AI in the Loop: Rethinking Agency in Human–Machine Collaboration and Its Pedagogical Implications

Liping Yang, Georgia State University

Three years after the launch of major generative AI tools, scholarly conversations have mostly shifted from initial resistance and uncertainty to exploring collaboration and pedagogy potentials, raising a deeper question: What does it mean to say "writing has always been a technology" when applied to human-machine collaboration and composition? This article explores how large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT challenge traditional understandings of rhetorical agency by functioning simultaneously as both rhetor and rhetorical audience. Drawing on both theoretical inquiries and classroom experience, I argue that, unlike previous communication technologies that primarily altered writing through changes in modality, AI introduces more than a medium shift: it acts as a co-authoring agent (Hart-Davidson, 2018; Duin & Pedersen, 2021); one that redistributes agency and reshapes how meaning, decision-making, and agency identity are formed in the writing process. In response to this shift, I propose a pedagogical framework grounded in metacognitive reflection and writing process theory to help students critically examine their rhetorical choices and maintain agency control in AI-supported composition. This reflective structure fosters a more intentional and independent relationship with AI, positioning students not as passive users but as intentional strategic communicators in a digitally mediated writing environment. Ultimately, the article calls for writing instruction that treats AI not merely as a functional tool, but as a rhetorical actor; one that invites us to reimagine authorship, agency, and pedagogy in the age of writing with intelligent machines.

AI in the Loop: Rethinking Agency in Human–Machine Collaboration and Its Pedagogical Implications

The launch of ChatGPT marked a new era of human–machine collaboration, introducing affordances that distinguish it from previous communication technologies. For instance, large language models can "generate and translate text and other content and perform other natural language processing (NLP) tasks" (Google Cloud, n.d.), and "generate text outputs (natural language, code, etc.) given inputs consisting of interspersed text and images" (OpenAI, n,d,). While humans have long integrated various tools into communication and writing

 DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/PCW-B.2026.2883.2.13

practices, the rapid rise of large language models (LLMs) left the fields of communication and composition largely unprepared for their integration.

Now, three years after ChatGPT's release, where do we stand in terms of collaborating with this technology through human–machine collaboration (Anderson, 2023; Li, 2024; Gupta & Shivers-McNair, 2025) and human–machine teaming (Duin & Pederson, 2021; McKee & Porter, 2022; Bedington et al., 2024) in our teaching and research? Since its launch, reactions have ranged from excitement and curiosity to anxiety, crisis, and even backlash. By 2025, however, a noticeable shift has taken place, despite ongoing and sometimes strong resistance (Fernandes et al., 2024; Brown et al., 2025). Drawing on recent developments at composition conferences such as the Conference on College Composition and Communication and Computers and Writing, along with related scholarly discussions, we can see that the initial panic has gradually settled into more normalized and, at times, enthusiastic conversations about AI's role in writing instruction and research.

Similarly, at Computers and Writing 2025, themed "Agency and Authorship," approximately 40% of presentations focused on AI, particularly in the classroom settings. These sessions explored pedagogical strategies, assignment design, critical AI literacy, and administrative perspectives on AI in writing instruction. This shift reflects an increasing strategic investment in AI's role in both classroom practice and writing program administration.

Against this backdrop of rapid evolution in academic discourse, this paper considers how AI is reshaping college writing instruction and practices and the broader theorization of agency positionality in the age of human–machine communication. I draw from current scholarship on digital rhetoric and writing, algorithm studies, critical AI literacy, and my own teaching and writing program administration experience to explore questions of authorship and agency in the context of AI, especially as they relate to this year's conference theme. In particular, I reflect on my recent experience leading a departmental AI working group to develop an AI-supported composition curriculum, as well as teaching freshman composition and an upper-level business writing course that integrated AI throughout the semester. I examine both the administrative and pedagogical implications of this integration and consider how AI can be used to cultivate students' critical and meaningful AI literacy, empowering them to engage with this evolving communicative landscape responsibly and reflectively.

Technology, Computer, and Machine in Writing

Writing has always evolved in a close relationship with technology or technological media (Ong, 1979) and mediums (McLuhan, 1964). From the moment

of its invention, writing was met with criticism. In Plato's *Phaedrus (Phaedrus, 257d-277a; Plato, 2002)*, he noted that writing would weaken memory by detaching knowledge from the speaker's mind and placing it into an external medium. This critique suggests that writing, as a communicative act, separates meaning from the speaker and embeds it into an external material form, what we now understand as a "medium." As such, the medium has always been central to the study and practice of writing.

The history of composition studies reflects sustained attention to how different media shape writing. From Marshall McLuhan's (1964) famous claim that "the medium is the message" to more recent scholarship in digital writing studies, researchers have explored how technological affordances shape writing practices (Kress, 2009), including delivery, genre, audience, and rhetorical situation Recent work by Gabriel (2000), Gu (2009), and Boltz (2000) on content creation; Porter (2009), Welch (2013), and Moe (2018) on delivery and production; and Gries (2018) and Ehrenfeld (2020) on circulation continues this tradition, emphasizing how writing is situated within and shaped by its material and technological environments. Across these conversations, we see that writing practices are continually mediated by the conditions of their time.

From ancient inscriptions on clay tablets, bamboo strips, and walls in Egypt and China, to handwritten manuscripts, printed books, and now digital documents on screens, each technological shift has expanded the "available means of persuasion" (Aristotle, 1991/350 B.C.E, p. 37), offering writers new ways to invent (Gallagher, 2020), deliver (Porter, 2009), and circulate (Gries, 2018) meaning. These changes have influenced not only how we produce text but also how we conceptualize writing itself in relation to evolving media and modalities (Selber, 2004). For example, with the introduction of paper, writers could preserve ideas more easily and experiment with layout and handwriting style. The advent of personal computers further expanded these design possibilities, allowing writers to manipulate fonts, spacing, margins, and visual hierarchy, enabling a more automated and efficient writing process with easier revision and editing. The internet introduced hypertext and non-linear reading paths, while also expanding access to a global audience. With the rise of Web 2.0, writing became participatory and socially interactive through blogs, wikis, and social media platforms. Readers became co-authors in the afterlife of digital writing (Gallagher, 2020) through comments, likes, and shares, transforming writing into an iterative, communal, and performative act.

These transitions reveal a central insight: writing is not a static or isolated act. It is a deeply social, cultural, and technological practice, embedded in the tools and communication technologies of its time. With each technological shift, new definitions of literacy emerge, such as electronic literacy, cyber literacy, digital literacy, technological literacy, and 21st-century literacies

(Yancey, 2004; Selber, 2004; Kress, 2009). What was once defined narrowly as the ability to read and write has evolved to encompass a broader set of competencies involving digital tools, multimodal communication, and networked environments. Writers today must not only develop new technical skills but also cultivate heightened rhetorical awareness—what Gurak (2001) refers to as a "consciousness" of composing in technologically mediated environments.

For instance, the shift from handwriting to word processing introduced new considerations such as automatic formatting, font choice, layout, and the use of white space. It also streamlined the processes of writing, revising, and editing, allowing changes without starting over from scratch. Writing for the web further required an understanding of networked writing cultures, including responsive design, hyperlinking, and multimodality, drawing on multiple semiotic modes to create meaning. Social media writing, shaped by the participatory culture of Web 2.0, demanded brevity, scannable formatting, visual emphasis, and awareness of the algorithmic and networked nature of the medium. Writers had to learn how to navigate hashtags, platform conventions, and real-time audience interaction. Each new platform has prompted writers to adapt their strategies and reframe their rhetorical choices through the five classical canons: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. To effectively craft a message, writers now must consider not only the content itself, but also how rhetorical decisions interact with platform, medium, media, and modality. Each technological shift requires writers to reconsider how writing is invented, arranged, styled, delivered, and circulated, always in relation to the affordances of new platforms and tools. This evolving body of practice and theory is encapsulated in digital rhetoric—the application of rhetorical theory to digital environments (Eyman, 2015). Each shift in modality reemphasizes the importance of intentionality in composing meaning across technological spaces. So, what new competencies are required to engage with the next "tech" moment—AI? What kind of rhetorical decision-making and writerly consciousness will be necessary to compose effectively with this new technological entity?

What sets AI apart from previous technological shifts is that it does not merely introduce surface-level changes in modality, such as page design or platform affordances, but fundamentally alters the underlying logic of meaning-making beyond and behind the surface. This shift exposes the limitations of existing digital rhetoric frameworks and underscores the need to revise both the theoretical foundations and pedagogical practices. Unlike earlier tools, generative AI brings in algorithmic reasoning and machine subjectivity (Gallagher, 2017; Vee, 2017), shaped by processes such as data mining, model training, and probabilistic language prediction. These systems reshape how writing is invented and delivered by generating texts that are semi-automatically co-produced through both user prompts and the model's pre-trained

knowledge base. Rather than changes happening solely *on* the screen, they now occur *behind* it—within the algorithmic infrastructures that inform AI outputs. As a result, writers must think beyond surface modality and engage with the logics of computation. To write effectively with AI, we must move past viewing it merely as a tool and begin treating it as an interlocutor, a reader, and at times, a co-author.

This is a fundamental rhetorical shift. AI is no longer just a medium to communicate *through,* but a communicative *subject* that we must dialogue *with*. As Andrea Guzman (2018) and Coeckelbergh & Gunkel (2015) have argued, AI should be understood as a "communicative subject," which shifts AI's role from not only a medium to communication *through*, but an agent to dialogue *to* and *with.* Therefore, communication is no longer anthropocentrically defined as human-to-human but also human-to-machine, where both parties can co-create meaning. In this sense, AI functions with rhetorical presence, which further makes communication no longer exclusively human-to-human but increasingly human-to/with-machine (McKee and Porter, 2022), with both parties co-constructing meaning. This demands a rethinking of rhetorical agency: if AI can shape discourse, influence audience reception, and co-generate language, then it must be considered as both a rhetor and a rhetorical audience with "rhetorical capability" (Reid, 2020) in this new rhetorical ecology of human-machine collaboration, communication, and composition (HMC).

As the MLA/CCCC (2023) joint statement on AI reminds us, "writing has always been a technology, and, as such, is always open to new technologies." But what does it mean for writing practice when the technology we integrate now participates in language generation, content invention, and meaning-making and interpretation? In the context of AI, modality shifts are no longer just about on-screen aesthetics or interactivity; they extend to authorship, agency, and the cognitive processes *behind the very* composing, delivery, and circulation. This further challenges writers today to understand how to strategically collaborate with AI, navigate its algorithmic logic, and critically assess how it shapes their agency, writing processes, and rhetorical choices, and adjust the rhetorical strategies and writing knowledge on process, genre, style, and purpose.

In classroom settings, students must be taught not only how to compose with AI, but also how to recognize the *distributed* nature of agency in the writing process. They need to understand how this shared authorship can shape their writing, thinking, and even emotional engagement in unpredictable and often uncontrollable ways. Developing metacognitive awareness is crucial: students must learn to reflect critically on how their rhetorical decisions are influenced, sometimes subtly, by algorithmic responses, and how

those influences affect both their writing process and the meaning they construct in collaboration with the machine.

In the following section, I analyze how distributed agency in human–machine collaboration (HMC) affects writers' consciousness, rhetorical strategies, and writing knowledge. Drawing from my experiences in classroom teaching and program administration in first-year writing, as well as from the core principles of learning and writing metacognition theory, I explore how to respond to the changes that AI has introduced into the writing process. This discussion considers what these shifts mean for concepts of authorship and for developing AI-aware pedagogy (AWAC AI Statement) in the age of human–machine collaboration.

Pedagogical Implications: Cultivating Agency in AI-Supported Writing

Metacognitive Reflection: Before, During, and After

As I began designing assignments that incorporated AI into the writing process, I quickly realized that it wasn't enough to simply introduce students to the tool just because AI is new, or because we can justify its inclusion by citing the idea that "writing has always been a technology" (MLA–CCCC Task Force, 2023). This alone does not ensure that students will engage with AI meaningfully. Nor is it sufficient to provide step-by-step instructions and assume that students will use the tool critically or effectively. Instead, we need to take a step back and reconsider students' roles as writers. What does it mean to say that "writing is a context", one that is social, cultural, and technological? And what does it mean to write *with* technology, or even to rethink what writing is in these emerging contexts? To support this reframing, I ask students to reflect on their own relationship with AI: Why would they choose to work with it? How do they understand their collaboration with it? Too often, students may view AI as a shortcut, something that helps them finish faster, while many instructors fear it as a threat to learning and authorship. My goal, however, is to help students see AI as a powerful but limited writing partner, one that demands thoughtful planning, critical engagement, and purposeful reflection. In doing so, we can begin to cultivate ethical and productive human–machine composition.

In one of McGraw-Hill's webinars, *Developing AI EdTech for Learning: Creating Real Value, Not Hype* (2024), AI's role in education was compared to riding an e-bike: before you can use the e-bike effectively, you have to know how to ride a regular bike. I often extend this analogy in my own teaching to illustrate how writers make rhetorical choices when selecting technologies to

support their writing process (Lockridge & Van Ittersum, 2020). AI can enhance your writing, but only if you already know how to think, plan, research, and write. Or, to extend the metaphor further, as we do in our multimodal recomposition project, the question is never just *what* tool you use (a bike, scooter, roller skates, or e-bike), but *why* you choose it and *how* it helps you reach your destination. In writing, the tool should serve your goals, not replace them. Regardless of the technology, paper, typewriters, computers, the web, or multimodal semiotic modes, these tools are meant to help you shape your narrative, build your argument, and deliver your message. The act of writing is still yours. The tool assists, but it does not author.

To support student agency in human–machine collaboration, I developed a three-stage metacognitive reflection framework (Yang & Harker, 2025) to guide students' engagement with AI as a process of planning, inquiry, and growth. Rather than reacting passively to AI-generated text, students are encouraged to take the lead at each phase of the interaction, ensuring their engagement remains intentional and reflective. The framework is structured around three key moments: before, during, and after using AI. At each stage, students are prompted to pause, reflect on their decisions, and intentionally direct both the writing and learning process. This reflective structure helps students build agency in the context of human–machine collaboration, enabling them to become more independent, confident, and strategic users of AI, fully in control of their choices, supported when needed, and equipped to transfer these experiences to future writing contexts.

Before students begin using AI in their writing, I ask them to pause and plan. This moment of intentionality is crucial. Instead of jumping straight into the tool, students are encouraged to set clear goals and take ownership of their writing process from the outset. They consider what they're trying to accomplish, why they feel the need to use AI or how, at that point, and which stage of writing, whether brainstorming, organizing, or revising, they believe AI can support. Most importantly, they reflect on how they can remain in control of their work, seeing AI as a resource to assist their thinking and planning. This early stage sets the tone, positioning students as the captains of their writing process.

As students begin actively engaging with AI, I remind them that language fluency or surface-level polish does not equate to cognitive depth or reasoning ability. Just because AI-generated text *sounds* polished doesn't mean it is good writing, nor should it necessarily be considered writing in the same way human-authored work is (Markey et al., 2024). In most cases, it is simply generated text. While AI may produce smooth, grammatically correct language, it does not truly comprehend the audience, the writer's purpose, voice, values, or the rhetorical exigency and nuance of the situation. That's where

the student's judgment and analysis become essential. During this phase, I encourage them to treat AI as a conversation partner, not an authority. They are urged to critically evaluate the AI's output by asking: Are the ideas accurate? Does the content reflect bias or assumptions? Does the tone align with the context? And most importantly, does the content support their rhetorical goals? This practice helps students resist the temptation to accept AI-generated text at face value. It reinforces the importance of maintaining their own agency and editorial authority, encouraging critical engagement throughout the writing process.

The final stage comes after the engagement is complete, but the learning isn't. This is when students reflect on what actually happened. They consider what worked and what didn't, whether the AI helped deepen their thinking or merely sped up the task, and whether the time saved upfront was worth the revision effort later, or if engaging with AI introduces greater cognitive or physical labor than completing the task without its assistance. More broadly, they examine what they've learned about themselves as writers: how they approach composition, what habits they rely on, and how AI fits (or doesn't) into that picture.

This post-use reflection is where students begin to build lasting awareness that can be transferred (Haskell, 2000; Moore, 2012; Wardle, 2017). It offers them a framework not only for how to use AI in the present, but also for how to carry and adapt that knowledge across future writing tasks, disciplines, and real-world contexts. Through these stages of intentional engagement, students become more confident, capable, and rhetorically informed writers supported by AI, but never dependent on it. They begin to develop a deeper understanding of what it means to be a writer, what counts as writing, and, in broader terms, what it means to be a thinking, ethical individual.

After applying this model throughout the semester, I found that it helped students cultivate a more critical and independent relationship with AI. More importantly, it supported the development of transferable habits of mind. Whether students are writing for academic, professional, or civic purposes in the future, they carry with them the ability to engage with AI both strategically and ethically. Based on their own reflections, many students reported that this process pushed them to think "more," "deeper," and "broader", and helped them develop stronger critical thinking skills. Some also shared that such practice made them realize that AI sometimes "challenge(s)" their thinking and agency, making them "overthink" their own voice. In short, they emerged not only as more confident writers but also as more literate and informed AI users: future digital citizens capable of making thoughtful, rhetorical decisions grounded in experience, reflection, and purpose—essential qualities in our increasingly AI-mediated communication landscape.

Conclusion

As AI becomes an increasingly common presence in academic scholarship and writing classrooms, and as it continues to be adopted by higher education institutions, the question is no longer *whether* we should integrate it, but *how* we can do so responsibly and meaningfully. This article has argued that human–AI collaboration in composition fundamentally alters the dynamics of rhetorical agency, challenging both writers and teachers to respond accordingly by centering human learning, thinking, and writing. Unlike traditional tools that merely extend human capability, AI introduces a new, shared agency into the writing process.

Therefore, writing instruction must go beyond teaching technical proficiency or basic AI functionality. It must engage with deeper pedagogical questions of authorship, agency, and rhetorical purpose. In composition pedagogy, this means foregrounding metacognition and implementing structured reflection—before, during, and after AI engagement, to cultivate students' intentional, independent, and ethical relationships with AI. These practices ensure more thoughtful and strategic approaches to human–machine composition (HMC), empowering students to become informed, responsible, and adaptive writers. Ultimately, students learn not just how to write *with* AI, but how to write *as* autonomous communicators in an increasingly complex, AI-mediated world.

References

Anderson, S. S. (2023). "Places to stand": Multiple metaphors for framing ChatGPT's corpus. *Computers and Composition*, *68*, 102778.

Aristotle. (1991). On rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse (G. A. Kennedy, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 350 BCE).

Bedington, A., Halcomb, E. F., McKee, H. A., Sargent, T., & Smith, A. (2024). Writing with generative AI and human-machine teaming: Insights and recommendations from faculty and students. *Computers and Composition*, *71*, 102833.

Brown, D. G., Lamb, C. E., & Byl, L. R. (2025). Don't train your model on my novel: AI refusal statements. https://dspacemainprd01.lib.uwaterloo.ca/server/api/core/bitstreams/ec64c67c-7e78-4b5b-85e2-5637e08d7810/content

Boltz, W. G. (2000). The invention of writing in China. *Oriens extremus*, *42*, 1-17.

Coeckelbergh, M., & Gunkel, D. J. (2025). *Communicative AI: A critical introduction to large Language models*. John Wiley & Sons.

Ehrenfeld, D. (2020). "Sharing a world with others": Rhetoric's ecological turn and the transformation of the networked public sphere. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, *50*(5), 305-320.

Eyman, D. (2015). *Digital rhetoric: Theory, method, practice* (p. 177). University of Michigan Press.

Duin, A. H., & Pedersen, I. (2021). *Writing futures: Collaborative, algorithmic, autonomous*. Charn, Switzerland: Springer.

Fernandes, M., SanoFranchini, J., & McIntyre, M. (2024, December). *What is GenAI refusal?* In *Refusing Generative AI in Writing Studies*. https://refusinggenai.wordpress.com/what-is-refusal/

Gabriel, B. (2009). History of writing technologies. In C. Bazerman (Ed.), *Handbook of research on writing: History, society, school, individual, text* (pp. 27–39). Routledge.

Gallagher, J. R. (2017). Writing for algorithmic audiences. *Computers and Composition*, *45*, 25-35.

Gallagher, J. R. (2020). *Update culture and the afterlife of digital writing*. .

Gu, B. (2009). *From oracle bones to computers: The emergence of writing technologies in China*. Parlor Press.

Gries, L., & Brooke, C. G. (Eds.). (2018). *Circulation, writing, and rhetoric*. .

Google Cloud. (n.d.). *Large language models (LLMs) with Google AI*. Google Cloud. Retrieved December 18, 2025, from https://cloud.google.com/ai/llms

Gu, B. (2000). *From the oracle bones to the computer: A rhetorical perspective on writing technology development in China* (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University).

Gupta, A., & Shivers-McNair, A. (2024). "Wayfinding" through the AI wilderness: Mapping rhetorics of ChatGPT prompt writing on X (formerly Twitter) to promote critical AI literacies. *Computers and Composition*, *74*, 102882.

Gurak, L. J. (2001). *Cyberliteracy: Navigating the internet with awareness*. Yale University Press.

Guzman, A. L. (2018). What is human-machine communication, anyway. *Human-machine communication: Rethinking communication, technology, and ourselves*, *117*, 1-28.

Guzman, A. L., & Lewis, S. C. (2020). Artificial intelligence and communication: A human–machine communication research agenda. *New Media & Society, 22*(1), 70–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819858691

Hart-Davidson, W. (2018). Writing with robots and other curiosities of the age of machine rhetorics. In *The Routledge handbook of digital writing and rhetoric* (pp. 248-255). Routledge.

Haskell, R. E. (2000). *Transfer of learning: Cognition and instruction*. Elsevier.

Kress, G. (2009). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. Routledge.

Li, R. (2024). A "Dance of storytelling": Dissonances between substance and style in collaborative storytelling with AI. *Computers and Composition*, *71*, 102825.

Lockridge, T., & Van Ittersum, D. (2020). *Writing workflows: Beyond word processing*. University of Michigan Press.

Markey, B., Brown, D. W., Laudenbach, M., & Kohler, A. (2024). Dense and disconnected: Analyzing the sedimented style of ChatGPT-generated text at scale. *Written Communication*, *41*(4), 571-600.

McGraw Hill. (2024, November 20). *Developing AI EdTech for learning: Creating real value, not hype* [Video]. McGraw Hill. https://www.mheducation.com/highered/blog/2024/11/developing-ai-edtech-for-learning-creating-real-value-not-hype.html

McLuhan, M. (1994). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. MIT press.

McKee, H. A., & Porter, J. E. (2022, July). Team roles & rhetorical intelligence in human-machine writing. In *2022 IEEE International Professional Communication Conference (ProComm)* (pp. 384-391). IEEE.

Moore, J. (2012). Mapping the Questions: The State of Writing-Related Transfer Research. In *Composition Forum* (Vol. 26). Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition.

McLuhan, M. (2019). The medium is the message (1964). In *Crime and media* (pp. 20-31). Routledge.

MLA-CCCC Joint Task Force on Writing and AI. (2023, July). *Working paper 1*. Humanities Commons. https://hcommons.org/app/uploads/sites/1003160/2023/07/MLA-CCCC-Joint-Task-Force-on-Writing-and-AI-Working-Paper-1.pdf

Moe, P. W. (2018). Something about the Written Delivery of the Line. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, *48*(1), 71-87.

Ong, W. J. (1979). Literacy and orality in our times. *Profession*, 1-7.

OpenAI. (n.d.). *Text generation and prompting.* https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/text?api-mode=responsesPlato. (2002). *Phaedrus* (R. Waterfield, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 370 BCE).

Porter, J. E. (2009). Recovering delivery for digital rhetoric. *Computers and Composition*, *26*(4), 207-224.

Reid, A. (2020). Synthetic speech and negotiation: AI's nonhuman rhetoric. *Enculturation, 31*. http://enculturation.net/synthetic-speech-and-negotiation

Selber, S. A. (2004). *Multiliteracies for a digital age*. SIU Press.

Vee, A. (2017). *Coding literacy: How computer programming is changing writing*. Mit Press.

Wardle, E. (2007). Understanding "transfer" from FYC: Preliminary results of a longitudinal study. *WPA: Writing program administration*, *31*(1-2), 65-85.

Welch, K. E. (2013). Reconfiguring writing and delivery in secondary orality. In *Rhetorical memory and delivery* (pp. 17-30). Routledge.

Yancey, K. B. (2004). Made not only in words: Composition in a new key. *College Composition & Communication*, *56*(2), 297-328.

Yang, L., & Harker, M. (2025, August). *Three-stage metacognitive reflection framework for AI engagement*. The WAC Clearinghouse. https://wacclearinghouse.org/repository/collections/continuing-experiments/august-2025/ethical-considerations/three-stage-metacognitive-reflection-framework/