Editors' Introduction to the Second Issue

We present this first refereed issue of *LiCS* with three articles that represent the kinds of scholarly work we hope to foster. All three articles offer new perspectives on important issues in composition studies: writing to learn, compulsory first-year composition, and digital literacy. By drawing on literacy studies and interrogating literacy in their pieces, the authors here reorient us to these established composition topics in ways that unsettle our assumptions.

For "Writing and Learning in View of the Lab," Catherine Prendergast embarked on a study to determine the most effective forms of writing to learn in the sciences. Her work in a summer research science lab leads her to question her questions, however, and she develops "a broader framework for learning, and a narrower one for writing" consonant with Mike Rose's call for a model of intelligence that "doesn't separate hand from brain." While raising important questions about the limits of writing to learn for the sciences, Prendergast offers a fascinating study on embodied intelligence and an elaboration of method we particularly appreciate.

In "The Legibility of Literacy" Michael Harker returns to the "well-traveled" ground of the abolition debate on compulsory composition and remaps it with theories from New Literacy Studies because, as Harker argues, this is how "we better understand why literacy remains composition's most pressing problem *and* solution." After reframing the debate historically and analyzing the latent autonomous theories of literacy at work in early abolitionist proposals, Harker returns us to the present and turns the same lens on where we stand now, urging a critical examination of our definitions of literacy to better address the challenges to literacy education.

Annette Vee offers a different kind of compelling history in "Understanding Computer Programming as Literacy." Reading a trajectory for programming in the history of textual literacy, Vee argues that programming is poised to shift from a "material intelligence," or specialized skill, to a literacy, a facility necessary to negotiate the infrastructure of everyday life. Vee argues that this possible future has implications for educators because literacy learning is shaped by the literate identities available to learners and by the environments shaped by programmers. Vee proposes a model of computational literacy that can help us understand and participate in the shape of things to come.

The symposium which kicked off our inaugural issue continues in Issue 2. Here, Matthew Ortoleva, Michael Pennell, and Gerald Campano extend the conversation about the intersections between literacy studies and composition studies. These responses illustrate how we hope the ongoing "Symposium" section will function: Ortoleva, Pennell, and Campano help us re-see the contours of the conversations begun in Issue 1 and offer suggestive critiques and arguments. Ortoleva invites us to attend to the relationship between the material and discursive by reconsidering the symposium's interest in "place" through ecological literacy. Pennell cautions us to recognize that another kind of place—digital environments—do not, in themselves, produce meaningful rhetorical situations in his response to the symposium conversation about academic and non-academic genres. Finally,

Campano also expands the conversation about place and spatial metaphors by asking us to confront "key terms such as epistemic privilege and historically subordinated knowledge" in spaces where "social and cultural boundaries" might obscure certain knowledges and literacies. We note his critique that in our stated desire to "bridge" literacy and composition studies, we imply the fields remain static and metaphorically—and therefore materially—limit the possibility of mutual transformation.

Our book review section debuts in this issue with a review of Eli Goldblatt's *Writing Home: A Literacy Autobiography*. Christian Smith considers Goldblatt's work with the literacy narrative as genre and the possibilities created when we ask "not what a literacy narrative is, but rather what it can be given enough space to move."

We are privileged to have worked with all of the contributors to this issue. We have each remarked on how excited we are by each of the pieces, and have noted that our excitement has only grown with frequent rereading. We hope that readers will share our pleasure in reading this issue, will circulate it widely, and will consider adding their voices to the conversation.

Brenda Glascott, *California State University, San Bernardino*
Tara Lockhart, *San Francisco State University*
Holly Middleton, *High Point University*
Richard Parent, *University of New England*
Chris Warnick, *College of Charleston*