Editors' Introduction to Issue 2.2

Literacy and Composition Studies scholarship has long been characterized by an attention to change. As the New Literacy Studies movement made clear, literacy is a situated, contextualized collection of practices that individuals and collectives activate in the process of communicating through symbols, texts, and technologies. As such, literacy is *emergent* and subject to a complex host of temporal and environmental factors, most notably, technological change, socioeconomic transformation and community metamorphosis. In this issue of *LiCS*, all of our contributions document and respond to the contextual transformations that shape literate action, emphasizing how our assumptions and stances to literacy change as legislation, technology, community, and capital morph over time.

Lisa Lebduska's "Literacy Sponsorship and The Post-9/11 G.I. Bill" charts permutations in literate activity over spans of dramatic upheaval and transformation. Challenging the hegemonic narrative of economic and social mobility made possible by the Post-9/11 G.I. Bill, Lebduska argues that in an era of fast capitalism and knowledge-based economies, the government's role as literacy purveyor pushes veterans toward for-profit, competency-based institutions rather than traditional public institutions. Exploring numerous examples, Lebduska contends that by positioning veterans as literacy consumers, the Post-9/11 G.I. Bill fails to deliver on its promise to function as an economically transformative agent, instead credentialing and reaffirming the worth of military experience at the expense of expanded literacy acquisition and enhanced democratic identity.

In "Hypersocial-Interactive Writing: An Audience of Readers-as-Writers," Rik Hunter revisits writer-centric notions of audience by emphasizing the hybrid literate identity of "readers-as-writers." Whereas social-turn scholarship in the era before social and digital media emphasized the writerly half of the audience dyad, Hunter argues that participatory media encourages writerly identity at least as much if not more than readerly identity. Drawing on audience scholarship, Hunter argues for a "hypersocial-interactive model of writing" that attempts to give equal treatment to the readerly and writerly literate identities in the age of digital communication. Pushing back against conceptions of audience articulated through "writing-about" or "responding-to" frameworks, Hunter invites us to rethink audience beyond the legacy of print, emphasizing how audiences make use of technological affordances and the social norms of virtual communities to become more active readers-as-writers. As reading technologies increasingly solicit collaborative interaction, Hunter proposes a valuable model of audience that takes into account the feedback mechanisms and peer-review processes that characterize digital literacy.

As Hunter reconfigures models of audience for digital writing, Michael Pennell prompts us to rethink one of the discipline's most revered and ubiquitous genres for the digital age in "(Re)Placing the Literacy Narrative: Composing in Google Maps." Pennell's reinvigorated literacy narrative assignment asks students to use Google Maps as a composing technology and interface in order to spatialize their literacy sponsorship; by "developing a visualization of the 'trade routes' students encountered in their literacy acquisition" the assignment provides one way to make the abstract concept of literacy sponsorship more concrete. By moving students from information consumption

to information production, Pennell's assignment   revises the contours of the literacy narrative, creating new relations between sociospatiality and temporality and potentially disrupting linear narratives of literacy acquisition. In the process, "(Re)Placing the Literacy Narrative" reworks one of Composition's most cherished assignments.

In addition to Lebduska, Hunter and Pennell, two *Symposium* pieces continue our ongoing dialogue among previously published *LiCS* articles. In "Lean On: Collaboration and Struggle in Writing and Editing," Laurie JC Cella and Jessica Restaino explore what Morris Young calls "little narratives," or personal touchstones that sustain research agendas and motivate us to continue moving forward in the research process. Placing a special emphasis on the distributed work of email-based collaboration, Cella and Restaino provide invaluable reflection on collaborative authorship, friendship, and the demands of the tenure clock in their essay.   In our second *Symposium* essay, "Literacy as a Legislative and Judicial Trope," Tabetha Adkins takes up Harvey J. Graff's critique that literacy studies "lack[s] adequate critical treatments of the contradictory place literacy holds in popular, school, familiar, and public cultures" by investigating the complex and often problematic treatment of literacy and literacy testing by the Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS). Paying special attention to SCOTUS cases in 1915 and 1959, as well as the 2013 decision regarding The Voting Rights Act of 1965, Adkins identifies the shifting and at times contradictory understanding of literacy that attends Supreme Court decisions on voting rights.

These contributions have raised important questions for us regarding the contexts, implications, and teaching of literate activity. We hope they are as generative for our readers.

Brenda Glascott, *California State University, San Bernardino*
Justin Lewis, *Western Oregon University*
Tara Lockhart, *San Francisco State University*
Holly Middleton, *High Point University*
Juli Parrish, *University of Denver*
Chris Warnick, *College of Charleston*