

Jeffrey T. Grabill

# TECHNOLOGY, BASIC WRITING, AND CHANGE

*ABSTRACT: This article explores a way to change the status and position of basic writing by focusing on technology design and its relationship with larger institutional systems. Many of our efforts to change the identity of writing programs focus on classroom issues or particular curricular efforts. The argument in this article is that the identity of basic writing is a function of larger institutional decision-making processes and therefore the focus of our efforts to change basic writing should also engage these institutional processes. The article focuses on how participating in technology design can be a wedge for engaging in decision-making about the purpose and identity of basic writing programs.*

As writing teachers, we are accustomed to thinking of change within classrooms and with our students. We like to think that our classrooms are dynamic, that we have some control over them, and that every now and then, we make a difference in the lives of a few of our students. Writing teachers, in my experience, are most likely to say that we never teach the same course the same way twice and that students, the real “subject” of a writing course, make each class new. I talk about my classroom this way, and I hope that my characterization is true, that as teachers we have the power and ability to change what happens in our classrooms. I want to talk about teaching writing and change, but I will do so by looking “outside” the classroom at systems that affect the classroom. In fact, to be argumentative, I suggest that real change cannot happen exclusively within the classroom but must also take place on “larger” institutional levels.

To engage these larger institutional levels, I draw on my own experience and focus on one aspect of program design that has been an effective lever for effecting institutional change—technology design. In this respect, I look at technology not in terms of specific classroom uses or ways technology can be used to foster particular pedagogies or means of text production. I look at technology as an

---

*Jeff Grabill is an assistant professor of English at Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia. His teaching and research interests include composition, technical and professional writing, and literacy studies. Direct all correspondence to Jeff Grabill, Department of English, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303-3083. His e-mail address is <jgrabill@gsu.edu>*

integral and necessary part of the institutional space occupied by a writing program. My purpose is to explore a method for local change that first is attentive to the institutional space that basic writing occupies and second develops tools — institutional wedges — to change that space. The institutional wedges in this case are technological in nature — the ways in which technologies can be designed to change a basic writing program by altering the place that program occupies in the larger institution (like an English Department or college). Basic writing, like all writing programs, has always been institutionally situated, so I'm exploring a way to see basic writing that allows us strategically to change and reposition it within the university and English department. My hope is to develop tools that enable the continued existence — the active creation and recreation — of sophisticated, dynamic basic writing programs within the shifting structures of colleges and universities. Participating in the design of the technologies utilized by a basic writing program constitutes one such tool for changing the institutional space basic writing occupies, for changing basic writing.

## **Technology Matters**

I should disclose from the outset my fundamental feeling about technology and writing instruction: we can't choose to write without technology, so our choice as writing teachers and program administrators is not whether basic writing uses technologies in the classroom but rather which technologies we use and how we use them. As Stuart Blythe has discussed, we are surrounded by technologies that we use but rarely think about. We sit at desks and use pens or pencils and paper; we write on black or white boards; and every now and then we flip on the overhead projector. Most importantly, when we decide to move the desks into a new configuration, when we decide to use the white board in a new way, we are participating in subtle ways in the design of those technologies. The answers to questions about which technologies we use and why can have a significant impact on the identity of a writing program.

The connections between technology and writing are deeper. Christina Haas argues that "technology and writing are not distinct phenomena; that is, writing has never been and cannot be separate from technology" (x). Haas writes that while her statement strikes many as "common sense" on one level, the implications of such a position aren't immediately clear. Haas notes, as do Sullivan and Dautermann, that technologies often become transparent in our lives and in the research we conduct on writing, which can be good (if technologies seamlessly aid production) and can be bad (if we fail to consider how

technologies affect our lives). It is this last point, the possibility that the transparency of technology can be harmful, that is my point of departure here. If we don't consciously choose to write in certain ways with certain technologies, then those decisions will be made for us, both actively (in the sense that we may be given access to certain writing technologies and not others) and passively (in the sense that writing technologies may never be made available to our programs, to our students).

But the connections between technology and writing are deeper still. As Nancy Kaplan writes, "each tool brings into the classroom embedded conceptions of what exists, what is good or useful or profitable, and what is possible with its help" (77). Her statement is remarkable in at least two ways. The first is the way in which she connects tools to ideology, to the ways in which the choices of writing technologies govern to a significant degree who we are and what we can do as writing teachers. The second sense in which her statement is remarkable is what Feenberg would call its "ambivalence," or the sense in which every technology brings with it both constraint and possibility. In other words, the choice to use technologies in a basic writing program changes things, but importantly, the technology itself is not an autonomous agent. Rather, the choice of a writing technology opens up possibilities, and some of these potential changes may be useful, some harmful; some possibilities will be actualized, and others will go unrealized.

This brings me to the core of why technology matters—we can change it. Somebody (usually somebodies) is making the choice (or not) to make available certain writing technologies (and not others) to basic writing students, teachers, and programs. Do we, as basic writing teachers and administrators, take part in these decision-making processes? If not, why not? As I'm trying to argue here, we cannot simply see technology as one isolated variable among others that can be included or separated from the ways in which we design our writing programs. In fact, I think we can see technology as a "wedge" for active change. As Feenberg has continually argued, cultural systems from the most local to the most global are always already technological, and the only way we can create a "good" system, even to decide on the definition of a "good" system, is if people who are affected by that system participate in its design. According to Feenberg's critical theory view of technology, technological systems matter a great deal, and if they remain invisible to those most affected by those systems, they will be designed to meet certain needs and not others because while technological systems may be invisible to some (perhaps many), they aren't invisible to everyone.

In basic writing, if we talk about writing technologies at all (Stan and Collins note the lack of work on computers and basic writing), we

talk about them in terms of the classroom or how individual students may or may not use computers. I think this work is important, but I want to push us beyond the classroom. I see choices of writing technologies as part of the institutional systems we call writing programs, English departments, and universities and therefore integral to the identities of those systems. Writing is always already technological, and institutional systems (like writing programs) are dynamic and continually shape how we conduct our lives as writing teachers; institutional systems continually shape what is possible for our students. Simply put, we can't choose to ignore writing technologies, and furthermore, writing technologies matter so much to the identity of writing programs (and therefore what is possible in the classroom) that we must participate in the design of the technological systems available to basic writing. Technological design, in other words, is an avenue for agency, for changing basic writing.

## **Institutions Matter**

My sense of technological design and the role of instructional technology in changing basic writing is dependent upon another concept—a particular view of institutions. I have used the term “institutions” and the phrase “institutional systems,” yet I think it is important to understand what I mean by these terms and how they facilitate a view of basic writing as an institutional system that is open to change.

During my time as co-director of Developmental (or basic) Writing, my colleagues and I began to think about its position within the university.<sup>1</sup> Like many in basic writing, we had been developing curricula over a number of years that were as challenging as any “normal” composition course, and we felt our students needed to be acknowledged for their efforts. We faced three local challenges related to Developmental Writing:

- \* the need to introduce sophisticated writing technologies to our students for reasons of access—students could not be successful at our university without access to these technologies.
- \* the need to make the course credit bearing—in nearly each case, Developmental Writing does not fulfill any part of the composition requirement. After our course, most students must then take the “normal” two courses in the composition sequence. Thus students earn credits in Developmental Writing that don't count, a problem with the status of the course.
- \* the need to develop a *way* to change both the course and

its relation to the larger institution (the department and the university as a whole)—our problems were larger than those we were used to addressing (e.g., classroom issues), and so how to change Developmental Writing became, itself, a challenge.

But what does it mean to talk of a program as part of an “institutional system”? And how can writing teachers change institutions? My view is that we must see basic writing programs as part of much larger institutional systems and that these systems can be changed. Both stances—seeing the institution as specific and concrete and seeing it as malleable—are uncommon. That is, many readers may be thinking that viewing basic writing as part of larger institutional systems is so commonplace as to be unworthy of comment—nothing new here. But I disagree. We don’t talk concretely and meaningfully about institutions because we don’t know how to see them. Thus we don’t see how something like technology design could change an institution.<sup>2</sup> In most uses of the term, “institution” is either abstract or unmanageably large (and sometimes both). In the abstract, we refer to Religion, English Studies, or The Law as institutions. We know what they are, and we even have an idea of how they operate, but it is tough to *see* them concretely, to see places to interact with and perhaps change such institutions. Similarly, the schools where we teach may seem more concrete, but they also appear hopelessly large, seemingly operated by invisible hands (or more powerful hands), certainly not ours. David Harvey writes that institutions are composed of “semiotic systems” (e.g., writing) that organize practices that affect people subject to or active through a particular institution. Institutions are the universities where we teach, the schools our children attend, and the locations of a great number of public interactions (the department of motor vehicles; social service agencies; parent-teacher groups; neighborhood committees). Institutions, then, are local systems of decision-making within which people act (rhetorically) in ways that powerfully affect the lives of others.

Conceptualizing institutions as I have is a first step toward change. To conceptualize institutional change, I draw on the concept of “institutional critique,” a pragmatic mechanism for change that “insists that institutions, as unchangeable as they may seem (and indeed, often are), do contain spaces for reflection, resistance, revision, and productive action” (Porter et al., 3). The claim that institutions can be changed rests on the definition of institutions as local rhetorical systems of decision-making (17). As is likely apparent, “space” is an important term for me as well. While the concept of “space” has metaphorical or symbolic connotations, space is also quite concrete and inhabitable. The space I am talking about with respect to institutions is very “real”: it is concrete and material as well as rhetorical/discursive (both the con-

crete and rhetorical refer to different, though often related, ways to conceptualize “reality”). For geographer Doreen Massey, space is constructed. Space is *produced* by interrelations and interactions between people—like the systems of decision-making that are institutions. The “space” of basic writing, then, is produced by people within university institutional systems. Basic writing is a set of interrelations (a system, like decision-making processes) with both discursive and material attributes and effects. My position is that because space is produced, it can be reproduced (changed), thereby changing the institution itself.

Both the university and the English department create rhetorical and material space for basic writing through processes like placement procedures, course number designations, administrative and teaching lines devoted to the course, and classrooms reserved for the course (those who have had difficulty scheduling a computer classroom for a writing class [a *discursive* act] can attest to the importance of such acts and the value of the *material* space attached to them). That is, the “space” of basic writing is a function of these processes. This space is both discursive (e.g., curriculum, budget lines, listings in course catalogs) and material (e.g., desks, teachers, classrooms). It is important to see that practices such as assessment and placement of students, allotting teaching lines, and curriculum and technology design are linked. They are part of a system of decision-making that connects specific courses and programs with the seemingly “larger” practices of the department, the college, the university. The key to changing institutions is to find the spaces within these institutional systems where change is possible; that is, to participate in decision-making about how we do our work in locations within the institution that we may not normally be. For us, the practices of technology and curriculum design (they are inextricably linked) were locations where we could act—they were spaces of reflection, resistance, revision, and productive action that affected the classroom, and most importantly, intersected with and affected the larger institution as well. Therefore, technology and curriculum became our “wedges” for changing the institutional space of basic writing.

## Changing Basic Writing

We turned to technology and curriculum as an institutional wedge for changing the position of Developmental Writing for three reasons: (1) we were committed to teaching writing with computers for intellectual and pedagogical reasons;<sup>3</sup> (2) we were committed to introducing sophisticated writing technologies to our students (access); and (3)

instructional technology and its necessary intersection with curriculum also intersected with the larger institution and was an area over which we had some control. In effect, technology and curriculum design was one part of the institutional system that affected basic writing—it was our “institutional wedge” for effecting change. An “institutional wedge” is a process or an issue that can be used to “pry open” other institutional systems or processes that might otherwise be closed. Technology design was a way for us to interact with other systems of decision-making within the university—instructional technology support, for example. In this case, technology and curriculum design became the wedges of choice because they were two of the few options available to us. Technology/curriculum design was one way in which we could change the course and make the course visible and accountable to others in the university. In the case of Developmental Writing, the course was “remedial” and didn’t “count.” By extension, so were the students and the work they produced. Most importantly, those affected by the exclusionary boundary between “basic” and “normal” writing had little say in its construction. The course had been defined for students and teachers (even if for good reasons). Developmental Writing, then, was an institutional space within which work was of little value, and historically, a space over which those most affected had little control.

The first space over which we did have some control was the curriculum of Developmental Writing. The process of changing that curriculum began long before I started teaching, and so from the perspective of those within the program, there had been nothing “basic” about Developmental Writing for a long time. The curriculum used in Developmental Writing when I first joined the program as a teacher had two important characteristics. It was designed to introduce students to a range of research and writing practices that were valued by the university (although not necessarily by “English”). The curriculum was also designed with a theory of Developmental Writing students that saw them deficient (if deficient at all) in terms of possessing effective strategies for accomplishing writing tasks. Thus the curriculum began with a paper on “observing culture” that introduced students to observation-based research and writing practices, a second paper on “culture and personal experience” that explicitly built on the first by asking students to write their way into the culture they had been observing, a third paper that asked students to analyze the public discourse surrounding an issue of concern to them in any number of local communities that intersected on campus (e.g., the town or within a residence hall), and a fourth paper that asked students to enter the public discourse they analyzed in the third paper. To aid students with these writing and research tasks, the curriculum was built around analytical strategies to guide their writing processes (e.g., ob-

servational research guides, audience strategies, possible organizational plans).<sup>4</sup> In subsequent years, we revised the curriculum to make writing technologies themselves objects of critique (in addition to “culture” and/or “public issues”), thereby linking the class to technology in a way that refused to allow it transparency.<sup>5</sup> The new curriculum was theoretically and pedagogically similar to the previous curriculum. What changed were the issues/objects we examined and a few of the methods.

The normal first year writing sequence consists of one course that is largely personal narrative (with wide variety) and one course that has a research writing component (almost exclusively writing the English research paper). In Developmental Writing, students are exposed to narrative techniques and a range of research writing techniques. The traditional English research paper – either about literature or utilizing the library to show proficiency with textual sources and MLA citation styles – is only *part* of the discourse of the university. In Developmental Writing, we introduce students to a range of research practices (e.g., observation-based and online research) and diverse ways of writing up their research (largely taken from the social sciences). In addition, Developmental Writing students are asked to analyze the cultures from which they come and those into which they are moving (e.g., “the university”). In short, the course, like many if not most basic writing courses, is intellectually challenging and meets our institutional responsibilities to prepare students both for the first year writing sequence and to introduce them to the research and writing practices of the university as a whole.

While curriculum design was important for our sense of the course – we knew it was no longer “remedial” – it becomes a method of institutional critique when those responsible for a class like Developmental Writing make this argument to others – and use the curriculum as evidence. In our case, we began with the department (which wasn’t difficult) and then began to have conversations with academic advisors on campus who were still recommending the class as a place for remedial grammatical work. Interacting with program stakeholders is a key move because it allows us as teachers and administrators to expand our “space” in order to begin the process of changing the identity of basic writing. Thus, over time, arguments must be made at multiple levels that (1) the class is no longer “remedial” or a “support program” (pick your negative construction), but that (2) it is a sophisticated, challenging course that better meets the needs of its students and/or its institutional reasons for existence. Our work with curriculum is serious work, and one way that we can put it to serious use is as a technique for program revision, a tactic that can facilitate conversations within the institution that can carve a place in decision-making about the work we do. In short, we tried to use new curricula as a



wedge for institutional change by constructing new relationships with stakeholders and hopefully altering the ways they make decisions about the program.

The second space over which we had some control was technology design. One of the best traditions within basic writing, I think, is the commitment to “put marginal students immediately within representative academic projects . . .” (Bartholomae “Writing” 70). The commitment to expose students to sophisticated literacies and ideas prevents basic writing from becoming (or being labeled as) “remedial,” a label that can have dire institutional consequences.<sup>6</sup> What is rarely a part of discussions about teaching the best a university has to offer is teaching *with the best technologies* the university has to offer. Given the argument that writing is a technology and that the act or processes of writing cannot be separated from technologies, this absence is striking. Inseparable from the writing and thinking of the academy are the technologies the academy writes and thinks with. At this university in particular, understanding the role of writing technologies was crucial for envisioning our students’ success. It was technologically a relatively rich university, and if our students were to be successful writers, they needed to be able to research and write successfully with computer technologies.

Pedagogically, we moved writing classes into computer classrooms because our classes became more like workshops, and in these workshops, students actually wrote in-class where peers, the teacher, and the writing tutor were present for assistance. But our move to computer classrooms was never meant to rest with word processing. Networked and internetworked technologies were central to our developing notions of writing and the curriculum revisions that followed.<sup>7</sup> Networked writing was another way to facilitate both in-class and more distant communication and collaboration between students and between students and their teacher. But technology was just as important for larger institutional reasons, in particular the access a computer-based writing program allowed our students. Access to computers for writing is an extremely important issue, and one that has occupied the computers and writing community for some time (see Hawisher et al.). Porter argues that access is perhaps the number one justice issue in computers and writing, and in his book on ethics and electronic writing, he provides a useful framework for understanding the complexity of access. In his framework, access is three-fold, encompassing infrastructural access (money and machines), literacy (education and training), and community acceptance (freedom to speak online). In a technologically rich environment, the borders between basic and normal writing were far more than textual – they were technological. During the Spring 1994 semester, for example, approximately 200 bulletin boards or newsgroups were set up for courses, and many more classes

used electronic mail (Yagelski and Grabill). So even if courses were not taught in dedicated computer classrooms, many university classes were utilizing sophisticated communication technologies, and nearly everyone on campus required written material to be word processed. Since 1994 (ages ago technologically), those numbers have only increased. In order to be successful writers at the university, students needed to be able to write with computer technologies. We felt strongly that Developmental Writing needed to provide the access to these technologies, especially for our students, and we provided all three types of access—to the machines, to literacies, and to community acceptance through the use of electronic communities in the classroom. In effect, we provided our students with an advantage.

The fact that Developmental Writing was a computer-based course may have added to its image as a “sophisticated” course—I think it did based on my conversations with stakeholders inside and outside the English department. But like changes in the curriculum, changes in technologies are only important as institutional levers if we use them outside the program. Technology design allowed us significant interaction with the university community outside English. Because we were involved with the design of our own instructional technologies, we were involved with technology support services on campus in a way that gave the program some status with that segment of the university community. Here as well we had to struggle with the perception that our students were “remedial” and therefore didn’t need the best technologies the university had to offer. Through conversations about the design of software, systems access for students, and the classrooms in which we wanted to teach, we were not only able to have significant control over the design of our courses, but we were able to legitimize our technology use to that portion of the university community who controlled it. Quickly, those of us associated with Developmental Writing became one of the primary contacts between instructional technology support and the English department, and just as importantly, our classrooms often served as test sites for new technologies. The move from a “remedial” program that needed to argue for why it needed computer technologies to a program with status and ethos as a technologically-based writing program was an important move and a piece of the larger argument necessary for changing Developmental Writing.

## **A New Developmental Writing?**

I claim that our processes of curricular and technology design were intended to change the institutional positioning of Developmental Writing.<sup>8</sup> But what has changed? My goal for Developmental Writ-

ing was to see it in a new way and to get others to see it differently as well. Institutions are dynamic, not static, and thus some change is inevitable. The key is to develop tactics for effecting *positive* institutional change. In the case of Developmental Writing, the most significant change has yet to take place—giving students credit for the work they do in the class—but I feel strongly that the groundwork has been laid for such a move. Collectively, over a number of years, we have changed the space of Developmental Writing because we have begun to change the nature of the differences between “basic” and “normal” classes and programs.

Changing basic writing is difficult work. Donna Dunbar-Odom, discussing basic writing textbooks, writes

There is no perfect textbook that will liberate or empower its readers on its own. However, authors and publishers of textbooks need to move away from practices and attitudes that predate the Dartmouth Seminar and begin to serve an avant garde function, testing and “transcending the boundaries” of the field of basic writing, re-imagining their audience as a consequence. In other words, basic writing courses and textbooks need to be designed and written so that they produce a narrative of the intellectually, developmentally, cognitively, and emotionally capable, and most importantly, literate adult. (7)

Changing textbooks and changing local curricula have a long history as attempts to change the nature and identity of writing courses and programs. What I am suggesting here is that these attempts absent a sense of institutional power and space may not work well because they often fail to move beyond the isolated classroom itself. As Robin McTaggart argues, “Clearly the development of educational work [i.e., change through participatory action research] cannot be achieved by looking at ‘teaching’ practice alone” (32). The problems we faced demanded that we see Developmental Writing as more than a set of students or classrooms. Indeed, we needed to see it as more than a single isolated course. We needed to see Developmental Writing as part of larger institutional systems of decision-making about what courses existed, their value, and their relation to the curriculum as a whole. Finally, we needed to use something over which we had some control and power as our “wedge” into these larger institutional systems. Technology and curriculum design (and not, for example, assessment and placement practices) served as such a wedge.

So what is Developmental Writing (for us, locally)? It is not a location for fixing remedial texts but is rather the institutional location where students designated as “developmental” by the university can be given their own space to grow as writers. This is not necessarily a

textual or psychological space (although it can be); this space is institutional. Our purpose is improved writing and high rates of student retention, and to achieve this purpose, we provide them with small classes, significant contact with instructors, tutors, and peers, a challenging curricula, and access to the best writing technologies the university has to offer. No longer a “remedial” class in the minds of those responsible for the program and some within the university community as a whole, Developmental Writing is a sophisticated, challenging course that grants its students exceptional access to the writing and writing technologies necessary to be successful in the university.

As an institutional system, basic writing can fulfill important needs for students within the university. My purpose here has been to think about the continued existence of basic writing by exploring ways of changing institutional systems. While only the partial story of one program — and a story with ambiguous results at that — the linked tactics of technology and curriculum design can facilitate the institutional change that enables basic writing teachers (and perhaps students) to participate in the construction of their own borders. The key is to find those spaces within local institutional systems that allow students, faculty, and administrators room for the reflection necessary to develop tools for resistance and institutional change.

### Notes

1. Developmental writing at Purdue is a relatively small program within the larger first year writing program. Offered only during the Fall semester, typically there are between 12-15 sections taught at a time. With the cap at 15 students per section (a real benefit of the program), Developmental Writing serves about 125 students each year. Students in this program benefit from small class sizes and a close relationship with the university writing center. A staff of undergraduate tutors is recruited and trained specifically for the program. One tutor is assigned to each section of Developmental Writing, and that tutor attends at least one class per week and meets with each student once a week for a writing tutorial.

The program is administered and taught exclusively by graduate students. Advanced graduate students work with the director of composition, but are generally responsible for curricula, instructional technology, and training new teachers (through a semester long mentoring program). While a wonderful opportunity for graduate students, the staffing of Developmental Writing is an indication of its status within the department and the university. My association with the program began as a new teacher and continued through two years as co-director and teacher. The narrative of this article and many of my arguments are the result of this direct and indirect collaboration.

2. Furthermore, we relegate such institutional work to the silence of service and therefore minimize this work and its effects. Most composition teachers and program administrators engage in some form of institutional action every day—fighting for writing programs is part of the history and *ethos* of rhetoric and composition. Yet we don't often think about this work beyond the framework of our own institutions, and we certainly don't frame such institutional action as "research" or write about it, even though these institutional actions are important to understand and share with others. This framework for understanding institutions and seeing them as a site for action and reflection is an attempt to value this work outside narrow local contexts.

3. The directors of Developmental Writing at the time that I began teaching in the program were Joanne Addison and Karin Evans. It was their decision to begin moving classes into computer classrooms because they saw the computer classroom as pedagogically beneficial and the technologies as likely to enhance the writing practices (if not abilities) of our students. My subsequent work was self-consciously an extension of their work.

4. The curriculum was modeled theoretically on the invention strategies in the textbook *Four Worlds of Writing* by Janice Lauer, Gene Montague, Andrea Lunsford, and Janet Emig.

5. The "we" I refer to here is Barb L'Eplattenier and I. Together we undertook a revision of the curriculum to include computer technologies as objects of critique.

6. At Georgia State, for example, all "remedial" programs must be eliminated as part of a university system realignment that will equalize standards across the state's four research universities. The rhetoric used to construct and maintain writing programs is meaningful—it can mean the elimination of programs and the good they can do for students. If basic writing wants to survive in a situation like this, its existence must be institutionally positioned differently from "remedial" work even though it might serve the same students.

7. One problem voiced by many teachers is the need to teach technology as well as writing, a need that consumes too much class time and energy. Teaching some technology will always be a "problem," but there are ways to lessen the burden of this. One way we have always done this is through the use of "mini-projects." These small, collaborative projects have a dual purpose: (1) to introduce students to collaborative work, and (2) to collaborate on learning the technologies necessary for success in the class. The class might decide, for instance, that it

is necessary to be able to open and save a new document in the word processor, to know how to cut and paste, and to use the spell checker. In addition, it also might be necessary to know how to read and send email messages. Small groups of students can volunteer or be assigned to learn and teach these discrete technologies to the class. But the larger point I want to make is that learning writing technologies cannot be seen as a “add-on” or “extra work” in a writing classroom. If writing technologies are important—either at the university or in the workplace—then they are curricular not extracurricular.

8. I think it is important to point out that it may not have been the intent of everyone involved with Developmental Writing to “change the institution.” In fact, early in my time with the program, it wasn’t my intention either—we were trying to put together a darn good course for our students. But during my second year as co-director of Developmental Writing, I began explicitly to think about the issues of identity and institutional change. The language I am using to describe it—institutional and border critique, for instance—has come later in an attempt to make sense of what I/we were trying to do and to help frame future institutional action.

### Works Cited

- Bartholomae, David. “Writing on the Margins: The Concept of Literacy in Higher Education.” *A Sourcebook for Basic Writing Teachers*. Ed. Theresa Enos. New York: Random House, 1987. 66-83.
- Blythe, Stuart. “Technologies and Writing Center Practices: A Critical Approach.” Diss. Purdue University, 1997.
- Dunbar-Odom, Donna. “And They Wrote Happily Ever After: The Nature of Basic Writing as Portrayed in Textbooks.” *Composition Chronicle* 9 (1996): 4-7.
- Feenberg, Andrew. *Critical Theory of Technology*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.
- Haas, Christina. *Writing Technology: Studies on the Materiality of Literacy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1996.
- Harvey, David. *Justice, Nature & the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996.
- Hawisher, Gail E., Paul LeBlanc, Charles Moran, and Cynthia L. Selfe. *Computers and the Teaching of Writing in American Higher Education, 1979-1994: A History*. New Directions in Computers and Composi-

- tion Studies. Ed. Gail E. Hawisher and Cynthia L. Selfe. Greenwich, CN: Ablex, 1996.
- Kaplan, Nancy. "Ideology, Technology, and the Future of Writing Instruction." *Evolving Perspectives on Computers and Composition Studies: Questions for the 1990s*. Ed. Gail E. Hawisher and Cynthia L. Selfe. Urbana: NCTE and Computers and Composition, 1991.
- Lauer, Janice M., Gene Montague, Andrea Lunsford, and Janet Emig. *Four Worlds of Writing*. 3rd ed. New York: HarperCollins, 1991.
- Massey, Doreen. "Politics and Space/Time." *Place and the Politics of Identity*. Ed. Michael Keith and Steve Pile. London: Routledge, 1993. 141-161.
- McTaggart, Robin. "Guiding Principles for Participatory Action Research." *Participatory Action Research: International Contexts and Consequences*. Ed. Robin McTaggart. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997. 25-44.
- Porter, James E., Patricia Sullivan, Stuart Blythe, Jeffrey T. Grabill, and Libby Miles. "(Re)writing Institutions: Spatial Analysis and Institutional Critique." unpublished (1998).
- Porter, James E. *A Rhetorical Ethics for Internetworked Writing*. *New Directions in Computers and Composition Studies*. Ed. Gail E. Hawisher and Cynthia L. Selfe. Greenwich, CN: Ablex, 1998.
- Stan, Susan and Terence G. Collins. "Basic Writing: Curricular Interactions with New Technology." *JBW* 17 (1998): 18-41.
- Sullivan, Patricia and Jennie Dautermann, Ed. *Electronic Literacies in the Workplace: Technologies of Writing*. Urbana: NCTE and Computers and Composition, 1996.
- Yagelski, Robert P., and Jeffrey T. Grabill. "Computer-Mediated Communication in the Undergraduate Writing Classroom: A Study of the Relationship of Online Discourse and Classroom Discourse in Two Writing Classes." *Computers and Composition* 15 (1998): 11-40.