Michigan
Technological
University
1885

Michigan Technological University

# Digital Commons @ Michigan Tech

Dissertations, Master's Theses and Master's Reports

2018

# Articulating Digital Archival Practice Within Writing Program Administration: A Theoretical Framework

Amanda Girard
*Michigan Technological University*, akgirard@mtu.edu

ARTICULATING DIGITAL ARCHIVAL PRACTICE WITHIN WRITING PROGRAM
ADMINISTRATION: A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK


By

Amanda K. Girard




A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In Rhetoric, Theory and Culture


MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

2018

This dissertation has been approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in Rhetoric, Theory and Culture.

Department of Humanities

Dissertation Advisor: *Karla Saari Kitalong*

Committee Member: *Robert R. Johnson*

Committee Member: *Stefka Hristova*

Committee Member: *John Irwin*

Department Chair: *Ronald Strickland*

# Table of Contents

# List of tables

# List of abbreviations

Arizona State University (ASU)

Boise State University (BSU)

California Digital Library (CDL)

Colorado State University (CSU)

Council of Writing Program Administration (CWPA)

Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives (DALN)

Digital Humanities (DH)

Family Educational Rights and Privacy Acts (FERPA)

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Learning Information Literacy Across the Curriculum (LILAC)

National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)

Research Aloud Protocol (RAP)

The WPA-L Listserv (WPA listserv)

University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR)

Writing Program Administrator (WPA)

Writing Studies Tree (WST)

# Abstract

Throughout Writing Program Administration scholarship there has been a clear call for archivization and archival work. This dissertation project takes an interdisciplinary approach to digital archival practices for Writing Program Administrators to consider and employ in their home institutions. While I recognize that WPAs are not typically identified as "archivists," I situate the digital archive within the digital humanities as an interdisciplinary, collaborative project and offer suggestions that lead to recommendations for making an institutional archive. I review archival practice in order to justify the digital archive as an appropriate vehicle for WPAs' work. Further, I argue that the digital archive must be useable and, therefore, consider other commonly used composition studies archives for their usability. Overall, my dissertation seeks to define digital archival practice for WPAs in order to inspire other educators to take up this meaningful, historical work.

# 1 Writing Program Administrators: The Interdisciplinary Makers of the Archive

"A … concrete definition of interdiscipline is where two or more disciplines combine to create new disciplinary formations in the pursuit of solving problems associated with the fields involved, as an intellectual working space where various forms of knowledge are brought forward in a mutually respected manner for the purpose of creating new knowledge. Further, an interdiscipline strives to bring new knowledge to the world where it can be applied in such arenas as decision making, policy creation, methodological formation, design processes, and other venues."

--Bob Johnson, "Craft Knowledge: Of Disciplinarity in Writing Studies"

Writing studies is often seen as an interdiscipline because of Writing Across the Curriculum, Writing in the Disciplines, Communication across the Curriculum, and other movements that currently and historically have swept across campuses to bring writing into all classrooms and accessible to all college students. However, writing studies encompasses much more than just student writing. The administrators who create writing programs are often housed in departments ranging from the humanities to technical communication—and may even be individuals who aid departments, like Computer Science or Mechanical Engineering, to incorporate writing into classrooms. The actual implementation of goals, such as those established by the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), must be carefully thought out and appropriate resources must be negotiated. In this same vein, Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) have created a clear call for writing studies

archives that would not only preserve the history of writing programs, but would also map the policies, theories, and decisions that were made in order to make these programs possible. In order to create or update these archives and "bring new knowledge to the world" WPAs must work interdisciplinarily (Johnson 682). Using theories from the digital humanities and library science, WPAs have the experience working across campuses and disciplines to create and maintain digital archives.

The development of the digital humanities further exemplifies the concept of interdisciplinarity. Initially established by computer science, but with a recognized need for rhetoricians, the complicated history of developing and defining the digital humanities makes it understandable to writing studies scholars because composition and rhetoric, as a discipline, developed quickly from a recognized need within open enrollment universities. The parallels between the development of these two disciplines make the possibility of "new disciplinary formations in the pursuit of solving problems" possible through the practice of collaboration (Johnson 682). In this case, I argue that writing studies work with the digital humanities in order to answer the call for WPA archives in a digital, usable way.

As writing studies scholars, many of us have come from English studies, Literature, Composition, Rhetoric, and an ongoing list of disciplines and majors that have been titled and categorized within academic institutions. David Gold points out that "rhetoric and composition historiography faces two primary challenges *integration* and *fragmentation"* when mapping our scholarship as a newly recognized discipline (17). The history of writing studies challenges and changes the narrative of previously recognized

scholarship. Although many have worked hard to establish our preexisting place as a discipline, interdisciplinarity is still key to our success.

Similarly, the digital humanities continues to develop as a young, collaborative field. Part I of Matthew Gold's *Debates in the Digital Humanities* grapples with defining the discipline. In his essay, Matthew Kirschenbaum asserts that:

> Whatever else it might be, then, the digital humanities today is about a scholarship (and a pedagogy) that is publicly visible in ways to which we are generally unaccustomed, a scholarship and pedagogy that are bound up with infrastructure in ways that are deeper and more explicit than we are generally accustomed to, a scholarship and pedagogy that are collaborative and depend on networks of people and that live an active, 24-7 life online.

Writing studies is accustomed to be bound up with "scholarship (and a pedagogy)" that is forward facing and collaborative. The digital humanities, which may be housed in English departments, also experiences tension between those who feel digital media scholars should be making and those who believe they should be interpreting. Kathleen Fitzpatrick argues that the digital humanities relies on this tension and should seek both plurality and praxis. She notes that the digital humanities' "background in humanities computing typically, but far from exclusively, results in projects that focus on computing methods applicable to textual materials." She specifies that "some of these projects have been editorial and archival in nature, producing large-scale digital text collections for scholarly study." Fitzpatrick's understanding of the digital humanities applies directly to the call for the archive that has occurred in WPA scholarship.

Further, the digital humanities establishes that one no longer needs to be an "archivist," in a traditional information science sense, to establish an archive—a commonly expressed concern among WPAs. Writing Program Administration has constructed calls for archivization specifically to accomplish composition studies research. These calls for archivization have guided the "decision making" process for the creation of specific WPA archives (Johnson 682). WPAs are not archivists, as recognized by Ruth Mirtz, but we create archives. I argue that composition and institutional archives that represent histories of institutional writing programs and composition materials must be digital in order to fulfill the WPA call.

The digital archives created in response align with writing pedagogy and "policy creation" through technological means of disbursement addressed by digital humanities scholars, such as Marlene Manoff and Andrew Feenberg, which I review and discuss briefly later in this chapter. Further, I argue that the digital archive is marked by its usability and navigability, which involve "design processes" that I will review in relation to the physical archive.

The WPA call also asks for methodologies to navigate the archive to be integrated into composition pedagogy, but I focus on the call for creation in this dissertation. We search out archives that may have items that serve our research interests and teach our students to do the same, as described in the scholarship of Barbara L'Eplattenier. Additionally, Linda Ferreira-Buckley argues that archival training is necessary beyond a theoretical and philosophical basis in order to create revisionist histories. Throughout this chapter I will discuss how WPA archival scholarship seeks to rewrite these prescriptive histories, but only to outline the call for WPA created archives—not to address or analyze

the material itself. For instance, in Donahue and Moon's collection, *Local Histories,* Gold's work examines nineteenth-century school readers that challenge the myth about the origins of composition history by providing other historical views. While our work in the archives to describe writing studies history is an important part of WPA scholarship, and we each have developed personal investments and interests in our own archival scholarship, these interests have manifested in our work already.

Our interests may even be the exigency for the creation of new digital archives that are focused on a particular research topic or area of study, such as *Melville's Marginalia.* Moreover, these archives may reach a very particular set of scholars or be used in classroom activities, such as the wide reaching and well known Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives (DALN), but contain very specific material localized to a particular subject matter, as opposed to a particular institution. The different digital formations of global archives within writing studies as a discipline will be further explored in Chapter 3 to show how the WPA call for the archive is being met on a large scale. Chapter 4 will address the more localized WPA archive as a live digital space created and maintained for curricular development; however, I first consider the call for the creation of writing studies archives and how a WPA digital archive might be accomplished collaboratively. Although writing scholars cannot do it all, collaborating with the digital humanities and library science can lead to the digital archives that we desire, and through these collaborations, Johnson's creation of "new knowledge" is realized as we work through design, organization, and policy creation together, establishing the new norms of digital creation and archivization.

The "who" of archivization comes into question when there is an opportunity for integrating archivists, users, and open-source, online publishing. McKee and Porter point out that using internet resources is the norm and consider digital archives to include forms such as electronic databases, digital repositories, and listserv archives, as well as sites such as university servers and computer hard drives (716). While these are all familiar forms of organization, which I will explore further in future chapters, these forms have been re-realized through digital means for WPAs and the general public.

## 1.1   Communal Memory and the Living Archive

Digital archivization is the creation of communal memory, not only for WPAs, but for anyone with access to online mediums. Manovich, sees "a computer database [as] a new metaphor that we use to conceptualize individual and collective cultural memory" (214). While Mark Poster has specific views about databases and the creation of culture, as reviewed in the next chapter, Manovich sees a wider view of databases creating communal memory. But who gets to contribute to this communal memory? Digital humanists, Burdick et. al., authors of the MIT *Digital Humanities Reader,* recognize the importance of collaboration and community in the realm of public memory through archivization by asserting that:

> The Digital Humanities offers new challenges and possibilities for institutions of memory such as archives, libraries, and museums: process-based concepts of "living" archives of the present; approaches to conservation and preservation based upon multiplying (rather than restricting) access to the remains of the past; participatory models of content production, research, and curatorship bringing

together professional and citizen scholars in team-based projects that interpret the

cultural patrimony as a public good; augmented approaches to programming and

informal education that promise to expand traditional library and museum

audiences and bring scholarship into public view; and enhanced means for

vivifying and promoting active or experientially augmented modes of engagement

with both the past and the present. (47-48)

These authors also recognize that new, online and open-source environments

allow for living archives, which I understand as archives that continually change and

grow organically with different authors, audiences, and collaborators. Previous material

archives are housed on restricted sites, such as museums, colleges, and libraries, but, with

the onset of the internet, archives now become open to the general public in a way never

before experienced.

Ferreira-Buckley attributes the restriction of archives originally to the beginning

of the National Archives in revolutionary France and the English Public Records act,

which both managed public agencies and systematized these records in the early 1800s

(578). She notes that the formal institutionalization of records changed citizens' rights

because "access to archives thus democratized, historical writing was irrevocably

altered," although, "historical materials were open to competing interpretations as never

before" (578). History was originally democratic, although not participatory, in nature—

or thought to be based on access and literacy level. Access to the archive meant access to

history and the freedom of one's own interpretation. With the onset of digital mediums,

we are moving away from the privatization of historical record that can allow for more

interpretations of history or materials. But, as I examine this idea further, the democratization of historical information, it is not as simple as it may seem.

Andrew Feenberg sees technology as a limitless phenomenon that can be adapted to any socio-political and/or cultural means while recognizing that technology often objectifies its user. In his introduction to *Transforming Technology: A Critical Theory Revisited*, Feenberg applies Frankfurt school critical theory to current day technological advancement by challenging socio-political boundaries that attempt to keep technological developments categorized and classified—which he sees as limiting democratic notions of freedom. Feenberg first examines instrumental theory, or the idea that technology is a neutral tool. He further analyzes substantive theory, or the concept that technology is creating our socio-cultural phenomenon and that users of technology are being objectified by our own technological development. His goal is to illustrate the extent to which both theories rely on the concept that "technology is destiny." In so doing, he posits that both theories seek to create boundaries around technological advancement, implying that boundaries curtail technological advancement (8).

## 1.2   The Democratic Archive

Feenberg's ideas seem to resonate within discussions of the need for WPA curricular archives because the audience for such archives is typically adjunct faculty or graduate students who are learning to teach or modifying their pedagogies to the institution. The digital archive directed towards those who are teaching first year composition classes could shape the users' pedagogical goals by displaying what is valued by the WPA and/or what has been considered historically worthy of preservation

8

by the users or administrators. Archival practices of recognition can limit the audience's ability to find new ways of teaching because it provides a fixed construct that they have access to. Feenberg further asserts that the conclusions of the Frankfurt school critical theorists lead to the belief that "in choosing our technology we become what we are, which in turn shapes our future choices" (14). I take this assertion to mean that we are our technology and technology is not neutral. He sees "technology…not [as] a destiny but a scene of struggle," because of the objectification that technology promotes within the user (Feenberg 15).

The "struggle" for the WPA archivist lies in design. What is kept or left out shows the user what the WPA valued and becomes representational of the program itself. I see it as ethical considerations about representing the past values of the writing program and the current departmental goals in a mutually compatible way. Feenberg believes that we have human control over technology, therefore we can create equality; however, there are assumptions about technologies and values built into the systems. Tamar Chute, the archivist at Ohio State University, argues that outreach through college and university archives lends itself to the advancing technologies of web pages as exhibits and the digitization of materials through the opportunities for collaborative exhibits and information sharing (144-45). While many argue that digitizing archives and making them publicly available lends itself to a more democratic way of information sharing, the way information is presented and shared, including the technologies that preserve the information itself, can affect the information itself. I agree with Manoff that "digitization does not lead in any simple or straightforward way to the democratization of knowledge" (390).

Despite this more "democratic" approach to information, many theorists debate whether or not this is a good thing. Will a general public value and add to the work of those that are academically predisposed towards maintaining the communal historic memory?

In relation to the concept of the open-sourced WPA archive, materials should be made public in order to maintain the history, or memory, of the institution in regards to writing studies, and, perhaps, curricularly, to aid those who teach and create scholarly work based in historicity. Further, we must work as a interdisciplinary collective to create these archives. For example in the digital humanities:

> It is not uncommon for dozens of people to work on a … project, each contributing domain-specific expertise … a team of database developers and data management experts may come from a school of information sciences, while interface designers may come from the arts, content developers may come from history departments, and coders may come from the computational sciences. (Burdick et al. 49)

I agree that online authorship and many other worthwhile projects rely on collaboration, but the digital archive must have a caretaker, just as a material archive has always relied on a curator. Burdick et al. note that description of digital humanist collaboration includes that "each member of the team works with the technical lead and project director who collaboratively articulate the technical and functional specifications for the project" (49). In the instance of the WPA digital archive, a WPA may be just the person to fit the role of "project director." Rose asserts that "WPAs should retain intellectual control over [archival records]," and, perhaps, some of these records, because they are so specific to

the institution that collects and houses them, should have limited access. Rose outlines

"what constitutes archival records" and "some basic principles and approaches to archival

management," but does not address a digital archival environment. Digital archival

practice is historically based in materiality, which I will discuss further in Chapter 2,

often relying on the collaboration of authorship and maintenance involving design,

collection, and rhetorical context; which can only aid the WPA in the daunting task of

initiating an archive.

## 1.3    Who Makes the WPA Archive?

Although WPAs are not archivists, we are "makers." Johnson identifies "four

causes of making" relating to writing studies. He sees us as:

> Makers who know the materials of the trade…understand the forms of various
>
> genres and media through which the products are disseminated and
>
> communicated…[and] aware of the dual ends of the production process and then,
>
> as user/audience advocates and artisans interested in the ethical dimensions of
>
> their craft...work[ing] with knowledge of the greater and complicated ends of use.
>
> (Johnson 685)

Johnson recognizes that writing studies scholars have a rhetorical understanding of digital

communication that translates not only to an understanding of what needs to be done, but

who needs to do it and how these new projects, such as digital archives, need to be tested.

Burdick at al. characterize this role as a project manager. Moreover, Johnson also

considers the end user and possible audiences of a project in a rhetorical way. Because

we are makers of digital archival projects, WPAs must consider the use of said projects

and must assess their usability. To address the WPA as "maker," I review the WPA call for the archive that identifies curricular material, administrative knowledge, and institutional history as the main focuses of our exigency. I recognize that these "materials of the trade" have been kept as artifacts, either in file drawers, boxes, or even in on campus archives, usually in paper form previously, but call for these items to exist digitally or become digital for ease of use and dissemination.

WPAs then not only become "makers," but, often, users of archives. Additional audiences for these archives include adjunct faculty, graduate students learning to teach, undergraduate students, institutional and departmental administrators, information scientists, archivists, historians, and librarians. Further, the production of a digital humanities project, such as a digital archive involves, potentially, "dozens of 'authors'—ranging from professors and librarians to student programmers, interns, staff, and community members—who contributed to its development" (Burdick et al. 49). Sometimes large-scale projects are passed down or continue to be worked on by many "authors" for generations. Moreover, the audience often includes the author. Therefore, the audience must be kept in mind when determining the usability of such an archive and its many implications.

As makers, WPAs are familiar with the materials to be preserved in the archive and are concerned with the end use of the materials (Johnson). WPAs have established a call for creating the archive and continue to discuss what should be included. Shirley K. Rose, in her chapter, "Preserving Our Histories of Institutional Change" argues that "developing an effective records management program and establishing, developing, and preserving a program archive should be a priority for WPAs," especiaChally since,

"WPAs are uniquely qualified to undertake this significant cultural project" (107). Rose calls for a writing program archive that maintains records valuable to the university at every level including administration, staff and students. Rose's institutionally specific archive focuses on a writing program holistically, but would also work as a representation for the discipline within the university during different time periods. She asserts that the archive must have a mission statement in order to create record keeping goals. I assume that such institutional records will preserve writing program history, but, perhaps, not in a public or open-source way.

Furthering Rose's assertions, Ruth Mirtz, in "WPAs as Historians," asserts that, despite WPAs having little or no training as historians, archives are necessary for WPAs to understand the political and pedagogical evolution of their first-year writing programs. Her essay seeks to describe the kind of historical research a WPA does and how it helps the WPA develop or discover an identity for a first-year writing program by investigating the history and rationales for previous policies and practices within one's own institution. Unfortunately, the WPA may uncover only what was kept or published, also illustrating the values of the institution. Mirtz calls for the archive because "without a full and rich archive of past materials, every document that does exist about the first-year writing program in the past has to be examined for how it describes and inscribes the program in the department and the university" (123). Mirtz stresses the importance of including as many materials as possible in a first-year writing program archive. She sees the items included as definitive representations of, not only the program itself, but also the institution and the wider discipline of writing studies. Mirtz speaks directly to Johnson's "making" by considering what is included and how those materials affect the "production

process" for larger end goals relative to the university "with knowledge of the greater and complicated ends of use" (685). The things we write and teach our students to write are inscribed on the program and the larger scholarly community when properly kept in the archive.

While Mirtz is addressing the first year program WPA directly, other scholars join in the call with other considerations that bring to light the larger struggle of the WPA. L'Eplattenier calls for an archive that no longer "ignore[s] the administrative aspects of writing programs," but instead brings this administrative history to light and brings about a legitimacy to Rhetoric and Composition academic administration that has been previously seen as "nonintellectual service work for a service course unworthy of serious study or research" (131, 136). L'Eplattenier calls for more information about the history of Rhetoric and Composition as a discipline within our particular institutions. While Rose recognizes the need to include previous writing curriculum in an archive, L'Eplattenier calls for recognition of administrative documents, and Mirtz asks for a first year program archive that inscribes university practice. In "Archival Research in the Field of Rhetoric and Composition," L'Eplattenier and Lisa S. Mastrangelo argue that "we are often told that our histories must do something…they must connect somehow to current teaching practices or current interests in the field," seemingly asking for a history that not only alights curriculum, but how those materials are put into practice as influenced by theory, scholarship, and actual instruction. Mirtz asserts that the archive automatically will fulfill a role within the university as definitive. However, archives traditionally do not provide context for research, but, rather, the materials that a researcher might be searching for. The WPA as archivist does not need to contextualize all of the materials or their usage

patterns in the archive, but should focus on accurate record keeping. If future researchers wish to contextualize archived curriculum, student documents, or administrative information then they must do so themselves with the materials provided. Archives all come with the freedom to interpret.

## 1.4   The Ethics of the Archive

The WPA and other makers, while working on the archive, must consider Johnson's consideration of the "ethical dimensions" involved with making. While Rose, L'Eplattenier, and Mirtz call for the artifacts of administrative practices to become archived, Gretchen Moon comments that "among the artifacts that memorialize a college's life, teachers' assignments and students' writing are strangely rare" (7). L'Eplattenier notes that the curricular archive exists, but what does this archive consist of? Typically, the WPA will help to maintain a curricular archive for graduate students, adjunct faculty, and others teaching writing, but rarely does this archive include actual student work. Moon believes that the missing curricular records within our institutions could inhabit a WPA archive together with students' responses.

McKee and Porter question the ownership of student work, whether from the 1980s or the 1880s, as an ethical question claiming that "those papers are also people" and pointing out the ways that traditional archives have been formed through deliberate accessioning as opposed to the WPA archives that might happen to include student work (60). With copyright legalities and FERPA, student responses are unlikely to exist in an open-sourced, digital archive. Even institutionally held archives with restricted access may not have IRB approval to harbor student work. While administrative details may also

be called for in a WPA archive, the plausibility of this archive being open-sourced

becomes narrow, because a lot could be detailed about a university program that is

typically kept private. Rose also addresses the availability and overseeing of the archive

when she states:

> The administrator/archivist is expected to make politically informed decisions in
>
> developing a plan for providing access to the writing program archives,
>
> determining who will have primary responsibility for maintaining the archive,
>
> who will be granted access and whether restricted access is necessary—also must
>
> ensure contents are described consistently, accurately, and in sufficient detail.
>
> The archivist must have discipline wide and program specific knowledge in order
>
> to analyze the records and anticipate their potential for research. (115)

An archive within a writing program may include private, student related information that

should not be shared with a general public. If the programmatic archive that Rose

suggests were to be open-sourced, then it would also be a representation of an

institutional history that is usually closed off to the general public. Rose implies that the

administrator as archivist will also work on curation and design within the archive, but is

the WPA able to do all of this?

Although invaluable, Mirtz points out that creating an archive may not be the

untenured WPA's top priority. While Mirtz points out that there is a call for a first-year

writing archive, she also states that:

> Without tenure, experienced WPAs who have a long-term investment in a writing
>
> program and are grounded in composition theory, the history of writing
>
> instruction, and the local history of their first-year writing program, there is little

hope that archives will be maintained or used to help provide a stronger identity

for the program itself and the position of the WPA. (128)

Mirtz identifies the need for an archive, but also the problem of the WPA taking on such

a task, especially a non-tenured WPA whose time is already spread thin. Clement et al.

also recognize, through an interview with Amy Earhart, an assistant professor of English

at Texas A&M University, that her digital archival work does not count towards tenure

because of the stipulations set in place that require printed published work (118).

Although WPAs are not currently rewarded for this work or may not even be recognized

in any official way, insights into the history of a particular program and digital

development of our work continues to be important as the historical context and means of

preservation continue to update and change.

       While Mirtz recognizes a need for a holistic WPA archive that is institutionally

based, her insights also present the reluctance of many WPAs to produce and maintain an

archive that may become an institutionalized historic space scrutinized by those inside the

institution and thus require more time and attention than a WPA is able to give.

Individual authorship and work is rewarded in the humanities, but the digital WPA

archive cannot be a single authored project. Burdick et al. recognize that "distributed

knowledge production means that a single person cannot possibly conceive of and carry

out all facets of a project" (50). However, a culture of individual expectation that

continues to be perpetuated by disciplines that rely on publication must not be continued

if digital projects are to be executed.

       How far can we take the concept of an individual doing it all when it comes to the

creation of digital archives? In "Toward a Notion of the Archive of the Future:

Impressions of Practice by Librarians, Archivists and Digital Humanities Scholars,"

Tanya Clement, Wendy Hagenmaier, and Jennie Levine Knies recognize a new hybrid

scholar, often termed a digital curator or digital librarian. These scholars represent the

interests of the digital humanities in collaboration with library science. Clement et al.

discuss the sites of digital library, archival and scholarly work while considering

publication, practitioners, and insights into practice and development, especially in

relation to open-source possibilities. In this work, Clement et al. interview five hybrid

scholars whose actual titles range from professor to digital curator (115). Further

illustrating that collaboration is key to create effective digital environments and projects

therein.

## 1.5   The Caretaker of the Archive

Luke Tredinnick proposes in *Digital Information Culture: The Individual and*

*Society in the Digital Age* that the digital archive is not just about the organizational

means of storing, but relies on the communal work of continual collection and

participation with information in order to create the living archive (165). Poster furthers

the concept of digital collaborative authorship when he observes that with the

"introduction of new technologies…the relation of a technology to social practice is a

complex, changing phenomenon that is not reducible to the goals of its developer"

(*Information Please* 192). Poster says that the "developer," although part of the

technological interaction, does not control the end means of use.

An author's or archivist's intention may not dictate the type of response or use of

her particular digital work. For instance, in online projects, such as "Narrating Bits,"

users may have the option to add their own comments without any sort of pre-approval. While this practice is democratic and demonstrates the power of digital mediums, it may cause some shocking responses. In order to counter unproductive commentary, sites like *Melville's Marginalia* offer to take users' comments, but a caretaker of the digital archival repository reviews comments and responds to the user before they are posted. Poster's sentiments seem to be reflected by databases that allow anyone to comment on anything, but can a database really be the caretaker of an archive?

In many ways algorithms already control much of the information that we see on a regular basis, such as that retrieved by a Google search. Manovich discusses how much access to information social media corporations or search engines have versus academics and whether or not this information is culturally relevant. Some archival sites allow users to add content freely. Listservs, including the WPA listserv, automatically capture and archive list emails. The DALN encourages users to contribute literacy narratives. However, each also has a WPA/archivist to maintain appropriate content. Manoff points out that "digitization provides access to selected artifacts of the past, both scholarly and popular, ordered and contextualized by producers and distributers," but what about when the software itself is choosing how the archive can be navigated or accessed (388)? The first archivist may be the technology itself by bringing information into being and the second archivist manipulates information by categorizing it in a way that is familiar as a result of his or her disciplinary orientation (*Archive Fever* 55-58). If the user is able to read, rewrite, or take apart the pieces of the code then s/he would be able to rewrite the digital database environment based on different norms—that are, of course, externally imposed.

However, in *The Mode of Information*, Mark Poster points out that when Derrida discusses "Electric Writing" he notes that the "computer dematerializes the written trace" therefore making the representation of the trace more like a speech act—which causes the writer to recognize him or herself in the machine (111-112). In other words, the writer is separated from the action of writing through the use of technology, but then must see him or herself collaborating with technology to get words across to others. Like Poster, Derrida also discusses the history of the word processor as creating a separation between the author, his work, and the public sphere (*Paper Machines* 20). Taking this idea further, Poster comments that authorship is no longer individual because the computer "depersonalizes the text" by "removing all traces of individuality from the writing." Poster seeks to break down the binaries between the subject/object by explaining that we have a more intimate relationship with our technology and tools (*Mode of Information* 113). Instead of the fluidity that Poster suggests, I assert that we have more of a relationship with technology based on its functionality, and, in turn, with those who create the programs, write the code, and determine what users can access. Therefore, almost everything that we access online is created using some form of collaborative authorship.

In regards to navigability, Manoff also points out that tags, annotations, new context, or re-assembly of new and old media items "alters our sense of history," perhaps referencing the nonlinear dynamic organizational strategies that databases and websites allow (388). But I question if archivists' descriptions and metadata have already done this "reordering" in previous historical context? I question how the archive will be based on usability instead of a basis in materiality through digital archival practice? Additionally,

20

how does design affect usability? Not only should the future digital archive be based on the historicity and the usability of the online archive, but representation of materials must also be considered when developing spaces of digital exchange.

The WPA digital archive must be a collaborative act between those at work within the writing program at a given university, previous institutional archives, and the digital humanities. In turn, any academically guided digital archive would naturally be considered a work of the digital humanities. Initially, Burdick et al. assert that "the Digital Humanities offers new challenges and possibilities for institutions of memory such as archives," and recognize that the historic curating of archives is the care for memory (47). I find these digital scholars' definition to be the most thorough at outlining the practices that the digital archive must commence in order to connect the online environment with the user psyche in both a practical and philosophical way.

While Rose recognizes that the administrator can also be an archivist, maintaining records can be demanding and cannot always be the WPA's top priority—yet another reason for collaboration. Rose claims that we do not have these archives because of a lack of resources, including a lack of time, money, access to material, and a lack of interest in the programmatic past. However, I believe that in many cases the WPA could work with the campus archivist and/or within a digital system that allows for this recordkeeping and maintenance to take place. Many have used widely available applications such as Dropbox or Omeka for just this purpose. Dropbox is a file saving/sharing service, but does not posture itself as a tool for archiving, per se. Omeka is a free, open-sourced online publishing platform specifically for curating collections to maintain historical memory. Although the ways that we now use email, the iCloud, and Google may change

our definition of online archives, there is a difference between material that is digitally designed and curated and that which is simply stored in online digital form.

For instance, the Arizona State University (ASU) Digital Atlas was developed in 2011 by Dan Bommarito as a quick and easy reference for Writing Program data including the mission and values statements; courses, grades, and enrollment; teaching faculty and employment conditions; program assessments and reports; schedules of program emails; committees, initiatives, partners; and budgets (Hooper-Lewis 12). This archive seems to meet many of the WPA standards set by Rose, Mirtz, and L'Eplattenier by addressing administrative and teaching needs. Overall, the ASU Digital Atlas sounds like a very comprehensive digital archive. However, it is interesting to question why the WPAs would choose to keep specific documents and data (14). Further, no one outside the ASU program will ever be able to investigate these questions, because the Digital Atlas is stored on Dropbox and is not open to public preview.

## 1.6   Answering the WPA Call for the Archive

WPAs are focused on the goal of creating an archive in order to establish and maintain communal memory within specific institutional spaces, but recognize that they themselves are not archivists. To establish appropriate WPA archives, we must engage in the interdisciplinarity suggested by many digital humanities scholars. Online archives are situated within the digital humanities; however, these interdisciplinary sites seldom have common practices, just as the digital humanities do not always rely on one definition. Commonalities within digital archival practice must be addressed in order to establish how the material archive manifests in a representational environment.

When I started this project, I had a very clear idea of what I was looking for based on the WPA call for the archive—an institutionally specific digital archive that held the curricular activities, sample papers, and other historical artifacts of a writing program, such as useful textbooks, WPAs' biographies, CVs, and copies of their reports and proposals as well as their institutionally specific published articles. If I were a WPA, these are the items I would like to begin studying to get my bearings at a new institution. However, I have not found my perfect, imaginary digital archive. I imagined that the digital writing studies archive pertaining to a specific university would include all of the previously mentioned items and more. I expected, in short, a plethora of curricular materials and relevant administrative documents pertaining to the institution that maintained this imagined, open-sourced archive.

Instead, I found databases and archives that focus on wider accessioning, such as CompPile which provides an inventory of many publications relative to writing studies. But, just because I did not find localized WPA archives in the way I thought I might, does not mean that these archives do not exist. As Laura Millar points out in her book, *Archives: Principles and Practices*, "the absence of records does not mean that the information, ideas or events never existed, just that there is no residual testimony or explanation of them" (3). In other words, the WPA digital archive that I am looking for may exist, but I haven't found it yet. Or, rather, I found all of these items grouped together and archived in different ways. I found what I will refer to as "global" WPA archives, or archives that focus on a specific topic within writing studies, such as textbooks, that could be useful to any scholar in the field in addition to the "local" curricular archives that are institutionally specific and usually curriculum based. I found

both archives through the "residual testimony and explanation" of the WPA digital archives in the form of keywords, conference communications, and other finding methods (Millar 3).

My finding method is not as outlandish as it sounds. Jeffrey Hoogeveen, in "The Progressive Faculty/Student Discourse of 1969-70 and the Emergence of Lincoln University's Writing Program," includes in his "archive" the ongoing memorial reconstruction of text that lives in conversation, allusion, gossip and faculty chat. While we may not want people to hear everything that we say in the halls, Hoogeveen's idea has been realized. The WPA listserv harbors digital conversations that continue to live on through its archive and available to anyone who joins. WPA archives housed within different educational institutions and digital spaces may vary in content, but the WPA call for the archive makes it clear that writing program learning materials and a history of the discipline within the institution must be included.

An archive that will be true to a writing program and cover the call for curricular as well as administrative materials must rely on collaboration. It took me a long time to find the collaborative archive that I imagined, and it is not yet digital, although the collaborative archivists have expressed a desire to make their work digital. The ideal collaborative, holistic writing program archive is described by its makers in the essay "'It Might Come in Handy.' Composing a Writing Archive at the University of New Hampshire: A collaboration between the Dimond Library and the Writing-across-the-Curriculum/Connors Writing Center, 2001-2003." In order to create the writing archive, it took a WPA (the director of the writing center), two graduate students, the campus archivist, and a historian. But, by working together, they created a living archive that will

grow and change with campus needs. Additionally, this physical archive contains all of the materials that were described in the WPA call; such as "informal and ephemeral materials related to curriculum and pedagogical changes and student writing-in-process with more typical types of holdings, such as course catalogs, prize winning essays, or published student literary journals" (116). These collaborative scholars at the University of New Hampshire recognize that their archive "has enhanced the Dimond Library's physical archival holdings and research/instructional activity while strengthening the intellectual and cultural identity of the writing program" (115). The vision for their archive was to help with program planning by way of program and future curricular development, identify trends for future practices and research, recontextualize the writing program in regards to the broader institution, a contribute to global writing program scholarship, even across the disciplines (119). Further, Slomba, the archivist on the team, recognized that "there is a tacit bias against collecting papers because they are difficult to collect, do not have inherent research value as secondary sources, and do not immediately reflect in themselves the student experience," however; the writing scholars on the team, Gannett, Tirabassi, Zenger, and Brereton, "were advocating the collection of papers for documenting both the process of writing as well as the textual products and along with evidence of writing pedagogies"; they did not want to collect only papers that were outstanding, but wished also to include "bad" papers in their work (123). Collecting papers with the assignments that elicited the response is always best, but any student work must be used with permission.

The archivist saw graduate students make use of the archive as soon as a year after its development in order to write seminar papers (125). The graduate students working on the archive saw value in preserving the theoretical and cultural stance of the center when staffing changes—in other words, they saw archiving as a "political act, a means of remaining visible, of preserving the program's written legacy, of marshaling evidence of its strength and vitality" (129). Brereton, the team's historian, sees this archival work as creating community within Writing Program Administration, within this particular institution and beyond—he sees "a rich, well-planned archive of writing, assembled in a collaborative manner with the guidance of a professional [as a] living thing, constantly subject to growth and change" (133). Clearly, I agree with Brereton's vision of the collaboratively created digital WPA archive.

When considering what to include in an institutionally specific archive, the WPA must consider the archive in general, which I will discuss more in the following chapter. While Rose, Mirtz, and L'Eplattenier consider curricular and institutional histories as a large part of archival development, collection can be difficult depending on individual institutional circumstance. Gretchen Flesher Moon and Patricia Donahue, in their edited collection *Local Histories: Reading the Archives of Composition*, selected essays emblematic of the archival research being done within institutions in order to outline specific histories of composition that are rhetorically witnessed through WPAs working as researchers. While recognizing a complicating factor--"what we do not have and thus cannot read"—Moon also notes that each history "aris[es] from a particular place and time" and that "these stories ground us in the specific and discrete circumstances of local writers, teachers, classrooms, and institutions that are diminished, forgotten, and lost" (2-

3). Moon recognizes that each composition researcher is working within a specific framework of their own institution and within the constraints of what their predecessors chose to keep or discard. In other words, the writing environment of a university is a space of constant change, and there is always a new WPA archivist, so an archive must be able to keep up with all of the changes, and be accessible by a new archivist. Moreover, the included materials must be easily added to/taken from in addition to being highly usable. The archives of educational institutions are chosen collectively, not only based on what an institution or higher education in general chooses to recognize, but also the "writing of disciplinary history [as] a highly collaborative act" (Donahue 223). Moon and Donahue work on challenging the myths of a single composition course history by producing a volume that sees history as "not a scene of objective enactment, but a textual phenomenon, consisting of unstable signifiers to which numerous and equally unstable signifiers can be and have been assigned" while recognizing that "'history' represents a set of materials that have been afforded documentary value" (Moon 222). Not only can composition histories be personalized by institutions, but they also change as more "history" is developed and discovered within institutions and academia in general—or even what later generations of researchers select to recognize and include.

In the following chapter I will continue to examine the history and development of the archive in general, both theoretically and in practice. Further, I will consider the changes to the archive brought on by digital environments. The physical archive has a certain draw for researchers and its physicality has always already been multimodal. In Chapter 2 I consider how this multimodality works online. In Chapter 3, I consider the findability and the organization of the archive in order to understand more global ways of

making the WPA archives that we already use. I examine three examples of established

archives in writing studies to further define ways of making WPA archives digitally. In

order to understand their usability, I will review some information science testing

methods and discuss what is being done in our own collaborative archives. In Chapter 4, I

consider the curricular archive and examine three examples. I review my examples using

heuristics to further understand what we are keeping, and how we are maintaining our

digital curricular archives. Lastly, Chapter 5 will draw conclusions about this work and

offer additional avenues for further research and discussion.

# 2   Redefining the Archive

"A revalorization of the archive may well involve its redefinition. This redefinition must account for its essential doubleness, as physical collection or space and as a concept or idea. This doubleness accounts in turn for the archive's continual oscillation between the poles of thing and theory (751-2)"

--Helen Freshwater, "The Allure of the Archive"

Archival research has long been romanticized. Academics often seek archival holdings in hopes of finding new material, but may be surprised by the limitations of archival research. When researchers are unable to find what they want because descriptions are misleading or they thought the archival holdings would answer all of their questions, instead of just leaving them with more, they are often disappointed. Misled by the archive's appeal, many find physical archival research to be grueling. Where does this romantic idea of archival discovery come from? Is the theory of the archive so misaligned with its physicality? Freshwater calls for a redefinition of the archive for these very reasons. The archive's dual role as a philosophy and a place has been seen as dichotomous. But, just as the archive has been studied or described as both, this "doubleness" does not need to put the archive at odds with itself or cause researchers further frustration.

In this chapter, I consider the different ways that the archive has been defined—both conceptually and physically. I pay special attention to how the archive has changed or adapted based on its contents, curator, medium, and mode. Overall, I see the archive as multimodal because it can manifest physically, digitally, or even cognitively. I use the

history of archiving, well-known philosophies of the archive, and digital humanities scholarship to study the idea of an archive in order to expand on ways that it continues to grow and change.

What is an archive? Initially, it could be argued that the concept of the archive was explored and developed by information scientists based on systematic organizational structures. The traditional, historic, and physical concept of the archive has changed with the onset of digital mediums, but the "new" online archive still remains a space for exploration. The movement from physical archiving to the digital has been spurred by academically inclined Digital Humanists who debate the merit of rhetoric in online spaces written in code. For instance, Lev Manovich maps the history of Babbage's Analytical Engine and Daguerre's daguerreotype to show the progression from "historical trajectories" into the realm of representation and "new digital media" (*Language of New Media* 20). New digital media theorists identify previous technologies that have led to the adaptation of new cultural and technological practices; similarly, I argue that digital archival practice is constructed from previous genres and concepts of the material archive.

When considering the digital archive retrospectively, one must also consider how media changes other material artifacts when moved to digital spaces. Many have considered the philosophy of the archive long before digital realms existed. While considering their theoretical reasoning and the applications that previous historians, digital media scholars, and cultural studies scholars have assigned to the concept of the "archive," I argue that the archive is well adapted to any multimodal situation, whether physical or digital, by using forms of communication other than written documents.

Further, I question where digital archival practice begins and how it is manifested in database systems. While Freshwater sees "doubleness" in the definition of the archive, connections between previously established archive theory and the adaptation of the physical archive to digital mediums begin to close the gap between the physical archive and the philosophies that guide it.

## 2.1 Romancing the Archive

Physical archives must be housed somewhere. Often, we consider the archive as a place, where a researcher sifts through fragmented collections of items. Many imagine a dimly lit basement of a library on a college campus or a museum funded by some sort of historic association. Lisa Mastrangelo, in a note to Barbara L'Eplattenier, explains her experience in the Vassar College archives as almost otherworldly because the library is "modeled after a European castle," while the archives are "sleek and modern" after a renovation ("Stumbling," 162). After a day of researching, Mastrangelo expects to walk into a world of the past on the street and "takes a long time to return to the twentieth century" ("Stumbling," 162). Mastrangelo's letter may romanticize the archive, but also points to a history of the archive. Archives are traditionally housed by formal institutions, like universities and libraries, but the modern physical archive actually began in revolutionary France (Ferreira-Buckley 578). Linda Ferreira-Buckley points out that current archival practices began with the founding of the National Archives in 1789 for the "management of all public repositories and agencies" (578). Ferreira-Buckley's main focus is how Michel Foucault's theoretical archival work lacks application. She sees Freshwater's "doubleness" as a fraud—wanting her audience to engage with the archive

31

methodologically. Similarly, in her book *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History*, Carolyn Steedman discusses a history of the archive since the 1700s—focusing on the material archive and found documents. Steedman relates her study to Jacques Derrida's earlier work and what is left out of his philosophy of the archive. Additionally, Steedman's work points out that, prior to this democratic record keeping process, archives often existed privately in castles or religious dwellings, such as monasteries.

Steedman connects the driving theory of the archive to history through her textual analysis of Foucault and Derrida. Steedman asserts that "Derrida had long seen in Freudian psycho-analysis a desire to recover moments of inceptions" or what "we think might be some kind of truth"; through " 'Archive Fever,' desire for the archive is presented as part of the desire to find, or locate, or possess that moment of origin, as the beginning of things" (3). Steedman's understanding of Derrida's work furthers the romantic notion of detection within the archive, while imagining the archive as a constructed history.

Mary Carruthers makes a similar historical connection through her understanding of monastic practices. Carruthers, in her book, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric and the Making of Images, 400-1200*, asserts that memory is a driving force throughout history and dates the creation of the historic imagery further back through her monastic study. Carruthers' study focuses on the monastic use of memory, where the monks used the "practice of meditation" to "make mental images or cognitive 'pictures' for thinking and composing" (3). This internal visual imagery was used as a way of thinking over something through representation as opposed to just rote memorization. Carruthers' monastic practice of housed memory shows that the "desire" discussed by

Derrida may just as well occupy the space of the human mind in the form of visual imagery. The edited collection *Beyond the Archives* further explores the serendipity of the archives, as its many authors further connect with their research in the archives in a seemingly magical way (Kirsch). Robert Connors may put it best when he says that "the archive is where storage meets dreams, and the result is history" (17). The history of the development of what we consider the physical archive today is based on who controlled history—the monarchy, the church, or the people.

Although an archive could be considered a collection that has some form of intrinsic, historic value, there is a reason that we have considered archives within libraries or museums as typical—accessibility. L'Eplattenier and Mastrangelo note that "traditionally, archives have been part of a formal institutional structure—federal/ governmental archives, libraries, universities, historical societies," but each may be different based on resources and regulation ("Archival Research" 212). Adding to the appeal of the archive, those who are granted access may feel privileged. They further describe the typical archive, for Rhetoric and Composition studies, as holding "single copies of artifacts" that are "often irreplaceable" ("Archival Research" 212). Archives are synonymous with the material presence of artifacts, but knowing that there is only one furthers the romantic idea of the physical archive. Gretchen Flesher Moon, in her work "Locating Composition History," states "archival sources …almost always require a researcher to be physically present and to hold the material in her hands, although some archival materials are now available online" (7). Moon recognizes the need for presence in the physical archive and then seems to include the online archive as an afterthought. Moon's verbal nod makes it clear that those engaged in online historical work still have a

lot to do to not only make digital archives recognizable, but also to create the same

appeal as the physical archive.

In her book, *The Archive Effect: Found Footage and the Audiovisual Experience of History*, Jaimie Baron states that archived artifacts are noted for being rare and this seems to add worth to one's discoveries within the archive—making the past present again (6). Baron's sentiments are similar to Mastrangelo's when she considers past and present; however, Baron is working with film, a medium that has become mostly digital and is made to be seen and shared. While the rarity associated with the physical archive may be seen as lost on the digital archive because of the wide accessibility and duplicability of digital objects and the lack of touch, many scholars agree that a feeling of detection fuels the desire to explore the physical archive. But how does this romantic notion of finding apply to the digital archive? Further, is the romance lost on the digital archive? The physical archive is vulnerable to fire, and theft and may include a lot more than what one is looking for; of course, without the aid of an archivist and appropriate organization, any archive may take quite some time to navigate, but many researchers seem to enjoy this aspect. Many researchers even include finding information or artifacts that they were not looking for as part of their positive experience within the archive. However, the pathos associated with the archive has changed with the onset of digital technology.

In order for the digital archive to invoke the same romantic feelings as the physical archive one must consider the design of the digital space. Just as the physical space of an archive can make a person feel like he or she is in a sacred place, the organization of the digital archive can create new ways of discovering to produce the

same effect of rarity. Most of the time, an archive is curated, like a museum, and put or held together by the thoughtful care of an archivist. In a digital environment curation is also related to web design and information architecture. The digital space of the archive is just as important as the physical design that we see in institutional holdings.

Mastrangelo recalls the renovated archival space within the historic architecture of the Vassar College library, and a visit to a well-designed digital archive may be just as memorable ("Stumbling" 162). The security and structure of the digital archives is similar to physical archives. Most digital archives are institutionally funded and their placement within university or governmental websites allows the information to maintain integrity and remain secure. Further, the digital archivist, like the archivist of a physical space, must make decisions about access. While any archive may have holdings available to the public, the level of security in both digital and material archives must concern how much of a footprint the user might leave. Just as the physical archive has protective systems to prevent fire or other damage to the space or holdings, the digital must also consider accessibility to the holdings as well as security in the form of platform stability and firewalls. I can only imagine that the updates to the Vassar College archive also included proper security to protect the archival holdings. Digital archives also need updates and the selection process of what to include in a space as vast as the digital archive as well as how it should look can be a daunting task for any archivist. As suggested earlier, the materials housed in the digital archive should be organized in such a way as to preserve the feelings of finding something new and accentuate the notion of rarity provided by the physical archive.

## 2.2   Reasoning the Memorable, Multimodal Archive

Organizing and making sense of the archive applies to both the physical space and the theoretical concept that Freshwater references when she considers "doubleness." Many scholars argue that organization is culturally constructed, but how does this idea connect the theoretical archive with the physicality of sorting? In their work, *Sorting Things Out,* Geoffrey C. Bowker and Susan Leigh Star claim that forms of classification and organization are natural, human reactions to our world. "To classify is human" (1). Throughout their text Bowker and Star assert that humans are driven to create organizational systems. We like recognizable order, like the Dewey Decimal Classification System in a library, but, in the archive, we also like to find new items. Bowker and Star point out that categories have their own material forces and are not only culturally driven, but also culturally derived (3). Bowker and Star loosely defined the archive as a collection of stuff, and their work explores the material archive.

From a different cultural standpoint, Lisa Gitelman, in her book *Always Already New*, draws on Bowker and Star's work to define media as "socially realized structures of communication, where structures include both technological forms and their associated protocols…a ritualized collocation of different people on the same mental map, sharing or engaged with popular ontologies of representation" (7). Gitelman's argument hinges on new media being defined by socio-cultural context, but her concept of routinized and shared expectations of organization based on the human mindscape are more pertinent to theoretical discussions of the digital archive. While socio-culture context may help an archivist determine what should be included in an archive, the organizational expectations may be both culturally derived based on familiar structures, such as those

established by information scientists or driven by previous forms of organizing. In other words, the organization of new media, such as the digital archive, may be based on what we are used to or what we expect. However, many media scholars relate online organization to humanity by considering how the mind works to organize thought; or, in the case of an archive, memory.

The term "archive" begins with the philosophical reasonings of organizational systems, as outlined by Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault, but has taken on new meaning in digital spaces. By beginning with the philosophical implications of the archive throughout French philosophy, I will continue to consider the history and purpose of archiving in general in order to move from the material to the digital archive as it has been shaped through cultural contexts. Because I am not an information scientist, I must consider what constitutes archival practice and how organizing structures have manifested within the digital environment from a rhetorician's perspective. I agree with Derrida, that the archive has always already been multimodal. Accordingly, the move from a material presence to an online informational vehicle, usually taking shape in a database form, is just a continuation of previous notions of an archive as relative to human memory.

Foucault's definition of the archive, according to his book *The Archaeology of Knowledge,* hinges on his concept of the *statement*, an atom-like structure that is produced through the recursive act of language and cultural situatedness (85). Foucault recognizes, in his essay "The Historical *a priori* and the Archive," that the 'archive' is not a culturally recognized history that has been assigned documentation, or even a space, such as a library, that may keep records intact, but is based in organization. For Foucault

an archive is "the law of what can be said, the system that governs the appearance of statements as unique events" (130). Foucault believes that the culture as the writer of the "statement" is no longer the question—but the concept of kairos or creating a rich environment in which the statement can be authored becomes the crux of the organizational argument. In turn, the archive is a space where researchers come to explore and find their argumentative support. Our current writing environment, including the archive, is not only multimodal as Derrida argues, but also a rich environment of overarching structures with which humans are already familiar and which attempt not only to mirror but also to shape human thought. The doubleness of organization both reflects and constructs human thought. Therefore, human thought creates organizational schemes and then the organizational schemes perpetuate what and how we can think—a tangled plurality.

Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge* recognizes that it is humanity that instills organizational structures to the surrounding world—including linguistic constructions—however, he brings into question the neutrality of the author of such systems. Foucault questions and circumvents Bowker and Star's claim that organizing is "natural" to humanity by recognizing that culture has a heavy hand in the construction process. Foucault takes his concept of the "statement" even further by referencing the recursive act of formulation that occurs between the "statement" and language in order to show that language exists to create the "statement." However, the "statement" is always culturally situated by the construct of language and the "statement always appear(s) in a moment of time and in a point in space" (85). How classifying structures are created becomes more about the when, where, and what of a given situation. Mark Poster furthers this aspect of

Foucault's work in his chapter "Foucault and Databases" by asserting that a new digital environment is a rich landscape for further construction.

Poster's work highlights new digital media as a driving force in a knowledge economy. His post structuralist reading of the cultural landscape serves as a backdrop to the ubiquitous media. However, Poster observes that electronic mediated language becomes an environment all its own and explainable in terms of the work of Foucault. The limitations of this culturally situated digital language move beyond cultural literacy for Poster and begin to create a knowledge hierarchy. Poster seems to say that databases create their own fields of meaning—the knowledge created through connections are presupposed by a database system (*Mode of Information* 96). Previous knowledge plays a huge role in these formations, but by analyzing the archivist's environment new knowledge might be formed. The limitations of this culturally situated digital language move beyond cultural literacy for Poster and begin to create a knowledge hierarchy. Further, Poster asserts that "digital encoding derives its peculiar strength from the degree to which it restricts meaning" (*Mode of Information* 94). Therefore, the online environment further supersedes cultural literacy of any sort that would initially dominate a knowledge environment based on the structured system culturally agreed upon. Poster asserts that "the media unconscious is, like Foucault's depictions of power, ubiquitous, not centered in an institution like the state, but not absent from that place either…a node in a network" (*Information Please* 37). Poster asserts that technology, culture, and globalization are inseparably intertwined, creating "heterogeneous glocal fragments" (*Information Please* 37*)*. Fragmented culture is not only difficult to control, but it can be difficult to maintain.

Language comes with its own imposition. Foucault asserts that:

> If one wishes to describe the enunciative level, one must consider that existence
> itself, question language not in the direction to which it refers, but in the
> dimension that gives it; ignore its power to designate, to name, to show, and,
> instead, turn one's attention to the moment—which is at once solidified (111)

and lies in Saussurian playfulness "that determines its unique and limited experience"
(111). Because language is socially constructed and defined in a cultural context, the only
flexibility it has is in the moment—the kairotic moment of use. The moment an item is
named it becomes archivable. Naming, by itself, does not create an object, but it does
begin to mandate what that object is, suggest what makes it culturally relevant and
worthy of attention, and affects findability. Historically, kairos provides a fluidity to any
linguistic environment—especially the online database—because of its changeability.

Foucault asserts that "for a statement to exist: it must be related to a whole
adjacent field," (Foucault 97). While Poster argues that the construction of the database
creates its own cultural environment of meaning. However, Poster seems to miss
concepts of kairos, Foucault's discursive formations within the archive, and the author
within our virtual reality. While Foucault does not address the usability issues of online
databases, his concept of discursive formation could move Poster's argument in another
direction. Foucault asserts that:

> The archive deploys its possibilities…on the basis of the very discourses that
> have just ceased to be ours; its threshold of existence is established by the
> discontinuity that separates us from what we can no longer say, and from that

which falls outside our discursive practice; it begins with the outside of our own

language; its locus is the gap between our own discursive practices. (131)

Foucault's goal is for the user to look at these practices—the gaps and the connections

surrounding the thing that we are searching for. Foucault asks us to question how

connections are being made and what or who is making them? Foucault asserts that, as an

organizing structure, an archive, or a database in Poster's case, does create its own

connections; but his concern is what drives these connections? Previous knowledge plays

a huge role in these formations, but by analyzing the archivist's environment new

knowledge might be formed.

Poster describes online databases as living in an organizational vacuum that

allows a breakdown of the elements that Foucault uses to describe the tangled plurality

that takes place in the discursive formation of knowledge environments. However, there

is still an online author, an archivist, and a moment when the electronic language is used,

and all of this is influenced by an external cultural expectation and familiarity with

organizational systems that the user must already inherently know in order to utilize the

database. The usability of technology cannot be ignored in the way that Poster wishes it

would be, because it is not mandated solely by culture. History is not an algorithm that

writes itself, but databases can create that illusion.

As pointed out by Derrida, an individual, more specifically, an archivist,

determines archivable content. Databases do not construct archives. While Poster

questions if databases construct culture, in a second observation about "the introduction

of new technologies" he sees "the control of culture" going in two separate directions: the

first involving the power of institutions to reach a larger population and the second

recognizing that "digital culture" is "empowering" to the individual user, making control difficult (*Information Please* 192-193*).* In the second direction that Poster discusses he sees the audience as able "to act on cultural objects" in digital space. A good example of this is N. Katherine Hayles' "Narrating Bits."

In her work, Hayles has broken down a linear article into keywords so that one may navigate the piece in a nonlinear, multimedia manner and comment on it. "Narrating Bits" is an attractive project and the editors at *Vectors* recognized Hayles excellent work, but this work also shows that the intention of the author may no longer render a desired response and proves Poster's points that institutions may put information out into the digital world, but they don't control how the audiences work on these cultural objects, which will likely be in new or idiosyncratic ways. Therefore, in what digital spaces might an archivist be necessary?

*Vectors* is a recognized academic journal that allows authors and designers to include statements with their works so that audience members have an opportunity to understand the intention of the work. After reading the artist statements for "Narrating Bits," I am sure that most of the comments within the nonlinear project are not the multimedia critique that the creators hoped for. Instead comments range from "Woooo!" to "I like vegetables and spam." In her statement Hayles specifically invited criticism and chose her mode of information delivery purposefully, for better or worse. Tara McPherson and Steve Anderson, the editors of *Vectors* at the time that Hayles' piece was digitally published, note that "the piece preserves the linearity of Hayles' argument, a careful parsing of the relationship of database to narrative." The editors recognize that Hayles' multimedia project preserves traditional organizational concepts of linearity

while reflecting on how this conventional narrative structure might be broken by using a database driven structure. "Narrating Bits" seems to articulate Manovich's assertion that the "computer age brought with it a new cultural algorithm: reality-media-data-database" furthering his idea that "the narrative is virtual while the database exists materially" and reversing previous notions of what was material or physically "real" versus what is "real" in the new, digital world (*Language* 224-224, 231). Manovich, a professor at CUNY and the Director of the Software Studies Initiative, recognizes the Baudrillardian move from material reality to hyperreality and applies this new concept of what is "real" to a database structure. While Hayles relies on previous narrative structures to write her way into the database, I question if a nonlinear database is the right system in which to ask for commentary or if commentary must be monitored and qualified in the same way that an archivist would consider metadata for an archive, which I will consider further in Chapter 3.

Like Foucault, Derrida also views the archive systematically based on structure and power—he sees the archive as creating a past that exists only through the determination of what is kept versus what is left out (*Archive Fever*). Additionally, Derrida views the archive as building the past, rather than simply articulating the past in some way. In *Archive Fever,* he asserts that:

> The archive, as printing, writing, prosthesis, or hypomnesic technique in general is not only the place for stocking and for conserving an archivable content *of the past* which would exist in any case, such as, without the archive, one still believes it was or will have been. No, the technical structure of the *archiving* archive also determines the structure of the *archivable* content even in its very coming into

existence and in its relationship to the future. The archivization produces as much

as it records the event. (17)

In other words, the archive not only represents history, but also produces it. Derrida

argues that while the archive itself does not bring the past into being, it creates a past that

is recognized. Steedman recognizes the archival drive, and the power within that creation.

Steedman begins by reviewing Derrida's and Foucault's theoretical reasonings for

archival drive and how the draw of the physical archive is relative to memory. Her study

is based on what is lost. She views Derrida's work through the lens of anthropologist and

Foucault scholar Ann Laura Stoler by considering the "assiduity of attention to look for

and find what isn't there" (4-5).  By maintaining an archive, or archivable content,

material is no longer mere "stuff," but becomes a recognizable historic item. The archive

essentially creates history. Derrida even considers his own archivability as an author. The

first archivist creates the database linking the pieces of information in a way that is

familiar to him or her. If the user is able to read, rewrite, or take apart the pieces of the

code, even by appending comments, then s/he would be able to rewrite the digital

database environment based on different norms—which are, of course, externally

imposed.

Memory, a rhetorical canon explored through the works of Derrida as well as

other new media theorists, is more community based than ever before with the onset of

digital mediums, but continues to be collaboratively determined by what is kept and

considered historically important. Derrida, in *Archive Fever*, asserts that "the first

archivist institutes the archive as it should be, that is to say, not only in exhibiting the

document but in *establishing* it…he reads it, interprets it, classes it," creating the initial

system (55). The author of the archive creates the structuring system. Derrida argues that the initial structures are based on Freud's psychoanalytical studies such that "the theory of psychoanalysis, then, becomes a theory of the archive and not only a theory of memory" connecting the construction of the archive to the creation of memory in the human mind (19). Many digital humanists consider online organization relative to the processes of human thought or memory when designing online spaces. But does human memory have a structuring system? Steedman sees Derrida's interpretation of Freud's theory differently: as a structured space. She claims that:

> The problem in using Derrida discussing Freud in order to discuss Archives, is that an Archive is not very much like human memory, and is not at all like the unconscious mind…an archive may indeed take in stuff, heterogeneous, undifferentiated stuff…texts, documents, data…and order them by the principles of unification and classification…this stuff is reordered, remade, then emerges—some would say like a memory—when someone needs to find it, or just simply needs it for new and current purposes. (68)

Steedman seems to ask a lot of human memory. She seems to disagree with any assertion that memory practice relates to the archive and further complicates multimodality, in the form of remixing, in regards to recall or organization, while mentioning that some might recognize this practice as the way memory works.

Carruthers does not equate memory with "archive," but instead considers memory "as the matrix of reminiscing cogitation, shuffling and collating 'things' stored in random-access memory scheme, or set of schemes—a memory *architecture* and a library built up during one's lifetime with the express intention that it be used inventively" (4).

Carruthers' remembering is similar to Steedman's idea of remixing, but Carruthers introduces structure by claiming that we design our memories carefully and constructively. Steedman seems to agree by stating that "the Archive is not potentially made up of *everything*, as is human memory; and it is not the fathomless and timeless place in which nothing goes away that is the unconscious" (68). Instead, "the archive is made from selected and consciously chosen documentation from the past and also from the mad fragmentations that no one intended to preserve and that just ended up there" (68). Steedman seems to state that the human mind is boundless when it comes to remembering, while the archive is subject to a specific selection practice in addition to some odds and ends. Steedman argues that the archive is a constructed space while memory is unstructured, so the two should not be compared. Carruthers argues that memory is a continuous selection process in the human mind that is remixed and used, much like Baron's audio/visual archives.

Baron also discusses Foucault and Derrida's archival philosophies as the basis for the archive, but applies their work to the audio/visual environment of archivization, which she defines as remixing previous compositions. Through archivization, items are reused or fashioned as reusable. Baron's work focuses on the audio visual archival environment of film and she claims that when footage has been "found" it "has an aura of being directly excavated from the past…the sense of the 'foundness' of the footage enhances its historical authority because what has been 'found' has not (ostensibly) been fabricated or shaped by the filmmaker who repurposes this footage" (6). Baron further notes that through this remixing, "paradoxically, then, something 'old' gains part of its power by also promising something 'new'" (6). Baron's example of found footage also

applies to the researcher searching the archive for that romantic discovery. Baron describes this search as looking for items that seem stolen away from the past in order to refashion them, whether informatively or otherwise, in our current research practices. Baron points out that this refashioning is part of what changes digital archive from a material place, because the physical archive "has ceased to reflect the complex apparatus that now constitutes our relation to the past through its photographic, filmic, audio, video, and digital traces" (7).

Baron's discussion of "found" footage relates to the Freudian death drive. In other words, based on the previously mentioned works, the archive, whether physical or perceived through memory, is a space where we keep things in order to negate the fear of loss. The death drive further suggests a repetitive aspect to archives in that the repetition of previously known materials leads to the death of their previous meanings and creates a new history based on what is remembered or chosen as memorabilia. Derrida also recognizes the archival drive as a theory of repetition, which Freud likened to the death drive, but Derrida sees as the possibility of something lost or forgotten (19). Just like memory, an archive is not meant to hold everything. But digital spaces can often seem "boundless," able to hold anything and everything, and, therefore, the selection process becomes even more important. Humans are bound to forget, overlook, and even lose things. Bowker and Star also note "positive forgetting" as a common way of dealing with communal history and artifacts, such as medical records, in a positive way. They cite that "rediscovery is easier than remembering" and the ability to change organizational identity as reasons why forgetting makes space for change (257-8). Moreover, Carruthers' analysis of monastic archives agrees that memory is not meant to hold everything,

claiming that "'Forgetting' is accomplished not by erasure but by placement within a scene," that is, by contextualizing to emphasize certain aspects and deemphasize others. Carruthers cites the development of Christianity from a pagan past as an "extraordinarily adept" example of "communal forgetting/remembering" (53, 57). Carruthers complicates the dichotomy of remembering versus forgetting by claiming that "forgetting is a variety of remembering" (53). Her understanding of forgetting seems to put all of the work of history on a spectrum and furthers Baron's argument of remixing to create new history.

## 2.3   Digitizing the Archive—The Archive, the User, and the Archivist

Similar to how Baron defines and applies the concept of remixing, Manovich considers a physical "collection of documents" in a new way relative to a computer database, stating that "it allows one to quickly access, sort, and reorganize millions of records; it can contain different media types, and it assumes multiple indexing of data, since each record besides the data itself contains a number of fields with user-defined values" (*Language* 214). Manovich reveals that the major differences between the material collection and the digital include the amount of "stuff" in the collection, how to access items, and the emphasis on the user-determined values. Such values may have been previously determined by archivists, but now seem to rely on design, organization, searchability, and user navigation. Manovich argues that the whole internet could be considered an archive. Similarly, Baron also considers the potential breadth of an archive in digital spaces by questioning if YouTube is an "archive without an archon" (140). However, even Manovich would see YouTube as a user-determined archive—people select what to record and share, no matter how mundane.

Baron considers if the term "archive" is made meaningless if used in regards to "a collection of data," versus a "database" or a "document;" while admitting that many see a continuity throughout these terms (140). She also considers the internet as an archive mandated by the electronic archivist of the search engine—and many databases are designed to act just this way by archiving everything, which I will explore in Chapter 3. But YouTube is user based. Baron concludes that the archive should be defined by its effectiveness—more specifically, "the structuring principles that govern how the data is filtered, accessed and used"—in other words, usability (141). For Baron, the archive is about organization—whether that is provided by the database, an archivist, or the user. Moreover, how the user understands or adds meaning to the information provided in the archive is important. Baron states that the "different archive effects produced through the appropriation of documents from material and digital archives is their respective effect on how and whether we attribute authority, historicity, and meaning(fulness) to the archival document as such in the era of digital media" (141-2). In other words, Baron asserts that the romantic draw of the digital archive is created through the user's understanding of it.

The presentation of the material, or curation, in digital spaces writes the rhetorical situation for the user. Baron questions the authority, or even the possibility, of an online archivist, but seems to subscribe to Derridian concepts of archiving. I question: within digital environments, who is the archivist or archon now? Baron sees the archive as audience focused and defines the archive based on the user's ability to interpret the online archive, but thinks of user created archives differently. While both physical and digital collections are built with the user in mind, navigation becomes key to create the desired feeling of the archive—especially in complex open systems, like the World Wide Web.

A familiarity with the off line organizational environment seems to aid with the construction of online archives, websites, and databases, and to mitigate usability issues. *Melville's Marginalia* is a site sponsored by Boise State University's Arts & Humanities Institute, Department of English, and College of Arts & Sciences. This online digital archive describes itself as "a virtual archive devoted to the recovery and documentation of books owned and borrowed by American author Herman Melville." The site provides many different ways to browse the books that Melville kept in his library, for example, by clicking the image of a book or volume or by using the catalogue for a search similar to that of a university library database. The site's purpose is to reveal notes written in the margins of Melville's books and contains photographs of Melville's actual handwriting as it appeared within books, as well as transcriptions of marginalia that could not be photographed for the project.

For organizational purposes, *Melville's Marginalia* seems to rely on Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin's concept of (re)mediation, or the representation of one medium in another. The images of the books online exemplify (re)mediation by imaging one form of media, the book page, in another form, the computer screen. (Re)mediation is serving an organizational purpose by showing in a new frame a construct with which the online user is already familiar. The site assumes that the user understands that the "marginalia" comes from the books that Melville read and, further assumes that the user will be familiar enough with the concept of transcription to understand where those notes come from. In short, *Melville's Marginalia* relies on the user's familiarity with previous media in order to understand the new digital archive and is, notably, collaboratively authored.

When a researcher approaches a physical archive there are organizing structures in place in order to make it possible for the audience to find what he or she is potentially looking for (often with the help of an archivist); however, these organizing structures do not dictate what the researcher might find. *Melville's Marginalia* harbors a very specific collection, partially based on the initial archivist's interests, and partially due to the wide varieties of possible representational forms available on the Internet. Melville's physical books from his library are scattered all over the nation. Although most are at Harvard University, very few people have access to the Harvard Library archives where these delicate, historically valuable books reside. Dr. Steven Olsen-Smith, the initial archivist of *Melville's Marginalia*, recognized the need for Melville's research notes to be accessible for himself and other Melvillian scholars. Therefore, the call for a digital archive was realized. Now a researcher is not restricted to what is available at the Harvard Library, which is only a partial collection of Melville's library anyway, but can browse many titles in one space—the space of representation.  While the researcher will not hold the physical volumes in his or her hands, digital representation of Melville's books and notes are now publicly available. Instead of sifting through a collection of items in a library archive that may not contain a full collection, Olsen-Smith has made it possible for his users to find most of the information in a specific place, although this is not always the case within digital spaces. Manovich recognizes that:

> The internet, which can be thought of as one huge distributed media database, also crystalized the basic condition of the new information society: overabundance of information of all kinds. One response was the popular idea of software "agents" designed to automate searching for relevant information…some

agents act as filters that deliver small amounts of information given the users'

criteria…others allow users to tap into the expertise of other users. (35)

The amount of information available on the web is unthinkably vast. Manovich

recognizes that technologically developed agency aids in the access of specific

information, but also highlights the significance in a hierarchical collaboration that makes

specific, searchable information accessible. Digital archivists with expertise and interest

in a specific area also act as user agents, helping users to find and filter specific

information; but online archivization is usually quite specific, and most is institutionally

inclined. The shift from a material archive to the digital is a cultural adaptation—an

adaptation of organizational methods and information retrieval—in order for interested

parties to find more specific information about a particular item. Unlike the physical

archive, a researcher in a digital archive finds herself sifting through less random stuff in

order to find more representations in a digital space—causing the archive to lose some

romance, even as it gains a semblance of efficiency.

Of course, with the onset of digital archival environments, the creation of a digital

archive has changed access to the archive and the idea of audience. Like any human

invention, the need for structure has found its way into new online technologies and

media that we use every day. Out of this need, the field of usability studies has been

deployed to create a better way for different "users," or interactive audiences to find what

they need on websites, databases, and online archives (digital archival metrics will be

explored in detail in Chapters 3). But interactive new digital media projects have been

developed that require an exploratory, interactive audience. These are based on

structuring the chaos of the human mind—similar to the structuring of the archive—and

hinge on concepts of co-authorship, multiple archivists, and collaboration. However, there is still an online author, an archivist who articulates the archive into being, and a moment when the electronic language is used to form an archive. All of this is influenced by an external cultural expectation and familiarity with organizational systems that the user must already inherently know in order to utilize the database or almost any online system.

Carruthers also recognizes the need for organization, claiming that "in order to create, in order to think at all, human beings require some mental tool or machine, and that 'machine' lives in the intricate networks of their own memory" (7). While Carruthers suggests organization based on human memory, much like Derrida and the monks before her, she also likens human thought to a machine. Poster takes Carruthers' assertion further by asserting that the materiality of technology furthers or changes the message. There is a "media unconscious" that "estranges the human from itself, introducing a symbiosis of human and machine that destabilizes the figures of the subject and object" creating the "humachine" (*Information* 36). The humachine is the user; in digital environments this means that s/he is both the author and the audience interacting with material technology and becoming part of the digital fields that make meaning.

Manovich joins this conversation by attempting to define and categorize the "digital medium itself, its material and logical organization" (*Language* 11). He asserts that "interactive computer media perfectly fits this trend to externalize and objectify the mind's operations," but "interactive media asks us to identify with someone else's mental structure" (61). Organization within the human mind is considered by media and cultural

studies scholars, such as Manovich and Poster, in order to discuss whether or not humanity can identify with machine operations.

While Carruthers' study of recollection could be the basis for a philosophy of organization for databases, and many digital humanists consider online organization relative to the processes of human thought or memory or the cultural implications of human/machine interaction, we must also consider the impact of previously established organization. Gunther Kress, in his essay "Gains and Losses: New Forms of Texts, Knowledge, and Learning," argues that "order is firmly coded: the order of chapters, the order of pages, of lines and of the line, and, of course, within lines as language, the order of syntax" (285). By arguing that we identify with an order that has already been engrained in us, Kress seemingly agrees with Foucault's notion of an archive that is based on structures. Kress also seems to see "access to the power of authorship" as "strictly governed" when discussing printed books (287).

I see new digital media's structures as based on a cultural imperative of previous organizational methods and new digital media theories put into practice, therefore making online design collaborative. Kress sees this collaboration in digital environment as creating "a feeling of fragmentation of the audience—who now are no longer just readers but visitors" once there is "the existence of …different entry points" (287). Kress references a webpage with thirteen different entry points that, in his opinion, does not assume a particular cultural readership, nor a specific "discernible reading path" (287). Logically, an organizational scheme like the Dewey Decimal Classification System would be a culturally accepted structure that could be reformulated to match an online environment in order for users to navigate sites. However, culturally accepted systems of

organization have not completely taken over the structuring of new digital media. Instead, new digital media has often been made to mirror previous vehicles of media delivery.

For example, an online journal, like Worcester State University's *Currents in Teaching and Learning*, has a table of contents and pages and a layout like a printed academic journal. *Melville's Marginalia* relies on the physicality of the book to design a digital archive, but future design concepts must move past offline representational reliance in order to create a space that is not just a representation, but is intuitively navigational because it uses all the affordances and constraints of the digital.

As previously discussed, there is a collective that often creates the online archive and ways of organizing this archive from a "collection of stuff" to a recognizable construct that still eludes many co-archivists. While the creators of *Melville's Marginalia* rely on hierarchies and media that are already culturally accepted and recognized by general audiences, specifically Melville scholars, not all online archives are as readily able to mirror the signs and signifiers at work in our society or in particular subcultures of our society. However, agreed upon notions of organization and order have been established societally for quite some time.

## 2.4   Finding in the Archive

Traditionally, finding aids, or descriptive tools used to discuss content, context, and structure of the archives and/or the significance, scope, nature, and purpose of the archived materials themselves, have been created by the archivist for the researcher (Millar 264). Finding aids often consider the original chronology of the document and the previous owner or agency that created or donated the archival materials, and are therefore

a precursor to metadata. While finding aids may organize the archive initially, metadata is "information about archives, whether traditional paper, visual, digital or in another medium, that describes the context, content and structure of the material and illuminates any other information that helps the archivist or user contextualize and use the material" (266). In other words, metadata is a type of finding aid. But who uses metadata and how do they use it? Morville, in his book *Ambient Findability,* points out that metadata is not important to the data itself, but supports administration and management of data—or organization—and there are different types of metadata, such as administrative, structural, and descriptive (125). Most users are familiar with descriptive metadata that provides "a word or phrase to describe the subject of a document for the purpose of retrieval," like a library card catalogue (125). Metadata is much older than the Internet; but digital archives have changed the ways that metadata is instituted and used.

Morville sees keywords as the crux for findability on the web; but one word or link is not as powerful as the finding aids, such as metadata, that archivists have created in the past. Carolyn Steedman's work complicates ideas about findability within the archive by asserting that the archival drive, or the Derridian *Archive Fever* that creates a researcher's exigency to "enter and use (the archive)" is actually a desire to have an archive, or a place to look (2). We often feel the reassurance of having something, like a box of files that is just physically present—something to look through. But how often do we actually engage with the material? Morville asserts that metadata "encapsulate[s] *aboutness* now to support findability later" (125). While this is true of traditional metadata in physical archives, Morville further defines how digital metadata works. Recognizing the resurgence of interest in metadata and findability, he outlines the

56

beginnings of taxonomies, ontologies, and folksonomies on the Internet (126-139).

Briefly, taxonomies involve hierarchical classification, often illustrated using tree

structures. Ontologies are based on the nature of existence—in online environments,

these relationships are illustrated by using a taxonomy with inferred rule. For example, a

Resource Description Framework —a standard model for data interchange that facilitates

data merging even with different underlying schemas—is an ontology (Morville 131).

Folksonomies emerged from online collaboration and have led to a rich environment of

tagging based on users' interests and relationships (Morville 135-136). However,

Morville's main point is how these structures can work together to create metadata (139).

Just as Manovich asserts that the Web 2.0 platforms have moved from content based to

communicative structures, Morville is showing that these structures have been embedded

into our daily media content. Both Manovich and Morville are discussing the Internet,

media, and metadata as interpreted and used by the consumer.

In the preface to his book, Morville notes that "most folks are more likely to win

the lottery than find this book" (xi). His point is well taken. Just as Richard Lanham

lamented about the many media and consumeristic avenues vying for our attention in his

*Economics of Attention*, Morville discusses how the internet's complexity hampers our

ability to find what we want and further describes searchability based on keywords. Yes,

words. Much like Foucault's enunciation level, we rely on our language more than ever

to find anything using technology. However, our informational organizational systems,

especially in the library sciences, have always relied on keywords, titles, and authors as a

way to find things—metadata.

While Poster discusses databases' ability to create their own cultural environments based on Foucault's concept of discursive knowledge, Lanham focuses on "a new oscillation between *at* and *through* vision," or a way of seeing that includes a specific type of attention, almost relative to a reality analysis (258). Lanham wants us to understand that we must analyze what we observe in the world, or what competes for our attention, and analyze why we interpret the attention-getting item the way that we do. Lanham asserts that digital technology has made revisionist thinking easier and more accessible (250). He optimistically believes that new digital media, complete with writing, images, and sounds, force the individual to consider more at once and, therefore, enact analysis in order to understand the connections embedded within this new form of text.

While I see that understanding this connectivity is important, I fear that because new digital media is still developing and there is so much to interpret, we could be oversimplifying the once complex. Manovich, in his article "The Practices of Everyday (Media) Life," supports this view when he points out that most media users are now consumers, with the onset of web 2.0 platforms, shifting the focus of digital media from rich content to communication. Lanham attempts to create a dichotomous system. However, the cultural implications for Lanham are much different because of the time in which he is writing. The move from using digital spaces as a content medium to a communicative one has had consequences for WPA study, among many other disciplines, as illustrated in the previous example of Hayles' work for *Vectors*. But how has an everyday technology like YouTube succeeded? While Manovich is discussing consumers, he notes that novices often imitate the strategies used by the "experts" that

have come before them—are these experts and novices equivalent users? Similarly, digital spaces often offer representations instead of the materials that were produced previously, or remix materials and their representations—as recognized by Baron. Many web 2.0 spaces promote changeability. According to Manovich, this often means a platform change, and these changes have very real implications for digital archives that are content based, as opposed to communication based.

For example, *Melville's Marginalia* was unavailable in April 2017 because the archive was moved to a new server. Much like the physical archive, the materials were unavailable while they were changing location. This content-based archive was digitally re-housed in order to update its search feature—a digital renovation. Recognizing that findability is important online, *Melville's Marginalia* now offers a search tool that uses XML coding to allow for keyword searches within both the handwritten and typed transcriptions. I learned about this change through *Melville's Marginalia's* Facebook page. Many websites use social media to advertise their services and changes because communication based social media sites have become the new word of mouth in our digital age. However, just like Myspace, these sites could become obsolete or forgotten in the future. In order to be remembered, many sites must constantly update online communication mediums and include photos or other attention getting representations. *Melville's Marginalia* provides many photos of the books and actual handwritten notes that appear on their pages—copies of the originals. While the user cannot smell the pages or feel the paper, the purpose of the online digital archive is the same as the physical archive: to provide a romantic notion of finding that motivates researchers.

Now *Melville's Marginalia* includes information on the search page about where the materials came from and how to search the collection effectively. While detailed explanations about the search features may take away from a feeling of discovery initially, this digital archive uses communicative mediums, like Facebook and Twitter, to heighten awareness about how the archive is being used, new ways to search, and what is being published that may be of interest to its users. While *Melville's Marginalia* includes content, communicative online mediums, like Facebook or Twitter, include information *about* the archive.

Descriptive information entices users and new audiences to visit the digital archive adding to the romantic idea of discovery. While feelings of rarity may not be maintained through the representation used in the digital archive, romance is created through findability and design. Therefore, how are Writing Program Administrators making digital archives in order to insure that materials are enticing and findable? How is information design adding to the allure of the online archive? Further, who is using the existing WPA archives and how are they being used? Making, findability, and usability testing are all important parts of the online archive puzzle—these elements fit together to make online archives just as elusive and exciting as their physical counterparts.

In Chapter 3, I explore WPA archives through the lens of findability. I consider how these archives are made and which heuristics might be applicable to the WPA digital archive. I focus on WPA archives that are well established and recognized. My extended examples include the Writing Program Administration Listserv (WPA listserv) that records our conversations, the Writing Studies Tree (WST) that maps our connections, and the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives (DALN) that tells our stories. I also

include some additional, but brief WPA archive examples to illustrate the many ways that these archives are crafted. In Chapter 4, I continue my discussion of WPA digital archive design by focusing on curricular based archives that are open-source and digital.

# 3   Designing the WPA Global Archive

"The word *archive* has specific disciplinary conditions applied to it, as do all words, and, as a result, how we label where we found the artifacts we find and use is an issue that we feel needs to be explored in greater depth…What we label the groupings of artifacts we find can and should tell readers specific things about them."

<div align="right">

--Barbara L'Eplattenier and Lisa S. Mastrangelo,

"Archival Research in the Field of Rhetoric and Composition"

</div>

"What we find changes who we become."

<div align="right">

--Peter Morville, *Ambient Findability*

</div>

As reviewed in Chapter 1, Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) have called for institutional, curricular, and programmatic archives in order to reflect the history of writing programs on their campuses. Overall, WPAs are asking to include a lot of different materials in the archive, like assignments, student papers, administrative documentation, textbooks, and disciplinary trends, to name a few. In Chapter 2, the many conditions of the archive are discussed at length, both theoretically and physically. The archives I describe and explore in this chapter each answer the call for the WPA archive, as reviewed in Chapter 1, in their own unique ways. My extended examples include the Writing Program Administration Listserv (WPA listserv) that records our conversations, the Writing Studies Tree (WST) that maps our connections, and the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives (DALN) that tells our stories. I also include some additional, but brief WPA archive examples to illustrate the many ways that these archives are crafted.

We tend to think of archives as primarily historic, but what about history in the making? While I advocate for digital archives, Clement et al. point out that "the digital environment is not the only appropriate venue for displaying the multifarious archives of Blake, Dickinson, or Whitman, but as a medium with different restrictions and different possibilities than the print environment" (116). Information can be accessed and delivered differently through digital mediums, even if the archive focuses only on a single history. However, many WPA archives are multifaceted—considering not only a singular history, but inclusive of disciplinary and institutional history. Potts argues that "rather than building systems that prioritize data above experience, we need to architect archives that focus on engagement with scholars and outreach with the public" (255). In other words, we need to create community through our archives—a space of collaborative knowledge and communication.

The move from using digital spaces as a content medium to using them to communicate, as established by Manovich, has changed the way archives work. Most communication based WPA archives, like the ones explored in this chapter, are well established and well known in our discipline—quite findable. In contrast, what I consider more content-based WPA archives tend to focus on curriculum, even when they are open-source, and are found buried within university websites. Upon my initial search, I found that WPAs, initially, have taken a global, critical approach to archivization. Before reviewing the archives that I have found, I will first consider modes of discovery within our archives.

In this chapter, I consider findability, which is a function of how things are labeled with keywords in order to be navigated by users. To explore findability in greater

depth, I consider archives created to reflect writing studies that are not curricular based, but address some of the other stories of our discipline. This chapter explores how these archives were created, how they might be found, and how information based evaluation methods might be applicable.

WPAs have been developing and using digital as well as physical archives for many years now and, therefore, creating our own keywords, organizational strategies, and digital designs—as recognized by L'Eplattenier and Mastrangelo. While not always recognized for this work, WPAs are doing the work of archivists by making. As acknowledged by Johnson, and reviewed in Chapter 1 of this dissertation, we are makers. Overall, with the onset of digital mediums, the ways archives are "made" is changing. Johnson's "four causes of making" also relate to these global WPA archives. He sees the "conceptions of making/crafting" as "*the making of products; the making of processes"* as well as "*the making of selves* and the *making of cultures"* (684). His "Economy and Heuristic of Craft Knowledge" includes these four conceptions and applies to how writing studies scholars use and make archives, as well as how archives entwine with our professional identities and create our academic culture. I will review the Writing Studies Tree thoroughly in this chapter to show how the production process and other pieces of Johnson's "craft knowledge puzzle" are exemplified.

While archival research is often cited, the process of putting together these digital archival projects is rarely discussed. Further, many WPA digital archives are living digital artifacts that we continue to construct, edit, and evaluate together. To this end, I will consider the WST and the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives thoroughly. In addition, platform and design must be taken into account as well as user response and

testing. In this chapter, I identify three different types of digital archives based on how they are made—the technologically mediated archive, the "digital surrogate" whose contents are digitized from a physical source, and those that are already digital, or born digital (Clement et al. 113). While these ways of making the digital archive may seem definitive, many of my examples are hybrids in that they include materials from more than one of these three categories. I explore each of these ways of making through the lens of "The Archive of the Future" and provide examples of WPA archives that fit each style of making. Helen R. Tibbo, in her chapter, "The Impact of Information Technology on Academic Archives in the Twenty-first Century," points out that most archives are currently born digital, but that is not usually the case with academic archives. I will focus on the WST and the DALN as born digital WPA archive examples. I will also discuss the problem of online metadata for the physical archive focusing Bloom's textbook archive and the Writing Centers Archive as examples. As writing studies continues to produce and work with both physical and digital archive, we must consider not only what we find, but what is findable and what defines our scholarship, institutions, and identity.

Tibbo addresses the changes that academic archives must make to keep up with ever advancing technology. She explains that information technology impacts "repositories, their collections, their staff, and their users" with the responsibility to "collect and preserve digital materials," "user expectation," and "the demand for digitization projects, digital preservation, and digital curation" (28). While exploring the WPA archives that tell our stories, I see Tibbo's impacts illustrated through our accessioning methods and the ways that we have designed our digital archives. Tibbo's work shows that researchers have not only come to expect digital archives, but also want

ease of use. With usability in mind, I will further discuss user testing, especially in regards to the specific surveys applicable to the DALN and general archival metrics developed primarily for libraries.

Many WPAs are familiar with the use of digital archives and use them in order to forward their own pedagogy. Perhaps the most widely known and used digital archive within composition studies is the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives. This notable archive began in 2007 and continues to be defined as a living archive that thrives on notions of critical pedagogy globally recognized by WPAs and other instructors and professors throughout our discipline. For instance the DALN includes a recorded reflection entitled "Pre-Service Teachers Use Their Literacy Narratives to Prepare for Classroom Teaching," where six soon to be teachers discuss how adding to the archive has affected their classroom expectations. The DALN has offered pedagogical opportunities in the field that support cultural comparison, digital technology, archival knowledge, and interaction in a way that writing studies is just beginning to recognize. In their article, "The Pedagogy of the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives: A Survey," Kathryn B. Comer and Michael Harker examine the ways that the DALN has been used pedagogically—not to create "best practices," but to establish the promising praxis that this interactive archive allows. These authors developed a survey that they dispensed using common writing studies listservs in order to gain a response about promising assignments associated with the site. However, they note that the DALN was initially established to preserve stories of literacy learning and recognize that an assignment used primarily to have students record their own literacy narratives is futile without appropriate context.

The DALN already aids instructors, professors, and WPAs in their professional goals and serves as an example of how an institutional archive will help scholars create, adapt, and construct themselves. Heightening awareness of digital archives that are already used within composition studies will encourage WPAs to begin to use these resources more. Publicly available sites, such as the ones highlighted in this chapter, potentially create community and often encourage contributions. By reviewing how these sites are developed by scholars, I will analyze how the well-known WPA archives are being made, and what is being included or left out, in ways that not only align with library and information science, but in new ways that consider design.

Design—or information organization—is crucial to any resource holding. In this chapter, I consider how writing archives that were developed for reasons other than curricular development are organized. I take into account not only how these archives were made, but also how materials were collected; what is considered metadata versus data in their holdings; and findability, curation, and design. While classifying current archives based on terms previously developed by information science and digital humanists can aid in the evaluative process, it is important to note that many of these archives are a result of WPAs who embraced making—even by accident. Based on how writing studies archives are being used and collaboratively created, further evaluation illustrates the liminality of technological spaces and community.

## 3.1  Findability

As writing studies scholars, we are already a specialized audience who understands language and keyword searches. In his book, *Ambient Findability*, Peter

Morville points out that "early adopters use search in support of mass customization," or, in other words, an audience cannot engage with something that he or she cannot find; therefore, we look for common ways of finding (13). Morville's examples focus on consumerism, like how Amazon initially made the most money selling books that a customer could not find in a store, but the idea is that users can find more specialized products and information on the web with minimal effort (149). Writing studies is a diverse field whose members understand communication. To accommodate our needs, our archives offer diverse navigation options. As Morville points out, genre plays a huge part in findability, recognition, and navigation within the digital space (146). Because a scholarly user knows what to look for, in regards to genre, our ability to find what we want is, presumably, better. Further, keyword searches dominate digital searches.

In digital archives, metadata can be a key word or phrase that helps one find either the archive itself or the materials stored within it. While keywords may be termed metadata, or the "employ[ment of] a word or phrase to describe the subject of a document for the purpose of retrieval," according to Morville; metadata has become the "stuff" of which many well recognized writing studies archives are made (125). Morville explains that metadata's purpose is to "encapsulate *aboutness* now to support findability later" (125). Morville is considering metadata through the lens of information architecture on the World Wide Web and available technologies.

However, according to Millar—who writes from an archival, editorial, and educational standpoint—metadata means "information about archives, whether traditional paper, visual, digital or another medium, that describes the context, content and structure of the material and illuminates any other information that helps the archivist or user

contextualize and use the material" (266). Metadata includes the information on the spine

of the book as well as the finding aids for materials in physical archives, but, now, with

the onset of digital mediums, metadata has become more like data and vice versa

(Morville 149). The previous, physical ideas that defined metadata have expanded in

digital spaces and the word has taken on a great deal of meaning in regards to finding as

well as defining our online experience.

Further, Morville notes that "in an age of location-awareness, when metadata can

be attached to people, possessions, and places, the findability and value of our documents

and objects will be shaped by strange new forms of sociosemantic *aboutness"* (152). In

other words, the metadata attached to a particular person or object will be based on their

findability—whether a person or object can be found through location tracking or

information available on the internet. "Sociosemantic *aboutness*" takes findability a step

further because it may return results that are not initiated by a keyword search. For

example, if I google the word "hot," I get a Microsoft outlook email description as a

result because it was once called Hotmail. Hotmail is no longer in the description or

definition—it is not a keyword in the search—but the email can still be found using the

word "hot" because of its algorithm history. The internal communication of our system

has replaced the more visual, physical metadata that we used in libraries and traditional

archives.

As our online experience becomes more communication based, metadata become

more and more informative instead of just assisting with content navigation. Again,

Morville uses Amazon as an example, explaining that we can now search information

inside of a book, use tags to look up reviews, and employ specific filters to find out what

a book is about and decide if we want it (149-150). Like Morville, Tarez Samra Graban, Alexis Ramsey-Tobienne, and Whitney Myers discuss "metadata projects" as "blur[ring] stark methodological distinctions between organizing, analyzing, and using historical information" which is "significant to historiography in rhetoric" (239). While metadata is defined slightly differently by Morville, Graban et. al., and Millar they all recognize that metadata is changing with use in digital spaces. What used to be information to help one find and navigate data or artifacts is now becoming the data and artifact in and of itself. As an example of how this change is affecting our disciplinary archives, I examine the Writing Studies Tree (WST), a non-linear representation of connections within our discipline, as an archive made up primarily of metadata.

## 3.2   The Writing Studies Tree

The WST, self-described as an "online, crowdsourced database of academic genealogies within writing studies," visually and textually maps "scholarly relationships in Composition and Rhetoric and adjacent disciplines." Born from a class taught by Sondra Perl at the City University of New York (CUNY) and created by a collaborative team of developers, visualization programmers, and advisors, the site invites scholars to add their own relationships within academia. Although the home page claims that it is an "interactive archive," and its creators see the mapped relationships as data, I see it more as an example of the data/metadata combining that Morville and Graban et al. discuss in relation to historical information. Morville refers to the reciprocation between metadata and data as "intertwingling," in accordance with Theodor Holm Nelson, a pioneer of information technology.

Intertwingling recognizes that previous organizational methods no longer work in non-linear, digital environments as we move seamlessly through pages, databases, multiple websites and social media, without a thought to category or hierarchy (64). With the cross over between data and metadata and the loss of traditional categorical organization, users largely rely on language to find what they want online. While intertwingling suggests that categorical or hierarchal means of organization have been retired, these known methods of organization are often re-invented or re-imagined for online findability. WPAs have whole websites and archives that go beyond using keywords as metadata and further exemplify the concept of intertwingling by using both non-linear design and categorical finding methods in new and different ways. For instance, the WST includes information about how to add to the dataset via a video walk through, discussion boards, tag cloud, lists of people, lists of institutions, and appropriate copyright information—which could also be considered metadata.

The WST is a visual representation of a dataset of relationships that are constantly changing; therefore, this site must be updated, maintained, and marketed or become obsolete. The WST requires users to update and maintain their own information and gives users the option of updating others' information also. While this maintenance of communal memory is intended to be inclusive, information can become outdated quickly if users lose interest. The creators of the WST recognize that by using participatory design they show that they trust their users, but some information may be incorrect (Miller et al.). Further, Miller et al. provide users with multiple ways to access and "view" information—the individual view, family tree view, and full network view (Miller et al.). If one is just visiting the site, then the information is accessible in several ways:

lists of people, lists of schools and institutions, the full network, recent additions, random pages, the key word cloud, and the tag cloud. These categories are listed across the top or the side of the webpage.

While the tabs at the top of the webpage are categorical, and expected based on typical patterns in web design, the cloud of keywords on the lower right side of the page and the mapping of relationships on the full network, individual, or family tree view are less traditional. Johnson points out that "on the one hand, creating…a taxonomic structure," such as a traditionally organized website or digital archives, "can limit the essence of the knowledge that is allowed to live and breathe in the construct" (683). But "on the other hand, crafting a visible construct is a beginning that can be played with, literally" and the WST's organization exhibits both of these digital constructs (Johnson 683). The user/author creates a profile within the WST, and can also "play" with the map to explore other's profiles and relationships by zooming in and out of different views. The site also includes a forum for questions and a digital space to discuss experiences and interactions with the WST.

While participatory design may have been the original intention, the creators must maintain this part of the site by responding to users. The WST acts as what Morville would call a "preeminent sandbox for exploring how interaction history can support social navigation" in the academic discipline of writing studies (150). While "popularity and reputation are the most common metrics" in many online sites, initially physical archival materials maintained their original organizational structures in order to create a researchable timelines. While new ways of writing relationship histories online may not layout a timeline they support findability.

In their *Kairos* article, Miller et al. explain that the WST goes beyond social media because of the wide angle view of many relationships beyond our own—both past and present. Unlike other web 2.0 platforms used for social networking, such as Facebook and LinkedIn, the WST is meant to display relationships beyond one's immediate connections and to maintain information about the pioneers of the writing studies field who have passed. In their article, Miller et al. further review ways that the WST is being used. For instance, Miller et al. discuss how the WST is being used for "institutional identity, pedagogy, professionalism, and research" with scenarios provided by the site's patrons. As with any archive, the information provided by the WST is used in many different ways, but I am more interested in the making of the WST itself.

The WST is both a product and a process. In regards to making within writing studies, Johnson sees "conceptions of making/crafting often limited to two types—*the making of products; the making of processes.* These two categories are indeed important and provide a way of thinking about the direct activities and products that writing studies professionals make. These two pieces, however, are only part of the craft knowledge puzzle" (Johnson 684). He then argues that identity, both individual and cultural, is also part of the puzzle that includes the whole of techne. The WST product, or "data," according to its creators, is the genealogy of the writing scholars who participate by adding to the site. The process is the mapping of relationships--metadata—put together by the multiple users. The different uses, recognized by Miller et al. as pedagogical, professional, and involving institutional identity, further the "craft knowledge" of our discipline.

The WST exemplifies the locality of scholars by mapping an individual and his/her connection to the writing studies academic culture in a global way—who they know, where they have worked. The site also includes sections to give "aboutness" information--details about the person's research, teaching and service, especially in regards to professional identity. Exploring the WST reveals the dynamics of writing studies culture based on where people go to school, where they work, and what they do during their careers. Using the WST reveals important relationships among members of the profession; encourages professional development, teaching, and research in our field; and thereby helps establish the identity of our discipline. In so doing, the WST exemplifies the "sociosemantic aboutness" that Morville discusses in a less explicit way. The WST may align more with Graban et al.'s "doing history in virtual spaces and with digital forms," regarding metadata as the user's ability to bring up "data records in a variety of forms and relations," and gaining access to "geographic and disciplinary locations" relative to collaboration and active pedagogy (240). Further, these authors see users "bridg[ing] a critical gap between data visualization and analysis, especially when the data points that users contribute, search for, and map constitute movable targets" (Graban et. al., 240). While the search capabilities of the WST may not support "sociosemantic aboutness" in the ways that other search engines' algorithms can, the site itself still supports the concept.

The WST provides a digital space where scholars share information that would typically appear on their curriculum vitae, combined with connections that they may have not been able to make without a digital medium—illustrating digital and physical community. Graban et al. argue that digital archival work is "communal and inventive,"

74

furthering the spectrum of digital archival projects that create tension between being a

"born-digital invention and analogue archival recovery" (238-239). The WST is "born-

digital," because the information archived on the site was created digitally and is

maintained in digital form by the audience/author, although, admittedly, continual site

maintenance can be problematic because it is based on user input. Additionally, the WST

also maps the history of its participants, providing a space for information recovery.

While Graban et al. shine a light on how we understand findability and metadata within

the prevalent and complex writing studies digital archives, digitization of any archive

lends itself to discussion of methods, methodology, and understanding. While a lengthy

discussion of the general move from physical to digital archiving is included in Chapter

1, discussing specific ways of making and reflection on how and why this is done in our

discipline in alignment with the digital humanities is pertinent to both the form and

function of the archive.

## 3.3   Making: The Three Types of Digital Archives

Library held archives have often relied on gifts. Collecting or amassing materials

for a library or archive is known as "accessioning." Archives often rely on the transfer of

ownership from an artifact's owner or donor to the archival institution, but scholars, such

as Lynn Bloom, Steven Olsen-Smith, and Cynthia Selfe, have actually set out to collect

their own materials for their digital archives (Millar 259). Lynn Bloom, in her article,

"Deep Sea Diving: Building an Archive as the Basis for Composition Studies Research,"

discusses the act of gathering textbooks to compile an archive in order to research the

evolution of authorship, textbook trends, and pedagogical trends in the 1990s. The WPA

archive has been discussed as a material place, but Bloom further comments on the

Composition Program Archive at the University of New Hampshire, a digital archive that

now makes textbooks widely available. Bloom defines her archive as "accidental"

because it began as a collection for her own research, and that "in the absence of a

textbook archive, [she] had to build her own" (282). Again, Bloom mentions that she is

acting as an "inadvertent archivist" and compares "deep sea diving" to archival work

throughout the article to seemingly distance herself from the term "archivist" and

characterize herself as a diver on a team exploring the historic sea (282,278). She views

her collection as an archive because "a single researcher, or team does not have world

enough and time to explore all the possibilities embedded in the primary materials" (286).

Bloom now "encourag[es] scholars to consider the materials they generate or acquire as

archives-in-progress rather than simply random collections" (283). Bloom worked by

herself, but, notably, recognizes the importance of teams when developing an archive.

Also, Bloom's archive moved from the materiality of textbooks to the online, digital

environment, further negotiating the spaces between the physical and the virtual,

although her archive is housed within the library database of the University of New

Hampshire and not all content is available online.

I consider Bloom's "archive" as metadata, like many other global WPA archives,

because the online database provided does not allow full viewing access to the textbooks

but is arranged more like a library database. Most users are familiar with more traditional

database structures and find them easily navigable. Bloom's article reflects on her

experience creating a digital archive as the initial archivist, offers suggestions and helpful

tips for beginning an archive, and includes reasons why archiving is problematic. Like

the WST creators, Bloom notes many ways that her textbook archive could be useful for researching pedagogical changes, differences in reading level, and design, to name a few. But she indicates that some of the problems of collecting texts for an archive is the "ephemeral nature of the works themselves" and the "editorial indifference" that causes texts to be treated as "commodities" instead of written works by publishers (286-287). Bloom considers who is providing these works (publishers) versus who might use her archive (academics) and how these users might treat the works differently than students. Bloom's considerations must be dynamic because of her different audiences. While the WST focuses on mostly academic and scholarly users, Bloom has to take the general consumer into account. While the WST is—in part—created by users and curated and maintained by an archivist, Bloom's archive relies on an "advocate who can ensure uninterrupted institutional commitment" to "keep the collection alive and visible" (287). The WST relies on its users and additional informative marketing, like visibility at conferences, to keep the archive up and running.

Similarly, Selfe's collection of literacy narratives is, by its very nature, collaboratively constructed. The DALN was built using exclusively digital material and is collaboratively created. Each type of collection method is a digital archive; however, archival accessioning within a digital environment is different than the accessioning processes employed in more traditional, material archives that are often housed within our institutions. Beginning from day one, she recorded and collected literacy narratives, then continued to invite people to add recorded or written literacy narratives to the collection. Each artifact is a "born-digital record," originally produced and maintained electronically (Millar 261). The additions to the DALN collection are considered gifts in

77

alignment with traditional archival practice. The archivists not only maintain the digital space and instructions, but also created the exigency to get the archive started and continue to aid in its growth by drawing attention to the project through conference presentations or booths that allow scholars to add their narratives on the spot. The DALN has a gift acknowledgement and a series of permission slips and release forms that must be signed when a literacy narrative is accepted.

Finding and arranging materials can be a daunting and expensive task when one focuses on a specific vein of knowledge. Steven Olsen-Smith traveled all over the United States scouring antique book stores and getting special privileges at the Harvard library in order to construct his archive of *Melville's Marginalia*. As opposed to relying on accessioning, or sending out a digital call for materials, Olsen-Smith set out to find "analog originals" in book stores, libraries, and museums in order to digitize those materials and/or provide transcripts that could serve as "digital surrogates" for those items that could not be scanned (Clement et al. 113). In other words, Olsen-Smith found the physical materials and digitized them, creating a digital surrogate for each item, whether it was an actual scan of a text or a typed transcript of the margin notes. While Olsen-Smith's archive is considered digitized because he had to create representations of the materials and Selfe's archive is born digital, because the materials are created digitally by the user, then added to the archive, the technologically mediated archive works a bit differently.

The technologically mediated, already digital archive is created by software. While *Melville's Marginalia* and the DALN may be restricted by the abilities of their website/database choices, the way content appears, is accepted, and is arranged is

78

primarily up to the initial archivist. The technologically mediated archive does not give the archivist this choice—the technology works as the archive. For example, most email systems offer archiving capabilities, but the user does not get to determine how things are curated or found—the system does. Older digital archiving was built into software in similar ways. The technologically mediated, already digital archive is exemplified by the WPA listserv archive, a digital conversation space for college and university Writing Program Administrators that has been around since 1993—before the WPA call for archivization was realized in academic journals. The WPA listserv includes an archive of previous digital conversations that was created and maintained by the software. Unlike a traditional archive, this digital space does not employ an archivist to organize and categorize the material, so it could perhaps be considered as a precursor to the common intertwingling that we often see in archives today. In regards to findability, the metadata to look up any item is well outlined by the system: date, string, subject, substring, timeline, or author information. While this may seem like a dynamic keyword search, it is actually a function of the software—much like a library database system; therefore "sociosemantic aboutness" does not work the same way. These digital conversations are collected by the software itself, and the platform itself does not have the algorithmic capability to work based off of keywords in the same way that google does. Findability in an archive that is just a function of the database depends heavily on the users' familiarity with the language of the discipline or memory of specific posts.

I identify three ways of making the digital WPA archives that I have found; including, but not limited to the technologically mediated, already digital archive  (WPA Listserv); the digitized archive, based on digital surrogates (Melville's Marginalia); and

the born digital archive (DALN).  While all of these self-identified archives are content based, findability within the archive is typically based on digital organizing structures. For Melville's Marginalia, not only did the content have to be collected and digitized, but it had to be organized using a digital platform with different permissions for an archivist versus a researcher—not just anyone can add to this archive. Additions must be submitted and reviewed before they can be included on the site. Similarly, the DALN was constructed digitally and then organized by the archivist, but has a more open-source format that allows additions from its audience/authors (users) without additional permissions or the re-working of content. The WPA-L relies on technology as an archivist and the users add to the content freely. Furthermore, findability in a digital environment entails not only finding materials, but also seeking out the archive itself, which I will discuss more in Chapter 4. Whether finding information within an archive or finding materials to include in an archive, finding is a daunting task.

## 3.4   Archival Design and Curation

Findability within a digital archive is wrapped up with design and curation. While gathering materials, digital or otherwise, helps with the creation of the archive, the organization, categorization and findability within the archive relies on curation. Curation in digital mediums can be facilitated by writing code, designing the organizational scheme, and/or selecting a platform—like Omeka. Omeka is a free, flexible, and open-source web-publishing platform for the display of library, museum, archives, and scholarly collections and exhibitions. While some archives rely on the software itself for curation, like the WPA-L, others work with designers to create digital spaces. Curation is

typically collaborative, but may be initiated by an initial archivist and then maintained by one or more people. Or curation could be ongoing depending on how open-source the digital archive is, which should be determined by the archivist. The WST exemplifies the collaborative nature of archival design. In their article, "Composing the Writing Studies Tree," Miller et. al. mention that they used Drupal 7 to construct the WST. Drupal is an open-source platform for building digital experiences. It's made by a dedicated community. Anyone can use it, and it is expected always to be free. Drupal offers many options for digital organization, but the danger in using a platform that offers so many options is that using too many may become confusing for the user—especially if the archive relies on users for much of its data.

While much institutional data can be found about different universities online, many programs may choose to keep data private. However, questions of platform are raised with the inclination of privacy. For instance, the Arizona State Digital Atlas, a WPA administrative archive that was developed and is maintained in Dropbox, allows for privacy, but the curation that Dropbox allows may not be as nuanced as other digital platforms. Because WPAs are not archivists first and foremost, they may not consider the complexities of developing an archive in a digital platform that may not continue to be maintained. While platforms like Omeka and Drupal are widely available, WPAs may tend to stick to creating an archive in course management sites, Dropbox, or social media sites that are more familiar.

For example, graduate students in Michigan Technological University's Humanities graduate program have the opportunity to teach an upper division undergraduate level technical communications course if they take a pedagogical and

curricular development course. Since the Humanities department is so interdisciplinary, not everyone wants to teach technical communications. Those who do and continue to teach the course are part of a Facebook group called "RTC Grad Instructors Resource." While considered a public group, members must be invited or ask permission to join. Additionally, Facebook itself is constantly changing and considered a social media platform as opposed to a more stably curated website specifically for curricular archivization. While this is not an example of a digital first-year writing curricular archive it harbors many of the same limitations because it is difficult to find and subscribe to and it may disappear when the current grad students who maintains it are gone. Further, the platform itself is unstable because it is being used for a purpose for which it was not intended, so the design may not even qualify as functional. While this is considered a "resource" and not an archive, it is being used as a repository for curricular material. I will discuss curricular archive design in Chapter 4, but see this "resource" as an example of a way that institutions are answering the WPA archival call without identifying a specific person as an archivist--by having a repository that does not require design or curation. While repositories, such as the "archive" for your email, are searchable, should we consider these digital spaces archives if they are not explicitly curated?

The design of the digital archive must be considered and tested. As WPAs and instructors, we constantly ask our students to consider design aspects of their work and produce multimodal projects. The digital WPA archive could also be viewed as a multimodal, interdisciplinary project, and, therefore, should be evaluated for its design as well. As Anne Wysocki points out, "there is little or nothing that asks composers and

readers to see and then question the values implicit in visual design choices, for such design is often presented as having no value other than functionally helping readers get directly to the point"(6). Similarly, Alana M. Miller, a content strategist at the California Digital Library, evaluated user experience for The Museum of Modern Art Archive's website in 2013. Miller points out that archives are often designed by archivists or digital librarians, who may not be the same as typical users, such as academics, students, or professionals.

Design is a choice and must be assessed in the same way as content itself. Jody Shipka considers the assessment of multimodal designs for her students, just as Wysocki relates design evaluation and choices to student work, but what of our own archival work? "Being rhetoricians in public archives involves coming to terms with our hybrid roles and recognizing how they become sites for invention," according to Graban et al. Further, these authors build on Barbara Biesecker's work by stating that "being rhetoricians in *digital* archives means constructing archival tools that enact the kinds of invention we think possible (quoted in Graban et al., 238). Potts also "calls for scholar practitioners in rhetoric to engage with the digital humanities as user advocates, experience architects, and participant-centered researchers" (255). Design is part of invention when creating digital archives and there are multiple roles for scholars to take when creating digital archives. But how is appropriate usability determined?

## 3.5   Usability Testing

What is the digital standard? Michael Seadle, a German information scholar, in his article, "Archiving in the networked world: metrics for testing," discusses the 2011

83

Aligning National Approaches to Digital Preservation conference and admits that everyone "generally agreed that the digital archiving community needs to develop benchmarking and other forms of measurement to enable a fair and open comparison and to make it possible for libraries and other cultural heritage institutions to make rational choices for long term digital preservation…well beyond purely technical functionality" (557-8). While Seadle focuses on the study of how librarians might keep a "digital long term archiving system" and how to test these systems; writing scholars are faced with the same problem.

The call for digital archival testing has been established through the work of information and library sciences. Notably, Elizabeth Yakel and Helen Tibbo have answered this call by creating survey tools; in their article "Standardized survey tools for assessment in archives and special collections," they discuss user-based evaluations that they have created and made available online specifically for librarians and other information scientists to use. Through the development of the Archival Metrics Toolkits, some challenges of developing appropriate usability tests for these different types of archives are identified. Yakel and Tibbo point out that "user-based evaluation in archives and special collections is in its infancy" (211).

The Archival Metrics Project offers five possible questionnaires and support materials that hinge on web usability testing for "researchers, archival web sites, online finding aids, student researchers, and teaching support" (212). In "The Development, Testing, and Evaluation of the Archival Metrics Toolkits," Duff et al. point out that archivists have been looking for a way to better understand their users' needs—the toolkits are an answer to that call (571-572). Archivists in North America have been

conducting usability studies to gain an understanding of their users and their users' needs

for approximately 30 years (572). Duff et al. point out that very little data has been

collected about archive users and relate the importance of understanding users to system

design (573). Designers and users often have different knowledge bases, and, therefore,

different needs.

Without a basic understanding of user wants and needs, designing a digital

archive becomes somewhat futile. However, developing a method to test and gather data

from users across many archives is challenging at best. To develop their survey based

toolkits, Duff et al. interviewed 12 professors, 16 students, and 14 archivists in order to

determine the services they would like to be available in the archive, their expectations

for archival research support, their archival research experiences, and how they would

prefer to give feedback (575). While this questioning helped Duff et al. develop the

"conceptual framework" for creating their toolkits, it also showed them that different

audiences had different expectations and used the archives for a variety of reasons. Duff

et al. identified three major types of interaction with the archive that hinge on personnel,

the physical archive, and the access tools (578). Depending on the audience for a specific

toolkit, in this case researchers, teachers, students, website users, and finding aid users,

they constructed series of interdependent questions for each kit, as opposed to a question

bank, so that the questions could build on each other and produce relatable data (581).

Overall, the goal of the toolkits is to give archivists hard data about their users so that

they can make necessary changes to their systems and services (590). The toolkits

provide a standard way of testing archival services and are free to download. The

Archival Metrics Toolkits were developed and tested in 2010, and continue to be a useful

resource for archivists today; however, the developers of the toolkits recognize that different audiences require different tools to understand the archive.

While the developers of the Archival Metrics Toolkits consider the usability of mostly physical repositories and the online finding aids, other digital library scientists are considering preservation in online environments for "technical functionality…legal issues…and educational testing" (Seadle 558). While Seadle discusses many of the technical implications of an online archive system throughout his article, two common questions that frequently arise are relative to the data capacity of an archive system and the ability to migrate digital content between formats (560). When selecting a platform for a digital archive, each of these items must be considered and discussed. Dropbox may provide enough storage space for a comprehensive, programmatic archive, but what about migration? These are the questions that we do not want to ask because it means that the WPAs who inherit our archives may have to spend hours sifting through holdings in order to use a new platform. Seadle suggests testing and outlines three different types of tests. Because I am studying online open-source archives that are published mostly through University websites, like the developers of the Archival Metrics Toolkits, I consider the heuristics that could be applied to WPA archives. Many WPA archives do not fit easily within the evaluate metrics that are available, but those that are similar to library archives do.

For example, the Writing Centers Archive, which is part of the Writing Centers Research Project, with material holdings housed at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, provides a searchable database to find recorded oral histories and materials, but does not provide any digital recordings online. Therefore, one would be able to search the

archive and know whether or not specific materials are available based on the online

database keyword search, which brings up other issues of findability, but would have to

travel to UALR in order to listen to the oral histories or see the materials themselves. As

reviewed previously, many enjoy "discovering" in the physical archive, but it can be

frustrating to "discover" what you need online, but not have physical access to those

materials. The Archival Metrics Toolkit would be an effective tool to test the Writing

Centers Archive because it would provide questionnaires for those using the online

search database as well as surveys for researchers visiting the physical archive, but some

questions may need to be altered to meet the needs of a writing studies audience. I will

discuss the toolkits in more detail in Chapter 4, but they can be downloaded from the

Archival Metric toolkits website at any time.

In order to use the Archival Metric toolkits to evaluate the usability of WPA

archives, the WPA would run into similar problems described by the toolkit developers

with static online access to surveys. However, the Archival Metrics toolkits were

developed in order to understand mostly physical repositories. My study focuses on WPA

open-sourced archives that I can access to understand what is working and what is not.

While some questions from the Archival Metrics Toolkits may be adapted to this new

audience, this is not why these particular tools were developed. In order to better

understand the WPA digital archive and evaluate it, I narrowed my project down to

findable, digital archives that focus on first-year writing programs that I will discuss

further in the next chapter. WPA administrative archives that are closer to my perfect,

imaginary digital archive do exist, such as the Arizona State University Digital Atlas.

However, I chose to identify those to which I have access and anyone can view or use to

produce their own WPA curricular archive. Similarly, Comer and Harker developed a curricular focused survey to discuss the DALN.

Comer and Harker specifically ask how teachers use the DALN for curricular means, although they recognize that the DALN was developed as a place to store literacy narratives, not necessarily as a curricular archive or teaching resource. However, archives are often used in academic environments in order to teach a tangible research process. The DALN is a teaching tool that allows students to not only browse the archive, but to record their own stories and become part of a living history. The DALN survey was developed specifically for teachers working in a digital environment with a detailed, specific archive that maintains an open-sourced, but targeted goal of recording oral histories about learning literacies. I will explore the surveys and heuristics used to analyze WPA archives further in Chapter 4.

Overall, this chapter has explored findability and making with specific examples. I have discussed how WPA archives have been created and maintained, even accidentally, such as Bloom's textbook archive. I have examined findability, both within the WPA archive according to Morville's definitions as well as by comparing the digital environment to previous archival finding methods. Moreover, I consider a user's initial interaction with a global WPA archive, such as the DALN, based on marketing and physical visibility. Further, I briefly describe digital archive surveys that determine use, such as Archival Metrics. I identify three different types of digital archives based on how they are made. My extended examples include the WPA listserv as a technologically mediated archive, the WST and the DALN as already digital archives, and *Melville's Marginalia* as an archive of digital surrogates.

While WPAs have created digital archives for different audiences and uses, such as the ones explored in this chapter, many have also answered the call for archives by creating curricular archives particularly for the use of graduate students in the discipline of composition and rhetoric in order to help these scholars to create their initial composition courses and find new ways to adapt assignments and syllabi to match their own teaching philosophies. The curricular archives, that both answer the call of WPAs and are digital to meet the needs of those in graduate programs that must have access to the material, also match a critical pedagogical standard that is being heralded and proliferated in online environments. While still maintained by an archivist, usually the WPA of the institution, and situated within the digital realms of a particular institution, these curricular archives are ripe for examination. While some may argue that the curricular archives are tested by the graduate scholars who frequently use them, there has not been a heuristic created to consider the different archives available. In Chapter 4, I examine and apply other archival heuristics that consider digital archives to several open-sourced curricular archives. In addition to considering heuristics, I also examine design and findability.

# 4  Testing the WPA Curricular Archive

"The project of establishing an archive presents an intellectual challenge. It is not merely an act of accumulating and filing documents; they also must be evaluated."

<div align="right">

--Shirley K. Rose

"Preserving Our Histories of Institutional Change"

</div>

Besides the archives that we all use, like those described in Chapter 3, many WPAs understand the call for an archive as a call for curricular archives for writing courses or a collection of a program's administrative documents. The administrative archive is typically for WPA use, and the curricular archive is representative of the program and its audience of those who teach writing courses. As with many online WPA archives the audience usually includes the author. Shirley K. Rose makes many compelling arguments as to why a WPA would like a local writing program archive and reviews uses for that archive, which I discuss in Chapter 1, but few WPAs discuss the process of making such an archive. Usually the WPA of the institution acts as an archivist to maintain the archive but may not act in the same way during accessioning because the selection process of curricular documents varies. The WPA must make decisions about what should be included and why. Further decisions include what platform is best for a digital archive and how the archive is to be maintained and added to. Many WPAs make these important decisions, but few are given credit for their efforts beyond their university. Therefore "common practices" often go unspoken because many WPAs will only discuss their archives as a reflective, personal experience. Although I recognize that there is no standard for WPA accessioning, we can evaluate the archives that are open-

sourced and available beyond the originating institution to determine what practices might be best to meet our own archival goals. In order to determine common practices, a researcher must turn to evaluation of current and accessible WPA archives. But what methods are best for such an evaluation?

In this chapter I review others' reflections about the creation process of the archive and I examine heuristics that may apply to WPA archival creation and design through the lenses of technical communication, library science, and the digital humanities. Moreover, I apply these heuristics to several open-sourced curricular archives. Primarily, I consider how local, digital composition archives and databases have been organized. How might these designs be evaluated for usability in order to help other WPAs create useful archives or test existing archives within their institutions?

## 4.1   Reflections on WPA Archival Creation

Besides covering much of the WPA call for the archive in Chapter 1, the digitization of the physical archive in Chapter 2, information about making in Chapter 3, and some extended examples about making archives used by many writing studies scholars, such as *Melville's Marginalia* and the DALN, it is important to contextualize examples of WPA archival creation in regards to reflection. Whilst many archives are created collaboratively, there are surprisingly few reflections about the creation of these archives.

As discussed in Chapter 1, the University of New Hampshire demonstrates collaborative collecting in their summer project work to document writing program histories. Cinthia Gannett, Amy Zenger, John Brereton, Elizabeth Slomba, and Kate

Tirabassi worked together to create a writing program archive and reviewed their process

through individual reflections in their chapter, "It Might Come in Handy: Composing a

Writing Archive at the University of New Hampshire." This archive is housed in the

Dimond Library, and its holdings include curricular and pedagogical materials as well as

student writing, course catalogues, photographs, prized essays, and published student

literary journals (116). The initial motivation for the collaborative project began when

Gannett, the Director of the Writing Center and WAC program, realized that there would

be a significant turnover in personnel in the department (120). She began by writing a

proposal to the University Writing Committee and it was met with approval on the

condition that the library archivist was invited into and involved with the collaboration.

Although the initial proposal included support for a professional consultant and

two graduate students, the addition of the library archivist added some much needed

understanding and education about archives to the project (121). Understanding and

developing the project was a recursive process; Slomba, the library archivist, reflects

about the differences in accessioning based on valuation between herself, as an archivist,

and the writing scholars (121-123). Her reflection supports the assertion that WPAs are

uniquely qualified for this work and includes information about how this collaboration

changed the way she pedagogically approached new student researchers in the library

(124-125). Further, Tirabassi and Zenger, two doctoral students who worked as assistant

directors to WAC and the Writing Center review their process of "valuing and

interpreting the artifacts" for collection, establishing a vision, and brainstorming what

should be included (126). From this brainstorming many lists "became the templates for

the hands on work" that included collecting and sorting and inviting others to submit

materials (127). Just as I discussed above, those who create the archives are often the users of the archives. The archivist notes that graduate students began to make use of the archive as soon as a year after its development in order to write seminar papers (125). Two graduate students, Tirabassi and Zenger, worked on the collective team that put this archive together and the initial users were also graduate students.

The WPA archive is a collaborative undertaking and represents the writing community of students and educators, as well as writing at the institution. Brereton, the historian-composition archivist who worked on the project, reflects on the creation of the archive as a "process itself [that] can be instructional for all participants" (132). He further describes the purposes of the writing archive as recognizing the centrality of writing, displaying writing in different disciplines, representing the writing program community, and a way to market or display the work that has been done (131-132). He characterizes the writing archive as a "living thing, constantly subject to growth and change" that will continue to instruct its users and its makers (133). Brereton's reflection is similar to Bloom's recognition that an archive must be updated and added to or become irrelevant.

As I began discussing in Chapter 3, Bloom went looking for "a comprehensive archive of twentieth-century textbooks," but "the existing archives—the National Archive of Rhetoric and Composition physically located at the universities of New Hampshire and Rhode Island—contains random and isolated volumes; many are missing entirely" (281). Although Bloom admits that "a partial collection is better than none," she went about making her own. Bloom was inspired to create her textbook archive based on the lack of available resources to conduct her research.

Even though her motivation was different than that of the Dimond Library/WAC/Writing Center collaborative, Bloom also sees the importance of teamwork when building the archive and considers archives as a constant work in progress (283). She worked with library personnel, but did not solicit outside donations because she focused on answering her research question and did not consider the materials she was collecting as an archive in progress at the time (282-3). She gained the funds for research, an assistant, and travel through her endowed professorship at the University of Connecticut and a research grant from NCTE (282). She estimates that she spent about 1,500-1,800 hours over 3 years to construct the archive and database (282). Her accessioning process included posting to email listservs (such as the WPA listserv), advertising in professional journals, sending letters and making phone calls, marketing at professional meetings, asking for faculty help, and sending research assistants to other offices and colleges (283). She acknowledges that the online library catalogues of today would have aided her process by allowing her to find books through interlibrary loan, but she was creating her collection in the mid 90s and electronic cataloguing was not available yet (284). Her secretary would enter all of the information into a computerized database as it came in, but she and her assistants would check and re-check all of the information against the textbooks (284). She ultimately gifted her collection to the National Archives of Composition and Rhetoric at the University of New Hampshire (285-6). While not all of Bloom's work is available online, she recognizes that if she had thought of her work as an archive initially, then she may not have struggled with the "problems of textbook collection" as much (286). Further, she believes that "every archive needs an advocate who can ensure uninterrupted institutional commitment of

personnel, space, and funds to maintain any archive" in addition to "keep[ing] the collection visible and alive" (287).

Bloom offers suggestions to begin creating a digital archive and Gannett et al. reflect on their process of creating a usable writing program archive at their institution, however no one has outlined standard ways to evaluate and create WPA digital archives. In their article, "Toward a Notion of the Archive of the Future: Impressions of Practice by Librarians, Archivists, and Digital Humanities Scholars," Tanya Clement, Wendy Hagenmaier, and Jennie Levin Knies discuss future archival practices from a digital standpoint based on interviews with five humanities scholars. Clement et al. asked a series of questions about digital project creation, scope, data, best practices of the host institution, and predictions for the future and discuss the interviewees reflections about digital practice, and the different roles of the archive, the archivist, and the scholar (117).

Although many of the technological issues of digital projects excite "hybrid librarians," a term that Clement et al. use to reference the blurring term for an archivist, librarian, scholar, and designer in our online age of production, they also consider what is standard in the archival production process (115). Gretchen Gueguen, one of the interviewees, discussed the importance of "communication between digital humanities centers and libraries and archives," (120). While this seems imperative to the success of a collaborative, like the WAC/Writing Center/Dimond Library group, when humanities scholars work in digital library positions they are often expected to do it all as hybrids. Clement et al.'s conclusions after the interviews include the need for "central, digital repositories that are open, interdisciplinary, multimedia and built to support cross-institutional projects;" "resources at archives and libraries to produce and publish small

and large curated data sets or scholarly editions and projects;" and "circulat[ion] for peer review and remixing within a wider community that is educated in the scholarly work these kinds of projects entail" (122-3). Clement et. al.'s research shows that community is necessary to any digital humanities archival project. The collaboration that these projects require is commonly associated with library resources. Further, the process of creating digital archival projects is recursive and must include scholars and users.

Gretchen Gueguen, an archivist for digital curation services at the University of Virginia Libraries interviewed for Clement et al.'s study, mentions that "digital project managers should take a lesson from IT and divide projects into achievable phases with manageable scopes" (120). Moreover, Doug Reside, a digital curator of the performing arts at the New York Public Library with a PhD in English who was also interviewed by Clement et al., believes that "curators and creators must build tools for gathering metrics into their projects and cooperate with external peer review groups" (122). Overall, the digital humanities are asking for evaluation of the archives that they produce in order to create the best product and user experience. Moreover, those who are program minded would like to handle these projects as recursive; in a way in which they can be tested or reviewed and then revised actively. Some of the archives I reviewed in the last chapter, like *Melville's Marginalia* and the DALN, have had pauses in service or presentation due to updates, but in the "archive of the future," as described by Clement et al., the archive would be continually tested and revised while still remaining available.

By considering reflective works, such as those of Clement et al., Bloom, and Garrett et al., I propose heuristics that may apply to the current development of the localized composition archive. Although future usability testing may test the

applicability of my analysis, using heuristics to understand the current practices of digital

archiving by Writing Program Administrators is pertinent to technical communications

and library science and may focus the field of understanding and/or developing standards

for how digital archives are made. Usability studies of digital archives are few and far

between and, as Laurie Mercier notes in her review of the *Maine Memory Network*, many

would "greatly benefit" from such studies in order to "make sense of the past" and

contextualize source material.  While discovery has always been a serendipitous aspect of

archival research, usability is key when WPAs seek to know the history of their

institutions and aid new composition instructors in curricular development. My

evaluation and analysis will be useful when developing any future WPA archive because

takes technical communications, information science, previous curricular evaluations,

and digital projects into consideration. The purpose of considering heuristics before

creating the WPA archive is to aid digital archival practices within composition studies.

Most localized WPA archives are curricular based and housed within institutional sites

that focus on teaching writing and, sometimes, include reflection. I will consider how the

elements within the archive are chosen on those results in order to assert common

practices and organizational themes to create a WPA digital archive. I do not consider the

curriculum itself.

## 4.2  Heuristics and Surveys

In this section, I reflect on Robert Johnson's "An Economy and Heuristic of Craft

Knowledge" in regards to the considerations of the collaborative WPA digital archive and

further reflect on the Archival Metrics and the DALN survey in regards to evaluation. As

discussed in Chapter 3, Johnson sees the "conceptions of making/crafting" as *the*

*making of products; the making of processes"* as well as "*the making of selves* and the

*making of cultures"* (684). His "Economy and Heuristic of Craft Knowledge" includes

these four concepts and applies to many WPA archives. I introduced Johnson's heuristic

when I reviewed the Writing Studies Tree in the last chapter to show how the production

process and other pieces of Johnson's "craft knowledge puzzle" are exemplified. I now

further consider how Johnson's heuristic applies to WPA archives in a broader way.

Table 4-1 Johnson's "An Economy and Heuristic of Craft Knowledge" reflecting the craft knowledge puzzle in regards to the aim of writing studies. The heuristic is included here in order to further illustrate how the WPA archive is made. Recreated from "Craft Knowledge: Of Disciplinarity in Writing Studies" (684). Permission for use in Appendix.

| Products | Processes | Selves | Cultures |
|----------|-----------|--------|----------|
| Evaluate | Construction | Reflect | Pro-act |
| Construct | Design | Act | Historicize |
| Edit | Invention | Evaluate | Persuade |
| Alter | Learn/Do | Construct | Listen |
| Invent | Converse | Identify | Describe |

In regards to the production of WPA program archives, they often display our

products, such as curriculum, syllabi, articles, etc., but are also products in and of

themselves. The processes in crafting a digital WPA archive include platform

construction, archival design, collaboration, and learning while we create. Selves are

revealed through the limited reflections and calls for the archive that I have reviewed in

98

this chapter and in Chapter 1. Further, the archive identifies the writing program within the university and writing across the curriculum throughout the university. The archive itself is ripe for evaluation—especially its construction. Finally, the archive is representative of the historical writing culture at the university—creating a record of that culture. Much of Johnson's heuristic applies to the WPA archive as a site of making. Moreover, we can see a lot of the overlap between this heuristic and Brereton's reflection about the writing archive as representational of the historicity of the writing program at the University of New Hampshire. Johnson's heuristic was designed specifically for writing studies and is not exhaustive. Other evaluative tools have been developed for digital archives through the vein of library science.

As discussed in the last chapter, Archival Metrics offers five possible questionnaires and support materials that hinge on web usability testing for "researchers, archival web sites, online finding aids, student researchers, and teaching support" (212). The toolkits were made to be used by libraries with patrons that may or may not engage with digital repositories. They may work well for the many WPA archives that are affiliated with their campus libraries. While Archival Metrics offers different questionnaires for different audiences, the "Website/Access Tool" survey may be especially pertinent to discovering users reactions to findability and design. Asking questions such as: how the user found the website, rating the content as well as the visual appearance and organization, whether or not the website was easy to use, and suggests questions that can be customized for a digital resources search tool.

In regards to peer review for the WPA curricular archive, Comer and Harker designed a survey specifically for the DALN to ask teachers how they were using the

archive pedagogically. Comer and Harker's survey was directed at teachers to discover how the DALN was being used. There is also an Archival Metrics toolkit that includes survey questions intending to measure the instruction use of collegiate archives and special collections. Both surveys ask some questions with concrete responses, like what course the archives are being used for, but they also ask more detailed qualitative questions about how the materials are being used, what assignments look like, how the use of the archive helps teachers pedagogically, and what goals are being met through the use of the archive. The Archival Metrics survey is a bit more general in order to serve a wider population of information scientists who seek to establish and maintain university libraries and their resources. Despite their different emphases, the common questions reveal that each survey is looking at the connections between teaching philosophy and use of the archive, how the archive is being used, and considering the usefulness and learning objectives that play in to the curricular development and use of the archive.

## 4.3   Curricular Archives

Open access, local, curricular archives, often maintained by WPAs, offer curricular information to graduate students, adjuncts, and other faculty who teach composition classes. Although the WPA call asks for curricular archives, they are very difficult to find and the archived material is often very selective and limited. While some archives provide the metadata to explain the selection process of the archived materials, others simply include what they can. The global WPA archives are publicly displayed and many of those who have created them have written short articles that detail the process of making them, curricular archives often go unexamined. Not only is the local

archive less findable, but the materials that are included vary based on institution and qualification. In this section I will evaluate the design and findability of three open-sourced, curricular archives.

### 4.3.1    Cornell University: John S. Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines

This self-described archive of teaching materials presents the winning materials for the John S. Knight award for writing exercises and the James F. Slevin assignment sequence award. These awards are given interdisciplinarily based on the many first-year writing seminars that are taught throughout Cornell's campus. Cornell takes aWriting in the Disciplines approach to their first-year writing seminar and awards outstanding materials that are developed in eighteen different departments.  Initially, I found this website through the Teaching Assistant support site. While the support site is open to the general public, it still specifies different audiences such as "Faculty" and "Graduate Instructors."  In order to view the curricular materials provided, the site redirects the user to the Cornell eCommons digital repository.  This repository is connected to the Cornell library, but any user can access the materials from the First-year writing Seminar Program site.

The repository allows the user to browse through assignment sequences or writing exercises and also has a search function. Each entry can be searched using the title, author's name, date issued, and/or "type" of paper/project or learning object, according to the directory. Further, when an entry is found, the metadata included to categorize the entry includes the title of the assignment sequence or writing exercise, author, year, and a brief description that sometimes includes part of the author's reflection about how the

assignment is meant to be used in the classroom. When the user clicks on the link to the paper/project, the PDF opens to a title page that includes the type of award won, the title of the piece, the author's name, the course number and course title for which the assignment was written, and the year that the award was received. Following the appropriate legalities, the title page also includes the notification that, although these materials are copyrighted by the author, they are made available through a Creative Commons Attribution.  Following the title page, the PDF includes the signed sheet that the author would have filled out to apply for the award. The next page is a short reflection from the author explaining and reflecting on the uses of the assignment. All of this information works as metadata before the writing exercise or assignment sequence itself. The overall schema of the site relies on previous design notions of the digital library and the metadata works to make the curricular materials findable.

As discussed in Chapter 2, we rely on forms of organization that we have grown accustomed to, so using the digital repository of the eCommons, that, presumably, is common to the scholars at the institution and beyond.  While this aligns with my criteria to explore institutionally specific open-source digital archives, it also creates a curricular writing identity for the institution. The selection process of materials is streamlined through the prizes awarded and those who might be reluctant to apply may be persuaded by the monetary awards associated with the recognition of writing assignment excellence. The writing exercises, handouts and sequences include a reflection from their authors, but, unfortunately, student samples are not part of this repository. The original call for a WPA archive asks for more student work; however, because of legal privacy policies, like FERPA, it might be difficult to get IRB approval to include student samples in a

repository of this size, a concern that I will discuss further in Chapter 5. Because the repository is organized by and associated with a library-like database, using the Archival Metrics toolkits to analyze its use might be the best way to begin developing a heuristic for this particular archive, but the materials themselves have a specific audience of those who teach writing or are learning to teach writing—first-year writing seminars at Cornell, to be exact. The DALN survey might work better if one were looking at how instructors are using the materials.

### 4.3.2 University of Pittsburgh: Department of English Composition Program--Teaching Archive

The Teaching Archive at the University of Pittsburg, located on the Department of English Composition Program website in the "About" section, is a bit less findable. The archive is a web page that consists of headings that point to specific writing classes, such as "Seminar in Composition" or "Written Professional Communication." This site offers a greater breadth of writing assignments beyond those specifically for a first-year writing class, but only offers a few choices for each via hyperlink under the author's name. On the archival site page, there is a short paragraph about each assignment where the author's name is embedded. These paragraphs serve as metadata, because once a user clicks on an author's name the assignment appears. Although the website serves as a stable platform that can be modified within the institution, the archive is a bit buried in the English department, lending itself to a specific audience of those learning to teach writing in this department alone. The list design works only because this archive is so small, otherwise, it would be unsearchable.

### 4.3.3 Colorado State University: Teaching with Writing@CSU--The Composition Archive

The CSU archive is linked to the Teaching with Writing@CSU webpage that acts as an open-access educational resource with links to teaching activities, relevant journals, teaching guides and the Colorado writing project as well as the archive. The Writing@CSU is part of the Writing Studio Open Educational Resource Project and the goal is to "allow writers and writing instructors to create and share writing textbooks with students, friends, and the general public." The archive link offers teaching materials used in the CSU composition program dating back to the late 90s. Once a user clicks on the link it takes him/her to a list of seven numbered writing courses. The first course link, CO130: Academic Writing, link provides a "Detailed Course Description," "Sample Syllabus," "Transfer Equivalents & Advanced Placement," and "Teaching Resources." The first course link includes transfer and placement information that may be relevant to students as opposed to just teachers looking at the resource.

The second course link, CO150: College Composition, opens to a bulleted list of dates ranging from 1996-2012. The page notes that current materials are available on the University Composition Web site. Clicking on different dates brings the user to different materials; some are in a format consistent with the website, including the same green, gold and burgundy colored format. Other dates, earlier than 2002 take the user to a database that seems separately linked to the archival site. Although the change of formats may be disconcerting because of the different information design, the dated links all contain relevant course goals, assignment information, and calendars. Some include additional administration materials and the "helpful things" link includes items such as

handouts and other aids for the classroom. This course link seems to primarily target teachers, but students who may want to learn more about the courses that they are about to take could also gain a lot of information from reviewing this archive. Further, if one were to write an article aligning trends in composition theory to teaching practice, this portion of the site could work as a good example.

The third course link, CP300: Writing Arguments, begins with the same bulleted headings at CP130, but also includes archived course materials from 1996-2000, like CO150. However, instead of clicking on the year, the links to click on are the names of those who taught the course or "Sample Course." Each name brings the user to the blue database where materials are listed and accessed. Additionally, in the linked database, the number of the class changes to CO250. The links within the blue database sometimes produce more links on the right side of a split screen, some come up with errors, and some take the user directly to text based documents. Overall, the organization of this archive is inconsistent, but this may be due to past systems that the University used, administrative decisions to change course names/numbers, and factors beyond the archivists' control. The CSU archive uses some of the same organizational strategies as the smaller University of Pittsburg archive, including findability by teachers' names and course titles. However, unlike the Pittsburg or Cornell archives, the CSU archive's platform includes database systems and, therefore, fewer pieces of document-based metadata and digital surrogate materials, like scanned in assignment sheets. The organization is not always consistent, depending on which database the materials are in or the course one is looking up, and may be a bit confusing, but this archive more densely populated than either of the other archives examined.

## 4.4  Digital Archive Usability

Usability within digital archives has received a lot of attention. The Archival

Metrics team created questionnaires specifically for the purpose of understanding user

needs. Rosalie Lack, a Public Content Manager at the California Digital Library, studied

the usability of her digital library and archival services in collaboration with the

Assessment and Evaluation Program and the Interface Design Team to determine

usefulness and the ease of use (71). Over four years, Lack and her collaborators used four

methods (Focus Groups, Interviews, Questionnaires, Usability Testing) to determine the

top ten themes that users struggled with as they used eight different digital library

resources. The California Digital Library (CDL) testing included more than "fifteen focus

group sessions, with approximately 150 participants; sixteen structured interviews; more

than 150 usability testing sessions, and approximately twenty-five questionnaires" in

addition to ongoing "analysis of usage logs and user feedback" (71).  The CDL evaluated

"ebooks, an archival finding aids site (Online Archives of California), a personalized

library portal (MyLibrary), a California statistics site (Counting California, a metasearch

tool (SearchLight), and online catalog (MeIvyl Catalog), a digital images delivery system

(Luna Insight) and library information webpages" (72). Whereas the Archival Metrics

toolkits could be used to survey many of these online environments, these scholars have

not published many findings. Instead they have concentrated on explaining their testing

protocols. The CDL themes determined through this ongoing testing include:

"Integration, Research, Online Resources, Recommendations, Navigation, Choosing the

Right Search Terms, Offer Simple and Advanced Search Options, Useful Search Results

and Sorted by Relevance, Unclear Labels and Icons, and Promot[ion] of Sites and

106

Services." Each of these themes apply to multiple archives that I have previously discussed, and I detail each criteria in order to further explore what could or should be included in the ideal WPA digital archive. Additionally, I include a summary of what criteria applies to each of my three example archives for analysis (Table 4-2).

Integration means one stop internet shopping, according to the CDL—meaning that a user can access many formats, such as texts, images, and videos, in the same library resource (76-77). Many formats do not easily translate to digital forms. The current local, curricular WPA archives are largely document based. Oral histories or videos are often part of the more global WPA archives described in Chapter 3, such as the DALN; however, few videos or audio explanations are include in the localized curricular archive. Integration may refer to larger, more global archive databases, such as the Purdue OWL. The digital composition archive at Colorado State University is embedded within their larger Writing @CSU system and may be considered an integrated resource. Further, the teaching materials section of the digital composition archive at CSU is part of a secondary database that links to the homepage. The CDL themes look at many different library resources and not just digital archives. Considering the integrated archive, *Melville's Marginalia*, although not completely inclusive, includes representations of physical books as well as documented transcriptions.

Research practices, the second CDL theme, focuses on how user groups (university faculty, graduate, and undergraduate students) conduct research and revealed that, initially, most of these users start with a Google search to get a basic overview of any topic and then used the library resources as a place where the information had already been evaluated (77). Other similar studies have been conducted to determine how

research is conducted.  For instance, the LILAC group (Learning Information Literacy Across the Curriculum) seeks to offer digital research about information literacy skills. In the interest of this group, research aloud protocol (RAP) videos are recorded by students to further understand how they conduct research and many begin using the available algorithms to locate information in databases such as Google or Wikipedia. Further illustrating the "emphasis on the use of primary source material in teaching as well as the popularity of historical and genealogical material online is a function of the widespread availability of digital access to these sources, but it is also a symptom of a desire for historical continuity…libraries and archives play a key role in maintaining and enabling this continuity" (Manoff 389). In other words, beginning with a Google search may start many on the path to research, but most researchers move on to trusted library resources. Moreover, continuity between the source material is expected even though the researcher is transitioning. Many traditional university library database systems are used in this same way to access information in their archives by giving the researcher initial summaries as metadata then referring the user to the archives. The Writing@CSU system mimics this process by providing the initial website that then connects to a secondary database with the desired further information.

The third theme identified by the CDL study "Online Resources: Is the Information Really There or Not?" proved especially problematic for archival finding aids (77).  Current users expect access to the digital equivalent of all information; however, archival finding aids often only offer databases with descriptions of the physical objects.  The local curricular archives that I have identified offer this information readily to the user, hence, why I selected them for this brief study, however

many global WPA archives are problematic in this regard. The Writing@CSU database may initially seem very useful, and much of the content is there, but I have also run across some broken links—which can be frustrating. The Writing Center Archive, physically housed at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, part of the Writing Centers Research Project, and sponsored by the International Writing Center Association, seems to offer online access to oral histories and materials; but the links simply lead to metadata. The National Archive of Rhetoric and Composition at the University of New Hampshire, where Bloom's textbook archive now resides, is also only partially digital. Findability of digital materials continues to be an issue for the WPA digital archive, local or global, and becomes one of the most important usability factors.

The fourth theme identified by the CDL is "Recommendations: Tell Us What You Think," meaning direct the user to the "best" or "top ten" resources to begin with. Too much information can be overwhelming, which is why we typically start with a search engine, such as Google, but Google is problematic because, as Manoff points out, there is "a lack of transparency" (390). In other words, we want to use an algorithm to help us find the most relevant information, but more and more people now understand that, oftentimes, you just gain access to the most used information, not the best information. Library databases often include the most popular starting points making it difficult for many students to know that there are other journals that they have access to. Further, within local, curricular WPA archives, how do we know which assignments are the best? Much of this information relies on the quality of the metadata, the scope of the archived material, and how it is categorized. For instance, the archive of teaching materials at Cornell University only includes assignment sequences and writing exercises that have

won a prize.  While this might be reassuring for a user who is looking for new assignments, how were these assignments selected for these prizes? What has been left out? If the collection is expansive, like the syllabi and past curricular materials dating back to the 1993 in CSU's archive, then are the past assignments still relevant?  Should they offer a "most used" assignment list? We all try to match our theory to our practice when reviewing possible curricular materials to be adapted to our own teaching style and coursework needs, but beginning writing instructors might not know how to select appropriate materials for their use. Therefore, we must be careful about how our materials are organized and labeled to support selection.

"Navigation" is the fifth theme identified by the CDL and notes the importance of including common elements (such as Home, Search, About, etc.). While many of these elements are found on the global WPA archives, many of the local curricular archives are buried within university websites and are navigable in different ways. As noted in Chapter 1, reliance on traditional headings and navigational methods, especially online, is reinforced by socio-cultural norms of organization, as suggested by Gunther Kress (285). Reinforced traditional organization methods are very popular, but the more global WPA archives, such as the WST, are sometimes heavily designed and offer too many ways of finding the same information. The CDL's themes further illustrate that users cling to traditional organization methods that they are used to.

The sixth theme identified by the CDL is "Choosing the Right Search Term." While much of our daily internet navigation relies on keyword searches, navigating the local curricular university archives often do not.  However, key words become very important when attempting to find the local curricular archive. Further, keywords often

hide the scope of the collection.  The Teaching Archive at the University of Pittsburg consists of only one page of links, so the scope can be seen at a glance. However, many archives, such as CSU's, include multiple databases and are much larger than the user initially realizes.

The CDL's seventh theme involves search options, citing users who want "some of the advanced options…[such as] finding aids and other historic materials included date, geographic location, proper names, and repository" (80). Although the materials available throughout the local, curricular archives are often organizationally based on one or more of these search options, none of the archives in this case study include multiple search options.

The eighth theme involves the usefulness of search results and sorting by relevance—showing that many users become frustrated by search engines when they do not produce expected results and/or contain enough information to help the user choose the best match. For example, the CSU archive is searchable by date, but the user cannot find additional descriptions or information about the contents until sifting through the materials brought up in a secondary, linked database. The University of Pittsburg archive is broken down into class description then materials are linked to the description based on the name of the instructor.  The name of the instructor usually would not be sufficient for the user to find the materials, but the additional description helps, However, the user does not know how these materials were selected to be included on the digital archival website. Users want the best results, which is why users desire search algorithms, like Google, to help them find such results.

The ninth CDL theme is "Unclear Labels and Icons" and the findings note that users found archival terms, such as "finding aids, repository, EAD, description summary, and folder list" especially difficult to understand and unintuitive. Terms can be problematic and a lack of clear description may also make findability difficult.

Lastly, the tenth theme identified is the "Promotion of Sites and Services," which has proven to be more than a little bit problematic for local, curricular writing archives. Most of them are difficult to find and require many clicks before getting to the actual archived materials that then lack search options. While the use of archived, curricular materials may be promoted within certain programs where graduate teaching assistants must take a practicum or for program development, they are not often easily found through online keyword searches or promoted outside of their own university department. With the onset of open-access, educational website resources, as promoted by the Writing Studio Open Educational Resource Project at CSU, we may see continual development and sharing of these valuable, curricular resources.

Table 4-2 WPA Curricular Archive Comparison based on the California Digital Library Themes. Using the curricular archives described in this Chapter, this table illustrates which of the previously described CDL themes are applicable to which archive for fast and easy comparison.

| CDL Themes | Cornell Archive | Pittsburg U Archive | CSU archive |
|---|---|---|---|
| Integration | | | X |
| Research | X | X | X |
| Online | X | X | X |
| Recommendations | X | | |
| Navigation | | | |
| Keywords | | X | |
| Advanced Search | | | |
| Useful Results | | X | |
| Unclear Labels | | | X |
| Promotion | | | |

Overall, the CDL themes are based on the testing of many library services, not just archives, As such, they offer a place to begin looking at digital archival services. Although not all of the themes address the particular use of open-source university writing archives with curricular content, many do apply to the three archives that I am evaluating. When considering what a local, curricular archive might include, I only considered archives that included the curricular information and were open access; however, many of the CDL themes deal with findability and navigability. Many of these same themes are also explored in the Archival Metrics questions. However, few asked for user feedback. The DALN survey specifically focused on how teachers were using the

global resource pedagogically; but these curricular archives simply offer content without asking for feedback. Whilst users can see WPA conversations on the listserv, the local, open-source curricular archive may be another digital space for collaborations and conversations to take place. Even though the CDL focused on important library science archival themes, the design of archives is also important to information science evaluation.

Alana M. Miller, a content strategist at the California Digital Library, evaluated user experience for The Museum of Modern Art Archive's website in 2013. Like Lack, Miller points out that archives are often designed by archivists or digital librarians, who may not be the same as typical users, such as students, academics, and other professionals. In her presentation, "DIY Usability Testing in the Archive," she recognizes that there is a "perceived problem," in which the staff receives many emails that are unspecific and that the user should be able to look up using available online resources, but the actual problem is that the "archives website is not serving their [researchers] needs"—lending exigency to her usability testing and critical analysis. Lack also points out that there are limits to usability testing because "it is certainly possible to create an extremely usable site that is not useful" (76). However, motivation for usability testing can be very different for open access sites that target audiences as specific as college level writing instructors. Miller's usability testing of the MOMA archives was spurred by the many emails that the reference staff continually received about the web design. Miller's insights started with a usability study, content inventory, and competitive analysis. She focuses on interviews/surveys to understand her primary demographic, and then conducts a content inventory, not only to see what the website contains, but also to

assess the value of the contents and make sure that everything is up to date. She

compared the MOMA archive to the Smithsonian and the Guggenheim to further

understand what type of digital holding each site has to offer and how they were

accessed. Moreover, she created a Functionality Matrix for Information Discovery that

explored findability within the sites themselves. While content within the archive sites I

am exploring is all relative to teaching writing, the navigability and findability of these

resources varies significantly and effects the organizational design of these document

based archives.  By considering some of the same elements as Miller did, I explore the

organizational strategies of these three archives.

Table 4-3 Competitive Analysis of WPA Curricular Archives. Drawing from Alana Miller's *DIY Usability Testing in the Archive* Functionality Matrix, I have created my own competitive analysis of information discovery within the three curricular archives that I examine in this chapter. *(X) indicates that the archive functionality criteria in the category is only partial

| Content Area | Cornell Archive | Pittsburg U Archive | CSU Archive |
|---|---|---|---|
| Known Scope | | X | |
| Browse by search term | X | | |
| Accepts recommendations | X | (X) | (X) |
| Multiple search options | X | | |
| Organized by year | X | X | X |
| Organized by author | X | X | (X) |
| Descriptive summary | X | X | X |
| Document based | X | X | (X) |
| Integrated with University Resources | X | | (X) |

Miller developed two competitive analysis matrixes; the first analyzes the content of the digital archives and the second analyzes functionality. My matrix compares three open-source, curricular based digital archives based on functionality. I reviewed the terms that Miller used to define her analysis, but coined some of my own to discuss findability, organization, and design.

116

I will discuss the significance of each of the terms although some are self-explanatory. "Known Scope" references the ability of a user to judge what is available in the archive by looking at the initial screen or database. The Pittsburg University archive is smaller, and perhaps more manageable, and therefore able to put all of the resources on one webpage. Other archives, like Cornell's, that are affiliated with digital repositories or library resources usually have usable organization strategies so that the scope of the archive is known. The second category, "Browse by search term" is an important part of findability. As covered in Chapter 3, keywords have become the primary way of finding information online, so incorporating this common finding method into archival searches seems inevitable. However, many older systems do not offer keyword searches. Cornell's site is able to offer this feature because it is part of the university's digital e-commons, so it includes metadata in the form of description and reflection, not just scanned in documents, for the system to search. The Pittsburg site may be too limited in scope to offer multiple search options. Further, the CSU archive is an older database linked to a webpage, so it would require a lot of retrofitting to include a keyword search option.

In regards to "Accepts Recommendations," all three sites offer contact information; however, only the Cornell archive explicitly asks for recommendations to better the archive and gives the email address for the archive itself in the middle of the page. "Multiple search options," the fourth criterion, refers to different ways to navigate the pages that the user may choose from, like drop down menus or search boxes. Unfortunately, Pittsburg and CSU are very limited in the ways that a user may navigate pages; often, the only choice is to click on the hyperlinks provided. However, the hyperlinked pages are typically organized by author of the assignment and/or year by

both the Pittsburg and CSU archives. CSU is more inconsistent than the other archives, perhaps because the archive dates back to the 1993 and is working with an older database. While some course materials on the CSU site, like those for CO300, are organized by author, most are organized by date.

All of the archives include metadata in the form of a "Descriptive summary" so that the user can understand what they are about to view. Most materials are "Document Based" because they are electronic replicas of an original document, like a PDF or a Microsoft Word document. Perhaps these materials were scanned in to be preserved this way or kept this way so that the user could easily print out copies. The CSU archive is a bit different because of the linked database; however, the database allows contents to be downloaded and printed out in document form.

Lastly, I consider how the archives are "Integrated with other University Resources." Digitally, what does it look like when the WPA digital archive as affiliated with campus library resources? Cornell's archive is located in their eCommons digital repository and maintained by the library, but can be found through a link on the John S. Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines website. The Pittsburg archive is located on the Department of English Composition Program website, but is not accessible through other university resources. CSU's archive is a link on the Writing@CSU website, but links to previous campus wide resources, such as an older database, which must have been maintained by the whole university at some point. But, like the Pittsburg archive, accessibility and findability are problems.

## 4.5   Best Practices in Digital Archiving

Although this matrix is not all encompassing, the combination of the different heuristics and matrixes in this chapter should give would-be WPA archivists a place to start, whether they are just beginning to compile an archive, digitizing materials for an existing or emergent archive, or considering the resources that are already in place. It is notable that those programs associated with WAC and WID, such as the Cornell digital repository and the Dimond Library collaboration, choose campus libraries as the place to house their archives. Whether digital or physical, the where of the archive is just as important as the who, what, and how.

When starting a digital archive it is important to consider the process as well as the product. A checklist, like "Best Practice Guidelines for the Development and Evaluation of Digital Humanities Projects" may be a good place to start. Red de Humanidades Digitales provides their best practices in several languages to highlight some of the commonalities when creating digital projects. Their practices include "teamwork, documentation, usability and information architecture, quality control, copyright, visibility and sharing, and the future of the project." This evaluative tool was developed for general use, but much of it applies to the creation of a digital WPA archive. I have established that most WPA archives are created by teams—the Red de Humanidades Digitales best practices includes a question checklist that asks about institutional affiliation and project leadership. Moreover, each category includes pertinent questions about the project's methodology, objective, audience, purpose, peer review, and metadata. Checklists like this one help us move towards a common language to

discuss digital projects that require collaborative teams working from different disciplines.

I began this chapter by considering the Writing Archive at the University of New Hampshire. In her reflection of that collaboration Garnnett states that the "sense that we would 'Hand stuff over. And the stuff would simply transform into accessible information and data' was simply uninformed" (121). Archives are active, living things. Whereas Garnnett's initial idea may seem naïve, many share her initial thought. Rhetoricians may recognize the critical questions that need to be answered—that show up in best practices checklists—they may not consider traditional archival processes or the computing necessary to create an archive. The digital humanities speaks to publicly visible "scholarship and pedagogy that are bound up with infrastructure in ways that are deeper and more explicit than we are generally accustomed to, a scholarship and pedagogy that are collaborative and depend on networks of people and that live an active, 24-7 life online" (Kirschenbaum). WPAs may be initially uncomfortable with forward facing projects that become the identity of writing at one's particular institution, the collaborations between campus libraries, digital humanities, and the different facets for writing at a university create the most successful archives based on reviews about the creation process and the evaluations that I have included in this chapter. In the following chapter I consider digital archiving beyond the WPA perspective to examine additional avenues of future research and discussion.

# 5   Digital Archiving: Discussion and Future Directions

"We view the archive as a critical rhetorical space that demands equally of its creators and users and a site for testing theories about how texts migrate among discourse communities and new practices come into being."

--"In, Through, and About the Archive: What Digitization (Dis)Allows," Graban et al.

Throughout this work I have discussed archiving with an audience of Writing Program Administrators in mind—an audience of administrators who have been tasked with archiving or maintaining records in their respective academic departments. While Graban et al. consider a larger audience for digital archiving, I consider the spaces of WPA archiving in regards to development, testing and use. I examine the romantic draw of the archive as a research site and method for researchers and writers. Additionally, I discuss some of the history and philosophy written about the movement from the physical to the digital. I have examined the history of WPA digital archiving based on global archives, such as the Writing Studies Tree and the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives, that are available for all to use and evaluate. And I have addressed the local curricular archive and used different heuristics to examine local curricular archives in order to determine what may be considered standard in regards to accessioning and organization for a WPA curricular archive. However, there are many avenues of WPA archiving, and a programmatic archive in general, that I have not addressed as extensively as such a model deserves. While I have addressed some of the history of the move from physical archiving to digital, there is a rich framework for much more theory and crafting from the perspective of the digital humanities. I explained some of the history of the WPA digital

archive based on usability, but there are many aspects of creating this sort of archive that I do not discuss in detail. There are, as well, many different ways to research using digital archives, as illustrated by those working on the archive in library and information science as well as the digital humanities.

The work of creating archives is quite interdisciplinary, and, as I established in Chapter 1, should be tackled collaboratively as a digital humanities project. However, I have reviewed several archives that were initiated in the interest of personal research. As I discuss the exigency for WPA archive creation, I am reminded of Carruthers' examination of the Latin word *inventio* which gave rise to both the words "invention" and "inventory" (11). Invention essentially means creation in both the sense of ideas and material items. Carruthers says that "we speak of people having 'inventive minds'...and they are generally good at 'making'" (11). Carruthers also points out that an inventory— whether mental, like an idea, or physical, like a material object—is necessary for invention or creation (12). As I have pointed out by citing Johnson, WPAs are makers, but even makers need exigency. Some may be motivated by the materials, but usually those materials are initially accessioned to aid with academic research. Two such archives are *Melville's Marginalia,* which was part of Steven Olsen-Smith's research agenda as a Melvillian scholar, and Lynn Bloom's textbook archive. While not all archives have such a clear cut connection to an archivist's research, it is important to consider what problems an archive might solve for WPAs and digital humanists and what sorts of research the WPA archives can support. For example, different trends have affected writing studies and the teaching of writing throughout the years. Adapting the WPA archive for our curricular goals, community identity, and research continues to be

challenging work realized in different ways. In the sections that follow, I outline how a digital archive may change a new WPAs initial experience of campus culture, concerns about preservation in digital environments, a consideration of how digital archiving may be viewed through the lens of the digital humanities as a computer science project, and address some common ways of practical making in the WPA digital archive.

## 5.1   Ethnography, Institutional Critique, and Archiving

While I address the call for the WPA archive in Chapter 1, many institutions do not currently have or maintain a writing program archive. Shirley Rose states that a lack of archives may be due to "a lack of interest in what went on in a program's past" (116). WPAs are often called on to understand a university setting and create change, but may not know the previous work done within a particular writing program. Rose recognizes that "professional WPAs…grant and garner more attention and rewards to efforts as innovation than to efforts at preservation" admitting that "it's easier to get attention for doing something new and different than to get recognition for making an informed decision to preserve an effective writing program practice" (116). Rose points out that preservation, which she considers to be an act of *inventio,* is not often connected to innovation for a WPA. So even beginning an archive is not seen or recognized as an inventive act by administration. To complicate the position further, administrators outside of the specific department where the writing program is housed may not know who the WPA is or what he or she is trying to do. Further, "the new administrator may consider disposal of old records as an eloquent and gratifying symbolic gesture for choosing new

direction for the writing program," which is, overall. what administration is asking for anyway (Rose 116). So, why do we need archives?

Many have written about how understanding an institution's culture is helpful when adjusting to a new WPA position and suggest methods similar to ethnography to gain access to the previously developed culture; however, institutional critique and historical recognition are also offered as possible methods. Most programmatic history is contained in previous files or boxes that we don't have time to deal with, yet this is the work that a WPA is expected to build on. Ruth Mirtz admits that "in [her] own work as a WPA, the paper trail has seemed important only as long as I have filing cabinet space to hold it; the concept of archiving never came to bear on me until [a] project" that involved intra-institutional historical research (128). Mirtz also points out that "because such local historical research probably would not result in publications recognized by conventional evaluation processes and because too many WPAs are untenured and must concentrate on national publication, elective local historical research is unlikely to be a WPA's top priority" (120).

Initially, WPA work was usually the purview of tenured faculty members, but that has now changed. Mike Palmquist notes that his "difficulty" with institutional change "dates to my initial efforts, shortly after I had become WPA for the first time (a curious reward for earning tenure), to expand the role of information technology in our composition courses" (95).In his essay "Information Technology as Other: Reflections on a Useful Problem," Palmquist recognizes the political implications of university change based on the theoretical concept that computers are inevitably entwined with writing. But it's also notable that Palmquist was surprised that he was "made" a WPA after earning

tenure. The tenure debate is constant within writing program administration because, initially, this position usually had tenure, but now WPAs do not always have this security of position from the university. The 2014 Council of Writing Program Administration conference call asked: "What does tenure mean for WPA work?" and many institutions continue to struggle with whether or not a WPA should have tenure before being awarded the position.

WPAs are often in tenuous positions, even within their home institutions. They may have great ideas for revising the programs they administer; however, attempting to change an institution's writing culture requires a collaborative approach and makes it all that more important that the WPA acknowledges the history of the institution. Creating a "writing culture" at institutions often begins by engaging in an ethnographic study of the current university identity. In the preface to *Writing Across the Curriculum: A Guide to Developing Programs*, Elaine Maimon asserts that an ethnographic approach to one's specific university setting is necessary in order to determine the best way to initiate a WAC program, often the responsibility of the WPA.

Many academics within any given university may have a vested interest in the institutional analysis and reform process, but maybe none more so than the WPA. The very identity of the WPA and the position itself is bound up with change. Jeanne Gunner offers "an appealing metaphor to capture the complexity of the WPA's relationship to change" as a "WPA ecology;" however, she recognizes that there is no "holistic system." Instead the WPA must "work in the face of the powerful cultural forces that we must challenge for significant change to be possible" (30). While Gunner relates the WPA position to Raymond Williams's "study of the pastoral as a genre that evolved into a

calcified form reproducing a hegemonic moral order," her work recognizes that WPAs must seek to create a new culture, although this approach may "have (intentionally or not) a historically sanitizing effect, erasing the cultural critiques that should inform writing program work" (30). Histories, institutionally or globally, are important to know and understand when entering a WPA position and a living digital archive makes these histories easily accessible, although the creation of such an archive seems unrewarding.

Christy Desmet notes that "the problem remains of how to imagine a writing program that invites individual teachers (and students) to exercise agency without deconstructing altogether the program itself" in the absence of a known history (49). It is often acknowledged that we learn from those who have come before us, but because of the political implications of WPA work, including a lack of power through tenure, intentional turnover every few years, and administrative and teaching duties that tend to be time consuming, understanding the history of the institutions that we work at becomes all the more important, although, often, unrealized. Mirtz agrees that

> Without tenured, experienced WPAs who have a long term investment in a writing program and are grounded in composition theory, the history of writing instruction, and the local history of their first-year writing program, there is little hope that archives will be maintained or used to help provide a stronger identity for the program itself and the position of the WPA (128).

In order to further understand and create change within our institutions, we must continually assess and evaluate our own identity within this liminal space and maintain ethical responsibility on a local and global level. While ethnographic approaches to understanding an institutional history are important, WPAs should consider how a living

digital archive would help them understand their university culture and own situatedness. Furthermore, a continuous program history would lend credibility to the department and the discipline.

Johnson states that "an interdiscipline strives to bring new knowledge to the world where it can be applied in such arenas as decision making, policy creation, methodological formation, design processes, and other venues" (682). If the WPA digital archive is considered a digital humanities project, then how does the archive affect these larger choices on college campuses? Chapter 1 outlines the WPA call for the archive that suggests both administrative information and curricular materials; however, we seem to have split these different types of archives up for privacy purposes. Arizona State University's Digital Atlas, which attempts to keep an updated set of data about the distribution of classes, sections of courses, and who was teaching, was developed in 2011 by Dan Bommarito as a quick and easy reference for Writing Program data including the mission and values statements; courses, grades, and enrollment; teaching faculty and employment conditions; program assessments and reports; schedules of program emails; committees, initiatives, partners; and budgets (Hooper-Lewis 12). Overall, the ASU Digital Atlas sounds like a very comprehensive administrative digital archive. It is interesting to question why the WPAs would choose to keep specific documents and data and why (14). However, the Digital Atlas is stored on Dropbox and is not open to public preview.

The character of a particular higher education institution also dictates what is included or left out of the archive, in addition to who has access to the archive itself. While there are differing ideas on what an archive should contain, there are also varying

thoughts about where the archive should be located and who should have access. While a

digital archive may seem more easily available than a physical archive, in fact, many

library databases are only accessible if you have specific passwords and permissions.

In order to do historical research in the realm of writing studies, archives are

imperative, but, recall that composition as a discipline became recognized throughout

higher education relatively late, coincident with the onset of open enrollment, f and

graduate programs in composition/rhetoric began only in the 1970s. In short, our

discipline is a bit too young to have realized the importance of this necessary record

keeping. The digital humanities arguments made by Manoff and Feenberg, about

technology not working quite as democratically as some theorists would like to believe,

may have parallels in  the act of accessioning materials and providing access to the WPA

digital archive.

## 5.2  Privacy

While much institutional data can be found about different universities online,

many programs may choose to keep data private. I discuss the position of the WPA as

maker of the digital archive and accessibility in regards to Rose's assertion that WPAs

must "draw on their knowledge of the broad field of writing research in order to meet

their responsibility to make the archive accessible to users" (115). While Rose is the

Director of Writing Programs at Arizona State University, and, therefore, made the final

decision to make the Digital Atlas a private archive, many others are also considering the

choices about privacy, platform and accessibility. There are many implications and

possible limitations to consider regarding privacy and permissions for use. McKee and

Porter argue that "although consent is not something often discussed in composition and rhetoric archival research, how materials got into an archive in the first place and under what conditions are essential ethical questions" (66). I discussed Slomba's questioning of keeping student writing for the Dimond Library/WAC/Writing Center collaborative archive in Chapters 1 and 4; McKee and Porter further question this practice. Based on standard archival practices, there is a common intake procedure in which the "legally recognized 'owners' of works sign deeds of gift giving;" and we see these structures in place in some instances of living digital archives, such as is the common practice of the DALN (McKee and Porter 67). But, in regards to the WPA archive, McKee and Porter state that WPAs do not often comply with common accessioning practices and "have just saved whatever the current WPA felt was appropriate to save" (67). They further question "how many students whose papers are in dusty writing program filing cabinets or now on hard drives and university servers gave permission for their papers to be there" (67)? Slomba states that the student writing in storage when the Dimond Library/WAC/Writing Center archive began came from storage and "were mostly prize-winning essays or publications of student literary and journalistic writing" as well as a "circulating collection of political science papers from the 1940s" (122). While other archives, such as Cornell University's John S. Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines collect award winning assignments and syllabi with the creator's permission, it is likely that other universities may also practice getting permission to keep and present awarded student work. Additionally, FERPA was not enacted until 1974 to protect student records, so, while McKee and Porter may question the ethics of keeping and archiving work from

before 1974, it is not unlawful. Overall, WPAs must be more mindful about accessioning and giving access to items and records in an ethical sense.

McKee and Porter provide a heuristic to help guide these choices in their article "The Ethics of Archival Research," but still barely scratch the surface of many questions WPAs may have. For example, if student papers are available in the university archive, then doesn't plagiarism become inevitable? We all know of the dusty file cabinets that Greek houses keep for future reference. Are we creating a similar resource? Is saving student papers in a widely available digital archive just making the plagiarism problem worse? While digitizing previous student work seems problematic, it is actually easier to search using developed software, like Turnitin. Moreover, search tools are constantly being developed that help users with findability. Even digital surrogates in a digital archive could be searchable using XML, as discussed in Chapter 2 with regards to *Melville's Marginalia.* When material is digital there are ways to make it searchable and, therefore, prevent or even facilitate plagiarism. WPAs must insure that they have proper safeguards in place to check searchable materials for plagiarism. Or the WPA or archivist may decide to make student material only accessible to certain populations, such as administration and faculty. In terms of the WPA archive, we must be more conscientious with our collecting, maintenance, and accessibility.

## 5.3 Platform

Questions of platform are raised with the idea of privacy in mind. Who has access to the writing program digital archives is just as important as what is kept and how the digital artifacts are kept in a changing digital environment. Because WPAs are not

archivists first and foremost, they may not be aware of the complexities of developing an archive in a digital platform that may not continue to be maintained. Michael Seadle, in his article "Archiving in the Networked World: Metrics for Testing," points out that "the digital archiving community needs to develop benchmarking and other forms of measurement to enable a fair and open comparison and make it possible for libraries and other cultural heritage institutions to make rational choices for long term digital preservation" (557). I have discussed Seadle's call for testing, but "long term digital preservation" is just as important.

Andrew Jewell, who was interviewed for "Toward a Notion of the Archive of the Future," as an associate professor of digital projects, is especially interested in the work of building digital humanities projects (Clement et al. 118). In his interdisciplinary role at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Library, Jewel argues that "the responsibility of the library or archive…should not only be to provide long-term preservation and stewardship of data; the library/archive should also act as a content creator, collaborating with other scholars to build digital publications and encouraging peer review by external groups" (Clement et al. 118). Preservation continues to be a librarian's concern, but how is platform selection and management making this possible? According to Ramsey, "the National Archives and Record Administration Electronic Records Initiative is working to provide long-term access to electronic contents" without reliance on any particular hardware or software using the Electronic Records Archives for the digital preservation of Federal Government records (83). Platform selection and management has been recognized as a national problem throughout digital archiving and this initiative makes digitizing collections easier and more accessible. However, no such universal platform

exists or is widely available to the everyday archivist. We all remember previous internet platforms that were once used, but have been replaced, such as Myspace; what are the implications of platform replacement for today's current digital archives? Jewel argues that "experimentation with interface…should be a top priority" and imagines future remixing of "clusters of data" that have progressed from "digital publications" (Clement et al. 118). While developing or maintaining platforms for consistent preservation in the digital archive is a priority that should be further explored, designing digital archives in creative and interesting ways may be another avenue of development.

Relying on previous organizational methods or adaptive organizational platforms such as Omeka and Drupal limit creativity and experimentation with design. Although common heuristics for usability, such as Jakob Nielsen's 10 Usability Heuristics for User Interface Design, set principles for simplicity; how does creative design factor in? I explore design heuristics and apply them to curricular digital archives in Chapter 4, illustrating that it is important to recognize the experimentation going on within digital archive design. Platform design and heuristics are often taken into consideration during software and platform development. Gretchen Geuguen, an archivist for digital curation interviewed by Clement et al., suggests that "digital project managers… take a lesson from IT and divide projects into achievable phases with manageable scopes" (120). Geuguen's comment seems to be addressed by changes in software development. The creation of the digital archive should take into consideration iterative process and agile development as ways of making from a computer science perspective. Future research could include examining digital archiving through the lens of coding and platform development. Usability and user based design are both important parts of user based

132

software development. Whereas I take usability into consideration with heuristic evaluation, how might we develop our standards a bit more to encourage usable archive design by writing program administratiors and other non-specialists?

## 5.4   Testing the Usability Tests

To further usability, usability testing the evaluation tools in order to create reliable heuristics is also important. The development of these tools must be researched and tested before the WPA or archivist can know that they will be effective—this is no small task. As discussed in Chapter 4, Lack, at the California Digital Library (CDL), studied the usability of her digital library and archival services in collaboration with the Assessment and Evaluation Program and the Interface Design Team to determine usefulness and the ease of use (71). It took four years for Lack and her collaborators to determine ten themes by using Focus Groups, Interviews, Questionnaires, and Usability Testing. Developing a strong evaluation tool takes time.

Duff et al. discuss the extensive testing and evaluation that it took to create the Archive Metrics toolkits that began with a literature review of the archivist's call for a better understanding of users (571). Duff et al. furthered their analysis of a need for the toolkits by asking professors, students, and archivists about the "services and support" that they expected from archives and, additionally, asked the archivists about to consider evaluation, "markers of good service," and goals (575). From this research Duff et al. created a conceptual framework in order to create the first questionnaires (577). They also developed the administrative procedures that go along with the surveys themselves in order to get a good response rate (Duff et al., 584-85). Once the toolkits had been

available for a year, the team sent a short survey to everyone who had registered to the site to download the toolkits—most of the questions asked about how the toolkits were being used (Duff et al., 587-590).

While the toolkits were created to be used as a standard way to assess how library archives are serving their users, it is important that these tools are also tested during and after development in a recursive way. Just as the DALN was not developed to be used curricularly, but Harker and Comer found that many teachers were using it to teach, Duff's research team found that the Archival Metrics Toolkits were used for more than just understanding how archives were working. Some other uses for the Archival Metrics toolkits included the development of other survey questions and teaching students how to create survey materials.

Harker and Comer do not discuss the creation of their survey, but do explain that it was "circulated on disciplinary listservs" and "receiv[ed] 78 initial participants" (69). To further their research, Harker and Comer followed up the initial survey with interviews. Although Harker and Comer did not spend as much time testing their survey as an evaluation tool, they did conduct a follow up method with participants in order to be sure that the information that they received was understood and accurate. Paying more attention the tools we use to measure and understand the archive will only help the WPA archive become more successful. While global WPA archives, like the DALN, have been used to teach, but not necessarily made for this reason, how are they made?

## 5.5  Making and Maintenance

Much of my dissertation has focused on making in both practical and theoretical ways. Through the examination of both global and local digital WPA archives has reveals some common ways of making as well as concerns about the sustainability of archival efforts. Although the WPA's initial idea of the archive may be a static repository, the living digital archive must consider the role of an archivist and continuous growth and change. Just as the Dimond Library/WAC/Writing Center collaboration found "archive is a verb, not a noun," even in physical collections, digital archives must consider accessioning and change in similar ways if they are to be maintained (121). The ways we make the living, digital archive affect the necessary maintenance.

Using different types of media to initially create the digital archive is exemplified by the DALN. Oral history recordings and video are popular for user based/made global WPA archives and projects. The DALN relies on these modes for the submission of literacy narratives. The LILAC project, discussed in Chapter 4, uses voice over and screencasts. The Writing Centers Research Project Archive at UALR also contains oral histories, but they are not accessible online. Patrick Gallagher, in an "Interchange" for *The Journal of American History*, argues that "oral and video histories, understood as artifacts, have become very important for bringing visitors closer to the reality of a story" (470). He further asserts that recordings in digital histories bring users a more "personal experience with history online" (470). These seem to be our favorite modes because they bring the user a more sensory experience—making the digital archive more like a communicative interaction.

The common use of video and sound recordings brings the archive to life in a physical way that users respond to, but, just as discussed earlier in regards to platform, the archive must be updated or continually marketed in order to be maintained. The DALN has been around for over 10 years now, but requires constant marketing in order to gain new literacy narratives (Comer and Harker 65). Comer and Harker state that "if you've been to a conference on composition, literacy, or pedagogy lately, chances are you have been recruited to share a story with the DALN" (65). In order to grow and continue to exist global WPA archives, like the WST and DALN, require constant publicity—which cost time and money.

The WST and DALN require marketing, meaning someone has to show up and set up at conferences and maintain a constant reminder of their online presence. Similarly, others discuss the cost of archival creation and maintenance. Bloom's textbook archive would not have been realized without a grant from the NTCE (282). Moreover, Gannett, the WPA involve in the Dimond Library collaboration, recognizes that she had to pay graduate student staff for 100 hours of work to create the archive (121). In order to create and sustain an archive, it must not be thought of as static. The digital archive requires resources, such as money and marketing, so that it can be created and further maintained.

With sustainability in mind, digital materials also come in to question. The previous discussion of the need for a common platform also extends to the materials being collected. Digital surrogates are common practice in our digital archives. While scanned in assignment sheets can be seen in curricular archives, like those at Cornell University, some sites, like *Melville's Marginalia* take this practice farther by designing

136

their site so that the user can feel like they are opening a book. The common use of digital surrogates makes me wonder if this is just a growing pain of technology development and the creation of digital archives? While the digital surrogate is customary in these sites, should it be? Moreover, the who of archiving is also questioned when an archive is passed on to a new WPA or new technology is introduced.

The CSU teaching archive, examined in Chapter 4, is an example of what happens with changing technology or a new archivist. When discussing how the structuring of the archive relates to structuring the future, Derrida asserts that "the archivization produces as much as it records the event" (*Archive Fever* 17). Any user can see the change in the database systems on the CSU teaching archive based on browsing; one may even be able to determine the date of this technological event. Applying Derrida's idea of the archivist further, he asserts that the "first archivist institutes the archive as it should be, that is to say, not only in exhibiting the document but in *establishing* it" while the second archivist manipulates the archived items by classifying them more or differently based on interpretation (*Archive Fever* 55-58). Using CSU as an example, while there is human interaction and involvement with the system, the previous database can be seen as the initial technological archivist and the new framework as the second archivist. The material is all held in the archive, but the user can see the different technological holdings as different archivists at work. The who of archiving was once always an archivist and now it is interesting to see how technology is taking on these roles.

## 5.6   Future Research

As these proposed avenues for future work demonstrate, my dissertation is a mere starting point for making and testing living WPA digital archives. The WPA call has been answered in ways examined throughout this work, but there are still many opportunities to create digital archives at our home institutions and for everyone to enjoy. The role of the WPA in the collaborative creation of archiving continues to be considered because we should be given credit for our inventive works. Moreover, the WPA already has so many responsibilities that the time necessary to develop and maintain an archive must be shared. Further, programs require monetary support to even begin an archive of their own and more grants need to be produced to aid in the production of global WPA archives. The importance of understanding technology by way of platform choice and development as well as in its new role in records maintenance must be revisited so that the archive can be made sustainable. The examination of common ways of making should happen consistently with viable, tested evaluation tools in order to inform WPAs of best practice. Overall, the living WPA digital archive leaves a lot to be said and done, both theoretically and practically, but we are already putting these archives into practice in our daily working lives.

# 6   Reference List

Baron, Jaimie. *The Archive Effect: Found Footage and the Audiovisual Experience of History*. New York: Routledge, 2014.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. 2011. Trans. Glaser, Sheila Faria. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014.

Bloom, Lynn Z. "Deep Sea Diving: Building an Archive as the Basis for Composition Studies Research." *Working in the Archives: Practical Research methods for Rhetoric and Composition*.  Eds. Alexis E. Ramsey, Wendy B. Sharer, Barbara L'Eplattenier, and Lisa S. Mastrangelo. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, 2010.  pp. 278-289.

Bowker, Geoffrey C. and Susan Leigh Star. *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999.

Burdick, Anne, Johanna Drucker, Peter Lunnenfeld, Todd Presner, and Jeffrey Schnapp. *Digital_Humanities*. Cambridge: MIT press, 2012. https://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/titles/content/9780262018470_Open_Access_Edition.pdf . Accessed 22 Oct 2015.

Clement, Tanya, Wendy Hagenmaier and Jennie Levine Knies. "Toward a Notion of the Archive of the Future: Impressions of Practice by Librarians, Archivists, and Digital Humanities Scholar" *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, Vol. 82, No. 2 (April 2013), pp. 112-130.

Cohen, Daniel J., Michael Frisch, Patrick Gallagher, Steven Mintz, Kristen Sword, Amy

    Murrell, William G. Thomas III, and William J. Turkel. "Interchange: The

    Promise of Digital History" *The Journal of American History*. Sept 2008.

    http://jah.oxfordjournals.org/. Accessed 5 Dec 2012.

Comer, Kathryn B. and Michael Harker. "The Pedagogy of the Digital Archive of

    Literacy Narratives: A Survey" *Computers and Composition* 35 (2015), pp. 65-

    85.

Connors, Robert. "Dreams and Play: Historical Method and Methodology."

    *Methods and Methodology in Composition Research.* Ed. by Gesa Kirsch and

    Patricia Sullivan. Southern Illinois Press, 1992, pp. 15-36.

Cornell University Library. "John S. Knight Institute for Writing in the

    Disciplines" *Ecommons: Cornell's Digital Repository.*

    *https://ecommons.cornell.edu/handle/1813/10813*. Accessed 10 Mar 2018.

Currathurs, Mary. *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of*

    *Images, 400-1200.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Trans. Eric Prenowitz.

    Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

--. *Paper Machine.* Mieke Bal and Hent de Vries, Eds. Rachel Bowlby,

    trans. Stanford: Stanford U Press, 2001.

Desmet, Christy. "Beyond Accommodation: Individual and Collective in a Large

    Writing Program." *Discord and Directions: The Postmodern Writing Program*

    *Administrator.* Eds. Sharon James McGee and Carolyn Handa. Logan: Utah

    State University Press, 2005, pp. 40-58.

Donahue, Patricia and Gretchen Flesher Moon, eds. *Local Histories: Reading the Archives of Composition.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2007.

Duff, Wendy M., Elizabeth Yakel, Helen R. Tibbo, Joan M. Cherry, Aprille McKay, Magia G. Krause, and Rebecka Sheffield. "The Development, Testing and Evaluation of the Archival Metrics Toolkits." *The American Archivist.* 75 (Fall/Winter 2010), pp. 569-599.

Feenburg, Andrew. *Transforming Technology: A Critical Theory Revisited.* Oxford: Oxford U Press. 2002.

Ferreira-Buckley, Linda. "Rescuing the Archives from Foucault." *College English* 61.5 (May 1999), pp. 577-583.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge &The Discourse on Language.* Trans. By A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.

Freshwater, Helen. "The Allure of the Archive." *Poetics Today.* 24.4 (Winter 2003), pp. 729-758.

Gannett, Cinthia, Elizabeth Slomba, Kat Tirabassi, Amy Zenger, and John C. Brereton. "It Might Come in Handy: Composing a Writing Archive at the University of New Hampshire." *Centers for Learning: Writing Centers and Academic Libraries in Collaboration.* Eds. James K. Elmborg and Sheril Hook. *Publications in Librarianship.* No. 58. Chicago: American Library Association, 2005, pp. 115-137.

Gitelman, Lisa. *Always Already New: Media, History, and the Data of Culture.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006.

Gold, David.  "Remapping Revisionist Historiography."  *College Composition and Communications.*  64.1 (Sept 2012), pp. 15-34.

Gould, Matthew. *Debates in the Digital Humanities.* 2012 ed. http://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/. Accessed 12 Mar 2018.

Graban, Tarez Samra, Alexis Ramsey-Tobienne, Whitney Meyers. "In, Through, and About the Archive: What Digitization (Dis)Allows." *Rhetoric and the Digital Humanities.* Eds. Jim Ridolfo and William Hart-Davidson. Chicago: U of Chicago Press. 2015, pp. 233-244.

Grusin, Richard and Jay David Bolter. *(Re)mediation: Understanding New Media.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999.

Gunner, Jeanne.  "Cold Pastoral: The Moral Order of an Idealized Form."  *Discord and Directions: The Postmodern Writing Program Administrator.* In Sharon James McGee and Carolyn Handa (eds.)*, Discord and Directions: The Postmodern Writing Program Administrator.*  Logan: Utah State University Press, 2005, pp. 28-39.

Fromm, Martin, Ed. *Currents in Teaching and Learning.* Worcester State University. https://www.worcester.edu/currents/ Accessed 2 Mar 2011.

Harker, Michael and Ben McCorkle. *Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives.* The Ohio State University and Georgia State University. http://www.thedaln.org/#/home. Accessed 5 Dec 2016.

Hayles, N. Katherine. "Narrating Bits." *Vectors: Journal of Culture and Technology in a Dynamic Vernacular.* Eds. Tara McPherson and Steve Anderson. Issue 1 (Winter 2005). University of Southern California. http://vectors.usc.edu/projects/index.php?project=6. Accessed 22 Nov 2015.

Hoogeveen, Jeffery. "The Progressive Faculty/Student Discourse of 1969-70 and the Emergence of Lincoln University's Writing Program" *Local Histories: Reading the Archives of Composition*. Eds. Patricia Donahue and Gretchen Flesher Moon Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2007, pp.199-219.

Johnson, Robert R. "Craft Knowledge: Of Disciplinarity in Writing Studies." *College Composition and Communication.* 61.4 (June 2010), pp. 673-690.

Kirschenbaum, Matthew "What Is Digital Humanities and What's It doing in English Departments?" *Debates in the Digital Humanities*. Ed. Matthew Gould. 2012 ed. http://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/. Accessed 10 Mar 2016.

Kress, Gunther. "Gains and Losses: New Forms of Texts, Knowledge, and Learning." *Multimodal Composition: A Critical Sourcebook.* Ed. Claire Lutkewitte. New York: Bedford/St. Marin, 2014, pp. 283-301.

Lack, Rosalie. "The Importance of User-Centered Design: Exploring Findings and Methods." *Journal of Archival Organization,* 4:1-2, 2007, pp. 69-86.

L'Eplattenier, Barbara. "Finding Ourselves in the Past: An Argument for Historical Work on WPAs" *The Writing Program Administrator as Researcher: Inquiry in Action and Reflection*. Eds. Shirley K. Rose and Irwin Weiser. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1999, pp. 131-140.

L'Eplattenier, Barbara and Lisa S. Mastrangelo. "Archival Research in the Field of

    Rhetoric and Composition." *Exploring Composition Studies.* Eds. Kelly Ritter

    and Paul Kei Matsuda. Logan: Utah State U Press, 2012.

Maid, Barry. "The WPA-L Listserv." *Council of Writing Program Administrators.*

    Arizona State University East. Site maintained by Charles Lowe.

    http://wpacouncil.org/wpa-l. Accessed 15 Mar 2018.

Machin, David. "Multimodality and the theories of the visual." *The Routledge*

    *Handbook of Multimodal Analysis.* Ed. Carey Jewitt. New York: Routledge,

    2009, pp. 181-190.

Maimon, Elaine. Preface. *Writing Across the Curriculum: A Guide to*

    *Developing Programs.* Susan H. McLeod and Margot Soren (eds). Writing Across

    the Curriculum: Colorado State University, 2000.

    https://wac.colostate.edu/books/mcleod_soven/mcleod_soven.pdf Accessed 15

    Feb 2014.

Manoff, Marlene. "Archive and Database as Metaphor: Theorizing the Historical

    Record." *Libraries and the Academy.* 10.4 (2010), pp. 385-398.

Manovich, Lev. *The Language of New Media.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002.

--. "The Practice of Everyday (Media) Life." 2008.

    http://manovich.net/index.php/projects/the-practice-of-everyday-media-life.

    Accessed 22 Oct 2014.

 --. "Trending: The Promises and Challenges of Big Social Data." 2011.

    http://manovich.net/index.php/projects/trending-the-promises-and-the-challenges-

    of-big-social-data. Accessed 10 Dec 2014.

McKee, Heidi and James E. Porter. The Ethics of Digital Writing Research: A Rhetorical
Approach. *CCC* 59.4 (2008), pp. 711-749.

Millar, Laura. *Archives: Principles and Practices*. New York: Neal-Schuman
Publishers, 2010.

Miller, Alana. "DIY Usability Testing in the Archive." *Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives
Conference.* Fall 2013. SlideShare. https://www.slideshare.net/AlanaMMiller/diy-
usability-testing-in-the-archive Accessed 1 Jun 2015.

Miller, Benjamin, Amanda Licastro, and Jill Belli. *Writing Studies Tree.* Creative
Commons. https://www.writingstudiestree.org/ Accessed 10 Feb 2018.

Miller, Benjamin, Amanda Licastro, and Jill Belli. "Composing the WST." *Kairos* 20.2
http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/20.2/topoi/miller-et-al/index.html Accessed 12
Mar 2018.

Mercier, Laurie. Review. "Maine Memory Network." *The Journal of American History*,
Vol. 90, No. 4 (Mar., 2004), p. 1558.

Mirtz, Ruth M. "WPAs as Historians: Discovering a First-year writing Program by
Researching Its Past." *The Writing Program Administrator as Researcher:
Inquiry in Action and Reflection*. Eds. Shirley K. Rose and Irwin Weiser.
Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1999, pp. 119-130.

Moon, Gretchen Flescher. "Locating Composition History."Patricia Donahue and
Gretchen Flesher Moon, eds. *Local Histories: Reading the Archives of
Composition*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2007.

Morville, Peter. *Ambient Findability.* Sebastopol: O'Reilly Media, 2005.

Murrell, William G. Thomas III, and William J. Turkel. "Interchange: The Promise of

     Digital History" *The Journal of American History*. Sept 2008.

     http://jah.oxfordjournals.org/ Accessed 5 Dec 2012.

Nielsen, Jakob. "10 Usability Heuristics for User Interface Design." *Nielsen Norman*

     *Group.* 1 Jan 1995. https://www.nngroup.com/articles/ten-usability-heuristics/

     Accessed 18 Feb 2018.

Olsen-Smith, Steven, Peter Norberg, and Dennis C. Marnon, Eds.  *Melville's Marginalia*

     *Online.*  Boise State University.  2011.  http://melvillesmarginalia.org/ Accessed

     29 Nov 2012.

Palfrey, John and Urs Gasser. *Born Digital*: *Understanding the First Generation of*

     *Digital Natives*.  New York: Basic Books, 2008.

Palmquist, Mike.  "Information Technology as Other: Reflections on a Useful Problem."

     *Discord and Directions: The Postmodern Writing Program Administrator.*  Eds.

     Sharon James McGee and Carolyn Handa.  Logan: Utah State University Press,

     2005, pp. 95-104.

Palmquist, Mike. "The Comp Archive." *Writing@CSU The Writing Studio.*

     https://writing.colostate.edu/comparchive/ Accessed 15 Apr 2018.

Poster, Mark.  *Information Please: Culture and Politics in the Age of Digital Machines.*

     Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

--. *The Mode of Information: Poststructuralism and Social Context.*

     Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1990.

Potts, Liza. "Archive Experiences: A Vision for User Centered Design in the Digital
Humanities" *Rhetoric and the Digital Humanities*. Eds. Jim Ridolfo and William
Hart-Davidson. Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 2015, pp. 255-263.

Ramsey, Alexis E. "Viewing the Archives: The Hidden and the Digital." *Working in the
Archives: Practical Research methods for Rhetoric and Composition*. Eds.
Alexis E. Ramsey, Wendy B. Sharer, Barbara L'Eplattenier, and Lisa S.
Mastrangelo. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, 2010, pp. 79-90.

Red de Humanidades Digitales (RedHD). "Best Practice Guidelines for the Development
and Evaluation of Digital Humanities Projects." Translation of Guía de buenas
prácticas y las preguntas. Version 1.1 (December 2013). PDF:
http://humanidadesdigitales.net/evaluacion/auto/gbp.pdf Accessed 24 Feb 2018.

Rose, Shirley K. "Preserving Our Histories of Institutional Change: Enabling Research
in the Writing program Archives" *The Writing Program Administrator as
Researcher: Inquiry in Action and Reflection*. Eds. Shirley K. Rose and Irwin
Weiser. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1999, pp. 107-118.

Seadle, Michael. "Archiving in the Networked World: Metrics for Testing." *Library Hi
Tech*. 29.3 (2011), pp. 557-564.

Scollon, Ron and Suzie Wong Scollon. "Multimodality and Language: A Retrospective
and Prospective View." *The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis*. Ed.
Carey Jewitt. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Shipka, Jodi. *Toward a Composition Made Whole*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh
Press, 2011.

Steedman, Carolyn. *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History.* Rutgers: New Jersey, 2001.

Tibbo, Helen. "The Impact of Information Technology on Academic Archives in the Twenty-first Century" *College and University Archives: Readings in Theory and Practice.* Eds. Christopher J. Prom and Ellen D. Swain. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2008, pp. 27-51.

University of Michigan, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, and the University of Toronto. "Archival Metrics." Funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. https://sites.google.com/a/umich.edu/archival-metrics/ Accessed 5 May 2016.

University of Pittsburg. "Teaching Archive." *The Department of English Composition Program.* http://www.composition.pitt.edu/about/teaching-archive Accessed 6 Apr 2018.

Wysocki, Anne Frances and Johndan Johnson-Eilola. "Blinded by the Letter: Why are We Using Literacy as a Metaphor for Everything Else?" *Cross-Talk in Com Theory: A Reader.* Eds. Victor Villanueva and Kristin L. Arola. 3rd ed. Urbana: NCTE, 2011.

Yakel, Elizabeth and Helen Tibbo. "Standardized Survey Tools for Assessment in Archives and Special Collections." *Performance Measurement and Metrics* 11.2 (2010), pp. 211-222.

# Appendix: Permission for Use

**Documentation of Fair Use of Tables and Permission for Use**

Based on the information I provide below, I, Amanda K. Girard, assert the use of all tables in this dissertation are either: 1) Significantly modified or adapted from the sources listed here or 2) Used with permission as granted by the letter that follows.

Table 4-1
Johnson, Robert. "An Economy and Heuristic of Craft Knowledge" Recreated from "Craft Knowledge: Of Disciplinarity in Writing Studies" (684). Permission for use in letter on following pages.

Table 4-2
WPA Curricular Archive Comparison based on the California Digital Library Themes. Based on Rosalie Lack's 10 themes from her study found in her text: "The Importance of User-Centered Design: Exploring Findings and Methods," and published in the *Journal of Archival Organization,* 4:1-2, 2007, pp. 69-86. The nature of Lack's article is to inform further analysis of library resources and is, therefore, fair use. Lack's work does not contain a table, but I am using her themes, which I cite and describe earlier in Chapter 4 to analyze three examples of my own.

Table 4-3
Competitive Analysis of WPA Curricular Archives. Drawing from Alana Miller's *DIY Usability Testing in the Archive* Functionality Matrix, I have created my own competitive analysis of information discovery within the three curricular archives that I examine in Chapter 4. Miller's presentation was meant to inform further analysis of digital archives and appears on Slideshare here: https://www.slideshare.net/AlanaMMiller/diy-usability-testing-in-the-archive and is, therefore, fair use. While I do not include any of Miller's tables exactly, I drew from her idea of competitive analysis to fill in my own tables.

2266 Briarcliff Rd NE
Atlanta, GA 30329
11 April 2018

Permissions Coordinator National Council of Teachers of English
1111 W. Kenyon Road
Urbana, IL 61801-1096

Dear Kurt Austin,

I am completing a doctoral dissertation at Michigan Technological University entitled "Articulating Digital Archival Practice within Writing Program Administration: A Theoretical Framework." I would like your permission to reprint in my dissertation a heuristic developed by Robert Johnson and included in his article "Craft Knowledge: Of Disciplinarity in Writing Studies" which appeared in College Composition and Communication, Vol. 61, No. 4 (June 2010), pp. 673-690. "An Economy and Heuristic of Craft Knowledge" appears as the first figure in the article on page 684. I have reproduced it as a table here:

### 4.2.1  Johnson's Heuristic

| Products | Processes | Selves | Cultures |
|----------|-----------|--------|----------|
| Evaluate | Construction | Reflect | Pro-act |
| Construct | Design | Act | Historicize |
| Edit | Invention | Evaluate | Persuade |
| Alter | Learn/Do | Construct | Listen |
| Invent | Converse | Identify | Describe |

Recreated from "Craft Knowledge: Of Disciplinarity in Writing Studies"
Figure 1. The aims of writing studies: To make, to craft. (684)

The requested permission extends to any future revisions and editions of my dissertation, including non exclusive world rights in all languages, and to the prospective publication of my dissertation by ProQuest through its ProQuest Dissertation Publishing business. ProQuest may produce and sell copies of my dissertation on demand and may make my dissertation available for free internet download at my request. Additionally, my dissertation will be available at the Michigan Technological University Library as part of its holdings. These rights will in no way restrict republication of the material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you. Your signing of this letter will also confirm that NCTE owns the copyright of the above described material. If these arrangements meet with your approval, please sign this letter and

return it to me as soon as possible. Or let me know if there is another process for permission to reprint material. Thank you so very much.

Best Regards,

*Amanda Girard*

Amanda Girard
PhD Candidate
Rhetoric, Theory, and Culture
Michigan Technological University

PERMISSION GRANTED FOR THE USE REQUESTED ABOVE:

Signature: *Kurt Austin*
Kurt Austin

Date: 4/11/18

Permissions Coordinator
National Council of Teachers of English
1111 W. Kenyon Road
Urbana, IL 61801-1096