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ABSTRACT

This project works to explore the relationship between the larger field of composition and the smaller subdiscipline of computers and composition by examining articles published in *College Composition and Communication* (*CCC*) and *Computers and Composition* (*C&C*) over the last 25 years. Based on a taxonomy of article types and topics for the technology-related articles published in both journals from 1983 to 2008, this study identifies seven major findings concerning the relationship between computers and composition and the larger field focused on. The first five findings highlight differences between the journals, the next one discusses a similarity between them, and the final one explores a new development in *C&C* exclusively. These findings include the: (1) journals’ overall (publication) relationship; (2) ways both participate in a “sticky Theory-Practice dance” (Grimm 266); (3) shifting leadership patterns (on field-related topics) between the journals; (4) ways each connect computers and composition work to other subdiscipline; (5) the patterns of topics in each journal, especially where there are absences; (6) their shared display of programmatic stasis and (slow) increase in treatment of professional topics; and (7) the slow and nuanced development of *C&C*’s treatment of article types and topics. This study then concludes by putting these findings in dialogue with current assertions about the relationship between *CCC* and *C&C* to explore how they both align and challenge previous assumptions.
INTRODUCTION

Exigences

Robert Connors argues that when beginning a research study “it is…common for the motivating [research] question to arise out of simple curiosity about one or both of two general questions: (1) Why are things around me as they are? or (2) Why do I see and judge things around me as I do?” (“Dreams and Play” 22). In many ways, this study arises from a curiosity similar to what Connors is describing here, a curiosity stirred after several conversations with colleagues and fellow graduate students.

The first class I taught as a graduate instructor was in one of my university’s computer writing classrooms. I was entirely dedicated to understanding how composition can be meaningfully taught in a computer-aided environment; however, I often felt misunderstood and (at times) disrespected by colleagues and fellow graduate students in my department who favored traditional classroom settings. When computer-aided assignments or pedagogies were brought up, my colleagues—those both inside and outside the field of rhetoric and composition—often responded with eye rolling and annoyance. Fellow graduate students were quick to explain the (many) ways in which they disagreed with computer-aided methods in the composition classroom. They were not bored when the topic was brought up—as Selfe contended in her 1999 CCCC chair’s address (“Technology”)—nor were they sympathetic to the extra time and effort I was exerting—as Lisa Gerrard observed during her attendance at the 1991 CCCC (“A View”). Rather, they were annoyed and almost combative: “Oh, here we go again with the technology thing; well, let me tell you what I think about it.” Needless to say, I was slightly taken aback and confused. As Connors’ work suggests, I found myself questioning, “Why are things around me as they are?”(22). Why are my colleagues and fellow graduate students—particularly the ones who study and research in the field of composition—reacting this way? How does the larger population of composition teachers see the computers and composition subdiscipline? And, perhaps more importantly, how and why has that understanding developed? In general, I began to
wonder about the relationship that exists between the larger field of composition and the smaller subdiscipline of computers and composition.

While Connors’ notion of research questions does found this study’s exigence in one way, this work is also informed by Kristie Fleckenstein, Clay Spinuzzi, Rebecca J. Rickly, and Carole Clark Papper’s recent article, particularly in the way in which it complicates Connors’ notion of the research question:

rather than beginning with a research question or artifacts, which are the conventional starting points for research, a rhetorical researcher enacts the systemic nature of ecological thinking through kairos, a move that shifts research from a process of problem identification and problem solving to a response to the urgency of a particular situation within which the researcher is immersed. What a researcher focuses on depends on the exigency of the moment. (407)

My questions about the relationship between the field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition, such as the ones mentioned above, are not mere passing interests for me; rather, searching for such answers responds to Fleckenstein et al.’s claim that research should be a “response to the urgency of a particular situation within which the researcher is immersed” (407). It seems imperative for me—a graduate student just finding her footing in the field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition—to better understand the particular situation I am immersed in and to better understand why my colleagues and fellow graduate students react the way they do. Understanding these comments and reactions necessarily means more closely exploring the relationship between the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition. It necessarily means understanding how the two are intertwined and how members of both understand each other.

In order to better understand the relationship between the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition, the current study will examine the content published in the main journals of both the larger field—College Composition and Communication—and the subdiscipline—Computers and Composition. Because “how we understand history depends on the methods of writing history” (Faigley “Veterans” 26), the exploration of these published journal articles will provide a picture of how both the larger and smaller subdiscipline write their own histories and articulate
their own identities. Overall, the project will focus on investigating a number of interconnected questions: What historical trends in the technology/computers and composition movement are revealed in the articles published in the two journals, *College Composition and Communication* and *Computers and Composition*, from 1983-2008? What types of work has the main journal in the subdiscipline, *Computers and Composition*, valued and thus published since 1983 (the date of the journal’s first publication)? Similarly, how many and what types of computers and composition articles has the main journal in the composition field as a whole, *College Composition and Communication*, published and thus valued? Do the published articles in *C&C* and *CCC* display similar and/or differing trends? What do those trends say about the computers and composition subdiscipline, its past, present, and potential future, and its relationship to and/or influence on the field at large? Working to find patterns and trends in *C&C* and *CCC*’s published material, this study will begin to explore the ways the subdiscipline of computers and composition is intertwined with the field of composition as a whole.

In the end, this research project has both a personal and professional exigence. On a personal level, it will be my attempt to better understand the (somewhat negative) reactions I have received from colleagues and fellow graduate students when technology was discussed in conjunction with the composition classroom. Furthermore, this research will work to help me better understand the rhetorical moment I find myself in as a graduate student who is relatively new to both the field and the subdiscipline. On a professional level, this study will also investigate issues that are salient to the field of composition; it will do so in two major ways: (1) This study’s explorations will provide the field of composition as a whole with a lens for better understanding the ways in which it relates to and is intertwined with the subdisciplines that comprise it—for instance, writing center, ESL/L2, basic writing, and assessment work—and in particular, the subdiscipline of computers and composition. Such a lens will also allow the field to examine how it represents the subdiscipline of computers and composition. (2) This study will also provide a lens for the subdiscipline of computers and composition to better understand its relationship to the field of composition as a whole, to better understand the ways its scholarship and work is represented within the larger field and how it represents and reflects movements in the larger field. This study’s findings may also provide a
means for those in the subdiscipline to better understand the reactions others have to their work and for the subdiscipline to better understand itself and its own development. Overall, this study’s exploration of the relationship between the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition will help both parties better understand each other and themselves.

Historical Voices

An endeavor such as this is inherently historical and must be approached with the proper historical context; only with a historical context can one come to meaningfully understand the relationship between the larger field and the subdiscipline of computers and composition. Thankfully, there are numerous historical accounts of the field to call on; as Sibylle Gruber states, “It is certainly not a novel idea to trace the history of writing studies in general and computers and composition specifically” (“The Good” 15). Histories of both the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition have been published in multiple venues—for example, full length books, anthologies, and journal articles—and these investigations inform this study in different ways. Specifically, this study benefited from two important contexts: (1) a historical background of the field of composition as a whole and (2) a historical context of the subdiscipline of computers and composition.

First, there were those works that provided this study with a context of the history of the composition field in general and its historical progression through the movements of traditional product-based thinking, process-based emphases, and social and cultural influences (Robert Connors’ Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy; Peter Smagorinsky’s Research on Composition: Multiple Perspectives on Two Decades of Change; Lynn Bloom, Donald Daiker, and Edward White’s 1996 book Composition in the Twenty-First Century: Crisis and Change; and their 2003 second volume, Composition Studies in the New Millennium: Rereading the Past, Rewriting the Future). Other pieces informed this study’s methods and research approach; by highlighting and explicating the importance of journals and professionalization in the field of composition; they grounded this study’s use of journals as a lens for understanding the profession (Debra Journet and Beth Boehm’s History, Reflection, and
Narrative: The Professionalization of Composition, 1963-1983 and Maureen Daly Goggin’s Authoring a Discipline: Scholarly Journals and the Post-World War II Emergence of Rhetoric and Composition. Anthologies of the field’s work also proved helpful in highlighting the major topics of importance in the field and foreshadowing the role that technology and computer-related topics play when placed within the larger context of composition (Susan Miller’s The Norton Book of Composition Studies, Victor Villanueva’s Cross-Talk in Composition Theory, and Erika Lindemann and Gary Tate’s An Introduction to Composition Studies). Finally, there were shorter pieces that helped provide snapshots of how the field was viewed and valued at different moments, whether it be a look at the field’s goals in general, its trend of axiomatic division, or its genesis and development (P. J. Corbett’s “Teaching Composition: Where We've Been and Where We're Going”; Richard Fulkerson’s “Composition Theory in the Eighties: Axiological Consensus and Paradigmatic Diversity” and his follow-up piece “Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century”; and Donna Burns Phillips, Ruth Greenberg, and Sharon Gibson’s “College Composition and Communication: Chronicling a Discipline’s Genesis”). Surveying and understanding these types of historical texts about the field of composition in general provided one kind of contextual foundation for the current study.

A second historical context was provided by the work that focused on the subdiscipline of computers and composition. As Hawisher et al. note, “Computers and composition, although it is a relatively young field, is, nonetheless, already informed by a lengthy and complex history; already located in rich and influential patterns of historical developments in education, composition studies, and the computer industry; already old in terms of cultural influences and relationships” (281). And, much as in the larger field, these histories help the subdiscipline “[become] self-conscious as a profession … [ensuring that the computers and composition] enterprise is no longer simply a series of experiments in composition, but a coherent subdiscipline with its own identity” (Gerrard “Preface” xii). Therefore, surveying these texts affords this study a historical context for better understanding the subdiscipline’s identity. Some of these pieces, like Gail Hawisher, Paul LeBlanc, Charles Moran, and Cynthia L. Selfe’s Computers and the Teaching of Writing in American Higher Education, 1974-1994: A History, provide this study with a complex lens for understanding the exigence, genesis, and development of
the subdiscipline and its goals. Other books and anthologies afforded a historical picture of the subdiscipline’s development and consciousness, of its movement from overwhelming enthusiasm to carefully researched critique and theory, and of the specific topics that were valued over time (Michelle Sidler, Richard Morris, and Elizabeth Overman Smith’s *Computers in the Composition Classroom: A Critical Source Book*; Gail Hawisher and Cynthia Selfe’s *Critical Perspectives on Computers and Composition Instruction and Passions, Pedagogies and 21st Century Technologies*; Cynthia Selfe and Susan Hilligoss’ *Literacy and Computers: The Complications of Teaching and Learning with Technology*; and Ilana Snyder’s *Page to Screen: Taking Literacy into the Electronic Era*). Finally, other shorter pieces offered different lenses with which to understand the changing goals and identity of the subdiscipline, thus providing a useful historical foundation for better understanding the subdiscipline (Lisa Gerrard’s “The Evolution of the Computers and Writing Conference, the Second Decade”; Sibylle Gruber’s “The Good, the Bad, the Complex: Computers and Composition in Transition”; Charles Moran’s “Computers and Composition 1983–2002: What We have Hoped for”; and Lisa Gerrard’s “Computers and Composition: Rethinking Our Values”).

While the above lists of historical investigations are valuable to the current study, few of these pieces have attempted to put these two types of historical contexts in dialogue with one another to explore the ways in which the smaller subdiscipline of computers and composition is intertwined with the larger field of composition. Exploring such a connection would help illuminate the relationship that exists between the two. One piece that does, however, is Lisa Gerrard’s 1991 article “Computers and Compositionists: A View from the Floating Bottom.” Her piece argues that there is a “low status [placed on] computer-based writing in the profession.” She argues that those in the larger field of composition have had many reactions to the smaller subdiscipline; some showed fear and resentment, others believed it was a fad and nuisance, while others contended the subdiscipline’s beneficial claims were not proven. She also explores the ways in which tenure and promotion guidelines often discredit the technology-based work of those in the subdiscipline, which to her only solidifies the fact that the larger field does not value the work of those specializing in computers. She concludes her piece by making a call to the field at large: “Our status as compositionists and our status as computerists are
intertwined”; thus, she advocates that the larger field work not only to understand but also to value the work done in the subdiscipline.

While Gerrard’s piece is one of the only ones that focuses exclusively on exploring this relationship, there have been plenty of professionals in the subdiscipline of computers and composition who have been vocal about the (marginal) relationship and (relatively low) value their work has to the field at large. In their editor’s letter in a 1990 special issue of Computers and Composition, Gail Hawisher and Cynthia Selfe state, “We are a group of scholars who attend each others’ presentations, but seldom hear our ideas echoed in more general intellectual exchanges. We exist, if you will, on the margin of English studies.” They argue further that an existence on the margins is both healthy and dangerous. It allows for a healthy freedom from certain conventions and for those in the subdiscipline to take and understand positions not possible from the “center of the pack.” However, they warn that a marginal existence also means that there is the danger that our best ideas, our best thinking may never reach other scholars. Mainstream professional publications, College Composition and Communication and Research in the Teaching of English, for example, have published only a small fraction of the best scholarship produced in the area of computers and composition. … Even worse, computers-and-composition specialists occasionally lapse into a satisfaction with this separation, take comfort in it.

Hawisher et al.’s historical book (Computers) pushes this argument regarding comfort in separation further; the authors synopsize that computers and composition specialists have seen themselves … as the chosen people and as a marginalized group. As a community of specialists, we have sometimes voiced the belief that our connection with computers makes us special: gives insight, perspectives, expertise that others don’t have. We have also said that what we do is not always appropriately valued by our parent group, ‘Composition Studies,’ and by its parent group, ‘English Studies.’ (282)

Similar claims about the subdiscipline’s isolation or marginal position are echoed in Selfe’s “Technology and Literacy,” where she claims that those who work in computers and composition are often “[assigned] to a peculiar kind of professional isolation ‘in their
own separate world’ of computer sessions and computer workshops and computers and writing conferences” (412), and Faigley’s *Fragments of Rationality*, where he contends that “computers and writing has remained on the margins” (166). Separately, Ellen McDaniel and James Porter have also voiced concerns about the lack of computers and composition work in some of the field’s larger publication venues. McDaniel claims,

> There is a tacit if not tangible approval by our society, our journal editors, and our book publishers that computer technology is worthy of merging with our traditional studies and merits space in print. Although most of our mainstream publications have been willing to publish this research, there remains much work that does not fit within the scope of our traditional journals. (90)

Speaking to the research done in the subdiscipline, Porter’s foreword in *Digital Writing Research* pushes this claim even further; he asserts

> the field of computers and writing has a long and strong record of research achievements—that’s the good news. The not-so-good news is the fact that few outside the field know that. Our work is still not very much recognized, acknowledged, or respected by other fields. …We don’t get no respect—not from Communication, not from Education, not from Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) studies, and, still, not very much from Rhetoric/Composition. (x)

He believes that in “many ways our research is firewalled from the mainstream composition research, treated as a quirky sub specialization for technogeeks rather than as a fundamental topic—for everyone in the field—critical to the understanding of writing” (xi). Claims like these, made by influential members of the subdiscipline like Hawisher, Selfe, Faigley, McDaniel, and Porter, provide this study with an interesting lens for exploration. The increased frequency of marginality claims in published works and their articulation by those outside of the subdiscipline’s direct genesis—in other words, the inclusion of more than Selfe and Hawisher—provide this study with an exigence to explore and understand these claims further. Working to explore the relationship between the field of composition at large and the subdiscipline of computers and composition may shed some light on the reasons why those in the subdiscipline have voiced these claims of marginality and whether such claims are legitimate.
However, comments about the subdiscipline’s marginality have been pushed even further by some in the subdiscipline. Hart-Davidson and Krause’s “Multivocal Textumentary” reads like a play of sorts where Krause’s voice is heard humming a REM song and asserting,

It’s the end of computers and writing as we know it (and I feel fine). I think that the end of our subdisciplinary status and entrance into the mainstream of composition studies is a good thing. I believe the distinction between computers and writing and composition-in-general is largely over, because our colleagues—once uninterested or even against the use of computers in the teaching of writing—have come over to our side. Essentially, the battle that has been fought for the last 20 or so years and that has been so clearly documented is over. We won. (490)

In that same play-like text, Trish Harris is heard questioning, “Will the everywhereness of instructional technology mean the end of computers and writing scholarship, and composition and rhetoric scholarship, as we know it? Yes.” (491). WIDE Research Center Collective’s webtext in Kairos draws on Hart-Davidson and Krause’s work and questions, “What happens if, in effect, computers and writing becomes the main field? What happens if that is the field of composition in the 21st century?” All of these authors have acknowledged Selfe and Hawisher’s earlier claims that the subdiscipline of computers and composition exist in a secondary state to the larger field, but all of these authors have then pushed further to argue that such a status is problematic because the field of composition in general will eventually move towards a focus on technology—or that such a focus has already arrived. Here we can see multiple manifestations of Hawisher et al.’s (Computers) claim that computer specialists at times see themselves as the “chosen people.” Once again, the increasing frequency of comments such as these by a wide range of authors provides the current study with an exigence, with a situation that calls for sustained investigation and research. Claims like these can only be articulated with meaning to the larger field of composition once they are fully understood and/or substantiated with research; interpreting the current study’s findings will afford us the opportunity of understanding, substantiating, and/or disproving such claims.
Finding Space

There is certainly a substantial corpus of historical work that focuses on both the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition; there is also no shortage of those in the subdiscipline who have acknowledged their marginalized position in relationship to the larger field. While Gerrard’s 1991 work (“A View”) does attempt to look at the relationship between the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition further, there is a shortage of work that attempts to pick up where she left off. There is a shortage of work that puts the larger field in dialogue with the subdiscipline; there is a shortage of work that focuses on their relationship—its development, dynamic, and progression. Such shortages provide a space for exploration; an exploration this study takes up.

In the end, this study will, as Royster and Williams contend regarding their own investigation of African American literacies, pay “attention to the shadows and to how unnoticed dimensions of composition history might interact with officialized narratives to tell a reconfigured, more fully textured story than we now understand” (581). Examining the subdiscipline’s journal publication history in C&C in conjunction with the larger field’s journal publication in CCC will not only help illuminate their relationship, but in the process—perhaps—also shed light on some of the reasons why my colleagues reacted the way they did when the topic of computer-aided teaching was broached and why those in the subdiscipline have voiced the marginalized concerns they have. Overall, this study’s exploration of the relationship between the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition will certainly provide a stepping stone for further work and perhaps a foundation of understanding that can “[build] bridges that allow [those in the subdiscipline] to venture into the center” (Hawisher and Selfe “Letter” 1990) and those in the center to venture into the margins.

Moving forward, the second chapter of this study will more closely explore the materials, coding schemes, and overall methods used in this study and work to articulate the rationale and validity of such choices. The third chapter will examine the seven findings this study illuminates concerning the published articles in C&C and CCC: five of which describe differences between the journals, one of which illuminate similarities,
and one which highlights a new trend exclusively in C&C. The concluding fourth chapter will re-examine what this study reveals concerning the relationship between the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition, move towards identifying additional data that could be drawn upon for further exploration of this relationship, and conclude by exploring what this study contributes to the field as a whole.
As noted in chapter one, this study will explore the relationship between the field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition using the articles published in the journals *Computers and Composition* and *College Composition and Communication* from 1983-2008 as a lens. This chapter will work to more closely detail the materials, coding schemes, and overall methods used in this study.

First and foremost, this study will work to be both socially and rhetorically self-conscious, following the calls of those such as Howard Zinn, Karl Popper, Hayden White, and Patricia Sullivan and James Porter:

To be “objective” in writing history, for example, is as pointless as trying to draw a map which shows everything—or even samples of everything—on a piece of terrain. No map can show all the elements in that certain terrain, nor should it if it is to serve efficiently a present purpose, to take us toward some goal. Therefore, different maps are constructed, depending on the aim of the mapmaker. Each map, including what is essential to its purpose, excluding what is irrelevant, can be accused of “partiality.” But it is exactly in being partial that it is most true to its particular present job. (Zinn 10-11)

Similarly, Karl Popper points out that “a point of view is inevitable; and the naïve attempt to avoid it can only lead to self-deception, and to the uncritical application of an unconscious point of view” (247). Likewise, Hayden White argues that it is important “to recognize that there is no such thing as a single correct view of any object under study but that there are many correct views, each requiring its own style of representation” (46-7). Finally, in their book *Opening Spaces: Writing Technologies and Critical Research*, Patricia Sullivan and James Porter call for researchers to adopt a “critical reflectiveness that makes explicit the biases, intrusions, doubts, and mistakes that characterize any research activity, … [for researchers to] ‘fess up,’ in other words, and include that confession in [their] write-up” (68-9). Heeding these rhetorical, social, and somewhat
postmodern research approaches, this study will work to construct, as Zinn says, a map that investigates a partial piece of the relationship between the computers and composition subdiscipline and the larger composition field through the content published in two important journals: *College Composition and Communication* and *Computers and Composition*. In the process, this study will remain conscious of its limitations and the speculations it draws from its findings, understanding that while the use of these two main print journals can present meaningful findings, those findings also have their limits and thus present only one view of this relationship, not “a single correct view,” as White would contend. Furthermore, as Sullivan and Porter advocate, this study will proceed with a critical reflectiveness and will work to “‘fess up’” (69) to and explore its limitations, doubts, and/or mistakes in the final discussion/conclusion section. Using this approach, I will attempt to understand, much as Hawisher et al. did in their 1996 historical investigation (*Computers*), not the but a story of the relationship between the computers and composition subdiscipline and the larger field of composition (16).

As mentioned earlier, this study will analyze the articles published in *Computers and Composition* (*C&C*) and *College Composition and Communication* (*CCC*). My use of journals here is intentional. It is my conscious decision as the partial “mapmaker” of this project, to use Zinn’s metaphor. Journal publications play an important and instrumental role in the field of composition; Robert Connors argues that the field of composition “was formed by and largely exists through the professional journals in which our work appears” (“Journals” 348). Connors contends that journal publications provide a clear reflection of that discipline’s past, a synchronic portrait of its current state, and a glimpse of its dreams and plans for the future. As icons, as loci of disciplinary authority, as editorial and soapboxes or coxswain’s benches, as steppingstones and milestone, journals figure largely in the life of every professional academician. (348)

In addition, he states that journals function as filters by “[defining] what sorts of work are acceptable and unacceptable to the discipline [and creating] implicit criteria for work to be done in the future” (Connors 351), thus helping to ensure that journal articles reach a certain set of increasingly rigorous standards while maintaining the credibility and relevancy of the journal’s content. Consequently, “when an essay appears in a major
field journal, it carries with it a weight of considerable authority” (Connors 352).
Similarly, Maureen Goggin asserts that she chose to utilize journals in her own historical investigation (“Authoring a Discipline”) because they “provide an important window [into] disciplinary practices” (xv). She contends that “of all the disciplinary discursive spaces (e.g., professional organizations, graduate programs, tenure-track positions, research centers, academic presses), journals have played one of the most important roles in fostering the field of rhetoric and composition” (xvi). Because of their authority, importance, high quality, and ability to “to proclaim and formalize [the] existence [of] a discipline” (Connors 350), the journals *College Composition and Communication* and *Computers and Composition* can provide a valuable lens for exploring both the computers and composition subdiscipline and its relationship to the larger composition field.³

As noted, my study will involve two main journals; first, I will be using *College Composition and Communication* (*CCC*) as an indicator for the field of composition as a whole. *CCC* has been in existence for over 50 years and is “the central venue of serious composition specialists, the one journal read by everyone in the field” (Connors 351). In addition, its central focus remains on the topic of writing in general. Rather than focusing on one area of specialization, the journal works to include and represent a broad range of specializations and voices within the field: “[CCC] publishes a wide range of articles, from theoretical and philosophical essays to research reports” (Connors 353). In 1987, *CCC* editor Richard Gebhardt articulated in his editor’s letter that “*CCC* needs to provide articles and publishing opportunities for scholars of many specialties … [;] it should be a journal in which specialists clarify their insights by writing articles for well-informed composition generalists as well as for other specialists” (19). Since Gebhardt, many editors have similarly emphasized academic diversity as a main goal of *CCC*. Furthermore, in 1984 Connors argued that “it is not hyperbolic to say that over 70% of the most important composition research over the past two decades has appeared in *CCC*” (“Journals” 353), and over 20 years later, *CCC* continues to achieve this high caliber of publication. Furthermore, *CCC* has upheld a rigorous blind review process throughout the last 25 years, as articulated and rearticulated in Harris’ 1994 editors’ letter and Cooper’s 2002 editor’s letter, helping to keep the quality and caliber of articles high.
Lastly, in 2008 (60.2) Deborah Holdstein announced that CCC had an acceptance rate of approximately 6%, making it more selective than PMLA or the Journal of the American Medical Association (“From the Editor” 60.2 246). She stated further that “thanks to an exacting group of editorial board members and consulting readers, we have a thorough and appropriately rigorous process of review. As I can reaffirm, CCC attracts, evaluates, and publishes ‘the best of the best’” (“From the Editor” 60.1 9). Therefore, analyzing the articles in CCC allows this study to more fully understand the high caliber, multi-vocal chorus that is the composition community at large.

Second, to explore the field of computers and composition subdiscipline, I will investigate the journal *Computers and Composition* (C&C). According to their online description, C&C contends that it is

a professional journal devoted to exploring the use of computers in composition classes, programs, and scholarly projects. It provides teachers and scholars a forum for discussing issues connected to computer use. The journal also offers information about integrating digital composing environments into writing programs on the basis of sound theoretical and pedagogical decisions and empirical evidence. (Computers and Composition)

The journal has been in existence since 1983, when a meeting at CCCC sparked a collaborative interest in the topic of teaching and learning with computers (Hawisher et al. *Computers* 90), and Hawisher et al. conclude that the journal remains closest to the subdiscipline’s history “because it is the earliest and also the most heavily subscribed to journal devoted to computers and composition studies” (“Blinding Insights” 42). Consequently, *Computers and Composition* is a good indicator of how the profession has “understood the role of technology … in its teaching over the years” (Hawisher “Blinding Insights” 42) and will thus provide a meaningful picture of the subdiscipline for this study.

I will begin my investigation with the articles published in both journals in 1983. First and foremost, 1983 marks the year when “The Fifth C” met at CCCC to discuss issues of technology and composition, and from that meeting, *Computers and Composition* published its first issue in the form of a newsletter in November that same year (Hawisher et al. *Computers*). Using the starting date of 1983 also ensures that this
study will include the entirety of the computers/technology related articles published in *College Composition and Communication* since, as the Richard Larson noted, issue 34.2 (1983) was “the journal's first extended look at the subject” (133). Furthermore, Hawisher et al.’s historical look at the computers and composition movement (*Computers*) argued that the time between 1983-1985 was a period of “growth and enthusiasm” (65) for the movement:

> Scholars and teachers, increasingly [identified] themselves as a socialized subgroup of composition studies and eager to validate their interests within the framework of professional recognition, established interest groups within existing national professional organizations; created their own journals (and, eventually, established a press and book series dedicated to the area of study); and started an annual conference to support the emerging discipline. (79)

Consequently, 1983 marks not only a time of enthusiasm and substantial growth for the subdiscipline of computers and composition but also the notable beginning of the subdiscipline’s presence in the larger field’s journal; therefore, it will serve as the “starting” date for this study. The “ending” date for this study will be 2008. When I began this study the last issues for the 2008 publication year were just released from both journals; therefore, such an “ending” date will ensure that the same 25 years are examined in both journals, allowing for parallel comparisons, and that the study includes the most recent data possible, allowing for the most accurate and meaningful findings.

**Data Analysis:**

This section will work to explore (1) the units of analysis used in this study for *C&C* and *CCC*’s journal articles; (2) the preliminary coding work done and the ways it informed the final coding method selected; (3) the overall double coding scheme used for analyzing journal articles; and (4) the ways each journal’s articles were examined for coding.

1. **Units of analysis**

   Journal articles used in this study:
were published in the print versions of *Computers and Composition* and *College Composition and Communication* from 1983-2008 (Note that only the articles published in the *print* versions of these journals were used; articles in either journal’s online counterpart were not. See the Conclusion chapter for an extended discussion of this limitation).

- were focused on college/university level issues/topics (ascertained by reading article abstracts and skimming article content). For example, pieces that focused on elementary or middle schools/students were not coded; furthermore, pieces like Ann Marie Malachowski’s (5.1 C&C), which explored how writing helped a head trauma patient, were excluded since the piece did not make direct connections to the academy. This limitation was chosen because of each journal’s focus on issues of higher education and to ensure that parallel and meaningful comparisons could be made with the data collected.

- were predominately focused on issues with computers/technology, meaning that they explored technology/computers for more than a passing moment; articles that were included did more than simply mention technological connections; they worked to expound on them in meaningful ways. (This notion of “predominant focus” will be explored further later in this chapter)

2. Preliminary coding work:

I began my research by conducting two different stages of preliminary coding exercises:

- First, I sampled a variety of years from both journals involved and read through abstracts and editors’ letters in order to allow themes and trends to emerge from the texts themselves. While reading through the sample set of articles, I began to notice certain themes and topics that emerged repeatedly. I began to color code these similarities and found that the articles fell into different types: most focused on issues of either pedagogy, research, or theory.

- Second, I then compared the above preliminary categories with the works of others who have commented on the subdiscipline of computers and composition in order to ensure that the results/findings of my study would meaningfully add to the current dialogue taking place. For example, in what ways might my coding
correlate to what Selfe and Hawisher previously articulated about the subdiscipline? Would my results comment on Hart-Davidson’s concern about the periphery position of computers and composition? How would my work align with Moran and Gerrad’s previous historical investigations?

- e.g., Hawisher et al. (Computers and the Teaching of Writing); Hawisher and Selfe (Critical Perspectives); Selfe and Hilligoss (Literacy and Computers); Porter (“Digital Writing Research”); Hart-Davidson and Krause (“Re: The Future of Computers and Writing”); Moran (“What We Hoped For”); Gerrard (“A View from the Floating Bottom,” “Rethinking our Values”)

Exploring these pieces allowed me to see the ways in which the categories from my preliminary coding both worked and did not work. While pieces like those mentioned above certainly did discuss the movement’s focus on pedagogy, research, and theory, there were additional topics they discussed for which my original categories did not afford. For example, almost all of the pieces above noted the importance of professional and programmatic issues in the subdiscipline: how the subdiscipline worked to professionalize itself and how the incorporation of computers in the composition classroom necessitated certain programmatic changes. After looking back at my sample set of articles, I determined that including the categories “professional” and “programmatic” would better describe some of the articles that did not fit neatly into the categories of either pedagogy, research, or theory. Furthermore, Hawisher et al.’s book in particular noted the importance of historical investigation to the subdiscipline and its maturity, and when looking back at the sample set of articles, I found once again that including such a category would allow certain articles to be more accurately coded. This oscillation between my sample set of data and outside literature on the subdiscipline resulted in six coding categories: pedagogy, research, theory, professional issues, programmatic issues, and histories. Finally, my survey of outside literature, specifically Hawisher and Selfe and Selfe and Hilligoss’ work, emphasized the movements in the subdiscipline from one topics and/or type of technology to the next. For example, their works discussed the subdiscipline’s movement from word processing, to MOOS, to MUDs, to email, etc. In order to track the changes in topics and technologies, I decided to
alter my coding scheme to not only analyze the types of articles in each journal (pedagogy, research, theory, etc.) but also to categorize the topic and/or technology discussed in each article. The specifics of this coding scheme are described below.

3. Coding Scheme:
Combining my preliminary coding and my exploration of literature, I created a double coding scheme to ensure the system would allow for the most meaningful findings possible. The final system includes first coding each article’s type (pedagogy, research, theory, professional, programmatic, historical), and second its main topic (i.e., word processing, (a)synchronous communication, email, eportfolios, assessment, etc.; see complete list of categories below).

Coding Article Types:
Article types were coded based on their primary purposes. Some articles utilized multiple categories (e.g., using a research project to create a theory, using theory to articulate classroom pedagogy); when this occurred, an article’s stated (and actualized) purpose was ascertained and coded; therefore, an article’s code reflects the piece’s final purpose, not all of the means used to get to that conclusion (i.e., if research was used to articulate a theory, the piece was coded as theory; if theory was used to articulate a particular classroom pedagogy, the piece was coded as pedagogy).

Keith Grant-Davie argues in Kirsch and Sullivan’s Methods and Methodology in Composition Research that “researchers should argue the validity and reliability of a coding system by demonstrating it directly to their readers through numerous examples. Inevitably this means that if validity and reliability are to be taken seriously, research involving coding systems cannot be reported briefly” (285). While I do not provide a long appendix of examples, as Grant-Davie advocates, I would like to further clarify my coding scheme to my readers. Therefore, below I have provided specific examples of articles that were coded in each category along with a brief summary of each article and its goal (each set of examples has at least one article from CCC and one from C&C.)
**Pedagogy:** article whose primary purpose is to address issues of classroom pedagogy, practice, and teaching with technology

  - Article discusses how to include hypertext in the composition classroom, what student reactions may be, and how to maintain a focus on writing.

  - Article works to describe the advantages of using a desktop publisher in an advanced composition classroom and provides in-class examples of how these principles were exhibited by students.

**Research:** article whose primary purpose is to report research results concerning working/teaching with technology

  - Study explores the influence of in-class discourse on the nature and rates of student participation in online discussions in two undergraduate computer-mediated classroom.

- *e.g.*, Harris, Jeanette. “Student Writers and Word Processing: A Preliminary Evaluation.” *College Composition and Communication*, (1985) 36.3 323-30.
  - Study examines 6 case studies of freshmen writers and how their writing and revision processes were affected by the use of word processing software.

**Theory:** article whose primary purpose is to articulate or analyze a particular theory concerning working/teaching with technology
  ▪ Article works to articulate a theoretical heuristic for instructors to use in order to better understand the social and political nature of technology.
  ▪ Article works to develop a theory of hypertext rhetoric by theorizing from Joseph Cornell’s artwork.
• e.g., DeVoss, Dânielle Nicole, Ellen Cushman, and Jeffrey T. Grabill. “Infrastructure and Composing: The When of New-Media Writing” College Composition and Communication. 57.1 (2005): 14-44.
  ▪ Article discusses how to incorporate new media composing into the classroom by offering a theory of “infrastructure” to guide our practices.
  ▪ (This third example was included to display how some of the articles coded in the study discussed pedagogy but worked to create a theory of that pedagogy and were thus coded as theory.)

**Professional Issues:** article whose primary purpose is to investigate salient professional issues for those who teach composition with computers and technology or to call some matter to their attention
  ▪ Article explores a program’s ability to shape the guidelines for tenure and promotion in ways that recognize alternative forms of labor within and against tenure traditions.
• e.g., Herrington, TyAnna K. “The interdependency of fair use and the first amendment.” Computers and Composition. 15.2 (1998): 125-43.
- Article explains recent copyright and intellectual property laws claiming that it is important for instructors to understand these issues and their connection to first amendment free speech rights.


  - Article makes a call for digital writing researchers to interrogate critically their research designs, examine carefully their relationships with research participants, and make sound ethical judgments; authors provide a heuristic grounded in rhetorical principles to help.

  - (This third example was included to clarify the coding category “professional”; while the content of this article was about research, it was not a research study itself but a call to those in the professional to examine their research practices and was thus coded in this study as “professional” *not* “research.”)

**Programmatic Issues:** article whose primary purpose is to explore larger issues dealing with the programmatic incorporation of and/or staffing issues connected with technology and/or computers in the composition classroom


  - Article interrogates one university’s administrative decisions as well as their pedagogical outcomes and concludes by proposing programmatic strategies for rearticulating online writing instruction in potentially productive ways.

- **e.g.,** Tobin, Laurence “Faculty Training in Computers and Composition: Warnings and Recommendations.” *College Composition and Communication.* 38.2 (1987): 195-98.

  - Article provides recommendations for creating an effective workshop for staff members who want to incorporate computers in their composition classes.
Histories: article whose primary purpose is to articulate a historical analysis or account concerning working/teaching with technology

  - Article looks at history of the Computers and Writing Conference and the trends that emerge with a focus on collaboration, theory, and issues of power/control.
  - Article explores the history of visual literacies in the field of composition.

Coding Article Topics:

After determining the proper article type above, articles were then coded according to the main topic they focused on (see list below). As mentioned earlier, the inclusion of this second layer of coding was influenced by outside literature that explored the subdiscipline’s movement from various topics and technologies over time. This study’s second coding layer will allow us to see what topics each journal focused on over time and how that correlates to—or fails to correlate to—the trends articulated in other historical accounts of the subdiscipline. When articles addressed more than one topic (e.g., using (a)synchronous communication with ESL students; or email technology in writing center tutoring), the main focus of the argument was determined (i.e., did the author(s) focus more on ESL students or the (a)synchronous technology; the practices of tutoring or the email technology?) and the article was coded appropriately.

- **Word Proc**: word processing
- **Soft**: introducing/analyzing/evaluation software
- **(a) sync**: both asynchronous and synchronous communication
- **Bib**: offers a bibliography on a particular topic
- **Staff**: issues with staff and/or colleagues
- **WC**: general writing center issues
- **Hyper**: hypertext
• ESL: ESL and L2 student/classrooms
• Basic: basic writing/writers
• Service: service learning; community connections
• E Mail: email
• Visual: visual rhetoric/visual emphasis
• EPort: eportfolios
• Program/training: broad programmatic issues and training staff/faculty/TAs
• O Class: online/distance classes/learning
• Culture: social/multicultural/gender/racial/handicap issues
• Web: webpage development, construction, analysis
• Interface: interface issues
• Copy: copyrighted material, intellectual property, fair use, plagiarism
• Code: HTML and coding
• Field: calls made to the field at large (general population)
• Tenure: tenure and promotion
• Assess: assessment
• Access: access to technology
• Course Management/Blog/Wiki
• Multi: multimodal/multimedia composition
• Game: gaming

Exploring these two levels of this coding scheme separately (the types and topics of articles) will allow for certain findings; however, layering these two levels on top of one another will allow for even more insight into the relationship between the journals and the field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition.

4. Individual Journal Coding:

*Computers and Composition*

• Since article abstracts were not available for *Computers and Composition* articles until 1994 on ScienceDirect, I could not depend solely on article abstracts for my coding purposes. Therefore, I followed three steps for coding C&C articles: (1) I read the editors’ articles summaries in each issue’s editor letter (when available);
(2) I then preceded to the article’s abstract/preview (whenever possible); and finally, (3) I skimmed each article, focusing on its introduction, thesis, headings, subheadings, and conclusion in order to ensure that I could meaningfully and accurately code the article. If the article matched the above “unit of analysis restrictions,” I continued to use the coding scheme described above, identifying the article’s type and topic.

**College Composition and Communication**

- For the majority of the articles in *CCC*, I first read the editor’s letter in search for article summaries and/or issue themes. I then moved to article titles and authors. If the author(s)’ name(s) or title in either of these areas hinted at a computer or technology topic, I (1) read the article’s abstract, and (2) skimmed the article, focusing on its introduction, thesis, headings, subheadings, and conclusion. If the article matched the above “unit of analysis restrictions,” I continued to use the coding scheme described above, identifying the article’s type and topic.

- For articles that did not immediately seem related to technology or computer and writing, I used the search function on the articles’ pdfs to look for the words “computer,” “technology,” “digital,” and “web” because these four terms arose repeatedly and consistently in my preliminary coding experiments throughout the 25 years of this study; “computer” and “technology” were used mostly in the 1980s and 1990s and “digital” and “web” in the late 1990s to present. If these words arose, I explored the article more closely, again (1) reading the article’s abstract, and (2) skimming the article, focusing on its introduction, thesis, headings, subheadings, and conclusion. If the article matched the above “unit of analysis restrictions,” I continued to use the coding scheme described above, identifying the article’s type and topic.

Finally, throughout the process of coding, I pulled sample sets of articles from both journals that were checked by an outside reader in order ensure the consistency and reliability of my coding scheme; these sample sets of article were compared on four separate occasions and resulted in approximately an 80% agreement rate each time.
This chapter has worked to acknowledge the limits of this study’s findings and explore the rationale behind the use of journals as a lens for understanding the field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition. It has also discussed the reason for using C&C and CCC specifically and the logic behind the starting and ending dates of this study (1982-2008). Next, it explained the preliminary coding work that was conducted and the ways such work informed the final coding scheme. Finally, this chapter has worked to explicate the double coding scheme used, the coding categories, and the specific methods used to code each journal’s content. Moving forward, the next chapter will work to explore the findings gathered from this coding work and make sense of what the trends and patterns that emerged suggest about the relationship between the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition.
FINDINGS

This study’s findings are best understood by triangulating three points of data from CCC and C&C over time: (1) the overall number of articles published; (2) the totals of different article types (e.g., pedagogy, research, theory, etc.) and (3) the various levels of emphases placed on different topics (e.g., word processing, (a)synchronous communication, hypertext, etc.). This triangulation elucidates several major trends concerning the relationship of the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition. The first six findings explore aspects of the relationship between C&C and CCC; the first five display differences between the journals, the last one explores a similarity. This chapter will examine how

(1) the journal publications are related overall;
(2) both journals participate in a “sticky Theory-Practice dance” (Grimm 266);
(3) the journals play a complicated game of follow the leader over time;
(4) each journal relates (or fails to relate) other subdisciplines to computers and composition;
(5) certain topics display a significant emphasis in one journal and absence in the other; and
(6) both journals display an overall trend of programmatic stasis and (slow) professional increase.

This study’s seventh finding presents an interesting picture of an emerging trend in C&C:

(7) the slow and nuanced appearance of a sophisticated development from single to multiple points of entry in the journal’s articles.

While this argument will progress linearly, there is no hierarchy among these findings; rather, they are best understood and interpreted when considered together in an overlapping, almost palimpsest, fashion where one layer can be placed on top of another to fill in the gaps and questions left by the others. As Kathleen Yancey (“Postmodernism” 2004) describes it, a palimpsest approach such as this can function as a “method for accomplishing a fuller representation … [helping us] think in terms of [multiple layers]” and offering various vantage points that “assist in constructing a more accurate
Figure 2: Computer articles in CCC’s “Staffroom Interchange” (740). Using space as a means of organizing and layering this study’s data, as opposed to linear time, will allow different and more complex relationships to become apparent.

1. CCC and C&C’s Overall Publication Relationship:
First, exploring the overall (publication) relationship between CCC and C&C will help provide a useful context for better understanding the six findings that follow. When Patricia Sullivan and James Porter (“Opening Spaces”) looked at the relationship of computers and composition articles published in various journals in the early 1990s, they reported that “between 1990 and 1992, Computers and Composition, the primary journal for the computers and composition community, published 52 articles on computers and writing, 100% of its total. No surprise there, but it is surprising that during that same time College Composition and Communication published only two articles on computers and writing (2.4% of its total)” (93-94). While the current study shows an increase from 2.4%, it is not one of great significance.

Between the years of 1983 and 2008 CCC published approximately 845 articles: 55 of them were computer-related—or 6% of them, as displayed in Figure 1. This percentage is a slight increase from the 2.4% Sullivan and Porter reported from two years of publications; however,
this relationship is further complicated. Of the 55 articles published in CCC that focused on computers, 12 or them—or approximately 18%—were published in the journal’s “Staffroom Interchange” section, a section that CCC’s editor (1987-1993) Richard Gebhardt (“Editor’s Column: Diversity”) described as publishing “shorter, lightly-documented articles or articles focused on the writing classroom” (10). This section was later discontinued in 1992 during Gebhardt’s time as editor in order “to remove from such articles a label authors sometimes have resented and promotion committees sometimes have used to devalue good work” (10). Regardless of the label, these 12 articles tended to be shorter in length, less formal in tone, and, at times, less nuanced in their arguments. Overall, then, about 80% of the computer-related articles published in CCC were full featured articles. Such numbers and percentages provide an interesting picture of the attention CCC was affording to the subdiscipline of computers and composition.

Additional insights on the journals’ relationship can be gleaned by examining the book reviews and introductions that CCC published. The length, type, and frequency of these book reviews no doubt changes with each editor over time; however, their existence is one of the elements that remained constant in CCC from 1983 to 2008. As Gebhardt wrote during his editorship, “[Book reviews’] value is obvious to busy people hungry for information and critical judgments about the scholarly publications and textbooks that are always being announced—in numbers too great for anyone to keep up with—in publishers' brochures and journal ads. They are equally valuable to authors and publishers eager for their titles to get due attention in the competition of new books for readers' time” (“The Value” 423). Certainly the book reviews provide a window into the types of topics and investigations the field as a whole regards as important. Of the 725 book reviews and introductions
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**Figure 3: Computer-related book reviews in CCC**
published in CCC from 1983 to 2008, 36—or approximately 5%—of those were focused on computer-related books, as indicated in Figure 3. Again, this relatively small percentage provides a glimpse into the subdiscipline’s presence in and relationship to the larger field.

Furthermore, plotting the overall publication numbers of articles relating to higher education over time can add another layer to the understanding of this relationship. The trends of publication in C&C provide few surprises. Publication numbers were small in 1983 during the journal’s inaugural year—only one feature article was published—but remained relatively constant after that. There was a slight jump in the number of articles around the mid 1990s when (a)synchronous communication emerged as a popular technology/article topic and the journal published a lengthy special issue focusing on writing centers. These publication numbers remained relatively consistent when the journal moved to a quarterly publication schedule in 2001. Plotting the computer-related publications in CCC over the last 25 years offers additional findings. CCC publication of computer-related articles was much more concentrated in the beginning of the movement. From 1983-1988, when
investigations into word processing were particularly popular in both journals, *CCC* published a high percentage of computer-related articles—43% of its overall total. This dropped off in the early 1990s and resulted in some years where there were no computer-related articles published at all (i.e., 1992, 1995, 2000, 2007). After the early 1990s, *CCC*’s publication of computer-related articles experienced two relatively larger surges: one in 1996 when Kathleen Yancey and Michael Spooner’s article focusing on email was the first computer-based article to have multiple responses in the journal’s “interchange” section and another around 2004 and 2005 when multimodal/media compositions became an increasingly popular topic and, interestingly, during *C&C*’s 20th anniversary.

Certainly, the relatively low numbers and percentages in *CCC*’s publishing of computer-related articles and book reviews speak to the larger field’s relationship to the subdiscipline and the emphasis it places on the subdiscipline’s work. While the scope of this study does not afford specific reasons for why their numbers are low or why computer-related publication numbers decreased in *CCC* in the early 1990s, one could speculate, with Gail Hawisher, Paul LeBlanc, Charles Moran, and Cynthia Selfe, that “after the first burst of enthusiasm, computers, at least from the perspective of *College English* and *College Composition and Communication*, seemed to disappear from sight—perhaps now considered part of the furniture, but more likely considered not the real business of English” (*Computers* 145). Furthermore, this study cannot draw concrete conclusions as to why certain blips in *CCC* publication numbers occurred, but it does show that higher publication numbers occurred during the subdiscipline’s beginning, at the point of its 20th anniversary, and at times when it introduced new technological movements: for example, word processing in the 1980s, email/(a)synchronous communication in the late 1990s, and multimodal/media composing in the mid 2000s. Such alignments could interestingly suggest that the larger field’s attention is difficult to hold and is captured only at moments of “special activity,” either during larger moments in the subdiscipline’s history or when new technologies are introduced. After paying attention to the subdiscipline’s genesis in the late 1980s, *CCC* does not pick up its computer-related publication numbers until a new technology emerges. *CCC*’s publication numbers certainly show that it acknowledges the subdiscipline; however, this acknowledgment surges and wanes relatively quickly (as Hawisher et al. note above).
2. The “sticky Theory-Practice dance”

We can see another important aspect of the relationship between CCC and C&C by turning toward the types of articles published in each journal over time. The data collected from C&C shows that in terms of its own articles the journal published the highest percentage of pedagogical-based articles. Of the 506 articles published from 1983-2008, 162, or approximately 32%, were pedagogy focused, meaning the articles’ primary purpose was to address issues of classroom pedagogy, practice, and teaching with technology; 111, or 22%, were research based, reporting research results concerning working/teaching with technology; 115, or 22%, were theory focused, articulating or analyzing particular theories concerning working/teaching with technology; 72, or 14%, discussed professional issues, investigating salient professional issues for those who teach composition with computers and technology or calling their attention to certain matters; 38, or 8%, examined issues at the programmatic level, exploring larger issues dealing with the programmatic incorporation of and/or staffing issues connected with technology and/or computers in the composition classroom; and 8, or 2%, explored historical accounts, articulating historical analyses or accounts concerning working/teaching.
with technology. Alone these data may not be surprising; however, if this is paired with the trends in article types published in *CCC*, an interesting picture emerges. From 1983 to 2008, *CCC* published the highest percentage of theory-based computer articles; a much higher percentage than research-or pedagogy-based articles. Twenty one out of a total 55 articles, or approximately 38%, were theory based; 12, or 21%, were pedagogy focused; 9, or 16%, were investigations into research; 9 were also focused on professional issues; 3, or 5%, about programmatic issues; and only 1 explored a historical approach.

Here, we can see an interesting difference between what the journals choose to emphasize in their publications; we can also see a familiar tension between theory and practice. The two graphs to the left visually articulate this; while the subdiscipline’s journal appeared to maintain an emphasis on pedagogy throughout the last 25 years, *CCC*’s interest in computer-related pedagogy based articles fell off significantly in late 1990s, near the end of the word processing movement. The same situation occurred with research-based articles that appeared in the two journals. Research in *C&C*
rose and fell when new technologies came into the subdiscipline’s consciousness, specifically in the late 1980s with word processing, the mid 1990s with email/(a)synchronous communication tools, the early 2000s with web/online and distance courses, and the mid 2000s with multimodal/media composition. However, the research-based articles in CCC fell off entirely after the work done with word processing in the late 1980s. What did increase, however, were the theory-based articles. The percentages of these theory-based articles show a steady increase in C&C and a slow, somewhat uneven, increase in CCC.

Looking more closely at specific article topics can help articulate C&C’s breadth of article types and CCC’s focus on theory-based articles; the topics of hypertext, (a)synchronous communication, eportfolios, and the internet provide four examples that best illuminate this relationship. Articles published in C&C on the topic of hypertext were both pedagogically and theoretically based (Pedagogy: e.g., DiPardo and DiPardo, Moulthrop and Kaplan, J.R. Watkins, Rea and White, Williams, Strasma; Theory: e.g.,
However, the two articles focusing on hypertext that were published in CCC were both theory-based, Janango (‘Hypertexts’) and Rhodes, the former explaining how Joseph Cornell’s artwork connected to the theory of hypertext and the latter how feminist theory could help articulate hypertextual properties. Articles on the topic of (a)synchronous communication tools followed a similar trend. In C&C there was a mix of pedagogy, research, and theory articles (Pedagogy: e.g., Kremers, Sirc and Reynolds, Eldred, Alexander, McKee (“Your Views”); Research: e.g., Peyton, van der Geest and Remmers, Pagnucci and Mauriello, Wolfe; Theory: e.g., DiMatteo, Moran (“We Write”), Barclay, Sirc). However, the two articles about (a)synchronous communication in CCC presented optimistic research in 1989 (Schiner and Rice) and theorized about mediating cultural conflicts in 2001 (Rouzie). Trends in the publication numbers of articles concerning eportfolios in C&C and CCC are much the same. C&C showed a breadth of pedagogy focused articles (e.g., R.M. Howard, Fischer, Forbes, S. Watkins, Pullman) while CCC had one article concerning eportfolios from Yancey (“Postmodernism”) in 2004 that worked to create a theory of eportfolios. A final example can also be seen with articles published concerning the internet. C&C published pedagogy, research, professional, and theory based articles concerning the intricacies and complications the internet presents (Pedagogy: e.g., Sorapure et al., Sidler, Turnley; Research: e.g., Burton and Chadwick, Helms-Park and Stapleton; Professional: e.g., Bauman; Theory: e.g., Johnson, P. Sullivan), while CCC published one theoretical article about navigating and negotiating cyberspace in 1998 (Reynolds).

As Nacey Maloney Grimm, Anne Frances Wysocki, and Marilyn M. Copper worded it, here we see “the sticky Theory-Practice dance” (266), where those in the field of composition almost “schizophrenically alternate between theory and practice” (267). Karen Kopelson recently noted in her 2008 CCC article that “the nature of [composition’s] disciplinary birth has led to recurrently documented tensions surrounding the significance of both theory and practice to our field’s identity and pursuits” (751-2). Lynn Worsham spoke to this split at length stating that the “sine qua non of intellectual work is theory; thus, the primary way to make the work of composition more seriously intellectual is to make it more seriously theoretical” (103). It is assertions like these—and
like Beth Daniell’s that “the recognition of composition as an academic field is linked to theoretical coherence” (132)—that may begin to explain the differences in the journals as reflected in the data. Such data make it appear that the larger field is moving in the direction of theoretical emphasis; however, such data also raises questions of whether there is a theoretical emphasis exclusively in terms of computer-related topics in CCC or whether an overall (hegemonic) emphasis on theory is emerging in the pages of CCC. Again the scope of this study does not afford specific reasons why such an emphasis exists or the extent to which it exists, but one could conclude, like Daniell, that “what has helped composition most is not the composition theories but the theory talk, the language that helps us sound like other university scholars” (134). Perhaps it is this type of theoretical language that the larger field feels it needs to adopt/favor in order to move forward.

However, there is a further complexity here. Discussing these findings in terms of theory versus practice creates a rather oversimplified dichotomy. The pedagogy articles published in C&C are much more complex and nuanced than the traditional definition of “pedagogy” affords for. This complexity first manifested itself as I worked to code C&C’s articles. In the 1980s and 1990s, articles were relatively easy to code; early articles on pedagogy did little more than discuss classroom examples and anecdotes; pieces on research often ended with the study’s findings and provided little discussion beyond that. However, around 2000 the articles became more difficult to code. Pieces like those of David Alan Sapp and James Simon, Beth Hewett, and Susan Miller-Cochran and Rochelle Rodrigo provide perfect examples of these difficult coding situations. All of these articles began by describing and reporting out research results but ended with extended discussions about how such research could inform specific classroom pedagogies. Such articles included elements of both research and pedagogy. Furthermore, and more pertinent to this section’s “sticky Theory-Practice dance,” pieces by Kate Kiefer, Robert Cummings, and Rebekah Colby and Richard Colby began with theoretical explorations and concluded with how such theory could inform pedagogical practices. For example, Cummings looked at the theoretical connections between the rhetorical triangle and the skills required for HTML coding; he then investigated how such connections could be explored specifically in the classroom. Colby and Colby’s
piece explored gaming theory first and then worked to apply such theory to World of Warcraft before talking about the ways such theory and gaming might be used in the classroom. The incorporation of both pedagogical and theoretical elements makes it too simple to call articles such as these “pedagogy.”

Likewise, it would be an oversimplification of this study’s findings to call C&C a “pedagogy-based” journal. Rather, the articles in C&C display a much more nuanced composition; as Gesa Kirsch noted in her 2003 piece “Ethics and the Future of Composition Research,” “Much of the recent scholarship actively challenges the boundaries among theory, research, and practice” (131). In such work, “boundaries begin to blur among what constitutes theory, what constitutes methodology, and what constitutes practice” (132). Similarly, Christine Farris and Chris Anson have noted that “[with] reluctance to assume top-down, research-to-theory-to-practice relationship, compositionists increasingly claim to favor some sort of dialectic relationship between theory and practice. …The assumption is that teachers’ critical reflection on their actual practice enables them to construct an ever-changing theory while in the process of changing that practice” (3). The data in this study—and articles by Keifer, Cummings, and Colby and Colby’s in particular—signal that the recent articles in C&C are not favoring practice over theory or visa versa; rather, they display a sort of emerging balance, a “sort of dialectic relationship between theory and practice” (Farris and Anson 3). In Under Construction (1998), Christopher Ferry asked, “Does theory inform [composition] work? Or does the work create theory? Both, of course. Theory and work are, or should be, inextricably bound, a serpent swallowing its own tail” (17-18). Perhaps now, a little more than 10 years after Ferry’s initial comment, the more recent articles in C&C are beginning to explore this circular serpent-swallowing-its-tail relationship. While it may be easy, or preferred, to conclude from this study that the field at large favors theory while C&C favors pedagogy, this would be an oversimplification. Moreover, it would be disingenuous to assume that CCC did not publish articles that explored the complex/nuanced relationship between practice and theory; however, such articles are not computer related, and thus lie outside of this study.10 What is clear is that the current subdiscipline of computers and composition appears to favor a complex hybrid, one that will no doubt continue to change and evolve as the subdiscipline and journal do.
3. A Nuanced Game of Follow the Leader

Another layer of the relationship between CCC and C&C can be explored by focusing on the chronological element of this study. This focus on time illuminates findings that pick up where studies like Hawisher et al. (Computers) and Janet Eldred’s left off. In their 1996 historical investigation, Hawisher et al. concluded that we have a similar history [to the larger field of composition] if we contemplate early work in the area of computers and composition. The preoccupation with editors, spellers, and the like reflects the traditional composition paradigm and its emphasis on product. The expressive and cognitive views, on the other hand, with their emphasis on the mental activity of the individual, contribute to invention and revision software and study composing processes with the microcomputer. With its emphasis on process follows (by tradition, not necessity) the concern with the individual, the private. (202)

Eldred’s 1991 article “Pedagogy in the Computer-Networked Classroom” pushes this history even further:

The technology used in our classrooms has reflected changing ideas about teaching writing. With traditional, product-centered teaching came an emphasis on editors, spell-checking features, and the like. Those classrooms that stressed process looked to word processing, to heuristic programs, and to the promise of an artificially intelligent machine that could help students think or ‘pre-write’ more critically. In the past decade, with the introduction of critical theories and with the resurgence of classical rhetoric, we have seen the growth of social pedagogies, pedagogies that stress writing as a dialogic, dialectic act which should at its best “empower” writers.

The data collected here from C&C evidences these assertions: overall, there is a historical pattern in the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition that moves from an emphasis on product to one on process and, finally, to one on social/cultural issues. In the early to mid 1980s, there was a surge in articles in C&C that exhibited a traditional product-based view of composition and focused on the effects of grammar software and spell checkers: for example, McCann (1984), Neuwirth et al. (1984), Zimmer (1985), Dalgish (1985), Reid and Findlay (1986) and Falk’s 1985
article that explained the sentence combining program she developed and the grammar skills it fostered. This was followed in the late 1980s and early 1990s by a wave of articles in C&C that focused on the revision and writing processes fostered by various technologies: for example, Parris (1985), Derrick (1986), Strickland (1987), Hult (1988), Berry (1989), van der Geest (1994), Eklundh (1994), and Schriner’s 1988 research study that examined how the use of word processors affected a students’ revision practices. Finally, as Eldred notes, in the early 2000s there was in increase in the amount of articles that explored the social and/or cultural implications or effects of various technologies: for example Bennett and Walsh (1997), Comstock and Addison (1997), LeCourt and Barnes (1999), Haas et al. (“Mentors” 2002), Redd (2003), and Warshauer’s 1995 article that worked to develop a teaching method that recognized and properly handled homophobic remarks in online discussion in order to avoid alienating homosexual students. Trends like these in C&C articles make it easy to see that the smaller subdiscipline follows the major trends and movements of the larger field. However, as in an earlier section, this study’s findings also play out in more complicated ways, ways that allow this study’s data to add to the current discussion of leadership between the field and subdiscipline.

As Hawisher et al. (Computers) have noted, “In one sense, computers and composition studies, as a subfield, has followed its parent field, composition studies … [;] in another sense, computers and composition, as a subfield, has also led its parent field of composition studies” (283). Using this study’s examination of article topics can help us substantiate Hawisher et al.’s claim and better understand exactly how this game of follow the leader has played out over the last 25 years.

Looking first at the later publication dates in C&C on topics such as word processing and software helps illustrate the ways C&C followed CCC. While a handful of articles on word processing were published early in C&C (e.g. Milone and Roth, both in 1984, and Sommers and Collins, Waddell, and Moore in 1985), the large bulk of word processing articles were published in C&C after 1988 and into the early 1990s. In contrast, articles on the topic of word processing emerged in CCC as early as 1983, Collier, and continued to be popular until 1985, for example, Sudol, Rodrigues, Catano, Case, Harris. Even more interesting, it was not until 1988 that articles like Hult and Stine’s in C&C began to move past enthusiastic accounts of word processing software to
critically examine the potential problems and/or complications that that could emerge. However, three years earlier critiques of word processing, or articles that strayed from the initial waves of enthusiasm, were published in CCC, e.g. Harris in 1985. Here, we can see, somewhat ironically, that even with a technology-based topic like word processing, there were times when the larger field led the smaller subdiscipline of computers and composition. The topic of software followed a similar trend. While articles about software emerged in both journals around 1983 and 1984—McCann, Winterbauer, and Neuwirth et al. in C&C; Breininger and Portch, Kolter and Anandam, Rodrigues and Rodrigues in CCC—it was not until 1992 that theory-based articles concerning software emerged in C&C—P. Taylor, Condon, Hepler, Eiler. It was six years earlier, in 1988, that CCC published the first somewhat more complex, nuanced, and theoretical articles concerning software programs, Hoat and Petersen et al. Once again, we see C&C somewhat following the leader here.

However, if we look at the topics of articles after the late 1980s, a different picture emerges. Looking at the topic of hypertext, for example, affords the opportunity to see a shift in leadership. Articles about hypertext occurred as early as 1990 in C&C, DiPardo and DiPardo, and the bulk of them were published between 1990 and 1995, Moulthrop and Kaplan, Guyer et al., Joyce, Amato, Bolter. In contrast, the first article about hypertext published in CCC was in 1998 (Janangelo “Hypertexts”), almost five years later, and followed by one in 2002 (Rhodes). Clearly, on this topic, C&C led CCC. Eportfolios followed a similar pattern. Most of the articles about eportfolios were published in C&C between 1996 and 2002, e.g. Purves, R. M. Howard, Forbes, S. Watkins, Knadler, Pullman. However, the one article about eportfolios that emerged in CCC was published in 2004—Yancey “Postmoderism”—almost eight years after C&C published a special issue on the topic. Similarly, C&C began to explore the implications of various social and cultural issues with technology in the mid-late 1990s—Alexander, Comstock and Addison, Richardson, Takayoshi “No Boys,” Wolfe, Janangelo “Technopower,” DeWitt, Aschauer—however, such articles did not emerge in CCC specifically until 2004 with Hawisher et al.’s (“Becoming Literate”) examination of gender and literacy.
Clearly, this is a complex, nuanced, and shifting game of follow the leader. As Hawisher et al.’s (Computers) history notes, at times the subdiscipline follows the larger field and at time it leads it. The data from this study help us see that overall the smaller subdiscipline is certainly engaged with the trends in the larger field, such as the emphases on product, process, and social influences. However, if we look at individual topics we can see that CCC may have been the leader in the 1980s with topics like word processing and software, but by the mid to late 1990s, it was C&C that was leading the way with topics like hypertext, eportfolios, and cultural/social issues relating to computers/technology. It seems easy to speculate that as the subdiscipline gained its own footing and momentum that the game of follow the leader flipped. Historically, then, a nuanced relationship has emerged: the smaller subdiscipline clearly reacts to larger movements in the field; however, it is the subdiscipline that leads that larger field when it comes to specific topics and types of technology.

4. Connections (and lack thereof) Between Subdisciplines

Putting the article topics in dialogue with one another can add yet another layer to the building picture of the relationship between CCC and C&C. Exploring the topics of writing centers, ESL/L2 learners, and basic writers display an interesting pattern: all three of these topics were connected to the subdiscipline of computers and composition in C&C but such connections were completely absent in CCC. From 1984 through the mid 1990s, C&C published numerous articles focusing on writing center work, examining the aspects of both tutoring and programmatic issues (e.g., Kotker, Coogan, Cullen and Balkema, Wood, George, Clark); the journal even published a special issue in 1995 (12:2), as the guest editors pointed out, partly in response to the 1987 special edition of The Writing Center Journal that focused on computers (Kinkead and Hult). Here, an interplay and connection emerged between two of the subdisciplines in the field of composition, one which never made it into the pages of CCC. From 1983 to 2008, CCC did not publish any articles specifically devoted to exploring the relationship between writing center work and the work of computers and composition. The same holds true for the topics of ESL/L2 and basic writers. In 2005, C&C published a special issue to address the concerns of using technology in ESL/L2 classrooms and/or with ESL/L2
students. During the same time period, CCC did not publish a single article that specifically discussed computers and composition and ESL learners. Finally, the publication statistics for the topic of basic writers follows the same trend. While the work concerning basic writers in C&C is a bit more limited, there were still pieces published in the late 1980s and early 1990s (e.g., Moberg, Etchison “Word Processing,” D’Agostino and Varone). There was only one computer-related article that mentioned basic writers in CCC (Rodrigues 1985), and its main argument focused more on word processing than ESL students.

Looking at these topic and publication trends, we can see that C&C worked to draw connections between itself and other subdisciplines in composition; Kevin De Pew’s introductory words in his editor’s letter for the C&C ESL special issue further articulate this:

Until recently, computers and composition studies (or digital writing) and second language writing studies (L2 writing) have been separate, sub-disciplines of composition studies. Although these sub-disciplines have rich theoretical and methodological traditions, scholars and instructors have often had to cobble together theories, methodologies, and pedagogies to do work that crossed these disciplinary boundaries. Or they tend to align themselves mostly with one discipline or the other. The goal of this special issue, therefore, is to work towards building a foundation for theorizing the work second language (L2) writers do in digital contexts as a field of inquiry in and of itself. (255)

It is not surprising, then, to find one subdiscipline connecting itself to another in a specialized journal like C&C, but what is perhaps more interesting is that CCC does not draw any of these connections. It could be debated whether it is CCC’s place, or whether it is within the CCC’s scope, to explore and/or showcase the connection between its subdisciplines; however, articulating and/or drawing such connections appears to align with some of the overall goals of the CCC. In his 1987 editor’s note, Gerbhardt stated

The field of composition studies draws on research and theories from a broad range of humanistic disciplines—English studies, rhetoric, cultural studies, gay studies, gender studies, critical theory, education, technology studies, race studies, communication, philosophy of language, anthropology, sociology, and others—
and from within composition and rhetoric studies, where a number of subfields have also developed, such as technical communication, computers and composition, writing across the curriculum, research practices, and the history of these fields. (19)

Similarly, in their 1993 article in *CCC*, “College Composition and Communication: Chronicling a Discipline's Genesis,” Donna Burns Phillips, Ruth Greenberg, and Sharon Gibson concluded that *CCC’s* mission could be articulated as the following: “*College Composition and Communication* can hold us together by providing a forum for hearing the voices of the many, the few, and perhaps most importantly, the [field as a whole]” (461). Finally, *CCC’s* website asserts that one of the places it draws its material from is “within composition and rhetoric studies, where a number of subfields have also developed, such as technical communication, computers and composition, writing across the curriculum, research practices, and the history of these fields” (“College Composition and Communication” NCTE *CCC* Online). It could be argued that initiatives like the one De Pew described above—ones where subdisciplines are not only included in the dialogue but explored in connection with other subdisciplines—enacts these manifesto-like comments concerning *CCC’s* goals. It could also be argued that if one of the goals of *CCC* is to provide a broad view of the field of composition, such a view necessarily includes putting the subdisciplines in dialogue with one another rather than asking readers to “to cobble together theories, methodologies, and pedagogies” (De Pew 225) from the various subdisciplines. No matter the opinion, this study’s data firmly shows that within the last 25 years *CCC* has not moved to connect computers and composition work to the subdisciplines of writing centers, ESL/L2 learners, or basic writers.

5. Areas of Emphasis and Absence

In their piece “History in the Spaces Left: African American Presence and Narratives of Composition Studies” for the *CCC’s* 50th anniversary issue, Jacqueline Royster and Jean Williams argued that “history is important, not just in terms of who writes it and what gets included or excluded, but also because history, by the very nature of its inscription as history, has social, political, and cultural consequences” (563). While Royster and Williams’ piece examined history in terms of the inclusion and exclusion of
African Americans, such an approach/lens can also be beneficial for further analyzing this study. So far, this study has looked at the relationship between *CCC* and *C&C* in terms of what has been *included* in both journals; to add another layer to this relationship, this section will use the lens of *exclusion*. The areas of online/distance courses, assessment, and cultural/social issues emerged in this study as the main topics that *C&C* valued but that *CCC*’s publication history did not significantly recognize; therefore, exploring these topics further will help us better understand this layer of their overall relationship.

Between 1983 and 2008, *C&C* published a total of 27 articles on the topic of online/distance education, and in 2006, it dedicated a special issue to the topic, 23.1. The majority of articles on the topic were published after 2000 and included pedagogical investigations (e.g., Quigley, Savenye et al., Sapp and Simon, Kiefer), research reports (e.g., Miller “A Review,” Reinheimer, Reilly and Williams, Blakelock and Smith), theoretical inquiries (e.g., Miller “How Near,” Brady, Fleckenstein, Stroupe), professional explorations (e.g., Peterson, Blair and Monske, Dyehouse), and programmatic examinations (e.g., Royar, Mason et al., DePew et al.). Once again, such publication trends in *C&C* are not surprising; certainly, a journal that specializes in teaching with technology would publish articles on the topic of online education. What is (perhaps) more surprising, however, is that during the same time period *CCC* did not publish a single article on the topic. While it could be argued that *C&C* is the proper specialized place for these types of articles, with titles such as “So you are going to be an online writing instructor: issues in designing, developing, and delivering an online course” (Savenye et al.) and “The debate about online learning: key issues for writing teachers” (Peterson), it could also be argued that some of these articles are directed to a broad, general (and perhaps novice) audience of teachers who all have the opportunity to teach online rather than to specialists in technology; thus, one could question why such articles—or articles with similar topics and approaches—never made the pages of *CCC*.

A similar trend emerged with the articles published about assessment and cultural/social issues. *C&C* published numerous articles on the topic of assessment in the areas of both theory and research (e.g., Newbold, Huot, Takayoshi “The Shape,” Yancey “Looking,” Wohlpert et al.). Meanwhile, *CCC* did not publish a single article concerning
the topic of assessment in digital work. In fact, in the publication of the CCCC Committee on Assessment’s 1995 position statement there was no mention of computers, technology, or digital work in their discussion of assessment practices. Furthermore, it was not until 2004 that a CCCC Position Statement on “learning, teaching and assessment in digital environments” was published. Even with such a position statement, however, there were still no articles published that directly addressed the topic of assessment in CCC. Such absences emerge again with the topic of cultural/social issues. From 1993 to 2008 there were 46 articles and two special issues (16.1, 1999: “Computers, Composition and Gender;” and 23.3, 1999: “Sexualities, Technologies and the Teaching of Writing”) published in C&C devoted to the topic of examining the implications and complications that arise when social/cultural influences are considered with technology; for example, how the use of computers and technology changes, alters, and/or becomes complicated when used with straight, bi, lesbian, and gay students (e.g., Comstock and Addison, Woodland, Alexander and Banks, DeWitt); students of different races (e.g., Bennet and Walsh, McKee “Your Views,” Redd, Eble and Breault, Suj de Montes et al.); and students of both genders (e.g., Haas et al. “Mentors,” Richardson, Pagnucci and Mauriello, Aschauer). These articles were pedagogical, theoretical, professional, and research-based and worked to make the cultural/social issues discussed more central than the technology used. However, during the same time period, CCC published only one article that focused on such a topic. In 2004, Hawisher et al. (“Becoming Literate”) examined the case studies of two women and how their gender affected their acquisition of literacy. Certainly, it is not that CCC did not include articles that focused on social/cultural issues or that the field as a whole does not value such investigations; as Russell Durst noted in 2006, “To judge from published work, composition specialists largely have accepted the social turn in the field” (98). Rather, as stated above in the discussion of who leads whom, it is the case that “many specialists in computers and composition studies were assimilating, and contributing to, composition studies’ move toward social and critical pedagogies” (Hawisher et al. Computers 184); members of the subdiscipline of computers and composition are “driven both by the social epistemologies dominant in composition studies” (Hawisher et al. Computers 238). The smaller subdiscipline is following the larger field by emphasizing social/cultural
issues, but the interesting finding here is that CCC does not (yet) recognize that move in its publication.

All three of these topics—online/distance courses, assessment, and cultural/social issues—reveal yet another layer about the relationship between CCC and C&C. Tracking the publications trends of online/distance courses, assessment, and social/cultural issues allows us to see what topics the subdiscipline of computers and composition emphasized that were absent in the larger field’s publication. Once again, such findings lead us to question whether it is CCC’s place, or within CCC’s scope, to include such articles in its publication; however, when the ratio between article publication is C&C: 27, CCC: 0 (re online/distance courses) or C&C: 46 CCC: 1 (re social/cultural issues), something rather significant is missing from the picture CCC is offering of the computers and composition community. And, as Royster and Williams remind us, such inclusions versus exclusions can have “social, political, and cultural consequences” (563) for our field’s—and its subdiscipline’s—identity and the role that each plays in the representation of the other.

6. Programmatic Stasis and (Slow) Professional Increases

The previous section worked to examine what was included in publication versus what was excluded. However, looking at what both publications excluded, or at least de-emphasized, throughout the last 25 years adds another layer to the emerging picture. From 1983 to 2008, both CCC and C&C published a low percentage of pieces that focused on programmatic concerns. Noting the definition of “programmatic” used in this study again may be helpful in avoiding confusion. For the purposes in this study, the coding label “programmatic” was given to pieces that took up issues concerning writing programs and explored topics outside of the individual classroom and individual instructor; for example, issues of program development or professional development for staff. Issues such as promotion and tenure were coded as “professional” due to their overall emphasis on the individual instructor and his/her work.

In total, C&C only published 38 programmatic articles, or 8% or its total; CCC published only 3 programmatic articles, or 5% of its total. In C&C there was an initial surge in programmatic articles in the late 1980s and early 1990s about concerns and issues with setting up the physical computer labs (e.g. Dobrin “Minicomputers,”
Bernhardt, Haralson, Moran “The Winds”). Around 1994 and 1995 a second surge emerged concerning programmatic issues and implementing online/distance courses—Royar, Mason et al.—and, in a special issue in 1995, the concerns a writing center director may have when incorporating technology into the center as a whole (e.g. Nelson and Wambeam, Harris and Pemberton, Simons et al., D. Selfe). Finally, a third surge in programmatic topics occurred around 2002 with articles concerning professional development for staff (e.g. Hea, Duffelmeyer, Journet). In CCC the three programmatic articles published all occurred before 1988 (Hocking and Visniesky, Tobin, Kinkead), and similarly focused on setting up physical lab spaces and training staff to work in those environments.

These low numbers prove particularly interesting when compared with some of the words of well-regarded members of the subdiscipline of computers and composition. In 2003, for example, Pamela Takayoski and Brian Huot noted the need for increased attention to issues of staff development:

Although computers and composition, a field that has been around since the early eighties, has amassed a string body of information, there are surprisingly few
relevant and current resources that can guide instructors who are teaching with computer technologies for the first time. (Takayoshi and Huot 3)

Similarly, Donald Daiker noted,

The problem is that composition teachers by and large are not—or are at least not yet—prepared to work in productive ways either with new technologies or with students who are learning them … the challenge to create a technologically informed and competent composition faculty is a formidable one. (Daiker 6)

Furthermore, in 2004 the “CCCC Position Statement on Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Writing in Digital Environments” included a two page section with recommendations for “administrators with responsibilities for writing programs” (787) and for “writing programs in concert with institutions” (788). Similar calls for programmatic focus were voiced by Stuart Selber as well as the collaborative team of Michelle Sidler, Richard Morris, and Elizabeth Overman Smith. In a later section of his 2008 book Multiliteracies in a Digital Age, Selber worked to articulate goals and requirements for departmental and institutional forces working with technology (224).

Finally, in the introduction to a later section of their Critical Source Book for Computers in the Composition Classroom, Sidler et al. stated that “the readings in this section offer an introduction to challenges faced by institutional programs, surveying arguments for and against computer implementation and offering practical advice for program administrators who consider going online” (369).

Pairing this study’s findings with these types of calls from the field and subdiscipline illustrates an interesting disjoint. Clearly, there are those in the field who have noted a deficit of work concerning the programmatic aspects of working with computers in composition; however, neither C&G nor CCC has published a significant number of articles with such a focus. Speculating on the reasons for such an absence are beyond the scope of this study; however, it is clear that both journals have published a higher percentage of work that discusses pedagogical and curricular issues as opposed to anything programmatic, departmental, or institutional.

Programmatic issues may have been neglected, relatively speaking, in both CCC and C&G; however, analyzing the percentages of professional articles published in both journals displays a relatively similar trend. While there were slow increases in both
journals, the number of professional articles published in both CCC and C&C is a rather small percentage when considered overall: C&C published 72 articles, 15% of its overall total, and CCC published 9 articles, 16% if its overall total. C&C had several small surges throughout its publication of professional articles: articles in the late 1980s and early 1990s focused on how C&C professionals could relate their work/goals to their colleagues (e.g., Cramer, Schwartz, Selfe and Wahlstrom, T. Howard); the late 1990s showed an increase in articles advocating for professionals to better understand how copyright and fair use laws affected their work and teaching (e.g., Gurak, Herrington, Logie, Shirk and Smith); around 2000 articles surfaced that examined the topic of tenure and promotion for teachers working with technology (e.g., Maid, Rickly, Gruber, Amy and Crow); and finally, after 2003, articles emerged that advocated for professionals to work towards better understanding multimodal/media composing (e.g., Ball, Lunsford, Evans and Po, Reid). The few professional articles that were published in CCC mainly focused on making general calls to those in the larger field, calls that drew attention to the importance (and complicated nature) of incorporating computers in composition and
its classrooms (e.g., Hawisher and Selfe “The Rhetoric,” Selfe “Technology and Literacy,” Yancey “Made Not Only,” Rice).

The inclusion of any articles that address the professionals in a field affirms in some way that the subdiscipline has reached a certain level of success. Certainly, the very existence of these types of articles in both journals displays a level of growth/maturity in the computers and composition movement; professional calls such as these presuppose that such an organized group of professionals exists who can be motivated to some extent. Hawisher et al. (Computers) note that “the 1990s brought a growing professional sophistication to the field of computers and composition studies” (253); John Trimbur, and later Ellen McDaniel, made similar claims: “We are becoming self-conscious about our work as disciplinary and disciplined project, devoted to questions that matter, and we appeal therefore to the volume and quality of research and scholarship” (Trimbur 135). However, this study shows that the number of programmatic and professional articles is drastically fewer than the number of pedagogical, theoretical, or research based articles published. Once again, while, the scope of this study will not allow for speculation as to why these percentages were relatively low, we can see a disjuncture between what is being called for and/or observed—by those like Takayoshi, Huot, Daiker, Trimbur and McDaniel—and what has actually emerged in the published pages of CCC and C&C. These data show an aspect of the relationship where the field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition are similar, but, perhaps not in the ways we might expect—or desire.

7. Nuanced Changes in C&C Topic Development

This section will pull together some of the trends mentioned above, specifically sections two and three, concerning the journals’ relationship to theory and who leads whom over time. Laying this section over those two—again, in a palimpsest-like fashion—will elucidate another complicated aspect of this relationship but, more importantly, an interesting phenomena emerging in C&C. By placing article types—e.g., pedagogy, research, theory—alongside the element of time, this section will show how patterns of publication changed in C&C in the late 1990s. More specifically, this section will look at the way early articles in C&C tended to move linearly in four steps: (1)
enthusiastic pedagogy, (2) critical research, (3) nuanced theory, and finally, (4) professional and programmatic issues. However, examining the topics of (a)synchronous communication, cultural/social issues, online/distance courses, and multimodal/media composing, all which emerged after the early 1990s, displays a different developmental schema: pedagogical enthusiasm, critical researched investigation, nuanced theory and professional and programmatic investigations all occur simultaneously rather than after one another linearly.

This pattern of enthusiastic pedagogy, critical research, and nuanced theory has been well documented in the field of computers and composition. In their book *Opening Spaces: Writing Technologies and Critical Research Practices*, Patricia Sullivan and James Porter state that “if we historically examine literature surrounding emerging technologies, we find optimism, followed by criticism, followed by denouement of direct discussion” (171). They argue further that “the discourse surrounding computer use in composition classrooms, at least over the last decade and a half, has been characterized most often by a rhetoric of technology that stresses optimism and hope (Hawisher and Selfe, 1991), a rhetoric that reflects the enthusiasm and vision of teachers who want to make things better for students” (167). Cynthia Selfe (“Technology and Literacy”) also called this an early period of “experimentation at the most basic level” (95). However, in the 1990s, this enthusiasm was quickly checked; many argued, like Hawisher and Selfe (“The Rhetoric”), that those in computers and composition could “longer afford simply, and only, to dwell on the best parts, to tell stories about the best classroom moments, and to feature the more positive findings about computers. Rather, we must begin to identify the ways in which technology can fail us” (61). Hawisher and Selfe further argue,

If electronic technology is to help us bring about positive changes in writing classes, we must identify and confront the potential problems that computers pose and redirect our efforts, if necessary, to make our classes centers of intellectual openness and exchange … [;] our objections lie not in the use of computer technology and on-line conferences but rather in the uncritical enthusiasm that frequently characterizes the reports of those of us who advocate and support electronic writing classes. (56)

Similarly, Michele Knobel, Colin Lankshear, Eileen Honan, and Jane Crawford call for a
“sober systematic assessments of actual practices” (47), Hawisher et al. (“Becoming Literate”) for “increasing caution ... [against] a utopian discourse that masked many of the problems associated with technology (210), Deborah Holdstein and Cynthia Selfe for “a healthy skepticism about computers that marks our more developed understanding of technology” (1), and finally Irvin Peckham for us to “ask two questions when ... considering classroom strategies: (a) what am I trying to do here and (b) will technology help me to do it better?” (337). Soon after this critical eye was adopted by those in the subdiscipline, others began to call for theoretical investigations. In the introduction to her book Page to Screen: Taking Literacy into the Electronic Era, Ilana Snyder stated, “[If] we are able to use these technologies intelligently, we need a theory of electronic literacy that is dynamic, critical, and reflexive” (xxiii). Deborah Holdstein argued that “We must attempt to develop a theory base of our own” (“A Theory” 32), Christina Haas and Christine M. Neuwirth that “clear articulation of theory must accompany any research agenda” (333), and Hawisher et al. (Computers) that those in computers and composition take up “more speculative or theoretical work” (192).

Clearly, many in the subdiscipline of computers and composition have reflected on this pattern of enthusiastic pedagogy, critical research, and nuanced theory; therefore, it should not be surprising that these historical trends manifested themselves in this study, particularly in the topics of word processing and software. In the mid 1980s, there was a surge of pedagogy-based articles that explored word processing; most gave anecdotal-like accounts of classroom experiences, and all of the articles published were enthusiastic and positive about the technology (e.g., Milone, Roth, Waddell, Dinan et al.). In the late
1980s and early 1990s, there was an increase in both pedagogical- and research-based pieces that articulated the complications and problems that could emerge with classroom use of word processors (Pedagogy: e.g., Hult, Stine, Kantrov, Peckham; Research: e.g., LeBlanc, Schriner, Cross, Friedlander and Markel). Finally, in the mid 1990s, pieces working to theorize the processes or effects of word processing emerged (e.g., Pennington, Dowling). Similar moves occurred in C&C’s software based articles: enthusiastic pedagogical introductions of software in the mid 1980s (e.g., McCann, Winterbauer, Neuwirth et al., Falk, Derrick), critical investigations in pedagogy and research in the late 1980s (e.g., Dobrin “Style Analyzers,” Day, Peek et al.), and theories of software criteria and contextual usefulness in the early 1990s (e.g., P. Taylor, Condon, Hepler, Eiler). The topics of word processing and software provide two examples that show a rather linear—chronological—progression through these enthusiastic/critical and pedagogical/research-based/theoretical trends; one follows (relatively) after the other every couple of years.

However, these trends change if we begin to look at the topics published in the mid 1990s. (A)synchronous communication, social/cultural, online/distance courses, and multimodal/media composition are
topics that demonstrate this trend best. The graph for (a)synchronous communication, for example, begins to show that rather than occurring one after another, the trends of pedagogy, research, and theory all occur at relatively the same time. For example, in 1990, Marshall Kremers published an article based on the pedagogical uses of (a)synchronous communication, Joy Kreeft Peyton published a research case study, and Anthony DiMatteo published a theoretical investigation about the autonomy such technology affords students. Trends in the topic of social/cultural issues display a similar pattern. In 1997, Jonathan Alexander (“Out”) explored pedagogical approaches that can help students explore their sexual identities online; Michelle Comstock and Joanne Addison researched the sexual identities articulated in webpages, and Elaine Richardson conducted deep case studies researching the technological literacies of three African American women; Todd Taylor called on the professionals in the field to better understand the effects technology has on different races; and Laura Sullivan (“Cyberbabes”) and Scott DeWitt worked to theorize the relationships between technology, gender, and sexual orientation, respectively.

Looking at the
graph for online/distance courses, we can see similar article topic alignment in 2001: pedagogy (e.g., Savenye et al., Hailey et al.); research (e.g., Miller “A Review”); theory (e.g., Miller “How Near”); professional (e.g., Peterson); and programmatic (e.g., Inman and Corrigan). Finally, the topic of multimodal/ media composition provides us with the most recent iteration of this trend: in 2005 and 2006, there are articles on pedagogy (e.g., Shipka), research (e.g., Tardy), theory (e.g., Grigar “Kineticism,” Mckee “Sound Matters”) and professional issues (e.g., Grigar “The Challenges”). Here, we see multiple points of entry for each topic; rather than moving linearly from enthusiastic pedagogy, critical research, and nuanced theory, these later topics were approached from multiple points simultaneously: pedagogy, research, theory, enthusiasm, criticism, etc.

However, what is particularly interesting and different about multimodal/ media composing is that theory is heavily emphasized. The theory spike in 2006 emerges out of a special issue on the topic; however, up until now, the pedagogy, research, and theory spikes in previous graphs were all relatively the same height. This spike stands much higher than the pedagogy and research articles based on the same topic. Perhaps this last topic displays the beginning of a new trend; perhaps C&C is beginning to favor theory articles overall. This theoretical emphasis is vaguely similar to CCC’s emphasis on theory-based articles discussed in section two. Furthermore, this trend of C&C following the larger movements in the field of composition, such as one that favors theory-based articles, is also vaguely correlated to what was discussed in section three. While these latter conclusions are simply speculation, what this study does show is that the way C&C discussed and published on different technologies has changed significantly in the last 25 years, moving
from a method based on a single point of entry to a method that takes advantage of multiple points of entry.

Moving forward, the final chapter of this study will review and synthesis these findings, explore additional data sources that could be drawn upon to better understand the relationship between the field and the subdiscipline of computers and composition, and work to articulate this study’s significance to the field at large.
CONCLUSION

In this study I have worked to explore the relationship between the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition; I have done so by using journals as a lens for understanding what both the field and subdiscipline value. *College Composition and Communication* was used as a measure for the field of composition as a whole—due to its dedication to providing a picture of the field as a whole and its competitive acceptance rates (Holdstein “From the Editor” 2008). *Computers and Composition* was used as a representative for the subdiscipline of computers and composition—due to its role as an “indicator of how the profession has understood the role of technology…in its teaching over the years” (Hawisher “Blinding Insights” 42) and its dedication to computer-and technology-related topics. Coding and categorizing the types and topics of the articles published in both journals from 1983-2008 allowed certain trends and patterns to emerge that speak to the relationship between the field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition. Six of these trends illuminated aspects of the field and subdiscipline’s relationship; the seventh displayed an interesting development in C&C articles. This concluding chapter will begin by re-examining what this study reveals concerning the relationship between the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition, move towards identifying additional data that could be drawn upon for further exploration of this relationship, and conclude by exploring what this study contributes to the field as a whole.

What Does This Study Reveal: A Review

1. **CCC and C&C Overall Publication Relationship:**

   Exploring the overall publication relationship between *CCC* and *C&C* allowed two interesting trends to emerge.

   First, this study’s data revealed that out of the total 845 articles published in *CCC* between 1983 and 2008, only 55 of them—or 5%—were based on computer-related topics. Moreover, of these 55 articles, approximately 20% were published in the journal’s
“Staffroom Interchange” section where articles tended to be shorter with fewer citations, less nuanced arguments, and generally written in a less formal genre. Furthermore, this study’s data revealed that of 725 book reviews published in CCC over the last 25 years, 36 addressed computer/technology focused books—approximately 6% of the overall total. These relatively low numbers and overall percentages in CCC’s publishing of computer-related articles and book reviews speak to the larger field’s relationship to the subdiscipline of computers and composition and to the relative (lack of) emphasis it places on the subdiscipline’s work. While the scope of this study does not afford specific reasons for why their numbers are low, such data does, in some ways, speak to the claims of marginality voiced by those in the subdiscipline. As noted earlier, Selfe, Hawisher, Faigley, McDaniel, and Porter (among others) have claimed that the subdiscipline continues to “exist, if you will, on the margin” (Hawisher and Selfe, “Editor’s Letter”); that those who study computer-related topics “don’t get no respect” (Porter “Foreword” xi) and are often “[assigned] to a peculiar kind of professional isolation ‘in their own separate world’ of computer sessions and computer workshops (Selfe “Technology” 412); and that the work of the subdiscipline is generally “firewalled from the mainstream composition research, treated as a quirky sub specialization for technogeeks rather than as a fundamental topic—for everyone in the field” (Porter “Foreword” xi). This study’s data cannot speak to whether the subdiscipline and those who work within it “get respect,” making such a claim is far beyond the scope of this study. What these data do show is that the subdiscipline does exist on the margins of the larger field of composition—only 6% of CCC articles and 5% of its book reviews being focused on computer-related topics looks like a marginal existence. However, could it be questioned here whether 5% is the “right” amount of emphasis the field should afford to the subdiscipline of computers and composition. If there were around 20 or so subdisciplines in the field of composition, this 5% would appear “appropriate;” therefore, this study raises the question whether there is a “proper” marginal existence for the subdisciplines of composition. Furthermore, these low numbers also suggest that claims like those expressed by Krause and Harris in Hart-Davidson and Krause’s “Multivocal Textumentary” have not manifested themselves. They claimed that “the distinction between computers and writing and composition-in-general is largely over, because our
colleagues—once uninterested or even against the use of computers in the teaching of writing—have come over to our side. Essentially, the battle that has been fought for the last 20 or so years and that has been so clearly documented is over. We won” (C&C article reprinted in Sidler et al.’s Critical Sourcebook 490); however, this study’s data shows that the subdiscipline of computers and composition has not become the focus of the main field—over the last 25 years it has occupied approximately 6% of the larger field’s focus, and this number did not show any sign of increase in more recent years. However, as Hawisher and Selfe note (“Editor’s Letter”), what is left to be debated is whether this marginal existence is beneficial or detrimental to the subdiscipline. Does marginalization afford those who work within the subdiscipline of computers and composition a certain freedom and/or view that can create new opportunities for research and theory, or does it “firewall” the work of those in subdiscipline, leaving them feeling disrespected, while leaving those outside of it mis/ill informed about their scholarship? These are indeed important and interesting questions that require further exploration, and this study’s findings of the low number of computer-related articles published in CCC can provide an exigence for further exploration of this issue.

Second, the data concerning the overall publication relationship between CCC and C&C also revealed that while the number of articles C&C published annually stayed relatively constant over the last 25 years (with a slight increase once the journal became a quarterly publication), the number of computer-related articles published in CCC was concentrated in the early 1980s. From 1983-1988 CCC published 43% of its overall percentage of computer-related articles, thus showing that the larger field’s journal was much more interested in the subdiscipline’s work during the first ten years of the movement. As Hawisher et al. (Computers) state, “After the first burst of enthusiasm, computers, at least from the perspective of [College English and College Composition and Communication], seemed to disappear from sight—perhaps now considered part of the furniture, but more likely considered not the real business of English” (145). Furthermore, this study’s data showed that the publication numbers of computer-related articles in CCC increased around 1996 and 2004—with articles published on the topics of email and multimodal composition. Interestingly, the surge of articles in CCC around 2004 and 2005 also aligned with the years of C&C anniversary issues. While this study
cannot draw concrete conclusions as to why certain blips in CCC publication numbers occurred, it does show that higher publication numbers occurred during the subdiscipline’s beginning, at the point of its 20th anniversary, and at times when it introduced new technological movements such as word processing, email/(a)synchronous communication, and multimodal/media composing (see earlier “Findings” chapter for a full exploration). Such alignments could interestingly suggest that the larger field’s attention is difficult to hold and is captured only at moments of “special activity” (either during larger moments in subdiscipline’s history or when new technologies are introduced). These publication data certainly show that CCC acknowledges the subdiscipline of computers and composition; however, this acknowledgment surges and wanes relatively quickly and tends to increase only around particularly eventful dates and technologies. While we cannot glean why this is from this study’s data, such alignment certainly displays the continuously fluctuating nature of the relationship between the larger field and the subdiscipline of computers and composition.

2. The “sticky Theory-Practice dance”

Exploring the types of articles published in CCC and C&C illuminated another aspect of their relationship. C&C published the highest percentage of pedagogy-focused articles—articles with the primary purpose of addressing issues of classroom pedagogy, practice, and teaching with technology. Of the 506 articles C&C published from 1983-2008, 162—or approximately 32%—were pedagogy focused. In contrast, of the computer-related articles published in CCC, theory articles were the most prevalent; of the 55 computer-related articles CCC published, 21—or 38% —were focused on articulating or analyzing particular theories concerning working/teaching with technology. The topics of hypertext, (a)synchronous communication, eportfolios, and the internet provided four examples that best illuminate the way C&C published a breadth of pedagogy, research, theory, professional, and programmatic articles on the topics while CCC often only published theory-based articles. As mentioned earlier, this difference between an emphasis on practice versus theory is certainly not new to the field of composition; Grimm et al., Kopelson, Worsham, and Daniell (among others) have all discussed the tension in the field concerning whether it should favor the intellectual focus of theory or the classroom focus of pedagogy. Initially, these data showed a rather
oversimplified dichotomy: C&C and its subdiscipline favored pedagogical work while CCC and the larger field favored theory.

However, there was a further complexity here. Beginning in the late 1990s the articles in C&C displayed an interesting hybridity. There were articles that began by describing and reporting out research results but ended with extended discussions about how such research could inform specific classroom pedagogies; there were articles that began with pedagogical issues and moved towards professional calls; but, more salient to this section’s “sticky Theory-Practice dance,” there were articles that began with theoretical explorations and concluded with how such theory could inform pedagogical practices. Overall, the articles in C&C displayed a blurring of boundaries and specifically a “sort of dialectic relationship between theory and practice” (Farris and Anson 3). While it may be easy, or preferred, to conclude from this study that the field at large favors theory while C&C favors pedagogy, this would be an oversimplification. Likewise, it would be disingenuous to assume that CCC did not publish articles that explored the complex/nuanced relationship between practice and theory; however, such articles were not computer-related and thus lie outside of this study. Finally, these data, in some ways, speak against assertions like Karen Kopelson’s that there is a major spilt between theory and practice in the current field; Kopelson states “‘It’s not too early…to observe an institutional consequence of strained relations between rhetorical theory and composition practice,’ nor even to predict their impending ‘segregation, or divorce’” (769); however, the complex hybrid of theory and pedagogy present in C&C articles appears to display a reconciliation of sorts, not a spilt. While interpreting this study’s data cannot concretely tell us whether more computer-related articles will adopt this hybrid of theory/pedagogy in the future, what these data do show is that there is a distinct difference between the computer-related theory and pedagogy articles published in CCC and the ones published in C&C.

3. A Nuanced Game of Follow the Leader

Plotting the types and topics of articles published in CCC and C&C over time highlighted another aspect of the relationship between the larger field of composition and the smaller subdiscipline of computers and composition. Following assertions like Gail Hawisher, Paul LeBlanc, Charles Moran, and Cynthia L. Selfe’s as well as Janet
Eldred’s, this study’s data revealed that work and scholarship done in the smaller subdiscipline of computers and composition reflects the movements taking place in the larger field of composition, for example, the field’s movement from product-based rhetoric, to process-based thinking, to consideration of social/cultural implication. C&C displayed an increase in the number of articles focused on traditional product-based views of composition in the early and mid 1980s, the processes of writers and the revision strategies fostered by various technologies in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and the social and/or cultural implications and effects of various technologies in the early 2000s. These data show the smaller field following the larger field. This pattern of CCC’s leadership was also found in the study’s data about word processing and software articles. Looking at the timeline of publication dates in both journals showed that CCC often published more complex and nuanced articles on the topics of word processing and software before C&C did. When looking at the articles published in both journals after the late 1980s, however, we see a shift in leadership, a shift in who publishes on certain topics first. With topics like hypertext, eportfolios, and social/cultural issues regarding digital technologies, it was C&C that published article first; it was the subdiscipline leading the larger field. Again, while the scope of this study cannot explain exactly why such a shift occurred, these journals do show that in general the subdiscipline follows the larger movements of the field, but when it comes to specific topics and technologies, there has been a shift over time and now the subdiscipline leads the larger field. While the subdiscipline may hold a marginalized position in relation to the larger field, it still holds a certain amount of influence in the overall relationship.

4. Connections (and lack thereof) Between Subdisciplines

Putting this study’s article topics in dialogue with one another illuminates the fact that while the articles in C&C worked to connect the subdiscipline of computer and composition to other subdisciplines in the field, the articles in CCC focused on computers/technology did not make the same connections. From 1984 through the mid 1990s, C&C published numerous articles focusing on writing center work, examining the aspects of both tutoring and programmatic issues; a connection between the work of computers and composition and writing centers never emerged in the pages of CCC. Similarly, in 2005 C&C published a special issue to address the concerns of using
technology in ESL/L2 classrooms and/or with ESL/L2 students; however, articles in CCC never addressed the connection between computers and composition and ESL learners. Lastly, while there were pieces published in the late 1980s and early 1990s in C&C that connected the work of computers and composition with the work of basic writing scholarship, CCC never published any articles that connected computers and composition and basic writers in a sustained, significant way. No doubt, it is not surprising to find one subdiscipline connecting itself to another in a specialized journal like C&C, but what is perhaps more surprising is that articles in CCC did not draw any of these connections. As mentioned earlier, it could be debated whether it is CCC’s place, or whether it is within CCC’s scope, to explore and/or showcase the connection between its subdisciplines; however, articulating and/or drawing such connections appears to align with CCC’s goal to present a broad picture of the field of composition (see Gerbhardt “Editor’s Note,” Phillips et al. and CCC online webpage). It could be argued that the field of composition is comprised of nothing but its subdisciplines. Therefore, rather than forcing those in the field to “to cobble together theories, methodologies, and pedagogies” (De Pew 225) between subdisciplines, it seems like addressing such connections in its published articles would properly fall under at least one of CCC’s goals as a journal. Again, while these later points are speculations, this study’s findings do illuminate an interesting issue regarding whether the larger field can and or should work to draw connections between the subdisciplines that comprise it.

5. Areas of Emphasis and Absence

This study’s data also illuminated topics that appeared to be important and relevant to the subdiscipline but were relatively ignored by the field at large. For example, between 1983 and 2008, C&C published a total of 27 articles on the topic of online/distance education, and in 2006, it dedicated a special issue to the topic, 23.1. However, during the same time period CCC did not publish a single article on the topic. Similarly, C&C published numerous articles on the topic of assessment in the areas of both theory and research. Meanwhile, CCC did not publish one feature article concerning the topic of assessment in digital work. Finally, from 1993 to 2008, there were 46 articles and two special issues (16.1, 1999: “Computers, Composition and Gender;” and 23.3, 1999: “Sexualities, Technologies and the Teaching of Writing”) published in C&C
devoted to the topic of examining the implications and complications that arise when social/cultural influences are considered with technology; during the same time period CCC published only one article that focused on such a topic (Hawisher et al. “Becoming Literate”). Tracking the publications trends of online/distance courses, assessment, and social/cultural issues allow us to see what topics the subdiscipline of computers and composition emphasized that are absent in the larger field’s publication. As noted earlier, such findings lead us to question whether it is CCC’s place, or within CCC’s scope, to include such articles in its publication; however, when the ratio between article publication is C&C: 27, CCC: 0 (re online/distance courses) or C&C: 46 CCC: 1 (re social/cultural issues) significant appears to be missing from the picture of the computers and composition community that CCC is offering in its journal. Findings such as this raise the question of how thoroughly the larger field’s publication can/should represent the work of its subdisciplines; they raise the question of how certain topics from the subdiscipline of computers and composition make it into the larger field’s journal while other do not. While this study certainly cannot answer these questions, this research provides an interesting exigence for further exploring how certain topics are emphasized while other are not. It also raises the question of how this selection process occurs with the topics emphasized in other subdiscipline and their accompanying journals—e.g. Assessing Writing, Journal of Basic Writing, Journal of Second Language Writing, WPA, Teaching English in the Two-Year College, Writing Center Journal, ATD, The WAC Journal, etc. Exploring the types of relationships other subdisciplines have to the field as a whole, as seen through the lens of their journal publication, could add an interesting dimension to this study’s findings.

6. Programmatic Stasis and (Slow) Professional Increases

Exploring the article types and topics that were excluded in both journals also reveals another aspect of the relationship between the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition: a shared lack of emphasis on programmatic and professional issues. From 1983 to 2008 both CCC and C&C published a low percentage of pieces that focused on programmatic concerns—issues concerning writing programs and topics outside of the individual classroom and individual instructor (for example, issues of program development and staff professional development). In total,
C&C only published 38 programmatic articles, or 8% of its total; CCC published only 3 programmatic articles, or 5% of its total. Similarly, the number of professional articles—articles that investigated salient professional issues for those who teach composition with computers and technology or called their attention to certain matters and/or happenings—published in both CCC and C&C was a rather small percentage when considered overall; C&C published 72 articles, 15% of its overall total, and CCC published 9 articles, 16% if its overall total.

These low numbers and percentages prove interesting when compared with some of the words of well regarded members of the subdiscipline of computers and composition. Takayoski and Huot as well as Daiker have commented on the need for more training resources for staff members working with computers in the composition classroom; Selber and Sidler et al. have also claimed that the subdiscipline needed to focus its attention on larger programmatic issues. Similar claims have been made about the field’s need for a focus on professional issues (Hawisher et al. (Computers), John Trimbur, Ellen McDaniel). Pairing this study’s findings concerning the lack of programmatic focus and the slow increases in professional-related articles next to these types of calls/observations from the field and subdiscipline illustrates an interesting disjoint. Clearly, there are those in the field who have noted a dearth of work concerning the programmatic and professional aspects of working with computers in composition; however, neither C&C nor CCC has published a significant number of articles with such a focus. While this study cannot speculate as to why such pieces have such low numbers in both the field and subdiscipline’s publications, it does raise an interesting question of whether this slow increase in professional articles will continue and whether programmatic issues will ever be taken up in significant ways. If these topics are addressed, this study also raises the question of whether these programmatic and professional articles will be published in the larger field’s journal or the subdiscipline’s—who will follow whom in this trend?

7. **Nuanced Changes in C&C Topic Development**

Finally, examining the development of article types and topics over time in C&C revealed a rather nuanced developmental scheme emerging in the subdiscipline’s publication. Articles published in C&C’s earlier years tended to move linearly from
enthusiastic pedagogy, to critical research, to nuanced theory, and finally to professional and programmatic issues over time. This development of enthusiasm to researched critique to sophisticated theory has been well tracked and documented by many in the field (Sullivan and Porter, Selfe “Technology and Literacy,” Hawisher et al. “Becoming Literate,” Holdstein and Selfe, among many others). However, examining the topics of (a)synchronous communication, cultural/social issues, online/distance courses, and multimodal/media composing, which all emerged after the early 1990s, allowed a different developmental schema to emerge: pedagogical enthusiasm, critical researched investigation, nuanced theory and professional and programmatic investigations all occurred simultaneously rather than after one another linearly. While the subdiscipline followed a rather single point of entry developmental pattern in its earlier years—where most topics were addressed with pedagogical articles first—the topics which emerge in C&C more recently show authors taking advantage of multiple points of entry. Nuanced theory is explored alongside enthusiastic pedagogy, alongside critical research, alongside (rather limited) discussions of programmatic and professional concerns.

However, this last data point also revealed one last trend in C&C; there was a larger number of theory-focused articles published in C&C on the topic of multimodal/media composition. Up until about 2006 the number of pedagogy, research, and theory articles published on topics like word processing, software, (a)synchronous communication, and social/cultural issues was relatively similar. However, the number of theory articles on the topic of multimodal/media composing was much higher than the number of pedagogy and research articles published on the same topic. Perhaps this last topic displays the beginning of a new trend. Perhaps C&C is beginning to show an emphasis on theory-based articles, similar to the emphasis the larger field showed towards theory-based computers-related articles. Lisa Gerrard (“Computers and Composition”) noted in 2003 that “now it looks as if the same process is occurring in computers and composition. Like our parent discipline, composition, we began in the classroom, looking for ways to improve instruction. Now we too are gradually beginning to theorize.” While this is only one topic—one small trend—it does stand out from the previous topics, and while one can only speculate such a move towards theory,
this study does show is that the way C&C has discussed different technologies over the last 25 years has changed, and continues to change, in significant ways.

What Additional Data Sources Could be Explored?

While the findings from this study certainly create a picture of the relationship between the larger field of composition and subdiscipline of computers and composition, it is important to remember that “there is no such thing a single correct view of any object under study but that there and many correct views, each requiring its own style of representation” (White 46-7). A study such as this creates a lens for understanding this relationship, not the lens; there are certainly many other ways to understand this relationship. As Connors has observed, “It is nearly always necessary to bring the research period to an end forcibly, since by its nature research is never ‘done,’ and investigation always seems more comfortable than conclusions” (“Dreams and Play” 28); the scope of this study limited the materials used, in this case, to the journals of *College Composition and Communication* and *Computers and Composition*; however, there are many other data sources one could draw on in order to continue exploring the relationship between the field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition.²¹

For example, while this study did examine the article published in both *CCC* and C&C, it did not explore the submissions rates of each journal. As Gerhardt noted during his time as editor, “How well *CCC* lives up to those idealistic statements [concerning the journal’s desire to represent the field as a whole] largely depends on those of you who submit articles” (“Editor’s Note” 1987 19). While this study does conclude that only a small percentage of articles in *CCC* were computer-related, it does not explore how many computer-related articles were submitted to *CCC* in the first place. It could be the case that few submissions were received by *CCC*’s editors; if that is the case this study’s findings might read a bit differently. Royster and Williams explored a similar situation in their own work; when examining Sheryl Fontaine and Susan Hunter’s edited collection, they noted, “As Fontaine and Hunter review the contributors who responded to their call, however, they note their regret that submissions from ethnic minorities were ‘conspicuously absent’ (11) despite their attempts to have the call for submissions broadly advertised and circulated” (567). It could have been the case that *CCC* editors
simply did not receive computer-related submissions—that such submissions were often sent directly to the editors of C&C. It could also be that CCC never received submissions in the topics, which this study concluded were missing from its pages. Exploring this complication would add another layer to the relationship between the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition.

In addition to investigating submission rates, another data source that could be explored is the influence of journal editors, reviewers, and board members. Interviewing editors, board members, and reviewers could shed light on the ways in which their personal goals, missions, and both conscious and unconscious biases could have affected the work that made it into both CCC and C&C. As Royster and Williams note, it is important to consider “the extent to which editors themselves, given their authority to set the parameters of submission, should assume some responsibility for the ways in which their choices passively and aggressively exclude and circumscribe participation” (568). It could have been the case that more computer-related articles appeared in the early pages of CCC because of conscious decisions made by the board members, reviewers, and editors of that time, Larson and Gebhard. It could also be the case that during certain periods of time CCC editors, board members, and reviewers were focused on highlighting the work of subdisciplines other than computers and composition—i.e. writing centers, WAC, assessment, basic writers, etc.—therefore, altering the way this study’s findings are interpreted. Finally, investigating the exigences for certain special issues and the influence editors, board members, and reviewers had on such decisions and publications could allow for better interpretation of this study’s findings. Overall, exploring the data sources surrounding the journal editors, board members, and reviews could further add to the findings of this study in meaningful ways.

Furthermore, while this study noted the authors of each of the articles included, it did not explore authors as a specific data set. Looking more closely at the number of overall authors and/or the frequency of particular authors could further complicate the relationship between the larger field and the subdiscipline of computers and composition. When discussing how to identify a “cohesive research paradigm in our field,” (143) Todd Taylor cites Joseph M. Moxely, asserting that “it is estimated that about 10 percent of the professionals in any field are responsible for publishing about 90 percent of the journal
articles and book titles” (143). This would be an interesting statement to research further; exploring how often certain authors are published and whether their repeated appearances affect the overall picture of the journal would further add to this study’s findings. For example, looking at how often authors like Selfe, Hawisher, and Yancey publish in C&C and whether their work comprises the majority of the computer-related work in CCC would add a new dimension to how the field as a whole was represented in this study. Such authors could be considered brokers or go-betweens of sorts whose work oscillates between the subdiscipline and the field in general. Such possibilities are certainly worth exploring further.

Finally, this study was limited to an examination of only two print journals, one to represent the larger field and one to represent the subdiscipline. Exploring the online counterparts of these two journals could add new insights. Furthermore, looking at additional journals like College English, Written Communication or JAC could provide a different picture of the field of composition at large, while looking at Kairos could open up more opportunities for understanding the subdiscipline of computers and composition. In addition, while journals do help provide one lens for understanding the field, there are many others; researching book publications, conference programs, or dissertation and thesis topics could provide interesting revisions to the findings outlined above. Lastly, stepping outside of the realm of published work and conducting interviews with those in the field could add yet another layer to the understanding of this relationship.

Where To Go From Here?

Fleckenstein et al. argue that “to paraphrase Bateson, research is undertaken so that new knowledge can be a difference that makes a difference” (406). My hope here is that this study will make a difference. The knowledge gained throughout this research process has certainly made a difference in my own personal career as a graduate student, thus satisfying the personal exigence mentioned in this study’s introduction. However, my hope is that this study will make a difference to those in the subdiscipline of computers and composition and to the field of composition as a whole. This study works to show the relatively small presence the subdiscipline has in the larger field’s journal,
the complex theory/practice hybrid that articles in C&C display, the ways in which the subdiscipline follows the larger movements of the field but leads the field in understanding specific technologies, the connections C&C draws between itself and other subdisciplines that CCC does not, the relative lack of programmatic and professional articles in both journals, and the emergence of a new sophisticated approach in C&C articles. Combined together, these individual findings begin to help us understand how the larger field of composition and the smaller subdiscipline of computers and composition are related, connected, and intertwined. More importantly, however, my hope is that this study makes a difference by pointing out the importance of examining the relationships between the subdisciplines that comprise the field of composition at large; after all, what would the field as a whole be without the smaller parts and factions that comprise it. In our current diversified and specialized field, how can there be a center without margins? In 1998, Anson and Farris argued that “composition studies has sought but never achieved a coherence made possible by a unified theory” (2); perhaps such a search for total unity is misguided. Perhaps it is the differences and the field’s subdisciplines and smaller factions that are intrinsic to the definition of the field as a whole. Perhaps the field itself is not meant to be unified but rather exist as a collection of smaller factions and/or subdisciplines loosely connected by common goals. Perhaps it is this type of thinking that a study such as this will encourage. While existing in our own professional subdisciplines and factions may help us specialize, ground our scholarship, and write/publish with more authority, stepping outside those categorizations to see the larger picture is equally important if we are to understand each other. If venues like CCC and its counterpart CCCC are the few places where our subdisciplines collide or where we turn to understand an area of study other than our own, it seems imperative that such outlets properly reflect the work being done by those in each subfield. My hope is that this study and its findings will provide an impetus for subdisciplines to step outside of their proverbial boxes and work to better understand the way their relationships to the larger field and other subdisciplines is playing out. Unity may not be the goal, but perhaps general understanding can be.
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NOTES

1. This is undoubtedly a large question with innumerable contextual factors. Fleckenstein et al.’s recent work also asks “how does one isolate a single question about a complex system when everything is interrelated and when one is immersed in the system?” (407) In no way will this study assume that it can understand all of the elements that affect the complex relationship between the larger field and the subdiscipline. However, for the sake of a manageable study certain limitations must be drawn. Therefore, heading Fleckenstein et al.’s words, the methods and conclusion sections of this study will also work to complicate—and thus in a way ground—the findings of this study.

2. Further proof of this historical abundance can be found by turning to Rebecca Moore Howard’s bibliographic work. In her section “histories and overviews of the composition field” there are just over 400 entries.

3. There are, no doubt, countless ways a historical investigation of the field and the subdiscipline of computers and composition could be taken up, for example, investigating books publications, textbooks, conference presentations, conference attendance, different journals, the persons involved in the field, etc. See the Conclusion chapter for further discussion. As Zinn notes, there are countless ways to draw a map of a single location, so a mapmaker must be certain of her aim and purpose in order to determine what to include and exclude. For the purpose of this study and its scope, I will limit my materials to the important print publications of the field and subdiscipline, see my discussion of Connors for further explanation, so as to best compare similar media and outlets for academic work.

4. Surely, there are a number of other dates which would prove useful in a historical investigation into the subdiscipline of computers and composition. Hawisher et al.’s book Computers look at the subdiscipline as far back as 1979, and traces of technology trends in publications can be found as far back at the 1960s—with the work of, for example, Marshall McLuhan in CCC—however, considering the purpose and scope of this project, it seems appropriate to focus on the dates relevant to the journals being investigated.

5. This section does not note the book reviews and introductions published in C&CC; this is intentional. Because nearly all of C&CC”s book reviews were focused on computer-related books, little insight could be gained from such data.

6. I must thank Richard Gebhardt and the insightful letters he published during his years as editor. While all of CCC’s editors’ letters proved beneficial to this study, his dedication to explaining the intricate processes that support the publication of CCC were invaluable to my work.

7. This alignment with emerging technologies is certainly just one of the many contextual factors that play into the increased number of publications. Events such as C&CC’s 20th anniversary and the accompanying special issues is just one example which complicates
my connections; the connections drawn here are constrained by the scope and data of this study and while they present a meaningful picture in many ways, there are certainly many additional aspects and studies to be done in order to better fill in the picture of the relationship between CCC and C&C. See the Conclusion chapter for further discussion.


9. This decrease in computer-related pedagogy-based articles also raises the question of whether CCC’s emphasis on pedagogical issues in general has decreased over the years. Perhaps this trend has less to do with the particular subdiscipline of computers and composition and more to do with the CCC’s overall disinterest in publishing pedagogy-based articles.

10. In 1994 there was an article published in CCC concerning the politics of interface which displayed a hybrid form similar to the articles being discussed from C&C. The article began by theorizing about the political implications of various interfaces and then moved to discuss how such issues could be addressed in the classroom. What complicates this CCC article is the fact that it was written by Cynthia and Dickie Selfe, two of the main figures in the C&C movement. This issue of authorial influence will be further discussed in the Conclusion chapter.

11. This notion of enthusiastic waves will be further discussed and explained in a later section of this chapter.

12. It should be noted that this interpretation can be somewhat complicated. In 2004 CCC did publish a position statement on “Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Writing in Digital Environments” that explored online teaching practices. However, the limits and scope of this study cover published feature articles, not position statements.

13. Even the 2006 revision of this CCC position statement on assessment has no mention of assessment in digital environments; its only mention of technology is its denouncement of the use of machine scoring for the assessment of writing.

14. What complicates the existence of this article is that it is lead authored by one of the co-editors of C&C, Gail Hawisher. Again, this issue of authorial influence and the repeated existence of authors in both the larger and smaller subdiscipline’s publications is explored more closely in the Conclusion chapter.

15. As a clarification it should be noted here that there were no topics that CCC discussed that were not in the pages of C&C.

16. It is clear that topics such as tenure and promotion could also be considered programmatic; in this book Multiliteracies for a Digital Age Stuart Selber treats them as such. However, this study was focused on discovering and articulating the differences
between similarly themed computer-focused pieces. Therefore, rather than search out and analyze similarities it worked to seek out and understand differences in order to allow meaningful trends to emerge.

17. I use “speak” here loosely, understanding that, as Fleckenstein et al. contend, “the problem is, of course, that data never do speak for themselves,” Keller points out (Secrets 27). All data require interpretation” (409). The following findings then are the result of my interpretations, and the limitations of these interpretations will be discussed below.

18. Early articles in C&C were no doubt similar to the types of shorter, less nuanced Staffroom Interchange articles in CCC; however, the point to be emphasized here is that around 1983 when computer-related articles emerged in CCC there were large numbers of full length, featured articles; however, many of the computer-related articles were never published in that portion of the journal. Instead, they fell into the Staffroom Interchange section.

19. It is important to note here that this study’s coding system only allowed each article to be counted once; therefore, the coding category assigned to it reflects the article’s main focus. For example, while Yancey’s article “Postmodernism” did discuss assessment its primary focus was on eportfolios and therefore it was coded as under the topic of “eportfolio” not “assessment.”

20. It may also be a possibility that the topic of multimodal composition itself invited more theoretical responses; perhaps it is not that C&C is moving towards an emphasis in theory in general, but that this specific topic afforded more theory-focused articles. Answers to such questions will no doubt emerge over time when new topics are introduced and explored in the journal.

21. In many ways this section also works to illuminate the limits of this study; as Royster and Williams say “those of us who use the narratives would better serve the discipline if we were required by common practice to re-articulate those gaps and limitations in our own uses of the narratives, rather than drifting in our valorization of them toward the assigning of primacy and the assumption of universality, even by default” (564). This section will explore those gaps in a way that recasts them as opportunities and exigences for additional research.

23. Exploring the citations in Kairos could also prove interesting. Investigating the ways in which the content in C&C and Kairos is related or intertwined could allow for a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between the larger field of composition and the subdiscipline of computers and composition.
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