



Reviews of the 2016 Conference on College Composition and Communication

Houston, TX | April 2016

Published by Kairos as a service to the field

CCCC Reviews Coordinating Editor

Andrea Beaudin

Review Board

Steven Corbett, *George Mason University*
Christopher Dean, *University of California, Santa Barbara*
D. Alexis Hart, *Allegheny College*
Will Hochman, *Southern Connecticut State University*
Kathy Patterson, *University of California, Santa Barbara*
Angela Shaffer, *Texas Tech University*
Fred Siegel, *Drexel University*

Kairos Senior Editor and Publisher

Douglas Eyman

Kairos Editor

Cheryl E. Ball

Production Editors

Cheryl E. Ball, Editor
James Jarrett, Managing Editor
Michael J. Faris, Production Editor

Book Design

Michael J. Faris

Reviews Assistant Editors

Thank you to the undergraduate students in Cheryl E. Ball's Fall 2016 editing course at West Virginia University for serving as assistant editors who completed the major copy-editing stages for the 2016 CCCC Reviews:

Rebekah Berry
Meaghan DeBoer
Isaac Farmer
Jessica Hamon
Ryan Herdman
Abigail Humphreys
Mike Mann
Morgan McMinn
Victoria Moneyhun
Kazu Negri
Cayla Nolder
Annie Palmer
Deni Remsberg
Kaitlyn Sands
Alexis Trbovich
Alexandra Vaughn
Olivia Wheeler
Claire Zain

Reviews of the 2016 Conference on College Composition and Communication (held in Houston, TX, April 6–9, 2016) are solicited and developed independently of *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* by the CCCC Reviews Coordinators. The views in these reviews may or may not reflect the views of *Kairos* editors (they probably do...), and reviews are published by *Kairos* as a service to the field. *Enjoy!*

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).



Table of Contents

The Unfamiliar and Familiar <i>By Andrea L. Beaudin</i>	1
CCCC 2016 Houston Overall Conference Review <i>By Natalie Malin</i>	2
RNF 2016: Research Network Forum at CCCC <i>Reviewed by Eric James Stephens</i>	5
AW.04: Writing Democracy 2016 Documenting Our Place in History: The Political Turn, Part II <i>Reviewed by Sheri Rysdam</i>	8
TSIG.08: Special Interest Group for Non-Native English Speaking Writing Instructors <i>Reviewed by Chen Chen</i>	10
FSIG.23: Filling the Chair: A Conversation About Graduate Student Mentorship <i>Reviewed by Megan Keaton</i>	13
A.04: Reconsidering Professional Credentials of Writing Program Faculty <i>Reviewed by Elizabeth J. Fleitz</i>	16
A.08: How to Hold a Slippery Fish: Methodological Challenges and Solutions for Studying Student Dispositions <i>Reviewed by Megan Schoettler</i>	18
A.10: Ethics in Action: Place-Based Ethics and Experience Architecture <i>Reviewed by Brett Oppgaard</i>	20
A.11: Approaching FYC from a Research Perspective: Using Teacher and Corpus Inquiry to Impact Practice <i>Sarah Tinker Perrault</i>	23
A.31: Teaching Writing to Support #BlackLivesMatter at Predominantly White Institutions <i>Reviewed by Tessa Brown</i>	28
A.37: Faculty Developer as Activist: Strategies for Writing Instructors and WPAs <i>Reviewed by Chen Chen</i>	31
B.11: Time to Take Stock: What We Can (and Can't) Learn from Current CHAT Methodology in Writing Studies Research <i>Reviewed by Matthew C. Zajic</i>	35

B.24: Medical Rhetoric and Scientific Communication	39
<i>Reviewed by Carie S. Tucker King</i>	
B37: Enacting Career Diversity in Rhetoric and Composition: Different Pathways for a Professional Life with a PhD in Rhetoric and Composition	42
<i>Reviewed by Sarah E. Polo</i>	
C.18: The Best of Three Worlds: Integrating Writing, Civic Engagement, and First-Year Experience Programs	45
<i>Reviewed by Glen Southergill</i>	
D.03: Antiracist Classroom Practices: Enacting Socially Just Agendas	47
<i>Reviewed by Eric James Stephens</i>	
D.16: Bridging Cultures, Languages, and Lands: An Illustration of Latina/o and Chicax Rhetorical Practices	50
<i>Reviewed by Isabel Baca</i>	
D.16: Bridging Cultures, Languages, and Lands: An Illustration of Latina/o and Chicax Rhetorical Practices	52
<i>Reviewed by Christina V. Cedillo</i>	
D18: State of Play: Gaming, Writing, Teaching, and Research	56
<i>Reviewed by Brandee Easter</i>	
E.04: Negotiating Competing Curricular, Institutional, and Disciplinary Interests in Advanced Composition	58
<i>Reviewed by Carie S. Tucker King</i>	
G01: The Purposes of Required Writing?	60
<i>Reviewed by Matthew C. Zajic</i>	
G.19: Uncovering the Hidden: Composition Scholarship as Language Activism	63
<i>Reviewed by Anjali Pattanayak</i>	
I.11: Re-Reading Appalachia: Literacy, Place, and Cultural Resistance	66
<i>Reviewed by Cecilia Bonnor</i>	
I.17: Redefining Narrative Writing as a Strategy for Action	70
<i>Reviewed by Ljiljana Coklin</i>	

I.18: Partnering with the Status Quo: Theories, Histories, and Cases of Problematic Partnerships for Action-Oriented Practitioners <i>Reviewed by Madeleine Sorapure</i>	74
J.24: Visual Rhetoric for Social Change in the Writing Classroom <i>Reviewed by Jessica Shumake</i>	77
K.02: Visual, Online, and Geographic Spaces: Places for Social Action <i>Reviewed by Sarah Hirsch</i>	79
K.06: Publishing in CCCC's Studies in Writing and Rhetoric <i>Reviewed by Carie S. Tucker King</i>	83
K.20: Rhetorical Listening: Difference, Materiality, and the Classroom <i>Reviewed by Kristi Murray Costello</i>	86
L.07: Develop, Design, Deliver: Teaching Graduate Students to Teach Writing Online <i>Reviewed by Carie S. Tucker King</i>	89
M.10: Framing Circulation for Action: Frameworks for Enabling Action via Circulation Studies <i>Reviewed by Meghan A. Sweeney</i>	92

The Unfamiliar and Familiar

By **Andrea L. Beaudin**

Texas Tech University
(andrea.beaudin@ttu.edu)

I have a confession to make: I have lived in Lubbock, Texas, for over six years, yet other than airports, I've not visited any of its cities other than Amarillo. You see, Lubbock is “centrally located,” which is a local euphemism meaning it's at least a six-hour drive to any other city in the state (or, for that matter, Albuquerque and Oklahoma City).

In a truly geographical sense, Houston was a disruption of my experience of Texas. Instead of flat, dusty, windy plains atop a 3,300-foot mesa, I was in an almost tropical, verdant city. It was much more metropolitan than Lubbock, with skyscrapers and traffic sprawling into its many sections and neighborhoods. It was part of a state I knew, still with its proudly Texan identity, but presented a different subculture and experience outside of what had become familiar to me in the Panhandle.

As you may have predicted, coming to Houston for the Conference of College Composition and Communication (CCCC) was very much a metaphor for my experience of CCCC each year. While this is a conference concerning college composition and communication, there are diverse expressions, interpretations, and foci as to what this means, should entail, and how to achieve it. Spurred by Joyce Locke Carter's (2016) call to “disrupt and innovate,” I ventured into some unfamiliar neighborhoods in my discipline by attending sessions on queer rhetorics, disability studies, and histories of the field.

Yet as I read through each of the reviews in this collection, I realize there were so many hidden gems I missed, as one may miss on the first visit to a city. I am grateful to the reviewers who have provided me (and many other) readers with a glimpse into so much that the CCCC has to offer, to teach, and to spark within us. I also cannot thank my fellow editors enough for their work in supporting this endeavor through their time and effort.

I hope you will take the chance to venture into new areas of what may be familiar—yet unfamiliar—territory by reading reviews outside of your usual scholarly neighborhood. It is through such exploration that we can innovate, disrupt, and create those strategies for action.

References

Carter, Joyce. (2016, June 9). Chair's Address, CCCC 2016 [Video file]. *YouTube*. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/86FHQMZJI54>

CCCC 2016 Houston Overall Conference Review

By **Natalie Malin**

Texas Woman's University
(nmalin@twu.edu)

I had heard about the famed national Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) and was thrilled to finally be able to attend one because Houston is in driving distance from my home near Dallas. Ok, so I'll admit I didn't drive—a colleague did—because I didn't trust my 11-year-old 166,000-mileaged Camry to make the four-hour trip south without a hitch. Good thing, too, since two weeks after we returned from CCCC, both rear wheels needed new bearings, yet another expense that made me want to hurry up and finish my dissertation so I can stop living off ramen. Ugh.

An extra surprise was that I also had the good fortune of having my proposal accepted, but after the initial excitement I felt from being acknowledged, I began to worry if I was up to snuff when compared to other professionals who had become regulars at the humungous venue. What should I wear? What should I pack? How do I introduce myself? Would anyone approach me? Is this sucker going to be all it's cracked up to be? Imposter syndrome was seeping into my pores reminding me of the anxiety I felt right before taking my comprehensive exams. I also had to find substitutes for all the composition classes I taught—at both colleges—and trust my 15-year-old and 19-year-old to not burn down our little house while I was away for three nights and four days, something I had never done before. I willed myself to enjoy this behemoth because this was my chance to experience it firsthand. I felt a bit guilty because I was actually looking forward to having a break from teaching, cooking, making my bed, and commuting an hour, almost as much as going to this thing.

So here are this newcomer's first impressions: arriving at the conference the day before workshops begin is a brilliant idea if you can swing it. You have time to walk around and explore the layout of the hotel and meeting rooms when you do this. Cities win bids to host CCCC because of many things, one of which is that they have enough hotel and convention space to hold 3,500 teachers and administrators, so saying the Houston Hilton of Americas is big is like saying writing professors like books. However, it seemed to me that most conference attendees appeared to arrive Wednesday afternoon, but they missed workshops by doing so, or at least the morning ones. Since I wasn't sure if I'd ever be able to attend a CCCC convention again, I was on a mission to do everything I could to get the full experience.

CCCC was not what I expected. It was better. For example, the first workshop I went to was a reading workshop, and at first I was shocked that only half a dozen of us sat around the five small round tables. Where was everyone? Is this normal? I have no idea why, but for some reason I expected 100 people to be at workshops and for them to be run very formally. Not so. After about an hour into the three-and-a-half-hour workshop, I felt like I was chatting with friends who really wanted to help their students and share what they learned from their own experiences and failures. For example, we teach students how to improve their writing, but we usually don't give them explicit directions on how to read. Hmmm, so interesting. I took notes in my wide-ruled spiral notebook as fast as I could and no one made me feel silly for doing so. No one was in a suit either, and come to think of it, I don't think anyone wore a tie. Most impressive was that no

one introduced themselves as “Dr. so and so” either when we went around the room for introductions. Wow.

The second workshop I attended after scarfing down some trail mix was on disabilities. I only had an hour break between the two workshops and did not realize I would continue chatting with this group even after our time was up. Thank goodness I had some snacks and a water bottle stashed in my oversize purse because I didn’t want to go all the way back up to my room on the 19th floor on the other side of the Hilton. I also didn’t think I’d have time to hit a restaurant with just an hour, assuming that the Papisitas restaurant and open-faced bar in the hotel lobby would be slammed. Again, only a small group of people attended this workshop, but I learned quickly that collegiality tends to improve if attendance size is more manageable.

The presenters were so down to earth yet brilliant without being know-it-alls. They shared some jokes with us and created a collaborative environment that was yet again stimulating. I learned about the usage of style sheets on Microsoft Word and felt like a dork for not clicking on them sooner since I tend to be a curious person. I was also a bit embarrassed when I learned I was sitting next to and chatting it up with Will Hochman, who couldn’t have been a nicer person. Hochman, who used to be editor of these *Kairos* CCCC Reviews, noticed I had a sticker on my nametag signifying that I was writing reviews for *Kairos*, and even introduced me to one of the editors personally—Andrea Beaudin, who just happened to be one of the presenters at this workshop; talk about kismet.

After a couple hours’ break I went to the Newcomers’ Orientation. People came from Jamaica, Canada, Tokyo, and Guadalajara! I would guess about 75 of us sat in the audience while chairs of different committees within CCCC introduced themselves and showed us a very informative slide presentation. They talked about ways to connect whether it be via Twitter, the Google app NCTE Go Mobile, the whiteboards in the hallways where we could use dry erase markers to contribute answers to prompts, or even the 4chouston.com hospitality website, and so on. Everyone was so upbeat and happy we were here and kept reminding us to ask anyone, especially those with a yellow Volunteer ribbon on their nametag, questions about anything, noting that they wanted us to make friends. And they meant it.

Afterward, I learned that many conference goers tend to meet up with their alma maters for dinner on Wednesday, the night before the conference officially begins. That was a lovely surprise. My friend I drove down with texted me while I was in the Newcomers’ Orientation inviting me to dinner, and she was willing to wait for me too. I met up with some people whose names I knew, but whose faces I had not ever seen. I acted like a schoolgirl again, but this time righted myself much quicker than when I found out Will’s last name. They were wonderful—letting me gush about everything from my experiences that day to my research—and gave me their cards too. I decided right then and there I was going to do the same when the shoe is on the other foot.

When I returned to my quiet, clean room with a beautiful view, I was tired but too wound up to sleep right away. I had been up very late the night before grading stacks of papers and thought I would jump into my jammies and be out, but I needed to play with all my handouts, look over my notes, and peruse the booklets on things to do in Houston and things associated with CCCC. I was so glad I brought empty tote bags, and this was only the preconference papers.

The next morning, I went to the Newcomers’ Coffee Hour, which started at 7:30 a.m. Yes, 7:30 a.m. My grogginess wore off the instant I sipped the super strong coffee and began getting to know some of the others at the table I sat at. One woman was from Austria and handed me her card with a smile in the first two

minutes of our conversation. Another one gushed with me over the sheer size of the hotel and the beautiful chandeliers and light fixtures. Together we learned of things like Cynthia Selfe's retirement, and I felt lucky to be present again. No one was stuffy!

Then the opening session of the conference was impressive. It was held in an adjacent and equally large building and was filled to capacity, which I would guess was about 300–400 people. Sondra Perl, another one of my heroes, was also retiring this year and gave a moving speech after accepting her Exemplar Award, noting that emancipatory pedagogy is a must. After her, Chair Joyce Locke Carter was fun to watch as her image with various light shows was projected onto the screen behind her. Some of her most poignant statements included “Failure is how we learn to write,” “Don't give power to a technocrat,” and that “Disrupting is a stance, a mindset.” She also listed dozens of innovations created by those in our profession, such as CompPile, eServer, *Kairos*, and the WAC Clearinghouse. My hand was starting to cramp from taking notes, but I didn't care.

I could write several more pages easily but want to leave readers with this, since much of what I would say is more glowing reviews about the unprecedented organic networking that happens at CCCC. Go to CCCC if you can. Don't be intimidated to walk up to someone and initiate a conversation. People started gabbing with me in the elevator and while waiting for the shuttle to the Bedford/St. Martin's party at the Astros ballpark. Bring comfy clothes and good shoes because you will be walking a lot in between sessions. Get outside just for a breather, too, if you can because, I tell you what, I was not prepared for all the fabulous non-stop intellectual conversation. It was wonderful to be surrounded with like-minded people and learn from them, but when I walked across the street to Discovery Park, a small wonderful space downtown where tall birch trees, public art, and fountains abound, right before heading back to Dallas, all I wanted to do was let everything sink in so I wouldn't forget. I have to find a way to go again.

RNF 2016: Research Network Forum at CCCC

Reviewed by Eric James Stephens

Clemson University
(*esteph5@clemson.edu*)

Co-Chairs: Risa P. Gorelick, *Research Network Forum*

Gina Merys, *Saint Louis University*

Speakers: Cynthia Selfe, *The Ohio State University*, “Pushing Back, Against Ourselves: Discipline at the Cellular Level”

Todd Taylor, *University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill*, “Mentors, Editors, Midwives, Producers, Exemplars, and Taxi Drivers: It Takes a Village to Manage Your Research”

Howard Tinberg, *Bristol Community College*, “The Research Imperative at the Community College: Why Doing the Research Matters”

Going into the Research Network Forum (RNF), I had mixed feelings. A colleague and I had been working on a paper for a little over a year with little success in publications, so I was excited to get some feedback on how we could improve the article. At the same time, the thought of meeting strangers to critique our work was not particularly appealing. The plenary speakers helped set the tone and put things at ease, for me at least, but I had other friends and colleagues who did not have as good of an experience at RNF.

Cynthia Selfe’s presentation resonated with what I try to accomplish as a young scholar and writing instructor. Using the theme and motif borrowed from the *Breaking Bad* television series, Selfe (and the other plenary speakers) encouraged each of us young scholars to push our research and break down some boundaries—at least a little bit. While the outline of the RNF description had the plenary speakers teaching us how to manage research, I gained newfound enthusiasm for my own research to push some boundaries.

Selfe called for young researchers to push boundaries, and although I felt like pumping my fist in the air afterward, there remained a looming problem: tenure and editors. The idea was close to being addressed during the Q&A portion of the session, but I feel we were the wrong audience for such a rallying call to break bad. Young researchers in graduate programs, adjunct positions, and lecturer positions do not have the room to break bad, even a little bit in some cases. I’ve had more than one conversation with more seasoned researchers that have said, “Good idea, but maybe wait to do that after you get tenure.”

The true audience for such a call to action should have been tenured faculty and journal editors. It doesn’t take much analysis using Foucault to see the power relationships in academe, and we graduate students, adjunct faculty, and lecturers are at the bottom of the barrel. In a Free Speech and Open Forum at Clemson University, Todd May (2016) discussed “the increasing corporatization of the university of structure [where the university is actively restructuring itself] to create more vulnerability among its faculty and staff.” Pushing boundaries sounds like a great idea, but in the face of passing a thesis defense or going up for tenure, there isn’t much room for boundary pushing. What would happen, though, if tenured faculty and journal editors pushed boundaries? What would happen if they decided to break bad? Selfe can stand up in a room full of young researchers and scholars and call for us all to break bad. She has tenure. I don’t.

With the keynote session complete and this rallying cry mulling in my mind, I walked over to Table 4 to begin the Works-in-Progress portion of RNF. I sat down to introduce myself to the other presenters, Stephanie Harper from University of Louisiana and Caleb Pendygraft from Miami University of Ohio, as well as our discussion leader, Paul Walker from Murray State. Each of us shared our projects and offered feedback on the projects and ideas we brought to present. Walker was particularly good with his feedback, quickly seeing the arguments we presented and some of the flaws or areas for improvement. As new scholars and researchers, Stephanie, Caleb, and I fell victim to bibliography spouting in response to each other's papers—though, I think I was the most guilty of that.

Despite the occasional “here's more stuff to read in your ‘free time’” comments, we were able to help each other refine what we wanted to say and where we wanted to go in our various projects. As a relatively new reader of Heidegger, my table helped me develop the idea of “being” and its relevance to my paper about muted group theory and the Mormon feminist movement, Ordain Women. I hope that I was able to help Stephanie and Caleb in the same manner they helped me, which would be a good reason to follow up and network past RNF. That is, after all, one of the purposes and the second word of the forum, to network.

I learned later that our table was fortunate to have gone so well. Without referencing names, tables, or institutional affiliations, I had one colleague whose experience did not pan out as well as my own, which brings me back to this idea of the correlation between power and the ability to break bad. Due to what I hope was a mistake, my colleague sat at their table as the only Works-in-Progress presenter with not one discussion leader, but three. Although their presentation did not deal explicitly with writing and composition, it certainly dealt with rhetoric, which is a common thread of CCCC and RNF. After presenting the work, the three discussion leaders went onto explain how this presentation did not belong at CCCC or RNF. As you may be able to imagine, one young scholar being told by three “experienced” discussion leaders that this research did not belong explicitly exemplifies my concern with young scholars breaking bad.

Perhaps those three discussion leaders did not attend the plenary address, or maybe weren't listening, or maybe didn't understand the message? I'm not sure. The welcome portion of the RNF program said, “The RNF has served as a mentoring branch of the CCCC community—welcoming both novice and seasoned members—in an effort to foster growth in the scholarship of the field.” Fostering growth. Hearing my friend and colleague's experience was disheartening. I understand that discussion leaders at RNF are volunteers, and the time they provide is precious. I wonder, though, if a quick how-to guide could be provided to discussion leaders that will encourage them to foster growth in young scholars rather than ostracizing them. Other friends who attended shared their experiences with me, all of them falling on this spectrum between fostering and ostracizing. It surprised me how many fell closer to the exclusionary side.

So with these experiences, I echo the plenary speakers' call for breaking bad to those who donate their time as discussion leaders—put aside your egos. Foster growth instead. I'm only in my first year as a PhD student, and this was my first experience with RNF, so maybe I'm not the one who should be asking for this. Maybe someone with tenure? Maybe the real question is, does it matter who asks? How you answer may show how willing you are to break bad—even a little bit.

References

May, Todd. (2016). The administration of vulnerability—Open forum letter. Retrieved from <http://blogs.clemson.edu/facultysenate/2016/01/09/the-administration-of-vulnerability-open-forum-letter-2/>

AW.04: Writing Democracy 2016 | Documenting Our Place in History: The Political Turn, Part II

Reviewed by Sheri Rysdam

Utah Valley University

(srysdam@uwu.edu)

Co-Chairs: Deborah Mutnick, *Long Island University*

Shannon Carter, *Texas A&M–Commerce*

Keynote Speaker: Tony Scott, *Syracuse University*

This year on April 6, 2016, I attended a Wednesday afternoon workshop at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in Houston, Texas. The workshop was titled, “Writing Democracy 2016 | Documenting Our Place in History: The Political Turn, Part II” and was part of a Writing Democracy-themed effort within the field that has been ongoing since 2011.

The event originated as a response to the 2008 economic crisis and has continued to follow the economic recovery or lack thereof. The organizers encourage participants to consider how we might “write democracy,” with an attention to the economy, location, history, public movements, and social turns. This review focuses primarily on Tony Scott’s keynote, titled “Subverting Fear and Crisis in the Political Economy of Composition,” which was drawn in part from his collection co-edited with Nancy Welch, *Composition in the Age of Austerity* (2016).

In his talk Scott walked the audience through some of the austerity measures from the past several decades, especially as they pertained to publicly funded education. There is less government funding than ever before. For example, Scott stated that in 1987, only 23% of tuition and fees covered the costs of higher education. The remained costs were made up in government funding. Comparatively, in 2013, tuition and fees covered 47%—nearly half—of the costs of higher education. Over 25 years later, the government pays for much less of the overall cost of high education. *Priorities are shifting away from education at an alarming rate.*

The education budget was also severely diminished in 2008, when attempts were finally made to address and rectify the financial challenges of the recession. Since then, although the economy has steadily improved, funding levels still have still not surpassed the pre-2008 numbers.

Funding and employment in education are clearly linked to issues of social justice and labor rights, and Scott was interested in examining the impact of these austerity measures on curriculum and pedagogy. Scott stated, “In an era of austerity, we now face the consequences of a field that has never established a scholarly habit of positioning composition scholarship in relation to the powerful economic factors that share composition work.” To wit, education, curriculum, and pedagogy are more influenced by, and increasingly shaped by, marketization instead of in current scholarship within the field.

In that regard, Scott is critical of curriculum software. He is concerned about how they shape ideas about authorship, agency, language, and learning. He is concerned about how they shape teachers’ labor and expertise. Scott encouraged the audience to think about how large institutional investments in this software positions teachers’ agency, creative and intellectual work—in addition to pedagogical practices and goals.

Inherent in economic downturns is a sense of crisis. According to Scott (and referencing Naomi Klein's 2007 discussion of *disaster capitalism*), crisis, such as economic crises like that which we see in funding cuts in public education, makes people act urgently but see myopically. It keeps people in a permanently reactionary state. By normalizing crisis we avoid or delay the normal critique and change that would naturally occur within an institution.

References

- Klein, Naomi. (2007). *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism*. New York, NY: Picador.
- Welch, Nancy, & Scott, Tony (Eds.). (2016). *Composition in the age of austerity*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

TSIG.08: Special Interest Group for Non-Native English Speaking Writing Instructors

Reviewed by Chen Chen

North Carolina State University

(cchen23@ncsu.edu)

Chair: Judith Szerdahelyi, *Western Kentucky University*

Speakers: Mary Tseptsura, *University of New Mexico*

Lami Fofana-Kamara, *Michigan State University*

Tatjana Schell, *North Dakota State University*

I met Lami Fofana-Kamara at the 2015 Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) when, together with another colleague, we discussed possibilities of bringing the issues about non-native English speaking writing instructors (NNESWI) to the conversations at the 2016 CCCC. For the first time, I discovered that there were other instructors like me who were also non-native, and that it was a research topic that had warranted scholarly attention. Following our conversation where we shared our experiences of teaching writing as non-native English-speakers and the challenges we were faced with, Fofana-Kamara and I joined another group of scholars who proposed this special interest group for the 2016 CCCC at this SIG meeting. It was exciting and gratifying to see several colleagues present to share their experiences and to discuss possible future actions to advocate for this group. This SIG meeting served as a first step for a more unified effort towards carving out a disciplinary space for non-native English speaking writing instructors in rhetoric and composition.

In response to the 2016 CCCC Call for Proposals (CFP) calling for our professional communities to “write strategies for action from a variety of perspectives: as they concern the experiences of students, instructors or others whose values, ideologies, abilities, and/or identities are underrepresented in mainstream education” (CCCC, 2015), this NNESWI SIG attempted to bring together writing instructors who were interested in developing strategic actions to provide better support for NNESWIs.

Present at the SIG meeting were the speakers as well as eight other participants, all of whom identified themselves as NNESWIs. The group first went around to share each other’s experiences teaching writing as NNESWIs, and then together we explored opportunities for strategic actions and how to use writing as a strategy for action.

Coming from various institutions, participants included graduate students as well as faculty members. Even though we were coming from different teaching contexts, we all indicated that the training we received to teach composition in the U.S. was not adequate. For many, composition courses did not exist in their home countries, even in their home languages. While most of us seemed to have received some training in teaching composition, in most cases the training was not always adapted for our specific needs. The challenges and difficulties we experienced were not adequately addressed by the academic and professional support we were provided by our respective institutions. At the same time, NNESWIs often bring not only diversity to our writing programs and writing classrooms but also different cultural and international perspectives to the

way we experience, practice, and teach writing.

In Fofana-Kamara's dissertation work, part of which she presented at an earlier session at the 2016 CCCC, several participants of her ethnographic study on NNEWSWs expressed that sometimes they would receive poor student evaluations due to their nonstandard English accents. The powerful narratives Fofana-Kamara presented demonstrated how NNEWSWs, despite their status as English writing instructors, were often still being judged by their accents and not their expertise on writing and writing instruction. Echoing Fofana-Kamara's work, other attendees at this SIG meeting also expressed a lack of confidence when teaching American students even after several years of teaching, due to their accents.

Sometimes, NNEWSWs could also experience professional discrimination during hiring practices. One speaker shared the story of a fellow Italian colleague who could not get past phone interviews on the job market due to his accent. Other times, they suffer from invisibility in their programs or a combination of visibility and invisibility that would be a hard balance to achieve.

On one hand, NNEWSWs enjoy a certain level of invisibility because they would not want to be treated differently just because they speak English with a different accent. Just like their fellow graduate students or instructors, they possess the same professional aspirations and work just as hard, or even harder, at their jobs and studies. On the other hand, they need visibility because they need extra support not only professionally, but personally. Often they are a minority group in their own program and may not be familiar with the immigration rules that they have to follow due to their visa status. Coming from a different country, it could also be emotionally taxing for them to adapt to local American culture on top of the stress they would experience like any other graduate student or writing instructor.

Because of these challenges, participants of the SIG meeting discussed how we could take strategic actions to help advocate for NNEWSWs. First, it was deemed important to foster a sense of community. A Facebook group and a listserv had been created by Judith Szerdahelyi that served as communication venues for people to share experiences, ideas, and continue to carry out conversations on the subject. Second, it was decided that we must continue to advocate for our professional space at our professional organizations such as CCCC and the Council of Writing Program Administrators.

For example, participants discussed the possibility of proposing a CCCC Position Statement to advocate for support for NNEWSWs. Such a statement would first identify who NNEWSWs are: not only instructors who are from a different country, but also those who speak English with a nonstandard accent. It would then highlight the benefits that NNEWSWs can bring to writing courses, programs, and our discipline as a whole. It would likely discuss related topics such as hiring practice and labor issues to ensure that NNEWSWs are being treated fairly. Furthermore, the statement would include guidelines on how to better provide stronger and more adequate professional development efforts to address their specific needs from individual writing programs, graduate programs, and institutions.

As a first SIG meeting, much time was spent for the participants to get to know each other and to share experiences and not enough time was spent on talking about strategic actions. However, this meeting itself served as one strategic action to help foster the sense of a community. Everyone was energized at the end of the meeting and ready to keep brainstorming for more ideas. To conclude the session, the participants outlined the next steps for the group. After the meeting, a proposal was drafted for next year's SIG meeting at the 2017 CCCC where we would continue the conversations until this group eventually

becomes a standing group at CCCC. This SIG meeting at Houston offered a first opportunity for members in this community to gather and share their experiences with one another, as well as identify problems and possible future actions. Next year, we plan to continue to grow our group by promoting our communication platforms such as listservs and social media accounts to increase our visibility in the field and beyond. At the 2017 SIG meeting in Portland, the group will focus on developing more specific strategic actions in order to address a myriad of issues that are related to, but not limited to: hiring practices, labor issues, professional development, institutional or programmatic support, and identity.

References

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2015). *Call for program proposals: Writing strategies for action*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CCCC/Convention/2016/CFP.pdf>

FSIG.23: Filling the Chair: A Conversation About Graduate Student Mentorship

Reviewed by Megan Keaton

Florida State University

(mkeaton@fsu.edu)

Co-chairs: Caddie Alford, *Indiana University*

Jennifer Juskiewicz, *Indiana University*

Speakers: Laura Micciche, *University of Cincinnati*

Christina LaVecchia, *University of Cincinnati*

Katie Zabrowski Dickman, *St. Louis University*

Dana Anderson, *Indiana University*

Caddie Alford, *Indiana University*

Jennifer Juskiewicz, *Indiana University*

This Special Interest Group (SIG) was designed to address graduate students' concerns by creating a space for dialogue among graduate students and faculty from a variety of universities. Each year, the chairs choose a topic for discussion, such as preparing for the job market or managing an academic digital presence. At the meeting, speakers begin by sharing their experiences with the topic then give members an opportunity to ask questions. Most of the meeting is guided by these questions. Lane concluded that there are steps women are trying to take towards a more equal Internet. For example, support spaces help, but it takes ongoing work, since such spaces are often invaded by trolls. Feminists have to continue the rhetoric of disruption—just as Davis disrupted the masculine space of public speech by speaking, by physically standing, by occupying space in the front of the legislature—by using the Internet and social media to insert a woman's voice into the public discussion.



Figure 1: Roundtable Panorama

At the 2016 conference, the Graduate Student SIG came together to discuss choosing a faculty chair and committee members, as well as ways to navigate the relationships among mentor, mentee, and committee members. The speakers were made up of mentor-mentee teams; with this balance, speakers were able to

offer perspectives from both sides of the relationship. Because the opening remarks and answers to questions covered some of the same topics, I will organize this review by the themes of this year's conversation.

Choosing a Mentor

The mentee speakers—Christina LaVecchia, Katie Zabrowski Dickman, Caddie Alford, and Jennifer Juskiewicz—began by explaining why they chose their mentors. These speakers recommended that a graduate student choose a mentor based on personalities, personal and academic interests and habits, and motivational strategies. They suggested that the student choose a chair whose personality traits are complementary with the student's personality. The speakers also recommended that a student find a mentor who has similar personal and academic interests as the mentee; this makes the relationship easier because the mentor and mentee can relate on multiple levels. Additionally, the speakers recommended that a student select a mentor whose motivational strategies work well for him or her. Some mentees, for example, may need a mentor who sets specific deadlines and workload, while others may need a more relaxed mentor. In a similar vein, the speakers suggested that a student identify a mentor who has work and organizational habits that work well for the student. Dickman, for instance, shared that she and her mentor both use color-coding when organizing their work.

Interspersed in this advice, the mentor speakers—Laura Micciche and Dana Anderson—explained what they see as the qualities of an effective mentor. The speakers asserted that an effective mentor celebrates the mentee's successes, advocates for the mentee, and points out opportunities in which the mentee could be involved. Micciche stressed that the mentee has responsibilities in the relationship as well; mentors want mentees to set deadlines for themselves and to ask their mentors for advice and feedback. Anderson emphasized that a mentor must be predictable to his or her mentee. To accomplish this, the mentor and mentee must discuss early on their expectations for the relationship, work habits, deadlines, and so on. Finally, both speakers maintained that the relationship between mentor and mentee will change as they work together, and it continues even after the student graduates.

Anderson stated that, prior to selecting a mentor, students must have specific ideas for their dissertation or thesis. If a student does not yet have specific ideas, it is too early to select a mentor. He recommended that, when the student is ready for a mentor, he or she should email the professor to set up an appointment to talk. During the meeting with the professor, the student should discuss their ideas about the project and then ask the professor to be his or her chair.

Choosing a Committee

The mentor speakers emphasized that the mentor and mentee should work together to select committee members; the mentee should not make these decisions alone. They recommended that the mentee consider a wide variety of committee members who have different interests and academic pursuits. Different perspectives, even those that disagree, are helpful in working on and revising one's project. Anderson stated that students should ask themselves whether they are "using all available means" when selecting committee members. At the same time, it is important to choose committee members who understand their roles in the committee and what each role entails. Micciche explained that committee relationships are influenced by institutional cultures; more collaborative departments will often produce more collaborative committees.

Talking about Pedagogy

Often, mentees think about their mentors helping with their research and turning that research into publications and conference presentations. However, the speakers emphasized that the mentor is a resource for one's teaching as well. The speakers recommended that a mentee ask his or her mentor to observe their classes and offer suggestions for improvement. A mentee can also come to their mentor when they are struggling with, or have questions about, their mentor's teaching. The mentor speakers suggested that, in addition to seeking advice from the mentor, students should ask other faculty members to observe their teaching; this offers the student a variety of perspectives.

Breaking Up with a Mentor

The mentor speakers discussed the difficult situation of beginning work with a mentor and realizing that the mentor is not the best person for the mentee and their project. The speakers recommended that the mentee pin the agency on the project because the project matters most; that is, they recommended talking in terms of what's best for the dissertation project and its direction. They emphasized that the project is the mentee's work, and he or she must be comfortable with the direction it is going. When ending a mentor-mentee work relationship, the mentee can explain to the mentor that the project is heading in a different direction, and another person may be more appropriate for the project. The mentee may also offer for the mentor to remain on the committee. Regardless of how the mentee presents the situation, he or she must be respectful to the mentor.

Making Use of the Cohort

All of the speakers emphasized that, though the mentor is an important person in a graduate student's life, there are other resources the mentee can use. In particular, the speakers pointed to the mentee's cohort. Because they are going through similar experiences as the mentee, a mentee can go to his or her cohort to seek out advice about work-life balance, share academic and professional struggles, and ask for feedback on their writing. After graduation, one's cohort can then become project collaborators, writing group participants, and/or lifelong friends.

During the meeting, participants made use of the session's hashtag, #isig23. [Visit a Storify project of the SIG's Twitter activity.](#)

A.04: Reconsidering Professional Credentials of Writing Program Faculty

Reviewed by Elizabeth J. Fleitz

Lindenwood University

(ejfleitz@gmail.com)

Chair: Natalie Belcher, *Delaware State University*

Speakers: John Peterson, *Stanford University*

Marjorie Stewart, *Glenville State College*

Duane Roen, *Arizona State University*

Steve Bailey, *Central Michigan University*

Daniel Cleary, *Lorain County Community College*

Steven Krause, *Eastern Michigan University*

This roundtable cited recurring Writing Program Administrators (WPA) listserv discussions as the motivation for its presentation. The question up for debate was whether or not a Master of Fine Arts (MFA) degree holder was appropriately qualified to be a faculty member in a university writing program. Unfortunately, as the roundtable progressed (and as the Q&A illustrated) the debate became more of a MFA versus PhD debate, turning questions regarding qualifications for writing faculty into a discussion of qualifications as faculty in general.

Four of the six listed speakers were in attendance. The first panel speaker (the reviewer apologizes for not knowing the speakers' names; introductions were not made at the beginning of the roundtable) discussed his experience hiring writing faculty, explaining his reasoning for not hiring MFAs for tenure-track full-time writing faculty due to their training as creative writers instead of as academic writers. Each of the speakers drew on their own experience in their own writing programs as support for their arguments; research on the subject was not cited. The second presenter provided an argument for hiring candidates with MFAs, referring to the large number of MFAs graduating every year, in debt and looking for jobs such as these; the presenter explained the necessity of hiring MFAs because they are so plentiful. He explained how to phrase a job advertisement to include the possibility of getting MFAs to apply as well as PhDs. The third speaker brought up the problem of the MFA being or not being a terminal degree, as its terminal status has been up for debate in recent years with the rise of the creative writing PhD. Because of this problem, some MFAs end up doing a PhD as it is increasingly seen as necessary, even obligatory. Additionally, the speaker brought up the problem of creative writing and rhetoric/composition not being in communication with each other, as there is much that the fields can draw from each other but currently do not. The fourth and final presenter noted that most of the speakers on the roundtable had MFAs, if not additionally PhDs. By a show of hands, that was the case for quite a few in the audience as well. This presenter argued in support of the MFA degree, noting that having MFA experience will be an aid in getting a faculty job.

There were about 25 attendees at the session, though about 8–10 left partway through the roundtable, an unfortunate distraction to an already fractious panel. The Q&A, as mentioned earlier, devolved into

an MFA versus PhD debate, exclusively using the speakers' individual experiences as support instead of established research. One audience member made the generalization that MFAs see composition teaching as uninteresting and want to teach only creative writing courses; thus, they can be a problem when hired for a writing program. Another audience member made the generalization that PhDs are uninterested in teaching exclusively in a first-year writing program and will leave the first chance they get. There was also a discussion of the wide variance in quality of MFA programs—in particular, the prevalence of online, non-residency MFAs that by definition do not provide any sort of teaching experience. There were reminders of how we must be collegial between MFAs and PhDs, and additionally the point was made that the credentials themselves are less important, and instead what is more telling for teaching success is the candidate's experience and ability to adapt. Ironically, directly after discussing how to create collegiality among writing program faculty regardless of degree, another audience member made a sweeping generalization about PhDs and their inability to teach. Unfortunately, very little was said of what is needed to be "qualified" for teaching in a writing program—which was the stated goal of the panel. More organization of the panel and better focus on the overall question for debate, along with reference to research on the subject, would have made this a more productive discussion. As it was, if this roundtable intended to bring together MFAs and PhDs in a collegial, intellectual discussion of the qualifications of writing program faculty, from this reviewer's perspective, it did not succeed.

A.08: How to Hold a Slippery Fish: Methodological Challenges and Solutions for Studying Student Dispositions

Reviewed by Megan Schoettler

Miami University of Ohio
(*schoetmp@miamioh.edu*)

Chair: Gwen Gorzelsky, *Colorado State University*

Speakers: Dana Lynn Driscoll, *Indiana University of Pennsylvania*

Amy Metcalf Latawiec, *Wayne State University*

Jennifer Wells, *New College of Florida*

In their 2012 article, Dana Lynn Driscoll and Jennifer Wells argued that, “individual dispositions, such as motivation, value, and self-efficacy, need to occupy a more central focus in writing transfer research.” Since then, Driscoll, Wells, Metcalf, and Gorzelsky have continued important work conceptualizing and testing how we study dispositions. In this presentation, they summarized their progress and provided implications for disposition researchers.

Dana Driscoll introduced The Writing Transfer Project, a two-year study with 48 classroom sections across multiple institutions. The research team used strong theoretical models, set up coding schemes, and in Driscoll’s words, “utterly failed to study dispositions.” During their summer research work, coders were trained to find generative and disruptive dispositions using Peter Smagorinsky and Joel Taxel’s (2005) collaborative coding strategy. However, when their work was reviewed by Driscoll, Wells, Metcalf, and Gorzelsky, many of the codes were over 40% inaccurate, identified inaccurately as generative or disruptive. Codes were also missed—for example self-efficacy was missed 60.7% of the time.

Driscoll stated that in this case, “weeping and gnashing of teeth . . . leads to opportunity.” After hundreds of hours invested in this project, the researchers have a much better idea of what has to be done to study dispositions. Driscoll provided several insights for disposition researchers: where we derive our definitions is critical part of the research process, we need a more nuanced definition of self-efficacy, we should stick to one or two dispositions when studying them, and we should consider the importance of student identities when studying dispositions.

As a part of her research, Amy Metcalf studies student self-efficacy in basic writing courses. Specifically, she teaches a self-regulated learning environment and wants to see if this classroom design cultivates efficacious beliefs about writing. In her courses, students choose a personal learning objective (PLO), which students develop and track across the semester. In scaffolded reflective writing, Metcalf found efficacious writing, for example: “I believe that the more we continue to write this paper, the stronger we will be.” In this study, Metcalf did not come up with a definition of self-efficacy that can be replicated, but we can work towards this as a field. Metcalf also warns that while self-efficacy research is important with basic writers, these students may be hard to recruit for interviews.

Jennifer Wells teaches writing about writing classes in which students specifically read about dispositions and knowledge transfer. One question asked of her by her colleague was, “How do we even know these classes

are working?” In other words, how do we know that this teaching content and environment is supporting developing writers and encouraging transfer? To answer this question, Wells researched collaboratively with two undergraduate peer writing tutors. Benefits of working with the tutors were that they have member status with research participants, they are familiar with the coursework and readings that peers have read, and being a co-researcher with a faculty member aids with student retention. So far, the student researchers have coded for transfer and self-regulation in their interviews and their practice is promising. Their coding work is 70% in agreement, in contrast to 54% from the broader Writing Transfer Project. Also, only 22% of codes were missed, contrasted with 68% percent from the Writing Transfer Project. Wells is not sure what exactly what led to the success, but sees the role of undergraduate researchers in disposition research as promising. The work of these students does take time, however, as her student researchers would get tired after 1.5 hours of coding. Wells wants composition researchers to consider the question: “What benefit to your project could be achieved by including undergraduates in your research?”

In 2017, we can look forward to reading more about Driscoll, Wells, Metcalf, and Gorzelsky’s research in *Composition Forum*.

Implications

As scholars in our field continue to do the important work of disposition research, it will be important to have ongoing conversations about which definitions of student dispositions we are using to build our studies and how we decide to code for dispositions. These researchers exemplify how we must engage critically with what each disposition means within our field, instead of cleanly taking theories and concepts from other fields (such as Albert Bandura’s work on self-efficacy) and applying them straight to the composition classroom. Like writers adapting skills and knowledge between classes, we must recontextualize and recognize the limitations and affordances of the disposition methodologies we use.

References

- Driscoll, Dana Lynn, & Wells, Jennifer. (2012). Beyond knowledge and skills: writing transfer and the role of student dispositions. *Composition Forum*, 26, Retrieved from <http://compositionforum.com/issue/26/beyond-knowledge-skills.php>
- Smagorinsky, Peter, & Taxel, Joel. (2005). *The discourse of character education: Culture wars in the classroom*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

A.10: Ethics in Action: Place-Based Ethics and Experience Architecture

Reviewed by Brett Oppegaard

University of Hawai'i
(brett.oppegaard@hawaii.edu)

Chair: Russell Willerton, *Boise State University*

Speakers: Derek G. Ross, *Auburn University*, “Leopold’s Land Ethic: (Re)envisioning Place in Technical Communication”

Russell Willerton, *Boise State University*, “Martin Buber’s Narrow Ridge: A Central Place for Ethical Action”

Michael Salvo, *Purdue University*, “Dialogic Ethics and Experience Architecture: Tracing Artifacts”

GPS hardware on every smart device has enabled the rise of both location-tracking capabilities and locative media. The potential for place-based content tailored to personal context, therefore has emerged with these surveillance-state concerns, and related issues, in tow.

The three presenters—Derek G. Ross (*Auburn University*), Russell Willerton (*Boise State University*), and Michael Salvo (*Purdue University*)—proposed alternative theoretical paradigms for approaching the rapidly evolving ethical dynamic of place-based media. Most of us might want information connected to us, related to where we are, but we also want to know at what cost.

Not much scholarship has been done in this realm to date, at least from a technical communication perspective. So the trio offered provocative and diverse ideas about how to get started addressing these types of issues from a conceptual standpoint.

Ross, speaking first, focused on Aldo Leopold’s “**The Land Ethic**,” in which the community of stakeholders in any place-based decision is enlarged from just humans to also include animals, plants, soils and waters, or collectively, the land. A key concern here, Ross argued, is if people think they have an indirect or direct duty to the ecosystem. With a direct duty to the land, humans have a moral obligation to consider the full ecosystem in terms of assigning equity to the stakeholders. In such situations, biotic and inanimate communities typically get ascribed low or no economic value (and no moral standing). Human actors, and their needs, therefore hold and sway the power. But with what Ross and Willerton describe as a hybrid place-based ethic, thoughtful people might be able to make richer, more ethically sound choices.

Willerton then described where such choices conceptually could be made. That brought into the conversation Martin Buber (1947/2002) and his ideas about the *narrow ridge*. Early in his long career as a philosophical author, Buber described life as an intimidating journey along a narrow ridge surrounded on both sides by an abyss. Later, Buber described the narrow ridge as a place between opposing camps. These camps are separated by existential mistrust between them. But, if they can figure out a way to come together on the precarious narrow ridge, and remain committed to staying there and working on the situation together, they can use it as a place for connection and community.

The two also applied their hybrid-ethic idea to a couple of cases: One involving documentation for

mortgage loans and the other the restyling of the federal rules of evidence, to determine how the land ethic and the narrow ridge were represented. As part of that process, they developed several key principles as starting points for the continuing discussion. Those were to

1. actively acknowledge the value of the environment in any decision-making process;
2. actively seek a space that participants can share;
3. actively seek grounds for dialogue; and
4. celebrate dialogue where it occurs.

Salvo collaborated on his portion of this presentation with Liza Potts of Michigan State, who was not in attendance. Salvo spoke last and wrapped the conversation into his poetic description of the experience architecture aspects of three places: Fallingwater, the iconic Frank Lloyd Wright home integrated with a creek in Pennsylvania; the Church of the Saint Louis of the French in Rome; and a League of Legends location within the land of Valoran, a virtual place within a massive multiplayer online game. His overriding research questions were, “how do we experience spaces?” and “what experience has been architected for use of the space?”

In that discussion, Salvo referenced prominently Anders Fagerjord (2011) and Edward Casey (1996), including displaying the Casey quote: “Just as there are no places without the bodies that sustain and vivify them, so there are no lived bodies without the places they inhabit and traverse” (p. 24). In other words, Salvo noted, they are connatural terms, and they interanimate themselves.

Rome and Valoran, within League of Legends, are both completely constructed spaces, Salvo said, while Fallingwater integrated a natural place with architecture designed to preserve that initial sense of place, rather than scraping the land to its foundations and starting from scratch.

Fallingwater, though, is not as purely natural as it might seem on its surface, Salvo commented. He mentioned walking through a field of flowers to get to the house, and admiring that natural beauty, before being led through a gift shop and cafeteria on the way to a tour of the home. The home was designed to be lived in by specific people, Salvo added, yet it now functions entirely as a museum of sorts. The story of Fallingwater is about Wright as well as the patrons and the location, he said, but it also is about Wright’s choice of materials, some of which were poor, and the constant maintenance needed to keep the structure from falling into disrepair and being reclaimed by the environment.

As part of the complexities of place-creation, many narratives coexist, yet only some are accessible at the surface of public discourse. The ethics of what gets told about a place and what doesn’t also should be a part of the larger theoretical discussion.

For players of the game the League of Legends, the landscape is as real as Fallingwater, Salvo said. People from around the world gather there and have experiences together. Some are producing the space and defining the places. Some are only consumers. And some are both producing and consuming.

This type of hybrid dynamic (of people in various physical places gathering in particular virtual spaces) can be related to a distributed physical-world company, with headquarters and offices in multiple locations. The information infrastructure and interface design creates the experiences, blending physical and digital stimuli to create a unified sensation. The ethics of such a situation determines how people will be treated and why they will be treated in those ways.

With technological developments creating a variety of new experiences, especially through the potential

of contextual awareness and locative media, place-based ethical decisions are being made. But what are the theoretical foundations of those decisions? What are their guiding principles? Who is choosing these frameworks and why? These are just some of the intriguing questions that this topic of discussion could open in future research.

References

Buber, Martin. (2002). *Between man and man* (Ronald Gregor-Smith, Trans.). London, UK: Routledge.

(Original work published 1947)

Casey, Edward S. (1996). How to get from space to place in a fairly short stretch of time:

Phenomenological Prolegomena. In Steven Feld & Keith H. Basso (Eds.), *Senses of place* (pp. 13–52).

Sante Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Fagerjord, Anders. (2011). Between place and interface: Designing situated sound for the iPhone. *Computers and Composition*, 28(3), 255–263. doi: 10.1016/j.compcom.2011.07.001

A.11: Approaching FYC from a Research Perspective: Using Teacher and Corpus Inquiry to Impact Practice

Sarah Tinker Perrault
University of California, Davis
(sperrault@ucdavis.edu)

Chair: Andrew Blake, *Delaware State University*

Speakers: Raymond Oenbring, *The College of the Bahamas*, “Course Assessment and Corpus Linguistics”

Kathleen Richards & Tammy Winner, *University of North Alabama*, “(Re)searching and (Re)thinking Writing Strategies in FYC: A Call for Action”

Mary McGinnis, *Ball State University*, “Dealing with Diversity and Marginalization: A Corpus Study of First-Year Composition Readers “

Cat Mahaffey, *University of North Carolina–Charlotte*, “There and Back Again: How a Journey into Online Course Design Changed the Way I Teach Writing”

This engaging panel offered thought-provoking questions and useful strategies for improving my teaching.

Course Assessment and Corpus Linguistics

The session opened with **Raymond Oenbring** explaining how he has been using corpus linguistics in assessing writing course outcomes at the College of the Bahamas. In this demonstration of what data-driven studies can offer rhetoric and composition, Oenbring examined a collection of 300 final polished essays from each of two general composition courses—a FYC course and a junior-level composition class—to find out if there were significant differences across majors or over time. For analysis, he used AntConc and “other free and commercial software packages” to look at features such as lexical density, periphrastic constructions, use of passive voice, and collocations.

In looking at these features, Oenbring reported that he paid particular attention to the “unique sociolinguistic features of the Bahamas” that arise in part due to its being both a former British colony and very close to the USA. He found no “observable losses or gains of features in Standard Bahamian English” and also no significant differences in hedges, vocabulary, or transitions across grades or between the lower-division and upper-division classes. However, he did notice that the “admittedly simplistic Flesch-Kincaid grade level followed the presumably increasing sophistication across [assigned paper] grades and across [class] levels.”

While Oenbring’s findings are not in and of themselves exciting, the presentation was valuable for his description of his research methodology and for the data itself. Research like Oenbring’s is useful both for guiding local program development and, as Richard Haswell (2005) and Chris Anson (2008) have argued in calling for research that is “replicable, aggregable, and data supported” (Haswell, 2005, p. 198), it also provides the field as a whole with information we can use in creating high-level knowledge about our pedagogy and its effects.

(Re)searching and (Re)thinking Writing Strategies in FYC: A Call for Action

Next, **Kathleen Richards** and **Tammy Winner** from the University of North Alabama gave a lively and hilarious talk on vital issues we all face in varying degrees: the need to change pedagogy to meet student needs, and a countering resistance to change among some faculty.

Assistant Director of the Center for Writing Excellence Kathleen Richards and Assistant Professor of English Tammy Winner described working in an environment in which timed, in-class writing is still emphasized, where “not everyone has made the change from the product to process approach,” and where “we still struggle to define the disconnect between what college writers/researchers need to learn and what some consider to be ‘good writing.’” As they explained, this is problematic not only for students, but also for the program and the university itself as teaching writing as a process is linked not only to student learning but also university-level issues such as retention and sustainability. Their own research bears this out: two years into a four-year IRB-approved study, they are finding that a revised curriculum results in better evaluations and in better student retention.

Changes in pedagogy are also important given that changes in student demographics and strengths—for example, in using technology, or in their comfort with group work—meaning the need for flexible teaching approaches is greater than ever.

Richards and Winners therefore decided to use more technology in their FYC course. This presentation described a range of teaching methods, including using clickers to “make participation into a game” that gets students involved, having students create YouTube videos, and assigning blogs. In contrast to most faculty, as part of the “respecting [students’] process,” they even encourage the use of cell phones: instead of having students put away their phones, they teach them to “use their phones to be college-level writers, especially with apps.”

This is not to say that Richards and Winner presented technology as a panacea; they noted that Millennials want instructors to be able to effectively use technology, and they recommended telling students why you are doing something. They also made it clear that we should not assume students already have given technological skills just because we see them as “digital natives.” In their own research, they asked questions such as, “what digital literacies do these students know?” For example, they knew students could download apps, but not if they could create blogs. In all cases, they asked how effective their pedagogies were, and how they compared to the more traditional practices in the department.

What they have found overall is that such assignments work. Describing one specific assignment, they talked about using blogs to teach audiences. While students were “used to writing to the BFFs [best friends forever],” they explained, blogs allowed them to teach students “how to write to a specific audience who isn’t their BFF.” They used blogs to teach rhetorical concepts too often taught in the context of decontextualized essays: logos, pathos, ethos, audience, clarity, diction, and so on. Students were asked to write about some point or event of interest in their community and to make use of this as an opportunity to meet people, to explore, and to use media. I particularly like the idea of building on students’ existing practices through “selfies as homework.” Overall, Richards and Winner reported that students responded to the assignment with great enthusiasm: “When they learned they could do the blog using the smart phone app, it became a whole new ballgame.” In the next class in the sequence, they built on students’ familiarity with the genre by having students use blogs to help shape a research problem, presenting blogs as “an electronic forum for

them to look at the rest of the world and look at what others are saying.” They have also had email from students who were in the class two years ago who are now blogging in their majors.

Overall, Richards and Winner struck an ideal balance by talking about what they do in the classroom and about how it works. Given the richness of the first two years of their research, I am eager to see their work published, and to find out what they learn in the next two years.

Dealing with Diversity and Marginalization: A Corpus Study of First-Year Composition Readers

Richards and Winner were so engaging and speaking on such a vital subject that I didn’t want them to stop talking. Fortunately, the next talk was equally compelling: a presentation by [Mary McGinnis](#) of Ball State University on how diversity is represented in FYC composition readers.

McGinnis first set the context: while her students are lively about gender issues, they “resist talking about race, and sexuality, and disability.” For example, when students read bell hooks on media socialization and racism, she reported an “utter silence in my classroom when we started trying to talk about that article,” a silence she said pointed to the truth of hooks’ point about internalization of ideology. She was surprised, as the article is both readable and about media, a topic that students know well. Furthermore, students had done well understanding Peggy McIntosh on white privilege.

On further reflection, however, McGinnis realized that it made sense for students to understand McIntosh and struggle with hooks; like McIntosh, most of McGinnis’s students are white and middle class. Their struggles to understand hooks were understandable, she pointed out, as they were “not accustomed to... seeing things from minority perspective” and lacked the critical thinking skills to read hooks because “they haven’t practiced talking or thinking about marginalization and its effects.” Lack of experience with this kind of activity “leaves them both uncomfortable and ill equipped to participate as citizens” and needs to be taught in FYC.

To understand what kinds of resources are used in FYC, and how these resources represent diverse groups, McGinnis is conducting a corpus study of FYC readers. She is looking for whether and how readers “further the marginalization of minority groups and tokenize marginal experiences” and also what they do well if and when they “make an effort to richly-present, marginalized groups as a valued part of society.” She also plans to examine whether FYC readers have changed over time in how they address marginality and difference.

McGinnis provided several examples of problematic representations in FYC readers. Drawing on Jonathan Alexander’s (2008) work, she explained that mentions of gay rights are often reduced to gay marriage; this “reinforces heteronormative values” (such as monogamy) and hides other issues such as higher suicide rate, access to restrooms, and other problems such as “violence, homelessness, and job loss.” Disability provides another example of how poorly FYC readers address diversity, as studies are often added to FYC as a single reading, or “tacked onto a race, class, gender triad” in an “add and stir” fashion that tends to oversimplify and “unproblematize.”

To find out if “this add-and-stir mentality” is applied to other forms of marginality as well,” McGinnis will examine a corpus of 63 texts from major publishers, focusing on best-sellers with the longest shelf life; one reader has 11 editions, and another has 15 editions. So far she has gotten through 7 texts, for a total of 356 articles, and has mostly focused on five editions (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 6th, and 9th) of *Rereading America*. Her

initial analysis has found “problematic trends in current editions,” such as the scant mentions of disability, religion, immigration, and language, and the reduction of sexuality to stereotypes (e.g., talking only about marriage).

In her next steps she will do deeper coding, looking for stereotypes. Although this research is in the early stages, it has great promise for revealing and even changing patterns of representation in commonly used readers.

There and Back Again: How a Journey into Online Course Design Changed the Way I Teach Writing

Finally, **Cat Mahaffey** returned us to a classroom focus with her talk on applying best practices in online teaching to pedagogy more generally. She organized the talk around seven points about online writing instruction (OWI), explaining how she adapted each to a conventional classroom environment.

First, students need an introduction to activities in an online writing course. Mahaffey adapted her online pre-course survey by removing the questions related to digital technologies and added a post-course reflective survey. She found this “very, very helpful to me as a teacher” as it showed what students had learned and where they still thought they had gaps.

Second, based on what she learned about teacher ethos online she set up a bi-weekly email communication that (a) reinforced her presence in the class, (b) “set the tone” for class communication, (c) helped keep students focused on the course, and (d) reminded them of the due dates. Mahaffey says that although we might think these are unnecessary in a face-to-face class, she found them helpful; as she said, students (especially first-year students) can get “really distracted and overwhelmed and postpone and procrastinate” and these emails were “really helpful in fostering better time management.”

Third, it is important to create community. Mahaffey required students to read and respond to blogs and forum posts by creating group assignments that required online interaction. She also created an “ask the instructor” forum and encouraged students to post questions there instead of emailing. Over the course of the semester, they started to answer each other’s questions, and next year she plans to turn it into a student forum where she can “just lurk and answer only if there’s a gap.”

Fourth, redundancy and repetition are important in online classes, and the predictability they create is just as valuable in face-to-face classes.

Fifth, alignment of course activities with learning objectives is crucial in both contexts, as is teaching for transfer. Mahaffey set up a series of course reflections that made the learning more explicit: students had to “engage with a course learning outcome, for example by saying ‘where they had seen it before, where they are seeing it now, and where they might go with it.’” She reported that when students were putting together end-of-term portfolios, they “had already engaged with learning outcomes and could map them to assignments.”

Sixth, student engagement matters, as “students need to move,” meaning they need to experience some confusion and ignorance “or they will feel they are just repeating what they already know.” To create this experience, Mahaffey used exercises that “destabilized” the students: they had to read a dense theoretical text, interpret it, and explain it to the class. Mahaffey reported that students like this assignment, which stretched their critical thinking skills, and that they were “really proud they could come away understanding something deeply enough to explain it to classmates.”

Seventh, documents need to be designed for online spaces. Mahaffey explained that she started to “design documents in spaces [she wants] students to compose in”; for example, when she wanted students to write blogs, she posted the assignment in a blog of her own. Among other benefits, this pushed her to learn the technology herself.

Mahaffey’s talk was the perfect ending for a panel that began with corpus linguistics and grew increasingly more specific about classroom practices. As I think ahead to fall classes, I am already considering how to apply her insights in my own teaching, while also thinking longer term about how to assess the success of the different strategies I learned in this session.

References

- Alexander, Jonathan. (2008). *Literacy, sexuality, pedagogy: Theory and practice for composition studies*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Anson, Chris M. (2008). The intelligent design of writing programs: Reliance on belief or a future of evidence. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 32(1), 11–36.
- Haswell, Richard H. (2005). NCTE/CCCC’s recent war on scholarship. *Written Communication*, 22(2), 198–223. doi:[10.1177/0741088305275367](https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088305275367)

A.31: Teaching Writing to Support #BlackLivesMatter at Predominantly White Institutions

Reviewed by Tessa Brown

Syracuse University

(trbrown@syr.edu)

Chair: Todd Craig, *Medgar Evers College, CUNY*

Speakers: Timothy R. Dougherty, *West Chester University of PA*

Randall Cream, *West Chester University of PA*

Michael Burns, *West Chester University of PA*

I'd call the energy in the room *thirsty*—a crowd of composition instructors had gathered to fill this large section of the ballroom, and they were thirsty: thirsty for solutions, for conversation, for connections. Thirsty, maybe, for a too-easy solution to a challenge that didn't have one: the work of teaching writing at a moment when the practice of college writing increasingly includes circulating petitions, writing letters to recalcitrant administrators, and decorating signs for visible campus actions. The audience wanted to know: How do we teach writing to support Black Lives Matter at a Predominantly White Institution (PWI)?

Our answers, and more questions, came from three professors at West Chester University who during the previous year had collaboratively designed, taught, and researched a set of First-Year Composition (FYC) lessons designed to engage their students in the protests and debates taking place at their campus. Timothy Dougherty opened the panel by explaining the context that drew the panelists to this work. Shaken by the deaths of Black people like Michael Brown and Eric Garner at the hands of police and vigilantes, the panelists, he said, “began to participate in an explosion of student-of-color led activism” on their campus. As student activism increased, however, a backlash emerged in anonymous spaces, like the social media app Yik Yak, and in campus graffiti. The panelists' move toward action was shaped by a feeling that “we need to support students pedagogically to interrupt and intervene, because... all the things our students have been saying about climate erupted like a geyser when normalized white space was interrupted.”

Randall Cream took the mic to describe the lesson study, a collaborative teaching and research methodology developed in Japan, where a team of no fewer than three instructors collaboratively and reflexively design and implement a set of lesson plans. The lesson study “focuses on teaching as observable, buildable, revisable practice” and also demands careful observation of students learning behaviors. The methodology's cycle starts with collaborative lesson design, and then has one instructor teach the lesson while another observes. The cycle then moves through revision, re-teaching, and re-observation, with instructors rotating roles. The distance between the three instructors promotes reflexivity and critical distance. And while this methodology took advantage of the unionized West Chester policy of two peer reviews a semester, Cream admitted that the group underestimated how many meetings would be involved. Nevertheless, as Dougherty pointed out, integrating research with teaching practice made sense for researchers also teaching a 4–4 load.

Finally, Michael Burns spoke to the results of the study, which found students highly resistant to engaging with antiracist activism. The teacher-researchers saw an attitude of “I got this already,” even as 75% of

their students said they were not interested in joining collective actions on campus. Ultimately, the study uncovered “the resilience of this unwillingness to join,” and the staying power of the white habitus that had students paying lip service to antiracism, while racism still ran rampant in anonymous spaces on campus and on the web. Asao Inoue (2015), citing Pierre Bourdieu (1977), described the white habitus as a matrix of tastes, perceptions, feelings, and emotions that, within the context of a university, work in tandem with official valorizations of white language practices through assessment regimes. Burns discussed how the panelists arrived at a critique of the white-centeredness of their experimental lesson design, which focused on creating awareness of white privilege. Lessons included the activity where students throw paper into a trashcan at the front of the room to illustrate privilege and in/access, and reading Gina Crosley-Corcoran’s (2014) popular article “Explaining White Privilege to a Broke White Person.” Students’ continued rejection of campus activism, the panelists suggested, attested to what John McWhorter (2015) has called “the privilege of white privilege education,” and left the panelists reconsidering how their pedagogy re-centered white students instead of moving more emphatically towards creating solidarity and disrupting multiculturalism. The panelists also reflected on how their different identities as White (Dougherty and Burns) and Black (Cream) men impacted how their students read their teaching and the constraints or affordances it gave them in offering up this pedagogy.

After a necessary question about the lack of women on the panel, attention in the Q&A moved to the solidarity work needed from other faculty, especially from administrators, if writing programs are to teach our students to engage in the real rhetorical spaces of campus life. This study was supported at West Chester, Dougherty said, by solidarity from their Writing Program Administrator (WPA), who volunteered FYC for the university’s General Education diversity requirement. One audience member, a woman of color, attested that “every day, it’s like starting over” against student resistance to her antiracist pedagogies, a resistance that becomes personal when students question the validity of her experiences and accuse her of having an agenda. She also testified for the students of color who write about their experiences but are “terrified in class to speak.” Another audience member asked whether administrative solidarity looks like an explicit recognition that student evaluations are statistically lower for instructors of color, especially women.

In their embrace of the lesson study methodology, the panelists were frank about the labor demanded of teacher–researchers and the advocacy they needed from unions, colleagues, and administrators to do this research while teaching full-time. Ultimately, the panel was a call to solidarity from faculty and administrators towards disrupting a campus whiteness that pays lip service to change but reaffirms white supremacy in the anonymous spaces of bathroom graffiti, online forums, and student evaluations. Dougherty, Cream, and Burns were reflexive and forthright in their acknowledgment that their pedagogy acquiesced to whiteness when it centered white students’ feelings instead of building solidarity with the real bodily danger faced by West Chester students of color.

References

- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1977). *Outline of a theory and practice* (Richard Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crosley-Corcoran, Gina. (2014, May 8). Explaining white privilege to a broke white person. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gina-crosleycorcoran/explaining-white-privilege-to-a-broke-white-person_b_5269255.html

- McWhorter, John. (2015, March 15). The privilege of checking white privilege. *The Daily Beast*. Retrieved from <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/03/15/the-privilege-of-checking-white-privilege.html>
- Inoue, Asao B. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies: Teaching and assessing writing for a socially just future*. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/inoue/ecologies.pdf>

A.37: Faculty Developer as Activist: Strategies for Writing Instructors and WPAs

Reviewed by Chen Chen

North Carolina State University

(cchen23@ncsu.edu)

Chair: Irwin Weiser, *Purdue University*

Speakers: Carol Rutz, *Carleton College*, “Activating Assessment through Faculty Development”

Stephen Wilhoit, *University of Dayton*, “Becoming Active in Faculty Development: Causes and Effects”

Stacey Sheriff, *Colby College*, “Think Globally, Act Locally: Using Faculty & Instructional Development to Support International Students”

The session began with Stephen Wilhoit’s presentation that gave a historical overview of faculty development, calling for action from the Writing Program Administrator (WPA) to explore different faculty development opportunities to help faculty have a better, more fulfilling life as well as to bring stronger service to the university.

To provide a definition and historical overview of faculty development, Wilhoit referred to the book *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present* (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2005), which defined the different stages of faculty development in the 20th century as Age of the Scholar (1950s and ’60s), Age of the Teacher (1960s and ’70s), Age of the Developer (1980s), Age of the Learner (1990s), and Age of the Network (2000s). In the 1950s and 1960s, the goal of faculty development focused on supporting faculty scholarship/academic competence. That emphasis expanded to instruction and organizational development in the following decade. In the 1980s, faculty development matured as a profession and began to focus on career-long, holistic development of the faculty. The 1990s brought rapid changes in instructional technologies that needed new pedagogical responses to these changes. At the same time, faculty roles and responsibilities became more complex as well. In the 2000s, the focus of faculty development shifted to an emphasis on collaboration across entities on campus and across institutions.

Wilhoit continued to discuss briefly the different elements of faculty development: organizational development, instructional development, and personal development. With this historical development in mind, and given the variety of services that faculty development can provide, such as creating an effective educational environment for teaching and learning, training instructors and administrators, and increasing job satisfaction, WPAs can seek opportunities to improve faculty development efforts of their institutions.

Wilhoit argued that WPAs should expand the conception of what faculty development was and could be: become familiar with current research and theory in faculty development and key organizations like Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD); build on their own strengths and expertise on pedagogy, assessment, program design, TA training, and rhetoric; and establish strategic partnerships with other administrators and entities on campus, such as chairs, deans, program directors, colleagues, teaching centers

Finally, in response to this year’s CCCC theme, Wilhoit offered us ideas of strategies for change for WPAs

to improve their faculty development efforts:

- Improve faculty development in home department or program
- Improve existing programs outside home department or program (such as Writing Across the Curriculum [WAC], Writing in Development [WID], and Writing Centers)
- Support curriculum reform or get involved in student services
- Help with program assessment, student learning assessment, student evaluation of teaching
- Join the work of your learning-teaching center
- Create support where it's needed—big or small—by working with others

Following up nicely to Wilhoit's call for WPAs to build partnerships with other entities and personnel on campus for faculty development efforts, Stacey Sheriff presented a local case of her institution, Colby College. As a WPA, she used faculty development to support international students, an effort that reflects what Wilhoit characterized as a measure to respond to emerging needs.

Faced with an increased international student population—from 6% to 14% in one year—Sheriff saw problematic areas in her program where faculty were not familiar with how to deal with issues that came with teaching international students. For example, some faculty would refer to international students as “those students” in a judging way, and some people hadn't even heard of the statement on “Students' Right to Their Own Language” (1974).

In order to address these issues, Sheriff argued that we should reach out to campus partners for faculty development efforts. At Colby College, the administration building is across the street from the building where English department is housed, but very little contact is made between the two entities. Sheriff planned to bridge that distance by bringing the stakeholders together and inviting people, such as the admissions staff, to faculty development workshops because these professional staff members could bring a different perspective on students' backgrounds, co-curricular experiences, and college priorities.

Sheriff went on to list several possible opportunities for advocacy and teaching in faculty development events that would bring the pedagogical implications on teaching international students into the conversations. For example, in teaching workshops on “inclusive pedagogy,” we should make language diversity part of this conversation, share the “Students' Right to Their Own Language” statement, and analyze writing assignments to brainstorm ways to accommodate international students' experience and cultural knowledge. In new faculty orientation, we should share student demographics with new faculty, include many kinds of student diversity, and workshop and revise course descriptions and learning goals with international students in mind.

As we all understand, working with other campus partners can be challenging, and even trying to change the pedagogical habits of our own writing instructors may be difficult as well. Sheriff suggested that we should find data to support our arguments on the importance of supporting international students. She provided resources for attendees where they could find these data:

- The **Department of Education** tracks the number of English learners, the top five languages spoken in the US other than English, and limited English proficient students by state.
- The **Institute of International Education** (IIE) provides a searchable database of Intensive English Programs, which can serve as a guide to help WPAs find local L2 or English as a Second Language (ESL) specialists; the IIE also provides data on enrollment, student perceptions, and

trends in international higher education.

Finally, Sheriff suggested that we should invite academic advisors to join an advising follow-up session to capitalize on faculty concerns and questions about students' listening, discussion, or writing "proficiencies." She also argued that instructors should learn about the details of standardized test scores on campus.

The last speaker on the panel, Carol Rutz, also talked about the importance of using data to support faculty development by effectively building on assessment of student learning in a WAC context. More specifically, she used the example of a particular curricular initiative of quantitative reasoning to show how instructors could develop strong assignments within the established WAC framework at the institution.

Based on the established WAC assessment framework, an assessment plan for better teaching students the responsible use of quantitative data in arguments was provided. The teaching goals of quantitative reasoning are listed on the handout Rutz offered for the session attendees:

- Institute a quantitative habit of mind for students.
- Help students implement quantitative methods correctly.
- Help students interpret and evaluate quantitative information thoughtfully.
- Help students communicate effectively with quantitative data.
- Give student ill-structured problems and assignments that involve real-world problems.
- Help students visually represent numbers to support their arguments.

Building from these objectives, Rutz provided a sample comparison rubric to evaluate assignment sheets (adapted from Haswell, 1988) that included the following components:

- Provides opportunity to develop earlier assignments into a final product
- Provides opportunity for feedback and revision
- Gives guidelines for grading that are clearly articulated (and for acceptable writing)
- Articulates learning goals of the assignment clearly
- Elicits higher order thinking and writing
- Prompts for effective use of data/evidence or quantitative reasoning
- Prompts for effective use of visuals
- Prompts for students to differentiate correlation from causation

Rutz's presentation neatly brought the two previous presentations together by rearticulating the importance of faculty development and its influence on students learning and program development. It also opened up some points for discussions such as how to collect data on students' progress over the years on the same assignment.

From there, the presenters let the session attendees chat with each other before reconvening for a final discussion on how we, as composition instructors and WPAs, could bring needed changes at our institutions by engaging in faculty development. Several questions emerged from audience discussions: Should we literally bring students into faculty development? How do we make faculty come to faculty development activities?

Indeed, the presenters offered strong theoretical arguments on faculty development and two local cases where WPAs and instructors could take action to initiate changes. However, to carry out these actions, we will have to deal with many of our own local challenges, but the advice given by the presenters did illuminate how we could develop tactics to address these challenges.

References

- Haswell, Richard H. (1988). Contrasting ways to appraise improvement in a writing course: Paired comparison and holistic. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, St. Louis, Missouri. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED294215.pdf>
- Sorcinelli, Mary Deane; Austin, Anne E.; Eddy, Pamela L.; & Beach, Andrea L. (2005). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Students' rights to their own language. (1974). *College Composition and Communication*, 25(3), 1–18.

B.11: Time to Take Stock: What We Can (and Can't) Learn from Current CHAT Methodology in Writing Studies Research

Reviewed by Matthew C. Zajic

University of California, Davis

(mczajic@ucdavis.edu)

Chair: Dylan Dryer, *University of Maine*

Speakers: Clay Spinuzzi, *University of Texas at Austin*

Russel Durst, *University of Cincinnati*

Mya Poe, *Northeastern University*

David Russell, *Iowa State University*

Carolyn R. Miller, *North Carolina State University*

Christiane K. Donahue, *Dartmouth College and Charles de Gaulle University–Lille III*

David Charney, *University of Texas at Austin*

If you are ready to talk about methods, research design, and theory, then let's chat about CHAT. Cultural-historical activity theory (or CHAT) is a theoretical framework developed out of Russian psychology (specifically Lev Vygotsky and Aleksei Leontiev) that helps researchers understand and analyze the relationship between people's thoughts and actions. I don't want to jump too quickly into CHAT just yet.

The organization of this panel was different from most and brought together a diverse combination of speakers. I'll let Clay Spinuzzi introduce CHAT, as his role was that of a speaker while the rest were all discussants to his opening remarks. Following Spinuzzi's introduction, I'll overview each speaker only briefly, as each only had a few minutes to talk.

Spinuzzi began by stating that CHAT helped solve a methodology problem that we faced as a field. Going back to the 1970s and 1980s, Spinuzzi posited that rhetoric and writing studies didn't have a paradigm, a set of methodologies, a set of methods, or a set of research techniques; in fact, composition studies was considered to not even be a valid area of scholarship and study. From here, composition studies continued to evolve and incorporate research methods and designs, though these methods tended to be paradigm agnostic and "sat next to each other like shy teens at a dance." Spinuzzi stated that we needed, as a field, to understand how people use both social and cognitive approaches, leading to the appropriation of CHAT within composition studies.

CHAT provided both social and cognitive components and allowed for a unifying paradigm previously lacking in writing studies methodology. Spinuzzi offered the cliffs notes version of the evolution of CHAT over the years:

- First Generation: concerned mediation, internalization, and proximal development;
- Second Generation: concerned activity system and structures of activities;
- Third Generation: pushed beyond systems to activity networks to include contradictions and rules.

In embracing the third generation of CHAT, Spinuzzi argued for solving past methodological problems, but new methodological problems have arisen:

- Problem 1: The social has overpowered the cognitive, and we need to rebalance our understandings.
- Problem 2: The theory of CHAT needs to be in dialogue with other theories.
- Problem 3: The phenomenon that reality has a single objective is problematic.

To address these problems, Spinuzzi called for a pivot to a possible fourth generation of CHAT (as it is “no longer whether we should stick with CHAT, but how to understand the ongoing discussion”). He then opened up the floor to the theoretical, methodological, and assessment lions.

First up was Russell Durst, who began by titling his response, “Who was Clay Spinuzzi?” Durst believed that CHAT needs retrofitting as the portions of it are small, researchers using CHAT aren’t publishing in main composition venues, and our graduate students are not being trained in CHAT. Much of the research involving CHAT comes from at least a decade or more ago and often from the technical and professional writing fields. Composition and rhetoric researchers may not even know where to access such research. In addition, graduate students are still often trained from a humanities mindset rather than empirical research, meaning that it “doesn’t help when people haven’t had the preparation.” (As a graduate student in education with interests in composition and writing studies and who has been trained in CHAT theory, I want to echo this point. If you were to ask many graduate students in composition studies just exactly what CHAT is, you might be prepared for some blank looks.) Durst then ended with two main takeaways: 1) if we want more CHAT-based research, then we need to learn how to apply it, and 2) we need less discussion and more application.

Then Mya Poe spoke on the assessment side of CHAT. Poe began with a focus on psychometrics as coming from a western cognitive tradition of assessment, focusing on the underlying constructs that can be measured and the building war between measurement and composition studies in how to select and use these tools. Writing assessment often deals with theory battles and often practice has been put into opposition of cognitive science. The main question Poe saw for CHAT within the context of writing assessment is as follows: “How do we do things with writing that can be measured in a way to acknowledge the social, individual, and structural?” Or, as she followed, “we are talking about construct representation.” Her view towards CHAT is the management of contradictions and the structural concerns that need to be addressed. To explore this, Poe emphasized Vygotsky’s history, his Jewish identity, racism that occurred, and that he wrote about the development of early generations of CHAT. To understand CHAT within assessment is to fully embrace the societal and contextual factors surrounding the implications for measurement held within CHAT that Vygotsky did not consider then.

David Russell approached the stage next, beginning with “I almost always agree with Clay, but today I am going to disagree,” specifically citing the notion that “I believe we’ve always pivoted from CHAT.” In this, Russell meant that we’ve not taken genre as a different approach to CHAT but, instead, as an integral approach to CHAT. Genre itself is a unit of analysis that can be used for varying levels of analyses, including both social and cognitive aspects. Russell cited that genre as a unit of analysis comes from important European traditions and phenomenology, allowing people to do certain types of research in reaction against genre and education as disciplinary constraints rather than affordances. Russell argued that now is a great opportunity for understanding the embodiment of genres and embodied cognition. We, as researchers, need to understand how we perceive and recognize genres as well as how we engage with them physically. Russell ended on a note suggesting that we still have much to learn as a field: “CHAT has a lot to

offer, but we need to recognize that *our* CHAT has not been *that* CHAT” (emphasis added).

Carolyn Miller then took the stage to explain why CHAT has made her feel uneasy and impatient. Her uneasiness has stemmed from the treatment of genre as an object rather than an action, on the preoccupation with objects rather than on rhetorical acts. She explored the connections across a number of triangles, including the rhetorical triangle, Vygotsky’s triangle, and C.S. Peirce’s semiotic triangle, ending on the note that the intersections between triangles could benefit from further exploration. She concluded with a focus on Mikhail Bakhtin over Vygotsky, calling for a need to reeducate Bakhtin rather than simply reform Vygotsky.

Down to the final two, Christiane Donahue took the stage for assessment 2.0. However, different from Poe, Donahue offered remarks as a naïve outsider to the guiding question of “what is writing and how can we measure writing to understand writing and the individual?” She spoke on her experiences of training faculty readers to describe what they saw in student essays rather than evaluating them (which she commented was tough for them) and noted that evaluation was not possible without context. She called for the need of a methodology to help account for the multiple layers of interpersonal factors involved in thinking about and looking at assessment, and she offered that CHAT might help us to develop such a methodology. She grounded her discussions in text analysis and the need to move beyond text analysis, with the goal of (again) pivoting CHAT to consider this. Her final comments then focused back around to the need for faculty to understand student work for what it does rather than what it fails to do.

David Charney took the stage as the final respondent and outed herself as the “cognitivist in the room, the experimentalist, and the empiricist.” She argued that the main critique against the cognitive approach has been that it’s been incapable of taking the social into account, fighting back that it’s not easy to capture the natural environment. During the ongoing methodological evolution, the drama within composition focused on labeling specific methodologies as “immoral, unethical, and inhumane,” barring them from mainstream journals; to Charney, this is why she feels that CHAT fails to exist in major journals. Charney points to numerophobia as a phenomenon in keeping certain methodologies out of these journals, and she felt that the CHAT we do now did not get shifted over. Instead, CHAT has flourished in professional and technical communication, spaces where a greater array of methodologies have been embraced. She also pointed to methods from educational psychology and the European Union that often get overlooked by composition researchers. She argued that due to a fragmented discipline, it is difficult to really know where we are or how to assess the actual limitations of CHAT. To end, she highlighted the need to look to the research questions first and then look to the methodologies, rather than assuming a methodology as the answer to all research questions.

Did you follow all that? Great, because the session only became more fun during the Q&A when Charles (Chuck) Bazerman was given the chance to act as an honorary respondent (my label). To summarize, Bazerman voiced concerns with the manners in which Spinuzzi had originally positioned them, neglecting Alexander Luria, the founder of modern day neuroscience, as a key player in the school of Russian psychology. Luria was focused more on the material connections and contributed to these different CHAT generations. Bazerman highlighted the issues that are presented when trying to reason and situate individuals within the context of a socially organized set of experiences. He ended with “no question.”

How do I even begin to summarize this session? The rich discussion on methodology, theory, and

assessment proved to be one of the most engaging sessions for me at this year's Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). The raw discussion of theory allowed for a discussion of composition studies often not focused on when discussing pedagogy or classroom applications. This session asked the audience members to step back and to consider a larger issue of the field as a whole: what are our methods? Even more so, I feel the discussion amongst all responders resonated an event stronger question: what (or where) is our field?

This chat on CHAT demonstrated to me the fragmented nature of our already small area of study, highlighting the need to consider the various components that contribute to writing and composition studies. I should not walk away from a session at one of the largest writing-focused conferences thinking, "wow, that was an amazing methodology discussion...and probably the only one I'll see this whole conference." We need to chat about theory and methodology as much as we do about classroom pedagogy, but in order to do so, we need to train our graduate students for entering these conversations. Neglecting to invite graduate students into issues of writing theory does a disservice to the field as a whole and limits these conversations for years to come. How should graduate students in the field of composition studies be prepared regarding research design, applicable methodologies, and theoretical frameworks? To consider the future of the methodology for our field is to consider how we prepare future scholars for research about writing as much as pedagogy about writing.

B.24: Medical Rhetoric and Scientific Communication

Reviewed by **Carie S. Tucker King**

The University of Texas at Dallas
(*cxl085200@utdallas.edu*)

Chair: John Misak, *Queensborough Community College*

Speakers: Ryan Eichberger, *University of Minnesota*, “Negotiating Crisis in the Magic Land: Blogging, Science Communication, and the Disneyland Measles Outbreak”

Russell Kirkscey, *Texas Tech University*, “A Rhetorical Framework for the Analysis of Patient Decision Aids”

Kyle Vealey, *Purdue University*, “Storytelling Failure in the Vale of Leven: How a Bacterial Outbreak at a Rural Hospital Became a Wicked Problem”

The room was small and crowded, with more people coming in as the presenters began. I was fortunate to get a seat near the front. I was excited about this presentation because of the titles and the diversity of the panel.

Ryan Eichberger began by sharing an overview of the anti-vaccination movement and referencing the measles-and-autism hoax. He then introduced the 2015 measles outbreak that began at Disneyland and his research questions:

- How did science communicators use the technological and social affordances of the blogging medium to communicate a pro-science message?
- What narrative(s) of science did these bloggers construct, including audiences, characters, and exigencies?
- What limitations did the blogging medium present, and what does this mean for the blog in 2016?

He sought to investigate what blog posts online by pro-vaccination writers were saying about vaccine refusal. He conducted a content analysis of 50 blogs (individual, aggregate, news, and organization blogs) that addressed the Disney outbreak and the issues related to vaccinations.

Through his research, Eichberger identified four types of blogs:

- Independent blogs written by well-informed or expert writers who wrote voluntarily, most focusing on their perspectives of what he called the “logical fallacies in non-vaccination arguments as well as to rebut the non-vaccination arguments of key public figures”;
- Aggregate blogs whose authors, qualified paid writers, received more responses or comments than other types of blogs and used at least two times as many tags as well as internal links (to their own posts) but tended to take a critical or sarcastic tone toward the non-vaccination arguments;
- Organizational blogs whose authors, official writers usually for health organizations, used few tags, received few comments, and varied per pro- and anti-vaccination platforms; and
- Mainstream blogs whose authors, also qualified paid writers, used tags and received comments or responses with more references to news and other sources and also included less biased perspectives.

Eichberger found that the blogs did not link as much to external sources (and thus did not interact in the conversation about immunization) but rather existed to tell stories.

In conclusion, Eichberger found that this was a failed conversation with no discussion. He recognized that the blogs created gaps in the conversation, maintained dehumanizing and angry tones, established hybridity (blogs did not fit into specific categories), included comments that made audiences into characters, and constrained the affordances of blogs and community.

Russell Kirkscey presented about patient decision aids—technical communication documents that biomedical practitioners have created—that help patients to understand the options and make informed decisions about their care including decisions about asking for testing.

Kirkscey defined patient decision aids (PDAs) as technical communication documents and noted that they may have multi-media components or may be print or online, and may be from healthcare practitioners or in clinical settings. He listed their functions as informational (providing options), persuasive (arguing for and against options), and evaluative (testing knowledge) with numeric values that may be subjective.

He noted that they can have multiple agendas and purposes. (He investigated this in his dissertation, which can be accessed through the Texas Tech Library’s collection of dissertations.) He shared the International Patient Decision Aid Standards Collaboration “Checklist for Users” to provide an example of current assessment of PDAs.

Kirkscey sampled non-commercial decision aids (what he terms “gateway documents”). The aids’ designers were hospital teachers and representatives, patient advocates, and employees of biomedical organizations and government health departments. He quickly shared the framework he used to rhetorically analyze these aids and then shared samples, such as the Kaiser Prenatal Testing Decision Tree (a print process chart for decision making), the Healthwise Alzheimer’s (interactive) Quiz, and the Kaiser Prenatal Testing “Understanding Your Options” web page.

Kirkscey posed questions about balance, bioethics, and design. Specifically, his research questions were

- How do biomedical professionals rhetorically construct patient decision aids?
- Do biomedical practitioners create decision aids that adhere to bioethical standards?
- Do decision aids achieve balanced argumentation for and against treatment?

Kyle Vealey presented a review of *Clostridium difficile* associated disease at Vale of Leven Hospital in Scotland. The outbreak occurred December 2007 to June 2008. Vealey addressed public inquiries and their importance. Citizens of the United Kingdom (UK) can submit petitions for public inquiries by submitting an e-form; those petitions with enough attention will be addressed by the government. He addressed the petition for a public inquiry so individuals in the UK whose family members were and are affected will be better prepared. He defined these as “wicked problems” and provided an excerpt from an official report of Scotland Parliament’s Public Petitions Committee:

The scale of the outbreak at the Vale of Leven Hospital was unprecedented... I am equally clear about the fact that the issue is not restricted to the Vale of Leven—it affects people, hospitals, and care homes throughout Scotland. The incidence of C diff is rising: year on year, the trend has been upwards. New strains are being diagnosed as we speak. At this point, no one is quite sure about the toxicity of the new 078 strain that has been discovered... A public inquiry would enable us to learn lessons not in a piecemeal way but

in a comprehensive way. (Public Petitions Committee, 2009)

Vealey concluded his presentation by suggesting that we can learn how to approach similar technical and public health issues by applying our analysis of the outbreak in the Vale of Leven. He also suggests that we need to continue to analyze situations like this and deliberate the best ways to manage such issues.

This panel provided some interesting, relevant, and diverse issues in medical rhetoric that encouraged me to consider asking more questions about past situations to better prepare for future issue in public health and medical communication. Judging by the size of the crowd at the panel, I was not the only one who anticipated that this was a valuable group of presentations, and the audience was not disappointed.

References

- Babrow, Austin S. (1992). Communication and problematic integration: Understanding and diverging probability and value, ambiguity, ambivalence, and impossibility. *Communication Theory*, 2(2), 95–130. doi:[10.1111/j.1468-2885.1992.tb00031.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1992.tb00031.x)
- Scotland. Parliament. Public Petitions Committee. (2009, January 27). Public Petitions Committee. 3rd Session. Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=3130&mode=pdf>

B37: Enacting Career Diversity in Rhetoric and Composition: Different Pathways for a Professional Life with a PhD in Rhetoric and Composition

Reviewed by Sarah E. Polo

University of Kansas
(sarahpolo@ku.edu)

Chair: Gail Pizzola, *University of Texas at San Antonio*

Speakers: Joanna Schmidt, *Texas Christian University*, Fort Worth, “Working Definitions: Alt-Ac, Identities, and Opportunities”

Anita Furtner Archer, *Raytheon*, “An Unexpected Outcome: Building a Career Path with Diverse Experiences”

Ruijie Zhao, *Parkland College*, “An Unexpected Step into an Expected Career: Looking Back at my PhD Education from the Vantage Point of a Community College Career”

Respondent: Amy Kimme Hea, *University of Arizona, Tucson*, “New Roles, New Responsibilities: Understanding the Roles & Complexities of PhD Programs in Career Diversity”

As a current PhD student in rhetoric and composition, I felt resistant to attending—yet also strongly drawn toward—the panel on “Enacting Career Diversity in Rhetoric and Composition: Different Pathways for a Professional Life with a PhD in Rhetoric and Composition.” Though still in the beginning stages of my own program, I am highly conscious of the uncertain position I will likely be in upon degree completion. Faced with a dwindling number of new tenure-track positions and an ever-growing adjunctification trend, I, and others in my same position, may remain on the job market for years, or may resort to accepting positions as part-time and contingent faculty members.

Of course, these concerns are not new ones, nor are they likely to be solved soon. Of the seven resolutions passed by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Annual Business Meeting at this year’s convention, five resolutions passed related to issues of labor. It is little wonder that many new, future, and even long-time PhDs have moved and continue to move outside of academia. It was this very issue that this panel on “Enacting Career Diversity in Rhetoric and Composition” addressed as part of the Consortium of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition. Certainly, this panel was a timely one.

Based purely on observations of age, it appeared that most of the approximate 25 attendees to the panel were aged 35 or younger. To attend was to acknowledge the reality of our situations, to attempt to be proactive about listening to and considering alternative paths, and perhaps to even secretly hope that we weren’t seen doing so by any less-supportive mentors and faculty at the conference.

Presenter one, Joanna Schmidt of Texas Christian University (TCU), Fort Worth, Texas, began the panel by establishing the general concept of alternate academic, or *alt-ac*, in her presentation, “Working Definitions: Alt-Ac, Identities, and Opportunities.” In addition to *alt-ac*, Schmidt presented the terms *post-ac* and *para-ac*, helpfully distinguishing between the related, yet distinct concepts. Using her experience as a simultaneous

full-time alt-ac staff member, graduate student, and graduate teaching assistant at TCU, Schmidt next presented a list of issues for current graduate students considering a career outside of academia to think about. This included redefining what it means to achieve “career success,” taking advantage of professional development opportunities (such as online teaching certificates or training in team-based learning), and searching for jobs that highlight individual expertise (also thinking rhetorically about how to present your experience in a way that fits alt-ac positions). Schmidt ended her presentation by speaking more directly to English departments, offering ways departments can support graduate students considering alt-ac paths, for instance, asking departments to actually vocalize their support or highlight alumni who have taken alt-ac jobs.

Presenter two was Anita Furtner Archer of Raytheon who spoke on “An Unexpected Outcome: Building a Career Path with Diverse Experiences.” Archer’s presentation, like all of the panelists, was based primarily on her experiences. She recounted her journey through high school, an undergraduate program, a master’s degree, PhD, and finally, a Fortune 500 company, Raytheon, first as a technical writer, and now as a security education manager. Archer summarized her journey as one beginning with “dreams of a tenure track position” in academia, but which was influenced by changes in her personal and professional life, as well as physical setbacks, all of which ultimately lead to an unexpected, yet successful career outside of academia. Archer ended by offering encouragement to individuals in similar positions, pointing out that she has been able to make connections to her love of teaching and language in her current career, despite its distance from her original plan.

Presenter three, Ruijie Zhao of Parkland College, spoke on “An Unexpected Step into an Expected Career: Looking Back at my PhD Education from the Vantage Point of a Community College Career.” Following the pattern of previous presenters, Zhao’s talk was heavily based in her personal experiences, though her own path did not lead outside of academia, but rather to work in a community college, Parkland College. She began with a definition of the term *community college* from the American Association of Community Colleges, focusing on distinctions between two-year and traditional four-year colleges. Zhao emphasized her own initial unfamiliarity with community colleges and the ways that accepting a position teaching at Parkland challenged her previous teaching experiences and her prior emphasis on feminist pedagogy. The bulk of Zhao’s presentation was spent answering the question of what a community college values, for example, teaching emphasis, service, and community engagement. To conclude, Zhao emphasized the “opportunities and rewards” of community college teaching.

Following the three panelists, a response was given by Amy Kimme Hea of the University of Arizona, Tucson. Kimme Hea offered several observations and concluding thoughts. First, we need to continue to break or reframe the dominant narrative that says PhD students have to become university professors, a problem Kimme Hea claimed was attributable to the egos of some current professors. Second, it should be okay for students to talk about considering alternative career paths; they shouldn’t have to fear a lack of support from their advisors and mentors. Finally, Kimme Hea called for the field to produce “public rhetors,” graduates of rhetoric and composition programs who can represent the work of composition to the broader public.

The Q&A time following Kimme Hea’s response yielded a variety of concerns felt by audience members, yet also provided an opportunity for the panelists to provide assurance and advice. For instance, one audience

member described the struggle to justify alt-ac positions to faculty members. Another asked about how to find a supportive mentor.

Despite whatever initial trepidation I may have felt at attending a panel on alternative-academic paths (as if a future hiring committee might see me there and interpret my attendance as a lack of seriousness about university teaching), the panel was reassuring and productive. Here were three women who had established successful careers outside of teaching at four-year universities and who were willing to share their experiences, providing a safe space for exploration and conversation. As Kimme Hea's response articulated, these conversations certainly need to be extended, within our departments and beyond.

C.18: The Best of Three Worlds: Integrating Writing, Civic Engagement, and First-Year Experience Programs

Reviewed by Glen Southergill
Montana Tech of the University of Montana
(gsouthergill@mtech.edu)

Chair: Patricia Bizzell, *College of Holy Cross*

Speakers: Morgan Reitmeyer, *Regis University*, “Contemplations in Action: Creating the First-Year Experience before the First Day of Class”

June Johnson Bube, *Seattle University*, “Framing the Themed Academic Writing Course as Civic Engagement”

Allen Brizee, *Loyola University Maryland*, “Civic Writing and #BaltimoreUprising: Health Equality, the Digital Divide, and Assessment in a First-Year Experience Program”

Respondent: Jenn Fishman, *Marquette University*

As any teacher would agree, technological issues are a difficult way to begin presentations. However, as a testament to the audience’s enthusiasm for the scholarship presented in session C.18, not a complaint about delays was heard. In sharp contrast, it is decidedly possible that voices of protest would have spoken had the powers-that-be tried to clear the room at the scheduled time of conclusion. Fortunately, no subsequent session appeared in the conference program to claim occupancy of our space.

Chaired expertly by Patricia Bizzell and contextualized insightfully by respondent Jenn Fishman, speakers Morgan Reitmeyer, June Johnson Bube, and Allen Brizee sought to answer the question, “how do we ensure high-impact outcomes when integrating writing, civic engagement, and FYE programs?”

Reitmeyer began by discussing the Regis Cohort Model. Taught by faculty from across the curriculum in a manifestation of Ignatian Reflection, Regis empowers student writing in its first-year program by way of an experience-reflection-action model. It asks students to undergo an event aligned with faculty interests, interrogate its meaning, and then engage with(in) the publics based on lessons learned. One poignant example surrounded rock climbing, which also provided fodder for students to consider their imprints on (and relationships with) ecologies less impacted by human development. Reitmeyer observed that the model was in some ways challenged by sizable logistical hurdles (rock climbing was now, by Student Life decree, no longer to be offered). Then again, those were not the only challenges (or revolts). Faculty have faced significant demands to maintain engagement for substantial periods of time. The intensive nature of the experience made finding simple reflection time for students difficult. But, for offsetting benefits, Reitmeyer observed that the diversity of experience and triangulation of several student perspectives contribute greatly to the formation of lasting student communities.

Next, June Johnson Bube explored a first-year service-learning experience program that endeavors to forge citizen stakeholders. In the formulation discussed by Bube, such citizen stakeholders can emerge from applying a Jesuit tradition of situating knowledge within a unifying framework—as understood by Loyola University Maryland (n.d.), for example, to include “*cura personalis*—the education of the whole person”

and an emphasis on liberal arts—to first-year experience program design philosophies. Bube noted in a brief contextual comment that such an intersection between Jesuit values and rhetoric can be aligned with investigations of assent by Wayne Booth (1974). Bube further suggested the resulting application of Jesuit tradition and rhetoric often employs commonly accepted practices, such as nudging students to better analyze and apply audience and situational knowledges via scaffolded assignments. Students under this approach were challenged by design to thoroughly investigate questions, take informed and defensible positions, and reach out to varied audiences and stakeholders. Yet, in a humility also reminiscent of the Jesuit tradition, Bube refrained from offering a silver bullet. Instead, she noted, some improvements in additional writing instruction time, assessment tools, and integration of the various elements of the program could be made in future iterations.

Finally, in a shrewd demonstration that the unexpected turn of events that may occur within empirical studies can still yield impressive productivity, Allen Brizee discussed findings emerging from a study scuttled due to “forces far beyond our control.” Brizee’s revised work employed qualitative and quantitative approaches in an Institutional Review Board (IRB) sanctioned analysis (which could be expanded to read “chi-squared crosstabs analysis completed by SPSS” for the statistically inclined readers) of twelve service-learning outcomes: Active Citizenship, Social Responsibility, Jesuit Values, Career Skills, Reflect(ions on) Faith/Spirituality, Consider(ing) Different Points of View, Think(ing) Reflectively, Communication Skills, Problem-Solving, Critical Thinking, Awareness of Cultures Off-Campus, and Think(ing) About Life Goals Differently. The study, Brizee observed, was in very early stages with “much work to do” included a promising “statistically significant” finding in which a population of service learning students demonstrated some higher rates of holistic (Jesuit) formation despite a context in which the FYE program to service-learning courses made “no statistically significant difference in the twelve learning outcomes from students who participated.

Consistently with Jenn Fishman’s invitations to continue to question and interrogate the exigencies and implications inherent to the panel, the conversation remains accessible to additional voices. The presentations demonstrated that high-impact paradigms include a strong sense of reciprocity otherwise easily overlooked. After all, interventions within the communities that bisect or extend the represented institutions can, in theoretically agreeable ways, co-transform authors, programs, and publics alike. In practice, as these scholars note, much work remains. And contrary to often-seen conflicts between epistemological slants, a variety of cultural, rhetorical, and empirical frames can co-exist in this important work facing the field. Especially with the addition of increasingly diverse voices, the best of worlds can grow to include fourth, fifth, sixth, and more points of view.

Technological delays did not deter the audience. Listeners in the room stayed. We should as a field remain.

References

- Booth, Wayne C. (1974). *Modern dogma and the rhetoric of assent*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Loyola University Maryland. (n.d.). History and mission. Retrieved December 12, 2016 from <http://www.loyola.edu/about/history-mission>

D.03: Antiracist Classroom Practices: Enacting Socially Just Agendas

Reviewed by Eric James Stephens

Clemson University
(esteph5@clemson.edu)

Chair: John Duffy, *University of Notre Dame*

Speakers: Asao Inoue, *University of Washington–Tacoma*, “Writing Assessment as an Antiracist Practice”

Staci Perryman-Clark, *Western Michigan University*, “Racial Profiling and a WPA’s Strategy for Institutional Change: A Call for Action”

Victor Villanueva, *Washington State University*, “Not All That New: Visual Rhetorics and the Latina or Latino Student”

This conference was my second time attending Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), with my first experience in 2014 in Indianapolis. During my first visit, I was making the transition from literature to rhetoric and writing, which meant I knew few people, either literally or intellectually, from the field. Since then, as I completed my coursework for my master’s degree and entered into my first year as a doctoral student, I became much more familiar with the writers and thinkers in my now home field of study. With Victor Villanueva’s (1993) *Bootstraps: From an American Academic of Color* as somewhat of a defining book for my thinking, I made a point to attend his panel to hear him speak. He, and the rest of the panel, did not disappoint.

With standing room only, Asao Inoue began the session with experiences in his writing classrooms. It didn’t take long for Inoue to problematize writing assessment as a racist practice, even at one point claiming that the traditional A, B, C, D, F grading system is, itself, racist. (While he did not go into grading system specifically, he did plug his 2015 book for those interested, *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies*.) Listening to Inoue share stories about students of different races come to a new awareness of diversity encouraged my own self-reflection about how I participate in my own classroom as an instructor.

The common thread with each story Inoue told provided a working example of what other writing instructors can and should do in their own classrooms. With his students, Inoue would examine what it meant to have “good writing” and the implications of racism within each criterion (e.g., assignment descriptions from his presentation). It’s easy to look at the whole and claim institutional racism. Implicit racism is a double-edged sword of sorts—it can be easily identifiable to those who see it, but to those who don’t, it is simply chalked up to people “unhappy with the world” or people “looking for things to complain about.” Rather than focusing on implicit racism, Inoue’s students studied traditional writing assessment guides for explicit racism in the institution and classroom.

By examining the words and the rubrics themselves, students and instructors can begin to see the dominant white male discourse overlaying the cultural, social, and linguistic sources of judging a piece of writing. What makes this practice antiracist exactly? How can instructors teach their students to interrogate

dominant discourses? From the beginning of a course, we need to talk to our students about problematizing writing assessment so that we can eventually create an antiracist writing assessment practice with them. This may be hard for some, myself included, being able to open a dialogue about the roots and implications of writing assessment, but it's worth it, isn't it? Using antiracist writing assessment does more than improve writing; it improves the individual.

Where Inoue's presentation made me want to be a better writing instructor, Staci Perryman-Clark's presentation made me want to be a better person. With matching conviction and passion, Perryman-Clark shared her experiences as a new writing program administrator of color who oversees primarily white first-year writing teaching assistants and part-time instructors. As part of a new pilot program at Western Michigan University to promote retention, students on track to receive a C or lower have the option to enroll in a different writing-intensive first-year writing course. One of the initial requirements was a recommendation from the student's instructor to drop the initial course in order to enroll in the pilot program. Issues of racial profiling ensued.

Once the referred students began working with full-time faculty, it became apparent that they were chosen for reasons other than issues with language. Most of the students were minorities or English language learners who were not necessarily struggling with the writing course. Perryman-Clark argued that the first-year writing teaching assistants and part-time instructors used the pilot program to “dump” the students who they deemed unworthy of their time or second chances. In a world and environment where white students receive second chances over and over and over again, Perryman-Clark saw another frustrating example of students of color being denied those second chances due to racial prejudice.

While the majority of first-year writing teaching assistants and part-time instructors were white females and the majority of referred students were students of color, it does not necessarily mean that the racial profiling was intentional. This does not, however, make it any less disturbing. While the pilot study is only in its first year, with another year of funding approved, I believe this is an excellent opportunity for Perryman-Clark and her institution to not only produce antiracist and linguistic diversity in writing program administrator (WPA) policy statements, but also further study of racial profiling in academia. How this study is to be framed is in the more than capable hands of Perryman-Clark. One thing is absolutely certain: her presentation made me rethink how I see my own students of color. I saw where I was doing well. I saw where I was guilty. I saw where I needed to improve in order to become an antiracist writing instructor and person.

Although Victor Villanueva's presentation did not directly call attention to antiracist classroom practices, as the title of the panel would suggest, his analysis of colonizing rhetorics showed me just how Eurocentric and colonized I am as a person. With historical and contextual examples of flawed Eurocentric theories and stories, Villanueva brought the multiplicities of histories of rhetorics to the surface. He showed examples of visual and verbal rhetorics from Mesoamerica, Central, and South America that, upon close examination, debunked anthropological theories—past and current. The purpose of his presentation was to show how “ancient rhetorics of the Western Hemisphere might offer Latina and Latino students a way into the discourse of the academy and conversely affect the ways we discuss visual rhetorics in the classroom.”

I may not have been the intended primary audience for the presentation, but I left questioning my own history. Two explicit examples from his presentation show what I mean. First, he shared a simple slide that read, “Until the lions have their own historians, tales of the hunt will always glorify the hunter.” More than

one history of rhetoric exists. One is not necessarily more important than the other, but what is important is that we are aware of those histories, those rhetorics. The other example seemed to break out of his scripted storytelling, but he questioned why we in the United States call Europe “The West” when it is east of us, and why we call China, Japan, and India “The Far East” when it is west of us. Our culture is so embedded in one history and one rhetoric that we can’t even label things in a way that makes geographic sense.

After listening to each of the three speakers, I left with two impressions/recommendations for myself and other new/experienced presenters. First, don’t just read a paper; instead, perform it. We tell our students all the time: show, don’t tell. When it comes time to present our own research, we seem to forget that. Second, care about what you do. Aside from the topic at hand, Inoue, Perryman-Clark, and Villanueva all share a common attribute: they love what they do. I attended the panel because I wanted to hear Villanueva speak, and next year both Inoue and Perryman-Clark are on my list of must-see panelists.

References

Inoue, Asao B. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies: Teaching and assessing writing for a socially just future*.

Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.

Villanueva, Victor, Jr. (1993). *Bootstraps: From an American academic of color*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

D.16: Bridging Cultures, Languages, and Lands: An Illustration of Latina/o and Chicanx Rhetorical Practices

Reviewed by Isabel Baca

University of Texas at El Paso

(ibaca@utep.edu)

Chair: Laura Anne Carroll-Adler, *University of Southern California*

Speakers: Victor Del Hierro, *Michigan State University*, “Familia-From-Scratch: Disrupting Settler-Colonialism through Indigenous Chicanx Histories of Migration”

Alexandra Hidalgo, *Michigan State University*, “A Video Exploration of the Hybrid Cultural Identities of Bilingual Latina/o Children”

Laura Gonzales, *Michigan State University*, “Insights into Multilingual Digital Work Coordination: It’s Not about Writing in English or Writing in Spanish, It’s about Being All the Time in Both Worlds”

When I perused the 2016 Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) program I knew I had to attend this panel. Its title resonated with me: as a Latina educator, I know the importance of bridging cultures, languages, and lands. The U.S. demographics are changing, and as such, so are the linguistic and cultural needs of the nation and its students. This panel not only met but exceeded my expectations; all three speakers showed us, the audience, how important it is to recognize, value, and bridge the diverse languages and cultures in this nation.

Victor Del Hierro, after thanking those who helped him with the work he was presenting, clearly identified the focus of his presentation: we must develop more ways to help students be in the university and help to make their experience meaningful. He argued that service learning helps us accomplish this. With the help of a PowerPoint presentation, Del Hierro shared his ideas on how the university enacts settler colonialism (a form of colonial formation where foreign people move into a region and an imperial power oversees the immigration of these settlers who consent, often only temporarily, to government by that authority). He shared his family’s migration story and developed his main argument. On the screen, we could read Del Hierro’s words:

We are increasingly finding that our support of students of color is a lot more complicated than previously anticipated. Beyond getting them **here** (to the university), we have to create experiences for them that not only develop them academically but offer them ways to make meaningful relations with their community (back home and at the location of the university).

Del Hierro ended with a call for action: We must disrupt university settler colonial relationships with the lands they occupy and push for service learning work that redistributes resources. Service learning as a means to help students of color make their college experience meaningful was emphasized throughout his entire presentation.

Alexandra Hidalgo's video essay inspired me. She narrated her personal linguistic and cultural journey and how it affected the way she is raising her two sons. Her story of losing her childhood English resonates with many multilingual children and adolescents' experience. Through this video essay, Hidalgo showed how language is power. This led to a discussion on how the benefits of being multilingual are staggering; these include both mental and social benefits. Though the benefits of being bilingual are many, raising children to be bilingual is challenging. As Hidalgo noted, "We must make a conscious effort to have our children speak both languages [English and Spanish]." The influence family, peers, and school have on promoting languages is powerful. As such, Hidalgo recommended that a way to keep and learn a language is to engage with students who speak the same language. The language of our children's peers is very influential.

Laura Gonzales began by acknowledging those who have been fighting for language diversity, including Aja Martinez, Geneva Smitherman, and Victor Villanueva. She immediately stated the purpose of her presentation by quoting Guerra (2012): "We must move beyond 'policy issues' in theorizing language diversity to further language as a 'matter of practice.'" Gonzales went on to argue that the translation work of multilinguals must be acknowledged as being rhetorical, cultural, technical, and intellectual.

She posed her research questions: What rhetorical practices do multilingual communicators use to translate information? What tools and strategies (technological, digital, etc.) do multilingual communicators use to translate? She examined these questions based on her work at Knightly News at the University of Central Florida (UCF Knightly Latino). She described her study and the data she collected. She described her coding scheme and showed a brief video of Knightly Latino. Through her description of what she calls "translation moments" (instances in time when multilinguals make a decision to transform information from one language to another) and the different processes involved in translation, Gonzales concluded that translation is not about writing in English or Spanish. She quoted Natalie, a student, in saying: "It's about living all the time in both worlds and knowing where to go in the moment."

Gonzales described translation processes and explained how multilinguals know how to draw on their linguistic resources. She went on to explain how translators work:

- Translators become aware of their roles as communicators moving across audiences.
- Translators use translation tools as sites for creativity and invention, not as sites for answers.
- Translators combine cultural, rhetorical, and technical skills to contextualize information across languages.

Gonzales called for a revised rhetoric of translation. She believes that translation is a culturally situated process, a cyclical process, and a creative act. And though she noted that translators may begin by using tools such as Google Translate when translating, they must then draw on their cultural knowledge for an accurate translation.

As I listened to all three speakers, I reflected on my own linguistic and cultural journey. I reflected on how I feel about my own journey with both English and Spanish and how this journey has impacted the way I raise my son. And just as importantly, I examined my language and cultural attitudes as an educator in a multicultural and multilingual nation. We **MUST** practice and convey positive language and cultural attitudes in and outside the classroom.

D.16: Bridging Cultures, Languages, and Lands: An Illustration of Latina/o and Chicanx Rhetorical Practices

Reviewed by **Christina V. Cedillo**

University of Houston–Clear Lake
(cedilloc@uhcl.edu, cvcedillo@gmail.com)

Chair: Laura Anne Carroll-Adler, *University of Southern California*

Speakers: Victor Del Hierro, *Michigan State University*, “Familia-From-Scratch: Disrupting Settler-Colonialism through Indigenous Chicanx Histories of Migration”

Alexandra Hidalgo, *Michigan State University*, “A Video Exploration of the Hybrid Cultural Identities of Bilingual Latina/o Children”

Laura Gonzales, *Michigan State University*, “Insights into Multilingual Digital Work Coordination: It’s Not about Writing in English or Writing in Spanish, It’s about Being All the Time in Both Worlds”

U.S. educators must be prepared to meet the needs of Latinx students, who are members of the fastest growing minority group in the country, as well as members of other linguistic minority groups. Carlos Ovando (2003) argued that U.S. educational language policies tend to stress “the superiority of American ‘civilization’ and democratic institutions” while simultaneously promoting English-only instruction that “destroy[s] minority cultures and...maintain[s] colonial domination” (p. 6). Thus, it is important for educators to see their students’ backgrounds as valuable, integral aspects of learning contexts rather than problems to be erased or overcome.

Teachers of composition are especially poised to incorporate the richness of their students’ home languages and dialects into productive pedagogies, as demonstrated by the speakers featured in Session D.16. The presenters examined many of the cultural and linguistic survival strategies used by Latinxs and Chicanxs both inside and outside the academy and invited the audience to consider how they might gain from the approaches already deployed by students. Their research also underscored the illusory distinctions we tend to draw between classroom and real-world contexts. Students’ needs do not disappear at the classroom door and what they learn in the classroom has an effect on their everyday lives. Each speaker looked at a different way by which Latinxs negotiate language use and language transfer in predominantly white spaces, highlighting the often overlooked rhetorical dexterity and invention that Latinxs deploy for survival purposes. The research presented by the panelists exemplified the conference theme, “Writing Strategies for Action,” in very productive ways.

The first presenter was Victor Del Hierro, who used Cherríe Moraga’s (1986) notion of *familia from scratch* to think about how migrant peoples create community with those with similar experiences and who have been through similar struggles. Attention to migration is especially important when speaking of Mexican and Chicanx people because migration is an indigenous practice and a fundamental element in the history and existence of Mexican peoples. He also drew on the work of Dylan Miner (2014), who wrote about low-riding as an indigenous ontology that privileges the slow-movement that permits people to establish ties to the

land as they travel, in contrast to the capitalist and colonial movements defined by haste and disconnection. Bringing together observations about the travels of migrant farm workers and college students with his own, he highlighted the unique relationship that Mexican and Chicax people maintain migration and narrative as intertwined praxes.

Del Hierro 's presentation focused on Mexican and Chicax students who have entered new academic environments and are away from their families. Students use their home language, Spanish, to create new familias from scratch in order to survive in the predominantly white spaces of academia. Students must do this because the university is part of settler colonialism, which attempts to erase indigenous people and their practices. Rather than highlight ethical relationships to the land and one's surroundings, settler colonialism stresses domination and control. Unlike the slow movement of indigenous peoples, settler colonialism creates distance and difference. This aspect of settler colonialism can be seen when universities separate themselves from the surrounding communities. Their occupation of the land translates into service learning courses that impose university ideals on the community with no attention to the community's needs or to reciprocity.

Through the framework of familias from scratch Del Hierro discussed his participation in Nuestros Cuentos, a collaborative service-learning project between MSU and the Lansing Public School District that was founded and is directed by Estrella Torrez. He explained that, as an undergraduate at the University of Texas at El Paso, his engagement with school changed once he began to feel accountable to his community. This happened when he worked as a mentor and tutor with UTEP's Gear Up Program. Accountability figures into the work students do as part of Nuestros Cuentos, as does mobility. Students spend time at MSU and at their local school sites, compose and publish short stories, and create classrooms and community. Their participation in this program allows them to create scaffolding practices based in their home languages and experience new practices that help them navigate different environments. Both sets of practices are crucial to student success and retention, and so Del Hierro suggested universities should provide more occasions for Mexican and Chicax students to participate in community-based service learning opportunities.

The second speaker was Laura Gonzales, who examined the research surrounding digital work coordination. Digital coordination entails the moves that professional writers make between digital resources and communities when they are writing for the web. She explained that most of the research in the field focuses on monolingual (English) speakers and contexts, though insights gleaned from looking at the translation strategies of multilingual writers can prove useful to instructors of technical writing. Citing research on code meshing (Fraiberg, 2010) and the blending of minoritized dialects and world Englishes (Young & Martinez, 2011), she suggested translation as a framework that fully acknowledges the rhetorical, cultural, and technical knowledge that multilinguals bring to the table.

Gonzales discussed her qualitative study conducted among professional writers working at Knightly News at the University of Central Florida. She looked at the ways that these writers composed bilingually, finding that they employed many of the same strategies that writers use in digital environments; these included reading aloud, negotiation, gesturing, and the use of digital translation tools. Out of 2,871 translation moments, the writers used more than one strategy 50% of the time. One especially interesting finding was how writers honed their use of translation applications: while the novice student might attempt to translate words or word clusters directly and then deconstruct and reconstruct for meaning, the experienced student was more likely to make deconstructing and reconstructing for rhetorical suitability and effectiveness part

of the translation process.

Gonzales's presentation revealed that writers do not just use technology to translate between languages; translation itself is a technology that allows people to engage in a culturally situated and creative praxis. By centering translation in the writing situation we can begin to understand that composition is always about negotiation because there is never a single language that is intrinsically correct. Instead, diverse contexts call for unique strategies and rhetorical approaches. Translation as a pedagogical framework also honors those literacy practices that students bring with them to the classroom because it highlights their perspectives about what works for members of their respective communities, who they see as their audiences, and what approaches they deem most appropriate in particular settings. Ultimately, multilingual writing is a complex and detailed process. By examining the composing practices of multilingual writers, educators can learn new strategies that will prove invaluable to technical writing students composing across languages, contexts, and fields.

In the final presentation, Alexandra Hidalgo spoke about her use of video to capture the literacy practices of multilingual speakers. Video provides a richer portrait of a speaker and their praxis because images and sound allow the researcher to capture the contexts of, and connections made by, language use more fully. Hidalgo states that multilingualism is both political and rhetorical: In learning more than one language, a person develops connections to more than one culture, composing a hybrid identity that allows the individual access to more than one perspective. To illustrate these matters, she screened her documentary *Alto Precio: The Cost of Raising Bilingual Children*.

Alto Precio is the moving story of her son William's reluctance to speak Spanish and of Hidalgo's efforts to ensure that he will embrace both English and Spanish. In an interview with her mother, Hidalgo described her own resistance to speaking English after returning with her mother to Venezuela from the U.S. following her parents' divorce. Citing Marilisa Jimenez Garcia's (2011) view that a "discussion of language...is always a discussion of power" (p. 418), she noted that refusing to speak English was a form of protest over losing her old life. After working with tutors and returning to the U.S. at the age of 16, Hidalgo regained her fluency. In a touching observation, she notes that her accent remains, to her a reminder of her parents and life in Venezuela, to others a sometime sign of her status as an outsider.

Hidalgo spoke to William in Spanish for most of his early life. By the time he was almost two, he spoke mostly Spanish, and as he began to make sentences, he blended both languages. Once he entered school, things changed and he began to speak one or the other depending on his audience. However, once his brother Santiago was born, William began to reject Spanish and now says that he doesn't like it, though that is the language that connects them to Hidalgo's mother and their Venezuelan culture. The documentary went on to show the strategies that she and her husband, Nate, have used to raise their sons in a bilingual environment, such as having Spanish-only lunches and asking that William "help" his father practice Spanish. She continues to find ways to ensure that William does not lose his Spanish, although she often wonders whether the strategizing and pressuring William are worth it. Considering the high cost in terms of losing one's roots and sense of place, Hidalgo has decided this is the price that must be paid so that he can be more open, empathetic, and creative as he grows.

Contemplating the preservation strategies developed by multilingual speakers like Hidalgo and her family is beneficial for teachers of composition because these strategies illuminate the difficulties faced

by translingual speakers and writers. These strategies also allow insight into the attitudes of speakers as they navigate complex social situations and make rhetorical choices regarding language use. As individuals navigate transcultural contexts, they must negotiate networks of norms, values, and biases of their own and those of others. By addressing these matters in the classroom, educators can help students learn to do this with discernment.

As a whole, this panel was instructive and encouraging, and I look forward to seeing the panelists' respective work in published form so that others may benefit from the knowledge they shared. Although each speaker's research is unique, together they demonstrated that our life experiences and survival strategies prove indispensable to us as writers and researchers, students and teachers. They also showed that we theorize and compose in the everyday, and those efforts must be acknowledged and appreciated. Only by understanding this can educators formulate pedagogies that express respect for all students, their respective cultural backgrounds, their home languages, and their needs as individuals.

References

- Fraiberg, Steven. (2010). Composition 2.0: Toward a multilingual and multimodal framework. *College Composition and Communication*, 62(1), 100–126.
- Garcia, Marilisa Jimenez. (2011). "Radical bilingualism": Language borders and the case of Puerto Rican children's literature. *Changing English*, 18(4), 417–423. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2011.630199>
- Miner, Dylan. (2014). *Creating Aztlán: Chicano art, Indigenous sovereignty, and lowriding across Turtle Island*. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press.
- Moraga, Cherríe. (1986). *Giving up the ghost: Teatro in two acts*. Los Angeles, CA: West End Press.
- Ovando, Carlos J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(1), 1–24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2003.10162589>
- Young, Vershawn Ashanti, & Martinez, Aja Y. (Eds.). (2011). *Code-meshing as world English: Pedagogy, policy, performance*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

D18: State of Play: Gaming, Writing, Teaching, and Research

Reviewed by Brandee Easter

University of Wisconsin–Madison
(bdeaster@wisc.edu)

Chair: Richard Colby, *University of Denver*, “State of Play: A Short History”

Speakers: Jan Holmevik, *Clemson University*, “Ludic Literacy: The Missing Link”

Jennifer deWinter, *Worcester Polytechnic Institute*, “Empathy Games: Narratives, Choices, and Emotional Connections”

Rebekah Shultz Colby, *University of Denver*, “Trends in Game-based Writing Pedagogy”

Douglas Eyman, *George Mason University*, “Scholarship on Games: A Typology of Writing Studies Research Methods”

This panel explored the current state of game scholarship by bringing together perspectives on history, pedagogy, game development, and research in the field.

Richard Colby opened with a brief history of games studies. He noted that although research in education is rich in gaming, it remains a minor subfield in composition and rhetoric. He elaborated that *College Composition and Communication* has printed one article on games while *College English* has only referred to games metaphorically. Additionally, less than 1% of presentations at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) since 2000 have been about games. He concluded with three main approaches to games: as texts, as pedagogical modes, and as ecologies.

Jan Holmevik began by taking a selfie with the room to capture how much the field is changing. He proposed that students are digital natives, not digital literates. Holmevik then delivered “an electrated lesson in ludic literacy,” with *Diablo* gameplay running silently behind him. This [video](#), by professional gamer Quin69 (2016a), showcased the complexities of gaming and provided support for Holmevik’s argument that learning to play is difficult. He called for a focus on developing a ludic literacy in students. To do so, he proposed that we rely on the expertise of others, take play seriously, help students access games, and encourage them “to fail in order to succeed.” He concluded by proposing that one of the payoffs is bringing “passion” into the classroom—another point he supported with [the gaming of Quin69](#) (2016b).

Jennifer deWinter brought her game development experience to the panel. She focused on empathy games and what is possible when players can take on the roles of “different characters with different choices.” Games such as *Depression Quest* and *That Dragon, Cancer* offer “storied frameworks” that allow players to approach diverse experiences and can foster empathy and pro-social behavior. She argued that the ability to identify with other subject positions can be powerful in games because they facilitate an embodied experience. DeWinter concluded by arguing that this experience is what makes games potentially well-suited not only for empathy, but also healing, such as in avatar creation for patients with post-traumatic stress disorder.

Rebekah Shultz Colby presented findings from her game-based pedagogy study, in which she interviewed 24 writing teachers in composition, rhetoric, and technical writing who incorporated gaming into their classrooms. Colby’s presentation focused on breaking down categories on the ways these instructors used

games. The most popular use was for rhetorical analysis, especially because games contain visual, aural, and procedural rhetorics. Rhetorical and multimedia game design were also popular approaches, as well as theory embodiment and interactive genre systems. Finally, she revealed that games offer networked spaces for students to conduct research and can help facilitate transfer.

Douglas Eyman provided a meta-analysis of research on games and gestured to productive gaps. He offered three principles for games research: mobilizing expertise; text and context; and locating writing as activity, object, and profession within game spaces. First, Eyman called on scholars to become expert players because we can't (and shouldn't) analyze games without fully understanding them. He argued that a lack of expertise not only puts the researcher at a disadvantage, but is also an ethical concern. Secondly, Eyman drew our attention to how research should consider both the text and context. Finally, Eyman broke down current approaches to games by taking an ecological view of writing. He identified five locations of writing: about games, around games, in games, through games, and writing games themselves. Eyman concluded that these locations provide insight into the methods researchers use, including historiography, close reading, theorizing games as cultural objects, ethnography, participatory action research, contextual inquiry/workplace study, and cultural historical activity theory.

The discussion continued by taking up issues of expertise, including how to make students co-teachers when they are the experts. Holmevik elaborated on the challenges ludic illiteracy has posed in his classroom, and the panelists briefly considered how analog games can be used productively. DeWinter took up critiques of empathy games that are concerned with the link between identity and games. She also echoed Eyman's call for scholars to attend to game development.

Ultimately, the "State of Play" was partially presented by the panelists and partially by the attendees themselves, who were numerous and energetic. I look forward to seeing how these discussions have encouraged and shaped the future "state of play."

References

- Quin69. (2016a, January 16). D3: GR88+ DMO wizard guide (Melee | 2.4 | Season 5) [Video file]. *You Tube*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6SyONIGAn5g>
- Quin69. (2016b, March 5). S5: R.I.P - main character DEAD [Video file]. *You Tube*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rpIUVTGpUM8>

E.04: Negotiating Competing Curricular, Institutional, and Disciplinary Interests in Advanced Composition

Reviewed by **Carie S. Tucker King**

The University of Texas at Dallas

(cxl085200@utdallas.edu)

Chair: Jill Davis, *Montana State University*

Speakers: Michelle Neely, *University of Colorado–Colorado Springs*, “Promoting Metaknowledge in Advanced Composition: A Stepping Stone, but from Where to Where?”

Katherine Mack, *University of Colorado–Colorado Springs*, “Advanced Composition: A Stepping Stone, but from Where to Where?”

Ann Amicucci, *University of Colorado–Colorado Springs*, “Students’ Writing Selves: Positioning Non-Academic Literacy Practices in Advanced Composition”

Marilee Brooks-Gillies, *Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis*, “‘Rhetoric and Writing’ not ‘Rhetoric or Writing’: Negotiating Disciplinary Tensions and Pedagogical Choices”

I have written a new advanced rhetoric course for my university, but I was interested to see how these instructors created, analyzed, and focused advanced composition instruction at their university. I entered the room, which contained about 12 people; I was surprised at the small audience, as I thought this would be a very popular presentation. I found the presentation to be beneficial and was sorry that more people did not attend, so I decided to review the panel.

Marilee Brooks-Gillies began the panel by describing the 3000-level course that is required for all English majors and is also allowed in lieu of other students’ university writing portfolios. She addressed some of the issues that the course designers faced. For example, what should be the course’s focus? Does this have meaning for rhetoricians? What content should we include? And could the course serve both English and other majors? She referenced other institutions and theories that related to the course development (Bawarshi, 2001; CCCC, 1967; Keene & Wallace, 1991; Wardle & Downs, 2007).

Ann Amicucci led a group from the audience in a skit about students’ struggles and instructors’ battles. She then led a discussion about out-of-class literacies: students finding writing in their fields, interviewing individuals outside the classroom, creating multimodal assignments, and analyzing family members’ or friends’ uses of literacy. She shared the implications—to contextualize writing activities in students’ lives, to make transfer opportunities visible to students, and to recognize and discuss students’ writing histories and futures. Amicucci emphasized that instructors should “make transfer opportunities visible”—a practice I have been emphasizing with my own colleagues, so this hit home for me. She also included in her notes, “We should recognize and discuss students’ writing histories and futures.” (When she discussed ePortfolios, Michelle Neely would later state that we need to consider transfer as a rhetorical act.)

Neely then presented how she integrated ePortfolios into the course. She reminded us that pedagogy and assessment connect and encouraged us to consider that connection as we designed assignments. She defined ePortfolios as a collection of student work presented electronically, usually in a web-based environment. She

stated that it was a pedagogical tool to foster development and it may be course-based or may evolve with students as they go through their degree to reflect their development. She shared some software suggestions and rubrics for assessment.

Neely then shared several ePortfolios with the group. She showed the contents that included “About Me,” a résumé, a statement of intent or purpose for the student (like a personal objective), related coursework, and a “Mind @ Work Analysis” (a final assignment for students to conduct their own primary research about workplace literacy).

She shared some of the issues, such as rhetorical theory versus vocational training and how to address that tension in course development, and she recognized that the ePortfolio contents requirements might hinder creativity for students.

I liked that the panel had attendees intermittently reflect (for 2–3 minutes) on their own university, courses, and experiences. They also shared a list of references, which they referenced throughout the presentation as they addressed theory, practice, and lessons that other instructors learned and shared.

References

- Bawarshi, Anis. (2001). The ecology of genre. In Christian R. Weisser & Sidney I. Dobring (Eds.), *Ecocomposition: Theoretical and pedagogical approaches* (pp. 69–80). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. (1967, December). Guidelines and directions for college courses in advanced composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 18(5), 266–268.
- Keene, Michael L., & Wallace, Ray. (1991). Advanced writing courses and programs. In Katherine H. Adams & John L. Adams (Eds.), *Teaching advanced composition: Why and how* (pp. 89–102). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Wardle, Elizabeth, & Downs, Doug. (2007). Teaching about writing, righting misconceptions: (Re)envisioning first-year composition as introduction to writing studies. *College Composition and Communication*, 58(4), 552–582.

G01: The Purposes of Required Writing?

Reviewed by Matthew C. Zajic

University of California, Davis
(mczajic@ucdavis.edu)

Chair: Cheryl Glenn, *Pennsylvania State University*

Speakers: Kathleen Blake Yancey, *Florida State University*, “Requiring All the Available Resources: Designing the Visual into First-Year Composition (FYC) Curricula and Programs”

Charles Bazerman, *University of California, Santa Barbara*, “Required Writing: Institutional Logics and Imperatives Meet Student Development”

Douglas Hesse, *University of Denver*, “Required Writing as a Liberal Art, in the Twilight of the Liberal Arts”

This panel’s title reminds me of a similar question that most of our undergraduate students ask at least once during their college career: what is the purpose of required writing? And with a packed room, this concern clearly remains on our end as well, though most likely for different reasons. As the session began, Cheryl Glenn promised the session to be one of the best at this year’s convention, and, with a packed panel, I did not doubt that.

As the first speaker, Charles (Chuck) Bazerman spoke to the institutional logics and imperatives of required writing. Though that was not how he began; instead, he offered a warning: “This talk is stuck in a time warp.” Bazerman explained that roughly twenty years ago (when he last taught first-year composition [FYC], a fact he felt quite embarrassed about), he gave a similar speech at a different CCCC panel, though for a different reason (the situated nature of writing rather than the required nature). Though this talk is now different, the points still remain similar: the exigency is dissolving from the bottom rather than from the top. To this point, Bazerman focused on the students’ needs as they first enter their specific disciplines. Students enter into a major life transition, and students need space to explore and reflect on this and prior life transitions; FYC acts as a space to explore these changes. Other first-year courses are often structured differently than FYC, as FYC allows for the integration of the personal, intellectual, social, and emotional issues arising during this transition period. Bazerman shared his own memories of this transition period, focusing on one of his college crushes: his own FYC instructor (though when he went back to visit many years later, he was saddened to learn that she did not remember him).

But FYC does more than support students through this transition; FYC sets the tone for writing at the university and has acted as the economic and institutional basis for the field of writing studies, though students are more focused on the former rather than the latter. Writing has acted as a minor topic within education, and even then, the focus has fallen primarily on K–12 writing. However, from these discussions that have influenced K–12 writing have often come from higher education discussions. And Bazerman emphasized that the context is quite different locally and nationally versus internationally. Across all contexts, often the question arises of which department owns writing, though the United States at least has access to the CCCC for this topic (while nothing like that exists internationally). Bazerman then shared his own trajectory, stating

that he would have never looked to genre or activity theory had it not been for FYC, and he believed that we would have never looked beyond to Writing Across the Curriculum and Writing in Disciplines (WAC/WID) without required writing, either. He ended by bringing us back to the institutional context, reminding us that writing must act as a “central functioning, functional system” within our own universities.

Doug Hesse then took the stage. Unlike Bazerman, who decided to use no presentation technology, Hesse jumped right into displaying a PowerPoint with a number of enticing visuals. Hesse tackled required writing as a liberal art by exploring his own “crabbiness” about the state of composition. This crabbiness expands across contexts, and we are “more fascinated by the shell than life at the center,” calling attention to the focus on the context over the content. His approach took the form of being essayistic for his desired purpose for required first-year writing. What followed was a series of pictures on the PowerPoint slides, starting with a landscape picture that he narratively described. This picture focused on an old hotel, to which Hesse began questioning about the context of the hotel, the reason for the hotel remaining there, and the interest into what came before that hotel. He then shifted to a document of Lyndon Johnson’s showing revisions made just moments after arriving to Andrews Airforce Base, commenting that hours could be spent analyzing the rhetorical choices. He then shifted focus again to a picture representing “Frozen Dead Guy Days,” which is described as “one of the most unique and quirky festivals” and includes events such as coffin racing (if you want more information, and I know that you do, check out the [website](#)).

Hesse’s goal was not to simply show us pictures but to get us to think about how these pictures begin discussions and let us consider writing opportunities. He placed the focus not on the written products coming from the various pictures but instead on the stories and the discussions that come from them. These are not writing exercises from political necessities or academic needs but for the ability to see the world as writers. The purpose for this type of writing tends to be viewed as less practical for educational reasons and for “academic settings.” Hesse argued that required writing needs to branch outside of the academic and to embrace writing as an explorative, essaying act. Required writing needs to branch beyond the requirements of the programs and refocusing on the discussion of writing about writing. “Instructors should not try to make first-year students into rhetoric and composition graduate students,” said Hesse, as he dove into discussions of viewing life as writing and viewing writing as something beyond the academic genres. Hesse finished by tracing his crabbiness back to the source: realizing that non-required writing is framed as hardly a marketable purpose for required first year writing, but required writing should be viewed as a liberal art to focus on the stories, the contexts, and the engagements created.

Kathleen Blake Yancey followed Hesse and took yet another perspective towards required writing: the role of the visual in FYC. She fought back against the notion of always needing to assign a required format or a required text, asking, “If you are always assigned a format, how do you design one yourselves?” She embraced the focus of multimodality as being always present, with us now only becoming more aware of it due to the technologies becoming available, and pushed back against the notion of the word-focused construct of writing. She demonstrated this through using an unformatted syllabus as a tool for learning. She presented a syllabus with no formatting and then displayed three additional examples, each with a new layer of formatting. In doing so, Yancey emphasized the role of the visual (evoking Jody Shipka’s 2011 work on multimodal sources), the affordances, and the abilities presented to manipulate more than solely the text on the page. In closing, Yancey shared three final conditions needed for required writing: 1) do not requiring

a specific format, 2) share with them ways to make meaning, and 3) allow them to do so.

But even with the three speakers sitting, the session was not yet finished. As the discussant, Howard Tinberg approached the podium and began his response with four words: “yes, yes, and yes.” Tinberg addressed the growing pressure felt by writing instructors to standardize FYC, encouraging attendees to consider the complexities involved at both the micro and macro levels of writing instruction and what the field can do to reinforce the various viewpoints previously discussed. His views from the community college is one that emphasizes utility in programmatic outcomes; he pushed attendees to consider the contexts surrounding the students at the institution. He worried about the divide and worries for the students who may be limited by the views of the institution to fully explore the possibilities that a required writing course might offer. The issue of standardized acts as a safety blanket to fall on when other pressing, pedagogical concerns are not being addressed; though the contexts we may know offer comfort and clarity (focusing specifically here on MLA style), are these contexts the best for the students?

After hearing these four speakers, I still cannot tell you the purpose of required writing. FYC has played an integral part to the creation of the field of writing studies, even though I feel that many graduate students (including myself) often take the presence of it for granted. Required writing can take many forms for many different reasons, and I feel that the four speakers here made clear the fact that no matter how we view it, we need to critically consider what happens in a writing course so many of us teach and so many of our undergraduates take. The perspectives offered here are but a starting point in a hopefully ongoing discussion as a field to think about the many forms and contexts that required writing can take and how we as instructors and researchers can continue to adapt and manipulate it to best fit the needs for our students.

References

Frozen Dead Guy Days. (n.d.). Retrieved April 09, 2016 from <http://frozendeadguydays.org/>
Shipka, Jody. (2011). *Toward a composition made whole*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

G.19: Uncovering the Hidden: Composition Scholarship as Language Activism

Reviewed by Anjali Pattanayak

University of Wisconsin–Platteville

(pattanayaka@uwplatt.edu)

Chair: Asao Inoue, *University of Washington, Tacoma*

Speakers: Mandy Macklin, *University of Washington*, “Lost in ‘Uptake’ Translation: Examining Hidden Negotiations in Genre Performance and the Politics of the Researcher”

Alison Cardinal, *University of Washington, Tacoma*, “Making Visible the Labor of Translation in Reflection”

Holly Gilman, *South Seattle Community College*, “Hidden Lessons in Placement Policy”

When we talk about multilingualism, we frequently use the language of triage. Students are placed in courses based on the level of emergency that is assigned to their English language skills, and they are treated like they need to be fixed or cured. This was not how Mandy Macklin, Alison Cardinal, and Holly Gilman approached the topic. Rather, they subverted the binary in which native speakers are privileged over nonnative speakers, and then examined the ways in which multilingualism can, and should, be framed as a strength.

Holly Gilman began the conversation by talking about placement testing and her foundational education classes, a term which she notes highlights opportunity rather than focusing on weakness as the term “developmental” education does. She teaches at an open admission, two-year institution where many of the students whom she works with (41%) use a language other than English at home, and the average age of her students is 31.5 years of age. The focus of her work was to examine how the placement test policy of her institution might devalue the skills that non-native speaking students might bring to the table.

Gilman in particular looked at the ways placement tests follow a linear communications theory model, in which the placement office takes on the role of the speaker who transmits the result of the placement test to the receiver students. This model removes any sense of agency from students, as they are passive recipients of information, treated as objects. She noted that this model runs counter to what is actually happening in the classroom, where students can retake the class, where integrated reading and writing doesn’t lend itself to a multiple choice test, and where “prestige-edited English” (or standardized academic English) is valued above all without question.

For placement tests, students are assigned to a native or non-native speaker placement test. There is no oversight on who gets assigned which test, and students have little to no feedback or information about which test they are taking. They cannot re-take the test for three months. Additionally, students are supposed to be informed that they can write a sample essay if they are unhappy with the results. Of the people that Gilman spoke to, only a fraction were informed of this as an option. The information is also not on the placement office website.

Gilman argued that these problematic practices are built on the mentality that students are *tabula rasa* on

which to be written, or objects that do not participate in decisions. She gave an example of a young student who was overheard speaking Spanish to a family member and who was automatically given the ESL test, despite having lived in the country since she was a child. Gilman used Bruno Latour (2005) to argue that students should be reframed as actants rather than objects. She also noted that the context of the advanced skills questions actually leads to ambiguity. She gave an example of a question which could reasonably be answered with any of the possible choices. The overall result is that students are treated as objects to receive placement tests, and thus they have no agency in a system with little to no oversight.

The placement practices of schools are problematic for all students, but become a particular challenge for multilingual or translanguaging students who are expected to speak prestige-edited English, with little attention being paid to the cultural and social values that are tied with language. Gilman noted that these placement tests are designed for ease-of-assessment and are based on the sort of linguistic assumptions that Bruce Horner and John Trimbur (2002) have discussed: “assumptions about language that were institutionalized in around the turn of the century, at the high tide of imperialism, colonial adventure, and overseas missionary societies, have become sedimented in the way we think about writing pedagogy and curriculum” (p.608). These postcolonial assumptions hurt all students, but those with multilingual backgrounds are penalized even further with their multilingualism treated as something that is a deficit or flaw, rather than a strength. Gilman argued that the way that placement tests are designed to privilege prestige-edited English is based on a tacit assumption that is ultimately racist in nature.

Macklin continued the conversation through her research designs for examining the hidden negotiation that she sees in multicultural and multimodal writing. The theoretical underpinnings of her research were based in rhetorical genre studies and in particular in Anne Freedman’s (1994) research on uptake. Macklin’s work is designed to research the hidden translation that happens for students between process and performance. She is researching a service learning section of freshman composition in which students will need to translate between genres outside of the classroom. Her goal is to study the messiness so that she can “capture uptake in the moment of actualization.” Right now her work is focused on student reflections and interviews to get a better understanding of perceptions. Part of the difficulty that she is finding is that these hidden negotiations of uptake are “both internal and external.”

What really made Macklin’s presentation stand out was the way that she engaged the audience in discussion about the research questions, methods, and limitations. In presenting the ways that she was thinking about her research, she created a framework from which the audience could also participate in thinking about designing research for uptake. She then engaged the audience in discussing how to look at her own research design and how to think about their own research designs to study uptake.

Cardinal built on the discussion of Macklin’s research by talking about how we as researchers can theorize reflection “so that it takes into account the process students go through to translate their languages, cultures and selves into Standard Written English for the purpose of reflection in the writing classroom.” Cardinal drew heavily on translation studies and upon a poststructuralist understanding of translation as a mediation of cultural difference in order to demonstrate how traditional understanding of reflection privileges the monolingual. She noted that language is not composed of discrete systems but is cultural. She deconstructed some of the structuralist assumptions that can still appear in the writing classroom as distinctly Western and out of a framework of “domestication.” This framework, which is still prevalent, assumes “English only”

and looks at translation or multilingualism as a weakness to be fixed. She hopes that in re-examining how reflection is used in the writing classroom and writing research, we will get to a point where the work that multicultural and multilingual students complete will not be devalued.

The focus of Cardinal's presentation was to encourage the audience to question the assumptions they are making when they assign reflection to think about whether we are privileging the monolingual. She argued that teaching for translation highlights linguistic differences and shows translation as something that all students do as they move between cultural context, not just multilingual students.

In order to highlight how this way of framing writing and reflection can be beneficial, Cardinal showed us some of the work that her multilingual students submitted. The work demonstrated the labor of translation and highlighted the influences of each of their cultural discourses, rather than trying to erase them under the auspices of middle class whiteness. Through their work, we could see how cultural and linguistic identities influenced them as they created a rich and complex multimodal text.

She included a call to action for the audience to consider how we can make the "labor of translation not only visible but grow it as a literacy practice." Like Macklin, she engaged the audience in the ways of thinking that she used as she designed her class and her research design.

All three scholars did an exemplary job of not just giving the structure, content, methods, and theory of their work, but actually inviting the audience into their mindset and the ways of thinking and knowing that they have been immersed in through their research. They created an interactive and collaborative environment which immersed the audience in their research and classrooms in a way that was incredibly powerful. In doing this, they brought the audience in as partners in the work of deconstructing the monolingual assumptions of the writing classroom and subverting the privilege of white middle class discourse in a way that doesn't devalue the labor, work, and strengths that multilingual and multicultural students bring to the table.

As we see an increasingly diverse student population in our classrooms, the questions that these three scholars are asking are vital. I hope that through this review I can invite readers to consider how assumptions of monolingualism and multilingualism can and should be deconstructed through writing, just as this panel did for the audience.

References

- Freadman, Anne. (1994). Anyone for tennis? In Aviva Freedman & Peter Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric* (pp. 43–66). London, UK: Taylor and Francis.
- Horner, Bruce., & Trimbur, John. (2002). English only and U.S. college composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 53(4), 594–630.
- Latour, Bruno. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor–network–theory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

I.11: Re-Reading Appalachia: Literacy, Place, and Cultural Resistance

Reviewed by Cecilia Bonnor

University of Houston

(cbonor@uh.edu)

Chair: Kim Donehower, *University of North Dakota*

Speakers: Joshua Iddings, *Virginia Military Institute*, “Re-Reading Appalachian Literacy: A Functional Linguistics Approach”

Emma Howes, *Coastal Carolina University*, “Libraries and Living Rooms: An Exploration of Where Archives and Communities Meet”

Sara Webb-Sunderhaus, *Indiana University–Purdue University–Fort Wayne*, “Re-Shaping Literacy Studies: A Theory of—and for—Appalachia”

This Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) session coincided with the recent publication of *Rereading Appalachia: Literacy, Place, and Cultural Resistance*, edited by Sara Webb-Sunderhaus and Kim Donehower (2015). All three speakers addressed various aspects of their research contributions to the book by considering place-based literacies, accessing archival and non-archival records for what they reveal about people’s lived experiences, and offering specific examples of how local texts can be fruitfully analyzed, so as to show how literacies are locally constructed.

First, Webb-Sunderhaus began her presentation by contextualizing the genesis of the edited collection, the inspiration for which came about while she was writing her dissertation. Webb-Sunderhaus pointed out that her dissertation director, Beverly Moss, suggested the book project. *Rereading Appalachia* sought to overcome the binaries of insiders and outsiders as well as to critique Peter Mortensen’s (1994) earlier work, which seemed to obscure the complex relationships of Appalachians with outside forces. As Webb-Sunderhaus noted, non-text-based cultural products have been well explored, but very little, if any, work has been done on literacy in Appalachia, which has led to a misconception about the absence of text-based literacies. Both Deborah Brandt’s (2001) *Literacy in American Lives* and Nancy Welch’s (2005) term *rhetorical space* inform the foci of this edited collection. Sponsors of literacy form a complex backdrop in which resistance calls into question our perceived notions of literacy. The essays in the book argue for a new theory of literacy for Appalachians. Welch’s (2005) work and James Paul Gee’s (1989) discussion of mastery of a secondary discourse suggested that individuals learn to value literacies through church and families. Resistance is complicated, and the book presented contradictory understandings of literacies as well as the contradictory nature of Appalachian identity. *Rereading Appalachia* offered a theory that acknowledges the complexity of Appalachian identity. Although group identities and family identity related to literacy are more readily accessible, the book attempted to offer individual perceptions of literacy. As this collection of essays pointed out, theories of literacy make simplistic assumptions about the meaning of literacy. The process of discovering new literacies, however, is difficult and painful, not only for research participants, but also for those who are undertaking research. Outside alienation needs to be understood. Accumulation of

literacy no longer can position Appalachians as passive, a central argument of this book which challenges Ellen Cushman's (1998) *naïve participant*. Another important term in the book is Elspeth Stuckey's (1991) notion of *violent literacy*, in which literacy is used to achieve exploitative ends. Literacy is both for good and for ill. Nevertheless, the contributors to the book attempt to show that literacy can have a beneficial impact on people's lives.

Next, in her presentation, Emma Howes showcased her contributions to *Rereading Appalachia* by focusing on feminist methodological approaches to her research on local histories in North and South Carolina. She discussed the implications of "archival accretion" and formal literacy building. Howes acknowledged the centrality of the mill industry in generating jobs during and following the Reconstruction era, although mill towns were unincorporated spaces. Mothers and children became part of larger labor pool. Both paid labor and formal education became attractive resources for local inhabitants. For example, social welfare programs as well as what might be considered personal development classes on hygiene and dress making were popular in the mill towns. "No cooking; no quilt" mill campaigns should be contextualized in larger national movements. By way of illustration, Howes mentioned that the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) and the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) were instrumental in sponsoring these educational objectives. The mill towns provided glimpses into the working lives of the local people. Mill towns not only highlighted investment models, but they also had an impact on literacy learning from rural to urban. Howes went on to argue that Brandt's (2001) term *ideological freights* can be seen in the archival histories of Appalachian mill towns. Furthermore, she emphasized that researchers have much to gain from contextualizing research participants' lived experiences within less traditional spaces. People's working lives in mill towns could be taken into account as part of archival accretion. According to Howes, other lingering concepts that played an important role in her research had to do with lived cultural places, process of methodological changes, and reactions. As she demonstrated, accessibility of people and places shows complicated relationships between their public and private lives. She emphasized that the history looks very different in the Glencoe Mill Museum from theoretical book learning.

Howes noted that the feminist archival work of Cheryl Glenn and Jessica Enoch (2010), who foregrounded why researchers approach groups of people, informed her own investigation. The larger social work has to do with connections and relationships. The nostalgic recollections of one research participant ("Leon") led Howes to acknowledge her own affective reactions to research situation. Although Leon was not associated with any archival collection, Howes felt compelled to demonstrate her ethos. As much as possible, she wanted to begin by trying to understand who the people were. Howes discovered that, more than discovering historical information, she established a relationship with Leon that generated an affective dimension. This presenter mentioned Gesa Kirsch and Liz Rohan's (2008) view that the communities researchers study are rarely intact, as a result of which existing feminist methodologies can offer deeper appreciation of the communities being studied. Such methodologies emphasize mutually contemplative dispositions. She recognized this contemplative strategy in her e-mail exchanges with Leon, who was concerned about her ability to understand the grassroots community. She provided excerpts from Leon's messages in which he urged her to set aside preconceptions. By discussing her correspondence with Leon, Howes touched on outside researchers' desire to respond to an urgency to communicate and convey these histories. Historical literacy campaigns taught her how to listen to pauses. Howes noted that ethos requires more than academic

research.

Lastly, Joshua Iddings offered an overview of his research on Systems Functional Linguistics (SFL), which he addresses more fully in a chapter in *Rereading Appalachia*. Iddings began by pointing out that, although this theory of language often has not been studied in the U.S., it has been studied extensively in Australia. He then discussed the uses of tenor, which is the role of language between interlocutors as well as the experiential nature of people's language choices. As Iddings noted, David Brown (2006) argued that SFL gives students choices and another way of expressing themselves without coercion. Iddings advocated for a pedagogy focusing on Appalachia as well as emphasizing that the textbook used should be by Appalachian writers. To illustrate his claim about the valuable insights of such texts, Iddings used Diane Gilliam Fisher's (2004) poem "Explosion at Winco, No. 9" (published in *Kettle Bottom*) to demonstrate how it could be analyzed, according to SFL's three stages: 1) Orientation; 2) Complication; and 3) Resolution. These stages thus offer a way to access the power of this poem, which aims to tell a heart-wrenching story. As Iddings showed in a session handout, SFL focuses on the smaller details and language of the text being analyzed. This approach can yield patterns of meaning in the poem, by leading audiences to make interpretations about the mental processes of men and women. In "Explosion at Winco, No. 9," men were portrayed as more physically active, whereas women were seen as less physically active participants. Iddings went on to argue that, by taking a look at these local texts, students are learning about their history and culture as well as their own lives. In addition, such texts can offer a vision for participating in democratic processes. Iddings showed that collectively deconstructing texts enables students to control a genre's language, by moving from collective to individual pieces. As though reinforcing the significance of the book's title, Iddings's SFL exercise offers possibilities for students to deconstruct texts and make them meaningful throughout their lives.

After the speakers gave their presentations, a productive question and answer exchange occurred. An audience member mentioned current educational approaches in which Appalachian writers are discussed in Honors or Advanced Placement (AP) courses (e.g., "The Mothman"). A question was raised about Common Core and how it would affect place-based literacies, studies, and education.

In addition, there were comments about representations of Southern Appalachia. Specifically, one of the speakers mentioned that notions of Hillbilly and Appalachia were deeply rooted in exploitative rewriting of ideologies. Mill owners are seen as people who took care of their workers, which was shocking to Howes, who noted potential sites of violence.

In discussing interviewing and researching communities, one of the speakers mentioned that resisting stereotypes actually closes off other areas that need to be analyzed. The example of Victoria Purcell-Gates's (1995) representation of Appalachia in *Other People's Words* was used in connection with the concept of "tellability," having to do with narratives we can and can't tell was also mentioned.

After the panel discussion, enduring questions for these researchers include: How do we enter communities? How do we account for multiple perspectives? In this connection, a panelist mentioned Ann K. Ferrell's (2016) "It's Really Hard to Tell the True Story of Tobacco" from Diane Goldstein and Amy Shuman's *The Stigmatized Vernacular*, which emphasized the layered complexity of encountering, researching, and explicating another community on its own terms.

References

- Brandt, Deborah. (2001). *Literacy in American lives*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, David. (2006). Micro-level teaching strategies for linguistically diverse learners. *Linguistics and Education, 17*, 175–195.
- Cushman, Ellen. (1998). *The struggle and the tools: Oral and literate strategies in an inner city community*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ferrell, Ann K. (2016). “It’s really hard to tell the true story of tobacco”: Stigma, tellability, and reflexive scholarship. In Diane E. Goldstein & Amy Shuman (Eds.), *The stigmatized vernacular: Where reflexivity meets untellability* (pp. 14–42). Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press.
- Fisher, D. G. (2004). Explosion at Winco, no. 9. In *Kettle bottom* (p. 7). Florence, MA: Perugia Press.
- Glenn, Cheryl, & Enoch, Jessica. (2010). Invigorating historiographic practices in rhetoric and composition studies. In Alexis E. Ramsey, Wendy B. Sharer, Barbara L’Eplattenier, & Lisa S. Mastrangelo (Eds.), *Working in the archives: A practical research guide for rhetoric and composition* (pp. 11–27). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Gee, James Paul (1989). What is literacy? *Journal of Education, 171*(1), 18–25.
- Kirsch, Gesa E., & Rohan, Liz (Eds.). (2008). *Beyond the archives: Research as a lived experience*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Mortenson, Peter. (1994). Representations of literacy and region: Narrating “Another America.” In Patricia Sullivan & Donna Qualley (Eds.), *Pedagogy in the age of politics: Writing and reading (in) the academy* (pp. 100–120). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Purcell-Gates, Victoria (1995). *Other people’s words: The cycle of low literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stuckey, J. Elspeth (1991). *The violence of literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Webb-Sunderhaus, Sara, & Donehower, Kim (Eds.). (2015). *Rereading Appalachia: Literacy, place, and cultural resistance*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.
- Welch, Nancy. (2005). Living room: Teaching public writing in a post-publicity era. *College Composition and Communication, 56*(3), 470–492.

I.17: Redefining Narrative Writing as a Strategy for Action

Reviewed by Ljiljana Coklin
University of California, Santa Barbara
(lcoklin@writing.ucsb.edu)

Chair: Janet Auten, *American University*

Speakers: Janet Auten, *American University*, “Literacy Narratives as Auto-Ethnography: Helping Students Locate Themselves in Academic Discourse”

Karen Shaup, *Georgetown University*, “Hunting for Genre in Geocaching: The Narrative of Place and Academic Writing”

Alison Klein, *University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth*, “Changing the Narrative: Story as Advocacy for Social Change”

A renewed interest in using narrative in teaching composition brought out a sizable audience that packed the conference room on an early Friday afternoon. The three presenters, Janet Auten, Karen Shaup, and Alison Klein, set out to dust off the old perceptions of narrative as an outdated genre in composition classes and infuse it with new energy and purpose. To demonstrate how that may be the case, the presenters offered a range of possibilities and new ways to bring narrative assignments back to the classroom at a graduate level in composition teacher education, in a first-year writing class, and in high school.

Doubling her duty as a chair, Auten briefly introduced the premise of the panel and then opened with her presentation, “Literacy Narratives as Auto-Ethnography: Helping Students Locate Themselves in Academic Discourse.” Auten introduced her experience of working with graduate students in composition teaching classes. Drawing on Stephen Brookfield’s (1995) *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*, Auten asked the students to compose a literacy narrative and examine writing strategies that have served them well. The goal of the assignment was to ask future composition teachers to locate themselves as students, critically reflect on their writing practices, and shape their positions as future teachers. After the initial unwillingness to make personal experience a part of their graduate work, the students followed the prompt and examined a literacy narrative through a list of reading response questions, thus turning personal experience into an analytical and reflective tool. Taking the projects through three stages—narration, reflection, and response—helped the students to establish connections between their experience and class readings. This critical distancing from the personal content led to further development of metacognitive awareness, as the students were able to use personal experience to illustrate scholarly ideas. In this way, Auten demonstrated how students turned literacy narrative into critical auto-ethnography, which helped shift the students’ perspective of writing from a means of communication to a mode of meta-reflection. The exercise in critical auto-ethnography was thus intended to provide a model for future critical action of composition teachers who could similarly use narrative to explore other academic genres or types of literacies, such as information or digital literacy, which might be essential to the work of their students.

Shaup’s “Hunting for Genre in Geocaching: The Narrative of Place and Academic Writing” focused on the role of narrative in teaching genre in a first-year composition course. Shaup designed a course around

geocaching, an outdoor scavenger hunt that uses GPS technology and user-generated content to create a personalized tour. The students worked collectively on tours, such as “Music in DC,” “Women March On,” “U Street/Gentrification,” or “HIV/AIDS Awareness.” By creating their tours, students were able to interact with various locations, create a narrative about them, and then invite the virtual community to either discover new locations or experience familiar ones in a new way. As they did so, the students were made to reflect on the nature of an effective narrative, as well as on the nature and limits of genre. Some of the questions they faced in the process were “What makes a tour attractive?,” “How can we structure both an effective tour and narrative?,” “How does something new become familiar?,” and “How can we improve, rather than imitate, narratives on the website?” The students learned that each tour called for a different genre, which they had to discover and adapt as they created narratives of specific locations.

By making students “hunt for genre,” Shaup wanted to reinforce two concepts about genres: that genres are both context specific and dynamic. In particular, she wanted the students to explore and stretch the limits of genre and engage with Peter Medway’s (2002) concept of a baggy genre, a genre that is amenable to revision and adaptation. The assignment was thus designed to help students understand that genre is a complex system, dependent on the context and open to revision, rather than a rigid form. Shaup believes that this exercise in adventurous use of narrative to explore a genre in action prepares first-year students effectively for new adventures in their future writing tasks.

Klein’s presentation, appropriately titled “Changing the Narrative: Story as Advocacy for Social Change,” demonstrated effectively the use of narrative to challenge negative perceptions of a marginalized community and turn personal narrative into a tool for social change. Klein introduced the Story Project, run by Shout Mouse Press, a program that invited teens of Ballou High School, a predominantly African American high school in Washington, D.C., to respond to the prompt “Our Lives Matter.” What started as an impassioned response to the unrests in Ferguson, MO, and Baltimore, MD, turned into a publication of the same title, a compilation of students’ narratives that shed light on the students’ lives, communities, experiences, and goals.

As Klein emphasized, narrative in this case helped students process politically and emotionally charged public events and encouraged them to speak back to the dominant narrative of race, violence, and injustice. Part of the success of the project Klein contributed to the three aspects of collaborative writing emphasized in studies like Felicia Mitchell’s (1992) “Balancing Individual Projects and Collaborative Learning in an Advanced Writing Class” and Vincent Gray’s (1993) “Just Short of Paradise: Collaborative Writing in Middle School.” The students needed to be engaged, or “turned on” by the project; the project had to have a broad and well-defined audience, and the project needed to be “published” or made public in some form in order to impart the significance of proofreading and editing the document. In this way, the communal writing project became also an effective opportunity to include and support novice writers. *Our Lives Matter* (2015) was sold in bookstores in Washington, D.C., and distributed to school libraries, and Klein had a few copies on hand during the conference. She stressed that the proceeds of the sales go to a Ballou High School scholarship fund and support future writing projects. Inspired by Klein’s talk, I purchased the book online and was excited to discover Shout Mouse Press and their intense focus on the power of narrative and personal voices: “Everyone has a story to tell and the ability to tell it. Our job is to amplify those voices, and to share them with you” (*Shout Mouse Press*, 2016). *Our Lives Matter* is an important yet fun piece of engaged

writing that empowers novice writers and strives to effect social change.

The three presentations received a fair share of questions from the audience. Perhaps the inevitable question that immediately followed the panel had to do with objective assessment of personal narratives. While the question may have been pragmatic in nature, it also reflected a considerable distrust of the personal in an academic setting. The panelists responded to the question with brief accounts of their own experience of evaluating narrative in their classes and mostly hinting at the larger purpose of the narrative assignment, after which the discussion widened to the rest of the audience members. A few takeaways from that discussion were to establish clear parameters for assessment that had less to do with the students' willingness to share the emotional content and more to do with their ability to critically examine personal experience, as well as to establish, analyze, and demonstrate a link between personal experience and the larger context in which it operates, such as, the composition teaching profession, an online game, or the dominant narrative of a marginalized group, as was the case of this panel.

Shaup's presentation also generated quite a bit of interest in terms of course and assignment design, her teaching experience, and students' responses to the assignment. While looking at the fun digital content of the assignment, many audience members wondered about the workload, and Shaup confirmed that designing the assignment and keeping up with students' trajectories was quite labor intensive and time consuming. The most revealing detail that Shaup shared with the audience was the students' resistance to inventing genre. A number of students felt at a loss when presented with a challenge of stretching the limits of a genre and creating a personalized story in a digital space. Their resistance had to do with the absence of models and hence responses like "What do you want from me?" or "Show me what to write." Perhaps next time Shaup teaches the course, she can use a few examples from her initial experience to demonstrate the possibility of stretching and redefining genre in order to encourage creativity and help students gain confidence. The question that remained after this presentation was the possibility of using the geocache assignment in classes beyond first-year composition.

With little time left, Klein took questions about *Our Lives Matter* and Shout Mouse Press after the session had finished, as she handled the sales of the copies she had with her. This inspiring and rewarding panel demonstrated effectively the significance and efficacy of narrative in teaching composition. As the examples provided showed, narrative offers a great potential for developing students' critical and analytical skills, facilitating self-discovery, and becoming a key strategy for action, be that exploring literacies, rediscovering new modalities, or redefining social perceptions. I have no doubt that the audience members left the panel with a renewed interest in teaching narrative and ample ideas for bringing narrative back to classroom.

References

- Brookfield, Stephen D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gray, Vincent. (1993). Just short of paradise: Collaborative writing in middle school. *English Journal*, 82(7), 58–60.
- Medway, Peter. (2002). Fuzzy genres and community identities: The case of architectural students' sketchbooks. In Richard Coe, Lorelei Lingard, & Tatiana Teslenko (Eds.), *The rhetoric and ideology of genre: Strategies for stability and change* (pp. 123–153). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Mitchell, Felicia. (1992). Balancing individual projects and collaborative learning in an advanced writing class. *College Composition and Communication*, 43(3), 393–400.

Our lives matter: The Ballou story project. (2015). Washington, DC: Shout Mouse Press.
Shout Mouse Press. (2016). Retrieved from <http://www.shoutmousepress.org/>

I.18: Partnering with the Status Quo: Theories, Histories, and Cases of Problematic Partnerships for Action-Oriented Practitioners

Reviewed by Madeleine Sorapure

University of California, Santa Barbara

(sorapure@writing.uscb.edu)

Chair: Elyse Eidman-Aadahl, *National Writing Project*

Speakers: Tyler Branson, *University of California, Santa Barbara*, “Situating Problematic Partnerships in the Field of Composition”

Todd DeStigter, *University of Illinois at Chicago*, “Unsettling Arguments: Preparing Writing Teachers in the Age of School Reform”

Jeff Grabill, *Michigan State University*, “From the Lab to the World: The Problematic Partnerships of Engagement”

Sarah R. Robbins, *Texas Christian University*, “Composing Collaborations: Setting Problematic Partnerships in Historical Context”

Session I.18 provided a particularly rich and useful response to Joyce Locke Carter’s opening session exhortation that we go forth and disruptively innovate. Carter enjoined us to direct our attention beyond the academy, to adopt an entrepreneurial rhetoric, to advocate and innovate, and to make a difference in addressing crucial problems in our field.

In Session I.18, we see the challenges but also—quite hopefully—the opportunities that come with problematic partnerships that we might engage in looking outward as public intellectuals. Complementing Carter’s emphasis on making and innovation, this session suggested several ways in which we can productively and ethically engage with partners outside the academy whose interests do not wholly coincide with our own.

The session was organized by Tyler Branson, whose dissertation focused on problematic partnerships. Branson’s opening presentation clearly laid out the scholarship on partnerships and collaborations. This theoretical framework was taken up in a nice range of ways by the three subsequent presenters, who provided detailed and engaging narrative examples of specific problematic partnerships.

Branson began by defining problematic partnerships as “collaborations between academics and powerful groups, individuals, or companies that may have interests related to, but not necessarily in step with, academics’ own disciplinary agendas.” The core problem with these relationships is the unequal power dynamic that puts academics at a distinct disadvantage. We often have to work with partners, for instance, in the publishing industry, in foundations that give research grants, and in governmental agencies that regulate K–16 education. They have the authority to make decisions that profoundly impact our professional and pedagogical lives but don’t necessarily share our values, goals, or vision.

Branson proposed that we ask three questions when we find ourselves in these kinds of problematic

partnerships:

1. What's the shared problem?
2. What are the power dynamics?
3. Where's the wiggle-room?

These questions can lead to a more knowledgeable and strategic stance from which to negotiate with problematic partners. Branson also described four predominant strategies that academics employ as they work in problematic partnerships: gaming the system, finding a place where you can exert power, leveraging your own resources, and seeing the partnership itself as a site of research. This last strategy—researching the partnership itself—was evident in the work of the three other presenters on the panel.

Sarah Robbins described two historical cases in which women used writing to negotiate problematic partnerships with unequal distributions of power. Robbins's first example focused on how the founders of Spelman College used the school's in-house publication, the *Spelman Messenger*, in rhetorically savvy ways in order to cultivate donors to their fledgling college for Black women in late-19th-century Atlanta. In Robbins's second example, she read the archives of curricular documents and other documents from Jane Addams's Hull-House Settlement in Chicago as demonstrating how the women leaders of this organization valued the cross-cultural voices of their immigrant students. In both cases, Robbins showed how analyzing the strategies historically undertaken by academic women in problematic partnerships has helped her as she takes on specific challenges as an administrator and educator in the present.

Todd DeStigter offered a compelling look at the creative deviance of two Advanced Placement (AP) composition teachers at an underfunded and struggling Chicago public high school. Working with a mandate that all seniors take a full year of AP composition with a curriculum centered on argumentation, these teachers were nevertheless able to create meaningful assignments and activities that valued students' voices, experience, and interests. The first step was to abandon the official AP curricular materials and broaden the concept of academic argumentation so as to include and encourage the “antagonistic activism” that students encountered in their communities. DeStigter, whose English education students do pre-service work in this high school, made the very important point that institutions are not monolithic or static. Indeed, returning to Branson's list of strategic approaches to problematic partnerships, we might add the strategy of looking within the partnering organization for allies or individual partners who share your values and can help you move forward.

In the last presentation, Jeff Grabill described the process of making an innovative pedagogical tool and the problematic partnerships involved along the way. After developing Eli, a software program that facilitates feedback and revision, Grabill and his collaborators decided that to be sustainable as a learning technology, Eli needed to be sold, not given away or made open source. Although it seems counterintuitive that starting a business is the best way to share a pedagogical innovation, Grabill argued that it was necessary in order to fund an infrastructure that supported users, provided training, and made the product viable. This presentation offered a valuable example of the “maker” culture that Joyce Carter called for, as compositionists themselves developed a software program that enacted and supported their pedagogical goals.

The session ended with very helpful connections made by the session chair, Elyse Eidman-Aadahl, who pointed out that academia itself is often a problematic partner, particularly when it is positioned (or positions

itself) as privileged, authoritative, and disconnected from the real world. I suppose one could see it as fortunate that the field of composition has relatively little experience with this position of privilege. Indeed, as Eidman-Aadahl noted, our field has a tradition of partnering across disciplines, in K–12 outreach, and in community service pedagogy. With Carter’s opening address and the overall theme of the 2016 Conference on College Composition and Communication encouraging compositionists to take action and to engage with a range of individuals and groups outside of the university, this panel on problematic partnerships provided substantive examples and useful strategies for doing so.

J.24: Visual Rhetoric for Social Change in the Writing Classroom

Reviewed by Jessica Shumake

University of Arizona
(shumake@email.arizona.edu)

Chair: Heather Graves, *University of Alberta*

Speakers: Rosanne Carlo, *College of Staten Island*, “Students as Actors, Not Consumers: Toward a Heuristic for the Production of Graphic Novels in the Composition Classroom”

Brenda Hardin Abbott, *Bay Path University*, “Challenging Gendered Scripts in Education through Movie Trailers: The Critical Potential of iMovie”

Heather Graves, *University of Alberta*, “Ethical Energy, Immoral Energy: Strategies for Teaching Visual Argument for Social Change”

I attended this panel on visual rhetorical pedagogies for social change because I teach digital storytelling, new media studies, and the critical analysis of visual texts. In my teaching, I look for ways to evaluate and analyze the structures, conventions, and storylines that frame and give coherence to the digital stories that captivate, move, and entertain us. A well-designed story directs our attention and arouses our emotions so that we suspend disbelief. Still, teaching students to name and describe the structural elements of a captivating digital story or persuasive multimodal text helps them to become better producers, revisers, and critics of their own and others’ work. As the projects on this panel illustrate, when we analyze multimedia and visual texts, we can better apply and incorporate what we have learned, from specific examples of effective communication and document design principles to our digital projects.

The first speaker, Rosanne Carlo, discussed a partnership among her composition students at a public land grant university in the southwest and students at a Title I high school in the same region. Carlo explained that she and her teaching partner from the high school collaborated to develop a shared curriculum and asked their respective students to analyze graphic narratives and then make their collaborative graphic narratives. Carlo argued that through the “production and revision process,” her composition students gained an “expanded perspective of literacy and of the creative process” as they made informed “rhetorical choices about the design of their projects” in collaboration with their high school partners. Carlo shared examples of different iterations of students’ projects to demonstrate how they grew in their awareness of ethical peer review practices. They offered feedback on other students’ visual narratives and eventually wrote reflective artist’s statements on the mixed emotions they experienced when they made suggestions that could potentially change too much of another student’s narrative. Carlo’s service-learning partnership with a local high school teacher modeled the paradigm shift of “writing for” community members, as described by Tom Deans (2000) in *Writing Partnerships: Service-Learning in Composition*, to “writing with” and “writing about” community members.

Brenda Hardin Abbott, the second speaker, discussed and shared materials from her curricular innovations in a first-year writing program at a small women’s university in western Massachusetts. Abbott offered a glimpse into what she termed the “infrastructure for multimodal composing” through the scaffolding of

assignments, the offering of feedback on students' production decisions, and the assessment of students' final projects. Abbott's presentation focused on clips from her students' multimodal projects, wherein students analyzed and then reimagined Hollywood films about education through their digital stories. Through the planning and creation of digital stories of their own, Abbott's students aimed to counter the gendered, racially prejudiced, and class-based scripts, stereotypes, and tropes found in Hollywood movies about high school. Abbott described how she often observed her students simultaneously enacting and countering the very scripts and tropes they sought to reimagine in their digital projects. Ultimately, Abbott argued that the critical potential of multimodal composition issues from its promise as a vehicle through which students can attempt to reimagine oppressive scripts and talk back to the Hollywood film industry. Abbott further argued that people of color and women are underrepresented as storytellers and story producers in the mainstream film industry and that the production of meaning must be democratized through making space for new storytellers. For Abbott, that democratizing space is the first-year composition classroom wherein students can produce new possibilities for those whose stories are told and those whose experiences are represented.

The third speaker, Heather Graves, Director of Writing Studies at the University of Alberta, discussed her collaborations with co-authors in engineering and organizational studies to apply their ongoing research on the relationship between text and image to the teaching of multimodal message analysis and production. Graves began her presentation by defining a multimodal message as the "combination of text and image to make an argument that has an impact." Graves's interest in marketing and organizational studies research is connected to her claim that when it comes to processing persuasive messages, "text alone is slow"; however, the combination of text and image has a more direct and immediate impact on an audience's established beliefs. In her discussion of strategies and structures to teach students to analyze advertisements, Graves used categories developed by Karen A. Schriver (1997) in her book *Dynamics in Document Design*. The majority of advertisements Graves presented to the audience from her research were circulated by environmental organizations concerned with the environmental impact of oil extraction in Alberta.

These presentations, taken together, offered contextualized theories of visual rhetoric to support students to analyze and create multimodal and digital projects with the potential to inspire critical action. At the end of this panel presentation, I left with not only a better understanding of the visual communication theories that are being put into practice to support students to analyze and compose digital projects, but also with many practical ideas about how visual analysis helps students to produce meaningful and critical work for social change.

References

- Deans, Tom. (2000). *Writing partnerships: Service-learning in composition*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Schriver, Karen A. (1997). *Dynamics in document design: Creating texts for readers*. New York, NY: Wiley.

K.02: Visual, Online, and Geographic Spaces: Places for Social Action

Reviewed by Sarah Hirsch

University of California, Santa Barbara
(shirsch@writing.ucsb.edu)

Chair: Gregory Wilson, *Texas Tech University*

Speakers: Leigh Elion, *University of Wisconsin–Madison*, “Tactical Multi-Modality: San Francisco’s Visual Culture and the Limits of Persuasion”

Clayton Benjamin, *University of Central Florida/USF Sarasota–Manatee*, “Humanities and GIS?: Situating Geographic Information Systems in Humanities Research”

John Gagnon, *Michigan State University*, “Making Docile: Visual Signage as an Exertion of State Power in Lansing’s Eastside”

The presentations on this panel dealt with visual and material rhetoric, ranging from politicized art and parody to cartography and street signs. The speakers on the panel discussed the rhetorical messages of these visual media and what they include and exclude with regards to lived experience. The panelists also explored how space is negotiated and redefined through these visual articulations.

Leigh Elion’s presentation, titled “Tactile Multi-Modality: San Francisco’s Visual Culture and the Limits of Persuasion,” was formulated around the question of failed communication. Elion contextualized her discussion by invoking the stories of young men of color killed by San Francisco police officers, and the subsequent exclusion families of the victims felt from the public discourse regarding the violence. This exclusion from the civic discourse surrounding the police use of excessive force resulted in a visual rhetorical move in the form of a poster placed at a local bus stop at 24th and Valencia in San Francisco’s Mission District. The bus stop, one of the Google Shuttle stops provided by the company to its many commuter employees, is located in a district in the midst of gentrification due to the proliferation of Silicon Valley tech workers who live in the city.

At the bus stop, an original Apple iPhone ad and its correlated tagline, “Shot on iPhone Apple 6s,” is placed on one side of the stop’s shelter area. The visual associated with the advertisement articulates the iconic rhetorical modes typical of Apple’s advertising: bold colors, clean lines, clear resolution, distinct contrasts, smiling couples, scenic nature shots. On the opposite side of the bus platform is the parody of the ad. The poster is a picture of Mario Woods, one of the shooting victims. In the corner of the poster is the silhouette of the Apple image and below Woods’s picture is the caption, “Shot on Keith Street.” It is clear that the poster is modeled on the ad, and Elion argued that the location of the poster anticipates a large audience of young, wealthy, predominantly White viewers. The result is that the parody confronts an audience that can’t quite—or doesn’t know how to—connect, but that is the point. The poster of Mario Woods performs what Elion called the *rhetoric of a closed fist*. It’s a form of embodied rhetoric, a nonverbal piece of text used in place of a verbal or explicitly written articulation. The visual serves as an interruption, an assertion of another narrative that has been excluded through the normal means of discourse.

Using the work of Lester Olson, Elion noted that though there is a lack of connection between the Mario Woods poster and the audience, this lack of remedy still results in argumentation. Though it seems like a closed rhetorical situation, the placement of the political parody next to the original ad produces uneasiness in the viewer. The ubiquity of Apple products and advertising are correlated with the ubiquity of police brutality. The poster thus provides a counter narrative of local communities and families who found no recourse in the city's legal proceedings. The poster works a moral violence on the viewer, offsetting the message of the original ad, which is predicated on situational ease. The parody points to this dichotomy, which causes disconcertion. The parody uses the ad to produce its unsettling rhetorical effect.

As such, Elion argued that images play a role in public debate. Mario Woods's portrait holds power in a chain of images and lays the groundwork for a foundational shift, in that it changes the discourse. The poster contributes to the elements of discourse when other voices were excluded from the debate. Even if it doesn't quite persuade, it has socioemotional benefits: hope for a future audience and the promotion of validation.

Clayton Benjamin's presentation, "Humanities and GIS?: Situating Geographic Information Systems in Humanities Research," focused on how and why maps are produced and how to make them more inclusive. In formulating his argument, Benjamin used Mei-Po Kwan and Guoxiang Ding's (2008) idea of the *geo-narrative* as a framework. In their article, "Geo-Narrative: Extending Geographic Information Systems for Narrative Analysis in Qualitative and Mixed-Method Research," Kwan and Ding explained that their study was "based on extending current GIS capabilities for the analysis and interpretation of narrative materials such as oral histories, life histories, and biographies" (p. 443). Benjamin explained this process as narratives mapped in visualized form, the argument being that the mixed methodologies of space and narrative help in the understanding of place and how people write places. Essentially, narrative creates place out of space. Thus, the geo-narrative model provides the map with the cultural and social aspects of lived experience. Mapping stories reveals the intricacies of lived experience as people interact with space and create place. Benjamin emphasized that space becomes place through meaning, and this meaning comes from discursive practices that construct place. This is what Benjamin called the *geo-argument*.

Within the geo-argument, place is understood as an intricate network of discursive social interaction. Benjamin noted that maps are thought to be objective and uncontested, which makes them effective in describing the reality of life on the ground and the reality of a particular place; thus maps are inherently rhetorical. They are the visual articulation of geographic information. In this sense, the geographic information system provides the possibility of visualizing people's lived experience in a particular place.

Places are created by the stories told about them, but they also facilitate identity formation. Benjamin explained that there is an ethos attached to the position of home. Place helps us identify ourselves through attributes such as accent and ideology. Places shape the way we think about the world and how we construct the world around us. Benjamin wanted to deconstruct maps to see who and what is written about our spaces more fully. He positioned it as a *geo-poetics*, an art form utilizing critical cartographers and critical geographers like artist Janet Cardiff (2005), who conducted audio walks. Benjamin argued that map artists use tools to form a disjunction between narrative, memory, and experience. In doing so they reject the authority of normative maps, not maps themselves. As art geographers, they deconstruct space and prescribe it with new meaning, reshaping place.

Benjamin believed that we can change the hegemonic thought of place. He noted how in changing geographical informational systems from a scientific tool to art, we have the potential to change how we perceive our world.

John Gagnon's talk came from observations he began to make during his walks to and from Michigan State's campus. In his presentation, "Making Docile: Visual Signage as an Exertion of State Power in Lansing's Eastside," Gagnon started out by citing Michel de Certeau (1984) and his assertion that the practitioners of the city are walkers. Gagnon's opening question that prompted his investigation pertained to the street signs and city ordinances he encountered in walking from the Eastside to MSU's campus in East Lansing. (East Lansing and Eastside are two distinct areas in the city of Lansing: East Lansing grew out from the MSU campus and now consists of 25 separate neighborhoods. The Eastside, geographically west of East Lansing, is a diverse community located close to downtown and Lansing's urban center.) "How," he wondered, "does visual signage—state-implemented signage—operate in communities?" Taking de Certeau's cue, he began chronicling his walks, thinking about how regulation and control was implemented via material signposts. Gagnon found that the further east he moved, the whiter and wealthier the neighborhoods became.

Gagnon noted how signage is an everyday form of visual rhetoric. They are an everyday text and tool of power. By taking the signs into account, Gagnon was able to turn what is invisible, the walk, into a visible entity marked by signs. He started by looking at how signage was working within the community itself and settled on three categories: informational, hospitable, and restrictive. The informative signs tended to be the most neutral, educating passersby on population information and mainly functioning objectively. The hospitable signs were mainly positive, welcoming visitors and the like. The restrictive signs were mostly negative, consisting of No Parking and Neighborhood Watch notifications.

Gagnon noticed that the visual rhetoric deployed by the state differentiated by neighborhood. In the Eastside, signage was dominantly restrictive and consisted of only three informative and one hospitable signs. On the other hand, the Michigan State Campus hosted mostly hospitable and informational signage. From his observations Gagnon argued that state-implemented signage can be used to manage people in communities. As the rhetorical-visual practices of the state, the signs become demographics themselves in showing how the state perceives the community. The signs become used as a type of surveillance and modify the behavior of the community. While the signage of Eastside is deterring and confining, the signage in East Lansing, near campus, tells a different story. The hospitable signs create an open and welcoming environment. The informational signs indicate that the neighborhood has value. From his analysis, Gagnon asserted that this dichotomy ultimately restricts intra- and inter-community movement. It impairs the ability for communities to collaborate. Gagnon noted that visual signage can easily "recede" into the background and go unnoticed, forgotten. But he encouraged us to know the signage in our community and how it is functioning. What story is it telling?

The talks on this panel promoted interesting discussion. Many commented on the commodification of the iPhone and the notion of every selfie as a type of portrait. Elion noted in response how Apple has a specific visual narrative that is always aesthetically pleasing and non-combative. All reflected on the compelling rhetorical work of the visuals discussed in each presentation.

References

Cardiff, Janet. (2005). *The walk book*. Retrieved May 6, 2016 from <http://www.cardiffmiller.com/>

[artworks/walks/audio_walk.html](#)

De Certeau, Michel. (1984). *The practice of everyday life* (Steven F. Rendall, Trans.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Kwan, Mei-Po & Ding, Guoxiang. (2008). Geo-narrative: Extending geographic information systems for narrative analysis in qualitative and mixed-method research. *Professional Geographer*, 60(4), 443–465.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00330120802211752>

K.06: Publishing in CCCC's Studies in Writing and Rhetoric

Reviewed by Carie S. Tucker King

The University of Texas at Dallas

(cxl085200@utdallas.edu)

Chair: Victor Villanueva, *Washington State University*

Speakers: Anna Plemons, *Washington State University*, “Navigating the System”

Lauren Rosenberg, *Eastern Connecticut State University, Willimantic*, “One Author’s Experiences”

The publishing process for *Studies in Writing and Rhetoric* (SWR) is proposal driven. It begins with about a 40-page proposal and a sample chapter. Reviewers get 40 days to respond to your proposal; they will send comments for the editor and comments for the author, and the editor will respond with one of the following determinations:

- Decline (We are not interested in this work.)
- Revise and Resubmit (We might be interested in this work.)
- Accept with Major Revisions (We are interested if you make the following major changes.)
- Accept with Minor Revisions (We are interested if you make the following minor changes.)
- Accept as-is (This determination never happens.)

A monograph is a sustained argument about conversations, and the author is intervening in the conversation. SWR is limited to four monographs a year, and the turn-around is one year for the entire process, so be prepared to wait if your work is accepted.

You will immediately receive a rejection if

- you are not proposing a monograph,
- you are proposing a work that is not SWR appropriate,
- you are proposing a trendy topic with only recent and only non-diverse resources, or
- you are proposing something that is not a dissertation. (This discussion in the panel was not clear to me, but I made a note of it.)

If you submit a proposal, you will receive reviewer comments. If the comments are positive (that is, they’re interested in the project), the author resubmits a full manuscript and the full manuscript goes through a re-review.

Villanueva stated that SWR does not get enough proposals from faculty at two-year colleges; the editorial board would like to encourage more faculty members at two-year colleges to propose monographs.

Plemons then shared the process of submitting a proposal. (She stated that CCCC is “developing a human process” for submission; her comment made the audience laugh.)

1. Go to NCTE’s Web site.
2. Log in.
3. Go to the book page. (The publication is a CCCC publication through NCTE, so be sure to stay within SWR.)
4. Log in as an author.

5. Submit your proposal.
6. Choose SWR for the proposal recipient.
7. Follow through the submission process.

She emphasized that the abstract is very important and should be framed specifically.

Rosenberg then shared her experience as an author. She said the process is doable and authors must move forward without fear or anxiety. Her manuscript came from her dissertation, but by the time she submitted the manuscript, the document was very different than her original submission.

She presented her writing-process experience through these stages:

1. Submitted proposal.
2. Was rejected but received valuable feedback.
3. Considered reviewers' responses for revision.
4. Responded with thanks and questions.
5. Met with reviewer (who offered) for help and a new perspective.
6. Resubmitted the document five years later (after a full rewrite).
7. Received editor's review and feedback. (The editor suggested changes in her tone, voice, style, authenticity, personal style, and focus.)
8. Returned to initial lens and revised the document.
9. Submitted a new proposal and was accepted.

She shared about the review process as well:

- Reviewer One offered help but did not follow-up when she tried to get help.
- Reviewer Two gave very discouraging response requesting a new and groundbreaking method.

She encouraged writers to join a writing group that collaboratively looked at reviews and worked through each other's works together. Her writing group helped her ask, "What is my driving theoretical view?"—the "so what?" question.

While Reviewer Two gave her hard comments, she responded and applied those comments to her revision.

Once she got through the submission, review, and revision processes, she moved into the production process, which took six months. This included a contract, a check for honorarium, work with the acquisitions editor, and various design decisions about typesetting, cover design, and further edits. Rosenberg shared that she had some say but she also listened to her editors and considered their expertise. (For example, she did not want to lose the emphasis on quotes by using block quote formatting, so she spoke up about her preferences and expectations.)

- The panel encouraged reviewers and writers to consider the following advice:
- Do your homework: Know what exists on the market.
- Look at works cited!
- Look at scholarship and put aside politics: quote a variety of sources in the corpus.
- Do not assume that the age of the scholarship matters. (Two of the panelists recommended that writers consider foundational scholarship that will be older.)
- Research.
- Review others' books.
- Publish yourself.

- Read.
- Share information with others.
- Market yourself.

The panel was valuable to me. I did not learn a lot, but I appreciated hearing the different perspectives of an editor, a reviewer, and an author.

K.20: Rhetorical Listening: Difference, Materiality, and the Classroom

Reviewed by **Kristi Murray Costello**

Arkansas State University

(kcostello@astate.edu)

Chair: Amy Lueck, *Santa Clara University*

Speakers: Esther Schupak, *Bar-Ilan University*, “Implications of Listening: Rhetoric for the Composition Classroom”

Nearly a year after proposals have been submitted for the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), the time is now. We attendees ride the elevator downstairs, stand in the inevitably long coffee line, and find ourselves with fifteen minutes to share our work with composition and communication students, peers, colleagues, and heroes from all over the world, many of whom do what we do, what we want to do, or what we used to do. No matter how many times we’ve found ourselves in the front of the room, there exists within us the multi-layered and palpable excitement, nerves, and exhaustion that result from the annual CCCC. The excitement comes from being in a space with brilliant, insightful, and inspiring peers. The nervousness comes from presenting in front of brilliant, insightful, and inspiring peers. The exhaustion comes from taking in panel after panel, finagling free books from publishers, and catching up over too many cocktails with old friends.

As we walk into panels, we can immediately gauge the level of nerves in the room. These nerves affect us all in different ways. For some of us, they make us rush through our presentations too quickly. For others, we go off script and begin to ramble. I want to think that it’s these same nerves and insecurities that cause some of us to neglect roadmaps and pointing words for our audiences, omit definitions of key terms, and flood our presentations with unnecessarily dense sentences, citation strings, and traces of an overly active thesaurus. These defense mechanisms became even clearer when I began reviewing sessions for *Kairos* several years ago. At times, I have entered a panel, ready and excited to review it, and then five minutes in realized I can’t because I’m having trouble following the speaker’s organization, main idea/s, or purpose well enough to summarize the panel for my readers. *Wait, I thought the study was with first-year comp students—when did we switch to talking about Advanced Comp? This term you’ve coined, how do you define it? Are you talking about your study now or someone else’s? Who are you quoting? No, don’t change the slide yet, I’m trying to take notes! I sigh and close my laptop or put down my pen, knowing that I will need to find a different session to review.*

This was not the case for Esther Schupak’s presentation, “Implications of Listening Rhetoric for the Composition Classrooms,” during the panel, “Rhetorical Listening: Difference, Materiality, and the Classroom.” Early in her presentation, Schupak shared that “the instructor must model listening.” She told us how she does this in her classrooms, but she showed us this through her cogently organized, purposeful presentation, which revealed to me that, though we had not yet talked, she was already listening to me and my fellow audience members.

Schupak opened her presentation by contextualizing her experience, which included her current position

teaching writing in Israel, and its connection to her research question: “How do we take such diverse students and bring them together in classroom community?” Then, she stated and substantiated her goal: to show students (and those of us in the room) that “studying theoretical models of listening rhetoric can be productive.” This was followed by a brief and pertinent review of scholarly literature and other pertinent pieces, which included Wayne Booth, Krista Radcliffe, Amos Oz, and psychologist Robert Keegan. Schupak explained how her experience varied from Keegan’s somewhat and that her students responded best to Oz. She displayed key quotes on PowerPoint slides projected with enough time for us to read them. Next, she outlined her specific strategies for integrating rhetorical listening into her class: “establish[ing] listening rhetoric as a pedagogical goal, model[ing] listening rhetoric, restate[ing] opposing opinion, learn[ing] to argue the opposite side, and a letter writing activity.”

She artfully brought it all together and back to her personal experience by sharing the questions she began to ask herself: “Do you really listen to your students? Or do you interrupt your students? Do you think about whom you’re going to call on next while a student is still talking? Is the expression on your face or tone of voice dismissive? Do you respect their discourse even if it is expressed in nonstandard English?” After garnering ethos and engaging in some introspection, like many teachers, she had found herself answering too many of these questions less than favorably. She outlined two specific methods for achieving her aforementioned strategies and “clearly defin[ing] space for listening in the classroom.”

The first method included having students “walk in the shoes” of their “opponent” through writing a paper on “an innocuous topic” from a viewpoint different than their own. She explained that she chose innocuous topics because she found that it’s more difficult for the students to adopt the opposite point of view with controversial topics. She summed up the aim of the strategy by saying that “the ultimate listening rhetoric is to admit that you were wrong.”

The second method was letter writing. Students in her classes were asked to write a letter to the class once every two weeks about a reading or issue discussed in the class. Then, class would start with the students reading their letters, followed by time for them to respond to the letters. Of this activity she said, “This means class start[ed] with listening.” At the end of the semester, students wrote a final letter that integrated quotations from other students’ letters. To conclude the discussion of this method, Schupak showed a student comment, which illustrated that her engagement in this process helped her to feel more connected to classmates, a sentiment that seemed representative of the class as a whole.

Schupak concluded her presentation by doing three things: 1) discussing the limits and hazards of her pedagogy (particularly unfortunate instances of students saying offensive statements, ranging from sexist to racist); 2) summing up her strategies; and 3) answering “so what?” She explained more thoroughly how the focus on listening has positively impacted the students, noting that her methods and overall focus on listening instilled in the students a greater sense of audience because they were ever presently aware that others, not just her, were actually going to read the things they wrote. As a result, she suggested that her students learned to write to each other and to be more sensitive and willing to hear things outside of their own experiences. Further, it was clear that this experience helped her to feel more connected with her students.

In the end, I’m sure that at some point I’ve been guilty of talking too fast, taking too long, or letting my insecurities lead me to value sounding smart and academic over being understood. Serving as a reviewer for

Kairos has reminded me of the importance of remembering my audience who is sleep-deprived and hungry for great ideas, trying to hold on to information and inspiration from multiple sessions, and may even be trying to summarize and respond to my work to share with you. Schupak shared a quote from Oz's (2005) memoir, *A Tale of Love and Darkness*, in which he described "not pretending to be interested or entertained," but actually being interested and entertained, and "not politely pretending to listen," but actually listening (p. 110). As I imagine other session attendees would agree, Schupak's presentation not only modeled this kind of authentic rhetorical listening, but also made it easy for those of us in the audience to be interested, entertained, and engaged.

References

Oz, Amos. (2005). *A tale of love and darkness*. Boston, MA: Mariner Books.

L.07: Develop, Design, Deliver: Teaching Graduate Students to Teach Writing Online

Reviewed by Carie S. Tucker King

The University of Texas at Dallas

(cxl085200@utdallas.edu)

Chair: Elif Demirel, *Karadeniz Technical University*

Speakers: Heidi Harris, *University of Arkansas at Little Rock*, “When OWI Meets QM: Online and Graduate Student Response to Principles-Based Course Design”

Kelli Cargile Cook, *Texas Tech University*, “Developing an OWI Infrastructure to Support Novice Instructors”

Kevin Eric DePew, *Old Dominion University*, “Why Tiaras Matter in OWI: Using Experiential Instructional Delivery to Prepare Online Writing Instructors”

S. David Grover, *Texas Tech University*, “How and How Much? Results of a Nationwide Survey on the Development of OWI Preparation Programs”

At my university, we are considering a transition of some of our freshman rhetoric courses to hybrid courses, and I have recently shifted a traditionally face-to-face technical communication course to a hybrid format to expand our offerings. Thus, I was eager to attend this panel and hear what other instructors are doing to successfully train graduate students. I was surprised at the small size of the audience, but the panel presented on Saturday morning at 9:30 A.M. I am glad I stayed in town for this panel’s presentation!

S. David Grover, from Texas Tech University, began by talking about the importance of online-writing instruction (OWI). He stated that online education is growing 15% while colleges are only growing 2%. Teaching assistants are an important part of this growth, but we need to begin educating instructors now. (He referenced “Report of the State of the Art of OWI,” Hewett et al., 2011.) Instructors need training, collaborative opportunities, and brainstorming opportunities. They can take advantage of tools that include listservs, conferences, and published research; however, currently, no OWI body of literature exists, and research is lacking.

Grover suggested methods of education to include role playing, class observations, teaching journals, reflective practice, research and publishing, and writing program administration training. He also suggested that online writing instructors-in-training create teaching journals and portfolios to reflect what they are learning and doing in their classes. (As a result of this suggestion, I began to journal my experiences in my own hybrid courses.)

Heidi Harris then shared what the University of Arkansas at Little Rock is doing for OWI. The school has created a graduate certificate (15 hours of coursework) in OWI. She (ironically) stated that OWI certificate courses must reflect the OWI principles that the instructors are learning to use as teachers, and UALR is doing this. She shared information about the certificate course, while addressing the student population, the growth of the program, and the methods and tools the OWI program is using.

She listed the following resources and I made this list to take back and apply to my own program.

Resources include:

- Access to online and mobile
- Watch videos
- Limit content overload
- Instructor interaction
- Feedback
- More practice
- Design on accessibility
- Design on free and available software, including Google Hangouts, GoogleDocs, Flip Grid, Weebly, and Blackboard
- Interaction in the discussion board through assignments

Kelli Cargile Cook, faculty at Texas Tech University, discussed the program that she began when she was previously a faculty member at Utah State University. She began the program for OWI in 2004, and she published her experiences as the program administrator in “Immersion in a Digital Pool” (2007). She shared that training needs to provide OWI trainees as students, instructors (share failures), observers (learn from master instructors), and as course designers.

She talked about the class she teaches and how she instructs her students in OWI. They teach Technical Writing (ENGL 2311) at Texas Tech and use a common syllabus, meet synchronously and asynchronously through the course, include individual and group assignments, and use multiple technologies. Those technologies include Google, Blackboard, Skype, Lync, GoToMeeting, and Adobe Connect.

She said she has her instructors tell students, “This is not a correspondence course; you must be present to succeed!” Instructors email their students three weeks, two weeks, and one week before the course begins to prepare the students to interact and to take the course seriously. These emails create scaffolding to help prepare students and also to model interaction by encouraging them to begin to interact and to consider tools that they could use to interact; for example, students can use the chat feature in Skype to send backchannel (non-video) information to other students or the class. Instructors must model this behavior with immediate feedback to push students forward.

Cargile Cook then gave the following actions that her OWI students practice:

- Assure access to everyone. Caption videos, work with real-time, and ensure that all students can access the information.
- Adapt to new technologies: e.g., use a headset with a microphone to cut background noise.
- Capitalize on technological affordances, but discuss and work around constraints that those tools might create.
- Prevent isolation. For example, when teaching via Skype or some other video technology, look at the students rather than at the screen. Consider how to interact with your students effectively.
- Build community with collaboration and interaction.
- Manage time well. OWI takes more time to prepare. OWI in class takes more time also. Plan ahead and prepare.
- Use support resources, because online-writing instructors can drown. Take advantage of technology support, brainstorm together, schedule expert and novice consultations, and observe others.

She said, “Just as students in their first online writing courses need scaffolding and support, so do novice online writing instructors.”

Kevin DePew then shared his experiences at Old Dominion University as an online writing instructor. He is teaching instructors who are external to ODU—“Teaching Writing from a Distance.” His course assignments include an instructional tool review, and he encourages his OWI students to think creatively. One student suggested Pinterest to teach visual rhetoric; he also referenced Sound Cloud for podcast hosting, and Blackboard for course portal. He also suggested Google Hangouts, Adobe Connect (WebX), and Second Life.

He said to ask OWI students the following questions:

- What are affordances?
- How do students use these tools? Do you want them to use the tools that way in class?
- How accessible is the technology you are considering? What is the learning curve?

DePew also said to consider challenges in class as real-life problems and use them as teaching opportunities. He asks his students to assess how they use technology and reflect on if the tool provides what they want students to use and how the tools facilitate their course objectives.

For the final project, he has his students present a pedagogical project to the course. Then he encourages the students to assess; he asks them to complete a feedback survey for OWI on the course, and he also asks students to conduct self-assessment. He shared some of his students’ feedback to reiterate the value of the assignments.

This panel was one of the most valuable I attended during the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). The instructors shared their own experiences with successes and failures, while providing diverse perspectives and experiences. They gave usable advice with suggestions on technology, assignments, assessment methods, and other creative ideas for instructing graduate students in OWI.

References

- Cargile Cook, Kelli. (2007). Immersion in a digital pool: Training prospective online instructors in online environments. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 16(1), 55–82. doi:[10.1080/10572250709336577](https://doi.org/10.1080/10572250709336577)
- Hewett, Beth L.; Minter, Deborah; Gibson, Keith; Meloncon, Lisa; Oswal, Scott; Olsen, Lisa; Warnock, Scott; et al. (2011). *Initial report of the CCCC Committee for best practice in Online Writing Instruction (OWI): The state-of-the-art of OWI*. Conference on College Composition and Communication. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CCCC/Committees/OWI_State-of-Art_Report_April_2011.pdf

M.10: Framing Circulation for Action: Frameworks for Enabling Action via Circulation Studies

Reviewed by Meghan A. Sweeney

Saint Mary's College of California

(mas36@stmarys-ca.edu)

Chair: Douglas Eyman, *George Mason University*

Speakers: Layne Gordon, *University of Louisville*

Kellie Gray, *George Mason University*

John Silvestro, *Miami University*

“Framing Circulation for Action: Frameworks for Enabling Action via Circulation Studies” was a direct response to Laurie Gries’s call to action at the 2015 Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). Gries called for composition scholars to utilize circulation studies as a lens to examine writing, and in true collegiality (what I love most about our discipline and the CCCC), Gries was in the audience to learn how these three scholars used circulation studies as a lens for exploring the writing classroom, the digital landscape, and a non-profit organization. I also was there to learn. Before this presentation, I had only seen circulation studies used in journal articles focused on rhetoric, with little to no thought about connections to composition, so I was excited to learn more about the implications for composition if we view writing through the lens of circulation.

John J. Silvestro, a PhD candidate at Miami University, started the panel discussion with a key definition and question to frame the overall discussion. The panelists used Gries’s (2013) definition of circulation as spatio-temporal flows of discourse. Together, they also relied upon John Trimbur’s (2000) question, “How can we see writing as it circulates through linked moments of production, distribution, exchange, and consumption?” (p. 196). With this definition and question, the panelists all sought to explore what frameworks and methods enable student, digital, and civic action through writing as it circulates.

After Silvestro’s framing of the discussion, Layne Gordon, a PhD student at University of Louisville, presented on how a circulation-based framework affects first-year composition. Gordon began with three assumptions that undergird her argument. The first assumption stems from The New London Group’s (1996) argument that students are increasingly positioned solely as workers; the second comes from Gries’s (2015) argument that students need to be able to experience the circulation of their texts; the third assumption is Gordon’s own argument that “we need to reclaim the economic context of circulation for circulation studies, particularly if we are to make circulation studies actionable in our pedagogy.” Working from these three assumptions, Gordon argued for a pedagogical framework based on “circulation that aims to explore the ways in which identities, mobilities, labor practices, and composing processes are constructed by and through circulation.” In doing so, a composition classroom can help students see how their writing doesn’t just stop once a text is turned into the professor. Instead, texts are allowed to create action in the community, and students are encouraged to examine how that circulation occurs and affects action.

Gordon then detailed a course design that would encourage students to examine and experience the

circulation of texts (detailed on a handout for the audience):

- Unit 1: “Define and understand circulation through personal reflection and exploration of particular issue related to *work*.”
- Unit 2: “Create a collection of texts about your chosen issue and examine how the collection circulates.”
- Unit 3: “Select a particular text out of this collection that has circulated widely and analyze its argument.”
- Unit 4: “Make your own argument about your chosen issue and circulation.”

To further show how the circulation framework would work in the classroom, Gordon detailed Unit 1 (on her handout). The three assignments in the unit include keeping a journal for homework assignments and reflections, making a “Concept in 60” video (a 60-second video using digital artifacts to explore a topic related to work), and remediating the “Concept in 60” (translating discussion of the topic to a new medium, like tweets). Throughout the unit, as students define circulation and as they create videos and remediations, they are required to share them with others outside the classroom and reflect on the circulation that occurred.

Gordon ended with her own call to action: for us all to create anthologies, readers, and textbooks that take up the issues of circulation; to consider how circulation pedagogies affect evaluation and assessment; and to build more pedagogies based on circulation to increase scholarship and understanding on how this concept affects the composition classroom.

Judging by the way Gordon talked about this pedagogical framework, I am under the impression that she has not yet taught this course. However, when she does, I am sure we will get to see examples of textual circulation that occurred in her first-year composition course. When we do, I look forward to exploring how this complicates our current discussions about transfer. At my own institution, I have watched as an assignment in a women and gender studies course has circulated through the campus, moving from a series of posters, to a Twitter campaign, to a campus-wide walkout. As I went through the process of writing this review for *Kairos*, I kept coming back to the current discussions at my own college and wondering how a first-year composition, that taught students to see their writing through the lens of circulation, could transfer to courses like women and gender studies. Overall, as you can probably tell, I found Gordon’s proposal for a course design generative for myself, as a teacher dedicated to first year writing.

While Gordon’s presentation got me excited about how circulation could invigorate the classroom, Kellie M. Gray got my inner methodology nerd excited. Taking on the visual rhetoric angle, Gray, a PhD student at George Mason University, used circulation studies to explore emoji in her presentation “Workable Methods for Studying Emoji.” Gray’s presentation also responded to Gries’s call for action, but more specifically she was building on Gries’s recent book, *Still Life with Rhetoric: A New Materialist Approach for Visual Rhetorics* (2015) and Gries’s article “Iconographic Research: A Digital Research Method for Visual Rhetoric and Circulation Studies” (2013), where she introduced iconographic tracking, a research method that “employs traditional qualitative and inventive digital research strategies to investigate the circulation, transformation, and consequentiality of images across genres, mediums, and contexts” (Gries, 2013, p. 332). Gray’s research project used iconographic tracking, but she also went into great detail on how she tracked emoji, making for an informative and enlightening presentation on methodologies and the tools available to study circulation.

Overall, Gray wanted to understand how emoji circulated. She found that emoji, as they circulated,

varied in appearance differing across platforms and devices used. For example, the emoji for a woman partying looks different when used in Google versus Twitter. While they both require the woman to wear bunny ears (Why? Seriously, why?), Google has just one woman, while Twitter has two.

To conduct her iconographic tracking study, Gray used two methods: mapping code hierarchies and coding/classifying the culture of emojis by using Zotero, NVivo, and NCapture. Gray cleverly named her first method “begging your friends to take screenshots” because that is how she mapped the code hierarchies. She received screenshots of emoji from her friends, who all used different devices and platforms. Gray logged the year, the device (e.g., MacBook Pro), and the browser (e.g., Chrome). The result is a spreadsheet that tracked variability in appearance as these emoji circulated in a digital landscape. Gray named her second method “coding and classifying culture...or ‘befriend your school’s data specialists STAT.’” To further track emoji, she used NCapture, which works with NVivo, to create a zine that “captured” stories from the web about emoji. In doing so, she was able to track how the culture of emoji circulated.

In closing her presentation, Gray concluded with action items that encouraged the audience to use this methodology to “evaluate, develop, experiment, and repeat.” As a part of the audience, I feverishly wrote down the software she used, especially NCapture, which was new to me. The method of iconographic tracking was also completely new to me, so I appreciated how well-thought out and methodical Gray’s presentation was.

With classroom and digital contexts explored, Silvestro completed the panel presentation with “In Backyards and Boardrooms: Making our Circulation Methods Actionable for Civic Organizations.” Silvestro is working with [The Women’s Fund of the Greater Cincinnati Foundation](#)—a 20-year-old non-profit organization with the goal of providing “a strong voice for women in our community” (Women’s Fund, 2016b). The organization has five specific strategies, but Silvestro, as part of his participatory action research, was asked to focus on three areas: “promote the use of a gender lens in all community research to better identify the barriers and educate decision makers with disaggregated data, build a common agenda and shared goals with key stakeholders, and champion relevant policy advocacy” (Women’s Fund, 2016a). Upon further reflection, Silvestro noted that these three areas were rooted in concerns of circulation and its effects on local communities and publics.

To study circulation in this context, Silvestro built upon Jim Ridolfo’s (2012) research method of “practitioner stories.” This method requires researchers to interview participants about their composing processes, with an emphasis on delivery and distribution, so discoveries can be made about intended and unintended circulation. Silvestro found this method useful in gaining perspective on the composing processes in The Women’s Fund. However, complicating his study was his desire to be useful to The Women’s Fund, so he had to figure out how to make the practitioner stories actionable. Silvestro asked, “What can I do and discover that makes their efforts to engage with circulation and its effects on publics stronger?” and “How can we make our circulation research methods more actionable for civic organizations?”

Silvestro began to answer these questions by looking at how the organization discussed circulation before his participation. Overall, the goal of the organization was to “get and motivate others to share, discuss, and recompose their research and their concerns.” Specifically, Meghan Cummings, the executive director, along with other executives, want their “research and [their] concerns discussed in backyards and boardrooms.” They also want their staff, members, and volunteers to share and discuss the work they are doing. They

created a Facebook page that posts #Smartricles, created a Twitter account, and distributed research as digital pdfs.

To engage with The Women’s Fund, Silvestro began with sharing his findings from the practitioner stories and creating visuals to show the group that they were focused on individuals and communities, while missing the “viral” circulation that they desired. In addition, he encouraged them to focus on getting others to share and circulate their work and to participate in the stories that are part of the discourse. He also participated in creating a hashtag for an event with Cokie Roberts. While he and others advocated for a hashtag that would participate in the discussion about poverty, the group went with #ConvoWithCokie (you can’t win them all). Finally, he tried to explain circulation to them and link circulation processes to their institution, which is hard.

The results of Silvestro’s actionable research are many. The group has grown in how they use social media and distribute digital texts. They use infographics to share their research (and to encourage others to share their research). They promote their hashtags for events, by creating selfie boards and displaying the hashtag. And at those events, they also share research data on poster boards and tabletop cards.

His action items (or advice for those of us who might want to conduct similar research) include the following: listen to how the group describes circulation then work with their terms; fit in with where they are and what they do; offer a “vision” of what they can and can’t do; and introduce tools, practices, and processes that they can use.

Together these panelists left me invigorated as a teacher, scholar, and researcher. Their take on pedagogy, methodology, and practices was inventive and serves as a sound reminder that good panels often go unheard because of our desire to fly home Saturday morning. People should be paying attention and watching for more work from these PhD students; it is careful research, and it is important research.

After the panel, I ran into Laurie Gries in the restroom at a sustainable restaurant across the street. I told Gries how great the panel was and asked what it was like to watch an entire panel dedicated to her call to action. She basically described it as amazing, enjoyable, and flattering; I look forward to seeing what is next for these three scholars.

References

- Gries, Laurie E. (2013). Iconographic research: A digital research method for visual rhetoric and circulation studies. *Computers and Composition*, 30, 332–348. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2013.10.006>
- Gries, Laurie E. (2015). *Still life with rhetoric: A new materialist approach for visual rhetorics*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60–92.
- Ridolfo, Jim. (2012). Rhetorical delivery as strategy: Rebuilding the fifth canon from practitioner stories. *Rhetoric Review*, 31(2), 117–129.
- Trimbur, John. (2000). Composition and the circulation of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 52(2), 188–219.
- The Women’s Fund of the Greater Cincinnati Foundation. (2016a). The issues. Retrieved from <https://www.gcfdn.org/Investing-in-Greater-Cincinnati/The-Womens-Fund/Our-Work/The->

Issues

The Women's Fund of the Greater Cincinnati Foundation. (2016b). Our focus. Retrieved from <https://www.gcfdn.org/Investing-in-Greater-Cincinnati/The-Womens-Fund/About-Us/Our-Focus>