SubField:

Michael Day: What word do you use to describe the computers and writing community? GEEKS! I would call computers and writing a field. You know, but that's me because it's so much a part of what I do. I like to give it the status of an entire field, and I think that justifies the work that we do as separate from what just rhetoric and comp does.

Laura Gonzales: I think in writing I describe it as a field. Like I write like the field of computers and writing. I think when I'm talking about it, I do talk about it as a community. In thinking about the relationship between rhetoric and writing or composition studies and then computers and composition, I think there was a lot of work done to establish computers and writing as a field, and so I want to honor that in my writing.

Charlie Moran: Yea, I felt that in 2003, if I can remember, I felt that computers and composition had a journal and a conference and, or was a subfield that was largely the responsibility of Cindy and Dickie Selfe, Gail Hawisher, Sibylle Gruber, a whole bunch of people who really started all of this. I guess I want to say two things, and they're not related. One is that institutions are a function of people, as well as what one might call disciplinary need, and now Cindy and Gail and all the computers and comp community are very, have been, are still very energetic, very powerful, and are very supportive. They support lots of people. I've never heard Cindy or Gail or any of the folk connected to us say, "no that's a terrible idea don't do this, no" [laughter]. They're really generative people, and if you have generative people at the center of a, whatever you want to call it, "subfield", it should be preserved, they should do it [laughter], it's wonderful.

Cheryl Ball: Can you, if I draw something here can you see it? [Jennifer-Yes] Alright, so this is the conversation that I have with the students in my class when I'm teaching them how to do, when I'm teaching them about like, undergraduates who don't know anything about writing studies how the field of computers and writing, "the field" [gesturing air quotes], is

positioned, right? And so the typical like pie wedge thing, right?, ok. [drawing diagram on board] So up here we have English studies, right? At the very top. Can you hear me? [Jennifer-Yupp] Ok, right? And so English studies is going to include everything that would be in an English department. It's going be you know, English Ed, it's going to be literature, American and Brit literature, creative writing, linguistics, rhetoric and composition, technical writing, etc. right? So, all of that stuff is up here. And then, you know, that's gonna span out to different slices of the pie, right? And then we have rhetoric and composition, ok. And so that's represented by four C's, right? Whereas, NCTE, is the English studies version. And then underneath this is computers and writing, right? The C&C community, right? Stuff like that. And then so like *Kairos* is here just for my own reference. And then I think of all of these as in disciplines. I call them fields because there's a community around this field that's different than the community around the rhet comp field. And some of this, you know we cross over, but like computers and writing is my home discipline because rhetoric and composition as a discipline could really give a fuck about what I do sometimes. And that's fine, like I don't care I don't need them. So, and I'll tell you more about that in a minute. Ok and then you can get farther down, farther engrained, right? Where like if you're looking at the whole pie, these things go out, right? So like rhet comp still exists out here in the margins. And down here you're going to get stuff like, and you get smaller and smaller variations. You might get people who do new media work or people who do games studies work or people who do DH work. And over here there's people who do electronic literature work that's in the creative writing piece of the pie that's totally separate but that's connected through a shared border. And you get code studies people until you get smaller and smaller until your points connect out. So, I used to say that new media was the smallest point that connected it to a bunch of other disciplines—media studies, comp studies, art and design, etcetera. I forgot to put technical communication up there but it goes in between rhet comp and C&W Ethic. A lot of people would probably disagree with me on that point but, I mean it came before C&W. It came in the 50's, right? So, and it grew into digital technology as a field whereas computers and composition also grew into digital technology but didn't become a thing in and of itself until we had digital technology.

5:21

Mike Palmquist: I tend to think it's a subfield of composition studies more generally within (6:00----) from other people. I think of composition rhetoric as a field or discipline. Field/discipline they mean functionally the same thing to me so I don't care too much about that but, so subfield or subdiscipline works. Community is a good word to describe the people who are actually engaged in it as opposed to (6:19----) research and teaching interests that people might get in and out of and really care about and want to read the literature on. It's a really good community, a pretty strong community over time.

5:56

Cindy Selfe: I have always considered my special field to be computers and composition and then my broader field to be composition studies. I'll often now refer to computers and composition as digital media studies just to make the two terms a little more different.

6:21

Jason Palmeri: Which, is it a field, is this subfield, is it an interdiscipline? It's hard to say. I mean I guess I generally see it as comp rhet or writing studies or whatever were calling the big thing at this moment as sort of a larger discipline of which computers, writing or digital rhetoric have articulated ourselves as a subfield. Though a lot of my work has been trying to push away from that and suggests that sort of the multimodal has always been a concern of the field as a whole, as has the technological even if it hasn't been recognized. So that's always a tough call. On the one hand, we want to be able to articulate a particular area of expertise in a tradition. And I think the truth is the field is so big now that nobody can be an expert in composition and rhetoric [laughter]. Like that's impossible, you know you just can't, you know I think. So, the idea of articulating subfields makes some sense to me, BUT has dangers because I don't want colleagues whose research may be in other areas to still also see how digital technologies could influence network in history of rhetoric, or in writing program assessment, or, I think the digital lens through just about anything you might want to research in composition and rhetoric. And that's the danger of claiming that as a subfield. So I don't know, I'm ambivalent about disciplinarity, I guess [laughter].