Archive 2.0: What Composition Students and Academic Libraries Can Gain from Digital-Collaborative Pedagogies

Matthew A. Vetter

Research across disciplines in recent years has demonstrated a number of gains associated with community engagement and service-learning pedagogies. More recently, these pedagogies are filtering into digital contexts as instructors become aware of the opportunities for learning made available by online writing venues. This case study describes an assignment model that engages composition students in two specific communities: the Ohio University libraries' special collections (archives) and the online encyclopedia Wikipedia. Student-participants in this study performed original research within special collections on regional topics in order to edit and create corresponding Wikipedia articles. The study ultimately finds that this assignment can lead to an increase in students' rhetorical knowledge and motivation levels while also promoting public awareness of library resources and contributing to public knowledge via Wikipedia.

In the past few decades, innovation and research in pedagogy across academic disciplines has sought to engage students with materials and forums outside the classroom. In the field of composition, service or "community" learning—the application of student assignments to goal-oriented, community-based projects—has become an increasingly popular and pervasive manifestation of these movements. Pedagogies that value civic or community engagement (Herzberg; Weisser) are also intrinsically linked to this trend. A rhetorical education centered on public discourse can be traced back to the sophists (Jarratt), but a more recent motivation for this move away from the classroom can be found in the emergence of social-epistemic theories of language in the late 1980s and early 1990s and their application to writing and literacy studies (Bizzell; Gee; Harris). Proponents of service learning in composition offer a number of rationales for the shift towards public discourse. Community-engaged service learning furthers the pedagogical agenda of the social turn by expanding the audience for student writing and enabling the study of discourse within specific communities. Such models also allow for the crossing of cultural and class boundaries as students go beyond the immediate and often homogeneous cultures of the university (Deans). Researchers in composition studies have found that service-learning leads to increased levels of motivation, as it promotes a greater sense of responsibility on the

part of students who undertake writing assignments that engage with outside audiences (Adler-Kassner, Crooks, and Watters; Feldman). The recognition and general acceptance of these educational gains has prompted scholars to begin thinking about the position of service-learning in the academy and how it might be further promoted, positioned, and sustained (Adler-Kassner, Crooks, and Watters).

Even more recently, scholars have appropriated figures as diverse as John Dewey and Jürgen Habermas as proponents for a public pedagogy (Barton; Richards). The use of these figures emerges within a slightly different context, however: digital pedagogies and the affordances of Web 2.0 technologies that allow users to interact and to produce discourse in virtual, online forums. Daniel Richards, for instance, utilizes Dewey's ethical pragmatism to argue for the capabilities of blogs as tools for civic activism. Matthew Barton, in an examination of Habermas' conception of a critical public sphere essential for participatory democracy, encourages the use of blogs, wikis, and discussion boards in the composition classroom. In the context of service and community-engagement learning, my use of "public pedagogy" is intended to evoke an educational model that moves beyond (private) educational spheres and involves students in projects that interact with one or more extra-academic publics, often for the purpose of providing opportunities for civic engagement and cultural participation.[1]

Ultimately, a move toward public pedagogies, digital or otherwise, is representative of a crucial shift of the boundaries of educational spaces, not only in composition but also across disciplines. Academic librarians and archivists, the professionals we so often work with to integrate research into student writing processes, have not been immune to this shift either. These professionals are increasingly challenging the static roles of "information-keepers" in order to find new and effective methods of engaging with their academic communities (Ismail et al.).

It is within these disparate yet connected contexts—service learning, civic engagement, digital pedagogies, and library research—that this article, which details a cross-disciplinary relationship between a writing program and a university library's archives (special collections), is situated. In the following, I describe an assignment model for cross-disciplinary, digital pedagogy I recently piloted in a junior-level composition course. This model is illustrated through a case study of a single student's experience with the project and also a class study, which examines the affordances of such a model. While the case study exemplifies the specific assignment model under examination in order to illustrate a student's negotiation of the project, the results of the larger study, including survey data and process logs, provide some insight into students' overall perceptions of the assignment. I ultimately argue that this type of

learning is a productive means to increase students' rhetorical knowledge by exposing them to multiple authorities and audiences and that this, in turn, allows them to realize their own (personal) authority which is so often "denied in [traditional] school contexts" (Penrose and Geisler 515). Much of this increase in rhetorical knowledge stems from the finding that students are more motivated by community-engaged projects, a finding that extends the work of Deans and Adler-Kassner, Crooks, and Watters. This study also answers calls from these authors to begin thinking about how service learning might be positioned in the academy by examining the opportunities made available by cross-disciplinary relationships.

Finally, the model described here demonstrates the pedagogical benefits of a project that encourages *digital*, as well as physical, community engagement. Students working within this pedagogical model complete a public writing task that requires the translation and transmission of local knowledge sets to an openly accessible (online) public database, providing them with valuable insights into how knowledge is produced and shared in digital forums, as well as how to become familiar with specific digital community conventions in order to accomplish this work.

A Collaborative Effort in Curriculum Development

In early fall of 2011, I was contacted by the Head of Art and Archives for Libraries at Ohio University, a midsize public university enrolling around 20,000 undergraduate students. She was interested in the possibility of collaboratively developing a writing assignment for a course I was teaching in the upcoming term that would engage students in research in the library's archives and special collections. Students completing this assignment would be made aware of the available materials in these collections and would be able to return to them for future research endeavors.

Over the next few weeks, we developed an assignment that would accomplish this research goal and also raise awareness of special collections resources through a more public venue: the online encyclopedia Wikipedia. The encyclopedia had recently piloted its Global Education Program, a public policy initiative sponsored by the Wikimedia Foundation, which seeks to "engage students and professors across disciplines, universities and countries in using Wikipedia as a teaching tool" with the goal of "improv[ing] Wikipedia's coverage of course topics" ("Wikipedia: Education Program"). The program provides sample course designs and assignment ideas, as well as support for students in the form of "help" chat channels and online ambassadors who are available to answer questions and solve issues.

With this ultimate venue for publication in mind, we constructed a project consisting of the following processes and goals. Students would perform

original research in the university archives and special collections to discover materials regarding a university-related topic and then edit a corresponding article on Wikipedia. In the process, students would develop relationships with the special collections curator whose collection they were researching, as well as with an assigned online ambassador, an experienced Wikipedian who volunteered time to assist students on the project. Ultimately, student-edited articles would help publicize and raise awareness of special collections because readers of these articles would be exposed to reference-links to the university archive's website.

The project was not designed entirely as a service to special collections and archives, however. From my perspective as a writing instructor, I was interested in using the encyclopedia as a way of teaching discourse community conventions as well as exposing students to a dynamic, social-process oriented model of knowledge construction. Because Wikipedia is built on a wiki platform, it allows multiple users to contribute to a single document while saving a record of individual contributions. Such a platform showcases collaborative writing processes, and having students observe and engage in these processes can be helpful on a number of cognitive and meta-cognitive levels, especially in terms of procedural, research and genre knowledge (Hood; Purdy; Vetter). Perhaps my most significant motivation was my desire to engage students with audiences and authorities outside the classroom, to get them to write for purposes beyond the course and teacher.

The collaborative nature of this project was influenced significantly by Kenneth Bruffee's 1984 landmark article "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind'." In what is now a well-known argument for collaborative learning, Bruffee insists that we thoughtfully organize collaborative learning situations that contribute to "a genuine part of students' educational developments" (652). Bruffee is careful, however, to recognize the problematic aspects of peer group learning when he poses the following questions: "How can student peers, who are not themselves members of the knowledge communities they hope to enter, help other students to enter those communities? Isn't collaborative learning the blind leading the blind?" (646). Bruffee addresses this difficulty, partially, by emphasizing the ways that such an assumption reifies a Cartesian model of knowledge in which these peer groups are themselves unqualified to access an outside source of knowledge. If we move beyond these reductive assumptions toward a model in which we begin to value the knowledge sets students bring as well as the collaborative work they engage in to negotiate and build knowledge, we can begin to value their contributions more thoroughly.

In the collaborative, cross-disciplinary model presented in this study, my intent is both to support Bruffee's evaluation of peer-group learning as well

as to insist that students benefit from the inclusion of collaborators outside their immediate peer group: special collections' curators and Wikipedia ambassadors, collaborators whose expertise and knowledge contribute to and motivate students in this project. These collaborators would also mitigate what Bruffee recognizes as the "pitfalls" of peer group learning: the "conformity, anti-intellectualism, intimidation, and leveling down of quality" that so often emerges when students depend on their peers for collaborative projects (652).

Designing the Study

In designing a pilot study that would explore the possibilities of this kind of collaborative-digital pedagogy, I was interested in the following research questions:

1. What can academic archivists and composition classes (both students and instructors) gain through collaborative, cross-disciplinary curriculum development?
2. How might students' perceptions of audience and authority differ in an assignment that attempts to accomplish public goals, one that incorporates a number of different audiences and collaborators?
3. Do students identify cross-disciplinary projects like this as more or less motivating than previous English assignments?
4. How do students respond to this type of cross-disciplinary pedagogy?

Student participants in this IRB approved study were enrolled in a junior-level, general education course—*Writing & Rhetoric II*—I taught during the winter quarter of 2012. Sixteen students overall, between the ages of 18 and 24, participated in the study. Because the study was situated within the practices and exigencies of the course, procedures for data collection followed closely the processes of the assignment. Students invented and researched topics in the library's archives and special collections after attending a presentation by curators on materials and policies of the collections. Their topic selections were limited, somewhat, to the availability of specific materials in the collections. Students then studied a corresponding Wikipedia article to find "gaps"—places they could identify as needing updating or revising. Next, students wrote a proposal letter to their assigned curator in which they described their plans for the article edit (see Appendix A for a description of the assignment sequence). These letters were followed by face-to-face interviews with the curator. Students then performed additional research and submitted a draft to their assigned online ambassador, who returned feedback concerning Wikipedia conventions. In the final segment of the assignment, students published their drafts.

Throughout the various assignment processes, I collected three sets of data. At two intervals in the assignment sequence, students wrote process logs to describe the influence of curators and ambassadors on their writing and research processes. Prompts for these process logs (see Appendix A), intentionally open-ended to avoid overly scripted responses from students, were designed to gain data about students' valuations of incorporating outside authorities in their writing processes. Additionally, after they had submitted their drafts for publication, students completed a questionnaire meant to gauge their perceptions of authority and audience, as well as their overall response to the project (see Appendix B). Students were given twenty-five minutes to answer nine open-ended, short response questions during which the instructor (myself) left the room. As stipulated by IRB, students were given the option of refusing to participate and were informed that their responses would be collected anonymously and would in no way affect their grade or standing in the course.

As all of the questions were qualitative, open-ended short responses, interpretation of the data was based on a type of thematic analysis drawn from Richard Boyatzis' *Transforming Qualitative Information*. A theme, according to Boyatzis, allows for qualitative analysis of a data set through recognition of "pattern[s] found in the information…that describe and organize possible observations [and/or] interpret aspects of the phenomenon" (vii). My use of this analytical method entailed the creation of codes or themes that commonly emerged in responses; when multiple themes emerged, all were included. For example, if a student lists two different themes in one question, such as identifying both the instructor and the Wikipedia public as significant authorities in the project, both were reported toward result totals. The qualitative data collected in this study informs the following two sections, in which I present a case study of a single student's experience navigating the project, followed by results of the larger class study, which focuses on student perceptions of authority and audience.

From Archive to Screen: Tracing One Student's Experience with the Archive Project

The project to perform archival research and improve a Wikipedia article on a university-related topic comes alive through a case study of a particular student, whom we'll call Mark. A baseball fan and journalism major, Mark became intrigued by university alumnus and professional baseball player George "Krum" Kahler, a particular interest of one of the archive curators. After hearing the curator talk specifically about the availability of materials in special collections related to this figure, Mark checked out the Wikipedia article for Kahler and discovered that it could use some work. In particular, Mark noticed a number of what he had come to think of, through class dis-

cussions and the project assignment, as gaps—omissions that might be filled in order to expand and improve the article. He noted many of these in a letter to the curator (see Appendix A for assignment prompt), excerpted below, which served the purpose of an introduction and project proposal:

> As you have seen from his Wikipedia page, the information on Kahler does not do him justice. Although his career was short and relatively average, he deserves more than merely three sentences for his biography. The information on there covers some of his general statistics such as earned run average, win-lose record, strikeout totals and birth and death dates. Needless to say, there is an enormous amount of information that could be added to this [Wikipedia article]. New sections could include his minor league career, information about his family, information on his football and basketball careers and his life after baseball.

Mark's proposal letter goes on to describe some of the materials he had already found in the library archives, including the Kahler Scrapbook, which according to Mark "gives an immense amount of information on Kahler by including articles, box scores and pictures of the athlete from his . . . high school days to his stint in the pros." Mark ends the letter by thanking the curator for his help and by expressing excitement about the project's goals. "Since Kahler was seen as a local hero," writes Mark, "it also adds more motivation to tell his story to the general audience." Such an attitude can tell us a lot about how students become motivated in research situations where there is a genuine audience as well as subjects they are invested in. Mark's investment in the research topic, and the relationship he formed with the curator who was also heavily invested, led to his motivation to share that interest with a larger audience. Later in the project, in one of his process logs, Mark wrote the following about the motivation he felt working with the curator one-on-one: "[The curator] sat down and showed me the information available at the Mahn Center along with giving me additional sources of his own [to] use. The excitement and enthusiasm he has for my subject has been rubbing off on me as well."

But Mark's comments are also evocative on another level. Because the project involved working across disciplines to collaborate with curators of special collections, students were able to access research materials that are not, by definition, broadly accessible to a larger audience. Working with these materials and making them more public allows students to participate first-hand in a process of research that goes beyond synthesis and argument. Mark, as well as his classmates, was able to share information with a public audience

that was previously only accessible to visitors of the archive. In doing so, these students were also able to witness how digital technologies are changing the way information is created, stored, and made public, to re-imagine what an archive can look like in the twenty-first century.

Yet Mark's process on this project did not stop at his interactions with the special collections curator. As part of the collaborative nature of this assignment, Mark also interacted and worked with a Wikipedia "ambassador," an experienced Wikipedian who volunteered time to help students learn, employ article conventions, and participate in the encyclopedia's development. Working with an ambassador allowed students to come to terms with specific writing conventions of Wikipedia and to translate their archival research into a format acceptable to the Wikipedia community. In particular, Mark recognizes the significance of the ambassador's support in relation to learning the Wikipedia community conventions of article organization:

> The advice that I received from [the Wikipedia ambassador] was very helpful in editing my article. She gave me more feedback than expected, mainly dealing with the organization of my article. I think it is very beneficial to have articles reviewed by experienced Wikipedians who know the guidelines and restrictions. After receiving [the ambassador's] advice, I was able to polish my page to make it better suited for Wikipedia.

While Wikipedia articles are never truly "finished," Mark's revisions based on the feedback received from the ambassador represent his final work on the project; and soon after, he "published" those revisions as his final draft of the assignment on Wikipedia.

As becomes evident in a case study of Mark, students working on this project benefit immensely from a cross-disciplinary digital model that invites multiple collaborators into the process. Students are challenged and motivated by the opportunity to work with different individuals, each having a separate agenda and interest in the project. The curator, for instance, is interested in sharing knowledge about a particular part of the archives as well as promoting and making archival materials more accessible through a public venue such as Wikipedia. The curator, however, doesn't always have a thorough understanding of conventional practices and politics of Wikipedia. Ambassadors working with students on this project met this need by helping students translate their research into article edits that were consistent with the encyclopedia's norms. Involving these figures in an assignment not only allows for added support and motivation for students working on a very public writing assignment—one with lasting consequences—but also creates a situation where students need

to forward a vision and assert authority while working with those outside individuals. The next section deals with this issue of authority, and how students working on projects with multiple collaborators and audiences might learn to take on personal authority by gaining access to rhetorical knowledge.

Authorities, Audiences, and the Possibilities for Rhetorical Knowledge in Public Writing

In "Reading and Writing Without Authority," Ann M. Penrose and Cheryl Geisler study the writing and reading processes of two student writers—one a college freshman, the other a doctoral student—in order to better understand how novice and expert writers differ in their ability to assume authority over their writing. They argue that Janet, the freshman, "has difficulty assuming authority in a complex writing task because of her strong commitment to an 'information-transfer model of education'" (515). Janet's commitment to this model, perpetuated by the types of traditional writing assignments common in academic contexts, prohibits her from taking a constructivist approach. Instead of seeing other texts and authors as making knowledge claims "subject to interpretation and criticism" (515), Janet insists on a truth-finding writing process in order to compile an objective report, and refrains from assuming authority while negotiating multiple sources. In contrast, Roger, the more experienced writer, is able to acknowledge and negotiate multiple subjectivities in order to compare the various positions in the literature. Penrose and Geisler's examination of these two student-writers allows them to challenge preconceived notions of how students gain authority over their writing. "The traditional response to the problem of lack of authority," they acknowledge, "is to try to increase the domain knowledge upon which authority is supposedly founded" (516). Domain knowledge, the mastery of a set of subject-specific topics in a given field of inquiry, *does* provide writers with strategies to negotiate meaning. However, to assume that mastery of a complex writing task requires *only* domain knowledge is, according to Penrose and Geisler, an oversimplification. A writer's authority must also come from "rhetorical knowledge," an understanding of a rhetorical, constructivist model of knowledge production and the role of personal subjectivity in that process:

> We would instead argue for the role of rhetorical knowledge in the development of authority. In order for Janet to take authority in this or any other situation, she needs to believe there is authority to spare—that there is room for many voices. She needs to understand the development of knowledge as a communal and continual process. Thus an alternative to the information-transfer model would be

to insist on more interactive models of education in which a genuine rhetorical perspective is not only taught but enacted. (517)

An interactive pedagogy that allows students to participate in the ongoing rhetorical construction of knowledge proposed by Penrose and Geisler might be accomplished in a number of ways. The digital-collaborative model presented in this study, one responsive to community-engagement and service learning, represents a particularly productive response to their recommendations. As a wiki, a writing technology that allows for multiple, ongoing contributions to a single written product, Wikipedia itself is a productive metaphor for understanding the social construction of knowledge. Yet students also have much to gain through their negotiation of the multiple authorities and audiences afforded in a cross-disciplinary, public writing project. The involvement of these extra-academic authorities and audiences, as the results of this study suggest, allow for a pedagogy that significantly displaces the instructor as sole authority over student work and provides public audiences for student writing. Such a shift dramatically increases opportunities for growth in rhetorical knowledge, as students negotiate multiple subjectivities to produce written work for users of Wikipedia.

Table 1. Student Perceptions of Authority Distribution

Authority Figure	n (N)	%
Professor	8 (16)	50%
Wikipedia Public	8 (16)	50%
Student (Self)	6 (16)	38%
Curator	4 (16)	25%

Table 1, which presents survey data (see Appendix B, question 7), displays student perceptions of authority figures operating in the project. As is evident from the percentages, many students identified two figures of authority. While a large portion of students (8 of 16) depicted the instructor as the most significant authority—often citing the "grade" as reasoning—this selection does not represent a majority. Rather, authority was displaced among the various audiences and research partners of the assignment. An equal portion of students (8 of 16) described Wikipedia ambassadors or Wikipedia public audiences as authorities. Students in this category often reported a desire for their work to remain public on the encyclopedia (i.e., for their work not be removed by another editor). As one student responded, "I believe the Wikipedia public held the most authority because at any moment they could say

your article was crap and go in and change it. This pushed me to write a better article that was constructed really well."

Additionally, a sizable portion of students (6 of 16) saw *themselves* as authorities in the project. Many of them discussed their "control" over the project, citing the public audience as a major factor:

> I held the authority, even with an online ambassador helping me and [offering] guidelines to follow. It is all my decision on what the page would consist of and how professional it would be. I cared about the assignment so I wanted to make sure that everything looks as good as possible for readers and for general public.

Finally, a smaller number of students (4 of 16) identified the special collections curator they worked with as an authority. While student perceptions are necessarily somewhat limited, these data demonstrate the possibility of displacing the instructor's authority in a public writing assignment, of enabling students to navigate multiple resources and authorities and, more importantly, cultivate their own authority in order to create knowledge in a public venue.

Much like their perceptions of authority, student conceptions of audience in this particular writing task varied greatly from a more traditional assignment in which they write for an imagined academic audience or for the instructor exclusively. Such conceptions were certainly influenced by the number of different individuals and communities involved in the project. Curators at the university library's special collections provided access to topics and materials and helped to guide students in the research process. Online Wikipedia ambassadors commented on student drafts of article edits. Students discussed their work in class among their peers, which constituted another audience. And always present: the eye of the instructor and the looming assessment. Add to these specific audiences the Wikipedia public, encyclopedia users who would read the articles, and what emerges is quite complex. Toby Coley, writing about wikis in general, provides a vivid description of such complexity:

> The concept of audience is challenged in the wiki because students now have to consider the identity of the audience on a much larger scale, since they have the ability to "publish" materials online. Though this audience may be limited by administrators, the students' conceptions of audience are still challenged through the immediacy of the audience and its impact on the physical (or digital) text. The audience is now an amalgamation of single-member audience, limited audience, undefined multi-audiences, fictionalized au-

dience, addressed, and invoked audience. ("Wikis and the Rhetorical Audience," para. 13)

Coley is drawing from Lunsford and Ede's influential 1984 work "Audience Addressed / Audience Invoked," but also relevant here is Keith Grant-Davie's identification of the audience as co-negotiating discourse with the rhetor "to achieve the rhetorical objectives" (268). For students to be able to perform such negotiations, for them to see how discourse both affects and is affected by audiences, they need to be writing for audiences beyond the instructor. A model of public writing with specific goals for production and distribution, one that involves multiple audiences and collaborators, allows for this.

When asked to identify the audience that "mattered the most to you as a writer" in the assignment sequence, students participating in the study overwhelming chose an outside audience.

Table 2. Student Identifications of Significant Audiences

n (N)	%	Identified Audience
9 (16)	56%	Wikipedia public
6 (16)	38%	Wikipedia Ambassador
3 (16)	19%	Curator
3 (16)	19%	Professor

While some students selected two audiences, which accounts for the skewing of percentages, the majority of students (9 of 16) selected the "Wikipedia public," often citing specific expectations from this audience: "The Wikipedia public mattered to me the most. I tried to put myself in someone else's shoes and think 'if I was researching the topic, what are the key things I would want to take away from it and what would I find most interesting?' With these points in mind, I put together my article."

Another large portion (6 of 16) chose the "Wikipedia Ambassador," often pointing to their expertise in the discourse community and the required processes of the assignment: "The ambassador's opinion would probably mean the most. He is supposed to be knowledgeable in the area of writing Wikipedia articles and their format. It also dictated how much more work was to be put into the project. If he didn't like it I would have to change more of the writing." Finally, an even number of students (3 of 16) chose either the curator or professor as important audiences, citing either the curator's expertise in the subject area or my final assessment as reasoning.

Interestingly, by prioritizing the professor as authority but not as audience, students overall perceived a real difference in what makes a piece of writing successful in a specific discourse community and effective in a class. Furthermore, and perhaps the most striking finding in this data, students *did* largely see themselves as writing for outside audiences. Such a finding suggests that despite the omnipresent threat of assessment and professor-authority, we can create curricula that allow students to negotiate among audiences outside the classroom and enact a pedagogy that supports students' development of rhetorical knowledge.

Factors of Motivation

The presence of extra-academic audiences provides more than an opportunity for students to gain rhetorical knowledge through negotiation of meaning with alternate groups and individuals: it also serves as a strong motivator. How do students perceive a model of cross-disciplinary digital pedagogy in comparison to previous composition assignments? Because they were students in a junior-level composition course (the second in a two-course general education requirement), participants in the study brought with them a range of experiences and opinions concerning previous exposure to composition pedagogy. Table 3 details student responses to the following prompt: "Compare this assignment to an assignment in a previous English course. Were you more or less motivated? Why?"

Table 3. Self-Assessed Student Motivation

n (N)	Motivation Level	Reasoning/Motivator
6 (16)	"More motivated"	Public/audience
4 (16)	"More motivated"	Research process/curator involvement
3 (16)	"More motivated"	New, different, unknown project
3 (16)	"More motivated"	Personal connection to topic
1 (16)	"More motivated"	Familiarity with Wikipedia
1 (16)	"Equal motivation"	Grade

Significantly, no student reported being less motivated and only one reported feeling "equal motivation." The majority of students were "more motivated" for a variety of reasons. Chief among these (6 of 16 students) was the public audience targeted by the assignment. Students were extremely motivated by the idea of publishing their work on Wikipedia. "The fact that I was working on a Wikipedia page," wrote one student, "was also more fun

than just writing down facts on paper for my professor to see. It's cool that it's in [the] public domain and that helped motivate me." Others compared this larger audience to the limited audience they had written for in previous writing classes: "This was different in that I have never had an assignment that would be open to public viewing in an English class. All of my previous assignments were only read by the instructors and my classmates. This added motivation, knowing of the audience that would be reading my work."

While the public audience plays a large part in motivation, one-fourth of the students were also motivated by the research process and curator involvement in the project:

> At first I was scared of the workload. How to balance between classes, but once I got into the library I knew this was something I was going to enjoy. The researching aspect was definitely my favorite. I had never before been in the University archives, so that experience was awesome. Not only did I research for my own topic, but also went in and researched my true passion: photography. The curators even let me scan an old photo and create a poster of it to hang in my room. They were amazing which pushed me to do my best.

Yet another significant portion of students (3 of 16) were motivated by the "new" and "different" assignment model: "I believe this project motivated me because it is interesting and different. I have [been] told that using Wikipedia as a source for research was banned for such a long time. I never thought that I would be creating an article myself." An equal number of students were motivated by the opportunity to write on a topic they had a personal interest in. Finally, a smaller number of students were motivated by the opportunity to gain familiarity with Wikipedia processes and conventions and by the grade they would receive for the assignment.

Student Recommendations

While the data previously discussed demonstrates that students felt more motivation in this project as compared to previous writing assignments, this study is also concerned with answering a more specific question: would students working on this kind of cross-disciplinary, digital assignment recommend a similar model to future classes? Survey results regarding this question found that students participating in this study unanimously (16 of 16) recommend the assignment, but not all for the same reasons. As might be expected, students spoke highly of the dynamic nature of Wikipedia as a writing forum open to the public to "read, revise, and edit." Additionally, a good number of students saw this as a publishing opportunity: "Because of this project . . . I

can brag to my friends that I am now a published author. This gives me great satisfaction." Students also commended the assignment for being different from writing tasks they had completed in the past, one participant calling it a "breath of fresh air compared to typical research papers that every other class is doing." Others recognized the value of multiple audiences beyond the instructor and valued gaining knowledge of the library's special collections. Finally, students also recognized the project as challenging and requiring them to "go outside [their] comfort zone." A few students, however, did have some reservations. The project would not be easy for students wanting to "slack off and write easy papers" and some stated that more time and guidance would have been helpful. Such reservations were couched in positive terms, however, and overall students expressed satisfaction with the project.

What We Can Gain

While this pilot study is certainly limited by its small sample size and lack of control group, there is much to gain from a close examination of a model of cross-disciplinary digital pedagogy. From the perspective of university libraries, and specifically special collections, this type of project accomplishes significant goals of mainstreaming and raising awareness of library archives and special collections.[2] The use of special collections is mainstreamed, in that students see this type of research as available to them in the search for information: student-participants who carried out this assignment are now more likely to utilize resources in special collections for future research endeavors and more likely to spread an awareness of archival resources among their peers. Further, awareness of the university's special collections is also cultivated for the public, as other users of Wikipedia are exposed to references and external links used in student-edited encyclopedia articles. The assignment also provides an opportunity for students to develop relationships with special collections curators. Finally, the use of Wikipedia in a cross-disciplinary writing assignment exposes librarians and curators to the numerous opportunities presented by the encyclopedia as a new model for information literacy. The importance of this collaborative model has only recently been recognized by academic librarians, as is evidenced in a recent study by Norah Bente Ismail et al.: "Few have realized the opportunities for cross-disciplinary relationships and pedagogy offered by the online encyclopedia as an alternative and more democratic episteme which might provide librarians an opportunity to engage in public intellectual tasks" (63). The curricular model offered in this study, then, is a manifestation of such opportunities, one in which librarians can engage in discourses outside their institutions as much as students.

From the perspective of the writing classroom, students also have much to gain from this model. Because it required local archival research and the

translation of that research into a publicly accessible forum online, the collaborative, cross-disciplinary conditions of the project allowed students to both participate in and observe the ways in which digital technologies are changing how information is produced, shared and accessed in the twenty-first century. Opportunities for the displacement of authority figures and the negotiation of multiple audiences make the enactment of rhetorical knowledge and the assertion of student authority a viable option in the composition classroom. Furthermore, as realized by scholars studying the convergences of Wikipedia and writing pedagogy, students exposed to the acts of composing that take place on the online encyclopedia can gain an understanding of writing as a recursive, collaborative, and utterly social process (Hood; Purdy; Vetter). That student-participants in this study unanimously recommended the assignment model further demonstrates their perception of its value.

Ultimately, coming to more concrete realizations of the opportunities provided by digital pedagogies and their implementation into service-learning environments also answers calls from Adler-Kassner, Crooks, and Watters to identify more sustainable ways to promote and position service-learning in the academy. Forging cross-disciplinary relationships with university archives and special collections and working together to contribute to a digital public knowledge project such as Wikipedia helps us reimagine the notion of the archive in light of recent and rapid technological change. Etymologically speaking, *archive* connotes the collection and storage of public records, yet the word is also linked to definitions of authority and power. *Archive* shares a morpheme with cognates *monarchy* and *oligarchy*, and is, in its most basic form, evocative of the power of the state to regulate public knowledge. Reconfiguring the archive in the twenty-first century, and harnessing digital technologies that are themselves more democratic, serves librarians and students in very positive ways while also demonstrating what public writing pedagogies can accomplish outside the academy.

Appendix A: Project Assignments

Process Log Prompt 1

After writing the proposal and meeting with your curator, describe this part of the project's influence on your progress. How has it affected the writing you've completed thus far on the project?

Process Log Prompt 2

After posting to your online ambassador's page and gaining their feedback, what have you learned about how a writer's audience can influence his or her

writing? How has your interaction with the online ambassador influenced your writing?

Curator Proposal Letter Assignment

In "What Is It We Do When We Write Articles Like This One—and How Can We Get Students to Joins Us?," Michael Kleine relates the knowledge he gains from interviewing eight professors about their writing processes. Among his findings, Kleine highlights the emphasis these professional writers place on their "involvement in genuine research communities" which serve as "starting points" for their own work (27). What we can learn from Kleine is that successful writing is always social and always requires input from and dialogue with other writers and thinkers who are involved in a community in which you are both members.

For this assignment, you'll initiate a conversation by contacting the curator who works in your topic area in order to gain valuable feedback about your proposed Wikipedia project. These curators are, in a sense, part of a community we've created that has a shared goal: to enable effective and valuable contributions to Wikipedia articles.

To accomplish this, you'll write a letter to the curator, utilizing the conventions of the genre of a letter (salutation and closing). Your letter should be 700–900 words and should be emailed to your assigned curator. Each email should also be cc'd to the instructor. As you write, be sure to address the following:

- Thank the curator for their involvement in your writing process.
- Identify a gap in the article, sections which could be expanded or corrected/updated. If creating a new article, explain why such an article is worthwhile and what information you might need and have already found to warrant its creation.
- Discuss how you can fill this gap with research you've already done at the special collections and archives.
- Provide an outline of your proposed edits/additions or your new article.
- Ask the curator for help with additional research problems/questions.
- Confirm your interview time.

Appendix B: Survey

Student Survey Questions

1. How did having multiple audiences for this assignment (your peers, the teacher, curators, Wikipedia ambassadors, other Wikipedia users who might view your article) change the writing you did on this project?

2. What about those audiences who were outside the classroom (curators, Wikipedia public, ambassadors) more specifically? How did your awareness of them in particular affect your approach to the assignment?
3. Over the course of the entire project, which of these audiences seemed to matter the most to you as a writer?
4. In your opinion, your success on this project depended mostly on your ability to meet the expectations of which audience or audiences? Why do you think that is?
5. Compare this writing assignment to an assignment in a previous English course. Were you more or less motivated? Why?
6. Think about how a teacher's authority and expertise (on the form and subject of your writing) normally influences a writing assignment. How was authority in this project distributed (or not) among audiences?
7. Who held the most authority for this project? And how has this influenced your writing?
8. Would you recommend this assignment to a future class? Why or why not?

Notes

1. Such a conceptualization departs from Henry Giroux's use of the term to describe the political and educational effects of mass media and global culture.

2. For a discussion of how this project achieved the goals of special collections and archives at Ohio University Libraries, see Matthew Vetter and Sarah Harrington, "Integrating Special Collections into the Composition Classroom: A Case Study of Collaborative Digital Curriculum."

Works Cited

Adler-Kassner, Linda, Robert Crooks, and Ann Watters. *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition*. Washington, DC: Amer. Assoc. for Higher Educ., 1997. Print.

Barton, Matthew D. "The Future of Rational-Critical Debate in Online Public Spheres." *Computers and Composition* 22.2 (2005): 177-90. Print.

Bizzell, Patricia. *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1992. Print.

Boyatzis, Richard E. *Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development.* Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1998. Print.

Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind.'" *College English* 46.7 (1984): 635-52. Print.

Coley, Toby. "Through the Looking Monitor: Alice in Wikiland." *Computers and Composition Online* (Spring 2011): n. pag. Web. 11 Mar. 2012.

Deans, Thomas. *Writing Partnerships: Service-learning in Composition*. Urbana: NCTE, 2000. Print.

Ede, Lisa, and Andrea Lunsford. "Audience Addressed/Audience Invoked: The Role of Audience in Composition Theory and Pedagogy." *CCC* 35.2 (1984): 155-71. Print.

Feldman, Ann M. *Making Writing Matter: Composition in the Engaged University*. Albany: SUNY, 2008. Print.

Gee, James P. "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction." *Journal of Education* 171.1 (1989): 5-17. Print.

Giroux, Henry. "Cultural Studies, Public Pedagogy, and the Responsibility of Intellectuals." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 1.1 (2004): 59-79. Print.

Grant-Davie, Keith. "Rhetorical Situations and Their Constituents." *Rhetoric Review* 15.2 (1997): 264-79. Print.

Harris, Joseph. "The Idea of Community in the Study of Writing." *CCC* 40.1 (1989): 11-22. Print.

Herzberg, Bruce. "Community Service and Critical Teaching." *CCC* 45.3 (1994): 307-19. Print.

Hood, Carra Leah. "Editing Out Obscenity: Wikipedia and Writing Pedagogy." *Computers and Composition Online* (Spring 2009): n. pag. Web. 11 Mar. 2012.

Ismail, Norah Binte, et al. "Librarian Perception of Wikipedia: Threats Or Opportunities for Librarianship?" *Libri: International Journal of Libraries & Information Services* 60.1 (2010): 57-64. Print.

Jarratt, Susan C. *Rereading the Sophists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured.* Carbondale, IL: SIUP, 1991. Print.

Kleine, Michael. "What Is It We Do When We Write Articles Like This One—and How Can We Get Students to Joins Us?" *Writing About Writing: A College Reader.* Eds. Elizabeth Wardle and Doug Downs. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2011. 22-32. Print.

Penrose, Ann M., and Cheryl Geisler. "Reading and Writing without Authority." *CCC* 45.4 (1994): 505-20. Print.

Purdy, James P. "When the Tenets of Composition Go Public: A Study of Writing in Wikipedia." *CCC* 61.2 (2009): 351-71. Print.

Richards, Daniel. "Digitizing Dewey: Blogging an Ethic of Community." *Computers and Composition Online* (Fall 2011): n. pag. Web. 11 Mar. 2012.

Vetter, Matthew. "Composing with Wikipedia: A Classroom Study of Online Writing." *Computers and Composition Online* (Winter 2013): n. pag. Web. 10 Feb. 2013.

Vetter, Matthew, and Sarah Harrington. "Integrating Special Collections into the Composition Classroom: A Case Study of Collaborative Digital Curriculum." *Research Library Issues* 283 (2013). Web. 22 Jan. 2014.

Weisser, Christian R. *Moving Beyond Academic Discourse: Composition Studies and the Public Sphere*. Carbondale, IL: SIUP, 2002. Print.

"Wikipedia: Education Program." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Wikimedia Foundation. 22 Sept. 2013. Web. 30 Jan. 2014.