

ON THE RAWNESS OF READING AND WRITING NEW MEDIA

MATERIALITIES, HISTORIES, AND HAPPENSTANCE

Cheryl E. Ball

James Kalmbach

Illinois State University

Our concept for this book started in 2004 with a discussion about the role of reader-response theory in new media. Despite that our professional identities at the time were broadly situated within the computers-and-writing community, a reader-response discussion made sense because our individual paths with new media began with the literary and poetic. For Jim, it was in 1971, when he composed a multimodal assemblage for a DIY litmag (do-it-yourself literary magazine), *Happenings Holding Tank*, mixing punch cards, poetry, and politicized images in a text called “Grand River 4pm Strike” (see, e.g., Kalmbach, 2006). For Cheryl, it was in 1997, when she was introduced (by M.A. Keller) to reading and composing literary hypertexts like Michael Joyce’s (1989) *afternoon* and interactive CD-ROMs such as *ScruTiny in the Great Round* (Dixon, Gasperini, & Morrow, 1992). Our early scholarly connections to creative writing were tied to new media in ways we could not foresee. And as our professional identities changed and grew to include combined interests in rhetoric, composition, technical communication, English education, and other English studies and related fields, so too, we posit, did the trajectory of new media within English studies grow and change. We decided that the best way to explore what it means to read new media in the context of English studies—and, moreover, to provide examples of new media reading and composing strategies—would be to bring together as many scholars, with just as many strategies, as possible.

In the process, we discovered that serendipity is a useful tool in understanding the roles of *reading and writing new media*, a phrase we soon abbreviated to RAW New Media. Originally, we were only using the acronym as a working title for the book. But then the following event happened. Walking down a Louisville street in Fall 2006, Cheryl passed a sign that she had passed four times earlier in the week but had not noticed, because she had not yet needed to notice it. The fifth time, it grabbed her attention: RAW—enacting our title of Reading and Writing, designed for a storefront we would later learn was, of course, a sushi bar. Although it might seem foolish (and even gross to some readers) to equate new media with raw fish, seeing the sign helped us see the usefulness of our working title as a necessary point of entry into the theorization of new media. It was the materiality of the sign that caught Cheryl's attention, not the letter characters. The downtown street was otherwise in shadow because of the tall buildings, but a small ray of sunshine reflected on the rough metal, reminding her of copper or hammered steel. The tiny concave portions held the light, which changed position depending on where she stood. It was while she was standing there, observing the unusual patterns of light on the nearly 4-foot-tall, metal sign that she realized it spelled R–A–W.¹ The sign was a serendipitous connection to how we view new media—materially rich, changing and remediating itself, some readers needing a moment to bring its meaning to light, becoming new again and again and again as we learn more about it. New media is a fresh, nascent area of English studies, a kairotic field that we are continually noticing anew despite its having been there for a while. New media, like that sushi-bar sign, is unexpected, elemental, ready for our engagement, and ripe for research. In *The Language of New Media*, Manovich (2001) said he wanted to “record the ‘research paradigm’ of new media during its first decade, before it slips into invisibility” (p. 8). *RAW New Media* intends to record the research paradigms of the second decade of new media in English studies, a decade indicated by a change from linked text and hypermedia to highly mediated and database-driven Web 2.0 sites. We start this introduction with a story about finding our cover art on a Louisville street because we believe it sets the mood for a book about new media in that the photo illustration combines materials, contexts, and (as in many cases with our teaching and learning) happenstance to show that new media is still theoretically raw in English studies.

In this book, we are not privileging specific types of texts, technologies, methodologies, or strategies other than how the scholars who submitted to our call perceived the term's scope. We ask readers to look constructively at the chapters herein to see new media as a kairotic moment in the histo-

ry of English studies. It is a time when we have outgrown literary hypertext, moved outwards from the confines of print-based traditions and are beginning to theorize what comes next. Morris (2007), in *New Media Poetics*, remarked on this complicated shift from literary hypertext (as exemplified in Landow's, 1992, version of *Hypertext*) to new media, and the love-hate relationship the fields share:

Although [*Hypertext*] provided a powerful launch for a newly technologized form of writing, . . . Landow's mapping of the difference between print and digital media onto Barthes' division between code-driven classical realist narratives and innovative or experimental texts is a strategy that emerges, in Ulmer's terms, from literacy rather than electracry. Misleading in at least three consequential ways, this conflation overestimates the agency of the electronic reader, underestimates the complexity of print texts, and occludes the genuinely revolutionary behavior of the digitized image. (p. 13)

Hypertext theory forms the basis of much of our knowledge of new media (as our authors show in some chapters), but is limited in its ability to help us research new media in more depth. Although many scholars would be tempted to set definitions, descriptions, and predefined terms for new media (as we editors have been tempted to do or have done elsewhere), we are reminded of Manovich's hesitancy in his introduction to not posit his book as *the* book on new media and also of Morris' (2007) statement that "it is all but impossible to give the term 'new media poem' a stable definition" (p. 18), a sentiment that can easily be applied to virtually all textual artifacts produced or distributed in and with new media. Memmott (2007) argued that stable definitions don't make sense when it comes to new media: "Similar to technologies, terms and categories should be allowed to emerge, evolve, and dissolve into obsolescence. Temporary and contextual, they should be granted short yet dynamic lives, generating new terms, categories, and conditions" (p. 305). For us, it is precisely the instability and uncertainty of the idea of "new media" that makes the term so useful. What is "new" has no fixed boundaries; it is constantly changing. Because it is constantly changing, it can be—indeed it must be—constantly historicized, theorized, and situated within cultural and social contexts. The ability of new media to resist definition is its greatest strength at the moment—to study new media is to study something that is constantly changing, and that means being more interested in questions than answers, in reading and writing processes rather than in textual artifacts. It is this uncertainty, these acts of continual change and emergence that

make new media powerful and worthy of articulation. This book, then, has become an example of the rawness of new media—each author approached new media with a different sense of the term and the field, a different path that led to writing a chapter, a different background that prompted that path—all of these elements converge to create a richness of examples, of meanings, of ways to interpret and discuss new media so that one, static definition cannot apply. And so we do not define new media because we believe that the theories presented herein invite readers to explore creating their own avenues of research. The organization of this book allows for fluid movements between its two major themes—reading and writing—as outlined in the next section.

RAW ORGANIZATION

We have grouped the book into five sections:

1. Prologue/Dialing/Loading/OnFocus
2. Site/Scene/Section I: Acts of Reading
3. Transition/Link/OnMouseOver/Interlude
4. Site/Scene/Section II: Acts of Writing
5. Epilogue/Closure/OnBlur/Disconnect?

The Prologue, Transition, and Epilogue are short sections, each containing one chapter that frames the two major sites/scenes/sections: Acts of Reading and Acts of Writing. This titular framework purposefully plays with commonplace terms, texts, and technological interfaces readers and writers have historically encountered when accessing texts, whether they are novels, plays, hypertexts, FLASH animations, movies, or other texts. That there are multiple titles to indicate what these sections accomplish—names that depend on multiple media, genres, and materiality, to name three issues readers and writers face—further indicates the rawness of new media. The Prologue, Transition, and Epilogue serve, respectively, as the book's call-to-action, transition between reading and writing, and the book's invitation to further research. These sections are not meant to serve as traditional introductions, summaries, or conclusions; instead, we have placed these three chapters in key positions because the authors draw on affective forms of persuasion that move the book forward in powerful ways not available in a traditional chapter structure. The Prologue, Transition, and Epilogue situate and contextualize the Reading and Writing sections in

ways that enact raw new media.

The Prologue, by Ames Hawkins, enacts the rawness of new media through powerful narratives on transgendered identity; screen-based writing, outlining, and plagiarism; FLASH failure, persistence, and pedagogy; and singing, cartoon frogs. This chapter is a manifesto on the possibilities and problems of reading and writing new media. It asks readers to read and virtually rewrite its materiality, just as Hawkins' had to rethink writing in a struggle to complete multiple FLASH-based projects. Hawkins' chapter calls readers to action, leading us to Acts of Reading.

The texts and strategies discussed in Acts of Reading include everything from reader-response theory in predigital, avant-garde film, to protocol analyses of literary hypertexts, to interpretations of the visual poetics in FLASH poems and of pathos in databases, to Marxist, post-human, and cultural analyses of new media as data and objects. Reading is constructed as an act of interpretation applicable to text-objects such as databases and informational Web sites as well as to situations, people, definitions, theories, and the act of reading itself. We are delighted at the range of texts, broadly construed, that our authors interpret in the Reading section—it is more in-depth than our original reader-response idea could have elicited, and we believe this book will serve readers better because of its scope.

Nine authors enact readings of a host of new media artifacts, starting with Kevin Moberly's chapter, "More than Definitions, Descriptions, and Differences: The Labor of Reading and Writing Media," in which he takes up the issue of why new media should not be easily categorized and, thus, pigeon-holed by scholars. In particular, Moberly argues for understanding new media as a political act rather than a critical category and for recognizing the human labor that underlies the production (in the acts of reading *and* writing) of new media artifacts. The labor of the reader is central to our perceptions of new media and that labor should not be decentered as we attempt to theorize new media's rawness. Licia Calvi, in "Disjoint Montage in *Blow Up*: The Role of Readers as Spectators in Pre-Digital Media," takes up the issues of decentering readers within film and new media that Moberly's chapter starts in the book. In order to interrogate the historical roots of situating readers within new media, Calvi compares Julio Cortazar's short story "Blow Up" to its film version. She examines the readerly/writerly shift that readers undergo because of these texts' labyrinthine narratives. A key aspect to this shift is recognizing that the narrative structure of these stories can best be read through a *disjoint montage* approach, in which the temporal nature of scenes in plotlines must be examined spatially—simultaneously, as a montage—in order for the reader to become a spectator-participant of the text and, thus, to understand the text. For

Michael Salvo, in “Cinders, Ash, and Commitment: Database Pathos in Six (Million) Parts,” understanding the text means coming to terms with his own understanding of and fascination with the Holocaust. In this emotional chapter, Salvo narrates his own role as reader of the Holocaust Witness Narrative Database by weaving several stories: his first memory of watching television; giving a toast at his brother’s wedding; the differences between reading about and understanding history; and at 13-years old, being assaulted on Yom Kippur for wearing the wrong tee shirt in his favorite pizzeria. Salvo powerfully demonstrates that nonfiction new media texts can use pathos to provide an affective experience that leads to commitment and solidarity for readers.

In a turn to the literary and visual in new media poems, M.A. Keller writes about “Megan Sappnar’s ‘Car Wash’ as a New Media Sonnet.” Keller explores one of the early kinetic poems that appeared on the *Poems that Go* Web site to argue that this new media text can be read as a conversation with poetic traditions and forms. Keller argues that although print traditions can deepen readers’ appreciation for new media, page-bound traditions only help readers understand a part of the text. He presents alphabetic and static-visual transcriptions of the text to show how a *visual* stanza appears in the middle of “Car Wash”—a poetic convention remediated by new media. David Ciccoricco also addresses literary traditions in relation to new media texts in “A Perfect Future Unread: John Cayley’s *What We Will*.” Cayley’s text is an exploratory, Web-based drama composed of a series of QuickTime VR animations. Ciccoricco connects the looping, interactive plot structure of *What We Will* to the function of grammatical style and communication technologies, both new (i.e., texting) and old (i.e., letter writing). In *Writing Machines*, Hayles (2001) described *technotexts* as interrogating their own “inscription technolog[ies]” (p. 25), a process which often makes new media texts that incorporate this self-reflexivity—such as *What We Will* and “Car Wash”—stand apart. Ciccoricco’s exploration of this reflexivity envelops readers, allowing us to imagine *what we will* to make meaning from such a rich new media example.

Jennifer Bay and Thomas Rickert take the reader further into the world of new media as it exists outside of a literary, humanistic interpretive framework. In their chapter, “Dwelling with New Media,” they draw on Martin Heidegger’s idea of *being* to develop the notion of “dwelling with” to interrogate our interactions with new media. The authors critique approaches to new media that require the reader to have meaning-making power over textual artifacts. Instead, they posit the idea that both human and new media exist alongside each other in a way that allows for technologies to make meaning alongside human being. Similar to Manovich’s

(2001) argument that the fifth principle of new media, *transcoding*, brings the cultural layer of humans into contact with the computing layer of new media data (which still, however, suggests human intentionality is strongest), Bay and Rickert offer a glimpse into what a world is like when the computing layer holds intentionality as well. In the next chapter, Madeleine Sorapure works to show how humans and new media technologies interact through databases. In “The Lifewriting of Dataselves: Autobiographical Acts in New Media,” she offers careful readings of several new media works that use databases to create artistic self-representations. “New media,” she says, “shape our sense of selfhood and identity by shaping the way we represent ourselves to others.” The four texts she analyzes represent the authors to us: “databody,” a static, female silhouette created with data from a National Decision Systems database; “Grey Area,” an animated series of graphs and other visual representations that showcase the artist’s desires over a 24-day period; “Autoportrait,” an interactive image created from Web-search results of a user’s own name; and “Greenwich Emotion Map,” a dynamic biomapping project where users upload their emotional and physical responses to particular GPS locations onto a Google Earth map of Greenwich, England.

Barry Thatcher examines Web sites using a global studies perspective in “New Media Across Cultures: Issues of Fit, Reciprocity, and Cultural Change.” Thatcher reports on a study in which he and nine graduate students analyzed university Web sites from nine countries including Nepal, China, Mexico, Canada, Israel, Argentina, United States, and others. Rather than approaching this study from a U.S. cultural perspective, which often presumes that informational displays that differ from U.S. cultural traditions are somehow inferior, Thatcher argues that researchers need to elicit what communication patterns are valued in the cultures those texts represent. Thatcher’s study uses “common human thresholds,” such as “I/other relations; defining and applying rules; status; degree of involvement; and authority” to elicit the cultural communicative differences in new media texts. He also says that although some cultures have stronger oral or stronger written traditions in relation to the common human thresholds, the university Web sites present a mixture of those traditions, suggesting that new media offers a space for the cultures studied to blend communicative strategies in new ways. Taking an historic approach to calling for more strategic new media research, Kip Strasma’s chapter concludes the Acts of Reading section. Strasma reminds new media scholars not to repeat what he argues is the failure of literary hypertext studies to follow-through with adequate user research. In “Reading ~~Hypertext~~ New Media: Proposing a Methodology of Emergence,” Strasma focuses on the transition from

hypertext to new media and juxtaposes the experiences of students reading Joyce's *afternoon: a story* and Moulthrop's *Victory Garden* in a class 10 years ago with more recent protocols of readers interacting with contemporary new media texts. These protocols reveal that readers have the same problems constructing meaning and navigating new media texts as student-readers did with literary hypertext a decade ago—a problem that Strasma stresses should be addressed through more stringent methods of researching new media texts that will draw on what researchers already know about the complicated reading processes in literary hypertext and that builds to include the advent of multimedia elements such as sound, video, and (arguably) increased reader interaction. In this chapter, Strasma recalls the historical trajectory that new media has taken in English studies—from the early period of print-centric literary hypertext to contemporary screen-centric new media, the latter of which Landow (2004) in *Hypertext 3.0* dismissed from the hypertextual tradition. The relationship between hypertext and new media is complicated in English studies because of the range of genres, media, technologies, and theoretical and other influences that press on our understandings of this historic arc, as this section on Reading presents. Strasma's chapter is situated at the end of this section to recall this complicated history and the time span between the field's initial theorizing of hypertext, perhaps most recognized in Landow's (1992) first version of *Hypertext*—a time-based comparison repeated in the next two chapters as well. Additionally, Strasma's chapter recalls the first chapter in this section by Moberly regarding the labor of reading, researching, and writing new media. In this way, we set up the recursive interaction between reading and writing new media, which the Transition chapter explores through narrative and student commentary.

In "A New Media Reading and Writing Scene," Robert Samuels demonstrates through a brief narrative of his nephew, Benjamin, how reading and writing are intimately connected in new media contexts. Through this story, Samuels examines the changes that new media is having on our understanding of reading and composing processes, especially in relation to our limited understanding of how students read and compose in new media both in and outside of the classroom. By comparing Benjamin's communication practices to Samuels' first-year writing students' hypertextual reading practices, Samuels shines a light on the pedagogical problem: that teachers still know little about students' new media usage outside the space of the classroom. This Transition chapter vividly propels us into the Writing section in a way that brings pedagogy to the forefront of the book.

Similar to the Acts of Reading section, the texts and strategies discussed in Acts of Writing include everything from writing the identities of

students and teachers as new media users, to teacher–scholars composing new media texts for the first time, to rewriting curricula in light of new media technologies and the students and teachers who inhabit those pedagogical spaces, to designing the physical and social spaces that foster new media pedagogies. The broad title of *Acts of Writing* is meant to apply to theorization, analysis, composition/design, administration, and teaching new media, with overlap between those categories. Writing and the teaching of writing become intimately linked in this section in the same way that Hawkins’ opening manifesto called for writing teachers to become new media composers themselves if they ever want to understand how to teach new media, even if taking on that task presents obstacles, as several authors in this section indicate. Those authors who faced challenges in writing in new media—whether it was their own text or creating a curriculum for their students—reflect on how to *teach* writing in new media contexts, recognizing that learning curves, Moore’s law, and quickly changing student populations, theoretical understanding, technological access, and departmental objectives all play a role in how we write with new media. We hope that RAW acts as a follow-up to the much-admired *Writing New Media* (Wysocki, Johnson-Eilola, Selfe, & Sirc, 2004), which was the first book in writing studies to theorize how to teach new media. Over the nearly two-decade history of hypertext and new media within English Studies, *Writing New Media* is the exception instead of the rule. The pedagogical applications and theories that RAW authors provide in *Acts of Writing*—from individual classroom pedagogies to entire administrative units/spaces—should add to the field’s knowledge of teaching new media in useful ways.

We start the *Acts of Writing* section with Richard Holeyton’s “How Much is Too Much New Media for the NetGen?” which, in part, responds to Samuels’ Transition piece regarding what is perceived as generational issues between teachers’ and students’ use of digital technology. He plays on the digital native/immigrant dichotomy set up in popular media to examine his own pedagogy in relation to two sets of students: one group from 1994, when students were thrilled to be posting their papers to the Web and using newsgroups for the first time, and a similarly structured class in 2003, updated with newer and more technologies. Holeyton writes about the difficulties of working with this latter group of students, when the course focus was on the digital technologies in which students were already immersed. (The immersion was compounded by a changing curriculum at Stanford University, where Holeyton teaches, which required the incorporation of new media into its writing classes.) Examining student’s flippant reactions to studying technology, Holeyton recommends that teachers

examine their pedagogical intentions when assigning different technologies just because they can, when a few—and even student-chosen ones—might work best. In “Teaching New Mediated Student Bodies: Five Applications,” Stacey Pigg complicates the notion of students as always-connected, technologically savvy, digital natives. She draws on the Embodied Literacies research she helped conduct, in which the writing practices of students were examined in relation to the new media technologies they used in academic settings. The outcome of that research indicated that although so-called digital natives may use various forms of digital electronic literacies, these literacies are often invisible to them. She offers five writing assignments that draw on rhetorical and critical analysis practice to help students recognize and reflect on their embodied literacies. Each assignment—such as journal writing about the physical spaces of technology literacy practices, evaluating chat transcripts for ethos and identity, and role-playing in a community blog—is theoretically informed and nicely sequenced so that new or long-time teachers can easily incorporate them into syllabi. Pigg’s application of identity and embodiment in these assignments serves as a useful comparison to the next chapter, in which authors use similar themes to complicate their own new media composition process.

Amy Kimme Hea and Melinda Turnley describe their processes of composing their first new media text, a Macromedia *DIRECTOR* piece, called “Build Your Own Interface Agent.” In their chapter, “Refiguring the Interface Agent: An Exploration of Productive Tensions in New Media Composing,” they outline the tensions they faced when they realized their traditional, print-based compositional strategies were called into question in the visual and animation-intensive environment of *DIRECTOR*. Their goal was to create a program where users could, literally, piece together their own interface agent, an act modeled on and yet mimicking Nicholas Negroponte’s ideal of an interface agent as a wonderful butler who does a user’s bidding with transparency. Hea and Turnley follow a tradition of computers-and-composition and technology scholars who critique the notion that interfaces can be transparent. By using new media composition techniques—specifically, visual figuration and interactivity (defined as user-choice)—Hea and Turnley enact the critique of transparency in their Interface Agent program. In the next chapter, Bob Whipple also articulates the choices he had to make when designing a new media text. In “Tiptoeing Through the Button Bars: New Remediators Create New Media Scholarship,” Whipple writes about the new media text he co-wrote with a colleague and engages in a discussion about the impact of extra-textual meaning on their composing processes for this scholarly work. Like Hea

and Turnley, Whipple and his co-author had to shift their long-standing notions of scholarship from the seeming transparency of linear, alphabetic, “seminar-like” papers to hypertextual, multimodal Web texts. This process of remediation—of transferring a conference paper to a designed, interactive, more in-depth scholarly commodity—is perhaps more difficult, Whipple suggests, than the assignments teachers ask students to compose for new media itself. More so, remediating from print to new media is difficult for authors of a certain academic background, in whose company Whipple places himself, who engage with new media as a *second rhetoric*, which is positioned after (and thus less important, institutionally, than) print literacy. What Whipple learns from this process is a lesson that all teachers and scholars who want to write new media scholarship can learn: Don’t let new media schmooze us when we compose our own scholarship, which is the same lesson we should be teaching students. Students *and* teachers need to be able to critically reflect on their own new media composition processes in order to choose which elements suit the rhetorical situation (and, we would add, aesthetic experience) of a text.

At the University of Illinois—Urbana–Champaign (UIUC), students who take Art 250: Writing With Video, an advanced composition course in the UIUC course catalog, become intimately aware of considering the rhetorical and aesthetic choices they make in their new media texts. In the chapter, “Writing with Video: What Happens When Composition Comes Off the Page?” authors Maria Lovett, Katherine Gossett, Carrie Lamanna, James Purdy, and Joseph Squier reflect on their experience teaching this course, which during its early implementation (around 2006), was often co-taught by English Department teachers and School of Art and Design teachers. This chapter describes the course, its goals, and examines the individual, infrastructural, and administrative issues and achievements in these sections. Although there are many teachers who implement similar new media composition strategies in their writing classes, UIUC’s cross-disciplinary tactic to implement new media composition as a programmatic goal is a model that many institutions wish to emulate. Such a class is not, of course, without its administrative and technological challenges. The authors address these issues and plans (as of late 2007) for the course.

It is not unusual, in fact, for teachers to have wonderful ideas about teaching with new media but soon realize the challenges, which sometimes seem insurmountable especially when a teacher is only one person in a department interested in such work. Laura McGrath ably tackles this complicated topic in “Negotiating Access to New Media: A Framework for Faculty and Other Stakeholders.” Moving beyond the individual classroom, McGrath examines issues of access and support for new media classrooms

and how teachers' views of this support can have a significant impact on the success of these classrooms. She offers a model for analyzing access, finding stakeholders in a department and across campus, and for—as Cynthia Selfe and other scholars have reminded us over the years—remembering the human component to work with technology. McGrath tells how she sought out the technology stakeholders, such as her campus' National Writing Project director, writing program administrator, and information technology support staff. Her ability to listen to these stakeholders' needs and to facilitate meetings, grant proposals, and workshops reshaped her department's and university's understanding of the role technology plays in teaching English studies classes. The Writing section concludes with "Creating a Center for Communication Design: Negotiating Pedagogy, Disciplinarity, and Sustainability in Communities of Practice." In this valuable chapter, Jennifer Sheppard details the process of creating a design center that would support her department's interests in graduate education in rhetoric and professional writing as well as its creative writing students while also performing technological outreach to other areas of campus and the community. A tall order, for sure. Like McGrath's need for stakeholder input, Sheppard suggests that communities of practice are needed to sustain the pedagogical import of these centers, and she interviewed multiple constituencies involved in the potential center in order to determine its policies, procedures, and pedagogy. Although the Design Center is still in its early years, Sheppard approaches the future of the center in pedagogically and technologically sustainable ways, which she outlines in the conclusion of her chapter. For readers who are tasked with creating a computer lab or design center for their department, McGrath's and Sheppard's chapters (and the theorists they draw on, such as Richard J. Selfe's, 2004, book, *Sustainable Computer Environments*) will be required reading.

From a department where another design center, the Digital Media Project, supports undergraduate new media composition, Carter Raney brings "New Media, New English: The RAW Interview." Raney (a composite character created by the interviewees) interviews The Ohio State University (OSU) writing teachers Scott Lloyd DeWitt, Aaron McKain, Jason Palmeri, and Cormac Slevin. In a parody of a *Rolling Stone*, self-aware, rock-star interview, Raney transcribes the interviewees' experiences with a cluster of new media-based first-year composition classes at OSU. They discuss, in magazine fashion, issues such as "Why OSU?" (Columbus is a hotbed of market testing!) "Why do you have an assignment where students create fake bands?" (Because everyone should be in a band! And because the rhetorical and critical thinking that students have to use to analyze the textual and visual genres bands produce make students better

writers while they have fun learning!) And, of course, the inevitable question: “How do you grade fake bands?” (Carefully! In context!) “The RAW Interview” appears in the epilogue because it smartly (and irreverently) touches on many of the reading and writing issues of other chapters. It both summarizes and lays bare the contents of this book to remind readers that, if they had been persuaded otherwise by all the fantastic chapters herein, new media is still inevitably raw, experimental, and open for much, much more interpretation and theorization. We hope, too, that readers will join us in continued experimentation and theorization on the *RAW New Media* Web site (<http://www.rawnewmedia.net>), where there is additional content for each chapter. As a teaser, we will mention that all authors have bios (some with pictures) online. Most chapters have supplemental material, including

- supporting documentation and multimedia (e.g., Strasma's videotaped reading protocols, Pigg's assignment sheets, Lovett et al.'s interviews with Writing with Video students, McGrath's technology needs survey and sample request for funding), and
- additional creative content (e.g., Salvo's video of his Holocaust Museum tour, Ciccoricco's GoogleMap that pin-points locations and descriptions of Cayley's London, Hea and Turnley's Interface Agent), and more.

We look forward to seeing you there!

NOTE

1. It is not purposeful, but still useful to our purpose of new media needing continued theorization, that our title invokes Claude Levi-Strauss' (1969) study of cultural myths in *The Raw and The Cooked*.

REFERENCES

- Dixon, Tennessee Rice; Gasperini, Jim; & Morrow, Charlie. (1992). *ScruTiny in the great round*. Los Angeles: Calliope Media.
- Hayles, N. Katherine. (2001). *Writing machines*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Joyce, Michael. (1989). *afternoon: a story*. Waterstown, MA: Eastgate.
- Kalmbach, Jim. (2006). Reading the archives: Ten years of nonlinear (*Kairos*) history. *Kairos: Rhetoric, Technology, Pedagogy*, 11(1). Retrieved March 28, 2008, from <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/11.1/binder.html?topoi/kalmbach/index.html>
- Landow, George. (1992). *Hypertext: The convergence of contemporary literary theory and technology*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Landow, George. (2004). *Hypertext 3.0: Critical theory and new media in an era of globalization*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. (1969). *The raw and the cooked*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Manovich, Lev. (2001). *The language of new media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Memmott, Talan. (2007). Beyond taxonomy: Digital poetics and the problem of reading. In Adalaide Morris & Thom Swiss (Eds.), *New media poetics* (pp. 293–306). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Morris, Adalaide. (2007). New media poetics: As we may think/How to write. In Adalaide Morris & Thom Swiss (Eds.), *New media poetics* (pp. 1–46). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Selfe, Richard J. (2004). *Sustainable computer environments: Cultures of support in English studies and language arts*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Wysocki, Anne Frances, Johnson-Eilola, Johndan, Selfe, Cynthia, & Sirc, Geoffrey. (2004). *Writing new media: Theory and applications for expanding the teaching of composition*. Logan: Utah State University Press.