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Abstract

Teaching writing by employing the tools made available by Web 2.0 technology allows students to meet the changing educational requirements for writing with technology. This paper argues that the wiki is a facile tool for teaching academic writing at the college level. It theoretically and pedagogically situates the wiki in a three-dimensional rhetorical context. This paper also demonstrates how and why the wiki functions as a collaborative writing tool adhering to a socially constructed view of knowledge. As a constructive hypertext, wikis can be used to teach, clarify, reinforce, and deepen many fundamental writing skills. This paper reviews the body of literature which connected a metacognitive approach with process-to-product writing for transformational learning. Research studies concluded that composing with hypertext facilitates metacognition, transformational learning, and collaboration and that a social constructivist view of knowledge, control, and power establishes the dialogic nature of digital rhetoric regarding both participation with and decision-making about the audience in a three-dimensional rhetorical situation constituted through logic, dialect, and rhetoric. My research supported the hypothesis that the wiki is a facile tool for teaching a metacognitive approach to process-to-product writing and transformational learning at the college level.
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Using a Wiki to Teach College Level Academic Writing

Because digital technology has given birth to the need for a plethora of new literacy skills, the digital environment requires students to perform tasks and solve problems using an increasing variety of technical, cognitive, and sociological skills. Educational wikis seem to be an excellent technology platform to teach, clarify, reinforce, and deepen many fundamental process-to-product writing skills. Teaching academic writing and constructive hypertext in a collaborative environment at the college level will help students organize their thoughts, connect ideas, gain a deeper understanding of subject-matter content, and transfer this new knowledge to writing more traditional linear academic essays. A defining feature of hypertext is its ability to present information in a variety of ways. Since writing nodes, establishing links with semantically significant connections, and the consideration of the total document structure are three key components of writing with hypertext, writing on a wiki, which requires a three-dimensional approach to the rhetorical situation, is a powerful and facile tool for teaching fundamental process-to-product-writing skills such as clustering, revising, editing, connecting and sequencing ideas, planning, drafting, organizing, cutting repetition, information flow, and voice. The following literature review discusses various theoretical perspectives encompassing hypertext, process writing, transformational learning, and metacognition theory from the hypothesis that helping students learn how to create a complex reader experience by writing and connecting text pages in a non-linear fashion facilitates close reading, academic writing, and critical thinking skills at the college level. My guiding research questions for this thesis include: How do the critical decisions made by writers when adding hyperlinks impact digital rhetoric? Why is the Wiki a good technology tool for teaching academic writing at the college level?

A chief goal of writing instruction is to design and implement a writing environment with literacy tasks through which students develop as writers. Writing functions in three predominant ways as students learn to write, write to learn, and write to demonstrate learning. Teaching
writing by employing the tools made available by Web 2.0 technology allows students to meet the changing educational requirements for writing with technology. This thesis argues that the wiki is a facile tool for teaching academic writing at the college level. It theoretically and pedagogically situates the wiki in a three-dimensional rhetorical context; and, demonstrates how and why it functions as a collaborative writing tool adhering to a socially constructed view of knowledge. As a constructive hypertext, wikis can be used to teach, clarify, reinforce, and deepen many fundamental writing skills. This paper reviews the body of literature which connects a metacognitive approach with process-to-product writing for transformational learning.

Writing and Technology

Present and emerging technology is redistributing the foundational tenets of composition-rhetoric theory and pedagogy onto the shifting sands of the Web 2.0 platform. As Lanham (1993) reminds us in *The Electronic Word*, the genre of writing has always been in flux. And the Web 2.0 platform testifies to the changed environment in which the written word is now also read. The printing press perfected by Johann Gutenberg in 1441 changed the literacy patterns of the world. The computer has done the same. Interactive media has turned readers into viewers and writers into multimodal composers to such a degree that technology and text have developed a symbiotic relationship (Ellerston, 2009). Because students are accustomed to navigating web pages and crawling social networking sites, writing teachers will be working in this emerging genre with and as interactive rhetoricians. Traditional goals for teaching writing must adapt to a multitude of twenty-first century literacies.

Teaching Writing and Technology

Teaching writing by employing the tools made available by Web 2.0 technology—including hypertext documents—would allow students to meet the changing educational requirements for writing with technology. According to The International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), technology-literate students should be able to “create media-rich presentations for other students on the appropriate and ethical use of digital tools and
resources” (as cited in Gerben, 2009, p. 5) by the time they graduate from high school. They also recommended that children aged four through eight, in prekindergarten to second grade, should be able to “in a collaborative work group, use a variety of technologies to produce a digital presentation or product in a curriculum area” (p. 5). According to ISTE, students should be able to use technology to collaborate before they can even compose academic texts. Hence, “parents and students are regularly told that computer literacy is a prerequisite to success in the new economy” (Herrington & Moran, 2009, p. 2). Accordingly, as a result of a qualitative research study conducted at Pepperdine University, Lee Ann Carroll recommended that instructors “rethink student work as ‘literacy tasks’ and not ‘writing assignments.’ [And to] focus on writing ‘differently,’ not just ‘better’” (Carroll, 2002, p. 129). This mode of instruction broadly defined critical literacy “to include the ability to understand and use different methods of inquiry, sources of information (including other people and nonprint media), ways of working (including collaboration), forms of technology, and genres or types of reading and writing” (p. 129).

Consequently, computers and other microchip-based technology have had a huge impact on academia, and subsequently, on writing. Students who participate in social networking sites such as Facebook, MySpace, nings, and blogs are accustomed to writing in the World Wide Web environment where computers translate hypertext markup language (HTML) to display text on a viewer’s screen. Yet, most people never need to learn HTML code because the social networking sites employ a graphic user interface (GUI) which simulates a word processing program such as Microsoft Word for example. This simple to use GUI is referred to as a WYSISYG (pronounced whiz-zee-whig), an acronym for What You See Is What You Get, because people can write on web pages without HTML code. A wiki is an example of an editable web page which uses a WYSISYG GUI.

**Definition and Classifications of a Wiki**

**Definition.** As a multimodal document, a wiki has three defining features: its structure, its ability to present information in a variety of ways, and its collaborative nature. In “Interface
as Exordium: The Rhetoric of Interactivity," Teena A. M. Carnegie describes a wiki basically as "a collaborative web site that allows users to add pages and produce and edit content" (p. 169).

**Classifications.** Current research elucidates the value of using a wiki in education. For example, Phillipson (2008) classified "five stages of inquiry" for instructional uses of wikis: resource, presentation, gateway, simulation, and illuminated. He designated a resource wiki as a knowledge form that is created collectively; a presentation wiki, as a structure to communicate an individual's work to a group; a gateway wiki as a place to develop a discussion of data; a simulation wiki to reproduce the essential features of an environment for exploration; and an illuminated wiki to collaboratively develop a group document which includes print, graphic, audio and video hyperlinks.

In Phillipson's taxonomy of wiki functions, the resource wiki functioned as a storehouse, or repository, for the raw data, or research, from which students could assemble knowledge. In academic writing, this benefits students by giving them access to multiple sources of information stored in one repository. They can analyze this material for the purpose of determining a position to argue in their academic papers. For the college classroom, using a wiki in this manner, simultaneously allows it to function as a presentation wiki. Phillipson (2008) described its purpose as "primarily for the convenience of the class, for peer evaluation, and for providing practical experience in the effective use of a communication forum" (p. 23). It may, however, grow beyond its original intention of representing the classroom work to the outside world and develop into a research resource. Its primary aim, however, remained "to leverage wiki software in order to support a class in its efforts to access, organize, and manipulate information effectively. It is thus more self-conscious than a resource wiki and more likely to highlight the process of assembling the information it contains" (p. 23).

This highlighting the "process of assembling the information it contains" holds implications for teaching academic writing. First, it implies that constructing both the resource and the presentation wiki leads to student involvement with the process of writing. Second, it
implies student engagement with the information, or subject matter content, which paves the way for student learning. Furthermore, the resource/presentation wiki functions as a tool for teaching academic writing. In addition to being a repository of data, having students actively construct the wiki means they will write the text for the individual nodes, think critically about the order in which the material needs to be presented, and consequently engage metacognitively with both the information and the overarching structure of the wiki. They will have to determine how to present one or more arguments with links in a grid-like form to address the needs of one or more audiences. This will require students to anticipate and answer critical questions through writing about research. An additional benefit is that instead of including chunks of supporting research material within the argument nodes, the wiki can make all of this supplementary information available to readers in the form of linked footnotes.

This resource/presentation wiki provides a visible space for students to engage with not only the consumption of the research, but the production of new ideas as a result of engagement with the research others have written. In this way, the wiki, as a Web 2.0 space, offers a means to shift the emphasis from consumption (a proficiency in text analysis) to text production—a move advocated by proponents of New Literacy Studies (Purdy, 2010) in which writing is a means to generate ideas as opposed to a means for delivering the ideas of others. This shift helps better prepare students to see themselves as capable knowledge producers because they come to view “knowledge production as an iterative, collaborative, evolving process through engaging with the technologies that embody this notion” (Purdy, 2010, p. 56). Consequently, constructing the wiki can help “present research as an active and dynamic activity fueled by written response to texts, an understanding that is the goal of much of the research-based writing assigned in the academy” (p. 56). As a result, the resource/presentational wiki functions as a tool to have students collaboratively construct knowledge.
Why Wiki?

Textured literacy

Interactive media has turned readers into viewers and writers into multimodal composers. “The ability to comfortably use and combine print, spoken, visual, and digital processes in composing a piece of writing” is what Kathleen Blake Yancey called “textured literacy” (Yancey, 2004, p. 38). Because writers were using these digital technologies to write many new kinds of texts, a key part of teaching writing in this century has been to help students develop fluency and competence in a variety of technologies (Yancey, 2004, p. 38). Academic writing tasks have therefore become as varied as the imagination of both teachers and students. Consequently, the incorporation of wikis into the educational environment has now brought hypertext into the mainstream classroom. And, researchers in the fields of psychology, process writing, and education are evaluating hypertext for its potential use in academic writing and transformational learning. Hypertext theorists have reasoned that this dynamic, interactive platform will also change the way writers write.

A wiki is a writing tool which reaches multiple learning styles and intelligences. Using a wiki as a technology tool for featuring hypertext writing assignments, students will have the opportunity to engage in a platform which not only promotes hypertext writing, but facilitates collaborative learning. Hypertext can be “constructed as a collaborative medium, and it makes possible forms of collaboration that emphasize the social construction of meaning” (Eryman, 1996). This creates a perspective that views virtual knowledge as infinite works-in progress believing that “what others know becomes what I know the more we interact online” (Gerben, 2009).

Our traditional goals for teaching writing must adapt to a multitude of twenty-first century literacies—and to the technologically competent students who inhabit our classrooms. However, there may be some resistance to learning how to incorporate these evolving technologies into instruction. For example,
Lankshear and Knobel (2006) have argued that in reference to post-typographic forms of texts people have one of two mindsets: that of the "insider" and that of the "newcomer" (p. 34). All of us born before 1970 or thereabouts are newcomers, and as such have had to learn to read and compose nonlinear text forms; those of us born after 1970 or thereabouts are insiders, and find nonlinear forms of texts natural. (as cited in Herrington & Moran, 2009, p. 7)

These nonlinear text forms include social networking sites, blogs, wikis, websites, and hypertext among others. As a matter of fact, 93% of teens use the internet, 64% of online teens ages 12 to 17 have participated in or more among a wide range of content-creating activities on the internet, and, 33% create or work on webpages or blogs, according to the 2007 report of the Pew Internet and American Life Project, "Teens and Social Media" (p.2). While this study shows that teens are prolific internet content creators, teachers who are newcomers to the world of multimedia may find this difficult. Outside of the classroom, teens are comfortable with the convergence of text, audio, and video files. Some teenagers, as the Pew report indicates, "even compose with these new tools in mind, adding hyperlinks to connect ideas together in different ways or enhancing written text with moving images and sounds (Herrington & Moran, 2009, p.7).

In "Computer-mediated communication and the confluence of composition and literature," Katherine Fischer, Donna Reiss, and Art Young posit that First Year Composition (FYC) should integrate communication technologies, including new media development tools. Online discussions of "literary and nonliterary texts along with the reading of hypertext and hypermedia literature online prepare students to think in ways that are more conducive to the world that has already shaped them as well as the world they will continue to shape" (as cited in Bergman & Baker, 2006, p. 145).

While Stuart Moulthrop and Nancy Kaplan agree with Fischer, Reiss, and Young about reading hypertext, they extend hypertext's value in FYC to include writing it. They believe that "writing hypertext helps engage students in an encounter with literature, raising the possibility of
a new community of critical and creative discourse. This community, whose conventions are not yet formed, can only be defined by a confluence of literature, composition, and technology” (as cited in Bergman & Baker, 2006, p. 143).

The wiki has many features which make it beneficial as an instructional aide. In addition to the simplicity of the graphic user interface (GUI) which allows the addition, deletion, and editing of pages with ease, there are five other advantages worth considering:

1. The ability to toggle administrative controls authorizing permissions;
2. The history feature which evidences all student participation and includes a revert option to earlier versions;
3. The discussion page which records all dialogue;
4. A site map which specifies connections between pages; and,
5. A list of abandoned pages indicating where links need to be developed.

First, the ability to toggle administrative controls authorizing permissions means that the administrator determines the levels of access users are granted to the wiki and how power is maintained or shared with them. There are different levels of access the administrator can give. The administrator can function as the designer for the overarching hierarchical structure and maintain all control. Or, the administrator can determine the design and then give control to a moderator to oversee its implementation. Or, all users can have complete access to all controls and can modify all aspects of the wiki (Phillipson, 2008). In a classroom environment, evaluating and analyzing potential structures before choosing one mirrors a metacognitive approach to the rhetorical situation.

Secondly, the history feature evidences all activity on the wiki by all users by recording all student participation and contributions to the site. This is especially useful for assessment purposes. A revert option to earlier versions provides a safeguard should users make undesirable changes to any wiki content. Thirdly, the discussion pages record all dialogue and consequently provide a space for peer review. Students can review content on the wiki and ascertain accuracy,
as well as, make corrections and/or additions to the posting. The site map, a fourth benefit, delineates specifies connections between pages. This provides a description of the pages, draws an outline for the reader/viewer, and portrays a visual representation of a possible navigation route to the contents. And finally, a list of abandoned pages indicates where links are broken or need to be developed. The sitemap and the list of abandoned pages are representations of effective or ineffective metacognitive strategies.

Writers use the same strategies for process-to-product writing regardless of the writing medium. A nonlinear technology platform like a wiki, or a traditional essay require teaching specificity of detail, narrative structure, organizational patterns, abstraction to higher-order thinking patterns (questions of significance), and analogical thinking (comparison to other situations). Writing a constructive hypertext, such as a wiki, helps students devise these rhetorical strategies on a three-dimensional platform.

Collaborative Nature of the Wiki

The wiki can be used by writing teachers as a collaborative writing tool for students in several ways. First, students can create their own pages on the wiki and have other students respond to their writing. In a peer review, for example, the reviewer can comment on a specific text and ask questions to the writer on the discussion page without making direct edits to the writer's text. The writer can go back and edit the document being reviewed. The discussion page feature of the wiki allows these conversations to take place in a semi-private space. It is only semi-private because subscribers to the wiki can click on the discussion page tab and read the comments. Another option is to comment directly onto the writer's posted text through the edit page feature. The reviewer can insert comments or ask questions directly onto the writer's text. The writer can review these remarks and make revisions accordingly. In this case, the writer would have to replace the comments/questions with the revised text and erase the reviewer remarks. Both methods allow a writing teacher to monitor peer responses and engage in the discussion. Writing teachers can also use this feature to comment on student texts not being peer
reviewed. However, all subscribers to the wiki are able to access the discussion page and read what’s posted. Therefore, writing teachers should only make comments suitable for a public audience. Unless the administrator, or in most cases the writing teacher, deletes the page, or takes down the wiki, these comments become a written artifact.

Peer response encourages revision by having students engage in critical thinking and discourse about the appropriateness of their writing, style, and organization (Harris, M., 1992, p. 372). Peer response also develops an extension of the invention process regarding brainstorming, the evolution and shaping of ideas, and planning; produces a deeper awareness of audience, audience expectations, and anticipated audience responses; exposes student writers to other writers writing styles; helps writers discriminate between useful and non-useful feedback; and, creates a community of writers (e.g., Dale, 1994; Eryman, 1996; Gibbons, 2010; Harris, 1992; Moxley, 2008). This community, whether it’s virtual or real, functions through collaboration exhibiting the conditions under which knowledge is socially constructed and control is negotiated by the group. The wiki, as an authoring tool, is capable of establishing this asynchronous community of writers.

While the wiki is an excellent writing medium for collaboration and peer review, it is also instant authoring tool viewable by the world because the publication of hypertext documents moves the readership beyond the classroom. Writing moves beyond the essay format and incorporates text, graphics, links, and sound (Kellen, 2002, p. 122). Writing wikis engages students with the production of their own texts instead of being passive receivers of Web information. Constructing the wiki requires an architect’s view of the digital space. When used as a writing tool for this macro environment, students engage with the overarching structure of the wiki. As Phillipson (2008) explained in his taxonomy of wikis, the purpose for the wiki’s creation determined its design. He identified the resource wiki as a knowledge form created collectively; a presentation wiki, as a structure to communicate an individual’s work to a group; a gateway wiki as a place to develop a discussion of data; a simulation wiki reproduced the
essential features of an environment for exploration; and an illuminated wiki collaboratively
developed a group document which included print, graphic, audio and video hyperlinks.

Wikis have become very prevalent in the Academy. They are being used to teach course
subject matter, including composition, literature, web design, and theory courses among others;
and, as an intranet site to help direct programs or to provide a community space for
administrators, employee, students, and/or teachers to collaborate. For example, both MSU’s
Teaching Writing Through Technology (TWTT) and Teaching Writing Through Literature
(TWTL) courses incorporated wikis. To use Phillipson’s (2008) taxonomy, the TWTT course
used the wiki as a resource wiki for its annotated bibliography; and, the TWTL course wiki could
be classified as a resource/presentation wiki because it both communicated individual work to the
group, as well as a knowledge form created collectively. Appendix A contains a list of academic
wikis as compiled by Moxley (2008), and at time of this writing, all links were functioning.

Wikis in the Academy are used by students, yet designed by faculty or administrators.
The final project for the TWTT course required students to design a writing assignment for
prospective students using technology as a tool for writing instruction. Appendix B contains the
sample assignment I wrote using a wiki for writing hypertext as part of a collaborative group
literacy project emphasizing peer review, and the construction of a wiki. The TWTL course
required students to create a syllabus including a unit which contained writing assignments for
literature. I wrote a sample syllabus for teaching what would be the equivalent of MSU’s College
Writing II course for FYC. It includes many frequently assigned literature readings whose
correlative writing assignment components have been adapted for a wiki. Appendix C includes
this sample syllabus for a FYC literary study course which utilizes a wiki for a variety of writing
tasks.

Three Predominant Functions of Writing

Literacy tasks involve more than reading and writing. Technology and text have
developed a symbiotic relationship. Consequently, incorporating technology into the writing
classroom will meet the needs of the technologically competent students who inhabit the classroom by helping them acquire the literacy skills demanded from them in the new information economy. This thesis demonstrates how the wiki addresses the three predominant functions of writing and why it should be considered for teaching academic writing at the college level.

Learning to Write

Learning to write comprises acquiring and practicing a broad spectrum of composing skills and strategies. For example, engaging in process-to-product writing requires students to be able to distinguish between the finished product and the actions a writer performs. Broadly conceptualized, the composing actions include, but are not limited to, interpreting curriculum documents, analyzing the audience and literacy tasks, determining invention strategies, putting rhetorical situations into context, evaluating sources, revising, and editing. Pedagogically, putting theory into practice includes:

1. Intentionally designing a curriculum which provides students with multiple opportunities to write while reaching a variety of learning styles;
2. Scaffolding writing instruction such that it enables students to acquire new writing strategies and skills in order to take their writing to the next level; and
3. Planning what students need to know in response to ongoing research.

In other words, learning to write means creating a classroom sold out to literacy in a collaborative environment which foregrounds a socially constructed view of knowledge cultivates safety for differences in race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, as well as, fosters sensitivity to language and power structures.

Process-to-product writing and hypertext. As the move from “print to screen expanded our sense of what writing included, advances in communications technologies began to make it possible for teachers to work with the new writing as a social, as well as an individual, process” (Herrington & Moran, 2009, p.5). Writing inside and outside of the classroom has morphed into a cacophony of voices audible through a network of online sources such as nings,
blogs, wikis, instant messaging, Twitter, chat rooms, email, online discussion boards and forums, as well as social networking sites like Facebook and MySpace. Thus, “to assume a postmodern turn, technology often allows authorship to be shared, dialogic, and multifarious” (Fischer, Reiss, & Young, 2006, p. 166). The platform for writing is no longer linear. The hyperlink—the warp and weft of the World Wide Web, has changed writing forever. It “radically changed text from linear to linked, distributed—what scholars and practitioners termed rhizomatic—that is, like a grass that propagates by its spreading roots, a shallow but broad, vast, and connected single organism” (Herrington & Moran, 2009, p.6). It took readers off of the page and put viewers in control of a screen. Readers lost the capacity to skip and scan and writers lost the ability to lead readers from beginning sentence to final punctuation mark.

Hypertext writing has a unique feature which allows the writer to link between ideas. In order to do this, the writer must take separate ideas, similar to paragraph topic sentences, and write the content of each thought on an individual page called a node. This node is the first page where subordinate ideas, or the supporting sentences of the paragraph, prove the content of the idea. In order to connect, or link the ideas, the writer must approach the rhetorical situation metacognitively. What this means is that the writer must think about thinking, or how to structure and arrange the ideas in order to get across his or her meaning. This can be done by creating an association of ideas or by generating a hierarchy of ideas—or both. The links help the writer create the structure within which s/he can develop meaning. Meaning is dependent upon the writer’s goals for the text.

This encompassing process of thinking about goals, content, invention, planning, and language are all components of a rhetorical strategy for the act of composing and developing meaning—or in other words, the rhetorical situation.

The rhetorical situation. Process-to-product writing breaks down the larger writing process into subordinate sub-processes. These sub-processes are contingent upon a metacognitive approach to writing which has been informed by the hierarchical cognitive process model of
Flower and Hayes (1980), as well as the recursive writing process models theorized by Emig (1971) and Perl (1979), and more recently the cognitive flexibility theory (CFT) proposed by Rouet, Levonen, Dillon, and Spiro (2009). Teaching process-to-product writing involves teaching specificity of detail, narrative structure, organizational patterns, abstraction to higher-order thinking patterns (e.g., questions of significance), and analogical thinking (e.g., comparison to other situations). Writing hypertext helps students devise these rhetorical strategies on a three-dimensional platform.

While the three predominant ways writing functions in the academy can be divided into learning to write, writing to learn, and writing to demonstrate learning, the boundaries between them are not so easily demarcated. The tasks involved in writing can draw upon all three. While the complex function of rhetoric has been comprehensively theorized by Lloyd Bitzer, James E. Porter has relocated rhetorical theory into the digital delivery realm; and, Joseph Moxley has interrogated the dialogic nature of socially constructed knowledge in online communities.

In "The Rhetorical Situation," Lloyd Bitzer defines seven components of the rhetorical situation.

Hence, to say the situation is rhetorical means: (1) rhetorical discourse comes into existence in response to situation, in the same sense that an answer comes into existence in response to a question, or a solution to a problem; (2) a speech is given rhetorical significance by the situation, just as a unit of discourse is given significance as answer or as solution by the question or problem; (3) a rhetorical situation must exist as a necessary condition of rhetorical discourse, just a question must exist as a necessary condition of an answer; (4) many questions go unanswered and many problems remain unsolved; similarly, many rhetorical situations mature and decay without giving birth to rhetorical utterance; (5) a situation is rhetorical insofar as it needs and invites discourse capable of participating with situation and thereby altering its reality; (6) discourse is rhetorical insofar as it functions (or seeks to function) as a fitting response to a situation.
which needs and invites it. (7) Finally, the situation controls the rhetorical response in the same sense that the question controls the answer and the problem controls the solution. Not the rhetor and not persuasive intent, but the situation is the source and the ground of rhetorical activity (Bitzer, 1968, pp. 5-6).

What Bitzer has outlined is the context in which rhetoric exists and the conditions which govern an appropriate response. Composition rhetoric takes these elements and constitutes them in written form.

Rhetoric functions to persuade, through words spoken or written, its audience in such a way that it becomes a mediator of change—in thought and action. Or as Bitzer says, “to produce action or change in the world; it performs some task” (Bitzer, 1968, pp. 3-4). He explains that “rhetoric is a mode of altering reality, not by the direct application of energy to objects, but by the creation of discourse which changes reality through the mediation of thought and action” (p. 4).

The wiki and the three-dimensional rhetorical situation. Writing constructive hypertext locates the rhetorical situation on a three-dimensional sphere and requires a metacognitive and metalanguage approach to the rhetorical situation. Writing nodes, establishing links with semantically significant connections (e.g., hypertext), and determining structure are three key components of writing on a wiki. Additionally the wiki, can function as a tool for collaborative writing because “by focusing on the creation of knowledge in the form of linked lexia, hypertext can be used to explicitly show how students can work together to negotiate meaning with the discourse communities of their class without necessarily coming to any kind of totalizing consensus” (Eryman, 1996). Theodore Nelson, who coined the term hypertext, describes it as “non-sequential writing—text that branches and allows choices to the reader, best read at an interactive screen” (as cited in Carter, 2003, p.4). Non-sequential writing is different from writing in a more traditional, linear format because it does not privilege a sequential structure. In hypertext, the task of sequencing (or at least part of it) belongs to the reader (Carter, 2003, p. 4).
A wiki, then, when utilized as a constructive hypertext, invites the active engagement between the writer and the reader. Constructive hypertext systems which “allow the reader to add new links and new lexia to the original work constitute a more concrete form of collaboration, as the original writer may attack, defend, or question the links or lexia that the reader has added, and all links and lexia remain accessible to successive readers” (Eryman, 1996). The most renowned example of this kind of constructive hypertext is Wikipedia. Created in 2001 by Jimmy Wales, Wikipedia an open source, web-based, free-content encyclopedia project, is a constructive hypertext which is written collaboratively by an anonymous volunteer pool of authors. At the time of this writing, it had 3,439,566 articles, and 21,818,527 pages in total with 419,213,779 edits and 852,097 uploaded files. There were 13,211,384 registered users and 1,758 administrators. Wikipedia is running MediaWiki version 1.16wmf4 (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:About), a free, web-based wiki software. The first wiki application, WikiWikiWeb, created by Ward Cunningham in 1994, has been succeeded by more than fifty wiki software engines (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison_of_wiki_software). The fact that the wiki software can be downloaded and used free of charge is appealing. Additionally, some wikiware, such as Wikispaces (http://www.wikispaces.com/) and Wikidot (http://www.wikidot.com/), give free upgrades for academic use.

While the book metaphor is still a feasible cognitive representation for online writing, there are differences. The concept of the page has been replaced by the screen, the reader by the viewer, and the page turn by the mouse click. Another difference is that text functions not only syntactically and semantically, but also directionally. Constructive hypertext deploys text, as well as graphics and video, as linking devices between pages. Readers are no longer able to skim chapters or an entire book. Instead, they navigate nodes of information based on whatever order suits individual needs. Consequently, order and sequence are destabilized. Therefore, the document structure must assist a reader in constructing meaning. This is where the writer has to
develop a metacognitive and metalanguage approach to the rhetorical construction of the hypertext document—especially if putting forth an argument.

Bitzer’s seven components of the rhetorical situation has been the standard theoretical framework since the middle of the twentieth century. However, Porter theorizes how digital rhetoric has shifted the rhetorical situation onto a three-dimensional platform. This has significant implications for using a wiki to teach academic writing at the college level.

In “Recovering Delivery for Digital Rhetoric,” James E. Porter (2009) argued that the delivery of Internet-based communications needed to be retheorized for the digital age. He noted “the importance of delivery in traditional rhetoric and argued that delivery should be viewed as a form of rhetorical knowledge (techne)” (p. 207). Here Porter said that rhetoric, “as techne, is the art of creating discourse, whether speech or writing, to achieve a desired end for some audience” (p. 207). In his two-part discourse, he then presented a theory for ‘digital delivery’ which consisted of five key topics—Body/Identity, Distribution/Circulation, Access/Accessibility, Interaction, and Economics—and showed how each of these topics functioned strategically and heuristically to guide digital writing.

Like Bitzer, Porter drew on classical Roman rhetoricians and showed how the body is enmeshed in persuasive effect. The first component in Porter’s theoretical framework, Body/Identity for digital delivery, is concerned with “online representations of the body, gestures, voice, dress, and image, and questions of identity and performance and online representations of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and ethnicity” (p. 207). He adopted a posthumanist approach to the virtual world in which he viewed the human body and technology as merged into the new hybrid identity of the cyborg. Porter claimed that “we need a robust rhetoric of digital delivery to understand how to be an effective rhetorical participant within [this] environment” (p. 213).

Distribution/Circulation, the second component of Porter’s digital delivery theoretical framework, was concerned with the rhetorical decisions about delivering the message to the
intended audience through a digital document as a distributor and a producer of discourse (p. 208). In Access/Accessibility, Porter’s third component, he interrogated the digital divide and differentiated it from accessibility—the level of connectedness for a particular demographic in society. Approaching the rhetorical problem from the perspective of audience access/accessibility meant “starting with audience need—and with the diversity of audiences—and then developing a rhetorical approach (or, more likely, a variety of approaches) to address that need” (p. 216). By using the example of writing a manual that helped people set up their DVD player, he showed how a flaw in techne confused formal cause and final cause because it confused ends with means and therefore was ineffective in achieving the desired end for the audience. Porter, therefore, recommended rearticulating the writing task by emphasizing audience need as the starting point, not the ending point of the discourse. He illustrated this emphasis on access/accessibility by asking a question with regard to a specific rhetorical situation in a digital environment: “People need to set up their DVD players—and some of these people do not have access to the Internet, some are seeing-impaired, some cannot read, etc. How do we help these people install their DVD players: What types of help do we offer?” (p. 216). Like Bitzer, Porter’s rhetorical framework demonstrated the importance of audience awareness. However, Porter examined the implications of the rhetorical situation in an online, i.e., virtual environment as opposed to the traditional print medium.

The final two components in Porter’s framework, Interaction/Interactivity and Economics, centered on the range of ways people interrelate in a digital environment and the economics of this exchange. While all writing resided in economic systems of value, exchange, and capital where motivation was based on desire, participation, sharing, and emotional connectedness, Porter claimed that the economics of rhetoric was dramatically changed in the realm of digital discourse where users engaged with each other through digital interfaces unlike traditional oral or print rhetoric (p. 218). Within the economic context of this digital environment, Porter advocated the co-production of knowledge by using the full capability of the
Web 2.0 platform. By interrogating the motivation that has caused readers to read what writers have written, Porter explained that the computer plus the Internet together have changed the distribution of knowledge and the rights of intellectual property, as well as, provided less savory opportunities to illegally download and share music, plagiarize, and participate in information sharing. He reminded us that “traditionally, rhetoric/composition has typically conceptualized writing from the standpoint of ‘composing’ (creating the isolated text) and ‘reading’ it. But when writing enters digital spaces, we need to reconceptualize writing from the point of view of production, consumption, and exchange” (p. 219). He pointed out that “this shift in vocabulary is not innocent or neutral. It forces us to think about writing as involving labor, as being involved in an economic system of exchange, as having status as a commodity with value (both use value to the reader, but also exchange value)” (p. 219).

**Argument in academic writing.** If rhetoric functions to persuade, through words spoken or written, its audience in such a way that it becomes a mediator of change—in thought and action, argument in academic writing serves a correlative purpose. Writers are expected to engage with the ideas of other writers and then transform this information, using evidence, claims, proofs, and warrants to persuade and/or convince readers that an argument holds true—or doesn’t. In the academy, writers are expected to engage in academic discourse by synthesizing information from a variety of sources, often conflicting, and to contribute something to the conversation. Based on the theories of Jürgen Habermas, Kenneth Burke, Chaim Perelman, Stephen Toulmin, Ralph Johnson, and Anthony Blaine, argument plays a central role in human activity, and is at the center of the structure of society and the real-world language it engages in (Carter, 2003, p. 6). According to Locke Carter, argument operates in three realms where “the products of argument—reasons, claims, premises—belong to the realm of logic; the procedures for conducting arguments belong to the realm of dialectic; and the processes of argumentation belong to the realm of rhetoric” (p. 6). Teaching process-to-product writing entails teaching all three of these: logic, dialect, and rhetoric. Student writing is informed through the research,
analysis, and synthesis of the ideas of others. After reading closely and thinking critically about these ideas, students must then use written language to represent their engagement with and thinking about the rhetorical situation. The task is to wrestle with the material and then write substantively about it in order to change reality through the mediation of thought or action.

**Invention strategies for arguments.** Process-to-product writing includes invention strategies, such as, brainstorming, freewriting, and stasis. Hypertext presents unique opportunities for teaching stasis. Stasis theory consists of asking four questions during the pre-write stage of process writing. Writers ask themselves questions about the facts, possible meanings of the issue being examined, the seriousness of the issue, and the possible action(s) needed. These conjectural, definitional, qualitative, and translatric questions require writers to develop rhetorical strategies to address and organize around these kinds of questions (Carroll, 2004). In other words, to arrive at points at issue in an argument, or “stasis,” the procedure within the invention strategy in which a writer asks these different kinds of questions, e.g., fact, definition, quality, and jurisdiction, “stand as a frame for discussions and arguments to follow” (Carroll, 2004, p. 158). Therefore, the arrangement of the information determines the logic of the argument to follow and language choice affects the writer’s ability to persuade the reader. However, the connections between the points may not at first be obvious. Hypertext’s visual linking feature offers a three-dimensional perspective to this invention stage of writing. Writers can experiment with linking strategies which can clarify the connections between the answers to these questions. This promotes a metacognitive approach to writing in which critical thinking is privileged during this stage of inquiry.

A defining feature of hypertext is its ability to present information in a variety of ways. Writing nodes is a key component of writing with hypertext. As Rainer Bromme and Elmar Stahl stated in *Writing Hypertext and Learning: Conceptual and Empirical Approaches*, hypertext "requires decisions about how areas of content and concepts should be distinguished from each other in order to enable their presentation as closed, separate units" (p. 7). In addition to creating
content, establishing links is a second key component of writing with hypertext. This is where the creation of hyperlinks—or hypertext, requires the writer to be aware of the semantically significant connections between the content of the separate units and the subject-matter written within those fields. This leads to the overarching or total structure of the hypertext document. It "must be planned in order to achieve coherence and to adapt the document to its anticipated audience" (p. 7). Since hypertext can be navigated by the reader in different ways, the writer's invention strategies must take this into consideration. Traditional texts are arranged in a linear order in order to establish coherence. Writing with hypertext changes the rhetorical situation from a linear to a nonlinear, almost three-dimensional order which must provide flexible ways of reading while maintaining coherence. For every node, the writer will not only compose the content, but must organize the ideas visually and explore the relationships between the nodes in order to establish the semantically significant links. This requires the writer to reflect on the reader's needs in order to create flexible options for navigating the hypertext. Since links are the reader's primary navigation tool, the writer needs to ensure that s/he makes the information available via links. In other words, the writer has to plan the hypertext's total structure while simultaneously anticipating possible reader navigation routes and maintaining coherence.

Writing with hypertext, therefore, changes the dynamics of the rhetorical situation with regard to invention strategies, audience, and the reinforcement of linked connections.

**Argument strategies.** The resource/presentation wiki discussed earlier, functions as a unique digital space, to not only write an argument, but to store all of the raw data used to formulate the argument. Stasis theory provides a logical approach to structuring nonsequential arguments. According to Carter, this concept of argumentation relies more on required elements than it necessarily involves order.

A hypertext author can use a given stasis as an invention heuristic to insure that a user, by browsing the argument, and the author, in absentia, can constitute the argument on common grounds. The effectiveness of this argument will be subject
to the actual order in which the nodes are traversed, but mentioned earlier, the hypertext author could mitigate primacy and regency effects through thoughtful linking, naming, and writing techniques. (Carter, 2003, p. 14)

As long as the reader is able to encounter the reasons, whether they are linked in a simple or complex relationship, the argument is valid. However, the “author needs to make the approach visible, concealing nothing from the reader” (p. 14).

The resource/presentation wiki functions as a facile writing tool for constructing hypertext arguments. The writer has to consider the needs of the reader when determining how to address argument strategies in this digital sphere. It requires a metacognitive and metalanguage approach which promotes the transference of linear process-to-product writing skills onto a nonlinear platform.

**Writing hypertext argument.** Writing with hypertext deliberately shifts control from the writer to the reader because the writer is giving the reader control as to how to read the writing. Hence, the writer must consider the loss of control over the readers reading order. Therefore, as in the Toulmin model for constructing arguments, the writer may choose not to “split up the claims, grounds, warrants, and data, but would keep these critical elements together” (Carter, 2003, p. 8). In this manner, the writer intentionally establishes a starting place for the reader—what would be the homepage on a wiki, and suggests an order for the reader to follow. By doing this, the writer insulates core arguments from the indeterminacy inherent in hypertext.

Because links help students write nonlinear documents, writers must visualize connections within the rhetorical situation (content details, narrative structure, organizational patterns, significance of claims, veracity of argument, and validity of assumptions) as if in a three-dimensional sphere. Hypertext permits students to experiment with how linking influences the development of meaning for readers by offering navigation routes through the text which show the connections between ideas.
Writing instruction at the college level uses argument as a primary device to teach academic writing. It is here that Carter's "concepts of informal logic, stasis theory, primacy/recency/repetition effects, spatial metaphors, and textual coherence as a starting point for building a rhetorical understanding of argumentation strategies in hypertext" (Carter, 2003, p. 3) are particularly cogent.

**Substantive logic for argument in hypertext.** The hypertext structure contains the argument (claims, grounds, warrants and data) as part of the overall rhetorical composition. Carter claimed that the order of the actual argument could be controlled by the manner in which the chunks of information were put into nodes. And he posited that one answer to the question of order in argumentation was "structuring arguments to try to take advantage of primacy, recency, and repetition effects" (Carter, 2003, p. 10). Additionally, the effects of primacy (the first thing the audience encounters) and recency (the last) could be used to the author's advantage if the starting point was known. Therefore, the construction of the hypertext influenced, to a certain extent, how the reader could traverse it. And, while order and sequence were destabilized, pre-existing argument structures could provide a framework for the argument. For example, formal logic or practical reasoning could be applied to the construction of the argument in a hypertext structure. While "Toulmin identified two kinds of logic, analytic or formal logic, the tool of science and mathematics; and substantive logic, the practical reasoning that informs everyday argumentation" (Carter, 2003, p. 10), Carter recommended substantive logic for writing hypertext argument because it was more dialogic in nature. Substantive logic, when viewed as a grid with categories to be completed, could be used to both evaluate and to complete hypertext arguments because claim, grounds, rebuttal, qualifiers, warrants, etc. could be written into nodes and linked together using a structure appropriate for the rhetorical context (Carter, 2003, p. 10). The ability to identify, to analyze, and to structure the written components of an argument is essential for both linear and non-sequential literacy tasks in postsecondary education in which process-to-product writing is privileged.
The significance of Bitzer’s seven components of the rhetorical situation and Porter’s five key topics for digital delivery demonstrate both how the situation controls the rhetorical response as the ground for rhetorical activity, and how writing hypertext requires critically thinking about the order and content of the nodes. The development of semantically significant links to help mitigate indeterminacy in hypertext production. As Herrington and Moran (2009) have pointed out:

With the advent of the hyperlink, the writer wrote with no certain knowledge of where the reader had been or where the reader would go next. Indeed, different readers would now almost certainly create their own paths through the hypertext/hypermedia composition. Writing for this linked medium brought new challenges for the writer, who now had to make decisions about not only voice, structure, syntax and vocabulary, but also what in the text to link to what, and for what purposes. (Herrington & Moran, 2009, p.6)

**Hyperlinking.** When determining how to present information to a reader, the writer must make choices about the type of information to include. Hypertext offers the writer the opportunity to link related or additional information without interfering with the main content of the text. Since a hypertext document gives the reader more control about how to travel through it, the writer must determine how much information needs to be in each node in order to generate meaning. This involves a way of thinking about the connections between details and the amount of information a reader might need. For example, HTML code can be written so that a mouse-over command causes additional information to be visible to the reader when the reader moves the mouse over the text. Or, a hyperlink can transport a reader to a node containing additional information. As Yancey states, “Hyperlinking is an excellent way to include additional material without interrupting a text’s coherence” (Yancey, 2004, p. 39). For example, “some teachers ask students to use hyperlinks in their academic essays to connect to additional research, refutations
of an argument, or information that is relevant to the essay but not appropriate to include in the body of the text” (p. 39).

One of the main benefits of using a wiki for composing a constructive hypertext is that a contributor does not need to know HTML code. Any linking decisions concerning text, intertext, and subtext for digital rhetoric are easily addressed because information can be linked to the main text using the edit page feature. Any time decisions need to be made regarding linking, order, structure, and meaning, the writer is engaged in both a metacognitive and a metalanguage approach to the rhetorical situation.

The metacognitive aspect of writing, the social construction of knowledge, and the transformational nature of learning are closely aligned to the three predominant functions of writing (learning to write, writing to learn, and writing to demonstrate learning). Therefore the acquisition of written language skills which take into consideration the way a student thinks and learns has positive implications for academic writing. Hypertext writing, which incorporates a metacognitive approach to associative learning by taking into account the multiple perspectives of knowledge formation, could, therefore, be a flexible technology tool for teaching academic writing. Constructive hypertexts, such as wikis, therefore support the second function of writing: writing to learn.

Writing to Learn

Writing to learn encompasses a broad spectrum of heuristic practices. Writing can be considered a way of knowing and interpreting the world. Literacy tasks requiring text-to-text, text-to-self, and text-to-world reflection, analysis and writing facilitate this kind of discovery. Close reading fosters critical thinking and facilitates substantive writing, while substantive writing helps students wrestle with ideas, solve problems, clarify issues, ask and answer questions, and/or reconsider points-of-view. Therefore, writing is a way of working out first thoughts, as well as, presenting final thoughts. Since academic writing follows certain conventions, creating specific student learning objectives for writing instruction can include
helping students acquire the skills and strategies to develop a central claim, determine a position on an issue, and advance an argument with convincing and/or persuasive warrants through prose which is clear, coherent, cogent, and logically structured. Novice writers’ final paragraphs often contain the true central claim and a direction for the argument. Consequently, requiring students to write multiple drafts is one approach to involve students with revision. Peer review is an effective method to engage students with the needs of their audience and it also provides an opportunity for collaboration. Sharing writing—in its ideal form, develops a community of writers who exchange ideas about process-to-product writing strategies, help each other improve as writers, and participate in the social construction of knowledge.

Knowledge as socially constructed. Unlike the static Web 1.0 platform, Web 2.0 is a dynamic, interactive, object-oriented platform that engages the user with text in a multimedia environment. Nonlinear composition requires a writer to develop an architect’s perspective toward text while mapping interactions for the user. Since messages are constructed using text links as syntactical elements (Ellerton, 2009), information can be presented in a variety of ways. This gives the reader more control over how to approach the information. As a result, the writer must consider the various ways the text can be written and the potential navigation routes the reader can take. Therefore, actively constructing a wiki can teach, clarify, reinforce, and deepen many fundamental writing skills. In addition to learning process writing skills such as planning, drafting, revising, organizing, cutting repetition, information flow, and voice, students learn how to create a complex reader experience by connecting text pages in a nonlinear fashion. And in the process, students practice close reading, substantive writing, and critical thinking. From this perspective, the way the information is presented is significant to what the reader can possibly learn. At the same time, structuring of the information for different reader perspectives actively engages the writer with making connections about the information and promotes transformational learning.
Learning theory. A wiki is a writing tool which reaches multiple learning styles and intelligences. Using a wiki as a technology tool for featuring hypertext writing assignments, students will have the opportunity to engage in a platform which not only promotes hypertext writing, but facilitates collaborative learning. Hypertext can be "constructed as a collaborative medium, and it makes possible forms of collaboration that emphasize the social construction of meaning" (Eryman, 1996). This creates a perspective that views virtual knowledge as infinite works-in progress believing that "what others know becomes what I know the more we interact online" (Gerben, 2009).

As all teachers know, the acquisition of knowledge—or learning—is a complex process. And theories about how learning takes place have evolved over time and in accordance with prevailing research results. Four paradigmatic learning theories bear discussing—behavioralism, cognitivism, constructivism, and humanism. The behavioral perspective of the early twentieth century as pioneered by John B. Watson, Edward Thorndike, and Robert Gagné among others views students as passive learners where the educator's role is to arrange the teaching environment to elicit desired student responses (Anson & Miller Cochran, 2009, p. 41). This theory was superseded by the cognitivist orientation to learning, championed by Noam Chomsky in the 1960s, which viewed the learner as an information processor where the teacher structured the content of material, not to change behavior, but to help students develop their capacities and skills to learn better. This theory was built upon by constructivism proponents John Dewey, Jean Piaget, Jerome Bruner, and Lev Vygotsky among others (Harris, J., 1997), who viewed learners as active information constructors developing subjective meaning based on conceptual knowledge and a core understanding of objective reality. In this constructive process, the learner connected what was already known with the new information being presented in order to devise new meaning in what became known as Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (Carroll, 2002, p. 91; Anson & Miller Cochran, 2009, p. 41). This view of learning as a process, took precedence over the skills-based approach of the cognitivist and behavioralist approach to teaching and
learning and paved the way for Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers' *humanism* theory in which students were viewed as active learners with affective and cognitive needs and teachers functioned as facilitators or guides in the learner's heuristic process.

The more recent learning theories represented a movement away from the student as receiver of teacher knowledge toward a transformational learning approach which was student-centered. Learners were viewed as active participants in a meaning-making process through which they took current knowledge gained through prior learning and engaged with new material in order to form new knowledge. This approach closely aligned with James Britton (Britton, 1975) and his language across the curriculum expressivist philosophy, as well as with composition theorists Janet Emig (1971) and Peter Elbow (1973) and their notions of the reflexive/extensive (which parallel Britton's poetical and transactional functions) aspect of the writing process, and with Flower & Hayes (1981) and Spiro (1995) and their views of composing as a metacognitive process. Peter Honebein (1996) characterized such environments in terms of seven goals: 1) Provide experience with the knowledge construction process; 2) Provide experience in and appreciation of multiple perspectives; 3) embed learning in realistic and relevant contexts; 4) Encourage ownership and voice in the learning process; 5) Embed learning in social experience; 6) Encourage the use of multiple modes of representation; and 7) Encourage self-awareness in the knowledge-construction process. (as cited in Anson & Miller-Cochran, 2009, p. 41)

At this point, a distinction should be made between collaborative learning and collaborative writing. Muriel Harris disentangles collaborative learning from what is more appropriately termed collaborative writing.

Although there has been some confusion in the use of "collaboration" to refer both to collaborative writing and collaborative learning about writing, collaborative writing is now identified as writing involving two or more writers working together to produce a joint product. When writing collaboratively, each
may take responsibility for a different portion of the final text, and there may be group consensus or some sort of collective responsibility for the final product (Harris, M., 1992, p. 369).

The distinction is between collaborative writing as the "products of multiple authors while collaboratively learning about writing involves interaction between writer and reader to help the writer improve her own abilities and produce her own text, though, of course, her final product is influenced by the collaboration with others" (Harris, M., 1992, p. 370).

**Epistemological shift in view of knowledge.** The roots for collaboration theory and practice grew out of an epistemological shift in the way we view knowledge. Four pertinent theorists regarding how texts are socially constructed, dialogic in nature, and intertextual are Andrea Lunsford, Kenneth Burke, Mikail Bakhtin, and Julia Kristeva.

Andrea Lunsford signifies the importance of collaborative learning and the social construction of knowledge by examining how positivistic principles regarded knowledge and reality as exterior, individually derived and held, immediately accessible, and based on verifiable facts. Control of this knowledge was held through a top-down transfer of information and resided in the possessors of information, as currency of the Academy in what Andrea Lunsford calls a *Storehouse* model (Lunsford, 1991, p. 4). This view of knowledge was shared by current traditional rhetoricians who emphasized the text. A second view of knowledge, what Lunsford call the *Garrett* model, viewed knowledge and reality as interior, as inside the student—solitary, individually derived, and individually held: It was based on absolutist ideals and informed by a deep-seated belief in individual "genius" in the Romantic sense of the term (p. 4). This correlated to the expressivist view shared by composition theorists Ken Macrorie, Peter Elbow, and Donald Murray which invested power and control in the individual student knower (p. 5). In these two models, the Storehouse emphasized the text and the authority of the teacher as transmitter of knowledge to the student, and, the Garret privileged the writer’s creative process and unique power and voice. In a third model, the Burkean Parlor, Lunsford proposed social constructivism
which focused on the sociocultural and historical settings in which writers develop their understanding of language and knowledge. In this model, collaboration was a key element in the constant negotiation of power and control where neither the text, nor any one individual was privileged (p. 9).

The theory of knowledge as being socially constructed, where language, power, and control are negotiated, drew deeply from the theories of Kenneth Burke. Burke, an important voice in New Rhetoric theory,

whose *Grammar of Motives* (1945) and *Rhetoric of Motives* (1950) developed an enlarged view of the domain of rhetoric by characterizing its purpose to be not just persuasion to action but change in attitude (which might precede or eventually give rise to action). Rhetoric for him is oriented very much toward interpretation and critique of texts and cultural practices and very little toward their making” (Dillon, G. L., 2005).

Burke’s critique of both texts and cultural practices may be why Lunsford advocated the Burkean Parlor as a model for social constructivism.

Another theoretical voice adding weight to this conversation about the rhetorical situation and the social construction of knowledge was Mikail Bakhtin. Bakhtin discussed dialogism and heteroglossia as two concepts which informed his corpus on literary theory. Dialogism inferred a two-way communication between the author and text s/he wrote. This text existed as an accumulation of signs, codes, epistemes, and intertextual references from within the social context of its origination. Bakhtin drew attention to “the way literature weaves discourses together from disparate social sources” (Rivkin, J. & Ryan, M., 2004, p. 674). The text therefore carried within it traces of the many voices which constituted it. Bakhtin referred to this polyvocality as heteroglossia. According to this theory, all words existed in dialog with other words and shifted emphasis away from individual literary works and toward the intertextual world in which individual literary works were set (p. 674).
We can see the influence of Burke and Bakhtin with regard to Lunsford's views on social constructivism and collaboration. In a collaborative environment, the writer has heard many voices who, together, were colearners who collaborated to negotiate meanings as well as construct knowledge. Beginning in the mid-1980s and continuing through the present time, social constructivism has been one of the dominant paradigms affecting writing instruction. Noted advocates of social constructivism are Kenneth A. Bruffee, Marilyn M. Cooper, James Berlin, and Patricia Bizzell.

Theoretical roots for social constructivism and collaboration in writing instruction run deep. For example, peer group critiquing, as advocated by social constructivists, reflected the workings of discourse communities which downplayed the role of single authority figures or a single source of knowledge. From this perspective, collaboration took place within a "social framework regulating textual production: to what Michel Foucault calls the 'discursive formation,' what Stanley Fish calls 'the interpretive community,' and what Patricia Bizzell calls 'the discourse community'" (Porter, 1986, p. 38). Guiding this social framework was a view of intertextuality that claimed "authorial intention is less significant than social context; the writer is simply a part of a discourse tradition, a member of a team, and a participant in a community of discourse that creates its own collective meaning. Thus the intertext constrains meaning" (p. 35).

The theory espoused by Ferdinand de Saussure, an early twentieth-century linguist, that "utterances are merely the manifestation of the rules of the system that lend order to the heterogeneity of language" (Rivkin & Ryan, 2004, p. 53) inculcated the notion of intertextuality posited by structuralist and poststructuralist theorists including Roland Barthes, Julia Kristeva, Jacques Derrida, and Michel Foucault (Porter, 1986, p. 35). The poststructuralist view challenged the classical assumption that writing was "a simple linear, one-way movement: The writer creates a text which produces some change in an audience. A poststructuralist rhetoric examines how audience (in the form of community expectations and standards) influences textual production and, in so doing, guides the development of a writer" (Porter, 1986, p. 40).
Intertext placed the audience in the context of cultural epistemes, assumptions of the discourse community, and what composition elements constituted argument, warrants, evidence, and proof. Because as Barthes says, "we know that a text consists not of a line of words, releasing a single 'theological' meaning (the 'message' of the Author-God), but of a multi-dimensional space in which are married and contested several writings, none of which is original: the text is a fabric of quotations, resulting from a thousand sources of culture" (as cited in Badmington & Thomas, p. 123). Barthes reminded us that 'the 'I' which approached the text was "already itself a plurality of other texts, of codes which are infinite" (p. 123).

It is here that we can see the significance intertextuality has had on writing hypermedia. Perhaps the most obvious "theory that hypertext embodies and makes explicit is Julia Kristeva's (1986) notions of intertextuality: Kristeva, influenced by the work of Bakhtin, charts a three-dimensional textual space whose three 'coordinates of dialogue' are the writing subject, the addressee (or ideal reader), and exterior texts" (Eryman, 1996). We can see how the intertext is dependent upon all of the other texts which have come before it, the intersections of words, syntax, and meanings, as well as the collected traces of semi-present ideologies. This intertextuality can be seen in the "footnotes that indicate source materials to which a given text is alluding, or which are known to have influenced the author. A constructive hypertext can make this notion of intertextuality an externally accessible 'mosaic' of multiple texts, placing the internal connections about which Kristeva theorizes into a visible forum which can be expanded by each subsequent reader" (Eryman, 1996).

This theoretical discussion has shown how the social-epistemic view of rhetoric and composition "has moved from a current-traditional model toward a process-oriented, more collaborative, less authority-centered model, focusing on an epistemology of socially constructed knowledge" (Eryman, 1996). These theoretical roots, grounded in the Formalist, Structuralist, and Poststructuralist schools of literary criticism, have grown toward a Postmodern notion of collaboration as a dialogic and polyvocal negotiation of power and control. This shift in the way
knowledge has come to be viewed corresponds to changes in the way text has come to be presented.

The wiki, as a Web 2.0 space, offers a means to shift the emphasis from consumption (a proficiency in text analysis) to text production—a move advocated by proponents of New Literacy Studies in which writing is a means to generate ideas as opposed to a means for delivering the ideas of others. This shift helps better prepare students to see themselves as capable knowledge producers because they come to view “knowledge production as an iterative, collaborative, evolving process through engaging with the technologies that embody this notion” (Purdy, 2010, p. 56). Teaching with technology to facilitate the social construction of knowledge is advocated by Joseph Moxley.

Moxley coined the term “datagogy” to help “articulate what happens when ‘crowds’ of teachers, students, and administrators use social software to develop pedagogical communities that value and are fueled by the ‘wisdom of crowds’—the surprising ability of crowds of people to develop pedagogies that are wiser and more engaging than those developed by individuals, even disciplinary experts” (Moxley, 2008, pp. 182-183). This concept of a datagogy viewed knowledge as socially constructed through collaboration within a “community of learning”. It operated in real time thereby engaging, through instant access, pedagogical collaboration and revision. Moxley claimed that datagogies challenged traditional assumptions about authorship, authority, collaboration, and power in such a way that teaching, learning, and writing have become more dialogical as opposed to presentational. Accordingly, knowledge has become conditional, subject to the next edit. And, “datagogies have the potential to dramatically alter collaboration, creativity, and community” (p. 183). Moxley differentiated between the “Community of Power” and the “Community of Learning” claiming that “online communities informed by the values of the Community of Learning more evenly distribute power, providing more democratic means for authorship and ownership of ideas” (p. 183). Moxley posited that
The Community of Power assumes that knowledge and justice are achieved by pioneering leaders (as opposed to crowds) who follow their self-interest. The values of the Community of Power are those of the academic reward system as well as those of our larger society, a society that prizes competition and individual accomplishment. This is the dominant discourse of accountability, standardized testing, and capitalism—the "survival of the fittest" mentality that fuels our world's economies. This community views universities as corporations and students as customers. (p. 186)

It is here in Moxley's view of the Community of Power that we can recognize what Andrea Lunsford (1991) termed the Storehouse view of knowledge in which the possessors of information own and control ideas as the currency of the Academy. Moxley argued that knowledge has exchange value in the Academy because "researchers are explorers who discover new knowledge. Scholarships, grants, and patents are traded as commodities, as units of power and prestige" (p. 186). This attitude of intellectual exchange as commodity in academic communities is paramount to the top-down transfer of knowledge inherent in a current-traditionalist, positivistic view of the Storehouse model. Citing Blackboard as one example, Moxley claimed that it does not represent a datagogy primarily because Blackboard characterized this closely held view of power. He drew a correlation between Bentham's Panopticon as a surveillance tool used within The Community of Power and teachers as the authority figures who monitored the activities of Blackboard users by toggling controls in order to permit or deny user access to groups or sections of the site.

Moxley advocated the development of The Community of Learning, as opposed to the Community of Power, as a space where people were interested in expanding, interpreting, and sharing ideas, as opposed to furthering power and self-promotion. This shift in the way knowledge is viewed correlates to what Lunsford (1991) termed a Burkean Parlor approach. For Moxley, in addition
to sharing altruistic values, members of the Community of Learning have a deep respect for dialogue and for the process of learning, which can involve participating in projects to extend their own knowledge—to write to learn in the parlance of writing across the curriculum theorists—or to share their insights, to be connected with the invisible college, a community without walls. (p. 191).

According to Moxley, incorporating technology into the writing classroom will therefore help students acquire the literacy skills demanded from them in the new information economy. While Blackboard did not adhere to the tenets of a datagogy as defined by Moxley, a wiki does conform to his requirements.

Moxley (2008) argued that traditional linear texts have given way to multimodal texts which are dialogic, hypertextual, and under constant revision. His concept of a datagogy viewed knowledge as socially constructed through collaboration within a community of learning. Lunsford (1991) proposed the Burkean Parlor as a sociocultural and historical setting in which writers develop their understanding of language and knowledge. In such a setting, peer group critiquing reflected the workings of discourse communities which downplay the role of single authority figures or a single source of knowledge. Eryman (1996) posited that hypertext writing facilitated collaborative learning by emphasizing the social construction of meaning and a Bahktinian polyvocality through computer-mediated dialogic interaction, as well as, by charting a three-dimensional textual space which applied Julia Kristeva’s notions of intertextuality.

The social construction of knowledge is dependent upon the individuals who belong to the discourse community. The wiki provides a unique opportunity to reach the various learning styles of the asynchronous community comprised of wiki collaborators.

Learning styles and hypertext. Hypertext writing, and any kind of academic learning, is complicated by individual student learning styles and multiple intelligences (Gardner, 2006). If for example, we were to consider Bernice McCarthy’s 4MAT System (1987), learning styles are divided up into the four quadrants of imaginative, analytic, common sense, and dynamic learners.
in which students ask key questions about meaning, content, experiment, and creative application respectively. The four learning styles provide a skeleton upon which to hang learning—and therefore, teaching. Effective teaching reaches all four learning styles. Teaching academic writing by using hypertext writing tasks is one method which takes into consideration different student learning styles.

The unique features of hypertext involve learners in associative writing. Because writing hypertext engages students in structuring the document to generate meaning based on nodes containing specific content, writers are able to experiment with links and navigation routes and therefore apply creative applications for structuring textual composition. In this regard, a student’s dominant learning style is applied to and within the hypertext rhetorical situation.

Because hypertext documents, such as wikis, can be read in multiple ways, it is not a sequential text (Foltz, 2009). Instead, links connect individual pages through a number of logical associations or complex relations. Therefore, the writer must ensure that each route provides the reader with clear and cohesive information. Hence, writing with hypertext requires an invention strategy which accounts for various linking options yet still produces a cogent document.

The way writers compose is changing. Traditional linear texts “have given way to multimodal texts—texts that are dialogic, hypertextual, and, thanks to versioning, under constant revision” (Moxley, 2008, p. 184). In addition to text, these compositions include digital audio, video, animation, and images as syntactical elements. Therefore, “these texts engage new ways of reading, interpreting, and collaborating as they allow users to interact as authors, coauthors, editors, and readers (p. 184). Because a wiki is a unique and flexible authoring tool allowing a composer or a group of composers to create a hypertext document, teaching academic writing using a wiki can easily accommodate McCarthy’s four quadrants of learners—imaginative, analytic, common sense, and dynamic, who ask key questions about meaning, content, experiment, and creative application.
The acquisition of written language skills which takes into consideration the way a learner learns has positive implications for academic writing. Hypertext writing, which incorporates a metacognitive approach to associative learning by considering the multiple perspectives of knowledge formation, could, therefore, be a flexible technology tool for teaching academic writing.

**Hypertext and metacognition.** Text processing, within a cognitive science context, seeks to research “how understanding is achieved through mental processes that act on text structures and reader knowledge” (Rouet et al., 2009, p. 158). With regard to text production, research by Braaksma, Rijlaarsdam, Couzijn, and van den Bergh (2002) presented in “Learning to Compose Hypertext and Linear Text: Transfer or Interference?” concluded that “experience with hypertext writing may help students to achieve better writing plans for both linear and hypertext” (p. 35). A study by Jacobson and Spiro (1995) entitled “Hypertext Learning Environments, Cognitive Flexibility, and the Transfer of Complex Knowledge: An Empirical Investigation” showed that the task of constructing the hypertext from two different reader perspectives involved a deeper understanding of the overall hypertext structure. Because the study participants were able to use their acquired knowledge, the participants reflected more strongly on the semantic structures of the subject area they were dealing with across a learning environment. The study results concurred with the knowledge-transforming model (p.325). This focus on semantic structures holds promising implications for academic writing instruction. And, the research conclusion that writing hypertext can promote learning makes teaching writing with hypertext an arguable benefit. The research by Braaksma, Rijlaarsdam, Couzijn, and van den Bergh (2002), showed that “analysis and ordering ideas is important in linear writing, but it appears to be more often elicited in hypertext writing” (p. 35). For the purpose of classroom praxis in writing instruction, this research implied that students could apply the strategies necessary for writing hypertext to linear composition. Student writers had to think about how to order the ideas of the argument, as well as, to compose them within the structure of the hypertext. Transitions in a linear
composition became links in nonlinear hypertext. Therefore, hypertext writers had to consider which words to use for links in order to give semantical cues to the reader. Additionally, hypertext writers had to make decisions about what information to include in each node and how the reader could reach that information. Consequently, the research by Jacobson and Spiro (1995), and Braaksma, Rijlaarsdam, Couzijn, and van den Bergh (2002) and Rouet et al., (2009) confirm the value to students of incorporating hypertext writing assignments for learning process-to-product writing strategies, as well as, for engaging in transformational learning.

**Cognitive flexibility theory (CFT).** Hypertext production involves the application of written language skills as well as the development of metacognitive ability. The long-held belief that writing is a recursive process has been substantiated by the cognitive flexibility theory (CFT) proposed by Rouet et al. (2009): “Based on their observations of students’ failure to acquire advanced knowledge, Spiro et al. (1991) claimed that ‘revisiting the same material, at different times, in re-arranged contexts, for different purposes, and from different conceptual perspectives is essential for attaining the goals of advanced knowledge acquisition’” (Rouet & Levonen, 2009, p. 13). In other words, the authors believed that learning occurred in a recursive manner. Additionally, they claimed that because hypertext promotes the multiple structuring of contents, it is a suitable medium to enhance the transfer of learning across situations.

As stated earlier, hypertext adheres to many of the same sub-processes of the writing process (e.g., Emig, 1971; Flower & Hayes, 1980; Perl, 1979). Subsequently, a recursive approach to processing and producing hypertext has demonstrated positive effects on transformational learning. This is evidenced in Jacobson and Spiro (1995) study, in which their experimental group read a hypertext multiple times, but, each time followed a different path through the document such that the order of nodes presented the information from different perspectives. In the study, the experimental group and the two control groups (who read the content in only one thematic order) worked with a computer-based drill-and-practice program to foster a deeper processing of the content. When tested on their knowledge about individual facts,
the participants in the control groups scored significantly higher than those in the experimental group. However, the experimental group achieved significantly better results in a transfer test, in which participants had to write essays on given problems. The results of the experiment indicated that processing the same material from different perspectives may increase the acquisition of flexibly applicable knowledge. However, it examined the receptive handling of given hypertext structures. Asking the learner to actively construct a hypertext from different thematic perspectives would correspond to the core assumption of CFT. Because of the learner's more active role, which is in the spirit of the theory, one could even say that such a learning scenario fits CFT assumptions even better than the experimental design used by Jacobson and Spiro (1995) themselves. (Bromme & Stahl, 2002, p. 42)

Research by Jacobson and Spiro (1995), and Braaksma, Rijlaarsdam, Couzijn, and van den Bergh (2002) and Rouet et al., (2009) conclude that actively constructing hypertext facilitates transformational learning. As defined earlier, a wiki is a constructive hypertext. The development of a wiki requires a metacognitive approach to the rhetorical situation. By combining the recursive nature of process-to-product writing with cognition theory, a wiki could be used to facilitate the type of transformational learning Bromme and Stahl investigated. This research validates learning outcome goals requiring the writing of essays marked by intellectual engagement and critical reflection. Therefore, the wiki can be used as an interactive tool for writing hypertext in college courses. Furthermore, in addition to facilitating transformational learning, actively constructing hypertext can foster critical thinking through argument, textual analysis, language awareness, rhetorical strategy development, and process-to-product writing. While the resource/presentational wiki is ideally suited for this purpose, it has also been demonstrated to be a prime digital space for facilitating the social construction of knowledge. Therefore, current research which has addressed the socially constructed nature of both hypertext
and process writing (Bruffee, 1984; Faigley, 1986; Lunsford, 1991; Talamo & Fasulo, 2002) supports using a wiki for teaching academic writing at the college level.

Writing hypertext gives students a deeper and more complex understanding of subject-matter content. Accordingly, writing functions as a way for students to demonstrate learning. When students segment, combine, cluster, link, and search for global relations between ideas, they will deepen their understanding of material—in any subject (Bromme & Stahl, 2002, p. 40). Students develop a web of understanding that is not linear. As a result, the writer develops a more sophisticated awareness of audience and links (Dillon, 2002, p. 68).

**Writing to Demonstrate Learning**

A third way writing functions in the academy is as a demonstration of learning. From a teaching standpoint, assessing learning through writing involves evaluating the extent to which a student demonstrates improvement as a writer or mastery of a subject. Versioning is one method to assess to what extent students are engaged with revision. It is important to remember that there is a constant tension between developing fluency and acquiring competency when carrying out new writing operations. In other words, student writers must be safe to experiment with language and take risks without fearing reprisals in the form of low grades so that learning can take place and their confidence as writers grows. At the same time, student writers need to understand that editing errors interfere with a readers’ understanding of the text and with their acceptance of the writer’s credibility. Therefore, correct usage is expected.

**Hypertext structure and content material.** A defining feature of hypertext is its ability to present information in nodes. As Rainer Bromme and Elmar Stahl stated in “Writing and Learning: Hypertext as a Renewal of an Old and Close Relationship,” hypertext requires decisions “about how areas of content and concepts should be distinguished from each other in order to enable their presentation as closed, separate units” (p. 7). In addition to creating content, establishing links is a second key component of writing with hypertext. This is where the creation of hyperlinks requires the writer to be aware of the semantically significant connections
between the content of the separate units and the subject-matter written within those fields. This leads to the overarching or total structure of the hypertext document. It "must be planned in order to achieve coherence and to adapt the document to its anticipated audience" (p. 7). Since hypertext can be navigated by the reader in different ways, the writer's invention strategies must take this into consideration. Traditional texts are arranged in a linear order in order to establish coherence. Writing with hypertext changes the rhetorical situation from a linear to a non-linear, almost three-dimensional order which must provide flexible ways of reading while maintaining coherence. For every node, the writer will not only compose the content, but must organize the ideas visually and explore the relationships between the nodes in order to establish significant links. This requires the writer to reflect on the reader's needs in order to create flexible options for navigating the hypertext. Since links are the reader's primary navigation tool, the writer needs to ensure that s/he makes the information available via links. In other words, the writer has to plan the hypertext's total structure while simultaneously anticipating possible reader navigation routes and maintaining coherence. In order to do this, the writer must have a good grasp of the content material.

Information on a wiki, as a hypertext document, can be constructed either hierarchically or associatively. Therefore, the way the information is presented is significant to what the reader can possibly learn. At the same time, the structuring of the information for different reader perspectives actively engages the writer with making connections about the information and promotes transformational learning. Consequently, actively constructing the wiki by making the syntactic and semantic choices necessary to write the nodes allows students to demonstrate that they have mastered the content material sufficiently well enough to write the hypertext.

The wiki functions as a unique digital space, to not only write an argument, but to store all of the raw data used to formulate the argument. As long as the reader is able to encounter the reasons, whether they are linked in a simple or complex relationship, the argument is valid. Because the writer has to consider the needs of the reader when determining how to address
argument strategies in this digital sphere, writing a constructive hypertext requires a metacognitive and metalanguage approach to a three-dimensional rhetorical situation. Additionally, it promotes the transference of linear process-to-product writing skills onto a non-linear platform.

In “Text and Hypertext,” Charles A. Perfetti explained that text processing, within a cognitive science context, sought to research “how understanding is achieved through mental processes that act on text structures and reader knowledge” (p. 158). With regard to text production, research by Braaksma, Rijlaarsdam, Couzijn, and van den Bergh (2002) concluded that writing hypertext may help students plan better for both linear and hypertext writing. Furthermore, and in line with the knowledge-transforming model, Bromme and Stahl (2002) showed that constructing a hypertext from two different reader perspectives aided participants in increased subject-matter content knowledge and in the development of semantic structures. This focus on semantic structures holds promising implications for academic writing instruction. And, the research conclusion that writing hypertext can promote learning makes teaching writing with hypertext an arguable benefit. The research by Braaksma, Rijlaarsdam, Couzijn, and van den Bergh et al., showed that while the analysis and ordering of ideas was important in linear writing, it was more frequently elicited in hypertext writing. For the purpose of classroom praxis in writing instruction, this research implies that students could apply the strategies necessary for writing hypertext to linear composition. Student writers have to think about how to order the ideas of the argument, as well as, to compose them within the structure of the hypertext. Transitions in a linear composition become links in non-linear hypertext. Therefore, hypertext writers have to consider which words to use for links in order to give semantical cues to the reader. Additionally, hypertext writers have to make decisions about what information to include in each node and how the reader can reach that information. Consequently, this research supports the hypothesis that incorporating hypertext writing assignments for learning process-to-product
writing strategies, as well as, for engaging in transformational learning also provides a measure for students writing to demonstrate learning.

**Theoretical Summary**

Phillipson’s (2008) classification of the “five stages of inquiry” for instructional uses of wikis: resource, presentation, gateway, simulation, and illuminated provided a frame upon which to hang the practical application of wikis for academic writing instruction. Carter (2003) posited that argument operated in three realms: logic (reasons, claims, premises); dialectic (procedures for conducting arguments); and rhetoric (processes of argumentation). Teaching process-to-product academic writing entails teaching all three of them because student writing, informed through the research, analysis, and synthesis of the ideas of others, must then use written language to represent their engagement with and thinking about the rhetorical situation. Bitzer (1968) and Porter (1986) claimed that the rhetorical situation was essentially a persuasive task to change reality through the mediation of thought or action. Each wiki Phillipson identified in his taxonomy functioned to address one or more stages of inquiry—the foundation of a rhetorical situation. Moxley (2008) advocated using datagogies as a digital environment which supported a community of learning, collaboration, and a socially constructed view of knowledge. And Eryman (1996), Phillipson (2008), and Purdy (2010) advocated engaging with the technologies that embodied this notion of knowledge production as a recursive, collaborative, evolving process. Yancey (2004), Lunsford (1991), and Harris (1992) supported this socially constructed view of knowledge for writing instruction. The theoretical foundation for the dialogic and intertextual nature of writing was established by Burke (as cited in Dillon, G. L., 2005), Bahktain (2004), and Barthes, Kristeva, Derrida, and Foucault (as cited in Porter, 1986) where Barthes gave birth to the primacy of the reader by announcing the death of the author. The tenets of transformational learning through writing was espoused by Emig (1971), Elbow (1973), Perl (1980), Flower and Hayes (1981), and Spiro (1995). Transformational learning through writing hypertext was proven by Rouet et. al. (2009), Braaksma, Rijlaarsdam, Couzijn, and van den
Bergh (2002), and Spiro (1995). Eryman (1996), Selfe (1999) Ellerston (2009), and Purdy (2010) warn of the dangers of not incorporating technology into the writing classroom and signal its importance for literacy in the new information economy. In accordance with the theoretical perspective of the social construction of knowledge and the technology which supports it, the wiki functions as a collaborative writing tool for both teaching academic writing at the college level and facilitating the social construction of knowledge. By establishing the theoretical context for the use of technology in the writing classroom, this paper has argued that the wiki is a practical application of that theory because

1. The wiki facilitates close reading, critical thinking, academic writing, transformational learning, and the social construction of knowledge;

2. Educational wikis are an excellent technology platform to teach, clarify, reinforce, and deepen many fundamental process-to-product writing skills such as clustering, revising, editing connecting and sequencing ideas, planning, drafting, organizing, cutting repetition, information flow, and voice;

3. Teaching academic writing and constructive hypertext in a collaborative environment at the college level will help students organize their thoughts, connect ideas, gain a deeper understanding of subject-matter content, and transfer this new knowledge to writing more traditional linear academic essays;

4. A wiki serves as a technology platform which targets various learning styles and engages writers in the three predominant functions of writing: learning to write, writing to learn, and writing to demonstrate learning;

5. A wiki engages students in literacy tasks which facilitate their ability to participate in the new information economy; and

6. Constructing a wiki requires students to take a metacognitive approach to a three-dimensional rhetorical situation which is constituted through logic, dialect, and rhetoric.
Limitations

The digital divide, resistance to teaching with technology, and the protection of intellectual and pedagogical property are three potential drawbacks which may limit or preclude the use of a wiki for teaching academic writing at the college level.

The Digital Divide

Access and power. The digital divide refers to the lack of access people have to technology. If education and the development of advanced literacy skills are a source of cultural, economic, and political power (Carroll, 2002), then an ever widening chasm separates those individuals with and without access to the tools necessary to develop technological literacy. This type of advanced literacy skill has become a prerequisite to success in the new information economy (Herrington & Moran, 2009, p.2; NTIA, 2010, p. 4). The digital divide “has considerable social, political, and intellectual currency” (Grabill, 2003, p. 459). This currency is deeply rooted in the notion of class which according to Julie Lindquist, can generally speaking “be said to refer to the systemic products of a social hierarchy sustained by unequal access to resources” (as cited in Grabill, 2003, p. 457). While resources can be material or symbolic, according to Stanley Aronowitz and William DiFazio, they are “constituted by the labor process but never independent of social and cultural relations” (as cited in Grabill, 2003, p. 457).

Census Bureau report. The Department of Commerce’s National Telecommunications and Information Administration’s (NTIA, 2010) report entitled Digital Nation: 21st Century America’s Progress Toward Universal Broadband Internet Access, based on a survey of over 50,000 households, was commissioned by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) and conducted by the United States Census Bureau. It noted the following about access to broadband technology at home (a selection and gloss of data reported on p. 4):

- While, virtually all demographic groups have increased their adoption of broadband services at home, the data also reveal that demographic disparities among groups have persisted over time. Persons with high incomes ($150,000 or greater), those who are
younger (persons 18-24 years old), Asians and Whites, the more highly-educated (84% with college degrees), married couples, and the employed tend to have higher rates of broadband use at home. With regard to gender, usage by males was 59.3% compared to females at 59% and is consistent with 2007 findings (48.3 percent v. 47.0 percent).

- Survey results demonstrate that persons in rural areas are less likely to use the Internet. For example, Blacks and Hispanics in rural areas exhibit a lesser propensity to use broadband than their counterparts in urban areas. A substantial difference in home broadband penetration remains between urban and rural areas. Although the gap has declined since 2007, it still is significant.

- Despite the growing importance of the Internet in American life, over 30 percent of households and 35 percent of persons do not use the Internet at home, and 30 percent of all persons do not use the Internet anywhere. Those with no broadband access at home amount to more than 35 percent of all households and approximately 40 percent of all persons, with a larger proportion in rural areas in both categories. Overall, the two most important reasons given by survey respondents for not having broadband access at home are “don’t need” and “too expensive.” Inadequate or no computer is also a major reason given for no home broadband adoption. In rural America, lack of availability is a much more important reason for non-adoption than in urban areas.

**Discussion.** These NTIA findings about the digital divide hold significance for educators on many levels. As Jeffrey T. Grabill (2004) says in “On Divides and Interfaces: Access, Class, and Computers,” socio-economic factors and various demographics which constitute the divide concern “writing and literacy as well as machines and wire” (p. 463). Language constitutes text on the World Wide Web—and it is not neutral. As demonstrated by Grabill (2004), Porter (2009) and Carnegie (2009), interfaces are not neutral either. There are a host of representational concerns which need to be addressed to prevent the divide from expanding. The NTIA
demographics which included income, age, education level, employment status, household type, and computer usage by gender represented factors which influenced, not only access to the Internet, but engagement with the language and graphics of the interface. These socio-economic factors raise concerns for educators about access, class, and computers when using technology to teach writing.

Resistance to Teaching with Technology

Resistance. Learning to teach writing through technology may comprise fear and risk. For many, it involves change. And change may be particularly difficult for newcomers to the world of multimedia. Lankshear and Knobel’s (2006) argument in reference to the “insider” and “outsider” mindsets regarding posttypographic text forms, claimed that those individuals born before 1970 or thereabouts are newcomers, and therefore, nonlinear forms of texts are not natural and must be learned (Herrington & Moran, 2009, p.7). Hence, a fear of change coupled with a fear that students may know more than their teachers can preclude the incorporation of new technologies into current praxis. The fear of a loss of authority, power, and/or control may be another factor for resistance to teaching writing through technology.

Academic writing is linear in design, and while the writing process is not so straightforward, it is the currently accepted practice for scaffolding writing instruction. Hypertext writing is neither linear in design nor straightforward as a writing process. There may be resistance to accepting that teaching writing using a constructive hypertext such as a wiki can accomplish the type of scaffolding used to help student writers improve their academic writing. While the research to date does not include any negative data about the effects of hypertext writing, writing hypertext is not yet a proven method for scaffolding writing instruction even though it has been proven as an effective tool for teaching the rhetorical situation—and more specifically, a three-dimensional rhetorical situation. One question which may arise is, “What can I do with hypertext writing assignments that I cannot do with my traditional linear writing assignments?” To overcome these potential objections, a sample syllabus which doesn’t use
hypertext writing assignments can be modified to show the ease with which assignments can be adapted. Four samples of constructive hypertext assignments using a resource/presentational wiki, including rationales for each assignment, are included in Appendix B.

**Protection of Intellectual and Pedagogical Property Rights**

**Marginalization of composition faculty.** Educators may continue to resist what Moxley called the Community of Learning because there is “considerable concern among faculty that new technologies will further marginalize composition faculty” (Moxley, 2008, p. 199). Robert Samuels argues that “recent initiatives concerning the use of computer-mediated instruction to improve writing skills in large lecture classes often work to undermine the professional status of composition teachers in North American universities” (Samuels, 2004, p. 63). He cites The University of California, where he negotiates contracts for nontenure-track faculty seeking long-term contracts based on having a particular expertise not replaceable by other faculty, as a site which currently deals with the questions: “What happens when someone puts most of her course material on the Web to help standardize writing instruction? Is this person still indispensable? Moreover, is anyone an expert if everyone shares access to the same resources and knowledge?” (Samuels, 2004, p. 68). He further interrogates intellectual property rights for material posted online.

These are valid concerns that must be articulated and negotiated. This literature review has attempted to show that the benefits to students in the form of improved academic writing efficacy outweigh

1. the experimental nature of writing constructive hypertext on a wiki; and
2. the perceived fear of risk and loss for educators by engaging with a wiki in a collaborative environment that views knowledge as socially constructed.
Conclusion

In colleges and universities, writing has generally functioned in three predominant ways. First, learning to write has consisted of mastering the basics of written language instruction. Second, writing to learn has served as a heuristic practice. And third, writing to demonstrate learning has functioned as an assessment tool within the teach/learn paradigm. Teaching writing through technology using a wiki applies a social constructivist view of knowledge, control, and power to digital composition rhetoric. The theoretical perspectives of Bitzer (1968), Carter (2003), and Porter (2009) have established the dialogic nature of rhetoric as involving both participation with and decision-making about the audience in a three-dimensional rhetorical situation constituted through logic, dialect, and rhetoric. Carter theorized that the products, procedures, and processes of argument in rhetoric functioned to persuade its audience to become mediators of change in thought and action. Porter contended that digital rhetoricians, not only produced the message, but also functioned as distributors of discourse; and that the digital interface engaged users with the social construction of knowledge. Porter’s notion of the rhetorical situation as digital rhetoric and its implications for the currency of exchange in the Academy is also posited by Moxley (2008). Moxley mirrored Lunsford’s (1991) conceptualization of a Burkean parlor for a socially constructed view of knowledge. He envisioned an entire Community of Learning as the desired model for collaboration and knowledge sharing and disavowed the Community of Power as too absorbed in self interest to function effectively in the digital realm of datagogies. Consequently, the wiki, and not an interface like Blackboard, provided the unique digital environment for engagement with the collaborative, knowledge-sharing environment of the three-dimensional rhetorical situation.

If learning to write comprises acquiring and practicing a broad spectrum of composing skills and strategies; writing to learn encompasses a broad spectrum of heuristic practices; and, writing to demonstrate learning shows how a student has improved as a writer; then, a wiki facilitates this text-to-text, text-to-self, and text-to-world reflection in academic writing at the
college level. A wiki, as a constructive hypertext and collaborative writing platform, allows students to engage in close reading, critical thinking, and substantive writing. Writing in this environment requires a metacognitive approach to a three-dimension rhetorical situation which promotes transformational learning through student engagement with complex literacy tasks. Research has shown that associative and hierarchical structuring of nonlinear argument in writing hypertext transfers to writing traditional linear composition. Therefore, the wiki is a facile tool for teaching academic writing at the college level.
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Appendix A

Examples of academic wikis compiled by Joseph Moxley

- Michael C. Morgan’s wiki sites at the Bemidji State University change each time he teaches a new course subject matter, including wikis for composition, web design, and theory courses. At <http://biro.bemidjistate.edu/wiki/>, Morgan links to course wikis he has developed with his classes since 1995.
- Public Writing Online Wiki, <http://www.writingwiki.org/default.aspx/WritingWiki/PublicWritingOnline.html>, is a classroom project that Darcy Webber has conducted with multiple classes.
- Pennsylvania State University’s wikis, following Richard Doyle’s leadership, provide a portal to composition teachers’ class wikis at the “Wiki Farm”: <http://psuwikiportal.pbwiki.com/>. To view one of the more developed course wikis, see <http://epochewiki.pbwiki.com/>.
- Skidmore College’s Greek Tragedy Wiki, <http://academics.skidmore.edu/wikis/GreekTragedy/index.php/Main Page>, provides a writing space for students enrolled in a Greek Tragedy course.
- Stanford University’s JournalismWiki, <http://traumwerk.stanford.edu:3455/Rheingold/79>, directed by Howard Rheingold, provides a community space for a journalism course. This wiki is more of a course management wiki than a content-development wiki.

However, some universities and academic journals are using wikis to help direct their programs or to influence teaching across universities—i.e., to create a datagogical space for administrators, teachers, and students to collaborate, as demonstrated below:

- WritingWiki, <http://writingwiki.org>, is open for all writers, although it is primarily used by writers in composition courses at USF.
- TeachingWiki, <http://teachingwiki.org>, aspires to be a community for college-level faculty, particularly faculty teaching rhetoric and composition.
- UBCWiki, <http://wiki.elearning.ubc.ca/HomePage>, at the University of British Columbia provides a variety of wiki pages and sites that address new media and online resources.
- ISopedia, <http://ispedia.terrv.uga.edu/>, at the University of Georgia addresses the unique concerns of information science researchers. This wiki is fashioned after Wikipedia, although its audience is more specialized: academic researchers.

Appendix B

Sample hypertext writing assignment for a group literacy project
Assignment: Writing Hypertext – Collaborative Group Literacy Project (Prose 105)

For this assignment, we'll learn how to make our own linked document. While there are lots of ways to do this, we'll use Word and our class Wiki. In groups, we'll weave together several ideas about literacy, and then combine them as a class until we create one unified belief. Then, we'll post it to our Wiki and invite other people around the world to respond to our ideas and share their own.

1. Since we have already listened to examples of the NPR program *I Believe* and written our own personal essays about literacy, we know what we believe as individuals. Now I want you to think about it as a class.
2. We'll work in groups. Take everyone's essay and merge it into one. Now take this document and break it into segments. Label each page to use later as a Wiki page. Once this is done, create connections between your segments. These connections will be your links. Ask yourselves, if I put these links in my document, what does it do? How does it change my essay? What does it do for it? Should I put a link here—or not? If I put in multiple links, can it be read in different ways?
3. Make a plan for writing, revising, deleting, adding to or changing your group's draft Wiki pages. Everyone needs to work together. If each group member is preparing a set of pages for the linked document, make sure each person uses the template. If one person is preparing pages for the linked document, make sure that each group member delivers all the text, graphics, etc. promptly and in an agreed-upon format. Use a group activity log to keep track of your work.
4. What's most important:
   - The thought behind your links.
   - The readability of your text.
   - Your attention to the needs and expectations of your readers.
   - The agreement between the pages (unified look, ease of navigation, consistent voice and tone).
5. Transfer your group's files to the class Wiki page. All files should be kept on the Wiki. Don't forget to upload all of the graphic files to the Wiki.
6. As a class, we're going to make a mega-cluster based on each group's cluster chart. Then we're going to weave it all together into one giant linked document and publish it on the Web.
## Writing Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk about class views on literacy</td>
<td>One class period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce concept of links. Demonstrate how to make them using Word and the class Wiki.</td>
<td>One class period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in groups</td>
<td>One class period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create clusters, cluster chart &amp; links</td>
<td>Due next class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review text, cluster chart, links &amp; Edit</td>
<td>One class period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider different ways to connect your clusters &amp; Create Reader Map</td>
<td>One class period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mega-Cluster</td>
<td>One class period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Wiki Revision</td>
<td>Due next class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish to Web</td>
<td>One class period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Essay: <em>To Link or Not to Link, That Is the Question</em></td>
<td>Due next class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing goal</td>
<td>Division of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create Cluster</strong></td>
<td>Collaborate on how to get your ideas across to your readers using a linked document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(segment individual essays and put similar ideas together in clusters)</td>
<td>Make a plan for writing, revising, deleting, adding to or changing your group’s draft Wiki pages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose the graphics and text for each page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organize clusters into chart</strong></td>
<td>Create a template for the cluster chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Decide which ideas and clusters need to be connected)</td>
<td>Use one sheet of paper for each page of your cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose the graphics and text for each page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set links</strong></td>
<td>Work out how your pages will connect with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Choose which text or graphics will propel the reader)</td>
<td>Choose graphic or text for each link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review text, cluster chart, and links</strong></td>
<td><strong>Peer review each others pages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Click through the document to make sure the links work, the ideas flow, and the text is logically placed)</td>
<td>Check spelling and grammar, dead links, pages without links, coherence, honest citation of sources (if used) and graphics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Your document needs to makes sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Make adjustments to the text, clusters or links)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consider different ways to connect your clusters &amp; Create Reader Map</strong></td>
<td><strong>The thought behind your links.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(What other ways can my reader navigate through the document? Does it change the purpose or the message? Should I change, add or delete links?</td>
<td><strong>The readability of your text.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Your attention to the needs and expectations of your audience.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The agreement between the pages (unified look, ease of navigation, consistent voice and tone).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mega-Cluster</strong></td>
<td><strong>Our document needs to makes sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Each group’s cluster chart on classroom blackboard, make connections, edit out duplication, collaborate to make global revision, revise on Wiki, publish to Web)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Will we simply link one page of our document to the next (like an electronic page turn) or will we offer our readers a new way of reading our work, perhaps by linking all our pages creatively from our introduction, or by offering multiple choices to our audience at different stages along the way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective Essay: <em>To Link or Not to Link, That Is the Question</em></th>
<th>Everyone</th>
<th>Give 3 examples from this assignment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explain why you made the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essay length: 3-5 pages, double-spaced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic Treatment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proofreading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments/Notes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group Literacy Project Rationale

While this hypertext assignment explains how to make a linked document, it focuses on helping students learn about literacy. Students will take their individual essays, segment them for group work, create cluster maps for their ideas, and then make a discovery draft to be used for a class global editing project. While it might sound complicated, it's really not. Students will find different ways to use links, identify different ideas about literacy within the class, and explore how different kinds of literacy relate to and with each other. Hypertext is a tool for teaching fundamental writing skills such as clustering, revising, editing, connecting and sequencing ideas. Pedagogical questions include: What are the critical decisions made by writers when adding hyperlinks? Why is the Wiki a good technology tool for a hypertext writing assignment?

Hypertext is ubiquitous. Students are accustomed to navigating web pages and crawling social networking sites. Everyone sees links, clicks on links, uses links. However, writing hypertext can teach, clarify, reinforce, and deepen many fundamental writing skills, and in the process, have students learn close reading, heuristic writing, and critical thinking skills which will enable them to acquire knowledge and comprehend course content material. How do writing teachers foster this transformational learning in their students? And how do writing teachers teach students to be better readers, writers, and thinkers?

Sibylle Gruber of Northern Arizona University believes that “the design of hypertext documents encourages students to create pieces that move beyond the essay format and that incorporate text, graphics, links, and sound. Furthermore, students’ engagement with the production of their own documents moves them from being passive receivers of Web information to becoming critical creators of such documents, evaluating the value of Web pages by carefully looking at the content, the appeal to the reader, and the use of nontextual materials. Additionally, the publication of hypertext documents moves the readership beyond the classroom” (as cited in Kellen, 2002, p. 122). Links, therefore, seem to be a powerful and facile tool for teaching process writing.

Purpose and Context of the Hypertext Literacy Assignment

For this assignment, students will learn how to make a linked document. While there are lots of ways to do this, they’ll use Word and the class Wiki. In groups, they’ll weave together several ideas about literacy, and then combine them as a class until they’ve created one unified belief. Then, they’ll post it on the class Wiki and invite other people around the world to respond to their ideas and share their own.

Since they have already listened to examples of the NPR program I Believe and written their own personal essays about literacy, they know what they believe as individuals. This project will transform students understanding of literacy—first as an individual and then as a group and then as a whole class—and deepen their understanding of process writing. I intentionally chose the topic of literacy to broaden student thinking about why being well-educated is important and what role literacy plays in society. I considered this quote when selecting the topic for this hypertext assignment:
"Literacy arouses hopes, not only in society as a whole but also in the individual who is striving for fulfillment, happiness and personal benefit by learning how to read and write. Literacy... means far more than learning how to read and write... The aim is to transmit... knowledge and promote social participation."

- UNESCO Institute for Education, Hamburg, Germany

**Writing With Hypertext**

- Develop a basic understanding of writing with links
- Develop a basic understanding of a Wiki as an authoring/co-authoring tool
- Make clusters
- Organize clusters into chart
- Set links
- Review text, clusters, and cluster charts for unity, coherence, and clarity
- Revise and Edit
- Consider different ways to connect clusters & Create Reader Map

**Why Constructive Hypertext? Why Wiki?**

1. The sample assignment creates a linked document about literacy which has students weave together their individual essays about literacy into a group document by working collaboratively to make group editing decisions, organize and connect ideas about literacy, and explore the use of links. Merging individual essays into a group discovery draft which must be globally revised and then segmented into discrete web pages which can be linked, teaches students process writing skills such as planning, drafting, revising, organizing, cutting repetition, information flow, and voice. The final class linked document demonstrates how to repeat the writing process and move from an individual to a group perspective where many voices can be heard. Students learn how to create a complex reader experience by connecting Wiki pages in a fashion.

2. Because linked documents can be written in classrooms with and without internet access, it is a flexible tool. Word processing programs feature linking options which make it simple to create links internally between files on a computer or even within a document so we don’t need the internet in order to use them. A connection to the Internet increases the number of technology tools available for teaching and experimenting with writing linked documents, but is not necessary in order to reap the benefits.

3. I chose to use the Wiki technology because it is a basic webpage with an edit button, has simple hyperlink feature, and easy-to-use upload/download features for incorporating multimedia. Additionally, students are able to collaborate. The history feature keeps track of all edits, so there is no need to save multiple drafts or revisions. All text changes are stored in the history of the Wiki document. Another benefit to using the Wiki is that students can each have their own page. All student material can be accessed from one location.

4. Links serve many different functions. Writing with links gives students a deeper and more complex understanding of the subject area. For example, the sample assignment will transform students understanding of literacy—first as an individual and then as a group and then as a whole class. When students segment, combine, cluster, link, and search for global relations between ideas, they will deepen their understanding of literacy—or any subject. Students develop a web of understanding that is not linear.
The student writer develops a more sophisticated awareness of audience. Writing with links deliberately shifts control from the writer to the reader because the writer is giving the reader control as to how to read the writing. This fosters close reading, substantive writing, and critical thinking.

Assessing the Hypertext Literacy Assignment

The assessment of a linked document requires the evaluator to determine how effective the writer was in making rhetorical choices: relaying his/her purpose, understanding his/her audience, effectively presenting the topic, understanding the context for writing and the culture from which s/he is writing. If traditional compositions are evaluated on focus, development, analysis, and clarity, then linked documents can be evaluated using the same criteria. Questions seem to arise with regard to evaluating design elements. My approach to assessing design elements is to determine their appropriateness/effectiveness in mirroring the message of the text. For example, if the topic is about music literacy, an appropriate/effective multimodal rhetorical choice would be a music clip, podcast, or some other type of audio file embedded into the composition. A less appropriate/effective rhetorical choice would be a photograph of the person playing the music, or staff of the music sheet. Of course, there are always exceptions.

Assessment of this literacy hypertext assignment will include focus, development, analysis, organization, topic treatment, mechanics, proofreading, peer review, revision improvement, with the addition of effectiveness/appropriateness of design elements. This last criterion will measure the effectiveness and/or appropriateness of the design elements, not the design elements themselves.
Appendix C

Sample syllabus for a FYC literary study course with three sample assignments included
ENWR College Writing II: Writing and Literary Study

Section: _____

Instructor: Dawn Moore
Office Room/Phone/Office Hours: moored5@mail.montclair.edu

English Department Web Site: http://www.montclair.english.edu

Required Books


Course Requirements and Explanation of Requirements

Class Participation, In-Class Writing, Homework, Wiki and Activities (20%)

1. I expect you to show up for every class and to be on time. However, life happens. If extraordinary circumstances arise, communicate with me. More than three absences will lower your final grade.
2. I expect you to come to class prepared. This means read the reading, engage in discussions, listen attentively, participate in peer review, and to read from your own writing occasionally.
3. I will assign in-class and out-of-class writing.

Papers (60%)
Four essays and one documented essay

Portfolio and Wiki Project (20%)
The class literary wiki will function as a cumulative individual and collaborative writing tool where you will post many of your out-of-class writing assignments. You will create an individual page from which you will create links to various writing assignments. In this sense, it will serve as a personal portfolio. The wiki will also function as an environment for collaborative writing and peer review.

Course Aims:
This course serves two primary purposes.

1. **It is a writing course.** It has been designed to help you improve your academic writing skills. Emphasis is on developing focused, analytical and clearly written essays. Writing is process. This means you will write multiple drafts, make significant revisions, review works-in-progress with your peers and develop methods for critiquing, editing and proofreading. You will also develop your abilities to summarize, paraphrase, evaluate sources, cite in the most current MLA style, and incorporate quotes as you learn to write about literature.

2. **This is a literature course.** It has been designed to help you improve your abilities to respond to, interpret, and analyze complex literary works and to appreciate literature as both art and representation. In other words, this course aims to help you develop your abilities to read, write and think critically about literature. You will develop your abilities to interpret these literary texts in the social, cultural, historical and political contexts in which they are written and read. We will explore the material contexts in which the literature we study has been produced, circulated, and received by the public. Throughout the course, I will ask you to consider the role of literature and how it functions in individuals' lives, in school, and in the culture at large.

**What You Can Expect:**

1. To read approximately 50-75 pages per week across an array of literature including the genres of poetry, drama, and short fiction.

2. To study a diverse selection of texts in five thematic units of 2 to 3 weeks each beginning with the reading, followed by a sequence of essay drafts, and concluding with a final essay, due at the end of the each unit.

3. To develop your critical reading, writing, thinking, and interpretive skills through out-of-class and in-class activities.

4. To receive feedback on your writing from peers and from me with the intent that you will revise your work based on this feedback.

5. To write 6,000 words or more of formal writing.

**Essay Criteria**

**Focus:** What is the main point of your paper? Your ideas must be clear in your own mind before they will be clear in writing. A focused paper is coherent and cohesive from the beginning, in the middle, and through the end. Deftly handled transitions link where your argument is headed from each point you make. All points should connect with your main argument in a logical sequence.
Development: How is your paper organized? What is the logical sequence of ideas? The textual evidence you present needs to prove your main point. Your main point is substantiated by thoughtful analysis. Effective arguments generally include in-depth discussion of significant points and reasonable—persuasive—treatment of the texts and ideas under discussion.

Analysis: Engage with the texts and ideas under discussion. Analysis is the work of explaining what statements or ideas mean - it is the work of interpretation, of making meaning out of statements, evidence, and ideas. Anticipate questions your readers may ask, such as, 'Why do you say/think that? Why do you say/think that and not this?'

Clarity: Does your paper make sense? Papers need to make connections between ideas, sections, paragraphs, and sentences. Word choice is important. The mechanics of correctness and the appropriate use of language and grammar contribute not only to overall clarity but to the success of the essay. Anticipate a reader asking, "What do you mean by that?"

Sample Guiding Questions for Your Reading:

- How do the writers' portrayals of life, culture, history, individuals, and common phenomena match up with your own sense of them?
- What are the aesthetic qualities of the text? What are the identifiable techniques the writer has employed? In what ways are these techniques similar or different to those used by other writers?
- What role does the writer's identity (e.g., race, class, gender, nationality, sexual orientation, etc.) and the writer's location (e.g., in history, within literary periods, geographically) play in determining topic, style, and perspective? More generally, does the writer's identity and location matter?
- Why am I reading this piece of literature? What can I gain from the study of literary texts? How does literature function in society? What is the role of literature and interpretation in our society? What ought it to be?

The Center for Writing Excellence: Located in Sprague Library, you are encouraged to take advantage of the expertise of trained graduate assistants who offer students free tutoring on all aspects of the writing process. Students are encouraged to schedule appointments at http://www.montclair.edu/cwe/, but drop-in hours are also available.
Academic Honesty and Plagiarism:
Definition of Plagiarism (from Student Handbook)
"Plagiarism means the use of another's words as if they were your own, and the
unacknowledged incorporation of those words in one's own work offered for credit.
The following guidelines for written work will assist the student in avoiding
plagiarism:

a) General indebtedness for background information and data is
acknowledged by inclusion of a bibliography of all works consulted.
b) Specific indebtedness for a particular idea, or for a quotation of four or
more words from another text, is acknowledged by footnote reference to
the actual source. Quotations of 4-5 words or more from a text are
indicated by the use of quotation marks."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Class One</th>
<th>Class Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Unit 1</td>
<td>The Literature in the Classroom Debate</td>
<td>How to Read Closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>Introduction to class wiki, accept invitations to join, create individual pages. Read Emily Dickinson, “There is no Frigate Like a Book”</td>
<td>Discuss personal writing assignment. Discuss readings. Discuss role of literature for a civil society, for schools, for students. Introduce Lindemann article.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Homework Writing 1 & 2 | Create a personal wiki page | Read: “The Theory” (pp. 4-12) in *The Thinker’s Guide to How to Write a Paragraph*  
Read: Chapter 2 (pp. 16-32) in *Making Literature Matter*  
Read: “No Place for Literature” by Erika Lindemann | Write: Create a new wiki page from your personal wiki page and write a 350-500 word response to Lindemann’s article.  
Write: Create a new wiki page from your personal wiki page and write a 350-500 word response to the question: “How does literature help you figure out how to live? Or as Tate says 'that is, how to vote and love and survive, how to respond to change and diversity and death and oppression and...” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Class One</th>
<th>Class Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Class</strong></td>
<td>Discuss personal writing assignment. Stage Tate/Lindemann debate.</td>
<td>Peer Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homework</strong> Essay 1</td>
<td><strong>Write:</strong> A 2-3 page double-spaced, typed draft on your response to the Tate/Lindemann debate. Put the two texts in conversation with each other and state your position on the issue in which you clearly identify your focus, cohesively develop your point(s), and provide an analysis of the texts under consideration in a cogent manner. Include at least one reference to each article. <strong>Post:</strong> Create and link a new wiki page from your personal wiki page and post your draft.</td>
<td>Rewrite essay based upon peer comments and your own re-thinking. Bring for submission 1) your paper AND 2) peer comments, 3) your first draft, and 4) any notes you have taken. Papers that do not include all drafts and notes will not be accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Class One</th>
<th>Class Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Class</strong></td>
<td>Collect essays.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homework</strong> Writing 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td><strong>Read:</strong> Chapter 3 (pp. 33-58) in Making Literature Matter <strong>Read:</strong> Tobias Wolff's &quot;The Rich Brother&quot;</td>
<td><strong>Read:</strong> &quot;The Practice&quot; (pp. 13-20) in The Thinker's Guide to How to Write a Paragraph <strong>Read:</strong> Herman Melville's &quot;The Paradise of Bachelors and the Tartarus of Maids&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(305) and James Baldwin's "Sonny's Blues" (318).

**Write:** Create and link a new wiki page from your personal wiki page and write a 350-500 word response to one of the following:

1) Explain which brother you sympathize with—Donald or Pete. Give reasons for your response, including, perhaps, reasons why you might be personally inclined to take one brother's side over the other. Or,

2) Explain who you sympathize with: Sonny or the older brother? Give reasons for your response from the text, and also from your own personal thinking.

(posted on wiki or found online at http://chss.montclair.edu/english/furr/ij21/par.tar.html)

**Write:** Create and link a new wiki page from your personal wiki page and write a 350-500 word response to the question “How does Melville use the backdrop of industrialization in the mid-19th century to question class divisions and the power relations within them?”

Using the Discussion feature of the wiki, comment on three peer wiki pages about Wolff/Baldwin:

1) Comment on what stood out to you in the writer’s response;
2) What idea you would like to hear more about; and
3) Cite one quote from the story which you feel speaks to what the writer is saying. (Please do not use the same quote for each peer.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Class One</th>
<th>Class Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Class</strong></td>
<td><strong>In-class writing:</strong> Paraphrase activity</td>
<td><strong>In-class writing:</strong> Paraphrase activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss the reading and personal writing exercise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homework</strong></td>
<td><strong>Read:</strong> “The Practice” (pp. 20-24) in <em>The Thinker’s Guide to How to Write a Paragraph</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Class One</td>
<td>Class Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>In-class writing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paraphrase activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read: “The Practice” (pp. 25-32) in <em>The Thinker’s Guide to How to Write a Paragraph</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>Class One</td>
<td>Class Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read: “The Practice” (pp. 33-39) in <em>The Thinker’s Guide to How to Write a Paragraph</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>Class One</td>
<td>Class Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read: “The Practice” (pp. 39-51) in <em>The Thinker’s Guide to How to Write a Paragraph</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>Class One</td>
<td>Class Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td>Class One</td>
<td>Class Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td>Class One</td>
<td>Class Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Raisin in the Sun</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin reading Lorraine Hansberry’s A Raisin in the Sun (433-473).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Write:** Create and link a new wiki page from your personal wiki page and write a 350-500 word response to questions TBA on the first half of the play.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Class One</th>
<th>Class Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class One</strong></td>
<td><em>A Raisin in the Sun</em></td>
<td><em>A Raisin in the Sun</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Class</strong></td>
<td>Discussion of homework and play. As a class explore “A Web Assignment” (521), as well as scholarly articles about the play. Discuss the context of the play: 1) Historical, 2) cultural, and 3) gender, race, ethnicity, and class. Discuss student interest levels for each. Separate into groups/pods and work to research content to add to wiki in your assigned context. Create and link a new wiki page from the wiki Home page for your group/pod.</td>
<td>Discussion of homework and end of play. As a class explore “A Web Assignment” (521), as well as scholarly articles about the play. Discuss annotated bibliography. Continue doing research in pods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homework</strong></td>
<td>Finish reading <em>A Raisin in the Sun</em> (473-502) <strong>Write:</strong> Create and link a new wiki page from your pod’s wiki page and begin researching and compiling links for your context area. Write a 150 word summary of the</td>
<td><strong>Write:</strong> Find, read, and write a 350-500 synopsis of a scholarly article about “A Raisin in the Sun” from the MSU database. Create and link a new wiki page from your personal wiki page and post your synopsis. <strong>Write:</strong> An annotate bibliography entry in MLA format about the scholarly article about which you just wrote. Post your entry and upload a PDF copy of the article under Annotated Bibliography on the class wiki.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12</td>
<td>Class One</td>
<td>Class Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>Discuss the wiki and the information currently on it. Discuss possible connections amongst the content on the wiki. Discuss strategies for linking content nodes. Work in pods to discuss how to link pod node to other nodes on <em>A Raisin in the Sun Project</em> wiki. Working in the same pods which researched the content for each node, peer review each other’s pages. Click through each page making sure the links work, the ideas flow, and the text is logically placed. Check spelling and grammar, dead links, pages without links, coherence, honest citation of sources (if used) and graphics. Consider how you present the information on each of your pages. Reformat text (i.e. create shorter</td>
<td>Each node within the wiki needs to be cohesive and coherent. Working in the same pods which researched the content for each node, decide what your first page will contain so that it functions as an introduction to the node. Select sentences from each individual’s page(s) to use on the group’s node landing page and then collaboratively write a summary which combines ideas and expresses the overall meaning of your node discussion. Use the “Discussion” feature of the wiki to collaborate about the summary and a navigation map. Set links as appropriate. Begin discussion of documented essay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
paragraphs or sentences, create wider margins, use indentations, bullets, etc.) to help your audience read the text easily on the page.

Your document needs to make sense. Think clarity, coherence and cohesiveness. Make adjustments to the text, nodes, graphics and/or links. Write, rewrite, cut or edit sections of your text in order to clarify the meaning of your discussion.

Focus your attention on the needs and expectations of your readers. You do not necessarily know your reader’s purpose for visiting the wiki. Research has shown that when readers revisit the same material in different and flexible ways, they can process the information better. Therefore, the thought behind your links, the agreement between the pages (unified look, ease of navigation, consistent voice and tone, and the ease with which a reader can navigate your text will affect their experience
on the wiki.

Include a navigation route or semantic cues for your page(s) and to the other pages in the wiki. Consider what effects the placement of links will have on how readers navigate through the document. Does it change the purpose or the message? Change, add or delete links as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homework</th>
<th><strong>Write</strong>: A summary detailing the content on the page(s) you created for your group’s node. Include several sentences indicating how the contents of your page fit in with the other pages in your group’s node. Write a paragraph demonstrating why your page is relevant to the novel <em>A Raisin in the Sun</em>. As you compose, consider how readers will process the information on your page. Write sentences and paragraphs which relate the content of your page in a clear and cohesive way.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chose which words or <em><em>The <em>A Raisin in the Sun</em> Project</em> wiki as a whole needs to be cohesive and coherent. Use the “Discussion” feature of the wiki to collaborate about the summary and a navigation map. Decide what the Home page will contain so that it functions as an introduction to the entire wiki discussion. Select sentences from each group’s node landing page summary to use on the wiki Home page and collaboratively write the summary for the wiki Home page. Set links as appropriate.</em>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Write</strong>: A 3-4 page rough draft of an essay on <em>A Raisin in the Sun</em>. Essay topic: <em>What issues do you think still need to be addressed to ensure equality among different groups of people? In what ways is this 1959 play relevant to life in the United States today?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
phrases will function as semantic links to connect your pages with each other and the other pages in the *A Raisin in the Sun Project* wiki and then create hyperlinks. Reflect before you make the decision: *To Link or Not to Link, That Is the Question.* Links are the primary navigation tools which offer your readers ways of reading your work and the *A Raisin in the Sun Project* wiki as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 13</th>
<th>Class One</th>
<th>Class Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Raisin in the Sun Documented Essay</strong></td>
<td><strong>A Raisin in the Sun Documented Essay</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Class</strong></td>
<td>Peer Review and discussion of appropriate documentation.</td>
<td>Peer Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homework</strong></td>
<td><strong>Write</strong>: A mid-process draft of your essay in light of what you have just read in class. It should be at least 50% different than your rough draft. Incorporate at least three sources into your new draft.</td>
<td><strong>Write</strong>: Final Copy with rough draft, mid-process, peer review, and any notes you have taken. Papers that do not include all drafts and notes will not be accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks 14 &amp; 15</th>
<th>Wiki Project and Portfolio Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Class/Homework</strong></td>
<td>The Wiki Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Throughout the semester, we have been writing on the wiki. Make</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| sure all of your work is complete and organized.  

* Portfolio is due on Final Exam Day |
Sample Assignment 1: Texts in Conversation

One of the writing assignments I have designed for use with the educational class wiki is a three-class-period project which has students read and then write on the wiki in preparation for their first formal essay assignment. For homework, students read “A Place for Literature in Freshman Composition” by Gary Tate which I have posted on class wiki. They are then asked to create and link a new wiki page from their personal wiki page and write a 350-500 word response to the question: “How does literature help you figure out how to live? Or as Tate says ‘that is, how to vote and love and survive, how to respond to change and diversity and death and oppression and freedom.’” During class one, we discuss the readings, student personal writing assignments, and the role of literature for a civil society, for schools, and for students. For homework, students read “No Place for Literature” by Erika Lindemann. After which they create and link a new wiki page from their personal wiki page and write a 350-500 word response to Lindemann’s article. During class two, we discuss student personal writing assignments, and after which student will stage a Tate/Lindemann debate. For homework, students write a 2-3 page double-spaced, typed draft on their response to the Tate/Lindemann debate in which they are asked to put the two texts in conversation with each other. They must state their position on the issue, clearly identifying their focus, while cohesively developing their point(s), by providing an analysis of the texts under consideration in a cogent manner. They must include at least one reference to each article. They will create and link a new wiki page from their personal wiki page and post their draft. They must bring four copies of their first draft to class. Class three is for Peer Review. Then for homework, students must rewrite the essay based upon peer comments and their own re-thinking. They must bring for submission the final copy of their paper, peer comments, their first draft, and any notes they may have taken. By stating that “papers that do not include all drafts and notes will not be accepted,” I am expecting original work.

Rationale: This assignment has students practice techniques for planning, organizing, drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading during defined stages of the writing process. Students also engage in close reading and critical thinking about opposing views of a current academic issue. They then have to synthesize the arguments by Tate and Lindemann, chose a position, and write a persuasive essay backed by textual evidence. By engaging in peer review, students will practice, and hopefully, improve as constructive commentators on texts written by peers. The topic of the first essay encourages students to inquire into commonly expressed concerns about literature and literary study through the use of two non-fiction texts—academic journal articles.
Sample Assignment 2: Text-to-text Reflection and Response

One of the writing assignments I have designed for use with the educational class wiki has students read Tobias Wolff's "The Rich Brother" and James Baldwin's "Sonny’s Blues". The first part of the writing assignment has them create and link a new wiki page from their personal wiki page and write a 350-500 word response to one of the following:

1) Explain which brother you sympathize with—Donald or Pete. Give reasons for your response, including, perhaps, reasons why you might be personally inclined to take one brother's side over the other. Or,

2) Explain who you sympathize with: Sonny or the older brother? Students are required to give reasons for their response from the text, and also from your’re their own personal thinking.

After some discussion the next class period, for homework, the students must use the Discussion feature of the wiki and comment on three peer wiki pages about Wolff/Baldwin:

1) Comment on what stood out to you in the writer’s response; and
2) What idea you would like to hear more about; and
3) How you think the writer could improve the draft.

Additionally, students must cite one quote from the story which they feel speaks to what the writer is saying. (They cannot use the same quote for each peer.)

Rationale: This assignment has students engage with two literary works, read closely, and begin to understand how their interpretations reflect their knowledge, values, experience, and political and cultural orientations by thinking critically about the two literary texts. By engaging in peer review, students will practice, and hopefully, improve as constructive commentators on texts written by peers.
Sample Assignment 3: The Documented Essay “A Raisin in the Sun”

While there are additional parts to this assignment, the documented essay is the priority writing assignment. The students will use the play by Lorraine Hansberry, “A Raisin in the Sun” as the basis for their research, collaborative writing on the wiki, annotated bibliography entry, and their formal documented essay. The unit will take seven class periods to complete.

In class 1, we will discuss the context of the play: 1) historical, 2) cultural, and 3) gender, race, ethnicity, and class. After determining student interest levels for each context, they will separate into groups/pods and work to research content to add to the wiki in their assigned context area. They will create and link a new wiki page from the wiki Home page for their group/pod. For homework, students will create and link a new wiki page from their pod’s wiki page and begin researching, compiling links for their context area, and creating new pages as necessary. They will write a 150 word summary of the research they found regarding the context of the play for their pod.

In class 2, we will explore “A Web Assignment,” as well as, scholarly articles about the play. We will discuss the annotated bibliography and continue doing research in pods.

In class 3, we will discuss the wiki and the information currently on it. Discuss possible connections amongst the content pages on the wiki. Discuss strategies for linking content nodes. Work in pods to discuss how to link pod node to other nodes on A Raisin in the Sun Project wiki. Working in the same pods which researched the content for each node, students will peer review each other’s pages. Students will revise the text, nodes, graphics and/or links in order to clarify the meaning of the overall A Raisin in the Sun Project wiki discussion. They will focus attention on the anticipated needs and expectations of their readers. Students will include a navigation route or semantic cues for their page(s) and to the other pages in the wiki. They will consider what effects the placement of links will have on how readers navigate through the document and make changes, additions or deletions to links as necessary. For homework, students will write a summary detailing the content on the page(s) they created for their group’s node. This summary will include several sentences indicating how the contents of their pages fit in with the other pages in their group’s node. Students will chose which words or phrases will function as semantic links to connect their pages with each other and the other pages in the A Raisin in the Sun Project wiki by creating hyperlinks. Additionally, students will write a paragraph demonstrating why their page is relevant to the novel A Raisin in the Sun.

In class 4, students will work on cohesiveness and coherency within the nodes and in the larger structure of the A Raisin in the Sun Project wiki. Working in the same pods which researched the content for each node, students will decide what the first page of their node will contain so that it functions as an introduction to the node. They will select sentences from each individual’s page(s) to use on the group’s node landing page and then collaboratively write a summary which combines ideas and expresses the overall meaning of their node discussion. Students will use the “Discussion” feature of the wiki to collaborate about the summary and a navigation map. They will set links as appropriate. Near the end of this class, we will begin discussion of documented essay. For homework, students will collaboratively write the home page summary for the A
Raisin in the Sun Project wiki by using the “Discussion” feature of the wiki. Additionally, they will write a 3-4 page rough draft of an essay on A Raisin in the Sun on the topic: “What issues do you think still need to be addressed to ensure equality among different groups of people? In what ways is this 1959 play relevant to life in the United States today?”

Classes 5 and 6 will be for peer review because students are required to write a mid-process draft.

**Rationale:** The documented essay is a formal writing assignment in which students will demonstrate their ability to write a clearly focused, interpretive, analytical essay about the literary work *A Raisin in the Sun*. They will base their essays on textual evidence as well as the collaborative research posted to the *A Raisin in the Sun Project* wiki and use the techniques for process writing (planning, organizing, drafting, revision, editing, proofreading). By this time, they should be competent, as well as, constructive commentators on texts written by peers. By writing nodes on the wiki to accommodate multiple reader perspectives, students will have engaged in associative reasoning, critical thinking, substantive writing, and close reading. They will be familiar with the various historical, cultural, and race/ethnicity/gender/class contexts which inform the novel and their interpretations. By this point, students will understand why all interpretations reflect the knowledge, values, experience, and political and cultural orientations of the interpreters; and, students will be able to frame arguments accordingly.