the standards must be flexible enough to accommodate a wider variety of work in more media than they do now.

Again, we can look to the Integrated Literacies Department for an articulation of flexible standards. The department’s revised policy lists four criteria for judging the quality of work—Scholarship, Significance, Impact, Attention to Context (see pg. 194 for full quotation). These four criteria are standards that could be met in a variety of ways with scholarship in a variety of media. Moreover, these standards define the evaluation criteria in such a way that disciplinary as well as departmental contexts are considered. Although the list of examples of scholarly work that follows is limiting and undercuts the flexibility of these standards to a certain extent, the potential exists for individuals in the
future to argue for the valuation of something that’s not on the list and might not even exist at this point in time. Finally, the criteria recognize that some work will cross categories, and they value work that “inform[s] and foster[s] further activity in instruction, research and creative activities, or service.” This allows for the valuing of projects that don’t fit neatly into one category but whose value lies in the crossing of categories, such as Toby’s training module for professional writing TAs.

**Teacher Professional Development: Learning Digital Media**

The valuing of Toby’s digital module for training professional writing TAs can also be considered from another angle: how well it prepares teachers for teaching with digital media. Interestingly, though the *Horizon Report* discusses the future of technologies for teaching and learning, it does not mention how teachers are supposed to learn how to teach with these technologies. Teaching teachers to teach with digital media is important and complicated.

The Integrated Literacies and Parallel Literacies Departments provide two different models for providing professional development opportunities focused on digital media for teachers at all levels, not only TAs. Both programs recognize that it takes time and ongoing support not only to learn to use digital media but also to learn how to incorporate it into teaching; they structure that time and support in different ways, however. The Integrated Literacies Department provides training integrated into coursework, whereas the Parallel Literacies Department provides a community-based peer support model.
The two models suggest a list of elements that are necessary for fostering the professional development of teachers comfortable with digital media pedagogy:

- A fully integrated pedagogy class for incoming TAs. While the Parallel Literacies Department’s required pedagogy class that Cosmo took incorporated online discussions, it was not fully integrated and did not meet in a computer classroom. A fully integrated course offers a space to imagine the possibilities for digital pedagogy.

- A second pedagogy/teaching methods class that could be integrated with digital media if the graduate student were interested. This would require faculty who regularly teach undergraduate classes in computer classrooms. It offers a space to learn hands-on about digital pedagogy and to see it modeled.

- The ability for teachers at all ranks (MA, PhD, lecturer, tenure track, tenured) to teach in computer classrooms. This requires computer classrooms and technological infrastructure. It offers a space to experiment with digital pedagogy.

- Support people to consult about pedagogy and to call upon for classroom assistance. A centralized location for this kind of interaction, such as in the CDMS, helps create a supportive community that can provide ongoing support and encouragement.

- Up-to-date computer technology in graduate student as well as faculty offices with the highest-end computer technology centrally available to all. This provides spaces to learn, practice, and experiment with specific applications.
either alone or in groups without overburdening the budget by “duplicating”
the most expensive technologies or restricting access to them.

- Regular workshops and ongoing professional development activities, such as
discussion groups, that could carry credit (for graduate students) or release
time (for faculty). This provides spaces to learn, practice, and experiment with
applications and to develop digital pedagogies.

- Special awards for digital media innovation in teaching and release time (or
fellowships) for the development of digital media pedagogies.

Not all of these elements exist at either location, and the last item in the list does not exist
in any great measure in either department, but they provide a vision for an approach to
providing professional development in digital media pedagogy that takes into account
four key ingredients—technological infrastructure, mentors, skills training, and ongoing
pedagogical support—that combine to create a culture in which digital media pedagogy
can flourish.

Questions for the Future

The two questions I raised at the beginning of this chapter—What might new
models of digital work look like? Who is doing such work now?—shed light on the
implications for revising tenure and promotion policy, training teachers to use digital
media in their classes, and generally supporting all kinds of digital media work. In order
for change to occur, the following questions need to be considered:
How can we evaluate work that pushes at the boundaries of academic genres without privileging any particular medium? The fault line between analysis and production needs to be seriously contemplated as we consider this question. Perhaps we can look to art or performance for models of how to value both digital analytical and production work.

How can we build flexibility into graduate education while maintaining “standards”? Discussions about balancing standards with flexibility when evaluating scholarship will likely help as we consider how to balance standards and flexibility in graduate requirements. Cosmo’s ideas for a multimedia candidacy exam suggest future possibilities; maybe everybody’s work doesn’t have to be composed in the same medium in order to fulfill requirements.

How can we support and encourage digital media production in any class, including composition? The analysis/production split is still alive among composition teachers, not to mention teachers of other subjects; providing proper professional development for digital pedagogy is likely to make digital production in any class, but particularly in composition classes, more attractive and increasingly accepted. In addition, we need to redefine literacy as the ability to understand and produce texts, rather than the ability to read and write. Instead of talking about “digital literacy” or “visual literacy,” we need to recognize that the skills students need in order to be fully literate and participate in society now include digital, visual, and a host of other skills.
beyond the ability to read and write alphabetic text. Recognizing this and including “the digital” when we talk about literacy would encourage an understanding of what our job is as composition teachers that includes digital media production under its umbrella.

- How can we support the time it takes to learn technology? Currently, time spent in an archive is seen as a valuable part of the process of scholarship, and scholars are often given fellowships and release time to do this; perhaps learning digital media skills could be seen as a parallel activity for scholars whose work is heavily dependent upon the use of digital media.

As we consider these questions, we should keep in mind the experiences of the individuals in this study. Ava, Alan, Benjamin, Toby, Cosmo, and Roxie can teach us about the potentials of digital media scholarship. Their projects reveal the variety of ways that digital media could be and is being used for research and scholarly production. The tenure track faculty in this study—Ava, Toby, and Emily—can teach us about the assumptions about scholarship and medium that underwrite tenure and promotion policy. Their experiences reveal the underlying assumptions that govern how we define and conduct scholarship. Moreover, their negotiations of their professional identities reveal the role of departments and disciplines in shaping choices about digital media research and shaping the ways that digital media is addressed in tenure and promotion policies. The PhD students in this study—Adele, Alan, Benjamin, Chester, Roxie, and Cosmo—can teach us about helping teachers learn to teach with digital media. Their attempts to come to terms with using digital media as teachers reveals the role of departments and
disciplines in shaping choices about digital media teaching and providing learning experiences focused on digital media pedagogy. As junior faculty and PhD students, these individuals represent the future of the profession. Their negotiations of their professional identities in disciplinary and departmental contexts give us a glimpse into what the future might hold for digital media in English Studies.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS
Digital Media & Technology In English Studies

A Survey for Assistant Professors

Directions:

This survey asks questions about your experiences with digital media/technology in your academic career.

The term “English Studies” is a catch-all term that I use to refer to various areas of study that are often, though not always, located together in English departments: literature, composition, rhetoric, film, folklore, cultural studies. When I use the term “English” in this survey, I am referring to this larger group of areas of study, not just the study of literature.

The term “digital media/technology” refers to all new technologies and new media that employ digital encoding of information. Some examples are digital video (DVD), digital photos/photography, the Internet, computerized word processing (Microsoft Word, Works), web-editing (Front Page, Dreamweaver), and email.

The term “digital media/technology” also refers to the devices that run the programs listed above. Some examples are DVD players, computers, PDAs, LCD projectors.

For each item, please place a checkmark in the box that best represents your response.
1. Have you submitted work to be published in an online journal or forum?  
   - Yes  
   - No (If No, Go to Item 3)

2. Have you had your work published in an online journal or forum?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - Forthcoming

3. Do you ever plan on submitting your work to be published in an online journal or forum?  
   - Definitely  
   - Probably  
   - Maybe  
   - I doubt it  
   - No, never

The following questions deal with the percentage of faculty and graduate students in your department using digital media/technology for teaching and research.

Use the following scale: 0-20%, 21-40%, 41-60%, 61-80%, 81-100%, Don’t know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. About what percentage of tenured faculty in your department uses digital media/technology to enhance student learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. About what percentage of tenured faculty in your department uses digital media/technology to enhance their research presentations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. About what percentage of tenured faculty in your department conducts research on or about digital media/technology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. About what percentage of tenure-track faculty in your department uses digital media/technology to enhance student learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. About what percentage of tenure-track faculty in your department uses digital media/technology to enhance their research presentations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. About what percentage of tenure-track faculty in your department conducts research on or about digital media/technology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. About what percentage of graduate students in your department uses digital media/technology to enhance student learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. About what percentage of graduate students in your department uses digital media/technology to enhance their research presentations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. About what percentage of graduate students in your department conducts research on or about digital media/technology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Does your department or university offer professional development workshops dealing with digital media/technology?  
   - Yes  
   - No (If No, Go to Item )  
   - Not sure (If Not sure, Go to Item )
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14. About how many professional development workshops dealing with digital multimedia/technology are offered in a typical year? _____________

15. About how many professional development workshops dealing with digital multimedia/technology did you attend last year (If none, write 0)? _______________

The following questions deal with the amount of technology training you have received in the last 12 months. Use the following scale: None, 1-5 hours, 6-10 hours, 11-20 hours, More than 20 hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>&gt; 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. About how many hours of formal basic technology skills training (e.g., word processing, web-building, course management tools) did you receive within the past 12 months?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. About how many hours in the past 12 months did you spend on your own teaching yourself new technology skills?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. About how many hours of formal training did you receive on integrating digital media/technology into your teaching?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. About how many hours in the past 12 months did you spend informally talking with others about integrating digital media/technology into your teaching?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some departments, faculty and graduate students feel pressured to use digital media/technology in ways that are inconsistent with their best judgment. Place a checkmark in the box that best represents the extent to which you feel pressured to do the following things more than you would want to do them. Use the following scale: A lot, Some, Very little, None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. To have students use digital media/technology.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. To have students create multimedia presentations rather than traditional essays.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. To have a personal web page/site.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. To have a course web page/site for each of the classes you teach.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. To teach students to be critical Internet users.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. To have students use online discussion.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. To correspond with students using email.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. To use a specific courseware package.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. To use digital media/technology in your teaching.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. To use digital media/technology in research presentations.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. To have students write traditional essays rather than create multimedia presentations.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In some departments, faculty and graduate students feel pressured to avoid using digital media/technology in certain circumstances. Place a checkmark in the box that best represents the extent to which you feel pressured to avoid the following activities. Use the following scale: A lot, Some, Very little, None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. To use digital media/technology in your teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. To conduct research on/about digital media/technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. To use digital media/technology in research presentations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. To publish your work in online journals or forums.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Place a checkmark in the box that best represents your ability to use the application or device listed below. Use the following scale: Expert (Exp), Advanced (Adv), Good, Novice (Nov), Have Not Used (HNU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>HNU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Word Processing (e.g., Microsoft Word, Word Perfect, Works)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Spreadsheets (e.g., Excel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Presentation software (e.g., PowerPoint)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Web Browser (e.g., Internet Explorer, Netscape)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Web page authoring program (e.g., Dreamweaver, FrontPage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Animation program (e.g., Flash)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Graphics editing program (e.g., Photoshop, Fireworks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Hypertext (but not web) authoring program (e.g., Hypercard, Storyspace)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Courseware (e.g., WebCT, Blackboard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Digital camera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Digital video editing program (e.g., iMovie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Audio recording device</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Digital sound editing program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Muds/MOOs or other simulated/virtual spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Chat room or instant messaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Online discussion board or bulletin board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Data analysis software (e.g., Hyperresearch, NUDIST, SPSS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Computer or video games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Bibliographic software (e.g., Endnote)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each application listed below, place a checkmark in the box that most closely represents your ability to integrate it into the teaching and learning process. Use the following scale: Expert (Exp), Advanced (Adv), Good, Novice (Nov), No ability (NA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55. Word Processing (e.g., Microsoft Word, Word Perfect, Works)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Spreadsheets (e.g., Excel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Presentation software (e.g., PowerPoint)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Web Browser (e.g., Internet Explorer, Netscape)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Web page authoring program (e.g., Dreamweaver, FrontPage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Animation program (e.g., Flash)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Graphics editing program (e.g., Photoshop, Fireworks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Hypertext (but not web) authoring program (e.g., Hypercard, Storyspace)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Courseware (e.g., WebCT, Blackboard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Creating a PDF file (e.g., with Acrobat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Digital camera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Digital video editing program (e.g., iMovie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Audio recording device</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Digital sound editing program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Muds/MOOs or other simulated/virtual spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Chat room or instant messaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Online discussion board or bulletin board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Data analysis software (e.g., Hyperresearch, NUDIST, SPSS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Computer or video games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Bibliographic software (e.g., Endnote)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. In which of the following types of classrooms have you taught (check all that apply):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional classroom (no computers, no Internet connection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional classroom with one Internet connection available for a portable computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional classroom with a media center (Computer/Projector/DVD/VCR/etc.) for the instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A computer for each student and computer/projector for the instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A computer for each student and media center for the instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Which of the following types of classrooms is available for you to teach in (check all that apply):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional classroom (no computers, no Internet connection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional classroom with one Internet connection available for a portable computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional classroom with a media center (Computer/Projector/DVD/VCR/etc.) for the instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A computer for each student and computer/projector for the instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A computer for each student and media center for the instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Do you have a personal web page/site you created yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No, somebody else created my web site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, I have no web site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place a checkmark in the box that best represents the frequency with which you use digital media/technology for each of the professional activities listed below.

Use the following scale: Always, Frequently, Occasionally, Seldom, Never

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79. Keeping track of grades (e.g., with a spreadsheet or other software)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Responding electronically to student work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Teaching yourself new technology skills (e.g., teaching yourself or trying out new software)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Email with students or colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Searching the Internet for information and resources relating to your research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Searching the Internet for information and resources relating to your teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Administrative duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Online “chat” or instant messaging with students or colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Submitting proposals/papers to conferences or publishers (e.g., via email or online submission form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Reading online journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Analyzing data using specialized software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Writing using word processing or other specialized software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Participating in a departmental listserv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Participating in a listserv relating to your field of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Professional presentations (such as conference or workshop presentations, invited talks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Managing bibliographic citations with bibliographic software (e.g., Endnote)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Maintaining your web site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Preparing digital materials (e.g., images, PDF files, audio/video, etc.) for class activities, lectures, or professional presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Sharing files with students or colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Participating in an academic bulletin board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Using Mud/MOO or other virtual spaces to communicate with students or colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place a checkmark in the box that most closely represents the extent to which digital media/technology has affected the way you do or think about the following things.

Use the following scale: Very big change, Big change, Moderate change, Small change, Not affected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very big change</th>
<th>Big change</th>
<th>Moderate change</th>
<th>Small change</th>
<th>Not affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100. The way space is organized your classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. The way you break up your class sessions into activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Your beliefs about curricular priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Your goals in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Your teaching methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. The types of formal assignments you give</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. What constitutes research in your field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. The topics you research/write about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. The way you go about research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Place a checkmark in the box that best describes the extent to which you agree with each of the statements listed below.

The term “English Studies” in the following statements refers to the various areas of study that are often, though not always, located together in English departments: literature, composition, rhetoric, film, folklore, cultural studies.

Use the following scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Agree Somewhat, Neutral, Disagree Somewhat, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109. There is too much focus on digital media/technology in my department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. Graduate students encourage me to try digital media/technology in my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. Undergraduate students encourage me to try digital media/technology in my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Teaching should be an interactive process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. Students should work on individualized projects as much as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. Discussion of course/curricular goals and how to achieve them occur regularly in my department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. Early adopters of technology exist in my department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. I (plan to) publish in journals committed to teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. “English Studies” classes should provide students with a capacity to work with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118. “English Studies” classes should provide students with a capacity to use technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. There are intellectual leaders in digital media/technology studies in my department.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. Some graduate students in my department spend too much time working with digital media/technology.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. It is a liability in my discipline to work with digital media/technology.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. Students are not ready to write essays until they have mastered sentences and paragraphs.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. I believe much of my research informs my teaching.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. “English Studies” classes should provide students with a capacity to deal with unique problems.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. Not enough faculty members in my department teach with digital media/technology.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. Not enough graduate students in my department teach with digital media/technology.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. The teacher, not the students, should decide what activities will be done in class.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128. Students should help establish the criteria on which their work will be assessed.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129. I believe doing research also makes me a better teacher.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130. “English Studies” classes should provide students with a capacity to think critically about technology.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131. Not enough faculty members in my department study digital media/technology.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132. Not enough graduate students in my department study digital media/technology.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133. Other faculty members encourage me to try out digital media/technology in my teaching.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134. There are senior professors in my department who are integrating digital media/technology into their teaching and/or research.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135. Some assistant professors in my department spend too much time working with digital media/technology.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136. There is not enough focus on digital media/technology in my department.</td>
<td>![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Place a checkmark in the box that best represents how often you need each type of support listed below.

Use the following scale: Weekly or more, 1-2 times a month, Seldom, Never

| 137. Mechanical support (e.g., computer and software fixes) | ![Weekly or more] ![1-2 times a month] ![Seldom] ![Never] |
138. Technical support (e.g., help learning how to use software, help opening an email attachment)  
139. Instructional support (e.g., incorporating technology into your course activities)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place a checkmark in the box that best represents how available each type of support is when you need it.</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Not available</th>
<th>None needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140. Mechanical support (e.g., computer and software fixes)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141. Technical support (e.g., help opening an email attachment)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. Instructional support (e.g., incorporating technology into your course activities)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place a checkmark in the box that best represents the quality of support you receive.</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>None received</th>
<th>None needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143. Mechanical support (e.g., computer and software fixes)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144. Technical support (e.g., help learning how to use software)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145. Instructional support (e.g., incorporating technology into your course activities)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place a checkmark in the box that best represents how much more you would use digital media/technology if you always received adequate support in each area.</th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Somewhat more</th>
<th>No more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>146. Mechanical support (e.g., computer and software fixes)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147. Technical support (e.g., help learning how to use software, help opening an email attachment)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148. Instructional support (e.g., incorporating technology into your course activities)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

149. Who provides technology support for those who need it in your department? (If you are unsure, write “unsure.”)
150. Including this year, for how many years have you been using digital media/technology to support teaching/learning?

☐ Haven’t started  ☐ Less than  ☐ 1-2  ☐ 3-5  ☐ 5-10  ☐ More yet. a year years years years years

(If you haven’t started yet, Go to Item 153)

151. In the space below, briefly describe the learning environment you want to create through the use of digital media/technology.

152. In the space below, briefly describe how you use digital media/technology for teaching.

153. In the space below, please describe any barriers that exist for you in regard to integrating digital media/technology more fully into your teaching.

154. In the space below, please describe the facilities (e.g., labs, office computers, etc.) provided by your department and/or university for faculty and graduate students to do academic work.

155. In the space below, please describe how you use digital media/technology in your academic research/writing/publishing processes.

156. In the space below, please describe any barriers that exist for you in regard to integrating digital media/technology more fully into your research/writing/publishing processes.

157. a. What is your field of specialization? ____________________________

b. In which department is your primary appointment (your “tenure home”)? ____________________________

158. For how many years have you been teaching? _____________

159. Where are you on the tenure track?

☐ First Year  ☐ Second Year  ☐ Third Year  ☐ Fourth Year  ☐ Fifth Year  ☐ Sixth Year  ☐ Not on tenure track

160. Gender:

☐ Male  ☐ Female

161. Race/Ethnic group: _______________________________

162. Age:

☐ 25 or younger  ☐ 26-30  ☐ 31-35  ☐ 36-40  ☐ 41-45  ☐ 46-50  ☐ 50 or older

Please use the remaining space (below and on back) to provide any additional comments you may have. Thank you again for your time.

1 For 151-156, about 1/3 of a page of writing space was provided below each prompt.
Digital Media & Technology In English Studies

A Survey for Graduate Students

Directions:

This survey asks questions about your experiences with digital media/technology in your academic career.

The term “English Studies” is a catch-all term that I use to refer to various areas of study that are often, though not always, located together in English departments: literature, composition, rhetoric, film, folklore, cultural studies. When I use the term “English” in this survey, I am referring to this larger group of areas of study, not just the study of literature.

The term “digital media/technology” refers to all new technologies and new media that employ digital encoding of information. Some examples are digital video (DVD), digital photos/photography, the Internet, computerized word processing (Microsoft Word, Works), web-editing (Front Page, Dreamweaver), and email.

The term “digital media/technology” also refers to the devices that run the programs listed above. Some examples are DVD players, computers, PDAs, LCD projectors.

For each item, please place a checkmark in the box that best represents your response.
1. Have you submitted work to be published in an online journal or forum?
   - Yes
   - No (If No, Go to Item 3)

2. Have you had your work published in an online journal or forum?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Forthcoming

3. Do you ever plan on submitting your work to be published in an online journal or forum?
   - Definitely
   - Probably
   - Maybe
   - I doubt it
   - No, never

The following questions deal with the percentage of faculty and graduate students in your department using technology for teaching and research.

Use the following scale: None, 1-20%, 21-40%, 41-60%, 61-80%, 81-100%, Don't know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use the following scale: None, 1-20%, 21-40%, 41-60%, 61-80%, 81-100%, Don't know</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. About what percentage of faculty in your department uses digital media/technology to enhance student learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. About what percentage of faculty in your department uses digital media/technology to enhance their research presentations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. About what percentage of faculty in your department conducts research on or about digital media/technology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. About what percentage of graduate students in your department uses digital media/technology to enhance student learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. About what percentage of graduate students in your department uses digital media/technology to enhance their research presentations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. About what percentage of graduate students in your department conducts research on or about digital media/technology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Does your department or university offer professional development workshops dealing with digital media/technology?
   - Yes
   - No (If No, Go to Item )
   - Not sure (If Not sure, Go to Item 13)

11. About how many professional development workshops dealing with digital media/technology are offered in a typical year? _____________

12. About how many professional development workshops dealing with digital media/technology did you attend last year (If none, write 0)? _____________
The following questions deal with the amount of technology training you have received in the last 12 months. Use the following scale: None, 1-5 hours, 6-10 hours, 11-20 hours, More than 20 hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>&gt; 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. About how many hours of formal basic technology skills training (e.g., word processing, web-building, course management tools) did you receive within the past 12 months?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. About how many hours in the past 12 months did you spend on your own teaching yourself new technology skills?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. About how many hours of formal training did you receive on integrating digital media/technology into your teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. About how many hours in the past 12 months did you spend informally talking with others about integrating digital media/technology into your teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some departments, faculty and graduate students feel pressured to use digital media/technology in ways that are inconsistent with their best judgment. Place a checkmark in the box that best represents the extent to which you feel pressured to do the following things more than you would want to do them. Use the following scale: A lot, Some, Very little, None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. To have students use digital media/technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. To have students create multimedia presentations rather than traditional essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. To have a personal web page/site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To have a course web page/site for each of the classes you teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. To teach students to be critical Internet users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. To have students use online discussion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. To correspond with students using email.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. To use a specific courseware package.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. To use digital media/technology in your teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. To use digital media/technology in research presentations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. To have students write traditional essays rather than create multimedia presentations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some departments, faculty and graduate students feel pressured to avoid using digital media/technology in certain circumstances. Place a checkmark in the box that best represents the extent to which you feel pressured to avoid the following activities. Use the following scale: A lot, Some, Very little, None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. To use digital media/technology in your teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. To conduct research on/about digital media/technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. To use digital media/technology in research presentations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. To publish your work in online journals or forums.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place a checkmark in the box that best represents your ability to use the application or device listed below. Use the following scale: Expert (Exp), Advanced (Adv), Good, Novice (Nov), Have Not Used (HNU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Word Processing (e.g., Microsoft Word, Word Perfect, Works)</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Spreadsheets (e.g., Excel)</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Presentation software (e.g., PowerPoint)</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Web Browser (e.g., Internet Explorer, Netscape)</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Email</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Web page authoring program (e.g., Dreamweaver, FrontPage)</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Animation program (e.g., Flash)</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Graphics editing program (e.g., Photoshop, Fireworks)</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Hypertext (but not web) authoring program (e.g., Hypercard, Storyspace)</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Courseware (e.g., WebCT, Blackboard)</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Digital camera</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Digital video editing program (e.g., iMovie)</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Audio recording device</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Digital sound editing program</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Muds/MOOs or other simulated/virtual spaces</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Chat room or instant messaging</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Online discussion board or bulletin board</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Data analysis software (e.g., Hyperresearch, NUDIST, SPSS)</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Computer or video games</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Bibliographic software (e.g., Endnote)</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each application listed below, place a checkmark in the box that most closely represents your ability to integrate it into the teaching and learning process. Use the following scale: Expert (Exp), Advanced (Adv), Good, Novice (Nov), No ability (NA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52. Word Processing (e.g., Microsoft Word, Word Perfect, Works)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Spreadsheets (e.g., Excel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Presentation software (e.g., PowerPoint)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Web Browser (e.g., Internet Explorer, Netscape)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Web page authoring program (e.g., Dreamweaver, FrontPage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Animation program (e.g., Flash)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Graphics editing program (e.g., Photoshop, Fireworks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Hypertext (but not web) authoring program (e.g., Hypercard, Storyspace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Courseware (e.g., WebCT, Blackboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Creating a PDF file (e.g., with Acrobat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Digital camera</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
64. Digital video editing program (e.g., iMovie)

65. Audio recording device

66. Digital sound editing program

67. Muds/MOOs or other simulated/virtual spaces

68. Chat room or instant messaging

69. Online discussion board or bulletin board

70. Data analysis software (e.g., Hyperresearch, NUDIST, SPSS)

71. Computer or video games

72. Bibliographic software (e.g., Endnote)

73. In which of the following types of classrooms have you taught (check all that apply):
   - Traditional classroom (no computers, no Internet connection)
   - Traditional classroom with one Internet connection available for a portable computer
   - Traditional classroom with a media center (Computer/Projector/DVD/VCR/etc.) for the instructor
   - A computer for each student and computer/projector for the instructor
   - A computer for each student and media center for the instructor
   - Other (please describe):

74. Which of the following types of classrooms is available for you to teach in (check all that apply):
   - Traditional classroom (no computers, no Internet connection)
   - Traditional classroom with one Internet connection available for a portable computer
   - Traditional classroom with a media center (Computer/Projector/DVD/VCR/etc.) for the instructor
   - A computer for each student and computer/projector for the instructor
   - A computer for each student and media center for the instructor
   - Other (please describe):

75. Do you have a personal web page/site you created yourself?
   - Yes
   - No, somebody else created my web site
   - No, I have no web site

Place a checkmark in the box that best represents the frequency with which you use digital media/technology for each of the professional activities listed below.

Use the following scale: Always, Frequently, Occasionally, Seldom, Never

76. Keeping track of grades (e.g., with a spreadsheet or other software)

77. Responding electronically to student work

78. Teaching yourself new technology skills (e.g., teaching yourself or trying out new software)

79. Email with students or colleagues

80. Searching the Internet for information and resources relating to your research
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>81. Searching the Internet for information and resources relating to your teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>82. Administrative duties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>83. Online “chat” or instant messaging with students or colleagues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>84. Submitting proposals/papers to conferences or publishers (e.g., via email or online submission form)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>85. Reading online journals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>86. Analyzing data using specialized software</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>87. Writing using word processing or other specialized software</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>88. Participating in a departmental listserv</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>89. Participating in a listserv relating to your field of study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>90. Professional presentations (such as conference or workshop presentations, invited talks)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>91. Managing bibliographic citations with bibliographic software (e.g., Endnote)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>92. Maintaining your web site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>93. Preparing digital materials (e.g., images, PDF files, audio/video, etc.) for class activities, lectures, or professional presentations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>94. Sharing files with students or colleagues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>95. Participating in an academic bulletin board</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>96. Using Mud/MOO or other virtual spaces to communicate with students or colleagues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Place a checkmark in the box that most closely represents the extent to which digital media/technology has affected the way you do or think about the following things.**

**Use the following scale: Very big change, Big change, Moderate change, Small change, Not affected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very big change</th>
<th>Big change</th>
<th>Moderate change</th>
<th>Small change</th>
<th>Not affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>97. The way space is organized your classrooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>98. The way you break up your class sessions into activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>99. Your beliefs about curricular priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100. Your goals in teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>101. Your teaching methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>102. The types of formal assignments you give</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>103. What constitutes research in your field</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>104. The topics you research/write about</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>105. The way you go about research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place a checkmark in the box that best describes the extent to which you agree with each of the statements listed below.

The term “English Studies” in the following statements refers to the various areas of study that are often, though not always, located together in English departments: literature, composition, rhetoric, film, folklore, cultural studies.

Use the following scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Agree Somewhat, Neutral, Disagree Somewhat, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106. There is too much focus on digital media/technology in my department.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. Teaching should be an interactive process.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. Students should work on individualized projects as much as possible.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. Other graduate students encourage me to try digital media/technology in my teaching.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. Undergraduate students encourage me to try digital media/technology in my teaching.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. Discussion of course/curricular goals and how to achieve them occur regularly in my department.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Early adopters of technology exist in my department.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. I (plan to) publish in journals committed to teaching</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. “English Studies” classes should provide students with a capacity to use technology.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. There are intellectual leaders in digital media/technology studies in my department.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. Some graduate students in my department spend too much time working with digital media/technology.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. It is a liability in my discipline to work with digital media/technology.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118. Students are not ready to write essays until they have mastered sentences and paragraphs.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. I believe much of my research informs my teaching.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. “English Studies” classes should provide students with a capacity to deal with unique or new problems.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. “English Studies” classes should provide students with a capacity to work with others.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. Not enough faculty members in my department teach with digital media/technology.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. Not enough graduate students in my department teach with digital media/technology.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. The teacher, not the students, should decide what activities will be done in class.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. Students should help establish the criteria on which their work will be assessed.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. I believe doing research also makes me a better teacher.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>“English Studies” classes should provide students with a capacity to think critically about technology.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>Not enough faculty members in my department study digital media/technology.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>Not enough graduate students in my department study digital media/technology.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>Faculty members encourage me to try out digital media/technology in my teaching.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>There are senior professors in my department who are integrating digital media/technology into their teaching and/or research.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>Some assistant professors in my department spend too much time working with digital media/technology.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>There is not enough focus on digital media/technology in my department.</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Place a checkmark in the box that best represents how often you need each type of support listed below.**

*Use the following scale: Weekly or more, 1-2 times a month, Seldom, Never*

| 134. Mechanical support (e.g., computer and software fixes) | □ □ □ □ □ □ □ |
| 135. Technical support (e.g., help learning how to use software, help opening an email attachment) | □ □ □ □ □ □ □ |
| 136. Instructional support (e.g., incorporating technology into your course activities) | □ □ □ □ □ □ □ |

**Place a checkmark in the box that best represents how available each type of support is when you need it.**

*Use the following scale: Almost always, Mostly, Frequently, Sometimes, Not available, None needed.*

<p>| 137. Mechanical support (e.g., computer and software fixes) | □ □ □ □ □ □ □ |
| 138. Technical support (e.g., help opening an email attachment) | □ □ □ □ □ □ □ |
| 139. Instructional support (e.g., incorporating technology into your course activities) | □ □ □ □ □ □ □ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place a checkmark in the box that best represents the quality of support you receive.</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>None received</th>
<th>None needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140. Mechanical support (e.g., computer and software fixes)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141. Technical support (e.g., help learning how to use software)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. Instructional support (e.g., incorporating technology into your course activities)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place a checkmark in the box that best represents how much more you would use digital media/technology if you always received adequate support in each area.</th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Somewhat more</th>
<th>No more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143. Mechanical support (e.g., computer and software fixes)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144. Technical support (e.g., help learning how to use software, help opening an email attachment)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145. Instructional support (e.g., incorporating technology into your course activities)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

146. Who provides technology support for those who need it in your department? (If you are unsure, write “unsure.”)

147. Including this year, for how many years have you been using digital media/technology to support teaching/learning?

- Haven’t started yet.
- Less than a year
- 1-2 years
- 3-5 years
- 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

*(If you haven’t started yet, Go to Item 150)*

148. In the space below, briefly describe the learning environment you want to create through the use of digital media/technology.

149. In the space below, briefly describe how you use digital media/technology for teaching.

150. In the space below, please describe any barriers that exist for you in regard to integrating digital media/technology more fully into your teaching.

---

For 148-153, about 1/3 of a page of writing space was provided below each prompt.
151. In the space below, please describe the facilities (e.g., labs, office computers, etc.) provided by your department and/or university for faculty and graduate students to do academic work.

152. In the space below, please describe how you use digital media/technology in your academic research/writing/publishing processes.

153. In the space below, please describe any barriers that exist for you in regard to integrating digital media/technology more fully into your research/writing/publishing processes.

154. What is your field of specialization within English studies?

________________________________________________________________________

155. For how many years have you been teaching? ____________

156. Where are you in your Ph.D. program?

- [ ] Just started
- [ ] Taking courses
- [ ] Preparing for or just passed candidacy exams
- [ ] Working on/writing the dissertation
- [ ] Getting ready to defend the dissertation

157. Gender:
- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female

158. Race/Ethnic group: _______________________________

159. Age:
- [ ] 25 or younger
- [ ] 26-
- [ ] 30
- [ ] 36-
- [ ] 40
- [ ] 41-
- [ ] 50
- [ ] 50 or older

Please use the remaining space (below and on back) to provide any additional comments you may have. Thank you again for your time.
Interview Questions for Case Study Participants

Semi-structured interviews were guided by the following questions:

1. What do you notice about the use of technology in this department? This college/university? Your discipline?

1-1. For each thing noticed in #1:
   1-1a. What do you think is going on here?
   1-1b. How would you explain that to your students? The department chair? The dean?
   1-1c. How does this connect to your teaching? Your research? Other aspects of your academic work?

2. Uses of technology:
   2a. Tell me a little about your uses of technology to teach? What led you to begin using technology in your teaching?
   2b. Tell me a little about your uses of technology for coursework and research. What led you to begin using technology for coursework and research?

2-2. Support:
   2-2a. In what ways do you feel supported?
   2-2b. In what ways do you feel unsupported?
   2-2c. What could the department do to make you feel more supported?
   2-2d. What could the university do to make you feel more supported?
   2-2e. If you could wave a magic wand, what one thing would you change about the culture of support either here specifically or in the discipline in general?

3. I want you to make a list of all the communication technologies or new media you use in your classes, for your research, or any other academic work you do.
4. From the list generated in #3, select the one item that best fits each of these four squares:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mostly willing to use it</th>
<th>Mostly imposed on me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly helpful results</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly not helpful or</td>
<td>4c</td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hurtful results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. And select the one that strikes you most as being a mixed blessing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed blessing</th>
<th>5a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In-depth analysis: Apply each of the following questions to one of 4a-d and 5a (whichever interviewee chooses).

6. What was it that led you to use this technology?

   6a. Do you use this technology for teaching? How?
   6b. How does this use connect to your pedagogical philosophy?
   6c. Do you use this technology for research or scholarship? How?
   6d. How does this use connect to your role or place in your department?
       College/university? Discipline?

7. Did any barriers or constraints stand in the way of your use of this technology?

   7a. What barriers or constraints stood in the way?
   7b. For each: How did it stand in the way? How did it hinder you?
   7c. For each: How did this hindrance connect to your life as a teacher? As a scholar? As an administrator?
7d. For each: If you could have waved a magic wand, what would have helped?

8. Did anything facilitate or help your use of this technology?

8a. What facilitated or helped?
8b. For each: How did it facilitate or help your use of this technology?
8c. For each: How did this “help” connect to your life as a teacher? As a scholar? As an administrator?

9. Looking back over your uses of this technology, what have been the big questions or confusions you have faced in using it?

9a. What were these?
9b. For each: How did this question/confusion relate to your life?
9c. For each: Did you get a complete answer? Partial? No answer at all?
9d. For each: If not a complete answer, what stood in the way?
9e. For each: Did asking this question impact or change you? How?
9f. For each: If you could have waved a magic wand, what would have helped?

10. Looking back over your uses of this technology, what have been the emotions or feelings you have had in connection with its use?

10a. What were these?
10b. For each: How did this emotion/feeling relate to your life as a teacher? As a scholar? As an administrator?
10c. For each: Did the emotion/feeling impact or change you? How?

11. Looking back over your uses of this technology, did you come to new ideas or conclusions in the process of using it?
11a. What were these?

11b. For each: How did this idea relate to your life as a teacher? As a scholar? As an administrator?

11c. For each: Did the idea impact or change you? How?

12t. Looking over your use of this technology, name any ways in which the technology has impacted your teaching in good ways, in ways that were helpful or facilitating to your work.

12a. Ways technology has helped?

12b. For each: How did this connect to your life?

12c. For each: Did the outcome affect you in any way? How?

13t. Looking over your use of this technology, name any ways in which the technology has impacted your teaching in bad ways, in ways that were hurtful or hindering to your work.

13a. Ways this technology has hurt or hindered?

13b. For each: How did this hindrance connect to your life?

13c. For each: Did the outcome affect you in any way? How?

13d. For each: If you could have waved a magic wand, what would have helped?

12r. Looking over your use of this technology, name any ways in which the technology has impacted your research/scholarship in good ways, in ways that were helpful or facilitating to your work.

12a. Ways technology has helped?

12b. For each: How did this connect to your life?

12c. For each: Did the outcome affect you in any way? How?
13r. Looking over your use of this technology, name any ways in which the technology has impacted your research/scholarship in bad ways, in ways that were hurtful or hindering to your work.

   13a. Ways this technology has hurt or hindered?
   13b. For each: How did this hindrance connect to your life?
   13c. For each: Did the outcome affect you in any way? How?
   13d. For each: If you could have waved a magic wand, what would have helped?

12p. Looking over your use of this technology, name any ways in which the technology has impacted your professional evaluation in good ways, in ways that were helpful or facilitating to your work.

   12a. Ways technology has helped?
   12b. For each: How did this connect to your life?
   12c. For each: Did the outcome affect you in any way? How?

13p. Looking over your use of this technology, name any ways in which the technology has impacted your professional evaluation in bad ways, in ways that were hurtful or hindering to your work.

   13a. Ways this technology has hurt or hindered?
   13b. For each: How did this hindrance connect to your life?
   13c. For each: Did the outcome affect you in any way? How?
   13d. For each: If you could have waved a magic wand, what would have helped?

14. Do you have any other thoughts you would like to share with me?
**Discourse-based interviews** will be based on class materials and will therefore change depending upon what is occurring in each class. However, interviews will be guided by the following general questions:

What do you notice?

What do you think is going on here?
  How does that relate to your pedagogical philosophy?
  How does that relate to your perception of your role in the class?

What were you trying to do there?
  How would you explain that to your students? The department chair? The dean?
  How does that relate to your pedagogical philosophy?
  How does that relate to your perception of your role in the class?

What went right here?

What went wrong here?
  If you could have waved a magic wand, what would have helped?

Do you think you will change this aspect of your class the next time you teach it? Why or why not?
Questions for Interviews with Key Administrators

Trends in computer usage by the faculty and graduate students (technology advisor):

1. Are there faculty members who consistently teach in computer classrooms?

PROBES (“yes”):
- Are they primarily tenured or non-tenured faculty?
- How often do they teach in computer classrooms? Every quarter? Once per year?
- Are their courses in computer classrooms primarily undergrad, grad, both?
- Are their courses in computer classrooms primarily composition or literature? Film? Folklore? Language? Media? Something else?
- Are their undergrad courses computer classrooms primarily introductory or advanced level?
- Why do they like teaching in the computer classrooms?

PROBES (“no”):
- Is it that they teach sometimes in computer classrooms or never?
- Why do you think this is?
- Are the classrooms not available, the students not interested, or the professors not interested?
- Do they say why they are not interested?
  - --perhaps outdated or unreliable technology?
    - PROBE: If the technology were more up to date or more reliable, would they teach there?
  - --perhaps they don’t feel they know enough about technology?
    - PROBE: If development workshops were available, would they teach there?
  - --are they just against technology b/c it’s too “new” or for some other reason?

2. Are there Ph.D. students who consistently teach in computer classrooms?

PROBES (“yes”):
- How often do they teach in computer classrooms? Every quarter? Once per year?
- Are their courses in computer classrooms primarily composition or literature? Film? Folklore? Language? Media? Something else?
- Are their courses computer classrooms primarily introductory or advanced level?
- Why do they like teaching in the computer classrooms?

PROBES (“no”):
- Is it that they teach sometimes in computer classrooms or never?
- Why do you think this is?
Are the classrooms not available, the undergrads not interested, or the grad students not interested?

Do they say why they are not interested?

- perhaps a lack of support?
- perhaps outdated or unreliable technology?
  - PROBE: If the technology were more up to date or more reliable, would they teach there?
- perhaps they don’t feel they know enough about technology?
  - PROBE: If development workshops were available, would they teach there?
- are they just against technology b/c it’s too “new” or for some other reason?

3. Are there faculty or graduate students who use technological tools, such as a listserv or discussion board, as a supplement to class even though they might not be teaching in a computer classroom?

PROBES:
- What sort of institutional support do they have for this?
- Who tends to do this more often, graduate students or faculty? Both the same?
- Do they prefer this to teaching in a computer classroom or do they do this because there aren’t enough computer classrooms to go around?

4. Do many faculty use technology for their research? Do many graduate students?

PROBE: In what ways do they use technology?

5. How much support is there for faculty and graduate students who wish to develop projects or courses that utilize innovative technologies?

PROBES:
- What is the nature of the support?
- What kinds of projects have people developed?
- Once someone has developed a project, do they usually do it again?
- Can faculty obtain leaves or reductions of course loads to develop such projects?
- Is there a mechanism for, or culture of, sharing computer-supported instructional technologies?

6. What kinds of computers and software do faculty have in their offices? What kinds of computers and software do graduate students have in their offices? Does the university support off-campus access to university resources and networks?
7. Does the department (or college) have labs for exclusive use by faculty and graduate students in your department (or college) [allow for different organization of IT support]?

**PROBES:**
- What are the labs like?
- What software packages are available?
- What are the lab hours?
- Who staffs the lab?
- How do faculty and graduate students gain access? (door code; keys)

**How computer classrooms are allocated (technology advisor or department chair):**

1. How are computer classrooms allocated?

2. Are some courses always taught in computer classrooms?

**PROBES:**
- Which classes are these?
- Who decides?
  - Are they primarily composition or literature or something else?

3. Do professors have to or are they allowed to request for their classes to be in computer classrooms?

**PROBES:**
- How does this work?
- Who decides?
- What sorts of classes do people usually request to be in a computer classroom?
  - Probe: graduate, undergraduate, literature, film, something else?

4. Are graduate students allowed to request to teach a class in a computer classroom?

**PROBES:**
- How do they do this?
- Who decides if they are allowed to?

5. Do graduate students have to go through training before they are allowed to teach in a computer classroom?

**PROBES:**
- What is the nature of the training?
- Can they request exemption? How does that work?
How work with computers figures in tenure decisions/professional evaluation (P&T or Department Chair):

1. Generally, what are your department’s policies for evaluating work with digital media or technology for tenure and promotion purposes?

2. If an assistant professor published a work online, perhaps in an online journal, how would the work be evaluated for tenure purposes?

   PROBE:
   - Has this happened? How did it turn out?
   - Does this happen frequently?
   - Would you anticipate different responses to such work at different levels of review (committee, outside evaluators, department, college, university)?

3. If an assistant professor developed a pedagogical project utilizing new media/new technologies, how would the work be evaluated for tenure purposes?

   PROBE:
   - Has this happened? How did it turn out?
   - Does this happen frequently?

The “culture of support” (technology advisor and/or department chair):

1. Does day-to-day support exist for graduate students and faculty who want to teach or do research with technology? What is the nature of the support?

2. Does your department have paid student technology assistants? Describe their work. Does the university? If the university does but the department doesn’t, how does the department benefit from the services of the technology assistants?

3. Does the department conduct technology training or professional development workshops for faculty and graduate students? Does the university? What are the workshops that were given last year? How well attended are the workshops? What is the participation level of members of the department?

4. Does the department or the institution have committees on technology? What does the technology committee do? Initiatives on technology? Provide monetary support to technology-rich research or teaching projects? What is the participation level of members of the department?

5. Does the department support/have technology-rich learning environments? Does the university have technology-rich learning environments? How accessible are these
environments to faculty in your department? To graduate students? What is the participation level of members of the department?

6. Are graduate students encouraged to do work with technology?

PROBES:
- If so, in what ways?
- How is their work evaluated?
- How do advisors treat work in digital media? Do they encourage/discourage students to become skilled at/involved in such projects? Why or why not?

Questions for the Department Chair:

1. What do you see as the role of digital media or technology in your department?
2. In what ways does the department support these uses of technology?
3. Can you give an example of one of the uses of technology in this department that you are most proud of as department chair?
4. How does the department advertise or promote its involvement with digital media and technology?
5. How does technology influence your job as department chair?
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