More opportunity should be given students for practice in writing beyond required composition. Even the most gifted writer must practice, and he should have experienced, mature, criticism of his work to help him improve his writing [. . . ] I am of the opinion that the chief way in which teaching in undergraduate courses can be improved is to recognize that teachers of freshmen have a responsibility to teach freshmen how to study as well as to present subject matter [. . . ] I believe also that arousing interest in a course is one of the best ways of improving both teaching and learning. This does not mean making a course easy, or lowering standards. It means creating in the student a desire for knowledge.
—Cecilia Hennel Hendricks, “Teacher’s Annual Report 1940–1941”

For most years between 1908 and 1953, Cecilia Hennel Hendricks served the faculty of Indiana University Bloomington (IU) in diverse ways, first as an instructor of English and supervisor of the first-year course, and later as the interim dean of women, director of first-year writing, assistant then associate professor of creative writing, editor of university publications, and founder of the first Indiana University Writers’ Conference. Taking sabbatical in the Palau Islands and teaching veterans when she retired, Hendricks fashioned a career that confounds a single scholarly focus and reflects diverse pedagogical concerns. As evidenced in the opening epigraph, she argued persistently for the intellectual enfranchisement of lower-level courses in whatever venues were available to her, and she made these claims in annual report summaries, course catalogs, correspondence with alumni and visiting writers, and memos to the university president. By the time she attained
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emeritus status, her local influence was strongly visible in first-year composition, in correspondence courses in literature and literacy, in writing curricula for the student from “far-away lands,” and in histories of her institution. Yet the story of Hendricks’s contribution to our disciplinary history is necessarily fraught. As an archival figure, Hendricks might appeal to very few; as a disciplinary figure, her presence seems marginal, due in part to an absence of what we traditionally value as material evidence of her work.

If we tried to recover Hendricks’s contributions through traditional artifact-based research practices that rely on the circulation of scholarly or pedagogical texts, we would sketch an erratic history. Her last publication for the field appeared as a short piece for the *Journal of Higher Education* in March 1954, yet her most significant report on composition requirements occurred in the April 1940 edition of *College English*. She authored no monograph or writing textbook. Aside from these works and a collection of letters compiled and published by her daughter, Cecilia Wahl, her digital presence in traditional search engines is minimal. Instead, the richness of Hendricks’s archive is in its *metadata*—in those facts of circulation and location that reside in bibliographic catalogs and finding aids (Day); in the various administrative data that can be generated about her texts, topics, subjects, and influences; in the patterns that emerge by noting unique topical relationships between and among her documents; and in the potential for creating user-contributed and user-interpreted assessments of how those data may have circulated socially (Smith-Yoshimura and Shein). Hendricks’s disciplinary archive really occurs, then, as a network of physical and digital sites where her influence can potentially *become* visible, materialized through research queries that seek to intimate the ways that Hendricks’s intellectual participation simultaneously fits and disrupts the rhetoric and composition landscape.

With Hendricks’s archival dilemma in mind, I want to draw a slight distinction between arguing for her as a disciplinary agent due to archival neglect and arguing for her usefulness as a case study in overcoming vexing material gaps in institutional archives (Royster and Williams 583; Glenn and Enoch 15–16). Though I support the work of scholars engaged in such recovery work (Ritter; Bordelon, “Muted Rhetors,” “Restructuring English”; Mastrangelo), my goal here is not to pursue the former but the latter, and I am eager to explore ways to refine a feminist historiographic methodology that digitally portrays rhetorical activity for which there may not be circulating artifacts. Indeed, even digital historiographic recovery is in need of mechanisms that will foster participatory engagement, including storage and ordering, presence and interactivity (Haskins; Cohen et al.). Even digital historiographic recovery is complicated by the lack (or seeming lack) of what we count as traditional archival sources that can be sutured together to tell a story of their own migration (Yakel 102; Ramsey 79).

This suturing is particularly fraught when trying to recover the work of women
instructors, who may not have published much and therefore whose true work—and disciplinary impact—may be rendered invisible, because it doesn’t appear in easily recoverable forms or forums. Often, these glimpses of pedagogical and administrative activity—a line in a personnel file or letter, or reference to a syllabus or course description—occur interstitially because of their embeddedness in often conservative ideologies of writing instruction and equally conservative administrative needs (Gunner 264). Or, they go underserved as archival evidence because our attitudes toward recovery are guided by a historical paradigm that places evidentiary value on illuminating and preserving stable relationships among persons, places, and things.

I contend that our attitudes toward recovery might better be guided by a historiographic paradigm that is committed to the nuances of research activity—one that provides a stronger understanding of “who the primary and secondary audiences are and who, even, the agents of research and scholarship include” (Royster 274), and one that helps to acknowledge the many outcomes of archivists’ work (Morris and Rose 52), or even those other important agents of archival recovery “besides the researcher and the archivist” (Glenn and Enoch 21).

To argue for this changing paradigm, I draw on my work developing the prototype for a Metadata Mapping Project (MDMP) whose principal function is to gather, geospatially organize, and portray the archive not as a series of stable locations of recoverable documents, but as a network of information about how women’s pedagogical and administrative contributions can themselves shift or change. This kind of network depicts a multivalenced life cycle of their contributions to the discipline by showing how they—and their perceptions and the “adjacent traditions” their texts have helped to instigate (Carr, Carr, and Schultz 25)—have moved and do move throughout various regions.

In its finished form, MDMP will be neither a digital archive nor an online exhibit of texts, but a user-contributed tool for tracking archival metadata (bibliographic, provenance, ownership, and so on) on primary-source materials that were written and circulated to provide instruction in the arts of reading, writing, and speaking in public or higher education settings in North America from the Progressive era to the present. These primary-source materials may include course documents written by women and implemented into college curricula; or they may include published or unpublished records of women’s written performances that explicitly model the argumentation and presentation of ideas in academic venues. More likely, they include departmental and institutional reports, curriculum vitae, correspondence, and written testimonials of other work accomplished. In all their forms, such materials provide evidence of women’s administrative, curricular, and creative involvements in what would become fairly significant programs of activity.

Through MDMP, I argue for a feminist historiographic methodology that relies more on mapping the potential *locatability* of these materials than on determining
their fixed geographic and temporal locations, highlighting the networks of activity that can be visualized between their origins, influences, and actual or imagined reach. In lieu of fixed nodes or points, locatability identifies the fluid relations and circulations or pathways of texts. This practice, in turn, troubles the assumption that women’s rhetorical texts were few in number or limited in scope, and may also disrupt the reliance of archival recovery on only those repositories that account for documents’ circulation near populated centers where large collections of them have been digitized. The work of MDMP is also to demonstrate possibilities for how historiographers might display their raw archival data alongside their analysis of it, and for imagining archives in their various forms. In sum, MDMP allows us a means to render such work visible by mapping references to pedagogical activities as traceable events.

This essay identifies the critical possibilities for feminist rhetorical historiography when it is focused on the patterning and visualization of such events. Using Hendricks’s metadata as a case study for the kinds of data MDMP seeks to organize en masse, I focus on how we can continue to grow our archival methods by looking to traceable events as digital emergences and by reconsidering location as the principal condition in recovering the work of marginal pedagogues.

Mapping as “Unmuting”:
Tracing and Retracing Historical Relationships

Before I address MDMP’s functions, I should explain what I see as its overarching historiographic contribution: to trace and retrace historical relationships based on user-contributed data, in turn giving scholars ways to reenvision what disciplinary relationships we assume to be true. In some respects, my digital representation of Hendricks’s activities is like Suzanne Bordelon’s “unmuting” of Rewey Belle Inglis and Ruth Mary Weeks, who served as the first and second women presidents of NCTE, and who, Bordelon argues, did more to professionalize and democratize the organization than their roles would seem to permit (“Muted Rhetors” 334). Like Bordelon, I assume there are benefits to examining the mundane internal documents related to composition curricula and writing programs, especially when they reflect attempts to reposition administrators as intellectual leaders (Rose 221) and modify their institutional structures (Rivers and Weber 188). The pathways of those mundane documents are in part what make the strands of unmarked activities of teaching and learning more visible for figures like Hendricks, whose principal contributions seem to involve administrative documents of limited circulation, and whose initial nontenured status might obscure them from view, even of feminist digital recovery efforts.

However, in other respects, Hendricks’s digital re-presentation in MDMP reflects my own commitment to studying histories as discursive practices that rely
less on what Susan Miller has called a “formalist, feature-driven view of texts” and more on a text’s ability to inspire trust (107). *Inspiring trust* means observing the material practices that both historically embed the text and result from it—for example, practices of reading and disseminating and valuating. For Miller, the same set of factors or material conditions that cause a text to be accepted as a legitimately circulating genre are also responsible for the text’s “mobility of trust,” wherein its accepted persuasiveness precedes any form of its written expression, and changes according to the shifting consciousness of the culture in which it is embedded (8, 10). The ability of Hendricks’s documents to be perceived as mobile and embedded in other material practices (and even neglected because of those material practices) becomes paramount to determining her disciplinary contributions, especially if we are determining her participation in rhetoric and composition largely through archival ephemera or unconventional documents. However, even more important to Hendricks’s recovery, and what I demonstrate in the following examples, is that until a query is made, we cannot see or predict the latent networks that might emerge. Thus, witnessing the full scope of Hendricks’s disciplinary participation requires a tool like MDMP because it enables historiographers to trace her curricular events as moveable networks of textual activity that occur as a result of their archival interventions in them.

My work with MDMP joins with similar projects that seek to illustrate the tension between relying on the text as artifact and treating the text as a network of material practices. This tension is precisely what MDMP helps bring into deeper relief, as one of its principal functions is to help users visualize new ways of using geographical mapping to infer disciplinary activity, suggesting that visualized histories are unstable at best, and that this instability is an important phenomenon in making new knowledge from our digitized historical practices. For example, a recent issue of the journal *Vectors* devoted to “Memory” highlights one way that visualized archival ephemera can move public memory projects toward this activity, and more specifically toward reading historians’ own motives for and fixations with artifacts or historical events. As well, digital interfaces such as the September 11 Digital Archive, the Metadata Offer New Knowledge (MONK) project, the University of Illinois’s Digital Collections Content Project (DCCP), and Colin Wilder’s Republic of Literature (RL) all demonstrate a commitment to shaping new systems of historical knowledge by contributing and studying dynamic data—more specifically, by looking to publicly available or user-contributed data sets for vital lacuna that shed light on ways of doing history. The goal of these projects is not simply to present alternative visualizations of the same kinds of relationships that we might find off-line between places, historians, and their artifacts or texts. Rather, like MDMP, their goal is to envision historical relationships that are made possible only as they emerge from, or are enabled through, the digital network and users’ participation in it.
FROM LOCATION(S) TO LOCATABILITY

To consider the flexible rhetorical locations of Hendricks is to consider the affordances and limitations of location at all, where locating describes a historiographic methodology that assumes that relationships between archival figures or subjects and their texts are place based. Although even archival ephemera do reside in specific places, I am interested in determining new or different ways of tracing their movements, which may or may not occur as a physical relocation of the ephemera themselves, but as a continual referencing of rhetorical activity they helped to inspire or charge.

I use the phrase “referencing of rhetorical activity” to indicate that Hendricks’s disciplinary involvements are clearest in the detailed descriptions of as-yet undigitized finding aids and administrative documents—most of them at Indiana’s Office of University Archives and Records Management, but some of them in obscure locations that do not reflect ties to the writing program. In addition, Hendricks’s lifetime achievements are best narrated in archival notes that link together her personal and academic papers and give a sense of the many public and institutional locations her pedagogy has influenced, as well as the insulated spheres in which her pedagogy has functioned.

This is not an unusual phenomenon for instructors such as Hendricks, whose many academic appointments were marked by periods of interruption that have not been critically mined. In the first phase of her career at Indiana, from 1908 to 1913, Hendricks taught “the freshmen” courses, served as dean of women, and acted as editor of university publications. After a seventeen-year hiatus—during which time she married, moved to Wyoming to homestead on the Shoshone Irrigation Project, ran on the Democratic ticket for state superintendent of schools, campaigned for Nellie Tayloe Ross’s gubernatorial bid, and raised three children—Hendricks embarked on another phase of her career that was more productively fraught than the first. After returning to the university in 1931, and until her retirement in 1953, Hendricks revised the elementary composition course based on inter- and cross-institutional research into writing instruction; was an advisor to the Mortar Board Society (an honors society for undergraduate women); organized the Hoosier Folklore Society out of a need to direct serious scholarly attention to folklore research and folkloric writing; was a longtime member of NCTE; and served as president of the local Phi Beta Kappa academic society for seventeen years. All of these commitments demonstrate Hendricks’s involvement in various forms of written expression—from civic to creative—and moreover that her accomplishments prior to 1913 simultaneously enabled and dis-enabled other professional accomplishments after 1931, which were in turn informed by her activities during the Wyoming years.

However, though various ephemera and references do point to Hendricks’s
significant disciplinary activity in more than one locale, and though I do not mean to diminish the importance of locality on overcoming regional biases toward historiographic subjects (Enoch 56), what these diverse sources lack is both an organizational and an interpretive framework for tracing them apart from the single institution where they are housed, as well as an ecological framework for realizing or imagining the full extent of their reach—including the various occasions when other researchers might be interested in her work. Not surprisingly, Hendricks’s institutional archive at Indiana University consists of administrative artifacts that reflect in equal parts a strong philosophy about how a college composition program should be run at a flagship school, and a strong leaning toward recognizing creative literary expression as a field of academic study. Scattered throughout the archive are actual or referenced testimonials from current and former students, writers she mentored, and university donors, all offering some endorsement of Hendricks’s influence on their own work in Wyoming, Indiana, or neighboring states.

Even more pervasively scattered throughout the archive are potential networks of information that researchers might realize if they had some mechanism for reading between the activities listed on her curriculum vitae, the kinds of archival metadata that circulate in accession records but not through the finding aid, and the various and sundry topical references that can be gleaned from encoded archival description of both her documents and their ephemera. These potential networks include researchers’ own affiliations, motivations, and interests, as well as the topics or associative terms that caused them to seek out Hendricks in the first place. The work of MDMP, then, is to create an epistemic network that makes visible browsable and dynamic lists that formally represent the kinds of topical relationships believed to exist among a set of data records at any point in time (what I term ontologies) and moveable maps. This kind of information network favors what I call a trans-location or transient locatability among references, rather than a web of static locations among traditional documents.

This process of exchanging of locations for trans-location or locatability is best reflected in Figure 1, which offers one of several possible visualizations (what I term ecologies) from MDMP’s wireframe. This visualization reflects a network gleaned from two documents found in Hendricks’s collection, based on relationships between their archival location (Indiana University), my locations while querying them (Indiana University and Florida State University), other places where they have likely influenced curricula or historicizations of that curricula (Indiana University and Purdue University), and where they have been disseminated to or encountered by other publics (Wyoming and Michigan). Not all of these locations are necessarily archives. Rather, they involve a network of relationships that are determined by combining and recombining archival clues. Through MDMP, then, I am exchanging a traditional emphasis on mapping the provenance of Hendricks’s documents for
mapping references to and interests in Hendricks's work by other researchers—what I call *location events* and *citation events*—and I am arguing for mapping as a way of suggesting (and trusting in) new topical relationships among her activities, in tandem with organizing existing ones.

For example, the ecology depicted in Figure 1 relies on a visualization of actual and extended locations of two documents. One document reflects an annual faculty report of Hendricks’s activity for the years 1940–41, which she sent to Dean Selatie Edgar Stout, and in which she made a strong argument for her promotion in rank based on an extraordinary record of activity while developing undergraduate curricula that year, and while practicing professional writing during her seventeen years away from campus. Most of the professional writing that Hendricks referenced in this report had either appeared in Wyoming newspapers or periodicals between 1913 and 1931, or would provide the basis for her later work as a volunteer instructor with the Hospitalized Veterans Writing Project, after her retirement and prior to 1961.

The second document on the map reflects a report that Hendricks coauthored with two other faculty members on the Committee on Administrative Research at the request of President Herman B. Wells, for which they composed “Some Correlations of the Departments of English of Purdue and Indiana Universities,” two schools
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*Figure 1. Wireframe image, showing a conceptual visualization of one kind of network that MDMP allows users to construct using two of Hendricks's documents. Visualization designed by Alli Crandell, Jan. 2013.*
that were competing for state funds at the time. Throughout this report, Hendricks cited the NCTE's College Section report on the present status of required courses in English in American colleges, which appeared in *College English* during March 1942. She also cited the July 22, 1941, University of Illinois bulletin that was published in *Studies in Higher Education* and reported on “The Problem of English Composition in American Colleges and Universities,” part of which offered a survey of English composition requirements in over 300 college catalogs and with information gleaned from 166 questionnaires (“Some Correlations” 2, 28). Hendrick's role in authoring this report was significant, not only because it influenced the English curriculum at Indiana, but also because it put her work in the purview of other institutions, where the report may have circulated the following year.8

What MDMP demonstrates is not just that these reports were drafted at Indiana University in 1933 and 1942 or are housed there now, but that disciplinary and extradisciplinary connections occur in the information gleaned from them and from other documents that get folded into the ecology. For simplicity’s sake, and because it offers a static representation of an otherwise dynamic visualization, Figure 1 depicts a series of location events based on only two documents and privileges each document’s descriptions through text boxes.9 Following the physical migration of these documents, unique icons indicate relationships between a document’s places of holding and the various places it has been. Other icons depict relationships between a document and the researchers who have contributed its metadata or accessed the query, while a third icon depicts the places or schools where the document is likely to have influenced curricula. When complete, the whole network will visually represent location events based on all of Hendrick's available documents—and other documents where her work is mentioned—within the parameters prescribed (the broad date range of 1880 to 1955), unless other filters were set. Further, other archival or curricular documents on the map would be identified with text boxes that appear or disappear as users mouse over their corresponding events, so that no single document appears to be privileged as primary or stable. The visualization will then change as users draw on more metadata, or as they selectively zoom in on or away from different events on the map. Other visualizations that MDMP makes possible include a network of relationships between citations and references (where the documents referenced have not yet been located), and a heat map showing concentrations of research activity surrounding particular documents, based on the number and nature of queries entered in MDMP.

This kind of visualization is increasingly important for noting and portraying events that would otherwise be subsumed by the spaces in archival holdings, get explained away as chronological or geographical gaps in an otherwise long career, or remain unmapped because they are too obscure. It is a way of materializing textual trust. For example, in spite of how vociferously Hendricks used her report to Dean...
Stout for positioning herself as a candidate for promotion, even quoting from student reflections on the final examination for English 2A, that report became absorbed into a brief paragraph on her 1942–43 annual faculty review, in which she described her development of a noncredit-bearing precomposition course for foreign students in response to institutional research. That single paragraph was in turn reduced to a single line on her 1943 curriculum vitae under “University Services,” just above an entry stating that she had authored another report on the “Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching” for the Indiana University chapter of AAUP (“Professional”). This regression calls into question how we define historiographic evidence in institutional archives, and whether a perceived “reduction” or “disappearance” of activity might reemerge—or emerge differently—if it were portrayed as an information network, or as a concentration of researchers’ involvement, rather than as series of events that are temporally bound. Thus, Hendricks’s archival locatability invites an examination of the many processes that are involved in historicizing her pedagogical activity, including those processes of remembering and referencing that are performed by her and by the researchers who contribute data to her records.

Although any ecology is more complex than the sum of its parts, what we potentially gain from such layered representations is a reminder of both the non-seamlessness of women’s pedagogical pathways and the need to approach them in historiographically non-seamless ways, perhaps looking outside of their home institutions or perhaps looking elsewhere in their archival documentation. We may also gain a sense of whether certain topics and their circulations are regionally biased, and whether and how researchers’ own institutional types have influenced their interest in the figures or topics they seek. Eventually, MDMP’s ecologies may provoke new questions for data gathering, and new possibilities for visualizing archival networks by encouraging the question of how relationships such as distance and scale should even be portrayed in those networks.

Enhancing Archival Participation

Because Hendricks does not appear in institutional archives as often as she might, and because her documents do not circulate in ways we might expect them to, MDMP’s visualizations aim to unfold or disrupt the constraints on archival searching that would otherwise flatten her rhetorical activities. However, mapped ecologies are not the only kinds of locatability that MDMP makes visible, or the only way I take up Miller’s mobility of trust in this project. In its completed form, MDMP will allow users three additional functions for making material those topical relationships that might otherwise get overlooked in traditional tools or search engines. Two of these functions are common in other digital archival tools—allowing users to search the entire contents of the database for any topic or term while they are navigating the
database, and allowing users to build data records or contribute to existing records by entering information into a form with prescribed data fields. The third function involves browsing and building ontologies that users construct by forming and re-forming topical relationships among available metadata records.

Contributing new data and exploring various arrangements of existing data are two ways that digital historiographic tools can and should enable greater participation from their users, in turn portraying the archive as a fluid and emergent network, where every text resides in a network of other topical relationships and experiences. Calling MDMP an ontology means accepting that these topical relationships are true but also disruptable; they may reflect a re-suturing of a finite number of topics, but each re-suturing can potentially enable new visualizations of how those topics are arranged, or new questions to ask of existing topics or terms. Overall, these relationships demonstrate how digital locatability involves reconstructing information about a document based on multiple sets of decision making, not only those of the document’s creator or archivist or researcher (Sharer; Morris and Rose).

To make these ontologies robust, MDMP’s data fields must simultaneously privilege information about the document, its users, and its researchers, and this process involves not only entering data points for visualizations like those in Figure 1, but also giving contributors some control over how the data are described. When users are ready to contribute to the database, they will go to a form with a series of data fields that elicit as much information about a document as possible, using some standard terms from the Dublin Core protocol but also employing other terms to describe documents that are noncirculating or obscure. Unlike Dublin Core, several of those fields ask for information about the researcher or contributor, including professional or institutional affiliations; how the data set was first acquired or where the reference was first noted; and what topical queries or disciplinary needs inspired the contribution. Although a garden menu of options will drop down to guide users in their description of items for each data field, users will also have the option of simply entering a brief description of the document or data they want to contribute into a text box, allowing their description to be searched as part of the record informing a document’s ecology. This process generates records that will enable researchers’ queries to draw up both contributed and speculative data, where contributed data are the actual terms that users select to describe their contributions, and speculative data are the resulting ontological relationships that MDMP reports between and among these terms.

When users are ready to browse the database, they will select from a truncated menu of data fields that reflect topics already identified in MDMP’s metadata. Depending on what topics users select, relevant submenus will appear in a split screen. For example, based on the limited data set that MDMP currently contains, users will see the following main topics listed: “composition,” “folklore,” “language edu-
cation,” “lower-division course,” and “recent trends,” among others; each of these topics organizes a series of subtopics and related topics that become visible in the split screen once a main topic is selected. When either a topic or subtopic is selected, the ontology shows corresponding lists of the related authors, texts, schools, and affiliations that are categorized under each topic, according to the data that MDMP currently contains that are both contributed and aggregated from other sources. If one of those authors, texts, schools, or affiliations is selected, the ontology represents a new set of relationships. For example, if a user decides to select one of Hendricks’s affiliations, such as NCTE, what results in the parameters field is a list of all other figures in MDMP who share that affiliation (including the scholars who use MDMP).

Another kind of ontology is constructed if the user selects one value in each corresponding list and applies parameters to conduct a new search. Table 1 shows a sample set of results from this kind of search, though the finished tool will feature the split screen enabling salient connections to be noted among the initial and resulting search fields. For example, if a user constructs an ontology by naming “Hendricks” and “composition” as the topical parameters, and leaves all other parameters undetermined, what MDMP generates is a series of lists that prompt the user to consider other ways of searching for Hendricks’s disciplinary activity: authors, including coauthors named on her documents; texts, including those that Hendricks authored and those in which she is cited; affiliations, including the Indiana University Writers’ Conference and her many professional organizations, such as NCTE and Phi Beta Kappa; schools, including those places where Hendricks’s documents have been stored (such as Indiana University), where they have influenced curriculum (Indiana and Purdue Universities), or where scholars or researchers were affiliated when they first learned of them (Indiana University and Florida State University); and related authors and terms, not only drawn from what users contributed to their data records, but also drawn semantically between topics already in the database.

Three significant relationships occur as a result of this simple search. First, “creative writing” is recognized as a related term given that it was entered as part of Hendricks’s metadata, though not included in MDMP’s main topics. A second modified search, adding “creative writing” as a parameter, would call up additional references, making other search relationships possible. Most notably, it would call up the name of American author Jesse Stuart, with whom Hendricks had frequent correspondence after he taught in residence at the Indiana University Writers’ Conference, and it would call up the names of the publications (mentioned only on Hendricks’s vitae) where she submitted journalistic arguments for promoting stronger literacy practices in public education during her years of homesteading, between 1913 and 1931.

The second significant relationship occurs in the introduction of “writing for women” as a main topic, in this case, a topic that was derived from the metadata that
### Table 1. Sample Results from MDMP's “Browse Ontologies” Function Using Only the Parameters “Cecilia Hendricks” and “Composition”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authors</strong></td>
<td>Cecilia Hendricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texts</strong></td>
<td>“A Debt to Freshmen” (<em>Journal of Higher Education</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Exemption from Required Composition” (<em>College English</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter from A. S. Jessup, Superintendent of Cheyenne Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter to Dr. Work with Final Teaching Summation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Some Correlations of English Departments”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affiliations</strong></td>
<td>AAUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoosier Folklore Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana College English Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Language Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortar Board Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Association of English Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Council of Teachers of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theta Sigma Phi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women's Faculty Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YWCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related Authors and Terms</strong></td>
<td>Creative writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First-year composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a user might contribute by writing into the text box when first creating the record. Although “writing for women” is not a common topic, it accurately reflects a pattern in Hendricks’s writing and mentoring activities throughout her long career—first as acting dean of women in the summers of 1907 and 1908, later as a frequent YWCA lecturer on suffrage and women’s role in higher education, and finally as an advisor to the women’s Mortar Board Society, where she spoke on getting published in women’s periodicals such as *Ladies’ Home Journal*. This pattern is historiographically significant, in turn, because it can enable users to recognize how much of Hendricks’s departmental activity between 1931 and 1953 advocated for alternative and diverse modes of rhetorical education—indeed, for a kind of public intellectualism—and eventually may inspire related subtopics, such as “feminine style,” “feminist pedagogy,” “technical communication,” or “public campaigns.”

A third discernible relationship is that Hendricks exercised some of her greatest administrative and pedagogical influence during a period of time when she was not on campus, while she was raising funds for the university’s first memorial fund and while campaigning for her own state superintendency of the Wyoming Public Schools in her years away from Indiana. In two separate letters dated 1922, Hendricks received alumni endorsements from A. S. Jessup, superintendent of Cheyenne Public Schools, and R. S. Ellison, vice president of the Midwest Refining Company in Casper, Wyoming, in which the writers linked her candidacy to explicit statements of their appreciation for her instruction in the elementary composition and literature classroom at IU. Standing on their own, these letters do not contain much persuasive archival evidence, yet their presence in an ontology with “composition” as one of its parameters signals new ways of looking for Hendricks’s pedagogical influences, providing a more complex portrait of her academic and public involvements, and of how historians might blur distinctions between them. Although the available ontologies are only as rich as the metadata they have to draw from, they promote a kind of patterning of archival evidence that becomes available when users explore topical relationships among archival ephemera, potentially expanding or complicating their definition of key terms.

I see two clear benefits to this kind of patterned visualization. First and foremost, it encourages a perception of digital tools much like Gesa Kirsch and Jacqueline Jones Royster’s “strategic contemplation,” by allowing the researcher to “engag[e] in inquiries that permit [her] to gain perspective from both close and distant views of a particular rhetorical situation or event” (659). Patterning positions the map and its viewers in the same interpretive network of expectations about what should appear in relation to what else. Second, though it operates on a simple algorithmic relationship, this patterning is also indicative of the move toward visualization that N. Katherine Hayles recommends, by “reconceptualiz[ing] materiality as the interplay between a text’s physical characteristics and its signifying strategies” (72; italics original).
In her view, texts are not things, or even text-objects, but rather dynamic “interplay[s] between the text as a physical artifact, its conceptual content, and the interpretive activities of readers and writers. Materiality thus cannot be specified in advance; rather it occupies a borderland—or better, performs as a connective tissue—joining the physical and mental, the artifact and the user” (72). What Hayles describes as a “connective tissue” or a “rejoining” I see at work in visualized networks of archival activity, especially as they emerge through user-contributed data. Because decisions about data gathering are made both by the user and by the ontological functions in MDMP, what results in each visualization, whether it is a map or a series of lists, is not a stable relationship based on a text’s material properties, but a locatable relationship between the beliefs, values, and expectations that surround any archival document.

Enabling Archival Critique

In “Humanities 2.0,” Cathy Davidson reminds us that the materialities of all texts, whether finite objects or virtual networks, divulge a historicization of power (or status) by revealing interactions between producer, consumer, and content (711). It is this relationship that I want our feminist historiographic methodologies to bring into deeper relief through spatial representation. By attending to the various ways that Hendricks’s documents “move through” certain archival paradigms, or do not get referenced at all, MDMP can help users to discover the ways women’s programmatic and curricular texts are or are not consumed, and to form assumptions about how they do or do not get historicized.

In developing MDMP, I have had to consider how it functions as both a digital tool and a critical methodology for feminist texts, mimicking or enhancing our actual research practices while also encouraging new practices. One challenge is developing data fields that can accommodate contributions in a variety of formats. In addition to the input form with prescribed fields, MDMP will need to aggregate content from open-access sites where other metadata can be found, such as CompPile, WorldCat, and ArchiveGrid, to make its ontologies genuinely rich. Another challenge is working within the constraints of a map and fulfilling the expectation that a map can portray unstable visualizations that are inventive and new. However, even if it is successful in promoting alternative histories, and even with a high level of user contributions, MDMP will not automatically promote meta-inquiry or ensure its own critique.

To ensure this critique, MDMP’s users must make a conscious commitment to both analyzing and imagining, especially when the metadata that they contribute, browse, or map constitute moveable targets—mobile events that require their trust. The difference may seem slight, but it is a difference between affording visualization tools generative versus purely demonstrative functions. In the case of MDMP, this means acknowledging that gathering and visualizing data are the same process,
rather than separate processes. It also means acknowledging that the views afforded by Hendricks’s different ecologies are not so much reflections on what is there, but dynamic snapshots of the kinds of questioning relationships researchers can potentially apply to her work.

In spite of the uncertainty of these snapshots, there is a historiographic usefulness to accepting visualization as a form of invention on its own, rather than as a technique by which to represent already recovered information (Lang and Baehr 174). While many topical strands and critical relationships can be realized on the basis of Hendricks’s activities, what makes them significant for a tool like MDMP is actually twofold. On the one hand, it is true that the strands do not all exist in any one fixed repository, and in fact can only be discerned through a meticulous treasure hunt through miniscule references of activity; for example, lines on a curriculum vitae pointing researchers to look at the published annuals of another institution altogether, or even extra-institutional locations for where the work might have circulated or been discussed. In response, digital tools like MDMP make this kind of strands easier by allowing users to draw a more multivalenced landscape that takes into account these things. On the other hand, it is also true that these strands can be used to help disrupt historiographers’ expectations of disciplinary agency even as they form them. In fact, Hendricks is one of those figures for whom claims of disciplinary agency are vexing at best because her work has not resulted in a straightforward narrative of programmatic growth, and this is what MDMP shows best.

While Hendricks’s administrative papers show a persistent commitment to institutional research, to the development of new curricula in lower-division classes, and to the promotion of the “junior-division teacher” according to broader trends in English studies, they also reconstruct a long professional journey from English instructor to associate professor of creative writing that ultimately favors a secure institutional positioning over a demonstrated record of teaching rhetoric and writing. After 1942, many of Hendricks’s alliances seemed on the fringe of traditional rhetorical activities. Though only a small set of her publications appeared in College English, PMLA, School and Society, and the Journal of Higher Education, most of Hendricks’s writing activity consisted of adult and juvenile fiction that she submitted to national and regional magazines, not all of which was published, as evidenced either by the typewritten and edited manuscripts in her collection, or by the responses of various editors in her rejection notes. On one or two occasions, a rejection note led Hendricks to reflect on her own teaching or writing in the frequent letters she sent to family or friends, and the reflections usually appeared in some form on the annual reports that Hendricks meticulously prepared to justify her professional writing activity as principally creative or folkloric.

Also, a significant amount of Hendricks’s intellectual activity is centered on the work she completed in 1950 during her sabbatical semester in Koror, where she acted as an educational advisor for the US Navy Trust in teaching English to local
schoolteachers (Essex). Yet very little of this work results in the intellectual enhancement of Hendricks’s involvements in rhetoric and composition at Indiana. While on Palau, Hendricks edited a sixty-page dictionary of the language (“Professional”), and after returning to IU, she transcribed tape recordings of island music and Palau folktales that would become the basis for five more years of creative scholarship in cultural folklore and in what we now recognize as translingual literacy. At least two key documents in Hendricks’s files, and numerous other references in her archival metadata, indicate that she gave extradepartmental and public lectures about the experience (Essex; Hendricks, Letter to Trust Territory; “Theta”). However, apart from President Wells’s complimentary letter congratulating her on her sabbatical achievement, nothing else in Hendricks’s archive points to a realization of her own plans to establish new courses in literacy, to revise the “sub-par” composition courses that were serving IU’s growing foreign student population at the time (Hendricks, Letter to Dr. Work), or to contribute in any demonstrable way to the first-year experience.

Such a lack of evidence may strike us as disappointing; there is an evidentiary process to feminist recovery work that often involves connecting traces of activity back to expected or hoped-for outcomes. However, as Hendricks’s case suggests, those traces or strands may reveal more complex forms of activity—and in some cases, very complex forms of inactivity—that can call into question historiographic assumptions about how to measure disciplinary participation. Rather than look for coherent narratives of growth or arcs of activity that show how the past has changed results for the present, we might consider whether digital historiography needs to link past with present practices in such explicit ways. It might be enough to achieve a renewed sensitivity to what Patricia Sullivan calls our “contemporary noetic positioning” (“Inspecting” 378): those aspects or clues that reveal what we think can and cannot be known in any historical moment. Alternatively, it might be enough to articulate how the knowledge we glean from our own feminist historical practices results in paradigmatic shifts away from recovery toward more transformative practices (Royster and Kirsch 18). If MDMP’s visualizations can in any way allow historiographers to become more conscious of those locating and legitimizing factors that they trust or distrust in a given historical moment, then we are on our way toward realizing and writing more nuanced professional narratives and noting how these narratives imply complex historical relationships between faculty, students, curricula, and working conditions, not to mention their extra-institutional publics.

**Digital Locatability as Epistemology**

Digital mapping tools best serve feminist historiographic work by provoking a single question: how might historians rematerialize the gaps between women’s institutional activities and how those activities have been memorialized, noticed, sought, or
missed? Even as MDMP’s visualizations and ontologies rely on textual activity, they also represent an unstable migration of the texts themselves, where a text’s migration may include those researchers’ queries that help to place it. Further, they work against the ways that traditional archives treat textual materials by privileging textual influences—the influences that archival holdings may have on each other, on other repositories, on other readers and curricula, and even on the researchers managing their queries. Mapping for instability in this way privileges a kind of historiography that is based on “unfinished” texts routinely being circulated or shared in order to promote collaborative exchange (Davidson 713). In short, recovery work in feminist rhetorical studies needs to account for all dimensions of recovery—unfinished and undetermined, discursive and imagined, demonstrative and generative, methodological and epistemological. The more data MDMP collects, the more broadly these speculations can be drawn, and the more metadata become realized as locatable outcomes of historiographers’ searching, rather than as fixed or stable points. Documents become accessible not as material forms that contain historical content, but as evidence of a mobility of trust in what should be the nature of their use.

Even as my interests shift from recovering and representing women’s pedagogical artifacts to reconstructing more mobile ecologies that are not necessarily place- or artifact-based, I still am interested in what Jenny Rice has called “the tectonics of place” (212), the unflattening and contouring of what might otherwise be read as flattened representations of rhetorical activity (204). This means that I use visualization tools to realize or invent more critical, flexible relationships among archival locations and events that I might otherwise assume to be static. To that end, I envision MDMP as a user-centered tool with four related aims:

1. Gathering and searching for information about unprocessed or obscure materials that impacted the development of college rhetoric instruction or writing programs, when those materials were authored by women;

2. Locating geospatially the actual and plausible movements of texts, authors, audiences, topics, and researchers; that is, visualizing but also discovering interactions among what I call the multiple agents of the textual archive;

3. Building ontologies that allow users access to various categories or sets of information by exploring algorithmic relationships between the terms that they search (and the places where those terms may occur); and moreover, considering how their knowledge of certain terms enables them to build knowledge about other terms they might not readily associate with their work;

4. Promoting its own critique.

Though I do not offer MDMP as an especially complex program for data mining, I do metaphorically extend it toward a genre of data-mining projects that offer new formulations for ways of learning rather than merely accessing analogue data for outmoded purposes and uses. Moreover, I hope that MDMP will provide a stron-
ger understanding of primary and secondary audiences and agents of research and scholarship, given that user contributions and queries will be separated and tracked, allowing us to inquire into what assumptions users bring to different search tasks. Isolating research queries as another form of metadata—and eventually visualizing or examining them—is not a novel suggestion. Nor is my suggestion that metadata visualizations of textual activity are sites of invention in their own right. These suggestions are grounded in Gesa Kirsch and Liz Rohan’s compilation of testimonials that archival research is a lived process when it occurs in and between various feminist spaces. They are also grounded in Royster and Kirsch’s claim that archives make good sites for the strategic contemplation of feminist methodologies because they prompt an “inward journey, focused on researchers noticing how they process, imagine, and work with materials” (85). These are all imaginative, inventive attitudes toward archival work, proving that, for many historiographers, archiving is already denotative and ontological (Biesecker 124), gesturing to what is “not yet” as much as to “what is.”

What is unique about MDMP’s methodology is that it signals the construction of an episteme that draws attention to ways of seeing and relating texts and their researchers. If the tool is truly successful, it will inspire visualization arrangements other than maps or timelines, taking seriously that a text’s life cycle is mutable depending on a researcher’s motives for seeking it out. Such abstract visualizations might do more to distort the map, rather than merely add new values to the map; or they might redraw the map to privilege researchers’ own locations as originating events. Further, they might resemble spatial reconstructions of topic modeling, where the topics include researchers’ own queries or ways of describing a particular text, and where the spatial relationships between topics helps those queries to further evolve.

Such realignment and refocusing of visualized data is not only timely for promoting the kinds of archival recovery efforts that are already underway in feminist rhetorical studies, it is also necessary for representing the textured, layered, and unstable subject positions of locatable agents, past and present. In “Rhetorical Agency as Emergent and Enacted,” Marilyn Cooper calls for a revision of those theories that posit agency as possessive or intentional, so as neither to over- nor understate the role of the individual, and ultimately to view the rhetorical agent as a complex system on its own, not merely as one member in a complex system. By this same logic, locatable agency would be determined but not determinate, responsible for the emergence of intentional actions as much as for the response to those actions (428), and causal—not in the sense that it causes an action to occur, but in the way it follows, explains, justifies, modifies, and orients observers’ understandings of what has occurred (436). How historiographers become locatable agents is affected in some way by what matters to them, and by their awareness of the material processes and pathways that help them to better know the archival materials and locations they
study. Perhaps MDMP’s greatest promise for rhetorical recovery is in positioning the historian as herself a moveable text.

NOTES

1. Hendricks founded the conference in 1940 as a way of fostering serious study of creative literary expression and bringing the tradition of Bread Loaf writing workshops to the Midwestern states.

2. It is worth mentioning that Hendricks was heavily invested in composition and lower-division English prior to World War I, and again between the wars, yet she is not popularly associated with composition’s development at Indiana in either period. Two other figures carry that distinction: Martin Wright Sampson, who chaired the English department from 1893 to 1906 and helped to usher in a “full course of study leading to the bachelor’s degree in English” (qtd. in Brereton 166–67); and Stith Thompson, who was historicized by Emeritus Professor Donald Gray as having standardized the curriculum in response to President Bryan’s vision of building a composition program more in line with what a large university would offer (Rudy 83). Ultimately, however, mine is not an argument for Figuring Hendricks as memorable or exceptional based on any set of accomplishments or traits.

3. MDMP’s prototype will go from static to working in 2013, with help from designer Alli Crandell.

4. MDMP differs somewhat from electronic resources that already and significantly locate primary and secondary source material together, such as ArchiveGrid and WorldCat, and that reflect the field’s resources according to topical relationships, such as CompPile or Rebecca Moore Howard’s bibliographies for rhetoric and composition. Although each of these projects blurs the distinction between repository and bibliographic tool in a useful way, MDMP draws ontological and visual relationships between the events that occur as a result of this blurring, and it considers nontraditional texts and archival ephemera.

5. Throughout this essay, Hendricks is used as an isolated example for a description of the prototype; however, in its finished form, MDMP is intended to depict metadata for multiple topics and subjects simultaneously, rather than one at a time.

6. Although many of Hendricks’s documents reside in an institutional archive that participates in Google Books and HathiTrust digitization, most of the documents themselves do not warrant digitization or bibliographic cataloging and would likely remain overlooked, constituting one of Elizabeth Yakel’s “evidentiary gaps” on the Web (112). In this case, they remain as invisible or partially visible as documents located at county historical societies, on small college campuses, or in other institutions whose collections have not been digitized and whose collection data have not been mined.


8. Hendricks mentions elsewhere in her archive only that the report did circulate, but not where. At the time that “Some Correlations” was published, Purdue offered neither the English BA nor graduate work in English, although it did, like Indiana, offer certification in the teaching of English. Unlike Indiana, Purdue offered a credit-bearing course in elementary composition for foreign students, which motivated Hendricks to propose and implement a noncredit version of the course at Indiana the following year. Hendricks would also allude to the “Some Correlations” report in other of her administrative documents to trace ongoing differences between how each English department would lay out a postwar curriculum.

9. The four levels of shading on the base map in Figure 1 simply reflect, from lighter to darker, the number of higher educational institutions that likely had sizeable composition programs in the broad range specified by the search parameters (1880–1955). Because most of Hendricks’s referenced activity occurs at or near educational institutions with stated public missions or sizeable composition programs, I find her bibliographic obscurity slightly more interesting and problematic than if her activity had occurred in areas further removed.
10. Wendy Sharer especially advocates for an awareness of how “various material processes [. . . ] affect the corpus of records on which we [. . . ] construct diverse and subversive narratives” (124). I am interested in how digital materialization raises the dual questions of what allows archival figures to be perceived as programmatic agents, and what allows certain programmatic histories to be traced (or not). These are not often answered in the same way.

11. Dublin Core refers to a set of fifteen terms used for naming archival data fields, suggested by the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative (DCMI), and intended for creators and users of open-access archives to achieve a certain level of coherence, conformity, and stability among the records they describe or create. The standards are intended to reflect current best practices among a broadly international metadata community (http://dublincore.org), though the terms themselves are not universal in their application to all archival documentation or ephemera.

12. Her recruitment by university president William Lowe Bryan to assist with writing the report for a historic ten-year survey of matriculation and retention patterns by discipline reflects a significant involvement in the university’s intellectual milieu.

13. After 1932, most of these letters were directed to her husband, John, who remained in Wyoming to manage their homestead and keep up the Honeyhill actuary after Hendricks returned to Indiana to teach.

14. Koror is located in the Palau Islands off the east coast of the Philippines. Hendricks went there to join her daughter and son-in-law, Cecilia and John Wahl, while they were stationed there after World War II.
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