LiCS

Literacy in Composition Studies

2017
Volume 5, Number 1

LiCS MISSION STATEMENT

Literacy in Composition Studies is a refereed open access online journal that sponsors scholarly activity at the nexus of Literacy and Composition Studies. We foreground *literacy* and *composition* as our keywords because they do particular kinds of work. We want to retain Composition's complicated history as well as FYC's institutional location and articulation to secondary education. Through literacy, we denote practices that are both deeply context-bound and always ideological. Literacy and Composition are therefore contested terms that often mark where the struggles to define literate subjects and confer literacy's value are enacted. We are committed to publishing scholarship that explores literacy at its intersection with Composition's history, pedagogies, and interdisciplinary methods of inquiry.

Literacy is a fluid and contextual term. It can name a range of activities from fundamental knowledge about how to decode text to interpretive and communicative acts. Literacies are linked to know-how, to insider knowledge, and literacy is often a metaphor for the ability to navigate systems, cultures, and situations. At its heart, literacy is linked to interpretation—to reading the social environment and engaging and remaking that environment through communication. Orienting a Composition Studies journal around literacy prompts us to investigate the ways that writing is interpretive as well as persuasive; to analyze the connections and disconnections between writing and reading; and to examine the ways in which literacy acts on or constitutes the writer even as the writer seeks to act on or with others.

LiCS seeks submissions that interpret literacy at a time of radical transformation in its contexts and circulation. We are open to a wide range of research that takes up these issues, and we are especially interested in work that:

- provides provisional frameworks for theorizing literacy activities
- analyzes how literacy practices construct student, community, and other identities
- investigates the ways in which social, political, economic, and technological transformations produce, eliminate, or mediate literacy opportunities
- analyzes the processes whereby literacies are valued or legitimated
- examines the literacies sponsored through college writing courses and curricula, including the range of literate activities, practices, and pedagogies that shape and inform, enable and constrain writing
- considers the implications of institutional, state, or national policies on literacy learning and teaching, including the articulation of high schools and higher education
- proposes or creates opportunities for new interactions between Literacy and Composition Studies, especially those drawing on transnational and cross-cultural literacy research

Editors' Introduction to Issue 5.1

This issue marks the start of *LiCS*' fifth year. The first issue of the journal was built around a symposium featuring scholars who have served on the Editorial Board over these five years. In that first symposium, Allan Luke posed the following question: in a time of transformational change for Composition, "Can the field keep up?" Our answer has been to make room and provide a platform specifically for scholars who want to move Composition forward through an attention to the problems of literacy. The articles, interview, book review, and symposium essays in this issue raise questions we find *LiCS* continuously revisits: How can we better understand the diverse literacy practices that inform and shape specific populations? How is the foundational concept of sponsorship remade by pedagogical innovations and increased recognition of how literacy practices migrate? How do we move forward in a political and cultural climate that does not value the questions we raise? What will it now mean to "keep up"?

Kaia Simon's "Daughters Learning from Fathers: Migrant Family Literacies that Mediate Borders" contributes to our understanding of how literacy practices are sponsored within Hmong families in the US. Opportunities for girls and women to access education and enter the professional workforce prompt the fathers in this study to revise traditional Hmong patriarchal constraints on daughters' literacy acquisition. Simon's ethnographic study, based on twenty-three Hmong women who came to the US as children, hinges on participants' descriptions of literacy events in their family contexts. She finds that Hmong fathers were central actors in these literacy events and that the different types of opportunities for literate women in the US led the families to revise Hmong gender roles.

In "Reciprocal Literacy Sponsorship in Service-Learning Settings," Kara Poe Alexander presents results from a semester-long assignment asking students in an upper-level professional writing course to partner with local small businesses to develop a professional writing identity. Analyzing students' reflections, written products, oral presentations, and anecdotal data from students' clients, Alexander illustrates how each group sponsored one another's rhetorical, technological, social, ethical, and critical literacies. Alexander's study has important implications for literacy learning and research. By presenting evidence of students sponsoring clients' literacies, Alexander complicates prior research on literacy sponsorship that, while recognizing the complexity of literacy sponsorship, "forwards a view of literacy sponsorship as a one-way, top-down endeavor where the 'sponsored' and the 'sponsor' retain fairly fixed roles" (22). Her research also demonstrates service-learning courses' potential for promoting reciprocal literacy sponsorship. As she argues, "by providing an important avenue to build relationships that can enable the reciprocity and exchange of literacy sponsorship, service-learning courses invite students and clients to seize literacy resources to meet their own goals, motivations, and needs" (27).

As the third feature of this issue, we are delighted to reprint an interview with Harvey J. Graff and Brian Street. The interview was conducted by Ana Maria de Oliveira Galvão, Maria Cristina Soares de Gouvêa, and Ana Maria Rabelo Gomes in Brazil in August 2014, during the V International Colloquium for Literacy and Written Culture. During the interview, Graff and

Street discuss the origins of their decisions to study literacy, the influences and experiences that have shaped their work, and the field's interdisciplinarity. Just two points of emphasis in their wide-ranging discussion are the importance of history and of understanding how epistemology gives rise to method. First published in *Educação em Revista,* an academic journal published by the Faculdade de Educação at the Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais in Brazil, the interview is reprinted here with permission.

Phillip Goodwin's review essay, "Around the Bend," synthesizes Frank Farmer's *After the Public Turn: Composition, Counterpublics, and the Citizen Bricouleur,* Amy Wan's *Producing Good Citizens: Literacy Training in Anxious Times*, and Jonathan Alexander and Jacquelyn Rhodes' *On Multimodality: New Media in Composition Studies* to offer a glimpse "around our current turn" toward the social in Composition Studies. In Goodwin's reading, all three monographs "challenge the perceived efficacy of our public engagement and the relevance of the institutional literacies we teach in public life" (74); further, these works foreground multimodality in the work of studying and teaching publics, broadly defined.

We close this issue with another symposium. To mark our fifth anniversary, we invited the Editorial Board and Editorial Associates to reflect on the last five years of the journal and to look ahead. Like the inaugural symposium, this one too is inflected by a question posed by Allan Luke: "considering the current political situation and events . . . and the situation on campuses, the attacks and backlash against minorities, issues of hate speech/academic freedom, and the place/role of literacies, writing and education . . . What is to be done?" Rebekah Buchanan situates her own response by first recounting a debate in NCTE's Connected Communities on the extent to which a classroom can or should be politicized; Buchanan offers examples of how she is negotiating and revealing the politics of schooling and community writing with pedagogies informed by her New Literacy Studies scholarship. Christian Smith proposes that now more than ever, rhetorical listening and mindful practice offer strategies for our time, both in our classrooms and communities.

In the piece that closes this issue Steve Parks reflects on how the election and its aftermath shifted how he views his partnerships, most notably with Syrians for Truth and Justice, when "it too often felt like much of the progressive inclusive rhetoric that has marked work in literacy in composition had been for naught" (88). In his meditation on the question, "What is to be done?" Parks turns to the primacy of quotidian acts: documenting lived experience, building broken alliances one by one, and preserving facts as the most necessary avenues to achieving justice.

It is our hope that readers submit symposium essays in response to this call and to the pieces published here. We return to the quotidian work of making room.

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

CONTENTS

Daughters Learning from Fathers:
Migrant Family Literacies that Mediate Borders

Kaia Simon—University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

KEYWORDS

family literacy, transnational literacy, gender, feminism, Hmong women

Scholarship in literacy studies has long demonstrated the significance of family literacy practices, with particular attention in recent decades to the literacy practices of migrant and refugee families.[1] Studies on migrant families have illuminated multiple aspects of their literacy: the experiences of migrant children as language and literacy brokers for adults (Al-Salmi and Smith; Guan et al.; Orellana); the intergenerational conflicts that emerge from literacy and language variations within families (Chao and Mantero; Figueroa; Sarroub); and the development and implementation of family literacy programs that incorporate literacy resources of migrant families within, or adjacent to, educational contexts (Alvarez; Auerbach; DaSilva Iddings; Moll and Gonzalez). Such studies often demonstrate that the differences in literacy access, education, and language fluency among members of migrant families result in conflict within families and between families and schools. While such literacy differences are a result of unequal conditions of migration and might be inevitable, my research reveals that conflict stemming from these differences is not. Based on an IRB-approved, empirical study of Hmong refugees, I show how literacy differences among generations of migrants can in fact inspire positive relations among family members, alter disempowering gender dynamics, and productively connect migrant families outward to public realms of literacy use, such as schools and workplaces. Specifically, in this article, I examine how literacy mediates a relationship often under-explored in studies of family literacy and literacy studies in general: fathers and daughters.

These issues surrounding family literacies and relationships are particularly acute for migrant groups who arrive to the US as refugees with varying histories of literacy experiences; these literacy histories might be affected by the geopolitical forces that also propelled the group's migration to a host nation (Brandt and Clinton; Duffy, *Writing*). Additionally, refugee groups often face reductive assumptions about their cultures, languages, religions, and conditions of relocation: as Victor Bascara notes, part of the refugee condition is to be perpetually "emplotted into a narrative of innocence, victimization, rescue, and recovery" (198). This narrative can interfere with refugees' access to the public resources of literacy,

and especially so for refugee women whom many assume to be further constrained by gendered cultural practices that interfere with their ability to act with agency (Narayama). Placing authority within migrant family literacies, as my study does, resists this narrative of refugee disempowerment, particularly for women from these groups whose access to literacy historically has been restricted. This study also contributes to conversations in family literacy studies that seek to value, and not intervene in or correct, migrant family literacy practices. I find that these relationships, fostered by interactions that center on literacy, inspire daughters to cross gendered borders between public and domestic spaces in order to access literacy resources. The daughters use these resources to achieve upward mobility as they also transform gender roles. Such insights into migrant family literacies ask scholars, educators, and the public to see literacy's role within migrant families, especially those families and cultures assumed to operate within strict patriarchal relations, as a force for positive change within families and a resource that helps children mediate borders to access public literacy resources.

> *"These relationships, and the literacy lessons at the center of them, inform these women's ability to achieve unprecedented access to education, professional careers, leadership, and advocacy. As the women who participated in my study cross borders into public realms and access literacy resources available there, they revise expected gender roles for Hmong women."*

The findings of this article are drawn from an ethnographic study of twenty-three Hmong women's literacy, in which I explore the multiple intersections among literacy, family, gender, and culture. While the conflicts that circulate around migrant family literacies mentioned above are also present in Hmong refugee families (Lee, R. et al.) and patriarchal gender dynamics remain a potent force for Hmong women's lives in general, I also find that literacy opened space for the women in my study to develop relationships with their parents that supported their development of multiple literacies within their homes. In terms of my focus here, literacy mediated daughters' relationships with their fathers and also helped the women cross typical gendered borders in Hmong family relationships. These relationships, and the literacy lessons at the center of them, inform these women's ability to achieve unprecedented access to education, professional careers, leadership, and advocacy. As the women who participated in my study cross borders into public realms and access literacy resources available there, they revise expected gender roles for Hmong women.

Context of the Study

When I asked participants to tell me about messages they received from their parents about literacy, twenty of the twenty-three women I interviewed mentioned specifically their fathers' support for their educations. These father-specific comments stood out to me because, as is evident in studies that depict home literacy practices (e.g., Al-Salmi; Alvarez; Brandt, *Literacy;* Cintron; Heath, *Ways;* Moll and Gonzalez et al.), whether or not these studies focus specifically on migrant family literacies, fathers are largely absent. These studies reveal what Deborah Brandt calls "the heavy hand of mothers" (*Literacy* 151) and women in family literacies. In literacy histories where fathers do appear (e.g., Gilyard; Rodriguez; Rose), fathers are more antagonistic or absent than involved figures in

literacy acquisition. Catherine Prendergast ("Or You Don't") and Brandt ("Accumulating") consider the role of fathers in accumulating, or not accumulating, literacy across generations. Vershawn Ashanti Young and David Kirkland consider the role of fathers and literacy in constructions of black masculinity. With the exception of Prendergast, these studies depict father-son relationships. All of this work points, from multiple approaches, to the data that the National Literacy Trust aggregates in its survey of studies of family literacy: fathers tend to be less involved, if at all, in their children's literacy acquisition and development—and even less so in the literacy of their daughters (Clark). Despite this trend in the literature, I find that for the Hmong women in my study, fathers played a noticeable role in their literacy development. Fathers verbally supported their educations, taught lessons at home, and invited them to cross borders into previously male-coded spaces. These relationships, and their fathers' influence in their literacy acquisition, became a resource these women drew from throughout their lives.

> *"I find that for the Hmong women in my study, fathers played a noticeable role in their literacy development. Fathers verbally supported their educations, taught lessons at home, and invited them to cross borders into previously male-coded spaces. These relationships, and their fathers' influence in their literacy acquisition, became a resource these women drew from throughout their lives."*

The Hmong are an ethnic group from Southeast Asia. They fled their villages in the mountains of Laos for refugee camps in Thailand at the end of the Vietnam War, due to the Hmong's alliance with the CIA in what became known as the Secret War.[2] For the Hmong who migrated to the US, relocation is what anthropologist Veena Das would call a "critical event": their lives were "propelled into new and unpredicted terrains" (5). These terrains were literal—the Hmong moved from refugee camps in Thailand to the United States—and cultural, as the Hmong lived an agrarian lifestyle in the mountains of Laos, practicing a primarily oral culture with very little literacy, until geopolitical forces displaced them from their homes and their way of life. After a critical event, writes Das, "new modes of action come into being which redefine[d] traditional categories" (6). One of the new modes of action for the Hmong is literacy.

Literacy as a new mode of action is especially significant for Hmong women. At the time of their relocation to the US, the Hmong had little alphabetic literacy in any language and maintained a primarily oral culture. In *Writing From These Roots*, John Duffy documents the multiple, sometimes competing, geopolitical forces that have acted upon the Hmong since their earliest history and interfered with their widespread literacy acquisition. Hmong women faced additional gendered interference: daughters were often, as one participant's mother told her, "prohibited" from access to the education that might have been available to their brothers, due to the patriarchal power structures that governed families. The daughters of the first generation of Hmong refugees, whether members of generation 1.5 or US-born, are the first to have widespread and expected access to literacy.[3]

These literate interactions are significant because in traditional father-daughter relationships in Hmong families, daughters often do not warrant much attention or investment from their fathers, literate or otherwise.[4] Yer, the only participant in this study whose parents were not supportive of her literacy, explains what she called "typical" relationships between Hmong parents and daughters: "My

parents are very traditional, and when I say that, I mean my dad was a typical Hmong male where he had no involvement in our lives because we were women. My mom took full care of bringing up the girls. Her priority was to make sure that we were well trained to be someone's wife one day."[5] Decisions about family matters, including education, often adhere to what fathers wanted: patriarchal structures of power, kinship, decision making, and the strict gendered division of labor are documented in ethnographic studies of the Hmong in both Laos (Ireson; Symonds) and in the US (Donnelly).

"By commenting on the centrality of literacy as a common site for opening, and fostering, the relationships between them and their fathers, these women reveal the interconnected nature of these gendered and cultural forces in their own literate development ."

By commenting on the centrality of literacy as a common site for opening, and fostering, the relationships between them and their fathers, these women reveal the interconnected nature of these gendered and cultural forces in their own literate development. I do not mean to imply that patriarchal relations were dismantled by these relationships and interactions. Instead, I intend to offer these findings as a corrective to the pervasive representations of "rigid Hmong patriarchy and Hmong women's submissiveness," as do Julie Keown-Bomar and Ka Vang in their study of Hmong women's agency and family relations (Keown-Bomar and Vang 140). The agency enacted by the women who participated in my study illustrates the need for approaches taken up by transnational feminist anthropologists Saba Mahmood and Laura Ahearn, who challenge scholars to expand notions of what agency means and how women experience it in their lived realities. In other words, agency does not have to manifest as resistance to power or conflict (Ahearn). Instead, I consider agency, as Mahmood does, in terms of women's ability to enact their desires. The relationships between daughters and fathers and the literacy lessons at their center are a form of cultural capital the women in my study use to enact agency as they pursue their desired literate opportunities in schools and workplaces, while they also maintain positive relationships with their families and communities.

In order to hone in on the effects of literacy for Hmong women, this study focuses on those who were children at the time of their relocation or were born shortly after their parents arrived in the US. I started recruiting participants from professional networks that I developed when living in communities that were primary resettlement sites for the Hmong beginning in the late 1970s. To expand participation from these networks, at the conclusion of each interview, I asked the participant to share the names of anyone who might also be willing to meet with me. Because such snowball sampling relies on social networks (Browne), the twenty-three women I interviewed have achieved educational levels that are not typical among most Hmong women. In contrast to the majority of Hmong women, who do not earn post-secondary degrees (Ngo and Lee; Xiong), all of my participants attended some post-secondary education and twenty-two have bachelor's degrees. Of these, thirteen continued to pursue graduate degrees, and eleven have master's degrees in fields such as counseling, social work, public policy, or education; one of my participants has earned a doctorate, and another was a PhD candidate at the time of our interview. Such credentials might lead readers to make associations between my participants and "model minority" stereotypes. As Bic Ngo and Stacey Lee make clear, however, the Hmong defy inclusion in this notion of Asian American upward

mobility for a few reasons. The Hmong resist assimilation as a diasporic group (Vang, C.) and do not demonstrate an upward trend in economic mobility in the 2010 census data, though more Hmong do earn high school diplomas and advanced degrees than past census records have shown (Xiong). The families of the women who participated in my study did not have the resources or social capital to be associated with the prominent image of Asian American families recently made popular by Amy Chua's *Battle Hymn of the Tiger Mother*. These scenes of literacy instruction between fathers and daughters are ad-hoc, improvised, and while they do participate in Immigrant Bargain and American Dream narratives (Alvarez, Vertovec), these interactions do not have the same neoliberal inflections that Susan Koshy locates and critiques in the Tiger Mother narrative as it applies to Asian Americans' upward mobility.

For my study, I conducted semi-structured oral literacy history interviews with twenty-three women who were children at the time of their family's relocation or born shortly thereafter and who are currently between the ages of 30 and 45.[6] This methodology is of particular salience when studying this group of refugee women because oral literacy history interviews allow participants to reveal their own literate practices in relation to the macrosocial forces that operate upon them, so that researchers can work to "untangle the knotted threads of literacy and history" (Vieira,"Doing" 139). Additionally, these literacy history interviews document the voices of migrant women who are too often left out of historical records. For these reasons, literacy history interviews" provide unexpected insights concerning the literacy development of individuals" (Duffy, "Recalling" 87), especially in the ways they reveal the individuals' own understandings of the role of literacy in their lives. Data collection occurred over an eight-month period in 2015-16. My interview protocol asked participants to share their literacy histories in relation to their K-12 educational experiences, their pursuit of higher education, their current work and literate practices. I also asked them to share their parents' messages and influences on their education and work. I transcribed all interviews. To extend my data collection beyond the interview transcripts, I also kept field notes at each interview and engaged in memoing throughout data collection (Heath and Street). When participants mentioned specific texts in the context of these literacy events, I asked them to share any copies or versions of these texts with me. Unfortunately, most of the texts had been lost over time—but I did collect samples of workplace writing, personal writing, and films created for college coursework. I also noted whenever participants referred to publicly available texts (published books, YouTube videos, etc.) and created a bibliography of these resources. The findings in this article draw primarily from interview transcripts and field notes.

In order to examine literacy's role as a mediating force for change for this generation, throughout the corpus of data I identified narratives of "literacy events," as defined by Shirley Brice Heath ("Protean" 445): specific memories where talk and texts, and talk about texts, intersect. Literacy events are productive units of analysis to answer the questions that animate this project, because participants' specific comments on literate activity speak to the ways literacy matters in their lived experiences of cultural change. I coded the interview transcripts for accounts of family literacy events and organized these excerpts according to prominent family members present. As I compiled the accounts that featured fathers and analyzed them in tandem, I specifically noted places where

participants linked the literacy events with their fathers to their present day lives and drew parallels between the literacy event to lasting effects on their identities, their worldviews, and their ability to access the public resources of literacy.

My data analysis methods center on the narratives my participants offered within their oral literacy histories, in keeping with my commitment to reflexive transnational feminist methodologies (Mahmood; Mohanty; Narayan; Sato) that privilege and preserve the accounts and epistemologies of research participants. These methods both account for and minimize my positionality as I represent and analyze the interview transcripts by foregrounding the voices of the women who shared their histories with me. My analysis of these interviews pays careful attention to the language used by the women who shared their stories with me, so that their self-presentation is preserved and respected.

Likewise, as Martin Packer argues, such narrative analysis of interview data "invite[s] the interviewer to adopt a new way of seeing the world, including a way of seeing the speaker, the interviewee" (100) through its respect of the plot and language offered by the interviewee. Additionally, the participants featured in this article reviewed drafts and offered

"In the explicit connections they make between the relationships with their fathers, life-long literacy practices, and their articulations of how their gender roles have changed, we are able to see how they give credit to these experiences as they continue to use literacy actively to mediate gendered borders between cultures, languages, families, communities, and US institutions."

feedback in advance of its being sent out for review. I turn now to sharing the findings from this focused analysis, to demonstrate that family literacies mediated these women's access to the public resources of literacy and informed their revision of traditional gender roles.

In what follows, I make this case through the accounts of five women. To protect their privacy, I refer to them by pseudonyms. Their names, education credentials, and current occupations are listed in Table 1 along with some notes pertinent to their experiences. The memories of these five women, related to me through literacy history interviews, represent in detail the various possibilities that these father-daughter literate relationships manifested in the lives of the women who participated in my study. These five women talked about how they carried these lessons and relationships with their fathers throughout their lives and revealed the meaning they assigned to these experiences. In the explicit connections they make between the relationships with their fathers, life-long literacy practices, and their articulations of how their gender roles have changed, we are able to see how they give credit to these experiences as they continue to use literacy actively to mediate gendered borders between cultures, languages, families, communities, and US institutions.

Table 1. Featured Participants

Name (Pseudonym)	Education	Current Work	Notes
Phoua	Bachelor's Degree, Elementary Education	2nd grade teacher	PaChoua's older sister
PaChoua	Bachelor's Degree, Elementary Education	5th grade teacher	Phoua's younger sister
Nhia	Bachelor's Degree, Political Science Master's Degree, Public Policy	Director of state government policy	Public advocate for Hmong women on marriage and domestic violence
Nalee	Bachelor's Degree, Ethnic Studies	Hmong language teacher	Began career in education as a tutor for pregnant teens
Mai	Bachelor's Degree, Political Science	Administrator at a state university	First woman president of the board for a local non-profit serving the Hmong community

Daughters Access Public Literacy Resources

Literacy facilitated these father-daughter relationships by offering them a site of connection that was new for Hmong daughters: access to education. As mentioned earlier, before daughters were expected (and required) to be educated in the US, they primarily occupied domestic spaces: doing chores, caring for younger siblings, cooking for the family. Daughters, by and large, did not have a public presence. After relocation, however, Hmong families had to readjust these practices to fit within a nation where the law would intervene if school-age daughters did not attend school. The place of daughters, and their relationships to other members of the family, were altered by their access to literacy. The women I interviewed told me their fathers responded by supporting their daughters' attendance and success in school, as long as she also contributed domestically as a traditional Hmong daughter might—and was at home when she was not in school.

By far, the most common literacy event between fathers and daughters—a narrative shared with me by twenty of my twenty-three participants—came in the form of "lectures" fathers gave to their daughters about the importance of an education, encouraging them to take full advantage of the opportunities presented to them. Fathers gave these lectures to both daughters and sons, which came up during interviews when participants commented that they weren't sure if they would have received the same encouragement to be educated if they'd grown up in Laos. Many participants told me that these lectures included a warning against taking work in manual labor. Five women voiced an experience that is common among children of migrant parents (Gonzalez et al.): that their fathers were supportive but "couldn't *really* help" them, meaning that these fathers were, like many immigrant parents no matter their previous home nation or languages, unfamiliar with school culture in the US. These interactions resulted in the building of father-daughter relationships where

these women felt that their literacy, measured in their educational achievements, was a reason their fathers took notice of them and became involved in their lives. They felt valued because of these interactions. In these lectures, fathers directed positive attention and messages about literacy to their daughters, centering literacy as the site of the interaction. The women I interviewed honored this relationship and expectation: all have pursued higher education.

Crossing Borders, National and Local

In addition to receiving verbal encouragement to access literacy through schooling from their fathers, the women also mentioned more literal acts of border crossing within narratives of literacy events. As literacy informed the development of relationships between fathers and daughters, fathers took action to make access to literacy physically possible for their daughters. Some of the fathers who participants told me "couldn't *really* help" their daughters with education found ways to increase their literate access: taking daughters to the library, driving them to and from school, or taking them to college interviews. By increasing their mobility, these fathers did in fact help their daughters access literate resources.

Phoua and PaChoua are sisters who teach at the same elementary school, and I met with them together in Phoua's classroom at the end of a school day. They are the two oldest daughters in their family, just over a year apart in age, and are, according to PaChoua, "always two peas in a pod." As they told me their family's story of migration, they included a literacy event featuring their father's literate intentions for them. Part of their father's inspiration to move his young family, as he told them, was his two daughters: "so we could have a better life, not in just wealth or whatever. He knew that education was the key, and if he stayed in Laos his daughters would never have the education that he wanted for us." Phoua and PaChoua's father made clear to his daughters that the opportunity for them to acquire literacy inspired him to move his family across national borders: from the jungles in Laos to the refugee camps in Thailand, from where they would eventually cross the border into the US. In their retelling of this family story, their father told them that he knew that if he decided to stay in Laos, his daughters would not be able to be educated. They knew he had always valued them, since he left his home country in order to ensure their access to literacy. His decision is an origin of the literate relationship that they continued to build, and neither daughter took her access to education for granted. They both expressed gratitude for their father's forward-thinking decision.

Phoua also articulated the lasting effects in her life from her father's actions to provide her geographic access to literacy. Phoua prioritized her education, saying that she was partially inspired by her father's words and his own pursuit of literacy at the local technical college. She always wanted to be an educator, telling me she imagined herself as a child teaching English lessons to her elders at her home. Phoua now teaches second grade in a diverse elementary school, and PaChoua teaches fifth grade at the same school. They both mentioned that they are proud to be role models for all of their students, but especially for students who are learning English as a second language. Their father's decision to cross national borders not only mediated their access to literacy at school but continues that access for the students they teach, many of whom have also crossed geographic borders to attend school.

Mai shared a similar literacy event of geographic border crossing as an example of her father's

support for her literacy. I first met Mai a few years ago, when she was the board president of a local non-profit that serves the local Hmong community and gave the keynote address at an annual Hmong fellowship dinner. She is the oldest daughter in her large family and told me that her father's support of her education was "extremely progressive"; she quickly added, "But what was he to do? He had seven girls!" In imagining her father's process of arriving at this progressive stance, Mai said that he had to "rewire that traditional brain of his and widen it a little bit" first to believe that his daughters could "be whatever we want to be here in the United States" and then to tell them that they could, and should, use their educations to find the way to live that life. Mai's father took action and decided to support her education in a strategic choice to move their family to live within a particular school's boundary, so she and her siblings would attend an elementary school with fewer Hmong students. In the midsized city where she grew up in the early 1980s, most Hmong families lived in the same neighborhoods and attended the same elementary schools. Mai told me that her father's decision to cross this border to relocate was bold at the time. As she told me, he wanted to create the conditions where she would "either sink or swim": he wanted her to be forced to rely on English as her primary language in school (saving Hmong for home, making sure she also remained fluent) so she wouldn't be behind and would have the "asset" of English fluency. Mai ultimately believes that her father's "design" was wise even as she admitted to feeling isolated at school. She credits her elementary school experience with her fluency in English and that she learned to be "very comfortable being the only minority student in class," both of which have served her well in professional settings. Mai told me that her father framed his choice to relocate as one that would help her "survive," and she agrees that it has.

Mai related the lasting effects of her access to the elementary school literacy resources her father ensured by moving to a new home: she told me that because she was enrolled in a school where she was one of the only Hmong students, she learned to take different types of opportunities, to take risks, and not to stay "stuck in a niche grouping." As an adult, Mai finds these lessons still serve her well: she is still not afraid to be uncomfortable, and she does not feel out of place when she is the only Hmong person, or the only woman, in a space. When she was elected board president of the non-profit organization, she was the first women ever to hold such a leadership position and faced resistance from many of those she worked to serve. Mai tells me her ability to endure as an outsider in majority-White or male-gendered spaces is shaped because "[my dad] has designed me to get to this place where, You want answers? I will figure that out for you. I can do that!" Her sense of her own capacity to increase the public visibility and leadership potential of Hmong women began to form during those elementary school experiences. She links this aspect of her personality to her father's intervention in her schooling.

These literacy events reveal the interconnections among fathers, daughters, access to literacy through education, and the lived consequences of crossing national and local political borders. These fathers encouraged their daughters to access public literacies through decisions that placed them in geographic locations that would make such access possible. These literacy events participate in the broader narrative of the Immigrant Bargain, which Alvarez notes migrant children often experience as a burden to succeed, since parents justify their sacrifices because of the potential opportunities for

their children. Years after their schooling is complete and they have achieved work in professional settings, Phoua, PaChoua, and Mai all acknowledged the hardships these decisions brought to their fathers and to themselves, but they did not say that they felt burdened by their fathers' expectations. Instead, they ultimately expressed gratitude for their fathers' decision making and for the opportunities they had because of them. Crossing geographic borders not only mediated their access to school but affected their literacy throughout their lives.

Crossing Borders Between Home and School

Some literacy events the daughters remembered were their fathers sharing school-based literacies with them, relying on schooling they'd obtained before their relocation. These literacy lessons crossed borders as fathers relied on knowledge and instructional practices from their own schooling and lives abroad. The lessons also crossed from home to school, as daughters drew from them throughout their educations. Seventeen participants' fathers came to the US with some alphabetic literacy (most commonly in Lao, French, or Hmong) and numeracy they had acquired through formal education in Laos, military training, or adult education programs in the refugee camps. Of these seventeen, five created an instructional relationship with their daughters, often centered in nightly lessons, homework time, or trips to the local library or bookstores to find reading materials. These scenes of academic lessons were more rare in my interviews, even among the fathers who'd been educated, because most of the fathers worked long hours in manufacturing jobs that did not leave time for home lessons. Nhia and Nalee both shared extended stories about how their relationships with their fathers developed through these lessons in alphabetic literacy, numeracy, and languages. They remembered their fathers supporting their access to school-based literacy by assuming a teacher-like role in their lives.

Nhia and I met in her government office, where she works in public policy. When I asked her about her earliest memories of education, she shared this literacy event:

> My father and my uncle worked out a deal where, even as a teenager, my uncle would go to school, hold a part time job at a gas station, and then he would get home at around midnight. I always knew that my job was to stay up past midnight because then my father would go and pick up my uncle from the gas station where he worked at and my uncle would come in with all of the remaining donuts. We would eat donuts and we would learn our ABCs. It worked out well because I was waiting for the donuts and my father wouldn't let us go to sleep until my uncle Mickey was home and we had gone through our A is for Apple and B is for Banana kind of thing, And this is before I went to school.

In remembering her late-night lessons and donuts with her father and uncle, Nhia referred to it as a sort of Early Childhood Education. In addition to the lessons about the ABCs, her father drilled multiplication tables with her by papering her bedroom walls with large sheets of paper, writing multiplication tables all over them, and having her recite them nightly. She called these lessons her "bedtime reading," bringing together the cozy imagery of this often-maternal practice with the image of her joining her uncle and father around a table, eating donuts and trying to win dictionary

competitions. Nhia pointed to these family literacy practices when she remembered her ease of access to school: they were the reason she excelled in math class until "at least ninth grade" and continues to be careful and aware of the words she chooses to use when speaking. She noted that her father's diligence in his lessons with her made her school experiences less burdensome. That he taught these lessons with no mind to her daily work in school—at times teaching her at levels far beyond what her teachers expected of her—also taught her to work hard to achieve the eventual ease of learning. She credited her father's lessons as part of how she developed her diligence and success throughout her schooling.

Nalee has worked in school-based settings her entire professional life and currently is the director of a Hmong language program. When Nalee and I met over coffee and began our conversation, it became immediately clear that her father is an important influence in her personal commitment to education. She proudly told me that her father was a language teacher in Ban Vinai refugee camp before his family relocated to the US and that her family was "different than the average Hmong refugee family" because her father created a homework station at the kitchen table and gathered his children there for nightly practice. She told me that he taught her all he could, until "eventually the education that we were part of became pretty much over his head." Nalee remembered learning to read and write in Hmong, multiplication tables, and how to count from one to eleven in French. She chuckled as she recalled the confused faces her teachers made when she repeated the lessons she learned from her father to them and they couldn't quite decipher what she was saying: "even before we went to school he was teaching us already, but he taught us in his accent." Nalee remembers feeling proud that she was ahead of her peers, even if her speech was marked as accented. For Nalee, education has always been and continues to be "a huge part of my life," and she connects her belief in the power of education to her father's influences that began with those lessons.

For both women, these nightly lessons facilitated their access to some literacies in school, but when fathers relied on the instructional methods they had experienced that did not align with classroom practices in American schools, there were some disconnects in expectations and consequences. Nhia remembers watching her sister play a multiplication game with her father that involved chopsticks and a ball, in which "if you recite any number that's off you would get hit with the chopsticks . . . . I had that luxury of watching, so I knew that I couldn't get any answers wrong." Nhia noted that her father's methods were less sympathetic than what she experienced in school. Nalee also said that her father's methods mirrored his own education experiences in Thailand where "once you learn the information you move on. It doesn't matter how old you are." When he introduced her to multiplication as a young child, she remembered, "I was just thinking what is this beast? I tried so hard . . . but I still didn't understand! I have to say though, when I got to third grade, we started doing actual multiplication and I was ahead. [I thought] is this all this is? Oh, this is easy!" Both Nhia and Nalee remarked that they believed their fathers emphasized numeracy because, as Nalee put it, "math is its own language" and their fathers were not hindered by a lack of English. They turned to numbers to mediate these interactions with their daughters. Both women found these family literacy practices beneficial in their ability to perform among public literacy work of school, especially in math class.

In addition to feeling prepared for success in school by her father's lessons, Nalee told me that

she has always felt "blessed" that her father did not adhere to "that community assumption that there was this whole sons and daughters thing where daughters were expected to do more housework and things like that" but instead "as far as education goes and opportunities and all of that it was just about who was interested in what." Nalee said she knew that "whatever I wanted to be a part of, he would be right there." In addition to helping her land her first summer job as an adolescent, Nalee credits her father for her "knack for tutoring," which she drew from during her work as a translator in a charter high school for teen mothers. Her tutoring skills led her to develop support for Hmong-speaking students that was responsive to their language and culture, and she eventually assumed most of the instructional duties for these students: developing curriculum and planning and delivering lessons. Nalee highlighted this experience and her expertise in the Hmong language when she interviewed to be a Hmong language instructor at a university. She does not have all of the educational credentials the job asked for, but she accepted their job offer and has since received a promotion to direct the program. Nalee has spent her professional life in schools, and she traces her entry to working for these public institutions, and her desire to be the best teacher she can be, to her relationship with her father.

Nhia's professional path has led her to work in public policy, which she decided to pursue partway through her undergraduate degree, when she switched her major from pre-med to political science. Nhia's desire to be a leader stems both from her father's messages about education and from a message her grandfather recorded for her parents on a cassette he sent them from Laos: her grandfather said that "the future leaders of the world are sitting inside the classrooms of America." Nhia's father, himself a military leader, told her that education would help her find a seat at the table "where decisions, our very futures, are being made." The inspiration she found in her relationship with her father meant she made the bold move to pursue his dream that his children be leaders, while defying his desire that she become a doctor. Despite her prominence as a leader for the Hmong community in her state and particularly for women, she revealed that her father still believes she should have become a doctor. Even so, while her father's lessons may not have produced the specific result he wanted, they manifest in her work in public policy. Nhia's realization that she did in fact want to be a leader led her away from a more lucrative profession in medicine to a career where she uses literacy to advocate for justice for underrepresented groups. She is a visible, and at times controversial, leader in the Hmong community and in her state government. She chose to have this path because she grew up seated at her family's table where she learned her ABCs and her future possibilities.

The literacy events depicted in this section reveal the ways that these fathers enacted literacy instruction with their daughters, developing relationships centered on home literacies that also support their success in school-based literacies. Even with the indirect connection to school, these lessons are clearly primarily grounded in family literacy practices—as these fathers relied on their heritage language as they share their own literacies with their daughters. These lessons are not always immediately accessible to daughters in school, but they eventually became a resource they draw from as a knowledge base and as an orientation to education more broadly. The dual nature of these effects results in their continued ability to access the resources that schools offer them: first as students

and later as professionals. These women credit the literacy events they had with their fathers as they locate the ways they developed and drew from these resources.

Family Literacies Revising Gender Roles

In the previous sections, I demonstrated how participants draw from their literate relationships with their fathers, crossing borders as they access public literacy resources in schools and workplaces. Many participants revealed that such access led them to question and revise the traditional gender roles they might have otherwise been expected to maintain when it came to marriage. Being married, becoming a daughter-in-law, and having children are central expectations for Hmong women. According to traditional practices, Hmong women marry young: in the US, if generation 1.5 and second generation daughters were not married during high school, then elders thought they should be shortly thereafter. Indeed, simply attending school during the day meant that these unmarried Hmong daughters had a public presence that resulted in great concern among many Hmong parents. They believed that their daughters' freedom outside the home would lead them to misbehave—making them less eligible for marriages into good families. Parents responded by restricting daughters' mobility outside of school hours, as participants told me during interviews and as Stacey J. Lee finds in her study of Hmong youth in schools. Accessing school literacies and choosing to continue to pursue higher education—in response to their fathers' support—often resulted in the disruption of typical expectations for age of marriage for Hmong women.

Among the women who shared their stories with me, three were married during or right after high school and pursued higher education while also filling the expected role of daughters-in-law in their husbands' families.[7] The rest of the women in my study delayed their marriages while they attended higher education and married after they had earned degrees. Three women were single at the time of our interview. Mai, who delayed her marriage not only until she had graduated but until her term as board president ended, told me that she was an "eyesore" among her extended family before she married, adding: "I mean, they've never had a Hmong female in their family beyond the age of sixteen, seventeen!" As in her experiences in school, she found support for this revision of her expected role in her relationship with her father, who, she reported, "was like, you do what you need to do [with school and work] and all that other stuff [getting married and having children] will happen." Her relationship with her father, and his support of her literate pursuits and public advocacy, offered her the resources she needed to withstand pressures to marry that came elsewhere in her community. Marriage, and the age at which Hmong women now get married, has shifted noticeably as Hmong women access public literacies. Delaying the age of marriage—and recognizing that a daughter has some agency in making the decision—is a clear revision of gender roles inspired by access to literacy.

The disruptions in expectations inspired by these relationships were not just in age of marriage, however. Literacy also became a resource that daughters could draw from as they measured their own value and attractiveness as future wives. Phoua shared one such literacy event that she said has informed one way she reconsidered her value as a Hmong woman. As a self-described "ugly

duckling," Phoua told me that "in the Hmong culture, it's so natural for people to do this . . . they will compare everybody. They will say oh, you're not as pretty as this one." Phoua told me these comments were hurtful until "my dad sat me down one day . . . and he was like, Okay. You might not be pretty, but I don't want you think about just beauty. I want you to focus on education . . . one day you're going to be educated and then you will be beautiful to everybody." Laughing, Phoua ended this memory by saying "I cherish those words!" Her father intervened and interrupted the cultural practice of commenting on physical beauty of women to reframe Phoua's sense of what she could, and should, value about herself as a Hmong woman. His message taught Phoua that literacy could open a different path to achieve different goals, that she could focus on herself and achievement rather than worry about outside judgment. She learned that literacy could be her access to resources that would make her an attractive wife. In this reframing, the gender roles and values for Hmong women are revised.

Crossing Borders into Male-Coded Spaces

For some daughters, their relationships with their fathers resulted in gendered border crossings into male-coded spaces that mediated their access to traditional oral literacies typically shared between fathers and sons. Nhia received lessons in oral history, which she told me her father "meant to be for the sons but he didn't have any sons," during times they went fishing together. She said that her father told her about the history of the Hmong people and about her clan in particular: "stories of what could be, what has been, what's broken, what could be put together again…eventually [I could] begin to hear all of the other messages that were being told that he wasn't just really putting into words for me. I just walked away from those years of my life with the understanding that I have an opportunity [to become a leader]." She told me that she felt these oral family histories shared by her father positioned Nhia in the long lineage of the leaders in her family, that her own literacy could give her the opportunity to contribute to the historical memory of her family and clan.

Nhia's fishing trips and cultural literacy lessons demonstrate how such changed relationships between fathers and daughters opened space for fathers to include daughters in lessons previously reserved for sons, offering them access to privileged cultural literacies and the opportunity to imagine themselves part of them. Nhia's current leadership in government policy places her within the stories her father told her: she is working to put things together for the Hmong in the US. She continues this difficult work even as she faces backlash from those in her community who feel she is out of her place as a Hmong woman—that she's crossed the border too far in assuming her role as a public advocate for women. Nhia locates the resolve to stand firm in her advocacy in her knowledge of her family's leadership lineage.

Phoua and PaChoua's father also included his daughters in these male-only spaces. They told me that their father spent a lot of time with them and "literally imparted the knowledge and the wisdom that his dad passed onto him and his brother to us." In this account of inter-generational teaching, "us" means two daughters: Phoua and PaChoua interrupt the patriarchal chain. PaChoua elaborates:

[My dad was able] to give us the knowledge and wisdom that they usually pass onto boys.

Because boys sat in meetings, they took care of the family issues. And we did, we got to sit through those too. We got to listen to it. We brought the waters in for the males like girls do, but my dad would always allow us to stay in the room. We weren't shooed away like girls usually do. He would invite us to stay, you know: It's okay girls. You can stay. He made us feel like we were important in this decision making, even though it was a room full of males. He's like: Listen. Listen. How did this person talk? Listen, how did this person talk? And did you see how wise he was with his words? And don't be like the fool like this one. And he would coach us. But if we were girls, we would be in the kitchen. We wouldn't hear that. We wouldn't get that coaching.

Even though PaChoua's language implies that she sees some separation between "girls" and herself and her sister when she repeats "like girls" and says "*if* we were girls," at the time of this memory they *are* girls. PaChoua's language indicates that in this memory she recognizes that her father is not treating her like a girl. PaChoua's father not only encourages her and Phoua to witness the male elders in discussion but also debriefs those discussions with her later, encouraging her active listening and evaluation of what she heard. In her memories of this rhetorical training, her father is inviting her to imagine herself one day also participating in these discussions. She can stay. He asks her to try to emulate the good examples and tells her "don't be like the fool." PaChoua concluded the story of this memory by telling me that she felt able to be a leader, and to become a teacher, because her father not only encouraged her to speak her mind but taught her how to do it eloquently.

Entry into these male-coded spaces inspired further revision to traditional marriage expectations for these daughters beyond delaying the age at which it happened. In this particular case, Phoua and PaChoua were invited to stay in and learn from elders' discussions, and their father demonstrated that he appreciated them and valued their opinions. Perhaps because they had been treated as more than just "like girls" by their father, Phoua and PaChoua both expressed that when the time came for them to think about choosing their partners, they'd wanted to marry men who "appreciate us as equal partners" and who "value our opinions." They understood that while this might be uncommon among traditional Hmong men, it was possible to find husbands who might have similar beliefs about their wives. Phoua and PaChoua, laughing, both told me that their "independence" can at times result in conflict in their marriages, but that ultimately they have found husbands who do consider them as equals and they are grateful to have married them. Phoua and PaChoua revised the courtship script for Hmong daughters by expecting to be treated with equality.

These women's fathers invited their daughters to cross the gendered borders within their families and gave them access to Hmong cultural literacies typically shared with sons. These daughters look to these interactions as one place where they gained a sense of their own potential for leadership. They continue to assert themselves into these community spaces and rituals, crossing gendered borders and in so doing transforming their own gender roles as they also publicly represent revised images of Hmong women as leaders. This is an important enactment of their access to public literacies, as Mai and Nhia especially offer public enactment of these leadership roles and can be models for expanding notions of the realms Hmong women should occupy. In their personal and professional

lives, literacy has allowed these three women to cross multiple borders and to participate as Hmong women in their families and communities, but in these cases we see them being Hmong women on their own timelines and on their own terms.

Family Literacies as Resources

Families, and their literacy practices, continue to move across borders. The current political unrest around the world is resulting in more displaced people seeking refugee status and protection. With the attention circulating around the migrations of groups of people, some of that focus has turned in particular to literacy access for young women and girls for whom education has been denied due to geopolitical interruptions and sexist forces.[8] It is clear that as families migrate, literacy will continue to mediate changes within families and as members of those families use literacy to access public resources. Literacy's role within these families is complicated: at times the source of conflict and strife, at times a source of relationship building and strengthening. Family literacy practices, regardless of whether or not they directly support or related to the literacy practices of schools, workplaces, or governments, can have lifelong effects of the children of migrants as they continue to mediate borders and establish a public presence in their home nation.

In this article, I have shown how daughters rely on literate relationships with their fathers throughout their lives to access these public resources of literacy and to transform their gender roles within their families and communities. Literacy, and the relationships it mediated, supported their experiences of upward mobility as it also inspired them to revise their expected gender roles. While all migrant groups events will not necessarily follow the pattern of the Hmong relocation to the US and the introduction of widespread literacy for women in one generation, studies such as this should inspire transnational writing scholars to look to family literacy practices as capaciously as possible, in order to better understand these resources that individuals carry with them into classrooms, workplaces, and writing in public. Further, as we broaden notions of literacy's role in feminist agency, we better understand that transnational women's experiences mediating multiple gendered borders, and their revisions of gender roles, are also intricately connected to family literacy practices. These nuanced insights help us to recognize the complex interactions between individuals, family literacies, and access to the public resources of literacy—and should challenge us to rethink ways that migrant family literacies serve as assets, especially as they are carried from homes into public spaces.

NOTES

[1] I would like to express my deep gratitude to Catherine Prendergast for her feedback on this article from its earliest stages. Special thanks to Kate Vieira for on-point and insightful suggestions on multiple drafts. Thank you to Amy Wan and the anonymous reviewers for offering productive critique and providing suggestions for improvement. Most importantly, I owe all of this work to the generous women who shared their literacy histories with me.

[2] The relocations of the Hmong after the end of the Vietnam War happened in waves, with one occurring between 1978-1982, one in 1987-8, and one in the mid 2000's at the closure of the last remaining refugee camp in Thailand. For more on this history, see Chan; Donnelly; Duffy; Tapp et al.; C. Vang.

[3] In keeping with common definitions among transnational scholars (e.g., Danico; Louie; Suarez-Orozco et al.; Vertovec), I define generation 1.5 as those who migrate when they are younger than the age of twelve.

[4] While these cultural specifics of gender bias are particular to the Hmong, these biased tendencies between fathers and their children are not, as sociologist Dalton Conley notes in *Pecking Order*. Conley's study of a wide corpus of data as well as qualitative interviews reveals that these gender biases transcend culture and economic status and have real economic and emotional effects that last throughout adulthood. Sons tend to benefit in terms of their confidence, self-esteem, and economic stability while daughters tend to experience negative effects in these realms.

[5] For another consideration of the "typical" roles and treatment of Hmong daughters, see Ka Vang.

[6] Similar methodologies appear in the following: Brandt, *Literacy;* Duffy, *Writing;* Lagman; Mihut; Prendergast, *Buying*; Vieira, *American.*

[7] When a Hmong woman marries, traditionally she becomes a member of her husband's family. Traditional kinship practices involve sons and daughters-in-law living with his parents, and the daughter-in-law (*nyab*, in Hmong) is expected to "serve" her in-laws through domestic labor: cooking, chores, caring for the family's children.

[8] Malala Yousafzai (whose father plays a prominent role her education) won the Nobel Peace Prize in 2014 because of her work to bring education to girls. "Boko Haram," the common name in the West for a Nigerian terrorist organization, is most often translated as "Western education is a sin." This isn't a perfect translation, but the words link the concepts of "education" and "harm." The group notoriously kidnapped girls from their school in 2014, inspiring the #BringBackOurGirls movement. For more on the translation of the name, see Murphy.

WORKS CITED

Ahearn, Laura M. "Language and Agency." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30.1 (2001): 109-37. Print.

Al-Salmi, Laila Z., and Patrick H. Smith. "Arab Immigrant Mothers Parenting Their Way into Digital Biliteracy." *Literacy in Composition Studies* 3.3 (2015): 48-66. Web. 10 Nov. 2016.

Alvarez, Steven. "Brokering the Immigrant Bargain: Second-Generation Immigrant Youth Negotiating Orientations to Literacy." *Literacy in Composition Studies* 3.3 (2015): 25-47. Web. 10 Nov. 2016.

Auerbach, Elsa. "Deconstructing the Discourse of Strengths in Family Literacy." *Journal of Reading Behavior* 27.4 (1995): 643-61. Print.

Bascara, Victor. "'In the Middle': The Miseducation of a Refugee." *Strange Affinities: The Gender and Sexual Politics of Comparative Racialization.* Eds. Grace Kyungwon Hong and Roderick A. Ferguson. Durham: Duke UP, 2011. 195-214. Print.

Brandt, Deborah. "Accumulating Literacy: Writing and Learning to Write in the Twentieth Century." *College English* 57.6 (1995): 649-68. Print.

---. *Literacy in American Lives.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.

Brandt, Deborah, and Kate Clinton. "Limits of the Local: Expanding Perspectives on Literacy as a Social Practice. *Journal of Literacy Research* 34.3 (2002): 337-356. Print.

Browne, Katherine. "Snowball Sampling: Using Social Networks to Research Non-Heterosexual Women." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 8.1 (2005): 47-60. Print.

Chang, Sucheng. *Hmong Means Free: Life in Laos and America.* Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1994. Print.

Chao, Xia, and Miguel Mantero. "Church-Based ESL Adult Programs: Social Mediators for Empowering 'Family Literacy Ecology of Communities.'" *Journal of Literacy Research* 46.1 (2014): 90-114. Print.

Chua, Amy. *Battle Hymn of the Tiger Mother*. New York: Penguin, 2011. Print.

Cintron, Ralph. *Angel's Town: Chero Ways, Gang Life, and Rhetorics of the Everyday.* Boston: Beacon, 1998. Print.

Clark, Christina. *Why Fathers Matter to their Children's Literacy*. London: National Literacy Trust, 2009. Web. 15 April 2016.

Conley, Dalton. *Pecking Order: Which Siblings Succeed and Why*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2004. Print.

Danico, Mary Yu. *The 1.5 Generation: Becoming Korean American in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 2004. Print.

Das, Veena. *Critical Events: An Anthropological Perspective on Contemporary India.* Delhi: Oxford UP, 1995. Print.

Da Silva Iddings, Ana Christina. "Bridging Home and School Literacy Practices: Empowering Families of Recent Immigrant Children." *Theory Into Practice* 48.4 (2009): 304-11. Print.

Donnelly, Nancy D. *Changing Lives of Refugee Hmong Women.* Seattle: U of Washington P, 1994. Print.

Duffy, John. "Recalling the Letter: The Uses of Oral Testimony in Historical Studies of Literacy." *Written Communication* 24.1 (2007): 84-107. Print.

---. *Writing From These Roots: Literacy in a Hmong American Community*. Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 2007. Print.

Figueroa, Ariana Mangual. "'I Have Papers So I Can Go Anywhere!': Everyday Talk About Citizenship in a Mixed-Status Mexican Family." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 1.51 (2012): 291-311. Print.

Gilyard, Keith. *Voices of the Self: A Study of Language Competence*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1991. Print.

Gonzalez, Laura M., Jose A Villalba, and L. Dianne Borders. "Spanish-Speaking Immigrant Parents and Their Children: Reflections on the Path to College." *Journal of Humanistic Counseling* 54.2 (2015): 122-139. Print.

Guan, Shu-Sha A., Patricia M. Greenfield, and Marjorie F. Orellana. "Translating into Understanding: Language Brokering and Prosocial Development in Emerging Adults from Immigrant Families." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 29.3 (2014): 331-55. Print.

Heath, Shirley Brice. "Protean Shapes in Literacy Events: Ever-Shifting Oral and Literate Traditions." *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook.* Eds. Ellen Cushman, et al. Boston: Bedford St. Martin's, 2001. 443-66. Print.

---. *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983. Print.

Heath, Shirley Brice, and Brian V. Street. *On Ethnography: Approaches to Literacy and Language Research.* New York: Teachers College P, 2008. Print.

Ireson, Carol J. *Field, Forest, and Family: Women's Work and Power in Rural Laos*. New York: Westview P, 1996. Print.

Keown-Bomar, Julie, and Ka Vang. "Hmong Women, Family Assets, and Community Cultural Wealth." *Claiming Place: On the Agency of Hmong Women*. Eds. Chia Youyee Vang, Faith Nibbs, and Ma Vang. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota, 2016. 117-43. Print.

Kirkland, David E. *A Search Past Silence: The Literacy of Young Black Men*. New York: Teachers College P, 2013. Print.

Koshy, Susan. "Neoliberal Family Matters." *American Literary History* 25.2 (2013): 344-80. Print.

Lagman, Eileen. "Moving Labor: Transnational Migrant Workers and Affective Literacies of Care." *Literacy in Composition Studies* 3.3 (2015): 1-24. Web. 10 Nov. 2016.

Lee, Richard M., et al. "The Family Life and Adjustment of Hmong American Sons and Daughters." *Sex Roles* 60.7 (2009): 549-58. Print.

Lee, Stacey J. *Up Against Whiteness: Race, School, and Immigrant Youth*. New York: Teachers College P, 2005. Print.

Louie, Vivian. *Keeping the Immigrant Bargain: The Costs and Rewards of Success in America.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2012. Print.

Mahmood, Saba. *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005.

Mihut, Ligia Ana. "Literacy Brokers and the Emotional Work of Mediation." *Literacy in Composition Studies* 2.1 (2014): 57-79. Web. 10 Nov. 2016.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham: Duke UP, 2003. Print.

Moll, Luis C., and Norma Gonzalez. "Lessons from Research with Language-Minority Children." *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook.* Eds. Ellen Cushman, et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 156-71. Print.

Murphy, Dan. "'Boko Haram' Doesn't Really Mean 'Western Education is a Sin.'" *The Christian Science Monitor.* The Christian Science Monitor, 6 May 2014. Web. 10 Nov. 2016.

Narayan, Uma. *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions, and Feminism*. New York: Routledge, 1997. Print.

Ngo, Bic, and Stacey J. Lee. "Complicating the Image of Model Minority Success: A Review of Southeast Asian American Education." *Review of Educational Research* 77.4 (2007): 415-53. Print.

Orellana, Marjorie Faulstich. *Translating Childhoods: Immigrant Youth, Language, and Culture.* Piscataway: Rutgers UP, 2009. Print.

Packer, Martin. "Qualitative Analysis Reconsidered." *The Science of Qualitative Research.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. 99-120. Print.

Prendergast, Catherine. "Or You Don't: Talents, Tendencies, and the Pooka of Literacy." *Enculturation* 16 *(*2013). Web. 6 May 2016.

Rodriguez, Richard. *Hunger of Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez (An Autobiography).* Boston: D.R. Godline, 1982. Print.

Rose, Mike. *Lives on the Boundary: A Moving Account of the Struggles and Achievements of America's Educationally Underprepared.* New York: Free P, 1989. Print.

Sarroub, Loukia K. *All American Yemeni Girls: Being Muslim in a Public School.* Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2005. Print.

Sato, Chizu. "A Self-Reflexive Analysis of Power and Positionality: Toward a Transnational Feminist Praxis." *Women, Literacy, and Development: Alternate Perspectives.* Ed. Anna Robinson-Pant. London: Routledge, 2004. 100-12. Print.

Suarez-Orozco, Carola, Marcelo M. Suarez-Orozco, and Irina Todorova. *Learning a New Land: Immigrant Students in American Society.* Cambridge: The Belknap P, 2008. Print.

Symonds, Patricia V. *Calling in the Soul in a Hmong Village: Gender and the Cycle of Life.* Seattle: U of Washington P, 2003. Print.

Tapp, Nicholas, et al., eds. *Hmong/Miao in Asia.* Bangkok: Silkworm, 2004. Print.

Vang, Chia Youyee. *Hmong America: Reconstructing Community in Diaspora.* Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2010. Print.

Vang, Ka. "The Good Hmong Girl Eats Raw *Laab.*" *Hmong and American: From Refugees to Citizens.* Eds. Vincent K. Her and Mary Louise Buley-Meissner. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society P, 2012. 101-12. Print.

Vertovec, Steven. "Migrant Transnationalism and Modes of Transformation." *The International Migration Review* 38.3 (2004): 970-1001. Print.

Vieira, Kate. *American By Paper: How Documents Matter in Immigrant Literacy.* Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2016. Print.

—-. "Doing Transnational Writing Studies: A Case for the Literacy History Interview." *Composition Studies* 44.1 (2016): 138-40. Print.

Xiong, Yang Sao. "Hmong Americans' Educational Attainment: Recent Changes and Remaining Challenges." *Hmong Studies Journal* 13.2 (2012): 1-18. Print.

Young, Vershawn Ashanti. *Your Average Nigga: Performing Race, Literacy, and Masculinity*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2007. Print.

Reciprocal Literacy Sponsorship in Service-Learning Settings

Kara Poe Alexander—Baylor University

KEYWORDS

literacy sponsor, service-learning, multiliteracies, composition pedagogy, social change

Usually richer, more knowledgeable, and more entrenched than the sponsored, sponsors nevertheless enter a reciprocal relationship with those they underwrite. They lend their resources or credibility to the sponsored but also stand to gain benefits from their success, whether by direct repayment or, indirectly, by credit of association. (Brandt, "Sponsors" 167)

[A]s more and more people participate in online writing spaces, we might assume there will be more and more opportunities for people to become literacy sponsors. (Hunter 20)

The concept of a literacy sponsor has had a significant impact on theory and practice in composition and literacy studies. By demonstrating that individual literacy achievement is affected by and tied to a variety of "people, institutions, materials, and motivations" (Brandt, "Sponsors" 167), this concept has revolutionized our conceptions of literacy and the way we teach writing. Deborah Brandt defines literacy sponsors as "any agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who enable, support, teach, model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold literacy—and gain advantage by it in some way" ("Sponsors" 166). Brandt's work helps scholars recognize the variety of internal and external forces that structure opportunities and shape literacy acquisition, development, and practices. Moreover, by connecting "literacy as an individual development to literacy as an economic development," Brandt's research teaches us that sponsors "set the terms for access to literacy and wield powerful incentives for compliance and loyalty" (166–67).

Since Brandt's groundbreaking work, literacy scholars have examined the myriad institutions and entities that sponsor literacy. Some of these sponsors include academies and schools (Carrick; Finders; Pitcock), government agencies (Lebduska; Pedersen), corporations (Debs), religious and missionary groups (Engelson; Moulder; Pavia), online forums (Pavia; Scenters-Zapico), comics (Fehler; Jacobs), and individuals (Daniell and Mortensen; Webb-Sunderhaus). Scholars have also observed how sponsored subjects respond to the sponsorship: with acceptance, compliance,

circumvention, subversion, reassignment, disruption, and diversion (see Brandt, "Sponsors"; Daniell and Mortensen; Pedersen). In practice, those sponsored might protest (Moulder), write (Moulder; Pitcock; Yi and Hirvela), forge new identities (Hogg), or build relationships (Carrick). In many cases, the sponsored even reappropriate the literacy resources offered by the sponsor to fulfill personal, social, and professional goals, thus empowering the sponsored agency to initiate change (Carrick; Daniell and Mortensen).

While this scholarship situates literacy sponsorship as a complex subject in which the sponsored seize literacy resources to achieve power and agency, this work, perhaps implicitly, forwards a view of literacy sponsorship as a one-way, top-down endeavor where the "sponsored" and "sponsor" retain fairly fixed roles: sponsor is always sponsor, and sponsored is always sponsored. Even when the sponsored claim agency and appropriate the literacy resources offered within the confines of the sponsorship, the sponsored is rarely presented as moving from *sponsored* to *sponsor* or as being able to reciprocate the sponsorship. Brandt argues that literacy sponsors "enter a reciprocal relationship with those they underwrite" ("Sponsors" 167), yet our conversations have not yet accounted for a notion of reciprocal literacy sponsorship where the roles of sponsor and sponsored are fluid, interchangeable, or nuanced.

One way to examine reciprocal literacy sponsorship is to explore sponsorship on a smaller scale, as it is practiced in the lives of individuals. At the core of Brandt's notion of literacy sponsorship is its connection to large-scale systems, conditions, and structures (i.e., economic, historical, political). But Brandt does not limit her definition of sponsorship to these forces. Instead, she emphasizes the roles individuals play in connection to these forces, including how literacy access and opportunities for literacy learning emerge ("Sponsors" 169). Moreover, her analysis of individual lives underscores how individuals such as parents, teachers, coaches, religious leaders, and supervisors do sponsor literacies. Of course, Brandt emphasizes how the motivations of these individual sponsors are always connected to a broader context, but her analysis does not preclude the idea that individuals can sponsor literacy.

If individuals, then, can function as literacy sponsors, what does literacy sponsorship look like when the role of literacy sponsor is fluid—when an individual functions both as *sponsor* and *sponsored*—when the sponsorship is reciprocal? One avenue for investigating this question of reciprocal literacy sponsorship emanates within service-learning contexts. In such settings, individuals with very different motivations and skill sets(students and clients/community partners) work together to perform tasks and accomplish goals (see Adler-Kassner, et al.; Deans). In composition courses, these projects often involve writing and communication. Students in service-learning settings are often seen as facilitators of social change who collaborate with others to rhetorically, materially, and socially facilitate change (see Coogan; Cushman, "Rhetorician"). In such a context, then, students might be enabled to become literacy sponsors. As of yet, however, theorists have not sufficiently explored the ways in which students might be or might become literacy sponsors, particularly in service-learning settings that involve interactions with others.

Most of the research on student sponsorship examines student "self-sponsorship" (see Hesse; Ruecker; Yi and Hirvela; Scenters-Zapico) or it amplifies the sponsorship of students by others

(teachers, schools, parents, institutions, video games, etc.). Very little research has examined how students might use their literacy knowledge, skills, and experiences to shape and sponsor the literacies of others, which constitutes a significant theoretical and pedagogical gap. Neglecting to account for the ways in which literacy sponsorship might be reciprocal and how students participate in sponsorship indicates that we do not yet fully recognize the dynamic way literacy sponsorship can work or value the active role students might play in the process.

In this essay, I consider how, in the context of service-learning, students might sponsor literacy and how this sponsorship might be reciprocal. In particular, I examine the ways in which students participate in literacy sponsorship with community clients and how, conversely, students are sponsored in the process, thus emphasizing the reciprocal nature of sponsorship and showing how the roles of sponsor and sponsored are fluid, interdependent, and shifting. To examine this concept of reciprocal literacy sponsorship, I apply a multiliteracies lens to my discussion of a semester-long course project I designed to develop a variety of literacies in students. This approach allows me to articulate the literacies students developed and sponsored through their interactions with clients. Learning these important literacies opened the door for students to share them with clients and thus sponsor literacy and for clients to sponsor certain literacies in students, thus establishing a dynamic, give-and-take relationship where both parties benefited through their relationship with each other. By engaging in multiple and varied writing experiences for public audiences with real motives and purposes, students and clients moved between sponsor and sponsored, passing along important literacies and skills and receiving them as well. I ultimately argue that projects that encourage students to move between sponsored and sponsor not only reinforce students' personal literacy skills but also bring confidence and empowerment to them as they become shareholders in the outcomes of their local, distant, and digital communities. This agency gives students the confidence to act for themselves in a given situation and to resist, disrupt, or intervene in certain discourses and discourse communities (Reynolds). This research is significant because it expands our understandings of literacy sponsorship as fluid and also brings students into the discussion on literacy sponsorship. When students feel confident in transferring literacies to others and when they are open to accepting literacy sponsorship from those they sponsor, they can become empowered agents of change that work strategically to sponsor literacies and to understand the larger systems at work in individual literacy development.

In what follows, I first explain the theoretical framework I applied to examine reciprocal literacy sponsorship. I then outline the pedagogical framework of the study by describing the service-learning project students completed and in which sponsorship occurred. Next, I highlight the results of the study by examining five multiliteracies students developed, sponsored, and were sponsored in: rhetorical, technological, social, ethical, and critical. I end with a discussion of reciprocal literacy sponsorship and the dynamic ways in which literacy sponsorship can be deployed and shared.

Theoretical Framework: The Multiliteracies Model

In 1996, a group of international scholars of language and literacy called the New London Group

(NLG) published "A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies," a revolutionary essay that argued for changes in literacy pedagogy as a response to rapidly evolving communication technologies and the increased prominence of cultural and linguistic diversity. Instead of solely focusing on language as the primary meaning-making mode, the NLG advocated for a pedagogy of "multiliteracies," an approach that broadens existing conceptions of literacy to encompass the many different ways meaning is constructed, expressed, and represented in this digital age. A pedagogy based on multiliteracies is multimodal: it emphasizes a variety of semiotic modes that can represent meaning, including the visual, spatial, tactile, gestural, auditory, and linguistic (Cope and Kalantzis; Kress). Although these modes differ by "culture and context, and have specific cognitive, culture, and social effects" (Cope and Kalantzis 5), they are used to make meaning, and, therefore, our classrooms must teach and reinforce this range of new literacies and skills. When our classrooms emphasize the great variety of semiotic resources available, students will have "the skills and knowledge they need to achieve their aspirations" (Cope and Kalantzis 5).

The pedagogical implications of a multiliteracies framework are vast. For one, composition studies now has a commitment to foster multiliteracies in students. Scholars now recognize the need to integrate multiple modes into classrooms. Students today compose texts in multiple modalities, including audio, video, and visual. Scholars continue to address practical ways to implement multiliteracies pedagogies into writing classrooms (Alexander; Bowen and Whithaus; Selber; Selfe, *Multimodal*; Sorapure).Today, meaning is made not just through words but through many different modes as well. Literacies are seen as multiple, and students now develop a range of multiliteracies. Second, a multiliteracies theory regards any meaning-making activity as a matter of *Design*. In the NLG's conception, Design is the central metaphor for what students need to learn about literacy. Learners integrate a variety of representational resources to make meaning, constantly remaking and using them as they work to achieve their purposes (Cope and Kalantzis 5). Finally, because literacy is focused on Design rather than grammar, a multiliteracies pedagogy is transformative and agentive: it "recognizes that meaning making is an active, transformative process" (Cope, Kalantzis, and Cloonan 72). Students are no longer passive recipients of knowledge or "agents of reproduction"; rather, they "are fully makers and remakers of signs and transformers of meaning"; they are "active designer[s] of meaning, with a sensibility open to differences, change, and innovation" (Cope, Kalantzis, and Cloonan 70, 72). The agency offered to students through a pedagogy of multiliteracies invites them to make and remake the world they live in. Agency here "is not simply about finding one's own voice but also about intervening in discourses of the everyday and cultivating rhetorical tactics that make interruption and resistance an important part of any conversation" (Reynolds 59).

One way I have found to develop an array of literacies in students and to offer them greater agency is by integrating service-learning projects into my classrooms. Service-learning has long been conceived as an avenue to develop important literacies and skills (Alexander and Powell; Ball and Goodburn; Mastrangelo and Tischio). And, because of its connection to "real-world" situations, it induces different motivations for literacy development. Students come to see their work as having import and effect and often have a greater desire to learn literacies that will aid their work with their client/community partner (see Adler-Kassner, et al.; Cushman, "Rhetorician"; Deans).In addition

to the service-learning component, assignments that are multimodal invite students to hone their literacies and skills in a variety of mediums and modes and to show them how this knowledge and understanding will be relevant to their professional, personal, and civic lives (see Selber; Selfe, *Multimodal*). In short, a multiliteracies frame provides greater insight into the ways in which reciprocal literacy sponsorship functioned in a service-learning setting.

Pedagogical Framework: Professional Digital Marketing Project

In response to calls in composition and literacy studies to develop multiliteracies in students, I designed the Professional Digital Marketing Project (PDMP). This project was the major semester project in an upper-level special topics course called "Writing in a Digital Age." In this course, I wanted students to develop a repertoire of complex literacies and skills that would enable them to be successful in today's workplace. With the goal of exposing students to a range of literacies (e.g., rhetorical, technological, social, ethical, and critical), the PDMP asked students to create a "professional digital identity" (PDI) for themselves and a local small business by marketing each online. For the first six weeks of the semester (Part I), students focused on establishing a PDI for themselves. They created and managed a professional website, a blog, and social media accounts, including Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and LinkedIn. For the last ten weeks (Part II), and working either individually or in teams, students did the same for a local small business that had minimal to no online presence. The project itself was an integrated assignment where students could (ideally) develop multiliteracies by completing all of the required tasks (see Appendix for assignment sheet).[1]

Participants

Twenty undergraduate Professional Writing majors at a mid-size private institution in the South participated in this study. Eighteen students identified as female and two as male. Six students worked individually on the project, and fourteen worked on a team. The students partnered with eleven local small businesses. In all cases, the contact at the business site was the business owner. Table 1 provides more detail about each client.

Table 1. Description of Clients

Business Name	Industry	Gender (Age)	# of Students
Altus Design	interior design firm	Female (55-59)	1
Coffee Cabaret	coffeehouse and cafe	Male (45-49)	3
Customized Cuts	hair salon	Female (55-59)	1
Dazzled Photography	photography studio	Female (50-54)	1
Égalité	retail clothing shop	Female (40-45)	1
Horizons Daycare	daycare	Female (60-65)	1
Vanilla Bakery	bakery	Female (50-55)	3

Business Name	Industry	Gender (Age)	# of Students
Jane's Cookies	at-home cookie business	Female (60-65)	2
Links to Learning	educational consulting firm	Female (50-55)	3
Real Food	lunch cafe	Female (40-44) Male (40-44)	3
Solid Threads	t-shirt printing business	Male (25-29)	1

Assignment Structure

Students first became familiar with the business through a series of tasks that involved students learning about the business and the audience(s) it serves. Students researched the business, interviewed employees, and performed a rhetorical needs assessment in which they analyzed the business's history, mission, goals, and needs. Students then worked for ten weeks with the client to develop a cohesive professional digital identity. Toward the end of the semester, students were asked to transition these online sites to their clients so that the clients could continue to digitally market their businesses after the students had completed the semester. This requirement meant that students had to teach their clients how to use and manage a range of technologies, tools, and literacy practices. Students met with their clients consistently throughout the ten weeks—both in and out of class. The clients came to class at least three times, and some of them came to class up to eight times. During these class meetings, the clients met individually with the student(s) working with them, and they also participated orally and gave feedback during class discussions and presentations. I encouraged students to approach the project and their client as a humble learner and to work "in solidarity with" the business rather than be the knowledge-holder or benefactor (Green 293). This approach helped instill a collaborative relationship between students and clients and perhaps led to an openness for reciprocal literacy sponsorship to occur. Through written reflections, weekly progress reports, and class discussions, students considered what they were doing and learning. These moments provided students an opportunity to openly discuss and raise questions about their responsibilities, the project, and the business and also to reflect on the literacies they were developing and sharing. Students gave final oral presentations over the process, the final products developed, and the PDIs they created. The clients attended and participated in these presentations. Students were evaluated on the sites they created, how many followers they gained, their writing, their attention to the rhetorical situation, and how well they established a cohesive PDI across multiple media.

Data Collection and Analysis

A variety of data were collected from students, including written reflections, two oral presentations, and written products (websites, blogs, and social media sites). I also collected anecdotal data from the clients, namely oral participation during class discussions and student presentations and observation during class meetings in which they were present.[2] I analyzed these

materials through the lens of the various multiliteracies individuals learn, a process that enabled me to precisely name the literacies that students developed and sponsored. In my analysis, I examine five multiliteracies: rhetorical, technological, social, ethical, and critical. I situate each literacy within scholarship from literacy studies that defines and explains each one and that also claims that students majoring in writing fields should possess.

Literacy Development and Sponsorship

Results show that this service-learning project gave students the opportunity to support, enable, and sponsor the literacies of others, both during the project as they collaborated with their clients and towards the end when they transferred the digital sites to their clients. Findings also demonstrate that this literacy sponsorship was not only a one-way, top-down endeavor from student to client; rather, as students were sponsoring literacies of their clients, the clients were also sponsoring literacies of students, thus emphasizing how—at least in service-learning settings where the sponsor-sponsored relationship involves individuals—literacy sponsorship has the potential to be reciprocal. These findings are important because they underscore how sponsorship is more fluid, malleable, and dynamic than the fixed terms of "sponsor" and "sponsored" might suggest.

"They are also valuable in demonstrating that service-learning courses are ripe sites for reciprocal literacy sponsorship to occur: by providing an important avenue to build relationships that can enable the reciprocity and exchange of literacy sponsorship, service-learning coursesinvitestudents and clientsto seize literacy resources to meet their own goals, motivations, and needs."

They are also valuable in demonstrating that service-learning courses are ripe sites for reciprocal literacy sponsorship to occur: by providing an important avenue to build relationships that can enable the reciprocity and exchange of literacy sponsorship, service-learning coursesinvitestudents and clientsto seize literacy resources to meet their own goals, motivations, and needs.

In what follows, I consider five multiliteracies: rhetorical, technological, social, ethical, and critical. In some literacies, students were the primary sponsors, while in other literacies the clients were.

Rhetorical Literacy

Through this service-learning assignment, students developed rhetorical literacies and sponsored their clients' rhetorical literacies as well. Rhetorical literacy has long been an esteemed outcome in our field. Stuart Selber argues that rhetorical literacy is made up of four parameters—persuasion, deliberation, reflection, and social action—that "delimit the terrain of rhetorical literacy and suggest the qualities of a rhetorically literate student" ("Rhetorical" 136). Kelli Cargile Cook views rhetorical literacy as "a multifaceted knowledge that allows writers to conceptualize and shape documents whatever their specific purpose or audience"; it "strives to develop in students a set of fluid skills and reflective practices that might be employed successfully given any audience, purpose, or writing situation" (10). Rhetorical literacy thus entails understanding how to use language to

persuade, and, on a practical level, how to create documents that align to the audience, purpose, context, and genre. As Nora Bacon points out, service-learning contexts are prime for developing rhetorical literacy because of the varied audiences and purposes available (606).

In order to successfully establish a PDI, students had to understand the audience, purpose, and context for each online site, for this rhetorical knowledge helped shape the content, design, and style. To understand the rhetorical situation, students conducted a rhetorical needs assessment and profile of the small business in which they learned about the business's audience(s) (i.e., clients, constituents, donors, parents, board members) and then composed material that would meet these audiences' needs and expectations. Students learned how to emphasize appropriate details, use appropriate tones, and remain focused on their overall goals and purposes as they composed. Ultimately, this knowledge led to students developing their rhetorical aptitude.

As students were developing rhetorical literacy, it became evident that they were also conveying their skills and knowledge to their clients. In one class discussion at the beginning of the project, several students mentioned that their clients were somewhat frustrated that the students didn't "just get started writing" but instead spent at least two weeks gathering information, conducting interviews, and compiling the rhetorical needs assessment. When the students explained to their clients the reasons they were taking their time at the beginning to learn about the business and to gather information, the clients understood and became more supportive of the time spent on the front end. Moreover, after the rhetorical needs assessment and the profile presentation were completed, some students remarked that their clients were having trouble understanding rhetorical concepts of audience and purpose. Marlee, for example, was working with her client to write content for the website. The client insisted Marlee draft long paragraphs of content about her business—its history, the story of how she came to start the business, and some other peripheral details. Not only was the content not web-friendly, but the client wanted to place this information on her home page because she thought the story would entice customers to buy her products. In working with her client to edit the text, Marlee emphasized the importance of thinking of the audience's needs and the purpose of the site. She reflects,

> At times it was difficult to balance my growing understanding of tailoring something to an audience with what my client wanted. Jan felt it important for her customers to understand the beginnings of the business, and she wanted this information on her home page. While I thought the story about how her business came to be was inspiring, I didn't think the material belonged on the home page. I also didn't think the writing was focused on what the customer might want to know about the business. This was a minor point of conflict between my client and me, but she ultimately understood about the importance of tailoring to an audience and honing in on a purpose. I think what also convinced her was when I shared with her the concept of "reader-based prose"… [T]hen she seemed to understand why I was pushing for certain elements. . . . She expressed to me later that she had never thought about [these concepts] before but that she was already a better writer now that she took these things into consideration.

Marlee's developing understanding of the rhetorical situation allowed her to share her knowledge with her client and sponsor the client's rhetorical literacy.

In another example, Lauren, who worked with a local daycare, acquired rhetorical literacy and also sponsored the rhetorical literacy of her client. She writes,

> When I was working on the website for Horizons Daycare, I first took a playful approach in my writing because the client really thought this would be the best approach […] and she wanted the website to have a "fun" feel to it. I therefore chose to design the website using an Alice in Wonderland theme where the words and language were dramatic, enthusiastic, and witty. However, after seeing revision suggestions from you and my classmates, and really considering what this design was communicating to the audience, I decided that this stylistic approach was not the best choice. I realized that a website with a professional tone would be more appropriate because we were ultimately writing to parents, not kids. […] I met with the client and gave her the reasons why I didn't think this one worked. She agreed, and together we changed the theme to be more educational and professional. After this experience, I now scrutinize my writing style and my choices much more than before. I know that the client considers them as well because she expressed to me during multiple meetings that she didn't realize how complicated writing can be.

These scenes of literacy sponsorship involve students "enable[ing], support[ing], teach[ing], [and] model[ing]" rhetorical literacy for clients (Brandt, "Sponsors" 166).While students were becoming more aware of how to tailor their writing to their intended audience and purpose, they also explained and instilled this rhetorical knowledge in their clients, which gave clients new understandings of how better to fulfill their own goals and agendas as business owners. Though I cannot know for sure the extent to which clients developed rhetorical literacy, I do know that through exposure to the ideas of audience, purpose, genre, context, and media, the clients now have a greater awareness of the ways a writer's choices can shape and impact an audience. In short, by developing a complex and nuanced understanding of the rhetorical situation, both students and clients are better able to shape their communications to address varied audiences and purposes. This interplay between analytical skills and rhetorical analysis enhanced students' understanding of how these factors shape and influence discourse and therefore impressed upon the clients as well. Rhetorical literacy thus emphasizes flexible skills that are applicable to a wide range of situations. Now, clients can be better equipped to engage in what Brandt terms the "real" economy of writing, which is "socially useful to them and others, on its own terms" ("Afterword" 775).

Technological Literacy

In addition to developing and sponsoring rhetorical literacies, students also acquired technological literacies that enabled them to meet and fulfill their individual, social, and collaborative goals and compounded into literacy sponsorship of clients. Technological literacy includes technical proficiency with software programs, computer applications, and online media (Gurak; Selfe, *Technology*; Selfe and Hilligoss) as well as the "ability to critique this research and act upon it to make

decisions and produce documents designed with and for users" (Cook 13). This latter conception is what Cynthia Selfe terms "critical technological literacy," which involves learning how to analyze and evaluate technology, its uses, and the diverse contexts surrounding it (*Technology*; see also Breuch; Coley; Selber).

During the assignment, students in this course developed both conceptions of technological literacy—technical proficiency and critical technological literacy. Throughout the semester, students became more adept at using technology to build a cohesive PDI. In a sense, then, the course, the assignment, and the larger

"Clients learned from students how to decide what medium fits the task, context, audience, and purpose and to place that information there. Students thus enabled technological literacy development in the business owners: they were the delivery system for the economies of literacy development ."

contexts of writing studies and service-learning were sponsors of these students' literacies. But this literacy development did not stop there: they also shared this technical knowledge with their clients. Towards the end of the project, when students were asked to hand off the digital sites to clients, students taught their clients how to perform simple technological tasks, including opening a browser, logging on to websites, sending emails, and downloading content. Students also demonstrated to clients how to use the specific platforms they had created for the business, including how to tweet, link, blog, and post. Michelle showed her client how to schedule posts on Facebook and Twitter. Zoe and her client had a long conversation about hashtags and together researched how businesses can harness hashtags to generate followers. Zoe then established a bank of hashtags that she passed along to the client. Students also discussed with their clients how each online composing medium (i.e., website, Facebook, Twitter, blog) has different conventions and purposes and that one should only post certain kinds of content to certain sites. Lola even commented: "My teammates and I tried to pass along our understandings of how to learn a technology so that our client could not only know how to use the various technologies but to use them successfully to meet her business goals." Clients learned from students how to decide what medium fits the task, context, audience, and purpose and to place that information there. Students thus enabled technological literacy development in the business owners: they were the delivery system for the economies of literacy development. Clients, however, took advantage of this opportunity and became equipped with many of the technical skills needed to meet the demands required for businesses to be successful in the twenty-first century.

Although students shared the first conception of technological literacy with clients (technical proficiency), they were less apt to impart the second, more complex definition of technological literacy to their clients (i.e., the ability to be more critical of technology and to act on it to achieve their own goals). The assignment required that students choose a client with little to no online presence, which led many students to assume that their client did not possess a great deal of technological literacy. As a result, they did not involve the clients in the process of rhetorical decision making or in creating the digital sites, thus withholding literacy sponsorship in this area. When students were ready to move forward with constructing the website and social media pages, they did so by themselves on their own computers. When evaluating what website builder to use, for instance, students went through

the process of analyzing and critiquing each one but did so without input from their client, except in some instances to discuss how much money the client was willing to spend. Isabel's reflection shows her complex learning process when making these decisions:

> I analyzed several website builders before choosing one to use. My previous website-building experience had been with Wordpress.com, which was free, was easy to set up, and did not require users to know code. However, I used Wordpress.org for this project, which required a bit more knowledge about programming, using plug-ins, and finding a web host, but it offered so much more to me in terms of designing a successful website. Users were also responsible for updating the software, maintaining back-ups for the site, and stopping spam on the site. It required more technical knowledge than a free Wordpress.com site. The way I learned to navigate and use Wordpress.org was mainly through experimentation and the resource pages on WordPress.org. I found that the best way I learned and remembered how to do certain functions on new software was simply through experimentation. Once I tried a certain function, if it was successful, I knew how to do it next time I needed it. If it was not successful, I kept trying or consulted resources until I found my answer.

Through research and experimentation, Selena came to recognize the potentials and limitations afforded through various site builders and then chose one that would best fit her goals, thus expanding her critical technological literacies. However, because she completed this work and made these decisions largely on her own, the client did not benefit from her developing understanding of such things as usability, readability, and functionality in technological contexts.

In addition to this failure to share knowledge about critical technological literacy, another problem was that students were often the only ones with access to the passwords, URLs, and content before the material went live. Even when the sites were finally posted, the majority of the clients chose to leave the creating and posting of material to the students. This approach remained consistent until the end of the semester, when the student had to share technical knowledge with the client. At this point, however, the literacy sponsorship focused more on disseminating how-to technical knowledge rather than augmenting critical technological literacies. This latter ability would have allowed clients to become more adept at harnessing affordances, conventions, and online media for their own ends. Ultimately, as the students propelled forward in their critical technological skills, the clients lagged behind, largely because the digital production was completed by students separately from their clients.

In sum, by engaging critically with multiple kinds of technologies, students developed technical proficiency in a range of modes, media, and technologies. Students also viewed it as extremely important to sponsor technological literacies in their clients, for without these skills, the digital marketing and economic gain could not occur. However, because the clients were not involved in more sustainable technological literacy instruction, their ability to continue managing these sites after the students left is questionable. Although the students' actions on the web ultimately increased sales and revenues, conveyed positive PDIs, and opened the door for greater exposure for the businesses,

because they completed the technical tasks and online marketing on their own, this technological literacy sponsorship was not as successful as it could have been.

Social Literacy

Although students were the primary literacy sponsors for rhetorical and technological literacy, clients were the main literacy sponsors of social literacy. Social literacy entails having "social skills," or the ability to collaborate and work well with others (Cook; Wolfe). Social literacy also entails recognizing that all discourse arises out of a social situation and that writing is socially situated (Cook; LeFevre). Acquiring social literacy empowered students to become more adept collaborators, communicators, and writers, and it allowed them to be successful in their collaborations with their clients and to be receptive to literacy sponsorship.

Clients taught students important social skills, including compromise, flexibility, and the ability to handle conflict in productive ways. Students had to learn to listen, empathize with, and understand someone else's point of view. They had to adjust their own schedules to meet the needs of busy clients, placing the clients' demands above their own and sympathizing with the plight of the small business. Kathy writes about how she learned and grew in her conflict management skills by observing her client:

> I sat in on a few staff meetings my client had with her employees. The environment got really tense in a few of them, and I didn't know how to respond. However, Theresa [the client] would say something funny or make an unexpected comment that would help everyone relax. She would lead the group in talking through the differences of opinions, and the atmosphere got less tense. I was amazed at Theresa's ability to communicate with such a different group of people and to make everyone feel valued while still clearly communicating what she needed to say. I learned a lot about conflict management and the importance of listening and observing from watching her at work.

Likewise, Jason noted, how the client instilled in him social literacy:

> My client taught me how to consider the opinions of others and work hard to create a good atmosphere where everyone can succeed. She also taught me to be more understanding of other people's situations, especially since she was so slow to respond to my emails and texts. This experience was difficult at times, but I learned a lot about the importance of consistent communication and how to handle my emotions.

These students came to recognize that social literacy involves cooperation and flexibility, and they received these messages largely through the sponsorship of their client, each of whom had something to gain in their developing understanding of social literacy, including increased profit, a good collaborative relationship with the student, and a strong business reputation.

Students also developed social literacy when they became more confident in vocalizing their

concerns to their clients. In one instance, a client with an interior design firm asked the student working with her to develop a second website for a different business she ran. The student approached me with concerns over having enough time to complete this request but remarked that she did not want to say "no" to her client. Together, we brainstormed options and discussed the importance of being open and honest—even if it meant disappointment. We even developed strategies for how she might say "no." Ultimately, the student had a follow-up conversation with her client and explained her concerns. The client was more than receptive to the student's concerns and proposed a creative alternative: the student could do the work after the semester was over and be paid for it. Through this situation, the student developed an understanding of how to communicate tactfully and respectfully yet assert herself and her opinion. With women, in particular, the ability to say no is a skill that brings empowerment and self-confidence (see Herrick; Wolfe and Powell), and since most of these businesses were owned by women, the clients served an important function in engendering social literacy sponsorship.

Developing social literacy was especially important because of the social status differences between the university students and the clients. The students were all White and mostly came from upper- and middle-class households, whereas the majority of the clients were older adults without college degrees who came from a diverse range of backgrounds, races, and cultures. Students expressed surprise when they discovered that some of the clients did not have (or know how to use) smartphones, did not have home Internet access, or were hesitant to spend money on a website, even though it would benefit their business. Through their interactions with their clients, however, students came to understand that various factors influence these business decisions. Examining these elements rather than making hasty decisions or purchases is a prudent action for business owners. The clients, too, had some pre-conceptions about the university students that were challenged through the social interactions they had. By interfacing , and by interacting with each other, students and clients were able to reciprocate the sponsorship of social literacies, ultimately becoming more adept and empathetic collaborators, communicators, and writers.

Not only did clients sponsor students' social literacy, but at times students sponsored the social literacy of their clients. In one instance, the client for Coffee Cabaret, a local café and coffee shop, did not particularly want a blog, which was required as part of the assignment. The student working here, Samantha, tried to persuade them to let her do a blog since this was part of the assignment requirements. She explained why a blog could be good for their business and presented to them many of the ideas she had already generated for blog content. The client recognized the predicament Samantha was in and told her that she could create the blog but to place it on Samantha's personal website and delete it after the semester was over rather than on the coffee shop's website. Samantha was glad to oblige the compromise. She created the blog, posting information for customers, pictures and news about upcoming catering events, and interesting stories. She even profiled some of the employees and regular customers, which generated a great deal of interest. When a blog post was ready, she even posted a link to the coffee shop's Facebook and Twitter pages. About halfway through the project, the client was so excited about customer responses to the blog that they asked Samantha to transfer all the blog content to the business's website. Samantha then created a new webpage on the

Coffee Cabaret website and transferred the blog material there. This example shows that Samantha was aware of the multiple social situations that, at times, held conflicting expectations for her. Samantha recognized, when talking with the client initially, that even though they did not want a blog, she was required to do one for the course. She could have responded to the client by not creating the blog (and thus not fulfilling the assignment criteria) or creating the blog without their knowledge

"The client came to value the blog and was able to negotiate the various ways it could be used on their website. This social acuity ultimately indicates how students and clients can appropriate agency within the frameworks they are given and reciprocate their literacy sponsorship."

(which raises ethical concerns). Instead, realizing these tensions, Samantha discussed the issues openly with me and the client and created an alternative with which all parties were ultimately pleased. Moreover, this situation led to Samantha sponsoring the social literacy of her client, albeit indirectly. The client came to value the blog and was able to negotiate the various ways it could be used on their website. This social acuity ultimately indicates how students and clients can appropriate agency within the frameworks they are given and reciprocate their literacy sponsorship.

Through both positive and negative experiences, the clients modeled and enabled literacy sponsorship. Students learned how to work better with others, which developed confidence in their social literacies. The clients both directly and indirectly worked to enable students to better express themselves in social situations, and the students participated in sponsorship as well. Merely by working through issues with another person, students and clients became more attentive to the issues involved in collaboration, conflict, project management, and writing for public audiences. The perceptions developed through this process empowered students to make decisions, collaborate with confidence, and be receptive to receiving social literacy sponsorship from the clients. Ultimately, this ability to negotiate demands, work well with others, and address conflict will better prepare students to meet the demands of the workplace.

Ethical Literacy

Reciprocal literacy sponsorship evidenced itself in ethical literacy as well, but the sponsorship was more indirect and unforeseen than in other literacies. Ethical literacy involves knowing when a particular action is right or wrong and understanding that there are consequences to the choices we make (Anderson; Coley; Cook; Fontaine and Hunter). Ethical literacy considers all stakeholders (Cook) and enables people "to make informed choices about whether, how, and where to use their knowledge" (Coley 20).

In this assignment, students had a responsibility to their clients, to the clients' audiences, and to me. Each had to first understand their client—the business itself, the clients served, the goals of the business, and so on. Students researched and collected data on the organization so that they could make better decisions about the content, form, style, and design of the PDIs they would develop. This in turn helped them make responsible ethical decisions that would impact their clients' identity and branding. Through interactions with their clients, they had to negotiate questions of ethical responsibility.

To give an example of ethical literacy sponsorship, students Selena and Chloe originally chose to partner with a local bakery in town. The client wanted to post images of the business's cakes and cookies to their website and Facebook page because she felt it would benefit the business, enticing customers to stop by the bakery or place online orders. The owner's son gave this team pictures to use—and represented them off as the originals. After glancing through the pictures, the students became skeptical that these photos originated with the business: some photos looked like stock photos, printed off the Internet, and others contained printed URLs on the back or bottom of the images. The students even searched online and found the exact same pictures the man had passed off as his "mom's photos" copyrighted to other businesses. The student team contacted me first because they did not know what to make of it. We discussed several possible courses of action, including asking for original photos from the business, acquiring more details about the pictures they did receive—to put this information on the website for customers—or asking for image citations to place on the website. The students contacted the man, and he became infuriated, refusing to explain himself or give them alternative photos. The man could have made an honest mistake with the pictures; however, because he did not explain himself, the students were convinced he was being deceitful. As a result, they took ethical steps to make sure that they would not violate copyright, privacy, or their own sense of right and wrong. They ultimately decided to abandon this client and find another one to partner with. Although it took them over two weeks to get caught up once they found another partner, they felt good about their decision. Indirectly (and unintentionally), this client enabled ethical literacy sponsorship in the students. He taught them valuable lessons about workplace ethics, codes of content, and fair use. While far from ideal, this situation served as a case study, inviting conversations about intellectual property issues, plagiarism, copyright, and legal and ethical responsibilities in contextualized ways. It also reminded us to take even greater care in establishing our own and others' PDIs. Students thus became more cognizant of the ethical implications and long-term effects of ethical and unethical decision-making. Although the literacy sponsorship was indirect, the collaboration with a client facilitated ethical literacy development.

Clients also sponsored students' ethical literacies more directly. Students had to consider the ethical implications of their decisions about technology use. A wide range of software programs were available for students on university computers (InDesign, Photoshop, Dreamweaver, iMovie, Word), but the clients often had little or no access to these tools. Students, therefore, had to come up with creative ways to choose the sites they were going to use. Students discussed with their clients which programs they owned and which ones they might be willing to purchase so that the transfer of the sites at the end of the project would occur with greater ease. The clients were straightforward with the students about the important criteria in technology use and purchase, such as cost, ease of use, learning curve, and features. Through these conversations, clients reinforced to students how business decisions are bound to issues of access, economics, and sociopolitical conditions. Chuck, for instance, wrote,

> When I first read the assignment and realized that we had to find a business with no online presence, I thought there was no way we would find such a place. I mean, everyone is online

these days. However, after working with my client and her business, I came to realize that she doesn't have the time, resources, or know-how to do any of the things I take for granted. These are the reasons she isn't online. It's not that she doesn't want to be online.

The clients were able to discuss with the students why they were not already online, and they seemed motivated to share this information with students to foster understanding. Students like Chuck learned that some small businesses do not have the finances to outsource their web design and social media needs, yet these same organizations also do not have access to resources that would help them learn these valuable skills themselves. So students worked with their clients to bypass some of these technological constraints, including introducing low-cost options, such as open-source software, free trial downloads, and Creative Commons. Conversations with clients increased students' awareness of these issues and instilled important ethical literacies. This sponsorship also taught students how to recognize the consequences of their actions. The clients had a major stake in sharing constraints regarding decisions about technology, and students benefited from their sponsorship.

As students developed ethical literacy in themselves, they also served as literacy sponsors to their clients' ethical literacy development. In one instance, the client at a hair salon posted images of her clients to Facebook on the day the page went live. When student Joy noticed pictures were posted to the page, she called her client and asked if she had gotten permission from the customers to post their pictures online. The client responded that she had not asked for permission but wasn't concerned because she sees these kinds of pictures online all the time. The student continued to be concerned: she didn't want the hair salon customers to be surprised or upset when they saw their images online. So, Joy proposed a solution. She would create a brief form that the business could use to get permission. The client ultimately removed the photos and soon uploaded photos for which they had permission. This ethical action fostered goodwill and helped the business establish a positive ethos. Because students shared their knowledge with the clients, clients also came to recognize their ethical responsibilities. They now consider a wider range of stakeholders as they continue to make decisions within and outside of the business.

Ethical literacy ultimately showed both students and clients that writing has real-life consequences. Although ethical literacy sponsorship was somewhat more indirect and tacit than other forms of sponsorship, it proved more reciprocal than technological or rhetorical literacy, allowing both clients and students to share their knowledge and convey important truths to each other. This mutual sponsorship of ethical literacy led both students and clients to be able to more effectively consider ethical considerations every time they write, act, interact with others, and make decisions.

Critical Literacy

By working with clients who occupied mostly different social positions, students sponsored and were sponsored in critical literacies. Cook defines critical literacy as "the ability to recognize and consider ideological stances and power structures and the willingness to take action to assist those in need" (16). Critical literacy involves a "transformation of the critical consciousness" and is

"emancipatory" (Thralls and Blyler 256). Stuart Selber writes that a critical literacy "first recognizes and then challenges the values of the status quo. Instead of reproducing the existing social and political order [a critical approach] strives to both expose biases and provide an assemblage of cultural practices that, in a democratic spirit, might lead to the production of positive social change" (171-72). Ira Shor claims that critical literacy "connects the political and the personal, the public and the private, the global and the local, the economic and the pedagogical, for rethinking our lives and for promoting justice in place of inequity" ("What" 1).

In this project, students developed critical literacies that empowered them to fruitfully and productively confront differences in power, gender, class, and age; to recognize and consider ideological and power structures; and to take appropriate action to assist others. First, students became more aware of how gender, age, and other social factors impact success, prestige, and position. Almost all of the business owners with whom the students worked were female, which challenged some essentializing gender stereotypes (see Brady; Ritchie). These women not only worked outside of the home but did so in arguably powerful positions. The stories students heard from their clients emphasized the variety of paths women can take to own a business and disrupted dominant myths about gender, entrepreneurship, agency, and divisions of labor. One student Ashlie remarked at length about her developing aptitude for critical literacy. She writes,

> I have always had an interest in social justice. Even at the age of ten, I was not afraid to call out relatives on their racist views. I even stood up for friends who were bullied. Even still, this project opened my eyes even more to the many problems that plague the world we live in, including sexism. I observed my client on multiple occasions facing difficulties in terms of growing her business because of her gender. For instance, one time I accompanied her to a large marketing event, and two other attendees (both men) moved her table to the far corner of the room so that fewer customers visited her booth. She wasn't happy about this, but she never said anything to them, only to me. I was surprised that she let them do that, but she told me that she didn't want to make a scene.
>
> [later]
>
> I began to recognize moments I had faced discrimination as a female. Nothing was really blatant, so I hadn't been aware of it before. But looking back, I can see little moments where boys interrupted me in class, ignored my contributions, or dominated a class project. Now, after working with my client, I will be even more conscious of these subtle moments and work to eliminate all types of prejudices as best I can.

Ashlie observed her client being discriminated against in the workplace. Although her client did not take action in the moment, she talked with Ashlie about the injustice of the situation and modeled alternative ways she could have responded. This experience led Ashlie to reflect on moments in her own life where she had been discriminated against but that she had not really considered before.

By learning about her client's life, she comes to understand with more clarity an ugly part of the world and feels, empathizes, and identifies with another, thus developing critical literacy. The client's experience enabled the learning that occurred in Ashlie. In indiscriminate moments with clients, students like Ashlie learned important lessons that fostered their critical literacy.

Clients also imparted to students the various social and power structures at work that both support and limit one's individual agency. As part of the project, students were asked to interview their clients to learn more about the history and background of the business. In most cases, these businesses were started out of necessity—the recession had just hit and many of the small business owners were either laid off or needed a way to supplement their or their partner's income. Through interviews and class conversations when the clients were present, the students were able to acknowledge, learn, and participate in discussions about important issues facing the clients because of their gender, age, class, and/or position as small business owners. Students came to understand that businesses—small or otherwise—may not and perhaps even do not operate as a place of privilege, thus disrupting dominant myths and expanding their critical literacy. Instead, there are a complex and varied external factors that influence business ownership and success. This growing critical awareness occurred as students, together with clients, engaged in critical reflection—an important component of developing critical literacy (see Cushman, "Critical"; Shor, *Empowering,* "What")—and were forced to confront their assumptions. The fact that the clients did not suppress or withhold the critical literacy sponsorship in these instances allowed students to develop greater critical literacy.

In sum, through working with people different from themselves in a service-learning setting, students moved between "sponsor" and "sponsored." They became more aware of their own subject positions and even recognized the places where they occupied privileged positions. Through reflection, they developed greater social, political, and critical awareness. They learned how to deploy and evaluate their writing and rhetorical strategies, becoming more conscious of the ways in which they used language. They also became more focused on the ways their audience might read or interpret writing based on social status or background and seek feedback on material before they post. Now, students and business owners can use their literacy practices to challenge the status quo and "discover alternative paths for self and social development" (Shor, "What" 1). Although critical literacy was not developed equally for all students or clients, they developed a critical consciousness that allowed them "to make broad connections between individual experience and social issues, between single problems and the larger social system" (Shor, *Empowering* 127). Becoming more aware of the subjective positions they occupy can enhance their ability to participate and act in the social and political discourses at work in the world. This sponsorship happened because of the various roles occupied by clients and students and the ways in which they seized these opportunities to sponsor each other.

Reciprocal Literacy Sponsorship

The examples of literacy sponsorship presented here illustrate the dynamic way in which

literacy sponsorship can be deployed and reciprocated in service-learning settings. The course itself underwrote occasions for literacy learning and "set the terms for individuals' encounters with literacy" (Brandt, "Sponsors" 169). The assignment afforded students an opportunity to practice a variety of literacies, to work with others, and to enable/support/teach/model and receive literacy sponsorship. Students took advantage of this unique opportunity afforded them and developed multiliteracies, sponsored the literacies of others, and opened themselves to sponsorship by the clients they came to know.

While this sponsorship occurred within a course setting mandating students to work with others and to "hand off" the technologies to clients before the semester was over, the students were still open to sponsoring and being sponsored by their clients. This course setting does not discount the reciprocal literacy sponsorship that occurred when students worked individually with clients. Rather, it enhances and expands it, demonstrating that students can work within the boundaries they are given to sponsor others and be sponsored by someone other than the teacher. In this study, students gained a range of literacies that empowered them to establish and maintain a PDI for themselves and their client. The development of these multiliteracies brought assurance to the students and will be valuable as they enter the workforce, attend graduate school, engage in acts of citizenship, volunteer, and join local communities. Yet, this literate development went further than just being beneficial to the individual; it also turned social and reciprocal when students sponsored the literacies of their clients and when clients sponsored literacies of students. Students and clients used their literacies, skills, and aptitudes to make positive changes in the world by sponsoring the literacy of others. While every service-learning course or every act of teaching and learning does not necessarily include sponsorship, by passing on literacies and offering the invitation to literacy, individuals can become instrumental agents of social change and alter the literacies and, therefore the lives, of others. Through reciprocal literacy sponsorship, individual literacy learning can be compounded and applied with greater confidence, critical awareness, and skill, even extending the sponsorship beyond the initial relationship.

In addition to the movement between "sponsor" and "sponsored," both clients and students gained advantage from the sponsorship by enabling, supporting, teaching, and modeling literacy. On a practical level, clients gained a website and social media presence for their business and developed valuable relationships with our university and its students. Students developed important literacies and skills that they can use in their professional and personal lives; they also received workplace experience and learned valuable life lessons by working with someone from a different social position.

The multiliteracies highlighted here offer instructive examples about the possibilities that exist in examining students as literacy sponsors and in seeing how clients can sponsor literacies in service-learning settings. When students and clients interact in meaningful ways, both are able to reap the benefits of sponsorship. Clients and other service-learning partners hold expertise in areas that students do not. They are often more knowledgeable about the business and the local community, and their broader life experiences enable them to share their knowledge and experiences with students. They also hold power and authority through their age, expertise, and experience and can exercise that authority by seizing hold of the sponsorship opportunity. Likewise, students possess unique

capabilities in terms of literacy knowledge and skills, as well as technical expertise, that they can share with clients. Here, students are invited to move effortlessly between sponsor and sponsor and to grow in their multiliteracies as a result. These interactions between clients and students ultimately promote a view of sponsorship that is dynamic, two-way, and fluid.

While students and clients reciprocated literacy sponsorship to each other, they also reciprocated it to me. While I designed the assignment and the course and played a role in sponsoring literacy, students also brought their learned skills and literacies back to the classroom, thus teaching me and further sponsoring and reciprocating literacy. Selber acknowledges that instructors may well lag behind students when it comes to specific technical skills and that student experiences outside the classroom can teach instructors, just like they did me. Not only did I learn and grow in my technical skills with social media, web design, and software programs, but I also was able to rethink certain aspects of the assignment and curriculum and to interrogate some of my own assumptions. Through student feedback and personal reflection during and after the project, students empowered me to become more reflective on my own teaching. I was able to confront my own biases about working with for-profit businesses in a service-learning context and to acknowledge more critically my own privileges as a college writing professor. I learned to listen better so that I could adequately balance the needs and goals of our classroom with those of the students and clients. I became an advocate for students and clients, and I learned to balance the individual needs of each person involved, often altering my curricular goals as the project evolved. Although I entered this project with certain goals in mind, the dialogue between me, students, and then allowed me to mentor and guide students while also developing skills in listening, adapting, and learning, all while sponsored in the process. This sponsor-sponsored relationship between student and instructor deserves greater future attention.

Ultimately, through this project, students developed multiliteracies, sponsored multiliteracies, and accepted literacy sponsorship from their clients. Through the lens of literacy sponsorship, students came to realize that they are shareholders in the outcome of our communities, have a real stake in the change that occurs, and can be involved in social change and transformation. Although the course was only one semester, students are now more prepared to face the literacy demands of the future and to pass on their experiences to others, thus becoming advocates and activists for social change and more open to opportunities for sponsoring and being sponsored on a local level. Through small-scale literacy encounters like this one, students and clients can sponsor literacy and feel empowered to continue in their literacy sponsorship. Educating students to work with others—to share their knowledge and to listen to those with whom they are working—will help lead to this learning and transformation. As John Scenters-Zapico claims, "It is clear that sponsorship is a complex, rhetorical process essential to literacy learning" (234). As we continue to design assignments, we need to consider the ways that we can move students from "sponsored" to "sponsor." When sponsorship is fluid and one functions as both sponsor and sponsored, the interests of both can converge in ways that may not have been envisioned. By presenting our students with opportunities for literacy sponsorship, students can develop literacies that are reinforced and fortified through the intentional and strategic literacy involvement with others. In the end, when we take our expertise into our communities, we become instrumental, intentional agents of social change, serving both academic

and civic interests. Students as literacy sponsors is a powerful way to begin this process.

Although reciprocal literacy sponsorship aided students in their development and sponsorship of multiliteracies, it is important to note that some complications remain in identifying students as literacy sponsors. For one, in the context of the classroom, students often lack the agency, authority, or opportunity to sponsor others. In this study, for instance, students were responding to an assignment created by an instructor, and this assignment largely set the terms for the literacy sponsorship to occur. Although students were able to work within this frame and still sponsor literacy, they were largely acting in response to the assignment criteria. Future studies might then examine how students can become sponsors in other contexts: in the workplace, in their home, with friends, in class. They might also try to name the types of sponsorship that occur in various contexts or how literacy sponsorship can reside inside other systems of sponsorship (e.g., a service-learning course) and how these systems might diverge or converge.

Another complication of considering students as literacy sponsors emerges when we ask what students gain from sponsorship. Brandt's definition of literacy sponsorship entails that sponsors gain advantage from sponsorship ("Sponsor" 166). For students in this study, beyond fortifying certain literacies, what they gained (or lost) through the sponsorship was not always clear. At times, the gain was tacit and indirect; other times it was unclear. Future studies might examine the aims, motivations, and goals students have for sponsoring others and what they stand to gain as a result. This research would be valuable in fleshing out how individual motivations might create or limit opportunities for sponsorship.

Finally, the literacy sponsorship students experience can take many different forms (e.g., direct, indirect, motivator, self-sponsor), yet our research has not accounted for this range of individual types of sponsorship. Future research should continue to examine the numerous ways and contexts that students might be or become literacy sponsors and what reciprocal literacy sponsorship might look like in other contexts. Research might address the various kinds of sponsorship in which students participate, the people they sponsor and how they come to sponsor, and in what contexts literacy sponsorship has the potential to be reciprocal. Although we are just beginning to consider these questions, reciprocal literacy sponsorship presents new opportunities for our classrooms, students, and communities.

NOTES

[1] This assignment was given in spring 2012, before mobile technologies became as popular as they are now. Although significant changes have occurred in social media since then, the findings presented here on literacy sponsorship are still relevant and significant.

[2] One limitation of this study is that I did not conduct interviews with the clients. This is largely because although I knew that students would have to hand off the sites to their clients and teach them rhetorical and online marketing techniques, only when I began to analyze the data did the notion of reciprocal literacy sponsorship emerge. Unfortunately, at this point I no longer had access to the clients. Future research could make literacy sponsorship a specific aim or component of the project or investigate literacy sponsorship from the perspectives of outside clients.

WORKS CITED

Adler-Kassner, Linda, Roberta Crooks, and Ann Watters, eds. *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition*. Washington: NCTE, 1997. Print.

Alexander, Kara Poe, and Beth Powell. "Team Writing for the Community: Literacies Developed in a Service-Learning Context." *Service-Learning and Writing: Paving the Way for Literacy(ies) through Community Engagement*. Ed. Isabel Baca. Boston: Brill, 2012. 47-71. Print.

Alexander, Kara Poe. "Material Affordances: The Potential of Scrapbooks in the Composition Classroom." *Composition Forum* 27(2013). Web. 15 Nov 2016.

Anderson, Paul V. "Ethics, Institutional Review Boards, and the Involvement of Human Participants in Composition Research." *Ethics and Representation in Qualitative Studies of Literacy*. Eds. Peter Mortensen and Gesa E. Kirsch. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1996. 260-85.

Bacon, Nora. "Building a Swan's Nest for Instruction in Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication* 51.4 (2000): 589-609. Print.

Ball, Kevin, and Amy M. Goodburn. "Composition Studies and Service Learning: Appealing to Communities?" *Composition Studies* 28.1 (Spring 2000): 79-94. Print.

Bowen, Tracey, and Carl Whithaus, eds. *Multimodal Literacies and Emerging Genres*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2013. Print.

Brady, Laura. "The Reproduction of Othering." *Feminism and Composition Studies: In Other Words*. Eds. Susan C. Jarratt and Lynn Worsham. New York: MLA, 1998. 21-44. Print.

Brandt, Deborah. "Afterword: The Real and Fake Economies of Writing." *JAC* 32.3-4 (2012): 769-78. Print.

---. "Sponsors of Literacy." *College Composition and Communication* 49.2 (1998): 165-85. Print.

Breuch, Lee-Ann Kastman. "Thinking Critically about Technological Literacy: Developing a Framework to Guide Computer Pedagogy in Technical Communication." *Technical Communication Quarterly* 11.3 (2002): 267-88. Print.

Carrick, Tracy Hamler. "Bootlegging Literacy Sponsorship, Brewing Up Institutional Change." *Community Literacy Journal* 2.1 (2007): 25-39. Web.8 May 2015.

Coley, Toby F. *Teaching with Digital Media in Writing Studies: An Exploration of Ethical Responsibilities*. New York: Peter Lang, 2012. Print.

Coogan, David. "Service Learning and Social Change: The Case for Materialist Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication* 57.4 (2006): 667-93. Print.

Cook, Kelli Cargile. "Layered Literacies: A Theoretical Frame for Technical Communication Pedagogy." *Technical Communication Quarterly* 11.1 (2002): 5-29. Print.

Cope, Bill, and Mary Kalantzis, eds. *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Cope, Bill, Mary Kalantzis, and Anne Cloonan. "A Multiliteracies Perspective on the New Literacies." *The New Literacies: Multiple Perspectives on Research and Practice*. Ed. Elizabeth A. Baker. New York: Guilford P, 2010. 61-87. Print.

Cushman, Ellen. "Critical Literacy and Institutional Language." *Research in the Teaching of English* 33.3 (1999): 245-74. Print.

---. "The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change." *College Composition and Communication* 47.1 (1996): 7-28. Print.

Daniell, Beth, and Peter Mortensen, eds. *Women and Literacy: Local and Global Inquiries for a New Century*. London: Routledge, 2007. Print.

Deans, Thomas. *Writing Partnerships: Service-Learning in Composition*. Urbana: NCTE, 2000. Print.

Debs, Mary Beth. "Corporate Authority: Sponsoring Rhetorical Practice." *Writing in the Workplace: New Research Perspectives*. Ed. Rachel Spilka. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1993. 158-69. Print.

Engelson, Amber. "The 'Hands of God' at Work: Negotiating between Western and Religious Sponsorship in Indonesia." *College English* 76.4 (2014): 292-314. Print.

Fehler, Brian. "Reading, Writing, and Redemption: Literacy Sponsorship and the Mexican-American Settlement Movement in Texas." *Rhetoric Review* 29.4 (2010): 346-63. Print.

Finders, Margaret J. "Literacy, Gender, and Adolescence: School-Sponsored English as Identity Maintenance." *The Relevance of English: Teaching that Matters in Students' Lives*. Ed. Robert Yagelski. Urbana: NCTE, 2002. 82-104. Print.

Fontaine, Sheryl I., and Susan M. Hunter, eds. *Foregrounding Ethical Awareness in Composition and English Studies*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1998. Print.

Gurak, Laura J. *Cyberliteracy: Navigating the Internet with Awareness*. London: Yale UP, 2003. Print.

Herrick, Jeanne Weiland. "'And Then She Said': Office Stories and What They Tell Us about Gender in the Workplace." *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 13.3 (1999): 274-96. Print.

Hesse, Douglas D. "Who Owns Writing?" *College Composition and Communication* 57.2 (2005): 335-57. Print.

Hogg, Charlotte. "Sponsoring Clubs: Cultivating Rural Identities through Literacy." *Women and Literacy: Local and Global Inquiries for a New Century*. Eds. Beth Daniell and Peter Mortensen. New York: NCTE, 2007. 109-23. Print.

Hunter, Rik. "Hypersocial-Interactive Writing: An Audience of Readers-As-Writers." *Literacy in Composition Studies* 2.2 (2014): 17-43. Web. 20 July 2016.

Jacobs, Dale. "Marveling at *The Man Called Nova*: Comics as Sponsors of Multimodal Literacy." *College Composition and Communication* 59.2 (2007): 180-205. Print.

Kress, Gunther. "Multimodality." *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. Eds. Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis. London: Routledge, 2000. 182-202. Print.

Lebduska, Lisa. "Literacy Sponsorship and the Post-9/11 GI Bill." *Literacy in Composition Studies* 2.2 (2014): 1-16. Web. 4 Sept 2016.

LeFevre, Karen Burke. *Invention as a Social Act*. Carbondale: SIUP, 1987. Print.

Mastrangelo, Lisa S., and Victoria Tischio. "Integrating Writing, Academic Discourses, and Service Learning: Project Renaissance and School/College Literacy Collaborations." *Composition Studies* 33.1 (2005): 31-53. Print.

Moulder, M. Amanda. "Cherokee Practice, Missionary Intentions: Literacy Learning among Early Nineteenth-Century Cherokee Women." *College Composition and Communication* 63.1 (2011): 75-97. Print.

New London Group. "A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures." *Harvard Educational Review* 66.1 (1996): 60-92. Print.

Pavia, Catherine Matthews. "Literacy Sponsorship of the 'My Online Friends' Discussion Board: Competing and Complementary Relationships." *Computers and Composition* 30.2(2013):132-45. Print.

Pedersen, Anne-Marie. "Negotiating Cultural Identities through Language: Academic English in Jordan." *College Composition and Communication* 62.2 (2010): 283-310. Print.

Pitcock, Ronald L. "'Let the Youths Beware': The Sponsorship of Early 19th-Century Native American Literacy." *Written Communication* 17.3 (2000): 390-426. Print.

Reynolds, Nedra. "Interrupting Our Way to Agency: Feminist Cultural Studies and Composition." *Feminism and Composition Studies: In Other Words*. Eds. Susan C. Jarratt and Lynn

Worsham. New York: MLA, 1998. 58-73. Print.

Ritchie, Joy S. "Confronting the 'Essential' Problem: Reconnecting Feminist Theory and Pedagogy." *JAC: Journal of Advanced Composition* 10.2 (1990): 249-73. Print.

Scenters-Zapico, John T. "Los Puentes Stories: The Rhetorical Realities of Electronic Literacy Sponsors and Gateways on the U.S.-Mexico Border from 1920–2001." *Rhetorics of the Americas: 3114 BCE to 2012 CE*. Eds. Damian Baca and Victor Villanueva. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. 227-54. Print.

Selber, Stuart A. *Multiliteracies for a Digital Age*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004. Print.

Multimodal Composition: Resources for Teachers. Ed. Cynthia L. Selfe. Cresskill: Hampton, 2007. Print.

Selfe, Cynthia L. *Technology and Literacy in the Twenty-First Century: The Importance of Paying Attention*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1999. Print.

Selfe, Cynthia L., and Susan Hilligoss. *Literacy and Computers: The Complications of Teaching and Learning with Technology*. New York: MLA, 1994. Print.

Shor, Ira. *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992. Print.

---. "What is Critical Literacy?" *Critical Literacy in Action: Writing Words, Changing Worlds*. Ed. Ira Shor and Caroline Pari. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook-Heinemann, 1999. 1-30. Print.

Sorapure, Madeleine. "Between Modes: Assessing Student New Media Compositions." *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* 10.2 (2006). Web. 10 Nov 2016.

Thralls, Charlotte, and Nancy Roundy Blyler. "The Social Perspective and Pedagogy in Technical Communication." *Technical Communication Quarterly* 2.3 (1993): 249-70. Print.

Webb-Sunderhaus, Sara. "A Family Affair: Competing Sponsors of Literacy in Appalachian Students' Lives." *Community Literacy Journal* 2.1 (2007): 5-24. Print.

Wolfe, Joanna. *Team Writing: A Guide to Writing in Groups*. Boston: Bedford, 2010. Print.

Wolfe, Joanna, and Elizabeth Powell. "Biases in Interpersonal Communication: How Engineering Students Perceive Gender Typical Speech Acts in Teamwork." *Journal of Engineering Education* 98.1 (2009): 5-16. Print.

Yi, Youngjoo, and Alan Hirvela. "Technology and 'Self-Sponsored' Writing: A Case Study of a Korean-American Adolescent." *Computers and Composition* 27.2 (2010): 94-111. Print.

Appendix

Professional Digital Marketing Assignment Part II: Marketing a Small Business

<u>Overview of Assignment</u>
This assignment asks you to identify a small business in our community and market it online to the public through a Website, a blog, Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn.

<u>Objectives</u>
- To enhance and expand your critical reading, thinking, and writing skills.
- To expand your own and your client's digital, rhetorical, and social literacies.
- To apply what you know about writing, rhetorical analysis, social media, and design to a real-world context and learn how to assess and fulfill someone else's rhetorical needs, audiences, and purposes.
- To help you recognize and make conscious choices as you work on the planning, design, and production of your work.
- To increase your social, political, cultural, and civic awareness about our community and instill in you activist approaches to community and civic engagement.

<u>Project Stages</u>
Task 1: Choose a Small Business and Write an Inquiry Letter
Select a local small business (with fewer than 10 employees) that interests you and with whom you would like to work. Look to see what kind of online presence it has. If it already has a website, you probably want to move on to another company (There are plenty that have no presence at all). You may, in fact, want to begin in the Yellow Pages or drive around town looking for places off-the-beaten path. Then, make a list of three potential businesses and write the first one an "inquiry letter" in the form of an email. Introduce yourself, explain what you are doing, inquire if they are interested in working with you for this project, and ask to set up a face-to-face meeting in which you will give them more details of the project (make sure you CC me on all emails to your client). If you haven't heard back from your first choice within 48 hours of initial contact, move on to your second choice. Repeat these steps until you have found a small business willing to work with you.

Task 2: Compose a Formal Business Letter to Client
Write a formal business letter to the client in which you give the client background information on the project and explain what you will be doing this semester. This letter is intended to be lengthier than the inquiry letter, allowing your client to understand what you will be doing and what role the client will have in the process.

Task 3: Research the Business, Interview the Client, and Analyze the Rhetorical Situation
When you market an organization to the public, you must understand the business itself and the rhetorical situation in which you are writing. You will need to learn as much about the business as you can. Research it on the Web. Collect print materials and other documents. Interview the client and other staff. Collect the following information about the business:
- Mission, history, and values.
- Goals.
- Services.

- Clients/customers/audiences (i.e., who is served and what are their demographics).
- Staff (i.e., who, how many, background, demographics, expertise).
- Communication preferences, types, and styles.
- Challenges and needs of the business.
- Technology programs (hardware, software) and level of general technological expertise.
- Graphics: logos, images (print and digital), tables/figures, etc.
- Background, history, and previous careers of the client or owner.
- Decide when you will volunteer or spend time at the site. Please note that you must spend at least <u>five hours</u> at the site.

Task 4: Present Your Client to the Class
After you conduct your research and analysis, you will then present your findings to the class in two ways: (1) a written analysis of the client and (2) a professional oral presentation.

<u>Written Analysis</u>
Compose a professional memo that includes the research from Task 3 as well as the following information.
1. *Business Analysis:* Who is your business (background/history, mission, values, goals, demographics, workplace culture, employees, organization set up, etc.)? What special characteristics does it have? What is its greatest strengths? Weaknesses? Etc.
2. *Marketing Strategy/ies:* How will you market your client to their audience? What are your goals? What areas will you focus on in your marketing of it? How will you increase their business? What are your goals? What do you hope to accomplish? Etc.
3. *Client Use of and Involvement with Web Tools:* How will your client use Twitter? Facebook? The website you create? How will you pass these web spaces over to your client?
4. *Tentative Website Design:* Compose a tentative draft of your website by listing all of your site's pages (1st level, 2nd level, 3rd level, etc.). List main pages and subpages and decide how they will all work together. Draw lines to connect pages and sections that will link to one another. Consider the following: Who is your audience? What is your purpose? What kind of content will be on the site? What do you want the site to do? What information will be on the home page? What will be the main/second/third-level pages of your site? How will the user navigate the site? And so on.

<u>Oral Profile Presentation</u>
Prepare a 10-minute oral presentation based on your written analysis in which you profile your business. Give detailed information about the business and your client (background, purposes/goals/vision, the clients/audience they serve, etc.) so that your audience can be more knowledgeable. After your presentation, you will have a few minutes for questions and conversation. We will invite members from each business to these presentations, and they will be invited to speak and participate.

Task 5: Create and Maintain a Facebook Page and Twitter Account for this Business
Consult with your client about what information should go on the pages and what kinds of posts they would like you to make. Plan, research, and gather content. Then, as soon as possible, begin posting to the social media sites. Ask your client to send you updates; post your own updates (ask permission first). Remember that the posts can be about anything—even current events, new items, or links to articles—anything in which your client's fans or followers might be interested.

Task 6: Create a Website (that Includes a Blog) for this Business
The website should include:
1. A minimum of 5 discrete pages (the content, purpose, and users' needs should dictate exactly how many).
2. A blog, complete with icon options (RSS, Facebook, Twitter, and other sites).
3. Additional pages/documents/information, as needed: brochure, flyer, newsletter, press kit, hours of operation, downloadable coupons, logo, images, fact sheets, resources page, video, and internal and external links relevant to your purpose and audience.

Task 7: Transfer the Website, Blog, and Social Media Accounts over to the Client
As you near completion of the project, consider how you want to transfer these materials over to your client. Consider what they need to know to be able to maintain this online presence after you leave. Plan for how you are going to teach them to use these technologies.

Task 8: Present Project Final Oral Presentation about Project
At the end of the semester, you will give a 15-minute oral presentation about this project. Highlight the process you went through to create an online presence for this business, including the work you performed, the sites/spaces you created, and challenges and successes you experienced. Tell us what you learned. Your clients will be invited to join us and to give a response to your presentation and the project.

Task 9: Compose a Written Reflection over the Project (Individual Assignment)
Submit a 3-5 page single-spaced reflection over this project—what you did, what you learned, how you changed, how you grew, how you developed. Think of this piece as a companion piece to the final products you created for your client. Some questions you might consider include:
- What are the most important things you learned through this project (about writing, research, social media, design, digital marketing, blogging, editing, your interests, service-learning, professional digital identities, social issues, our community, etc.)?
- What literacies did you develop and how (i.e., rhetorical, functional, critical, ethical, digital/technological, social)?
- How will you use what you have learned this semester? In other words, what will you do with the knowledge and experience you have gained?
- What skills have you gained or improved upon? How will these new skills help you?
- What was it like to work with a client? What successes did you have? What challenges did you face? What did you learn?
- What did you learn about our community? How has this experience reshaped you or your thinking?

An Interview with Harvey J Graff & Brian Street[1]

Ana Maria de Oliveira Galvão—Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais
Maria Cristina Soares de Gouvêa—Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais
Ana Maria Rabelo Gomes—Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

The following interview took place in August 2014, during the V International Colloquium for Literacy and Written Culture (*V Colóquio Internacional Letramento e Cultura Escrita*), which was sponsored by the Centre for Literacy, Reading and Writing (*Centro de Alfabetização, Leitura e Escrita*) (CEALE), and by the Post-Graduate Programme in Education of the Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), Brazil.[2] This historical meeting brought together two of the most influential thinkers from the generation that rekindled the field of studies on oral language and literacy during the second half of the 1970's. During this meeting, Ana Maria de Oliveira Galvão, Maria Cristina Soares de Gouvêa, and Ana Maria Rabelo Gomes, professors of History, Psychology, and Anthropology of Education, sought to understand the context in which these authors' most important works were created. They generated a debate about current issues that represent a challenge to those in the field, such as academic literacy and the relations among oral language, written culture, and indigenous populations.

For those who study literacy in its various dimensions and contexts, the names Harvey Graff and Brian Street are immediately associated with the group of authors who, from the mid-70s, revolutionized an important field of studies that was under development at the time: the one focused on the relations between orality and written culture. The number of quotations and translations of their works on all continents is evidence of their roles in configuring literacy research over the last several decades.

Eric Havelock (1991) points to four fundamental publications, between the years 1962 and 1963, that contributed to the formation of the research area. These works, about different themes and from different countries, had in common a focus on orality: in 1962, *The Gutenberg Galaxy* by McLuhan in Canada and *La pensée sauvage* by Lévi Strauss in France were published; in 1963, Jack Goody and Ian Watt published the article "The Consequences of Literacy" in England, and Eric Havelock published *Preface to Plato* in the United States. According to Havelock (1991), in that moment, the actual transformations that the means of communication were going through had contributed to the (re)consideration of orality and writing as important objects of study. The works from this period, in areas as varied as anthropology, sociology, and psychology, emphasized the oral characteristic of language and its deep implications, at all levels, of the introduction of writing in traditional cultures. Much of this research focused, through field work, on societies that were still oral, looking for traces of what is normally called primary orality, such as melodies, songs, epic stories, and dances, which were preserved orally and passed on through generations (Havelock, 1991).

Many of these studies aimed to typify the different cultures based on the roles they gave to oral and written words. The basic hypothesis was that, according to Havelock (1988), if "the mean is the

message," the latter would suffer transformations as a consequence of the process through which it was transmitted/received. In this sense, the oral cultures and the written cultures are basically different regarding their means of transmitting and appropriating language. Ong (1982/2002) is one of the authors who generated a hypothesis generalizing aspects of the psychodynamic of primary orality cultures, suggesting characteristics of an oral way of thinking that would be less analytical, concrete, traditionalist, redundant, fragmented, and original. Those scholars working from this perspective aimed to point to the main effect of writing as a "separation": between what is known and who knows it; between the interpretation and the information; between the word and the sound; between the source of communication—the writer—and the receiver—the reader; between the past and the present; between academic learning and traditional wisdom; between the "high" languages controlled by writing, and the "low" languages, controlled by orality; between being and time.

In the last three decades, however, the assumptions of those studies have been questioned and problematized. The work of Harvey Graff and Brian Street was essential in shifting the perspective on literate phenomena. Alongside other researchers, they have shown, through consistent and rigorous work, that the relations between orality and writing were much more complex than those first studies assumed. The great dichotomy established between oral/written would be, in this sense, unable to explain the intricate existing relations among the different types of language, their characteristics, and the ways of thinking present in diverse cultures. In many of the early works on orality and written culture, "evolution" is considered linearly, as if all peoples travelled, some slower, others faster, the same path, towards a single end. The basis for this concept is an evolutionary and teleological perspective of history, in which discontinuities and contradictions are eliminated so as to create a linear, homogeneous, and coherent history. More than simply describing in a dichotomized way the differences between written and oral cultures, the contemporary studies aim to apprehend the social, historical, and technical conditions around which, in different historical cases, a certain written culture and a determined set of political, social, and cultural impacts were built. Historiographical and anthropological works completed in recent years have continued to show the richness and diversity of cultures that are not so technologically advanced, demonstrating the various directions "evolution" can take.

Harvey Graff entered the spotlight after the publication of his already classic book, *The Literacy Myth: Literacy and Social Structure in the Nineteenth Century City* (Academic Press, 1979; new edition, Transaction Publications, 1991), and has since emerged as one of the most important historians on literacy history in the world. In *The Literacy Myth*, Graff thoroughly analyzes Canada's case in the 19th century, arguing that the relations between literacy and the phenomena of societal and personal progress—or between illiteracy and criminality—are neither direct nor universal and can only be understood in very specific spatial and temporal contexts. After the publication of this groundbreaking work, Graff developed his research on the same theme (1981, 1987, 1995, 2007, 2011), showing that even though the penetration of writing in oral and/or native cultures does cause profound social, religious, ideological, political, economic, and cultural transformations, the great divisions traditionally posited between oral and written cultures are insufficient to analyze those changes.

In fact, according to Graff it is very difficult or nearly impossible to conceptualize *literacy*, unless the definition is considered historically and, in this way, contextualized in time and space. Graff shows, for instance, that written culture has different meanings, which vary depending on their acquisition, roles, and uses, for members of different continents, regions, states, or even groups. More recently, Graff has also been working in the areas of social history, including the history of growing up (1995), urban history (2008) and the history of interdisciplinarity (2015). He served as professor at Texas University at Dallas (1975-1998) and Texas University at Santo Antonio (1998-2004). Since 2004, he has been a professor in the English and History departments at Ohio State University, where he became Ohio Eminent Scholar in Literacy Studies. At OSU, Graff runs the interdisciplinary group LiteracyStudies@OSU.

Brian Street's body of work has also had significant repercussions in the study of literacy, mainly since the publication of an ethnographic study conducted in Iran during the 1970s (Street, 1984). By describing religious, commercial, and schooled literacy practices, the author complicates the idea, held by both individuals and groups such as UNESCO, that only literacy defined by hegemonic western standards would be able to bring progress to countries that were then considered underdeveloped. From this research and studies by other authors around the theme of New Literacy Studies, and in countries such as Nepal, India, and South Africa, Street elaborated the idea that literacy can be analyzed through autonomous and ideological models (1995). An autonomous understanding of literacy treats literacy as a cultural good, beneficial in itself to all, in any place or time, capable of transforming individuals and society despite differences in contextual factors. Inversely, an ideological model does not consider literacy as something good in and of itself, but instead views literacy acquisition as a process that is strictly associated with the sociocultural conditions/institutions within certain contexts. Situated between authority/power and individual resistance/creativity, literacy practices should be considered not only as aspects of "culture" but also as power structures, according to Street (1995). Thus, Street does not consider writing as a milestone between two completely different types of culture: for him, the oral and the written coexist incessantly; there is a continuous transit between those two forms of expression. In similar fashion to Graff (1994), Street does not consider writing itself to be solely responsible for transformations in cultures: oral language is also capable of prompting fixation, separation, and abstraction. Moreover, the paintings, rituals, and narratives typical of primarily oral cultures are able to transform the evanescence of sound into something almost permanent, distancing people from the immediate time and developing abstract thought. More recently, Street (1999, 2005, 2012) has been working on themes such as the relations among literacy, numeracy, and academic literacy.

For over 20 years, Street was a Professor of Social and Cultural Anthropology at the University of Sussex. He is currently an Emeritus Professor at the University of King's College, London, United Kingdom. He is a Visiting Professor at the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania in the United States. He has also been working with colleagues in Brazil with particular interest in ethnographic and academic literacies perspectives.

***

Ana Galvão: You've developed your inaugural works almost at the same time—the 1970s—although in different perspectives: historical and anthropological. The results of your works, on the 19th century in Canada [*The Literacy Myth: Literacy and Social Structure in the Nineteenth Century* (1979, 1991), by Harvey J. Graff] and on the 70s in Iran [*Literacy in Theory and Practice* (1984), by Brian Street], had great impact in the literacy studies field. Both helped to overcome the first generation of studies, such as Jack Goody and Eric Havelock's works, by putting literacy as a phenomenon that can only be understood in context. Your studies also helped to not dichotomize orality and writing and to understand that literacy is not always related to individual or social progress. In this sense, the concepts of *literacy myth* and the *autonomous versus ideological models* have, for scholars who came after you, great relationships. For us, you would be seen then as two leading researchers of a generation that would change the face of literacy studies. How do you see this relationship between your works today? At the time you developed them, did you have this awareness that they were making a revolution in the field of literacy studies? This is our first question.

Harvey Graff: *The Literacy Myth* was a historical conjuncture. It reflects the coming together of several currents of the post-World War II period, but in particular developments of the 1960s. First of all, it was shaped by my own growing up. I remember very well the politics of the 1960s. In fact, I have never eaten grapes since I boycotted grapes with Cesar Chavez in the 1960s. I protested against Vietnam, I marched for civil rights. My teachers, particularly in the university, were very encouraging of crossing different fields of study, of being critical, and by being critical the lasting legacy for me was always asking questions. I was taught that good questions are more important than answers. Answers are temporary.

So part of the politics and civil rights struggle was the rediscovery that for many young people schools were failing. They were not taught either a basic literacy or higher levels of abilities to use literacy (or multiple literacies). This is true for many students (in the United States but not only in the US), particularly minority students, but also for students from the middle class. So together, the radical politics, the protests, and the discovery of the problems in school shaped me and my scholarship. The key people I read in those days were Jonathan Kozol—and I think his first book, *Death at an Early Age*, was his best work, long before we were aware of the Cuban style literacy campaigns—and the work of Paulo Freire, which was another influence.

So those things formed one platform. My family was liberal, more or less, so that helped me to begin to form my own judgments. Then I went to graduate school in history. I decided to study in Canada, partly because of the Vietnam War, but I did not know at that point that I would end up studying what was then called the "new social history." It was the effort to reconceive and find sources and methods to understand and to conduct research in ways that include all the people, the people who did not usually find their way into written and printed sources on the shelves of official archives. And my advisor, Michael B. Katz, who had transformed the history of education with his book *The Irony of Early School Reform,* was doing one of the first quantitative social history projects using census

and related routinely-generated sources.

Despite its ambiguity, one of the variables on the Canadian census from 1850 asked about literacy. In the census of 1860, one of the questions was: can you read or write? So in my second semester in grad school, my advisor says: "Play around with that data, see if it's useful and where it may lead." Then I went off to read about literacy and major authors. This was 1971, 1972, and Goody's collection *Literacy in Traditional Societies* (1968) was a new book at the time. For me, what was important about that book is that it had a chapter by a British economic historian, Roger Schofield, on the measurement of literacy. This certainly raised questions. Roger was skeptical of the modernization equation: "there's literacy and then there's industry and then there's literacy and then there's cities and then there's…." Roger raised the questions that led me to think for many years. For example, about the effects on literacy levels of patterns of migration from countryside to cities and the effects of families working in mills. Both could lead to lowering literacy levels. Published work in Europe and North America supported such views, so this led me to more hypothesis and questions.

At the same time, the distinguished British historian Lawrence Stone wrote a very influential paper in the journal *Past and Present* that was pretty much an elegant summary of the triumph of literacy. It was in contrast with people like Edward Thompson and Eric Hobsbawm, and what other social, cultural, labor, and working class historians were beginning to suggest or argue. So it was the combination of my background, the politics of the times, questions about school—what was school good for, did it work, how could it work—and the new social histories effort to study more people. My study and my first two seminar papers, one on urban literacy and one on rural (the rural article did not get into the *Literacy Myth* book) were completely quantitative. My advisor told me, "you can't do a dissertation that is only quantitative. You have to research other sources." So part one of *The Literacy Myth* was mainly quantitative. The beginning and part two were efforts to interpret the numerical data. To try to get a sense of what schooling was like, I looked at the debate between contemporary 1960s issues about how do students learn to read best. Do they learn the letters first, do they learn to read by A, B, C? Or through what was radical in the 1830s, what we call today the whole word method or sometimes "look-see": let's look at the word, and autonomously the word will form in your head. I later learned that the very good reading teachers use the "eclectic method": whatever works works. Different kids learn in different ways.

So in reading, in studying the literature—this is my last comment—as part of my research, I discovered the debates in economics about modernization; I discovered the powerful efforts (coming out of American sociology) of democracy to conquer, what a later President would call the "evil empire"—the communist world. And for American capitalism to take control of the underdeveloped world, the third world, if we were going to export literacy. And we were going to train teachers, and we were going to sell millions of textbooks to the third world. So, industrialization and communications were issues. All those things were really becoming more apparent. As I looked across a number of fields, and my wonderful teachers said "look widely, let your questions lead you,"

I became very critical of how literacy was taught and used, critical to the point that over the years I meet people who say, with great ignorance, "you're anti-literacy," and I say "oh my god, I make my living by reading and writing." When I wrote "The Literacy Myth after 30 Years," I tried to clarify that the literacy myth was accepted because it was partly true, but its ideological power was contradictory. Does that answer your question?

Ana Galvão: Thank you.

Brian Street: Ok, I can come in in lots of ways there, but why don't I come in on the history? I found myself reading Harvey, and a book about 1066 onwards [Michael Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: English, 1066-1307* (1979)]….

Harvey Graff: Oh, yeah, that book came out in 1979.

Brian Street: A whole series of historians have provided literacy which located many of the differences in meanings of the term; for instance, until about the 12th century the word literacy in England meant "knowing Latin." It was only a bit later, as Clanchy points out (1979), that the word shifted its meaning; until about the 13th century, for people who knew Anglo-Saxon, Latin was what counted, he argued. So that was interesting as an anthropologist. There were later studies in the 18th century. One of the studies of 19th century literacy was about the fact that working class people actually were quite engaged with literacy, they knew quite a lot of literacy. One quote I remember was that in parliament, in about the 1880s maybe, conservative members of parliament said "we must start teaching literacy at school because we got all those working class trade union members learning literacy in a challenging way; if we're not careful, it'll become like France and we'll have a revolution." So the teaching of literacy in school was very much an ideological move in order to control people. Not to claim expansion or all the things that the rhetoric now claims about giving literacy to the poor and the working class. It was the opposite: "This will enable us to control." And then Harvey's work quoted all this; I was really up with this; it must have been in the early 80s that we got to this.

So how did I get to this [work]? Now we go back instead. My first degree was English. I shifted to anthropology for all kinds of accidental reasons, and my PhD was on written texts, on European representations of non-European society in popular fiction. When that was finished, I was in Oxford with people working around these fields, including those well aware of the relation between history and anthropology. But if I was going to move on in anthropology, I needed to do field work. I'd been to Iran, so I went back to Iran. I hadn't gone to study literacy, I'd gone to study rural-urban migration; one of the big themes in anthropology at that point, that was 1970. But sitting in this village, I found myself observing literacy practices. I actually had Jack Goody's book with me; a friend had given it to me. And I knew Jack, I used to go to stay with him in Cambridge, my tutor was a friend of his. And the more I sat in this village, where people sold fruit to the city, and engaged in this kind of complex literacy, the more the stronger version of what Jack Goody had in that book seemed not to fit.

So to jump ahead, I got back to Oxford. I didn't stay very long. I popped up to Cambridge and Jack was running a seminar. I joined in, we discussed these things, and I said "well, that doesn't seem to fit what I've been finding." In the village where I did field work, Iranian people engaged in what I called commercial literacy, religious literacy, schooled literacy, a whole variety of skills in reading and writing, none of which were recognized from outside, which continued to treat them as "illiterate." The Farsi word—and it took me a while to understand this—was "bi-savod," which meant basically without knowledge. "You should come to study their "bi-savod." That's exactly what I did, but coming to different conclusions about their "knowing." Sitting there with these people, elaborate, sophisticated, complex, in the antique shop, drinking tea, smoking bubble pipes, they would look at the school textbook I'd been learning from, "Farsi, book 3," and they'd say: "school textbooks are so bad, they have no relationship to what we really have to do, the commercial literacy, or canonic literacy—if you go to the Mecca, there is religious literacy."

So all this elaboration, and then back in England looking at the literature, and the stories were beginning to work their way around, as I say, and there was this particular view of literacy in traditional society. Jack, in his piece in it, it seemed to do this what I termed a "great divide." Now, since then—he is still alive [Jack died in 2015]—I see him occasionally; we met in Paris at a conference awhile back. He lives in France. He has continually said that the divide was never as great as I made it sound. But if you look at literacy in traditional society, it seems to be there. But the later books—we've discussed this, we've been going through the details—the later books did offer, he claims, a more sophisticated view of understanding literacy than either that early book or my representation of him.

So when you start getting into these fields—we have historians now, anthropologists, there's people of different cultures and countries, everyone picking up certain different bits of it—I wouldn't want to hold to people just picking up the "Goody" as a "baddy" as it were [*laughs*] or "Brian's opposing Goody." It's more subtle. I do say all that to my students when they're coming into studying literacy classes, which I do in Philadelphia in the Graduate School of Education and in King's [King's College, London] where I teach, I want to move beyond any caricature. But I also want to make a link here, to work through with people, not just one moment of time through ethnography. We're also taking account of terms of historical movements and shifts, way back to Anglo-Saxon, but also in Iran, all historical movements there, South Africa—there's quite a lot going on there, there's very much concern there with historical movement. So the history and the ethnography, I think, blend very well.

Harvey Graff: I agree. To get back to *1066* [*From Memory to Written Record*], the book was by Michael Clanchy, a wonderful man. It's based on 30 years of research, reading hundreds of thousands of documents for three centuries. And one of the things that plays off what Brian said: he pointed out that not only the formal definition of literacy came from Latin, but the early medieval England, was really a trilingual society with French and Anglo-Saxon as well as Latin. And today

I show this to some of my students who are studying multilingualism—some of my education students are interested in second language studies and some of my students are coming from foreign languages. There's the idea that there is a history and dynamic that we have to contend with if we're looking at multilinguality today. And I think it is best when history and anthropology come together. The University of Michigan has been one of the great centers for this. Too often ethnography becomes so overly focused on such a small thing that it really has no context anymore. We need to give that spirit of history back to ethnography, historicizing ethnography, and thinking about history ethnographically, even though we never had the sources. This is a reflection of what we were talking about in the conference [*V Colóquio Internacional Letramento e Cultura Escrita*] yesterday, different ways of reading sources when you don't have the complete sources.

Brian Street: One of the points I made yesterday was with a colleague called Jan Blommaert, who works in Europe, at Tilburg University, and he made the point strongly that the study of ethnography is not simply a particular method or skill: it's the epistemological shift. I think that that gets missed sometimes when people, maybe in sociology, linguistics or other disciplines, look at anthropology and look at ethnography only as another skill. They take ethnography as though it was just a narrow skill. Whereas Jan—and I would agree with him—would take an ethnographic perspective as being epistemological recognition of how we understand images of local people's meanings and practices. We apply that to literacy then, and so you say to policy makers and people in school contexts "ok, let's find out what people themselves make of reading and writing."

I mentioned today one response is that people say they buy the dominant model, they say "I'm not literate." We've experienced this at the University of Pennsylvania when I worked with graduate students moving into doing a doctorate, and we talked about what literacy skills do you need in order to do this doctorate. The first position from their tutors as well as themselves is "we've already become literate, we've got our degrees, we've got masters, we've done all this, dissertation, so we don't need to worry about that, we need to worry about the theoretical-methodology issues of the research." And then, "Bang!." They hit up against it. The tutor starts giving them feedback. It is a literacy event reading comments in the margin: maybe to do with argument, often to do with structure, certainly to do with the genre of writing they were engaged with. So we then developed the notion of illiteracies in that context, to say that there are all kinds of features of writing that you are required to do as a doctoral student and to move on in the system which aren't made explicit. The tutors don't say "here's what you have to do as a doctoral student as opposed to as a master's student." And then it gets even more difficult to get to grips with some of it—some don't, they drop out.

And then some start going to conferences, they write articles, they come to conferences like this today—you see all of those PowerPoints. Where do people learn how to do that? More, varied literacy practices, which are often hidden. The practical feature of this theoretical-methodological shift is to recognize that everybody engaged in literacy, whether it's the trader in the Karachi Street or the PhD student in Philadelphia, may need support in moving on with their literacy.

We're not simply saying "no need to teach them literacy; they've got it." Rather, we are saying we can help improve and develop, but let's build with what they've got, and let's look at what they need. Some women in Uganda might need some further help in keeping lists of objects and the prices of them so that when these men challenge them and rip them off, they can say "look, I've got it down in writing." So it becomes an ideological challenge back to dominant perspectives. That might be enough: they don't have to go to a literacy class and sit there and do all this formal stuff. Maybe that's enough. In South Africa, some people would say "no, I want to go further, because I want to actually challenge the dominant apartheid ideology." So the point is, when they're involved in education, "which literacies?" becomes the question. Very often, there are hidden literacies that people aren't aware of, and very often you can build on the literacies people bring with them and then extend them according to the context.

Harvey Graff: I think there is a shift under way. For many years, it was up to the student who had to find and develop, consciously or unconsciously, the structure that hid those literacies. The clever students ferret them out. Or, the older more senior graduate students passed them on. Today, and I think partly generationally, but partly in the USA in response to the crisis of jobs, we want to prepare our students better, and our students want to do everything. There's a crisis if you don't have a publication before you look for a job. So I think there's one small sign: in the USA there has been a whole rash of guide books for these students, four or five in the last few years. I don't know if you've read Frank Furstenberg, the sociologist; he wrote one a year or two ago.

My point here is: those literacies are sometimes learned consciously, sometimes unconsciously, sometimes you find a guide. That guidebook can be oral or written. It can be passed on laterally from another student. It can be passed on from an instructor who says "you gotta learn this book." In psychology, there is the American Psychological Association guide; in modern languages and literature, the Modern Language Association has a guide; you have to almost memorize it. History and anthropology have quite the same formalization. But when we apply this to other levels, there's the danger of a kind of softening of the dominant model, when you come in from outside and say "okay, I'm not going to have one method of instruction, but I'm going to bring in two or three models." The real challenge is how we legitimate systems to teach people in different places for them to learn enough to begin to ask their own questions about literacy.

I was talking to my colleague Elaine Richardson last night. Elaine is a wonderful example of someone who had a very hard life and then went to college for the second time, and it was the right time. We need to build systems at all levels for students not to just succeed one time. For example, Judy Kalman's warning about so many common uses of technology, the claim that there is *one* way. Even though we dress it up with technology, it's still a form, even a soft form, of a dominant ideology and myth. Part of what I am saying is that there is more than one form of the dominant and many more forms of what Brian has characterized as the ideological. So we need more deconstruction. We haven't done a very good job in studying the relationships among those different kind of dominant and supposedly

related other factors.

Brian Street: So one concrete example of that: I'm working with doctoral students and I discussed with their colleagues as well about what we mean by the word "essay." So students have to learn to write an essay. The first move is, you discover, is it needs to be quite different than in biology or, say, psychology. But the second move is: you *abandon* it once you try to move up the system. Because if you try to write an article for a journal, if you sent them an essay, they'll think you're stupid. Because that isn't what they want.

So how do you find that out? One way they find it out is they send it out and the journal writes back and says "total rubbish." And the student at that point might think, "hmmm, I've hit my ceiling here" and go off and do something else. Another might be that the student works with tutors who have a more sophisticated understanding of academic literacy and might say: "yes, you've learned all this stuff, you've got a PhD and a dissertation. Don't forget it, but actually you have to move on. Because now, you go somewhere else."

So how do you know the genre of writing? And now, I had a discussion with a colleague here about this; he works in psychology and showed me an article he'd written for an English journal, and they almost rejected it. I said "Well, let's have a look at it", and we discussed it, and I said to him, "do you like Agatha Christie?" He said "yes," and we discussed that for a while. So for the first five or six pages he was circling around, not giving too much away, and in fact Agatha Christie often waits until the last page. And I've talked to people, people in China have that particular genre, should we say, of writing. I'm afraid this US, UK type journal doesn't believe in that, that for very boring reasons historically, takes a narrow view: tell me what you're going to say, say it, tell me what you've said. And at first my colleague said "well, that is so childish." But, off he went, and came back with a new draft, dropped the first 6 pages, sent it off to the journal and of course they accepted it, and he is now on the editorial board. What we've talked about is how can you persuade this editorial board to be a little bit more culturally varied?

One more footnote here: this very narrow view of literacy ("tell me what you're going to say; say it"), if you look at 19th century scientific writing—Charles Darwin is an example I always use since my research was about reading works like these—*Origin of species* is more Agatha Christie than "tell me what you're going to say." He circles around, he's trying to engage with Lamarck, who had a different theory of evolution anyway. And he does it in a very, might I say, gentlemanly way. So it was only recently that we got to this rather narrow little genre. So, one issue with students as we move around these fields is first to recognize "this is what it's like"[in a given writing context]—different genres, different power, different ideology. And secondly, maybe we can shift them a little bit. And that has been tough.

Harvey Graff: Perhaps with psychologists like your colleague on editorial boards, we can develop more complicated and appropriate notions about genres in written and other forms of communication. It takes a long time, but I try and teach my students to write in more than one way. Writing an

American dissertation is not the way to learn to write anything useful (*laughs*). History, as a discipline, typically expects a book to follow from a doctoral dissertation. We do dissertations for many bad reasons and there are a few good reasons, but dissertations are not like books.

But, there are signs of change. I'm working with some scientists and some people in medicine now about what in the US we generally call writing across the curriculum. The basis of that is that all the students have to take the first and second level of writing this kind of general composition. More and more of us are teaching writing and other forms of communication more explicitly. I teach a second level writing course for honors students and the subtitle is "reading and writing about reading and writing." I make them think hard about what it means to read and to write. I have them do a couple of different papers and research papers, but they're largely based on required reading. So I can make sure they can do at least that reading. And they write two papers, two different kinds of papers. This is just one example of many examples. I read early and revised drafts, provide criticism and compare the drafts. Revision is a requirement and an explicit goal.

Requirements and practice differ in different fields. In science, for example. I have a colleague—this is a man who's a world expert on insects—he teaches Biology 101 to 800 students who don't want to be there. He makes them read the *New York Times* every day, and in small groups they write science policy [the word he uses is briefs], short position papers. His students have never thought about using what they're learning in science. He's very concerned about understanding science to be a better citizen, because most of these students are not going to become biologists. Touching on the points Brian was making, this friend has also just finished a major research study of the admission test for medical school, and even though most biology students do not intend to go to medical school, the nature of that examination has reshaped and, in his view, ruined how first year biology is taught to almost every college student. So that represents another way in which one mode of reading, and instruction, can have a major determining effect. This influential practice is not autonomous, but it is a dominant mode, and it was not the intention of the medical school people, but in universities, they have different series of levels of decision making about the curriculum, outcome, and shaping the nature of reading and writing.

Brian Street: So the same thing, and let me just give one more example, working in another university in London, Queen Mary, around these issues. A concrete example of a student who'd done history at A-level in England and then came to the university, and he was combining History and Anthropology. He got an A in his A-level at school. In his first year at the university, he continued to get an A for writing his history essays. I can still see it now, the essay that he wrote for the anthropologist, the tutor using exactly this phrase I refer to all the time: "you can't write, get down to the study center." The student showed it to me, and we discussed what's going on here; the student says "of course I can write, I got A in history." What was going on was that when he tried to do an account of theoretical developments in anthropology using what he thought was a history model, it was a different period, and the anthropologist jumped on him and said "you're falling

into an old traditional model of anthropology, we forget it now. That model saw progress, earlier periods were backward, primitive, stupid, and now we've moved on, we're modern." And that was the 19th century view in anthropology. One of the first things we try to do with students is say "look, we no longer adhere to that, let's call it that evolutionary theory of progress." And what the tutor thought the student was doing with his historical account of theoretical development was an evolutionary account. So the poor student, it wasn't so much to do with going to the study skills center and learning how to do your verbs and nouns; it was actually an epistemological question about the genre and the discipline. And that is *the* theme, I think, in the academic literacies, not just for universities, but for schools too.

Harvey Graff: There's a failure of the anthropology instructor here to say what kind of writing was appropriate for this course. And this anthropology teacher could allow some negotiation. The student says: "I'm a history student. We need to explore the differences and the similarities."

Maria Cristina Gouvêa: In this sense, we can consider that literacy came to an interdisciplinary field about that dialogue between history, anthropology, and psychology. Can we define that like this? And do you think that we could teach and research like that today? I was thinking about the dialogue between Clifford Geertz and Robert Darnton during 17 years, sharing the same discipline in the University of Princeton. They really developed a dialogue between the two fields.

Brian Street: Well, more than two fields. I'm putting social linguistics, and I'm being careful here.

Maria Cristina Gouvêa: So do you consider that we can think that literacy came to be an interdisciplinary field and that it will continue like that?

Brian Street: I think it should be, but how that works in practice is complicated. I have colleagues at King's College who say, "I teach my discipline, my subject. I don't have to teach writing; literacy, that's for school. If these kinds can't do it properly, send them to the clinic to fix them."

Harvey Graff: Where I teach, I'm associated with composition people as well as literature and history people. And I will say: "you have to talk about reading *and* writing." And they say "no, we won't talk about reading." My very dear friend Deborah Brandt, who's one of the best scholars of writing literacy in the US, says "too much is said about reading, Harvey. I won't do reading," and I say "Deborah, you are crazy" and she says "maybe." But my new book (*Undisciplining Knowledge: Interdisciplinarity in the Twentieth Century* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015)] is about literacy studies' failure to be interdisciplinary and suggesting ways to change. There's a lot of multidisciplinarity, I think. For me, interdisciplinarity is not about disciplines, it's about questions and problems and fashioning new and different ways to answer them. But I find too often literacy studies people who say "we're going to take three words from linguistics," but they don't know linguistics. "We're going to borrow words from cognitive psychology," but they don't know cognitive

psychology. You have to know, I think; that's my definition, not everybody's, but mine, at least within that particular part of different disciplines, is you have to know the basics; and I find people saying, "I'm taking an anthropological approach to ethnography," but they don't know what that means. The word was current, the word was sexy. Now, Clifford Geertz never understood history and Darnton never understood anthropology, but they had a lot of fun together. And I think that if you look for relationships, one can be critical. A lot of criticism is negative, but it can also be constructive.

Brian Street: And we go back to square one to ask who said the word "literacy." You have to say "what do you mean by it," not assume we'll know where we're going. And that's just the word literacy. Start doing that with other words, like class, gender, ethnicity….

Harvey Graff: Each of us does need to know what we mean. When Brian says literacy, when I say literacy, we better be able to say what do we mean.

Brian Street: We don't just, I think, describe; we do try to model what is happening. I would say I would use the word literacy as being at the tip of the iceberg and always recognize what literacy practices it actually refers to. Then I would translate the word in context and always make it about literacy practices rather than just the word literacy.

Ana Galvão: Your work had great impact in academic circles, but the ideas of *literacy myth* and *autonomous model of literacy* are very strong today; it seems that they are stuck in people. Do you think your concepts could be useful to understand and to criticize government programs, school projects, projects with communities that had established very recently contact with literacy, as, in the Brazilian case, indigenous people?

Ana Gomes: That's a very good question for us, and we have this strong policy now that thinks in an *autonomous model* about literacy that every child has to learn to read and write at the second age. Even if we can criticize this, my personal question is about the other policy that we had to develop for indigenous people because this policy was invading the classroom of indigenous schools and we created another program. So we have *Pacto Nacional pela Alfabetização*, for all Brazilians with one material, one Portuguese for everybody, and we created *Saberes Indígenas na Escola*, for a hundred and eighty languages to produce each material for each language but they have similar features, because they are public policies. And it's terrible because we cannot lose the opportunity to ask you about this contradiction. We have to defend the indigenous language, but we use tools that are too similar to the same policies we are trying to confront... So?

Harvey Graff: Can I ask you a question or two about the indigenous languages in Brazil?

Ana Gomes: Yes.

Harvey Graff: Are they all written?

Ana Gomes: Many of them, and because of the missionaries. All indigenous languages in Brazil are considered in danger of disappearing. So we have different situations, but there's no strong tradition of written language in many of them. All of them became to be written because of the missionaries or because of school, but today it's a reality.

Harvey Graff: Are there common elements among them? Part of my answer would be to try and build on those common elements. You can't build 180 curricula, but a smaller number. To me, the problem in general when I think internationally is you need to build, and I think there are lessons from history and anthropology here. In my new work, I'm looking at the missionaries again. They have a bad press, but I think some of the missionaries at least did some very interesting things in understanding local cultures and creating alphabets that lasted for centuries. But, more importantly, we need to find ways to teach people to translate from an indigenous language or a constructed common indigenous language into Portuguese and move back and forth.

I've been thinking particularly in my program LiteracyStudies@OSU about some new concepts. We began a program last year on literacy and translation, and the people most involved are people who do real translation. But I've been thinking about translation within languages. We talked about academic literacies in English. We are really asking our students to translate from writing in a language of history to writing in a lab report in biology. We're teaching them to translate both across different areas but also on different levels as well, and to think of ways to promote some students in different curricula to move back and forth. That is a kind of bilingualism, but I think it is more than traditional bilingualism. We need to think about how what's common across languages and the language practices in the sense Brian was talking about. I've also been thinking about how some of the literacy people in the US have been talking about navigating different literacies. Navigation to me seems too much like there is a path, so I'm thinking about negotiation instead. Sometimes negotiation is easy. Sometimes it's within ourselves, sometimes it's with their parents, sometimes it's with their teachers, but finding ways to help students negotiate among different practices, among different languages, that's my answer.

Brian Street: So, a concrete example that involves this negotiation is that if we look at the latest book title from my colleague, I think it's called *Companion of English Studies* [Street and Leung, Routledge, 2014]. It contains about 30 articles, and it involves exactly that kind of negotiation we talked about. The first move is you can no longer talk about standard English. The world speaks English, few people in this little island over there have a particular version or versions of it. But all around the world there are different versions. Now, TESOL, they are shifting, but they have tended to try to do this almost autonomous model, if you like, of English. Englishness, with people using it with a big E. So this volume, then, negotiates with people all over the world ways of representing the complex

varieties that the language varieties of English take.

One example is when I was sitting by the table in Singapore with a group of colleagues, people of Chinese background but also people from south India, and people from four or five different languages, but they were all speaking English. It was not the same English, they were speaking the variety of where they came from. Fine, we're negotiating and we're communicating, we may get lost with some of the words that might not quite work. We had a problem with "refraction" here today actually. So having such a framework—and this is what I have to say to policy makers—"there isn't an answer that is solid, but rather a framework that says now we can negotiate." Helping us to understand the different meanings, and they're shifting all the time.

I think it's a good idea to try to learn Portuguese, but not the whole thing in a single package. Instead, you learn aspects of it that are relevant to what you mean to do. That's what people have done in the world all the time. In Africa, there is a complex overlap of language varieties I want to use. When we're working with policy makers we want to say this sort of thing, not just "we have an alternative list of categories, silos fixed for you" but rather it's an epistemological shift. And so in Brazil's case, I think if you can find a way of actually being together, people working on indigenous languages, also the "campo" stuff going on, and some of the issues around standard Portuguese and whatever. And actually negotiate and discuss which developments are appropriate for which purposes and you get quite a different take. There are bits of Brazil where I thought that would be more the case. I know that governments got a bit more autonomous but I thought there was a little bit more flexibility here than we've had in the UK, where we have the national literacy strategy, phonics, and the US has "No child left behind." I thought you had a little bit more flexibility here. That's what I'd be sitting around a table talking to policy makers about: let's build in this variety of knowledge we've got and understanding, take account of what we celebrate in indigenous languages and varieties of Portuguese, including the academic literacy thing, and the campo issue—people from rural areas coming in to study. Let's see what happens when we put all of that together.

Harvey Graff: I think we need to tell policy people, "let's make Brazil the best in the world in indigenous language education."

Ana Gomes: It takes a long time, it's a big challenge.

Harvey Graff: The lesson I've learned, I have preached complexity my whole life. You cannot teach complexity to policy makers. They see the world in a simple image. I figured this out, but I haven't figured out how you put complexity into a simple image. That's one next step.

Brian Street: But what metaphor I have for that, you know we work with UNESCO and such agencies, they create this wall that says there's a language, it's built by this, or literacy, but it doesn't quite work. So I was working in Ethiopia with the government, lots of different languages, variety. And so, one metaphor we use is there are cracks in the wall and our current position in terms of policy

in the future is we're not getting that much bigger. They're going for cracks in the wall. We're not claiming we "want to change the world or the walls," but in Ethiopia we got funded. Uganda, India, just little cracks in the wall, where because what they're doing doesn't work. So in England the government's response is "what we're doing doesn't work," it looks as though children in school are doing even worse in literacy, so "I know what we'll do, we'll sit them down for even longer…."

Harvey Graff: …and give them more tests!

Brian Street: Or, "oh, look, here's some cracks in the wall! Look, there are some ways in which a more social practice approach seems to have helped these students a lot." Are you willing to listen? Some say no, and some don't, but that's about as far as we've got with negotiating with policy makers.

Harvey Graff: It's always going to be "cracks in the wall."

Vicki Graff: You know what Leonard Cohen says about that?

Brian Street: Who? Keep going?

Harvey Graff: The Canadian folk singer…

Vicki Graff: The cracks in the wall. That's where the light gets in.

<p align="center">***</p>

NOTES

[1] This essay originally appeared in the April/June 2016 issue of *Educação em Revista*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0102-4698156010. Reprinted with permission by *Educação em Revista* and under the CC-BY-2.0 licence.

[2] Interview conducted by Ana Maria de Oliveira Galvão, Maria Cristina Soares de Gouvêa, and Ana Maria Rabelo Gomes at the Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (FaE/UFMG), Belo Horizonte – MG, Brazil. Initial transcription by Cecília Lana, Clarissa Vieira, and Marina Duarte. Revised for initial publication by Vicente Cardoso Júnior. Revised for publication in *Literacy in Composition Studies* by Tara Lockhart.

WORKS CITED

Graff, Harvey. *Literacy in History: An Interdisciplinary Research Bibliography*. Garland, TX, 1981.

---. *The Legacies of Literacy: Continuities and Contradictions in Western Culture and Society*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987. Print.

---. *The Labyrinths of Literacy*: *Reflections on Literacy Past and Present*. London: Falmer P, 1995.

---. *The Literacy Myth: Cultural Integration and Social Structure in the Nineteenth Century*. New Brunswick: Transaction, 1991. Print.

---. *Literacy Myths, Legacies, and Lessons*: *New Studies on Literacy*. New Brunswick, NY: Transaction, 2011. Print.

---, ed. *Literacy and Historical Development*: *A Reader*. Carbondale: Southern UP, 2007. Print.

---. *Conflicting Paths: Growing up in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995. Print.

---. *Undisciplining Knowledge*: *Interdisciplinarity in the Twentieth Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2015. Print.

Havelock, Eric. "The Oral-Literate Equation." *Literacy and Orality*. Eds. David Olson and Nancy Torrance. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991. 11-27. Print.

Kalman, Judy, and Brian V. Street. *Literacy and Numeracy in Latin America*: *Local Perspectives and Beyond*. New York: Routledge, 2012. Print.

Ong, Walter. *Orality and Literacy*: *The Technologizing of the Word*. 2nd ed. Routledge: London and New York, 2002. Print.

Street, Brian V. *Literacy in Theory and Practice.* NY: Cambridge UP, 1984. Print.

---. *Social Literacies*: *Critical Approaches to Literacy in Development, Ethnography and Education*. London: Longman, 1995. Print.

---. *Students Writing in the University: Cultural and Epistemological Issues*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999. Print.

---. *Navigating Numeracies*: *Home/School Numeracy Practices. Multiple Perspectives on Attainment in Numeracy*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2005. Print.

Review Essay: Around the Bend

Phillip Goodwin—University of Nevada, Reno

I n 2014, *College English* published a special issue edited by Jacqueline Rhodes and Jonathan Alexander titled *Reimagining the Social Turn*. In the introductory essay to the issue, Rhodes and Alexander describe the social turn as a series of turns over the last three or four decades. They explain the impetus for this collection is their feeling that the "assumptions and theoretical bases upon which the 'social turn' in composition studies emerged have shifted—again" (481). The metaphor of a series of turns or shifts in a much larger turn allows us to view the developments in our pedagogies as both part of a trajectory that comes from situating writing and writers in socio-political and economic contexts and, necessarily, the subjective relationships writers have to these contexts in their current moment. The latest turn toward community engagement and embodied activism, what Elenore Long and Paula Mathieu, among others, call the public turn, has moved writing outside of academic contexts and situated it locally and at the intersections of economics, race, gender, and class. Rhodes and Alexander write that one of the many challenges facing our field is to reimagine how to teach writing "*right now*, in this particularly vexed sociopolitical and economic context" (emphasis in original, 485). That is, shifting economies and new material realities have once again changed the contexts in which writing takes place. The essays in this issue attempt to understand these shifting contexts and where the next turn is taking us while providing ways to remain committed to ethical action and social responsibility.

To my mind, one of the more interesting essays to take this up is Jonathan Alexander and Susan Jarratt's "Rhetorical Education and Student Activism." In this essay Alexander and Jarratt use an instance of student activism at their campus to discover how protesters understood the relationship between rhetorical principles and the tactics they employed and, more to the point, whether their protest was influenced by their rhetorical education in writing courses. In this particular protest, students from the Muslim Student Union used the tactic of interruption to protest a speech by Michael Oren, then Israel's Ambassador to the United States. One by one the student-protesters stood, loudly declared a statement that challenged Israel's occupation of Palestine and Oren's involvement in Israeli military actions, and walked out. Jarratt and Alexander interviewed five of the protesters and discovered that this strategy was implemented because of the Muslim Student Union's continued exclusion from public forums in the campus community. The protesters also felt it was important to be heard because a string of conservative, university-sponsored speakers were normalizing pro-Israeli, anti-Islam, and anti-Palestinian messages.

Alexander and Jarratt found a profound disconnect between the "world of ideas" of the classroom and the "world of action" (539) in this incident. The students reported that although they were exposed to critical theory that allowed them to think and question the world, none of this work created the possibility for action. The students' sophisticated understanding of activism and the available means for intervention came from extracurricular, self-sponsored activities. Alexander and

Jarratt are not shy about recognizing the failure of the social turn to effectively influence students' knowledge of rhetorical practices and engagement. Ultimately, their essay questions the efficacy of the kinds of deliberative democratic discourses privileged in our pedagogies and classrooms and these deliberative discourses in the lived experiences of our students' public lives.

The notion that institutional discursive spaces are closed to many, particularly women and minorities, is not new to composition. Increasingly, though, our field's legitimate anxieties about the privatization of public life, corporate protections from public oversight, and limited forums for discussing public matters—so eloquently articulated in Nancy Welch's *Living Room*—have generated a felt need for what Welch calls rhetoric from below: teaching alternative forms of public writing and activism that assert rhetorical space in a privatized and individualized society. If, as Rhodes and Alexander describe it, composition studies is taking yet another turn, the books reviewed here allow us to see around the bend In their own ways, these texts respond to our anxieties about the decline of public life in a neoliberal era and, like Welch, ask us to consider and adjust our pedagogies to implement rhetoric from below and renew the efficacy of our public engagement.

Frank Farmer's *After the Public Turn: Composition, Counterpublics, and the Citizen Bricoleur* argues for the importance of public sphere theory in our public writing pedagogies. To think in terms of publics and counterpublics requires us to include the study of oppositional discourses and alternative discursive spaces in our pedagogies and challenges the sometimes limited forms writing takes in narrowly conceived public writing assignments. For instructors who, like Alexander and Jarratt, question the efficacy of our instruction or want to supplement our models for going public, Farmer's study of counterpublics and what he dubs the "citizen bricoleur" offers new possibilities for public engagement. Counterpublics, Farmer argues, are an important, and in our field overlooked, aspect of social formation and public participation. Although not prescriptive in its pedagogical suggestions, *After the Public Turn* is intended to have us consider what counterpublics mean to rhetoric and writing studies, and how this can give our students a greater "understanding of what qualifies as democratic participation, of what counts as authentic public engagement, of what a *citizen* is" (emphasis in original, 19). With this focus, *After the Public Turn* provides an important juncture for the social turn and its pedagogical commitments.

In the introduction, Farmer provides his readers with an understanding of publics and counterpublics informed by Jürgen Habermas' theory of the bourgeois public sphere and important critiques of it by Nancy Fraser, Rita Felski, Oscar Negtand Alexander Kluge, and Michael Warner. These critiques give the reader a sense that counterpublics are pluralistic and, importantly, there are multiple kinds of counterpublics that are always oppositional to dominant publics. For Farmer's purposes, Warner's conception that publics and counterpublics are formed through the production and reflexive circulation of texts provides the most generative theory. Farmer describes that publics, unlike audiences, have a temporal aspect that ebb and flow as exigencies inevitably shift. With this understanding of counterpublics Farmer writes that publics "can be discovered in some surprising places and can express a range of very different social, cultural, and political viewpoints" (21). Because counterpublics can form outside institutional spaces and introduce oppositional discourses, Farmer cannot overstate the important implications public sphere theory has on composition's public turn.

After introducing his readers to the foundations of public sphere theory, Farmer divides his book into two parts. The first, "Cultural Publics," introduces the reader to one of Farmer's most important concepts, the "citizen bricoleur." *Bricolage*, a term at its most basic meaning to cobble something new from old materials, takes on new significance for Farmer when the citizen bricoleur cobbles a new cultural artifact from everyday materials. This act is at once culture-forming and public making. The act is also subversive in that instead of participating in cultural consumption, the citizen bricoleur, "situated at the intersection of (certain) cultures and (certain) publics," participates in alternative world making by "mak[ing] texts, and the worlds within which they circulate" (68). To illustrate the citizen bricoleur, Farmer turns to a study of anarchist and punk "zines" and the rudimentary ways in which they were crafted and circulated. Farmer's interest is not zines' subculture status but the way in which their material production and reflexive circulation also crafts counterpublics through creating oppositional discursive space. In the second chapter of this section, Farmer makes a case for including zines and cultivating citizen bricoleurs in our classrooms. He argues that zines and the counterpublics they form offer a distinct mode of public address, and, because they are varied in tone, register, topic, and multiple voices, they are a site of democratic discourse and public participation. Most importantly, the process of making zines allows students to forge their own publics and forums.

In his second section, "Disciplinary Publics," Farmer applies the understating of counterpublics to academic contexts. He argues that in certain contexts, some academic disciplines might be defined as "disciplinary counterpublics." A disciplinary counterpublic might emerge when members of a discipline "locate their work within the 'groves of academe' but who desire that their contributions not remain there" (106). A disciplinary counterpublic might also emerge when members of a discipline with an already established public orientation go public in unsanctioned ways (122). To orient disciplinary counterpublics, Farmer examines three cases of going public from different disciplines—architecture, teacher education, and science and technology studies—that can be understood as working from disciplinary counterpublics. In the following chapter, Farmer uses the lens of disciplinary counterpublic to make the case that composition is a counterpublic of a certain kind. Farmer revisits the idea of the citizen bricoleur and suggests that because of its institutional positioning, compositionists might make use of the bricoleur's tools in the ways we go public with our pedagogies. The bricoleur, from a compositionist's perspective, will find new ways of performing the critical function of our public engagement, in the public spaces we make, and in the activism we perform.

Farmer returns to the concept of the bricoluer in his epilogue, offering a composite sketch of who s/he might be, the projects s/he takes up, and how to find her or his work. The citizen bricoleur, he argues, is an important model for understanding the intersection of publics, counterpublics and contemporary rhetoric. This is especially relevant for complicating the underexamined public writing tasks of the composition classroom. Although ambitious in its calls for reorienting our public turn, *After the Public Turn* is nonprescriptive by necessity. If we are to authentically "go public" through adopting the ethos of the bricoleur, then we, and our students, must cultivate our own resourcefulness in ways pertinent to the publics we hope to form.

If *After the Public Turn* asks us to consider ways in which our pedagogies can help students create their own publics, then Amy Wan's *Producing Good Citizens: Literacy Training in Anxious Times*

asks us to consider how our pedagogies of citizenship integrate students into already formed publics and cultivate public subjectivities. Wan's book is at once a critique of the ambient and unspecified ways citizenship is used to justify literacy education and a call to examine how literacy training is implicated in and used as a tool to produce habits of citizenship aligned with the needs of the emerging global and service economies. By calling attention to the historical linking of literacy to citizenship and by recognizing the limitations of our assumptions that literacy leads to a full liberatory and participatory citizenship, *Producing Good Citizens* asks us to consider what values and practices are being promoted and excluded in our classrooms, and it asks us to cultivate pedagogies that promote more robust notions of citizenship that are politically and materially situated.

Producing Good Citizens draws a parallel between our current moment of profound economic and social change and a similar moment of industrialization and mass immigration a century earlier. Through a study of three sites of literacy and citizenship training—immigrant naturalization classes, union worker education programs, and the university—Wan's book uncovers how "themes of work and productivity have been integral to how we imagine the citizen" and how the "good citizen" is evaluated by their potential for economic productivity (15). Though, as Wan writes, it is "not a neat parallel," what both moments share is "education through literacy as a mass strategy to shape citizenship [and its practices]" to particular economic ends (3).

Wan presents an historical and theoretical framework of citizenship that contextualizes the ambient and uncritical ways citizenship has been taken up in our classrooms. It investigates how citizenship as a concept is entangled with literacy's function in credentialing the "good citizen." The first chapter challenges the ways in which our lack of specificity about the meanings of citizenship make it a kind of "superterm" that "allows us to elide crucial concerns about the access to, impact, and exercise of citizenship" (17). By examining how citizenship is taken up in various composition pedagogies, Wan uncovers our belief that through literacy, citizenship is an achievable status and thus can create political equality and equal access to rewards. Though these assumptions about literacy and citizenship are not limited to our classrooms, they provide Wan with a lens for examining how the literacy training found in her case studies transmits certain values and habits of citizenship.

Three case studies, each an individual chapter, provide historical analysis of specific sites of literacy training in the 1910s and 1920s. The cases provide insight into how literacy training of the late Progressive era served to produce workers for the emerging industrial economy and how citizenship was defined through one's work potential. The documents Wan examined, "labor newspapers, federally produced citizenship textbooks, conference proceedings, hearings, journals"(12), demonstrate the underlying rationale and goals for teaching literacy in immigrant naturalization courses, worker education programs, and higher education. More importantly, the documents reveal how the habits of citizenship cultivated in these educational spaces craft public identities for the students that are aligned with the objectives and interests of the sponsoring institutions. For instance, the readings and assignments for naturalization courses attempted to teach newly arrived immigrants to identify their citizenship as individuated and through their work. They promoted obedience and loyalty to employers, and the lessons, Wan writes, "served to transform immigrants into workers who could be exploited, and literacy training enforced particular habits of work that kept workers from being

to excitable or amenable to radicalization" (69). In union-sponsored worker education programs, unions sought also to identify citizenship in relationship to work; however, they attempted to teach a critical literacy specifically designed to cultivate a working-class consciousness. They taught workers to be critical of exploitation in a mass production economy and to think of work and workers in collective terms. In much the same way, the first-year composition course shaped the citizen-worker to usefully employ their advanced literacy skills in managerial positions of an industrial society. Educators in higher education attempted to demonstrate the relevance of English education by linking it to the communication practices necessary for the office work and scientific management that accompanied mass manufacturing.

Wan concludes by connecting the case studies to contemporary sites of citizenship negotiation that are tied to literacy. These include immigration policy like the DREAM Act, campus-wide strategic plans, and education reform like the Common Core State Standards and *A Test of Leadership*, more commonly known as the Spellings Report. All three sites, Wan points out, "defines students almost exclusively in terms of their productive capacities" for the knowledge economy. Ultimately, *Producing Good Citizens* recognizes literacy as an important tool for producing citizens and public subjectivities and asks us to consider what kind of societies we are helping to produce when our rote invocations of citizenship don't question citizenship's implications for students when the leave our classrooms.

Both Farmer's and Wan's texts speculate about the kinds of public subjectivities our pedagogies teach and the lessons students take away about being public. Both raise questions of citizenship, and both ask what are the possibilities for publicness afforded by our pedagogies. In other words, at a time when public identities are limited by a closing public sphere, how can we teach students ways of authoring their identity and authorizing themselves to be public? Jonathan Alexander and Jacqueline Rhodes' answer to that question is multimodality.

Unlike other texts on new media and digital technologies, *On Multimodality: New Media in Composition Studies* doesn't uncritically champion multimodality; rather, it carefully considers how new media can broaden the disciplinary bounds of composition studies by expanding its practices and purposes. Although Alexander and Rhodes recognize the potential for the inclusion of new media to fundamentally reconfigure our work, they see composition at a crossroads and argue that because "multimedia and multimodal composing have become key ways of meaning-making among younger generations of college students" the study and teaching of twenty-first-century textual production is crucial for the further development of our field (18). Citing Cynthia Selfe, Alexander and Rhodes navigate this crossroads, arguing that rhetorical practices "are in fact the domain of composition studies" (2).

By situating rhetorical practices at the fore of composition studies, Alexander and Rhodes clear room for bringing new forms of authoring and composing into our classrooms and suggest that new media is a way to teach other ways of invention, delivery, and rhetorical possibilities for composition. As part of the purpose of the book is to explore the richness of what new media has to offer and to broaden the scope of composition studies, Alexander and Rhodes encourage us to examine new media and multimedia for their rhetorical capabilities, distinct logics, and different affordances

(19). They caution against perceiving all forms of multimodal composition as equally valid, and they caution against reducing the various media and modes to one another. This includes viewing new media through "print-driven compositional aims, biases, and predispositions" (19). That is, though multimodal texts are composed, *everything* is not writing. It is not lost on Alexander and Rhodes that multimodal composition is necessarily circulated and consumed in different forums and that to teach multimodality also requires us to "teach students to participate productively in different public spheres … [and] engage a more rhetorically sophisticated *techne* of such participation" (20).

Much of the exploration on multimodality comes from Alexander and Rhodes, and their colleagues' own experiences with working with and teaching it. *On Multimodality* is intended for composition teachers who have only recently come to multimedia or who are looking for an access point into this subfield of composition. That is, the audience for this book is the novice practitioner of new and multimedia. As such, the first chapter traces a history of new media in composition studies and the pedagogical and disciplinary pressures that have shaped its uptake thus far. What's more is that while laying down this foundation, Alexander and Rhodes provide an excellent literature review of the texts that continue to influence the field's ideological perspectives of new media as well as important theoretical texts in new media studies and publics theory. This is work that has helped compositionists in this area reimagine and broaden how multimodality can be taken up in composition studies and that has influenced Alexander and Rhodes' own thinking in the "logics" and "affordances" of different media and technological platforms.

The next three chapters examine some of the more common "genres" of multimedia composing that are found in composition classrooms. Each chapter is dedicated to one genre: video narratives, photo manipulation and photo mashups, and video gaming. These chapters are at once a critique of the ways print-centric approaches to composition are often privileged in the production and study of these genres and also an exploration of the generative rhetorical possibilities afforded by these genres. Criticism is strongest in the first of these chapters, "Direct to Video: Rewriting the Literacy Narrative." Alexander and Rhodes survey videos produced for composition and advanced composition courses that have been posted online. They find more often than not these assignments simply replicate text-essays and their structures in video form. They examine some of the reasons why these assignments result in the lackluster forms they do and suggest our attentions should focus on genre and expanded models of how students engage with and ultimately play with it. The rest of the chapter attends to generative questions and the generative capacities video affords. They also offer detailed assignment descriptions of their own and of their colleagues along with descriptions of the units and scaffolding that lead students to engage with video as its own form. Without being prescriptive they provide enough variety in materials and approaches that teachers can feel comfortable in developing their own assignments and projects.

The next chapter on photo manipulation offers the clearest example of the generative capacities of new media to communicate ideas in ways print cannot. It argues that in an image-laden world, students can learn to be "prosumerists" in that they can both understand how they are formed by the messages of the images they consume while at the same time they can produce images that challenge those norms and cultural narratives. Alexander and Rhodes imagine that the spectacle of representa-

tion allows students to participate in their own public authoring. They use their own their own photo manipulation projects in which they queer gender norms to demonstrate how manipulation can be used "as a pedagogical tool to provoke critical reflection" and be used in rhetorical action (117).

The third chapter on video games turns to the "collaborative and interactive ways in which composers engage media spaces as sites of literacy development" (127). Alexander and Rhodes avoid the obvious text-centric justifications for bringing gaming into a classroom, that on a basic level games are "textually and visually rich and require quite a bit of reading, writing, and multimodal thinking" and instead want to use games to consider "multimodality as both multiple modes of communication and multiple paths and possibilities of communicative interaction" (128). The case studies Alexander and Rhodes provide not only demonstrate the various modes and interactions that occur in these spaces and how they are navigated by gamers, but more importantly they focus on how gamers manipulate these gaming spaces to "write" their own experiences. That is, the case studies examine the ways in which gamers collaboratively play against the designs of the game creators and play according to their own ideas about the game space. Alexander and Rhodes argue that the literacy practices to do so are highly complex and require "compositional flexibility" (168). They also suggest that there is great possibility for transferable skills and robust communicative practices" to be learned in these highly collaborative spaces (168). The chapter concludes with suggestions as to how gaming can be brought into the composition classroom. These range from the more basic, using the game itself as a text for discussion and reflection on students' own literacy development, to more complicated projects of students creating and designing their own games. With each suggestion, Alexander and Rhodes provide lenses that encourage students to critically engage the rich literacy environment and generate meta-analyses and meta-writing that examine such environments.

Up to this point in the book, Alexander and Rhodes examine particular kinds of multimodal composition, their rhetorical possibilities, and their importance to the composition classroom. They also explore the possibilities for students to author their own public subjectivities through developing an understanding of the rhetorical affordances available through that specific media, including an understanding of the way it circulates. The final chapter of the book changes course, drawing attention to how representation and the construction of subjectivity is crafted and enforced through engagement in multimodal online spaces. At the heart of this chapter is their concern that the "networked sphere has implications for the subject and our sense of subjectivity" that cannot be ignored (175). Alexander and Rhodes use a variety of multimedia responses and their normalizing discourse to the 2007 Virginia Tech shooting as a case study to theorize how persuasion works in multimediated public spheres. This case study is intended to model a pedagogy that helps students consider how media "purposefully or unconsciously" can be used to discipline and normalize subjects (200). Alexander and Rhodes write that "[w]e cannot robustly teach students how to mine the rhetorical affordances of media unless we also enact pedagogies that think about mediation and subjectivity together" (200). And so the final chapter acts as a check against the previous chapters. By examining how multimedia environments also produce normalizing discourse it cautions us against uncritically assuming multimodality is liberatory and democratic, ideas we are quick to champion as they have been woven into our pedagogies at least since the social turn.

Although studies in multimodality and multimodal pedagogies have been a particular subfield of composition studies for thirty years, if not longer, the rapid development and proliferation of new media and digital technologies has made multimodality an increasingly important aspect of our field. These sudden changes call for theorizing about new media and its application and relevance in composition studies. With a strong commitment to pedagogy, *On Multimodality* invites teachers to develop new practices and participate in discussions that have the potential to broaden our field.

The three books discussed here, despite their distinct subject matters, offer a glimpse of what is around our current turn. They recognize that by taking the social turn we commit our pedagogies to social justice; in a moment when the closing of public spaces and the politics of discourse create narrow public subjectivities that offer little in the way of affecting change, of acting and enacting, our pedagogies must teach students to create publics and also explore the rhetorical possibilities available for composing our own subjectivities and enacting our own citizenship. These books embrace rhetoric as both an analytical and a productive art and understand that the two are not mutually exclusive. Forming publics lends itself to multimodality, and multimodality lends itself to forming publics; and so our current turn is a rhetorical turn in which students are productive in writing their own citizenship and subjectivities.

Like Alexander and Jarratt's essay, these texts challenge the perceived efficacy of our public engagement and the relevance of the institutional literacies we teach to public life. Wan's book makes clear that literacy instruction and our citizen-subjectivities are often informed by and serve the needs of the institutions we inhabit and which sponsor instruction. Pressures from an increasingly corporate university that include budget austerity, accountability assessment, and an emphasis on efficiency push our instruction toward literacies that are useful for the knowledge-economy and away from meaningful public engagement. Yet by committing to the social turn, we commit our pedagogies to social justice and ethical action. In order to teach a rhetoric from below and teach students ways of engaging, ways of producing their own public subjectivities, and ways of acting in the world there needs to be a more robust engagement with publics and counterpublics theory and multimodality within literacy studies scholarship. Farmer, Wan, and Alexander and Rhodes begin that process and continue the trajectory of the social turn.

WORKS CITED

Alexander, Jonathan, and Susan C. Jarratt. "Rhetorical Education and Student Activism." *College English* 76.6 (2014): 525-44. Print.

Alexander, Jonathan, and Jacqueline Rhodes. *On Multimodality: New Media in Composition Studies*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 2014. Print.

Farmer, Frank. *After the Public Turn: Composition, Counterpublics, and the Citizen Bricoleur*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2013. Print.

Rhodes, Jacqueline, and JonathanAlexander. "Reimagining the Social Turn: New Work From the Field." *College English* 76.6 (2014): 481-87. Print.

Wan, Amy J. *Producing Good Citizens: Literacy Training in Anxious Times*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2014. Print.

Welch, Nancy. *Living Room: Teaching Public Writing in a Privatized World*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2008. Print.

Teaching as a Political Practice

Rebekah J. Buchanan—Western Illinois University

The day after the election I sat down and wrote a commentary for Tri-States Public Radio called "Teaching Faith in Our Democratic Process." I was unsure what I would find in my classrooms or what the atmosphere on campus would be, but I knew that I had to find real and focused ways in which to continue to promote activism and social justice in my classrooms and community. Although I see myself as an activist in and outside the classroom, I wanted to make sure I was mindful about approaching the social justice work I do as we moved into a new presidency and a new way of leadership in our country.

I was also reminded that there is continued work to do in talking about advocacy and leadership with other educators. After Donald Trump's victory, NCTE (National Council of Teachers of English) member Paul Thomas posted a link to his blog post, *Dark Mourning in America: "The world is at least/fifty percent terrible"* in one of NCTE's Connected Communities (Teaching and Learning). By the end of the day, the post had received almost 50 replies, with some contributors explaining why the classroom is not a place for politics and why it's important to keep politics out of professional organizations such as NCTE. On the other hand, there were some strong feelings about why the discussion of the election and recent events is important to address in our schools, classrooms, and professional organizations.

The discussion engaged educators and scholars at all levels, prompting NCTE President Doug Hesse to post a paragraph from the conclusion of the Presidential Address that he would be giving at the NCTE Conference in Atlanta later in the week:

> The identity that brings us all to Atlanta today is that of teacher. What unites all of us is our commitment to our students, our belief in language, in reading and writing, in literate lives of possibility, in worlds enlarged through language to be more decent, humane, and peaceful. That holds us together. Of course, there are people in this room who hold different views on many things. I take those differences as things to be prized, shared, and explored--not as things to be regretted. We gather around our sacred common purpose.

Hesse's words remind me of why I teach. For me, teaching has always been a political act. Following pedagogical thinkers such as John Dewey, Paolo Friere, and bell hooks, I work to create learning situations where students become self-aware, critical thinkers, and "agents of change." As Freire argues, education is never neutral. We either continue to recreate the status quo or we challenge our world and valued knowledge.

We often recreate the status quo without realizing it. Or, do so even in our attempts to challenge it. The texts we choose for students to read say as much as those we ask them not to read. One way

that I have made an effort to engage students in the politics of education and teaching is through mindfulness. I am mindful about my choices of texts and explicit with students about not only my choices of texts in the class, but the texts I chose not to use and why. If I choose to just present my reading lists to students without discussion, I am doing no more to challenge valued knowledge—my valued knowledge—than someone who uses texts that I might be weary of teaching.

For example, in my Teaching Writing in Secondary Schools course, I share with students why I choose to use the texts of Penny Kittle and Kelly Gallagher as examples of teacher practitioners. We look at Kittle's and Gallagher's histories of writing and teaching and their approaches to their students and classrooms. In doing so, I am explicit about why I feel that Kittle and Gallagher approach teaching writing in the high school classroom in ways I find effective and inspirational. I also contrast them to other classroom approaches. We talk just as much about the classrooms Kittle and Gallagher create and the students they work with as we do their pedagogical approaches. I have found that the more explicit I am with students about my choices, the more open they are in talking about their own choices. I know that not all of my students have the same beliefs about teaching, learning, and politics that I do. And I don't pretend that they should, but I also believe that it is important for me to address my beliefs in the classroom in meaningful and constructive ways. I choose to do this through what I ask them to read as well as the ways I encourage them to write and reflect.

As a scholar who uses New Literacy Studies as a framework for most of my scholarship, I see literacy as social, cultural, and political. I believe that the writing I ask my students to do will either encourage them to think critically and examine cultural norms, or it will perpetuate the status quo. To this end, I try to encourage students to use writing as a tool of activism. We use writing to address what is taking place on campus and in our larger community. For example, we actively discuss what the nomination and approaching confirmation of Betsy DeVos[1] will mean for students who are choosing a career in public education. Students are asked to read and watch about what is happening with the confirmation hearing of Ms. DeVos and then write to their senators about the how they feel about the choice of DeVos as Secretary of Education. Although I can't require writing senators, I can engage students in a conversation about our current educational climate (something they care about deeply) and then encourage them to be active participants in the larger community. After our discussions, many students have said they have sent letters or called their senators with their concerns.

This semester I find that I am also spending more time encouraging students to look at historical contexts for current political actions. This semester I am using the rhetoric of our current political and activist cultures for discussion and analysis. As I teach a course on Feminist Activist Communities of Writing, I am introducing my students to the ways in which some of the current actions, such as the Women's March, echo what women's suffrage activists did during the 1913 March on Washington, what civil rights activists did during the Selma March and the March on Washington, what activists against sexual assault did during Take Back the Night marches and Slut Walks.

I see it as a continuation of what literacy scholars have proposed throughout the past five years of *Literacy in Composition Studies*. In the second issue, Gerald Campano addresses how theoretical and methodological orientations from practitioner researchers such as Cochran-Smith and Lytle,

and identity and experience theorists such as Alcoff, Mohanty, and Moya help him navigate his reading of *LiCS*. Campano presents the story of the writings of the performance arts and literacy group Dancing Across Borders where students use art and performance to present their narratives of schooling, asking "their audiences to take seriously their claims about schooling, particularly the ways in which the institution can exclude and perpetuate inequality" (80). It is work such as this that encourages me as I design experiences for my students that will motivate them to be active citizens and participants in our democracy.

LiCS has a history of addressing the political. Phyllis Mentzell Ryder argues for Malala Yousafzai's counter-narrative where Malala controls the representation of her attack and her choices to not "justify revenge on the 'bad Muslims'" (179). Mentzell Ryder presents Malala's rhetoric of nonviolent action as a dismantling of the revenge narrative. Mentzell Ryder ends her piece calling on scholars to return to the work of Gramsci and Spivak and "focus on the potential agency of subaltern voices" (184). I have used Mentzell Ryder's piece with students who have taught *I Am Malala* in the small, rural communities surrounding my institution. I have worked with one of our student teachers as she found ways to engage her rural farming community with Yousafzai's text. Her predominantly white Christian students loved *I Am Malala,* and the discussions they had around language, religion, and acceptance helped her better approach discussions of the election as they unfolded in her student teaching classroom this fall.

We are entering a time in the United States where the current political climate makes it acceptable to other whole groups of people based on fears and concepts that others have fought against. But I would argue that much of this is not new. There is a deep history of –isms in American culture. There is also a deep history of activism and movement-based change. For me, what's happening on campuses and in the larger public is a reminder that we cannot ever be complacent. We must continue to purposefully create classrooms where dialogue and activism are at the center, and students and faculty are both being mindful of the ways in which the classroom and literacy are political.

NOTES

[1] As of the writing of this piece, DeVos' nomination had not yet been confirmed.

WORKS CITED

Campano, Gerald. "Literacies In/For Action: Prefigurative Pedagogies and Collective
      Knowledge Projects." *Literacy in Composition Studies* 1.2 (2013): 78-85. Web. 12 Mar. 2017.

Dewey, John. *Experience and Education*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997. Print.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed, 30th Anniversary ed.* London: Continuum, 2006. Print.

Gallagher, Kelly. *Write Like This: Teaching Real-World Writing Through Modeling and Mentor Texts*.
      Portland, ME: Stenhouse, 2011. Print.

Hesse, Douglas. "RE: Dark Mourning in America: 'The World Is at Least/Fifty Percent Terrible'"
      NCTE Teaching and Learning Forum. National Council of Teachers of English, 12
      Nov. 2016. Web. 31 Jan. 2017.

hooks, bell. *Teaching to Transgress*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Kittle, Penny. *Write Beside Them: Risk, Voice, and Clarity in High School Writing*. Portsmouth:
      Heinemann Educational Books. 2008. Print.

Mentzell Ryder, Phyllis. "Beyond Critique: Global Activism and the Case of Malala
      Yousafzai." *Literacy in Composition Studies* 3.1 (2015): 175-87. Web. 12 Mar. 2017.

Contemplative Listening, Contemplative Literacy

Christian Smith—Coastal Carolina University

live and teach in a state that flew the confederate flag on the statehouse lawn until July of 2015. It was removed only after nine were shot dead in a racially charged hate crime and still, only then, after mounting pressure and one woman, Bree Newsome, scaled the 30' flagpole to take the flag down herself. I used to think that there was something about the Deep South that made every moment in the classroom imbibed with a sense of urgency that was somehow unique; I no longer feel this way. The presidential election last year demonstrated that a candidate could encourage racist discourse and court white supremacists and still be voted in by millions outside of the south. So, now that we have an administration that continues to normalize racist and xenophobic discourse many of us—writing teachers, literacy scholars—are wondering what we can do and how we might be uniquely positioned to respond.

At this point, I think the appropriate response is to highlight all the work that has been done on listening in our related fields. Encourage classrooms insistent on the practice of listening to multiple voices for the common places of identification we can build on. Listening not to further validate white supremacist discourse, but to note the ways that our students are often emotionally identified with the cultural logics of racism in ways they wouldn't advocate if questioned explicitly. As Krista Ratcliffe's work on rhetorical listening makes clear, these logics are reactions that play out through emotional identifications and triggered responses. I think of the student who offers the knee-jerk response "all lives matter!" when discussing the #BlackLivesMatter movement, without realizing how such a response works to undermine legitimate concerns and is, above all, an unwillingness to listen to those concerns. Rhetorical listening and an attunement to the relationships between ideology and language, on the other hand, can look for spaces of mutual identification. As James Baldwin mentioned in an interview with *Life* magazine in 1963:

> Most Americans lead lives they deny, and they find it almost impossible to be coherent on any level. You have to listen very hard to a college president or an elevator operator to find out what it is he's really saying. They are both trapped between the language imposed on them, which is not theirs, and what they really want to say, which they don't trust. (qtd. in Howard 89)

As literacy researchers and teachers of writing, I would argue attending to these *between* spaces of language is not only always necessary but also currently absolutely vital—but how? And what might this look like in practice? For me, the growing movement of contemplative pedagogy in higher education is an appropriate place to start.

For the past fifteen or so years, many in the academy have worked towards articulating the

relationship between pedagogy and mindfulness. Academics working to incorporate mindful practice in a range of courses and have discovered the ways mindfulness may affect retention, transfer, and metacognitive awareness. More specifically to my concerns here, they have been questioning how such practices may work towards antiracist pedagogies for social justice. According to Arthur Zajonc, one of the most well-known advocates, contemplative pedagogical practices "support the development of student attention, emotional balance, empathetic connection, compassion, and altruistic behavior" (83). Similarly, in writing studies, Gesa E. Kirsch has argued that contemplative practices "can enhance creativity, listening, and expression of meaning—key goals of most writing courses" (W2). More recently, Christy I. Wenger's landmark book, *Yoga Minds, Writing Bodies: Contemplative Writing Pedagogy*, has given literacy workers a framework to think through these issues. As Wenger notes:

> Mindful knowing is, by default, connected knowing as it refuses the mindless fragmentation of our scattered lives. Along the way, this contemplative model may help student writers find balance and compassion on and off the page; teaching difference as embodied may lead to stronger and more pragmatic understandings of social justice and personal transformation through the formation of an embodied, feminist-contemplative ethics. (26)

Wegner's *mindless fragmentation* speaks to the ways that conflicting cultural logics often play out in both our teaching practices and our student's writing. Further, I would argue, attuning ourselves to this fragmentation may be the central concern of a rhetorical education. If we take Richard Lanham's definition of rhetoric as the "science of human attention-structures" (134) seriously, then the *composition of* attention itself becomes a literacy worth thinking about. In my own classes, this has been encouraged through mindful practice and contemplative reading.

Contemplative reading practices in the classroom work by inviting students to sit in silence before reading aloud a mutual text together—going from student to student until the text is finished and, again, sitting in silence. Rather than the pressure that comes with an obligation to immediately respond, contemplative reading resists the need to respond by focusing on sitting with the text itself and becoming mindful of the cultural logics the text elicits. In *Contemplative Practices in Higher Education,* Daniel P. Barbezat and Mirabai Bush discuss how contemplative reading practices are ways to practice close critical reading but note how the immediate judgments and emotional responses of the reader become folded into the text itself. Such practices, I feel, can work to expose cultural logics without an immediate identification with them. In that moment between, that aporetic pause, is an invitation to practice listening.

Recent research suggests something that many of us have known for a long time: social media reinforces our political and cultural biases. How could it be that, this time last year, so many on the left were elated by what looked like a complete collapse of the GOP only to be shown that something closer to the opposite was true after November 8th? How many of us sat with increasing disbelief until the final results were in? If nothing else, such a disjuncture gestures towards the need for increased listening to genuine grievances to discover mutual identifications. This is not to say that we normalize

white supremacist discourse or that we validate xenophobia—in the classroom or anywhere else—but that we encourage silence, and practice listening to the cultural logics and discourses we are all enacting.

WORKS CITED

Barbezat, Daniel P. and Mirabai Bush. *Contemplative Practices in Higher Education: Powerful Methods to Transform Teaching and Learning.* Jossey-Bass. 2014.

Howard, Jane. "Doom and Glory of Knowing Who You Are." *LIFE Magazine*, 24 May 1963, 86-90. Web. 11 Mar. 2017.

Kirsch, Gesa E. "From Introspection to Action: Connecting Spirituality and Civic Engagement." *College Composition and Communication* 60.4 (2009): W1-W15. Print.

Lanham, Richard. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms.* U of California P, 1991.

Wegner, Christina I. *Yoga Minds, Writing Bodies: Contemplative Writing Pedagogy.* The WAC Clearinghouse, 2015.

Zajonc, Arthur. "Contemplative Pedagogy: A Quiet Revolution in Higher Education." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 134 (2013): 83-94. Web. 11 Mar. 2017.

"I Hear Its Chirping Coming From My Throat": Activism, Archives, and the Long Road Ahead

Steve Parks—Syracuse University

Several weeks ago, I opened an email from my colleague Bassam al-Ahmad, with the message, "Can you please proof this interview for inclusion in our archival database." The database was the result of a year-long partnership which had produced *Syrians for Truth and Justice* (stj-sy.com), an organization founded by human rights activists which had created a network of citizen journalists across Syria to record the many abuses associated with the current conflict. Indeed, many of the founders of *STJ*, themselves, had been the victims of harassment, detention, and torture by the Assad government.

Looking quickly at the attached document, I learned that the subject of the interview was Dr. Jafal Nofa, a Syrian doctor who was arrested by Syria's Assad government for using civil disobedience to advocate for human rights. Near the end of the interview, when reflecting upon his experience of extreme torture and deprivation, he tells the following story about a young boy:

The most painful incident I can never forget is the story of a young boy.

The boy was arrested during a police campaign along with 15 other children. They were detained for 10 years. A few months before release, he was brought to Adra civil prison. He was a young man in his twenties at the time. He was hyperactive, moving a lot, and playing all the time. I asked him whether he gets bored from doing this or not. He answered that he cannot rest and he could never know the meaning of being quiet. I asked him why and he narrated his sad story to me:

"After I was arrested as a young boy, I was taken to Palmyra Prison. One cold day, they put us out in the yard to stand there as punishment. A small bird fell on the ground, unable to move its wings or fly. I stared at it with the tenderness of a child, but one of the guards saw me and asked whether I liked it. I remained silent because I was afraid to answer. So he asked me again, but this time in an aggressive and loud voice. I hesitantly answered that it was a nice bird. He ordered me to go and get it. When I held it in my hands, it was chirping. For a short while, I thought that this guard hadn't lost all of his humanity or maybe he is here against his will. I hadn't completed the thought when I heard him asking me to swallow this bird. I didn't understand and I asked how could I swallow it alive! He shouted at me and ordered me to swallow it. So I did. This incident happened years ago, but up till this moment, I hear its chirping coming from my throat, especially in moments of silence. I hate to remember that incident, and this is why I don't like to stay calm.

***

Part of the goal of this symposium is to address the question, "What is to be done?" One way to situate a response would be to talk about the need for activism—connecting our classes to community campaigns for justice, organizing street marches, and lobbying against discriminatory and racist policies (see Trump's recent "travel ban" executive order). Such actions are vitally necessary. And I hope to be able to continue to do such work in the near and distant future.

I want to use this space, however, to focus on a different type of work, one perhaps seemingly a bit distant from such actions—the creation of archives as sites of documented experience as an aligned strategy from which the above-mentioned activism can benefit and draw upon. And I want to do so by discussing a set of projects in which I have been fortunate enough to participate—projects that begin in the UK, extend to the Middle East, and ultimately end in documenting a young girl's journey from Guatemala to Philadelphia.

Archiving History/Documenting Atrocities

For the past twenty years, I have been working with the Federation of Worker Writers and Community Publishers (FWWCP). The organization originated in the late 1970s in the United Kingdom, during the period which would lead to Thatcherism, the deliberate destruction of working class institutions, and the implementation of a neo-liberal agenda marked by de-industrialization and, as recently debated in the UK, increased global immigration. During this period, as you might expect, there was an intense reconsideration of working class identity—a reconsideration that manifested in some instances to an uptick in the National Front, to some working-class allegiance to Thatcher, and to the consistent defeat of Labor. Clearly I am painting with a broad brush here.

Within this historical moment, the FWWCP was an interesting counterweight. For the organization was a network of close to 100 individual working-class writing groups, spread across the United Kingdom, who self-published their individual and communal histories. The writers were miners, dockworkers, and sign painters; some of them could write with ease, some of them struggled with basic literacy tasks. As the organization expanded, the writers began to include Caribbean, African, and Middle Eastern immigrants. Writers began to emerge from disabled, LBGT and survivor communities. And through yearly meetings that brought these groups together, they collectively did the difficult work of creating a vision of the working class which was inclusive, premised upon the value of laboring experience, and which attempted to organize for an increased recognition of working-class values and legitimate needs. To me, they were organic intellectuals, organizing as a community for increased cultural literacy and political rights. And their literacy activism soon became the model for my own efforts to establish similar work first in Philadelphia and then in Syracuse.

But the FWWCP and its writers were also mostly poor or working poor. And in 2007 and 2008, the organization went bankrupt.

Suddenly a network that had lasted 30 years, circulating over one million self-published working-class writings, was reduced to a disparate set of locations, where publications were resting in attics and basements. That is, the FWWCP had been too poor to have established its own archive, and, within the UK, their work was not seen as "literature" (at least by the British Arts Council) so they

also had no university presence. Consequently, it seemed to me and my UK partners, the FWWCP's legacy would be unavailable for future worker writers and working class literacy activists.

And so with my colleague, Nick Pollard, from Sheffield Hallam University, Jessica Pauszek, from Syracuse University, and the members of the newly formed "FED" (a reconstituted FWWCP), we decided to create an archive of this work. In this sense, my involvement in archival work emerged in response to a specific crisis within a community that was in danger of having its self-defined history slowly vanish. While there are many methodological and theoretical issues which could be explored, for the purposes of this article, I just want to point out that, after many setbacks, an archive of over 2,500 FWWCP publications now exists at London Metropolitan University.

And I want to highlight one aspect of our collaborative work. In creating the archival categories, we invoked the practices of community literacy partnerships. We worked with FWWCP founding members and members of its former writing groups to create the organizing categories of the collection. We also attended annual festivals of the new FED to get feedback and insight. That is, our goal in creating the archive was not merely to save the texts, but to articulate the theoretical and cultural framework within which those texts were produced—the FED's understanding of what it meant to be worker writers writing about being working class. Moreover, our strategic goal was to use the prestige of the university to claim important work had been done by the FWWCP—work that scholars and students could learn from.

This sense of needing to preserve the voices and texts of oppressed individuals and communities, of the need to build a model which demonstrated the framework which produced those stories, and using university prestige to validate the results of this work, ultimately led me to my colleague, Bassam al-Ahmad and, as a consequence, to read the "bird" story which appeared in my email.

Prior to our meeting, Bassam had worked at the Syrian Center for Media and Free Expression. At the outset of the Arab Spring protests, the organization's offices were stormed by Assad's troops. Bassam was captured, tortured, and held in a detention center for almost a year. At one point, he was granted a trial and released on the promise of returning to face charges. Instead, he escaped to Turkey. I met him when he was a Democracy Fellow at Syracuse University. Together with other Syrian activists, we created Syrians for Truth and Justice (STJ), a project partially housed at Syracuse University. As noted above, STJ uses a network of in-country Syrian citizen journalists to record the systemic violation of human rights now occurring, such as the intentional bombing of civilian sites. Through connections in refugee camps and refugee communities, we are also recording testimonies of survivors of torture not only from Assad's government, but from ISIS and the proliferating militias.

We are currently developing a project to sponsor a series of reconciliation workshops designed to help repair some of the damage done by state-sponsored sectarian violence, militia sponsored relocations, and ISIS atrocities. And we are beginning to attempt to map the network of detention centers used by each of these organizations and, by doing so, demonstrate how these personal experiences were the result of systemic efforts. Here the goal is to record the horrors produced by that system and, hopefully, help to create spaces where individuals and communities can rebuild a sense of a future, a future marked by inclusion and tolerance.

Creating Networks at Home

Viewing the recent presidential election from the perspective of my English and Syrian colleagues, it was clear how the past year has been marked by the articulation of working-class concerns into an anti-immigrant, anti-Muslim bigotry, a bigotry always existent under a false decorum of manners, but now being expressed with full-throated enthusiasm. When additionally interwoven with blatant sexism, it too often felt like much of the progressive inclusive rhetoric that has attempted to mark work in literacy in composition had been for naught. Or at least, what we imagined to be the political efficacy of our work, the strategies taught to students and infused in our partnerships here and abroad, seemed to be called into question. Certainly, "community" as an organizing term hadn't carried the collective power imagined in the face of a nationalist "Make America Great Again" mantra.

It was for me, at least, a very depressing period—a period made worse when placed in the context of colleagues who can no longer enter the country; of students who face (along with their families) deportation, often back to violent and conflict-ridden contexts; of classrooms where an undercurrent of distrust and animosity always seems ready to break forth. And to be honest, I am less than sure about any answer I might offer to "What can be done?"

And yet, like so many others, I need to move forward.

And so, I have recently taken on a new project brought to me by an old friend, Mark Lyons, whose work on Mexican migrant farm workers was published by my press, New City Community Press (NCCP), over ten years ago. He approached me about an oral history concerning a fourteen-year old girl who travelled from Guatemala to the United States, primarily by herself, only to be caught at the border and placed in detention. Her detention led to a hearing, which led to an abusive foster home, and ultimately to her being brought into the life of a Philadelphia family where education and a future were made possible. Of course, I am clearly shrinking the complexity of this story quite significantly. I mention elements of her story to state that my press also agreed to publish the testimony. And in deciding to publish the story, I was also deciding to use elements of our field (community publishing, narrative, cultural rhetoric, etc.) to invest her experience within a network that could produce a curricular, cultural, and legal response to the current political moment. Similar to the work with STJ and the FED, then, it was an attempt to create a counter-narrative in which actual (not alternate) facts could be established and used by multiple parties in support of important political work.

Now I had certainly attempted such work before, often in the service of producing a systemic change in a local neighborhood. With this book, I am thinking about how to begin a process of weaving together a new constellation of alliances, one that perhaps begins in the local moment of a classroom but that is fully articulated across the parallel streams of local, regional, national, and international networks of economic and political power. Too often, I think, by not drawing these additional contexts into the work at hand, I have come to believe that the small change produced by such publications only ameliorated the worse elements of systemic trends, masking the true source of the problem actually being faced. And I have come to realize, hopefully not too late, that there is a connection between the history of this (now) young woman from Guatemala, the experiences of the working class in England, and my colleagues in Syria. It is not a straight line, a clear path, but

it is a network that needs to be brought to light in community publications so that readers can find commonality, not enemies, as they look outward from their home to the broader world that dictates much of their existence.

Moreover, the goal should be more than to simply trace rhetorical or material networks of possible alliances. It should also include a search to think through moments where potential alliances had been disarticulated, fractured, under the force of the past election cycle. These nodal points needed to be re-established, needed to be brought back into contact to maintain and expand the possibilities of equity, inclusion, and justice. In *History and Class Consciousness,* György Lukács speaks of capitalism as a state of constant crisis management, one endlessly stitching together micro-moments to sustain its global dominance. I understand the current moment as one in which the "global order" is attempting to patch over the Trump/Brexit phenomena of economic nationalism (though not perhaps the bigotry implied in such attitudes). And I see our role as countering this attempt, drawing together different alliances, moving in a different direction.

That is, I am less interested in learning how to stitch my values into the current triumph, discover a nostalgic (and racialized) vision of "middle America," then I see the work as being part of a concerted effort to create alternative networks which establish the hegemony of progressive inclusive economic and cultural values. And for this to occur, the term "community" and community publications have to be re-cast less as a description of bounded geographic spaces, but instead as moments of global narratives being imbricated in local histories. An imbrication that if interrupted by local moments of resistance could ripple outward, and, if such resistant moments could be aligned with other such moments, perhaps an alternative future could be created.

For here is the essential point, undergirding all of the above: each of these archival projects are premised upon the ability of bodies—defined by others and literally fixed in space by policies and treated as other, as "illegal" or "terrorist,"—that found a way to move anyway. That is, these documentation projects reveal an agency, a mobility, which both disrupts the centrality of Western narratives which demonize their bodies and demands we align with them, work to support and expand their ability to move beyond such narrow categorizations, and support those local moments of resistance until in their sheer number they tip the web of connections that stands for "global" into a new direction, perhaps one based upon a sense of a different set of values, goals, and dreams.

And here, I should add that, in practice, the work looks much less "revolutionary" then might be imagined from the above rhetoric. In fact, a lot of the work of publishing the book and drawing it into a larger effort has meant creating a small team of dedicated students (Rafael Evans, Molly Velaquez, and Zach Barlow), long-time immigrant activists (Mark Lyons) and myself. It has involved considering what resources could be linked to this story, how those linkages could materially interrupt work at schools, agencies, detention centers, and policies in Philadelphia. It has meant considering how such interruptions could be linked/aligned with regional and national moments. It has been the slow work of calling individuals, establishing moments of intersecting interests, creating common conversational and policy-informed spaces. That is, it has meant using all the rhetorical skills, conceptions of literacy, and understandings of power that mark our field in the service of deliberate actions, momentary tactics, and strategies for change.

Finally, on a personal level, for me, it has meant the beginning of re-situating the landscape of my location in the discipline, primarily marked by a focus on local communities, outwards towards a focus on a system of momentary alliances and friction that produce "the global" in all its oppressions and opportunities. And I am in the process of re-educating myself to be an effective ally in this new landscape, to understand what engaging in work that frames community within multiple global contexts simultaneously can and can not produce. I consistently ask myself how the voices of those in Syria, the UK, and the US, from Daraa to Birmingham to Philadelphia, could be linked in a disruptive fashion towards an articulation of an alternative set of nodal points that better support an inclusive world. So where I realize others came to this realization earlier—have written more theoretically and eloquently than I am now—when pressed for an answer to "What do we do now?" And I have found myself replying, "We learn, we act, we build, and we continue."

The Long Road Ahead

I began by posing archival and documentation work as aligned and supportive of political work being done by street activist, policy advocates, and non-profit organizations, all of whom are attempting to navigate the new "information landscape" that has emerged post-election. And through the work of the FWWCP, STJ, and NCCP documentation projects, I've tried to show how such work can demonstrate the power of past collective actions, the importance of recording the present, and the possibility of building a better future.

That is, the FWWCP archive is about documenting an inclusive and, we might say, human rights-based conceptual framework for working-class identity; STJ is about archiving its opposite—an armed network dedicated to torture and violence, to the elimination of any such a human rights framework; and, finally, the work of NCCP has become about documenting the experiences of those on the margins of the current political/economic system and beginning to consider how such experiences might produce the possibility of new alliances, new futures.

I want to end, however, with a more immediate purpose for such work. In all of these documentation projects, there is an attempt to use our disciplinary skills to accurately record, document, and archive fundamental facts about what occurred at specific historical moments to communities in crisis.

Facts which can document systemic human rights abuses.

Facts which can be used, we hope, to bring the perpetuators of such abuses to justice and reconciliation.

Facts that demonstrate the possibility of building, through dialogue and collaboration, inclusive visions of just communities.

I end with this stress on the value of facts because, today, it could be argued that we are increasingly living in a fact-free media culture or, at least, in a culture where basic facts are placed into "equal time" conversations with propaganda and false news. Within such a toxic media mix, my fear is that the voices and experiences of those on the wrong side of privilege and progress are being lost. Or rather, I fear the concerns of the oppressed have few platforms which can validate the legitimacy of their claims, can present evidence for the need to redress their concerns, and can be

used to collaboratively develop new economic policies premised on equality and tolerance, policies not smeared with racial animus but meant to create the context for true social justice.

And so out of these beliefs, several years ago and still today, I turned to archival and documentation work—to the slow methodological collection of testimony, texts, recordings, and visual artifacts that evidences an alternative moral universe, an alternative framework from which to shape a public and political agenda. And I do so intentionally from and within a university setting because, despite the slowly eroding effect of right wing attacks on such institutions, there is still a legitimating function we can serve. As scholars and researchers, we can use our degrees, our publications, and, yes, our archives to validate the struggles of those whose bodies are on the front lines of human rights struggles.

That is, I like to believe that perhaps, even from our most privileged of positions, and perhaps, even in the smallest of ways, we can claim to have stood in alliance with those whose humanity is under assault, but who continue to try move forward.

Perhaps, that is, we help create a world where birds can fly and young children are allowed to look at them in wonder.

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATES